

General model-free weighted envelope estimation

Daniel J. Eck

January 18, 2022

Abstract

Envelope methodology is succinctly pitched as a class of procedures for increasing efficiency in multivariate analyses without altering traditional objectives [Cook, 2018, first sentence of page 1]. This description is true with the additional caveat that the efficiency gains obtained by envelope methodology are mitigated by model selection volatility to an unknown degree. The bulk of the current envelope methodology literature does not account for this added variance that arises from the uncertainty in model selection. Recent strides to account for model selection volatility have been made on two fronts: 1) development of a weighted envelope estimator, in the context of multivariate regression, to account for this variability directly; 2) development of a model selection criterion that facilitates consistent estimation of the correct envelope model for more general settings. In this paper, we unify these two directions and provide weighted envelope estimators that directly account for the variability associated with model selection and are appropriate for general multivariate estimation settings for vector valued parameters. Our weighted estimation technique provides practitioners with robust and useful variance reduction in finite samples. Theoretical justification is given for our estimators and validity of a nonparametric bootstrap procedure for estimating their asymptotic variance are established. Simulation studies and a real data analysis support our claims and demonstrate the advantage of our weighted envelope estimator when model selection variability is present.

Keywords: dimension reduction; model averaging; envelope methodology; nonparametric bootstrap; bootstrap smoothing; model selection

1 Introduction

Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be an independent sample where $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a target parameter that we want to estimate. Suppose that $\tilde{\theta} = \tilde{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n)$ is a \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically normal estimator of θ with asymptotic variance $\Sigma > 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{n} (\tilde{\theta} - \theta) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, \Sigma). \quad (1)$$

The idea of envelope methodology is to estimate θ with less asymptotic variability than Σ through the exploitation of a parametric link between θ and Σ [Cook et al., 2010, Cook and Zhang, 2015, Cook, 2018]. Envelope methodology originated as a method to reduce the variability of a regression coefficient matrix β in the multivariate linear regression model [Cook et al., 2010, Su and Cook, 2011, 2012, Cook and Su, 2013, Cook, 2018]. The key insight behind using envelope methodology as a variance reduction tool was the observation that some linear combinations of the response vector may be invariant to changes in the predictors. Such linear combinations represent variability in the response vector that is not directly relevant to the estimation of β and should be discarded. Cook and Zhang [2015] extended envelope methodology to the general setting where one only has a target parameter θ , a \sqrt{n} consistent and asymptotically normal estimator of θ as in (1), and a \sqrt{n} consistent estimator $\hat{\Sigma}$ of Σ .

In both the multivariate linear regression model and the general estimation framework in (1), variance reduction obtained through envelope methodology arises from exploiting a subspace of the spectral structure

of the variance matrix with dimension $u < p$ that contains $\text{span}(\theta)$. The dimension u of the envelope space is unknown in practice. In many envelope modeling contexts one can estimate u with information criteria, likelihood ratio tests, or cross-validation. Information criteria and likelihood ratio tests can be estimated with full Grassmannian optimization [Cook et al., 2010, Cook and Zhang, 2016, 2015, Zhang and Mai, 2018], the 1D algorithm [Cook and Zhang, 2016, 2015], or the fast envelope estimator [Cook et al., 2016]. Recently, Zhang and Mai [2018] proposed new model-free information criteria that can estimate u consistently. With u estimated, the variability of the envelope estimator is assessed via the bootstrap. However, most bootstrap implementations are conditional on $u = \hat{u}$ where \hat{u} is the estimated dimension of the envelope space. These procedures ignore the variability associated with model selection. Eck and Cook [2017] provided a weighted envelope bootstrap to alleviate this problem in the context of the multivariate linear regression model. In this context the variability of the weighted envelope estimator was appreciably lower than that obtained by bootstrapping the multivariate linear regression model parameters as in Eck [2018]. Eck et al. [2020] provided a double bootstrap procedure for envelope estimation of expected Darwinian fitness from an aster model [Geyer et al., 2007, Shaw et al., 2008] which demonstrated useful variance reduction empirically. That being said, the theoretical motivations for each of these bootstrap procedures are not applicable for envelope estimation in general settings. The weights in Eck and Cook [2017] are constructed from the Bayesian Information Criterion values of the multivariate linear regression model evaluated at all envelope estimators fit at dimension $u = 1, \dots, p$. Model selection volatility is taken into account in Eck et al. [2020] by criteria that also require a likelihood.

In this paper we provide weighted envelope estimators that are appropriate for envelope estimation in the general setting described by the setup in (1). These settings do not require the existence of a likelihood function and avoid having to condition on an estimated envelope dimension. We then provide bootstrap procedures which estimate the variability of our weighted envelope estimators. More importantly, our bootstrap procedures estimate the variability of the envelope estimator at the true, unknown, dimension u . This is because as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the weight at u converges to 1 fast enough to not incorporate influences from other envelope dimensions. The envelope estimators developed in this paper are a powerful and practical unification of the methodology in Eck and Cook [2017] and Zhang and Mai [2018]. Our approach greatly generalizes the appropriateness of envelope model averaging beyond the context of multivariate linear regression models while simultaneously maintaining robust variance reduction in finite-samples as well as comparable to the estimators in Zhang and Mai [2018]. In practical applications, our approach encapsulates the variability associated with model selection volatility. We now motivate envelope methodology and weighted estimation techniques.

2 Envelope properties

We first provide the definition of a reducing subspace and an envelope.

Definition 1 (Reducing subspace). *A subspace $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is a reducing subspace of a matrix M if $M\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{R}$ and $M\mathcal{R}^c \subset \mathcal{R}^c$ where \mathcal{R}^c is the orthogonal complement of \mathcal{R} relative to the usual inner product.*

A reducing subspace \mathcal{R} of a matrix M allows one to decompose M as $M = P_{\mathcal{R}}MP_{\mathcal{R}} + Q_{\mathcal{R}}MQ_{\mathcal{R}}$ where $P_{\mathcal{R}}$ is the projection into \mathcal{R} and $Q_{\mathcal{R}} = I - P_{\mathcal{R}}$. When the eigenvalues of M are distinct, a reducing subspace is a direct sum of eigenspaces of M .

Definition 2 (Envelope). *The M envelope of $\text{span}(U)$ is defined as the intersection of all reducing subspaces \mathcal{R} of M which satisfies $\text{span}(U) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. The envelope subspace is denoted by $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$.*

The subspace $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$ is a small targeted part of the spectral structure of M which contains the span of U . Denote $u, 0 \leq u \leq p$, as the dimension of $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$. All things being equal, a smaller value of u indicates

that stronger inferences can be obtained by taking advantage of the envelope structure when U and M are a parameter of interest and a covariance matrix respectively.

To see the benefit of envelope methodology, first consider the case when $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$ is known. Let $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times u}$, $u < p$, be a known semi-orthogonal basis matrix for $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$. Let $U = \theta\theta^T$ and $M = \Sigma$ and suppose that we have \sqrt{n} -consistent $\tilde{\theta}$ as in the initial setup (1). The envelope estimator of θ is then $P_\Gamma\tilde{\theta}$ where $P_\Gamma = \Gamma\Gamma^T$. Notice that,

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n} \left(P_\Gamma\tilde{\theta} - \theta \right) &= P_\Gamma \left\{ \sqrt{n} \left(\tilde{\theta} - \theta \right) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, P_\Gamma\Sigma P_\Gamma \right), \\ \sqrt{n} \left(Q_\Gamma\tilde{\theta} \right) &= Q_\Gamma \left\{ \sqrt{n} \left(\tilde{\theta} - \theta \right) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} N \left(0, Q_\Gamma\Sigma Q_\Gamma \right),\end{aligned}$$

where $Q_\Gamma = I - P_\Gamma$ and $Q_\Gamma\theta = 0$ by definition. In this demonstration we see that $P_\Gamma\tilde{\theta}$ consistently estimates θ with less asymptotic variability than that of the original estimator. The remaining piece of $\tilde{\theta}$, given by $Q_\Gamma\tilde{\theta}$, is a \sqrt{n} consistent estimator of 0 with non-trivial asymptotic variability given by $Q_\Gamma\Sigma Q_\Gamma$. Therefore $P_\Gamma\tilde{\theta}$ is all that is needed to estimate θ while $Q_\Gamma\tilde{\theta}$ produces extra variability that is nonessential to the estimation of θ . Let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the spectral matrix norm. Envelope methodology leads to massive efficiency gains in settings where $\|Q_\Gamma\Sigma Q_\Gamma\| \gg \|P_\Gamma\Sigma P_\Gamma\|$. When one has the true u but needs to estimate all other quantities then the asymptotic variability of the envelope estimator $P_\Gamma\Sigma P_\Gamma$ incurs an additional cost resulting from said estimation, see Section 5.2 of Cook et al. [2010] and Section 3.3 of Cook and Zhang [2015] for specific examples.

In practical settings, all envelope modeling quantities, including u , require estimation. In such general cases where the likelihood function need not be known, Zhang and Mai [2018] proposed to estimate a semi-orthogonal basis matrix $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times u}$ of $\mathcal{E}_M(U)$ by minimizing the generic moment-based objective function:

$$J_n(\Gamma) = \log |\Gamma^T \widehat{M} \Gamma| + \log |\Gamma^T (\widehat{M} + \widehat{U})^{-1} \Gamma|, \quad (2)$$

where \widehat{M} and \widehat{U} are \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators of M and U . The motivations for (2) comes its population counterpart, $J(\Gamma) = \log |\Gamma^T M \Gamma| + \log |\Gamma^T (M + U)^{-1} \Gamma|$, where Cook and Zhang [2016] showed that any Γ which minimizes $J(\Gamma)$ must satisfy the envelope condition that $\text{span}(U) \subseteq \text{span}(\Gamma)$. Assuming that the true envelope dimension u is supplied, the \sqrt{n} -consistency of the estimated envelope estimator that is constructed from a minimizer of (2) is established in Cook and Zhang [2016]. The true envelope dimension is not known in practice.

3 Weighted envelope methodology

We introduce model-free weighted envelope estimation that offers a balance between variance reduction and model misspecification in finite samples. The idea is to weigh each envelope estimator evaluated at different candidate dimensions with respect to a measure of fit of the candidate envelope dimension. The weighted envelope estimators that we propose are of the form

$$\hat{\theta}_w = \sum_{k=0}^p w_k \hat{\theta}_k, \quad w_k = f_k(\mathcal{I}_n(1), \dots, \mathcal{I}_n(p)), \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_k$, $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$, f_k are, respectively, the envelope estimator, an information criteria that assesses the fit of the envelope dimension, and a function of all information criteria at proposed dimension k , and n is the sample size. As is standard in model averaging, we require that f_k and $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$ be chosen so that $w_k \geq 0$ and $\sum_k w_k = 1$. However, unlike typical model averaging contexts, $\hat{\theta}_k$ is consistent for all weight choices that satisfy $\sum_{k=u}^p w_k \rightarrow 1$ where $w_k \geq 0$ for $k \geq u$. Such weight choices induce a consistent estimator since

the envelope estimator $\hat{\theta}_k$ is a consistent estimator for θ for all $k \geq u$. It is of course more desirable to select $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$ and f_k so that $w_u \rightarrow 1$.

In this paper, we study two choices of $\mathcal{I}_n(\cdot)$ and one choice of f_k so that $w_u \rightarrow 1$ at a fast enough rate to facilitate reliable estimation of the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u$, u unknown, via a nonparametric bootstrap. The weights will be of the form

$$w_k = \frac{\exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n(j)\}}. \quad (4)$$

The choice of f_k that yields the weights (4) is motivated by Eck and Cook [2017], where the choice of $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$ in Eck and Cook [2017] reflected the BIC value of a multivariate linear regression model with the envelope estimator at dimension k plugged in. The two choices of $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$ that we study here facilitate weighted envelope estimation within the general envelope estimation context (1). The first choice of $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$, denoted $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$, allows for consistent estimation of the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u$ using the nonparametric bootstrap. This is achieved by setting $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) = J_n(\hat{\Gamma}) + \text{pen}(k)$ and showing that 1) $J_n(\hat{\Gamma})$ can be cast a quasi-likelihood objective function that is optimized via a full Grassmannian envelope optimization routine [Zhang and Mai, 2018]; 2) this partially optimized quasi-likelihood objective function can be cast as an M-estimation problem. The second choice of $\mathcal{I}_n(k)$, denoted $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$, corresponds to sequential 1 dimension (1D) optimization [Cook and Zhang, 2016, 2015, Zhang and Mai, 2018]. The choice $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ does not facilitate the same consistent estimation of the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u$. However, we demonstrate that the choice $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ allows for reliable estimation of the variability of the envelope estimator that is estimated using the 1D algorithm at the true u . Both our simulations, and the simulations presented in Zhang and Mai [2018] find that the choice of $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ exhibits greater empirical variance reduction than the choice of $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$. Moreover, the 1D optimization routine is faster, more stable, and less sensitive to initial values than the Full Grassmannian approach [Wang et al., 2019].

3.1 Weighted envelope estimation via quasi-likelihood optimization

In this section we construct $\hat{\theta}_w$ in (3) where the information criteria $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ is derived from full Grassmannian optimization of the objective function (2). The minimizer $\hat{\Gamma}$ of the objective function (2) is the estimated basis of the envelope subspace at dimension u . After obtaining $\hat{\Gamma}$, the envelope estimator is $\hat{\theta}^{\text{FG}} = \hat{\Gamma}\hat{\Gamma}^T\tilde{\theta}$ where the superscript FG denotes envelope estimation with respect to full Grassmannian optimization. This envelope estimator is the original estimator projected into the estimated envelope subspace. When u is known, $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ is \sqrt{n} -consistent and has been shown to have lower variability than θ in finite samples [Cook et al., 2010, Cook and Zhang, 2015, Cook, 2018]. The weighted envelope estimator corresponding to $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ is

$$\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}} = \sum_{k=0}^p w_k^{\text{FG}} \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}}, \quad w_k^{\text{FG}} = \frac{\exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(j)\}}, \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}}$ is the envelope estimator of θ constructed from full Grassmannian optimization of $J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k)$ at dimension k . In the remaining part of this Section we make $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ and demonstrate how our choices supplement Section 4.2 to yield consistent estimation of the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$.

