

SEMI-STANDARD PARTIAL COVARIANCE VARIABLE SELECTION WHEN IRREPRESENTABLE CONDITIONS FAIL

Fei Xue and Annie Qu

Purdue University and University of California Irvine

Abstract: Traditional variable selection methods could fail to be sign consistent when irrepresentable conditions are violated. This is especially critical in high-dimensional settings when the number of predictors exceeds the sample size. In this paper, we propose a new semi-standard partial covariance (SPAC) approach which is capable of reducing correlation effects from other covariates while fully capturing the magnitude of coefficients. The proposed SPAC is effective in choosing covariates which have direct effects on the response variable, while eliminating the predictors which are not directly associated with the response but are highly correlated with the relevant predictors. We show that the proposed SPAC method with the Lasso penalty or the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD) penalty possesses strong sign consistency in high-dimensional settings. Numerical studies and a post-traumatic stress disorder data application also confirm that the proposed method outperforms the existing Lasso, adaptive Lasso, SCAD, Peter–Clark-simple algorithm, and factor-adjusted regularized model selection methods when the irrepresentable conditions fail.

Key words and phrases: Irrepresentable condition, Lasso, model selection consistency, partial correlation, smoothly clipped absolute deviation.

1. Introduction

Variable selection is an important model-building tool for selecting covariates relevant to the response variable, which is fundamental for the construction of a sparse model when the number of relevant covariates is much smaller than the total number of observed covariates. This is especially crucial under high-dimensionality where the number of covariates far exceeds the number of observations. For high-dimensional data, traditional regularization variable selection methods (Tibshirani, 1996; Fan and Li, 2001; Zou and Hastie, 2005; Yuan and Lin, 2006; Zou, 2006; Candes and Tao, 2007; Zhang, 2010) are effective in achieving model selection and parameter estimation simultaneously under irrepresentable conditions (Zhao and Yu, 2006; Fan and Lv, 2011; Kim et al., 2008), which assume that correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates are relatively weak compared with correlations among relevant covariates.

However, the irrepresentable conditions could fail whether the dimension is high or not. For example, in mediation analysis for identifying mediators which transmit effects from an exposure factor to an outcome variable, spurious mediators (irrelevant covariates) could be strongly correlated with the exposure factor and true mediators (relevant covariates) (Jerolon et al., 2018; Chén et al., 2017; Imai and Yamamoto, 2013). Although some modified model selection methods have been proposed to incorporate strongly correlated covariates, they either do not possess variable selection consistency (Wang and Wang, 2014; Maier and Rodríguez-Salas, 2017; Hilafu and Yin, 2017; Bühlmann et al., 2013), or impose a more restrictive condition such as knowing the true number of relevant covariates (Javanmard and Montanari, 2013). In particular, several existing methods (Sharma et al., 2013; Fu et al.,

2014; Zeng and Xie, 2012; Huang et al., 2016) tend to group and select highly correlated relevant and irrelevant predictors together. Jia and Rohe (2015) propose to transform the design matrix so that the irrepresentable conditions are satisfied. However, the error terms are no longer independent from each other after transformation. More importantly, model-based transformation loses its original interpretation in practice.

Under high-dimensional settings (Fan et al., 2018), sure independence screening (Fan and Lv, 2008) screens out variables through marginal correlations between the response and covariates. However, the marginal correlations between irrelevant covariates and the response could increase when the irrelevant covariates are strongly correlated with relevant covariates, which may reduce the effectiveness of the sure independence screening. The Peter–Clark-simple (PC-simple) algorithm (Bühlmann et al., 2010) was developed to screen variables via partial correlation to solve the correlation problem. Moreover, Cho and Fryzlewicz (2012) generalize the partial correlation to the tilted correlation, and Li et al. (2016) and Jin et al. (2014) incorporate inter-feature correlations to improve detection of marginally weakly associated covariates. In addition, Bradic (2016) proposes a subsample bootstrap aggregation approach to circumvent the irrepresentable conditions, and Fan et al. (2018) develop the factor-adjusted regularized model selection (Farm-Select) method to decorrelate highly-correlated covariates.

The partial correlation approach measures each individual covariate effect after removing other covariate effects (Peng et al., 2009; Bühlmann et al., 2010; Li et al., 2017; Tang et al., 2017). However, the range of partial correlation is bounded between minus one and one, and therefore the partial correlation may not fully capture strong signals of some relevant

covariates. This motivates us to develop a new semi-standard partial covariance (SPAC) approach to fully use the magnitude of signal strength. The proposed SPAC is more powerful than partial correlation in identifying relevant covariates.

Compared with traditional regularization methods, the proposed method encourages selecting covariates which have direct effects on the response variable, while discouraging the selection of irrelevant covariates which are strongly correlated with relevant covariates. We demonstrate estimation consistency and variable selection consistency for the proposed SPAC method with the Lasso penalty (SPAC-Lasso) or the SCAD penalty (SPAC-SCAD). The proposed method can handle both fixed-dimensional settings and high-dimensional settings when relevant and irrelevant covariates are highly correlated with each other.

Our work has the following contributions. First, the proposed variable selection approach can mitigate the bias of model selection caused by the violation of irrerepresentable conditions for the Lasso or the SCAD method. We show that the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD are still sign consistent and especially effective when correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates are higher than correlations among relevant covariates. Second, the proposed SPAC is more effective in acquiring signal strength and thus more powerful in selecting relevant predictors than traditional partial correlation. Numerical studies confirm that the proposed method outperforms traditional penalty-based variable selection methods, the PC-simple algorithm and the Farm-Select method for highly dependent covariates.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides the model framework for the variable selection problem. Section 3 introduces the SPAC and presents the proposed methodology. Section 4 establishes theoretical properties of the SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD.

Section 5 discusses the implementation of the proposed method. Section 6 presents various simulation studies. Section 7 illustrates a real data application to post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) of African Americans.

2. Model framework and notation

We formulate the variable selection problem under a linear regression setting,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ consists of samples for the response variable Y , $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij})$ is a $n \times p$ random design matrix, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^T$ is a coefficient vector, and the noise vector $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N_n(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ is uncorrelated with \mathbf{X} . Let \mathbf{x}_j be the j th column (j th covariate) of \mathbf{X} for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Without loss of generality, we assume that each column is standardized from independently and identically distributed samples, that is, $\mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j = n$ and mean $\sum_{i=1}^n x_{ij} = 0$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$. Then each row of \mathbf{X} is identically distributed from a p -dimensional random vector $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{X}} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^T$ with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and positive-definite covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_{p \times p}$ whose diagonal elements are all 1's. In addition, we assume that the response variable is standardized with $\sum_{i=1}^n y_i = 0$, and thus the intercept can be omitted.

Here we assume that the linear model in (2.1) is sparse, where most covariates have zero coefficients and are irrelevant to the response Y . That is, only the first q covariates in \mathbf{X} have non-zero coefficients and are relevant to the response variable, and let $\beta_i = 0$ if and only if $i > q$. In addition, we let $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{Cov}(Y, X_1, \dots, X_p)$, and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} = (\sigma^{ij})$, where $i, j \in \{Y, 1, 2, \dots, p\}$.

Under the sparsity assumption, the penalized least squares regression methods (Tibshi-

rani, 1996; Fu, 1998) select variables through minimizing the penalized least squares function

$$L(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p p_{\lambda}(\beta_j), \quad (2.2)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ represents the Euclidean norm, $p_{\lambda}(\cdot)$ is a penalty function, and λ is a tuning parameter. Here the $p_{\lambda}(\beta_j)$ could be the Lasso, adaptive Lasso, or SCAD penalty, which have the forms $p_{Lasso,\lambda}(\beta_j) = \lambda|\beta_j|$, $p_{ALasso,\lambda}(\beta_j) = \lambda|\beta_j|/|\hat{\beta}_{0j}|$, and

$$p_{SCAD,\lambda}(\beta_j) = \begin{cases} \lambda|\beta_j| & \text{if } 0 \leq |\beta_j| \leq \lambda \\ \frac{a\lambda|\beta_j| - 0.5(|\beta_j|^2 + \lambda^2)}{a-1} & \text{if } \lambda < |\beta_j| \leq a\lambda \\ \frac{\lambda^2(a^2-1)}{2(a-1)} & \text{if } |\beta_j| > a\lambda, \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

where ‘‘ALasso’’ represents the adaptive Lasso penalty, $a > 2$, and $\hat{\beta}_{0j}$ is an initial estimator of β_j .

3. A New Variable Selection Method

In this section, we propose a semi-standard partial covariance (SPAC) variable selection approach to achieve selection consistency when the original irrepresentable conditions (Zhao and Yu, 2006; Fan and Lv, 2011) fail, that is, there exist strong correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates. The proposed SPAC is able to capture the relationship between a relevant covariate and the response variable conditional on other covariate effects, as we derive this SPAC from the notion of partial correlation. For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, let $\rho_j = \text{Corr}(\varepsilon_Y, \varepsilon_j)$ be the partial correlation between the response Y and covariate X_j , where ε_Y and ε_j are the residuals of linear regression models with Y and X_j as responses, respectively, and $X_{-j} = \{X_k : k = 1, \dots, j-1, j+1, \dots, p\}$ as predictors.

