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Abstract—Online learning algorithms have a wide variety of applications in large scale machine learning problems because users can know the performance of current models trained by existing data and they also can update the new models rapidly after data changes. However, the standard online learning methods still suffer some issues such as lower convergence rates and limited capability to select features or to recover the true features. In this paper, we present a novel framework for online learning based on running averages and introduce a series of online versions of some popular existing offline algorithms such as Elastic Net, Minimax Concave Penalty and Feature Selection with Annealing. We prove the equivalence between our online methods and their offline counterparts and give theoretical feature selection and convergence guarantees for some of them. In contrast to the existing online methods, the proposed methods can extract models with any desired sparsity level at any time. Numerical experiments indicate that our new methods enjoy high feature selection accuracy and a fast convergence rate, compared with standard stochastic algorithms and offline learning methods. We also present some applications to large scale machine learning problems because users can know the performance of current models trained by existing data and they also can update the new models rapidly after data changes. However, the standard online algorithms have some limitations. Firstly, they do not use the full gradient to update the parameter vector in each iteration. Online learning methods are sequential methods, using one observation or a mini-batch for acceleration [4] in each iteration. As a consequence, online methods suffer a lower convergence rate than traditional batch learning algorithms, \( \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n}) \) for general convexity and \( \mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n) \) for strongly convex functions [5]. More importantly, the standard online algorithms, such as stochastic gradient descent, are not able to exploit the sparse structure of the feature vector, i.e. they cannot select features and recover the support of the true signal.

In this paper, we introduce a new framework of online learning methods, based on running averages. The terminology running averages is not novel in computer science, but it is first introduced here for online supervised learning problems. We will give more details about running averages in Section I. We also present some applications to large datasets where again the proposed framework shows competitive results compared to popular online and offline algorithms.

Index Terms—online learning, feature selection, running averages

I. INTRODUCTION

Online learning is one of the most promising approaches to efficiently handle large scale machine learning problems. Nowadays, the size of datasets is rapidly increasing in various areas such as bioinformatics, medical imaging and computer vision. In big data learning, one often encounters datasets so large that they cannot fit in the computer memory. Online learning methods are capable of addressing these issues by constructing the model sequentially, one example at a time.

A comprehensive survey of the online learning and online optimization literature has been presented in [1].

In this paper, we assume that a sequence of i.i.d observations \( z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_n \) are generated from an unknown distribution, and the goal is to optimize a loss function

\[
L(w) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(w; z_i)
\]

where \( f(\cdot; z_i) : \mathbb{R}^p \to \mathbb{R} \) is a per-example loss function.

In online learning the coefficient \( w \) is estimated sequentially, from \( z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_{i-1} \) is obtained a coefficient vector \( w_i \). In the theoretical analysis of online learning, it is of interest to obtain an upper bound of the regret,

\[
R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(w_i; z_i) - \min_w \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(w; z_i),
\]

which measures what is lost compared to their offline versions, and in a way measuring the speed of convergence of the online algorithm.

Traditional online learning algorithms are all designed based on a sequential procedure. Zinkevich [2] proved that under the assumption that \( f(w; z_i) \) is Lipschitz-continuous and convex w.r.t \( w \), the online learning regret enjoys a convergence rate \( \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n}) \). Furthermore, if \( f(w; z_i) \) is strongly convex function, Hazan [3] showed that the regret has a faster convergence rate of \( \mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n) \).

However, traditional online algorithms have some limitations. Firstly, they do not use the full gradient to update the parameter vector in each iteration. Online learning methods are sequential methods, using one observation or a mini-batch for acceleration [4] in each iteration. As a consequence, online methods suffer a lower convergence rate than traditional batch learning algorithms, \( \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n}) \) for general convexity and \( \mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n) \) for strongly convex functions [5]. More importantly, the standard online algorithms, such as stochastic gradient descent, are not able to exploit the sparse structure of the feature vector, i.e. they cannot select features and recover the support of the true signal.

In this paper, we introduce a new framework of online learning methods, based on running averages. The terminology running averages is not novel in computer science, but it is first introduced here for online supervised learning problems. We will give more details about running averages in Section I.

A. Related Work

Online optimization and regularization. To cope with high dimensional data (e.g. \( p > n \)), various feature selection methods have been proposed to exploit the sparse structure of the coefficient vector. For instance, the \( \ell_1 \) regularization has been widely used in linear regression as a sparsity inducing penalty. Also, several online algorithms were designed to solve the feature selection problem in online learning settings. For online convex optimization, there are two main lines of research. One is Forward-Backward-Splitting [6], which proposes a framework for online proximal gradient (OPG). The other one is Xiao’s Regularized Dual Averaging method (RDA) [7], which extended the primal-dual sub-gradient method from [8] to the online setting. In addition, some
online variants are developed in recent years, such as OPG-ADMM and RDA-ADMM in [9]. Independently, Ouyang designed stochastic ADMM in [10], the same algorithm as OPG-ADMM. Besides, Fan proposed Truncated Stochastic Gradient Descent (TSGD) in [11]. Langford [12] and Nguyen [13] also proposed the similar ideas in online and stochastic learning.

There is another line of research about online feature selection in high dimensional settings. In [14], a new idea of online learning is proposed that features arrive one by one, instead of observations, and we need to decide what features to retain. Unlike the traditional online learning that we can build and update model based on the current data, the disadvantage of this new online setting is we cannot build a model for prediction until all features are disclosed. In this paper, we just consider the traditional online learning, so we will not cover algorithms such as [14] for comparison.

