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ABSTRACT. We develop a framework to characterize frequentist properties of Bayesian and $L_0$ model selection. Specifically to what extend can one trust the solution to select the (Kullback-Leibler) optimal model, portray selection uncertainty, and how quickly does one discard parts of the model space. We outline its general basis and then focus on linear regression. The contribution is not proving consistency under a given prior / $L_0$ formulation but describing how selection depends on the formulation’s sparsity and on problem characteristics such as sample size, signal-to-noise, problem dimension and true sparsity. We prove a strong form of convergence for renormalized $L_0$ penalties leading to asymptotically valid uncertainty quantification. These results unify and extend Bayesian and $L_0$ selection literature and signal limitations of methodological interest: asymptotically optimal sparse formulations can significantly reduce power for moderate $n$, whereas adopting less sparse priors can improve power trade-offs. These issues are compounded by the fact that model misspecification often causes an exponential drop in power. Our examples confirm these findings, underlining the importance of considering the data at hand’s characteristics to judge the quality of model selection procedures, rather than relying purely on asymptotics.
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1. Introduction

Selecting a probability model within a candidate set and quantifying the selection uncertainty are two fundamental tasks in Statistics. The Bayesian framework provides a generic strategy, given models and priors one obtains posterior model probabilities that guide model choice and provide uncertainty quantification (UQ). $L_0$ penalties are also powerful selection criteria, although it is less clear how to portray uncertainty. We contribute to understanding when can one hope to recover the optimal model (in a sense defined below), at what rate, what are the underlying principles, what are some effects of model misspecification and whether posterior probabilities, or pseudo-posterior probabilities for $L_0$ penalties, are asymptotically valid for UQ in the frequentist sense. There are general finite-dimensional results (Dawid [1992], Walker [2004], Kleijn [2017]) and increasing literature on Bayesian model selection (BMS) in high dimensions (reviewed below). Despite these advances there remain fundamental issues that are not sufficiently understood. Even in the best studied case of linear regression current results were either obtained under specific prior conditions or focus on asymptotic optimality rather than finite-$n$ sparsity vs. power trade-offs, further the technical complexity may hamper understanding the simple principles at stake. Regarding UQ, a minimal requirement is that the posterior (or pseudo-posterior) probability assigned to the optimal model converges to 1 as $n \to \infty$. We refer to this property as posterior consistency (PC). PC is not guaranteed in general, even when the probability of selecting the optimal model converges to 1 [Johnson and Rossell, 2012, Moreno et al., 2015]. A more satisfying requirement is that such posterior probability bounds the (frequentist) probability of choosing the optimal model, a result that we show here. Our interest is on model selection UQ rather than UQ on parameters. Note however that a common first step for the latter is proving PC (or a weaker result of posterior concentration near the optimal model, e.g. see Rousseau and Szabo [2018]), thus our results may also be of interest there.

Our main contributions are outlining a framework to study high-dimensional BMS and applying it to linear regression, giving simple PC rates as a function of generic prior/$L_0$ penalty aspects and problem characteristics ($n$, dimension, true sparsity, signal-to-noise, misspecification). We also show their asymptotic validity for UQ and a strong form of convergence for $L_0$ penalties. This finding may be of independent interest: $L_0$ penalties are often viewed as less computationally convenient than $L_1$ or folded-concave penalties, but quantifying selection uncertainty for the latter is hard. The PC rates we provide are of fundamental interest yet hard to come by. Most results focus on a prior satisfying pre-specified conditions (sparsity, dispersion, tail thickness) and either study consistency (with no rates), posterior concentration on a neighborhood of the correct model (as opposed of exactly on that model), or on asymptotic optimality. We describe how (under suitable conditions) to a first-order of approximation there are only three relevant aspects of the prior: the sparsity in model prior probabilities, the prior dispersion on parameters, and whether the prior is local or non-local. We show that the first two are essentially equivalent and can decrease power, as the induced sparsity is not data-dependent. We also help quantify how much posterior evidence is assigned to model space subsets, e.g. any neighbourhood around the optimal model. Specifically splitting the space into 3
subsets describes how sparsity decreases power by making it harder to discard small non-spurious models (defined below). As an implication one can often use less sparse formulation to improve finite-\(n\) behavior, some of our empirical examples may be striking in that regard. We emphasize upfront that here we prioritize simplicity over mathematical sophistication. Although we describe a strategy to prove PC in general settings, adapting it to specific cases requires non-trivial work to bound Bayes factor tails. We offer advice for such adaptations and fully deploy the framework to linear regression, including simple forms of misspecification such as a non-linear data-generating truths, omitting relevant variables or the presence of heteroskedastic correlated errors.

We introduce notation. Let \(M_1, \ldots, M_K\) be a set of candidate models for an observed outcome \(y = (y_1, \ldots, y_n)\) with densities \(p(y \mid \theta_k, \phi, M_k)\) for \(k = 1, \ldots, K\), \(\theta_k \in \Theta_k\) a parameter of interest and (potentially) \(\phi \in \Phi\) a nuisance parameter with prior density \(p(\theta_k, \phi \mid M_k)\). All densities are in the Radon-Nikodym sense in particular allowing discrete and continuous outcomes/parameters. Let \(p_k = \dim(\Theta_k), \ d = \dim(\Phi)\). Without loss of generality let \(\Theta_k \subset \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p\) for \(k = 1, \ldots, K\), i.e. models are nested within a larger model, and let \(\bar{p} = \max_k p_k\) be the maximum model size. For instance, in regression one might set \(\bar{p} = \min\{n, p\}\) as \(p_k > n\) result in data interpolation. Although not denoted explicitly in high-dimensional problems \(p\) and \(K\) may grow with \(n\), and this is precisely our focus. The posterior probability assigned to an arbitrary \(M_k\) is

\[
p(M_k \mid y) = \left(1 + \sum_{l \neq k} p(y \mid M_l) p(M_l) p(M_k)\right)^{-1} = \left(1 + \sum_{l \neq k} B_{lk} p(M_l) / p(M_k)\right)^{-1}
\]

where \(p(y \mid M_k) = \int p(y \mid \theta_k, \phi, M_k)dP(\theta_k, \phi \mid M_k)\) is the integrated likelihood under \(M_k\), \(p(M_k)\) the model prior probability and \(B_{lk} = p(y \mid M_l) / p(y \mid M_k)\) the Bayes factor between \(M_l\) and \(M_k\).

Our goal is to study PC, i.e. as \(n\) grows when does \(p(M_l \mid y)\) converge to 1 and at what speed, when \(y\) is sampled from some data-generating density \(f^*(y)\) and \(M_l\) is defined as the smallest model minimizing Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence to \(f^*\).

**Definition 1.** Let \((\theta^*, \phi^*) = \arg\min_{\theta \in \Theta, \phi \in \Phi} KL(f^*, p(y \mid \theta, \phi))\). Define \(t = \arg\min_{k \in \mathcal{M}^*} p_k\), where

\[
\mathcal{M}^* = \{k : \exists (\theta_k^*, \phi_k^*) \in \Theta_k \times \Phi : KL(f^*, p(y \mid \theta_k^*, \phi_k^*)) = KL(f^*, p(y \mid \theta^*, \phi^*))\}
\]

is the set of all models minimizing KL-divergence to \(f^*\).

In principle \(f^*\) can be outside the assumed class and there may be multiple KL-optimal models, hence the need to define \(M_l\) as the smallest. For instance if data are truly generated by one of the posed models, i.e. \(f^*(y) = p(y \mid \theta_l^*, \phi_l^*, M_l)\) for some \(\Theta_l \subset \Theta\), then also \(f^*(y) = p(y \mid \theta_k^*, \phi_k^*, M_k)\) for any \(\Theta_k \supset \Theta_l\). For simplicity we assume \(M_l\) to be unique, but our results are valid more generally by defining \(M_l\) to be the union of all smallest KL-optimal models. To clarify ideas consider variable selection. There each model chooses a subset of \(p_k\) amongst \(p\) potential variables, \(\phi \in \mathbb{R}^+\) is the residual variance and \(M_l\) is the smallest model minimizing mean squared error under \(f^*\). The number of models is \(K = \sum_{j=0}^p \binom{p}{j}\), in particular \(K = 2^p\) if \(\bar{p} = p\). We adopt a fully Bayesian framework where no priors are data-dependent. An alternative is to use adaptive
priors, say replacing \( p(M_k) \) by some data-dependent \( \hat{p}(M_k) \). Studying adaptive priors is beyond our scope, however our results show that fully Bayesian formulations can learn the true sparsity (see \cite{Han2017} for related results). Note also that we focus on BMS where one entertains a collection of models. An alternative is to use shrinkage priors, i.e. consider a single model and set a continuous prior on \( \theta \) concentrating most mass on subsets of \( \Theta \). While interesting shrinkage priors are fundamentally different as any zero Lebesgue measure subset of \( \Theta \) has zero posterior probability, hence in our view they are more suitable for parameter estimation than for model selection. For results on shrinkage priors see  

\cite{Bhattacharya2012, Song2017, Rockova2018}. 

We remark that maximizing (1) is equivalent to finding \( k = \arg \max_{k} h(\mathbf{y}, k) \) where \( h(\mathbf{y}, k) = p(\mathbf{y} \mid M_k)p(M_k) \). Alternatively one can let \( h(\mathbf{y}, k) \) be an \( L_0 \)-penalized likelihood, e.g. the Bayesian information criterion (BIC, \cite{Schwarz1978}). Model selection consistency requires \( P_{\mathbf{Y}}(\hat{\mathbf{k}} = t) \rightarrow 1 \) as \( n \rightarrow \infty \), that is \( h(\mathbf{y}, t) > \max_{k \neq t} h(\mathbf{y}, k) \) with probability tending to 1. We show the stronger result that the re-normalized \( \hat{h}(\mathbf{y}, t) = h(\mathbf{y}, t)/\sum_{k \neq t} h(\mathbf{y}, k) \), which can be viewed as pseudo-posterior probabilities, converges to 1 and provide asymptotically valid selection UQ.

We lay out further notation. Let \( a_n > 0 \) and \( b_n > 0 \) be two deterministic sequences, then \( a_n \ll b_n \) and \( a_n \preceq b_n \) denote \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0 \) and \( \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n \leq c \) for some constant \( c > 0 \) (respectively). Let \( S_l = \{k : M_l \subset M, p_k = l\} \) be the set of \( l \)-dimensional spurious models, (containing \( M_l \) plus some spurious parameters), \( S_l^c = \{k : M_l \not\subset M, p_k = l\} \) the non-spurious models, \( S = \bigcup_{l=p_{t+1}}^{p} S_l \) and \( S^c = \bigcup_{l=0}^{p_{t}} S_l^c \). Denote by \( |S| \) the cardinality of \( S \). We state a minimal condition that can be relaxed but simplifies the exposition.

\begin{enumerate}
\item \( p(M_k) \) depends on \( k \) only through \( p_k \) 
\end{enumerate}

For any \((k,l)\) we denote \( r_{p_k,p_l} = p(M_k)/p(M_l) \). For completeness, to relax (A1) one would replace \( r_{p_k,p_l} \) by a more general \( p(M_k)/p(M_l) \) in the sequel. This is trivial in Sections 2-4 providing rates for a generic \( r_{p_k,p_l} \). In Section 5 one would subdivide the sums in Corollary 1 across models with common \( p(M_k)/p(M_l) \).

We review selected high-dimensional BMS literature. \cite{Johnson2012} proved PC in linear regression with \( p \ll n \) by using certain non-local priors \( p(\theta_k \mid M_k) \) and (non-sparse) uniform \( p(M_k) \). \cite{Narisetty2014} showed that if \( p \ll e^n \) then letting \( p(\theta_k \mid M_k) \) become diffuse at an appropriate rate as \( p \) grows also achieves PC. Using increasingly diffuse priors was advocated as early as \cite{Foster1994}. \cite{Shin2018} extended \cite{Johnson2012} to \( p \ll e^n \) under certain increasingly diffuse non-local priors. \cite{Yang2017} studied diffuse local priors in a much more general framework. These results proved PC but no specific model selection rates were given, further as shown here diffuse priors can significantly decrease finite-\( n \) power. \cite{Castillo2015} showed that, by using so-called complexity priors \( p(M_k) \) and Laplace priors \( p(\theta_k \mid M_k) \), one discards regression models that overshoot the dimension of \( M_k \) by more than a certain factor. \cite{Chae2016} proved PC for symmetric non-parametric errors under similar priors. \cite{Gao2015} extended these results to general structured linear models under misspecified sub-Gaussian errors, and \cite{Rockova2017} to regression trees. \cite{Han2017} extended complexity priors to non-parametric settings and showed posterior concentration around models optimizing a bias-variance
trade-off. These contributions provide significant insights, the focus however is showing that complex models are asymptotically discarded a posteriori (a weaker condition than PC) and that one obtains good parameter estimation rates. Yang et al. [2016] obtained PC rates for increasingly diffuse \( p(\theta_k | M_k) \) and \( p(M_k) \) that decay exponentially with model size. To summarize, the three main strategies to attain PC in high dimensions are setting \( p(\theta_k | M_k) \) to non-local priors, letting \( p(\theta_k | M_k) \) be increasingly diffuse, or penalizing complexity via \( p(M_k) \). We show how the latter two favor small models a priori regardless of the data, and hence may incur a loss of power when truth is non-sparse, the signal-to-noise ratio is small or \( n \) is not large.

We outline our main results. Corollaries 1-2 in Section 5 provide \( L_1 \) bounds on the posterior (or pseudo-posterior) probability assigned to spurious and non-spurious models, overall and for any given model size \( l \). The bounds simply add up rates obtained for individual models (see Sections 3-4), and the latter are nearly equivalent to finite \( p \) settings (up to lower-order terms and regularity conditions). That is, high-dimensional rates are essentially given by sums of model-specific finite \( p \) rates. Sections 5.1-5.4 provide even simpler asymptotic expressions. Similar expressions were derived elsewhere, e.g. see Dawid [1999] for fixed \( p \), Johnson and Rossell [2012], Narisetty and He [2014] and Castillo et al. [2015]. Our rates do have value, however, in their construction by integrating Bayes factor tails (Section 2) and in considering more general \( p(M_k) \), simple forms of misspecification and \( L_0 \) penalties. Further our bounds for \( m \in S \) are tighter relative to Castillo et al. [2015], which do not feature a prior dispersion term \( \tau \) and hence require sparser \( p(M_k) \). Relative to the Johnson and Rossell [2012] results on convergence in probability, our rates are tighter, more general and apply to \( L_1 \) convergence, in particular proving consistency for larger \( p \). Section 2 presents a framework of value beyond linear regression, including a result (Lemma 1, a near-trivial observation) guaranteeing that correct model selection rates are upper-bounded by PC rates, i.e. that posterior probabilities and renormalized \( L_0 \) penalties provide asymptotically valid UQ.

Finally, we briefly discuss the relevance of the findings in Section 5. These show that asymptotically \( P(S \mid y) \) is typically larger than \( P(S_c \mid y) \), as the latter decays exponentially in two signal-strength parameters \((\lambda, \bar{\lambda})\) that are proportional to \( n \) and design matrix eigenvalues. By setting sparse \( p(M_k) \) or diffuse priors (large \( \tau \)) one obtains smaller \( P(S \mid y) \) and hence better asymptotic rates, but this strategy also assigns larger \( P(S_c \mid y) \) to small \( l < p_t \), reducing power. Examples of sparse/diffuse priors include Narisetty and He [2014] and the complexity priors in Castillo et al. [2015], and underlie much of the state-of-the-art BMS literature. Figures 1-3 show examples where, although \( p_t = 5, 10, 20 \) is fairly small (sparse truth), the losses in power are substantial. Section 5 shows that one can set less sparse priors and still get \( P(S \mid y) \) to vanish, for three popular \( p(M_k) \) defined in Section 3:

- Uniform: \( E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll (p - p_t)/\tau^{\alpha/2} \)
- Beta-Binomial(1,1): \( E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll (p_t + 1)(p - p_t)^{1 - \alpha}/\tau^{\alpha/2} \)
- Complexity(c): \( E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll (p_t + 1)p^{1 - \alpha - c}/\tau^{\alpha/2} \)
Here \( \alpha \) is a constant taken arbitrarily close to 1 for local priors and to 3 for the non-local pMOM prior. Under uniform \( p(M_k) \) then \( p \) can be at most \( \tau^{\alpha/2} \), under a Beta-Binomial(1,1) \( p \) can be polynomial in \( \tau \) (if \( p_t \ll \tau^{\alpha/2} \)), and under the Complexity prior \( p \) can be arbitrarily large. The implication is that if \( p \) is not too large one can trade asymptotic optimality to gain finite-\( n \) power, e.g. in our examples combining the Beta-Binomial(1,1) with the pMOM prior exhibited a good performance.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our general framework. We show that PC can be studied by integrating pairwise \( B_{kt} \) tails and that \( E_{f^*}(p(M_t \mid y)) \) bounds the frequentist correct selection probability, hence \( p(M_t \mid y) \) is an asymptotically valid UQ measure. For generality we show how to bound such integrals for generic exponential or polynomial tails on \( \log(B_{kt}) \), then make these precise for chi-square and F-distributions featuring in linear regression. Section 3 characterizes the posterior probability of individual linear regression models for several priors and discusses the effect of sparse priors on pairwise selection consistency. For clarity we focus on cases where Bayes factors have a tractable expression, but as illustration we include a non-local prior where such an expression is unavailable and misspecified models where tail probabilities are harder to bound. We show that failing to include true non-linearities or omitting relevant variables causes an exponential drop in power, whereas misspecifying the error covariance structure need not do so. Section 4 extends Section 3 to \( L_0 \) penalties. Section 5 combines the model-specific rates from Sections 3-4 into overall rates for \( p(M_t \mid y) \) and model subsets \( S_l, S_c \), in particular allowing to bound the posterior mass assigned to model space subests around \( M_t \). Section 7 concludes. We offer moderate detail to clarify the main steps to deploy our framework. A number of auxiliary lemmas, technical results and all proofs are in the supplementary material.

2. Approach

2.1. Posterior consistency. From (1) posterior consistency means \( \sum_{k \neq t} B_{kt} r_{p_k,p_t} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \). The difficulty in high dimensions is that the number of terms \( K - 1 \) grows with \( n \), hence the sum can only vanish if each term \( B_{kt} r_{p_k,p_t} \) converges to 0 quickly enough. Although this intuition is clear, obtaining probabilistic bounds for this stochastic sum is non-trivial. The \( B_{kt} \)’s may exhibit complex dependencies that require a delicate case-by-case treatment. A conceptually simpler route than characterizing high-dimensional stochastic sums is to work with deterministic expectations of bounded variables. Since \( p(M_t \mid y) = 1 - \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \) one can find conditions for \( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \xrightarrow{L_1} 0 \), that is by definition of \( L_1 \) convergence, the goal is to show that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \right) = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k \neq t} E_{f^*} (p(M_k \mid y)) = 0,
\]

where \( E_{f^*}(\cdot) \) is the expectation under \( f^* \). Some trivial but relevant remarks are in order. First, \( L_1 \) convergence in (2) implies convergence in probability. Specifically let \( b_n > 0 \) be a sequence such that \( \lim_{n \to \infty} b_n = 0 \), if \( E_{f^*}(1 - P(M_t \mid y)) \leq b_n \) then \( 1 - P(M_t \mid y) = O_p(b_n) \). Naturally (2) may require more stringent conditions than convergence in probability, but
in our examples we obtain essentially tight rates and the gains in clarity are substantial. Second, one can evaluate the sum on the right hand side of (2) for fixed \( n, p \) and \( K \), i.e. the expression can be used in non-asymptotic regimes. Finally, per Lemma \(^1\) bounding \( E_{f^*}(p(M_t \mid y)) \) also bounds the (frequentist) correct model selection probability that \( \hat{k} = t \) when \( \hat{k} \) is the highest posterior probability model or the median probability model in \cite{Barbieri:2004}. The implication is that posterior model probabilities provide asymptotically valid UQ for model selection.

**Lemma 1.** Let \( \hat{k} \) be either the posterior mode or the median probability model, then

\[
P_{f^*}(\hat{k} = t) \geq P_{f^*}(p(M_t \mid y) \geq 1/2) \geq 1 - 2E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \right).
\]

Lemma \(^1\) can be equivalently stated as \( P_{f^*}(\hat{k} = t) \geq 2E_{f^*}(p(M_t \mid y)) - 1 \).

Our strategy to characterize (2) is straightforward. We first bound individual \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) via tail probabilities for pairwise \( B_{tk} \) (Lemma \(^2\)), then rates for \( p(M_t \mid y) \) are given by deterministic sums. Lemma \(^2\) bounds \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) using that \( p(M_k \mid y) \leq (1 + B_{tk}r_{n,p_k})^{-1} \). This bound neglects the contribution of \( \sum_{t \neq k, t} B_{tk}r_{n,p_k} \) to \( p(M_k \mid y) \) but by definition PC implies \( \sum_{t \neq k, t} B_{tk}r_{n,p_k} / B_{tk}r_{n,p_k} \xrightarrow{P} 0 \), i.e. the neglected term is asymptotically negligible.

**Lemma 2.** Let \( 0 \leq u \leq \bar{u} \leq 1 \). Then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \leq u + (1 - \bar{u}) + \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} P_{f^*}(B_{kt} \geq r_{n,p_k} / (1/u - 1)) \, du.
\]

Lemma \(^2\) is a trivial exploitation of expressing \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) as the integral of its survival (or right tail probability) function. The reason for introducing \((u, \bar{u})\) is that it is often simpler to replace \( P_{f^*} \) by an upper-bound via tail inequalities, which may only hold for \( u \in (y, \bar{u}) \). In Section \(^{2.2}\) we specialize Lemma \(^2\) to the common cases where suitably re-scaled \( \log(B_{tk}) \) has either exponential or polynomial tails.

A convenient strategy to bound \( \sum_{k \neq t} E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) is to either plug in finite-\( n \) bounds from Lemma \(^2\) into (2) or to group models for which one can find an asymptotic bound for \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) that holds uniformly across \( k \), then summing across \( k \). This is the strategy used for our linear regression examples in Sections \(^{3-4}\). More generally it can be hard to find such finite-\( n \) or uniform bounds, for those situations we provide sufficient conditions to bound the posterior probability of model subsets defined by their size in Lemma \(^{S13}\) or by more general groupings in Lemma \(^{S14}\). To alleviate the exposition we outline the idea and refer the reader to Lemmas \(^{S13,S14}\) for details. Let \( a^{(l)}_n \) and \( \hat{a}^{(l)}_n \) be sequences such that \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \ll a^{(l)}_n \) for all \( l \in S_l \) and \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \ll \hat{a}^{(l)}_n \) for all \( l \in S_l^c \). Then under suitable conditions (see Lemmas \(^{S13,S14}\)) one can obtain global
bounds by adding up model-specific bounds, i.e.

\[ E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p+1}^{p_0} a_n^{(l)} \left| S_l \right| \]

A stronger result is obtained if \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \leq a_n^{(l)} \) uniformly across \( k \in S_l \) for all \( n > n_0 \) where \( n_0 \) does not depend on \((k, n)\), and then \( E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p+1}^{p_0} a_n^{(l)} \left| S_l \right| \) for \( n > n_0 \) (analogously for \( k \in S_l^c \)). This is our strategy for the linear regression examples in Sections 3-5.

The rates \((a_n^{(l)}, \tilde{a}_n^{(l)})\) are associated to Bayes factors and \(p(M_k)\), see Sections 3-4. Note also the role of model space dimensions \( |S_l|, |S_l^c| \) and of \( p_l \) (sparsity of \( f^* \)). The evidence for spurious models \( P(S \mid y) \) converges to 0 whenever \( a_n^{(l)} \) decrease sufficiently fast relative to \( |S_l| \) and \( \tilde{p} \). As discussed this can be achieved via diffuse priors \( p(\theta_k \mid M_k) \) or setting sparse \( p(M_k) \). \( P(S^c \mid y) \) measures the power to detect true signals and has often been regarded as less challenging than \( P(S \mid y) \). The reason is that Bayes factors discard spurious models at a faster rate than non-spurious ones [Dawid, 1999, Johnson and Rossell, 2010], hence typically \( \sum_{l=p+1}^{p_0} |S_l| \tilde{a}_n^{(l)} \ll \sum_{l=p+1}^{p_0} |S_l| a_n^{(l)} \). However one should not neglect the term \( \sum_{l=0}^{p_0} |S_l| \tilde{a}_n^{(l)} \), particularly under non-sparse \( f^* \) (large \( p_l \)). Sparse priors favor small \( p_k < p_l \) and, although this effect is often asymptotically negligible, it can matter for finite \( n \). An alternative advocated by Rossell and Telesca [2017] and Shin et al. [2018] is to enforce data-dependent sparsity that only affects \( l \in S \), e.g. via non-local priors. See Sections 5-6 for further discussion.

2.2. Tail integral bounds. A generic strategy to apply Lemma 2 is to upper-bound \( B_{kt}r_{ps,pt} \) or a suitable transformation, e.g. in Sections 3-4 we bound \( d \log(B_{kt}r_{ps,pt} g) \leq W \) for some \( d, g > 0 \), where \( W \) is a random variable for which one can characterize the tails. Then trivially \( P(B_{kt} > r_{ps,pt}/(1/u−1)) \leq P(W > d \log(g/(1/u−1))) \) and \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) can be bounded by integrating the tails of \( W \). One can use this strategy on a case-by-case basis, i.e. for a given model/prior, but to facilitate applying our framework Lemmas 3-4 give non-asymptotic bounds for the common cases where \( W \) has exponential or polynomial tails, respectively. In Sections 3-4 as \( n \rightarrow \infty \) we let \( g \rightarrow \infty \) and set the other parameters such that the integrals in Lemmas 3-4 and hence \( E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) are bounded by \( b/g^a \) times a term of smaller order, where \( b \) is a constant and \( a \) should be thought of as a constant close to 1. Lemmas 5-6 are adaptations to chi-square and F distributions useful for linear regression, for simplicity they state asymptotic bounds as \( g \rightarrow \infty \), but the proofs also provide non-asymptotic bounds.

**Lemma 3.** Let \( u, \bar{u} \in (0, 1) \) such that \( u < \bar{u}, d > 0 \) and \( g \geq 1/u−1 \). Let \( W > 0 \) be a random variable satisfying \( P(W > w) \leq bw e^{−lw} \) for \( w \in (u, \bar{u}) \) and some \( b > 0, c \geq 0, l > 0 \).
If \( ld = 1 \), then
\[
\int_{\bar{u}}^{u} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < b \frac{d}{g^{ld}} \left[ d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/\bar{u} - 1} \right) \right]^{c} \log(1/\bar{u}).
\]

If \( ld < 1 \), then
\[
\int_{\bar{u}}^{u} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < b \frac{d}{g^{ld}} \left[ d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/\bar{u} - 1} \right) \right]^{c} \frac{1}{1 - ld} \left( \frac{\bar{u}}{1 - \bar{u}} \right)^{1 - ld}.
\]

If \( ld > 1 \), then
\[
\int_{\bar{u}}^{u} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < b \frac{d}{g^{ld}} \left[ d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/\bar{u} - 1} \right) \right]^{c} \frac{(1/\bar{u} - 1)^{ld - 1}}{ld - 1}.
\]

**Lemma 4.** Let \( u, \bar{u} \in (0, 1) \) such that \( u < \bar{u} \) and let \( d > 0 \), \( g \geq 1/u - 1 \). Let \( W > 0 \) be a random variable satisfying \( P(W > w) \leq b/w^{c} \) for all \( w \in (u, \bar{u}) \) and some \( b > 0 \), \( c > 1 \).

If \( c - 1 > \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \) then
\[
\int_{u}^{\bar{u}} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < \frac{b}{d^{c-1}} \left[ \frac{1}{\log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right)} \right]^{c-1}.
\]

and otherwise
\[
\int_{u}^{\bar{u}} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < \frac{b}{d^{c-1}} \left[ \frac{1}{\log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right)} \right]^{c}.
\]

3. **Model-specific rates for linear regression**

Let \( y \in \mathbb{R}^{n} \), \( X \) be an \( n \times p \) matrix. The data analyst poses a standard linear regression \( p(y \mid \theta, \phi) = \mathcal{N}(y; X\theta, \phi I) \) where \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p} \), \( \phi > 0 \). \( X_{k} \) denotes the \( n \times p_{k} \) matrix and \( \theta_{k} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{k}} \), the regression coefficients for the columns in \( X \) selected by \( M_{k} \). For simplicity \( X_{k}^T X_{k} \) is assumed invertible for \( p_{k} \leq \bar{p} \) throughout. In this section we bound \( E_{f}^{*}(p(M_{k} \mid y)) \) for a single \( M_{k} \). The results are along the lines of current literature, but provide several extensions and a unification that helps understand variable selection in high dimensions. There are also new results on the effect of misspecification and non-local priors rates that are more general and tighter than currently available, further the construction can be directly extended to study \( L_{0} \) penalties (Section 4).