Under the normality assumption

$$(Y, X_1, \dots, X_p)^T \sim N_{p+1}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}), \quad (3.1)$$

it is well-known that $\rho_j = \text{Corr}(Y, X_j \mid X_{-j})$ (Baba et al., 2004), indicating that the partial correlation measures the linear relationship between Y and X_j conditional on other covariates. Moreover, non-zero partial correlations correspond to relevant covariates, while zero partial correlations correspond to irrelevant ones.

However, partial correlation is unable to fully capture signal strength, which is the magnitude of β_j , due to its bounded range. To overcome this limitation, we propose the following SPAC and provide the association between the SPAC and partial correlation in Lemma 1.

Definition 1. The semi-standard partial covariance (SPAC) between the response Y and covariate X_j is $\gamma_j = \beta_j/d_{jj}^{1/2}$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$, where d_{jj} is the j th diagonal element of the precision matrix $\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{C}^{-1}$.

The exponent $1/2$ of d_{jj} in Definition 1 ensures that γ_j does not depend on the scale of $X_j \mid X_{-j}$ by the following lemma.

Lemma 1. Let $s_j = \{\text{Var}(Y \mid X_{-j})\}^{1/2}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Under the normality assumption (3.1), we have

$$\gamma_j = \rho_j s_j = \frac{\text{Cov}(Y, X_j \mid X_{-j})}{\{\text{Var}(X_j \mid X_{-j})\}^{1/2}}, \quad s_j^2 = \frac{1/\sigma^{YY}}{1 - \rho_j^2} = \frac{\beta_j^2}{d_{jj}} + \sigma_\epsilon^2.$$

By definition, $\gamma_j = 0$ if and only if $\beta_j = 0$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, implying that we can select relevant covariates through identifying non-zero SPACs. Lemma 1 shows that the SPAC is equivalent to the multiplication of the partial correlation and s_j under the normality

assumption. Moreover, the proposed γ_j standardizes the partial covariance $\text{Cov}(Y, X_j \mid X_{-j})$ by $\{\text{Var}(X_j \mid X_{-j})\}^{1/2}$, instead of both s_j and $\{\text{Var}(X_j \mid X_{-j})\}^{1/2}$ in the partial correlation, which is the reason that we refer to γ_j as “semi-standard” partial covariance. We involve s_j in the SPAC, since s_j is an increasing function of partial correlation ρ_j and also incorporates the magnitude of coefficient β_j as indicated in Lemma 1. Therefore, the proposed SPAC is able to fully capture the signal strength of relevant predictors while removing effects from other covariates.

We illustrate SPAC and compare it with partial correlation from a geometric perspective using a toy example. Let $\mathbf{y} = \beta_1 \mathbf{x}_1 + \beta_2 \mathbf{x}_2 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with $\beta_1 \neq 0$ and $\beta_2 = 0$, that is, \mathbf{x}_1 is relevant but \mathbf{x}_2 is irrelevant. We also assume that \mathbf{x}_1 and \mathbf{x}_2 are correlated. By definition, $\gamma_1 \neq 0$ and $\gamma_2 = 0$.

We plot the relationships of \mathbf{x}_1 , \mathbf{x}_2 , and \mathbf{y} in Figure 1. As shown in the left graph, $\hat{\omega}_1$ is the angle between the two bold blue lines which represent residuals of projections from \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{x}_1 onto \mathbf{x}_2 . Then $\hat{\rho}_1 = \cos(\hat{\omega}_1)$ is the sample partial correlation based on samples in \mathbf{x}_1 , \mathbf{x}_2 , and \mathbf{y} . The length of the bold blue line for residuals of \mathbf{y} is a sample estimator of s_1 , denoted by \hat{s}_1 . By Lemma 1, $\hat{\gamma}_1 = \hat{s}_1 \cos(\hat{\omega}_1)$ is a sample estimator for γ_1 , which is also the projection from residuals of \mathbf{y} onto residuals of \mathbf{x}_1 , represented by the red line in the left graph.

Similarly in the right graph of Figure 1, $\hat{\rho}_2 = \cos(\hat{\omega}_2)$ and $\hat{\gamma}_2$ are the sample partial correlation and sample SPAC for \mathbf{x}_2 , respectively. The $\hat{\gamma}_2$ is not exactly zero due to sample variation. The differences between sample SPACs and sample partial correlations come from \hat{s}_1 and \hat{s}_2 . As shown in Figure 1, \hat{s}_2 is just the sample variance of the error term, while




Figure 1: Illustrations of SPAC and partial correlation when X_1 and X_2 are correlated.

\hat{s}_1 contains the error variation and increases as signal coefficient β_1 increases, implying that \hat{s}_1 should be larger than \hat{s}_2 . Therefore, SPAC is more effective in distinguishing relevant covariates from irrelevant covariates than partial correlation.

Compared with coefficients β , the SPAC takes account of correlation effects from other covariates. Specifically, since $1/d_{jj}^{1/2} = \{\text{Var}(X_j | X_{-j})\}^{1/2} = (1 - R_j^2)^{1/2}$ (Lauritzen, 1996; Raveh, 1985), the SPAC for covariate X_j is

$$\gamma_j = \beta_j \{\text{Var}(X_j | X_{-j})\}^{1/2} = \beta_j (1 - R_j^2)^{1/2},$$

where R_j is the coefficient of multiple correlation between X_j and all other covariates. When X_j is independent of other covariates, γ_j is the same as β_j . On the other hand, when X_j is correlated with other covariates, the SPAC mitigates correlation effects from other covariates via multiplying β_j by $(1 - R_j^2)^{1/2}$. Thus, we propose to focus on estimating SPAC γ_j instead of coefficient β_j to achieve model selection consistency for data with strong correlations

between irrelevant covariates and relevant covariates.

Specifically, we replace coefficient β_j in the penalized least squares function (2.2) with $\hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, and estimate $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^T$ by minimizing

$$L(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p p_\lambda(\gamma_j) \hat{d}_{jj}, \quad (3.2)$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{d}} = (\hat{d}_{11}, \dots, \hat{d}_{pp})^T$ is a consistent estimator of diagonal elements $\mathbf{d} = (d_{11}, \dots, d_{pp})^T$. Substituting $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ by $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, we obtain a new matrix $\mathbf{X}^* = (\mathbf{x}_1 \hat{d}_{11}^{1/2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p \hat{d}_{pp}^{1/2})$ which serves similarly as a design matrix for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. The squared Euclidean norm of the j th column in \mathbf{X}^* is $\hat{d}_{jj} \mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{x}_j = \hat{d}_{jj} n$ for $j = 1, \dots, p$, which leads to different weights on penalization for different covariates. However, the SPAC of each covariate could be equally important. To avoid unequal weighting, we reweight the penalization term via multiplying the penalty $p_\lambda(\gamma_j)$ in (3.2) by \hat{d}_{jj} for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Consequently, the proposed SPAC estimator is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}),$$

and the corresponding estimator for the coefficients is $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\hat{d}_{11}^{1/2} \hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{d}_{pp}^{1/2} \hat{\gamma}_p)^T$.

We adopt the Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD penalty functions, respectively, to shrink SPACs in the following Examples 1–3, and refer to the corresponding estimators as SPAC-Lasso, SPAC-ALasso, and SPAC-SCAD, respectively. We compare these estimators with the original Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD estimators in Sections 6 and 7.

Example 1. If we use Lasso penalty, the penalized loss function in (3.2) becomes

$$L_{Lasso}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{d}_{jj} |\gamma_j|. \quad (3.3)$$

Accordingly, the proposed estimator with Lasso penalty (SPAC-Lasso) is

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{Lasso} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_{Lasso}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{d}}).$$

Example 2. Suppose that $\hat{\gamma}_0 = (\hat{\gamma}_{01}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{0p})^T$ is a consistent initial estimator for γ . The objective function for the SPAC method with the adaptive Lasso penalty (SPAC-ALasso) is

$$L_{ALasso}(\gamma, \hat{\mathbf{d}}) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j \right\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p \hat{d}_{jj} \frac{|\gamma_j|}{|\hat{\gamma}_{0j}|^\mu}, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\mu > 0$ is a tuning parameter. The corresponding SPAC-ALasso estimator is

$$\hat{\gamma}_{ALasso} = \underset{\gamma}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_{ALasso}(\gamma, \hat{\mathbf{d}}).$$

Example 3. Similarly, the objective function for the proposed SPAC method with the SCAD penalty (SPAC-SCAD) is

$$L_{SCAD}(\gamma, \hat{\mathbf{d}}) = \frac{1}{2} \left\| \mathbf{y} - \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j \right\|^2 + n \sum_{j=1}^p p_{SCAD, \lambda}(\gamma_j) \hat{d}_{jj}, \quad (3.5)$$

where $p_{SCAD, \lambda}(\cdot)$ is defined in (2.3), and the corresponding SPAC-SCAD estimator is

$$\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD} = \underset{\gamma}{\operatorname{argmin}} L_{SCAD}(\gamma, \hat{\mathbf{d}}).$$

4. Consistency Theory

In this section, we demonstrate the asymptotic properties of the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD estimators, and provide examples satisfying conditions for consistency of the proposed method. Although Lemma 1 is under the normality assumption, we do not require this normality assumption in the following subsection.