The convergence rate for the above methods is $O(\log(n)/n)$ when the loss function is strongly convex, and $O(1/\sqrt{n})$ for general convex function. In practice, they do not perform well in true signal recovery, which is also confirmed in our numerical experiments below.

In [3], an online Newton method was proposed, which used a similar idea with running averages to update the inverse of the Hessian matrix. This method enjoys the computational complexity $O(p^2)$, but they did not address the issues of standardizing the variables and feature selection.

B. Our Contributions

In this paper, we propose a new framework for online learning based on running averages. Many of methods proposed in our framework enjoy a fast convergence rate and can recover the support of the true signal. Moreover, the proposed methods can address the issue of model selection, which is to obtain models with different sparsity levels and decide on the best model, e.g. using an AIC/BIC criterion. For example in Figure 1 are shown the solution paths obtained by the proposed online least squares with thresholding method, as well as the proposed online Lasso algorithms.

A brief summary of the convergence rates and computational complexity of various methods including the proposed methods are shown in Table 1.

Here, we summarize the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed running averages algorithms: although the proposed online methods based on running averages sacrifice computational complexity and memory compared with classical online methods, they enjoy a fast convergence rate and high estimation accuracy. More importantly, the proposed methods can select features and recover the support of true features with high accuracy and they can obtain models with any desired sparsity level at any time.

II. Setup and Notation

In this section, we will provide a general framework about running averages. First, we establish notation and problem settings. We denote vectors by lower case bold letters, such as $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and scalars by lower case letters, e.g. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. A sequence of vectors are denoted by subscripts, i.e. $w_1, w_2, \ldots$, and the entries in a vector are denoted by non-bold subscripts, like $w_i$. We use upper case bold letters to denote matrices, such as $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and upper case letters for random variables, like $X$. Given a vector $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define vector norms: $\|\gamma\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\gamma_i|$ and $\|\gamma\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i^2}$.

A. Running Averages

In mathematical statistics, given a distribution with unknown parameters $\theta$ and the i.i.d random variables $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$, a sufficient statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n)$ contains all the information necessary for estimating the model parameters. In big data learning problems the large datasets cannot fit in memory, and current online learning methods cannot select features with an arbitrary sparsity level at any time.

Motivated by this concern, we propose the running averages framework, which contains two modules, a running averages module that is updated online as new data is available, and a model extraction module that can build the model with any desired sparsity from the running averages. A diagram of the framework is shown in Figure 2.

Let $(x_i, y_i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$ be observations with $x_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \ldots, x_{ip})^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and we denote data matrix $X = (x_1^T, x_2^T, \ldots, x_n^T)^T$, $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_n)^T$. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Memory</th>
<th>Computation</th>
<th>Convergence</th>
<th>Feature True Feature</th>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Running Averages</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Regret</th>
<th>Selection</th>
<th>Selection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SADMM</td>
<td>$O(p)$</td>
<td>$O(p)$</td>
<td>$O(n)$</td>
<td>$O(n)$</td>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p)$</td>
<td>$O(n)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OLS-th</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OMCP</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>OFSA</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>$O(p^2)$</td>
<td>Fast</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The running averages are the cumulative averages over the observations. They are
\[
\mu_x = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i, \mu_y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i, \quad \text{and} \quad S_{xx} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^T, S_{xy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i y_i, S_{yy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i^2
\]
is the sample size \(n\). The running averages can be updated with an incremental implementation, for example
\[
\mu_x^{(n+1)} = \frac{n}{n+1} \mu_x^{(n)} + \frac{1}{n+1} x_{n+1},
\]
similar to the procedure from Chapter 2.5 in [15].

The running averages have the following advantages: a) they cover all necessary sample information for model estimation, b) the dimension of the running averages will not increase with sample size \(n\), c) they can be used in the online learning setting because they can be updated one example at one time.

**B. Data Standardization**

Data standardization is an important procedure in real data analysis, especially for feature selection. For this purpose, the data matrix \(X\) and the response vector \(y\) are usually standardized by removing the mean, and \(X\) is further standardized by making all columns on the same scale. However, because we discard the data and only use the running averages, we will need to standardize the running averages.

Denote \(1_n = [1, 1, \ldots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n\), and by \(\sigma_{x_j}\) the sample standard deviation for the random variable \(X_j\). By running averages, we can estimate the standard deviation:
\[
\sigma_{x_j} = \sqrt{S_{xx_j} - (\mu_{x_j})^2},
\]
in which \((S_{xx})_{jj}\) is the \(j\)-th diagonal entry for \(p \times p\) matrix \(S_{xx}\). Then, denote by \(\Pi = \text{diag}(\sigma_{x_1}, \ldots, \sigma_{x_p})^{-1}\) the \(p \times p\) diagonal matrix containing the inverse of standard deviation \(\sigma_{x_j}\) on the diagonal. Denote by \(\bar{X}\) the standardized data matrix \(X\), and \(\bar{y}\) as the centralized \(y\), we can standardize data as
\[
\bar{X} = (X - 1_n \mu_{x}) \Pi, \quad \bar{y} = (y - \mu_{y}1_n)
\]
From these equations we obtain the running averages of the standardized dataset:
\[
S_{\bar{x}\bar{y}} = \frac{1}{n} \bar{X}^T \bar{y} = \frac{1}{n} \Pi X^T y - \mu_y \Pi \mu_x = \Pi S_{xy} - \mu_y \Pi \mu_x
\]
\[
S_{\bar{x}\bar{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \bar{X}^T \bar{X} = \Pi (\frac{X^T X}{n} - \mu_x \mu_{x}^T) \Pi = \Pi (S_{xx} - \mu_x \mu_{x}^T) \Pi
\]
(5)
(6)
For convenience, hereinafter, we will still use \(S_{\bar{x}\bar{x}}\) and \(S_{\bar{x}\bar{y}}\) to represent the running averages after standardization.