Zhang and Mai [2018] showed that optimization of J_n in (2) is the same as optimization of a partially minimized quasi-likelihood function. Define this quasi-likelihood function as,

$$l_n(M, \theta) = \log |M| + \text{tr} \left[M^{-1} \left\{ \widehat{M} + (\tilde{\theta} - \theta)(\tilde{\theta} - \theta)^T \right\} \right], \quad (6)$$

and, for some candidate dimension $k = 1, \dots, p$, define the constraint set for the minimization of (6) to be,

$$\mathcal{A}_k = \left\{ (M, \theta) : M = \Gamma\Omega\Gamma^T + \Gamma_o\Omega_o\Gamma_o^T > 0, \theta = \Gamma\eta, \eta \in \mathbb{R}^k, (\Gamma, \Gamma_o)^T(\Gamma, \Gamma_o) = I_p \right\}. \quad (7)$$

Minimization of (6) over the constraint set (7) is the same as minimizing J_n in (2).

Lemma 1. [Zhang and Mai, 2018, Lemma 3.1]. The minimizer of $l_n(M, \theta)$ in (6) under the envelope parameterization (7) is $\widehat{M}_{E_{nv}} = \widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{\Gamma}^T\widehat{\Omega}\widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{\Gamma}^T + \widehat{\Gamma}_o\widehat{\Gamma}_o^T\widehat{\Omega}_o\widehat{\Gamma}_o\widehat{\Gamma}_o^T$ and $\widehat{\theta} = \widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{\Gamma}^T\widetilde{\theta}$ where $\widehat{\Gamma}$ is the minimizer of the partially optimized objective function $l_n(\Gamma) = \min_{\Omega, \Omega_o, \eta} l_n(\Gamma, \Omega, \Omega_o, \eta) = J_n(\Gamma) + \log |\widehat{M} + \widehat{U}| + p$ where $\widehat{U} = \widetilde{\theta}\widetilde{\theta}^T$.

We show that optimization of the quasi-likelihood $l_n(M, \theta)$ can be cast as an M-estimation problem when $\widehat{M} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(\mathbf{X}_i, \widetilde{\theta})$ provided that $\widetilde{\theta}$ is an optimal solution to some objective function, as in the same vein as Stefanski and Boos [2002, pg. 29]. The justification that a nonparametric bootstrap procedure will consistently estimate the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ follows from bootstrap theory for M-estimators in Section 2 of Andrews [2002]. Therefore recasting (2) and (6) as an M-estimation problem is an important theoretical consideration for our proposed methodology. The requirement that $\widehat{M} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(\mathbf{X}_i, \widetilde{\theta})$ is mild and it holds in linear regression, maximum likelihood estimation, and M-estimation. Our parameterization of \widehat{M} gives,

$$\begin{aligned} l_n(M, \theta) &= \log |M| + \text{tr} \left[M^{-1} \left\{ \widehat{M} + (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)(\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)^T \right\} \right] \\ &= \log |M| + \text{tr} \left[n^{-1} \sum_{j=i}^n M^{-1} \left\{ h(\mathbf{X}_i, \widetilde{\theta}) + (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)(\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)^T \right\} \right] \\ &= \log |M| + n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{tr} \left[M^{-1} \left\{ h(\mathbf{X}_i, \widetilde{\theta}) + (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)(\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)^T \right\} \right] \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\log |M| + \text{tr} \left[M^{-1} \left\{ h(\mathbf{X}_i, \widetilde{\theta}) + (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)(\widetilde{\theta} - \theta)^T \right\} \right] \right) \\ &= n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i, \theta, M). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 1 then gives,

$$l_n(\Gamma) = \min_{\Omega, \Omega_o, \eta} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i, \Gamma, \Omega, \Omega_o, \eta) = J_n(\Gamma) + \log |\widehat{M} + \widehat{U}| + p, \quad (8)$$

where the minimization takes place over \mathcal{A}_k . The minimization of $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i, \theta, M)$ over \mathcal{A}_k provides estimates for both Γ and η and yields $\theta = \Gamma\eta$ and $M = \Gamma\Omega\Gamma^T + \Gamma_o\Omega_o\Gamma_o^T$. The proof of Lemma 3.1 in Zhang and Mai [2018] reveals that $\widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} = \widehat{\Gamma}\widehat{\Gamma}^T\widetilde{\theta}$. In Section 4.2 we develop a nonparametric bootstrap to consistently estimate the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$. Now define

$$\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) = J_n(\widehat{\Gamma}_k) + \frac{Ck \log(n)}{n}, \quad (k = 0, 1, \dots, p), \quad (9)$$

as in Zhang and Mai [2018] where $C > 0$ is a constant and $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(0) = 0$. The envelope dimension is selected as $\hat{u}_{\text{FG}} = \arg \min_{0 \leq k \leq p} \mathcal{I}_n(k)$. Theorem 3.1 in Zhang and Mai [2018] showed that $\mathbb{P}(\hat{u}_{\text{FG}} = u) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, provided that $C > 0$ and \widehat{M} and \widehat{U} are \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators of M and U respectively.

Zhang and Mai [2018] provided evidence that selecting \hat{u}_{FG} in this manner leads to envelope estimators with lower variability than traditional estimators and that the correct dimension selection improves in n . However, correct dimension selection was far from perfect in their simulations, especially for small and moderate sample sizes. Moreover, dimension selection is being ignored in these simulations. We use $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ in (9) to construct $\widehat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}}$ in (5). This construction yields consistent estimation of θ as seen in Section 3.3 and consistent estimation of the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ through the combination of Theorem 1 and our formulation of $l_n(M, \theta)$ as an M-estimation problem.

3.2 Weighted envelope estimation via the 1D algorithm

In this section we construct $\hat{\theta}_w$ in (3) where the information criteria $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ is derived from the 1D algorithm [Cook and Zhang, 2015, 2016]. The 1D algorithm performs a sequence of optimizations that each return a basis vector of the envelope space (in the population) or a \sqrt{n} -consistent estimator of a basis vector for the envelope space (in finite-samples). The number of optimizations corresponds to the dimension of the envelope space and is provided by the user. The returned envelope estimator is $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{1D}} = \hat{\Gamma}\hat{\Gamma}\tilde{\theta}$ where the estimated basis matrix $\hat{\Gamma}$ is obtained from the 1D algorithm. The weighted envelope estimator corresponding to `oneD(k)` is

$$\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{1D}} = \sum_{k=0}^p w_k^{\text{1D}} \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{1D}}, \quad w_k^{\text{1D}} = \frac{\exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(j)\}}. \quad (10)$$

When $C = 1$ in (11), the terms $n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ are BIC values corresponding to the asymptotic log likelihood the envelope model of dimension k .

The algorithm is as follows: Set $u_o \leq p - 1$ to be the user inputted number of optimizations. For step $k = 0, \dots, u_o$, let $g_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denote the k -th direction to be obtained by the 1D algorithm. Define $G_k = (g_1, \dots, g_k)$, and (G_k, G_{0k}) to be an orthogonal basis for \mathbb{R}^p and set initial value $g_0 = G_0 = 0$. Define $M_k = G_{0k}^T M G_{0k}$, $U_k = G_{0k}^T U G_{0k}$, and the objective function after k steps

$$\phi_k(v) = \log(v^T M_k v) + \log\{v^T (M_k + U_k)^{-1} v\}.$$

The $(k + 1)$ -th envelope direction is $g_{k+1} = G_{0k} v_{k+1}$ where $v_{k+1} = \arg\max_v \phi_k(v)$ subject to $v^T v = 1$.

In the population, the 1D algorithm produces a nested solution path that contains the true envelope:

$$\text{span}(G_1) \subset \text{span}(G_{u-1}) \subset \dots \subset \text{span}(G_u) = \mathcal{E}_M(U) \subset \text{span}(G_{u+1}) \subset \dots \subset \text{span}(G_p) = \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Replacing M and U with \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators \hat{M} and \hat{U} yields \sqrt{n} -consistent estimates $\hat{G}_k = (\hat{g}_1, \dots, \hat{g}_k) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k}$, $k = 1, \dots, p$ by optimizing

$$\phi_{k,n}(v) = \log(v^T \hat{M}_k v) + \log\{v^T (\hat{M}_k + \hat{U}_k)^{-1} v\}.$$

The resulting envelope estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{1D}}$ is therefore \sqrt{n} -consistent [Cook and Zhang, 2015].

Zhang and Mai [2018] proposed a model selection criterion to estimate u in practical settings. This criterion is,

$$\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k) = \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) + \frac{Cj \log n}{n}, \quad (k = 0, \dots, p), \quad (11)$$

where $C > 0$ is a constant and $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(0) = 0$. The envelope dimension selected is given by $\hat{u}_{\text{1D}} = \arg \min_{0 \leq k \leq p} \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$. Theorem 3.2 in Zhang and Mai [2018] showed that $\mathbb{P}(\hat{u}_{\text{1D}} = u) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, provided that $C > 0$ and \hat{M} and \hat{U} are \sqrt{n} -consistent estimators of M and U respectively. We use $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)$ in (11) to construct $\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{1D}}$ in (10). This construction yields consistent estimation of θ as seen in Section 3.3 and allows for reliable estimation of the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{1D}}$.

3.3 Consistency properties of weighted envelope estimators

Weighted envelope estimators exhibit desirable consistency properties. First of all, the weights in (5) and (10) can be constructed so that they both satisfy $w_u^{\text{FG}} \rightarrow 1$ and $w_u^{\text{1D}} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 2. For any constant $C > 0$ and \sqrt{n} -consistent \hat{M} and \hat{U} in (9), $w_u^{\text{FG}} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Lemma 3. For any constant $C > 0$ and \sqrt{n} -consistent \widehat{M} and \widehat{U} in (11), $w_u^{ID} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proofs of both Lemmas are included in the Supplementary Materials. Lemmas 2 and 3 facilitate consistent estimation of θ using $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID}$.

Lemma 4. For any constant $C > 0$ and \sqrt{n} -consistent \widehat{M} and \widehat{U} in (9) and (11), both $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG} \rightarrow \theta$ and $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID} \rightarrow \theta$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

The proof of Lemma 4 immediately follows from Lemmas 2 and 3 and Zhang and Mai [2018, Proposition 2.1]. While consistency is desirable, Lemma 4 does not provide knowledge about the asymptotic variability of $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ or $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID}$. Therefore, these estimators do not offer any assurance of variance reduction via model-free weighted envelope estimation. We expect that $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID}$ will have lower asymptotic variance than $\widetilde{\theta}$ when $u < p$, but explicit computations of the asymptotic variance for both estimators are cumbersome. We will instead estimate the asymptotic variability of $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID}$ with a nonparametric bootstrap. Theoretical justification for these bootstrap procedures are provided in the next section.

4 Bootstrapping for model-free weighted envelope estimators

4.1 Nonparametric bootstrap

Let $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ be the original data. We will estimate the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_u^{FG}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_u^{ID}$ by bootstrapping with respect to the weighted estimators $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\widehat{\theta}_w^{ID}$. We will also show that bootstrapping with respect to $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ can consistently estimate the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_u^{FG}$.

For each iteration of this nonparametric bootstrap procedure we denote the resampled data by $\mathbf{X}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^*$ where each \mathbf{X}_i^* , $i = 1, \dots, n$ is sampled, with replacement, from the original data with equal probability $1/n$. Define the bootstrapped envelope estimators $\widehat{\theta}^{FG*} = \widehat{\theta}^{FG}(\mathbf{X}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^*)$, $\widehat{\theta}^{ID*} = \widehat{\theta}^{ID}(\mathbf{X}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^*)$, and the bootstrapped version of the original estimator $\widetilde{\theta}$ as $\widetilde{\theta}^* = \widetilde{\theta}(\mathbf{X}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^*)$. Furthermore, define \widehat{M}^* and \widehat{U}^* in the same manner as \widehat{M} and \widehat{U} with respect to the starred data.

4.2 For quasi-likelihood optimization

In this section we provide justification for the nonparametric bootstrap as a method to estimate the variability of $\widehat{\theta}_w^{FG}$. Define

$$J_n^*(\Gamma) = \log |\Gamma^T \widehat{M}^* \Gamma| + |\Gamma^T (\widehat{M}^* + \widehat{U}^*)^{-1} \Gamma|, \quad (12)$$

as the starred analog to J_n in (2) and define,

$$l_n^*(M, \theta) = \log |M| + \text{tr} \left[M^{-1} \left\{ \widehat{M}^* + (\widetilde{\theta}^* - \theta)(\widetilde{\theta}^* - \theta)^T \right\} \right], \quad (13)$$

as the starred analog to l_n in (6). Define $\widehat{\Gamma}^*$ as the minimizer to (12). When $\widehat{M}^* = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(\mathbf{X}_i^*, \widetilde{\theta}^*)$ both Lemma 1 and our likelihood derivation in Section 3.1 give,

$$l_n^*(\Gamma) = \min_{\Omega, \Omega_o, \eta} n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i^*, \Gamma, \Omega, \Omega_o, \eta) = J_n^*(\Gamma) + \log |\widehat{M}^* + \widehat{U}^*| + p,$$

which is the starred analog to (8). Thus $\widehat{\Gamma}^*$ is an M-estimator, being the minimizer of the partially minimized objective function $l_n^*(\Gamma)$. We then let $\widehat{\theta}_u^{FG*} = \widehat{\Gamma}^* \widehat{\Gamma}^{*T} \widetilde{\theta}^*$ where $\widetilde{\theta}^*$ is obtained in the same minimization of $\sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{X}_i^*, \Gamma, \Omega, \Omega_o, \eta)$. The envelope estimator $\widehat{\theta}_u^{FG*}$ is a product of M-estimators obtained from the same

objective function. Therefore we can use the nonparametric bootstrap to consistently estimate the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ [Andrews, 2002, Section 2]. The problem with this setup is that u is unknown and requires estimation. We show that bootstrapping with respect to our weighted envelope estimator consistently estimates the variability of the envelope estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ at the true unknown dimension when $\widehat{M}^* = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n h(\mathbf{X}_i^*, \tilde{\theta}^*)$.