4.1 Consistency under high dimensionality

In this subsection, we establish the variable selection consistency and estimation consistency of the SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD under high dimensionality, where $p = p_n$, $q = q_n$, and

$\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{C}_n$ increase as n grows. Similar results for fixed dimensions of p and q are provided in Section S2 in the supplementary material. For the high-dimensional settings, the Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD methods require correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates being relatively small compared with correlations among relevant covariates to achieve variable selection consistency (Zhao and Yu, 2006; Huang et al., 2008; Kim et al., 2008; Fan and Lv, 2011). The proposed SPAC approach mitigates correlation effects from other covariates to achieve model selection consistency when relevant and irrelevant covariates are strongly correlated and the original irrepresentable conditions fail.

Following similar notation as in Zhao and Yu (2006), let $\hat{\gamma} =_s \gamma$ if and only if $\text{sign}(\hat{\gamma}) = \text{sign}(\gamma)$, and an estimator $\hat{\gamma}$ is **strongly sign consistent** if there exists a tuning parameter λ_n , a function of n , such that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P \{ \hat{\gamma}(\lambda_n) =_s \gamma \} = 1,$$

where the λ_n is independent of the data.

To show the sign consistency of the proposed method, we define the following notations. Let $\mathbf{X}(1)$ and $\mathbf{X}(2)$ be the first q_n and remaining $p_n - q_n$ columns in \mathbf{X} , respectively, such that $\mathbf{X}(1)$ contains relevant covariates, and $\mathbf{X}(2)$ consists of irrelevant covariates. Let $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} / n$ be the sample covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} , with diagonal elements all 1's since the covariates are standardized as mentioned in Section 2. Thus, $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n$ and the true covariance matrix \mathbf{C}_n are both correlation matrices, and can be partitioned into blocks

$$\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11} & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{12} \\ \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21} & \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{22} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{C}_n = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_n^{11} & \mathbf{C}_n^{12} \\ \mathbf{C}_n^{21} & \mathbf{C}_n^{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

according to $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}(1), \mathbf{X}(2))$. Similarly, we partition γ into $\gamma(1) = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_{q_n})^T$ and

$\gamma(2) = (\gamma_{q+1}, \dots, \gamma_p)^T$, representing relevant and irrelevant coefficients of SPACs, respectively.

In addition, we define conditions for the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD as follows.

Condition 1 (Irrepresentable condition for SPAC-Lasso). There exists a positive constant η such that

$$\left\| \mathbf{V}(2) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1} \mathbf{V}(1)^{-1} \text{sign}\{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1)\} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 1 - \eta,$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$ represents the infinity norm of a matrix, and $\mathbf{V}(1)$ and $\mathbf{V}(2)$ are diagonal matrices $\text{diag}\{1/d_{11}^{1/2}, \dots, 1/d_{qq}^{1/2}\}$ and $\text{diag}\{1/d_{q+1q+1}^{1/2}, \dots, 1/d_{pp}^{1/2}\}$, respectively.

Condition 2 (Irrepresentable condition for SPAC-SCAD). There exists a positive constant η such that

$$\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n^*}(h_{\min}) \left\| \mathbf{V}(2) \hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1} \mathbf{V}(1)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \leq 1 - \eta,$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{\lambda_n^*}(\cdot) = p'_{SCAD, \lambda_n^*}(\cdot)/\lambda_n^*$, $h_{\min} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq q_n} |\beta_j|/2$, and $\lambda_n^* = \lambda_n \max_{1 \leq j \leq q_n} d_{jj}^{1/2}$.

Condition 1 is required for the sign consistency of the SPAC-Lasso, while Condition 2 is required for the SPAC-SCAD under high-dimensional settings. Condition 2 is weaker than Condition 1 when signals are strong since the SCAD penalty gradually levels off. The above two conditions are modified from the original irrepresentable conditions proposed in Zhao and Yu (2006) and Fan and Lv (2011) for Lasso and SCAD, respectively. However, the proposed Conditions 1 and 2 could still hold for cases where the original irrepresentable conditions fail. We illustrate this with examples in Section 4.2.

Condition 3. For some positive constants $0 < \kappa_0, \kappa_2 < 1/2$ and $\kappa_1 > 0$, $\log p_n = O(n^{1-2\kappa_0})$, $q_n = O(n^{\kappa_2})$, $h_{\min} \geq (\log p_n/n)^{1/2}$, and $p_n \geq n^{\kappa_1}$.

Condition 3 allows the number of covariates to grow exponentially, but requires a lower bound of signal strength similarly as in Fan and Lv (2013) and Zheng et al. (2014)). The requirement $p_n \geq n^{\kappa_1}$ comes from Cai et al. (2011) to ensure the consistency of the constrained L_1 -minimization estimator (CLIME) (Cai et al., 2011) which is adopted in the following theorems. We let $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ be the diagonal elements of the CLIME. Then, $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ is consistent under some regularity conditions and a sparsity assumption of the precision matrix (Cai et al., 2011).

Following notations in Cai et al. (2011), we model the sparsity of the precision matrix \mathbf{D} through defining

$$\mathcal{G}_u(K_{p_n}, M_{p_n}) = \left\{ \mathbf{D} : \max_{1 \leq j \leq p_n} \sum_{i=1}^{p_n} |d_{ij}|^u \leq K_{p_n}, \|\mathbf{D}\|_1 \leq M_{p_n} \right\}, \quad (4.1)$$

where $0 \leq u < 1$, K_{p_n} and M_{p_n} are positive and allowed to increase as n grows. We consider data with precision matrices $\mathbf{D} \in \mathcal{G}_u(K_{p_n}, M_{p_n})$ throughout this subsection. Details of other regularity Conditions 4, 5, and 6 are provided in Section S1 in the supplementary material. Also, proofs for the following theorems are provided in Section S4 in the supplementary material.

Theorem 1. *Let $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ be diagonal elements of the CLIME of \mathbf{D} . If Conditions 3, 4, and 5 are satisfied, and Condition 1 holds with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$, then we have the following properties for the minimization of $L_{Lasso}(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ in (3.3) with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$.*

(1) *Strong sign consistency: There exists a strict local minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{Lasso}$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{Lasso} =_s \boldsymbol{\gamma}$.*

(2) *Estimation consistency: The corresponding estimator of coefficients $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^{-1}\hat{\gamma}_{Lasso}$ satisfies*

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{\infty} = O\{(\log p_n/n)^{1/2}\}.$$

Theorem 2. *Let $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ be diagonal elements of the CLIME of \mathbf{D} . If Conditions 3, 5, and 6 are satisfied, and Condition 2 holds with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$, then we have the following properties for the minimization of $L_{SCAD}(\gamma, \hat{\mathbf{d}})$ in (3.5) with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$.*

(1) *Strong sign consistency: There is a strict local minimizer $\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD}$ such that $\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD} =_s \gamma$.*

(2) *Estimation consistency: The corresponding estimator of coefficients $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^{-1}\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD}$ satisfies*

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{\infty} = O\{(\log p_n/n)^{1/2}\}.$$

Theorems 1 and 2 state that, even though the number of covariates increases exponentially, the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD are able to select the true model with probability tending to 1 under Conditions 1 and 2, respectively. Moreover, the estimators for coefficients based on SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD both converge to the true β .

Note that Condition 1 could still be valid even when the original irrepresentable conditions (Zhao and Yu, 2006) for Lasso are violated. Similarly, Condition 2 is able to accommodate highly correlated covariates when the irrepresentable condition for the SCAD method (Fan and Lv, 2011) fails. We illustrate this point with examples in the following subsection.

4.2 Examples satisfying the proposed conditions

In this subsection, we give some examples where the proposed irrepresentable Conditions 1 and 2 still hold even when the original irrepresentable conditions for Lasso and SCAD fail, respectively. We suppose that \mathbf{C}_n is a submatrix of \mathbf{C}_{n+1} as the dimension increases.

We first consider using an extended block-exchangeable covariance matrix structure, which is defined as a block diagonal matrix consisting of identity matrices and \mathbf{R} :

$$\mathbf{C}_n = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{I}_{q_n - q_0}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{I}_{p_n - q_n - (p_0 - q_0)}\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where

$$\mathbf{R}_{p_0 \times p_0} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}^{11} & \mathbf{R}^{12} \\ (\mathbf{R}^{12})^T & \mathbf{R}^{22} \end{pmatrix} \quad (4.3)$$

is block-exchangeable with

$$(\mathbf{R}^{11})_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j \\ \alpha_1 & i \neq j \end{cases}, \quad (\mathbf{R}^{22})_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j \\ \alpha_3 & i \neq j \end{cases}, \quad (\mathbf{R}^{12})_{i,j} = \alpha_2.$$

Here, α_1 , α_2 , and α_3 are unknown constants, \mathbf{R}^{11} is a $q_0 \times q_0$ matrix, and p_0 and q_0 are constants independent of n .

The \mathbf{R} is a fixed-dimensional and dense sub-matrix in \mathbf{C}_n . The number q_0 represents the number of relevant covariates whose covariance matrix \mathbf{R}^{11} is non-sparse, while p_0 represents the total number of covariates whose covariance matrix \mathbf{R} is non-sparse. There are $p_0 - q_0$ irrelevant covariates whose covariance matrix \mathbf{R}^{22} is dense. In addition, \mathbf{R}^{12} represents the covariance matrix between the correlated relevant and irrelevant covariates. We use $\mathbf{C}_n = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{I}_{q_n - q_0}, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{I}_{p_n - q_n - (p_0 - q_0)}\}$ instead of \mathbf{R} as the covariance matrix to include a

diverging and sparse covariance matrix for high-dimensional settings. Even under the sparse covariance matrix setting, the original irrepresentable conditions still could fail.