**III. ALGORITHMS**

In this section, we propose several online learning algorithms based on running averages. First, we design online least squares based on running averages, which we apply to feature selection by thresholding. And we also propose the online feature selection with annealing (OFSA) to solve the constrained least squares problem. Then we consider some regularization models, such as Lasso, Elastic net, and Minimax Concave Penalty. To simplify notation, we denote OLS to represent online ordinary least squares, OLSth for online ordinary least squares with thresholding, Olasso for online Lasso, OElnet for online elastic net, and OMCP for online minimax concave penalty.

**A. Preliminaries**

Before we start introducing the running averages-based algorithms, we prove that our online algorithms are equivalent to offline algorithms. Actually, in our running averages online learning framework, we share the same objective loss function with offline learning, which is the key point to prove their equivalence.

**Proposition 1.** Consider the following penalized regression problem:
\[
\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2n} ||y - X\beta||^2 + P(\beta; \lambda),
\]
in which \(\beta\) is the coefficient vector and \(P(\beta; \lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^{p} P(\beta_j; \lambda)\) is a penalty function. It is equivalent to the online optimization problem based on running averages.
\[
\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2} (\beta^T S_{xx} \beta + S_{xy} - \beta^T S_{xy} + P(\beta; \lambda),
\]
(7)
(8)

**Proof.** The optimization function (7) can be rewritten as
\[
\frac{1}{2n} ||y - X\beta||^2 + P(\beta; \lambda) = \frac{1}{2n} (y - X\beta)^T (y - X\beta) + P(\beta; \lambda)
\]
\[
= \frac{y^T y}{2n} - \frac{\beta^T X^T y}{n} + \beta^T \frac{X^T X}{n} \beta + \sum_{j=1}^{p} P(\beta_j; \lambda),
\]
in which \(S_{yy} = y^T y/n, S_{xy} = X^T y/n, S_{xx} = X^T X/n\) are running averages. Thus, the batch learning problem is equivalent to our running averages online learning problem. \(\square\)

**B. Online Least Squares**

In the OLS, we need to find the solution for the equations \(X^T X \beta = X^T y\). Since \(X^T X\) and \(X^T y\) can be computed by using running averages, we obtain:
\[
S_{xx} \beta = S_{xy}.
\]
(9)
Thus, online least squares is equivalent to offline least squares.
### C. Online Least Squares with Thresholding

The OLSth is aimed at solving the following constrained minimization problem:

$$\min_{\beta, \|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{1}{2n} \|y - X\beta\|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

It is a non-convex and NP-hard problem because of the sparsity constraint. Here, we propose a three-step procedure to solve it: first, we use the online least squares to estimate $\hat{\beta}$, then we remove unimportant variables according to the coefficient magnitudes $|\beta_j|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. Finally, we use least squares to refit the model on the subset of selected features. The prototype algorithm is described in Algorithm 1. And in the high dimensional setting ($p > n$), we can use the ridge regression estimator in the first step.

**Algorithm 1 Online Least Squares with Thresholding**

**Input:** Training standardized running averages $S_{xx}, S_{xy}$ and sample size $n$, sparsity level $k$.

**Output:** Trained regression parameter vector $\beta$ with $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k$.

1. Fit model by least squares estimator $\hat{\beta}$.
2. Keep only the $k$ variables with largest $|\beta_j|$.
3. Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.

### D. Online Feature Selection with Annealing

Unlike OLSth, OFSA is an iterative thresholding algorithm. The OFSA algorithm can simultaneously solve the coefficient estimation problem and the feature selection problem. The main ideas in OFSA are: 1) uses an annealing plan to lessen the greediness in reducing the dimensionality from $p$ to $k$. 2) removes irrelevant variables to facilitate computation. The algorithm starts with an initialized parameter $\beta$, generally $\beta = 0$, and then alternates two basic steps: one is updating the parameters to minimize the loss $L(\beta)$ by gradient descent

$$\beta = \beta - \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta},$$

and the other one is a feature selection step that removes some variables based on the ranking of $|\beta_j|$, $j = 1, 2, \ldots, p$. In [16] are shown more details about the offline FSA algorithm, such as applications and theoretical analysis. For regression, the computation of

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} = -\frac{X^T y}{n} + \frac{X^T X \beta}{n} = S_{xx} \beta - S_{xy},$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

falls into our running averages framework. Thus, we derive the OFSA which is equivalent to the offline FSA in [16]. The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2.

**Algorithm 2 Online Feature Selection with Annealing**

**Input:** Training running averages $S_{xx}, S_{xy}$ and sample size $n$, sparsity level $k$.

**Output:** Trained regression parameter vector $\beta$ with $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k$.

Initialize $\beta = 0$.

for $t = 1$ to $N^{\text{iter}}$ do

Update $\beta \leftarrow \beta - \eta (S_{xx} \beta - S_{xy})$

Keep only the $M_t$ variables with highest $|\beta_j|$ and renumber them 1, ..., $M_t$.

end for

Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.

