

# ON MINIMAX OPTIMALITY OF SPARSE BAYES PREDICTIVE DENSITY ESTIMATES

BY GOURAB MUKHERJEE AND IAIN M. JOHNSTONE

*University of Southern California and Stanford University*

We study predictive density estimation under Kullback-Leibler loss in  $\ell_0$ -sparse Gaussian sequence models. We propose proper Bayes predictive density estimates and establish asymptotic minimaxity in sparse models.

A surprise is the existence of a phase transition in the future-to-past variance ratio  $r$ . For  $r < r_0 = (\sqrt{5} - 1)/4$ , the natural discrete prior ceases to be asymptotically optimal. Instead, for subcritical  $r$ , a ‘bi-grid’ prior with a central region of reduced grid spacing recovers asymptotic minimaxity. This phenomenon seems to have no analog in the otherwise parallel theory of point estimation of a multivariate normal mean under quadratic loss.

For spike-and-slab priors to have any prospect of minimaxity, we show that the sparse parameter space needs also to be magnitude constrained. Within a substantial range of magnitudes, spike-and-slab priors can attain asymptotic minimaxity.

**1. Introduction and Main results.** Predictive density estimation is a fundamental problem in statistical prediction analysis [1, 7]. Here, it is studied in a high dimensional Gaussian setting under sparsity assumptions on the unknown location parameters. Fuller references and background for the problem are given after a formulation of our main results.

We consider a simple Gaussian model for high dimensional prediction:

$$(1) \quad \mathbf{X} \sim N_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_x \mathbf{I}), \quad \mathbf{Y} \sim N_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y \mathbf{I}), \quad \mathbf{X} \perp\!\!\!\perp \mathbf{Y} | \boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

Our goal is to predict the distribution of a future observation  $\mathbf{Y}$  on the basis of the ‘past’ observation vector  $\mathbf{X}$ . In this model, the past and future observations are independent, but are linked by the common mean parameter  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  which is assumed to be unknown. The variances  $v_x$  and  $v_y$  may differ and are assumed to be known.

The true probability densities of  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  are denoted by  $p(\mathbf{x} | \boldsymbol{\theta}, v_x)$  and  $p(\mathbf{y} | \boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y)$  respectively. We seek estimators  $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{x})$  of the future observation

---

*MSC 2010 subject classifications:* Primary 62C12; Secondary 62C25, 62F10, 62J07

*Keywords and phrases:* Predictive density, Asymptotic Minimavity, Proper Bayes Rule, Sparsity, High-dimensional, Least Favorable Prior, Spike and Slab

density  $p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y)$ , and study their risk properties under sparsity assumptions on  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$  as dimension  $n$  increases to  $\infty$ .

To evaluate the performance of a predictive density estimator  $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ , we use Kullback-Leibler ‘distance’ as loss function:

$$L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})) = \int p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y) \log \frac{p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y)}{\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})} d\mathbf{y}.$$

The corresponding KL risk function follows by averaging over the distribution of the past observation:

$$\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}) = \int L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})) p(\mathbf{x}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_x) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Now, given a prior measure  $\pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , the average or integrated risk is

$$(2) \quad B(\pi, \hat{p}) = \int \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}) \pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}).$$

For any prior measure  $\pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta})$ , proper or improper, such that the posterior  $\pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x})$  is well defined, the Bayes predictive density is given by

$$(3) \quad \hat{p}_\pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \int p(\mathbf{y}|\boldsymbol{\theta}, v_y) \pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x}).$$

The Bayes predictive density in (3) minimizes both the posterior expected loss  $\int L(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}(\cdot|\mathbf{x})) \pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{x})$  and the integrated risk  $B(\pi, \hat{p})$  in the class of all density estimates, e.g. Sec. 2.4 of [31]. The minimum is the Bayes KL risk:

$$(4) \quad B(\pi) := \inf_{\hat{p}} B(\pi, \hat{p}).$$

We study the predictive risk  $\rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p})$  in a high dimensional setting under an  $\ell_0$ -sparsity condition on the parameter space. This ‘exact’ sparsity condition has been widely used in statistical estimation problems, e.g. [17, Ch. 8]. With  $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 = \#\{i : \theta_i \neq 0\}$ , consider the parameter set:

$$\Theta_n[s] = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 \leq s\}.$$

The minimax KL risk for estimation over  $\Theta$  is given by

$$(5) \quad R_N(\Theta) = \inf_{\hat{p}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}),$$

the infimum being taken over *all* predictive density estimators  $\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x})$ . We often write **pde** for predictive density estimate. The notation  $a_n \sim b_n$  denotes  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $a_n = O(b_n)$  denotes  $|a_n/b_n|$  is bounded for all large  $n$ .

1.1. *Main Results.* Henceforth, we assume  $v_x = 1$ . As the problem is scale equivariant, results for general  $v_x$  will easily follow. A key parameter is the future-to-past variance ratio

$$(6) \quad r = v_y/v_x = v_y, \quad v = (1 + r^{-1})^{-1}.$$

Here  $v$  is the ‘oracle variance’ which would be the variance of the UMVUE for  $\theta$ , if both  $\mathbf{X}$  and  $\mathbf{Y}$  were observed. The variance ratio  $r$  determines not only the magnitude of the minimax risk but also the construction of minimax optimal **pdes**. In our asymptotic model, the dimension  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and the sparsity  $s = s_n$  may depend on  $n$ , but the variance ratio  $r$  remains fixed.

In the sparse limit  $\eta_n = s_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , for any fixed  $r \in (0, \infty)$ , Mukherjee and Johnstone [32] evaluated the minimax risk to be:

$$(7) \quad R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]) \sim \frac{1}{1+r} s_n \log(n/s_n) = \frac{1}{1+r} n \eta_n \log \eta_n^{-1},$$

and a thresholding based **pde** was shown to attain the minimax risk.

By their nature, thresholding rules are not smooth functions of the data. This paper develops proper Bayes **pdes** – necessarily smooth functions – that are asymptotically minimax in sparse regimes. Throughout we consider sparse symmetric priors

$$(8) \quad \pi[\eta] = (1 - \eta)\delta_0 + \frac{1}{2}\eta(\nu^+ + \nu^-),$$

where  $\delta_0$  is unit mass at 0, and  $\eta \in [0, 1]$  is the sparsity parameter, while  $\nu^+$  is a probability measure on  $(0, \infty)$  and  $\nu^-$  is its reflection on  $(-\infty, 0)$ . Priors on  $\theta$  are built from i.i.d. draws:

$$\pi_n(d\theta) = \prod_{i=1}^n \pi[\eta_n](d\theta_i),$$

where  $\eta_n = s_n/n$ . The Bayes **pde** based on prior  $\pi_n$  is the product density estimate:

$$\hat{p}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{p}(y_i|x_i).$$

We begin with a discrete ‘grid prior’  $\nu_G^+$  in which the support points have equal spacing

$$(9) \quad \lambda = \lambda(\eta) = \sqrt{2 \log \eta^{-v}},$$

and geometric mass decay at rate  $\eta^v = e^{-\lambda^2/2}$ . More precisely,

$$\nu_G^+ = (1 - \eta^v) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta^{(j-1)v} \delta_{\lambda j}.$$

The corresponding sparse grid prior  $\pi_G[\eta]$  built via (8) has a schematic illustration in Figure 1. Such discrete priors are a natural starting point for our predictive setting given their optimality properties in point estimation, recalled in the next subsection.

Our first result gives a precise description of the first order asymptotic maximum risk of the Bayes pde  $\hat{p}_G$  based on the multivariate product prior  $\pi_{G,n}$ . Define

$$(10) \quad \begin{aligned} h_r &= (1+2r)(1+r)^{-2}(1-2r-4r^2)/4 \leq 1/4 \\ h_r^+ &= \max(h_r, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Let  $r_0 = (\sqrt{5}-1)/4$  be the positive root of the equation  $4r^2 + 2r - 1 = 0$ , and note that  $h_r^+ > 0$  iff  $r < r_0$ .

**THEOREM 1.1.** *As  $\eta_n = s_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , for any fixed  $r \in (0, \infty)$  we have*

$$\max_{\Theta_n[s_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_G) = R_N(\Theta_n[s_n])(1 + h_r^+ + o(1)) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus for all  $r \geq r_0$ ,  $\hat{p}_G$  is exactly minimax optimal, while for all  $r < r_0$ , it is minimax suboptimal but still attains the minimax rate, and has maximum risk at most 1.25 times the minimax value, whatever be the value of  $r$ .

As the future-to-past variance ratio  $r$  decreases, the difficulty of the predictive density estimation problem increases, as we have to estimate the future observation density based on increasingly noisy past observations. Theorem 1.1 shows that rules which are minimax optimal for higher values of  $r$  can be sub-optimal for lower values of  $r$ . This phenomenon was seen with threshold density estimates in [32, Sec. S.2, Lemma S.2.1] as well as in the recent work of [28] on non-sparse prediction.




FIG 1. *Schematic for the grid prior. The uniform spacing  $\lambda$  between the support points is shown on the x-axis and the logarithm of the probabilities of the support points on the y-axis, the latter having linear decay.*

To obtain asymptotic minimaxity for all  $r$ , we need to modify the prior. The Bi-grid  $\pi_B$  prior is obtained from  $\pi_G$  by selecting an ‘inner zone’ on which the spacing of the prior atoms is reduced from  $\lambda$  to  $b\lambda$ , where

$$b = \min\{4r(1+r)(1+2r)^{-1}, 1\}.$$

Note that  $b < 1$  iff  $r < r_0$ . The decay ratio in the inner zone is increased from  $\eta^v = e^{-\lambda^2/2}$  to  $\eta^{vb^2} = e^{-b^2\lambda^2/2}$ . See Figure 2 for a schematic depiction.

More precisely,  $\pi_B$  is a sparse symmetric prior of form (8) with

$$\nu_B^+ = c \left[ \sum_{k=1}^K \eta^{(k-1)vb^2} \delta_{\nu_k} + \eta^{(K-1)vb^2} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta^{jv} \delta_{\mu_j} \right].$$

The normalization  $c = c(\eta)$  is at (28). The support points fall in two zones:

- (i) Inner zone:  $\nu_k = \lambda + (k-1)b\lambda$  for  $k = 1, \dots, K$
- (ii) Outer zone:  $\mu_j = \nu_K + j\lambda$  for  $j = 1, 2, \dots$

The cardinality of the inner zone is

$$(11) \quad K = 1 + \lceil 2b^{-3/2} \rceil.$$

A main result of the paper is that the Bayes predictive density estimate  $\hat{p}_B$  based on the product prior  $\pi_{B,n}$  is asymptotically minimax optimal.

**THEOREM 1.2.** *For each fixed  $r \in (0, \infty)$ , as  $\eta_n = s_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , we have*

$$\max_{\Theta_n[s_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_B) = R_N(\Theta_n[s_n])(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$




FIG 2. Schematic for the bi-grid prior. The  $x$ -axis now shows the two spacings, and the  $y$ -axis the two different rates of log-linear decay of the prior probabilities.

The following theorem shows that the bi-grid prior  $\pi_{\mathbf{B}}$  is also asymptotically least favorable.