Similarly, we define $\mathbf{C}_n = \text{diag}\{\mathbf{I}_{q_n-q_0}, \mathbf{R}_{p_0 \times p_0}, \mathbf{I}_{p_n-q_n-(p_0-q_0)}\}$ as an extended block-autoregressive (block-AR) covariance matrix, where

$$(\mathbf{R}^{11})_{i,j} = \alpha_1^{|i-j|}, (\mathbf{R}^{22})_{i,j} = \alpha_3^{|i-j|}, (\mathbf{R}^{12})_{i,j} = \alpha_2^{|i-(q_0+j)|}. \quad (4.4)$$

When the covariance matrix \mathbf{C}_n is extended block-exchangeable as in (4.2), the sparsity assumption in (4.1) holds with $K = p_0\{(p_0-1)!/\Delta_1\}^u$ and $M = p_0!/\Delta_1$, where $(p_0-1)!$ and $p_0!$ denote the factorials of p_0-1 and p_0 , respectively, and $\Delta_1 = (1-\alpha_1)^{q_0}(1-\alpha_3)^{p_0-q_0}q_0(p_0-q_0)(\alpha_1\alpha_3-\alpha_2^2)$. When the covariance matrix is extended block-AR, the sparsity assumption in (4.1) holds with $K = p_0\{(p_0-1)!/\Delta_2\}^u$ and $M = p_0!/\Delta_2$, where $\Delta_2 = (1-\alpha_1^2)^{q_0}(1-\alpha_3^2)^{p_0-q_0}[1-\alpha_2^2(1-\alpha_1\alpha_2)^2(1-\alpha_3\alpha_2)^2/\{(1-\alpha_1^2)(1-\alpha_3^2)(1-\alpha_2^2)^2\}]$. Note that in both cases, the K and M do not depend on p_n . To simplify the following statements, we let $L_0 = q_0/m_0$, where $m_0 = |\sum_{i=q_n-q_0+1}^{q_n} \text{sign}(\beta_i)| = |\sum_{i=q_n-q_0+1}^{q_n} \text{sign}(\gamma_i)| > 0$.

Proposition 1. *Let $p_n = \exp(n^{1-2\kappa_0})$ and $q_n = n^{1/3}$ with $1/3 + \tau < \kappa_0 < 1/2$ and $0 < \tau < 1/6$. Under the normality assumption (3.1), suppose that \mathbf{C}_n is an extended block-exchangeable covariance matrix of the form in (4.2) with $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in (-1, 1)$ such that $\alpha_1\alpha_3 \neq \alpha_2^2$ and \mathbf{C}_n is positive definite for any large constants q_0 and p_0-q_0 , where $q_0 < p_0-q_0$. Then there exists a constant $0 < \delta < 1/2$ such that*

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1} \text{sign}\{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1)\}\|_\infty \geq 1 \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - O(n^{-\delta}) \quad (4.5)$$

if $|\alpha_2| > \alpha_1 L_0$. Conversely, (4.5) implies $|\alpha_2| > \alpha_1 L_0 \geq \alpha_1$, $\alpha_3 \geq |\alpha_2|$, and

$$|\mathbf{V}(2)\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1}\mathbf{V}(1)^{-1} \text{sign}\{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1)\}| < |\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1} \text{sign}\{\boldsymbol{\beta}(1)\}| \quad (4.6)$$

for sufficiently large constants m_0 and $p_0 - q_0$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$, where the inequality holds element-wise.

Proposition 2. *Under the conditions of Proposition 1, if for some constant $0 < \delta < 1/2$,*

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1}\|_{\infty}\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(h_{\min}) \geq 1 \quad \text{with probability at least } 1 - O(n^{-\delta}), \quad (4.7)$$

then $\alpha_3 \geq |\alpha_2| > \alpha_1$, and

$$\|\mathbf{V}(2)\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1}\mathbf{V}(1)^{-1}\|_{\infty}\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(h_{\min}) < \|\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1}\|_{\infty}\mathcal{P}_{\lambda}(h_{\min}) \quad (4.8)$$

for sufficiently large constants m_0 and $p_0 - q_0$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$.

The failure of the original irrepresentable conditions (Zhao and Yu, 2006; Fan and Lv, 2011) of the Lasso and SCAD method implies inequalities (4.5) and (4.7), respectively. By Propositions 1 and 2, if the original irrepresentable conditions fail, then correlations between relevant covariates are the smallest among correlations of all covariates, followed by correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates. More importantly, the inequalities in (4.6) and (4.8) hold even when the original irrepresentable conditions are violated, indicating that the new irrepresentable Conditions 1 and 2 for the SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD, respectively, can still be valid.

The following corollaries provide sufficient conditions for the SPAC-Lasso to be strongly sign consistent when the true covariance matrix is extended block-exchangeable as in (4.2) or extended block-AR with \mathbf{R} defined as in (4.4). We also provide a similar corollary in Section S4 in the supplementary material for the strong sign consistency of the SPAC-SCAD under the extended block-exchangeable covariance matrix structure.

Corollary 1. *Let $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ be diagonal elements of the CLIME of \mathbf{D} . Suppose that the conditions of Proposition 1 and Condition 4 are satisfied, and that $h_{\min} \geq n^{-\kappa_0}$. If there exists a positive constant η such that*

$$|\alpha_2| \leq (1 - \eta) \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_1}{1 - \alpha_3} \right)^{1/2} \alpha_1 L_0, \quad (4.9)$$

then the SPAC-Lasso possesses strong sign consistency and the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\mathbf{V}}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{Lasso}$ is consistent for sufficiently large q_0 and $p_0 - q_0$.

Under the extended block-exchangeable structure with large n , the weak irrerepresentable condition (Zhao and Yu, 2006) of Lasso holds for large α_1 . However, when $\alpha_1 < |\alpha_2|/L_0 \leq |\alpha_2|$, the Lasso is not sign consistent by Proposition 1. In contrast, Corollary 1 shows that the SPAC-Lasso is strongly sign consistent given that α_3 is sufficiently large, even when α_1 is small.

Corollary 2. *Suppose that conditions of Corollary 1 are satisfied, except that \mathbf{C}_n is an extended block-AR covariance matrix with \mathbf{R} defined in (4.4) and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3 \in (0, 1)$, such that $2|\alpha_2 - z|\{\alpha_2 + 1/(1 + z)\} < 1$, where $z = \alpha_1$ or α_3 . Further suppose that true coefficients of relevant covariates have the same sign. If (4.5) is satisfied, then $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$, and the SPAC-Lasso is strongly sign consistent when there is a constant $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\max \left\{ \frac{\alpha_2}{|\alpha_2 - \alpha_3|}, 1 \right\} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha_3^2}{1 - \alpha_1^2} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\alpha_2(1 - \alpha_1\alpha_2)}{(1 + \alpha_1)(1 - \alpha_2)} \leq 1 - \eta. \quad (4.10)$$

Corollary 2 states that, under the extended block-AR structure, the failure of the weak irrerepresentable condition of Lasso also implies that correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates are stronger than correlations among relevant covariates, that is, $\alpha_2 > \alpha_1$. More importantly, even when the weak irrerepresentable condition fails, the SPAC-Lasso is

still strongly sign consistent, given that the α_3 is sufficiently large. This is consistent with the results of the extended block-exchangeable example.

In the following proposition, we present another sufficient condition for Conditions 1 and 2 of the proposed method when the correlation structure does not have a specific form. We first introduce some notations as follows. Let $\mathbf{C}_n = (c_{ij})_{p \times p}$ with $c_{ij} \geq 0$, and $\mathbf{C}_{n,i}$ be a submatrix of \mathbf{C}_n with the i th row and i th column removed for each $i = 1, \dots, p$. Denote the i th column of \mathbf{C}_n with the i th entry removed as \mathbf{v}_i , that is, $\mathbf{v}_i = (c_{1i}, \dots, c_{i-1i}, c_{i+1i}, \dots, c_{pi})^T$. In addition, we let φ_i be the largest angle between \mathbf{v}_i and any column vector in $\mathbf{C}_{n,i}$, and let $\lambda_{\min,i}$ and $\lambda_{\max,i}$ be the smallest and the largest eigenvalues of $\mathbf{C}_{n,i}$, respectively.

Proposition 3. *Suppose that normality assumption (3.1), Conditions 3 and 4 are satisfied with $\kappa_0 > \max\{\kappa_2 + \kappa_3, (\kappa_2 + \kappa_4)/2\}$. If*

$$0 \leq \frac{1 - \|\mathbf{v}_j\|_2^2 / \lambda_{\max,j}}{1 - \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2^2 / \lambda_{\max,i} - \|\mathbf{v}_i\|_2^2 \sin^2 \varphi_i / \lambda_{\min,i}} < g_n^2$$

holds for all $i \in \{1, \dots, q_n\}$ and $j \in \{q_n + 1, \dots, p_n\}$, with $g_n = (1 - \eta) / \|\mathbf{C}_n^{21}(\mathbf{C}_n^{11})^{-1}\|_\infty$ for some $\eta > 0$, then $\|\mathbf{V}(2)\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{21}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n^{11})^{-1}\mathbf{V}(1)^{-1}\|_\infty \leq 1 - \eta$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-\delta})$.