Our strategy applies to any prior but the required algebra varies, hence for illustration we focus on several popular choices. First we consider Zellner’s prior
\[
p(\theta_{k} \mid M_{k}, \phi) = \mathcal{N}(\theta_{k}; 0, \tau \phi (X_{k}^{T} X_{k})^{-1}),
\]
where \( \tau \) is a known prior dispersion, as it leads to concise expressions that highlight the main ideas. We then extend results to Normal priors
\[
p(\theta_{k} \mid M_{k}, \phi) = \mathcal{N}(\theta_{k}; 0, \tau \phi V_{k})
\]
with general positive-definite covariance \( V_k \) and to the pMOM prior [Johnson and Rossell 2012]

\[
p(\theta_k \mid \phi, M_k) = N(\theta_k; 0, \tau \phi V_k) \prod_{j \in M_k} \theta_j^2 x_j^j / (\tau \phi)
\]

where \( V_k = \text{diag}(X_k^t X_k)^{-1} \). In our parameterization \( \tau \gg n \) leads to essentially constant prior variance in these three priors, whereas \( \tau \gg n \) leads to increasingly diffuse priors that encourage sparse models. Default choices include the unit information prior where prior variance in these three priors, whereas

\[
\tau \gg n \text{ leads to essentially constant prior variance in these three priors, whereas } \tau \gg n \text{ leads to increasingly diffuse priors that encourage sparse models. Default choices include the unit information prior where prior variance in these three priors, whereas }
\]

between (models such that \( \tau \gg n \) plays a similar role than sparse \( \tau \gg n \) plays a similar role than sparse

\[
\lambda_{tm} = (X_t \theta_t^*)' (I - X_m(X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m') X_t \theta_t^* / \phi^*.
\]

(B1) The maximum model size \( \bar{p} \ll \min\{n, p\} \) and the prior dispersion \( \tau \gg \bar{p} \).

(B2) For any \( m \in S^c \), let \( M_q = M_l \cup M_m \). Then \( \lambda_{tm} \gg p_q \) for constant \( \beta_1 \in (0, 1) \).

It is possible to allow for larger \( \bar{p} \) in (B1), e.g. under Zellner’s prior \( B_{mt} \) depends on squared residual sums, these are 0 for \( p_m \geq n \) and one obtains trivial \( B_{mt} \). However (B1) seems a natural restriction as \( p_m \geq n \) results in data interpolation. Also then \( \tau \gg \bar{p} \) simply requires \( \tau \gg n \), as in all default \( \tau \) choices discussed above. Regarding (B2), \( \lambda_{tm} \) grows with \( n \) at a rate given by \( \theta_t^* \theta_t^* / \phi^* \) and the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of \( X_t^t (I - X_m(X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m) X_t \). For instance if \( X' X = n I \) then \( \lambda_{tm} = n (\theta_t^* \theta_t^* / \phi^* \text{, where } M_l = M_l \setminus M_m \). Alternatively if \( X_t^t (I - X_m(X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m) X_t \) has full rank and smallest eigenvalue equal to \( v_{tm} \), then \( \lambda_{tm} \geq v_{tm} (\theta_t^* \theta_t^* / \phi^* \text{. (B2) says that one should not consider models such that } p_q \geq \lambda_{tm} \), i.e. of large size relative to the signal strength and correlations between \( (X_t, X_m) \). A detailed study of eigenvalues is beyond our scope, but common assumptions are \( \lambda_{tm} \gg n \text{ [Johnson and Rossell 2012]} \) or \( \lambda_{tm} \gg \max\{n/\tau, p^2 + 25 / \tau \} \) for some constant \( \delta > 0 \text{ [Narisetty and He 2014]} \). In fact, we purposely state our main results in terms of \( \lambda_{tm} \), to emphasize the intrinsic dependence BMS rates on these signal-to-noise parameters.

The results from this section can be summarized as follows. For Zellner’s and Normal priors \( E_f(p(M_m | y)) \ll \tau^{-\alpha(p_m - p_l)/2} p_m^{\alpha(p_m - p_l)/2} \) for spurious \( m \in S \) and any fixed \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \), under mild conditions. That is, setting large \( \tau \) plays a similar role than sparse \( p(M_k) \) in discarding spurious variables. In fact for Zellner’s prior one can obtain a slightly tighter rate \( r_{p_m, p_l} \tau^{-(p_m - p_l)/2} \), up to a logarithmic factor. The pMOM prior attains faster rates
$r_{p_m,p_l}^{α} τ^{-3α(p_m−p_l)}$ for $m ∈ S$. For non-spurious $m ∈ S^c$ then $E_{f^∗}(p(M_m \mid y))$ decreases exponentially with $\min\{λ_{M_m}^α, κn\}$ for fixed $α \in (0, 1)$, $κ > 0$. For simplicity we consider $p(θ_k \mid φ, M_k)$ with Normal tails but from [Dawid, 1999] the rates for other priors cannot be faster (up to lower-order terms), including thicker-tailed priors. We defer further discussion to Section 7. Importantly, to obtain these rates $(τ,r_{p_m,p_l})$ can be sparse but one must preserve power to detect truly active variables, else one may not even be able to achieve pairwise selection consistency. Section 3.1 makes this notion precise and describes sufficient conditions on $(τ,r_{p_m,p_l})$.

3.1. Model priors and conditions for pairwise consistency. A necessary condition to attain global posterior consistency is pairwise consistency when comparing $M_m$ with an arbitrary $M_t$, i.e. $B_{tm}r_{p_t,p_m} \xrightarrow{P} 0$. Pairwise consistency depends on the signal strength as measured by $λ_{M_t}$, prior model probabilities and prior dispersion $τ$. We list two technical conditions that, as shown in subsequent sections, guarantee pairwise consistency for all priors considered here. Besides technical precision, this section characterizes the maximum sparsity one can afford via several popular priors while retaining the ability to detect signals, see Lemma 5 below.

(C1) Let $m ∈ S$. As $n → ∞$, $τ ≫ 1$ and $r_{p_m,p_l} \ll τ^{β_2(p_m−p_l)/2}$ for some fixed $β_2 \in (0,1)$. (C2) Let $m ∈ S^c$. As $n → ∞$, $log(r_{p_m,p_l}) \ll λ_{tm}^{3} + (p_m − p_l)log(1 + τ)$ for all fixed $β_3 \in (0, 1)$.

Recall that $τ ∝ n$ corresponds to roughly constant prior variance. Intuitively, (C1)-(C2) ensure that $(r_{p_m,p_l}, τ)$ do not favor $M_m$ over $M_t$ too strongly a priori. In fact for $m ∈ S$ and under Zellner’s and Normal priors, if $r_{p_m,p_l} ≥ τ^{(p_m−p_l)/2}$ then $B_{tm}r_{p_t,p_m}$ does not converge to 0 in probability, i.e. (C1) is essentially necessary. This follows from the expressions and sampling distributions of $B_{tm}$ in (4) and (6) below. Similarly for $m ∈ S^c$, if $r_{p_m,p_l} ≥ λ_{tm} + (p_m − p_l)log(τ)$ then $B_{tm}r_{p_t,p_m}$ is inconsistent. More generally, for a wide class of priors it holds that if $m ∈ S$ then $B_{M_m} \equiv τ^{(p_m−p_l)/2}$ where $τ$ measures overall prior dispersion, whereas if $m ∈ S^c$ then $[logB_{M_t}]/λ_{M_t} \xrightarrow{P} c$ for some constant $c > 0$ [Dawid, 1992]. That is, (C1)-(C2) ensure consistency for a wide class of priors. An exception are non-local priors, which are defined as satisfying $lim_{θ_k→0} p(θ_k \mid M_k) = 0$, these attain faster rates for $m ∈ S$ and (C1) could be relaxed slightly (e.g. to $β_2 \in (0, 3)$ for the pMOM prior in Section 3.5).

Conditions (C1)-(C2) depend on $τ$ and $r_{p_m,p_l} = p(M_m)/p(M_t)$. Lemma 5 makes (C1)-(C2) explicit for three popular model space priors of the form $p(M_m) = P(p_k = p_m)/p_{p_{m}}$, where $P(p_k = l) = \sum_{p_k = l} p(M_k)$ is the prior probability of selecting $p_k = l$ variables. These are the so-called uniform prior $P(p_k = l) ∝ \binom{p}{l}$, the Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior $P(p_k = l) ∝ 1$ [Scott and Berger, 2010] and the complexity prior $P(p_k = l) ∝ 1/p^d$ for $c > 0$ [Castillo et al., 2015].

Lemma 5. Let $λ_{M_t} > 0$ as in (C2) and $M_m$ have $p_m \in [p_l, p]$ variables. Then

(i) Uniform prior. If $τ ≫ 1$ then (C1)-(C2) hold.
(ii) Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior. If $τ \gg [p/(p−p_l)]^{2/β_2}$ then (C1)-(C2) hold.
(iii) Complexity prior. If $τ ≫ 1$ then (C1)-(C2) hold.
Let $M_m \in S^c$ be a model with $p_m < p_t$ variables.

(i) Uniform prior. (C2) holds if and only if $\lambda_{tm}^{\beta_3} \gg (p_t - p_m) \log(\tau)$.

(ii) Beta-Binomial($1, 1$) prior. If $\lambda_{tm}^{\beta_3} \gg (p_t - p_m) \log((p_t - p_t)\tau/p_m)$ then (C2) holds.

(iii) Complexity($c$) prior. If $\lambda_{tm}^{\beta_3} \gg (p_t - p_m) \log(p^c(p - p_t)\tau/p_m)$ then (C2) holds.

That is when $p_m \geq p_t$ one may take any $\tau \gg 1$, but for smaller $p_m < p_t$ one must ensure that the prior sparsity induced by $(\tau, r_{p_t, p_m})$ does not smoother the signal in $\lambda_{tm}$. Specifically for the Beta-Binomial and Complexity priors one essentially needs that $\lambda_{tm}^{\beta_3} \gg p_t \log(\tau p)$ and $\lambda_{tm}^{\beta_3} \gg p_t \log(\tau p^{1+c})$ respectively. We remark that $p_t$ and $\lambda_{tm}$ are unknown, (C2) states that if the prior sparsity via $\tau$ or $p(M_k)$ is too strong relative to the true sparsity $p_t$, $p$ or signal strength $\lambda_{tm}$ then one may not even achieve pairwise consistency. $\lambda_{tm}$ depends on the eigenvalues of $X'X$, but even under an ideal $X'X = nI$ one has $\lambda_{tm} = n(\theta_t')\theta_t' / \phi^*$ where $M_t = M_t \setminus M_m$ then (C2) requires $(\theta_t')'(\theta_t') / \phi^* \gg (p_t/n) \log(\tau p)$ for these two priors, which may not hold when $p_t$ grows with $n$ ($M_t$ is not sparse) or $(\theta_t')'(\theta_t') / \phi^*$ decreases with $n$ (small signals). These conditions are similar to those in Castillo et al. [2015] for Laplace spike-and-slab priors and in van der Pas et al. [2017] for the horseshoe prior, see also Bühlmann and van de Geer [2011] (Chapter 2) for related conditions on thelasso and other likelihood penalties.

3.2. Zellner’s prior with known variance. Under Zellner’s prior and known $\phi^*$, simple algebra gives

\[
B_{tm} = \exp\left\{-\frac{\tau}{2\phi^*(1 + \tau)} W_{mt}\right\} \left(1 + \tau\right)^{pm-p_t \over 2} \tag{4}
\]

and hence in Lemma 2

\[
P_{f^*} \left( B_{mt} > \frac{r_{p_t, p_m}}{1/u - 1} \right) = P_{f^*} \left( W_{mt} > \frac{1 + \tau \log(\frac{1}{u - 1})}{\phi^*} \right), \tag{5}
\]

where $W_{mt} = \tilde{\theta}_m'X_m'X_m\tilde{\theta}_m - \bar{\theta}_i'X_i'X_i\bar{\theta}_i$ is the difference between residual sums of squares under $M_t$ and $M_m$ and $\tilde{\theta}_m = (X_m'X_m)^{-1}X_m'y$ the least-squares estimate.

**Proposition 1.** Assume that $f^*(y) = N(y; \theta_t^*; \phi^*I)$ and consider $m \neq t$.

(i) Let $m \in S$. Assume Conditions (B1) and (C1), then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \leq \frac{[\log(g)]^{(pm-p_t)/2}}{g} \ll \frac{r_{pm, p_t}^{\alpha}}{\tau^{\alpha(pm-p_t)/2}} \tag{6}
\]

for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$.

(ii) Let $m \in S^c$. Assume Condition (C2) and that $\lambda_{tm}$ satisfies Condition (B2). Then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2} + e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}'/2} \tag{7}
\]

for any fixed $\alpha' \in (0, 1), \gamma \in (0, 1)$. 

3.3. Zellner’s prior with unknown variance. Let \( \phi^* \) be unknown and \( s_k = y'y - y'X_k(X_k'X_k)^{-1}X_k'y \) the residual sum of squares under \( M_k \), then

\[
B_{tm} = \left( \frac{\hat{s}_m}{s_t} \right)^{\frac{a_y+n}{2}} (1 + \tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{n-p_m} \tilde{F}_{mt} \left( \frac{p_m-p_t}{n-p_m} \right)^{-\frac{a_y+n}{2}} (1 + \tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{n-p_m},
\]

where \( \hat{s}_m = l_\phi + y'y - \frac{r}{r+1} y'X_m(X'_mX'_m)^{-1}X'_my \) and

\[
\tilde{F}_{mt} = \frac{(s_t - \hat{s}_m)/(p_m-p_t)}{s_m/(n-p_m)} \leq \frac{(s_t - s_m)/(p_m-p_t)}{s_m/(n-p_m)} = F_{mt}.
\]

\( F_{mt} \) is the F-statistic to test \( M_t \) versus \( M_m \) and the inequality follows from trivial algebra.

**Proposition 2.** Assume that \( f^*(y) = N(y; X_i\theta^*_i; \phi^* I) \) and Conditions (B1), (B2), (C1), (C2).

(i) Let \( m \in S \). Let \( g = (1 + \tau)^{(p_n-p_t)/2} r_{p_t,p_m} \). If \( \log(g) \ll n - p_m \), then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \leq \left( \frac{1}{g} \right)^{1-4\gamma \log^2(n-p_m)} \lesssim \frac{p_m,p_t}{\tau \alpha^{p_m-p_t}}
\]

for any fixed \( \alpha < 1 \). If \( \log(g) \gg n - p_m \) then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \exp \left\{ -\frac{(n-p_t-5)}{2} \log \left( \frac{\log^2(g)}{n-p_t-6} \right) \right\} \ll e^{-\kappa n}
\]

for any fixed \( \gamma < 1, \kappa > 1 \).

(ii) Let \( m \in S^c \). Then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2, \kappa n\}},
\]

for any fixed \( \gamma \in (0,1), \alpha \in (0,1), \kappa > 0 \).

3.4. Normal prior with general covariance. Consider \( p(\theta_k | \phi, M_k) = N(\theta_k; 0, \tau \phi V_k) \).

Let \( \rho_{k1} \geq \ldots \geq \rho_{kp_n} > 0 \) be the \( p_n \) non-zero eigenvalues of \( V_kX_k'X_k \), \( F_{mt} \) the F-test statistic in (7), and \( \tilde{F}_{mt} \) be as in (7) after replacing \( \hat{s}_k = l_\phi + y'y - y'X_k(X_k'X_k+\tau^{-1}V_k^{-1})^{-1}X'_ky \).

Then simple algebra shows

\[
B_{tm} = \left( 1 + \frac{p_m-p_t}{n-p_m} \tilde{F}_{mt} \right)^{-\frac{a_y+n}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^{p_m} (\tau \rho_{mj} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \prod_{j=1}^{p_t} (\tau \rho_{tj} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]

We assume (C1)-(C2) and two further technical conditions (D1)-(D2). Both can be relaxed, but they simplify exposition. Under (D1) the interpretation of \( \tau \) is comparable to that in Zellner’s prior. (D2) is used to ensure that the Bayesian-flavoured F-statistic \( \tilde{F}_{mt} \) is close to the classical \( F_{mt} \), and is a mild requirement since typically \( \tau \geq n - \lambda_0 \).

(i) For some constant \( c_{mt} > 0 \), \( \prod_{j=1}^{p_m} (\tau \rho_{mj} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} / \prod_{j=1}^{p_t} (\tau \rho_{tj} + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \asymp (c_{mt} \tau)^{(p_m-p_t)/2} \).

(ii) As \( n \to \infty \), \( \lambda_0 \ll \tau \rho_{pt} \).

**Proposition 3.** Assume that \( f^*(y) = N(y; X_i\theta^*_i; \phi^* I) \). Consider \( m \neq t \) and that Conditions (B1), (B2), (C1), (C2), (D1) and (D2) hold.
(i) Let $m \in S$. Then

$$E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \max \left\{ C_{r_{pm,pt}}^{\alpha}(pt_{m-pm})/2, e^{-\kappa n}, e^{-\tau pt_{m-pm}}/2 \right\}.$$  

(ii) Let $m \in S^c$. Then

$$E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \exp \left\{ -\min\{\gamma \lambda, \kappa n, \tau pt_{m-pm}/2 \} \right\}.$$ 

3.5. pMOM prior. From Proposition 1 in [Rossell and Telesca 2017] the Bayes factor is

$$B_{tm} = D_{tm} \left(1 + \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} \tilde{F}_{mt} \right)^{-\frac{a_n + n}{2}} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^{p_m} (\tau \rho_{mj} + 1)^{1/2}}{\prod_{j=1}^{p_n} (\tau \rho_{tj} + 1)^{1/2}},$$

where

$$D_{tm} = \int \int N(\theta; \tilde{V}K, \phi V) \frac{d\theta_d}{\sqrt{\phi}} \frac{d\theta_t}{\phi} \prod_{j \in J_M} d(\theta_{mj}/\sqrt{\phi}) d\theta_{mj} d\phi$$

$$d(z) = z^2/\tau, \tilde{V}_k^{-1} = X'_kX_k + V_k^{-1}/\tau, \tilde{\theta}_k = \tilde{V}_kX'_k \tilde{y} \text{ and } \tilde{F}_{mt}, \tilde{s}_k \text{ and } \rho_{kj} \text{ are as in } \phi \text{ for the particular case } V_k = \text{diag}(X'_kX_k)^{-1}. \text{ The interest of pMOM priors is that } D_{tm} \text{ penalizes spurious models } m \in S, \text{ since the posterior distribution of } d(\theta_{mj}/\sqrt{\phi}) \text{ concentrates around 0 for } \theta_{mj}^* = 0. \text{ Proposition 4 shows that } D_{tm} \text{ accelerates the rate of } E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \text{ by a factor } h^{p_m-p_t}_n \text{ where essentially } h_n \approx \sigma^{-1} \tau/n \text{ and } \sigma \text{ is the largest (posterior) variance in } \tilde{V}_m. \text{ That is, if as usual } \sigma \approx 1/n \text{ then the accelerating factor is } \tau^{p_m-p_t}/\phi. \text{ As a side remark this rate is tighter than that in } \text{Johnson and Rossell 2012}, \text{ e.g. even under uniform } p(M_k) \text{ one obtains PC when } p \ll \tau^{n/2} \text{ for any } \alpha < 3 \text{ (Section 5) whereas the result in } \text{Johnson and Rossell 2012} \text{ required } p \ll n. \text{ To ease upcoming algebra we assume (D1) and that } X_k \text{ has zero column means and unit variances, then } V_k = n^{-1} I, \rho_{kj} \text{ are the eigenvalues of } X'_kX_k/n \text{ and } \rho_{tj} = \rho_{kj} + 1/\tau \text{ those of } \tilde{V}_k^{-1}/n. \text{ Proposion 4. Assume that } f^*(y) = N(y; X_0; \phi^* I). \text{ Consider } m \neq t \text{ and that Conditions (B1), (C1) and (D1) hold. Let } m \in S. \text{ Then}

$$E_{f^*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \max \left\{ C_{r_{pm,pt}}^{\alpha}(pt_{m-pm})/2, e^{-\kappa n}, e^{-\tau pt_{m-pm}}/2 \right\} + P_{f^*}(D_{mt} > 1/h^{p_m-p_t}_n).$$

The bound in Proposition 4 is the sum of two terms. The first term contains the acceleration factor $h_n$, but as above, and by Proposition 5 the second term $P_{f^*}(D_{mt} > 1/h^{p_m-p_t}_n)$ that Proposition 5 is of a smaller order, specifically it vanishes near-exponentially for any $h_n \leq \sigma^{-1} (\tau/n)(\tilde{\rho}_{m_{mp}}/\tilde{\rho}_{m1})^{1/2}$. Proposition 5 requires technical conditions (E1)-(E4).

(E1) As $n \to \infty$, $\tau \tilde{\rho}_{m_{mp}} > 1$ and $\tau \tilde{\rho}_{t1} > \sqrt{\tilde{\theta}_t^*/\tilde{\theta}_t} / \min_{j \in J_M} |\theta_{tj}^*|.$

(E2) As $n \to \infty$, $h_n^{-1/(\tilde{\rho}_{m_{mp}}-\tilde{\rho}_{m1})} > \phi^* / \min_{j \in J_M} (\theta_{tj})^2$ for fixed $\delta \in (0, 1).$

(E3) As $n \to \infty$, $h_n^{(\tilde{\rho}_{m_{mp}}-\tilde{\rho}_{m1})}/(\tau pt_{m-pm}) > \left[ \max_{j \in J_M} (\theta_{tj})^2 / \phi^* |\tilde{\rho}_{m1} \tilde{\rho}_{t1} / (\tilde{\rho}_{m_{mp}} \tilde{\rho}_{m1})]^{1/2} \text{ for fixed } \epsilon \in (0, 1 - \delta).$
As \( n \to \infty \), \( n\hat{\rho}_{mpn} \gg [\hat{\rho}_{m1}\hat{\rho}_{11}/(\hat{\rho}_{mpn}\hat{\rho}_{pn})]^{1/2} \)

**Proposition 5.** Let \( m \in S \). Let \( h_n, \tau, \delta \) and \( \epsilon \) satisfying (E1)-(E4) and

\[
h_n \leq \frac{1}{2\sigma}(\tau/n)(\hat{\rho}_{mpn}/\hat{\rho}_{m1})^{1/2}
\]

where \( \sigma \) is the largest diagonal element in \( \hat{\Sigma}_m \). Then

\[
P_f(D_{ml} > 1/h_n^{p_m-p_n}) \ll p_t e^{-c \min\{\log(\Lambda_m), (n-p_m)^\gamma\}} + (p_m - p_t)e^{-c \min\{h_n^{1/\beta}, (n-p_m)^\gamma\}}
\]

for any \( \gamma < 1 \), where \( \Lambda_m = \min_{M_k \subset M_m; p_k=p_m-1} \lambda_{mk} \).

Conditions (E1)-(E4) are mild and essentially require that \( \tau \) and \( n \) grow quickly enough relative to \( \hat{\rho}_{mpn} \). For instance if \( \tau \geq n \), \( \theta_{*} \) is constant in \( n \) and \( \hat{\rho}_{m1}/\hat{\rho}_{mpn} < c \) for some constant \( c \), then (E1) and (E4) are satisfied when \( n\hat{\rho}_{mp_n} \gg 1 \), (E2) and (E3) hold for any \( h_n \gg 1 \) and \( (\delta, \epsilon) \) can be taken arbitrarily close to \( 0 \). Note that \( n\hat{\rho}_{mp_n} \gg 1 \) is a minimal requirement that posterior variances in \( V_m \) converge to 0, which is necessary for the least-squares estimator to be consistent. Then taking \( \sigma \approx 1/n \) for simplicity, Proposition 5 implies that \( E_f(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll \delta_{p_m,p_t} e^{-\gamma/2(p_m-p_t)/2} \) under (C1) and the minimal assumption that \( \log(p_t) \ll \log(p_\beta) \ll n^{1-\delta-\epsilon} \).

We remark that the pMOM is just one possible non-local prior that vanishes at a quadratic rate as \( \theta_{mj} \to 0 \). Other choices are possible, e.g. the peMOM density vanishes at a \( e^{-\phi/\theta_{mj}} \) rate and we hypothesize should achieve \( E_f(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll \delta_{p_m,p_t} e^{-\gamma/2(p_m-p_t)} \) for any \( \alpha < 1/2 \), however for brevity we do not pursue this here.

### 3.6. Extensions to model misspecification.

Sections 3.2 and 3.3 consider a data-generating function \( f^*(y) = N(y; X\theta^*, \phi^*I) \) that lies in the considered family. Fully considering model misspecification requires an extensive treatment beyond our scope, but we develop extensions to misspecified non-linear regression and to heteroskedastic correlated errors.

The intuition is as follows. Lemma 2 only requires tail probabilities for \( B_{int} \), where \( B_{int} \) are bounded by ratios of quadratic forms involving least-squares estimators (Sections 3.2 and 3.3). When \( f^*(y) = N(y; X\theta^*, \phi^*I) \) such forms are chi-square or F-distributed and one may obtain tail bounds via their moments or moment-generating functions. For other \( f^* \) alternative tail bounds are available, e.g. Hsu et al. [2012] and Rudelson and Vershynin [2013] gave exponential bounds for sub-Gaussian errors, Bellec [2014] under a Bernstein moment condition for sub-Gaussian and log-concave distributions, and Klass and Nowicki [1997], Giné et al. [2000] and Houdré and Reynaud-Bouret [2003] for more general settings. Mohsenipour [2012] provides a monograph for quadratic forms of Gaussian and other standard variables. See also Zholud [2014] for the relative error of approximating F-statistic tails under non-normal and non-identically distributed errors.

Proposition 6 below considers \( f^*(y) = N(y; W\beta^*, \xi^*I) \) for some \( n \times q \) matrix \( W \) and \( \beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^q \), i.e. the linear model \( p(y \mid \theta, \phi) = N(X\theta, \phi I) \) is misspecified. This includes...
of generality we set the restriction $\text{tr} \Sigma^* = n$ to ensure identifiability and interpret $\phi^* = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}_{\varphi^*}(y_i)$ as the average variance. Proposition 7 gives rates that depend on the eigenvalues of sandwich-type covariance matrices and for simplicity focuses on Zellner’s prior. As an interesting contrast to Proposition 6 where misspecifying the linear model is guaranteed to decrease power, this need not be the case when misspecifying the
residual correlation. Before stating the result we define the required eigenvalues. For any two nested models $M_k \subset M_q$ with $p_q \leq n$ let $X_q = (X_k, X_s)$, where $X_s$ are the variables in $M_q$ but not in $M_k$, and $\tilde{X}_s = (I - H_k)X_s$ their orthogonal projection on $X_k$. For any matrix $A$ denote by $\varrho(A)$ and $\varrho(A)$ its smallest and largest eigenvalue. Let $\omega_{kq} = \varrho(\tilde{X}_s^* \tilde{X}_s (\tilde{X}_s^* \tilde{X}_s)^{-1})$, $\bar{\omega}_{kq} = \varrho(X_s^* \tilde{X}_s (X_s^* \tilde{X}_s)^{-1})$. Further let $L_q$ be the set of $n \times (n - p_q)$ matrices $T$ such that the matrix $(X_q T)$ is full-rank. Define $\tilde{T} = (I - H_q)T$, $\omega_q = \max_{L_q \varrho(\tilde{T}_s^* \tilde{T}_s (\tilde{T}_s^* \tilde{T}_s)^{-1})}$ and $\bar{\omega}_q = \min_{L_q \varrho(\tilde{T}_s^* \tilde{T}_s (\tilde{T}_s^* \tilde{T}_s)^{-1})}$.

Proposition 7. Assume (B1), (B2), (C1), (C2') and that $f^*(y) = N(y; X_t \theta_t^*, \phi^* \Sigma^*)$ where $\Sigma^*$ is positive-definite and $\text{tr}(\Sigma^*) = n$. Let $p(\theta_k \mid \phi, M_k)$ be Zellner’s prior and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$ be constants.

(i) Let $m \in S$. If $(\omega_m/\tilde{\omega}_m) \log(r_{p_m,p_{1/2}}^{p_m}) \ll n - p_m$ then

$$E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll \left[r_{p_m,p_{1/2}}^{p_m} \right]^{-\gamma \omega_m/\tilde{\omega}_m},$$

whereas if $(\omega_m/\tilde{\omega}_m) \log(r_{p_m,p_{1/2}}^{p_m}) \gg n - p_m$ then $E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\kappa n}$.

(ii) Let $m \in S^c$ and let $\delta \in (0, 1)$ be the largest constant such that $\lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}^{1-\delta} \gg \omega_q/\omega_{mq}$. If $(\omega_q/\tilde{\omega}_q) \left[\lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m} + \log(\frac{\gamma \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m} \omega_q}{2 \omega_{mq}})\right] \ll n - p_q$ then

$$E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}/2, \kappa n\}} + \exp\left\{ -\frac{\gamma \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m} \omega_q}{2 \omega_{mq}} \right\}.$$

Conversely, if

$$(\omega_q/\tilde{\omega}_q) \left[\lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}/2 + \log((1 + \tau)\frac{p_m - p_q}{p_{1/2} I_{p_m, p_{1/2}}})\right] \gg n - p_q$$

then $E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}} + e^{-\kappa n}$.

