

Sparse Density Estimation with Measurement Errors

Xiaowei Yang^a, Huiming Zhang^{b*}, Haoyu Wei^c and Shouzheng Zhang^d

a. School of Mathematics and Statistics, Chaohu University, Hefei, Anhui, China.

b. School of Mathematical Sciences, c. Guanghua School of Management, Peking University, Beijing, China.

d. Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, CA, USA. e-mail:
yxw8290@163.com; cute@pku.edu.cn; cute@pku.edu.cn; carol_z@berkeley.edu

Abstract: This paper aims to build an estimate of an unknown density of the data with measurement error as a linear combination of functions from a dictionary. Inspired by the penalization approach, we propose the weighted Elastic-net penalized minimal ℓ_2 -distance method for sparse coefficients estimation, where the adaptive weights come from sharp concentration inequalities. The optimal weighted tuning parameters are obtained by the first-order conditions holding with a high probability. Under local coherence or minimal eigenvalue assumptions, non-asymptotical oracle inequalities are derived. These theoretical results are transposed to obtain the support recovery with a high probability. Then, some numerical experiments for discrete and continuous distributions confirm the significant improvement obtained by our procedure when compared with other conventional approaches. Finally, the application is performed in a meteorology data set. It shows that our method has potency and superiority of detecting the shape of multi-mode density compared with other conventional approaches.

MSC 2010 subject classifications: Primary 62J12; secondary 62H12.

Keywords and phrases: density estimation, Elastic-net, measurement error, support recovery, multi-mode data.

Contents

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 1 | Introduction | 2 |
| 2 | Density Estimation | 3 |
| 2.1 | Mixture models | 3 |
| 2.2 | Estimation for sparse density with measurement errors | 4 |
| 2.3 | We cannot transform the mixture models to linear models! | 6 |
| 3 | Sparse Mixture Density Estimation | 7 |
| 3.1 | Data-dependent weights | 7 |
| 3.2 | Non-asymptotic oracle inequalities | 9 |
| 3.3 | Correct support identification of mixture models | 11 |
| 4 | Simulation and Real Data Analysis | 12 |
| 4.1 | Tuning parameter selection | 13 |
| 4.2 | Multi-modal distributions | 13 |
| 4.3 | Mixture of Poisson distributions | 15 |
| 4.4 | Low dimensional mixture model | 16 |
| 4.5 | Real data examples | 17 |
| 5 | Summary and Discussions | 20 |
| A | Technical Details | 21 |
| | Acknowledgements | 32 |
| | References | 33 |

*Corresponding author. The first three authors Xiaowei Yang, Huiming Zhang, and Haoyu Wei are co-first authors who contribute equally to this work.

1. Introduction

Over the years, the mixture models have been extensively applied to model unknown distributional shapes in astronomy, biology, economics, and genomics see [McLachlan et al. \(2019\)](#) and references therein. The distributions of real data involving potential complex variables often show multi-mode and heterogeneity. Due to the flexibility, it also often appear in various distribution-based statistical techniques, such as cluster analysis, discriminant analysis, survival analysis, empirical Bayesian inference. Flexible mixture models can naturally represent how the data are generated as mathematical artifacts. There are theoretical results showing that the mixture can approximate any density in the Euclidean space well, and the number of the mixture can also be finite (for example, a mixture of several Gaussian distributions). Although the mixture model is inherently attractive to the statistical modeling, it is a well-known difficult to infer, see [Balakrishnan et al. \(2017\)](#). From the computational aspect, the optimization problems of mixture models are non-convex. Although existing computational methods, such as EM and various MCMC algorithms, are capable of making the mixture model fit the data relatively easily. It should be emphasized that the mixture problems are essentially difficult to be unrecognizable, and the number of components (says, the order selection) is hard to determine, see [Chen and Khalili \(2008\)](#). There is a large amount of literature on its approximation theory and various methods have been proposed to estimate the components, see [DasGupta \(2008\)](#) and references therein.

Nonparametric and combinatorial density estimation method were well studied in [[Devroye and Lugosi \(2001\)](#), [Biau and Devroye \(2005\)](#), as well as [Meister \(2009\)](#)]. These can be used to consistently estimate the amount of the components of the mixture when the components have known functional forms. When the number of candidate components is large, however, the non-parametric method becomes computationally infeasible. Fortunately, the advance of high-dimensional inference would compensate for this gap and guarantee the correct identification of the mixture components with a probability attending to one. With the advancement of technology, high-dimensional problems have been being applied to the forefront of statistical researches, and high-dimensional inference method has been applied to the infinite mixture models with a sparse mixture of $p \rightarrow \infty$ components, which is an interesting and challenging problem, see [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#) and [Bertin et al. \(2011\)](#). We propose an improvement of the sparse estimation strategy proposed in [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#), in which Bunea et al. propose a ℓ_1 -type penalty to obtain a sparse estimate (SPADES), while we add a ℓ_2 -type penalty and extend the oracle-inequality results to our new estimator.

In the real data, we often encounter the situation that the i.i.d. samples $X_i = Z_i + \varepsilon_i$ are contained by some zero-mean measurement error $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$, see [Chen \(1998\)](#), [Hall et al. \(2008\)](#), [Meister \(2006\)](#), [Cheng and van Ness \(1999\)](#). For density estimation of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$, if there exists an orthogonal basis of functions, the estimation method is quite easy. In the measurement-error setting, however, finding an orthogonal based density function is not easy, see [Schennach and Bonhomme \(2013\)](#). [Schennach and Bonhomme \(2013\)](#) suggests the assumption that the conditional distribution function of X_i given Z_i is known. This condition is somewhat strong since the most conditional distribution is hard to get the explicit formula (except the Gaussian distribution). To address this predicament, particularly with nonorthogonal base functions, the SPADES model is attractive and makes the situation easier to deal with. Based on the SPADES method, our approach is an Elastic-net calibration approach which is simpler and more interpretable than the conditional inference procedure proposed by [Schennach and Bonhomme \(2013\)](#). In this paper, we proposed the corrected loss function to debias the measurement error, and this is motivated by [Nakamura \(1990\)](#). We derive the honest variable selection consistency based on weighted $\ell_1 + \ell_2$ penalty, while some theoretical results of SPADES only contain the situation of the equal weights setting which is not plausible in sense of adaptive (data-dependent) penalized

estimation. Moreover, we perform the Poisson mixture model to approximate the complex discrete distribution in the simulation part, while existing papers only emphasize the performance of continuous distribution models. Note that the multivariate kernel density estimator can only deal with continuous distribution and it requires a multivariate bandwidths section, while our method is dimensional free (the number of the required tuning parameters are only two).

This paper is presented as follows. Section 2 introduces the density estimator which can deal with measurement errors. In this section, we introduce data-dependent weights for Lasso penalty, and the weights are derived by the event of KKT conditions holding with a high probability. In Section 3, we give a condition that can accurately estimate the weights of the mixture, with a probability tending to 1. We show that, in an increasing dimensional mixture model under the local coherence assumption, if the tuning parameter is higher than the noise level, the recovery of the mixture component can hold with a high probability. In Section 4, we study the performance of our approach on artificial data generating from mixed Gaussian or Poisson distributions compared with other conventional methods, which indeed shows the improvement by employing our procedure. Besides, the simulation also demonstrates that our method is better than the traditional EM algorithm even under a low dimensional model. Considering the multimodal density aspect of the meteorology dataset, our proposed estimator has a stronger ability in detecting multiple modes for the underlying distribution, comparing with other methods such as SPADES or un-weighted Elastic-net estimator. Section 5 is the summary and the proof of theoretical results is delivered in the Appendix.

2. Density Estimation

2.1 Mixture models

Suppose that $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent random variables with a common unknown density $h \in \mathbb{R}^d$. However, the observations are contaminated with measurement errors $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as latent variables, the observed data are actually $X_i = Z_i + \varepsilon_i$. Let $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ be a series of density functions (such as Gaussian or Poisson), and $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ are also called basis functions. Assume that the estimator of h belongs to the linear combination of $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$. The $W := W_n$ is a function of n , which is of particular intriguing for us, since there may be $W \gg n$ (the high-dimensional setting). Let $\beta^* := (\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_W^*) \in \mathbb{R}^W$ be the unknown true parameter. Assume that

- (H.1): the $h := h_{\beta^*}$ is defined as

$$Z \sim h(z) := h_{\beta^*}(z) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* h_j(z), \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* = 1. \quad (2.1)$$

If the base is orthogonal and there are no measurement errors, a perfectly natural method is to estimate h by an orthogonal series of estimators in the form of $h_{\tilde{\beta}}$, where $\tilde{\beta}$ has the coordinates $\tilde{\beta}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_j(X_i)$. However, this estimator depends on the choice of W , and a data-driven selection of W or the threshold needs to be adaptive. This method, as well as many other methods, can only be applied to $W \leq n$, nonetheless, we want to solve more general problems, the base functions $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ are not necessarily orthogonal for instance. Here the W is not necessarily less than n , and we want to achieve the best convergence.

Theorem 33.2 in DasGupta (2008) states that any smooth density can be well approximated by a finite mixture of some continuous functions. However, Theorem 33.2 in DasGupta (2008) does not make sure that how many components W are required for the mixture. Thus the hypothesis of the increasing-dimensional W is reasonable. For discrete distributions, there is

also a similar mixture density approximation, see Remark of Theorem 33.2 in [DasGupta \(2008\)](#). Suppose that:

- (H.2): the density of the observed data is the linear combination of a series of some new based density functions $\{\tilde{h}_j\}_{j=1}^W$ if we still use the original true parameter β^* :

$$X \sim g(x) := g_{\beta^*}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \tilde{h}_j(x). \quad (2.2)$$

Note that the $\{\tilde{h}_j\}_{j=1}^W$ are not the true mixture density since we wrongly use the contaminated data to fit the unobserved data. The direct estimation of coefficients based on $\{\tilde{h}_j\}_{j=1}^W$ in equation (2.2) is nothing but imprecise.

2.2 Estimation for sparse density with measurement errors

This subsection aims to construct a sparse estimator for the density $h(z) := h_{\beta^*}(z)$ as a linear combination of known densities.