**THEOREM 1.3.** *If  $s_n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $s_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , then*

$$B(\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}) = R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]) \cdot (1 + o(1)).$$

Unlike Theorem 1.2 we need the assumption that  $s_n \rightarrow \infty$ . It ensures that  $\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}$  actually concentrates on  $\Theta_n[s_n]$ , namely that  $\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}(\Theta_n[s_n]) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . For the case where  $s_n$  does not diverge to  $\infty$  an asymptotically least favorable prior can be constructed from a sparse prior built from ‘independent blocks’. The construction is discussed in Section 2.3.

**1.2. Discussion.** A fully Bayesian approach is a natural route to **pdes** with good properties [2, 13], with advantages over ‘plug-in’ or thresholding based density estimates. Indeed, a coordinatewise threshold rule  $\hat{p}_{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_{\mathbf{T}}(y_i|x_i)$  is typically built from univariate **pdes** which combine two Bayes **pdes** – for example based on uniform  $\hat{p}_{\mathbf{U}}$  and cluster priors  $\hat{p}_{\mathbf{CL}}$ , as in [32, Eq. (14)]:

$$\hat{p}_{\mathbf{T}}(y_i|x_i) = \begin{cases} \hat{p}_{\mathbf{U}}(y_i|x_i) & \text{if } |x_i| > v^{-1/2}\lambda \\ \hat{p}_{\mathbf{CL}}(y_i|x_i) & \text{if } |x_i| \leq v^{-1/2}\lambda. \end{cases}$$

This is manifestly discontinuous as a function of the data  $\mathbf{x}$ .

The bi-grid Bayes rule achieves the same purposes as the hybrid  $\hat{p}_{\mathbf{T}}$ . Indeed, the close spacing  $b\lambda$  in the inner section of  $\pi_{\mathbf{B}}$  yields the same risk control as the (unevenly spaced) cluster prior for small and moderate  $\theta$ , while the uniform  $\lambda$  spacing in the outer section of  $\pi_{\mathbf{B}}$  controls risk for large  $\theta$  in the same way as the uniform prior.

Decision theoretic parallels between predictive density estimation and the point estimation of a Gaussian mean under quadratic loss have been established by [4, 9–12, 20, 22, 39] for unconstrained  $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ , and by [38], [6], [24] and [32] for various constraint sets  $\Theta$ .

The phase transition seen in Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 seems however to have no parallel in point estimation. Indeed, it follows from [16] that a first order minimax rule for quadratic loss in the sparse setting is derived from the Mallows prior [27], with  $\nu_{\mathbf{Q}}^+ = (1-\eta) \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \eta^{j-1} \delta_{\lambda_e j}$ . Here  $\lambda_e = \sqrt{2 \log \eta^{-1}} = v^{-1/2}\lambda$  so that the predictive setting involves a reduced spacing in the prior. More significantly, there is no analog in point estimation of the inner section with its further reduced spacing for  $r < r_0$ .

Our main technical contribution lies in sharp methods for bounding the global KL risk for general bi-grid priors, see Lemmas 2.2 and 2.3, and for

spike-and-slab priors, Section 3. The sharp predictive risk bounds established here provide new asymptotic perspectives in the information geometric framework of [21, 23, 40] and augment new sparse prediction techniques for general multivariate predictive density estimation theory developed in [4, 10, 22, 25, 26, 29].

1.3. *Minimax risk of Spike and Slab priors.* Some of the most popular Bayesian variable selection techniques are built on the “spike and slab” priors [8, 15, 30]. Such priors and their computationally tractable extensions have found success in variable selection in high-dimensional sparse regression models, e.g. [3, 14, 34–37] and the references therein. While this is a well established methodological research area [33], optimality of their respective predictive density estimates has so far not been studied.

Here, we consider simple “spike and slab” prior distributions in the flavor of the foundational paper [30]. Thus, let

$$(12) \quad \pi_S[\eta, l] = (1 - \eta)\delta_0 + \eta/(2l)I\{\mu \in [-l, l]\} d\mu .$$

Now consider the multivariate Bayes predictive density  $\hat{p}_S[l]$  based on the  $n$  dimensional prior containing i.i.d. copies of  $\pi_S[s_n/n, l]$  as before. Such Bayes pdes are necessarily asymptotically sub-optimal.

LEMMA 1.1. *For any fixed  $l \in [0, \infty)$ , we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \max_{\Theta_n[s_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_S[l]) \right\} / R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]) = \infty$$

The result is hardly surprising, as the support of  $\pi_S$  is restricted to  $[-l, l]$  for  $l$  fixed, and the corresponding pde has large risk away from the support. Consider therefore bounded subsets of the sparse parameter sets  $\Theta_n[s_n]$ :

$$\Theta_n[s, t] = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 \leq s \text{ and } |\theta_i| \leq t \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n\}.$$

We allow  $t = t_n$  to increase with  $n$ , and note next that the increase must be at least as fast as  $\lambda_n$  to have minimax risk equivalent to  $\Theta_n[s_n]$ .

LEMMA 1.2. *For all  $t_n$  there is a simple bound*

$$R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]) \leq s_n t_n^2 / (2r).$$

If  $t_n > \lambda_n = \sqrt{2 \log \eta_n^{-v}}$ , then

$$(13) \quad R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]) \sim s_n \lambda_n^2 / (2r) \sim R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]).$$

The next result says that there is a substantial range of sparsities  $\eta_n = s_n/n$  for which  $\hat{p}_S[t_n]$  is asymptotically minimax over the bounded sets  $\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]$ , and hence also over  $\Theta_n[s_n]$ :

**THEOREM 1.4.** *As  $\eta_n = s_n/n \rightarrow 0$ , suppose that  $t_n/(\log \eta_n^{-1})^{1/2} \rightarrow \infty$  but  $\log t_n/(\log \eta_n^{-1}) \rightarrow 0$ . Then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ \max_{\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_S[t_n]) \right\} / R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]) = 1 .$$

Note that if  $t_n \rightarrow \infty$  at a rate slower than  $(\log \eta_n^{-1})^{1/2}$  then, by Lemma 1.2,  $R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n])$  is no longer equivalent to  $R_N(\Theta_n[s_n])$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . At the other extreme, we show next that if  $t_n$  grows at rate  $\eta_n^{-\beta}$  or higher for any  $\beta > 0$ , then no spike and uniform slab procedure can be minimax optimal.

**THEOREM 1.5.** *If  $\eta_n = s_n/n \rightarrow 0$  and  $\log t_n = \beta \log \eta_n^{-1}$  for some  $\beta > 0$ , then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,*

$$\min_{l > 1} \max_{\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_S[l]) \geq (1 + \beta) R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]) (1 + o(1)) .$$

**1.4. Organization of the Paper.** Section 2 presents the risk properties of the Grid and Bi-grid prior based **pdes** and proofs of the main results. Section 3 proves the spike-and-slab results. Section 4 compares the performance of the **pdes** through simulation experiments. Proofs of all lemmas are in the Appendix.

**2. Proof of the main results.** We focus on priors with i.i.d. components  $\pi(d\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \pi_1(d\theta_i)$ . The predictive density then has product form  $\hat{p}_\pi(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{p}_{\pi_1}(y_i|x_i)$  and the predictive risk is additive

$$(14) \quad \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_\pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\theta_i, \hat{p}_{\pi_1}).$$

When the context is clear, we drop the subscript and write  $\hat{p}_\pi$  for the univariate Bayes predictive density also.

For our sparse parameter sets  $\Theta_n[s]$  and  $\Theta_n[s, t]$ , there is an easy reduction of the maximum multivariate risk of a product rule to a univariate risk maximum. Indeed, (14) yields

$$(15) \quad s_n \sup_{|\theta_n| \leq t_n} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_1) \leq \sup_{\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}) \leq n(1 - \eta_n) \rho(0, \hat{p}_1) + s_n \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_1).$$



*Sparse priors.* We turn now to the predictive risk properties of univariate priors of the form

$$\pi(d\mu) = (1 - \eta)\delta_0 + \eta\nu(d\mu).$$

The following risk decomposition is fundamental; it is proved in the appendix.

LEMMA 2.1. *Let  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . For a sparse prior,*

$$(16) \quad \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_\pi) = \frac{\theta^2}{2r} - \mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}(Z) + \mathbb{E} \log D_\theta(Z),$$

where  $D_\theta(Z) = N_{\theta,1}(Z)$  and

$$(17) \quad N_{\theta,v}(Z) = 1 + \frac{\eta}{1 - \eta} \int \exp \left\{ \frac{\mu Z}{\sqrt{v}} + \frac{\mu\theta}{v} - \frac{\mu^2}{2v} \right\} \nu(d\mu) .$$

Clearly  $N_{\theta,v}(Z), D_\theta(Z) > 1$ , and so we have the simple but useful “basic lower” and “basic upper” risk bounds

$$(18) \quad \frac{\theta^2}{2r} - \mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}(Z) \leq \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_\pi) \leq \frac{\theta^2}{2r} + \mathbb{E} \log D_\theta(Z).$$

From Jensen’s inequality,

$$(19) \quad \mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}(Z) \leq \log (\mathbb{E} N_{\theta,v}(Z)),$$

and since  $\mathbb{E} \exp(\zeta Z) = \exp(\zeta^2/2)$ ,

$$(20) \quad \mathbb{E} N_{\theta,v}(Z) = 1 + \frac{\eta}{1 - \eta} \int \exp \left( \frac{\mu\theta}{v} \right) \nu(d\mu),$$

and, in particular,

$$\mathbb{E} D_0(Z) = \mathbb{E} N_{0,v}(Z) = (1 - \eta)^{-1}.$$

Consequently, from the right side of (18), then (19) (for  $v = 1$ ) and the previous display,

$$(21) \quad \rho(0, \hat{p}_\pi) \leq \log(1 - \eta)^{-1} = \eta(1 + o(1)) \quad \text{as } \eta \rightarrow 0.$$

Return now to the univariate reduction (15). From (21) it is clear that  $n\rho(0, \hat{p}_1) \leq n\eta_n(1 + o(1)) = s_n(1 + o(1))$ . So for the minimaxity results of Theorems 1.1, 1.2 and 1.4, it suffices to show the univariate bound

$$(22) \quad \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_1) \leq \lambda_n^2/(2r) + o(\lambda_n^2),$$

for then

$$\sup_{\Theta_n} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_\pi) \leq s_n[\lambda_n^2/(2r) + o(\lambda_n^2)].$$

2.1. *Risk Properties of the Grid and the Bi-grid Priors based estimates.*  
To allow a unified analysis, we introduce a class of discrete sparse priors that includes both grid and bi-grid priors. For  $0 < b \leq 1$  and  $r > 0$ , let

$$(23) \quad \pi_{\mathbf{D}}[\eta; b, r] = \sum_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} \pi_j \delta_{\mu_j}$$

where  $\mu_{-j} = -\mu_j$ ,  $\pi_{-j} = \pi_j$ . The support points satisfy  $\mu_0 = 0$  and  $\mu_j = \lambda \alpha_j$  for  $j > 0$ , where the piecewise linear spacing function

$$(24) \quad \alpha_j = \begin{cases} 1 + b(j-1) & 1 \leq j \leq K \\ \alpha_K + j - K & j > K \end{cases}$$

has increments  $\dot{\alpha}_j = \alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j = b$  or  $1$  according as  $j \leq K$  or  $j > K$ . Set  $\zeta = \eta^v$ . The prior masses are given by

$$\pi_0 = 1 - \eta, \quad \pi_j = c(\eta) \eta \zeta^{\beta_j - 1},$$

for  $j \geq 1$ . The decay function in the prior probabilities

$$(25) \quad \beta_j = \begin{cases} 1 + b^2(j-1) & 1 \leq j \leq K \\ \beta_K + j - K & j > K \end{cases}$$

has the same form as  $\alpha_j$  with  $b$  replaced by  $b^2$ . This choice is crucial for Lemma 2.2 below and its consequent risk bounds. In particular, note that  $\beta_j \leq \alpha_j$  and that the increments  $\dot{\beta}_j = \beta_{j+1} - \beta_j$  satisfy

$$(26) \quad \dot{\beta}_j = \dot{\alpha}_j^2 \quad \text{all } j \geq 1.$$

In addition,  $l \rightarrow \alpha_l^2 - \beta_l$  is increasing for  $l \geq 1$ , as

$$(27) \quad (d/dl)(\alpha_l^2 - \beta_l) = \dot{\alpha}_l(2\alpha_l - \dot{\alpha}_l) \geq 0.$$

