arXiv:1708.00427v1 [stat.ME] 1 Aug 2017

Fast Exact Conformalization of Lasso using Piecewise Linear Homotopy

Jing Lei[1]

[1]Department of Statistics, Carnegie Mellon University

December 27, 2021

Abstract

Conformal prediction is a general method that converts almost any point predictor to a prediction set. The resulting set keeps good statistical properties of the original estimator under standard assumptions, and guarantees valid average coverage even when the model is misspecified. A main challenge in applying conformal prediction in modern applications is efficient computation, as it generally requires an exhaustive search over the entire output space. In this paper we develop an exact and computationally efficient conformalization of the Lasso and elastic net. The method makes use of a novel piecewise linear homotopy of the Lasso solution under perturbation of a single input sample point. As a by-product, we provide a simpler and better justified online Lasso algorithm, which may be of independent interest. Our derivation also reveals an interesting accuracy-stability trade-off in conformal inference, which is analogous to the bias-variance trade-off in traditional parameter estimation. The practical performance of the new algorithm is demonstrated using both synthetic and real data examples.

1 Introduction

Conformal prediction is a generic technique that converts point estimators, such as density estimators, regression function estimators, and cluster estimators, to prediction sets with valid coverage under very weak assumptions. Conformal prediction features an "out-of-sample" fitting approach, which re-fits the model by augmenting the data set with a candidate data point. Based on the re-fitting, it calculates a conformity score for the candidate data point, which measures how well this data point agrees with the sample and the model. Under a symmetry assumption of the fitting procedure and exchangeability of sample points, the conformity score can be transformed to a valid p-value. The prediction set is then obtained by thresholding the p-values obtained at all candidate data points.

Conformal prediction has two attractive properties. First and most importantly, conformal

prediction offers *model-free* coverage guarantee. On average, conformal prediction sets always cover at least the nominal level as long as the data points are exchangeable and the fitting procedure is symmetric with respect to the input data points, even when the model is completely misspecified. Second, conformal prediction can be combined with almost any existing point estimators. Even if an estimator is asymmetric, one can always construct a symmetric version using a U-statistic type transform.

Since its first appearance as an online learning tool (Vovk et al., 2005, 2009), conformal prediction has been developed in the statistical literature in a few directions. Including optimal choices of conformity score and statistical efficiency (Lei et al., 2013; Lei and Wasserman, 2014), efficient computation for complex input data types or fitting procedures (Hebiri, 2010; Lei et al., 2015; Chen et al., 2016), and classification (Lei, 2014; Sadinle et al., 2016). Recently, Lei et al. (2017) systematically extended the conformal prediction method to high dimensional regression.

Despite the attractive properties and all the progress, the application of conformal prediction often comes at a high computational cost, especially for high-dimensional complex data. By definition, in order to compute the conformal prediction set, one needs to exhaustively search all points in the sample space, where for each point the model needs to be re-fitted and the conformity score needs to be re-calculated. Therefore, the form of a conformal prediction set depends on the initial estimator as well as the conformity score. For some simple cases, close-form characterizations of conformal prediction sets are available, such as least squares regression or ridge regression (Burnaev and Vovk, 2014). Efficient approximations are available for kernel density estimator (Lei et al., 2013) and kernel nonparametric regression (Lei and Wasserman, 2014).

In high-dimensional problems, the estimators are inevitably more complicated and hence the corresponding conformal prediction sets are much harder to characterize. On the other hand, conformal prediction is most useful in high dimensional settings as the model assumptions such as sparsity and low-intrinsic dimensionality are often not true, and the inference tools developed under such assumptions are often invalid under model misspecification.

Our starting point of high-dimensional conformal prediction is the Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), one of the most popular and well-studied sparse linear regression methods. To compute the conformal prediction set at a new covariate vector x, the algorithm implemented in the `conformalInference` package developed in Lei et al. (2017) scans a set of grid points in the y-space, each with a new Lasso fitting and ranking of the fitted residuals. The output is essentially an evaluation of the indicator function of the prediction set at these grid points. If the grid size is 100, then this procedure costs more than 100 times computing resource as the original Lasso fit, for just a single value of covariate vector x, which is rather prohibitive in practice.

There are several attempts to efficiently conformalize the Lasso. Lei et al. (2017) considered

a sample splitting technique developed in Lei et al. (2015) that detaches the fitting step and ranking step (see also Vovk et al. (2005), under the name of *inductive conformal prediction*). This method loses some statistical efficiency, as both the fitting and ranking are carried out on a reduced sample size. Moreover, the sample splitting adds another layer of randomness which may be undesirable for the construction of prediction intervals. Hebiri (2010) proposed a partial conformalization of Lasso that uses the fitted residuals in a similar way as the original conformal prediction. However, that algorithm is not fully symmetric regarding the augmented sample and hence loses the key property of model free coverage guarantee. More recently, Chen et al. (2016) proposed a method of finding a smaller search space. This method, which may reduce the computational cost by a constant fraction, is still based on evaluating the indicator function of the prediction set on a set of grid points.

In this paper, we develop an algorithm that efficiently and exactly computes the conformal prediction set for the Lasso. Unlike the grid search based methods, we prove that the Lasso conformal prediction sets are unions of intervals and our algorithm finds the exact end points of these intervals from a single Lasso fitting on the original input data set. Our main technique is a novel piecewise linear homotopy of Lasso solution under perturbation of a single sample point of the training data. Such a piecewise linear homotopy allows us to explicitly track the re-fitted residuals as a piecewise linear function of the varying candidate value of y, which in turn leads to a simple rule of determining if y is in the conformal prediction set.

In addition to the main contribution, our derivation leads to the following interesting observations.

1. Due to the piecewise linearity of the refitted residuals, the conformal prediction set of Lasso is a union of intervals. In most cases, the prediction set is a single interval. We provide sufficient conditions for the prediction set to be an interval. Such conditions can be easily verified in extensions such as the elastic net.

2. Our derivation also reveals an interesting accuracy-stability trade-off in conformal inference, which is analogous to the well-known bias-variance trade-off. Here the term "accuracy" refers to the magnitude of fitted residuals, and the term "stability" refers to how fast the fitted residuals change when one response value changes. When the estimator is heavily regularized, the fit is more stable but less accurate, and vice versa. The most statistically efficient (i.e., the shortest) conformal prediction set is achieved when the two competing criteria are balanced.

3. Our perturb-one analysis of Lasso can also be used to efficiently update the Lasso solution when the data points arrive sequentially. A non-linear homotopy algorithm for online Lasso has been developed by Garrigues and El Ghaoui (2009). Our algorithm is piecewise linear and hence easier to implement. Moreover, Garrigues and El Ghaoui

(2009) only derives formulas for finding the points of change on the homotopy path, it does not provide validity guarantee of continuation after the points of change. In contrast, our derivation provides a more complete theoretical justification, including validity of continuation under a natural assumption that each point of change involves only a single coordinate.

In Section 2 we briefly introduce conformal prediction and its combination with the Lasso. In Section 3 we derive the piecewise linear homotopy algorithm with theoretical justification, and investigate sufficient conditions under which the prediction set is an interval. In Section 4 we demonstrate the performance of the algorithm on synthetic and real data examples. In Section 5 we conclude the paper with some discussion.