That is, under $\Sigma^* \neq I$ the rate for $m \in S$ differs from the correctly-specified case at most by a power factor that depends on $\omega_m/\tilde{\omega}_m$. We avoid a detailed study of eigenvalues, but to gain intuition note that both $n^{-1}X_t^* \Sigma^* X_t$ and $n^{-1}X_t^* \tilde{X}_t$ are essentially sample covariance matrices for variables in $M_m$ but not in $M_t$. Whenever they converge to similar limiting covariances, say under diagonal $\Sigma^*$ that is independent of $X$, one expects $\omega_m/\tilde{\omega}_m$ to be close to 1. For $m \in S^c$ one attains exponential rates in $\lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}$, where note that $\omega_m \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m} \leq \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m} \leq \omega_{mq} \lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}$ and $\lambda_{\tilde{\omega}_m}$ is the non-centrality parameter in (B2).
4. $L_0$ Penalties

Let $h(y, m) = p(y | \hat{\theta}_m, \hat{\phi}_m)e^{-\eta_m}$ where $(\hat{\theta}_m, \hat{\phi}_m) = \arg\max_{\theta_m \in \Theta_m, \phi \in \Phi} p(y | \theta, \phi)$ be an $L_0$-penalized likelihood, where $\eta_m$ is a penalty that may depend on $(p_m, n, p)$. For instance the BIC corresponds to $\eta_m = 0.5p_m \log(n)$, the risk inflation criterion (RIC, Foster and George [1994]) to $\eta_m = 0.5p_m \log(p^2)$, and the extended BIC (EBIC) from Chen and George [1994] to $\eta_m = 0.5p_m \log(n) + \xi \log \binom{p_m}{p}$ for some $\xi \in (0, 1)$. In the remainder of this section we assume Conditions (C1')-(C2') below, these are trivial modifications of Conditions (C1)-(C2) from Section 3.1.

(C1') Let $m \in S$. As $n \to \infty$, $\eta_m - \eta_t \gg 1$.

(C2') Let $m \in S^c$. As $n \to \infty$, $\eta_t - \eta_m \ll \lambda_{t, m}^3$ for all fixed $\beta_3 \in (0, 1)$.

Condition (C1') is satisfied by the BIC, RIC and EBIC, and indeed by any criterion where the penalty on complexity grows to infinity as $n \to \infty$ (the AIC does not satisfy this requirement, however). Condition (C2') is also mild, e.g. for the BIC it suffices that $p_t \log(n^{1/2}) \ll \lambda_{t, m}^3$, for the RIC that $p_t \log(p) \ll \lambda_{t, m}^3$, and for the EBIC that $p_t \log(n^{1/2}p^3) \ll \lambda_{t, m}^3$. Now, consider the normalized $L_0$-penalized likelihood

$$\tilde{h}(y, m) = \frac{h(y, m)}{\sum_{l=1}^K h(y, l)} = 1 - \sum_{l \neq m} \tilde{h}(y, l).$$

Intuitively $\tilde{h}(y, m)$ plays the role of the posterior probability of $M_m$ and $h(y, t)/h(y, m)$ that of the Bayes factor $B_{tm}$ times $p(M_t)/p(M_m)$. It is of interest to show that $\tilde{h}(y, t)$ converges to 1 in the $L_1$ sense. From (2) it suffices to obtain rates for

$$\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l \neq t} E_{f^*} \left( \tilde{h}(y, l) \right) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l \neq t} E_{f^*} \left( \left[ 1 + h(y, t)/h(y, m) \right]^{-1} \right).$$

Recall that (11) is stronger than studying on model selection consistency for $L_0$ penalties, for the latter see Bunea et al. [2007] or Raskutti et al. [2011]. In particular, from Lemma 4 rates on (11) also apply to $P_{f^*}(\hat{m} = t)$, where $\hat{m} = \arg \max_{\theta_m} p(y, m)$. The latter observation provides a justification for using $\tilde{h}(y, m)$ as a measure of model selection uncertainty under $L_0$ penalties. In this section we bound individual $E_{f^*} \left( \tilde{h}(y, m) \right)$, see Section 5 to combine these bounds and obtain global variable selection rates.

In linear regression straightforward algebra shows that

$$\frac{h(y, t)}{h(y, m)} = \left( 1 + \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} F_{mt} \right)^{-\frac{n}{2}} e^{\eta_m - \eta_t},$$

where $F_{mt}$ is the $F$-test statistic in (7). The resemblance of (12) to (6) allows extending Proposition 2 to $L_0$ penalties. Briefly, proceeding as in the proof of Proposition 2 gives

$$E_{f^*} \left( \left[ 1 + \frac{h(y, t)}{h(y, m)} \right]^{-1} \right) \leq \int_0^1 P_{f^*} \left( (p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > 2 \frac{n - p_m}{n} \log \left[ \frac{e^{\eta_m - \eta_t}}{1/u - 1} \right] \right) du.$$
Expression (12) is identical to replacing $g = r_{p_m,p_n}(1 + \tau)^{(p_m - p_n)/2}$ by $e^{\eta_m - \eta_t}$ in the proof of Proposition 2. Proposition 8(i) follows immediately, and Proposition 8(ii) is also obtained directly by proceeding as in (S.8).

**Proposition 8.** Assume that $f^*(\mathbf{y}) = N(\mathbf{y}; \mathbf{X}_t^\star; \phi^\star I)$. Consider $m \neq t$ and that Conditions (B1), (B2), (C1”) and (C2”) hold.

(i) Let $m \in S$. If $\eta_m - \eta_t < n - p_m$ then

$$E_{f^*}(\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}, m)) \leq e^{-(\eta_m - \eta_t)(1 - 4\sqrt{\eta_m - \eta_t}/n)}.$$ 

for all $n \geq n_0$, where $n_0$ is fixed and does not depend on $m$. If $\eta_m - \eta_t < n - p_m$ then $E_{f^*}(\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}, m)) < e^{-\kappa n}$ for any fixed $\kappa > 0$ and $n \geq n_0$.

(ii) Let $m \in S^c$. Then

$$E_{f^*}(\hat{h}(\mathbf{y}, m)) < e^{-\alpha(\eta_m - \eta_t)}e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_{\alpha}^m/2, \kappa n\}}$$

for all $n \geq n_0$ where $n_0$ is fixed and does not depend on $m$ and fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$.

For instance rates for the BIC are obtained by plugging $\eta_m = 0.5p_m \log(n)$ into Proposition 8 and analogously for the RIC and EBIC. Comparing (12) to $B_{tm}$ in (6) shows that the BIC is essentially equivalent to and attains the same rates than setting $\tau = n$ (unit information prior) and uniform $p(M_m)$, the RIC to $\tau = p^2$ and uniform $p(M_m)$, and the EBIC with $\xi = 1$ to $\tau = n$ and Beta-Binomial(1,1) $p(M_m)$. Although not done here for brevity, note also that the model misspecification results for Zellner’s prior in Section 3.6 extend directly to $L_0$ penalties.

5. Global variable selection

Corollaries 12 below specialize (3) to the linear model rates obtained in Sections 3.4. These rates vanish at most exponentially in $n$, e.g. for Zellner’s prior $E_{f^*}(p(M_m | \mathbf{y})) \leq \max\{r_{p_m,p_n}^{\alpha}e^{(p_m - p_n)/2}, e^{-\kappa n}\}$ for $m \in S$ and $E_{f^*}(p(M_m | \mathbf{y})) = e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_{\alpha}^m/2, \kappa n\}}$ for $m \in S^c$, where $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ and $\kappa > 0$ are constants. Corollaries 12 focus on the cases $r_{p_m,p_n}^{\alpha}e^{(p_m - p_n)/2} \gg e^{-\kappa n}$, $e^{-\gamma \lambda_{\alpha}^m/2} \gg e^{-\kappa n}$, $e^{-\alpha(\eta_m - \eta_t)} \gg e^{-\kappa n}$, the cases where $e^{-\kappa n}$ is the dominating term are less interesting and can be tackled trivially by plugging $e^{-\kappa n}$ into Lemma S13.

**Corollary 1.** Assume that $E_{f^*}(p(M_m | \mathbf{y})) \leq r_{p_m,p_n}^{\alpha}e^{(p_m - p_n)/2}$ for all $m \in S$ and $E_{f^*}(p(M_m | \mathbf{y})) \leq r_{p_m,p_n}^{\alpha}e^{(p_m - p_n)/2}e^{-\gamma \lambda_{\alpha}^m/2}$ for all $m \in S^c$ and $n \geq n_0$, $\lambda_{\alpha}$ as defined in (B2) and fixed $n_0 > 0$, $\alpha > 0$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Let $A > 0$ be such that $A^{a'}(p_t - p_m) \leq \lambda_{\alpha}^m$ for all $p_m < p_t$ and some $a' < \alpha$. Let $A > 0$ be such that $A^{a'}(m) \leq \lambda_{\alpha}^m$ for all $p_m > p_t$ and some $a' < \alpha$, where $s(m)$ is the number of variables included in $M_t$ but not in $M_m \in S^c$. 

Then

\[ E_f^*(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p_l}^{\bar{p}} \left( p - p_l \right) \frac{r_l^{2\alpha}}{r_\alpha(l-p_l)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \]

(14)

\[ \sum_{l=0}^{p_l-1} E_f^*(P(S_l^c \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{p_l-1} \left( p \right) \left( \frac{\bar{p}_l}{\alpha} \right)^{\alpha(l-p_l)/2} e^{-\alpha'(p_l-1)/2} \]

(15)

\[ \sum_{l=p_l}^{\bar{p}} E_f^*(P(S_l^c \mid y)) \leq \left( \frac{p}{p_l} \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{l=p_l+1}^{\bar{p}} \sum_{j=0}^{p_l-1} \left( p_l \right) \left( \frac{p - p_l}{l - j} \right) e^{-\frac{(p_l-j)\lambda}{2}}. \]

(16)

Corollary 2. Let \( h(y, m) \) be a maximized likelihood under an \( L_0 \) penalty \( \eta_m \) and \( \tilde{h}(y, m) \) the renormalized bounds on \( h(y, m) \) as in Section 4. Let \( \eta_m = \eta_m - \eta \). Assume that \( E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \leq e^{-\alpha(\eta_m - \eta)} \) for all \( m \in S \) and \( E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \leq e^{-\alpha(\eta_m - \eta)} e^{-\lambda \alpha_m/2} \) for all \( m \in S^c \) and \( n \geq n_0, \lambda \alpha_m \) as defined in (B2) and fixed \( n_0 > 0, \alpha > 0, \gamma \in (0, 1) \). Let \( \bar{\lambda} > 0 \) and \( \bar{\lambda} > 0 \) be as in Corollary 1. Then

\[ E_f^* \left( \sum_{m \in S} \tilde{h}(y, m) \right) \leq \sum_{l=p_l}^{\bar{p}} \left( p - p_l \right) e^{-\alpha \eta_l} \]

\[ E_f^* \left( \sum_{l=0}^{p_l-1} \sum_{m \in S_l^c} \tilde{h}(y, m) \right) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{p_l-1} \left( p \right) e^{-\alpha \eta_l} e^{-\lambda \alpha'(p_l-1)/2} \]

\[ E_f^* \left( \sum_{l=p_l}^{\bar{p}} \sum_{m \in S_l^c} \tilde{h}(y, m) \right) \leq \left( \frac{p}{p_l} \right) e^{-\frac{1}{2}} + \sum_{l=p_l+1}^{\bar{p}} \sum_{j=0}^{p_l-1} \left( p_l \right) \left( p - p_l \right) e^{-\frac{(p_l-j)\lambda}{2}}. \]

Corollaries 12 follow from Lemma S13 noting that in variable selection there are \( |S_l| = \binom{p - p_l}{l-p_l} \) spurious models of size \( l \) and splitting the models in \( S^c \) according to how many variables from \( M_l \) they miss. For simplicity Corollaries 12 assume that the asymptotic bounds on \( E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \) apply uniformly across \( m \) for all \( n \geq n_0 \), but this assumption can be relaxed to the conditions specified in Lemma S13 and Lemma S14. The result is expressed in terms of \( \bar{\lambda}, \bar{\lambda} \), these can be loosely interpreted as the smallest signal-to-noise across all variables in \( M_t \) and are discussed in Section 5.4. For instance, if \( X'X = nl \) then one can take \( \bar{\lambda} = \bar{\lambda} = n \min_i (\theta_{ij}^2)/\phi^* \). The remainder of this section derives simpler asymptotic expressions for (14)-(16) for the three model priors \( p(M_k) \) in Section 3.1. We summarize our upcoming results. For \( m \in S \) and uniform \( p(M_k) \) one can handle \( p \leq \tau^{\alpha/2} \) variables, and then \( E_f^*(P(S \mid y)) \ll (p - p_l)/\tau^{\alpha/2} \) where \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) for Zellner’s and Normal priors and \( \alpha \in (0, 3) \) for the pMOM prior. The Beta-Binomial(1,1) allows up to \( p \leq \tau^\alpha \) variables for arbitrarily large but fixed \( a \), and even larger \( p \) under certain \( p(\theta_k \mid M_k) \), whereas under the Complexity prior \( p \) can be exponential in \( n \). For \( m \in S^c \) rates are exponential in \( \gamma \lambda^{\alpha^2}/2 - p_t \log(p) \) when \( p_m < p_t \) and \( \gamma \lambda^{\alpha^2}/2 - (\bar{p} - p_t) \log(p - p_t) \)
when $p_m \geq p_t$. That is, if $p_t \log(p) \ll \lambda\alpha'$ then the posterior mass on small $p_m$ models vanishes asymptotically, and that on large models when $(\bar{p} - p_t) \log(p - p_t) \ll \lambda\alpha'$.

We remark that such asymptotic expressions can be misleading. Specifically as $n \to \infty$ under the pairwise consistency Conditions (C1)-(C2) the contribution of $\tau(l-p_t)/r_{l,p_t}$ in (15)-(16) becomes negligible relative to that of $\Delta$ and $\bar{\lambda}$, but for finite $n$ the term $\tau(l-p_t)/r_{l,p_t}$ can have a marked detrimental effect on (15). A practical strategy is to evaluate numerically (14)-(16) for finite $n$. As an illustration we evaluated (14)-(15) for the Complexity($c = 1$) prior under four cases, the results are in Figure 1. The figure highlights how (15) becomes smaller than (14) for large enough $n$, i.e. asymptotically one can detect the truly active variables and the main difficulty is to discard $m \in S$, but for smaller $n$ then (15) can be orders of magnitude larger than (14). Case 1 considers $p = n$, $\bar{p} = n$, sparse $p_t = 5$ and a moderately strong $\lambda = \bar{\lambda} = 0.5n$. Case 2 considers larger $p = n^2$ and slightly less sparse $p_t = 10$, here asymptotics do not kick in until $n > 1000$. Cases 3-4 are analogous to Cases 1-2 but with smaller $\Delta = \bar{\lambda} = 0.25$ and suggest a marked drop in power relative to Cases 1-2. This is important in applications, e.g. under $X'X = nI$ then $\Delta = \bar{\lambda} = n \min(\beta_{ij}^2)/\phi^2$, Cases 1-2 correspond to a pairwise correlations between $y$ and each individual covariate $\geq 0.447$, and Cases 3-4 to correlations $\geq 0.243$. See Section 6 for further numerical experiments.

5.1. Uniform prior, $m \in S$. The uniform prior sets $r_{l,p_t} = 1$. Then $E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll 1/\tau^{\alpha(l-p_t)/2}$ for any $\alpha < 1$ under Zellner’s and Normal priors and $\alpha < 3$ under the pMOM prior, and (14) becomes

$$E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \approx \frac{\bar{p} - p_t}{\tau^{\alpha/2}} \leq \frac{1}{\tau^{\alpha/2}} \leq \sum_{m=1}^{\bar{p} - p_t} \frac{(p - p_t)}{\tau^{\alpha/2}} = \frac{\bar{p} - p_t}{\tau^{\alpha/2}} \frac{(p - p_t)}{\tau^{\alpha/2}}.$$

If $p - p_t \ll \tau^{\alpha/2}$ then $E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll (p - p_t)/\tau^{\alpha/2}$, providing a simple description of the effect of prior dispersion on sparsity. As an example under the unit information prior $\tau = n$, then one can handle up to $p - p_t \ll n^{1/2}$ variables under Zellner/Normal priors and $p - p_t \ll n^{3/2}$ under the pMOM. Another default is $\tau = \max\{n, p^{2+\alpha}\}$ for some small $\alpha > 0$ [Fernández et al., 2001], then $p - p_t \ll \tau^{\alpha/2}$ and $\lim_{n \to \infty} E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) = 0$ under Zellner’s, Normal and pMOM priors. The rates for the BIC and RIC are obtained by plugging $\tau = n$ and $\tau = p^2$ into (17).

5.2. Beta-Binomial prior, $m \in S$. The Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior sets $r_{l,p_t} = (p_t)/(p_t)$, hence

$$E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\bar{p}} \binom{l}{p_t} \frac{1}{\tau^{\alpha(l-p_t)/2}} \left[ \frac{(p - p_t)}{(p - l)!} \right]^{1-\alpha} \left[ 1 - \frac{(p - p_t)}{\tau^{\alpha/2}} \right]^{p_t-1} - 1.$$

The right-hand side follows from the binomial coefficient’s ordinary generating function and, if $\tau^{\alpha/2} \gg (p_t + 1)(p - p_t)^{1-\alpha}$, its limit is $e^{(p_t+1)(p-p_t)^{1-\alpha}/\tau^{\alpha/2}} - 1$. Hence

$$E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \ll e^{(p_t+1)(p-p_t)^{1-\alpha}/\tau^{\alpha/2}} - 1 \times \frac{(p_t + 1)(p - p_t)^{1-\alpha}}{\tau^{\alpha/2}}.$$
Since $\alpha$ can be taken arbitrarily close to 1, $S$ receives vanishing posterior mass as long as $p_t^{a+\epsilon}(p - p_t) \ll \tau^{a/2}$ for arbitrarily large but fixed $a > 0$ and any small $\epsilon > 0$. For instance, under $\tau = n$ one can handle up to $p_t \ll n^{a/2}$ and $p - p_t \ll n^{a/2}$, i.e. $p$ can grow polynomially with $n$.

We remark that one can obtain slightly tighter rates for specific priors. For instance, for Zellner’s prior and known $\phi^*$ Lemma S17 gives $E_{\theta^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \leq [\log(g)](p_m - p_t)/2 + 1/g$, where $g = \tau(p_m - p_t)/2r_{p_t, p_m}$, then Lemma S15 shows that

$$E_{\theta^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \frac{(p_t + 1)(p - p_t)^{a/2}}{\tau^{1/2}}$$

for any fixed $a > 1$, which is smaller than (18) as the dependence on $p$ is now logarithmic. Similarly, for unknown $\phi^*$ and Zellner’s prior Lemma S16 gives that

$$E_{\theta^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \frac{(p_t + 1)}{\tau^{1/2}}2^{[\log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t))]}(p - p_t)/(n - p).$$

5.3. Complexity prior, $m \in S$. Here $r_{l,p_t} \propto p^{l(p_l - l)}(p_{l+1})/(p_1)$, hence

$$E_{\theta^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{p} \left( \frac{l}{p_t} \right) \left( \frac{(p - p_t)^{1 - \alpha}}{\tau^{a/2} p^2} \right) -^{l-p_t} \leq 1 - \frac{(p - p_t)^{1 - \alpha}}{\tau^{a/2} p^2} - 1 \times \frac{(p_t + 1)(p - p_t)^{1 - \alpha}}{\tau^{a/2} p^2}.$$

Since $\alpha$ can be taken arbitrarily close to 1, $S$ receives vanishing posterior probability under the minimal requirement that $\tau \geq 1$.

5.4. Non-spurious models. Discarding $m \in S^c$ requires $\lambda_{tm}$ to grow quickly enough with $n$, and per Lemma S1 this is particularly critical for small models $p_m < p_t$. Corollary S2 obtains separate rates for $p_m < p_t$ and $p_m \geq p_t$. The rate for $p_m < p_t$ depends on a lower bound $\tilde{\lambda}_{\theta^*} \leq \lambda_{tm}/(p_t - p_m)$. Intuitively $\lambda_{tm}$ grows with $\theta^*_j$ and $p_t - p_m$, since smaller $p_m < p_t$ models miss more truly active variables. To help interpret Corollary S2, Lemma S3 shows that $\lambda_{tm}/(p_t - p_m) \geq v_{tm} \min_j(\theta^*_j)^2/\phi^*$ where $v_{tm} > 0$ depends on the projection of $X_t$ onto $X_m$, i.e. in Corollary S2 one can set $\tilde{\lambda}_{\theta^*} = \min_{m \in S^c, p_m < p_t} v_{tm} \min_j(\theta^*_j)^2/\phi^*$ and interpret $\tilde{\lambda}_{\theta^*}$ as the smallest signal-to-noise across all active variables.

Lemma 6. Let $M_m$ be a model with design matrix $X_m$, $p_m < p_t \leq n$ variables and $\lambda_{tm} = (\theta^*_j)^2 X_t^\top(I - X_m(X_m^\top X_m)^{-1}X_m^\top)X_t\theta^*_j/\phi^*$. If $X_t$ has rank $p_t$, then $\lambda_{tm} \geq v_{tm}q_{tm} \min_j(\theta^*_j)^2/\phi^*$, where $q_{tm} \geq p_t - p_m$ and $v_{tm}$ are the rank and smallest non-zero eigenvalue of $X_t^\top(I - X_m(X_m^\top X_m)^{-1}X_m^\top)X_t$ respectively.

Corollary 3. Assume that $E_{\theta^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \leq e^{-\gamma/\lambda_{tm}/2}$ for all $m \in S^c$ and $n \geq n_0$ and fixed $n_0$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For $M_m \in S^c$ let $s(m)$ be the number of variables included in $M_t$ but not in $M_m$. 

(i) Let $\Lambda > 0$ be such that $\Lambda^{\alpha'}(p_t - p_m) \leq \lambda_{tm}^\alpha$ for all $p_m < p_t$ and some $\alpha' < \alpha$. Then

$$E_f^* \left( \sum_{p_m=0}^{p_t-1} P(S_t^c \mid y) \right) \leq e^{-\gamma \Lambda^{\alpha'}/2 + (p_t-1) \log(p)}$$

(ii) Let $\bar{\Lambda} > 0$ be such that $\bar{\Lambda}^{\alpha'}(m) \leq \lambda_{tm}^\alpha$ for all $p_m > p_t$ and some $\alpha' < \alpha$. Assume that $\gamma \bar{\Lambda}^{\alpha'}/2 > \log(p/p_t)$ and $p_t \log(p_t) \ll \bar{p}$, then

$$E_f^* \left( \sum_{p_m \geq p_t} P(S_t^c \mid y) \right) \leq e^{-\gamma \bar{\Lambda}^{\alpha'}/2 + (\bar{p} - p_t + 1) \log(p - p_t)}.$$

Corollary 3 connects the rate to discard non-spurious $m \in S^c$ with non-centrality parameters $\lambda_{tm}$, $p_t$, $\bar{p}$ and $p$. For small models $p_m < p_t$ the rate is exponential in $\Lambda^{\alpha'}/2 - p_t \log p$, where $\alpha'$ satisfying $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha \geq \bar{\Lambda}^{\alpha'}(p_t - p_m)$ can typically be taken arbitrarily close to 1. For instance, from Lemma 6 $\lambda_{tm} \geq (p_t - p_m)\Lambda$ and under the minimal assumption that $\Lambda \geq p_t$ it is easy to show that $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha \geq (p_t - p_m)\bar{\Lambda}^{\alpha'}$ for any $\alpha' < 2\alpha - 1$. Since $\alpha$ is arbitrarily close to 1, so is $\alpha'$. A similar argument can be made for taking $\alpha$ close to 1 in Corollary 3(ii).

6. Empirical examples

We illustrate the effect of the prior formulation and signal strength on linear regression rates with two simple studies. Section 6.1 shows simulated data under orthogonal $X'X$ and Section 6.2 considers a setting where all pairwise correlations are 0.5, in both cases covariates are normally distributed with zero mean and unit variance. We considered three prior formulations: Zellner’s prior ($\tau = n$) coupled with either a Complexity($c = 1$) or Beta-Binomial(1,1) priors on the model space, and the pMOM prior (default postModeOrtho and modelSelection in R package mombf, respectively) with 10,000 iterations (i.e. $10^4 \times p$ variable updates) after 1,000 burnin.

6.1. Orthogonal design. We considered four scenarios and simulated 100 independent datasets under each. In Scenario 1 we set $p = 100$, $n = 105$ and $p_t = 5$ truly active variables with coefficients $\theta_j^* = 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 1.5$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p_t$. In Scenario 2 again $p = 100$, $n = 105$ but coefficients were less sparse, we set $p_t = 20$ by repeating four times each coefficient in Scenario 1, i.e. $\theta_j^* = 0.25, 0.25, 0.25, 0.25, \ldots, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5, 1.5$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p_t$. Scenarios 3-4 were identical to Scenarios 1-2 (respectively) setting $p = 500$ and $n = 510$. The true residual variance was $\phi^* = 1$ under all scenarios.

Figure 2 shows marginal inclusion probabilities $P(\theta_j \neq 0 \mid y)$. The Zellner-Complexity prior gave the smallest inclusion probabilities to truly inactive variables ($\theta_j^* = 0$), but incurred a significant loss in power to detect truly active variables. In agreement with our theory this drop was particularly severe for $p_t = 20$, e.g. when $n = 110$ inclusion...
\[ \theta_j^* = 0.5, \ p_t = 5, \ p = n \]
\[ \theta_j^* = 0.5, \ p_t = 10, \ p = n^2 \]

\[ \theta_j^* = 0.25, \ p_t = 5, \ p = n \]
\[ \theta_j^* = 0.25, \ p_t = 10, \ p = n^2 \]

\[ \theta_j^* = 0.5, \ p_t = 5, \ p = n \]
\[ \theta_j^* = 0.5, \ p_t = 10, \ p = n^2 \]

\[ \theta_j^* = 0.25, \ p_t = 5, \ p = n \]
\[ \theta_j^* = 0.25, \ p_t = 10, \ p = n^2 \]

Figure 1. Variable selection. Upper bounds for spurious \( E_{f^*}(P(S \mid y)) \) and small non-spurious \( E_{f^*}(\sum_{t=0}^{p_t-1} P(S^c_t \mid y)) \) models under a Complexity\((c = 1)\) prior.

Probabilities were close to 0 even for fairly large coefficients. Also as predicted by the theory the power increased for \((n, p) = (510, 500)\) under all priors, but under the Zellner-Complexity prior it remained low for \( \theta_j^* = 0.25 \). The MOM-Beta-Binomial prior showed
Figure 2. Average marginal inclusion probabilities under orthogonal $X'X$ and $\phi^* = 1$ for three prior formulations: Zellner-Complexity(1), Zellner-Beta-Binomial(1,1), pMOM-Beta-Binomial(1,1). For both Zellner’s and pMOM priors $\tau$ was set to obtain unit prior variance ($\tau = n$, $\tau = 0.348n$) a good balance between power and sparsity, although for $n = 100$ it had slightly lower power to detect $\theta^*_j = 0.25$ relative to the Zellner-Beta-Binomial.
Scenario 1: \( p_t = 10, p = n, \theta_j^* = 0.5 \)

Scenario 2: \( p_t = 10, p = n, \theta_j^* = 0.25 \)

Figure 3. Linear regression simulation with pairwise correlations\(= 0.5 \). Average \( p(M_t \mid y) \), \( P(S \mid y) \) and \( \sum_{l<p_t} P(S_l^c \mid y) \) under Zellner-Complexity(1), Zellner-Beta-Binomial(1,1), \( pMOM-Beta-Binomial(1,1) \) priors.
6.2. Correlated predictors. We considered normally-distributed covariates with all pairwise correlations equal to 0.5. We set $p = n$, $p_t = 10$ and considered two scenarios. In Scenario 1 $\theta_j^* = 0.5$ for all active variables $j = 1, \ldots, p_t$, whereas Scenario 2 considered weaker signals $\theta_j^* = 0.25$ again for $j = 1, \ldots, p_t$. Figure 3 shows that whichever prior achieved largest $p(M_t | y)$ depended on $n$ and the signal strength. As predicted by Corollary 1 for large enough $n$ all three priors discarded small non-spurious models, i.e. $\sum_{t<p} P(S^*_t | y)$ vanished, but the required $n$ can be fairly large. Overall, the MOM-Beta-Binomial prior achieved a reasonable compromise between discarding spurious $m \in S$ and detecting truly active variables.

7. Discussion

We proposed a generic strategy to obtain PC rates for posterior probabilities and for pseudo-posterior probabilities obtained by renormalizing $L_0$ penalties, and showed that these guarantee asymptotically valid UQ in model selection. In variable selection the rates unify current literature and clarify how the critical formulation aspects are the complexity penalization via prior dispersion and model prior probabilities, and whether the prior is local or non-local. The critical aspects of the data are $n$, $p$, true underlying sparsity $p_t$ and the signal strength as given by non-centrality parameters, which depend on the size of non-zero KL-optimal coefficients and the correlation structure in $X$. Model misspecification also plays a role, e.g. omitting or misspecifying covariate effects lead to an exponential drop in power. We gave simple expressions describing how the posterior concentrates on the optimal model, or any other subset of the model space, for several popular priors. We did not study prior aspects such as thick-tailed parameter priors, but such variations typically affect model selection rates only up to lower-order terms (asymptotically). For instance for a wide class of local priors it is well-known that for spurious models $B_{mt} = O_p(1/\tau^{(p_m-p_t)/2})$ [Dawid 1999], which implies that their $L_1$ rates cannot be any faster, and our obtained $L_1$ rates are $1/\tau^{\alpha(p_m-p_t)/2}$ (or tighter) for any fixed $\alpha < 1$. This is an interesting contrast to the results in Castillo et al. [2015], who showed that to attain asymptotically optimal minimax parameter estimation one should use Laplace or even thicker tails. We also avoided a detailed study of eigenvalues and imposing conditions on the design matrix. This was to highlight the main principles (the role of non-centrality parameters) and keep the results as general as possible. For a study on eigenvalues see Narisetty and He [2014] (Remarks 4-5 and Lemma 6.1) and references therein. Conceptually our findings should apply to other asymptotically Normal regression models, but a rigorous proof requires a technical treatment beyond our scope.