Recall the definition of the $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ norm $\|f\| = (\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f^2(x)dx)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. For $f, g \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let the inner product be $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)g(x)dx$. Note that if the density $h(z)$ belongs to $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and assume that $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ has the same distribution X , for any $f \in L_2$, we have $\langle f, h \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f(x)h(x)dx = Ef(X)$. If $h(x)$ is the density function for a discrete distribution, the integral is replaced by summation, and we can define the inner product as $\langle f, h \rangle := \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} f(k)h(k)$.

Let us minimize the $\|h_\beta - h\|^2$ on $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$ to obtain the estimate of $h(z) := h_{\beta^*}(z)$, i.e. minimizing

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_\beta - h\|^2 &= \|h\|^2 + \|h_\beta\|^2 - 2\langle h_\beta, h \rangle \\ &= \|h\|^2 + \|h_\beta\|^2 - 2Eh_\beta(Z) \propto -2Eh_\beta(Z) + \|h_\beta\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

The (2.3) implies that minimizing the $\|h_\beta - h\|^2$ for true observations $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is equivalent to minimizing

$$-2Eh_\beta(Z) + \|h_\beta\|^2 \approx -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(Z_i) + \|h_\beta\|^2. \quad (2.4)$$

For the convenience analysis of the measurement error, suppose that

- (H.3): the i.i.d. observations $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ have following decomposition:

$$g_\beta(X_1) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j \tilde{h}_j(X_1) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j [h_j * f_\varepsilon](X_1) \approx \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j [h_j + e_j](X_1)$$

where $\{e_j(x)\}_{j=1}^W$ are technically assumed to be some orthogonal error functions, and the given base functions $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ are orthogonal to the error functions $\{e_j(x)\}_{j=1}^W$. Moreover, we also assume that the error functions as the perturbation functions have the zero empirical average evaluated at the observed data $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_j(X_i) \approx Ee_j(X) = 0$ for any j .

The assumption (H.3) means that $\{e_j(x)\}_{j=1}^W$ is an instrumental function to deal with the misspecified base function $\{\tilde{h}_j\}_{j=1}^W$ in (2.2). Here, we mimic the idea of instrumental variables

in econometrics, so we suppose that there always exists such functions. For $g_\beta(X_1)$ we have the following approximation:

$$-2Eg_\beta(X) \approx -2E \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j [h_j + e_j](X) = -2Eh_\beta(X) \approx -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(X_i).$$

For the observations $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ with the measurement errors $\{\varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$, minimizing the $\|g_\beta - g\|^2$ is equivalent to minimizing $-2Eg_\beta(X) + \|g_\beta\|^2$. More specifically, we approximate $-2Eg_\beta(X) + \|g_\beta\|^2$ by the argument below:

$$\begin{aligned} -2Eg_\beta(X) + \|g_\beta\|^2 &\approx -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(X_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq W} \beta_i \beta_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} [h_i(z) + e_i(z)][h_j(z) + e_j(z)] dz \\ &= -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(X_i) + \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq W} \beta_i \beta_j \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_i(z) h_j(z) dz + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq W} \beta_i^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} e_i^2(z) dz \\ &\approx -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(X_i) + \|h_\beta\|^2 + c \sum_{1 \leq i \leq W} \beta_i^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the equality stems from the orthogonality assumption for $\{e_j(x)\}_{j=1}^W$. It is easy to see that c introduces some approximate information regarding the measurement errors, see [Rosenbaum and Tsybakov \(2010\)](#) for similar purpose. It is different from SPADES, since adjusting for the presence of measurement error is important for accurately describing the relationship between the true covariates and the outcome of interest.

It is plausible to assign more constrains for the candidate set of β in the optimization, for example, the ℓ_1 constrains $\|\beta\|_1 \leq a$ where a is the tuning parameter. More adaptively, we prefer to use the weighted ℓ_1 restriction $\sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| \leq \tilde{a}$ where the weights ω_j 's are data-dependent will be specified later. From the discussion above, now we propose the following *Corrected Sparse Density Estimator* (CSDE):

$$\hat{\beta} := \hat{\beta}(\omega_1, \dots, \omega_W) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W} \left\{ -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_\beta(X_i) + \|h_\beta\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^2 \right\} \quad (2.5)$$

where c is the tuning parameter for ℓ_2 -penalty. As we said before, c also present the correction for adjusting the measurement errors in our observations.

For CSDE, if $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ is an orthogonal system, it can be clearly seen that the CSDE estimator is consistent with the soft threshold estimator, and the explicit solution is $\hat{\beta}_j = \frac{(1-\omega_j/|\tilde{\beta}_j|)_+ \tilde{\beta}_j}{1+c}$, where $\tilde{\beta}_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_j(X_i)$ and $x_+ = \max(0, x)$. In this case, we can see that ω_j is the threshold of the j -th component of the simplest mean estimator $\tilde{\beta} = (\tilde{\beta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_W)$.

From sub-differential of the convex optimization, the corresponding Karush-Kuhn-Tucker conditions (necessary and sufficient first-order condition) for minimizer (2.5) is

Lemma 1 (KKT conditions in short, Lemma 4.2 of [Buhlmann and van de Geer \(2011\)](#)). *Let $k \in \{1, 2, \dots, W\}$ and $c > 0$. Then, a necessary and sufficient condition for CSDE to be a solution of (2.5) is*

1. $\hat{\beta}_k \neq 0$ if $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j < h_j, h_k > -c\hat{\beta}_k = w_k \text{sign}(\hat{\beta}_k)$.
2. $\hat{\beta}_k = 0$ if $\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j < h_j, h_k > -c\hat{\beta}_k \right| \leq w_k$.

Since all β_j^* are non-negative, when doing minimization in equation (2.5), we have to put a non-negative restriction for optimizing (2.5).

In fact, we do prefer to adapt the weight lasso penalty as a convex adaptive ℓ_1 penalization due to the computational feasibility and optimal first-order conditions. We require that the larger weights are assigned to the coefficients of unimportant covariates, while the smaller weights are accompanied by important covariates. So the weights represent the importance of the covariates. The larger (smaller) weights shrink to zero more easily (difficultly) than the un-weighted lasso, with appropriate or even optimal weights, which may lead to less bias and more efficient variable selection. The derivation of the weight will be given in Section 3.1.

2.3 We cannot transform the mixture models to linear models!

In this part, we will illustrate that in the mixture models, even without measurement error, (2.1) can't be partially transformed into the linear model, namely

$$Y = X^T \beta + \varepsilon,$$

where Y is the n -dimensional response variables, X is the $W \times n$ -dimensional fixed design matrix, β is a W -dimensional vector of model parameters, the ε is a $n \times 1$ -dimensional vector for random error terms with zero mean and finite variance. Consider the least square objective function $U(\beta)$ for estimating β ,

$$U(\beta) = (Y - X^T \beta)^T (Y - X^T \beta) = -2Y^T X^T \beta + \beta^T X X^T \beta + Y^T Y. \quad (2.6)$$

Minimizing (2.6) is equivalent to minimizing $U^*(\beta)$ in the following formula (2.7)

$$U^*(\beta) = -2Y^T X^T \beta + \beta^T X X^T \beta. \quad (2.7)$$

Comparing the objective function (2.7) with (2.4), it is easy to obtain

$$Y = \left(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\right)^T, \quad \beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_W)^T, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} h_1(X_1) & \cdots & h_1(X_n) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_W(X_1) & \cdots & h_W(X_n) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Substituting Y , X and β into a linear regression model, we get

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \\ \vdots \\ \frac{1}{n} \end{pmatrix}_{n \times 1} = \begin{pmatrix} h_1(X_1) & \cdots & h_W(X_1) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ h_1(X_n) & \cdots & h_W(X_n) \end{pmatrix}_{n \times W} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \vdots \\ \beta_W \end{pmatrix}_{W \times 1} + \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_1 \\ \vdots \\ \varepsilon_n \end{pmatrix}_{n \times 1}.$$

Then,

$$\varepsilon_i = \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j h_j(X_i), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (2.8)$$

It can be seen from equation (2.8) that the value of ε_i is no longer random if X was the fixed design matrix. Furthermore, even X is a random design, take the expectation on both sides of (2.8), and one can find that the left side is not equal to the right side, that is,

$$E(\varepsilon_i) = 0 = \frac{1}{n} - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j E h_j(X_i).$$

It leads to additional requirement $\sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j E h_j(X_i) = \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow 0$ which is meaningless as $n \rightarrow \infty$, since all β_j and h_j are positive, this is a contradiction to $\sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j E h_j(X_i) > 0$ for all n .

Both of the two situations above contradict the definition of the assumed linear regression model, hence we can't convert the estimation of (2.1) into the estimation problem of linear models. Thus the existing oracle inequalities are not applicable anymore, we will propose the oracle inequalities later. However, we can transform the mixture models to corrected score Dantzig selector such as Belloni et al. (2017). Although Bertin et al. (2011) studies the oracle inequalities for adaptive the Dantzig density estimation, their study does not contain the error-in-variables framework and the support recovery content.

3. Sparse Mixture Density Estimation

In this section, we will present the oracle inequalities for estimators $\hat{\beta}$ and $h_{\hat{\beta}}$. The core of this section consists of 5 main results, corresponding to the oracle inequalities for estimated density (Theorems 1 and 2, respectively), upper bounds on ℓ_1 -estimation error (Corollaries 1 and 2, respectively), and support consistency (Theorem 3) as the byproduct of Corollary 2.

3.1 Data-dependent weights

The weights ω_j 's are chosen adequately such that the KKT condition for stochastic optimization problems has a high probability to be satisfied.

As mentioned before, the weights in (2.5) rely on the observed data since we calculate the weights which make sure the KKT conditions hold with a high probability. The weighted Lasso estimates could have less ℓ_1 estimation error comparing with Lasso estimates, see also the simulation part. Next, the question we need to consider is what kind of data-dependent weights configuration can enable the KKT conditions to be satisfied with a high probability. The fundamental way to get data-dependent weights is to apply a concentration inequality for a weighted sum of independent random variables. Moreover, the weights should be a known function of data without any unknown parameter. There is a criterion that can help to obtain the weight grounded on Bernstein's concentration inequality in SPADES. Whereas, the convergence rate of the probability upper bounds of the summation of n independent random variables deviated from its expected value for Bernstein's concentration inequality is $\exp\left(-\frac{c_1 t^2}{c_2 n + c_3 t}\right)$. Contrasting to the Bernstein's concentration inequality, the McDiarmid's inequality (also known as the bounded difference inequality which is used for obtaining the desired weights) has a faster convergence rate $\exp\left(-\frac{c_1 t^2}{n}\right)$ in t .