Theorem 1. *Let $\tilde{\theta}$ be a \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically normal estimator. Let $\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}}$ be the envelope estimator obtained from full Grassmannian optimization at dimension $k = 0, \dots, p$ and let $\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}}$ be the weighted envelope estimator with weights w^{FG} . Let $\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*}$ and $\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}*}$ denote the corresponding quantities obtained by resampled data. Then as n tends to ∞ ,*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}} \right) = \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) + O_P \left\{ n^{(1/2-C)} \right\} + O_P \left[n^{\{Cu+1/2\}} \right] \exp \{ -n|O_P(1)| \}. \quad (14)$$

Remarks:

1. Theorem 1 shows that our bootstrap procedure consistently estimates the asymptotic variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ when u is unknown. We see that the second O_P term in (14) vanishes quickly in n . These terms are associated with under selecting the true envelope dimension. Therefore it is more likely that our bootstrap procedures will conservatively estimate the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ in finite samples.
2. We advocate for the case with $C = 1$ because of the close connection that $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ has with the Bayesian Information Criterion, similar reasoning was given in Zhang and Mai [2018]. The $Ck \log(n)/n$ penalty term in $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ facilitates the decaying bias in n represented by the O_P terms in (14). Redefining $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$ to have a penalty term that is fixed in n , similar to that of Akaike Information Criterion, fundamentally changes the O_P terms in (14). Specifically, the $O_P(n^{-1/2})$ term (when $C = 1$) disappears and the weights w_k^{FG} fail to vanish for $k > u$. Therefore unknown non-zero asymptotic weight is given to candidate models with dimension $k > u$. Weighting in this manner is therefore suboptimal and is not advised.
3. The weights w_k^{FG} have a similar form to the weights which appear in the model averaging literature [Buckland et al., 1997, Burnham and Anderson, 2004, Hjort and Claeskens, 2003, Claeskens and Hjort, 2008, Tsague, 2014]. These weights are of the form

$$w_k = \frac{\exp \{ -n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)/2 \}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp \{ -n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(j)/2 \}} \quad (15)$$

and they correspond to a posterior probability approximation for model k under the prior that assigns equal weight to all candidate models, given the observed data. The weights (15) do not have the same asymptotic properties as our weights. The difference between the two is a rescaling of C . Weights (15) replace the constant C in (14) with $C/2$. When $C = 1$, nonzero asymptotic weight would be placed on the envelope model with dimension $k = u + 1$. Therefore, weighting according to (15) leads to higher estimated variability than is necessary in practice.

4.3 For the 1D algorithm

In this section we provide justification for the nonparametric bootstrap as a method to estimate the variability of $\hat{\theta}^{\text{1D}}$. It is important to note that the M-estimation argument which justified using $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*}$ as a consistent estimator for the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}$ does not hold here, we cannot cast the 1D objective function $\phi_k(v)$ as an M-estimation problem. The best we can do is verify that bootstrapping with respect to $\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{1D}}$ is asymptotically

the same as bootstrapping with respect to $\hat{\theta}_u^{1D}$. We first define the quantities of the 1D algorithm applied to the starred data.

For step $k = 0, \dots, p - 1$ of the 1D algorithm applied to starred data, let $\hat{g}_k^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ denote the k -th direction to be obtained. Define $\hat{G}_k^* = (\hat{g}_1^*, \dots, \hat{g}_k^*)$, and $(\hat{G}_k^*, \hat{G}_{0k}^*)$ to be an orthogonal basis for \mathbb{R}^p and set initial value $\hat{g}_0^* = \hat{G}_0^* = 0$. Define $\hat{M}_k^* = \hat{G}_{0k}^{*T} \hat{M}^* \hat{G}_{0k}^*$, $\hat{U}_k^* = \hat{G}_{0k}^{*T} \hat{U}^* \hat{G}_{0k}^*$, and the objective function after k steps

$$\phi_{k,n}^*(v) = \log(v^T \hat{M}_k^* v) + \log\{v^T (\hat{M}_k^* + \hat{U}_k^*)^{-1} v\}.$$

The $(k + 1)$ -th envelope direction is $\hat{g}_{k+1}^* = \hat{G}_{0k}^* v_{k+1}^*$ where $v_{k+1}^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{v^T v = 1} \phi_k^*(v)$. The estimated projection into envelope space is then $\hat{P}^* = \hat{G}^* \hat{G}^{*T}$. We then arrive at the bootstrapped envelope estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^{1D*} = \hat{P}^* \tilde{\theta}^*$. We show that bootstrapping $\hat{\theta}_u^{1D}$ estimates the variability of the envelope estimator $\hat{\theta}_u^{1D}$ at the true unknown dimension.

Theorem 2. *Let $\tilde{\theta}$ be a \sqrt{n} -consistent and asymptotically normal estimator. Let $\hat{\theta}_k^{1D}$ be the envelope estimator obtained from the 1D algorithm at dimension $k = 1, \dots, p$ and let $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ be the weighted envelope estimator with weights w^{1D} . Let $\hat{\theta}_k^{1D*}$ and $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D*}$ denote the corresponding quantities obtained by resampled data. Then as n tends to ∞ ,*

$$\sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_w^{1D*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{1D} \right) = \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_u^{1D*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{1D} \right) + O_P \left\{ n^{(1/2-C)} \right\} + O_P \left[n^{\{Cu+1/2\}} \exp \{-n|O_P(1)|\} \right]. \quad (16)$$

The remarks to Theorem 2 are similar to those for Theorem 1. We see that the second O_P term in (16) vanishes quickly in n . These terms are associated with under selecting the true envelope dimension. Therefore it is more likely that our bootstrap procedures will conservatively estimate the variability of $\hat{\theta}_u^{1D}$ in finite samples. As previously mentioned, we advocate for the case with $C = 1$ because of the close connection that $\mathcal{I}_n^{1D}(k)$ has with the Bayesian Information Criterion, and we note that the weights w^{1D} have a similar form to the weights which appear in the model averaging literature with similar weights as those in (15). Manuals for available software recommend use of one-directional optimizations, such as the 1D algorithm or the ECD algorithm [Cook and Zhang, 2018], because they are faster, stable, and less sensitive to initial values [Wang et al., 2019].

5 Examples

5.1 Exponential family generalized linear models (GLMs) simulations

Cook and Zhang [2015] showed that envelope estimation can provide variance reduction for parameter estimation in exponential family GLMs when predictors are normally distributed. We demonstrate that model free weighted envelope estimation can also achieve variance reduction in this context while accounting for model selection variability. Model free envelope estimation techniques and maximum likelihood estimation are then used to estimate the canonical parameter vector corresponding to GLMs (the regression coefficient vector with canonical link function). Estimation is performed using functionality in the TRES R package [Wang et al., 2019]. Following the recommendations in the TRES R package manuals, we use the 1D algorithm. We will therefore compare the performance of $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ to $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$, the envelope estimator of θ evaluated at estimated dimension \hat{u}_{1D} . A nonparametric bootstrap with sample size 5000 is then used to estimate the variability of these estimators. Our bootstrap simulation will consider two model selection regimes for obtaining \hat{u}_{1D} . In one regime, we estimate the envelope dimension at every iteration of the bootstrap (variable u regime, estimated dimension denoted as \hat{u}_{1D}^*). In the other regime, we estimate the dimension

of the envelope space in the original data set and then condition on this estimated dimension as if it were the true dimension (fixed u regime, estimated dimension denoted as \hat{u}_{1D}). The fixed u regime ignores the variability associated with model selection. Theorem 2 provides some guidance for the performance of the nonparametric bootstrap for estimating the variability of $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$. A formal analog does not exist for the other envelope estimators, although empirical evidence in Zhang and Mai [2018] and Eck et al. [2020] suggest that the variable u regime will provide some robustness to variability in dimension selection.

We simulate four different exponential family GLM settings where $p = 8$ and the true envelope dimension is $u = 2$. These four settings are divided into two GLM regression models and two settings within these GLM regression models. The GLM models considered are the logistic and Poisson regression models. Within these models, one simulation setting is designed to be favorable to envelope modeling and one is not. Nonignorable model selection variability is present in all of these simulation settings. Predictors are generated $X \sim N(0, \Sigma_X)$, where $\Sigma_X = \Gamma\Omega\Gamma^T + \Gamma_0\Omega_0\Gamma_0^T$. We construct the canonical parameter vector (regression coefficient vector as $\theta = \Gamma\Gamma^T v$ where Γ and v are provided in the supplement materials). In the logistic regression simulations we generate $Y_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\text{logit}(\theta^T X_i))$, and in the Poisson simulations we generate $Y_i \sim \text{Poisson}(\exp(\theta^T X_i))$. Our logistic regression simulation settings are Setting A: Ω has diagonal elements 2 and 3, Ω_0 has diagonal elements $\exp(-4), \exp(-3), \dots, \exp(1)$; Setting B: Ω has diagonal elements -4 and -5, Ω_0 has diagonal elements $\exp(-3), \exp(-2), \dots, \exp(2)$. Our Poisson regression simulation settings are Setting A: Ω has diagonal elements 1 and 10, Ω_0 has diagonal elements $\exp(-6), \exp(-5), \dots, \exp(-1)$; Setting B: Ω has diagonal elements -3 and -2, Ω_0 has diagonal elements $\exp(-4), \exp(-3), \dots, \exp(1)$.

In both logistic and Poisson models, the configurations of Ω and Ω_0 is designed to be favorable (unfavorable) to envelope estimation in setting A (setting B). Ratios of bootstrap standard deviations for estimators of the first component of the canonical parameter vector across all simulation settings are depicted in Table 1. These ratios are of the form $r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{1D}) = \widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\tilde{\theta}) / \widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$ where the standard deviations $\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\tilde{\theta})$ and $\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$ are the element in the first row and the first column of

$$\left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\tilde{\theta}_b^* - \tilde{\theta})(\tilde{\theta}_b^* - \tilde{\theta})^T \right)^{1/2}, \quad \left(\frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B (\hat{\theta}_{w_b}^{1D*} - \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})(\hat{\theta}_{w_b}^{1D*} - \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})^T \right)^{1/2},$$

respectively, and B is the bootstrap sample size. Envelope estimation provides variance reduction in all settings. However, notice that the fixed u regime exhibits erratic performance across n . This is due to the large variability in the estimated dimension across n , details of which are in the Supplementary Materials. Weighted envelope estimation and envelope estimation under the variable u regime perform similarly with the weighted estimator performing slightly better. These simulations demonstrate the utility of weighted envelope estimation in the presence of model selection variability. Similar results are observed for other components of the canonical parameter vector as seen in the Supplementary Materials.

5.2 Real data illustration

Diabetes is a group of metabolic diseases associated with long-term damage, dysfunction, and failure of different organs, especially the eyes, kidneys, nerves, heart, and blood vessels [American Diabetes Association, 2010]. In 2017 approximately 5 million adult deaths worldwide were attributable to diabetes; global healthcare expenditures on people with diabetes are estimated USD 850 billion [Cho et al., 2018]. Diabetes remains undiagnosed for an estimated 30% of the people who have the disease [Heikes et al., 2008]. One way to address the problem of undiagnosed diabetes is to develop simple, inexpensive diagnostic tools that can identify people who are at high risk of pre-diabetes or diabetes using only readily-available clinical or demographic information [Heikes et al., 2008].

model	n	Setting A			Setting B		
		$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$
Logistic	300	1.22	1.16	3.26	0.99	0.97	1.13
	500	1.88	1.76	2.88	1.04	1.02	1.14
	750	1.03	0.95	3.64	1.29	1.27	1.48
	1000	1.00	0.88	3.50	1.04	1.02	1.14
Poisson	300	1.15	1.11	2.09	1.15	1.13	1.41
	500	2.58	2.29	17.29	1.35	1.21	2.38
	750	3.81	3.48	61.88	1.12	1.10	1.17
	1000	4.09	3.62	93.11	1.58	1.49	2.85

Table 1: Performance of envelope estimators of the first component of the regression coefficients for the logistic and Poisson regression models in comparison to the MLE. The first and fourth ratio columns display the ratio of the bootstrap standard deviation of the MLE to that of the weighted envelope estimator. The second and fifth ratio columns display the ratio of the bootstrap standard deviation of the MLE to that of the envelope estimator under the variable u dimension selection regime. The third and sixth ratio columns display the ratio of the bootstrap standard deviation of the MLE to that of the envelope estimator under the fixed u dimension selection regime.

We examine the influence of several variables on a positive diagnosis of diabetes. We will let a positive diagnosis of diabetes be when an individual’s hemoglobin percentage (also known as HbA1c) exceeds a value of 6.5% [World Health Organization, 2011]. We will consider an individual’s height, weight, age, hip size, waist size, and gender, all of which are easy to measure, inexpensive, and do not require any laboratory testing, and a measure of their stabilized glucose as predictors for a positive diagnosis of diabetes. The data in this analysis come from a population-based sample of 403 rural African-Americans in Virginia [Willems et al., 1997], and is taken from the `faraway` R package [Faraway, 2016]. We considered a logistic regression model with response variable denoting a diagnosis of diabetes (1 when HbA1c > 6.5% and 0 otherwise) that includes log transformed values for each continuous covariate and a main effect for gender. The log transformation was used to transform these variables to univariate normality while maintaining a scale that is interpretable.

Model free envelope estimation techniques and maximum likelihood estimation are then used to estimate the canonical parameter vector corresponding to this logistic regression model. Estimation is performed using functionality in the `TRES` R package [Wang et al., 2019]. We will compare the performance of $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ to $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$. A nonparametric bootstrap with sample size 5000 is then used to estimate the variability of these estimators. Our bootstrap simulation will consider both the variable u and fixed u model selection regimes. Performance results are displayed in Table 2. We see that $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ are very similar to each other and both are very different than the MLE $\tilde{\theta}$. Similarity of $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ follows from empirical weights $w_1 = 0.982$, $w_2 = 0.0176$, and $w_k \approx 0$ for all $3 \leq k \leq 7$. Also observe that the bootstrap standard deviation estimates vary across the model selection procedures. Most notably, the fixed u regime provides massive variance reduction while the weighted estimator and variable u regime provide similar modest but appreciable variance reduction. The variance reduction discrepancy between the fixed u regime and the the weighted estimator and variable u regime is due to large model selection variability. Specifically, the selected dimension probabilities across our nonparametric bootstrap procedure are $p(\hat{u}_{1D} = 1) = 0.568$, $p(\hat{u}_{1D} = 2) = 0.358$, $p(\hat{u}_{1D} = 3) = 0.067$, and $p(\hat{u}_{1D} = 4) = 0.007$. It is clear that unaccounted model selection variability may lead users astray when they use the fixed u regime in estimating standard deviations via bootstrapping. This example shows how difficult it can be to report reliable variance reduction in practice, and how tempting it can be to ignore model selection variability.