The normalizing constant  $c(\eta)$  is determined by

$$(28) \quad \frac{1}{2c(\eta)} = \frac{1 - \eta^{b^2 v K}}{1 - \eta^{b^2 v}} + \frac{\eta^{b^2 v(K-1)+v}}{1 - \eta^v}.$$

Since  $\pi_{\mathbf{D}}$  is a sparse prior, we may apply the decomposition of predictive risk given in Lemma 2.1. Inserting the discrete measure (23), we obtain

$$(29) \quad N_{\theta, v}(Z) = 1 + \sum_{j \neq 0} N_j,$$

$$(30) \quad N_j = \pi_0^{-1} \pi_j \exp\{v^{-1/2} \mu_j Z + v^{-1}(\mu_j \theta - \tfrac{1}{2} \mu_j^2)\}$$

In the special case  $v = 1$ , it will be helpful to write  $D_\theta(Z) = N_{\theta,1}(Z)$  as

$$(31) \quad D_\theta(Z) = 1 + \sum_{j \neq 0} D_j,$$

$$(32) \quad D_j = \pi_0^{-1} \pi_j \exp\{\mu_j Z + \mu_j \theta - \tfrac{1}{2} \mu_j^2\}.$$

The probability ratio  $\pi_j/\pi_0$  can also be written in exponential form. To this end, introduce  $c_1(\eta) = c(\eta)(1 - \eta)^{-1}$ . Recall that  $v^{-1} = 1 + r^{-1}$  and  $\zeta = \eta^v = \exp(-\lambda^2/2)$  and then rewrite  $\eta = \zeta^{v^{-1}} = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(1 + r^{-1})\}$ . We arrive at

$$(33) \quad \pi_0^{-1} \pi_j = c_1(\eta) \exp\{-\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda^2(\beta_j + r^{-1})\}.$$

We can therefore, for example, rewrite

$$(34) \quad \begin{aligned} D_j &= \exp\{\mu_j Z - G(\mu_j; \theta)\} \\ G(\mu_j; \theta) &= \tfrac{1}{2} \mu_j^2 - \mu_j \theta + \tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 (\beta_j + r^{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

To obtain an upper bound for  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_D)$  we use (17). We focus on two consecutive terms  $N_j, N_{j+1}$  in (29); ignoring all other terms trivially yields a lower bound for  $N_{\theta,v}$ . For the upper bound for  $D_\theta$ , a single (suitably chosen) term  $D_j$  in (31) suffices, but more care is needed to show that the neglected terms are negligible.

Bring in a co-ordinate system  $(l, \omega)$  for  $\theta$ : each  $\theta \geq 0$  can be uniquely written in the form  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega)$  for a uniquely determined  $l \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\omega \in [0, \dot{\alpha}_l)$ . We can therefore write  $l = l(\theta)$  and  $\omega = \omega(\theta)$ .

We argue heuristically that  $l(\theta)$  is an appropriate choice of index for our bounds. Indeed, from (30) and (33),

$$(35) \quad \mathbb{E} \log N_j = c - \tfrac{1}{2} \{(\mu_j - \theta)^2/v - \lambda^2 \beta_j\}$$

after collecting terms not involving  $j$  into  $c$ . Hence, for  $\theta \in [\mu_l, \mu_{l+1})$ , the choice  $j = l$  or  $l + 1$  will minimize or nearly minimize the quadratic, and these suffice for the lower bound. For  $D_\theta$ , we have from (34) that  $\mathbb{E} \log D_j = -G(\mu_j; \theta)$ . We show in the Appendix (in the proof of Lemma 2.2) that  $j \rightarrow G(\mu_j; \theta)$  is indeed minimized at  $j = l$  for each  $\theta \in [\mu_l, \mu_{l+1})$ .

Focus therefore on the terms  $N_{l(\theta)}$  and  $D_{l(\theta)}$ . When  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega)$ ,

$$\mu_j \theta - \tfrac{1}{2} \mu_j^2 = \tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 (2\alpha_j(\alpha_l + \omega) - \alpha_j^2).$$

Combining this with (33), for  $j = l, l + 1$ , we can write

$$(36) \quad \begin{aligned} N_l &= c_1(\eta) \exp\{\tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 n(l, \omega) + \alpha_l \lambda Z / \sqrt{v}\} \\ N_{l+1} &= c_1(\eta) \exp\{\tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \tilde{n}(l, \omega) + \alpha_{l+1} \lambda Z / \sqrt{v}\} \\ D_l &= c_1(\eta) \exp\{\tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 d(l, \omega) + \alpha_l \lambda Z\} \end{aligned}$$

in terms of three linear functions of  $\omega$ :

$$(37) \quad \begin{aligned} n(l, \omega) &= v^{-1}(\alpha_l^2 + 2\alpha_l\omega) - \beta_l - r^{-1} \\ d(l, \omega) &= \alpha_l^2 + 2\alpha_l\omega - \beta_l - r^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

and, corresponding to  $N_{l+1}$ ,

$$(38) \quad \check{n}(l, \omega) = n(l, \omega) + 2v^{-1}\dot{\alpha}_l\omega - (1 + v^{-1})\dot{\alpha}_l^2.$$

We now state our key uniform bounds on the risk components of (23).

LEMMA 2.2. *For any fixed  $r \in (0, \infty)$  and  $b \in [0, 1]$ , with  $\lambda$  defined in (9), uniformly in  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega) \geq \lambda$ , we have the following bounds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta, v}(Z) &\geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(n \vee \check{n})(l, \omega) + O(1), \\ \mathbb{E} \log D_{\theta}(Z) &\leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 d^+(l, \omega) + O(\lambda), \end{aligned}$$

For  $0 \leq \theta < \lambda$  we just have  $\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta, v}(Z) \geq 0$ , and  $\mathbb{E} \log D_{\theta}(Z) \leq O(\lambda)$ .

The rather intricate proof is given in the appendix. The appearance of the positive part of  $d(l, \omega)$  in the upper bound may be understood this way: if  $d(l, \omega) < 0$ , we cannot expect the term  $D_l$  to dominate  $D_0 = 1$  in (31).

In the reverse direction, we need only a bound for  $\theta \in [\mu_1, \mu_2]$  in our proofs of theorems 1.1 and 1.2.

LEMMA 2.3. *For any fixed  $r \in (0, \infty)$  and  $b \in [0, 1]$ , with  $\lambda$  defined in (9), uniformly in  $\theta \in \lambda[\alpha_1, \alpha_2]$ , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta, v}(Z) \leq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 n(1, \omega) + O(\lambda).$$

2.2. *Proof of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2.* Inserting the bounds of Lemma 2.2 in risk decomposition (16), we get

$$(39) \quad \begin{aligned} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_D) &= (2r)^{-1}\lambda^2\sigma(l, \omega) + O(\lambda) \\ \sigma(l, \omega) &= (\alpha_l + \omega)^2 - r(n \vee \check{n})(l, \omega) + rd^+(l, \omega). \end{aligned}$$

Our task is to investigate when  $\sigma(l, \omega) \leq 1$ . First assume  $d(l, \omega) \geq 0$ . In this easier case, from (37),  $r(n - d) = \alpha_l^2 + 2\alpha_l\omega$ , and so

$$\sigma(l, \omega) \leq (\alpha_l + \omega)^2 - r(n - d) = \omega^2 \leq 1,$$

Now, suppose that  $d(l, \omega) < 0$ . For  $l = 0$ , control on the risk is immediate from (18), and so, from now on  $l \geq 1$ . We compare  $n(l, \omega)$  and  $\check{n}(l, \omega)$  for

$\omega \in [0, \dot{\alpha}_l]$  by using (38). Both are linear functions of  $\omega$ , intersecting at  $\omega_* = \dot{\alpha}_l(1+v)/2 < \dot{\alpha}_l$ . Now  $n(l, 0) > \tilde{n}(l, 0)$  while  $\tilde{n}$  has a larger positive slope. Hence  $n \vee \tilde{n}$  equals  $n$  on  $[0, \omega_*]$  and  $\tilde{n}$  on  $[\omega_*, \dot{\alpha}_l]$ . Observe that on the right interval  $[\omega_*, \dot{\alpha}_l]$ ,

$$\partial\sigma/\partial\omega(l, \omega) = 2[\alpha_l + \omega - rv^{-1}(\dot{\alpha}_l + \alpha_l)] \leq 2(1 - rv^{-1})\alpha_{l+1} < 0.$$

Hence, in seeking the maximum of  $\sigma(l, \omega)$  on  $[0, \dot{\alpha}_l]$ , we may confine attention to  $0 \leq \omega \leq \omega_*$ . On this range

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(l, \omega) &= (\alpha_l + \omega)^2 - rn(l, \omega) \\ &= \omega^2 + (\alpha_l^2 + 2\alpha_l\omega)(1 - rv^{-1}) + r\beta_r + 1 \\ (40) \quad &= 1 + \omega^2 + r(\beta_l - \alpha_l^2) - 2r\alpha_l\omega \\ &\leq 1 + \omega^2 - 2r\omega = \bar{\sigma}(\omega), \end{aligned}$$

say, where we used  $\alpha_l \geq 1$  and  $\alpha_l^2 - \beta_l \geq \alpha_1^2 - \beta_1 = 0$ , from (27).

In particular  $\bar{\sigma}(0) = 1$  and  $\bar{\sigma}(\omega_*) = 1 + \omega_*(\omega_* - 2r)$ .

For the grid prior,  $b = 1$  and one evaluates

$$\bar{\sigma}(\omega_*) = 1 + (1 + 2r)(1 + r)^{-2}(1 - 2r - 4r^2)/4 = 1 + h_r.$$

Consequently,  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_G) \leq (2r)^{-1}\lambda^2\{1 + h_r^+\} + O(\lambda)$ , which establishes the upper bound in Theorem 1.1. For the lower bound, we look at the risk at  $\theta_* = \lambda(1 + \omega_*)$ . Apply Lemma 2.3 using  $n(1, \omega_*) = 2v^{-1}\omega_*$ , to get from (18)

$$\rho(\theta_*, \hat{p}_G) \geq (2r)^{-1}\lambda^2\{(1 + \omega_*)^2 - 2rv^{-1}\omega_*\} + O(\lambda) = (2r)^{-1}\lambda^2(1 + h_r^+) + O(\lambda),$$

since the quantity in braces equals  $1 + \omega_*^2 - 2r\omega_* = \bar{\sigma}(\omega_*) = 1 + h_r^+$ . This completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

We now turn our attention to proving Theorem 1.2. We first verify that if  $b \leq \min\{1, 4r\}$ , then  $l \geq K$  necessarily implies  $d(l, \omega) \geq 0$ . Set  $K_* = 1 + 2b^{-3/2}$ . From the monotonicity (27), along with  $\omega \geq 0$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} d(l, \omega) &\geq \alpha_l^2 - \beta_l - r^{-1} \geq \alpha_{K_*}^2 - \beta_{K_*} - r^{-1} \\ &= 4b^{-1/2} - 2b^{1/2} + 4b^{-1} - r^{-1} \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

using  $b \leq 1$  for the first two terms and  $b \leq 4r$  for the second pair.