Lemma 2. Suppose X_1, \dots, X_n are independent random variables, all values belong to A . Let $f : A^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and satisfy the bounded difference conditions

$$\sup_{x_1, \dots, x_n, x'_s \in A} |f(x_1, \dots, x_n) - f(x_1, \dots, x_{s-1}, x'_s, x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n)| \leq C_s,$$

then for all $t > 0$,

$$P\{|f(X_1, \dots, X_n) - Ef(X_1, \dots, X_n)| \geq t\} \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{2t^2}{\sum_{s=1}^n C_s^2}\right\}.$$

We define the KKT conditions of optimization evaluated at β^* (it is from the sub-gradient of the optimization function evaluated at β^*) by the events below:

$$\mathcal{F}_k(\omega_k) := \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \langle h_j, h_k \rangle - c\beta_k^* \right| \leq \omega_k \right\}, k = 1, 2, \dots, W.$$

Assume that

- (H.4): $\exists L_k > 0$ s.t. $\|h_k\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |h_k(X_i)| \leq L_k$.
- (H.5): $0 < \max_{1 \leq j \leq W} |\beta_j^*| \leq B$.

The (H.4) and (H.5) is a common assumption in sparse ℓ_1 estimation, see [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#), [Zhang and Jia \(2020\)](#).

Hence we could check that the following event is verified by some difference conditions. Note that $Eh_k(X_i) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle$ (which is free of X_i), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \langle h_j, h_k \rangle - \left(\sum_{i \neq s} h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j \neq s} \beta_j^* \langle h_j, h_k \rangle + h_k(X'_s) - Eh_k(X'_s) \right) \right| \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left| h_k(X_s) - h_k(X'_s) + Eh_k(X'_s) - Eh_k(X_s) \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} (|h_k(X_s) - h_k(X'_s)| + |Eh_k(X'_s) - Eh_k(X_s)|) \leq \frac{4L_k}{n}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality above is due to $|h_k(X_i) - Eh_k(X_i)| \leq 2L_k$.

Next, we apply the McDiarmid's inequality on the event $\mathcal{F}_k^c(\omega_k)$ by (H.5). Then

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{F}_k^c(\omega_k)) &= P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \langle h_j, h_k \rangle - c\beta_k^* \right| \geq \omega_k \right\} \\ &\leq P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - Eh_k(X_i) \right| + c\beta_k^* \geq \omega_k \right\} \\ &\text{(by (H.5)) } \leq P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - Eh_k(X_i) \right| \geq \omega_k - cB \right\} \\ &\text{(define } \tilde{\omega}_k := \omega_k - cB > 0) \leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{2\tilde{\omega}_k^2}{16L_k^2/n} \right\} = 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{n\tilde{\omega}_k^2}{8L_k^2} \right\} =: \frac{\delta}{W}, \quad 0 < \delta < 1. \end{aligned}$$

Considering the previous line,

$$\omega_k := 2\sqrt{2}L_k \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2W}{\delta}} + cB =: 2\sqrt{2}L_k v(\delta/2) + cB, \quad (3.1)$$

where $v = v(\delta) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{W}{\delta}}$.

The weight ω_k in our paper is different from [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#) that gives the un-shift version ($\tilde{\omega}_k = 4L_k \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{W}{\delta/2}}$), due to the Elastic-net penalty. And we define a modified version of event of KKT condition

$$\mathcal{K}_k(\omega_k) := \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \leq \tilde{\omega}_k \right\}, k = 1, 2, \dots, W \quad (3.2)$$

holds with the probability $1 - 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{n\tilde{\omega}_k^2}{8L_k^2} \right\}$ at least.

3.2 Non-asymptotic oracle inequalities

The oracle inequality connects the performance of an obtained estimator with the true parameter which is not available in practice, see [Candes \(2008\)](#) for more discussions. Introduced by [Donoho and Johnstone \(1994\)](#), oracle inequality is a powerful non-asymptotical and analytical tool that seeks to provide the distance from the obtained estimator and a true estimator.

For $\forall \beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$, let

$$I(\beta) = \{j \in \{1, \dots, W\} : \beta_j \neq 0\}$$

be the indices corresponding to the non-zero components of the vector β , i.e. the support in mathematical jargon. If there is no ambiguity, we would like to write $I(\beta^*)$ as I_* for simplicity. And

$$W(\beta) = \sum_{j=1}^W I(\beta_j \neq 0)$$

is the number of its non-zero components, where $I(\cdot)$ represents the indicative function. Let

$$\sigma_j^2 = \text{Var}(h_j(X_1)), \quad 1 \leq j \leq W.$$

Below, we will state the non-asymptotic oracle inequalities for $h_{\hat{\beta}}$ (with the high probability $1 - \delta(W, n)$ for any integer W and n) which measures the L_2 distance between $h_{\hat{\beta}}$ and h . For $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$, define the correlation for the two base densities: h_i and h_j ,

$$\rho_W(i, j) = \frac{\langle h_i, h_j \rangle}{\|h_i\| \|h_j\|}, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, W.$$

Our results will be established under the local coherence condition, we define the maximal local coherence as:

$$\rho(\beta) = \max_{i \in I(\beta)} \max_{j \neq i} |\rho_W(i, j)|$$

It is easy to see that it measures the separation of the variables in the set $I(\beta)$ from one another and from the rest, and the degree of separation is measured in terms of the size of the correlation coefficients. However, the regular condition introduced by this coherence may be too strong, it may exclude the cases where the “correlation” can be relatively large for a small number of pairs (i, j) and almost zero for otherwise, for instance. So we consider the definition of cumulative local coherence given by [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#):

$$\rho_*(\beta) = \sum_{i \in I(\beta)} \sum_{j > i} |\rho_W(i, j)|.$$

Define

$$H(\beta) = \max_{j \in I(\beta)} \frac{\omega_j}{v(\delta/2) \|h_j\|}, \quad F = \max_{1 \leq j \leq W} \frac{v(\delta/2) \|h_j\|}{\tilde{\omega}_j} = \max_{1 \leq j \leq W} \frac{\|h_j\|}{2\sqrt{2}L_j},$$

where $\tilde{\omega}_j := 2\sqrt{2}L_j v(\delta/2)$.

By using the definition of $\rho_*(\beta)$ and the notations above, we present the key result of this paper which lays the foundation for the oracle inequality of the estimated mixed coefficients.

Theorem 1. Under the assumption (H.1)-(H.5) and $c = \frac{\min_{1 \leq j \leq W} \{\tilde{\omega}_j\}}{B}$, then the true base functions $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ satisfies cumulative local coherence assumption

$$12FH(\beta)\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \leq \gamma, \quad (3.3)$$

and all $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, we have the following oracle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_{opt1}(1-\gamma)}{(\alpha_{opt1}-1)} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \frac{\alpha_{opt1}}{\alpha_{opt1}-1} \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_{opt1}+1}{\alpha_{opt1}-1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{18\alpha_{opt1}^2}{\alpha_{opt1}-1} H^2(\beta) v^2(\delta/2) W(\beta) \end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - \delta$ at least, where $\alpha_{opt1} = 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\|h_{\beta} - h\|^2}{9H^2(\beta)v^2(\delta/2)W(\beta)}}$.

It is worthy to note that here we use $\sqrt{W(\beta)}$ instead of $W(\beta)$, and the later is used in Bunea et al. (2010). The reason of the phenomenon is quite clean actually: we introduce the ℓ_2 penalty and derive our result in a more general frame while Bunea et al. (2010) derive their result under restriction $\gamma = 1$. Now, let us address the sparse Gram matrix $\psi_W = (\langle h_i, h_j \rangle)_{1 \leq i, j \leq W}$ with a small number of non-zero element in off-diagonal positions, define $\psi_W(i, j)$ as the element (i, j) -th of position ψ_W . The condition (3.3) in Theorem 1 can be transformed to the condition

$$12SH(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \leq \gamma,$$

where the number S is called the sparse index of matrix ψ_W which is defined as follows:

$$S = |\{(i, j) : i, j \in \{1, \dots, W\}, i > j \text{ and } \psi_W(i, j) \neq 0\}|,$$

where $|A|$ is the number of elements of set A .

Sometimes the assumption (3.3) does not necessarily imply the positive definiteness of ψ_W . Next we give similar oracle inequality that is valid under the hypothesis that the Gram matrix ψ_W is positive definite.

Theorem 2. Under the assumption (H.1)-(H.5) and Gram matrix ψ_W are positive definite with minimum eigenvalues greater than or equal to $\lambda_W > 0$. For all $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$, we have the following oracle inequality with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \frac{\alpha_{opt2}}{\alpha_{opt2}-1} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \frac{\alpha_{opt2}}{\alpha_{opt2}-1} \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha_{opt2}+1}{\alpha_{opt2}-1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{576\alpha_{opt2}^2}{\alpha_{opt2}-1} \frac{G}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2), \end{aligned}$$

where $G = G(\beta) := \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} L_j^2$ and $\alpha_{opt2} = 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\|h_{\beta} - h\|^2}{288 \frac{G}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2)}}$.

Remark: The argument and result of Theorem 1 in this paper is more refined than the conclusion of Theorem 1 in Bunea et al. (2010) for Lasso by letting $\gamma = 1/2$ and $c = 0$. In addition, Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 of this paper respectively give the optimal α value of the density estimation oracle inequalities, namely α_{opt1} , α_{opt2} . It provides potentially sharper bound for the ℓ_1 -estimation error bound.

Next, we will present ℓ_1 -estimation error for the estimator $\hat{\beta}$ by (2.5), and the weights are defined by (3.1).