2 Background

2.1 Conformal prediction

Given independent and identically distributed data $(Z_i)_{i=1}^n$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ from an underlying distribution P, the problem of prediction set is to find a $\widehat{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $P(Z_{n+1} \in \widehat{C}) \geq 1-\alpha$, where $\alpha \in (0,1)$ is a prescribed error level.

This setup includes both unsupervised and supervised statistical learning. For example, in unsupervised learning problems such as density estimation or clustering, Z_i's are the data points and there is no response variable. In supervised learning problems such as linear regression, $Z_i = (X_i, Y_i)$ is the covariate-response pair, such that $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^1$ and $p = d-1$. The prediction set $\widehat{C}$ gives a prediction set of Y for each X by defining $\widehat{C}(x) = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^1 : (x,y) \in \widehat{C}\}$.

The general recipe of conformal prediction starts from a function

$$A(z_1, ..., z_n; z_{n+1}) : \mathbb{R}^{d\times(n+1)} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^1 ,$$

such that A is symmetric in the first n inputs. In the following we define $\vec{z} = (z_1, ..., z_{n+1})$ and $\vec{z}_{-i}$ by removing z_i in $\vec{z}$ for $i = 1, ..., n+1$.

The function A is called the *conformity score* function. It has two components. The first is a modeling component, in that A usually involves a model fitting step. The second is a deviation (or conformity) component, in that A also measures how well the last input agrees with the fitted model. For example, in density estimation, we can define $A(\vec{z}_{-(n+1)}; z_{n+1}) = \widehat{f}(z_{n+1})$, where $\widehat{f}$ is an estimated density function of P using the augmented data set $\vec{z}$. In regression, we can define $A(\vec{z}_{-(n+1)}; z_{n+1}) = -|y_{n+1} - \widehat{f}(x_{n+1})|$ where $\widehat{f}$ is an estimated regression function using data $\vec{z}$. A higher value of conformity implies better agreement between the sample point and the fitted model.

Given an x_{n+1}, at which a prediction of Y is wanted, the conformal prediction method proceeds by defining a p-value for each candidate value $y \in \mathbb{R}^1$:

$$\widehat{p}_y = 1 - \frac{1}{n+1} \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}\left(A_i \geq A_{n+1}\right) \tag{1}$$

where $A_i = A(\vec{z}_{-i}; z_i)$ for $1 \leq i \leq n+1$ and $y_{n+1} = y$. The conformal prediction set is then obtained by thresholding the p-values at α:

$$\widehat{C}(x_{n+1}) = \{y : \widehat{p}_y \geq \alpha\}\,. \tag{2}$$

It can be shown (Lei et al., 2013, 2017; Vovk et al., 2005) that under the assumption that $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{n+1}$ are exchangeable, then $\widehat{p}_{Y_{n+1}}$ has a sub-uniform distribution and is hence a valid p-value. Therefore we have

$$P(Y_{n+1} \in \widehat{C}(X_{n+1})) \geq 1 - \alpha\,. \tag{3}$$

Such a coverage guarantee requires only exchangeability of input data and symmetry of the conformity score function A, which holds for almost all popular model fitting algorithms. The probabilistic statement about the coverage needs to be interpreted with care, as detailed in the following remark.

Remark 1. *The probability in (3) refers to the joint distribution of $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{n+1}$. Therefore, the coverage guarantee is in an average sense. It averages over the training sample $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{n}$, as well as the new data pair (X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}). In other words, the actual coverage may be more than $1-\alpha$ for some training sample or some values X_{n+1}, and less than $1-\alpha$ for other combinations of training sample and X_{n+1}. This shall* not *be interpreted as a weakness of conformal prediction. In fact, one can also show (Lei and Wasserman, 2014; Lei et al., 2017) that when the initial model estimator is accurate, which typically holds under standard regularity conditions, then the conformal prediction set is nearly optimal and may provide asymptotic conditional coverage*

$$P(Y \in \widehat{C}(x) \mid X = x) = 1 - \alpha + o_P(1) \quad \forall x\,.$$

So conformal prediction shall be regarded as an additional level of protection against potential model misspecification, producing valid average coverage even when the regularity conditions are violated and the fitting is arbitrarily bad.

2.2 Conformal prediction with Lasso

Now we focus on linear regression where $Z_i = (X_i, Y_i)$ with $X_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^1$, and p can be much larger than n. Suppose we are given a paired training sample of size n, $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^{n}$,

and would like to construct a conformal prediction set of Y at future covariate $X_{n+1} = x_{n+1}$ using the Lasso as the base estimator. Following the general recipe described above, we only need to specify the conformity score function A, which in turn requires specification of the model fitting method and the conformity measure.

For any estimated regression coefficient vector $\widehat{\beta}$, it is natural to use the fitted residual to measure the "agreement" or "conformity" of a data point (x, y):

$$-|y - x'\widehat{\beta}|\,. \tag{4}$$

Let $\|\cdot\|_1$ denote the vector ℓ_1 norm. For a given tuning parameter $\lambda > 0$, we consider the Lasso estimate using the augmented data

$$\tilde{\beta}(y) = \arg\min_{\beta\in\mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - x_i'\beta)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(y - x_{n+1}'\beta)^2 + \lambda\|\beta\|_1\,. \tag{5}$$

That is, $\tilde{\beta}(y)$ denotes the Lasso estimator one would obtain when including (x_{n+1}, y) as the $(n+1)$th data point. Here $y_{n+1} = y$ is a candidate value in $\mathbb{R}^1$. Using the notation of the general recipe and the convention $y_{n+1} = y$, we have, for a given tuning parameter $\lambda > 0$,

$$A_i(y) = -|y_i - x_i'\tilde{\beta}(y)|, \quad i = 1, ..., n+1\,.$$

According to the definition of the conformal prediction set $\widehat{C}(x)$, $y \in \widehat{C}(x_{n+1})$ if and only if $A_{n+1}(y)$ ranks no higher than $(n+1)\alpha$ among $\{A_i(y) : 1 \le i \le n+1\}$ in ascending order. A brute-force method of computing $\widehat{C}(x_{n+1})$ would be to calculate and rank $A_i(y)$ for all y and all i, which is practically infeasible. In practice one can only evaluate $\mathbf{1}_{\widehat{C}(x_{n+1})}(y)$ over a fine grid of y values.

3 Efficient and exact conformalization of Lasso

3.1 A piecewise linear homotopy for the perturb-one Lasso

Now we derive our main technical component of our method: a piecewise linear homotopy of the Lasso solution. To simplify notation and facilitate discussion, we use the following notation and terminologies.

- $\widehat{\beta}$ is the Lasso solution using the original data set $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$.
- $y_{n+1}(t) = x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta} + t$ for a fixed $x_{n+1} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Our discussion will focus on positive values of t but the derivation extends easily to the negative values as well.

- We use $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ to denote the Lasso solution one would get by adding $(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}(t))$ as the $(n+1)$th sample point.
- $v(t)$ denotes the dual variable of the Lasso problem, see (8) below.
- For a matrix Σ and a set J of indices, Σ_J denotes the diagonal submatrix indexed by J. For a vector x, x_J denotes the subvector indexed by J.
- $\widehat{\Sigma} = n^{-1}\sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i'$ is the sample covariance matrix.