Now return to (40) – we have

$$\sigma(l, \omega) \leq 1 + \omega_*(\omega_* - 2r)_+.$$

Since  $d(l, \omega) \leq 0$ , we must have  $l < K$  and hence  $\dot{\alpha}_l = b$ . Clearly  $\sigma(l, \omega) \leq 1$  so long as  $\omega_* = b(1+v)/2 \leq 2r$ , or equivalently,  $b \leq 4r/(1+v)$ . So in this case, for *all*  $\theta$  we have  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_D) \leq (2r)^{-1}\lambda^2 + O(\lambda)$ , which establishes (22) and hence Theorem 1.2.

2.3. *Proof of Theorem 1.3.* As  $\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}$  is i.i.d. and due to the product structure of the problem, its Bayes risk simplifies

$$B(\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) = nB(\pi_{\mathbf{B}}, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}).$$

For the univariate problem the Bayes risk of the prior  $\pi_{\mathbf{B}}$  is

$$\begin{aligned} B(\pi_{\mathbf{B}}, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) &\geq c_0 \eta_n \{ \rho(\lambda_n, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) + \rho(-\lambda_n, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) \} \\ &= 2c_0 \eta_n \rho(\lambda_n, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) \geq 2c_0 \eta_n [\lambda_n^2/(2r) - \mathbb{E} \log N_{\lambda_n, v}(Z)], \end{aligned}$$

where the equality above follows by symmetry and the inequality by (16). From (28) we have  $2c_0 \geq 1 - O(\eta_n^{b^2 v})$ . Lemma 2.3 shows that  $\mathbb{E} \log N_{\lambda, v}(Z) = O(\lambda)$  because  $n(1, 0) = 0$ . Hence  $B(\pi_{\mathbf{B}}, \hat{p}_{\mathbf{B}}) \geq \eta_n \lambda_n^2/(2r) \cdot (1 + o(1))$  and the proof is done.

*Remark.* When  $s_n$  does not diverge to  $\infty$ , an ‘independent blocks’ sparse prior using  $\pi_{\mathbf{B}}$  is asymptotically least favorable, along the lines of [17, Ch. 8.6]. Let  $\pi_S(\tau; m)$  denote a single spike prior of scale  $\tau$  on  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . This chooses an index  $I \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  at random and sets  $\theta = \tau e_I$ , where  $e_i$  is a unit length vector in the  $i$ th co-ordinate direction. We randomly draw  $\tau$  from  $(\nu_{\mathbf{B}}^+ + \nu_{\mathbf{B}}^-)/2$ . However, instead of (9), we choose  $\lambda = v^{1/2}(t_m - \log t_m)$  where  $t_m = \sqrt{2 \log m}$ . The independent blocks prior  $\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}$  on  $\Theta[s_n]$  is built by dividing  $\{1, \dots, n\}$  into  $s_n$  contiguous blocks  $B_j$ , each of length  $m = m_n = \lfloor n/s_n \rfloor$ . Independently for each block  $B_j$ , draw components according to  $\pi_S(\cdot; m)$  and set  $\theta_i = 0$  for the remaining  $n - m_n s_n$  coordinates. This prior is supported on  $\Theta[s_n]$  as any draw from  $\pi_{\mathbf{B},n}$  has exactly  $s_n$  non-zero components. The proof that it is least favorable is then analogous to that of Theorem 6 in [32].

**3. Risk properties of Spike and Slab procedures.** We again use the risk decomposition provided by Lemma 2.1, now with the univariate spike and slab prior  $\pi_S[\eta, l]$ . We use  $N_{\theta, v}^S(Z)$  and  $D_{\theta}^S(Z)$  to denote the associated risk components of Lemma 2.1 for the spike and slab predictive density estimates  $\hat{p}_S[l]$  based on the prior  $\pi_S[\eta, l]$  for some  $l > 0$  (the dependence on  $l$  is kept implicit in the notations).

*Proof of Lemma 1.2.* For the first upper bound, simply take  $\nu = \delta_0$  in Lemma 2.1; the corresponding  $\pi_0 = \delta_0$  has  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_{\pi_0}) = \theta^2/(2r)$ . The bound now follows from (15). For the second statement, we claim that whenever  $t_n > \lambda_n$ , then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$(41) \quad R_N(\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]) \sim R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]) \sim s_n \lambda_n^2/(2r).$$

Indeed, the independent blocks prior  $\pi_n^{IB}$  constructed in [32, Theorem 6] to show that  $R_N(\Theta_n[s_n]) \sim s_n \lambda_n^2 / (2r)$  is actually, by its very definition, supported on  $\Theta_n[s_n, \nu_n]$ , where  $\nu_n < \sqrt{v} \sqrt{2 \log[n/s_n]} \leq \lambda_n < t_n$ . Since obviously  $\Theta_n[s_n, \nu_n] \subset \Theta_n[s_n, t_n] \subset \Theta_n[s_n]$ , the conclusion (41) follows.  $\square$ .

For lower bounds on risk of its predictive density estimate, the following convexity inequality is helpful. It is proved in the appendix.

LEMMA 3.1. *If  $\eta \leq \frac{1}{2}$  and  $\theta l / v \geq 1$ , then*

$$\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta, v}^S(Z) \leq \theta l / v.$$

The *proof of Lemma 1.1* follows easily from the above lemma. From the left side of (18) and Lemma 3.1,

$$\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l]) \geq \frac{\theta^2}{2r} - \frac{\theta l}{v}, \quad \text{for } \theta \geq \frac{v}{l}.$$

Hence,

$$\sup_{\Theta_n[s_n]} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l]) = s_n \sup_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l]) = \infty.$$

3.1. *Proof of Theorem 1.4.* An alternative representation for  $N_{\theta, v}^S$  will be useful. Completing the square in (17), we get

$$(42) \quad N_{\theta, v}^S(Z) = 1 + c(\eta) \sqrt{v} \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} Z_{\theta, v}^2\right) \Phi_{l, v},$$

where we have set  $Z_{\theta, v} = Z + \theta / \sqrt{v}$  and

$$\Phi_{l, v} = \Phi(v^{-1/2}(l - \theta) - Z) - \Phi(v^{-1/2}(-l - \theta) - Z).$$

In the appendix, we show that, uniformly in  $v \in (0, 1)$ ,  $l \geq 1$  and  $|\theta| \leq l$ ,

$$(43) \quad \mathbb{E} \log \Phi_{l, v} \geq a_0 := \log \phi(0) + 2/3.$$

The constant  $c(\eta) = \eta(1 - \eta)^{-1} \{2l\phi(0)\}^{-1}$  satisfies

$$(44) \quad -\log l - \lambda^2 / (2v) \leq \log\{(1 - \eta)^{-1} c(\eta)\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \log \frac{\pi}{2} - \log l - \lambda^2 / (2v)$$

From the preceding three displays and  $\mathbb{E} Z_{\theta, v}^2 = 1 + \theta^2 / v$  we obtain

$$(45) \quad \begin{aligned} -\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta, v}^S(Z) &\leq -\log c(\eta) - \frac{1}{2} \log v - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} Z_{\theta, v}^2 - \mathbb{E} \log \Phi_{l, v} \\ &\leq \log l + \lambda^2 / (2v) - \theta^2 / (2v) + O(1). \end{aligned}$$

For  $D_\theta^S$ , we show in the appendix that for each  $r > 0$ , and with  $\lambda = \sqrt{2v \log \eta^{-1}}$  and  $\tilde{\lambda} = \lambda/\sqrt{v} + \sqrt{2 \log \lambda}$ ,

$$(46) \quad \mathbb{E} \log D_\theta^S(Z) \leq \begin{cases} O(\lambda \log \lambda) & 0 < \theta < \tilde{\lambda} \\ \theta^2/2 - \lambda^2/(2v) + O(\lambda) & \theta \geq \tilde{\lambda}. \end{cases}$$

We assemble these pieces to bound  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l])$  and claim that

$$\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l]) \leq \begin{cases} \theta^2/(2r) + O(\lambda \log \lambda) & 0 < \theta < \lambda \\ \lambda^2/(2r) + \log l + O(\lambda \log \lambda) & \lambda \leq \theta < \tilde{\lambda} \\ \log l + O(\lambda) & \tilde{\lambda} \leq \theta. \end{cases}$$

For  $0 < \theta < \lambda$ , simply use the basic upper bound (18) along with (46). For the remaining two cases, we use the full decomposition (16) of Lemma 2.1. To this end, note from (45) and  $v^{-1} = r^{-1} + 1$  that

$$\theta^2/(2r) - \mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}^S(Z) \leq \lambda^2/(2r) - (\theta^2 - \lambda^2)/2 + \log l + O(1).$$

Combining this with the bounds in (46) yields the remaining two bounds.

For any  $l \geq 1$  such that  $\log l = o(\lambda^2)$ , we conclude that as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\sup_{\theta} \rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l]) \leq \frac{\lambda^2}{2r} (1 + o(1)).$$

This completes the proof of (22) and, as remarked there, the proof of Theorem 1.4.

**3.2. Proof of Theorem 1.5.** We use the basic lower risk bound (18), and show that for suitable  $\theta$  that  $\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}^S Z$  cannot be large enough to offset the leading term  $\theta^2/(2r)$ . To obtain a result uniform over all slab widths  $l$ , we need two different types of upper bound on  $N_{\theta,v}^S$ .