An interesting observation is that, depending on how large $p$ is relative to $n$ one can consider less sparse priors, this opens a venue to detect smaller signals and may have implications for parameter estimation. This is particularly relevant when the truth is non-sparse, effect sizes are small or the model is strongly misspecified. As future research it would be exciting to develop strategies to study frequentist properties for a problem at hand, that is one has observed some data with a given $n$, $p$ and other characteristics, say the sample correlations between covariates. It would be interesting to study various model
selection procedures conditional on this information, particularly given that asymptotic optimality can be misleading.
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SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Section S1 provides a number of auxiliary results required for our derivations. These include bounds on central and non-central chi-square and F distributions, obtaining non-centrality parameters and bounding Bayesian F-test statistics for nested linear models, and bounding certain high-dimensional deterministic sums (e.g. as arising in establishing posterior consistency for variable selection under Zellner’s prior). The remaining sections provide proofs for all our main and auxiliary results.

S1. AUXILIARY RESULTS

A1. Chi-square and F-distribution bounds. For convenience Lemma S1 states well-known chi-square tail bounds. Lemmas S2–S3 provide Chernoff and useful related bounds for left and right non-central chi-square tails. In Lemmas S5–S4 we derived convenient moment-generating function-based bounds for the ratio of a non-central divided by a central chi-square variables, in particular including the F-distribution when the two variables are independent. Finally, Lemma S6 gives moment bounds used in our theorems to characterize extreme events.

Lemma S1. Chernoff bounds for chi-square tails
Let $W \sim \chi^2_\nu$. For any $w > \nu$

$$P(W > w) \leq \left( \frac{ew}{\nu} \right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} e^{-w/2}.$$ 

Further, for any $w < \nu$

$$P(W < w) \leq \left( \frac{ew}{\nu} \right)^{\frac{\nu}{2}} e^{-w/2}.$$ 

Lemma S2. Chernoff bounds for non-central chi-square left tails
Let $W \sim \chi^2_\nu(\lambda)$ be a chi-square with non-centrality parameter $\lambda$ and $w < \lambda$. Then

$$P(W < w) \leq \exp\{ \frac{\lambda s}{1 - 2s} - sw \} \frac{1}{(1 - 2s)^{\nu/2}}$$
for any \( s < 0 \), and the right hand side is minimized for \( s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{4w} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\nu^2}{4w^2} + \frac{\lambda}{w}} \). In particular, setting \( s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{w}} \) gives
\[
P(W < w) \leq \frac{\exp\{-\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda} - \sqrt{w})^2\}}{(\lambda/w)^{\nu/4}}.
\]

**Lemma S3.** Chernoff bounds for non-central chi-square right tails

Let \( W \sim \chi^2_{\nu}(\lambda) \). Let \( w > \lambda + \nu \), then
\[
P(W > w) \leq \frac{\exp\{\frac{\lambda s}{1 - 2s} - sw\}}{(1 - 2s)^{\nu/2}}
\]
for any \( s \in (0, \frac{1}{2}) \), and the right hand side is minimized for \( s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{4w} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\nu^2}{4w^2} + \frac{\lambda}{w}} \).

In particular, setting \( s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\lambda/w} \) gives
\[
P(W > w) \leq e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\nu}{\lambda\nu}\right)^2} \left(\frac{w}{\lambda}\right)^\nu.
\]

Alternatively, one may set \( s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{2w} \) to obtain
\[
P(W > w) \leq \left(\frac{ew}{\nu}\right)^\nu e^{-\frac{\nu}{2} + \frac{\nu}{2} (1 - \frac{\nu}{\lambda\nu})}
\]

**Lemma S4.** Moment-generating function-based bounds for right F tails

Let \( W = U_1/\nu_2/(U_2/\nu_1) \) where \( U_1 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_1}(\lambda), U_2 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_2}, \lambda \geq 0, \nu_1 \geq 1 \) and \( \nu_2 \geq 1 \). In particular, if \( U_1 \) and \( U_2 \) are independent then \( W \sim F(\lambda, \nu_1, \nu_2) \). Let \( w > \lambda + \nu_1 \).

(i) Consider the case \( \lambda = 0 \). Then for any \( s \in (\nu_1/w, 1) \),
\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq \left(\frac{ews}{\nu_1}\right)^{\frac{\nu_1}{\nu_2}} e^{-ws/2} + (es)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}} e^{-\nu_2/2}.
\]

(ii) Consider the case \( \lambda > 0 \). Then for any \( s \in ((\lambda + \nu_1)/w, 1) \)
\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq \frac{e^{\frac{\lambda - t}{2} - tws}}{(1 - 2t)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}} + (es)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}} e^{-\nu_2/2},
\]
where \( t \in (0, 1/2) \), and the right hand side is minimized by setting \( t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu_1}{4ws} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\nu^2}{4w^2} + \frac{\lambda}{w}} \).

In particular, we may set \( t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{ws}} \) to obtain
\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq e^{-\frac{\nu_2}{2} + \frac{\nu}{\lambda\nu}} \left(\frac{ws}{\lambda}\right)^{\frac{\nu_1}{\nu_2}} + (es)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}} e^{-\nu_2/2}.
\]

Alternatively, we may also set \( t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu_1}{2ws} \) to obtain
\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq \left(\frac{ews}{\nu_1}\right)^{\frac{\nu_1}{2}} e^{-\lambda/2} e^{-\frac{\nu_2}{2} (1 - \lambda/\nu_1)} + (es)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}} e^{-\nu_2/2}.
\]
Corollary S1. Let \( W = U_1 \nu_2 / (U_2 \nu_1) \) where \( U_1 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_1}(\lambda), U_2 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_2}, \nu_1 \geq 1 \) and \( \nu_2 > \nu_1/(2 - \sqrt{3}) \). Consider \( w \in ((\nu_1 + \lambda)/(2 - \sqrt{3}), \nu_2) \).

(i) If \( \lambda = 0 \), then

\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq \left( \frac{e \nu_1}{\nu_2} \right)^{\frac{w}{\lambda}} e^{-\frac{w}{\lambda}} \left( 1 - \sqrt{2w/\nu_2} \right) + e^{-\frac{w}{\lambda}}.
\]

(ii) If \( \lambda > 0 \), then

\[
P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq \left( \frac{w}{\lambda} \right)^{\frac{w}{\lambda}} e^{-\frac{w}{\lambda}} \left( 1 - \sqrt{\lambda/(w(1-\sqrt{2w/\nu_2}))} \right)^2 + e^{-\frac{w}{\lambda}}.
\]

Lemma S5. Moment-generating function-based bounds for left F tails

Let \( W = U_1 \nu_2 / (U_2 \nu_1) \) where \( U_1 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_1}(\lambda), U_2 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_2}, \lambda \geq 0, \nu_1 \geq 1 \) and \( \nu_2 \geq 1 \). Then for any \( s \geq 1 \) and \( t < 0 \)

\[
P(\nu_1 W < w) \leq \exp \left\{ \frac{M}{1 - tws} \right\} + e^{-\frac{s}{2} (s - 1 - \log(s))},
\]

and the right hand side is minimized for \( t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu_1}{2ws} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\nu_1^2}{4ws^2} + \frac{\lambda}{ws}} \). Further, if \( s < \lambda/w \) we may set \( t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{ws}} \) to obtain

\[
P(\nu_1 W < w) \leq \frac{e^{-\frac{s}{2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{ws}{\lambda}} \right)^2}}{(\lambda/(ws))^{\frac{s^2}{4}}} + e^{-\frac{s}{2} (s - 1 - \log(s))}.
\]

Lemma S6. Moment bounds for F distribution

Let \( W \sim F(\nu_1, \nu_2) \) be an F-distributed random variable with degrees of freedom \( \nu_1 \geq 1, \nu_2 > 4 \). Then for any \( w > \nu_2 / (\nu_2 - 2) \), \( s \in [1, \nu_2/2 - 2] \)

\[
(S.1) \quad P(W > w) < a \left( \frac{\nu_2 (s + \nu_1/2 - 1)}{\nu_1 w (\nu_2/2 - s - 1)} \right)^s \left( 1 - \frac{s}{\nu_2/2 - 1} \right)^{\nu_2 - 1} \frac{(\nu_1 w/2 - 1)^{\nu_1 - 1}}{(\nu_1/2 - 1)^{\nu_1 - 1} \Gamma(\nu_1 > 2)} \left( 1 - (w - 1) \nu_1/2 - 1 \right)^{\nu_2 - 1}.
\]

where \( a = e^{\frac{\lambda}{2}}/(\pi \sqrt{2}) \) if \( \nu_1 = 1 \), \( a = e^{2 - \sqrt{2\pi}} \) if \( \nu_1 = 2 \) and \( a = e^{2/(2\pi)} \) if \( \nu_1 > 2 \).

Consider \( s = \min\{ (w - 1)\nu_1/2 + 1, \nu_2/2 - 2 \} \). If \( w \leq (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6) / \nu_1 \) then \( P(W > w) < a \left( 1 + \frac{\nu_1 (w - 1) + 4}{\nu_2 - \nu_1 (w - 1) - 4} \right)^{(w - 1)\nu_1/2 + 1} \frac{(\nu_1 w/2 - 1)^{\nu_1 - 1}}{(\nu_1/2 - 1)^{\nu_1 - 1} \Gamma(\nu_1 > 2)} \left( 1 - (w - 1) \nu_1/2 - 1 \right)^{\nu_2 - 1} \)

where

\[
\left( 1 + \frac{\nu_1 (w - 1) + 4}{\nu_2 - \nu_1 (w - 1) - 4} \right)^{(w - 1)\nu_1/2} \leq e^{\frac{\nu_1 (w - 1) \nu_1 (w - 1) + 2}{2(\nu_2 - \nu_1 (w - 1) - 2)}}
\]

and

\[
\left( 1 - \frac{(w - 1) \nu_1/2 - 1}{\nu_2/2 - 1} \right)^{\nu_2 - 1} < e^{-\frac{\nu_1 (w - 1) \nu_1 (w - 1) + 2}{2}} e^{\frac{\nu_1 (w - 1) \nu_1 (w - 1) + 2}{2}}.
\]
If \( w > (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)/\nu_1 \) then

\[
P(W > w) < ae \left( \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}{\nu_1 w} \right)^{\frac{\nu_1}{2} - 2} \left( \frac{\nu_1/2 + \nu_2/2 - 3}{\nu_1/2 - 1} \right)^{\nu_1 - 1} \frac{1}{(\nu_1/2 - 1)^{\frac{\nu_1}{2}}} I(\nu_1 > 2) \frac{1}{(\nu_2/2 - 1)^{\frac{\nu_2}{2}}}.
\]

**A2. Non-centrality parameter for nested models.** For convenience Lemma [S7] states a known result on the difference of sum of squares between nested linear models (proven in the supplementary material). Lemma [S8] is an extension to misspecified linear models and Lemma [S9] is an extension to heteroskedastic errors. Lemmas S10-S11 characterize the distribution and tails of Normal shrinkage estimators and related F-test statistics.

**Lemma S7.** Consider two nested Normal linear regression models \( M_m \subset M_q \) with respective full-rank design matrices \( X_m \) and \( X_q = (X_m, X_s) \), where \( X_s \) are the columns in \( X_q \) not contained in \( X_m \). Let \( H_m = X_m(X_m'X_m)^{-1}X_m' \) and \( H_q = X_q(X_q'X_q)^{-1}X_q' \) be the projection matrices for \( M_m \) and \( M_q \). Assume that truly \( f^*(y) = N(y; X_q\theta_q^*, \phi^*I) \), where potentially some or all of the entries in \( \theta_q^* \) can be zero and \( \theta_q^* = (\theta_q^*\theta_s^*)' \). Let \( \hat{\theta}_q \) and \( \tilde{\theta}_m \) be the least squares estimates, then

\[
\frac{1}{\phi^*} (\theta_q^*X_q'X_q\hat{\theta}_q - \theta_q^*X_q'X_m\tilde{\theta}_m) \sim \chi^2_{p_q - p_m}(\lambda_{qm}),
\]

where \( \lambda_{qm} = (X_q\theta_q^*)'(I - H_m)X_q\theta_q^*/\phi^* = (X_q\theta_q^*)'H_q(I - H_m)H_qX_q\theta_q^*/\phi^* \).

**Lemma S8.** Consider two linear regression models \( M_m \subset M_q \) as in Lemma [S7] and let \( \hat{\theta}_m \) and \( \hat{\theta}_q \) be the least squares estimates. Assume that truly \( f^*(y) = N(y; W\beta^*, \xi^*I) \) and let \( \theta_q^* = (X_q'X_q)^{-1}X_q'W\beta^* \) be the KL-optimal regression coefficient. Then

\[
\frac{1}{\xi^*} \theta_q^*X_q'X_q\hat{\theta}_q - \theta_q^*X_q'X_m\tilde{\theta}_m \sim \chi^2_{p_q - p_m}(\lambda_{qm}),
\]

where \( \lambda_{qm} = (X_q\theta_q^*)'(I - H_m)X_q\theta_q^*/\xi^* = (W\beta^*)'H_q(I - H_m)H_qW\beta^*/\xi^* \).

**Lemma S9.** Let \( X_q = (X_m, X_s) \) as in Lemma [S7], where \( p_q \leq n \). Assume that truly \( y \sim N(X_q\theta_q^*, \phi^*\Sigma^*) \) where potentially some or all of the entries in \( \theta_q^* \) can be zero and \( \theta_q^* = (\theta_q^*\theta_s^*)' \). Assume that \( \sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma^{i} = n \), so that \( n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(y_i) = \phi^* \). Let \( \hat{\theta}_q \) and \( \tilde{\theta}_m \) be the least squares estimates, \( \hat{X}_s = X_s - X_m(X_m'X_m)^{-1}X_m'X_s \). Let \( \tilde{\phi}(A) \) be the smallest and largest eigenvalue of \( A \).

(i) Let \( \omega_{mq} = \tilde{\phi}(\hat{X}_s'\Sigma\hat{X}_s(\hat{X}_s'\hat{X}_s)^{-1}) \), \( \omega_{mq} = \tilde{\phi}(\tilde{X}_s'\Sigma\tilde{X}_s(\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}) \). Then

\[
\omega_{mq} Z_1 \leq \frac{\hat{\theta}_q'X_q'X_q\hat{\theta}_q - \theta_q^*X_q'X_m\tilde{\theta}_m}{\phi^*} \leq \omega_{mq} Z_1
\]

where \( Z_1 \sim \chi^2_{p_q - p_m}(\lambda_{qm}) \), \( \lambda_{qm} = (\theta_q^*)'W^{-1}\theta_q^* \) and \( W = (\hat{X}_s'\hat{X}_s)^{-1}\hat{X}_s'\Sigma\hat{X}_s(\hat{X}_s'\hat{X}_s)^{-1} \).

Further,

\[
\frac{1}{\omega_{mq}} \lambda_{qm} \leq \lambda_{qm} \leq \frac{1}{\omega_{mq}} \lambda_{qm},
\]
where \( \lambda_{qm} = (\theta_q^*)'X_q'(I - X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X_m)X_q\theta_s^*/\phi^* \).

(ii) Let \( L_q \) be the set of \( n \times (n - p_q) \) matrices \( T \) such that the matrix \( (X_q, T) \) is full-rank. Define \( \tilde{T} = (I - X_q(X'_qX_q)^{-1}X'_q)'T \), \( \omega_q = \max_{L_q} \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{T}\Sigma\tilde{T}((\tilde{T}\tilde{T})^{-1}) \) and \( \omega_q = \min_{L_q} \tilde{\omega}(\tilde{T}\Sigma\tilde{T}((\tilde{T}\tilde{T})^{-1}) \). Then

\[
\frac{\omega_{mq}Z_1}{\omega_qZ_2} \leq \frac{\hat{\theta}_q'X_qX_q\hat{\theta}_q - \hat{\theta}_m'X_mX_m\hat{\theta}_m}{y'y - \theta_q'X_qX_q\theta_q} \leq \frac{\omega_{mq}Z_1}{\omega_qZ_2},
\]

where \( Z_1 \) is as in Part (i) and \( Z_2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p_q} \).

**Lemma S10.** Assume that truly \( y \sim N(X_q\theta_q^*, \phi^*I) \). Let \( \hat{\theta}_q = (X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)X_q'y \) where \( V_q \) is positive-definite, \( \mu = (X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}X_q'X_q\theta_q \) and \( \Sigma = (X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}X_q'X_q(X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1} \). Denote by \( \hat{\theta}_{qi}, \theta_q^* \) and \( \mu_i \) the \( i^{th} \) entry in \( \hat{\theta}, \theta_q^* \) and \( \mu \) respectively, by \( \sigma_{qi} \) the element \((i, i)\) in \( \Sigma, x_{qi} \) the \( i^{th} \) column in \( X_q \), and by \( X_m \) the matrix obtained by removing the \( i^{th} \) column in \( X_q \). Then

\[
\frac{\hat{\theta}_{qi}^2}{\phi^*\sigma_{qi}} \sim \chi^2_{n-p_q} \left( \frac{\mu_i^2}{(\phi^*\sigma_{qi})^2} \right).
\]

Let \( \tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = (X_q'(I - X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X'_m)x_{qi})^{-1} \) and \( \lambda_{qi} = (\theta_{qi}^*)^2/(\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}\phi^*) \), then

\[
\frac{\tau^2\rho_{pq}}{\tau^2\rho_{pq} + 1} \leq \frac{\sigma_{ii}}{\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}} \leq \frac{\tau^2\rho_{pq}}{\tau^2\rho_{pq} + 1} \leq (1 - 2\delta_{pq}^*) \leq (1 + 2\delta_{pq}^*) \leq \lambda_{qi} \left( 1 - 2\delta_{pq}^* \right) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\tau^2\rho_{pq}} \right) \leq \lambda_{qi} \left( 1 + 2\delta_{pq}^* \right) \left( 1 + \frac{1}{\tau^2\rho_{pq}} \right)
\]

where \( \delta_{pq}^* = \sqrt{\left( \theta_q^*\theta_q^*/(\tau\rho_{pq} + 1)|\theta_{pq}^*| \right)} \) and \( \rho_{pq} \geq \ldots \geq \rho_{pq} > 0 \) are the eigenvalues of \( V_qX_q'X_q \).

**Lemma S11.** Assume that truly \( y \sim N(X_q\theta_q^*, \phi^*I) \) and let \( \theta_q, \lambda_{qi}, V_q \) and \( \rho_{pq} \geq \ldots \geq \rho_{pq} > 0 \) be as in Lemma S10. Let \( \tilde{s}_q = \tilde{\sigma}_q^* + y'y - y'X_q(X_q'X_q + \tau^{-1}V_q^{-1})^{-1}X_q'y \). Assume that, as \( n \to \infty \), \( \tau_{pq} \gg 1 \) and \( \tau_{pq} \gg \sqrt{(\theta_{pq}^*)^2/|\theta_{pq}^*|} \).

(i) Let \( \theta_{pq}^* \neq 0 \) and \( h_n > 0 \) be a sequence satisfying \( h_n \gg \phi^*/(\theta_{pq}^*)^2 \). Then for any fixed \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \), \( n \to \infty \),

\[
P\left( \frac{\hat{\theta}_{pq}^2}{\tilde{s}_q/(n - p_q)} < \frac{1}{h_n} \right) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{pq}/2} + e^{-(n - p_q)^\gamma}
\]

\[
P\left( \prod_{i=1}^{p_q} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{pq}^2}{\tilde{s}_q/(n - p_q)} < \frac{1}{h_n^p} \right) \ll p_q(e^{-\gamma \min_i \lambda_{pq}/2} + e^{-(n - p_q)^\gamma}).
\]
(ii) Let \( \theta_{qi}^* \neq 0 \) and \( \hat{h}_n \gg (\theta_{qi}^*)^2/\phi^* \). Then for any fixed \( \gamma \in (0,1) \), as \( n \to \infty \),
\[
P \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}^2_{qi}}{s_q/(n-p_q)} > \hat{h}_n \right) \ll e^{-\gamma h_n/(2\sigma_{pi})} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma}/2 \ll e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma}/2.
\]

(iii) Let \( \theta_{qi}^* = 0 \) and \( \hat{h}_n \gg \sigma_{pi} \). Then for any fixed \( \gamma \in (0,1) \), as \( n \to \infty \),
\[
P \left( \frac{\hat{\beta}^2_{qi}}{s_q/(n-p_q)} > \hat{h}_n \right) \ll e^{-\gamma h_n/(2\sigma_{pi})} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma}/2 \ll e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma}/2.\]

A3. Bound for a Bayesian F-test statistic under a general Normal prior.

Lemma S12. For any model \( k \) let \( s_k = y'y - y'X_k(X_k'X_k)^{-1}X_k'y \) and \( \hat{s}_k = l_\phi + y'y - y'X_k(X_k'X_k + \tau^{-1}V_k^{-1})^{-1}X_k'y \) where \( \tau > 0 \), \( l_\phi > 0 \), and \( V_k \) is a symmetric positive-definite matrix. In particular \( s_0 = y'y \) denotes the sum of squared residuals under the model with no covariates. Let \( m \) be a given model and for any other model \( k \) define \( F_{mk} = \frac{(s_k - s_m)/(p_m - p_k)}{s_m/(n-p_m)} \) and \( \hat{F}_{mk} = \frac{(\hat{s}_k - \hat{s}_m)/(\hat{p}_m - \hat{p}_k)}{\hat{s}_m/(\hat{n} - \hat{p}_m)} \). Then, for any model \( t \), it holds that
\[
1 \leq \frac{\hat{s}_k}{\hat{s}_t} \leq 1 + \frac{(s_0 - s_t)/s_t}{1 + \tau \rho_{t,p}}
\]
and that
\[
(p_m - p_t)\hat{F}_{mt} \leq \frac{\tau\rho_{t,p}}{1 + \tau\rho_{t,p}}(p_m - p_t)F_{mt} + \frac{1}{1 + \tau\rho_{t,p}}p_m F_{m0},
\]
where \( \rho_{tp} \) denotes the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of \( V_tX_t'X_t \).

A4. Asymptotic bounds on series. Lemma \[ S13 \] provides sufficient conditions to bound the total posterior probability assigned to \( S_l \) and \( S^c_l \), and to unions thereof such as \( S \) and \( S^c \). In turn, sufficient conditions for Lemma \[ S13 \] (i) are that \( \sigma_{l,n}/b_n \) is a (non-strictly) decreasing series in \( n \) for all \( n \geq n_0 \) with common \( n_0 \) across all \( l \), or alternatively that \( \lim\n\to\infty \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\hat{p}} \sigma_{l,n+1}/b_{n+1} \leq \lim\n\to\infty \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\hat{p}} \sigma_{l,n}/b_n < \infty \).

Lemma \[ S14 \] provides sufficient conditions to bound the total posterior probability across different model subsets \( A_{l,n} \) that are indexed by some model characteristic \( l \), say its total number of variables or the number of active variables, by adding asymptotic bounds for each specific \( A_{l,n} \). Corollary \[ S2 \] is a specialization to the case where all models have a common asymptotic bound, for instance in our variable selection examples all spurious models \( k \in S \) of equal size \( p_k \) share such a bound. Lemmas \[ S13, S15, S16 \] are auxiliary results to bound the total posterior probability assigned to spurious models under Zellner’s prior when the residual variance is assumed either known or unknown, respectively.

Lemma S13. Let \( a_n^{(l)} \) and \( \hat{a}_n^{(l)} \) be sequences such that, as \( n \to \infty \), \( E_f^*(p(M_k \mid y)) \ll a_n^{(l)} \) for all \( l \in S_l \) and \( E_f^*(p(M_k \mid y)) \ll \hat{a}_n^{(l)} \) for all \( l \in S^c_l \). Denote by \( \sigma_{i,n} = \sum_{k \in S_l} E_f^*(p(M_k \mid y)) \), \( \sigma_{i,n} = \sum_{k \in S^c_l} E_f^*(p(M_k \mid y)) \) the mean posterior probability assigned to size \( l \) spurious and non-spurious models respectively.
Let \( b_n = \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\tilde{p}} a_n^{(l)} |S_l|/(\tilde{p} - p_t) \). Suppose that the following two conditions hold
\[
\sigma_{\tilde{p}, n} \ll b_n
\]
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\tilde{p}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n+1}}{b_{n+1}} - \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{b_n} = 0.
\]
Then \( E_f(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\tilde{p}} a_n^{(l)} |S_l| \).

(ii) Let \( \tilde{b}_n = \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_n^{(l)} |S_l|/(\tilde{p} + 1) \). Suppose that the following two conditions hold
\[
\tilde{\sigma}_{\tilde{p}, n} \ll \tilde{b}_n
\]
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{p}} \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{l,n+1}}{\tilde{b}_{n+1}} - \frac{\tilde{\sigma}_{l,n}}{\tilde{b}_n} = 0.
\]
Then \( E_{f^*}(P(S^c \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{\tilde{p}} \tilde{a}_n^{(l)} |S_l^c| + \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\tilde{p}} a_n^{(l)} |S_l| \).

Lemma S14. Let \( A_{l,n} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, K\} \) be subsets of the model space indexed by \( l = l_{n}^{(0)}, \ldots, l_{n}^{(1)} \), where their size \( |A_{l,n}| \) may grow with \( n \). Let \( g_{n}^{(l)} > 0 \) be a set of decreasing series also indexed by \( l = l_{n}^{(0)}, \ldots, l_{n}^{(1)} \). Denote by \( \sigma_{l,n} = \sum_{k \in A_{l,n}} E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \) and by \( \bar{g}_{n} = \sum_{l=0}^{l_{n}^{(1)}} g_{n}^{(l)}/(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1) \). Assume that the following two conditions hold
(i) \( \sigma_{l_{n}^{(1)}, n} \ll \bar{g}_{n} \)
(ii) \( \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=0}^{l_{n}^{(0)}} \sigma_{l,n+1}/\bar{g}_{n+1} - \sigma_{l,n}/\bar{g}_{n} \leq 0 \)
Then \( \sum_{l=0}^{l_{n}^{(1)}} \sum_{k \in A_{l,n}} E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{l_{n}^{(1)}} g_{n}^{(l)} \).

Corollary S2. Let \( A_n \subseteq \{1, \ldots, K\} \) be a subset of the model space, where \( |A_n| \) may grow with \( n \). Assume that \( \mu_{k,n} = E_{f^*}(p(M_k \mid y)) \ll b_n \) as \( n \to \infty \) for all \( k \in A_n \), where \( b_n > 0 \). Assume that the following condition holds
\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} \mu_{k,n+1}/b_{n+1} - \mu_{k,n}/b_n \leq 0.
\]
Then \( \sum_{k \in A_n} \mu_{k,n} \leq |A_n| b_n \).

Lemma S15. Let \( \tau, p, \bar{p} \leq p, p_t \leq \bar{p} \) be such that as \( n \to \infty, \tau^{1/2} \gg (p_t + 1)(\bar{p} - p_t)^{a/2} \log^{3/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t)) \), \( p_t \geq 1, p \geq 1, \bar{p} \geq 1 \). Then for any fixed \( a > 1 \) it holds that
\[
\sum_{l=p_t+1}^{\bar{p}} \left( \frac{l}{p_t} \right) (l - p_t) \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t)) \leq \frac{(p_t + 1)(\bar{p} - p_t)^{a/2} \log^{3/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t))}{\tau^{1/2}}
\]

Lemma S16. Let \( P(S \mid y) \) be the posterior probability assigned to spurious models with \( p_k \leq \bar{p} \) variables under Zellner’s prior \( p(\theta_k, \phi \mid M_k) = N(\theta_k; 0, \tau \phi(X_k^t X_k)^{-1}) IG(\phi; a_\phi, l_\phi) \).
and let \( p \) be the total number of variables. Let \( p(M_k) = \binom{(\bar{p} + 1)}{p}^{-1} \) be Beta-Binomial\((1,1)\) prior probabilities on the models. Assume that truly \( y \sim N(X; \theta_1; \phi I) \) for some \( t \) with \( p_t \leq \bar{p} \). Assume also that as \( n \to \infty \) it holds that \((\bar{p} - p_t) \log(\tau(p - p_t)) \ll n - \bar{p} \) and that \([\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t)]^\alpha \ll \tau^{1/2} \), where \( \alpha = \sqrt{(\bar{p} - p_t)[\log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t))]/(n - \bar{p})} \). Then
\[
E_{P^*}(P(S \mid y)) \leq \left(\frac{p_t + 1}{\tau^{1/2}}\right)^{2[\log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_t))]/\sqrt{(p - p_t)/(n - \bar{p})}}.
\]

A5. Tail integral bounds for chi-square and F distributions. Lemmas S17-S18 adapt Lemmas 3.4 to chi-square and F-distributed random variables \( W \). For simplicity Lemmas S17-S18 state asymptotic bounds as \( g \to \infty \) and one should think of \( \alpha \) and \( d \) as being arbitrarily close to 1 and 2 (respectively), but the proofs also provide non-asymptotic bounds.

**Lemma S17.** Let \( g > 0 \) and \( W \sim \chi^2_\nu \) where \( \nu \) may depend on \( g \) and, as \( g \to \infty \), \( \log g \gg \nu \).