For technical reason, we consider that $\|h_j\| = 1$ for all j in (2.5), i.e. the based functions are normalized. This normalization mimics the covariates' standardization procedure when we do some penalized estimation in generalized linear models. For simplicity, we put $L := \max_{1 \leq j \leq W} L_j$.

For any other choice of $v(\delta/2)$ greater than or equal to $\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2W}{\delta}}$, the conclusions of Section 3 are valid with a high probability. It imposes restriction on the predictive performance of CSDE. As pointed out in Bunea (2008), for the ℓ_1 -penalty in the regression, the adjustment sequence ω_j required for the correct selection is usually larger than the adjustment sequence ω_j that produces a good prediction. The selection of the mixed density shown below is also true. Specifically, we will take the value $\beta = \beta^*$ and $v = v(\delta/2W) = \sqrt{\frac{\log(2W^2/\delta)}{n}}$ then $\alpha_{opt1}, \alpha_{opt2} = 2$, in below we give the corollary of Theorem 1,2.

Corollary 1. *Given the same conditions as Theorem 1 with $\|h_j\| = 1$ for all j , let $\alpha_{opt1} = 2$, we have the following ℓ_1 -estimation error oracle inequality:*

$$\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{72\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)W(\beta^*)}{1 - \gamma} \frac{(L + L_{\min})^2}{L_{\min}} \quad (3.4)$$

with probability $1 - \delta/W$ at least, where $L_{\min} = \min_{1 \leq j \leq W} L_j$.

Corollary 2. *Given the same conditions as Theorem 2 with $\|h_j\| = 1$ for all j , let $\alpha_{opt2} = 2$, we have the following ℓ_1 -estimation error oracle inequality, with probability $1 - \delta/W$ at least,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{288\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)G^*}{L_{\min}\lambda_W},$$

where $G^* = \sum_{j \in I_*} L_j^2$.

If the number $W(\beta^*)$ of the mixed indicator elements is much smaller than \sqrt{n} , then the inequality (3.4) guarantees that the estimated $\hat{\beta}$ is close to the true β^* , and the ℓ_1 -estimation error will be presented in the numerical simulation in Section 4. Our results of Corollary 1 and 2 are non-asymptotic for any W and n . The oracle inequalities are guiders for us to find an optimal tuning parameter with order $O(\sqrt{\frac{\log W}{n}})$ for sharper estimation error and better prediction performance. This is also an intermediate and crucial result which leads to the main result of correctly identifying the mixture components in Section 3.3. In the following section, we turn to cope with the identification of I_* . The selection of correct components is derived by the proposed oracle inequality for the weighted $\ell_1 + \ell_2$ penalty.

3.3 Correct support identification of mixture models

In this section, we will study results on the support recovery of our CSDE estimator. There are a few versions of support recovery while most of the results are the consistency of ℓ_1 -error and prediction error. Here we borrow the framework of Bunea (2008) and Zhang and Jia (2020), they give many proof techniques to deal with the correct support identification in linear models by $\ell_1 + \ell_2$ regularization. Let \hat{I} be the set of indicators consisting of non-zero elements of $\hat{\beta}$ in the given (2.5). In other words, \hat{I} is an estimate of the true support set $I(\beta^*) := I_*$. We will study that for a given $0 < \varepsilon < 1$,

$$P(\hat{I} = I(\beta^*)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$$

under some mild conditions.

In order to identify the I_* consistently, we need more assumptions about some special correlation conditions than ℓ_1 -error consistency.

Condition (A):

$$\rho_*(\beta^*) \leq \frac{LL_{\min}\lambda_W}{288G^*}.$$

Moreover, we need an additional condition that the minimal signal should be higher than a threshold level and quantified by the order of tuning parameter. We state it as follows:

Condition (B):

$$\min_{j \in I^*} |\beta_j^*| \geq 4\sqrt{2}v\left(\frac{\delta}{2W}\right)L,$$

where $v\left(\frac{\delta}{2W}\right) := \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2W^2}{\delta}}$.

When performing simulation, condition (B) is the theoretical guarantee that the smallest magnitude of β_j must be greater than a threshold value as a minimal signal condition. It is also called Beta-min condition, see [Buhlmann and van de Geer \(2011\)](#).

Theorem 3. *Let $0 < \delta < \frac{1}{2}$ be a given value and define $\epsilon_k := |E[h_k(X_1)] - E[h_k(Z_1)]|$. Assume that both condition A and B are true, and give the same conditions as Corollary 2, then*

$$P(\hat{I} = I_*) \geq 1 - \left(4W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + 2\delta \right),$$

where $\epsilon_k^* = \epsilon_k / \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L$.

Under the beta-min condition, the support estimation is very close to the true the support of β_j^* . The probability of the event $\{\hat{I} = I_*\}$ is high when W is growing. The $\hat{\beta}$ recovers the correct support with the probability at least $1 - \left(4W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + 2\delta \right)$. The result is non-asymptotic, it is true for any fixed W and n . Similar conclusion about support consistency, see Theorem 6 of [Zhang and Jia \(2020\)](#).

4. Simulation and Real Data Analysis

[Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#) suppose the spades estimation to deal with the samples for sparse mixture density, and they also derive an algorithm to complement their theoretical result. Their findings successfully handle the high-dimensional adaptive density estimation in some degree. However, their algorithm is costly and unstable. In this section, we deal with the tuning parameter directly and compare our CSDE method with the SPADES method (AdaLasso) in [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#) and other similar methods. In all cases here, we fix $n = 100$ for $W = 81, 131, 211, 321$, which is known as the dimension of the unknown parameter β^* . The performance of each estimator is evaluated by ℓ_1 -estimation error and total variation (TV) distance between the estimator and the true value of β^* . The total variation (TV) error is defined as:

$$\text{TV}(h_{\beta^*}, h_{\hat{\beta}}) = \int |h_{\beta^*}(x) - h_{\hat{\beta}}(x)| dx.$$

4.1 Tuning parameter selection

In [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#), the λ_1 is chosen by coordinate descent method, while the mixture weights are detected by general bisection method (GBM). But in our article, the optimal weights can be computed directly. So it is much easier to carry out than [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#). The ℓ_1 -penalty term $\sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j|$ with optimal weights is defined by

$$\omega_k := 2\sqrt{2}L_k v(\delta/2) + cB,$$

where $L_j = \|h_j\|_\infty$, which usually can be computed easily for a continuous h_j .

For a discrete base density $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$, it can be estimated as the following approximation by using concentration inequalities from Exercise 4.3.3 of [Chow and Teicher \(2003\)](#):

$$|\text{med}(X) - E(X)| \leq \sqrt{2\text{Var}(X)}, \quad (4.1)$$

$$\bar{x} \approx x_{med} (1 + O(n^{-1})) \approx h^{-1}(L_j) (1 + O(n^{-1})), \quad (4.2)$$

where \bar{x} and x_{med} represent the sample mean and sample median respectively in each simulation, then we only need to select the λ_1 and $c = \lambda_2$, and they can be detected by nesting coordinate descent method. Besides, the precision level is assigned as $\xi = 0.001$ in our simulation.

4.2 Multi-modal distributions

First, we examine our method in a multi-modal Gaussian model that is similar to the first model in [Bunea et al. \(2010\)](#). However, our mixture Gaussian has a different variance, which leads the meaningful weights to our estimation. The model is assigned as follow:

$$h_\beta^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \phi(x|a \cdot j, \sigma_j). \quad (4.3)$$

We choose $a = 0.5, n = 100$ and:

$$\beta^* = (\mathbf{0}_8^T, 0.2, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_5^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_5^T, 0.15, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.15, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{W-76}^T)^T. \quad (4.4)$$

with

$$\sigma = (\mathbf{1}_{20}^T, \mathbf{0.8}_6^T, \mathbf{0.6}_{11}^T, \mathbf{0.4}_{11}^T, \mathbf{0.6}_6^T, \mathbf{0.8}_{11}^T, \mathbf{1.2}_{W-76}^T)^T. \quad (4.5)$$

An acceptable measurement error $e_j(x)$ satisfied $Ee_j(X) = 0$ is chosen as:

$$h_j(x) + e_j(x) \sim N(a \cdot j, 1.1\sigma_j^2). \quad (4.6)$$

Then we use the sample x_1, \dots, x_n i.i.d. $\sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* [h_j(x) + e_j(x)]$ to estimate β^* . We replicate the simulation $N = 100$ times. The results of simulation are presented in Table 1, we can see our method has the more and more excellent performances as the W increases which matches the non-asymptotical results in the previous section. The best performance is far better than the other three method when $W = 321$. It's worthy to note that the better approximation following the increasing of W , matching the and Theorem 3 in our previous section.

We plot the solution path to compare the performance of the four estimators in $\beta_j \in I(\beta)$ for every W in Figure 1 (the result of Enet in $W = 321$ is not be shown due to its poor performance.). These figures also provide strong support for the above analysis. Meanwhile, we plot the probability densities of the several estimators and the true density to complement the visual sensory of the advantage in our method in Figure 2, in which the powerful competency

TABLE 1

The mean and standard deviation of the errors in the four estimators of β^* under $N = 100$ simulations, with $n = 100$. The quasi-optimal λ_2 is $c = 0.002$ for Enet, while $c = 0.027$ is for the adaptive method.

| | W | λ_1 | L_1 error | TV error |
|-----------------|-----|-------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Lasso</i> | 81 | 0.065 | 2.133 (2.467) | 1.137 (1.115) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 2.061 (1.439) | 1.114 (0.805) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.053 | 1.922 (2.211) | 1.258 (1.296) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 2.191 (4.812) | 1.405 (2.329) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 131 | 0.068 | 2.032 (0.985) | 1.352 (0.712) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 2.236 (2.498) | 1.409 (1.056) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.056 | 1.880 (2.644) | 0.972 (1.204) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.635 (0.342) | 0.863 (0.402) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 211 | 0.071 | 2.572 (4.187) | 1.605 (2.702) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 2.061 (1.883) | 1.353 (1.516) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.058 | 1.764 (1.041) | 0.832 (0.610) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.648 (0.168) | 0.791 (0.415) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 321 | 0.074 | 2.120 (2.842) | 1.146 (1.115) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 10.173 (82.753) | 7.839 (67.887) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.061 | 2.106 (4.816) | 0.818 (1.565) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.623 (0.085) | 0.634 (0.199) |

of detecting the multi-mode is shown (whereas other methods only find the most strong signal, ignoring other meaningful but relatively weak signals).