Define  $t_\lambda$  and  $\tilde{t}_\lambda = o(t_\lambda)$  by setting  $\log t_\lambda = \beta \lambda^2/(2v)$  and  $\log \tilde{t}_\lambda = \log t_\lambda - \lambda$ . We look first at large values of  $l$ , using representation (42). Observe first that for  $l > \tilde{t}_\lambda$ , the right side of (44) yields

$$\sqrt{vc}(\eta) \leq C \exp\{-\log \tilde{t}_\lambda - \lambda^2/(2v)\} = C \exp\{-\tilde{\theta}^2/(2v)\}$$

for a constant  $C = C(v)$  if we set  $\tilde{\theta}^2 = \lambda^2 + 2v \log \tilde{t}_\lambda$ . Using now (42) and  $\Phi_{l,v} < 1$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \log N_{\theta,v}^S(Z) &\leq \log\{1 + C \exp[-\tilde{\theta}^2/(2v) + (Z + \tilde{\theta}/\sqrt{v})^2/2]\} \\ &\leq \log 2 + \log(1 + C) + Z^2/2 + |Z|\tilde{\theta}/\sqrt{v}. \end{aligned}$$



Consequently  $\mathbb{E} \log N_{\tilde{\theta}, v}^S(Z) \leq k_1 + k_2 \tilde{\theta}$  where  $k_i = k_i(v)$ . Hence, from the left side of risk bound (18),

$$\rho(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{p}_S[l]) \geq \frac{\tilde{\theta}^2}{2r} - k_1 \tilde{\theta} - k_2.$$

Now observe from the definition of  $\tilde{t}_\lambda$  that  $\tilde{\theta}^2 = (1 + \beta)\lambda^2 - 2v\lambda$  and that  $\tilde{\theta} < t_\lambda$  for large  $\lambda$ . We conclude that for large  $\lambda$ ,

$$(47) \quad \inf_{l > \tilde{t}_\lambda} \sup_{\theta \in [0, t_\lambda]} \frac{\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l])}{\lambda^2/(2r)} \geq 1 + \beta + O(\lambda^{-1}).$$

For  $l \leq \tilde{t}_\lambda$ , we set  $\theta = t_\lambda$  and use the left side of (18), then Lemma 3.1:

$$\sup_{\theta \leq t_\lambda} \rho(t_\lambda, p_S[l]) \geq \frac{t_\lambda^2}{2r} - \frac{t_\lambda l}{v} \geq \frac{t_\lambda^2}{2r} - \frac{t_\lambda \tilde{t}_\lambda}{v} \geq \frac{t_\lambda^2}{2r} (1 + o(1)),$$

where in the last inequality we used  $\tilde{t}_\lambda = o(t_\lambda)$ . Consequently,

$$(48) \quad \inf_{l \leq \tilde{t}_\lambda} \sup_{\theta \in [0, t_\lambda]} \frac{\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_S[l])}{\lambda^2/(2r)} \geq \frac{rt_\lambda^2}{\lambda^2} (1 + o(1)).$$

Combining (47) with (48) and then using (15) to go over to the multivariate problem, we obtain

$$\min_{l > 1} \max_{\Theta_n[s_n, t_n]} \rho(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \hat{p}_S[l]) \geq (1 + \beta) s_n \lambda_n^2 / (2r) (1 + o(1)).$$

Theorem 1.5 now follows from (13) of Lemma 1.2.

**4. Numerical Experiments.** We looked at the numerical effectiveness of our asymptotic results under different levels of sparsity  $\eta_n$ , with special focus on moderate values. The product structure and the good bounds (15) relating maximal multivariate and univariate risks allow us to concentrate on the maximal risk of the univariate pdes. We use a constrained prior space

$$\mathbf{m}_l(\eta) = \{\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}) : \pi(\theta = 0) \geq 1 - \eta, \pi(|\theta| > l) = 0\},$$

and set  $l = 5\lambda = 5\sqrt{2\log \eta^{-v}}$ . We consider three sparsity levels: (a) Moderate:  $\eta = 0.1$ , (b) High:  $\eta = 0.001$ , (c) Very High:  $\eta = 10^{-10}$ .

Figure 3 shows univariate risk plots in the three sparsity regimes for the following pdes:

- Hard threshold Plug-in pde (H-Plugin):

$$\hat{p}_H(y|x) = p(y|\hat{\theta}_H, v_y) \text{ where } \hat{\theta}_H(x) = x I\{|x| > (v_x/v)^{1/2}\lambda\} .$$

- Cluster prior and Thresholding (C-Thresh) based asymptotically minimax pde  $\hat{p}_T$  proposed in [32, Eqn. (12)-(14)]
- Bayes pde based on the bi-grid prior (Bi-Grid):  $\hat{p}_B$
- Spike and Slab predictive density estimator (SS):  $\hat{p}_S[l]$  .

The basic features of the risk plots are unchanged even under moderate sparsity. The hard threshold plug-in density estimator  $\hat{p}_H$  does poorly for small values of  $r$ . For each  $r$ , the maximal risks of  $\hat{p}_T$  and  $\hat{p}_B$  lie near or below the asymptotic level of  $\log \eta^{-1}/(1+r)$  under high and very high sparsity, and at worst moderately above the asymptotic level for moderate sparsity.

Table 1 reports the maximum value of the risk plots for these predictive estimators. [Table 2 in the Supplement shows the locations of their respective maxima.] The tables and plots show that the Bi-grid prior Bayes pde and the C-Thresh pde  $\hat{p}_T$  have similar worst case performance. The maximal risk of the spike and slab procedure is higher than that of  $\hat{p}_T$  or  $\hat{p}_B$  but does not exceed the asymptotic minimax level by much.

Sparsity	r	Asymp-Theory	H-Plugin	C-Thresh	Bi-Grid	SS
0.1	1	1.1513	120.4%	83.3%	86.6%	104.9%
	0.5	1.5351	173.6%	109.2%	105.5%	117.4%
	0.25	1.8421	278.5%	129.9%	125.5%	131.6%
	0.1	2.0933	588.1%	144.2%	156.0%	145.2%
0.001	1	3.4539	109.1%	70.5%	70.8%	87.2%
	0.5	4.6052	162.1%	86.4%	84.6%	96.9%
	0.25	5.5262	267.6%	89.4%	95.9%	107.0%
	0.1	6.2798	582.8%	106.9%	114.0%	117.6%
1E-10	1	11.5129	123.9%	79.6%	78.9%	86.7%
	0.5	15.3506	185.4%	88.0%	87.3%	94.2%
	0.25	18.4207	308.4%	94.6%	96.0%	100.3%
	0.1	20.9326	677.0%	101.8%	101.9%	106.0%

TABLE 1

*Numerical evaluation of the maximum risk for the different univariate predictive densities over  $[-l, l]$  as the degree of sparsity ( $\eta$ ) and predictive difficulty  $r$  varies. Here, we have chosen  $l = 5\lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is defined in (9). In ‘Asymp-Theory’ column we report the asymptotic minimax risk  $\lambda^2/(2r)$ . In the other columns, we report the maximum risk of the estimators as quotients of the ‘Asymp-Theory’ risk.*




FIG 3. Risk plots  $\rho(\theta, \cdot)$  for univariate predictive density estimators  $\hat{p}_H$  (black),  $\hat{p}_T$  (dark green),  $\hat{p}_B$  (blue) and  $\hat{p}_S$  (red) versus  $\theta \in [0, l]$ , for  $l = 5\lambda$ . Columns vary with moderate, high and very high sparsity,  $\eta = 0.1, 0.001, 10^{-10}$ , left to right. Rows vary  $r = 1, 0.5, 0.25$  and  $0.1$  from top to bottom. The horizontal line shows the asymptotic univariate minimax risk of  $\log \eta^{-1}/(1+r) = \lambda^2/(2r)$ , with  $\lambda = \sqrt{2 \log \eta^{-v}}$  and  $l$  shown in the insets.

**5. Future work.** In this paper our results are based on known sparsity levels. Recently, computationally tractable Bayesian methods which adapts to unknown sparsity levels and possibly dense signals have been developed for point estimation [3, 5, 37]. Using the approach of Johnstone and Silverman [18, 19] for point estimation, an interesting future direction will be to construct adaptive predictive density estimates.

## 6. Appendix: Proof Details.

6.1. *Proof of the “risk decomposition” Lemma 2.1.* Using (16), write the Bayes predictive density as

$$(49) \quad p_D(y|x) = \frac{\int \phi(y|\mu, r) \phi(x - \mu) \pi(d\mu)}{\int \phi(x - \mu) \pi(d\mu)} = \phi(y|0, r) \frac{N(x, y)}{D(x)},$$

after rewriting numerator and denominator in the first ratio respectively as

$$\pi_0 \phi(y|0, r) \phi(x) N(x, y), \quad \text{and} \quad \pi_0 \phi(x) D(x).$$

After simple algebra, we find

$$(50) \quad N(x, y) = \int \exp \left\{ \mu \left( x + \frac{y}{r} \right) - \frac{\mu^2}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{1}{r} \right) \right\} \frac{\pi(d\mu)}{\pi_0}$$

and  $D(x)$  is analogous, but without terms in  $y$  and  $r$ . Note also that

$$\mathbb{E}_\theta \log \left( \frac{\phi(Y|\theta, r)}{\phi(Y|0, r)} \right) = \mathbb{E}_\theta \left[ \frac{\theta Y}{r} - \frac{\theta^2}{2r} \right] = \frac{\theta^2}{2r}.$$

Hence, from (49) and the definition of predictive loss

$$L(\theta, p_D(\cdot|x)) = \mathbb{E}_\theta \log \left( \frac{\phi(Y|\theta, r)}{p_D(Y|x)} \right) = \frac{\theta^2}{2r} - \mathbb{E}_\theta \log N(x, Y) + \log D(x).$$

To obtain  $\rho(\theta, \hat{p}_\pi)$ , take expectation also over  $X \sim N(\theta, 1)$ . Since  $Y \sim N(\theta, r)$  independently of  $X$ , the random variable  $X + Y/r \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta/v, 1/v)$  may be expressed in the form  $\theta/v + Z/\sqrt{v}$ . Recalling the sparse prior form  $\pi(d\mu) = (1 - \eta)\delta_0 + \eta\nu$ , we get

$$N(X, Y) \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} 1 + \frac{\eta}{1 - \eta} \int \exp \left\{ \frac{\mu Z}{\sqrt{v}} + \frac{\mu\theta}{v} - \frac{\mu^2}{2v} \right\} \nu(d\mu) = N_{\theta, v}(Z),$$

and the Lemma follows from the previous two displays.

6.2. *Proofs of the lemmas used in Section 2.1.*

**Proof of Lemma 2.2.** We do the easy lower bounds involving  $N_{\theta,v}(Z)$  first. Indeed, the bound for  $\theta < \lambda$  follows just from  $N_{\theta,v}(Z) \geq 1$ . For  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega) \geq \lambda$ , by (36) we know:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \log N_l &= \log c_1(\eta) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 n(l, \omega), \text{ and,} \\ \mathbb{E} \log N_{l+1} &= \log c_1(\eta) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 \{n(l+1, \omega) - 2\dot{\alpha}_l \alpha_{l+1}/v\}.\end{aligned}$$

But  $\log c_1(\eta) = \log c(\eta) - \log(1 - \eta)^{-1} = O(1)$  as  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, the proof of the lower bound is completed by using

$$\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}(Z) \geq \max\{\mathbb{E} \log N_l, \mathbb{E} \log N_{l+1}\}.$$

The proof of the upper bound on  $\mathbb{E} \log D_\theta(Z)$  is more involved, and we first outline the approach. From (31) and  $1 + x + y < (1 + x)(1 + y/x)$ , we have

$$(51) \quad \log D_\theta(Z) \leq \log(1 + D_l) + \log(1 + \check{D}_l),$$

where we set  $\check{D}_l = \sum_{i \notin \{0, l\}} D_i/D_l$ . Henceforth in the proof, we make the choice  $l = l(\theta)$  except that when  $0 \leq \theta < \mu_1$  we set  $l = 1$ .

For the first term (henceforth we call it the main term) in (51) we will show

$$(52) \quad \mathbb{E} \log(1 + D_l) \leq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 d^+(l, \omega) + O(\lambda) & \text{for } l \geq 1 \\ O(1) & \text{if } 0 \leq \theta < \lambda \end{cases}$$

with  $O(\lambda)$  being uniform in  $l$ . For the other term in (51) we will show that it is  $O(\lambda)$  for all  $l$  (and so, henceforth we call it the remainder term). For that purpose, we write  $D_{i,l} = D_i/D_l$  and decompose

$$\check{D}_l = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_{l+k,l} + \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} D_{l-k,l} + \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D_{-j,l}.$$

We have  $D_{-j} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} D_j \exp\{-2\mu_j\theta\} \leq D_j$  since  $\mu_j = -\mu_{-j}$ ,  $\pi_{-j} = \pi_j$  and  $\mathcal{L}(Z)$  is symmetric. Hence

$$\sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D_{-j,l} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{\leq} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} D_{j,l} = \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} D_{l-k,l} + 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_{l+k,l}.$$

Now use the elementary inequality  $\log(1 + \sum \gamma_m) \leq \sum \log(1 + \gamma_m)$  to obtain

$$(53) \quad \mathbb{E} \log(1 + \check{D}_l) \leq 2\mathbb{E} \log\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_{l+k,l}\right) + \log 2 + 2\mathbb{E} \log\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} D_{l-k,l}\right).$$

We will later show that the two main right side terms are each  $O(\lambda)$ . This concludes the outline; we now turn to detailed analysis.