Lasso estimator [17] is the most famous one, and it finds the solution for the convex optimization problem

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2n} \|y - X\beta\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p} |\beta_j|,$$

where $\lambda > 0$ is a tuning parameter.

Then the SCAD [13], the Elastic Net [19] and the MCP [20] were proposed to deal with the variable selection and estimation problem. Like the Lasso estimator, these methods can exploit the sparse structure of the coefficients.

The literature [21] introduce gradient-based method with thresholding function to solve the regularized loss minimization problems. Here, we use this method in our running averages framework. The general algorithm is in Algorithm 3.

**Algorithm 3 Online Regularized Method by GD**

**Input:** Training running averages $S_{xx}, S_{xy}$, sample size $n$, penalties $\lambda$.

**Output:** Trained sparse regression parameter vector $\beta$.

Initialize $\beta = 0$.

for $t = 1$ to $N^{\text{iter}}$ do

Update $\beta \leftarrow \beta - \eta (S_{xx} \beta - S_{xy})$

Update $\beta \leftarrow \Theta(\beta; \eta \lambda)$

end for

Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.

### F. Memory and Computational Complexity

In general, the memory complexity for the running averages is $O(p^2)$ because $S_{xx}$ is a $p \times p$ matrix. The computational complexity of maintaining the running averages is $O(np^2)$. And except OLSth, the computational complexity for obtaining the model using the running average-based algorithms is $O(p^2)$ based on the limited number of iterations, each taking $O(p^2)$ time. As for OLSth, it is $O(p^3)$ because we need to compute the inverse of matrix. We can conclude that the running averages storage does not depend on the sample size $n$, and the computation is linear in $n$. Hence, when $n >> p$, compared to the batch learning algorithms, the running averages based methods need less memory and have
less computational complexity. And they can achieve the same convergence rate as the batch learning algorithms.

G. Model Adaptation

Detecting the environmental changes and rapidly adapting to the changes are common problems in online learning research. Our running averages online methods can adapt to environmental changes for large scale data streams. For example, for a large scale data stream, given a fixed $n_0$, we can calculate the running averages for every $n_0$ observations and obtain one or more models from the running averages. The size of $n_0$ can be used to trade-off between model adaptation and model sensitivity. If $n_0$ is small, the model will adapt quickly but it will be too adaptable and only large signals (values of the true coefficients) can be detected. If $n_0$ is large, the model will adapt slower, but it will be able to extract weaker features from the data.

IV. THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

We will give the theoretical analysis for our methods in this section. In the beginning, we will show that OLSih method can recover the support of true features with high probability. In our theorem, the data are not normalized and all the features do not have the same unit. Thus, we consider the data normalization in our theoretical analysis. Although the intercept $\beta_0$ is necessary in the application, we do not cover it here.

Proposition 2. Suppose we have the linear model

$$y = X\beta \ast \ast \eta, \eta \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I),$$

$X = [x_1^T, x_2^T, \ldots, x_n^T]^T$ is data matrix, in which $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p, i = 1, 2, \ldots$ are independent drawn from $N(0, \Sigma)$. Also, we have $\sigma_j^2, j = 1, 2, \ldots$, are the diagonal entries for $\Sigma$, and $\hat{\sigma}_j$ is an estimator for $\sigma_j$. Denote $\Pi = \text{diag} \{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \ldots, \sigma_p\}^{-1}$, and $\hat{\Pi} = \text{diag} \{\hat{\sigma}_1, \hat{\sigma}_2, \ldots, \hat{\sigma}_p\}^{-1}$. Let $S_{\beta^*} = \{j, \beta_j^* \neq 0\}$, $|S_{\beta^*}| = k^*$ and $b = \min_{j \in S_{\beta^*}} |\hat{\sigma}_j|^2$. When the sample size $n \geq 9\lambda^2p/\lambda b^2$, for any $\lambda$ satisfying $0 < \lambda < \lambda_{\min}(\Pi X^T X \Pi)$, with probability $1 - \exp\{-\lambda^2b^2/(18\sigma^2 + p/2\log(e\lambda^2b^2/9\sigma^2))\} - 2\exp\{-n/200\}$, the top $k^*$ values of $|\hat{\beta}_j|/\hat{\sigma}_j$ are exactly $S_{\beta^*}$.

Proof. First, we have $\hat{X} = X\hat{\Pi}$. Define $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\sigma}$ as the OLS estimator before and respectively after we normalize the data matrix. Because

$$\hat{\beta} = (X^T \hat{\Pi} X)^{-1}X^T \hat{\Pi} y - (X^T \hat{\Pi} X)^{-1}X^T y = \Pi^{-1}(X^T \Pi X)^{-1}X^T \hat{\Pi} y = \Pi^{-1} \beta,$$

thus we have $\hat{\beta} = \Pi^{-1} \beta$. And we also have $\Pi^{-1} \beta = \Pi^{-1} \beta^* + \sqrt{\epsilon} \phi$ with $\epsilon \sim N(0, (1/2 \Pi X^T X \Pi)^{-1})$. Take $\tau = \sqrt{b/3\epsilon}$, then $\tau^2 \geq p/\lambda$ since $n \geq 9\lambda^2p/\lambda b^2$. Then according to Lemma[3] with probability

$$1 - \exp\{-\lambda^2b^2/18\sigma^2 + p/2\log(e\lambda^2b^2/9\sigma^2)\},$$

we have $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq 2\sqrt{b/3\epsilon}$ for $|\beta_j^*| < b/3, \forall j \in S_{\beta^*}$. Thus, we have

$$|\hat{\beta}_j|/\hat{\sigma}_j < |\beta_j^*| < b/3, \forall j \in S_{\beta^*}.
$$