Fig 1: The estimated support of β^* by the four types of estimators, and the W is varying. The circles represent the means of the estimators under the four specific approaches, while the half of the vertical lines mean the standard deviations.

4.3 Mixture of Poisson distributions

In the second set of our simulations, we study the mixture of discrete distribution: the mixture Poisson distribution

$$h_{\beta^*}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* p(x|\lambda_j = a \cdot j), \quad (4.7)$$

where $a = 0.1$, and:

$$\beta^* = (\mathbf{0}_8^T, 0.2, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_5^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_5^T, 0.15, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.15, \mathbf{0}_{10}^T, 0.1, \mathbf{0}_{W-75}^T)^T. \quad (4.8)$$

The adjusted weights are calculated by (2.5), and in discrete distributions, we define $\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} f(k)g(k)$. Meanwhile, the Poisson distribution with measurement errors can be treated as a negative binomial distribution. Namely:

$$p(x|\lambda_i) + e_i(x) \sim NB\left(r, \frac{\lambda_i}{\lambda_i + r}\right), \quad (4.9)$$

where λ_i is the mean for i -th observation and r is the common dispersion parameter. Here, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n = 100$.

For a practical r , we choose $r = 6$, which leads an increment $\lambda_i j^2 / r$ in the variance. Similarly, we replicate each simulation to estimate the parameter $N = 100$ times with the sample coming from the mixture negative binomial distribution above. The result is shown in Table 2. The result is actually akin to that in the previous mixture Gaussian distribution, while the strong performance of our method is shown clearly when W is considerable.

TABLE 2

The mean and standard deviation of the errors in the four estimators of β under $N = 100$ simulations. The λ_2 is chosen as $c = 0.005$ for Enet, while $c = 0.203$ for the adaptive method.

| | W | λ_1 | L_1 error | TV error |
|-----------------|-----|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| <i>Lasso</i> | 81 | 0.048 | 1.796 (0.006) | 0.002 (0.001) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 1.796 (0.006) | 0.002 (0.001) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.138 | 1.811 (0.013) | 0.002 (0.005) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.806 (0.008) | 0.003 (0.005) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 131 | 0.051 | 1.828 (0.006) | 0.003 (0.001) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 1.830 (0.009) | 0.004 (0.002) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.145 | 1.880 (0.006) | 0.002 (0.005) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.854 (0.006) | 0.002 (0.004) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 211 | 0.053 | 1.935 (0.010) | 0.005 (0.003) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 2.061 (0.014) | 0.007 (0.008) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.152 | 1.935 (0.008) | 0.005 (0.003) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.861 (0.005) | 0.003 (0.002) |
| <i>Lasso</i> | 321 | 0.055 | 1.927 (0.031) | 0.005 (0.002) |
| <i>Enet</i> | | | 2.123 (0.026) | 0.009 (0.009) |
| <i>AdaLasso</i> | | 0.158 | 1.938 (0.008) | 0.005 (0.003) |
| <i>CSDE</i> | | | 1.852 (0.002) | 0.002 (0.001) |

4.4 Low dimensional mixture model

Surprisingly, our method has more competitive efficacy than some popular methods (such as EM algorithm), even the dimension W is relatively small. To see this, we introduce the following numerical experiments to estimate the weights of the low dimensional mixed Gaussian model:

the samples x_1, \dots, x_n come from the model:

$$h_{\beta^*}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* \phi(x|\mu_j, \sigma_j).$$

The updating equation for EM algorithm in t -th step is:

$$\omega_{ij}^{(t)} = \frac{p_j^{(t)} \phi(x_i; \mu_t, \sigma_t)}{\sum_{s=1}^W p_s^{(t)} \phi(x_i; \mu_s, \sigma_s)}, \quad \beta_j^{(t+1)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_{ij}^{(t)}}{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_{ij}^{(t)}}.$$

Here we consider two scenarios:

- (1) $W = 6, \beta = (0.3, 0, 0, 0.3, 0, 0.4)^T, \mu = (0, 10, 20, 30, 40, 50)^T, \sigma = (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)^T$
- (2) $W = 7, \beta = (0.1, 0, 0, 0.8, 0, 0, 0.1)^T, \mu = (0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6)^T, \sigma = (0.3, 0.2, 0.2, 0.1, 0.2, 0.2, 0.3)^T$.

For each scenario $n = 50$, and the fitter levels (cessation level) in the EM approach and our method are both $\xi = 10^{-4}$. A well-advised initial value in the EM approach is the equal weight.

We replicate the simulation $N = 100$ times, and the optimal tuning parameters stem from the CV (so under each simulation they are not the same, albeit they are very close to each other). The result can be seen in Table 3.

TABLE 3
The eventual simulations result.

| | | L_1 error | TV error |
|------------|------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Scenario 1 | EM | 0.2547758(0.1217747) | 0.2045831(0.09807962) |
| | CSDE | 0.2055284(0.1449865) | 0.1852503(0.104226) |
| Scenario 2 | EM | 0.1109372(0.05491049) | 0.1107578(0.05491172) |
| | CSDE | 0.1090387(0.03715101) | 0.108296(0.03683571) |

4.5 Real data examples




Fig 3: The sample histogram of the azimuth in Beijing Nongzhanguan at 6am and Qingdao Coast at 12am.




Fig 2: The density map of the four estimators' means and the true denses. The result of Enet in $W = 321$ is not be shown due to its exactly poor performance.

Practically, we consider using our method to estimate some densities in the environmental science field. In the area of meteorology, wind, which is mercurial, has been an advisable object to study for a long time. Take notice of the speed of the wind at one specific location maybe not diverse, so we will use the wind's azimuth angle with a more sparse density at two locations in China. Concerning many types of research about the estimated density for wind existed, so there is a possibility to use our approach to cope with some difficulties in meteorology science.

There have been some very credible meteorological data sets. We would use the ERA5 hourly data in [Hersbach et al. \(2018\)](#) to continue our analysis. We would like to choose a continental area and a coastal area in China which refers to Beijing Nongzhanguan and Qingdao Coast, respectively. The location of these two area are: $[116.3125^\circ E, 116.4375^\circ E] \times [39.8125^\circ N, 39.8125^\circ N]$. Take notice that the wind in one day may be highly correlated, therefore, using the data at a specific time point of each day in a consecutive period as i.i.d. samples are reasonable. The sample histogram of 6 am in Beijing Nongzhanguan and at 12 am Qingdao Coast is shown in Figure 3. Here we use the data from 2013/01/01 to 2015/12/12.

As we can see, their density does be multi-peak (we used 1095 samples). Now we can use our approach to estimate the multi-mode densities based on a relatively small size of samples, which is only a tiny part of the whole data from 2013/01/01 to 2015/12/12. Because one year has nearly 360 days, we may assume that every day is a latent factor that forms the base density. So the model is designed as

$$h_{\beta^*}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{360} \beta_j^* \phi(x|\mu_j, \sigma_j) \quad (4.10)$$

with the mean and variance parameters:

$$\mu = (1, 2, \dots, 360)^T, \quad \sigma = t \cdot \mathbf{1}_{360}^T, \quad (4.11)$$

where the t is seen as the bandwidth (or tuning parameter). With the different sub-samples, the values are computed are different.

Another critical issue is how to choose the tuning parameter λ_1 and λ_2 . Then we apply the cross-validation criterion, namely choosing λ_i minimizing the difference of two estimators derived from the separated samples in random dichotomy.

Now start to construct the samples for estimating procedure. Assume that an observatory wants to figure some information about the wind in the two areas. However, it doesn't have intact data due to the limited budget at its inception. The only samples it has are 6 ~ 8 days' information each month for the 2 areas and these days scatter randomly. This imperfect data does increase the challenge of estimating the trustworthy density, and we would compare our method with other previous methods, in which appraising the difference between the complete data sample histogram and the estimated density under each method is for the evaluation. Notice that the samples are only a tiny part of the whole data, so the n is relatively small. The small sample and large dimension setting coincide with the non-asymptotical theory provided in the previous section. The estimating density has been shown in Figure 4.

Evidently, in this practical application, we can see that our method vindicates its more efficient estimating performance and stability from its propinquity of the complete sample histogram, namely the efficacious capacity of detecting the shape of multi-mode density, and the stronger inclination to bear resemblance to each other subsample (although some subtle nuances do exist by reason of the different subsample).




Fig 4: The density map of the four estimators' approaches for the three random subsamples.

5. Summary and Discussions

The paper deals with the deconvolution problem using Lasso type methods: the observations are X_1, \dots, X_n which are independent and generated from $X_i = Z_i + \varepsilon_i$; and the goal is to estimate the unknown density h of the Z_i . we assume that the function h can be written as

$h(\cdot) = h_{\beta^*}(\cdot) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* h_j(\cdot)$ based on some functions $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^W$ from a specific dictionary and propose to estimate the coefficients of this decomposition with the Elastic-net method. For this estimator, we show that under some classical assumptions on the model such as coherence of the Gram matrix, finite sample bounds both for the estimation and the prediction errors valid with a relatively high probability can be obtained. Moreover, under a beta-min condition, we prove a variable selection consistency result. An extensive numerical study is also conducted. The following estimation problem is also similar to the CSDE.

Aggregate density estimator with measurement errors. Based on the idea of model average, our aim is to aggregate some candidate density models h_1, \dots, h_W based on the data $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ containing measurement errors. It means we need to construct a new aggregated estimator as the convex combination of h_1, \dots, h_W , which is approximately the best among h_1, \dots, h_W . The aggregation we consider here in the form of $h_{\hat{\beta}}$ by appropriately chosen the weight vector $(\beta_1, \dots, \beta_W) \in \mathbb{R}^W$.