(i) Let \( d \geq 2 \) and \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) be fixed constants. Then, as \( g \to \infty \),
\[
\int_0^1 P\left(W > d \log \left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du \leq \frac{1}{g} \left(\frac{4e^\nu}{\nu}\right)^{\nu/2} \left[\log \left(\frac{g}{e^{\nu/4}}\right)\right]^{\nu+1} \ll \frac{1}{g^\alpha}.
\]

(ii) Let \( d \in (1,2) \) and \( \alpha \in (0,1) \) be fixed constants. Then, as \( g \to \infty \),
\[
\int_0^1 P\left(W > d \log \left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du \leq \left(\frac{1}{g}\right)^{d-1} \left[\frac{4e^{3/4}}{\nu}\right]^{\nu/2} \left[\log \left(\frac{g}{e^{\nu/3}}\right)\right]^\nu \ll \frac{1}{g^{\alpha(d-1)}}.
\]

**Lemma S18.** Let \( F \sim F_{\nu_1, \nu_2} \), \( d > 1 \) be a fixed constant and \( g > 0 \) be a function of \((\nu_1, \nu_2)\).

(i) Assume that \( \nu_1 \ll \log(g) \ll \nu_2 \) as \( \nu_2 \to \infty \). Then, for any fixed \( \alpha \in (0, d - 1) \),
\[
\int_0^1 P\left(\nu_1 F > d \log \left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du \leq e^{\nu_1}\frac{1}{g} + \frac{e^{-\nu_1}}{g^{d-1-d}} \left[\frac{1}{\nu_2}\log \left(\frac{g}{\nu_2}\right)\right]^{\nu_2} \ll \frac{1}{g^\alpha}.
\]

(ii) Assume that \( \nu_1 \ll \nu_2 \ll \log^\gamma(g) \) as \( \nu_2 \to \infty \) for all fixed \( \gamma < 1 \). Then, for any fixed \( \alpha < 1 \),
\[
\int_0^1 P\left(\nu_1 F > d \log \left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du \ll \exp \left\{-\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2} \log \left(\frac{\log^\alpha(g)}{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}\right)\right\}.
\]

**S2. Proof of Lemma 1**

The result follows from simple observations and Markov’s inequality. We first prove the result when \( \hat{k} = \arg \max_k p(M_k \mid y) \) is the posterior mode. If \( p(M_1 \mid y) > 1/2 \) then \( \hat{k} = t \), therefore
\[
P_{P^*}(\hat{k} = t) \geq P_{P^*}(p(M_1 \mid y) \geq 1/2).
\]
This implies
\[ P_{f^*}(\hat{k} \neq t) \leq P_{f^*}(p(M_t \mid y) < 1/2) = P_{f^*} \left( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \geq 1/2 \right) \leq 2E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \right) \]
where the right-hand side follows from Markov's inequality. Therefore
\[ P_{f^*}(\hat{k} = t) \geq 1 - 2E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{k \neq t} p(M_k \mid y) \right), \]
as we wished to prove.

For the case where \( \hat{k} \) is the median probability model it suffices to prove that if \( p(M_t \mid y) > 1/2 \) then \( \hat{k} = t \), since then \( \hat{k} \) holds and all subsequent arguments remain valid. Let \( \theta_j \) be the \( j^{th} \) element in \( \Theta, \Theta_t = \Theta_1 \times \ldots \times \Theta_t \) be the parameter space for the KL-optimal \( M_t \), and recall that the median probability model decides that \( \theta_j \in \Theta_j \) if and only if \( P(\theta_j \in \Theta_j^* \mid y) > 1/2 \). Since \( p(M_t \mid y) = P\left( \bigcap_{j=1}^p \theta_j \in \Theta_j^* \mid y \right) \), we have that
\[ 1 - p(M_t \mid y) = P\left( \bigcup_{j=1}^p \theta_j \notin \Theta_j^* \mid y \right) \geq P(\theta_j \notin \Theta_j^* \mid y) \]
for all \( j = 1, \ldots, p \). Therefore if \( P(\theta_j \notin \Theta_j^* \mid y) > 1/2 \) for any \( j = 1, \ldots, p \) that implies that \( p(M_t \mid y) < 1/2 \). Equivalently, \( p(M_t \mid y) \geq 1/2 \) implies that \( P(\theta_j \notin \Theta_j^* \mid y) \geq 1/2 \) for all \( j = 1, \ldots, p \), as we wished to prove.

S3. Proof of Proposition S13

The result is a particular case of Lemma S14. Specifically, to prove Proposition S13(i) in Lemma S14 set \( A_{i,n} = S_i, t_n^{(0)} = pt, t_n^{(1)} = p, g_n = b_n \) and \( g_n^{(l)} = a_n^{(l)} \mid S_i \), then the desired result follows.

Analogously, to prove Proposition S13(ii) in Lemma S14 set \( A_{i,n} = S_i^*, t_n^{(0)} = 0, t_n^{(1)} = \bar{p}, g_n = \bar{b}_n \) and \( g_n^{(l)} = \bar{a}_n^{(l)} \mid S_i^* \).

S4. Proof of Proposition [1]

S4.1. Proof outline for Zellner’s prior and known \( \phi \). Consider first a spurious model \( m \in S \). Under \( f^*(y) = N(y; X_i \theta_i^*; \phi^* \sigma^2) \) it is well-known that \( W_{mt} / \phi^* \sim x_{p_m-p_t}^2 \) (see Lemma S7), and by Lemma 2
\[ E_{f^*} \left( p(M_m \mid y) \right) < \int_0^1 P_{f^*} \left( \frac{W_{mt}}{\phi^*} > \frac{1 + \tau}{\tau} \log \frac{(1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m-p_t}{2}} r_{pt,p_m}}{1/u - 1} \right) du. \]
To bound this integral we use Lemma S17. Specifically set \( \nu = p_m - p_t, g = (1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m-p_t}{2}} r_{pt,p_m} \), and note that \( \nu \ll \log(g) \) as \( n \to \infty \) under Conditions (B1) and (C1). Then by Lemma S17
\[ E_{f^*} \left( p(M_m \mid y) \right) \leq \frac{[\log(g)]^{(p_m-p_t)/2}}{g} \ll \frac{r_{p_m,p_t}^{\alpha \nu}}{(1 + \tau)^{\alpha(p_m-p_t)/2}} \]
for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. Consider now $m \in S^*$, and let $M_q = M_t \cup M_m$ and $\lambda_{tm}$ as defined in Condition (B2). Clearly $W_{mt} = \hat{\theta}_m X_m \bar{X}_m \hat{\theta}_t \sim \chi^2_{p_q-p_t}$, $W_{qm}/\phi^* \sim \chi^2_{p_q-p_m}(\lambda_{tm})$. To ease notation let $b_n(u) = \frac{1+\tau}{2} 2 \log((1+\tau)\frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m} (1/u - 1)})$. From (5),

$$P_f\left(\frac{W_{mt}}{\phi^*} > b_n(u)\right) \leq P_f\left(\frac{W_{qm}}{\phi^*} < \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2}\right) + P_f\left(\frac{W_{qt}}{\phi^*} > \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2}\right)$$

for any $c_n(u) > 0$. Specifically set $c_n(u) = \frac{1+\tau}{2} \frac{2 \log(e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}/(1/u - 1))}{\beta_1, 1}$ and $\beta_1 \in (0, 1)$ as in Condition (B2). Our strategy is to bound the first term in (S.3) via the non-central chi-square left tail inequality in Lemma S2, the second term via a Chernoff bound (Lemma S1) and then use Lemma S17 to bound its integral. The derivations are in Section S4.2 and show that, under Conditions (B2) and (C2),

$$\int_0^1 P_f\left(\frac{W_{mt}}{\phi^*} > b_n(u)\right) du \leq e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2} + e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$$

for any fixed $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\gamma \in (0, 1)$.

S4.2. Derivations under Zellner’s prior and known $\phi$. The goal is to bound (S.3). By Lemma S2 $P_f(W_{qm}/\phi^* < (c_n(u) - b_n(u))/2) = \frac{1+\tau}{2}$

$$P_f\left(\frac{W_{qm}}{\phi^*} < \frac{1+\tau}{2} \log \left(\frac{r_{p_m,p_t} e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}}{(1+\tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m}}}\right)\right) \leq \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha} - \frac{1+\tau}{\tau} \log \left(\frac{r_{p_m,p_t} e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}}{(1+\tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m}}}\right)\right)^2\right\},$$

From Condition (C2) we have that $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha + \log(r_{p_m,p_t}) - 0.5(p_m - p_t) \log(1+\tau) \leq 2\lambda_{tm}^\alpha$, hence (S.4) is $\leq e^{-0.5(\sqrt{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha} - \sqrt{2\lambda_{tm}^\alpha})^2} \leq e^{-0.5\lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$ for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Since (S.4) does not depend on $u$, $\int_0^1 P_f(W_{qm}/\phi^* < (c_n(u) - b_n(u))/2) du \leq e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$. A condition for Lemma S2 to apply is that $r_{p_m,p_t} < e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha} - \lambda_{tm}^\alpha (1+\tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m}}$, from (B2) this holds for large enough $n$.

Regarding the second term in (S.3), we seek to bound

$$\int_0^1 P_f\left(\frac{W_{qt}}{\phi^*} > \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2}\right) du < \int_0^1 P\left(\frac{W_{qt}}{\phi^*} > 2 \log \left(\frac{e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}(1+\tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m} (1/u - 1)}}{r_{p_t,p_m} (1/u - 1)}\right)\right) du.$$ 

Under the assumption that $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha + (p_m - p_t) \log(1+\tau) + \log(r_{p_t,p_m}) \geq p_q - p_t$, by Lemma S17 the integral is $\leq 1/\left(e^{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}(1+\tau) \frac{p_m-p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m} (1/u - 1)}\right)^\gamma$ for any fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. Note that from Condition (C2) $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha + (p_m - p_t) \log(1+\tau) + \log(r_{p_t,p_m}) \geq \lambda_{tm}^\alpha$ and by Condition (B2)
\( \lambda_{tm} \gg p_q \), hence the required assumption holds. In summary \( E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2} \) for fixed \( \alpha' \in (0, 1), \gamma \in (0, 1) \).

**S5. Proof of Proposition 2**

**S5.1. Proof outline for Zellner’s prior and unknown \( \phi \).** Here \( \tilde{F}_{mt} \) plays the role of \( W_{mt} \) in (4) when \( \phi^* \) was assumed known. For precision the right-hand side in (6) does not hold if \( p_m = p_t \), as then \( \tilde{F}_{mt} = \infty \), but our upcoming argument still applies by lower bounding \( s_{tm} \geq \tilde{s}_{tm} \) in (6), where \( M_{m'} \) adds any single variable to \( M_m \). To apply Lemma 2 note that \( P_{f^*}(B_{mt} > r_{p_t,p_m}/(1/u - 1)) = \)

\[
P_{f^*} \left( \tilde{F}_{mt} > \frac{n - p_m}{p_m - p_t} \left( \frac{(1 + \tau) \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_q}}{((1 - \tau) r_{p_t,p_m})^{\frac{1}{2}}} - 1 \right) \right) < P_{f^*} \left( (p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u) \right),
\]

where \( b_n(u) = 2[(n - p_m)/(n + a_\phi)] \log((1 + \tau) \frac{p_m - p_t}{r_{p_t,p_m}}/(1/u - 1)). \) The right hand side follows from \( \log(z) \leq z - 1 \) and is written for analogy with (5).

Let \( m \in S \) be a spurious model, then \( F_{mt} \sim \mathcal{F}(p_m - p_t, n - p_m) \) where \( \mathcal{F} \) is an \( F \)-distribution. In Lemma S18 set \( \nu_1 = p_m - p_t, \nu_2 = n - p_m, \gamma = (1 + \tau)(p_m - p_t)/2r_{p_t,p_m} \) and \( d = 2(n - p_m)/(n + a_\phi) \). If \( \log(g) \ll n - p_m \), then \( E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll \)

\[
\int_0^1 P_{f^*}((p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u)) du \leq \left( \frac{1}{\varrho} \right)^{1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{\log g}{n - p_m - 5}} \ll \frac{r_{p_m,p_t}}{\varrho^2 n - 2p}\n
\]

for any fixed \( \alpha < 1 \). Also by Lemma S18 if \( \log(g) \gg n - p_m \) then

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \log \left( \frac{n - p_t - 5}{n - p_t - 6} \right) \right\} \ll e^{\gamma n m}
\]

for any fixed \( \gamma < 1, \kappa > 1 \), since \( p_t \ll n \) by Condition (B1).

Consider now \( m \in S^c \) and let \( M_q = M_m \cup M_t \). Since \( s_q \leq s_m \), then

\[
(p_m - p_t)F_{mt} \leq \frac{n - p_m}{n - p_q} \left( (p_q - p_t)F_{qt} - (p_q - p_m)F_{qm} \right),
\]

where marginally \( F_{qt} \sim \mathcal{F}(p_q - p_t, n - p_q) \) and \( F_{qm} \sim \mathcal{F}(\lambda_{tm}, p_q - p_m, n - p_q) \). Combining (S7) and (S5), \( P_{f^*}((p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u)) \ll \)

\[
P_{f^*}((p_q - p_m)F_{qm} < \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2} \frac{n - p_q}{n - p_m} + P_{f^*}((p_q - p_t)F_{qt} > \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2}),
\]

where we set \( c_n(u) = 2 \log(e^{\lambda_{tm}/(1/u - 1)})[(n - p_q)/(n - p_m)] \), analogously to (S3). We defer derivations to Section S5.2. The strategy is to bound the first term in (S8) via a left-tail inequality for the non-central F (Lemma S5) and the second term via Lemma S18. Then under Condition (B1) it holds that

\[
E_{f^*}(p(M_m \mid y)) < \int_0^1 P_{f^*}((p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u)) du \ll e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2, \kappa n\}},
\]
Derivations under Zellner’s prior and unknown $\phi$. To bound the first term in (S.8) we use left tail inequality for the non-central F distribution in Lemma S5. Specifically, in Lemma S5 set $w = |c_n(u) - b_n(u)|/(n - p_q)/(2(n - p_m)) = [\lambda_m - \log((1 + \tau)^{(mn - p_m)^{r_{p_m, p_m}}})](n - p_q)/(n - p_m)$ and take arbitrarily large but fixed $s$, then $sw \ll \lambda_m$, and the first term in (S.8) is

$$\ll e^{-\lambda_m(1 - \lambda_m^{(\alpha - \gamma)/2})^2} + e^{-n-p_q(s-1-log(s))} \leq e^{-\gamma\lambda_m} + e^{-\kappa n},$$

for any fixed $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$.

For the second term in (S.8) we use Lemma S18. Specifically set $\nu_1 = p_q - p_t$, $\nu_2 = n - p_q$, $g = e^{\lambda_m^\alpha/2}(1 + \tau)^{(n-p_m)/2}$, then if $\log(g) \ll n - p_q$ it holds that

$$\int_{0}^{1} P\left((p_q - p_t) F_{qt} > c_n(u) + b_n(u)/2\right) du = \int_{0}^{1} P^{*}\left((p_q - p_t) F_{qt} > 2 \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du,$$

which is $\ll \frac{1}{g^\alpha}$ for any $\gamma < 1$, whereas if $\log(g) \gg n - p_q$ then the integral is $\ll e^{-\kappa n}$ for any $\kappa > 0$, since $p_q \ll n$.

Summarizing, $E^{*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_m^\alpha/2, \kappa n\}}$ for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$.

S6. Proof of Proposition 3

S6.1. Proof outline for Normal prior with general covariance. Let $b_n(u) = 2 \log(r_{p_m, p_m}(c_m\tau)^{(p_m-p_t)})$, proceeding as in (S.5) gives that $P^{*}(B_{mt} > r_{p_m, p_m}/(1/u - 1)) \ll P^{*}\left((p_m - p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\right)$. Elementary arguments (Lemma S12) show that $(p_m - p_t) F_{mt} \leq (p_m - p_t) F_{mt} + p_m F_{m0}/(1 + \tau p_t)$, hence $P^{*}\left((p_m - p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\right) < (S.9) P^{*}\left((p_m - p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u) - 1\right) + P^{*}\left(p_m F_{m0} > 1 + \tau p_t\right).

The first term in (S.9) is analogous to (S.5) and under (D2) the second term is bounded by the F right tails in Corollary S1. This gives that

$$E^{*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \max\left\{r_{p_m, p_t} \tau^{\alpha(p_m - p_t)/2}, e^{-\kappa n}, e^{-\tau p_t/2}\right\}$$

for $m \in S$ and $E^{*}(p(M_m | y)) \ll \exp\{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_m^\alpha/2, \kappa n, \tau p_t/2\}\}$ for $m \in S^c$, see Section S6.2.

S6.2. Derivations for Normal prior with general covariance. Briefly, for $m \in S$ proceeding as in (S.6) gives that

$$\int_{0}^{1} P^{*}\left((p_m - p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u) - 1\right) du \ll \max\left\{r_{p_m, p_t} \tau^{\alpha(p_m - p_t)/2}, e^{-\kappa n}\right\}$$

for any fixed $\alpha < 1$, $\kappa > 0$. For $m \in S^c$ proceeding as in (S.8) shows that

$$\int_{0}^{1} P^{*}\left((p_m - p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u) - 1\right) du \ll e^{-\min\{\gamma \lambda_m^\alpha/2, \kappa n\}}$$
for any $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $\kappa > 0$. Further, since $F_{m0} \sim \mathcal{F}_{\frac{n-p_m}{p_m}(\lambda_{m0})}$ where $\lambda_{m0} \leq \lambda_0 \leq \tau_{p_{m1}}$ under (D2), Corollary [S1][ii] implies that $P_f(\frac{r_{m0}}{p_m} > 1 + \tau_{p_{m1}}) \ll e^{-\tau_{p_{m1}}/2}$.

Summarizing, $E_f^{n}(p(M_n \mid y)) \ll \max \{ r_{\alpha}\gamma, e^{-\kappa n}, e^{-\tau_{p_{m1}}/2} \}$ for $m \in S$ and $E_f^{n}(p(M_n \mid y)) \ll \exp \{-\min \{\gamma{\lambda_{m0}/2}, \kappa n, \tau_{p_{m1}/2} \} \}$ for $m \in S^c$.

**S7. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 4**

**S7.1. Proof outline for MOM prior.** To apply Lemma 2 we seek to bound (S.11)

$$P_f \left( B_{mt} > \frac{r_{p_{m}p_{m1}}}{1/u - 1} \right) \leq P_f \left( D_{mt} \left( 1 + \frac{p_{m} - p_{t}}{n - p_{m}} \tilde{F}_{mt} \right)^{\frac{n-a_{\gamma}}{2}} > \frac{r_{p_{m}p_{t}}(c_{mt})^{\frac{p_{m} - p_{t}}{2}}}{1/u - 1} \right).$$

Let $m \in S$, $h_n \gg 1$ and $b_n(u) = 2r_{p_{m}p_{t}}(\sqrt{c_{mt}h_{n}}^{p_{m} - p_{t}})/(1/u - 1)$. From (S.5), we have that (S.11) is

$$P_f \left( (p_{m} - p_{t})\tilde{F}_{mt} > \frac{n - p_{m}}{1 + a_{\phi}} b_n(u) \right) + P_f \left( D_{mt} > \frac{1}{h_{n}^{p_{m} - p_{t}}} \right).$$

The first term in (S.12) can be bounded as in (S.9) since $\lim_{n \to \infty} (n - p_{m})/(n + a_{\phi}) = 1$ under (B1), obtaining

$$\int_{0}^{1} P_f \left( (p_{m} - p_{t})\tilde{F}_{mt} > b_n(u) \right) du \ll \max \{ r_{\alpha}\gamma, (h_{n}\sqrt{\tau})^{\alpha(p_{1} - p_{m})}, e^{-\kappa n}, e^{-\tau_{p_{m1}/2}} \},$$

as we wished to prove.

**S7.2. Derivations for the pMOM prior.** The Normal densities in $D_{mt}$ can be lower- and upper-bounded using the eigenvalues of $\tilde{V}_{m}$ and $\tilde{V}_{t}$, giving $D_{mt} \leq$

$$\frac{r_{p_{t}/2}}{\tilde{p}_{p_{1}/2}} \frac{r_{p_{m}p_{t}/2}}{\tilde{p}_{p_{m1}/2}} \frac{1}{(\tau/n)^{p_{m} - p_{t}}} \left[ \prod_{j \in M_{t}} \left( \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^{\phi} + \frac{1}{n_{p_{m}p_{t}}}}{2} \right) \right] IG \left( \phi; a_{\phi} + n/2, \hat{s}_{m} \right) \leq \frac{\prod_{j \in M_{t}} \left( \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^{\phi} + \frac{1}{n_{p_{m}p_{t}}}}{2} \right) \right] IG \left( \phi; a_{\phi} + n/2, \hat{s}_{m} \right) \leq \frac{1}{h_{n}^{p_{m} - p_{t}}} \frac{1}{(\tau/n)^{p_{m} - p_{t}}} \left[ \prod_{j \in M_{t}} \tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^{\phi} \right]^{p_{t}}.$$
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The strategy is to tackle the numerator and denominator separately using that for any $W_1, W_2$ and any $a > 0, \delta > 0$ it holds that $P(W_1/W_2 > 1/a) \leq P(W_1 > 1/a^{1-\delta}) + P(W_2 < a^\delta)$. Hence

\begin{equation}
(S.13)
P(D_m > 1/h_n^{\rho_m-p_t}) \leq \left( \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{4e} \min_{j \in M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2}{s_t}(n-p_t) \right)^{p_t} \leq h_n^{(1-\delta)(\rho_m-p_t)} + \int \left[ \max_{j \in M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2}{s_t}(n-p_t) \right]^{p_t} \text{IG}\left( \phi; \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2}, \frac{s_m}{2} \right) d\phi \end{equation}

where we used that, for any $l \geq 1$,

$$
\int \frac{1}{\phi} \text{IG}\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2}, \frac{s_m}{2} \right) d\phi = \frac{\Gamma\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2} + p_t \right)}{\Gamma\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2} \right)\left( \frac{s_m}{2} \right)^l} \leq \left( \frac{n-p_m}{s_m} \right)^l.
$$

\begin{align*}
\int_{\frac{1}{\phi}} & \text{IG}\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2}, \frac{s_m}{2} \right) d\phi = \frac{\Gamma\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2} + p_t \right)}{\Gamma\left( \frac{a_{\phi}+n}{2} \right)\left( \frac{s_m}{2} \right)^l} \leq \left( \frac{n-p_m}{s_m} \right)^l.
\end{align*}

since $a_{\phi}+n+2p_t-2 > n-p_t$. When $p_t = 0$ the first term in (S.13) is trivially 0 and likewise for the second term the upcoming arguments can be trivially modified, hence we focus on the $p_t \geq 1$ case. The first term requires the left tail of $\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2(n-p_t)/\tilde{s}_m$, which by Lemma S10 is the ratio of a non-central $\chi^2$ and a $\chi^2_{n-p_t}/(n-p_t)$ random variables. In Lemma S11 we show that when Condition (E1) holds such left tail is $\ll e^{-\gamma \Delta \lambda_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_t)^2/2}$, where $\gamma \in (0, 1)$ is fixed and $\Delta_2 = \min_{M_t \subseteq M_t, p_k = p_1} \Delta_{1k}$ is the smallest non-centrality parameter due to removing a single variable from $M_t$. Hence the first term in (S.13) is

\begin{equation}
(S.14)
\leq \sum_{j \in M_t} P\left( \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2}{s_t}(n-p_t) \leq \sqrt{2\pi} \frac{h_n^{(1-\delta)(\rho_m-p_t)}}{4e} \right) \ll p_t\left( e^{-\gamma \Delta \lambda_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_t)^2/2} \right),
\end{equation}

where the right-hand side follows from Corollary S2 and noting that the bound $e^{-\gamma \Delta \lambda_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_t)^2/2}$ holds uniformly across $j \in M_t$.

Consider the second term in (S.13). The strategy is to split the integral into four terms, then tackle term separately using inequalities for ratios of chi-square variables. Specifically let $A = \left\{ \phi : \max_{j \in M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2}{s_t}/\phi > 1/(n\tilde{\rho}_{mpm}) \right\}$, $B = \left\{ \phi : \max_{j \in M_t \setminus M_t, p_k = p_1} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2}{s_t}/\phi \leq 1/(n\tilde{\rho}_{mpm}) \right\}$, and $A^c$ and $B^c$ be their respective complementary sets. Then splitting the integral into $A \cap B, A^c \cap B, A \cap B^c$, and $A^c \cap B^c$ gives that the second term in (S.13) is

\begin{align*}
(S.15)
&< P\left( \left[ \max_{j \in M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2(n-p_m)}{s_m} \right]^{p_t} \left[ \max_{j \in M_t \setminus M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2(n-p_m)}{s_m} \right]^{p_t} \leq \left[ \frac{1}{n\tilde{\rho}_{mpm}} \right] p_t \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mpm}}{\hat{\rho}_{11}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left[ \frac{\rho_{mpm}}{\rho_{m1}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau / h_n}{\hat{s}_m} \right)^{p_t} \right) \nonumber \\
&\quad + \left[ \max_{j \in M_t \setminus M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2(n-p_m)}{s_m} \right]^{p_t} \left[ \max_{j \in M_t} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{ij}^2(n-p_m)}{s_m} \right]^{p_t} \left( \frac{1}{n\tilde{\rho}_{mpm}} \right) p_t > \left[ \frac{1}{n\tilde{\rho}_{mpm}} \right] p_t \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mpm}}{\hat{\rho}_{11}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left[ \frac{\rho_{mpm}}{\rho_{m1}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau / h_n}{\hat{s}_m} \right)^{p_t} \right)
\end{align*}

where we used that, for any $l \geq 1$,
To bound (S.15) note that $P(W_1 + W_2 + W_3 + W_4 > a/4) \leq \sum_{i=1}^4 P(W_j > a)$ where $W_1, W_2, W_3, W_4$ are arbitrary random variables, hence we may split the target probability in (S.15) into four terms. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1 - \delta)$ be a fixed constant, the first term is

$$
P \left( \left[ \max_{j \in M_1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2(n - p_m)}{\hat{s}_m} \right]^{p_t} \left[ \max_{j \in M_1 \setminus M_t} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2(n - p_m)}{\hat{s}_m} \right]^{p_m - p_t} \right)
$$

$$
> \frac{1}{2^{p_m}} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{t1}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{p_m/2} \left[ \frac{\tau / n}{h_{n}^{\delta}} \right]^{p_m - p_t}
$$

$$
\leq P \left( \max_{j \in M_1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} > \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{t1}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \right)
$$

$$
+ P \left( \max_{j \in M_1 \setminus M_t} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} > \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{t1}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \right)
$$

$$
\sum_{j \in M_t} P \left( \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} > \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{t1}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \right)
$$

$$
\leq p_t \left( e^{-\gamma_{2m}/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)^{1/2}} \right) + (p_m - p_t) \left( e^{-\gamma/2} \frac{\rho_{mp_m}^{1/2}}{2\sigma_{jj}h_{n}^{1/4} + \rho_{m1}^{1/2}} + e^{-(n-p_m)^{1/2}} \right)
$$

where from the definition $h_n \leq 1/(2\sigma)(\tau/n)(\rho_{mp_m}/\rho_{m1})^{1/2}$ we have

$$
\frac{\rho_{mp_m}^{1/2}}{2\sigma_{jj}h_{n}^{1/4} + \rho_{m1}^{1/2}} \geq h_{n}^{-1-\delta-\epsilon}.
$$

The right hand side in (S.16) follows from Lemma S11, Assumption E3 and Corollary S2 (since the bounds hold uniformly across $j$). Note that for $j \in M_1$ Lemma S11(iii) requires that $h_n \rho_{n}^{p_t} \left( \hat{\rho}_{mp_m} \hat{\rho}_{t1} / \hat{\rho}_{m1} \right)^{1/2} \geq (\theta_{m_j}^{*})^{2} / \phi^{*}$, which holds by Assumption (E3). For $j \in M_1 \setminus M_t$ Lemma S11(iii) requires that the critical point $(\tau/n)\rho_{mp_m}^{1/2} / (h_{n}^{1/4} + \rho_{m1}^{1/2}) \geq 1$. Since $\delta + \epsilon < 1$ it suffices that $h_n \leq (\tau/n)(\rho_{mp_m}/\rho_{m1})^{1/2}$, which is satisfied by definition.