We will show that, under appropriate conditions, starting from $t_0 = 0$, we can find an increasing sequence $(t_k : k = 0, 1, 2, ...)$ such that

1. the support of $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ is constant, denoted by J_k, on each interval $[t_k, t_{k+1})$;
2. $\widehat{\beta}_{J_k}(t)$ is a linear function of t on $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$, with a slope vector denoted by $\eta(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{|J_k|}$;
3. $v_{J_k^c}(t)$ is a linear function of t on $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$ with a slope vector denoted by $\gamma(k) \in \mathbb{R}^{|J_k^c|}$.

In the following we derive the exact formulas for all the objects of interest in a recursive manner, including t_k, J_k, $\eta(k)$, and $\gamma(k)$.

3.1.1 The initial piece of the homotopy

Using optimality condition of $\widehat{\beta}$ we have

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta})x_i + v = 0\,, \tag{6}$$

where $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the dual variable satisfying $v_j = \text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_j)\lambda$ if $\widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0$ and $v_j \in [-\lambda, \lambda]$ if $\widehat{\beta}_j = 0$.

When $t = 0$, we have $y_{n+1}(0) = x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta}$ so that (6) can be written as

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta})x_i - (y_{n+1}(0) - x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta})x_{n+1} + v = 0\,, \tag{7}$$

which implies the following result.

Lemma 3.1. $\widehat{\beta}(0) = \widehat{\beta}\,.$

Next we investigate properties of $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ for $t \geq 0$. The discussion and derivation for $t \leq 0$ is analogous and omitted. In general, the optimality condition of $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ can be written as

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_i - (y_{n+1}(t) - x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_{n+1} + v(t) = 0\,, \tag{8}$$

where $v(t) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the corresponding dual variable.

We start from $k = 0$ and $t_0 = 0$. By definition, $J_0 = \{j : \widehat{\beta}_j(0) \neq 0\}$. Now assume that the dual variables v_j ($j \in J_0^c$) are not on the boundary: $\max_{j \in J_0^c} |v_j| < \lambda$. Then for small values of t we shall expect $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ to have the same support with the same signs as $\widehat{\beta}(0)$. In particular, we can write the optimality condition for $\widehat{\beta}(t)$, assuming it has the same signs as $\widehat{\beta}(0)$.

$$-\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_{i,J_0} - (y_{n+1}(t) - x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_{n+1,J_0} + v_{J_0} = 0\,, \tag{9}$$

$$\|v_{J_0^c}(t)\|_\infty \leq \lambda\,, \tag{10}$$

where

$$v_{J_0^c}(t) = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_{i,J_0^c} + (y_{n+1}(t) - x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta}(t))x_{n+1,J_0^c} \tag{11}$$

Combining (7) and (9) we have

$$\widehat{\beta}_{J_0}(t) = \widehat{\beta}_{J_0}(0) + \eta(0)t\,, \tag{12}$$

where

$$\eta(0) = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_{i,J_0}x_{i,J_0}'\right)^{-1} x_{n+1,J_0} = \frac{n^{-1}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_0}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}}{1 + n^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}'\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_0}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}}\,. \tag{13}$$

The last equality in (13) uses the Sherman-Morrison identity.

For the coordinates in J_0^c, we can combine (7) with (11) and (12), which leads to

$$v_{J_0^c}(t) = v_{J_0^c}(0) + \gamma(0)t \tag{14}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\gamma(0) =& x_{n+1,J_0^c} - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_{i,J_0^c}x_{i,J_0}'\right)\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n+1} x_{i,J_0}x_{i,J_0}\right)^{-1} x_{n+1,J_0} \\ =& \frac{x_{n+1,J_0^c} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{J_0^c,J_0}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_0}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}}{1 + n^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_0}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_0}}\,.\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

In order for $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ given in (12) to be a valid solution, it is sufficient and necessary to satisfy the sign constraint:

$$\text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_{J_0}(t)) = \text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_{J_0}(0)) \tag{16}$$

and the dual variable bound

$$\left\|v_{J_0^c}(t)\right\|_\infty = \left\|v_{J_0^c}(0) + \gamma(0)t\right\|_\infty \leq \lambda\,. \tag{17}$$

Therefore, the largest positive value t that satisfies both constraints are

$$t_1 := \min_{j\in J_0}\left(-\frac{\widehat{\beta}_j(0)}{\eta_j(0)}\right)_{++} \bigwedge \min_{j\in J_0^c}\left(\frac{\mathrm{sign}(\gamma_j(0))\lambda - v_j(0)}{\gamma_j(0)}\right)_{++} \tag{18}$$

where for a real number z, $(z)_{++}$ equals z if $z > 0$ and equals ∞ if $z \le 0$. In (18), we use the convention that $0/0 = 0$, $z/0 = \mathrm{sign}(z)\infty$ if $z \neq 0$.

Now we have completed the first piece in the piecewise linear homotopy. Next we show how to find directions in the following pieces of the homotopy.

3.1.2 The points of change and validity of continuation

Definition 1. *We call $t \in \mathbb{R}$ a* point of change *if the solution $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ of the augmented the Lasso problem (5) with $y_{n+1} = x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta} + t$ changes its support at t.*

By definition, t_1 given in (18) is such a point of change, since for t slightly larger than t_1 the support of $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ will be different from J_0. Suppose that the support changes to J_1. Then one would expect to be able to define $\eta(1)$ similarly as in (13) by replacing J_0 with J_1, with a similar rule of update as in (12) applicable to $t \in [t_1, t_2]$ for some $t_2 > t_1$.

Formally, Theorem 3.2 below establishes a recursive way to find all points of change as well as explicit formulas for both the primal and dual variables as functions of t, under the assumption that the support of $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ changes in only one coordinate at each point of change. Similar formulas can be derived for negative values of t.

Theorem 3.2. *Let $t_0 = 0$, $J_0 = \{j : \widehat{\beta}(0) \neq 0\}$, and for $k \ge 0$ define*

$$\eta(k) = \frac{n^{-1}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}{1 + n^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}, \tag{19}$$

$$\gamma(k) = \frac{x_{n+1,J_k^c} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{J_{k-1}^c,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}{1 + n^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}. \tag{20}$$

$$\widehat{\beta}_{J_k^c}(t) = 0 \quad \textit{and} \quad \widehat{\beta}_{J_k}(t) = \widehat{\beta}_{J_k}(t_k) + \eta(k)(t - t_k), \quad \forall\, t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}], \tag{21}$$

$$v_{J_k^c}(t) = v_{J_k^c}(t_k) + \gamma(k)(t - t_k), \quad \forall\, t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}], \tag{22}$$

$$t_{k+1} = t_k + \min_{j\in J_k}\left(-\frac{\widehat{\beta}_j(t_k)}{\eta_j(k)}\right)_{++} \bigwedge \min_{j\in J_k^c}\left(\frac{\mathrm{sign}(\gamma_j(k))\lambda - v_j(t_k)}{\gamma_j(k)}\right)_{++}, \tag{23}$$

$$J_{k+1} = \begin{cases} J\backslash\{j\} & \textit{if the minimum of (23) is achieved by } j \in J_k, \\ J \cup \{j\} & \textit{if the minimum of (23) is achieved by } j \in J_k^c. \end{cases} \tag{24}$$

Assume $\|v_{J_0^c}(0)\|_\infty < \lambda$ and for some $K \ge 1$,

1. $\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ *has full rank for* $0 \le k \le K-1$,

2. (23) *achieves its minimum at only one* j *for* $1 \le k \le K-1$.