	$\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$	$\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$	$\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$	$\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}^*}^{1D})$	$\tilde{\theta}$	$\widehat{\text{sd}}^*(\tilde{\theta})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}^*}^{1D})$
log(Age)	1.78	0.66	1.78	0.68	0.69	2.03	0.82	1.24	1.21	1.19
log(Weight)	0.70	1.69	0.70	1.81	0.38	1.26	2.67	1.58	1.48	7.07
log(Height)	0.03	4.39	0.03	4.73	0.09	-4.39	5.07	1.16	1.07	54.76
log(Waist)	0.68	1.93	0.68	2.06	0.26	2.65	2.98	1.54	1.45	11.60
log(Hip)	0.49	3.26	0.49	3.47	0.24	-2.64	4.23	1.30	1.22	17.80
Female	0.40	0.62	0.40	0.64	0.62	0.17	0.74	1.19	1.17	1.20
log(Stab. Gluc.)	5.11	0.93	5.11	0.93	0.83	5.03	1.07	1.15	1.15	1.29

Table 2: Performance of envelope estimates of the regression coefficients for the logistic regression of diabetes diagnosis on seven predictors. The first, third, and sixth column display the weighted envelope estimator, the envelope estimator with $\hat{u}_{1D} = 1$, and the MLE respectively. The second column displays the bootstrap standard deviation of the weighted envelope estimator. The fourth and fifth columns display the bootstrap standard deviation for the envelope estimator under the variable u and fixed u regimes respectively. The seventh column displays the bootstrap standard deviation of the MLE. The last three columns displays the ratio of bootstrap standard deviations of all envelope estimators to the those of the MLE.

5.3 Reproducing and extending Monte Carlo simulations of Zhang and Mai [2018]

Here, we compare the performance of $\hat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ to the consistent envelope estimators $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}}^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ using the simulation settings in Zhang and Mai [2018]. For our first comparison we reproduce the Monte Carlo simulations in Section 4.2 of Zhang and Mai [2018] and add both $\hat{\theta}_w^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_w^{1D}$ to the list of estimators under comparison. Performance of all estimators at a sample size of $n = 75$ is also assessed. The data generating models that are considered are a single predictor linear regression model with 10 responses, a logistic regression model with a 10 predictors, and a Cox proportional hazards model with 10 predictors. In all three modeling setups, the true dimension of the envelope space is set at $u = 2$. In-depth details about this simulation setup are presented in Zhang and Mai [2018]. It is important to note $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}}^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ are estimated according to the variable u regime. The Monte Carlo sample size is 200, as in Zhang and Mai [2018].

Table 3 displays the results. From Table 3 we see that the weighted envelope estimators perform very similarly to the consistent envelope estimators. This suggests that the variability in model selection is captured by all envelope estimators. This finding is expected in larger samples when the correct dimension selected percentage approaches 1, and it is a direct consequence of Lemmas 2 and 3 and Theorem 3.2 in Zhang and Mai [2018]. On the other hand, this finding is illuminating for sample sizes where the correct dimension selected percentages are nowhere near 1. Some variability in selection of u which was used to construct both $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}}^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ is incorporated into these simulations since u is estimated at every iteration.

We now demonstrate the small sample performance of weighted envelope estimation in the linear and logistic cases of Zhang and Mai [2018]. As before, this simulation uses the exact specifications in Zhang and Mai [2018] which were not designed to showcase weighted envelope estimation techniques. We ignore the Cox proportional hazards model case because appreciable envelope estimation was not observed in the original Monte Carlo simulation. For this bootstrap procedure, we generated one data set corresponding to the linear and logistic regression models in the previous simulation at sample sizes $n = 75, 150, 300$. We then perform a nonparametric bootstrap to estimate the variability of each envelope estimator using a bootstrap sample size of 200 iterations. We repeat this process 25 times, and report the average ratios of standard deviations relative to the standard estimator across these 25 Monte Carlo samples. Note that estimates of u are allowed to (and do) vary across the iterations of the 25 Monte Carlos samples.

Table 4 displays the results with respect to the first component of the parameter vector (other components behave similarly) in both regression settings. In Table 4 we see that weighted envelope estimation provides larger variance reduction than given by $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}^*}^{1D}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}^*}^{FG}$ and is comparable to oracle estimation in most settings.

Model	Correct Selection %			Estimation Error $\ \hat{\theta} - \theta\ _F$					
	n	1D	FG	Standard	Envelope				
				true u	1D	FG	W1D	WFG	
Linear	75	74	63.5	0.69	0.50	0.55	0.55	0.54	0.55
	150	93	81	0.49	0.31	0.33	0.33	0.34	0.33
	300	99	92	0.33	0.19	0.19	0.20	0.19	0.19
	600	99	92.5	0.23	0.13	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14
Logistic	75	22.5	42	4.04	1.04	1.06	1.00	1.09	1.08
	150	72	77.5	2.16	0.56	0.67	0.60	0.67	0.64
	300	92	89.5	1.40	0.34	0.35	0.34	0.37	0.36
	600	98	94	0.98	0.22	0.22	0.24	0.24	0.24
Cox	75	35	38	2.07	1.99	1.95	1.96	2.04	2.05
	150	57.5	53.5	1.33	1.24	1.21	1.22	1.27	1.28
	300	83	75.5	0.98	0.90	0.89	0.90	0.93	0.93
	600	100	93	0.79	0.72	0.72	0.72	0.75	0.75

Table 3: Table of Monte Carlo simulation results for different envelope estimators with respect to three different envelope models in the spirit of Table 3 from Zhang and Mai [2018]. Left panel includes percentages of correct selection for these envelope estimators. Right panel includes means and standard errors of $\|\hat{\theta} - \theta\|_F$ for the standard estimator and the envelope estimators with either true or estimated dimensions.

Model	n	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_u)$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}}^{FG})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}^*}^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}^*}^{FG})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{1D})$	$r(\tilde{\theta}, \hat{\theta}_w^{FG})$
Linear	75	0.992	2.024	1.768	0.991	0.947	1.094	1.024
	150	1.076	1.592	1.524	1.033	1.008	1.105	1.046
	300	1.236	2.219	2.108	1.173	1.102	1.264	1.171
Logistic	75	1.013	1.054	1.022	0.978	0.966	1.079	1.033
	150	1.548	2.741	2.459	1.231	1.008	1.374	1.079
	300	4.525	7.338	5.738	1.331	1.003	1.450	1.042

Table 4: Ratios of standard deviations for envelope estimators relative to the MLE.

The estimators $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{FG}}^{FG}$ and $\hat{\theta}_{\hat{u}_{1D}}^{1D}$ outperform weighted envelope estimation. However, this variance reduction is due to underestimation of u in many of the original samples. Thus, weighted envelope estimation provides a desirable balance between model variance reduction and robustness to model misspecification.

6 Discussion

We proposed two weighted envelope estimators that properly account for model selection uncertainty in general envelope estimation settings. These estimators are a unification of the weighted envelope estimators proposed in Eck and Cook [2017] which only account for model selection variability in the context of multivariate linear regression, and the generic algorithms (FG and 1D algorithms) in Zhang and Mai [2018] which provide consistent envelope dimension selection in general problems but have no finite-sample guarantees. Our weighted envelope estimators are theoretically justified, intuitive, and easy to implement. Our numerical examples show that our estimators possess desirable properties, especially when the sample size is prohibitively small for consistent envelope estimation techniques that do not properly account for variability in model selection.

Efron [2014] provided a double bootstrap procedure that aims to incorporate variability in model selection. Their formulation is applicable for exponential families and it has been applied to envelope methodology [Eck et al., 2020, 2018]. Useful variance reduction was found empirically in this context. Neither Efron [2014] or Eck et al. [2020] provided formal asymptotic justification for the bootstrap procedures that are implemented within. In this paper we provide formal justification for the bootstrap procedures that are developed within. Moreover, our weighted envelope estimators are appropriate for a more general class of envelope models than either Efron [2014], Eck et al. [2020], or Eck and Cook [2017] can claim. The idea of a model free weighting of envelope estimators across all candidate dimensions extends to partial envelopes [Su and Cook, 2011], inner envelopes [Su and Cook, 2012], scaled envelopes [Cook and Su, 2013], predictor envelopes [Cook and Su, 2016], sparse response envelopes [Su et al., 2016], tensor response regression [Li and Zhang, 2017], matrix-variate response regression [Ding and Cook, 2018a] which is explicitly mentioned in Ding and Cook [2018b], and envelopes regression models with nonlinearity and heteroscedasticity [Zhang et al., 2020].

One noted limitation of bootstrapping a weighted envelope estimation is that it can be computationally expensive, especially when p is large [Yau and Volaufova, 2019]. In such settings, we recommend investigating if the range of candidate dimensions can reasonably be reduced to a less computationally burdensome set of values or using the variable u approach when estimating the envelope dimension at every iteration of the nonparametric bootstrap. Existing envelope software implements the former approach in the context of multivariate linear regression [Lee and Su, 2019]. Our simulations provide some empirical justification for the performance of the latter approach.

Yau and Volaufova [2019] developed a novel hypothesis testing procedure with respect to the multivariate linear envelope model. They showed that model averaging as in Eck and Cook [2017] is very successful and is comparable in performance to their proposed methodology. They dismissed the model averaging technique by saying, “there is an intuitive justification for why the model average estimator is not that viable. We may recall that the original motivation for applying the envelope model is to achieve dimension reduction. When one obtains $\hat{\theta}_w$, it is true that this estimator accounts for the variability for selecting u , however, because all possible envelope models are involved in (5) and (10), it becomes unclear which subspace is being projected to as a result.” The motivation for envelope methodology is not to “achieve dimension reduction,” rather the motivation for envelope methodology is to increase efficiency in multivariate analyses without altering traditional objectives [Cook, 2018, first sentence of page 1]. Dimension reduction is at the core of envelope methodology, but it is just a means to an end for achieving useful variance reduction. The reporting of a specific subspace is not of foundational importance to practitioners seeking variance reduction, especially when there is both uncertainty in the subspace selected and its dimension.

When there is uncertainty about the correct envelope dimension, model averaging with our weighted envelope estimator provides a desirable balance between massive variance reduction and correct model specification.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank R. Dennis Cook, Forrest W. Crawford, Karl Oskar Ekvall, Dootika Vats, and Xin Zhang for valuable feedback that improved the presentation of this paper.

Supplementary Materials

Supplementary materials are available with this paper. This supplement includes proofs of all technical results and it doubles as a fully reproducible technical report that makes all R based analyses transparent. The simulations in Section 5.3 are not included in the supplementary materials. These simulations are

adopted from MatLab code that accompanied Zhang and Mai [2018]. This code is readily available upon request.

Supplementary Materials for "General model-free weighted envelope estimation"

This supplement contains the proofs of all technical results that appear in the main text. It is also a fully reproducible technical report which makes the R based simulations and diabetes data analysis fully transparent. The Matlab based simulations adopted from Zhang and Mai [2018] are not fully reproduced here, however the code to produce those simulations is available upon request. This supplement begins with the proof of technical results followed by numerical examples and the R functions used to create these examples.

Proofs of technical results in main text

Proof of Lemma 2. Note that

$$w_k^{\text{FG}} = \frac{\exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(j)\}} = \frac{\exp[n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)\}]}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp[n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(j)\}]}.$$

By definition of $\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k)$, we have that

$$n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(u)\} = n\{J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k) - J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_u)\} + C(k-u)\log(n). \quad (17)$$

We show that $w_k^{\text{FG}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \neq u$ by following a similar argument as the proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in Zhang and Mai [2018]. Lemma 2 in Zhang and Mai [2018] states that $J(\Gamma_u) < J(\Gamma_k) < 0$ for all $k = 0, \dots, u-1$, and $J(\Gamma_k) = J(\Gamma_u)$ for all $k = u+1, \dots, p$. First suppose that $k = 0, \dots, u-1$. In this setting, we have that (17) tends to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now suppose that $k = u, \dots, p$. In this setting, we have that $n\{J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k) - J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_u)\} = O_P(1)$ in (17). Therefore (17) tends to ∞ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ when $k = u+1, \dots, p$. Putting this together implies that $w_k^{\text{FG}} \rightarrow 0$ for all $k \neq u$ and $w_u^{\text{FG}} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Note that

$$w_k^{\text{1D}} = \frac{\exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(j)\}} = \frac{\exp[n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\}]}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp[n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(j)\}]} \quad (18)$$

We show that $w_k^{\text{1D}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \neq u$ by following a similar argument as the proof of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 in Zhang and Mai [2018]. First suppose that $k > u$ and observe that

$$n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\} = n\left\{\sum_{j=u+1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) + \frac{C(u-k)\log(n)}{n}\right\}.$$

We have that $\phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) = O_P(n^{-1})$. Therefore

$$n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\} \rightarrow -\infty$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From (18) we can conclude that $w_k^{\text{1D}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k > u$.