*The Main term in (51).* We first dispose of the case  $0 \leq \theta < \lambda$ . From (32) and (33),

$$D_1 = c_1(\eta) \exp\{\lambda Z + \lambda\theta - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2(2 + r^{-1})\}.$$

Since  $\theta < \lambda$  and  $c_1(\eta) < (1 - \eta)^{-1}$ , and using  $\log(1 + x) \leq \log 2 + (\log x)_+$ ,

$$\log(1 + D_1) \leq \log 2 + \log(1 - \eta)^{-1} + \lambda Z$$

and hence  $\mathbb{E} \log(1 + D_1) \leq O(1)$ .

Now suppose that  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega) \geq \lambda$  and use representation (36) for  $D_l$ . Abbreviating  $\frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 d(l, \omega)$  as  $d_{l\omega}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \log(1 + D_l) &= \mathbb{E} \log D_l + \mathbb{E} \log(1 + D_l^{-1}) \\ &= \log c(\eta) + \log(1 - \eta)^{-1} + d_{l\omega} + \log 2 + \mathbb{E}(\log D_l^{-1})_+. \end{aligned}$$

Symmetry of  $\mathcal{L}(Z)$  about 0 implies that  $\log D_l^{-1} \stackrel{\mathcal{D}}{=} -\log c(\eta) + \log(1 - \eta) + \mu_l Z - d_{l\omega}$ . By inspection the normalization constant  $c(\eta) < 1$ , so

$$\mathbb{E}(\log D_l^{-1})_+ \leq -\log c(\eta) + \mathbb{E}(\mu_l Z - d_{l\omega})_+.$$

From the previous two displays and  $\log(1 - \eta)^{-1} = O(\eta)$ , we have

$$(54) \quad \mathbb{E} \log(1 + D_l) = d_{l\omega} + \mathbb{E}(\mu_l Z - d_{l\omega})_+ + O(1).$$

We now bound the expectation on the right side. Consider first those  $l$  for which  $\alpha_l \leq 2 + r^{-1}$  and thus  $\mu_l \leq (2 + r^{-1})\lambda$ . Noting that

$$\mathbb{E}(\mu_l Z - d_{l\omega})_+ \leq -d_{l\omega} I\{d_{l\omega} \leq 0\} + \mu_l \mathbb{E} Z_+,$$

we then conclude that

$$d_{l\omega} + \mathbb{E}(\mu_l Z - d_{l\omega})_+ \leq (d_{l\omega})_+ + (2 + r^{-1})\phi(0)\lambda.$$

Now consider the remaining  $l$ , with  $\alpha_l \geq 2 + r^{-1}$ , for which we claim that

$$(55) \quad \alpha_l^2 - \beta_l - r^{-1} \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha_l^2.$$

We verify this via the equivalent form  $\alpha_l^2 - 2\beta_l \geq 2r^{-1}$ . We have

$$\frac{d}{dl}(\alpha_l^2 - 2\beta_l) = 2(\alpha_l \dot{\alpha}_l - \dot{\beta}_l) > 0$$

for both  $1 \leq l \leq K$  and  $l > K$ . So if  $l_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  satisfies  $\alpha_{l_0} = 2 + r^{-1}$ , we have

$$\alpha_l^2 - 2\beta_l \geq \alpha_{l_0}^2 - 2\beta_{l_0} \geq \alpha_{l_0}^2 - 2\alpha_{l_0} = (2 + r^{-1})r^{-1} \geq 2r^{-1}.$$

Since  $\omega \geq 0$ , we have from (37) and (55),

$$d_{l\omega} \geq \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2[\alpha_l^2 - \beta_l - r^{-1}] \geq \frac{1}{4}(\lambda\alpha_l)^2 = \frac{1}{4}\mu_l^2.$$

From the bound  $\mathbb{E}(Z - x)_+ \leq \phi(x)/x^2$  we calculate

$$\mathbb{E}(\mu_l Z - d_{l\omega})_+ \leq \mu_l \mathbb{E}(Z - \mu_l/4)_+ \leq 16 \frac{\phi(\mu_l/4)}{\mu_l} \leq M_b,$$

uniformly in  $\lambda \geq 1$  and  $l$  such that  $\alpha_l \geq 2 + r^{-1}$ . Combining the two cases with (54), we have proven the bound (52) on the first term of (51).

We turn now to bounding the remainder (53). This depends on the decay between successive terms  $D_j$ , so we start by using (34) to derive a useful representation for  $D_{j+1}/D_j$ . Indeed, using  $\mu_j = \lambda\alpha_j$  and  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega)$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_j &= \Delta(j; l, \omega) = (2/\lambda^2)[G(\mu_{j+1}; \theta) - G(\mu_j; \theta)] \\ &= \dot{\alpha}_j[\alpha_{j+1} + \alpha_j - 2\alpha_l - 2\omega] + \dot{\beta}_j \end{aligned}$$

and arrive at, for  $j \geq 1$ ,

$$(56) \quad \frac{D_{j+1}}{D_j} = \exp\{\lambda\dot{\alpha}_j Z - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2\Delta_j\}.$$

We now show that  $l \rightarrow \Delta_l$  achieves a maximum at  $l = 0$ . This will also verify the claim in Section 2 that  $j \rightarrow G(\mu_j; \theta)$  is minimized at  $j = l(\theta)$  for each  $\theta \in [\mu_l, \mu_{l+1})$ . The argument splits into two largely parallel cases.

Suppose first that  $j \geq l$ , so that  $j = l + k$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Using  $\alpha_l + \omega \leq \alpha_{l+1}$ , then  $\dot{\beta}_{l+k} = \dot{\alpha}_{l+k}^2$  and finally  $\dot{\alpha}_{l+k} + \alpha_{l+k} = \alpha_{l+k+1}$ , we have

$$(57) \quad \begin{aligned} \Delta_{l+k} &\geq \dot{\alpha}_{l+k}[\alpha_{l+k+1} + \alpha_{l+k} - 2\alpha_{l+1}] + \dot{\alpha}_{l+k}^2 \\ &= 2\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}(\alpha_{l+k+1} - \alpha_{l+1}) \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

with strict inequality when  $k \geq 1$ .

Suppose now that  $j < l$ , so that  $j = l - k - 1$  for  $k \geq 0$ . Using  $\alpha_l + \omega \geq \alpha_l$ , then  $\dot{\beta}_{l-k-1} = \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}^2$  and finally  $\dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1} + \alpha_{l-k-1} = \alpha_{l-k}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{l-k-1} &\leq \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}[\alpha_{l-k} + \alpha_{l-k-1} - 2\alpha_l] + \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}^2 \\ &= 2\dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}(\alpha_{l-k} - \alpha_l) \leq 0,\end{aligned}$$

with strict inequality when  $k \geq 1$ .

As final preparation, we record a useful bound whose proof is provided at the end this proof.

LEMMA 6.1. *If  $a_1, a_2, \dots$  are positive, then for each  $n \geq 1$ ,*

$$(58) \quad \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} a_k \right) < \log(1 + a_1) + \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k}.$$

We next concentrate on bounding the *first term of (53)*. Use (58) with  $a_k = D_{l+k}/D_l$  and  $\log(1 + a_1) \leq \log 2 + (\log a_1)_+$  to write

$$(59) \quad \mathbb{E} \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} D_{l+k,l} \right) \leq \log 2 + \mathbb{E} \left( \log \frac{D_{l+1}}{D_l} \right)_+ + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{D_{l+k+1}}{D_{l+k}} \right\}.$$

In (56) with  $j = l$ , we have seen that  $\Delta_l \geq 0$  and so

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \log \frac{D_{l+1}}{D_l} \right)_+ \leq \lambda \dot{\alpha}_l \mathbb{E} Z_+ \leq \lambda \phi(0).$$

When  $j = l + k$ , observe from (57) that  $\Delta_{l+k} \geq 2\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}^2 + 2\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}(\alpha_{l+k} - \alpha_{l+1})$ . From (56), now with  $j = l + k$  for  $k \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left\{ \frac{D_{l+k+1}}{D_{l+k}} \right\} &= \exp \{ \tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 [\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}^2 - \Delta_{l+k}] \} \\ &\leq \exp \{ -\tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 [\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}^2 + 2\dot{\alpha}_{l+k}(\alpha_{l+k} - \alpha_{l+1})] \} \\ &\leq \exp \{ -\tfrac{1}{2} \lambda^2 b^2 - \lambda^2 b^2 (k-1) \},\end{aligned}$$

so that the right side of (59) is  $O(\lambda) + O(e^{-\lambda^2 b^2/2}) = O(\lambda)$ .

*Second term of (53).* Now use (58) with  $a_k = D_{l-k}/D_l$ :

$$(60) \quad \mathbb{E} \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{l-1} D_{l-k,l} \right) \leq \log 2 + \mathbb{E} \left( \log \frac{D_{l-1}}{D_l} \right)_+ + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{l-2} \frac{D_{l-k-1}}{D_{l-k}} \right\}.$$



In (56) with  $j = l - 1$ , we have seen that  $\Delta_{l-1} \leq 0$  and so

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\log \frac{D_{l-1}}{D_l}\right)_+ \leq \lambda \dot{\alpha}_{l-1} \mathbb{E}Z_+ \leq \lambda \phi(0).$$

From (56), now with  $j = l - k - 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left\{\frac{D_{l-k-1}}{D_{l-k}}\right\} &= \mathbb{E}\{\exp\{-\lambda \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}Z + \tfrac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \Delta_{l-k-1}\}\} \\ &\leq \exp\{\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda^2 \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}[\dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1} + 2(\alpha_{l-k} - \alpha_l)]\}, \end{aligned}$$

as  $\Delta_{l-k-1} \leq 2\dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1}(\alpha_{l-k} - \alpha_l)$ . Since  $j \rightarrow \dot{\alpha}_j$  is increasing and  $\dot{\alpha}_j \geq b$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1} + 2(\alpha_{l-k} - \alpha_l) &\leq \dot{\alpha}_{l-k} - 2(\alpha_l - \alpha_{l-k+1}) - 2\dot{\alpha}_{l-k} \\ &\leq -b - 2(k-1)b. \end{aligned}$$

Using  $\dot{\alpha}_{l-k-1} \geq b$  again, we conclude that

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{\sum_{k=1}^{l-2} \frac{D_{l-k-1}}{D_{l-k}}\right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \exp\{-\tfrac{1}{2}\lambda^2 b^2 - \lambda^2 b^2(k-1)\} = O(e^{-\lambda^2 b^2/2}).$$

Thus, we have proved the desired bound on the second term. This completes the proof of the lemma.