In Lemma[2] taking $\delta = 1/5$ with probability $1 - 2\exp\{-n\delta^2/8\}$

$$|\hat{\beta}_j|/\hat{\sigma}_j < |\beta_j^*| < \sqrt{\epsilon} \hat{\sigma}_j,$$

where $\epsilon < \sqrt{b/3\epsilon}$ for $|\beta_j^*| < b/3, \forall j \in S_{\beta^*}$. Then, we have

$$|\hat{\beta}_j|/\hat{\sigma}_j < |\beta_j^*| < (1 + \delta)b/3, \forall j \in S_{\beta^*}.
$$

Now since

$$(1 - \delta)b - (1 + \delta)b/3 = (1 + \delta)b/3.$$

According to Lemma[3] we have

$$P(\|\hat{\eta}\|^2 > \lambda \tau^2) \leq \exp\{-\lambda \tau^2/2 + p/2\log(e\lambda \tau^2/p)\}.$$
Theorem 1. (True feature recovery for OLS-th) With the same setting as Proposition 2 for any $\lambda > 0$ and $n$ such that $\sqrt{\lambda} < 0.8\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Pi^T\Sigma\Pi}) - \sqrt{\delta/n}$ and $n \geq 9\sigma^2p/\lambda^2$, then with probability $1 - \exp\{-\lambda^2/2n(18\sigma^2p + p/2\log(c\lambda^2n/9\sigma^2))\} - 2\exp\{-n/200\} - \exp\{-n/50\}$, the top $k^*$ values of $|\beta_j\sigma_j|$ are exactly $S_{\beta^*}$.

Proof. According to Lemma 5 we have

$$p\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Pi)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Pi^T\Sigma\Pi})(1 - \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta/n}} \right) > 1 - \exp\{-n\delta^2/2\}.$$  

From here since $tr(\Pi^T\Pi) = p$ we obtain

$$p\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Pi)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \frac{\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Pi^T\Sigma\Pi})(1 - \delta)}{\sqrt{\delta/n}} \right) > 1 - \exp\{-n\delta^2/2\}.$$  

Taking $\delta = 1/5$ and since $0 < \sqrt{\lambda} < (1 - \delta)\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Pi^T\Sigma\Pi}) - \sqrt{\delta/n}$ we have

$$p\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Pi)}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \sqrt{\lambda} \right) > 1 - \exp\{-n/50\}.$$  

Because $(\lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Pi)/\sqrt{n})^2 = \lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Xi\Pi)/n$, thus we have

$$p\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\Pi^T\Xi\Pi)}{n} \geq \lambda \right) > 1 - \exp\{-n/50\}$$

combining with Theorem 3 and Lemma 5 we get the conclusion.

Finally, we consider the regret bound for the OLS and OLS-th algorithms. In fact, all the feature selection algorithms we mentioned will degenerate to OLS if the true features are selected. First, we define the regret for a sparse model with sparsity levels $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k^*$:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(\beta_i; z_i) - \min_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(\beta; z_i),$$

in which $\beta_j$ is the coefficient vector at step $i$ and $z_i = (x_i, y_i)$.

Observe that for $\forall i > 0$, the loss functions $f$ from (13) are twice continuously differentiable. We denote $\beta_{n+1} = \arg \min_\beta \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} f(\beta)$ and $(X^TX)_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^T$. We will need the following assumptions:

Assumption 1. Given $n_0 \geq p$, there exist scalars $0 < m < M$ such that for any $n \geq n_0$ we have

$$0 < m \leq \lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n} (X^TX)_n) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\frac{1}{n} (X^TX)_n) < M.$$  

Assumption 2. Given $n_0 \geq p$, there exist constants $D$ and $G$ such that $\|\beta_i - \beta_j\| < D, \forall i, j > n_0$ and $\|\nabla f(\beta_i)\| \leq G, \forall i \geq n_0$.

Proposition 3. Given $n_0 > p$, under Assumptions 1, 2 when $n \geq n_0$, the regret of OLS satisfies:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - x_i^T \beta_i)^2 - \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - x_i^T \beta_i)^2 \leq O(\frac{\log(n)}{n}).$$

Theorem 2. (Regret of OLS-th) Let $\lambda > 0$ and $n_0 = O(n^\alpha) > p$, $\alpha \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ be such that $\sqrt{\lambda} < 0.8\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Pi^T\Sigma\Pi}) - \sqrt{\delta/n}$ and $n \geq 9\sigma^2p/\lambda^2$. With the Assumptions 1, 2 holding for $X_{S_{\beta^*}}$, then with probability at least

$$1 - n \exp\{-\lambda^2/2n(18\sigma^2p + p/2\log(c\lambda^2n/9\sigma^2))\} - 2n^p \exp\{-n/200\} - n \exp\{-n/50\},$$

the regret of OLS-th satisfies:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - x_i^T \beta_i)^2 - \min_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (y_i - x_i^T \beta_i)^2 \leq O(n^{\alpha - 1}).$$

V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section we evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithms and compare them with offline learning methods and some standard stochastic algorithms. First, we present the results of numerical experiments on synthetic data, comparing the performance on feature selection and prediction. We also provide regret plots for the running averages based algorithms and compare them with stochastic algorithms. Finally, we evaluate the running averages algorithms on real data.