Regarding the second term in (S.15),

$$
P \left( \left[ \max_{j \in M_1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} \right]^{p_t} \left[ \max_{j \in M_1 \setminus M_t} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} \right]^{p_m - p_t} \right)
$$

$$
> \frac{1}{2^{p_m}} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{t1}} \right]^{p_t/2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{p_m/2} \left[ \frac{\tau / n}{h_{n}^{\delta}} \right]^{p_m - p_t}
$$

$$
+ P \left( \left[ \max_{j \in M_1} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} \right] \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\tau / n}{h_{n}^{\delta}} \right]^{p_m - p_t} \right)
$$

$$
+ P \left( \left[ \max_{j \in M_1 \setminus M_t} \frac{\tilde{\theta}_{m_j}^2}{\hat{s}_m/(n - p_m)} \right] \frac{1}{2} \left[ \frac{\hat{\rho}_{mp_m}}{\hat{\rho}_{m1}} \right]^{1/2} \left[ \frac{\tau / n}{h_{n}^{\delta}} \right]^{p_m - p_t} \right).
$$
The first summand in (S.17) is identical to that in (S.16), hence $\ll p_t \left(e^{-\gamma \Delta n/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)^{\gamma}/2}\right)$. The second summand is zero since $h_n \leq n \hat{\rho}_{m_p} (\tau/n) (\hat{\rho}_{m_p} / \hat{\rho}_{m_1})^{1/2}$ and $\delta + \epsilon < 1$. To see this note that $\sigma_{jj}$ is the $j^{th}$ diagonal element in $V_k$, hence $1/\sigma_{jj} \leq n \hat{\rho}_{m_p}$ and by definition

$$h_n \leq [(\tau/n)/(2\sigma)](\hat{\rho}_{m_p} / \hat{\rho}_{m_1})^{1/2} \leq \tau \hat{\rho}_{m_p}^{3/2} / \hat{\rho}_{m_1}^{1/2}.$$

Now, the third term arising from (S.15) is

$$P \left( \max_{j \in M_m} \frac{\hat{\theta}_{mj}^2}{s_m/(n-p_m)} \right)^{p_m-p_t} \left( \frac{1}{n \hat{\rho}_{m_p}} \right)^{p_t} \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_p}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t} \leq \sum_{j \in M_m} P \left( \frac{\hat{\theta}_{mj}^2}{s_m/(n-p_m)} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{2h_n^\delta \hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_p}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t} \ll (p_m-p_t) \left(e^{-\gamma g_n/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)^{\gamma}/2}\right),$$

(S.18)

where

$$g_n = \frac{1}{\sigma_{jj}} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{2h_n^\delta \hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_p}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t}.$$

The right hand side in (S.18) follows from Lemma S11(iii) and noting that

$$\left( \frac{\tau/n}{2h_n^\delta \hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_p}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t} \gg \sigma_{jj},$$

since by definition $h_n \leq [\tau/(2n\sigma)](\hat{\rho}_{m_p})^{1/2} / (\hat{\rho}_{m_1})^{1/2}$ and by Assumption (E4) $n \hat{\rho}_{m_p} / (\hat{\rho}_{m_1} \hat{\rho}_{m_1}) \gg 1$. This also implies that $g_n \geq h_n^1 - \delta$.

Finally, the fourth term arising from (S.15) is

$$P \left( \frac{1}{n \hat{\rho}_{m_p}} \right)^{p_m} > \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_p}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_m/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t} = \left( \frac{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}}{\hat{\rho}_{m_1}} \right)^{p_t/2} \left( \frac{\tau/n}{h_n^\delta} \right)^{p_m-p_t} \gg 0,$$

(S.19)

since $1/\sigma_{ii} \leq n \hat{\rho}_{m_p}$ and hence $h_n \leq [\tau/(2n\sigma)](\hat{\rho}_{m_p})^{1/2} / \hat{\rho}_{m_1}^{1/2} \leq [\tau/2] \hat{\rho}_{m_p}/ \hat{\rho}_{m_1}^{1/2}$, and again recalling that by (E4) $n \hat{\rho}_{m_p} / (\hat{\rho}_{m_1} \hat{\rho}_{m_1}) \gg 1$. 


Combining (S.14), (S.16), (S.17), (S.18) and (S.19) we obtain that $P(D_m > 1/h_n^m - p_t) \ll p_t(e^{-\gamma_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_t)/2}) + p_t(e^{-\gamma_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2}) + (p_m - p_t)\left(e^{-(\gamma/2)h_n^{1-\delta-\epsilon}} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2}\right)$

$$+ p_t(e^{-\gamma_2/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2}) + (p_m - p_t)(e^{-\gamma h_n^{1-\delta/2}} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2}) \ll p_t(e^{-\gamma/2} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2}) + (p_m - p_t)e^{-\gamma h_n^{1-\delta-\epsilon}} + e^{-(n-p_m)/2},$$

since $\Lambda_t \geq \Lambda_m$ for any $M_m \subset M_t,$ which proves the desired result.

**S9. Proof of Proposition 6**

To proof runs analogously to Section 3.3 the only adjustment is finding a new bound for Bayes factor tail probabilities under $f^*(y) = N(y; W\beta^*,\xi^*I).$ For any $M_k$ denote the KL-optimal variance by $\phi_k^* = \xi^* + (W\beta^*')(I - H_k)W\beta^*/n.$ Recall from (S.5) that $P_{f^*}(B_m > r_{p_t,p_m}/(1/u - 1)) < P_{f^*}((p_m - p_t)F_m > b_n(u))$, where $F_m$ and $b_n(u)$ are as defined in (S.5). Specifically $b_n(u) = 2[(n - p_m)/(n + a_\phi)]\log((1 + \tau)\frac{h_n^{1-\delta}}{u^2}r_{p_t, p_m}/(1/u - 1))$ and

$$W_m = \hat{\beta}_m'X_m'X_m\hat{\theta}_m - \hat{\beta}_t'X_t'X_t\hat{\theta}_t,$$

and $\hat{\theta}_m, \hat{\theta}_t$ are the least-squares estimates under $M_m$ and $M_t$ respectively. To bound tail probabilities for (S.20) note that

$$P_{f^*}((p_m - p_t)F_m > b_n(u)) = P_{f^*}\left(\frac{U_1}{U_2/(n - p_m)} > \frac{\phi_m^* b_n(u)}{\xi^*}\right),$$

where $U_1 = W_m/\xi^*$ and $U_2 = s_m/[(n - p_m)\phi_m^*].$ In Lemma S8 we prove that $W_m/\xi^* \sim \chi^2_{p_t-p_m}(\lambda_m)$ for any l such that $M_s \subset M_l,$ where $\lambda_m = (W\beta^*')H_m(I - H_m)H_mW\beta^*/\xi^*.$ $H_l = X_l(X_l'X_l)^{-1}X_l', H_l = X_l(X_l'X_l)^{-1}X_l'.$ Further, since $f^*(y)$ has Gaussian tails it follows that $U_2 = s_m/[(n - p_m)\phi_m^*]$ has exponential tails with expectation equal to 1 under $f^*$. This implies that the tail inequalities from Lemma S4, Corollary S1 Lemma S5 and Lemma S6 still apply up to a constant factor, since the proofs just require having the ratio of two (possibly dependent) random variables: $U_1$ being a non-central chi-square and $U_2$ a random variable with exponential tails. We outline the proof separately for the cases $m \in S$ and $m \in S^c.$

Consider first $m \in S.$ Then $\phi_m^* = \phi_t^*$ and $\lambda_m = (W\beta^*')H_m(I - H_m)H_mW\beta^*/\xi^* = 0$ by definition of $M_t.$ The result is based on showing that the rate from Lemma S18 still applies. To see this in (S.32) define $\nu_1 = p_m - p_t, \nu_2 = n - p_m, d = 2[(n - p_m)/(n + a_\phi)], g = (1 + \tau)\frac{h_n^{1-\delta}}{u^2}r_{p_t, p_m}e^{\nu_1/\nu_2}.$ If $\log(g) \ll \nu_2$ for all fixed $\gamma < 1,$ then the bound in Lemma S6 and (S.35) hold up to a constant and the argument leading to (S.34) remains valid and $E_f(p(M_m | y)) \leq 1/g^\alpha$ for any $\alpha < d - 1,$ as we wished to prove. Conversely if $\log(g) \gg \nu_2$ for all fixed $\gamma < 1,$ then the bound in Lemma S6 and (S.35) hold up to a constant and the argument leading to (S.36) remains valid, giving that $E_f(p(M_m | y)) \ll e^{-\kappa M}$ for any fixed $\kappa > 0,$ as we wished to prove.
Consider now \( m \notin S \). We define \( M_q = M_m \cup M_t \) and use the bound in (S.8). Specifically, \( E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) < \int_0^1 P_f^* ((p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u)) \, du < \)

\[
\int_0^1 P_f^* \left( (p_q - p_m)F_{qm} < \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2} \frac{n - p_m}{n - p_q} \right) \, du
\]

\[
+ \int_0^1 P_f^* \left( (p_q - p_t)F_{qt} > \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2} \right) \, du,
\]

where \( c_n(u) = 2 \log(e^{\lambda \gamma m} / (1/u - 1))[(n - p_q) / (n - p_m)] \). Note that \( \lambda_qm = \lambda_{tm} \), to see this let \( M_v = M_m \setminus M_t \) and define \( \tilde{X}_v = (I - H_t)X_v \). Basic properties of orthogonal projections give \( H_q = H_t + \tilde{X}_v (\tilde{X}_v^\prime \tilde{X}_v)^{-1} \tilde{X}_v \), hence

\[
\lambda_{qm} = (W\beta^*)'H_t(I - H_m)H_tW\beta^* = \lambda_{tm},
\]

since \( \tilde{X}_v (\tilde{X}_v^\prime \tilde{X}_v)^{-1} \tilde{X}_v W\beta^* = 0 \) by definition of \( M_t \).

Since \( \phi_q^* = \phi_t^* \), the first term in (S.21) is

\[
\int_0^1 P_f^* \left( \frac{U_1}{U_2/(n - p_m)} < \phi_t^* \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2} \frac{n - p_q}{n - p_m} \right) \, du
\]

and is proven to be \( \lesssim e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2} + e^{-\kappa} \) as in Section S5.2, using that \( \lambda_{tm} \gg \lambda_{tm}^* \phi_t^*/\xi^* \) by assumption, and that \( U_1 \sim \chi_2^{p_q - p_m}(\lambda_{tm}) \) and \( U_2 = s_q / [(n - p_q)\phi_t^*] \) so that Lemma S5 applies up to a constant. The second term in (S.21) is proven to be \( \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2, \kappa \eta} \) also following Section S5.2 and using that Lemma S18 applies up to a constant. Combining these two terms \( E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2, \kappa \eta} \) for any \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \), \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \) and \( \kappa > 0 \), as we wished to prove.

Finally, to show that

\[
\lambda_{tm} = (W\beta^*)'H_t(I - H_m)H_tW\beta^* \leq (W\beta^*)'(I - H_m)W\beta^* = \lambda_m^*,
\]

it suffices to prove that for any two projection matrices \( A, B \) it holds that \( s'ABA s \leq s'Bs \), i.e. \( B - ABA \) is positive semidefinite. Let \( l \) be an eigenvalue of \( B - ABA \) and \( v \in \mathbb{R}^n \) its corresponding eigenvector, that is \( (B - ABA)v = lv \). Since \( (B - ABA)v = Bv - BA v \), it follows that

\[
(B - ABA)(B - ABA)v = (B - ABA)(Bv - BA v) = Bv - BA v - AB v + BA v = Bv - BA v = (B - ABA)v = lv.
\]

Hence \( l \) is also an eigenvalue of \( (B - ABA)(B - ABA) \), so \( l \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( B - ABA \) is positive semidefinite.

S10. PROOF OF PROPOSITION 7

Recall that from [S.5] we showed that

\[
E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) < \int_0^1 P_f^*(B_{mt} > r_{p_m} / (1/u - 1)) \, du < \int_0^1 P_f^* ((p_m - p_t)F_{mt} > b_n(u)) \, du,
\]
where \( b_n(u) = 2[(n-p_m)/(n+a_\phi)] \log((1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} \frac{r_{pt,p_m}}{(1/u-1)}) \), \( F_{mt} = (n-p_m)(s_m-s_t)/(s_m(p_m-p_t)) \) is the F-test statistic, and \( s_k = y'y - \theta_k' \bar{X}_k \hat{X}_k \theta_k \) is the residual sum of squares under \( M_k \). Note also that from Lemma S9 under \( f^*(y) = N(y; \theta^*_k, \phi^* \Sigma^*) \) the F-test statistic can be bounded by a ratio of chi-square distributed random variables. Specifically, for any two models \( M_i \subset M_k \) let \( X_k = (X_i, X_s) \) where \( X_s \) are the columns in \( X_k \) not contained in \( X_i \). Then Lemma S9 gives

\[
\frac{\omega_{rk} Z_1}{\omega_{rk} Z_2/(n-p_k)} \leq (p_k-p_t) F_{kl} \leq \frac{\omega_{rk} Z_1}{\omega_{rk} Z_2/(n-p_k)},
\]

where \( Z_2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p_k}, Z_1 \sim \chi^2_{p_m-p_k} (\tilde{\lambda}_{qm}), \tilde{\lambda}_{qm} = (\theta^*_k)^{1/W^1} / \phi^*, W^{-1} = (\hat{X}_k' \hat{X}_k)' \Sigma^* (\hat{X}_k' \hat{X}_k)^{-1} (\hat{X}_k' \hat{X}_k) \) and \( \hat{X}_k = (I\kappa^{-1} - X_k(X_k'X_k)^{-1}X_k)X_s \). The strategy for the proof is to combine (S.22) with Lemmas S4, S5 to bound \( P_{f^*}(\{(p_m-p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\}) \), then Lemma S18 to bound its integral with respect to \( u \).

We address separately the cases \( m \in S \) and \( m \in S^c \). Consider first \( m \in S \). Then

\[
P_{f^*}(\{(p_m-p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\}) \leq P_{f^*} \left( \frac{Z_1}{Z_2/(n-p_k)} > \frac{\omega_{rk}(n-p_m)}{\omega_{tk}(n+a_\phi)} \log \left( \frac{(1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} r_{pt,p_m}}{1/u-1} \right) \right).
\]

By Lemma S18 if \( \frac{\omega_{rk}}{\omega_{tk}} \log((1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} r_{pt,p_m}) \ll n-p_m \) then

\[
\int_0^1 P_{f^*}(\{(p_m-p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\}) \, du \ll r_{pm,p_t} (1+\tau)^{(p_t-p_m)/2} \omega_{rk}/\omega_{tk},
\]

for any fixed \( \alpha \in (0,1) \), and conversely if \( \frac{\omega_{rk}}{\omega_{tk}} \log((1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} r_{pt,p_m}) \gg n-p_m \) then

\[
\int_0^1 P_{f^*}(\{(p_m-p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\}) \, du \ll e^{-\kappa n}
\]

for any \( \kappa > 0 \), as we wished to prove.

Consider now \( m \in S^c \) and let \( M_q = M_m \cup M_t \). From S8 we have \( P_{f^*}(\{(p_m-p_t) F_{mt} > b_n(u)\}) < \) (S.23)

\[
P_{f^*}(\{(p_q-p_m) F_{qm} < \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2} n - p_q \} + \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2} n - p_m) + P_{f^*}(\{(p_q-p_t) F_{qt} > \frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2} n - p_m)\}
\]

where we set \( c_n(u) = 2[(n-p_m)/(n+a_\phi)] \log(e^{\tilde{\lambda}_{tm}/(1/u-1)}) \), for some \( \delta \in (0,1) \) satisfying \( \tilde{\lambda}_{tm} \gg \omega_q/\omega_{mq} \) so that

\[
\frac{n-p_q}{n-p_m} \frac{c_n(u) - b_n(u)}{2} = \frac{n-p_q}{n+a_\phi} \tilde{\lambda}_{tm} + \log((1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} r_{pt,p_m})
\]

and

\[
\frac{c_n(u) + b_n(u)}{2} = \frac{n-p_m}{n+a_\phi} 2 \log \left( \frac{e^{\tilde{\lambda}_{tm}/2}(1+\tau)^{p_m-p_q} r_{pt,p_m}^{1/2}}{1/u-1} \right).
\]
Combining this with \( \text{(S.22)} \), the first term in \( \text{(S.23)} \) is

\[
\text{(S.24)} \quad \leq P_f \left( \frac{Z_1}{Z_2 / (n - p_q)} \leq \frac{\bar{\omega}_q}{\omega_{mq}} \frac{n - p_q}{n + a_{\phi}} \left( \lambda_{tm}^\delta - \log((1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} \right) \right),
\]

where \( Z_1 \sim \chi^2_{p_q-p_m}(\lambda_{tq}) \) and \( Z_2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p_q} \). Let \( w \) be the critical point in \( \text{(S.24)} \) and note that \( w \ll \lambda_{tm} \), since \( p_q \ll n \) by assumption (B1), the choice of \( \delta \) guarantees that \( (\bar{\omega}_q/\omega_{mq})\lambda_{tm}^\delta \ll \lambda_{tm} \), and \( (\bar{\omega}_q/\omega_{mq})\log((1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} \ll \lambda_{tm} \) by assumption, hence we may use Lemma S5 to bound the left tail of \( (n - p_q)Z_1/Z_2 \). Specifically, if \( \bar{\lambda}_{tm} \sim \chi^2_{n-p_q} \) we may use Lemma S18 to bound the left tail of \( (n - p_q)Z_1/Z_2 < w \) \( e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}/2} + e^{-\kappa n} \) for any \( \gamma \in (0, 1), \kappa > 0 \).

Now, from \( \text{(S.22)} \) the integral of the second term in \( \text{(S.23)} \) is

\[
\text{(S.25)} \quad \leq \int_0^1 P_f \left( \frac{Z_3}{Z_4 / (n - p_q)} < \frac{n - p_m}{n + a_{\phi}} \frac{\omega_{tq}}{\omega_q} \right) \frac{\log((1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} \right)}{1/u - 1} du
\]

where \( Z_3 \sim \chi^2_{p_m-p} \) and \( Z_4 \sim \chi^2_{n-p_m} \). The integral in \( \text{(S.24)} \) can be readily bounded by Lemma S18. Specifically, if

\[
(\omega_q/\omega_{tq}) \left[ \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\delta}{2} + \log((1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} \right) \ll n - p_q
\]

then Lemma S18 implies that \( \text{(S.24)} \) is

\[
\ll \left( \frac{1}{e^{\lambda_{tm}^\delta/2}(1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} r_{pi,p_m}^{1/2}} \right)^{\gamma \omega_q/\omega_{tq}} \ll \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\delta \omega_q}{2 \omega_{tq}} \right\},
\]

for any fixed \( \bar{\gamma} \in (\gamma, 1) \) and the right hand side was obtained using Condition (C2). Then

\[
E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\delta} + e^{-\kappa n} + \exp \left\{ -\frac{\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\delta \omega_q}{2 \omega_{tq}} \right\}.
\]

Conversely, if

\[
(\omega_q/\omega_{tq}) \left[ \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\delta}{2} + \log((1 + \tau)^{\frac{p_m - p}{r_{pi,p_m}}} \right) \gg n - p_q
\]

then Lemma S18 implies that \( \text{(S.24)} \) is \( \ll e^{-\kappa n} \) for any \( \kappa > 0 \), and in that case

\[
E_f^*(p(M_m \mid y)) \ll e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\delta/2} + e^{-\kappa n},
\]

as we wished to prove.

S11. PROOF OF LEMMA 2

By definition \( P(M_k \mid y) = (1 + \sum_{l \leq k} B_{lk} r_{pi,p_k})^{-1} \). Since \( B_{lk} \geq 0 \) and \( r_{lk} \geq 0 \) for all \( l \), clearly \( P(M_k \mid y) \leq U_k \) where \( U_k = (1 + B_{lk} r_{pi,p_k})^{-1} \). Given that \( U_k \in [0, 1] \) we have that

\[
\text{(S.26)} \quad E(U_k) = \int_0^1 P(U_k > u) du \leq u + (1 - u) + \int_0^u P(B_{lk} < (1/u - 1)r_{pi,p_k}) du,
\]

since \( P(U_k > u) = P(B_{lk} < (1/u - 1)r_{pi,p_k}) \). We note that \( \text{(S.26)} \) holds when \( U_k \) is a continuous, discrete or mixture of continuous and discrete random variables.
S12. Proof of Lemma 3

Clearly,
\[ \int_{\bar{u}}^{u} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < \left[ d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right]^{c} b \frac{b}{g^{ld}} \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} (1/u - 1)^{ld} du. \]

The case \( ld = 1 \) follows trivially from
\[ \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} (1/u - 1)^{ld} du = \log(\bar{u}) - \log(u) - (\bar{u} - u) < \log(1/u), \]
since \( 0 < u < \bar{u} < 1 \) by assumption.

For the case \( ld \neq 1 \), applying the change of variables \( v = \log(1/u - 1) \) gives
\[ \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} (1/u - 1)^{ld} du = \int_{1/\bar{u} - 1}^{1/u - 1} v^{ld} \frac{dv}{(v + 1)^{2}} < \int_{1/\bar{u} - 1}^{1/u - 1} v^{ld - 2} dv = \left[ \frac{1}{1 - ld} \left( \frac{1}{u} - 1 \right)^{ld} - \frac{1}{u} - 1 \right]^{ld - 1}. \]

If \( ld < 1 \) then \( 1 - ld > 0 \) and the right hand side is \( < (\bar{u}/(1 - \bar{u}))^{1 - ld}/(1 - ld) \), as desired.
If \( ld > 1 \) then \( 1 - ld < 0 \) and the right hand side is \( < (1/u - 1)^{ld - 1}/(ld - 1) \).

S13. Proof of Lemma 4

Clearly
\[ \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} P \left( W > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right) du < \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} d^{c} \left[ \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right]^{c} du. \]

A first trivial bound is found by noting that the integrand is decreasing in \( u \), hence
\[ \int_{u}^{\bar{u}} \left[ \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right]^{c} du < \frac{b}{d^{c}} \left[ \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \right]^{v}. \]

Applying the change of variables \( v = \log(g) - \log(1/u - 1) \) gives that the right hand side of (S.27) is
\[ = \int_{v}^{\bar{v}} \frac{b}{d^{c}} \frac{ge^{-v}}{(1 + ge^{-v})^{2}} dv. \]

where \( v = \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right) \) and \( \bar{v} = \log \left( \frac{g}{1/\bar{u} - 1} \right) \). Notice that \( ge^{-v}/(1 + ge^{-v}) \) is decreasing in \( v \) and \( 1/(1 + ge^{-v}) \) is increasing in \( v \), hence \( ge^{-v}/(1 + ge^{-v})^{2} \leq ge^{-\bar{v}}/[(1 + ge^{-\bar{v}})(1 + ge^{-\bar{v}})] \).
Thus, (S.29) is
\[
< \frac{b}{d^c (1 + ge^{-v})(1 + ge^{-\bar{v}})} \int_{\bar{v}}^{v} \frac{1}{v^c} dv = \frac{b}{d^c} \bar{u}(1 - \bar{u}) \left( \frac{1}{\log^{c-1}(\frac{g}{1/\bar{u}-1})} - \frac{1}{\log^{c-1}(\frac{g}{1/\bar{u}-1})} \right)
\]
(S.30)

Both (S.28) and (S.30) give valid bounds for the target integral. Clearly, (S.30) is smaller than (S.28) if and only if
\[
c - 1 > \log\left(\frac{g}{1/\bar{u} - 1}\right).
\]

S14. PROOF OF LEMMA S17

Chernoff’s bound for chi-square tails (Lemma S1) gives that
\[
P\left(W > d \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) \leq \left(\frac{1/u - 1}{g}\right)^{d/2} \left[\frac{d e}{\nu} \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right]^{\frac{\nu}{2}}
\]
for any \(u\) such that \(d \log(g/(1/u - 1)) > \nu\), that is for \(u > \bar{u}\) where we define \(\bar{u} = (1 + ge^{-\nu/d})^{-1}\). Further define \(\bar{u} = 1 - u\).

These exponential tails are of the form required by Lemma 3. To prove Part (i), set \(l = 1/2\) and \(c = \nu/2\) in Lemma 3, when \(d = 2\) then \(ld = 1\) and hence
\[
\int_{0}^{1} P\left(W > 2 \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du < 2u + \frac{1}{g} \log(1/u) \left[\frac{2e}{\nu} \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right]^{\frac{\nu}{2}}
\]
(S.31)

Given that \(\log(g) \gg \nu\) by assumption, the first term in (S.31) is of a smaller order than the second term. The second term in (S.31) is \(\approx \frac{1}{g} (4e/\nu)^{\nu/2} \log^{\nu/2+1}(g/e^{\nu/4})\), giving the desired result. Further, since \(\log(g) \gg \frac{\nu}{2} \log(1 + g)\) by assumption we have that \(\frac{1}{g} (4e/\nu)^{\nu/2} \log^{\nu/2+1}(g/e^{\nu/4}) \ll 1/g^\alpha\) as \(g \to \infty\) for any fixed \(\alpha \in (0, 1)\), as we wished to prove. The case \(d > 2\) follows trivially since \(P(W > d \log(g/(1/u - 1)))\) decreases in \(d\). For precision’s sake, when \(d > 2\) Lemma 3 and trivial algebra give the finite-sample bound
\[
\int_{0}^{1} P\left(W > 2 \log\left(\frac{g}{1/u - 1}\right)\right) du < \frac{2}{1 + ge^{-\nu/d}} + \frac{1}{g} \left[\frac{2e^{2/d}}{\nu} \log\left(\frac{g}{e^{\nu/(2d)}}\right)\right]^{\frac{\nu}{d/2 - 1}} \ll 1/g^\alpha.
\]
To prove Part (ii), set \( l = 1/2 \) and \( c = \nu/2 \) in Lemma \[\textbf{S3}\] when \( d < 2 \) then \( ld < 1 \) and hence

\[
\int_0^1 P \left( W > 2 \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \right) \, du < 2u + \left( \frac{1}{g} \right)^{\nu/\nu} \left[ \frac{de}{\nu} \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \right]^{\frac{\nu}{\nu}} \frac{1}{1-d/2} \left( \frac{u}{1-u} \right)^{1-d/2}
\]

\[
= \frac{2}{1 + ge^{-\nu/d}} + \left( \frac{1}{g} \right)^{d-1} \left[ \frac{2de^2}{e^{\nu/(2d)}} \log \left( \frac{g}{e^{\nu/(2d)}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\nu}{\nu}} \frac{1}{1-d/2} \leq \left( \frac{1}{g} \right)^{d-1} \left[ \frac{4e^{3/4}}{\nu} \log \left( \frac{g}{e^{\nu/4}} \right) \right]^{\frac{\nu}{\nu}}
\]

since \( u/(1-u) = g/e^{\nu/d} \). Following the same argument as in the \( d = 2 \) case, the right-hand side is \( \ll 1/g^\alpha(d-1) \) for any fixed \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \).

**S15. PROOF OF LEMMA \[\textbf{S18}\]**

We seek to bound

\[(S.32) \int_0^1 P \left( \nu_1 F > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \right) \, du \leq u + (1 - \bar{u}) + \int_u^1 P \left( \nu_1 F > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \right) \, du,
\]

for suitably defined \( u < \bar{u} \). The strategy is that when \( \log(g) \ll \nu_2 \) one may use the exponential bound in Corollary \[\textbf{S1}\] for the integrand in \((S.32)\), then Lemma \[\textbf{S3}\] to bound its integral. For the case \( \log(g) \gg \nu_2 \) for all fixed \( \gamma < 1 \), one may use the polynomial bound in Lemma \[\textbf{S6}\] for the integrand, then Lemma \[\textbf{S4}\] to bound \((S.32)\).

Consider first the case where \( \log(g) \ll \nu_2 \). Corollary \[\textbf{S1}\] gives

\[(S.33) P \left( \nu_1 F > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \right) < 2 \exp \left\{ \frac{d}{2} \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) \left( 1 - \sqrt{\frac{2d \log(g/(1/u-1))}{\nu_2}} \right) \right\}
\]

for any \( d \log(g/(1/u-1)) \in (\nu_1/(2 - \sqrt{3}), \nu_2) \). Equivalently, in terms of \( u \), \((S.33)\) holds for

\[
u_1 \in \left( \frac{1}{1 + ge^{-\nu_1/(d(2-\sqrt{3}))}}, \frac{1}{1 + ge^{-\nu_2/d}} \right).
\]

Denote the left endpoint of this interval by \( u_l \), define \( \bar{u} = 1 - u_l \), and for future reference note that \( 1/\bar{u} - 1 = e^{\nu_1/(d(2-\sqrt{3}))}/g \). Clearly, for any \( \omega \in \left( 0, \sqrt{\frac{2d}{\nu_2} \log(g/(1/\bar{u} - 1))} \right) \)

Expression \((S.33)\) is \( < 2e^{-d \log(g/(1/u-1))(1-\omega)} \), which is of the form required by Lemma \[\textbf{S3}\]. Before applying the lemma we must check that \((S.33)\) holds for \( u \in (u_l, \bar{u}) \), i.e. that \( u < \bar{u} \) implies \( d \log(g/(1/u-1)) < \nu_2 \). Since \( \log(g/(1/u-1)) \) is increasing in \( u, u < \bar{u} \) implies that

\[
d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u-1} \right) < d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/\bar{u}-1} \right) = 2d \log \left( \frac{g}{e^{\nu_1/(2d(2-\sqrt{3}))}} \right),
\]

hence \( d \log(g/(1/u-1)) < \nu_2 \) for large enough \( \nu_2 \) and thus the bound in \((S.33)\) is valid for \( u \in (u_l, \bar{u}) \).
In Lemma 3 set $b = 2$, $c = 0$ and $l = (1 - \omega)/2$, where \( \omega \) is as defined above. We focus on the case where \( ld < 1 \), the \( ld \geq 1 \) case follows then trivially by observing the integrand decreases in \( d \). By Lemma 3 the integral in (S.32) is

\[
\leq 2u + \frac{2[\bar{u}/(1 - \bar{u})]^{1-d(1-\omega)/2}}{g^{d(1-\omega)/2}(1 - d(1 - \omega)/2))} = \frac{2}{1 + g\nu_1/(d(2 - \sqrt{3}))} + \frac{2e^{-\nu_1(1-d(1-\omega)/2)/(d(2-\sqrt{3}))}}{[1 - d(1 - \omega)/2]} \left( \frac{1}{g} \right)^{d(1-\omega)-1}
\]

(S.34)

since \( \omega < \sqrt{2d \log(g/(1 - \bar{u} - 1))} \), \( \nu_1/(d(2 - \sqrt{3})) \ll \nu_1 \) and \( d > 1 \) by assumption. In particular since \( \log(g) \ll \nu_2 \) by assumption one can take any fixed \( \omega \in (0,1) \) that is arbitrarily close to 0, then (S.34) is \( \ll 1/g^\alpha \) as \( \nu_2 \to \infty \) for any fixed \( \alpha < d - 1 \), as we wished to prove.