**Proof of Lemma 6.1.** We use induction. The bounds  $1 + x + y < (1 + x)(1 + y/x)$  and  $\log(1 + x) < x$ , valid for positive  $x, y$ , establish the case  $n = 1$ . For general  $n$ , let  $a'_k = a_{k+1}/(1 + a_1)$  for  $k = 1, \dots, n$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} \log\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^{n+1} a_k\right) &= \log(1 + a_1) + \log\left(1 + \sum_{k=1}^n a'_k\right) \\ &< \log(1 + a_1) + \log(1 + a'_1) + \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} \frac{a'_{k+1}}{a'_k} \\ &< \log(1 + a_1) + \frac{a_2}{a_1} + \sum_{k=2}^n \frac{a_{k+1}}{a_k}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequalities use the cases  $n - 1$  and  $n = 1$  in turn.

**Proof of Lemma 2.3.** We modify some of the methods used in Lemma 2.2 to incorporate now  $v = r(1 + r)^{-1} \in (0, 1)$ . With  $N_j$  defined as in (29) and (30), and arguing as around (51), we bound

$$\log N_{\theta, v}(Z) \leq \log(1 + N_1) + \log(1 + \check{N}_1),$$

with  $\check{N}_1 = \sum_{j \notin \{0,1\}} N_{j,1}$  and  $N_{j,1} = N_j/N_1$ . The desired control of the main term is easier here than in Lemma 2.2: for  $l = 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \log(1 + N_1) &\leq \log 2 + \mathbb{E}(\log N_1)_+ \\ &\leq \log 2 + \log(1 - \eta)^{-1} + v^{-1/2} \lambda \mathbb{E}|Z| + 2^{-1} \lambda^2 n(1, \omega) \\ &\leq 2^{-1} \lambda^2 n(1, \omega) + O(\lambda). \end{aligned}$$

Turn now to the remainder term. Since  $N_{-j} \stackrel{D}{=} N_j \exp(-2v^{-1/2} \mu_j \theta)$ , we may argue as before to obtain the analog of (53):

$$\mathbb{E}\{\log(1 + \check{N}_1)\} \leq \log 2 + 2 \text{Rem}(\lambda),$$

where, using Lemma 6.1 with  $a_k = N_{k+1,1}$  and setting  $\check{R}_k = N_{k+1}/N_k$ ,

$$\text{Rem}(\lambda) = \mathbb{E} \log \left( 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} N_{k+1,1} \right) \leq \log 2 + \mathbb{E}(\log \check{R}_1)_+ + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \check{R}_{k+1}.$$

Using definition (30) and then (33) and (24), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \check{R}_k &= (\pi_{k+1}/\pi_k) \exp\{v^{-1/2}(\mu_{k+1} - \mu_k)(Z + \theta) - \frac{1}{2}v^{-1}(\mu_{k+1}^2 - \mu_k^2)\} \\ &= \exp\{\lambda v^{-1/2} \dot{\alpha}_k(Z + \theta) - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2[v^{-1} \dot{\alpha}_k(\alpha_{k+1} + \alpha_k) - \dot{\beta}_k]\} \\ &= \exp\{\lambda v^{-1/2} \dot{\alpha}_k Z - \frac{1}{2}\lambda^2 v^{-1} \gamma_k(\omega, v)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we put  $\theta = \lambda(1 + \omega)$  and used  $\dot{\beta}_k = \dot{\alpha}_k^2$  and  $\alpha_{k+1} = \dot{\alpha}_k + \alpha_k$  to write

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_k(\omega, v) &= -2v^{1/2} \dot{\alpha}_k(1 + \omega) + \dot{\alpha}_k^2 + 2\dot{\alpha}_k \alpha_k + v \dot{\alpha}_k^2 \\ &= \dot{\alpha}_k[(1 + v)\dot{\alpha}_k + 2(\alpha_k - \sqrt{v}(1 + \omega))]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $b \leq 1$ , we necessarily have  $K - 1 = \lceil 2b^{-3/2} \rceil \geq 2$ , and therefore  $\alpha_1 = 1, \alpha_2 = 1 + b$  and  $\dot{\alpha}_1 = b$ . Consequently, at  $k = 1$  we have

$$\gamma_1(\omega, v) = b[b + bv + 2 - 2\sqrt{v}(1 + \omega)] \geq b(bu^2 + 2u),$$

since  $\omega \leq b$  and we have set  $u = 1 - \sqrt{v} \geq 0$ . We arrive at

$$\log \check{R}_1 \leq \lambda v^{-1/2} b Z - \frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 v^{-1} b u(bu + 2),$$

and therefore  $\mathbb{E}(\log \check{R}_1)_+ \leq \lambda v^{-1/2} b \mathbb{E} Z_+ = O(\lambda)$ .

For  $k \geq 2$ , we write  $\log \mathbb{E} \check{R}_k = -\frac{1}{2} \lambda^2 v^{-1} (\gamma_k - \dot{\alpha}_k^2)$ , and from  $\dot{\alpha}_k \geq b$ ,

$$\gamma_k - \dot{\alpha}_k^2 = \dot{\alpha}_k[v \dot{\alpha}_k + 2(\alpha_k - \sqrt{v}(1 + \omega))] \geq b^2(v + 2(k - 2)).$$

since  $\alpha_k - \sqrt{v}(1 + \omega) \geq \alpha_k - \alpha_2 \geq (k - 2)b$ . This entails

$$\sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} \check{R}_k \leq e^{-b^2 \lambda^2 / 2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \exp(-v^{-1} \lambda^2 b^2 k) = O(\lambda).$$

The last two paragraphs show that  $\text{Rem}(\lambda) = O(\lambda)$  and complete the proof.

6.3. *Detailed proof of the lemmas and the inequalities used Section 3.*

**Proof of Lemma 3.1.** From (20), we find

$$\mathbb{E} N_{\theta,v}^S(Z) \leq 1 + \frac{\eta}{1-\eta} \frac{1}{2l} \int_{-\infty}^l \exp\left(\frac{\mu\theta}{v}\right) \nu(d\mu) \leq 1 + \frac{\eta}{(1-\eta)} \frac{e^w}{2w},$$

for  $w = \theta l/v \geq 1$ . From this and Jensen's inequality (19), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E} \log N_{\theta,v}^S(Z) \leq w + \log \left\{ e^{-w} + \frac{\eta}{(1-\eta)} \frac{1}{2w} \right\} \leq w,$$

since the term in braces is bounded by  $1/e + 1/2 \leq 1$ .

**Proof of (43).** Use  $v \leq 1$ , then  $0 \leq \theta \leq l$  and finally  $l \geq 1$  to conclude

$$\Phi_{l,v} \geq \Phi_{l,1} \geq \Phi(-Z) - \Phi(-l-Z) \geq \Phi(-Z) - \Phi(-1-Z).$$

Now use symmetry of  $Z$  and then Jensen's inequality to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \log \Phi_{l,v} &\geq \mathbb{E} \log \int_Z^{Z+1} \phi(s) ds \geq \mathbb{E} \int_Z^{Z+1} \log \phi(s) ds \\ &= \log \phi(0) - 2/3. \end{aligned}$$

**Proof of (46).** From the definition (42) with  $v = 1$  and using  $\Phi_{l,1} \leq 1$ ,

$$\log D_{\theta}^S(Z) \leq \log 2 + [\log c(\eta) + (\theta + Z)^2/2]_+.$$

From the upper bound in (44), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \log D_{\theta}^S(Z) \leq 2^{-1} \mathbb{E}[(\theta + Z)^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2]_+ + O(1).$$

Now if  $\theta < \tilde{\lambda}$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\theta + Z)^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2]_+ &\leq [\theta^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2]_+ + 2|\theta| \mathbb{E}Z_+ + \mathbb{E}Z^2 \\ &\leq [\tilde{\lambda}^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2]_+ + 2\tilde{\lambda} \phi(0) + 1 \end{aligned}$$

which suffices for the first bound.

If  $\theta \geq \tilde{\lambda}$ , we put  $W = (\theta + Z)^2$  and  $c = \lambda^2/v$  and apply the inequality  $\mathbb{E}(W - c)_+ \leq \mathbb{E}(W - c) + cP(W < c)$ , valid for  $W \geq 0$ . For all  $\theta \geq \tilde{\lambda}$ , we have  $\{|\theta + Z| \leq \lambda/\sqrt{v}\} \subset \{Z < -\sqrt{2\log \lambda}\}$  and so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\theta + Z)^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2]_+ &\leq \mathbb{E}(\theta + Z)^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2 + v^{-1}\lambda^2 P(Z > \sqrt{2\log \lambda}) \\ &\leq \theta^2 - v^{-1}\lambda^2 + O(\lambda) \text{ as } \lambda \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the Mills ratio bound  $P(Z > x) \leq x^{-1}\phi(x)$ .

**Acknowledgements.** GM was supported in part by the Zumberge individual award from the University of Southern California’s James H. Zumberge faculty research and innovation fund. IMJ was supported in part by NSF DMS 1407813 and 1418362 and thanks the Australian National University for hospitality while working on this paper.

## References.

- [1] Aitchison, J. and Dunsmore, I. R. (1975). *Statistical prediction analysis*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- [2] Aslan, M. (2006). Asymptotically minimax Bayes predictive densities. *Ann. Statist.*, **34**(6), 2921–2938.
- [3] Bhattacharya, A., Pati, D., Pillai, N. S., and Dunson, D. B. (2015). Dirichlet-laplace priors for optimal shrinkage. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **110**(512), 1479–1490.
- [4] Brown, L. D., George, E. I., and Xu, X. (2008). Admissible predictive density estimation. *Ann. Statist.*, **36**(3), 1156–1170.
- [5] Carvalho, C. M., Polson, N. G., and Scott, J. G. (2010). The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals. *Biometrika*, pages 465–480.
- [6] Fourdrinier, D., Marchand, E., Righi, A., and Strawderman, W. E. (2011). On improved predictive density estimation with parametric constraints. *Electron. J. Stat.*, **5**, 172–191.
- [7] Geisser, S. (1993). *Predictive inference*, volume 55 of *Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability*. Chapman and Hall, New York. An introduction.
- [8] George, E. I. and McCulloch, R. E. (1997). Approaches for bayesian variable selection. *Statistica sinica*, pages 339–373.
- [9] George, E. I. and Xu, X. (2008). Predictive density estimation for multiple regression. *Econometric Theory*, **24**(2), 528–544.
- [10] George, E. I., Liang, F., and Xu, X. (2006). Improved minimax predictive densities under Kullback-Leibler loss. *Ann. Statist.*, **34**(1), 78–91.
- [11] George, E. I., Liang, F., and Xu, X. (2012). From minimax shrinkage estimation to minimax shrinkage prediction. *Statist. Sci.*, **27**(1), 82–94.
- [12] Ghosh, M., Mergel, V., and Datta, G. S. (2008). Estimation, prediction and the Stein phenomenon under divergence loss. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **99**(9), 1941–1961.
- [13] Hartigan, J. A. (1998). The maximum likelihood prior. *Ann. Statist.*, **26**(6), 2083–2103.
- [14] Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005a). Spike and slab gene selection for multigroup microarray data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **100**(471), 764–780.
- [15] Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005b). Spike and slab variable selection: frequentist and bayesian strategies. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 730–773.
- [16] Johnstone, I. M. (1994). On minimax estimation of a sparse normal mean vector. *Ann. Statist.*, **22**(1), 271–289.
- [17] Johnstone, I. M. (2013). Gaussian estimation: Sequence and wavelet models. Version: 11 June, 2013. Available at "<http://www-stat.stanford.edu/~imj>".
- [18] Johnstone, I. M. and Silverman, B. W. (2004). Needles and straw in haystacks: empirical Bayes estimates of possibly sparse sequences. *Ann. Statist.*, **32**(4), 1594–1649.
- [19] Johnstone, I. M. and Silverman, B. W. (2005). Empirical Bayes selection of wavelet thresholds. *Ann. Statist.*, **33**(4), 1700–1752.