All experiments are run on a desktop computer with Core i5 - 4460S CPU and 16Gb memory.

A. Experiments for Simulated Data

Here, we generate the simulated data with uniformly correlated predictors: given a scalar $\alpha$, we generate $z_i \sim N(0, 1)$, and then we set

$$x_i = \alpha z_i 1_{p \times 1} + u_i, \quad u_i \sim N(0, I_p).$$

Finally we obtain the data matrix $X = [x_1^T, x_2^T, \cdots, x_n^T]^T$. It is easy to verify that the correlation between any pair of predictors is $\alpha^2/(1 + \alpha^2)$. We set $\alpha = 1$ in our experiments, thus the correlation for any two variables is 0.5. Given $X$, the dependent response $y$ is generated from the linear regression model:

$$y = X\beta^* + \eta, \quad \eta \sim N(0, I_n).$$

(14)

where $\beta^*$ is a $p$-dimensional sparse parameter vector. The true coefficients $\beta_i^* = 0$ except $\beta_{10j}^* = \beta, \beta_{j}^* = 1, 2, \cdots, k$, where $\beta$ is signal strength value.

The simulation is based on two data parameter settings: (1): $p = 1000$ and $k = 100$; (2): $p = 10000$ and $k = 1000$. In each data parameter setting, we consider the signal strength $\beta \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$ (weak, medium and strong signals). The sample size $n$ varies from 1000 to 10$^6$ for both parameter settings. Stochastic ADMM [10] and TSGD [11] are used to compare with our algorithms. Besides, we cover Lasso [17] as a batch learning method for comparison.

For each method, the sparsity controlling parameters are tuned to obtain $k$ variables. This can be done directly for OFSA and OLS-th, and indirectly through the penalty parameter for the other methods.

The following criteria are used in the numerical experiments: the true variable detection rate (DR), the root of mean square error (RMSE) on the test data, and running time (Time) of the algorithm.

The variable detection rate DR is defined as the average number of true variables that are correctly detected by an algorithm divided by the number of true variables. So if $S_{\beta}$ is the set of detected variables and $S_{\beta^*}$ are the true variables, then

$$DR = \frac{E(|S_{\beta} \cap S_{\beta^*}|)}{|S_{\beta^*}|}.$$
### Table II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Lasso</th>
<th>TSGD</th>
<th>SADM</th>
<th>OLSth</th>
<th>OMCP</th>
<th>OElnet</th>
<th>RAve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10^4</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10^5</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results for various settings are presented in Table II. In the setting of p = 1000 and k = 100, we replicate the experiments 100 times and present the average results. And in the setting of p = 10000 and k = 1000, we obtain the results by repeating the experiments 20 times because of the limitation of our computational resources.

Table II shows the results of the numerical experiments for the running averages based online methods, stochastic optimization methods, and Lasso. Compared to Lasso, the running averages online methods enjoy low memory complexity. In the Lasso experiment, the larger datasets cannot fit in memory, hence we cannot obtain the experimental results for the large datasets. In our methods, we input running averages rather than data matrix. The memory complexity for running averages is O(p^2), which is better than O(np^2) for batch learning in the setting of n > p. In addition, comparing Lasso with the running averages methods, we can draw a conclusion that our running averages methods outperform Lasso in true signal recovery and prediction.

We also implemented some classical and state-of-the-art online learning algorithms as baseline for comparison. Online learning algorithms enjoy low memory complexity and they can update model as soon as possible when data changes. However, in theory, the convergence rate for online learning algorithms is much slower than the batch learning algorithms [24]. Besides, most of the current online learning algorithms cannot recover the support of true signal. Stochastic ADMM is a case in point. We used multiple λ in stochastic ADMM and chosen the λ that induces the k non-zero features, where k is the largest number of non-zeros features smaller than n, the number of true features. From the numerical experiment, we can draw a conclusion that stochastic ADMM does not perform very well in true feature recovery and prediction.

According to the [11], we implemented the following truncated stochastic gradient descent (TSGD):

\[
\hat{\beta}(n) = \text{Truncate} \left( \beta(n) - \eta(y_n - x_n^T \beta(n-1)) \right),
\]

where the operator “Truncate” keeps the k largest \( |\hat{\beta}_j| \). From Table II we can conclude that TSGD also has limited capability on true feature recovery.

In contrast, the proposed running averages based online methods can recover the true signal, and perform very well in prediction. When the signal is weak (\( \beta = 0.01 \)), although the running averages methods need a large sample size n to recover the weak true signal, they outperform the batch learning methods and stochastic learning methods in our experiment.

Finally, we know that the computational complexity for obtaining the model from the running averages does not depend on the sample size n, but the time to update the running averages, shown as RAve in Table II, does increase linearly with n. Indeed, we observe in Table II that the running time of OFSA and OLSth does not have obvious change for the same p. However, because of the need to tune the penalty parameters in OMCP and OElnet, it takes more time to run the these algorithms. However, the computational complexity for stochastic learning algorithms will increase with sample size n. This is especially true for stochastic ADMM, which takes a large amount of time to tune the parameters to select k features. When the sample size n is very large, running the stochastic ADMM takes more than a day.