Then for all $t \in [0, t_K]$, $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ *is the unique Lasso solution corresponding to the data set* $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^{n+1}$ *with* $y_{n+1} = y_{n+1}(t)$ *and tuning parameter* λ.

In the recursion, the case of $K = 0$ has been treated in Section 3.1.1. The remaining of the proof amounts to verify that the primal variable given in (21) is a valid Lasso solution for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$, provided that the result holds for $t \in [0, t_k]$, $k = 1, ..., K-1$. We call this the *validity of continuation*. Here we cannot directly repeat the argument used for the initial piece because by construction of t_k the assumption $\|v_{J_k^c}(t)\|_\infty < \lambda$ is violated at $t = t_k$.

Theorem 3.2 uses a simple and useful sufficient condition for validity of continuation by assuming that only one coordinate of inactive variables has its dual variable on the boundary when the support changes. We call this the *simple change assumption*, formally given below.

Definition 2. *We say a point of change* $t = t_k$ $(k = 1, 2, ...,)$ *is* simple *if only one coordinate achieves the minimum in* (23).

A few remarks are in order before we prove Theorem 3.2.

Remark 2. *A nonlinear piecewise smooth homotopy of the Lasso after adding a single data point has been proposed by Garrigues and El Ghaoui (2009). That paper aims at finding the Lasso solution after adding the* $(n+1)$*th data point* (x_{n+1}, y_{n+1})*, by considering adding* (tx_{n+1}, ty_{n+1}) *as the* $(n+1)$*th data point and letting* t *change from* 0 *to* 1*. It derives formulas for finding the points of change, but does not prove validity of continuation. In this paper, Theorem 3.2 provides a simpler and more theoretically justifiable solution to the same problem, since one can use the piecewise linear homotopy by varying* t *from* 0 *to* $y_{n+1} - x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta}$*. Our piecewise linear homotopy makes use of the observation that adding data point* $(x_{n+1}, x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta})$ *does not change the solution (Lemma 3.1). The linearity of the primal and dual updates also makes it easier to check validity of continuation. Finally, we note that the homotopy considered in Garrigues and El Ghaoui (2009) cannot be used to derive the conformal prediction set of Lasso.*

Remark 3. *The requirement of the change points being simple is to make the calculation more tractable. When the joint distribution of* (X, Y) *is continuous, a point of change being non-simple implies that two jointly continuous variables are equal, which has probability 0. This assumption has never been violated in our numerical experiments. In the rare case of a non-simple point of change, the homotopy is still piecewise linear, but finding the explicit formulas for the active set and the slopes becomes more complicated.*

Remark 4. *The requirement of $\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ being full-rank is also natural. When it is not full rank, the Lasso solution is not unique, which happens with zero probability if the columns of design matrix are generally positioned (Tibshirani, 2013). In the rare case that $\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ is rank deficient, one can add a small ridge penalty term to avoid the problem. We will extend our results to the case of elastic net in Section 3.4 below.*

Proof of Theorem 3.2. The initial piece with $k = 0$ has been established in Section 3.1.1.

The case of $K = 1$ requires no more proof. When $K \geq 2$, we prove by induction. Assume that the claim holds for $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ for some $0 \leq k \leq K-2$. It suffices to prove validity of continuation for $t \in [t_{k+1}, t_{k+2}]$.

Consider two cases.

> Case 1. At t_{k+1}, one active variable in J_k becomes inactive. This corresponds to the scenario that the minimum of (23) is achieved at some $j \in J_k$.
>
> Case 2. At t_{k+1}, one inactive variable in J_k^c becomes active. This corresponds to the scenario that the minimum of (23) is achieved at some $j \in J_k^c$.

Under the assumption that t_{k+1} is a simple point of change, these two disjoint cases cover all possibilities.

In Case 1, let $j \in J_k$ be the coordinate that $\widehat{\beta}_j(t_{k+1}) = 0$. We know that $\eta_j(k)$ and $v_j(t_{k+1})$ must have different signs, because $0 = \widehat{\beta}_j(t_{k+1}) = \widehat{\beta}_j(t_k) + \eta_j(k)(t_{k+1} - t_k)$ and $v_j(t) = \mathrm{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_j(t_k))\lambda$ for all $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$. The conjectured dual variable is, for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough,

$$v_j(t_{k+1} + \epsilon) = v_j(t_{k+1}) + \gamma_j(k+1)\epsilon = \mathrm{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_j(t_k))\lambda + \gamma_j(k+1)\epsilon\,. \tag{25}$$

As a result, in order to establish validity of continuation, it suffices to show that $\gamma_j(k+1)$ and $\eta_j(k)$ have the same sign.

Using (19) we have

$$\eta(k) = c\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1} x_{n+1,J_k}$$

for some $c > 0$. Using the fact that $J_k = J_k \cup \{j\}$ and blockwise matrix inversion, we have

$$\eta_j(k) = c\left(\widehat{\Sigma}_{jj} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,J_{k+1}}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_{k+1}}^{-1}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_{k+1},j}\right)^{-1}\left(x_{n+1,j} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,J_{k+1}}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_{k+1}}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_{k+1}}\right)$$

On the other hand, using (20) have

$$\gamma_j(k+1) = c'(x_{n+1,j} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,J_{k+1}}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_{k+1}}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_{k+1}})$$

for some $c' > 0$. Therefore we confirm that $\gamma_j(k+1)$ and $\eta_j(k)$ have the same sign.

In Case 2, let $j \in J_k^c$ be such that $v_j(t_{k+1}) \in \{\pm\lambda\}$. By construction $\widehat{\beta}_j(t_{k+1}) = 0$ and the conjectured solution $\widehat{\beta}_j(t_{k+1}+\epsilon) = \eta_j(k+1)\epsilon$ for $\epsilon > 0$ small enough. In order to establish validity of continuation, we need to show that $\eta_j(k+1)$ has the same sign as $v_j(t_{k+1})$.

Using (19) we know that $\eta_j(k+1)$ is the j-coordinate of $c\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}_{J_{k+1}} x_{n+1,J_{k+1}}$ for some $c > 0$. Using blockwise inversion we have

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_j(k+1) =& c\left(\widehat{\Sigma}_{jj} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}_{J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k,j}\right)^{-1}\left(x_{n+1,j} - \widehat{\Sigma}_{j,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}^{-1}_{J_k} x_{n+1,J_k}\right)\\ =& c'\gamma_j(k)\,,\end{aligned}$$

for some $c, c' > 0$. Therefore $\eta_j(k+1)$ as the same sign as $\gamma_j(k)$. But $v_j(t_{k+1}) = v_j(t_k) + \gamma_j(k)(t_{k+1} - t_k)$, thus $v_j(t_{k+1})$ must have the same sign as $\gamma_j(k)$. As a result, we have confirmed that $\eta_j(k+1)$ and $v_j(t_{k+1})$ have the same sign. ■

3.2 The conformal Lasso algorithm

Now we describe an efficient and exact algorithm to compute the Lasso conformal prediction set. We introduce a few more notations.