- [20] Kobayashi, K. and Komaki, F. (2008). Bayesian shrinkage prediction for the regression problem. *J. Multivariate Anal.*, **99**(9), 1888–1905.
- [21] Komaki, F. (1996). On asymptotic properties of predictive distributions. *Biometrika*, **83**(2), 299–313.
- [22] Komaki, F. (2001). A shrinkage predictive distribution for multivariate normal observables. *Biometrika*, **88**(3), 859–864.
- [23] Komaki, F. (2006). Shrinkage priors for bayesian prediction. *the Annals of Statistics*, pages 808–819.
- [24] Kubokawa, T., Marchand, É., Strawderman, W. E., and Turcotte, J.-P. (2013). Minimality in predictive density estimation with parametric constraints. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **116**, 382–397.
- [25] Kubokawa, T., Marchand, É., and Strawderman, W. E. (2015). On predictive density estimation for location families under integrated squared error loss. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, **142**, 57–74.
- [26] Kubokawa, T., Marchand, É., Strawderman, W. E., *et al.* (2017). On predictive density estimation for location families under integrated absolute error loss. *Bernoulli*, **23**(4B), 3197–3212.
- [27] Mallows, C. (1978). Minimizing an integral. *SIAM Review*, **20**(1), 183–183.
- [28] Maruyama, Y. and Ohnishi, T. (2016). Harmonic bayesian prediction under alpha-divergence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.05899*.
- [29] Matsuda, T. and Komaki, F. (2015). Singular value shrinkage priors for bayesian prediction. *Biometrika*, **102**(4), 843–854.
- [30] Mitchell, T. J. and Beauchamp, J. J. (1988). Bayesian variable selection in linear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **83**(404), 1023–1032.
- [31] Mukherjee, G. (2013). *Sparsity and Shrinkage in Predictive Density Estimation*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University.
- [32] Mukherjee, G. and Johnstone, I. M. (2015). Exact minimax estimation of the predictive density in sparse gaussian models. *Annals of Statistics*, **43**(3), 937.
- [33] O’Hara, R. B., Sillanpää, M. J., *et al.* (2009). A review of bayesian variable selection methods: what, how and which. *Bayesian analysis*, **4**(1), 85–117.
- [34] Park, T. and Casella, G. (2008). The bayesian lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **103**(482), 681–686.
- [35] Rocková, V. (2017). Bayesian estimation of sparse signals with a continuous spike-and-slab prior. *Annals of Statistics*.
- [36] Ročková, V. and George, E. I. (2014). Negotiating multicollinearity with spike-and-slab priors. *Metron*, **72**(2), 217–229.
- [37] Ročková, V. and George, E. I. (2016). The spike-and-slab lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*.
- [38] Xu, X. and Liang, F. (2010). Asymptotic minimax risk of predictive density estimation for non-parametric regression. *Bernoulli*, **16**(2), 543–560.
- [39] Xu, X. and Zhou, D. (2011). Empirical bayes predictive densities for high-dimensional normal models. *J. Multivariate Analysis*, **102**(10), 1417–1428.
- [40] Yano, K. and Komaki, F. (2017). Information criteria for prediction when the distributions of current and future observations differ. *Statistica Sinica*, **27**, 1205–1223.

## 7. Supplementary Risk plots.

Here, through numerical evaluations we provide further insights on the risk properties for the **pdes** considered in the previous sections. Figure 4 below shows the risk of the grid prior is well controlled below the desired limit when  $r = 1$ . Also, the plot reveals that the risk function exhibits periodicity for sufficiently large parametric values (in this case as  $|\theta| \geq 2\lambda$ ) with a period of  $\lambda$ . In Figure 5 we have the risk plots of the grid and bi-grid priors for different values of  $r$ . The bi-grid comes in play for  $r < r_0 \approx 0.309$ . From the plots we see that for  $|\theta| \in [\lambda, 2\lambda]$ , the risk function for the grid prior is roughly decreasing in  $|\theta|$  for large value of  $r$  but is bi-modal as  $r$  decreases towards  $r_0$ . At  $r_0$  its two peaks are equal in height and as  $r$  decreases further the gap between the maximal risk of the grid prior and the bi-grid prior widens. In Figure 6, we exhibit a scenario where the **pde** based on the grid prior is no longer optimal and its risk is far dominated by the bi-grid prior based **pde**.




FIG 4. Plot of the risk of  $\hat{p}_G$  as the parameter  $\theta$  varies over  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . Here,  $\lambda = 5$ ,  $r = 1$  and  $\eta = \exp(-\lambda^2)$ . The risk is well controlled below the asymptotic theory benchmark minimax value of  $\lambda^2/(2r) = 12.5$ . The vertical line denotes multiples of  $\lambda$  along the x-axis.

To understand the differences in the risk properties between the grid and bi-grid prior as  $r$  varies, we now concentrate on the behavior of the risk components theoretically analyzed in Section 2. Following the proofs of theorems 1.1 and 1.2, we concentrate on the dominant component of the risk  $\sigma(l, \omega)$  as defined in (39) where,  $\theta = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega)$ . Figure 7 plots  $\sigma(l, \omega)$




FIG 5. Plot of the risk of  $\hat{p}_G$  (in black) and  $\hat{p}_B$  (in red for  $r < r_0 = (\sqrt{5}-1)/4 \approx 0.309$ ) as the parameter  $\theta$  varies over  $\mathbb{R}^+$ . Here,  $\lambda = 5$  and  $\eta = \exp(-\lambda^2/(2v))$ . The vertical line denotes multiples of  $\lambda$  along the x-axis.

for  $\hat{p}_G$  and  $\hat{p}_B$  as  $l, \omega$  vary. Note, that for the representation of  $\theta$  is different for  $\pi_G$  and  $\pi_B$  as the  $\alpha_l$  and  $\beta_l$  are different. As such, for  $\hat{p}_G$ ,  $\omega$  always varies over  $[0, 1]$  where as for the bi-grid prior  $\omega$  only varies over  $[0, b]$  for some initial  $l$  denominations. In figure 7, we have 3 plots. The top plot shows the dominant risk for  $\hat{p}_G$  when  $r = 1$ . The dominant risk here is always contained




FIG 6. In black dotted line we have the plot of  $\hat{p}_B$  and in gray we have plot of  $\hat{p}_G$ . The vertical lines mark  $\lambda$  and  $2\lambda$  while the horizontal line represents the bench mark  $\lambda^2/(2r)$ . Here,  $\lambda = 5$ ,  $r = 0.1$  and  $\eta = \exp(-\lambda^2/2)$ . The maximal risk of  $\hat{p}_G$  is 1.18 times the bench mark value. The risk of  $\hat{p}_B$  is controlled below the bench mark value.

below the minimax value (shown in dotted horizontal line). Here,  $d^+(l, \omega)$  starts being positive roughly at  $l = 1$  and  $\omega = 0.5$  onwards; and so, the plot of  $\sigma(l, \omega)$  for  $\hat{p}_G$  has 3 piecewise quadratics for  $\theta \in [\lambda, 2\lambda]$  but 2 piecewise quadratics for the following intervals. The next plot shows the dominant risk for  $\hat{p}_G$  when  $r = 0.25$ . In this case,  $d^+(l, \omega)$  starts being positive roughly at  $l = 2$  and  $\omega = 0.5$  onwards; and so, the plot of  $\sigma(l, \omega)$  for  $\hat{p}_G$  has 3 piecewise quadratics for  $\theta$  in the interval  $[2\lambda, 3\lambda]$ . Here, the dominant risk is not always contained below the minimax value. The bottom plot shows the dominant risk for  $\hat{p}_B$  when  $r = 0.25$  and it is always contained below the minimax value. Note, that we have used different colors to display the dominant risk for different values of  $l$  and have used vertical lines to partition the  $\theta$  values belonging to different values of  $l$ . These partitions are same for the top two plots as they both involve  $\hat{p}_G$  but is different for  $\hat{p}_B$  in the bottom plot.






FIG 7. For  $r = 1$ , the top plot displays the dominant risk  $\sigma(l, \omega)$  of  $\hat{p}_G$  in the y-axis as  $|\theta| = \lambda(\alpha_l + \omega)$  varies in the x-axis. The next two plots show the dominant risk of  $\hat{p}_G$  and  $\hat{p}_B$  respectively for  $r = 0.25$ . For each plot, the benchmark minimax value (adjusted) of  $\lambda^2$  is represented by the dotted horizontal line. The vertical lines partition  $|\theta|$  into intervals corresponding to the different values  $l$  (based on the coordinate system for  $\theta$  used in Section 2; the purple lines denotes the boundaries for differential spacings) and different colors are used to display the dominant risk in these partitions. Here,  $\lambda = 5$  for all the 3 plots.




FIG 8. From top to bottom we have the plots of the risk of  $\hat{p}_S[l]$  as  $|\theta|$  varies over the interval  $[0, t]$  for  $l = \lambda, 0.75t, t$  respectively. Here,  $r = 1$ ,  $\lambda = 3$  and  $t = 5\lambda$ . The shaded rectangle in each plot has base on the support of the prior  $[0, l]$  and has height equaling the minimax benchmark value of  $\lambda^2/(2r) = 4.5$ .

Figure 7 displays the risk plots for Spike and Slab prior based pdes  $\hat{p}_S[l]$ . For three different choices of  $l$  the risk plots were tracked the interval  $[0, t]$ . It was seen that the risk is controlled below the benchmark value of  $\lambda^2/(2r) = 4.5$  when  $l = t$ . In that case, the risk function initially increases at a quadratic rate and peaks near  $\lambda$  and thereafter decreases at a rapid rate.

Table 2 shows the locations of the maxima of the pdes discussed in Section 4.

Sparsity	r	Theory	H-Plugin	C-Thresh	Bi-Grid	SS
0.1	1	1.52	2.46	2.52	2.47	2.38
	0.5	1.24	2.41	2.49	2.17	2.10
	0.25	0.96	2.37	2.46	1.80	1.78
	0.1	0.65	2.33	2.74	1.36	1.31
0.001	1	2.63	3.39	3.06	3.12	3.13
	0.5	2.15	3.39	2.84	2.84	2.73
	0.25	1.66	3.39	2.26	2.28	2.30
	0.1	1.12	3.39	1.68	1.69	1.70
1E-10	1	4.80	5.93	4.94	4.91	5.05
	0.5	3.92	5.93	4.39	4.37	4.37
	0.25	3.03	5.93	3.43	3.89	3.58
	0.1	2.05	5.92	2.52	2.54	2.56

TABLE 2

Numerical evaluation of the location of maxima of the risk plots over  $[-l, l]$  for the different univariate predictive densities as the degree of sparsity ( $\eta$ ) and predictive difficulty  $r$  varies. Here, we have chosen  $l = 5\lambda$ , where  $\lambda$  is defined in (9). In ‘Asymp-Theory’ column we report the theoretically obtained first order asymptotic maxima.

E-MAIL: [gourab@usc.edu](mailto:gourab@usc.edu)E-MAIL: [imj@stanford.edu](mailto:imj@stanford.edu)