In general, when correlations between relevant and irrelevant covariates are larger than correlations among relevant covariates, the original irrerepresentable conditions are likely to fail. Under this case, correlations among irrelevant covariates could be high due to the positive-definiteness constraint on correlation matrices. This indicates that, for each pair of relevant and irrelevant covariates, variables other than such a pair are more correlated with the irrelevant covariate than the relevant one. Then, the irrerepresentable conditions of the proposed SPAC method are likely to hold by Proposition 3. Consequently, the irrepre-

sentable conditions for the proposed SPAC method can still be satisfied when the original irrepresentable conditions are violated.

5. Implementation

In this section, we discuss implementation of the proposed method with the Lasso, adaptive Lasso or SCAD penalty. For estimation of diagonal elements \mathbf{d} , we apply the CLIME in our algorithms under high-dimensional settings, which estimates the j th column of the precision matrix \mathbf{D} through the following minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} |\mathbf{b}|_1 \quad \text{subject to } |\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n \mathbf{b} - \mathbf{e}_j|_\infty \leq \lambda_d, \quad (5.1)$$

where $1 \leq j \leq p$, $\mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a vector with 1 in the j th coordinate and 0 in others, λ_d is a tuning parameter, $|\cdot|_1$ and $|\cdot|_\infty$ represents the 1-norm and infinity norm of a vector, respectively. We solve the problem (5.1) via the “fastclime” R package (<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/fastclime/index.html>), and then let \hat{d}_{jj} be the j th element of the solution. In the fixed-dimensional settings, we use the sample precision matrix to estimate diagonal elements

$$\hat{d}_{jj} = \{(n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1}\}_{jj}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (5.2)$$

For the SPAC-ALasso, we estimate the initial estimator $\hat{\gamma}_0 = (\hat{\gamma}_{01}, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_{0p})^T$ in (3.4) through $\hat{\gamma}_{0j} = \hat{\beta}_{0j} / \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2}$ ($1 \leq j \leq p$), which implies that an initial estimator $\hat{\beta}_0$ for β is required. We use the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator of β as the initial estimator $\hat{\beta}_0$ under fixed-dimensional situations. For high-dimensional settings, we first select variables via the SPAC-Lasso and then compute OLS estimators of coefficients for the selected variables. We let $\hat{\beta}_0$ be the vector consisting of OLS estimators for selected covariates and zeros for

non-selected covariates. For the tuning parameter related to the adaptive Lasso penalty in (3.4), we let $\mu = 1$ in this paper and compare the proposed SPAC-ALasso to the traditional adaptive Lasso method with $\mu = 1$.

We use the coordinate descent algorithm (Fu, 1998; Breheny and Huang, 2011) to solve the minimization problems with objective functions in (3.3), (3.4), and (3.5) for the SPAC-Lasso, SPAC-ALasso, and SPAC-SCAD, respectively. We illustrate this with $p = 1$ first. The unpenalized least squares solution of the univariate setting is $z = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} / (n\hat{d}^{1/2})$. Accordingly, the proposed SPAC-Lasso, SPAC-ALasso, and SPAC-SCAD estimators have closed forms

$$\hat{\gamma}_{Lasso}(z, \lambda) = \text{sign}(z)(|z| - \lambda)_+, \quad \hat{\gamma}_{ALasso}(z, \lambda, \hat{\gamma}_0) = \text{sign}(z) \left(|z| - \frac{\lambda}{|\hat{\gamma}_0|} \right)_+, \quad (5.3)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD}(z, \lambda, a) = \begin{cases} \text{sign}(z)(|z| - \lambda)_+ & \text{if } |z| \leq 2\lambda \\ \{(a-1)z - \text{sign}(z)a\lambda\}/(a-2) & \text{if } 2\lambda < |z| \leq a\lambda \\ z & \text{if } |z| > a\lambda, \end{cases} \quad (5.4)$$

respectively.

For a multivariate case, we use these univariate solutions to obtain coordinate-wise minimizers, except that we replace z in (5.3) and (5.4) by the unpenalized solution of the regression with the partial residual of \mathbf{x}_j ($1 \leq j \leq p$) as response

$$z_j = \mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{r}_{-j} / (n\hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2}) = \mathbf{x}_j^T \mathbf{r} / (n\hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2}) + \gamma_j^{(l-1)}, \quad (5.5)$$

where $\mathbf{r}_{-j} = \mathbf{y} - \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbf{x}_i \hat{d}_{ii}^{1/2} \gamma_i^*$ is \mathbf{x}_j 's partial residual, $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{y} - \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbf{x}_i \hat{d}_{ii}^{1/2} \gamma_i^*$, and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^* = (\gamma_1^*, \dots, \gamma_p^*)^T$ is the most recent updated estimator for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. A complete algorithm for the SPAC-SCAD is provided in Algorithm 1, including estimation of the \mathbf{d} in Step 2 and the coordinate descent method in Step 4. Algorithms of the SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-ALasso are

similar to Algorithm 1, except that we replace $\hat{\gamma}_{SCAD}$ in Step 4 by $\hat{\gamma}_{Lasso}$ or $\hat{\gamma}_{ALasso}$ in (5.3), respectively.

Algorithm 1 (SPAC-SCAD)

1. Set $l = 1$. Set tolerance ϵ , initial values $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{(0)}$, and tuning parameters λ and a .
 2. Calculate $\hat{\mathbf{d}}$ using (5.2) or through solving (5.1) for $j = 1, \dots, p$.
 3. Calculate $\mathbf{r}^{(0)} = \mathbf{y} - \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} \gamma_j^{(0)}$.
 4. For $j = 1, \dots, p$, estimate $\gamma_j^{(l)}$ as follows

Calculate z_j using (5.5);

Calculate $\gamma_j^{(l)} = \hat{\gamma}_{SCAD}(z_j, \lambda, a)$ using (5.4);

Update $\mathbf{r}^{(l)} = \mathbf{r}^{(l-1)} - \mathbf{x}_j \hat{d}_{jj}^{1/2} (\gamma_j^{(l)} - \gamma_j^{(l-1)})$.
 5. Iterate Step 4 until a convergence criterion is satisfied, for example,

$$\min_j \left\{ \left| (\gamma_j^{(l)} - \gamma_j^{(l-1)}) / \gamma_j^{(l-1)} \right| \right\} < \epsilon.$$
-

6. Simulations

In this section, we compare the performance of the proposed method and existing model selection approaches in simulation studies. We generate data 100 times based on a linear regression model, $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + N_n(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$, where \mathbf{X} is a $n \times p$ matrix and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector. Each row of the design matrix \mathbf{X} is independently and identically distributed from a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}_{p \times 1}$ and a block-exchangeable covariance matrix $\mathbf{C}_{p \times p}$ of the form in (4.3) with the parameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)^T$. The first q elements in the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are nonzero and take value β_s , while the remaining ones are zero.

We implement the Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD methods via the coordinate descent algorithm (Fu, 1998; Breheny and Huang, 2011). Since the purpose of the proposed method is to provide model selection consistency when the traditional methods fail, we first check whether the original weak irrepresentable condition is satisfied or not for the covariates selected by Lasso. If the weak irrepresentable condition is violated, we adopt the proposed method; otherwise, the standard Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD methods can still be applicable. We use the “pcalg” R package (<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/pcalg/index.html>) to implement the PC-simple algorithm with a significance level 0.05, which is a method based on partial correlations. The Farm-Select method is implemented via the “FarmSelect” R package (<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/FarmSelect/index.html>). In each penalty-based method, the tuning parameter λ is selected by the extended BIC (EBIC) which is effective for small n but large p (Chen and Chen, 2008). For the SCAD method and the proposed SPAC-SCAD method, we choose $a = 3.7$ (Fan and Li, 2001). For the adaptive Lasso, we apply the Lasso estimator as the initial estimator for weighting.

To evaluate the performance of each method, we compute the false negative rate (FNR) and false positive rate (FPR) as follows

$$\frac{\sum_{j=1}^p I(\hat{\beta}_j = 0, \beta_j \neq 0)}{\sum_{j=1}^p I(\beta_j \neq 0)}, \quad \frac{\sum_{j=1}^p I(\hat{\beta}_j \neq 0, \beta_j = 0)}{\sum_{j=1}^p I(\beta_j = 0)},$$

respectively, where $I(\cdot)$ is an indicator function. The FNR represents the proportion of relevant covariates which are not selected, while the FPR represents the proportion of selected irrelevant covariates. We define the overall false rate of a method as the summation of the FNR and FPR. A method with smaller overall false rate indicates a better performance in

model selection. We calculate means of the FNRs and FPRs for all the implemented methods using 100 replications.

Setting 1: Let $p = 250$, $q = 5$, $n = 80$, $\beta_s = 0.4$, and $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.1, 0.3, 0.8)^T$, $(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)^T$, $(0.3, 0.5, 0.8)^T$, or $(0.5, 0.7, 0.9)^T$.