Consider now the case \( \log^7(g) \gg \nu_2 \) for all fixed \( \gamma < 1 \). Lemma S6 gives that, for all \( d \log(g/(1/u - 1)) > \nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6 \),

(S.35) \[ P(\nu_1 F > d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right)) < \left( \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}{d \log(g/(1/u - 1))} \right)^\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2} \frac{1}{2^{\nu_1 - 1}} \frac{ae}{(\nu_2/2 - 1)^2}. \]

It is easy to check that \( d \log(g/(1/u - 1)) > \nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6 \) if and only if \( u > 1/(1 + g/e^{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}) \). Define \( u = 1/(1 + g/e^{\omega(\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)}) \) for any fixed \( \omega < 1 \), and \( \bar{u} = 1 - u \). Then clearly \( u > \bar{u} \) implies that \( u > 1/(1 + g/e^{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}) \) and hence the bound in (S.35) applies to all \( u > \bar{u} \).

The polynomial tails in (S.35) are of the form required by Lemma 4 for \( c = \nu_2/2 - 2 \). We apply Lemma 4 (note that \( g \geq 1/u - 1 = g^\omega/e^{\omega(\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)} \) as required by the lemma), which gives that (S.32) is

\[
< 2u + \left( \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}{d \log \left( \frac{g}{1/u - 1} \right)} \right)^\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2} \frac{1}{2^{\nu_1 - 1}} \frac{ae}{(\nu_2/2 - 1)^2}
\]

(S.36)

\[
= \frac{2}{1 + g/e^{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}} + ae \left( \frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6}{d \log(g/(1 - \omega))} \right)^\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2} \left[ (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6) \log(g) + \omega(\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6) \right]_{\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2}}^{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}
\]

where \( (\nu_2 - 4)/(\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5) \) is arbitrarily close to 1 for large enough \( \nu_2 \) from the assumption that \( \nu_1 \ll \nu_2 \). The first term in (S.36) is \( < 2e^{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6 - \log(g)} \ll 2e^{-\log^\alpha(g)} \) for any \( \alpha < 1 \),
whereas the second in term in \((\text{S.36})\) is
\[
\ll \exp \left\{ -\frac{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 5}{2} \log \left( \frac{\log^\alpha (g)}{\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6} \right) \right\},
\]
for any \(\alpha < 1\) as \(\nu_2 \to \infty\), as we wished to prove.

### S16. PROOF OF LEMMA 5

#### S16.1. Condition (C1).
Let \(m \in S\) be a spurious model and \(r_{pm,pt} = p(M_m)/p(M_t)\). We wish to prove (C1), that is as \(n \to \infty\), \(r_{pm,pt} \ll \tau^{\beta_2(p_m-p_t)/2}\) for some fixed \(\beta_2 \in (0, 1)\). Note that for \(m \in S\) we have \(p_m - p_t \geq 1\).

Under a uniform model prior \(r_{pm,pt} = 1\), thus (C1) holds if and only if \(1 \ll \tau\).

Under a Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior \(r_{pm,pt} = \)
\[
\left( \frac{p}{p_m} \right) = \frac{p_m!(p - p_m)!}{p_m!(p - p_m)!} \leq \left( \frac{p_m - p_t}{p_m - p_t} \right)^{p_m - p_t} \ll \left( \frac{ep_m}{p_m - p_t} \right)^{p_m - p_t}
\]
where the \(\ll\) statement follows from Stirling’s bound. Now, \(r_{pm,pt} \ll \tau^{2\beta_2(p_m-p_t)/2}\) if and only if \(r_{pm,pt} \ll \tau^{\beta_2(p_m-p_t)/2}\). Since \(p_m \geq \bar{p}\), a sufficient condition for (C2) to hold is that \(\tau \gg [\bar{p}/(p - p_t)]^{2/\beta_2}\), for some \(2/\beta_2\) that is arbitrarily close to 2.

Proceeding analogously to \((\text{S.37})\), under the complexity prior
\[
r_{pm,pt} \ll \left( \frac{p}{p_m} \right)^{p_m - p_t} \ll \left( \frac{ep_m}{p_m - p_t} \right)^{p_m - p_t},
\]
where note that \(ep_m/p^p(p - p_t) \propto p_m/p^{p+1} \ll 1\), implying that \(r_{pm,pt} \ll 1\). Hence \(\tau \gg 1\) suffices to guarantee \(r_{pm,pt} \ll \tau^{\beta_2(p_m-p_t)/2}\) for any fixed \(\beta_2 > 0\).

#### S16.2. Condition (C2).
Let \(m \in S^*\). We wish to prove (C2), that is as \(n \to \infty\),
\[
\log(r_{pm,pt}) \ll \lambda_{\beta_3} + (p_m - p_t)\log(\tau) \quad \text{for all fixed } \beta_3 \in (0, 1).
\]
We treat separately the cases \(p_m \geq p_t\) and \(p_m < p_t\).

Consider first \(p_m \geq p_t\). Under a uniform prior \(r_{pm,pt} = 1\). Recall that under Condition (B2) \(\lambda_{tm} \gg 1\), hence \(\tau \geq 1\) implies \(\lambda_{\beta_3} + (p_m - p_t)\log(\tau) \gg \log(r_{pm,pt}) = 0\), as desired. Under a Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior, in \((\text{S.37})\) we showed that \(r_{pm,pt} \ll (ep_m/(p - p_t))^p(p_m - p_t)\) and hence \(\log(r_{pm,pt}) \preceq (p_m - p_t)\log(ep_m/(p - p_t)) \ll \lambda_{\beta_3} + (p_m - p_t)\log(\tau)\), since \(\lambda_{tm} \gg 1\) by (B2) and \(\tau \gg \bar{p}/(p - p_t)^{2/\beta_2} \gg (p_m/(p - p_t))^{2/\beta_2}\) by assumption. Similarly, for the complexity prior \((\text{S.38})\) implies \(\log(r_{pm,pt}) \preceq (p_m - p_t)\log(ep_m/(p - p_t))\). Since \(\lambda_{tm} \gg 1\) from (B2) and \(\tau \gg 1\) by assumption, \((p_m - p_t)\log(ep_m/(p - p_t)) \ll \lambda_{\beta_3} + (p_m - p_t)\log(\tau)\) as we wished to prove.

Consider now \(p_m < p_t\). Under a uniform prior \(\log(r_{pm,pt}) = 0\), hence (C2) holds if and only if \(\lambda_{\beta_3} \gg (p_t - p_m)\log(\tau)\). Under a Beta-Binomial(1,1) prior \(\log(r_{pm,pt}) \ll \)
(p_m - p_t) \log(ep_m/(p - p_t)), thus a sufficient condition for (C2) to hold is that
\[
(p_m - p_t) \log \left( \frac{ep_m}{p - p_t} \right) \ll \lambda_{tm}^2 + (p_m - p_t) \log(\tau) \Leftrightarrow (p_t - p_m) \log \left( \frac{\tau(p - p_t)}{ep_m} \right) \ll \lambda_{tm}^2,
\]
as we wished to prove. Finally, under the complexity prior we saw that \( \log(r_{p_m,p_t}) \preceq (p_m - p_t) \log \left( \frac{ep_m}{p - p_t} \right) \), hence a sufficient condition for (C2) is
\[
(p_t - p_m) \log \left( \frac{\tau p^c(p - p_t)}{ep_m} \right) \ll \lambda_{tm}^2,
\]
concluding the proof.

S17. PROOF OF LEMMA 6

Recall that \( \lambda_{tm} = (\theta_t^*)'X'_tH_mX_t\theta_t^*/\phi^* \), where \( H_m = I - X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X'_m \) is a projection matrix with rank \( \geq n - p_m \). Let \( q \) be the rank of \( X'_tH_mX_t \) and note that, since \( X_t \) is assumed full-rank and \( H_m \) projects onto the orthogonal space to that spanned by the columns of \( X_m \), we have that \( q \in [p_t - p_m, p_t] \). Consider the eigendecomposition \( X'_tH_mX_t = EWE' \), where \( E \) is a \( p_t \times q \) matrix containing the eigenvectors and \( W = \text{diag}(w_1, \ldots, w_q) \) contains its eigenvalues. Since \( w_j \geq v_{tm} \), it follows that
\[
\phi^* \lambda_{tm} = (\theta_t^*)'EWE'\theta_t^* = \sum_{j=1}^q w_j(\theta_t^*)'e_j e_j' \theta_t^* \geq v_{tm} \sum_{j=1}^q (\theta_t^*)'e_j e_j' \theta_t^* = v_{tm}(\theta_t^*)'EE'\theta_t^*.
\]
Consider the case where \( X'_tH_mX_t \) is full-rank \( (q = p_t) \), then \( E \) is a square orthonormal matrix satisfying \( EE' = I \), hence \( \lambda_{tm} \geq v_{tm}(\theta_t^*)'\theta_t^*/\phi^* \). Consider now the \( q < p_t \) case, then
\[
v_{tm} \sum_{j=1}^q (\theta_t^*)'e_j e_j' \theta_t^* > v_{tm} \left( \min_j (\theta_{tj}^*)^2 \right) 1'EE'1,
\]
where \( 1 = (1, \ldots, 1)' \) is the \( q \times 1 \) vector. Since the columns in \( E \) contain eigenvectors and these have unit length, we obtain \( 1'E = 1' \) and hence \( 1'EE'1 = q \geq p_t - p_m \), as we wished to prove.

S18. PROOF OF COROLLARY 1 AND COROLLARY 3

We prove Corollary 1 and its asymptotic version Corollary 3. Corollary 1 Expression (14). Applying Proposition S13 with \( |S_t| = \binom{r-p_t}{l-p_t} \) gives that for all \( n \geq n_0 \),
\[
E_{f^*} (P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p_t+1}^p \binom{p}{l-p_t} \frac{r_{l,p_t}^{1/2}}{r_{l,p_t}^{1/2}},
\]
as desired.
Corollary 1 Expression (15) and Corollary 3 Part (i) Let $t < p_t$. Applying Proposition S13 with $|S_t^c| = \binom{p_t}{t}$ and using that $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha \leq (p_t - p_m)\lambda_{tm}^\alpha$ for all $p_t > p_m$ gives that for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{p_m=0}^{p_t-1} P(S_t^c \mid y) \right) \leq \sum_{l=0}^{p_t-1} \binom{p_t}{l} \tau^\alpha \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}{r_{l,pt}} e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2} \leq \sum_{l=0}^{p_t-1} \binom{p_t}{l} \frac{1}{r_{l,pt}} \frac{e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}}{\tau^\alpha/2}$$

$$= e^{-\frac{1}{2} (\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2 - \alpha p_t \log(r))} \sum_{l=0}^{p_t-1} \frac{pe^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2 - (\alpha/2) \log(r_{l,pt})}}{(p_{l,pt})} \frac{1}{r_{l,pt}}$$

Evaluating this expression for specific $r_{l,pt}$ gives rates for any desired model space prior. For simplicity, under pairwise consistency Conditions (C1)-(C2) the term $r_{l,pt}$ is asymptotically negligible relative to $e^{\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$. Dropping the former term and using the geometric series sum gives

$$e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2} \left[ 1 - \frac{(pe^{\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2})^{p_t}}{1 - pe^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}} \right] \leq \frac{pe^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}}{p_t}$$

as desired.

Corollary 1 Expression (16) and Corollary 3 Part (ii). We obtain separate bounds for $p_m = p_t$ and $p_m > p_t$, then add them up. First consider $p_m = p_t$. Applying Proposition S13 and Stirling’s bound $\binom{p}{p_t} \leq (pe/p_t)^{p_t}$ implies that for all $n \geq n_0$,

$$(S.39)$$

$$E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{p_m=p_t}^{p_t} P(S_t^c \mid y) \right) \leq \binom{p_t}{p_t} e^{-\gamma \min_{p_m=p_t} \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}{2}} \leq \binom{p_t}{p_t} e^{-\gamma \min_{p_m=p_t} \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}{2}} < \binom{p_t}{p_t} e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$$

since a model with $p_m = p_t$ the number of missed truly active variables is $s(m) \geq 1$.

Now consider $m \in S^c$ such that $p_m > p_t$. We split the $\binom{p_t}{p_m}$ ways to choose $p_m$ out of $p$ variables according to the number of truly active variables (those in $M_t$) not included in each individual model $M_m \in S^c$. The number of ways to choose $j$ out of the truly $p_t$ active variables and $p_m - j$ out of the $p - p_t$ truly inactive variables is $\binom{p_t}{j} \binom{p_t}{p_m-j}$. Note that then the number of variables included in $M_t$ but not in $M_m$ is $s(m) = p_t - j$, and thus $\lambda_{tm}^\alpha s(m) = \lambda_{tm}^\alpha (p_t - j) \leq \lambda_{tm}^\alpha$ by assumption. Hence for any $n \geq n_0$,

$$E_{f^*} \left( \sum_{p_m=p_t+1}^{p_t} \binom{p}{p_m} \right) \leq \sum_{j=0}^{p_t} \frac{p_t!}{j! (p_t-j)!} \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{p_t} \frac{\lambda_{tm}^\alpha}{\tau^{\alpha/2} (p_t-j) / 2} e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$$

$$\leq \sum_{j=0}^{p_t} \frac{p_t!}{j! (p_t-j)!} \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{p_t} \frac{p_t!}{l! (p_t-l)!} e^{-\gamma \lambda_{tm}^\alpha/2}$$

$$(S.40)$$

$$= \frac{p_t!}{j! (p_t-j)!} \sum_{l=p_t+1}^{p_t} \frac{1}{l! (p_t-l)!} \frac{1}{\tau^{\alpha/2}}.$$
For simplicity we drop the $r_{l,p_l}$ term given that under pairwise consistency conditions (C1)-(C2) it is asymptotically dominated by $e^{\bar{\lambda}x/2}$, but the upcoming argument can be easily extended to incorporate $r_{l,p_l}$. Using that $l - j \geq 2$ and the geometric series sum, the inner summation with respect to $l$ is

$$
\leq \sum_{l=p_l+1}^{p} \frac{(p - p_l)^{(l-j)}}{\tau^{\alpha/2}(l-j)^{(l-j)}} \leq \left( \frac{2}{p - p_l} \right)^j \sum_{l=p_l+1}^{p} \left( \frac{p - p_l}{2^{\alpha/2}} \right)^l = (S.41)
$$

$$
\left( \frac{2}{p - p_l} \right)^j \left( \frac{p - p_l}{2^{\alpha/2}} \right)^{\tilde{p}+1} - \left( \frac{p - p_l}{2^{\alpha/2}} \right)^{p_l+1} \leq \left( \frac{2}{p - p_l} \right)^j - \frac{1}{\tau^{\alpha/2}}.
$$

Noting that $(p_j) \leq p_l^j$ and using the geometric series sum we obtain that (S.40) is

$$
\leq \left( \frac{p - p_l}{2^{\alpha/2}} \right)^{\tilde{p}} e^{-p_l \bar{\lambda}x/2} \sum_{j=0}^{p_l-1} \left( \frac{p_l}{p - p_l} \right) \left( \frac{2e^{\tilde{\lambda}x/2}}{p - p_l} \right)^j
$$

(S.42)

since $p_l e^{\tilde{\lambda}x/2} \gg p - p_l$ by assumption.

Adding (S.39) and (S.42) gives

$$
E_{\psi} \left( \sum_{p_m \geq p_l} \mathbb{P}(S^c_l \mid y) \right) \leq e^{-\bar{\lambda}x/2} \left( e^{p_l \log(p_e/p_l)} + e^{(\tilde{p} - p_{l+1}) \log((p - p_l)/2) + (p_l - 1) \log(p_l) - (\tilde{p}/2) \log(\tilde{p})} \right)
$$

(S.43)

$$
\leq e^{-\bar{\lambda}x/2} \left( e^{p_l \log(p_e/p_l)} + e^{(\tilde{p} - p_{l+1}) \log(p - p_l)} \right) \leq e^{-\bar{\lambda}x/2 + (\tilde{p} - p_{l+1}) \log(p - p_l)},
$$

where the second line in (S.43) follows from the assumption that $p_l \log(p_l) \ll \tilde{p}$ (so that $(p_l - 1) \log(p_l) \ll (\tilde{p} - p_{l+1}) \log(2)$) and the third line from the assumption that $e^{p_l \log(p_e/p_l)} \ll e^{(\tilde{p} - p_{l+1}) \log(p - p_l)}$.

**S19. Proof of Lemma [S1]**

To bound the right tail consider $s \in (0, 1/2)$, then by Markov’s inequality

$$
P(W > w) = P(e^{sW} > e^{sw}) \leq e^{-ws} E(e^{sW}),
$$

where $E(e^{sW}) = (1 - 2s)^{-\frac{\tau}{2}}$. The log of the right hand side is minimized for $s^* = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{2w}$, where note that $w > \nu$ guarantees that $s^* > 0$. Plugging $s = s^*$ gives the bound stated above.

To bound the left tail consider $s < 0$, then by Markov’s inequality

$$
P(W < w) = P(e^{sW} > e^{sw}) \leq e^{-ws} E(e^{sW}),
$$

where the right hand side is again minimized by $s^* = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{2w}$ and note that $w < \nu$ guarantees that $s^* < 0$. Plugging $s = s^*$ gives the desired bound.
S20. **Proof of Lemma S2**

The result is analogous to Lemma S1. For any $s < 0$, Markov’s inequality gives $P(W < w) = P(e^{sW} > e^{ws}) \leq e^{-ws}E(e^{sW})$, where $E(e^{sW}) = \exp\left(\frac{\lambda s}{1 - 2\nu}\right)$ is the non-central chi-square moment generating function. Straightforward algebra shows that the upper bound is minimized for $s = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu}{4w} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\nu^2}{4w^2} + \frac{\lambda}{w}}$.

S21. **Proof of Lemma S3**

The proof is identical to that of Lemma S2 except that here we restrict $s \in (0, 1/2)$. The restriction $s < 1/2$ arises from the fact that the chi-square moment generating function is undefined for $s \geq 1/2$.

S22. **Proof of Lemma S4**

By definition $\nu_1 W = U_1 \nu_2 / U_2$, where $U_1 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_1}(\lambda)$ and $U_2 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_2}$. Let $s > 0$. If $U_1 < ws$ and $U_2 / \nu_2 > s$ then it follows that $U_1 \nu_2 / U_2 < w$, hence

$$P\left(\frac{U_1 \nu_2}{U_2} > w\right) \leq P(U_1 > ws) + P(U_2 < s \nu_2).$$

The result for the case $\lambda = 0$ is obtained by using the Chernoff bounds in Lemma S1 to bound $P(U_1 > ws)$ and $P(U_2 < s \nu_2)$. When $\lambda > 0$ use Lemma S3 to bound $P(U_1 > ws)$ and Lemma S1 to bound $P(U_2 < s \nu_2)$. Note that Lemma S3 requires $ws > \lambda + \nu_1$ and Lemma S1 requires $s \nu_2 < \nu_2$, i.e. $s$ must satisfy the constraints $(\lambda + \nu_1)/w < s < 1$.

S23. **Proof of Lemma S5**

By definition $\nu_1 W = U_1 \nu_2 / U_2$, where $U_1 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_1}(\lambda)$ and $U_2 \sim \chi^2_{\nu_2}$. Then for any $s \geq 1$

$$P(\nu_1 W < w) \leq P(U_1 < ws) + P(U_2 > s \nu_2) \leq \frac{\exp\left(\frac{\lambda s}{2(1 - 2t/\nu_1)}\right)}{(1 - 2t/\nu_1)^{\nu_1/2}} + e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}(s-1 - \log(s))}$$

where the first term is given by Lemma S2 for any $t < 0$ and the second term by Lemma S1. By Lemma S2 the first term is minimized for $t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\nu_1}{4ws} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\nu_1^2}{4w^2s^2} + \frac{\lambda}{ws}}$, and if $ws < \lambda$ then we may set $t = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\frac{\lambda}{ws}}$, obtaining

$$e^{-\frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{\lambda} - \sqrt{ws})^2} = e^{-\frac{\lambda}{2w}(s-1 - \log(s))}.$$

S24. **Proof of Lemma S6**

Let $s > 0$, by Markov’s inequality $P(W > w) \leq E(W^s)/w^s$. For $s \in [1, \nu_2/2 - 2]$ we have that

$$E(W^s) = \left(\frac{\nu_2}{\nu_1}\right)^s \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_2}{2} + s\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_2}{2}\right) / \Gamma\left(\frac{\nu_2}{2} - s\right).$$

(S.44)
Expression (S.1) is obtained by upper-bounding the Gamma functions in the numerator in (S.44) and lower-bounding the denominator using Stirling’s formula bounds
\[ \sqrt{2\pi z^{z+\frac{1}{2}}} e^{-z} \leq \Gamma(z+1) \leq e z^{z+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-z}, \]
which hold for any \( z > 0 \), i.e. \( \nu_1 > 2, \nu_2 > 2 \). The bounds for \( \nu_1 = 1 \) and \( \nu_1 = 2 \) are obtained similarly by noting that then \( \Gamma(\nu_1/2) = \sqrt{\pi} \) and \( \Gamma(\nu_1/2) = 1 \) respectively.

To motivate the choice \( s = \min\{(w-1)\nu_1/2+1, \nu_2/2-2\} \), we minimize an asymptotic version of the bound as \( \nu_2 \to \infty \). Let \( c = \lim_{\nu_2 \to \infty} 2s/\nu_2 \in [0,1) \), then in (S.1)
\[
\lim_{\nu_2 \to \infty} \frac{\nu_2}{(\nu_2/2-s-1)} = \frac{1}{1/2-c/2} = 2/(1-c)
\]
and
\[
\left(1 - \frac{s}{\nu_2/2-1}\right)^{\nu_2-1} = \left(1 - \frac{s}{\nu_2/2-1}\right)^{\nu_2-1} \left(1 - \frac{s}{\nu_2/2-1}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq e^{-s},
\]
since \((1-s/z)^z \leq e^{-s}\) for all \( z \geq 1 \). Hence as \( \nu_2 \to \infty \)
\[
P(W > w) \leq a \left( \frac{2/(1-c)}{\nu_1 w} \right)^s (s + \nu_1/2 - 1) \left( \nu_1/2 - 1 \right)^{s-1} \frac{1}{s + \nu_1/2 - 1} e^{-s}
\]
Setting the derivative of the log-bound equal to zero gives
\[
\log \left( \frac{2/(1-c)}{\nu_1 w} \right) + \log(s + \nu_1/2 - 1) + \frac{1}{2(s + \nu_1/2 - 1)} = 0.
\]
Note that as \( w \to \infty \) the solution to the equation above must satisfy \( s \to \infty \), hence its third term converges to 0 and an approximate solution is given by
\[
\frac{\nu_1 w}{2/(1-c)} = s + \frac{\nu_1}{2} - 1 \Rightarrow s = \frac{\nu_1}{2} \left( \frac{w}{1-c} - 1 \right) + 1.
\]
Recall that \( s < \nu_2/2 \), so that \( c \) is 0 when \( s \ll \nu_2/2 \) and \( c < 1 \) when \( s \simeq \nu_2/2 \), hence the solution must satisfy \( s \geq \frac{\nu_2}{2} (w-1) + 1 \). We thus take \( s = \min\{ \frac{\nu_2}{2} (w-1) + 1, \nu_2/2-2 \} \).

Finally, to obtain the desired bounds note that if \( w \leq (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)/\nu_1 \) then \( s = \frac{\nu_2}{2} (w-1) + 1 \), whereas if \( w > (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)/\nu_1 \) then \( s = \nu_2/2 - 2 \). Plugging in \( s = \frac{\nu_2}{2} (w-1) + 1 \) and rearranging terms gives the expressions in Lemma S6 for the \( w \leq (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)/\nu_1 \) case.

When \( w > (\nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6)/\nu_1 \), plug in \( s = \nu_2/2 - 2 \) to obtain
(S.45) \[ a \left( \frac{\nu_2}{\nu_2-2} \right)^{\frac{\nu_2-2}{2}} \left( \nu_1 + \nu_2 - 6 \right) \left( \nu_1 w \right)^{\frac{\nu_2-2}{2}} \left( \nu_1/2 + \nu_2/2 - 3 \right) \frac{2^{\nu_1-1}}{\left( \nu_1/2 - 1 \right)^{\nu_1-1}} I(\nu_2 > 2) \left( \frac{1}{\nu_2/2-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.
\]
and note that
\[
\left( \frac{\nu_2}{\nu_2-2} \right)^{\frac{\nu_2-2}{2}} = \left( 1 + \frac{2}{\nu_2-2} \right)^{\frac{\nu_2-2}{2}} < e^{\nu_2^2-2} < e.
\]
S25. PROOF OF LEMMA S7

Let $\tilde{X}_s = X_s - X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X'_mX_s$ be orthogonal to the projection of $X_s$ on $X_m$. Then clearly $X'_m\tilde{X}_s = 0$ and

$$\hat{\theta'}_q X'_qX_q\hat{\theta}_q - \hat{\theta'}_m X'_mX_m\hat{\theta}_m = (\hat{\theta'}_m X'_mX_m\hat{\theta}_m + \hat{\theta'}_s X'_sX_s\hat{\theta}_s) - \hat{\theta'}_m X'_mX_m\hat{\theta}_m = \hat{\theta'}_s X'_sX_s\hat{\theta}_s,$$

where $\hat{\theta}_s = (X'_s\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}\tilde{X}_s'y$. Since $E_{f^*}(y) = X_m\theta'_m + X_s\theta'_s$, $\tilde{X}_s'yX_m = 0$ and $\tilde{X}_s'y\tilde{X}_s = \tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s = \tilde{X}_s'(X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X'_mX_s) = \tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s$, we have that $\hat{\theta}_s$ is normally distributed with mean

$$E_{f^*}(\hat{\theta}_s) = (\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}(\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s\theta'_m + \tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s\theta'_s) = (\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s\hat{\theta}_s = \theta^*_s$$

and covariance $\phi^*(\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1} = \phi^*[X'_s(I - X_m(X'_mX_m)^{-1}X'_mX_s)]^{-1}$. That is,

$$\tilde{\theta}_s \sim N(\theta^*_s, \phi^*(\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}),$$

implying that $\tilde{\theta}_s'X_s'\tilde{X}_s\hat{\theta}_s/\phi^*$ follows a $\chi^2_{p - p_m}$ with non-centrality $\lambda_{qm} = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'\tilde{X}_s\theta^*_s/\phi^*$.