For the future study, it is also interesting and meaningful to do hypothesis testing about the coefficients $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^W$ in sparse mixture models. For a general function $h : \mathbb{R}^W \mapsto \mathbb{R}^m$ and a nonempty closed set $\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^m$, we can consider

$$H_0 : h(\beta^*) \in \Omega \text{ vs. } H_1 : h(\beta^*) \notin \Omega.$$

A. Technical Details

For convenience, we first give a preliminary lemma and proof, now define the random variables

$$M_j = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{h_j(X_i) - E h_j(X_i)\}.$$

Consider the event \mathcal{E} by

$$\mathcal{E} = \bigcap_{j=1}^W \{2|M_j| \leq \tilde{\omega}_j\},$$

where $\tilde{\omega}_k := 2\sqrt{2}L_k \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{W}{\delta/2}} =: 2\sqrt{2}L_k v(\delta/2)$.

Then we have the following lemma which is cornerstone for the proofs in below.

Lemma 3. Suppose that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq W} L_j < \infty$ and $c = \frac{\min_{1 \leq j \leq W} \{\tilde{\omega}_j\}}{B}$, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$, on the event \mathcal{E} , we have

$$\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 6 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof of Lemma 3

According to the definition of $\hat{\beta}$, for any $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^W$, we find

$$-\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i) + \|h_{\hat{\beta}}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j^2 \leq -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\beta}(X_i) + \|h_{\beta}\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^2. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then

$$\|h_{\hat{\beta}}\|^2 - \|h_{\beta}\|^2 \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\beta}(X_i) + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| - 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^2 - c \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 &= \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} + h_{\beta} - h\|^2 \\ &= \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \langle h_{\beta} - h, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle \\ &= \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 - 2 \langle h, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle + 2 \langle h_{\beta}, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 \\ &= \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 - 2 \langle h, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle + \|h_{\hat{\beta}}\|^2 - \|h_{\beta}\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Combining (A.3) and (A.4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| - 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^2 - c \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j^2 \\ &\quad - 2 \langle h, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\beta}(X_i). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

According to the definition of $h_{\beta}(x)$, it gives $h_{\beta}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j h_j(x)$ with $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_W)$. For the 3 terms in (A.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &- 2 \langle h, h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta} \rangle + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\hat{\beta}}(X_i) - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_{\beta}(X_i) \\ &= 2 \cdot \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j h_j(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j h_j(X_i) \right) - 2E(h_{\beta'} - h_{\beta})(X_i)|_{\beta'=\hat{\beta}} \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_j(X_i) (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) - 2 \sum_{j=1}^W E[h_j(X_i)] (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_j(X_i) - E[h_j(X_i)] \right) (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_j(X_i) - E[h_j(X_i)] \right) (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\beta_j| - 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^2 - c \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j^2. \end{aligned}$$

Conditioning on the event \mathcal{E} , we have

$$\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j (|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j|) + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j^2 - \hat{\beta}_j^2).$$

Adding $\sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j)^2$ to both sides of the above inequality, it gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j)^2 \\ & \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j (|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j|) + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j^2 - \hat{\beta}_j^2) + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & c \left[\sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j^2 - \hat{\beta}_j^2) + \sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j)^2 \right] = c \left[\sum_{j=1}^W (\beta_j^2 - \hat{\beta}_j^2 + \beta_j^2 - 2\beta_j \hat{\beta}_j + \hat{\beta}_j^2) \right] \\ & = 2c \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j) = 2c \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \beta_j (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j) \leq 2cB \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} |\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j| \leq 2 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \tilde{\omega}_j |\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption $c = \frac{\min_{1 \leq j \leq W} \{\tilde{\omega}_j\}}{B} \leq \frac{\tilde{\omega}_j}{B}$.

So we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j (|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j|) + 2 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \\ & \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j (|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j|) + 2 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\tilde{\omega}_j \leq \omega_j$ for all j .

We know that when $j \in I(\beta)$, $\beta_j \neq 0$, when $j \notin I(\beta)$, $\beta_j = 0$. Considering $|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j| \leq |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|$ for all j , we have

$$2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \omega_j (|\beta_j| - |\hat{\beta}_j|) \leq 4 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + c \sum_{j=1}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 & \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 4 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 2 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \\ & = \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 6 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

The Proof of Theorems

According to the construction of $\tilde{\omega}_j = 2\sqrt{2}L_j \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log \frac{2W}{\delta}}$ in the formula (3.1), the sum of the independent random variables $\zeta_{ij} = h_j(X_i) - Eh_j(X_i)$ is determined by Hoeffding's inequality,

and $|\zeta_{ij}| \leq 2L_j$. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathcal{E}^c) &= P\left(\bigcup_{j=1}^W \{2|M_j| > \tilde{\omega}_j\}\right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^W P(2|M_j| > \tilde{\omega}_j) \leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \exp\left(-\frac{2n^2 \cdot \tilde{\omega}_j^2/4}{4nL_j^2}\right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{j=1}^W \exp\left(-\log \frac{2W}{\delta}\right) = 2W \cdot \frac{\delta}{2W} = \delta. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1

By using Lemma 3, we need an upper bound on $\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j|$. For easy notation, let

$$q_j = \hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j, \quad Q(\beta) = \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} |q_j| \|h_j\|, \quad Q = \sum_{j=1}^W |q_j| \|h_j\|.$$

According to the definition of $H(\beta)$, that is, $H(\beta) = \max_{j \in I(\beta)} \frac{\omega_j}{v(\delta/2)\|h_j\|}$, we have

$$\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \leq v(\delta/2) H(\beta) Q(\beta). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Let $Q_*(\beta) := \sqrt{\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_j^2 \|h_j\|^2}$. Using the definition of $h_\beta(x)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} Q_*^2(\beta) &= \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_j^2 \|h_j\|^2 = \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_\beta\|^2 - \sum_{i, j \notin I(\beta)} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle \\ &\quad - (2 \sum_{i \notin I(\beta)} \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle + \sum_{i, j \in I(\beta), i \neq j} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle). \end{aligned}$$

As $i, j \notin I(\beta)$, $\beta_i = \beta_j = 0$, it is easy to see,

$$\sum_{i, j \notin I(\beta)} \langle h_i, h_j \rangle q_i q_j \geq 0.$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &2 \sum_{i \notin I(\beta)} \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle + \sum_{i, j \in I(\beta), i \neq j} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle \\ &= 2 \sum_{i \notin I(\beta)} \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle + 2 \sum_{i, j \in I(\beta), j > i} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle = 2 \sum_{i \in I(\beta)} \sum_{j > i} q_i q_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle. \end{aligned}$$

By the definitions of $\rho_W(i, j)$ and $\rho_*(\beta)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} Q_*^2(\beta) &\leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_\beta\|^2 + 2 \sum_{i \in I(\beta)} \sum_{j > i} |q_i| |q_j| \|h_i\| \|h_j\| \frac{\langle h_i, h_j \rangle}{\|h_i\| \|h_j\|} \\ &\leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_\beta\|^2 + 2\rho_*(\beta) \max_{i \in I(\beta), j > i} |q_i| \|h_i\| |q_j| \|h_j\|. \end{aligned}$$

In fact,

$$\max_{i \in I(\beta)} |q_i| \|h_i\| \leq \sqrt{\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} q_j^2 \|h_j\|^2} = Q_*(\beta), \quad \max_{i \in I(\beta), j > i} |q_j| \|h_j\| \leq \sum_{j=1}^W |q_j| \|h_j\|.$$

Thus

$$Q_*^2(\beta) \leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 + 2\rho_*(\beta)Q_*(\beta) \sum_{j=1}^W |q_j| \|h_j\| = \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 + 2\rho_*(\beta)Q_*(\beta)Q. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

By (A.7), we can get

$$Q_*^2(\beta) - 2\rho_*(\beta)Q_*(\beta)Q - \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 \leq 0.$$

In order to find the upper bound of $Q_*(\beta)$, apply the properties of the quadratic inequality to the above formula,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_*(\beta) &\leq \rho_*(\beta)Q + \sqrt{\rho_*^2(\beta)Q^2 + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2} \leq \rho_*(\beta)Q + [\rho_*(\beta)Q + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|] \\ &\leq 2\rho_*(\beta)Q + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Note that $W(\beta) = |I(\beta)| = \sum_{j=1}^W I(\beta_j \neq 0)$, employing Cauchy-Schwarz inequalities, we have

$$W(\beta) \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} |q_j|^2 \|h_j\|^2 = \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} I^2(j \in I(\beta)) \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} |q_j|^2 \|h_j\|^2 \geq \left(\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} I(\{j \in I(\beta)\}) |q_j| \|h_j\| \right)^2 = Q^2(\beta).$$

Then

$$Q_*^2(\beta) = \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} |q_j|^2 \|h_j\|^2 \geq Q^2(\beta)/W(\beta).$$

Combined with (A.8), we can get $Q(\beta)/\sqrt{W(\beta)} \leq Q_*(\beta) \leq 2\rho_*(\beta)Q + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|$. Therefore,

$$Q(\beta) \leq 2\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}Q + \sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

By Lemma 3, we have the following inequality established by probability exceeding $1 - \delta$.

$$\begin{aligned} &\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 6 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \quad (\text{by (A.6)}) \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)Q(\beta) \quad (\text{by (A.9)}) \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)[2\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \sum_{j=1}^W |q_j| \|h_j\| + \sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|] \\ &= \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 12v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \frac{\|h_j\|}{\tilde{\omega}_j} + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\| \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 12FH(\beta)\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\| \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \gamma \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|, \end{aligned}$$

where the second last inequality follows from the definition of $F := \max_{1 \leq j \leq W} \frac{v(\delta/2)\|h_j\|}{\tilde{\omega}_j}$, and the last inequality is derived by the assumption $12FH(\beta)\rho_*(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)} \leq \gamma, (0 < \gamma \leq 1)$.