- $r_i(t) = y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta}(t)$ $(i = 1, ..., n, n+1)$ denotes the fitted residual when using $(x_{n+1}, y_{n+1}(t))$ as the $(n+1)$th data point, where $y_{n+1}(t) = x_{n+1}'\widehat{\beta} + t$.
- Throughout the rest of this paper we let $\widehat{C}(x_{n+1})$ be the Lasso conformal prediction set at x_{n+1}, using the negative absolute fitted residual (4) as conformity score function.
- For a set C and a number z, $C + z = \{y : y - z \in C\}$ denotes the shifted set.

By definition, $y_{n+1}(t) \in \widehat{C}(x_{n+1})$ if and only if the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ among all fitted residuals (including itself) is no higher than $(n+1)\alpha$ in decreasing order.

Theorem 3.2 implies that the Lasso solution $\widehat{\beta}(t)$ is piecewise linear. Therefore, the fitted residuals $r_i(t)$ are also linear in t between a pair of consecutive points of change (t_k, t_{k+1}). Then one can easily find all values of t in (t_k, t_{k+1}) at which the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ changes, by solving $|r_{n+1}(t)| = |r_i(t)|$ for t in the interval $[t_k, t_{k+1}]$. Denote these points by $t_k = t_{k,0} < t_{k,1} < t_{k,2} < ... < t_{k,\ell_k} = t_{k+1}$. Between these points, the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ is constant. Then we have

$$\left[\widehat{C}(x_{n+1}) - y_{n+1}(0)\right] \cap [t_k, t_{k+1}) = \bigcup_{\ell \in L_k} [t_{k,\ell}, t_{k,\ell+1}) \tag{26}$$

where L_k consists of all ℓ's in $\{0, ..., \ell_k - 1\}$ such that the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t_{k,\ell})|$ among $\{|r_i(t_{k,\ell})| : 1 \le i \le n+1\}$ is no higher than $(n+1)\alpha$ in decreasing order.

Algorithm 1 Conformal Prediction with Lasso

Input: Data $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$, new covariate x_{n+1}, range $(y_{\min}, y_{\max})$, miscoverage level $\alpha \in (0,1)$, Lasso parameter λ

Output: $\widehat{D} = \widehat{C}(x_{n+1}) \cap [y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$.

Let $\widehat{\beta}(0)$ be the Lasso solution on data $(x_i, y_i)_{i=1}^n$ with tuning parameter λ

$y_{n+1}(0) \leftarrow x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta}(0)$, $t_0 \leftarrow 0$, $k \leftarrow 0$

$\widehat{D}_+ \leftarrow \{y_{n+1}(0)\}$

while $t_0 + ... + t_k < y_{\max} - y_{n+1}(0)$ **do**

  Let J_k be the active set of $\widehat{\beta}(t_k)$.

  Calculate $\eta(k)$, $\gamma(k)$, t_{k+1} as in (19), (20), (23).

  $t_{k+1} \leftarrow \min(t_{k+1}, y_{\max} - y_{n+1}(0) - (t_0 + ... + t_k))$.

  $\{t_{k,1}, ..., t_{k,\ell_k - 1}\} \leftarrow \{t \in (t_k, t_{k+1}) : |r_i(t)| = |r_{n+1}(t)| \text{ for some } 1 \le i \le n\}$.

  $L_k \leftarrow \left\{1 \le \ell < \ell_k : \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \mathbf{1}\left[|r_i(t_{k,\ell})| \le |r_{n+1}(t_{k,\ell})|\right] \le \lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil \right\}$

  $\widehat{D}_+ \leftarrow \widehat{D}_+ \bigcup \{\cup_{\ell \in L_k} [t_{k,\ell}, t_{k,\ell+1})\}$.

  $k \leftarrow k + 1$

end while

Repeat the above procedure analogously for negative values of t, obtaining $\widehat{D}_-$.

Return $\widehat{D} = y_{n+1}(0) + (\widehat{D}_+ \cup \widehat{D}_-)$.

We summarize the algorithm of conformal prediction using Lasso in Algorithm 1. Some of the steps, such as finding the rank of fitted residuals and solving linear equations, are simple enough so the details are omitted.

Remark 5. *Algorithm 1 requires an interval $[y_{\min}, y_{\max}]$ as part of the input. Theoretically speaking, this interval can be chosen simply as $[y_{(1)}, y_{(n)}]$, the sample range of the response variable, where $y_{(1)} \le y_{(2)} \le \ldots \le y_{(n)}$ are the order statistics of the response variable. Doing this will incur a loss of coverage no more than $2/(n+1)$, because $P(Y_{n+1} \in [Y_{(1)}, Y_{(n)}]) \ge 1 - 2/(n+1)$. In our numerical experiments, we set the search range even more conservatively, enlarging the sample range by 50% of length*

$$[y_{\min}, y_{\max}] = \left[y_{(0)} - 0.25(y_{(n)} - y_{(0)}), \quad y_{(n)} + 0.25(y_{(n)} - y_{(0)})\right] . \tag{27}$$

3.3 When is the Lasso conformal prediction set an interval?

Being an interval is a conceptually and practically desirable property of a prediction set. From the original definition, it is generally unclear if the Lasso conformal prediction set is an interval at a particular covariate value x_{n+1}. Theorem 3.2 and Remark 3 imply that the conformal prediction set must be a union of intervals. However, as we explain next, very often the prediction set is an interval.

Consider $t \in [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ for a pair of consecutive points of change (t_k, t_{k+1}). We focus on the case $t_k > 0$. For $1 \le i \le n$, the residuals $r_i(t) = y_i - x_i'\widehat{\beta}(t)$ is a linear function satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} r_i(t) =& r_i(t_k) - x'_{i,J_k}\eta(k)(t - t_k) \\ =& r_i(t_k) - \frac{n^{-1}x'_{i,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}{1 + n^{-1}x'_{n+1,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}(t - t_k)\,, \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

whereas for the $(n+1)$th data point

$$\begin{aligned} r_{n+1}(t) =& r_{n+1}(t_k) + (t - t_k) - x'_{n+1,J_k}\eta(k)(t - t_k) \\ =& r_{n+1}(t_k) + \frac{1}{1 + n^{-1}x'_{n+1,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k}}(t - t_k)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

According to (29), when t moves away from 0, the fitted residual $r_{n+1}(t)$ does not change its sign and its absolute value is strictly increasing in a piecewise linear manner with a slope of $(1 + n^{-1}x'_{n+1,J_k}\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1}x_{n+1,J_k})^{-1}$ in the kth piece of the homotopy, which is close to 1 if n is large and $\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ is well-conditioned. Similarly, (28) suggests that when $\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ is well-conditioned and n large, the residuals $r_i(t)$ change slowly for $1 \le i \le n$.

Combining these two observations, we expect that in most cases, $r_{n+1}(t)$ changes faster than $r_i(t)$ $(1 \le i \le n)$. So $|r_i(t)| = |r_{n+1}(t)|$ only happens for one negative value and one positive value of t. As a result, the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ increases monotonically as t moves away from 0. In this case, $\widehat{C}(x_{n+1})$ is an interval containing $y_{n+1}(0)$. Formally we have the following result.