### Variable Detection Rate (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Lasso</th>
<th>TSGD</th>
<th>SADM</th>
<th>OLSth</th>
<th>OMCP</th>
<th>OElnet</th>
<th>RAve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10^4</td>
<td>46.05</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10^5</td>
<td>72.40</td>
<td>11.22</td>
<td>11.11</td>
<td>11.12</td>
<td>11.13</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The variable detection rate (%), which is better than the comparison between different online and offline algorithms, averaged 20-100 runs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n</th>
<th>Lasso</th>
<th>TSGD</th>
<th>SADM</th>
<th>OLSth</th>
<th>OMCP</th>
<th>OElnet</th>
<th>RAve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10^4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10^4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10^5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B. Regret Analysis

In this section, we present results about the regret of the different online methods. In traditional online learning, we consider the upper bound for regret [2], [3]. Here, we focus on comparing the regret of the running averages based online algorithms with the state of the art stochastic learning algorithms.

We present the plots of regret in Figures 3 and 4. Figure 3 shows the curve of the regret for $\beta = 1$ (left), $\beta = 0.1$ (middle), $\beta = 0.01$ (right). The sample size $n$ varies from 1000 to $10^6$. The regret of the stochastic ADMM method does not converge when we control the number of selected features to at most $k$. Figure 4 compares the convergence rate of regret for the running averages methods and stochastic algorithms. We compare slopes to see the difference in convergence rates. The convergence rate of regret for running averages methods is close to $O(n^{-1})$. TSGD seems also to have about the same convergence rate but starts off with a plateau where the regret does not converge. The stochastic ADMM does not converge at all in our experiments.

C. Real Data Analysis

In real data analysis, we applied the running averages based methods on two real world datasets. The first dataset is about age estimation from a single image. Age estimation is a regression problem, as the age has a continuous range of values. The dataset is called Wikiface [25], [26], containing 53,040 face images of actors from Wikipedia and their age. The faces are cropped and resized to $224 \times 224$ pixels. From each face image a 4096 dimensional feature vector is extracted using the pre-trained VGG-16 [27] convolutional neural network (CNN). A linear regression model is used to estimate the age from the 4096 dimensional feature vector.

The second dataset is the Year Prediction MSD dataset, from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [28]. This dataset, which has 90 features and 463,715 training observations, is about the prediction of the release year of a song from audio features. In this dataset, we show how to extend linear regression model to a polynomial nonlinear model by using running averages: we generate new features as products of all pairs of the 90 features, obtaining a 4185 dimensional feature vector. Then we compute the running averages and input them into OLSth or OFSA. Here, we will compare the $R^2$ of the linear model with the nonlinear model.

In the real data analysis, the results are shown as the average of 20 random splits of 87.5% training and 12.5% test data in the first dataset, 80% training and 20% test data in the second dataset. For each method, multiple models are trained using various values of the tuning parameters and sparsity levels $k$. Then the parameter combination with the largest average $R^2$ on the test set over 20 random splits is reported in Table III.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>OLSth</th>
<th>OFSA</th>
<th>Lasso</th>
<th>TSGD</th>
<th>SADMM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wikiface</td>
<td>53040</td>
<td>4096</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.503</td>
<td>0.400</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Prediction MSD (nonlinear)</td>
<td>463715</td>
<td>4185</td>
<td>0.303</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Prediction MSD</td>
<td>463715</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.237</td>
<td>0.157</td>
<td>0.183</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table III we can see that offline Lasso cannot handle the large size of the Year Prediction MSD data with pairwise interactions, and the stochastic methods obtain an $R^2$ of 0. In contrast, our running averages based methods not only can be used to build the non-linear model, but also they have better performance than the linear model.
VI. Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we proposed a new framework for online learning based on running averages. As one type of sufficient statistic, we define the running averages to replace the data matrix, and we show how to normalize the data in the running averages and design a series of feature selection algorithms based on them.

In contrast to the standard stochastic methods, the proposed framework can be used for model selection, in the sense that different models with different sparsity levels can be built at the same time, without seeing the data again. This is especially useful when the number of observations increases and more complex models can be extracted from the data.

The running averages based methods enjoy good convergence rate and a low computation complexity. More importantly, they can recover the support of the true signal with high probability. We give theoretical guarantees for OLSth that they can recover the support of the true signal in the setting of \( n \gg p \).

In numerical experiments, we have demonstrated that the running average methods outperform traditional stochastic learning algorithms and batch learning methods in prediction and feature selection. Moreover, the regret of the running averages methods diminish faster than the traditional stochastic learning algorithms.

The running averages methods could have a wide variety of applications, for example for detecting environmental changes and for anomaly detection. And in signal processing, they could detect and recover the true weak signal.

However, we also need to pay attention to the weaknesses of the running averages based methods. On one hand, they cannot address ultra-high dimensional datasets, the case of \( p \gg n, \) or \( p \to \infty \) with \( n \to \infty \). The memory complexity and computational complexity for the running averages methods both are \( O(p^2) \). A very large \( p \) will cause the problem that the running averages cannot fit in memory. On the other hand, we do not cover the classification problem in this paper. The research on running averages based methods for classification problem is one of our future research topics.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A. The Proof of Proposition 3

Proof. According to our OLS algorithm, we have the following equations:

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^T \beta_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i x_i , \quad (15)
\]

\[
\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^T \beta_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i x_i , \quad (16)
\]

Here we have \( \beta_0 = 0 \).