Now suppose that $k < u$. Let

$$n\{\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{1D}}(k)\} = n\left\{\sum_{j=k+1}^u \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) + \frac{C(u-k)\log(n)}{n}\right\}.$$

The function $\phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) \rightarrow \phi_j(v_j) < 0$ in probability as shown in the proof of Propositions 5 and 6 in Cook and Zhang [2016]. Therefore $n \{ \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(u) - \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(k) \} \rightarrow -\infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. From (18) we can conclude that $w_k^{\text{ID}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k < u$. Therefore $w_k^{\text{ID}} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \neq u$ which implies that $w_u^{\text{ID}} \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. \square

i!-

Proof of Theorem 1. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_w^{\text{FG}} \right) &= \sqrt{n} \left(w_u^{\text{FG}*} \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} - w_u^{\text{FG}} \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) + \sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}*} \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}} \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} \right) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) + \sqrt{n} \left\{ \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}*} \left(\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}} \left(\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) \right\} \end{aligned}$$

We show that $w_k^{\text{FG}}, w_k^{\text{FG}*} \rightarrow 0$ for all $k \neq u$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left\| \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}*} \left(\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} \right) - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}} \left(\hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) \right\| \\ \leq \sum_{k \neq u}^p \left(\sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}*} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} \right\| + \sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right\| \right) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ where the rates of the bound are given by (14). We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right\| &= \frac{\sqrt{n} \exp \{ -n \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) \}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp \{ -n \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(j) \}} \left\| \hat{\theta}_j^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right\| \\ &\leq \sqrt{n} \exp \{ n \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(u) - n \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) \} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right\| \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{n}) \exp \left[n \{ \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(u) - n \mathcal{I}_n^{\text{FG}}(k) \} \right] \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{n}) \exp \left[n \left\{ J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_u) - J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k) \right\} + C(u-k) \log(n) \right] \\ &= O_P \left(n^{C(u-k)+1/2} \right) \exp \left[n \left\{ J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_u) - J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

The same steps as (19) yield

$$\sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}*} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} \right\| \leq O_P \left(n^{C(u-k)+1/2} \right) \exp \left[n \left\{ J_n^*(\hat{\Gamma}_u^*) - J_n^*(\hat{\Gamma}_k^*) \right\} \right]. \tag{20}$$

For $0 \leq k < u$, we have that $J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_u) - J_n(\hat{\Gamma}_k) = J(\Gamma_u) - J(\Gamma_k) + o_p(1)$ where $J(\Gamma_u) < J(\Gamma_k)$ as in the proof of Zhang and Mai [2018, Theorem 3.1]. Similarly we have that

$$J_n^*(\hat{\Gamma}_u^*) - J_n^*(\hat{\Gamma}_k^*) = J(\Gamma_u) - J(\Gamma_k) + o_p(1).$$

Therefore the rates for the exponent in the last line of (19) and the right hand side of (20) are $-n|O_P(1)|$. Notice that the rates in the last line of (19) and the right hand side of (20) are upper bounded when $k = 0$. Putting this together yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right\| &= O_P \left(n^{Cu+1/2} \right) \exp \{ -n|O_P(1)| \}, \\ \sqrt{n} w_k^{\text{FG}*} \left\| \hat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}*} - \hat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}*} \right\| &= O_P \left(n^{Cu+1/2} \right) \exp \{ -n|O_P(1)| \}; \end{aligned}$$

for all $0 \leq k < u$.

Now consider $u < k \leq p$. From the proof of Zhang and Mai [2018, Theorem 3.1] we have that $J_n(\widehat{\Gamma}_u) - J_n(\widehat{\Gamma}_k) = O_p(n^{-1})$. Combining this result with the steps in (19) yields

$$\sqrt{n}w_k^{\text{FG}} \|\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}\| \leq O_P \left(n^{C(u-k)+1/2} \right). \quad (21)$$

A similar argument applied to the starred data gives

$$\sqrt{n}w_k^{\text{FG}^*} \|\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}^*} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}^*}\| \leq O_P \left(n^{C(u-k)+1/2} \right). \quad (22)$$

The rates in both (21) and (22) are upper bounded when $k = u - 1$. Putting this together yields

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}w_k^{\text{FG}} \|\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}}\| &= O_P \left(n^{1/2-C} \right), \\ \sqrt{n}w_k^{\text{FG}^*} \|\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}^*} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}^*}\| &= O_P \left(n^{1/2-C} \right); \end{aligned}$$

for all $u < k \leq p$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\sqrt{n} \left\{ \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}^*} \left(\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}^*} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}^*} \right) - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^{\text{FG}} \left(\widehat{\theta}_k^{\text{FG}} - \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{FG}} \right) \right\} \\ &= O_P \left(n^{1/2-C} \right) + O_P \left(n^{Cu+1/2} \right) \exp \{ -n|O_P(1)| \}, \end{aligned}$$

as desired and the conclusion follows. □

i!–

Proof of Theorem 2. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\theta}_w^{\text{ID}^*} - \widehat{\theta}_w^{\text{ID}} \right) &= \sqrt{n} \left(w_u^* \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{ID}^*} - w_u \widehat{\theta}_u^{\text{ID}} \right) + \sqrt{n} \left(\sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^* \widehat{\theta}_k^* - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k \widehat{\theta}_k \right) \\ &= \sqrt{n} \left(\widehat{\theta}_u^* - \widehat{\theta}_u \right) + \sqrt{n} \left\{ \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^* \left(\widehat{\theta}_k^* - \widehat{\theta}_u^* \right) - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k \left(\widehat{\theta}_k - \widehat{\theta}_u \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We show that $w_k, w_k^* \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\sqrt{n} \left\| \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k^* \left(\widehat{\theta}_k^* - \widehat{\theta}_u^* \right) - \sum_{k \neq u}^p w_k \left(\widehat{\theta}_k - \widehat{\theta}_u \right) \right\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^p \left(\sqrt{n}w_k^* \|\widehat{\theta}_k^* - \widehat{\theta}_u^*\| + \sqrt{n}w_k \|\widehat{\theta}_k - \widehat{\theta}_u\| \right) \rightarrow 0$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for all $k \neq u$ and find the rates at which they vanish. We have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}w_k\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| &= \frac{\sqrt{n} \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(k)\}}{\sum_{j=0}^p \exp\{-n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(j)\}} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| \\
&\leq \sqrt{n} \exp\{n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(u) - n\mathcal{I}_n^{\text{ID}}(k)\} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| \\
&= \sqrt{n} \exp\left\{n \sum_{j=1}^u \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) - n \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) + (u-k) \frac{C \log n}{n}\right\} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| \\
&= n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}} \exp\left\{n \sum_{j=1}^u \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) - n \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j)\right\} \|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| \\
&= O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right] \exp\left\{n \sum_{j=1}^u \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j) - n \sum_{j=1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j)\right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where the last equality follows from the fact that $\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| = |O_P(1)|$ for all $k = 1, \dots, p$. This is because $\hat{\theta}_k \rightarrow \theta$ for all $k = u, \dots, p$ and $\|\hat{\theta}_k\| \rightarrow a \leq \|\theta\|$ for all $k = 1, \dots, u-1$ since the envelope estimator exhibits shrinkage when $k = 1, \dots, u-1$. First suppose that $k = 1, \dots, u-1$. In this setting $\phi_{k,n}(\hat{v}_k) \rightarrow \phi_k(v_k) < 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ [Cook and Zhang, 2016, proof of Theorems 5 and 6]. From (23) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}w_k\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| &\leq O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right] \exp\left\{n \sum_{j=k-1}^u \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j)\right\} \\
&= O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right] \exp\{-n|O_P(1)|\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Now suppose that $k = u+1, \dots, p$. In this setting, $\phi_{k,n}(\hat{v}_k) = O_p(n^{-1})$ [Zhang and Mai, 2018, proof of Theorem 3.1]. From (23) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}w_k\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| &\leq O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right] \exp\left\{-n \sum_{j=u+1}^k \phi_{j,n}(\hat{v}_j)\right\} \\
&= O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The same steps in (24) and (25) apply to the starred data so that

$$\sqrt{n}w_k^*\|\hat{\theta}_k^* - \hat{\theta}_u^*\| \leq O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right] \exp\{-n|O_P(1)|\}, \quad (k = 1, \dots, u-1), \tag{26}$$

and

$$\sqrt{n}w_k^*\|\hat{\theta}_k^* - \hat{\theta}_u^*\| = O_P\left[n^{\{C(u-k)+1/2\}}\right], \quad (k = u+1, \dots, p). \tag{27}$$

Our conclusion follows by noting that (24), (25), (26), and (27) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}w_k\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| &\leq O_P\left[n^{\{Cu+1/2\}}\right] \exp\{-n|O_P(1)|\}, \quad (k = 1, \dots, u-1); \\
\sqrt{n}w_k\|\hat{\theta}_k - \hat{\theta}_u\| &\leq O_P\left\{n^{(1/2-C)}\right\}, \quad (k = u+1, \dots, p); \\
\sqrt{n}w_k^*\|\hat{\theta}_k^* - \hat{\theta}_u^*\| &\leq O_P\left[n^{\{Cu+1/2\}}\right] \exp\{-n|O_P(1)|\}, \quad (k = 1, \dots, u-1); \\
\sqrt{n}w_k^*\|\hat{\theta}_k^* - \hat{\theta}_u^*\| &\leq O_P\left\{n^{(1/2-C)}\right\}, \quad (k = u+1, \dots, p);
\end{aligned}$$

respectively. □

Numerical examples

The following software packages are needed to reproduce the analyses in the main text.

```
rm(list = ls())
library(tidyverse)
library(TRES)
library(MASS)
library(foreach)
library(doParallel)
library(xtable)
library(faraway)
```

To register doParallel to be used with foreach, we call the registerDoParallel function and specify the number of cores to be used for parallel computing.

```
numCores <- detectCores() - 1; numCores

## [1] 15

registerDoParallel(cores = numCores)
RNGkind("L'Ecuyer-CMRG")
```

Logistic regression simulations

Setting A:

We reproduce the logistic regression simulation in the main text. We first create the basis matrix Γ for the true envelope space and the basis matrix for its orthogonal complement Γ_0 .

```
p <- 8; u <- 2
v1 <- matrix(rep(1/sqrt(p), p), nrow = p)
O <- qr.Q(qr(v1), complete = TRUE)
Gamma <- O[, 1:u]
Gamma0 <- O[, (u+1):p]
```

We next create the core of the material and immaterial variation, denoted as Ω and Ω_0 respectively.

```
Omega <- diag(2:3)
Omega0 <- diag(exp(c(-4:1)))
```

We now build the variance matrix of the predictor variables and construct the true canonical parameter vector (regression coefficient vector) as an element contained in $\text{span}(\Gamma)$.

```
SigmaX <- Gamma%*%Omega%*%t(Gamma) + Gamma0%*%Omega0%*%t(Gamma0)
beta <- Gamma %*% t(Gamma) %*% (1 + (1:p - p/2)/(p^2))
eig <- eigen(SigmaX)
SigmaX.half <- eig$vec %*% diag(sqrt(eig$val)) %*% t(eig$vec)
```

We now perform the nonparametric bootstrap procedure for all envelope estimators of the canonical parameter vector mentioned in the main text and the MLE. This nonparametric bootstrap has a bootstrap sample size of 5000. Our bootstrap simulation will consider two model selection regimes for determining the envelope dimension \hat{u}_{1D} at every iteration. In one scheme, we estimate the envelope dimension at every iteration of the bootstrap (variable u). In the other scheme, we estimate the dimension of the envelope space in the original data set and then treat this estimated dimension as the true dimension when we resample our data and calculate these envelope estimators (fixed u), thus ignoring the variability associated with model selection. Theorem 3 in the main text provides some guidance for the performance of the nonparametric bootstrap for estimating the variability of $\hat{\theta}_w^{\text{ID}}$, an analog does not exist for the other envelope estimators.

The `logistic_sim` function below generates a logistic regression model that incorporates the above envelope structure that is stored in your global environment. The function then calls on `model.boot` (code is in the Appendix) to perform the nonparametric bootstrap with respect to all considered estimators. This function also returns the estimated envelope dimension at every iteration of the nonparametric bootstrap.

```
logistic_sim <- function(n, p = p){
  X <- matrix(rnorm(n*p), nrow = n) %*% SigmaX.half
  gx <- as.numeric(X %*% beta)
  Y <- rbinom(n, size = 1, prob = 1 / (1 + exp(-gx)))
  data_sim <- as.data.frame(cbind(Y, X))
  m1 <- glm(Y ~ -1 + ., family = "binomial", data = data_sim)
  model_boot(model = m1, nboot = nboot, cores = numCores)
}
```

We perform the nonparametric bootstrap at five different sample sizes.

```
set.seed(13)
n <- c(300, 500, 750, 1000)
nboot <- 5000
system.time({
  lsims <- lapply(n, function(j) logistic_sim(n = j, p = p))
})

##      user      system   elapsed
## 11838.292    100.072    830.252
```

The distribution of the estimated dimension across bootstrap iterations and sample sizes is depicted below:

```
u_boot_l <- lapply(1:length(lsims), function(j){
  round(table(lsims[[j]][, 4*p+1]) / nboot, 3)
})

## n = 300
u_boot_l[[1]]

##
##      1      2      3      4      5      6
## 0.407 0.410 0.158 0.022 0.002 0.000
```

```
## n = 500
u_boot_l[[2]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.659 0.298 0.040 0.003

## n = 750
u_boot_l[[3]]

##
##      1      2      3      4      5
## 0.312 0.436 0.212 0.037 0.003

## n = 1000
u_boot_l[[4]]

##
##      1      2      3      4      5
## 0.456 0.436 0.101 0.007 0.000
```

The Frobenius norm of all bootstrapped covariance matrices for all estimators across sample sizes is depicted below:

```
volume_boot_l <- do.call(rbind, lapply(1:length(lsims), function(j){
  unlist(lapply(normvar(lsims[[j]]), function(x) norm(x, type="F"))))
}))
rownames(volume_boot_l) <- n
xtable(volume_boot_l, digits = 3)
```

	se_wt	se_env	se_env.fixedu	se_MLE
300	3.705	4.102	0.366	4.297
500	0.477	0.569	0.132	2.153
750	1.064	1.198	0.068	1.026
1000	0.784	1.033	0.053	0.792