Theorem 3.3. *If*

$$\max_{1 \le i \le n} \left| x'_{i,J}\widehat{\Sigma}_J^{-1}x_{n+1,J} \right| < n\,, \tag{30}$$

for all the active sets J as t varies over the real line, then the Lasso conformal prediction set is an interval.

Remark 6. *The quantity $x'_{i,J}\widehat{\Sigma}_J x_{i,J}$ is the leverage score of the ith sample point constrained on the active set J. In ordinary least square regression, a small leverage score implies robustness at x_i. In our analysis, it turns out that $x'_{i,J}\widehat{\Sigma}_J x_{n+1,J}$, $1 \le i \le n$, which we call the* cross leverage scores*, measure the stability of fitted residuals under the addition of a new sample point at x_{n+1} when the active set is J. Further discussion about robustness and stability is given in Section 5.*

Efficient implementation of Algorithm 1. Although the condition of Theorem 3.3 is hard to verify over all values of t. It is easy to verify for any given pair of consecutive points of change. Suppose we have found $0 \le t_k < t_{k+1}$ and need to find $\left[\widehat{C}(x_{n+1}) - y_{n+1}(0)\right] \cap [t_k, t_{k+1}]$ in Algorithm 1. If (30) holds for $J = J_k$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left[\widehat{C}(x_{n+1}) - y_{n+1}(0)\right] \cap [t_k, t_{k+1}) \\
&= \begin{cases} \emptyset, & \text{if } \ t_k \notin \widehat{C}(x_{n+1})\,, \\ [t_k, t_{k+1}), & \text{if } \ t_k \in \widehat{C}(x_{n+1}), \ \ t_{k+1} \in \widehat{C}(x_{n+1})\,, \\ [t_k, t^*), & \text{if } \ t_k \in \widehat{C}(x_{n+1}), \ \ t_{k+1} \notin \widehat{C}(x_{n+1})\,, \end{cases}
\end{aligned}$$

where $t^* \in (t_k, t_{k+1})$ is the unique value that satisfies $|r_i(t^*)| = |r_{n+1}(t^*)|$ for some $1 \le i \le n$ and the rank of $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ crosses the threshold $\lceil (n+1)(1-\alpha) \rceil$ at t^*. This leads to a substantial speedup of Algorithm 1.

An accuracy-stability trade-off. According to (28) and (29), if $n^{-1} x_{i,J_k} \widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1} x_{n+1,J_k}$ is much smaller than 1 for all i and all active sets J_k on the solution path, then $|r_{n+1}(t)|$ will quickly become larger than other $|r_i(t)|$'s as t moves away from 0. Thus, for larger values of λ, the size of J_k tend to be smaller and $x_{i,J_k} \widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}^{-1} x_{n+1,J_k}$ is also smaller, which leads to a shorter conformal prediction interval. We call this the benefit of stability: The original fitted residuals $r_i(t)$ changes slowly under the perturbation of the $(n+1)$th data point with a slope near 0, while the $(n+1)$th fitted residual $r_{n+1}(t)$ changes much faster with a slope near 1. On the other hand, when λ is large, the Lasso algorithm searches for $\widehat{\beta}$ over a smaller feasible set, thus the estimate suffers from an inferior accuracy: The fitted residuals $r_i(0)$ may be large to start with, which leads to a wider conformal prediction interval. Therefore we have the accuracy-stability trade-off in conformal prediction: λ needs to be large enough for the fitted residuals to be stable, but not too large so the fitted residuals are small.

3.4 Extension to the elastic net

The elastic net (Zou and Hastie, 2005) adds an ℓ_2 penalty to the Lasso problem. The resulting objective function is then strongly convex and the solution is more stable. Our derivation for the Lasso easily extends to the elastic net. Now we consider the problem

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\beta}^{(\mathrm{en})}(t) = \arg\min_{\beta} \Bigg\{ & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - x_i'\beta)^2 \\
& + \frac{1}{2} \left[x_{n+1}' \widehat{\beta}^{(\mathrm{en})}(0) + t - x_{n+1}'\beta \right]^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1 + \frac{\rho}{2} \|\beta\|_2^2 \Bigg\}, \qquad (31)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\widehat{\beta}^{(\mathrm{en})}(0) = \arg\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(y_i - x_i'\beta)^2 + \lambda\|\beta\|_1 + \frac{\rho}{2}\|\beta\|_2^2$$

is the elastic net estimate using the original data. A similar homotopy holds for the elastic net solution path indexed by t, using an almost identical derivation.

Corollary 3.4. *Lemma 3.1 and Theorem 3.2 hold for the solution path* $\{\widehat{\beta}^{(\mathrm{en})}(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$, *with* $n\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ *replaced by* $n\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k} + \rho I_{|J_k|}$ *for all* $k \geq 0$, *where* I_m *denotes the* $m \times m$ *identity matrix.*

Using the analogous versions of (28) and (29) with with $n\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k}$ replaced by $n\widehat{\Sigma}_{J_k} + \rho I_{|J_k|}$, we obtain an easy to verify sufficient condition for the elastic net conformal prediction set to be an interval.

Corollary 3.5. *If* $\rho \geq \|x_{n+1}\| \cdot \max_{1\leq i\leq n} \|x_i\|$, *then the elastic net conformal prediction set at* x_{n+1} *is an interval.*

4 Numerical experiments

We examine the statistical and numerical performance of the conformal Lasso algorithm over a wide range of synthetic data sets and two real data examples.

4.1 Synthetic data examples

Our synthetic data examples follow the setup of those in Lei et al. (2017). We consider both low dimensional and high dimensional settings.

Low dimensional setting. In the low dimensional setting, the sample size is set to be $n = 100$, and the covariate has dimensionality $p = 10$. We consider three different models to generate the data pair (X, Y).

- Model I (Standard Gaussian linear model). In this model $Y = X'\beta + \epsilon$, where β is a p-dimensional vector whose entries are 1 or -1 with a random sign. The marginal distribution of X is $N(0, I_p)$ where I_p is the identity matrix. The noise ϵ has a standard normal distribution, and is independent of X and β.
- Model II (Nonlinear additive model). This model uses $Y = \sum_{j=1}^{p} f_j(X(j)) + \epsilon$, where each f_j is a B-Spline function with 4 degrees of freedom (using function `bs` in `R` package `splines`) and coefficients randomly generated from $\{-1, 1\}$. Again, ϵ is standard normal and independent of X and all f_j's.

- Model III (linear model with Non-Gaussian correlated design and heavy-tailed noise). The model is linear: $Y = X'\beta + \epsilon$ with β generated the same way as in Model I. The covariate matrix X is generated by taking a column-wise weighted moving average of a random matrix Z using iid Uniform$(0, 1)$ weights. Each column of Z is randomly sampled from one of the three distributions: normal, Bernoulli with parameter 0.5, skewed normal with skewness parameter 5. The columns of Z are scaled to have the same variance. Finally, the noise has a student t-distribution with 2 degrees of freedom. We note that the noise, and hence the response variable Y, does not have a finite second moment.