Add \( x_i x_i^T \beta_n \) to both sides of (15), obtaining

\[
(X^T X)_n \beta_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i x_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i x_i^T \beta_n .
\]

(17)

where again we denoted by \( (X^T X)_n \) the matrix obtained by summing the first \( n \) columns of \( X^T X \) for any matrix \( X \) and any integer \( n \).

Subtracting (17) from (15) we obtain:
\( (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta_n) = y_n x_n - x_n x_n^T \beta_n = -\nabla f_n(\beta_n), \)

in which we denote \( f_n(\beta_n) = \frac{1}{2} (y_n - x_n^T \beta_n)^2 \). Hence we have the iterative formula in \( n \)-th \( (n \geq n_0) \) iteration:

\[
\beta_{n+1} = \beta_n - (X^T X)^{-1}_n \nabla f_n(\beta_n). 
\]  

(18)

For \( \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p \), we have:

\[
\beta_{n+1} - \beta = \beta_n - \beta - (X^T X)^{-1}_n \nabla f_n(\beta_n), 
\]

thus we have the following equation:

\[
(X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta) = (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_n - \beta) - \nabla f_n(\beta_n), 
\]

Multiplying by the transpose of \( \beta_{n+1} - \beta \) on both sides of (19) we get

\[
(\beta_{n+1} - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta) = (\beta_n - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_n - \beta) - 2 \nabla f_n(\beta_n)^T (X^T X)^{-1}_n \nabla f_n(\beta_n). 
\]

By simple calculation, for \( n, n_0 \), we have

\[
2 \nabla f_n(\beta_n)^T (\beta_n - \beta) = (\beta_n - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_n - \beta) - (\beta_{n+1} - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta) + \nabla f_n(\beta_n)^T (X^T X)^{-1}_n \nabla f_n(\beta_n). 
\]

For \( n_0 \geq n \), we sum eq (21) from \( (n_0 + 1) \) to \( n \)

\[
2 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\beta_i - \beta) = \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} (\beta_i - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{i} (\beta_i - \beta) - \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{i} (\beta_{i+1} - \beta) + \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i). 
\]

After rearranging the formula, we get

\[
2 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\beta_i - \beta) = \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) 
\]

(21)

The inequality holds because \( (X^T X)_{i} \) is positive definite, hence we have:

\[
(\beta_{n+1} - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta) \geq 0. 
\]

Then we denote

\[
Q_i = \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\beta_i - \beta) - \frac{1}{2} (\beta_i - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} (\beta_i - \beta) 
\]

By rearranging the formula and taking \( \beta = \beta_{n+1} \), we get

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} Q_i \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{n} (\beta_{n+1} - \beta) 
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\max}(X^T X)_{n} \| \beta_{n+1} - \beta \|^2_2 
\]

\[
\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} M_n D^2 
\]

where in the last inequality we used Assumption 2. Because \( f_i(\beta) = \frac{1}{2} (y_i - x_i^T \beta)^2 \) is second order differentiable, according to its Taylor expression, we have

\[
f_i(\beta) = f_i(\beta) + \nabla f_i(\beta)^T (\beta - \beta) + \frac{1}{2} (\beta - \beta)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} (\beta - \beta) 
\]

(20)

Thus we have

\[
\sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) = \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} Q_i, 
\]

and get

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + M_n D^2 
\]

Based on Assumptions 1 and 2, we have \( 0 < m < \lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{2} (X^T X)) \) and

\[
\| \nabla f_i(\beta) \|^2_2 \leq G \text{, so we have } 
\]

\[
\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (X^T X)_{i}^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) \leq \frac{1}{2m} G^2 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{n} \frac{1}{i} \leq \frac{G^2}{2m} \log(n) 
\]

So we get

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) \leq \frac{C_{n_0}}{n} + \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} + \frac{M_n D^2}{2n} \leq O(\log(n)) 
\]

Consequently,

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) \leq \frac{C_{n_0}}{n} + \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} + \frac{M_n D^2}{2n} \leq O(\log(n)) 
\]

The proof of Theorem 2

Proof. According to Theorem 1 the probability for true feature selection for sample size \( \geq n_0 \) is greater than

\[
1 - e^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} = 2pe^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} \leq 2pe^{\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} \leq 2pe^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} = 2pe^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} 
\]

since \( n_0 \geq 9\sigma^2/\lambda^{2} \). Using the union bound we get that the true features are selected for all sample sizes \( i \), with \( n_0 \leq i \leq n \) with probability at least

\[
1 - ne^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} = 2pe^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} = 2pe^{-\lambda^{2}/(2\sigma^2 + p/2 \log(\lambda^{2}/(9\sigma^2)))} 
\]

Thus with this probability the true features are selected for all sample sizes \( i \) with \( n_0 \leq i \leq n \) and the OLS-like algorithm degenerates to the OLS algorithm on the features from \( S_{n_0} \). Assumption 1 is

\[
0 < m < \lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n} (X^T X)_{S_{n_0}}), \lambda_{\max}(\frac{1}{n} (X^T X)_{S_{n_0}}) < M. 
\]

Following the proof of Proposition 3 we obtain

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) \leq \frac{C_{n_0}}{n} + \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} + \frac{M_n D^2}{2n}. 
\]

(22)

From (22) since \( n_0 = O(n^a) \) we have

\[
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\beta)) \leq O(n^{a-1}) 
\]

Thus we get the conclusion.