The estimated efficiency gains for envelope estimators ($se^*(\hat{\theta})/se^*(\hat{\theta}_{env})$) across sample sizes is depicted below:

```
SEs_boot_l <- lapply(1:length(lsims), function(j){
  do.call(cbind, lapply(normvar(lsims[[j]]), function(x) sqrt(diag(x))))
})
ratios_boot_l <- lapply(1:length(lsims), function(j){
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(wtEnv)
  out <- cbind(SEs_boot_l[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_l[[j]][, 1],
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env)
  SEs_boot_l[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_l[[j]][, 2],
```

```

# ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env_hat(u))
SEs_boot_1[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_1[[j]][, 3])
colnames(out) <- c("se(MLE)/se(env_wt)", "se(MLE)/se(env_varu)",
                  "se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)")
round(out, 3)
})

## n = 300
ratios_boot_1[[1]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.224           1.158           3.263
##           1.142           1.112           1.646
##           1.013           0.965           8.304
##           1.160           1.091           3.225
##           1.439           1.331           1.816
##           1.154           1.137           1.319
##           1.057           1.034           1.142
##           1.183           1.152           1.596

## n = 500
ratios_boot_1[[2]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.879           1.763           2.883
##           1.291           1.270           1.563
##           2.141           1.951           9.651
##           2.177           1.969           5.369
##           2.205           2.064           2.811
##           1.460           1.434           1.547
##           1.107           1.091           1.138
##           1.209           1.186           1.319

## n = 750
ratios_boot_1[[3]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.028           0.951           3.642
##           0.977           0.921           1.475
##           1.067           0.999           11.346
##           0.774           0.732           5.263
##           0.632           0.592           2.721
##           1.138           1.117           1.301
##           0.941           0.919           0.963
##           1.018           0.972           1.415

## n = 1000
ratios_boot_1[[4]]

```

```
## se (MLE) /se (env_wt) se (MLE) /se (env_varu) se (MLE) /se (env_fixu)
##          0.997          0.881          3.498
##          1.001          0.919          1.134
##          1.008          0.924          10.073
##          1.490          1.350          5.495
##          0.502          0.378          2.191
##          1.481          1.420          1.740
##          0.936          0.859          1.211
##          1.012          0.914          1.305
```

Setting B:

We next create the core of the material and immaterial variation, denoted as Ω and Ω_0 respectively, build the variance matrix of the predictor variables, and construct the true canonical parameter vector (regression coefficient vector) as an element contained in $\text{span}(\Gamma)$.

```
Omega <- diag(exp(-c(4:5)))
Omega0 <- diag(exp(c(-3:2)))
SigmaX <- Gamma%*%Omega%*%t(Gamma) + Gamma0%*%Omega0%*%t(Gamma0)
beta <- Gamma %*% t(Gamma) %*% (1 + (1:p - p/2)/(p^2))
eig <- eigen(SigmaX)
SigmaX.half <- eig$vec %*% diag(sqrt(eig$val)) %*% t(eig$vec)
```

We perform the nonparametric bootstrap at five different sample sizes.

```
set.seed(13)
RNGkind("L'Ecuyer-CMRG")
n <- c(300, 500, 750, 1000)
nboot <- 5000
system.time({
  lsimsB <- lapply(n, function(j) logistic_sim(n = j, p = p))
})

##          user          system          elapsed
## 11804.324          86.218          807.427
```

The distribution of the estimated dimension across bootstrap iterations and sample sizes is depicted below:

```
u_boot_lB <- lapply(1:length(lsimsB), function(j){
  round(table(lsimsB[[j]][, 4*p+1]) / nboot, 3)
})
u_boot_lB

## [[1]]
##
##          1          2          3          4          5          6          7
```

```
## 0.019 0.126 0.328 0.332 0.155 0.036 0.003
##
## [[2]]
##
##      1      2      3      4      5      6      7
## 0.003 0.083 0.275 0.363 0.212 0.056 0.007
##
## [[3]]
##
##      1      2      3      4      5      6      7
## 0.006 0.073 0.243 0.358 0.243 0.070 0.008
##
## [[4]]
##
##      1      2      3      4      5      6      7      8
## 0.002 0.041 0.166 0.324 0.300 0.131 0.032 0.003
```

The Frobenius norm of all bootstrapped covariance matrices for all estimators across sample sizes is depicted below:

```
volume_boot_lB <- do.call(rbind, lapply(1:length(lsimsB), function(j){
  unlist(lapply(normvar(lsimsB[[j]]), function(x) norm(x, type="F"))
}))
rownames(volume_boot_lB) <- n
volume_boot_lB

##           se_wt      se_env se_env_fixedu      se_MLE
## 300  2.7301055  2.8562090      1.9606413  2.6950735
## 500  1.1832098  1.2586726      0.8433347  1.4049298
## 750  0.4918665  0.5098347      0.4319702  0.9439191
## 1000 0.6538492  0.6800432      0.5299688  0.7114760
```

The estimated efficiency gains for envelope estimators ($se^*(\hat{\theta})/se^*(\hat{\theta}_{env})$) across sample sizes is depicted below:

```
SEs_boot_lB <- lapply(1:length(lsimsB), function(j){
  do.call(cbind, lapply(normvar(lsimsB[[j]]), function(x) sqrt(diag(x))))
})
ratios_boot_lB <- lapply(1:length(lsimsB), function(j){
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(wtEnv)
  out <- cbind(SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 1],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env)
    SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 2],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env_hat(u))
    SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_lB[[j]][, 3])
  colnames(out) <- c("se(MLE)/se(env_wt)", "se(MLE)/se(env_varu)",
    "se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)")
  round(out, 3)
})
```

```

})

## n = 300
ratios_boot_lB[[1]]

##   se (MLE) /se (env_wt)  se (MLE) /se (env_varu)  se (MLE) /se (env_fixu)
##           0.991           0.970           1.129
##           1.014           0.992           1.356
##           1.051           1.041           1.120
##           0.995           0.986           0.992
##           0.898           0.890           0.864
##           0.958           0.942           0.856
##           0.924           0.915           0.851
##           0.947           0.937           0.854

## n = 500
ratios_boot_lB[[2]]

##   se (MLE) /se (env_wt)  se (MLE) /se (env_varu)  se (MLE) /se (env_fixu)
##           1.045           1.025           1.135
##           1.111           1.065           1.559
##           0.967           0.960           0.927
##           0.971           0.967           0.916
##           1.023           1.020           1.034
##           0.995           0.993           0.994
##           0.994           0.992           0.991
##           1.005           1.004           1.000

## n = 750
ratios_boot_lB[[3]]

##   se (MLE) /se (env_wt)  se (MLE) /se (env_varu)  se (MLE) /se (env_fixu)
##           1.293           1.274           1.475
##           1.557           1.507           2.798
##           0.981           0.980           0.816
##           0.993           0.936           1.060
##           0.990           0.987           1.069
##           1.054           1.044           1.117
##           1.063           1.060           1.086
##           1.063           1.062           1.076

## n = 1000
ratios_boot_lB[[4]]

##   se (MLE) /se (env_wt)  se (MLE) /se (env_varu)  se (MLE) /se (env_fixu)
##           1.044           1.025           1.140
##           1.042           1.019           1.183
##           1.028           1.022           1.064

```

##	1.022	1.013	1.064
##	0.990	0.987	0.977
##	1.002	0.999	0.998
##	1.009	1.019	1.032
##	1.009	1.005	1.019

Poisson regression simulations

Setting A:

We reproduce the Poisson regression simulation in the main text. The setup is essentially the same as the logistic regression simulations. We first create the basis matrix Γ for the true envelope space and the basis matrix for its orthogonal complement Γ_0 .

```
p <- 8; u <- 2
v1 <- matrix(rep(1/sqrt(p),p), nrow = p)
O <- qr.Q(qr(v1), complete = TRUE)
Gamma <- O[, (p-u+1):p]
Gamma0 <- O[, 1:(p-u)]
```

We next create the core of the material and immaterial variation, denoted as Ω and Ω_0 respectively.

```
Omega <- diag(c(1,10))
Omega0 <- diag(exp(-6:-1))
```

We now build the variance matrix of the predictor variables and construct the true canonical parameter vector (regression coefficient vector) as an element contained in $\text{span}(\Gamma)$.

```
SigmaX <- Gamma%*%Omega%*%t(Gamma) + Gamma0%*%Omega0%*%t(Gamma0)
beta <- Gamma %*% t(Gamma) %*% (1 + (1:p - p/2)/(p^2))
eig <- eigen(SigmaX)
SigmaX.half <- eig$vec %*% diag(sqrt(eig$val)) %*% t(eig$vec)
```

The `poisson_sim` function below generates a Poisson regression model that incorporates the above envelope structure that is stored in your global environment. The function then calls on `model.boot` (code is in the Appendix) to perform the nonparametric bootstrap with respect to all considered estimators. This function also returns the estimated envelope dimension at every iteration of the nonparametric bootstrap.

```
poisson_sim <- function(n, p = p){
  X <- matrix(rnorm(n*p), nrow = n) %*% SigmaX.half
  gx <- as.numeric(X %*% beta)
  Y <- rpois(n, lambda = exp(gx))
  data_sim <- as.data.frame(cbind(Y, X))
  m1 <- glm(Y ~ -1 + ., family = "poisson", data = data_sim)
  model_boot(model = m1, nboot = nboot, cores = numCores)
}
```

We perform the nonparametric bootstrap at five different sample sizes.

```
set.seed(13)
RNGkind("L'Ecuyer-CMRG")
n <- c(300, 500, 750, 1000)
nboot <- 5000
system.time({
  psims <- lapply(n, function(j) poisson_sim(n = j, p = p))
})

##          user      system   elapsed
## 10135.183      81.872    691.811
```

The distribution of the estimated dimension across bootstrap iterations and sample sizes is depicted below:

```
u_boot_p <- lapply(1:length(psims), function(j){
  round(table(psims[[j]][, 4*p+1]) / nboot, 3)
})

## n = 300
u_boot_p[[1]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.446 0.425 0.117 0.012

## n = 500
u_boot_p[[2]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.911 0.086 0.003 0.000

## n = 750
u_boot_p[[3]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.522 0.436 0.040 0.002

## n = 1000
u_boot_p[[4]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.901 0.097 0.002 0.000
```

The Frobenius norm of all bootstrapped covariance matrices for all estimators across sample sizes is depicted below:

```

volume_boot_p <- do.call(rbind, lapply(1:length(psims), function(j){
  unlist(lapply(normvar(psims[[j]]), function(x) norm(x, type="F"))
}))
rownames(volume_boot_p) <- n
xtable(volume_boot_p, digits = 3)

```

	se_wt	se_env	se_env_fixedu	se_MLE
300	0.814	0.904	0.286	1.192
500	0.123	0.160	0.003	0.748
750	0.025	0.030	0.000	0.525
1000	0.025	0.031	0.000	0.522

The estimated efficiency gains for envelope estimators ($se^*(\hat{\theta})/se^*(\hat{\theta}_{env})$) across sample sizes is depicted below:

```

SEs_boot_p <- lapply(1:length(psims), function(j){
  do.call(cbind, lapply(normvar(psims[[j]]), function(x) sqrt(diag(x))))
})
ratios_boot_p <- lapply(1:length(psims), function(j){
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(wtEnv)
  out <- cbind(SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 1],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env)
    SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 2],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env_hat(u))
    SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_p[[j]][, 3])
  colnames(out) <- c("se(MLE)/se(env_wt)", "se(MLE)/se(env_varu)",
    "se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)")
  round(out, 3)
})

## n = 300
ratios_boot_p[[1]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.152           1.115           2.086
##           0.893           0.837           1.470
##           0.999           0.937           1.563
##           2.480           2.381           4.364
##           2.279           2.127           3.707
##           2.344           2.157           3.452
##           2.785           2.712           4.875
##           2.783           2.698           5.668

## n = 500
ratios_boot_p[[2]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)

```

```

##           2.579           2.287           17.290
##           3.670           3.179           39.262
##           2.820           2.486           21.889
##           2.679           2.347           18.994
##           2.376           2.089           16.124
##           2.403           2.104           15.983
##           2.390           2.094           15.526
##           2.353           2.073           12.627

## n = 750
ratios_boot_p[[3]]

## se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           3.810           3.479           61.878
##           5.573           5.277           341.419
##           2.975           2.711           235.859
##           4.420           3.991           47.244
##           3.407           3.059           247.080
##           4.870           4.487           180.729
##           3.545           2.984           24.367
##           4.794           4.439           23.493

## n = 1000
ratios_boot_p[[4]]

## se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           4.092           3.623           93.113
##           3.368           2.990           480.452
##           4.228           3.764           398.744
##           5.218           4.722           330.380
##           3.714           3.378           301.965
##           4.782           4.297           285.126
##           4.918           4.432           240.507
##           4.934           4.455           30.992

```

Setting B:

We first create the basis matrix Γ for the true envelope space and the basis matrix for its orthogonal complement Γ_0 , build the variance matrix of the predictor variables, and construct the true canonical parameter vector (regression coefficient vector) as an element contained in $\text{span}(\Gamma)$.

```

Omega <- diag(exp(c(-3, -2)))
Omega0 <- diag(exp(-4:1))
SigmaX <- Gamma%*%Omega%*%t(Gamma) + Gamma0%*%Omega0%*%t(Gamma0)
beta <- Gamma %*% t(Gamma) %*% rowMeans(Gamma)
eig <- eigen(SigmaX)
SigmaX.half <- eig$vec %*% diag(sqrt(eig$val)) %*% t(eig$vec)

```

We perform the nonparametric bootstrap at five different sample sizes.

```
set.seed(13)
RNGkind("L'Ecuyer-CMRG")
n <- c(300, 500, 750, 1000)
nboot <- 5000
system.time({
  psimsB <- lapply(n, function(j) poisson_sim(n = j, p = p))
})

##          user      system   elapsed
## 12486.444    88.840    853.086
```

The distribution of the estimated dimension across bootstrap iterations and sample sizes is depicted below:

```
u_boot_pB <- lapply(1:length(psimsB), function(j){
  round(table(psimsB[[j]][, 4*p+1]) / nboot, 3)
})

## n = 300
u_boot_pB[[1]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.521 0.387 0.086 0.005

## n = 500
u_boot_pB[[2]]

##
##      1      2      3
## 0.785 0.200 0.015

## n = 750
u_boot_pB[[3]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.081 0.785 0.129 0.004

## n = 1000
u_boot_pB[[4]]

##
##      1      2      3      4
## 0.730 0.245 0.025 0.000
```

The Frobenius norm of all bootstrapped covariance matrices for all estimators across sample sizes is depicted below:

```

volume_boot_pB <- do.call(rbind, lapply(1:length(psimsB), function(j){
  unlist(lapply(normvar(psimsB[[j]]), function(x) norm(x, type="F"))
}))
rownames(volume_boot_pB) <- n
xtable(volume_boot_pB, digits = 3)