Further, we can find that, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + (1 - \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\| \\ & = \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h + h - h_{\beta}\| \\ & \leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\| + 6v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\|h - h_{\beta}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the elementary inequality $2st \leq s^2/\alpha + \alpha t^2$ ($s, t \in \mathbb{R}, \alpha > 1$) to the last two terms of the above inequality, it yields

$$\begin{aligned} 2\{3v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\}\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\| & \leq \alpha \cdot 9v^2(\delta/2)H^2(\beta)W(\beta) + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2/\alpha, \\ 2\{3v(\delta/2)H(\beta)\sqrt{W(\beta)}\}\|h_{\beta} - h\| & \leq \alpha \cdot 9v^2(\delta/2)H^2(\beta)W(\beta) + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2/\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + (1 - \gamma) \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 18\alpha v^2(\delta/2)H^2(\beta)W(\beta) + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2/\alpha + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2/\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Simplifying, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \frac{\alpha(1 - \gamma)}{(\alpha - 1)} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha - 1} \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha - 1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{18\alpha^2}{\alpha - 1} H^2(\beta)v^2(\delta/2)W(\beta), \quad \alpha > 1, 0 < \gamma \leq 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Optimizing α to obtain the sharp upper bounds for the above oracle inequality

$$\alpha_{opt1} := \arg \min_{\alpha > 1} \left\{ \frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha - 1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{18\alpha^2}{\alpha - 1} H^2(\beta)v^2(\delta/2)W(\beta) \right\} = 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\|h_{\beta} - h\|^2}{9H^2(\beta)v^2(\delta/2)W(\beta)}}$$

by the first order condition.

So far, Theorem 1 is proved by substituting α_{opt1} into (A.10).

Proof of Theorem 2

By the minimal eigenvalue assumption for ψ_W , we have

$$\|h_{\beta}\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j h_j(x) \right\|^2 = \beta^T \psi_W \beta \geq \lambda_W \|\beta\|^2 \geq \lambda_W \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \beta_j^2. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Using the definition of ω_j and assumption $L_{\min} := \min_{1 \leq j \leq W} L_j > 0$, thus

$$\omega_j = 2L_j \left(\sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2W/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{cB}{2L_j} \right) \leq 2L_j \left(\sqrt{\frac{2 \log(2W/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{cB}{2L_{\min}} \right).$$

Since $cB = \tilde{\omega}_{\min} = 2\sqrt{2}L_{\min}v(\delta/2)$ and $v(\delta/2) = \sqrt{\frac{\log(2W/\delta)}{n}}$, we have

$$\omega_j \leq 4\sqrt{2}L_jv(\delta/2).$$

Let $G(\beta) = \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} L_j^2$, we can get by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality

$$\begin{aligned} 6 \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} \omega_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| &\leq 24\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2) \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} L_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| \\ &\leq 24\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2) \sqrt{\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} L_j^2} \sqrt{\sum_{j \in I(\beta)} (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2} \leq 24\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2) \sqrt{\frac{G(\beta)}{\lambda_W}} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where the last inequality above is due to

$$\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\|^2 = \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq W} (\hat{\beta}_i - \beta_i)(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j) < h_i, h_j > \geq \lambda_W \sum_{j \in I(\beta)} (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2$$

from (A.11).

Let $b(\beta) := 12\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2)\sqrt{\frac{G(\beta)}{\lambda_W}}$, Lemma 2 implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2b(\beta) \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h_{\beta}\| \\ &= \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2b(\beta) (\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h + h - h_{\beta}\|) \\ &\leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2b(\beta) \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\| + 2b(\beta) \|h_{\beta} - h\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using the inequality $2st \leq s^2/\alpha + \alpha t^2$ ($s, t \in R, \alpha > 1$) for the last two terms on the right side of the above inequality, we find

$$\begin{aligned} 2b(\beta) \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\| + 2b(\beta) \|h_{\beta} - h\| &\leq \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2/\alpha + b^2(\beta)\alpha + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2/\alpha + b^2(\beta)\alpha \\ &= \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2/\alpha + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2/\alpha + 2b^2(\beta)\alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \leq \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2/\alpha + \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2/\alpha + 2b^2(\beta)\alpha.$$

We have

$$\frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 \leq \frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + 2\alpha b^2(\beta).$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} \|h_{\hat{\beta}} - h\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j| + \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \sum_{j=1}^W c(\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 &\leq \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha-1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{2\alpha^2}{\alpha-1} b^2(\beta) \\ &= \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha-1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{576\alpha^2}{\alpha-1} \frac{G(\beta)}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2). \end{aligned}$$

To get the sharp upper bounds for the above oracle inequality, we optimize α

$$\alpha_{opt2} := \arg \min_{\alpha > 1} \left\{ \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha-1} \|h_{\beta} - h\|^2 + \frac{576\alpha^2}{\alpha-1} \frac{G(\beta)}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2) \right\} = 1 + \sqrt{1 + \frac{\|h_{\beta} - h\|^2}{288 \frac{G(\beta)}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2)}},$$

by the first order condition. This completes the proof of Theorem 2.

Proof of Corollary 1

Let $\tilde{\omega}_{\min} := \min_{1 \leq j \leq W} \tilde{\omega}_j$. We replace $v(\delta/2)$ in Theorem 1 by the larger value $v(\delta/2W)$. Substitute $\beta = \beta^*$ in Theorem 1, we have

$$\frac{\alpha_{opt1}(1-\gamma)}{\alpha_{opt1}-1} \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{18\alpha_{opt1}^2}{\alpha_{opt1}-1} H^2(\beta^*) v^2(\delta/2W) W(\beta^*)$$

by $h = h_{\beta^*}$. Since $\tilde{\omega}_j \geq \tilde{\omega}_{\min}$ for all j , we get

$$\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{18\alpha_{opt1}}{1-\gamma} \cdot \frac{1}{\tilde{\omega}_{\min}} \cdot \max_{j \in I(\beta)} \frac{\omega_j^2}{\|h_j\|^2} \cdot W(\beta^*).$$

In this case, $\alpha_{opt1} = 2$ and $\|h_j\| = 1$, thus

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| &\leq \frac{36}{1-\gamma} \cdot \max_{j \in I(\beta)} \frac{\omega_j^2}{\tilde{\omega}_{\min}} \cdot W(\beta^*) \\ &= \frac{72\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)W(\beta^*)}{1-\gamma} \max_{j \in I(\beta)} \frac{(L_j + L_{\min})^2}{L_{\min}} \leq \frac{72\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)W(\beta^*)}{1-\gamma} \frac{(L + L_{\min})^2}{L_{\min}} \end{aligned}$$

from

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\omega}_{\min} &= 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_{\min}, \\ \omega_j^2 &= [2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)]^2 \left[L_j + \frac{\tilde{\omega}_{\min}}{2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)} \right]^2 = [2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)]^2 [L_j + L_{\min}]^2. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of corollary 1.

Proof of Corollary 2

Let $\beta = \beta^*$ in Theorem 2, with $\alpha_{opt2} = 2$, we replace $v(\delta/2)$ in Theorem 2 by the larger value $v(\delta/2W)$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_{\min} |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \sum_{j=1}^W \tilde{\omega}_j |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{576\alpha_{opt2}G^*}{\lambda_W} v^2(\delta/2W).$$

By the definition of $\tilde{\omega}_{\min}$, we can obtain

$$\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \leq \frac{576\alpha_{opt}2G^*v^2(\delta/2)}{\tilde{\omega}_{\min}\lambda_W} = \frac{576 \cdot 2G^*v^2(\delta/2W)}{2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_{\min}\lambda_W} = \frac{288\sqrt{2}G^*v(\delta/2W)}{L_{\min}\lambda_W}.$$

This concludes the proof of corollary 2.

Proof of Theorem 3

The following lemma is by virtue of KKT conditions. It derives a bound of $P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I})$ which is easily analysed.

Lemma 4 (Proposition 3.3 in Bunea (2008)).

$$P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I}) \leq W(\beta^*) \max_{k \in I_*} P(\hat{\beta}_k = 0 \text{ and } \beta_k^* \neq 0).$$

To present the proof of Theorem 3, first we notice,

$$P(\hat{I} \neq I_*) \leq P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I}) + P(\hat{I} \not\subseteq I_*).$$

Next, we control the probability on the right side of the above inequality.

For the control of $P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I})$, by Lemma 4, it remains to find $P(\hat{\beta}_k = 0 \text{ and } \beta_k^* \neq 0)$.

In below, we will use the conclusion of Lemma 2 (KKT condition). Recall that $E[h_k(Z_1)] = \sum_{j \in I_*} \beta_j^* < h_k, h_j > = \sum_{j=1}^W \beta_j^* < h_k, h_j >$. Since we assume that the density of Z_1 is the mixture density $h_{\beta^*} = \sum_{j \in I_*} \beta_j^* h_j$. So for $k \in I_*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\hat{\beta}_k = 0 \text{ and } \beta_k^* \neq 0) &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j < h_j, h_k >\right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k; \beta_k^* \neq 0\right) \\ &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] + E[h_k(Z_1)] - \sum_{j=1}^W \hat{\beta}_j < h_j, h_k >\right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k; \beta_k^* \neq 0\right) \\ &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] - \sum_{j=1}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) < h_j, h_k >\right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k; \beta_k^* \neq 0\right) \\ &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] - \sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) < h_j, h_k > + \beta_k^* \|h_k\|^2\right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k\right) \\ &\leq P\left(|\beta_k^* \|h_k\|^2 - 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k \leq \left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)]\right| + \left|\sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) < h_j, h_k >\right|\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)]\right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*| \|h_k\|^2}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k\right) \tag{A.13} \end{aligned}$$

$$+ P\left(\left|\sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) < h_j, h_k >\right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*| \|h_k\|^2}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k\right). \tag{A.14}$$

Similar to Lemma 2, for (A.13), we use Hoeffding's inequality. Since $\|h_k\| = 1$ for all k . Consider condition (B), $\min_{k \in I_*} |\beta_k^*| \geq 4\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L$ and $L \geq \max_{1 \leq k \leq W} L_k$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] \right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*| \|h_k\|^2}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(X_1)] + E[h_k(X_1)] - E[h_k(Z_1)] \right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*| \|h_k\|^2}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(X_1)] \right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*|}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \epsilon_k \right) \quad (\text{put } \epsilon_k := |E[h_k(X_1)] - E[h_k(Z_1)]|) \\
&\leq P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(X_1)] \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \epsilon_k \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(X_1)] \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \epsilon_k \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(X_1)] \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L(1 - \epsilon_k^*) \right) \quad (\text{let } \epsilon_k^* = \epsilon_k / \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L) \\
&\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{4n^2v^2(\delta/2W)L^2(1 - \epsilon_k^*)^2}{4nL^2} \right\} \\
&= 2 \exp \left\{ -n(1 - \epsilon_k^*)^2 \frac{\log(2W^2/\delta)}{n} \right\} = 2 \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1 - \epsilon_k^*)^2}. \tag{A.15}
\end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound of (A.14), using condition (A) and condition (B), by the definitions of $\rho_*(\beta^*)$ and $W(\beta^*)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*| \|h_k\|^2}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k \right) \\
&= P \left(\left| \sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq \frac{|\beta_k^*|}{2} - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L_k \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\left| \sum_{j \neq k}^W (\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*) \frac{\langle h_j, h_k \rangle}{\|h_j\| \|h_k\|} \cdot \|h_j\| \|h_k\| \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\rho_*(\beta^*) \sum_{j \neq k}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right) \leq P \left(\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L}{\rho_*(\beta^*)} \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\sum_{j=1}^W |\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \frac{288\sqrt{2}G^*v(\delta/2W)}{L_{\min}\lambda_W} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{W}.
\end{aligned}$$

Where the second last inequality is by condition (A) and the last inequality above is by using the ℓ_1 -estimation oracle inequality in Corollary 2.