For each model, we generate a data set of $n = 100$ training sample points, each accompanied with 100 testing sample points. A conformal prediction set with target coverage level 0.9 ($\alpha = 0.1$) is calculated for each testing sample point using each of the three methods: the exact conformal lasso algorithm presented in this paper; the grid point evaluation method implemented in the `conformalInference` package (Lei et al., 2017); the split conformal method proposed in (Lei et al., 2017). The base estimator is Lasso with λ chosen by the median of the cross-validated values from 100 independent samples of the same size. The search range used in both the exact method and the grid evaluation method is chosen according to (27).

The experiment is repeated on 100 independently generated samples. We report the average empirical coverage, average size of the conformal prediction set (length of interval), and average running time per data set (in seconds) in Tables 1 to 3 for models I, II, III, respectively. One standard error is given in the parenthesis following the average number.

From the simulation we observe that all three methods provide valid and nearly perfect coverage. The grid method and exact method give similar lengths, where the slight difference is due to the rounding between neighboring grid points in the grid method. In this setting, the exact method is much faster than the grid method, with same solid performance.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.911 (0.004)	0.910 (0.004)	0.905 (0.004)
Length	3.57 (0.03)	3.77 (0.05)	3.51 (0.03)
Time	32.2 (0.07)	0.008 ($< 10^{-3}$)	0.045 ($< 10^{-3}$)

Table 1: Simulation 1(I): Low-dimensional setting with the standard linear model.

High dimensional setting. In the high dimensional setting, the sample size is $n = 200$, and the covariate dimensionality is $p = 500$. Similarly we consider three models, but with sparsity.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.897 (0.005)	0.890 (0.006)	0.898 (0.005)
Length	5.95 (0.13)	7.29 (0.30)	5.98 (0.14)
Time	30.5 (0.03)	0.008 ($< 10^{-3}$)	0.076 (0.002)

Table 2: Simulation 1(II): Low-dimensional setting with the nonlinear additive model.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.909 (0.004)	0.906 (0.005)	0.905 (0.004)
Length	18.0 (0.53)	20.1 (0.95)	17.5 (0.50)
Time	32.3 (0.07)	0.008 ($< 10^{-3}$)	0.070 (0.002)

Table 3: Simulation 1(III): Low-dimensional setting with the non-Gaussian, correlated, heavy-tail, linear model.

- Model I (sparse Gaussian linear model). The difference from the low dimensional case is that only the first 5 coordinates of β are non-zero, and set to be -8 or 8 with signs chosen at random.
- Model II (sparse nonlinear additive model). The difference from the low dimensional setting is that only 5 f_j's are non-zero, and the linear coefficients of the spline bases are set to be -8 or 8 with signs chosen at random.
- Model III (non-Gaussian, correlated, heavy-tail, linear model). The difference is that only first 5 coordinate of β are non-zero, and set to be -8 or 8, with signs chosen at random.

The simulation is carried out in the same manner as in the low dimensional setting. For computational efficiency, instead of searching the entire interval specified by (27), the exact algorithm stops when it finds the end points of the interval in the conformal prediction set that contains $x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta}$. The results are summarized in Tables 4 to 6.

A notable observation in the high dimensional setting is a substantial over-conservative coverage for the grid method in Model I. This is a rounding error due to an *ad hoc* interpolation between two neighboring grid points used by the algorithm when finding the end points of the prediction interval. Such a rounding error becomes substantial when the grid is not dense enough but the response variable happens to have non-negligible probability mass near the cut-off point. This illustrates an advantage of the exact method, as it offers exactly the desired level of coverage, often with a shorter interval. Again, the computing time of the exact method still compares favorably against the grid method, even when the grid is sparse.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.937 (0.003)	0.899 (0.004)	0.895 (0.004)
Length	4.15 (0.02)	4.09 (0.05)	3.61 (0.02)
Time	93.9 (0.6)	0.01 ($< 10^{-3}$)	7.8 (0.07)

Table 4: Simulation 2-I: High-dimensional setting with the standard linear model.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.905 (0.004)	0.900 (0.005)	0.903 (0.004)
Length	23.55 (0.85)	30.5 (1.85)	23.46 (0.85)
Time	50.4 (0.85)	0.01 ($< 10^{-3}$)	10.2 (0.87)

Table 5: Simulation 2-II: Hi-dimensional setting with the nonlinear additive model.

4.2 Real data examples

We apply the exact conformal Lasso algorithm to two data sets: the diabetes data (Efron et al., 2004) and the Boston housing data (Harrison and Rubinfeld, 1978).

The diabetes data. The diabetes data is considered in Efron et al. (2004) to illustrate basic properties of the LARS algorithm. It contains 442 subjects. Each subject has ten covariates, including age, gender, body mass index, blood pressure, and six blood serum measurements. The response is a continuous measurement of diabetes progression one year after the initial measurement. According to Efron et al. (2004), one may either consider the linear model that uses a regularized linear function of the ten covariates to predict the response, or one may fit a regularized quadratic function as a linear combination of the 10 original covariates and 54 second order terms. For ease of interpretation, we center and scale the response variable so that the sample variance is 1.

In our data examples, we implement the algorithm with a more realistic way of choosing the Lasso tuning parameter. To this end, we randomly split the data set into a fitting subsample of size 300, and a testing sample of size 142. We use the cross-validation with confidence method (CVC, Lei, 2017) on the fitting subsample to choose a value of $\widehat{\lambda}$ that gives a parsimonious model fit with competitive predictive risk. Then we consider four values of λ: $(2^{1/2}, 1, 2^{-1/2}, 2^{-1})\widehat{\lambda}$. For each value of λ we construct the Lasso conformal prediction set at target coverage level 0.9 for each data point in the testing sample using the search range given in (27). The procedure is repeated with 100 independent sample splittings. We report four quantities: the average coverage, average length of the prediction set, average number of linear pieces on the homotopy covered in the search, and average number of active variables on the linear homotopy covered in the search.

	grid	split	exact
Coverage	0.902 (0.004)	0.904 (0.004)	0.897 (0.004)
Length	15.9 (0.63)	17.9 (1.39)	15.2 (0.59)
Time	44.8 (0.19)	0.010 ($< 10^{-3}$)	5.64 (0.01)

Table 6: Simulation 2-III: High-dimensional setting with the non-Gaussian, correlated, heavy-tail, linear model.

The results are summarized in Figure 1. The averaged quantities of interest are plotted as a function of $\log_2(\lambda/\widehat{\lambda})$, together with one standard deviation. Here the choice of λ has very little effect on the coverage, as all four values of λ give the right empirical coverage. We also observe that the tuning parameter value exhibits a trade-off between the prediction accuracy (size of prediction interval), computational efficiency (number of linear pieces on the homotopy path), and interpretability (number of active variables on the homotopy path). In particular, the choice $\lambda = \widehat{\lambda}$ given by the CVC method reaches a good balance in this trade-off. Moreover, the linear model seems to have the same predictive power when compared to the quadratic model, while being more computationally efficient.

The Boston housing data. The Boston housing data consists of demographic and housing condition information of 506 areas in Boston (Harrison and Rubinfeld, 1978). There are 13 covariates including demographic information, location, air quality, and housing condition. The response variable is the median value of owner-occupied homes. All variables are centered and standardized to have unit variance.