```

	se_wt	se_env	se_env_fixedu	se_MLE
300	0.199	0.214	0.195	0.167
500	0.058	0.073	0.025	0.106
750	0.062	0.064	0.058	0.076
1000	0.037	0.045	0.009	0.073

The estimated efficiency gains for envelope estimators ($se^*(\hat{\theta})/se^*(\hat{\theta}_{env})$) across sample sizes is depicted below:

```

SEs_boot_pB <- lapply(1:length(psimsB), function(j){
  do.call(cbind, lapply(normvar(psimsB[[j]]), function(x) sqrt(diag(x))))
})
ratios_boot_pB <- lapply(1:length(psimsB), function(j){
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(wtEnv)
  out <- cbind(SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 1],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env)
    SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 2],
    # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env_hat(u))
    SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 4] / SEs_boot_pB[[j]][, 3])
  colnames(out) <- c("se(MLE)/se(env_wt)", "se(MLE)/se(env_varu)",
    "se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)")
  round(out, 3)
})

## n = 300
ratios_boot_pB[[1]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.153           1.133           1.407
##           0.704           0.669           0.817
##           0.950           0.911           0.840
##           1.492           1.470           1.804
##           1.556           1.479           1.939
##           1.603           1.512           1.899
##           1.120           1.088           1.361
##           0.810           0.769           0.650

## n = 500
ratios_boot_pB[[2]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)

```

```

##           1.346           1.211           2.377
##           1.780           1.600           4.014
##           1.115           1.102           1.165
##           2.162           2.020           3.292
##           2.156           1.982           4.672
##           2.387           2.189           5.502
##           1.007           0.872           3.387
##           1.234           1.202           1.373

## n = 750
ratios_boot_pB[[3]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.124           1.104           1.168
##           1.089           1.068           1.064
##           1.204           1.188           1.196
##           1.941           1.851           1.969
##           1.973           1.885           1.977
##           2.274           2.176           2.323
##           0.815           0.798           0.873
##           1.226           1.224           1.250

## n = 1000
ratios_boot_pB[[4]]

##   se(MLE)/se(env_wt) se(MLE)/se(env_varu) se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
##           1.584           1.486           2.852
##           1.611           1.463           7.292
##           1.651           1.611           1.793
##           2.615           2.446           4.653
##           2.605           2.377           7.169
##           2.723           2.495           7.324
##           0.949           0.849           8.528
##           1.454           1.427           1.615

```

Build Table in main text

We now build Table 1 in the main text.

```

tab_sim <- rbind(cbind(n, do.call(rbind, lapply(ratios_boot_l,
  function(xx) xx[1, ])),
  do.call(rbind, lapply(ratios_boot_lB, function(xx) xx[1, ]))),
  cbind(n, do.call(rbind, lapply(ratios_boot_p, function(xx) xx[1, ])),
  do.call(rbind, lapply(ratios_boot_pB, function(xx) xx[1, ]))))
xtable(tab_sim, digits = 2)

## % latex table generated in R 3.6.1 by xtable 1.8-4 package

```

```
## % Mon Feb 3 13:49:00 2020
## \begin{table}[ht]
## \centering
## \begin{tabular}{rrrrrrrr}
## \hline
## & n & se(MLE)/se(env\_wt) & se(MLE)/se(env\_varu) & se(MLE)/se(env\_fixu) & se
## \hline
## 1 & 300.00 & 1.22 & 1.16 & 3.26 & 0.99 & 0.97 & 1.13 \\
## 2 & 500.00 & 1.88 & 1.76 & 2.88 & 1.04 & 1.02 & 1.14 \\
## 3 & 750.00 & 1.03 & 0.95 & 3.64 & 1.29 & 1.27 & 1.48 \\
## 4 & 1000.00 & 1.00 & 0.88 & 3.50 & 1.04 & 1.02 & 1.14 \\
## 5 & 300.00 & 1.15 & 1.11 & 2.09 & 1.15 & 1.13 & 1.41 \\
## 6 & 500.00 & 2.58 & 2.29 & 17.29 & 1.35 & 1.21 & 2.38 \\
## 7 & 750.00 & 3.81 & 3.48 & 61.88 & 1.12 & 1.10 & 1.17 \\
## 8 & 1000.00 & 4.09 & 3.62 & 93.11 & 1.58 & 1.49 & 2.85 \\
## \hline
## \end{tabular}
## \end{table}
```

Diabetes example

Model free envelope estimation techniques and maximum likelihood estimation are then used to estimate the canonical parameter vector corresponding to a logistic regression model (the regression coefficient vector with inverse logit link function) for diabetes diagnoses.

We load in the diabetes data from the faraway package. Log transformations are used for several predictor variables as a means to transform the variable to approximate normality while maintaining a scale that is interpretable. The response variable is a diagnosis of diabetes based in an individual's hemoglobin percentage (HbA1c). A positive diagnosis is when HbA1c > 6.5%. Only complete records are kept for this analysis.


```
data(diabetes)
## add diagnosis and roughly transform predictors to univariate normality
dat <- diabetes %>% mutate(diagnose = ifelse(glyhb > 6.5, 1, 0)) %>%
  mutate(l.stab.glu = log(stab.glu), l.weight = log(weight),
         l.age = log(age), l.hip = log(hip), l.waist = log(waist),
         l.height = log(height)) %>%
  dplyr::select(diagnose, l.age, l.weight, l.height, l.waist, l.hip,
               gender, l.stab.glu)
## exclude missing observations
dat <- na.omit(dat)
## turn gender to factor variable
dat$gender <- as.factor(dat$gender)
```

Here are density plots of the log transformed predictor variables.

```

dat %>% dplyr::select(-diagnose) %>% keep(is.numeric) %>%
gather() %>% ggplot(aes(value)) +
  facet_wrap(~ key, scales = "free") +
  theme_minimal() +
  geom_density()

```



We now fit the model with diagnosis as a response variable and log transformed versions of age, weight, height, waist, hip, and stabilized glucose as predictors.

```

m1 <- glm(diagnose ~ ., family = "binomial", data = dat,
          x = TRUE, y = TRUE)
betahat <- m1$coefficients
xtable(summary(m1))

```

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(> z)
(Intercept)	-21.3575	23.0558	-0.93	0.3543
l.age	2.0285	0.7583	2.67	0.0075
l.weight	1.2546	2.4216	0.52	0.6044
l.height	-4.3927	5.2798	-0.83	0.4054
l.waist	2.6525	3.0997	0.86	0.3922
l.hip	-2.6424	3.6213	-0.73	0.4656
genderfemale	0.1744	0.6025	0.29	0.7722
l.stab.glu	5.0333	0.6602	7.62	0.0000

We now perform the nonparametric bootstrap procedure for all envelope estimators mentioned in the main text and the MLE. This nonparametric bootstrap has a bootstrap sample size of 5000.

```
set.seed(13)
numCores <- detectCores()
nboot <- 5000
RNGkind("L'Ecuyer-CMRG")
boot_sample_diabetes <- model_boot(model = m1, nboot = nboot,
  cores = numCores, intercept = TRUE)
```

The distribution of the estimated dimension across bootstrap iterations is depicted below. A non-trivial amount of model selection volatility exists across iterations of our nonparametric bootstrap.

```
round(table(boot_sample_diabetes[, ncol(boot_sample_diabetes)]) / nboot, 3)

##
##      1      2      3      4      5
## 0.568 0.358 0.067 0.007 0.000
```

The Frobenius norm of all bootstrapped covariance matrices for all estimators is depicted below:

```
unlist(lapply(normvar(boot_sample_diabetes), function(x) norm(x, type="F"))

##          se_wt          se_env se_env_fixedu          se_MLE
## 26.762481    30.571294    1.040725    37.316460
```

Ratios of bootstrap standard errors are reported below. These ratios compare the MLE to the envelope estimators under study. The bootstrap standard error for the MLE is displayed in the numerator, so that a value greater than 1 indicate variance reduction via envelope methodology.

```
SEs_diabetes <- do.call(cbind, lapply(normvar(boot_sample_diabetes),
  function(x) sqrt(diag(x))))
ratios_diabetes <- cbind(SEs_diabetes[, 4] /
  SEs_diabetes[, 1], # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(wtEnv)
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env)
  SEs_diabetes[, 4] / SEs_diabetes[, 2],
  # ratio of SE(MLE) to SE(Env_hat(u))
  SEs_diabetes[, 4] / SEs_diabetes[, 3])
```

```

colnames(ratios_diabetes) <- c("se(MLE)/se(env_wt)",
  "se(MLE)/se(env_varu)", "se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)")
rownames(ratios_diabetes) <- names(m1$coefficients)[-1]
xtable(ratios_diabetes, digits = 3)

```

	se(MLE)/se(env_wt)	se(MLE)/se(env_varu)	se(MLE)/se(env_fixu)
l.age	1.241	1.208	1.191
l.weight	1.581	1.475	7.070
l.height	1.156	1.073	54.761
l.waist	1.541	1.448	11.599
l.hip	1.296	1.220	17.800
genderfemale	1.192	1.170	1.197
l.stab.glu	1.147	1.146	1.287

The estimated envelope dimension and weights vector are displayed in the code below. We can see that the estimated envelope dimension is 1 in the original sample, and the vector of weights is close to a point mass at 1. The weighted envelope estimator and the envelope estimator at the estimated dimension are very similar. That being said, the bootstrap distribution for the estimated envelope dimension u is far from a point mass at 1 and the bootstrap standard errors for the weighted envelope estimator are lower than those obtained by using the variable u approach which selects u at every dimension.

```

Y <- dat$diagnose
X <- as.matrix(m1$x) [, -1]
n <- nrow(X)
a <- betahat[1]
b <- betahat[-1]
model_cov <- Logistic_cov(Y = Y, X = X, a = a, b = b)
M <- model_cov$M; U <- model_cov$U
bic_val <- bic_compute(M = M, U = U, n = n)

## estimated dimension in the original sample
u <- which.min(bic_val)
u

## [1] 1

## estimated weights for the weighted technique in
## the original sample
min_bic_val <- min(bic_val)
wt_bic <- exp(min_bic_val - bic_val) / sum(exp(min_bic_val - bic_val))
round(wt_bic, 4)

## [1] 0.9921 0.0078 0.0001 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000

```

We now replicate Table 2 in the main text. This table displays the performance of envelope estimates of the regression coefficients (canonical parameter vector) for the logistic regression of diabetes diagnosis on seven predictors. The first, third, and sixth column display the weighted envelope estimator, the envelope

estimator with $\hat{u} = 1$, and the MLE respectively. The second column displays the bootstrap standard error of the weighted envelope estimator. The fourth and fifth columns display the bootstrap standard error for the envelope estimator under the variable u and fixed u regimes respectively. The seventh column displays the bootstrap standard error of the MLE. The last three columns displays the ratio of bootstrap standard errors of all envelope estimators to the those of the MLE.

```
Ghat <- manifold1D(M = M, U = U, u = u)
Env_diabetes <- as.numeric((Ghat %*% t(Ghat)) %*% b)
Env_wt_diabetes <- as.numeric(wtenv(M, U, wt = wt_bic, b))
inference_diabetes <- round(cbind(Env_wt_diabetes,
  SEs_diabetes[, 1], Env_diabetes, SEs_diabetes[, 2],
  SEs_diabetes[, 3], b, SEs_diabetes[, 4]), 4)
rownames(inference_diabetes) <- names(betahat)[-1]
tab <- cbind(inference_diabetes, ratios_diabetes)
colnames(tab) <- NULL
xtable(tab, digits = 3)
```

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
l.age	1.775	0.660	1.775	0.679	0.688	2.029	0.820	1.241	1.208	1.191
l.weight	0.702	1.685	0.702	1.806	0.377	1.255	2.665	1.581	1.475	7.070
l.height	0.033	4.388	0.033	4.728	0.093	-4.393	5.074	1.156	1.073	54.761
l.waist	0.681	1.932	0.681	2.056	0.257	2.652	2.978	1.541	1.448	11.599
l.hip	0.491	3.263	0.492	3.466	0.238	-2.642	4.229	1.296	1.220	17.800
genderfemale	0.401	0.624	0.402	0.636	0.621	0.174	0.744	1.192	1.170	1.197
l.stab.glu	5.112	0.932	5.112	0.933	0.831	5.033	1.069	1.147	1.146	1.287

References

Miscellaneous

- American Diabetes Association. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. *Diabetes Care*, 33 (Supplement 1):S62–S69, 2010.
- D. W. K. Andrews. Higher-order improvements of a computationally attractive k -step bootstrap for extremum estimators. *Econometrica*, 70:1:119–162, 2002.
- S. T. Buckland, K. P. Burnham, and N. H. Augustin. Model selection: An integral part of inference. *Biometrics*, 53:603–618, 1997.
- K. P. Burnham and D. R. Anderson. Multimodel inference. *Sociological and Methods Research*, 33:261–304, 2004.
- N. H. Cho, J. E. Shaw, S. Karuranga, Y. Huang, J. D. da Rocha Fernandes, A. W. Ohlrogge, and B. Malanda. IDF Diabetes Atlas: Global estimates of diabetes prevalence for 2017 and projections for 2045. *Diab. Res. Clin. Prac.*, 138:271–281, 2018.