Therefore, by the definition of $W(\beta^*)$, $W(\beta^*) = |I_*| \leq W$, we have

$$P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I}) \leq W(\beta^*) \max_{k \in I_*} P(\hat{\beta}_k = 0) \leq W(\beta^*) 2 \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1 - \epsilon_k^*)^2} + W(\beta^*) \frac{\delta}{W}$$

$$\leq 2W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + W \frac{\delta}{W} = 2W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + \delta.$$

For the control of $P(\hat{I} \not\subseteq I_*)$, let

$$\tilde{\eta} = \arg \min_{\eta \in \mathbb{R}^{W(\beta^*)}} z(\eta), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where

$$z(\eta) = -\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j \in I_*} \eta_j h_j(X_i) + \left\| \sum_{j \in I_*} \eta_j h_j \right\|^2 + \sum_{j \in I_*} (4\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2)L_j + 2cB)|\eta_j| + c \sum_{j \in I_*} \eta_j^2.$$

Consider the following random event,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bigcap_{k \notin I_*} \left\{ \left| -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) + \sum_{j \in I_*} \tilde{\eta}_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2)L_k \right\} \\ & \subseteq \bigcap_{k \notin I_*} \left\{ \left| -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) + \sum_{j \in I_*} \tilde{\eta}_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \leq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} := \Psi. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Let $\bar{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^W$ be a vector corresponding to the component of the index set I_* having $\tilde{\eta}$ given by equation (A.16), and the component at other corresponding positions is 0. By Lemma 1, we know that $\bar{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^W$ is a solution of (2.5) on the event Ψ . It is recalled that $\hat{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^W$ is also a solution of (2.5). Through the definition of the indicator set \hat{I} , we have $\hat{\beta}_k \neq 0$ for $k \in \hat{I}$. By construction, we obtain $\tilde{\eta}_k \neq 0$ for some subset $T \subseteq I_*$. The KKT conditions indicate that any two solutions have non-zero components at the same positions. Therefore, $\hat{I} = T \subseteq I_*$ on the event Ψ . Further, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\hat{I} \not\subseteq I_*) & \leq P(\Psi^c) = P \left(\bigcup_{k \notin I_*} \left\{ \left| -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) + \sum_{j \in I_*} \tilde{\eta}_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) + \sum_{j \in I_*} \tilde{\eta}_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\ & = \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) + E[h_k(Z_1)] - E[h_k(Z_1)] + \sum_{j \in I_*} \tilde{\eta}_j \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\ & = \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] - \sum_{j \in I_*} (\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*) \langle h_j, h_k \rangle \right| \geq 2\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E[h_k(Z_1)] \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.18})$$

$$+ \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| |\langle h_j, h_k \rangle| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\}. \quad (\text{A.19})$$

According to the previously proved (A.15) formula, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(Z_i) - E h_k(Z_1) \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E h_k(X_1) \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L - \epsilon_k \right\} \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^W P \left\{ \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_k(X_i) - E h_k(X_1) \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L(1 - \epsilon_k^*) \right\} \leq 2W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

For the upper bound of (A.19), observe Theorem 2, we can use a larger $v(\delta/2W)$ instead of $v(\delta/2)$. Considering the construction of $\tilde{\eta}$ in (A.16), we find

$$P \left(\sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \frac{288\sqrt{2}G^*v(\delta/2W)}{L_{\min}\lambda_W} \right) \leq \frac{\delta}{W}.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{k \notin I_*} P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| | \langle h_j, h_k \rangle | \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^W P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| \left| \frac{\langle h_j, h_k \rangle}{\|h_j\| \|h_k\|} \|h_j\| \|h_k\| \right| \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\
& \leq \sum_{k=1}^W P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| \rho_*(\beta^*) \geq \sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L \right\} \\
& = \sum_{k=1}^W P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \frac{\sqrt{2}v(\delta/2W)L}{\rho_*(\beta^*)} \right\} \\
& \text{(using condition (A)) } \leq \sum_{k=1}^W P \left\{ \sum_{j \in I_*} |\tilde{\eta}_j - \beta_j^*| \geq \frac{288\sqrt{2}G^*v(\delta/2W)}{L_{\min}\lambda_W} \right\} \leq \sum_{k=1}^W \frac{\delta}{W} = \delta.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\hat{I} \neq I_*) & \leq P(I_* \not\subseteq \hat{I}) + P(\hat{I} \not\subseteq I_*) \leq 2W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + \delta + 2W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + \delta \\
& = 4W \left(\frac{\delta}{2W^2} \right)^{(1-\epsilon_k^*)^2} + 2\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Song Xi Chen's Group (<http://songxichen.gsm.pku.edu.cn/>) for sharing the meteorological data sets.

References

- Balakrishnan, S., Wainwright, M. J., & Yu, B. (2017). Statistical guarantees for the EM algorithm: From population to sample-based analysis. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(1), 77-120.
- Belloni, A., Rosenbaum, M., & Tsybakov, A. B. (2017). Linear and conic programming estimators in high dimensional errors-in-variables models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 79(3), 939-956.
- Bertin, K., Le Pennec, E., & Rivoirard, V. (2011). Adaptive Dantzig density estimation. *Annales de l'IHP Probabilités et statistiques* (Vol. 47, No. 1, pp. 43-74).
- Biau, G., & Devroye, L. (2005). Density estimation by the penalized combinatorial method. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 94(1), 196-208.
- Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y. A., & Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of Lasso and Dantzig selector. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1705-1732.
- Buhlmann, P., & van de Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Springer.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., & Massart, P. (2013). *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press.
- Bunea, F. (2008). Honest variable selection in linear and logistic regression models via ℓ_1 and $\ell_1 + \ell_2$ penalization. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2, 1153-1194.
- Bunea, F., Tsybakov, A. B., Wegkamp, M. H., & Barbu, A. (2010). Spades and mixture models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(4), 2525-2558.
- Candes, E. J. (2006). Modern statistical estimation via oracle inequalities. *Acta numerica*, 15, 257-325.
- Cheng, C. L. & van Ness, J. W. (1999) *Statistical Regression with Measurement Error*. New York: Wiley.
- Chen, S. X. (1998). Measurement errors in line transect surveys. *Biometrics*, 899-908.
- Chen, J., & Khalili, A. (2008). Order selection in finite mixture models with a nonsmooth penalty. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(484), 1674-1683.
- Chow, Y. S., & Teicher, H. (2003). *Probability theory: independence, interchangeability, martingales*, 3rd. Springer.
- DasGupta, A. (2008). *Asymptotic theory of statistics and probability*. Springer.
- Devroye, L., & Lugosi, G. (2001). *Combinatorial methods in density estimation*. Springer.
- Donoho, D. L., & Johnstone, J. M. (1994). Ideal spatial adaptation by wavelet shrinkage. *biometrika*, 81(3), 425-455.
- Hall, P., & Lahiri, S. N. (2008). Estimation of distributions, moments and quantiles in deconvolution problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(5), 2110-2134.
- Hersbach, H. et al. (2018). Operational global reanalysis: progress, future directions and synergies with NWP[M]. European Centre for Medium Range Weather Forecasts.
- Lemler, S. (2016). Oracle inequalities for the Lasso in the high-dimensional Aalen multiplicative intensity model. *Annales De L Institut Henri Poincare-probabilites Et Statistiques*, 52(2), 981-1008.
- Martin, R. (2009). *Fast Nonparametric Estimation of a Mixing Distribution with Application to High Dimensional Inference*, PhD thesis, Purdue University.
- McLachlan, G. J., Lee, S. X., & Rathnayake, S. I. (2019). Finite mixture models. *Annual review of statistics and its application*, 6, 355-378.
- Meister, A. (2006). Density estimation with normal measurement error with unknown variance. *Statistica Sinica*, 195-211.
- Nakamura, T. (1990). Corrected score function for errors-in-variables models: Methodology and application to generalized linear models. *Biometrika*, 77(1), 127-137.
- Rosenbaum, M., & Tsybakov, A. B. (2010). Sparse recovery under matrix uncertainty. *The Annals of Statistics*, 2620-2651.
- Schennach, S., & Bonhomme, S. (2013). Penalized Least Squares Methods for Latent Variables Models. In *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Volume 3, Econometrics: Tenth World Congress* (Vol. 51, p. 338). Cambridge University Press.
- Tokdar, S. T., Martin, R., & Ghosh, J. K. (2009). Consistency of a recursive estimate of mixing distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5A), 2502-2522.

- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 267-288.
- Zhang H., & Jia, J. (2020). Elastic-net Regularized High-dimensional Negative Binomial Regression: Consistency and Weak Signals Detection. *Statistica Sinica*, <https://doi.org/10.5705/ss.202019.0315>
- Zou, H., & Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(2), 301-320.
- Zou, H., & Zhang, H. (2009). On the adaptive elastic-net with a diverging number of parameters. *Annals of statistics*, 37(4), 1733.