Table 1 shows that the proposed method performs better than existing model selection approaches under Setting 1. Specifically, the ratio of overall false rate of each penalty-based method to that of the proposed method with the same penalty function is greater than 1 across all covariance matrices. Also, the overall false rates of the Farm-Select method and the PC-simple algorithm are both larger than that of the proposed SPAC-SCAD. In particular, the ratio of overall false rates is the largest when $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.5, 0.7, 0.9)^T$ where covariates are most correlated. For example, the ratio between the traditional Lasso and the proposed SPAC-Lasso is 6.637 when $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.5, 0.7, 0.9)^T$, which is much larger than corresponding ratios under other $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$'s.

Moreover, the FNRs of the SPAC-Lasso, SPAC-ALasso, and SPAC-SCAD are smaller than those of the traditional Lasso, adaptive Lasso, and SCAD methods given each $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, respectively. This also holds for the FPR. In addition, we present violation rates in the last row of Table 1, which is the percentage of the original weak irrepresentable condition being violated based on 100 simulated data. The violation rates are all close to 1 since the original weak irrepresentable condition does not hold for the true covariance matrices in this setting.

Setting 2: Let $p = 1000$, $q = 20$, $n = 150$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.3, 0.5, 0.8)^T$, and $\beta_s = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5$, or 0.6 .

We consider high-dimensional situations with one thousand covariates in Setting 2. Re-

Table 1: Results of Setting 1. The “Ratio” for each penalty-based approach is the ratio of FPR+FNR calculated from the traditional method to the FPR+FNR from the proposed method with the same penalty. The “Ratio” for Farm-Select (or PC-simple) is the ratio of FPR+FNR for Farm-Select (or PC-simple) to that of SPAC-SCAD. “Violate” represents the percentage of the original weak irrepresentable condition being violated based on selection results of Lasso in 100 simulated data.

α		(0.1, 0.3, 0.8)	(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)	(0.3, 0.5, 0.8)	(0.5, 0.7, 0.9)
Lasso	FNR	0.804	0.718	0.744	0.744
	FPR	0.002	0.005	0.007	0.018
SPAC-Lasso	FNR	0.510	0.382	0.460	0.112
	FPR	0.002	0.003	0.006	0.003
	Ratio	1.576	1.876	1.614	6.637
ALasso	FNR	0.794	0.778	0.794	0.890
	FPR	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.006
SPAC-ALasso	FNR	0.500	0.430	0.528	0.384
	FPR	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002
	Ratio	1.589	1.808	1.505	2.321
SCAD	FNR	0.148	0.196	0.380	0.859
	FPR	0.126	0.093	0.057	0.004
SPAC-SCAD	FNR	0.126	0.120	0.214	0.303
	FPR	0.052	0.043	0.038	0.003
	Ratio	1.542	1.775	1.734	2.821
Farm-Select	FNR	0.200	0.600	0.200	1.000
	FPR	0.065	0.029	0.065	0.004
	Ratio	1.489	3.859	1.052	3.281
PC-simple	FNR	0.496	0.530	0.696	0.892
	FPR	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.007
	Ratio	2.809	3.273	2.782	2.937
Violate		0.900	0.940	0.860	0.970

sults in Table 2 show that the proposed method still outperforms other competing methods in terms of overall false rate. In addition, the ratios between overall false rates are larger for scenarios with larger β_s , indicating that the proposed method improves existing methods more when signals are stronger. The FNR and FPR of the PC-simple algorithm for relatively larger β_s are not provided in Table 2 since the PC-simple algorithm is quite time-consuming under settings with strong signals and thousands of correlated potential predictors. It takes more than a few hours to run the algorithm for only one replication. However, we can still observe that the proposed SPAC-SCAD outperforms the PC-simple algorithm based on results under $\beta_s = 0.2$ and $\beta_s = 0.3$.

We incorporate binary covariates in the following Setting 3. We first simulate data from a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix \mathbf{C} of the form in (4.3), and then transform 2 relevant and 60 irrelevant covariates X_j to $\text{sign}(X_j)$.

Setting 3: Let $p = 250$, $q = 5$, $n = 80$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (0.5, 0.7, 0.9)^T$, and $\beta_s = 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6$, or 0.7 .

The proposed method also performs better than other methods even when we have binary potential predictors, according to the results in Table 2. For instance, when $\beta_s = 0.5$, the FNR of the SPAC-ALasso is 0.320, only 43.4% of the FNR of the adaptive Lasso method, indicating that the proposed SPAC-ALasso selects more relevant covariates. Similarly, the FPR of the SPAC-ALasso is smaller than that of the adaptive Lasso, implying that the proposed SPAC-ALasso selects fewer irrelevant covariates. In addition, the overall false rate of the SPAC-SCAD decreases much faster than that of the PC-simple algorithm as β_s increases, which is consistent with the fact that partial correlation is unable to fully use

signal strength due to its bounded range.

Table 2: Results of Settings 2 and 3. The “Ratio” for each penalty-based approach is the ratio of FPR+FNR calculated from the traditional method to the FPR+FNR from the proposed method with the same penalty. The “Ratio” for Farm-Select (or PC-simple) is the ratio of FPR+FNR for Farm-Select (or PC-simple) to that of SPAC-SCAD. “Violate” represents the percentage of the original weak irrepresentable condition being violated based on selection results of Lasso in 100 simulated data.

Setting		Setting 2					Setting 3					
β_s		0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.5	0.6	0.7
Lasso	FNR	0.986	0.972	0.852	0.586	0.415	0.976	0.912	0.782	0.642	0.388	0.180
	FPR	0.007	0.008	0.010	0.016	0.019	0.003	0.009	0.016	0.018	0.025	0.028
SPAC-Lasso	FNR	0.921	0.639	0.357	0.094	0.020	0.904	0.692	0.334	0.182	0.044	0.006
	FPR	0.003	0.007	0.012	0.019	0.021	0.002	0.003	0.009	0.011	0.013	0.014
	Ratio	1.075	1.516	2.334	5.328	10.625	1.082	1.325	2.329	3.425	7.214	10.557
ALasso	FNR	0.998	0.990	0.936	0.659	0.466	0.982	0.954	0.854	0.738	0.496	0.300
	FPR	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.005	0.005
SPAC-ALasso	FNR	0.969	0.806	0.565	0.340	0.249	0.914	0.744	0.478	0.320	0.108	0.042
	FPR	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.000	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.001
	Ratio	1.031	1.229	1.657	1.939	1.881	1.075	1.284	1.788	2.309	4.569	7.080
SCAD	FNR	0.827	0.702	0.580	0.323	0.073	0.824	0.830	0.780	0.612	0.476	0.242
	FPR	0.005	0.008	0.008	0.007	0.004	0.024	0.008	0.008	0.009	0.006	0.005
SPAC-SCAD	FNR	0.513	0.296	0.108	0.013	0.001	0.774	0.499	0.298	0.158	0.078	0.032
	FPR	0.007	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.001	0.005	0.006	0.007	0.004	0.004	0.002
	Ratio	1.599	2.339	5.235	22.118	44.648	1.090	1.659	2.585	3.825	5.908	7.275
Farm-Select	FNR	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.850	0.800	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.400	0.200
	FPR	0.000	0.001	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.016	0.016	0.024	0.000	0.029	0.029
	Ratio	1.923	3.296	8.944	>50	>50	1.306	2.011	3.359	6.154	5.250	6.712
PC-simple	FNR	0.992	0.997	—	—	—	0.918	0.876	0.844	0.786	0.726	0.682
	FPR	0.005	0.007	—	—	—	0.005	0.006	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.007
	Ratio	1.917	3.305	—	—	—	1.186	1.746	2.789	4.880	8.981	20.242
Violate		0.980	0.970	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.909	0.899	0.980	0.960	0.970	1.000

Since the estimation of diagonal elements \mathbf{d} could be inaccurate, we investigate the robustness of the proposed method with respect to the estimation of \mathbf{d} in the following Setting 4. In this setting, we replace \hat{d}_{jj} in the implementation of SPAC-Lasso by $\hat{d}_{jj} + u_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, where u_j 's are independently and identically distributed from a truncated nor-

Table 3: Results of Setting 4.

α	(0.1, 0.3, 0.8)					(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)				
Method	Lasso	SPAC-Lasso				Lasso	SPAC-Lasso			
σ_u	—	0	1	3	5	—	0	1	3	5
FNR	0.988	0.843	0.903	0.895	0.918	0.958	0.848	0.867	0.915	0.908
FPR	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.002
FNR+FPR	0.989	0.843	0.903	0.896	0.919	0.960	0.849	0.868	0.917	0.910

mal distribution with minimum value $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \{-\hat{d}_{jj}\}$, mean 0, and variance σ_u^2 . Here, we require the random noise $u_j \geq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \{-\hat{d}_{jj}\}$ to ensure that $\hat{d}_{jj} + u_j$ is positive for each $j = 1, \dots, p$.

Setting 4: Let $p = 500$, $q = 6$, $n = 100$, $\beta_s = 0.3$, and $\alpha = (0.1, 0.3, 0.8)^T$ or $(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)^T$. The variance parameter $\sigma_u = 0, 1, 3$, or 5 .