- G. Claeskens and N. L. Hjort. *Model Selection and Model Averaging*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2008.
- R. D. Cook. *An introduction to envelopes: dimension reduction for efficient estimation in multivariate statistics*, volume 401. John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
- R. D. Cook and Z. Su. Scaled envelopes: scale-invariant and efficient estimation in multivariate linear regression. *Biometrika*, 100:939–954, 2013.
- R. D. Cook and Z. Su. Scaled predictor envelopes and partial least squares regression. *Technometrics*, 58:155–165, 2016.
- R. D. Cook and X. Zhang. Foundations for envelope models and methods. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 110(510):599–611, 2015.
- R. D. Cook and X. Zhang. Algorithms for envelope estimation. *J. Comp. Graph. Statist.*, 25(1):284–300, 2016. doi: 10.1080/10618600.2015.1029577.
- R. D. Cook and X. Zhang. Fast envelope algorithms. *Statist. Sin.*, 28(3):1179–1197, 2018.
- R. D. Cook, B. Li, and F. Chiaromonte. Envelope models for parsimonious and efficient multivariate linear regression. *Statist. Sin.*, 20:927–1010, 2010.
- R. D. Cook, L. Forzani, and Z. Su. A note on fast envelope estimation. *J. Mult. Analy.*, 150:42–54, 2016.
- S. Ding and R. D. Cook. Matrix variate regressions and envelope models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 80(2):387–408, 2018a.
- S. Ding and R. D. Cook. Supplement: Proofs, technical details and additional results for “matrix-variate regressions and envelope models”. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 80(2):387–408, 2018b.
- D. J. Eck. Bootstrapping for multivariate linear regression models. *Statist. Prob. Let.*, 134:141–149, 2018.
- D. J. Eck and R. D. Cook. Weighted envelope estimation to handle variability in model selection. *Biometrika*, 104(3):743–749, 2017.
- D. J. Eck, C. J. Geyer, and R. D. Cook. Supporting data analysis for “combining envelope methodology and aster models for variance reduction in life history analyses”. 2018. <http://hdl.handle.net/11299/178384.1>.
- D. J. Eck, C. J. Geyer, and R. D. Cook. Combining envelope methodology and aster models for variance reduction in life history analyses. *J. Statist. Plan. Inf.*, (205):283–292, 2020.
- B. Efron. Estimation and accuracy after model selection. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 109:507:991–1007, 2014.
- Julian Faraway. *faraway: Functions and Datasets for Books by Julian Faraway*, 2016. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/faraway/index.html>.
- C. J. Geyer, S. Wagenius, and R. G. Shaw. Aster models for life history analysis. *Biometrika*, 94:415–426, 2007.
- Kenneth E Heikes, David M Eddy, Bhakti Arondekar, and Leonard Schlessinger. Diabetes risk calculator: a simple tool for detecting undiagnosed diabetes and pre-diabetes. *Diabetes care*, 31(5):1040–1045, 2008.
- N. L. Hjort and G. Claeskens. Frequentist model average estimators. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 98:464:879–899, 2003.

- M. Lee and Z. Su. *Renvlp: Computing Envelope Estimators*, 2019. <http://cran.radicaldevelop.com/web/packages/Renvlp/Renvlp.pdf>.
- Lexin Li and Xin Zhang. Parsimonious tensor response regression. *J. Am. Statist. Assoc.*, 112(519):1131–1146, 2017.
- R. G. Shaw, C. J. Geyer, S. Wagenius, H. Hangelbroek, and J. R. Etterson. Unifying life-history analyses for inference of fitness and population growth. *Am. Nat.*, 172:E35–E47, 2008.
- L. A. Stefanski and Dennis D. Boos. The calculus of m-estimation. *Am. Statist.*, 56:29–38, 2002.
- Z. Su and R. D. Cook. Partial envelopes for efficient estimation in multivariate linear regression. *Biometrika*, 98:133–146, 2011.
- Z. Su and R. D. Cook. Inner envelopes: efficient estimation in multivariate linear regression. *Biometrika*, 99:687–702, 2012.
- Z. Su, G. Zhu, X. Chen, and Y. Yang. Sparse envelope model: Efficient estimation and response variable selection in multivariate linear regression. *Biometrika*, 103:579–593, 2016.
- G. N. Tsague. On optimal weighting scheme in model averaging. *Am. J. Appl. Math. and Statist.*, 2(3): 150–156, 2014.
- W. Wang, J. Zeng, and X. Zhang. *TRES: Tensor Regression with Envelope Structure and Three Generic Envelope Estimation Approaches*, 2019. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/TRES/index.html>.
- J. P. Willems, J. T. Saunders, D. E. Hunt, and J. B. Schorling. Prevalence of coronary heart disease risk factors among rural blacks: a community-based study. *S. Med. J.*, 90(8):814–820, 1997.
- World Health Organization. Use of glycated haemoglobin (HbA1c) in diagnosis of diabetes mellitus: abbreviated report of a WHO consultation. Technical report, Geneva: World Health Organization, 2011.
- Tat S. Yau and J. Volaufova. A note on hypothesis testing in the envelope model. *Comm. Statist.*, 2019. DOI: 10.1080/03610918.2019.1672737.
- X. Zhang and Q. Mai. Model-free envelope dimension selection. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 12:2193–2216, 2018.
- X. Zhang, C. E. Lee, and X. Shao. Envelopes in multivariate regression models with nonlinearity and heteroscedasticity. *Biometrika*, 2020. In Press.

Appendix: R code

```
#####  
#           1D optimization solve for gamma           #  
#####  
  
## stored in global environment  
ballGBB1D <- function(M, U, opts=NULL) {  
  W0 <- get_ini1D(M, U)  
  if (is.null(opts$xtol))  
    opts$xtol = 1e-8 else if (opts$xtol < 0 || opts$xtol > 1)  
      opts$xtol = 1e-8  
  
  if (is.null(opts$gtol))  
    opts$gtol = 1e-8 else if (opts$gtol < 0 || opts$gtol > 1)  
      opts$gtol = 1e-8  
  
  if (is.null(opts$ftol))  
    opts$ftol = 1e-12 else if (opts$ftol < 0 || opts$ftol > 1)  
      opts$ftol = 1e-12  
  
  if (is.null(opts$mxitr))  
    opts$mxitr = 800  
  
  X <- OptManiMulitBallGBB(W0, opts, fun1D, M, U)$X  
  return(X)  
}  
  
## compute M and U with normal predictors for logistic  
## regression model with normal predictors  
Logistic_cov <- function(Y,X,a,b){  
  n <- nrow(X); p <- ncol(X)  
  theta <- a + X%*%b  
  wts <- as.numeric(exp(theta)/((1 + exp(theta))^2))  
  wts <- wts/mean(wts)  
  Exw = t(wts) %*% X / n  
  Sxw <- t(X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) %*%  
    diag(wts) %*% (X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) / n  
  Ys <- theta + (Y-exp(theta)/(1+exp(theta)))/wts  
  Eyw <- t(wts) %*% Ys / n  
  Sxyw <- t(X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) %*%  
    diag(wts) %*% (Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) / n  
  Syw = t(Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) %*%  
    diag(wts) %*% (Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) / n  
  M <- Sxw  
  U <- Sxyw%*%t(Sxyw) / as.numeric(Syw)  
  out = list(M = M, U = U)
```

```

    return(out)
}

## compute M and U with normal predictors for poisson
## regression model with normal predictors
## (Needs editing)
Poisson_cov <- function(Y,X,a,b){
  n <- nrow(X); p <- ncol(X)
  theta <- a + X%%b
  wts <- as.numeric(exp(theta))
  wts <- wts/mean(wts)
  Exw = t(wts) %% X / n
  Sxw <- t(X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) %%
    diag(wts) %% (X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) / n
  Ys <- theta + (Y-exp(theta))/wts
  Eyw <- t(wts) %% Ys / n
  Sxyw <- t(X-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Exw, simplify=FALSE))) %%
    diag(wts) %% (Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) / n
  Syw = t(Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) %%
    diag(wts) %% (Ys-do.call(rbind, replicate(n, Eyw, simplify=FALSE))) / n
  M <- Sxw
  U <- Sxyw%%t(Sxyw) / as.numeric(Syw)
  out = list(M = M, U = U)
  return(out)
}

## compute BIC scores
# functionality is from the TRES package, but is edited to include
# fitting when u = p
bic_compute <- function(M, U, n, opts = NULL, multiD = 1){
  p <- dim(M)[2]
  Mnew <- M
  Unew <- U
  G <- matrix(0, p, p)
  G0 <- diag(p)
  phi <- rep(0, p)
  for (k in 1:p) {
    if (k == p){
      gk <- ballGBB1D(Mnew, Unew, opts)
      phi[k] <- n * (log(t(gk) %% Mnew %% gk) +
                    log(t(gk) %% solve(Mnew + Unew) %% gk)) +
                log(n) * multiD
      G[, k] <- G0 %% gk
      break
    }
  }
  gk <- ballGBB1D(Mnew, Unew, opts)
  phi[k] <- n * (log(t(gk) %% Mnew %% gk) +

```

```

        log(t(gk) %*% solve(Mnew + Unew) %*% gk)) +
    log(n) * multiD
    G[, k] <- G0 %*% gk
    G0 <- qr.Q(qr(G[, 1:k]), complete = TRUE)[, (k + 1):p]
    Mnew <- t(G0) %*% M %*% G0
    Unew <- t(G0) %*% U %*% G0
  }
  bic_val <- rep(0, p)
  for (k in 1:p) {
    bic_val[k] <- sum(phi[1:k])
  }
  u = which.min(bic_val)
  bic_val
}

## compute weighted envelope estimator from a weight vector
## and the original estimator
wtenv <- function(M, U, wt, b){
  p <- ncol(M)
  Env_wt <- rep(0,p)
  for(i in 1:p){
    if(i < p){
      G <- manifold1D(M = M, U = U, u = i)
      Env_wt <- Env_wt + wt[i] *
        as.numeric((G %*% t(G)) %*% b)
    }
    if(i == p) Env_wt <- Env_wt + wt[i] * b
  }
  return(Env_wt)
}

## compute covariance matrices from bootstrap output
covar <- function(reg){
  p <- (ncol(reg) - 1) / 4
  covwt <- cov(reg[, 1:p])
  covenv <- cov(reg[, (p+1):(2*p)])
  covenvfixedu <- cov(reg[, (2*p+1):(3*p)])
  covMLE <- cov(reg[, (3*p+1):(4*p)])
  out = list(covwt=covwt, covenv=covenv,
            covenvfixedu = covenvfixedu, covMLE=covMLE)
  out
}

## compute normed matrices from bootstrap output

```

```

normvar <- function(reg){
  p <- (ncol(reg) - 1) / 4
  n <- nrow(reg)
  sewt <- crossprod(reg[, 1:p]) / n
  seenv <- crossprod(reg[, (p+1):(2*p)]) / n
  seenvfixedu <- crossprod(reg[, (2*p+1):(3*p)]) / n
  seMLE <- crossprod(reg[, (3*p+1):(4*p)]) / n
  out = list(se_wt=sewt, se_env=seenv,
            se_env_fixedu = seenvfixedu, se_MLE=seMLE)
  out
}

## Compute the bootstrap deviations for the weighted envelope
## estimator, the envelope estimator with fixed dimension, the
## envelope estimator with variable dimensions, and the MLE
## Also report the selected envelope dimension at every
## iteration of the nonparametric bootstrap
model_boot <- function(model, nboot = 1000, cores = 15,
  intercept = FALSE){

  ## important quantities an MLE of beta
  dat <- model$data
  model <- update(model, x = TRUE, y = TRUE, data = dat)
  Y <- model$y
  X <- model$x
  n <- nrow(X)
  b <- betahat <- model$coefficients
  a <- 0
  if(intercept){
    a <- betahat[1]
    b <- betahat[-1]
    X <- matrix(X[,-1], nrow = n)
  }
  p <- ncol(X)

  ## intermediate envelope quantities
  fn <- NULL
  fam <- model$family$family
  if(fam == "binomial"){
    fn <- function(Y,X,a,b) Logistic_cov(Y=Y,X=X,a=a,b=b)
  }
  if(fam == "poisson"){
    fn <- function(Y,X,a,b) Poisson_cov(Y=Y,X=X,a=a,b=b)
  }
  model_cov <- fn(Y = Y, X = X, a = a, b = b)
  M <- model_cov$M; U <- model_cov$U

```

```

bic_val <- bic_compute(M = M, U = U, n = n)
u <- which.min(bic_val)
min_bic_val <- min(bic_val)
wt_bic <- exp(min_bic_val - bic_val) / sum(exp(min_bic_val - bic_val))

## estimators
Ghat <- manifold1D(M = M, U = U, u = u)
Env <- as.numeric((Ghat %*% t(Ghat)) %*% b)
Env_wt <- as.numeric(wtenv(M, U, wt = wt_bic, b))

## bootstrap routine
registerDoParallel(cores = cores)
output <- foreach(i=1:nboot, .combine=rbind,
  .export=c("ballGBB1D", "manifold1D", "wtenv", "fn")) %dopar% {

  ## refit model using bootstrap pairs
  m_boot <- update(model, data = dat[sample(1:n, replace = TRUE), ],
    x = TRUE, y = TRUE)

  ## important quantities including the MLE of beta
  ## from the bootstrap sample
  Y_boot <- m_boot$y
  X_boot <- m_boot$x
  b_boot <- beta_boot <- m_boot$coefficients
  a_boot <- 0
  if(intercept){
    a_boot <- beta_boot[1]
    b_boot <- beta_boot[-1]
    X_boot <- matrix(X_boot[, -1], nrow = n)
  }

  ## intermediate envelope estimation quantities
  model_cov_boot <- fn(Y=Y_boot, X=X_boot, a=a_boot, b=b_boot)
  M_boot <- model_cov_boot$M; U_boot <- model_cov_boot$U
  #M <- vcov(m_boot); U <- beta_boot %o% beta_boot
  bic_val_boot = bic_compute(M=M_boot, U=U_boot, n=n)
  u_boot <- which.min(bic_val_boot)
  min_bic_val_boot <- min(bic_val_boot)
  wt_bic_boot <- exp(min_bic_val_boot - bic_val_boot) /
    sum(exp(min_bic_val_boot - bic_val_boot))

  ## envelope estimators from bootstrap sample
  G_boot <- manifold1D(M = M_boot, U = U_boot, u = u_boot)
  G_boot_fixedu <- manifold1D(M = M_boot, U = U_boot, u = u)
  Env_boot <- as.numeric((G_boot %*% t(G_boot)) %*% b_boot)
  Env_boot_fixedu <- as.numeric((G_boot_fixedu %*%
    t(G_boot_fixedu)) %*% b_boot)

```

```
Env_wt_boot <- as.numeric(wtenv(M = M_boot, U = U_boot,  
  wt = wt_bic_boot, b = b_boot))  
  
## discrepancy  
c((Env_wt - Env_wt_boot),  
  (Env - Env_boot),  
  (Env - Env_boot_fixedu),  
  (b - b_boot), u_boot)  
}  
output  
}
```