The numerical experiment is conducted in a similar way as in the diabetes data, including both the linear model and quadratic model with 103 covariates. We randomly split the data into a fitting sample of size 400, and a testing sample of size 106. The results for 100 independent sample splits are plotted in Figure 2.

A similar observation is that all values of λ give the right level of average coverage with very small variability. There are also two notable differences from the diabetes data. First, the Boston housing data exhibits a higher degree of predictability than the diabetes data. Comparing the upper right panels of Figures 1 and 2, the 90% Lasso conformal prediction intervals in the Boston housing data are much shorter than those in the diabetes data with comparable levels of regularization. Second, the inclusion of quadratic terms significantly improves prediction for the Boston housing data, with a substantial drop in the length of prediction intervals. On the contrary, the linear and quadratic model give nearly the same prediction interval lengths in the diabetes data. Finally, in Boston housing data, smaller values of λ tend to produce shorter prediction intervals, using a moderately large number of variables, which suggests that the covariates carry rich information about the response and little regularization is needed.




Figure 1: Results for the diabetes data. The x-axis indexes four values of λ, where $\widehat{\lambda}$ is the tuning parameter chosen by the CVC method.

5 Discussion

Conformal prediction has deep connections to statistical techniques such as jackknife, bootstrap, and cross-validation, in the use of estimates obtained from slightly perturbed data. It is also linked to the notion of algorithmic stability, which has gained substantial attention in both the statistics and machine learning literature, and has been proved fundamentally important in both learning theory and statistical reproducibility (Shalev-Shwartz et al., 2010; Yu, 2013; Wang et al., 2016). Roughly speaking, algorithmic stability requires the estimate to change little when one data entry is changed arbitrarily. Conformal prediction reflects the importance of algorithmic stability from a slightly different perspective, which we call *residual stability*. When the residuals are stable, then the conformalized residuals $(r_i : 1 \le i \le n)$ will change slowly when the trial response value y_{n+1} changes, while the last residual r_{n+1} changes almost linearly with a slope close to one. Then by construction, the conformal prediction set is a narrow interval, as $|r_{n+1}|$ quickly outgrows $(|r_i| : 1 \le i \le n)$ as y_{n+1} moves away from the initial predicted value $\widehat{y}_{n+1} = x'_{n+1}\widehat{\beta}$.




Figure 2: Results for the Boston housing data. The x-axis indexes five values of λ, where $\widehat{\lambda}$ is the tuning parameter chosen by the CVC method.

In the case of Lasso, although it is known that the support recovery cannot be algorithmically stable (Xu et al., 2012), the fit is usually stable when λ is conventionally chosen. Our experiments have confirmed this in many different settings using both synthetic and real data, where (30) holds even when the active set changes frequently on the homotopy path. Understanding the residual stability of prediction algorithms would be an important topic for future research.

The current paper provides an initial understanding of the residual stability of the Lasso, which leads to a simple and efficient algorithm of conformalizing the Lasso estimator. It is possible to extend the methods and results to other settings, such as generalized Lasso (Tibshirani and Taylor, 2011), graphical Lasso (Friedman et al., 2008), and sparse subspace estimation (Jolliffe et al., 2003; d'Aspremont et al., 2005; Zou et al., 2006; Vu et al., 2013; Chen and Lei, 2015; Lei and Vu, 2015).

References

Burnaev, E. and Vovk, V. (2014), "Efficiency of conformalized ridge regression." in *COLT*, pp. 605–622.

Chen, K. and Lei, J. (2015), "Localized Functional Principal Component Analysis," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110, 1266–1275.

Chen, W., Wang, Z., Ha, W., and Barber, R. F. (2016), "Trimmed Conformal Prediction for High-Dimensional Models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.09933*.

d'Aspremont, A., Ghaoui, L. E., Jordan, M. I., and Lanckriet, G. R. (2005), "A direct formulation for sparse PCA using semidefinite programming," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 41–48.

Efron, B., Hastie, T., Johnstone, I., and Tibshirani, R. (2004), "Least angle regression," *Annals of Statistics*, 32, 407–499.

Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2008), "Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso," *Biostatistics*, 9, 432–441.

Garrigues, P. and El Ghaoui, L. (2009), "An homotopy algorithm for the Lasso with online observations," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 489–496.

Harrison, D. and Rubinfeld, D. L. (1978), "Hedonic housing prices and the demand for clean air," *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 5, 81–102.

Hebiri, M. (2010), "Sparse conformal predictors," *Statistics and Computing*, 20, 253–266.

Jolliffe, I. T., Trendafilov, N. T., and Uddin, M. (2003), "A modified principal component technique based on the LASSO," *Journal of computational and Graphical Statistics*, 12, 531–547.

Lei, J. (2014), "Classification with confidence," *Biometrika*, 101, 755–769.

— (2017), "Cross-Validation with Confidence," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.07904*.

Lei, J., G'Sell, M., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R. J., and Wasserman, L. (2017), "Distribution-Free Predictive Inference For Regression," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, to appear.

Lei, J., Rinaldo, A., and Wasserman, L. (2015), "A conformal prediction approach to explore functional data," *Annals of Mathematics and Artificial Intelligence*, 74, 29–43.

Lei, J., Robins, J., and Wasserman, L. (2013), "Distribution Free Prediction Sets," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 278–287.

Lei, J. and Vu, V. Q. (2015), "Sparsistency and agnostic inference in sparse PCA," *The Annals of Statistics*, 43, 299–322.

Lei, J. and Wasserman, L. (2014), "Distribution-free prediction bands for non-parametric regression," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 76, 71–96.

Sadinle, M., Lei, J., and Wasserman, L. (2016), "Least ambiguous set-valued classifiers with bounded error levels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.00451*.

Shalev-Shwartz, S., Shamir, O., Srebro, N., and Sridharan, K. (2010), "Learnability, stability and uniform convergence," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 2635–2670.

Tibshirani, R. (1996), "Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 58, 267–288.

Tibshirani, R. J. (2013), "The lasso problem and uniqueness," *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7, 1456–1490.

Tibshirani, R. J. and Taylor, J. (2011), "The solution path of the generalized lasso," *Annals of Statistics*, 39, 1335–1371.

Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005), *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*, Springer.

Vovk, V., Nouretdinov, I., and Gammerman, A. (2009), "On-line predictive linear regression," *The Annals of Statistics*, 37, 1566–1590.

Vu, V. Q., Cho, J., Lei, J., and Rohe, K. (2013), "Fantope projection and selection: A near-optimal convex relaxation of sparse PCA," in *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pp. 2670–2678.

Wang, Y.-X., Lei, J., and Fienberg, S. E. (2016), "Learning with differential privacy: Stability, learnability and the sufficiency and necessity of ERM principle," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17, 1–40.

Xu, H., Caramanis, C., and Mannor, S. (2012), "Sparse algorithms are not stable: A no-free-lunch theorem," *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 34, 187–193.

Yu, B. (2013), "Stability," *Bernoulli*, 19, 1484–1500.

Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005), "Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 67, 301–320.

Zou, H., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2006), "Sparse principal component analysis," *Journal of computational and graphical statistics*, 15, 265–286.