The results of Setting 4 in Table 3 show that the overall false rate of the SPAC-Lasso with noise increases as the variance σ_u^2 increases, but this overall false rate is still smaller than that of the Lasso method. For example, when $\alpha = (0.1, 0.3, 0.8)^T$, the overall false rate of the SPAC-Lasso with $\sigma_u = 5$ is 0.919 larger than that with $\sigma_u = 0$, but smaller than 0.989 which is the overall false rate of the Lasso method. Thus, the proposed method is robust to certain errors in the estimation of \mathbf{d} . Although we use the CLIME for the estimation of d in this paper, this can also be replaced with other consistent estimators.

Setting 5: Let $p = 150$, $q = 3$, $n = 80$, and $\beta_s = 0.5$. The parameters $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3)^T$ are $(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)$, $(0.8, 0.4, 0.2)$, $(0.1, 0.3, 0.8)$, $(0.8, 0.3, 0.1)$, $(0.2, 0.4, 0.7)$, $(0.7, 0.4, 0.2)$, $(0.4, 0.5, 0.7)$, or $(0.7, 0.5, 0.4)$.

In Setting 5, we examine the robustness of the proposed method when the original weak irrepresentable condition holds. As shown in Tables 4–5, the proposed method still outper-

forms the existing methods in terms of FNR+FNP when $\alpha_3 > \alpha_1$. In addition, the proposed method performs comparably to the existing methods when $\alpha_1 > \alpha_3$, where the original weak irrepresentable condition holds. For example, the ratios of overall false rates of the adaptive Lasso method to those of the proposed SPAC-ALasso are greater than 1.5 when $\alpha_3 > \alpha_1$, and are equal to or quite close to 1 when $\alpha_1 > \alpha_3$. In summary, the proposed method performs similarly to the regular penalization method when the weak irrepresentable condition holds, but performs much better than the existing method when the condition fails.

Table 4: Results of Setting 5. The “Ratio” for each penalty-based approach is the ratio of FPR+FNR calculated from the traditional method to the FPR+FNR from the proposed method with the same penalty. “Violate” represents the percentage of the original weak irrepresentable condition being violated based on selection results of Lasso in 100 simulated data.

α		(0.2, 0.4, 0.8)	(0.8, 0.4, 0.2)	(0.1, 0.3, 0.8)	(0.8, 0.3, 0.1)
Lasso	FNR	0.240	0.110	0.357	0.103
	FPR	0.009	0.002	0.006	0.002
SPAC-Lasso	FNR	0.143	0.123	0.123	0.110
	FPR	0.003	0.002	0.003	0.002
	Ratio	1.699	0.895	2.871	0.942
ALasso	FNR	0.297	0.393	0.257	0.373
	FPR	0.002	0.001	0.001	0.001
SPAC-ALasso	FNR	0.160	0.413	0.147	0.373
	FPR	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001
	Ratio	1.852	0.952	1.748	1.000
SCAD	FNR	0.073	0.647	0.057	0.660
	FPR	0.012	0.002	0.009	0.002
SPAC-SCAD	FNR	0.050	0.657	0.030	0.663
	FPR	0.007	0.002	0.006	0.002
	Ratio	1.493	0.985	1.830	0.995
Violate		0.797	0.037	0.743	0.007

Table 5: Results of Setting 5. The “Ratio” for each penalty-based approach is the ratio of FPR+FNR calculated from the traditional method to the FPR+FNR from the proposed method with the same penalty. “Violate” represents the percentage of the original weak irrepresentable condition being violated based on selection results of Lasso in 100 simulated data.

α		(0.2, 0.4, 0.7)	(0.7, 0.4, 0.2)	(0.4, 0.5, 0.7)	(0.7, 0.5, 0.4)
Lasso	FNR	0.520	0.103	0.353	0.170
	FPR	0.010	0.004	0.013	0.004
SPAC-Lasso	FNR	0.303	0.110	0.163	0.193
	FPR	0.007	0.004	0.006	0.004
	Ratio	1.708	0.943	2.158	0.884
ALasso	FNR	0.593	0.310	0.377	0.327
	FPR	0.002	0.002	0.003	0.002
SPAC-ALasso	FNR	0.380	0.310	0.200	0.350
	FPR	0.001	0.002	0.002	0.003
	Ratio	1.562	1.000	1.882	0.931
SCAD	FNR	0.280	0.463	0.187	0.493
	FPR	0.012	0.008	0.015	0.009
SPAC-SCAD	FNR	0.140	0.473	0.133	0.497
	FPR	0.006	0.008	0.010	0.010
	Ratio	1.991	0.980	1.409	0.991
Violate		0.883	0.007	0.890	0.133

7. Real data application

In this section, we apply the proposed method to high-dimensional genetic data collected in the Detroit neighborhood health study (<https://dnhs.unc.edu/>), which is a representative study focusing on post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) of African American adults in Detroit, Michigan. This study collects gene expression data and post-traumatic checklists based on incident trauma exposures, which is a 17-item self-reported measures of PTSD symptoms. We treat the average of the 17 post-traumatic checklist scores as the response

Y . Studies (Logue et al., 2015; Kuan et al., 2017) show that gene expression is associated with PTSD. To identify gene probes which are relevant to PTSD, we consider using all the gene probes as potential predictors.

Since the number of all gene probes is over 15,000 and the sample size is only 93, we first apply screening to the gene probes based on correlations among probes and marginal correlations between probes and Y . For each probe X_j , we let \mathbf{c}_j denote the vector consisting of correlations between this probe and other probes. Since the proposed method targets correlated data, we consider X_j to be correlated with others and select it if the average absolute value of elements in \mathbf{c}_j is greater than 0.1. Moreover, we calculate marginal correlations between selected probes and the response variable, and filter out probes with absolute values of the marginal correlations less than 0.15, which are unlikely to be important probes. After the screening, we retain 3591 gene probes for further analysis.

To evaluate the performance of different methods, we randomly partition all the observations into 95% for training and 5% for testing 100 times. For each method, we estimate parameters using the training sets, calculate the mean number of selected probes, and compute the average of prediction mean squared errors (PMSE) in testing sets based on 100 replications. However, the PMSEs of the PC-simple algorithm and the Farm-Select method are unavailable, since the PC-simple algorithm only provides variable selection results without coefficient estimation and the R package of the Farm-Select method does not have an intercept in the model. To calculate prediction errors for the two methods and compare them to other methods, we adopt the OLS to estimate the coefficients of probes selected by each method and calculate PMSE based on the OLS estimation, denoted by OLS-PMSE.

The original weak irrepresentable condition fails in each training set based on the selection results of Lasso, indicating that the proposed method is more suitable for the data than traditional methods.

Table 6 provides averages of PMSEs, OLS-PMSEs, and numbers of selected probes, respectively, for all the methods. According to the table, the proposed method produces smaller PMSE and smaller OLS-PMSE than existing methods. In particular, the average OLS-PMSE of Lasso is 18.7% more than that of the SPAC-Lasso. Similarly, the average PMSE of the traditional adaptive Lasso and SCAD methods are 16.2% and 17.3% more than those of the proposed SPAC-ALasso and SPAC-SCAD, respectively. Moreover, in terms of OLS-PMSE, the Farm-Select method and PC-simple algorithm perform worse than the proposed method. Among all the methods, the SPAC-ALasso produces smaller PMSE with relatively fewer selected probes, while the prediction errors of methods with the SCAD penalty are larger than errors of methods with other penalties.

Table 6: Average results for the real data.

	PMSE	OLS-PMSE	NS
Lasso	0.9306	0.9868	73
SPAC-Lasso	0.8283	0.8310	74
ALasso	0.9568	1.0406	20
SPAC-ALasso	0.8232	0.9101	22
SCAD	1.3353	1.3164	38
SPAC-SCAD	1.1387	1.1298	39
Farm-Select	—	1.2429	40
PC-simple	—	1.3278	5

In addition, we apply these methods to all the samples and summarize selected probes in

tables in Section S3 of the supplementary material. On one hand, *ILMN_1716728*, *ILMN_1682259*, *ILMN_3307729*, *ILMN_1670134*, *ILMN_1793201*, *ILMN_1811507*, *ILMN_1656111*, and *ILMN_3248844* are common probes selected by the Lasso, SPAC-Lasso, ALasso, SPAC-ALasso, SCAD, SPAC-SCAD, and Farm-Select. Thus, these probes are very likely to be associated with the response. Among them, *ILMN_1716728*, *ILMN_3307729*, and *ILMN_3248844* are also selected by the PC-simple algorithm, indicating that these three probes are extremely likely to be relevant to PTSD. On the other hand, *ILMN_1663035* from the *SREBF1* gene is only selected by the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-ALasso. According to the existing literature (Kuan et al., 2017), the *SREBF1* gene is indeed associated with PTSD.

In conclusion, the proposed method leads to smaller PMSE and OLS-PMSE than existing variable selection methods with similar numbers of selected probes, showing that the proposed SPAC strategy improves the accuracy of variable selection.

8. Discussion

We propose a new variable selection approach to address the problem where the original irrepressible conditions fail due to the strong dependency between relevant and irrelevant covariates. The violation of the irrepressible conditions leads to inconsistency of model selection based on traditional methods. In this paper, we introduce a semi-standard partial covariance (SPAC), which has a clear geometric interpretation based on projections and takes advantage of both coefficients β and partial correlations. Moreover, we develop a SPAC method which penalizes SPACs instead of coefficients β or partial correlations alone to mitigate selection of irrelevant covariates that are strongly correlated with relevant covariates.