Finally, note that for any $k$ with full-rank $X_k$ we have $\theta'_k = (X'_kX_k)^{-1}X'_kW/\beta^*$ and that $X_s\theta^*_s = X_q\theta^*_q - X_m\theta^*_m = (H_q - H_m)X_k\theta^*_k$, hence $\lambda_{qm} = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'(I - H_m)X_m\theta^*_m/\phi^* = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'(H_q - H_m)(I - H_m)(H_q - H_m)X_k\theta^*_k/\phi^* = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'(H_q - H_m)H_qX_k\theta^*_k/\phi^*.$

S26. PROOF OF LEMMA S8

The proof is analogous to that for Lemma S7. Briefly for any full-rank $X_k$ we obtain the KL-optimal $\theta^*_k = (X'_kX_k)^{-1}X'_kW/\beta^*$, hence the data-generating truth can be written as

$$f^*(y) = N(X_m\theta'_m + X_s\theta'_s + W/\beta^*, \xi^*I) = N(X_m\theta'_m + X_s\theta'_s + I - H_q)W/\beta^*, \xi^*I).$$

Following the proof of Lemma S7,

$$W_{qm} = \hat{\theta'}_q X'_qX_q\hat{\theta}_q - \hat{\theta'}_m X'_mX_m\hat{\theta}_m = \hat{\theta'}_s X'_sX_s\hat{\theta}_s,$$

where $\tilde{X}_s = (I - H_m)X_s$ and $\hat{\theta}_s = (\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}\tilde{X}_s'y$. Since $\tilde{X}_s'yX_m = 0$ and $\tilde{X}_s'y(I - H_q) = 0$, it follows that

$$E_{f^*}(\hat{\theta}_s) = (\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}\tilde{X}_s'(X_m\theta'_m + X_s\theta'_s + (I - H_q)W/\beta^*) = \theta^*_s$$

and Cov$(\hat{\theta}_s) = \xi^*(\tilde{X}_s'\tilde{X}_s)^{-1}$. Therefore

$$\frac{W_{qm}}{\xi^*} = \lambda^2_{p - p_m}(\lambda_{qm})$$

where $\lambda_{qm} = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'\tilde{X}_s\theta^*_s/\xi^*$. Since $(\theta^*_s)'X_s'\tilde{X}_s\theta^*_s = (\theta^*_s)'X_s'(I - H_m)X_s\theta^*_s$ and $X_s\theta^*_s = X_q\theta^*_q - X_m\theta^*_m = (H_q - H_m)W/\beta^*,$

$$\lambda_{qm} = \frac{(W/\beta^*)'(H_q - H_m)(I - H_m)(H_q - H_m)W/\beta^*)}{\xi^*}.$$
Proof of Part (i). In the proof of Lemma S.7 we showed that
\[ \hat{\theta}'_m X_m' X_m \hat{\theta}_m = \tilde{\theta}'_s X_s' \tilde{X}_s, \]
where \( \theta_s = (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)^{-1} \tilde{X}_s' \tilde{y}, \) and \( X_s = X - X_m (X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m' X_s. \) By assumption \( f^*(y) = N(y; X \theta^*, \phi^* \Sigma^*), \) hence \( f^*(\hat{\theta}_s) = N(\hat{\theta}_s; \theta_s^*, \phi^* W) \)
where
\[ W = (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)^{-1} \hat{\theta}'_s \Sigma^* \tilde{X}_s (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)^{-1} = (X_s' H_m X_s)^{-1} X_s' H_m \Sigma^* H_m X_s (X_s' H_m X_s)^{-1}, \]
and \( H_m = I - X_m (X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m'. \) Noting that
\[ \hat{\theta}'_s \tilde{X}_s \hat{\theta}_s = \hat{\theta}'_s \tilde{X}_s W W^{-1} \hat{\theta}_s = \hat{\theta}'_s \Sigma^* \tilde{X}_s (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)^{-1} W^{-1} \hat{\theta}_s, \]
and recalling that \( \omega_{mq} \) and \( \bar{\omega}_{mq} \) are the smallest and largest eigenvalues of \( \tilde{X}_s \Sigma^* \tilde{X}_s (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)^{-1}, \)
we obtain
\[ \omega_{mq} Z_1 \leq \frac{\hat{\theta}'_s \tilde{X}_s \hat{\theta}_s}{\phi^*} \leq \bar{\omega}_{mq} Z_1, \]
where \( Z_1 = \hat{\theta}'_s W^{-1} \hat{\theta}_s / \phi^* \sim \chi^2_{p_m - p_m} (\hat{\lambda}_{qm}) \) and \( \lambda_{qm} = (\theta_s^*)' W^{-1} \theta_s^* / \phi^*. \) Since \( W^{-1} = (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s)(\tilde{X}_s' \Sigma^* \tilde{X}_s)^{-1}(\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s), \) we also have
\[ \frac{(\theta_s^*)' (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s) \theta_s^*}{\omega_{mq} \phi^*} \leq \bar{\lambda}_{qm} \leq \frac{(\theta_s^*)' (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s) \theta_s^*}{\omega_{mq} \phi^*}, \]
where \((\theta_s^*)' (\tilde{X}_s' \tilde{X}_s) \theta_s^* / \phi^* = (\theta_s^*)' \tilde{X}_s' (I - X_m (X_m' X_m)^{-1} X_m) X_s \theta_s^* / \phi^* = \lambda_{qm}, \) completing the proof.

Proof of Part (ii). For any \( T \in I_q \) the matrix \( X_F = (X_q, T) \) is full-rank, hence \( y = X_F \hat{\theta}_F \) and \( y'y - \hat{\theta}'_q X_q' X_q \hat{\theta}_q = \hat{\theta}'_F X_F' X_F \hat{\theta}_F - \hat{\theta}'_q X_q' X_q \hat{\theta}_q. \) By Part (i) this implies that
\[ \omega_{qF} Z_2 \leq \frac{y'y - \hat{\theta}'_q X_q' X_q \hat{\theta}_q}{\phi^*} \leq \bar{\omega}_{qF} Z_2, \]
where \( Z_2 \sim \chi^2_{n-p_F}, \) \( \omega_{qF} = \delta (T' \Sigma T (T'T)^{-1}), \) \( \bar{\omega}_{qF} = \delta (T' \Sigma T (T'T)^{-1}), \) \( \text{and} \) \( T = (I - X_q (X_q' X_q)^{-1} X_q') T. \) Since the bound applies to any \( T \in I_q \) and we defined \( \omega_q = \min_{I_q} \omega_{qF}, \)
\( \bar{\omega}_q = \min_{I_q} \bar{\omega}_{qF}, \) hence
\[ \omega_q Z_2 \leq y'y - \hat{\theta}'_q X_q' X_q \hat{\theta}_q \leq \omega_q Z_2. \]

Combining this with Part (i) gives that
\[ \omega_{mq} Z_1 \leq \frac{\hat{\theta}'_s X_s' X_s \hat{\theta}_s - \hat{\theta}'_m X_m' X_m \hat{\theta}_m}{\phi^* y'y - \hat{\theta}'_q X_q' X_q \hat{\theta}_q} \leq \frac{\bar{\omega}_{mq} Z_1}{\omega_q Z_2}, \]
as we wished to prove.
S28. Proof of Lemma \[S10]\)

From standard Normal theory \(y \sim N(X_q\theta^*; \phi^*I)\) implies that \(\hat{\theta}_q \sim N(\mu^*, \phi^*\Sigma)\). Hence marginally \(\hat{\theta}_{qi} \sim N(\mu_{qi^*}, \phi_{qi^*}\sigma_{i^*})\) and thus \(\hat{\theta}_{qi}^2/(\phi_{qi^*}\sigma_{i^*}) \sim \chi^2_i(\mu_{qi^*}^2/(\phi_{qi^*}\sigma_{i^*}))\). All that remains is to bound \(\mu_i^2/\sigma_{ii}\).

We first bound \(\sigma_{ii}\). Let \(e_i\) be the \(i^\text{th}\) canonical eigenvector with \(e_{ii} = 1\) and \(e_{ij} = 0\) for \(i \neq j\). Then \(\sigma_{ii} = \left\langle e_i'\Sigma e_i \right\rangle = \left\langle e_i'(X_q'X_q)^{-1/2}(X_q'X_q)^{1/2}(X_q'X_q)^{-1/2}e_i \right\rangle = e_i'(X_q'X_q)^{-1/2}A^2(X_q'X_q)^{-1/2}e_i\), where \(A = (X_q'X_q)^{1/2}(X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}(X_q'X_q)^{1/2}\). The eigenvalues of \(A\) are the same as the eigenvalues of \((X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}X_q'X_q\) (see proof of Lemma \[S12\]), and these are the inverse of the eigenvalues of \(I + (X_q'X_q)^{-1}V_q^{-1}/\tau\), hence the eigenvalues of \(A\) are \(\tau\rho_{q1}/(\tau\rho_{q1} + 1) \geq \ldots \geq \tau\rho_{qpa}/(\tau\rho_{qpa} + 1) > 0\). Therefore

\[
\frac{\tau^2\rho_{q2}}{\tau^2\rho_{qpa} + 1} \leq \sigma_{ii} \leq \frac{\tau^2\rho_{q1}^2}{\tau^2\rho_{q1}^2 + 1}
\]

where \(\tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = e_i'(X_q'X_q)^{-1}e_i\) is the \(i^\text{th}\) diagonal element in \((X_q'X_q)^{-1}\). Using the blockwise matrix inversion formula, \(\tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = (x_{qi}')(1 - X_m(X_m'X_m)^{-1}X_m'x_{qi})^{-1}\).

We now bound \(\mu_i^2\). Note that \(\mu_i^2 = (\theta_{qi}^*)^2 + (\mu_i - \theta_{qi}^*)^2 + 2\theta_{qi}^*(\mu_i - \theta_{qi}^*)\), hence if we can find an upper bound \(u\) such that \(|\mu_i - \theta_{qi}^*| < u\) then it follows that

\[
\mu_i^2 \geq (\theta_{qi}^*)^2 - 2u|\theta_{qi}^*| = (\theta_{qi}^*)^2 \left(1 - \frac{2u}{|\theta_{qi}^*|}\right)
\]

\[
\mu_i^2 \leq (\theta_{qi}^*)^2 + u^2 + 2u|\theta_{qi}^*| = (\theta_{qi}^*)^2 \left(1 + \frac{u^2}{|\theta_{qi}^*|^2} + \frac{2u}{|\theta_{qi}^*|}\right)
\]

Let \(D = (X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}X_q'X_q - I\) and note that \(\mu - \theta_q^* = D\theta_q^*\). We already saw that the largest eigenvalue of \((X_q'X_q + V_q^{-1}/\tau)^{-1}X_q'X_q\) is \(\tau\rho_{q1}/(\tau\rho_{q1} + 1)\), hence the largest eigenvalue of \(D\) is \(1/(\tau\rho_{q1} + 1)\).

\[
(\mu_i - \theta_{qi}^*)^2 \leq (\mu - \theta_q^*)'(\mu - \theta_q^*) = (\theta_q^*)'D^2\theta_q^* \leq \frac{(\theta_q^*)'(\theta_q^*)}{(\tau\rho_{q1} + 1)^2}
\]

In \((S.46)\) we may set \(u = \sqrt{(\theta_q^*)'(\theta_q^*)/(\tau\rho_{q1} + 1)}\). Hence

\[
\frac{\mu_i^2}{\sigma_{ii}\phi^*} \leq \left[\frac{(\theta_{qi}^*)^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}\phi^*} \left(1 - \frac{2u}{|\theta_{qi}^*|}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau^2\rho_{q1}^2}\right) \frac{(\theta_{qi}^*)^2}{\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}\phi^*} \left(1 + \frac{2u}{|\theta_{qi}^*|} + \frac{u^2}{(\theta_{qi}^*)^2}\right) \left(1 + \frac{1}{\tau^2\rho_{qpa}^2}\right)\right].
\]

Recall that \(\tilde{\sigma}_{ii} = (x_{qi}')(1 - X_m(X_m'X_m)^{-1}X_m'x_{qi})^{-1}\), hence \((\tilde{\theta}_{qi}^*)^2/(\tilde{\sigma}_{ii}\phi^*) = \lambda_{qi}\) as desired.
A FRAMEWORK FOR POSTERIOR CONSISTENCY IN MODEL SELECTION

S29. Proof of Lemma S11

Let \( \mu_{qi} \) and \( \sigma_{ii} \) be as defined in Lemma S10 and \( s_q = y'y - y'X_q(X_q'X_q)^{-1}X_q'y \) the residual sum of squares under the least squares estimate of \( \theta_q \). The target probability is

\[
(\text{S.47}) \quad P\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}/\sigma_{ii}}{s_q/(n-p_q)} \leq \frac{1}{\sigma_{ii}h_n}\right) \leq P\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}/\sigma_{ii}}{s_q/(n-p_q)} < \frac{2}{\sigma_{ii}h_n}\right) + P\left(\frac{s_q}{\hat{s}_q} < \frac{1}{2}\right).
\]

From Lemma S12, we have that \( s_q/\hat{s}_q \geq \left(1 + (s_0 - s_q)/(s_q(1 + \tau\rho_{q,p_q}))\right)^{-1} \), hence the second term in (S.47) is

\[
(\text{S.48}) \quad P\left(1 + \frac{s_0 - s_q}{s_q(1 + \tau\rho_{q,p_q})} > 2\right) = P\left(p_qF_{q0} > (n-p_q)(1 + \tau\rho_{q,p_q})\right)
\]

where \( F_{q0} = [(s_0 - s_q)/p_q]/[s_q/(n-p_q)] \) is the F-test statistic to compare \( M_q \) with the model that includes no covariates. To bound this tail probability, in Corollary S1(ii) set \( w = (n-p_q)(1 + \tau\rho_{q,p_q})/p_q \), \( \nu_1 = p_q \), \( \nu_2 = n \) and note that \( w \gg \nu_2 \gg (n-p_q) \) for any \( \gamma < 1 \), hence (S.48) is \( \ll e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma} \).

To bound the first term in (S.47), note that \( [\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}/\sigma_{ii}]/[s_q/(n-p_q)] \) is the ratio of a non-central chi-square random variable and central chi-square, each divided by its respective degrees of freedom \((1, n-p_q)\) respectively. Hence we may apply the tail inequality in Lemma S5, setting \( w = 2/(\sigma_{ii}h_n) \). Lemma S10 guarantees that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mu^2_{qi}/(\sigma_{ii}\phi^*)}{\lambda_{qi}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \frac{\mu^2_{qi}/(\sigma_{ii}\phi^*)}{(\hat{\theta}^2_{qi})^2/(\hat{\sigma}_{ii}\phi^*)} = 1,
\]

hence the assumption that \( h_n \gg \phi^*/(\hat{\theta}^2_{qi})^2 \) implies that \( w \ll \lambda_{qi} \), i.e. that the critical point is below the non-centrality parameter \( \lambda_{qi} \). Then by Lemma S5 the first term in (S.47) is

\[
\ll e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)(s - 1 - \log(s))/2} \leq e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)c}
\]

for any fixed \( s < \lambda_{qi}/w \), \( \gamma \in (0, 1) \) and \( c = s - 1 - \log(s) \) is an arbitrarily large constant. Summarizing, (S.47) is \( e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma/2} \), proving the first part of the lemma. As a direct implication

\[
P\left(\prod_{i=1}^{p_q} \frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}(n-p_q)}{\hat{s}_q} < \frac{1}{h_n^{p_q}}\right) \leq P\left(\min_{i=1,\ldots,p_q} \frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}(n-p_q)}{\hat{s}_q} < \frac{1}{h_n}\right)
\]

\[
\leq \sum_{i=1,\ldots,p_q} P\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}(n-p_q)}{\hat{s}_q} < \frac{1}{h_n}\right),
\]

which by Lemma S14 is \( \ll p_q(e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma}) \), concluding the proof of Part (i).

Regarding Parts (ii) and (iii), by Corollary S1,

\[
P\left(\frac{\hat{\theta}^2_{qi}/\sigma_{ii}}{\hat{s}_q/(n-p_q)} > \frac{\hat{h}_n}{\sigma_{ii}}\right) \ll e^{-\gamma h_n/(2\sigma_{ii})} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma/2} \ll e^{-\gamma\lambda_{qi}/2} + e^{-(n-p_q)\gamma/2},
\]


as long as $\bar{h}_n/\sigma_{ii}$ is asymptotically larger than the non-centrality parameter $\lambda_{qi}$. For the case $\theta^*_{qi} = 0$ this simply requires that $\bar{h}_n \gg \sigma_{ii}$, which holds by assumption. For the case $\theta^*_{qi} \neq 0$ this requires that $\bar{h}_n/\sigma_{ii} \gg (\theta^*_{qi})^2/(\phi^* \sigma_{ii})$, that is $\bar{h}_n \gg (\theta^*_{qi})^2/\phi^*$, which holds by assumption. Note that we can equivalently use $\sigma_{ii}$ or $\bar{\sigma}_{ii}$, since $\lim_{n \to \infty} \sigma_{ii}/\bar{\sigma}_{ii} = 1$ by Lemma S10.

S30. PROOF OF LEMMA S12

Note that $s_m$ is the sum of squared residuals under the least-squares estimate, hence $\tilde{s}_m > s_m$ and

$$\begin{equation}
\frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} \bar{F}_{mt} = \frac{\tilde{s}_t - \tilde{s}_m}{\tilde{s}_m} < \frac{\tilde{s}_t - s_m}{s_m} = \frac{s_t - s_m}{s_m} + \frac{\tilde{s}_t - s_t}{s_m} = \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} \bar{F}_{mt} + \frac{\tilde{s}_t - s_t}{s_m}.
\end{equation} \tag{S.49}
$$

To prove Lemma S12 it suffices to show that we can upper-bound $\tilde{s}_t - s_t = (S.50)$

$$y'X_t(I_{t}X_t)^{-1}X_t'y - y'X_t(I_{t}X_t + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1})^{-1}X_t'y \leq \frac{y'X_t(I_{t}X_t)^{-1}X_t'y}{1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t}} = \frac{s_0 - s_t}{1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t}},$$

where $s_0 = y'y$ is the sum of squared residuals under the model with no covariates. Then $\tilde{s}_t \leq s_t + (s_0 - s_t)/(1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t})$, proving the first part of the lemma, and further (S.49) is

$$\leq \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} \bar{F}_{mt} + \frac{1}{1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t}} \left( \frac{s_0 - s_m}{s_m} - \frac{s_t - s_m}{s_m} \right) = \frac{\tau \rho_{tp_t}}{1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t}} \frac{p_m - p_t}{n - p_m} \bar{F}_{mt} + \frac{1}{1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t}} \frac{F_{m0}p_m}{n - p_m},$$

proving the second part of the lemma.

To prove (S.50), the left-hand side is equal to

$$y'X_t(I_{t}X_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left[ I - (X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}(X_t'X_t + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1})^{-1}(X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] (X_t'X_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}X_t'y$$

$$< (1 - l)y'X_t(I_{t}X_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}X_t'y,$$

where $l$ is the smallest non-zero eigenvalue of $(X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}(X_t'X_t + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1})^{-1}(X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. An elementary argument below shows that $l = \tau \rho_{tp_t}/(1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t})$, hence $1 - l = 1/(1 + \tau \rho_{tp_t})$ as desired.

Consider arbitrary invertible square matrices $A, B$ of equal dimension and let $\rho$ be an eigenvalue of $B^{-\frac{1}{2}}A B^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. Then $B^{-\frac{1}{2}}A B^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \rho \nu$ where $\nu$ is the corresponding eigenvector, thus $AB^{-\frac{1}{2}} = \rho B^{-\frac{1}{2}} \nu$ and $\rho$ is an eigenvalue of $AB^{-1}$ with eigenvector $B^{\frac{1}{2}} \nu$. Consequently $(X_t'X_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}(X_t'X_t + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1})(X_t'X_t)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ has the same eigenvalues as $I + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1}(X_t'X_t)^{-1}$, and trivially the eigenvalues of the latter are $1 + \frac{1}{\tau \rho_{j}}$ for $j = 1, \ldots, p_t$.

Therefore the eigenvalues of $(X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}(X_t'X_t + \tau^{-1}V_{t}^{-1})^{-1}(X_t'X_t)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are $\tau \rho_{j}/(1 + \tau \rho_{j})$. 

S31. Proof of Lemma S14

We need to show that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{g_{n}} = \lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{\bar{g}_{n}(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1)} < \infty.
\]

To see that this series converges we shall show that it increases at a rate slower than \(1/(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1)\), i.e. the inverse of its number of terms. Specifically, define \(m = l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1\) and \(s_{l,m} = \sigma_{l,n}/(m\bar{g}_{n})\), the increase in the series between \(m\) and \(m+1\) is

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{m+1} s_{l,m+1} - \sum_{l=1}^{m} s_{l,m} = s_{m+1,m+1} + \sum_{l=1}^{m} (s_{l,m+1} - s_{l,m}).
\]

If we can show that this increase is \(\ll 1/m\) then by the ratio test it follows that (S.51) is a convergent series. Regarding the first term on the right hand side of (S.52),

\[
s_{m+1,m+1} \ll \frac{1}{m} \iff \frac{\sigma_{l_{n}^{(1)},n}}{(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1)\bar{g}_{n}} \ll \frac{1}{l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1} \iff \sigma_{l_{n}^{(1)},n} \ll \bar{g}_{n},
\]

which holds by Assumption (i). Regarding the second term in (S.52),

\[
\sum_{l=1}^{m} s_{l,m+1} - s_{l,m} \ll \frac{1}{m} \iff \sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n+1}}{(l_{n+1}^{(1)} - l_{n+1}^{(0)} + 1)\bar{g}_{n+1}} - \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1)\bar{g}_{n}} \ll \frac{1}{l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1}.
\]

The right-hand side holds since \(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)}\) is non-decreasing by assumption, hence

\[
\sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n+1}}{(l_{n+1}^{(1)} - l_{n+1}^{(0)} + 1)\bar{g}_{n+1}} - \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{(l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1)\bar{g}_{n}} \leq \frac{1}{l_{n}^{(1)} - l_{n}^{(0)} + 1} \sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n+1}}{(\bar{g}_{n+1} - \bar{g}_{n})} - \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{\bar{g}_{n}}
\]

and by Assumption (ii)

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{l=I_{n}^{(0)}}^{I_{n}^{(1)}} \frac{\sigma_{l,n+1}}{\bar{g}_{n+1} - \bar{g}_{n}} - \frac{\sigma_{l,n}}{\bar{g}_{n}} \leq 0.
\]

S32. Proof of Corollary S2

The result is an immediately application of Lemma S14 to the case where \(g_{n}^{(l)}\) does not depend on \(l\). Specifically, in Lemma S14 set \(\bar{g}_{n} = b_{n}\) and note that Assumption (i) in Lemma S14 is satisfied since \(\mu_{|A_{n}|,n} \ll b_{n}\). Also Assumption (ii) in Lemma S14 is equivalent to the assumption made in the statement of Corollary S2 that

\[
\lim_{n \to \infty} \sum_{k \in A_{n}} \frac{\mu_{k,n+1}}{b_{n+1}} - \frac{\mu_{k,n}}{b_{n}} \leq 0.
\]
We seek to bound
\[
\sum_{l=\bar{p}+1}^{\bar{p}} \binom{l}{p_l} \frac{[(l - p_l) \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))]^{\frac{\tau - p_l}{2} + 1}}{\tau^{\frac{\tau - p_l}{2}}}
\]

(S.53) \[= \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l)) \sum_{l=\bar{p}+1}^{\bar{p}} \binom{l}{p_l} \left[ \frac{(\bar{p} - p_l)^a \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))}{\tau} \right]^{\frac{\tau - p_l}{2}}.\]

Let $l_0 > p_l$ be an arbitrary fixed integer. The sum in (S.53) can be split into two sums over $l \leq l_0$ and $l > l_0$. Let $a > 1$ be a fixed constant, then there exists fixed $l_0$ such that for $l > l_0$ it holds that $(l - p_l)^{1+2/(l - m)} < (l - p_l)^a \leq (\bar{p} - p_l)^a$. Also note that, as $n \to \infty$, for any fixed $l \leq l_0$ we have $\max_{l \leq l_0} (l - p_l)^{1+2/(l - m)} / \tau \sim 1 / \tau \leq (\bar{p} - p_l)^a / \tau$. Hence we have that (S.53) is
\[
\leq \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l)) \sum_{l=\bar{p}+1}^{\bar{p}} \binom{l}{p_l} \left\{ \frac{(\bar{p} - p_l)^a \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))}{\tau} \right\}^{\frac{\tau - p_l}{2}}
\]
(S.54) \[< \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l)) \left( 1 - \frac{(\bar{p} - p_l)^{a/2} \log^{1/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))}{\tau^{1/2}} \right)^{-(p_l+1)} - 1,\]

the right-hand side following from the Binomial coefficient’s ordinary generating function. If $\tau^{1/2} \gg (p_l + 1)(\bar{p} - p_l)^{a/2} \log^{3/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))$, which is guaranteed by assumption, from the definition of the exponential function (S.54) is
\[
\leq \log(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l)) \left( e^{(p_l+1)(\bar{p} - p_l)^{a/2} \log^{3/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l)) / \tau^{1/2}} - 1 \right)
\]
\[\ll \frac{(p_l + 1)(\bar{p} - p_l)^{a/2} \log^{3/2}(\tau^{1/2}(p - p_l))}{\tau^{1/2}},\]

the right-hand side following from $\lim_{z \to 0} (e^z - 1) / z = 1$. This proves the desired result.

S34. Proof of Lemma S16

Let $g = \tau^{(p_k - p_l)/2} r_{p_l, p_k}$ where $r_{p_l, p_k} = p(M_l) / p(M_k) = p_l!/(p_l - p_l)!/(p_k - p_k)! < (p - p_l)^{p_k - p_l}$. Then $\log(g) < (p_k - p_l) \log(\tau(p - p_l)) \ll n - \bar{p}$ by assumption. In this case for $m \in S$ we saw in Section 3.3 that
\[
E_{f^*}(Z_k) < \int_0^1 P((p_m - p_l)F_{md} > b_n(u))du
\]
where \( b_n(u) = 2[(n-p_k)/(n+a_\phi)] \log((1+\tau)^{(2k-p_k)/2} r_{p_k}/(1/u-1)) \). Then Lemma S18(i) gives \( E_f^*(Z_k) \leq g^2\sqrt{\log(n)/(n-p_k)}/g \). Applying Proposition S13

\[
E_f^*(P(S \mid y)) \leq \sum_{l=p_l+1}^{p} \left( \frac{1}{p_l} \left( \frac{\tau^{1/2} (p-p_l)}{\tau^{1/2}} \right) \right)^{1-p_l} - 1
\]

(S.55)

where \( c_n = \sqrt{\langle p - p_l \rangle [\log(\tau^{1/2} (p-p_l)))/(n-p) \rangle} \) and the right-hand side follows from the Binomial coefficient’s ordinary generating function.

If \( [\tau^{1/2} (p-p_l)]^{2c_n} \ll \tau^{1/2} \), which holds by assumption, then (S.55) is

\[
\exp \left\{ \frac{(p_l+1)[\tau^{1/2} (p-p_l)]^{2c_n}}{\tau^{1/2}} \right\} - 1 \approx \frac{(p_l+1)[\tau^{1/2} (p-p_l)]^{2c_n}}{\tau^{1/2}}
\]

since \( \lim_{z \to 0} (e^z - 1)/z = 1 \), as we wished to prove.

**S35. Proof of Corollary S1**

The result is obtained by setting \( s = 1 + \frac{w}{\nu_2}(1 - \sqrt{1+2\nu_2/w}) \) in Lemma S4 and applying basic inequalities. We first check that when \( w \in ((\nu_1 + \lambda)/(2 - \sqrt{3}), \nu_2) \) then \( s \in ((\nu_1 + \lambda)/w, 1) \) as required by Lemma S4. Clearly, \( s < 1 \). Further note that \( s \) is decreasing in \( w/\nu_2 \leq 1 \), thus plugging \( w/\nu_2 = 1 \) into the expression of \( s \) gives that \( s \geq 2 - \sqrt{3} \). Hence \( 2 - \sqrt{3} > (\nu_1 + \lambda)/w \) implies that \( s > \nu_1/w, \) as desired.

To motivate \( s \) asymptotically as \( w \to \infty \) we set \( s \) such that the two terms for \( P(\nu_1 W > w) \) in Lemma S4 under \( \lambda = 0 \) are approximately equal. The leading factor in the first term is \( e^{-w/\nu_2} \) and the second term is \( e^{-w/2} (s-1 - \log(s))/2 \), hence we seek \( s \) such that \( ws = \nu_2 (s - 1 - \log(s)) \), i.e. \( (1 + \log(s))/s = 1 - w/\nu_2 \). To find such \( s \) suppose that \( \nu_2 \) is a function of \( w \) such that \( \lim_{w \to \infty} w/\nu_2 = 0 \), then \( \lim_{w \to \infty} (1 + \log(s))/s = 1 \) and hence \( \lim_{w \to \infty} s = 1 \). Plugging in the second order Taylor expansion \( \log(s) \approx s - 1 - (s-1)^2/2 \) around \( s = 1 \) gives \( \nu_2 (s - 1 - \log(s)) \approx \nu_2 (s - 1)^2/2 \). After simple algebra solving the second order equation \( ws = \nu_2 (s - 1)^2/2 \) under the restriction that \( s < 1 \) gives \( s = 1 + \frac{w}{\nu_2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1+2\nu_2/w} \right) \), as desired.

To complete the proof we plug our choice of \( s \) into Lemma S4. Consider first Lemma S4(i). Since \( s < 1 \) the first term is

\[
\leq \left( \frac{ew}{\nu_1} \right)^{\nu_2/2} e^{-w/\nu_2} = \left( \frac{ew}{\nu_1} \right)^{\nu_2/2} \exp \left( -\frac{\nu_2}{2\nu_2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1+2\nu_2/w} \right) \right)
\]

where considering that \( w < \nu_2 \) and that \( z(1 - \sqrt{1+2/z}) \geq -\sqrt{2z} \) for any \( z \in (0, 1) \),

\[
e^{-\frac{\nu_2}{2\nu_2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{1+2\nu_2/w} \right)} \leq e^{-\frac{\nu_2}{2\nu_2} \left( 1 - \sqrt{2w/\nu_2} \right)}.
\]
Regarding the second term, since $s - 1 - \log(s) > (s - 1)^2/2$ for all $s \in (0, 1)$,
\[ e^{-\frac{w}{2} (s-1-\log(s))} < e^{-\frac{w}{2} \frac{(s-1)^2}{2}} = e^{-\frac{w}{2} \frac{s^2}{2}} (1 - \sqrt{1 + 2w/s/w})^2 < e^{-w/2}, \]
where the last inequality follows from $z^2(1 - \sqrt{1 + 2/z}) > 2z$ for all $z \in (0, 1)$ and plugging in $z = w/\nu_2$.

Consider now Part (ii). Then
\[ P(\nu_1 W > w) \leq e^{-\frac{w}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{2}{w}}\right)^2} \left(\frac{wS}{\nu_2}\right)^{\nu_1/2} + (es)^{\nu_2/2} e^{-\frac{w}{2}}, \]
The second term is identical to the $\lambda = 0$ case, hence $< e^{-w/2}$. Regarding the first term we just showed that $s = 1 + \frac{w}{\nu_2} (1 - \sqrt{1 + 2w/\nu_2}) > 1 - \sqrt{2w/\nu_2}$, hence the first term is
\[ < \left(\frac{w}{\nu_2}\right)^{\nu_1/2} e^{-\frac{w}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{2w/\nu_2}\right)^2} \left(1 - \sqrt{\frac{\nu_1}{w(1 - \sqrt{2w/\nu_2})}}\right)^2, \]
as we wished to prove.
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