We establish the strong sign consistency of the proposed SPAC-Lasso and SPAC-SCAD under high-dimensionality. Specifically, we transform irrepresentable conditions to achieve variable selection consistency, which solves the problem when the Lasso or SCAD method is not sign consistent. Since our goal is to target situations where the traditional methods fail, we first check whether the original weak irrepresentable condition holds or not. If it is violated, numerical studies show that the proposed approach is more effective, and outperforms the traditional variable selection methods.

In contrast to partial correlation approaches such as the PC-simple algorithm, the proposed method takes full advantage of signal strength, as SPACs incorporate the magnitude of coefficients. This is also reflected in the numerical studies where the SPAC-ALasso and the PC-simple algorithm both produce relatively small false negative rates but large false positive rates, since they tend to select fewer covariates compared with other methods. However, as signal strength increases, the false positive rate of SPAC-ALasso decreases significantly compared to the PC-simple algorithm. Additionally, the proposed method can still achieve sign consistency for non-Gaussian distributed covariates such as categorical covariates, where partial correlation is unable to capture the conditional independence. In simulation settings with binary covariates, the proposed method performs much better than the PC-simple algorithm in terms of overall false rate.

Although theoretical properties on the consistency of the SPAC-ALasso are not provided in this paper, the proof should be similar to that of the SPAC-Lasso. Moreover, the SPAC idea is flexible and can be readily applied to other penalty-based methods and the generalized linear model framework.

Supplementary Materials

We provide additional conditions, theorems, tables, corollaries, and proofs for Lemma 1, all the theorems, propositions and corollaries in the online supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge support for this project from the National Science Foundation (NSF grant DMS 1821198).

References

- Baba, K., R. Shibata, and M. Sibuya (2004). Partial correlation and conditional correlation as measures of conditional independence. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics* 46(4), 657–664.
- Bradic, J. (2016). Randomized maximum-contrast selection: Subagging for large-scale regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 10(1), 121–170.
- Breheny, P. and J. Huang (2011). Coordinate descent algorithms for nonconvex penalized regression, with applications to biological feature selection. *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 5(1), 232–252.
- Bühlmann, P., M. Kalisch, and M. H. Maathuis (2010). Variable selection in high-dimensional linear models: Partially faithful distributions and the PC-simple algorithm. *Biometrika* 97(2), 261–278.
- Bühlmann, P., P. Rütimann, S. van de Geer, and C.-H. Zhang (2013). Correlated variables in regression: Clustering and sparse estimation. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* 143(11), 1835–1858.
- Cai, T., W. Liu, and X. Luo (2011). A constrained l_1 minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 106(494), 594–607.
- Candes, E. and T. Tao (2007). The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when p is much larger than n . *The Annals of Statistics* 35(6), 2313–2351.

-
- Chen, J. and Z. Chen (2008). Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces. *Biometrika* 95(3), 759–771.
- Chén, O. Y., C. Crainiceanu, E. L. Ogburn, B. S. Caffo, T. D. Wager, and M. A. Lindquist (2017). High-dimensional multivariate mediation with application to neuroimaging data. *Biostatistics* 19(2), 121–136.
- Cho, H. and P. Fryzlewicz (2012). High-dimensional variable selection via tilting. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 74(3), 593–622.
- Fan, J., Y. Ke, and K. Wang (2018). Factor-adjusted regularized model selection. *Available at SSRN 3248047*.
- Fan, J. and R. Li (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 96(456), 1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and J. Lv (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh-dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 70(5), 849–911.
- Fan, J. and J. Lv (2011). Nonconcave penalized likelihood with NP-dimensionality. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 57(8), 5467–5484.
- Fan, J., Q.-M. Shao, and W.-X. Zhou (2018). Are discoveries spurious? Distributions of maximum spurious correlations and their applications. *The Annals of Statistics* 46(3), 989–1017.
- Fan, Y. and J. Lv (2013). Asymptotic equivalence of regularization methods in thresholded parameter space. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 108(503), 1044–1061.
- Fu, G.-H., W.-M. Zhang, L. Dai, and Y.-Z. Fu (2014). Group variable selection with oracle property by weight-fused adaptive elastic net model for strongly correlated data. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 43(10), 2468–2481.
- Fu, W. J. (1998). Penalized regressions: The bridge versus the Lasso. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 7(3), 397–416.

-
- Hilafu, H. and X. Yin (2017). Sufficient dimension reduction and variable selection for large-p-small-n data with highly correlated predictors. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 26(1), 26–34.
- Huang, J., P. Breheny, S. Lee, S. Ma, and C.-H. Zhang (2016). The Mnet method for variable selection. *Statistica Sinica* 26(3), 903–923.
- Huang, J., S. Ma, and C.-H. Zhang (2008). Adaptive Lasso for sparse high-dimensional regression models. *Statistica Sinica* 18(4), 1603–1618.
- Imai, K. and T. Yamamoto (2013). Identification and sensitivity analysis for multiple causal mechanisms: Revisiting evidence from framing experiments. *Political Analysis* 21(2), 141–171.
- Javanmard, A. and A. Montanari (2013). Model selection for high-dimensional regression under the generalized irrepresentability condition. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 3012–3020.
- Jerolon, A., L. Baglietto, E. Birmele, V. Perduca, and F. Alarcon (2018). Causal mediation analysis in presence of multiple mediators uncausally related. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.08018*.
- Jia, J. and K. Rohe (2015). Preconditioning the Lasso for sign consistency. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 9(1), 1150–1172.
- Jin, J., C.-H. Zhang, and Q. Zhang (2014). Optimality of graphlet screening in high-dimensional variable selection. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15(1), 2723–2772.
- Kim, Y., H. Choi, and H.-S. Oh (2008). Smoothly clipped absolute deviation on high dimensions. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 103(484), 1665–1673.
- Kuan, P., M. Waszczuk, R. Kotov, C. Marsit, G. Guffanti, A. Gonzalez, X. Yang, K. Koenen, E. Bromet, and B. Luft (2017). An epigenome-wide DNA methylation study of PTSD and depression in World Trade Center responders. *Translational psychiatry* 7(6), e1158.
- Kuan, P.-F., M. A. Waszczuk, R. Kotov, S. Clouston, X. Yang, P. K. Singh, S. T. Glenn, E. C. Gomez, J. Wang,

-
- E. Bromet, and B. J. Luft (2017). Gene expression associated with PTSD in World Trade Center responders: An RNA sequencing study. *Translational psychiatry* 7(12), 1297.
- Lauritzen, S. L. (1996). *Graphical Models*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Li, R., J. Liu, and L. Lou (2017). Variable selection via partial correlation. *Statistica Sinica* 27(3), 983–996.
- Li, Y., H. Hong, J. Kang, K. He, J. Zhu, and Y. Li (2016). Classification with ultrahigh-dimensional features. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01541*.
- Logue, M. W., A. K. Smith, C. Baldwin, E. J. Wolf, G. Guffanti, A. Ratanatharathorn, A. Stone, S. A. Schichman, D. Humphries, E. B. Binder, J. Arloth, A. Menke, M. Uddin, D. Wildman, S. Galea, A. E. Aiello, K. C. Koenen, and M. W. Miller (2015). An analysis of gene expression in PTSD implicates genes involved in the glucocorticoid receptor pathway and neural responses to stress. *Psychoneuroendocrinology* 57, 1–13.
- Maier, A. and D. Rodríguez-Salas (2017). Fast and robust selection of highly-correlated features in regression problems. In *2017 Fifteenth IAPR International Conference on Machine Vision Applications (MVA)*, pp. 482–485. IEEE.
- Peng, J., P. Wang, N. Zhou, and J. Zhu (2009). Partial correlation estimation by joint sparse regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 104(486), 735–746.
- Raveh, A. (1985). On the use of the inverse of the correlation matrix in multivariate data analysis. *The American Statistician* 39(1), 39–42.
- Sharma, D. B., H. D. Bondell, and H. H. Zhang (2013). Consistent group identification and variable selection in regression with correlated predictors. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 22(2), 319–340.
- Tang, Y., H. J. Wang, and E. Barut (2017). Testing for the presence of significant covariates through conditional marginal regression. *Biometrika* 105(1), 57–71.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society:*

- Series B* 58(1), 267–288.
- Wang, X. and M. Wang (2014). Combination of nonconvex penalties and ridge regression for high-dimensional linear models. *Journal of Mathematical Research with Applications* 34(6), 743–753.
- Yuan, M. and Y. Lin (2006). Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 68(1), 49–67.
- Zeng, L. and J. Xie (2012). Group variable selection for data with dependent structures. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* 82(1), 95–106.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(2), 894–942.
- Zhao, P. and B. Yu (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 7, 2541–2563.
- Zheng, Z., Y. Fan, and J. Lv (2014). High dimensional thresholded regression and shrinkage effect. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 76(3), 627–649.
- Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive Lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101(476), 1418–1429.
- Zou, H. and T. Hastie (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* 67(2), 301–320.

Department of Statistics, Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN 47907, USA

E-mail: feixue@purdue.edu

Department of Statistics, University of California Irvine, Irvine, CA 92697, USA

E-mail: aqu2@uci.edu