

High-dimensional variable selection with heterogeneous signals: A precise asymptotic perspective

Saptarshi Roy, Ambuj Tewari, Ziwei Zhu

September 13, 2022

Abstract

We study the problem of exact support recovery for high-dimensional sparse linear regression when the signals are weak, rare and possibly heterogeneous. Specifically, we fix the minimum signal magnitude at the information-theoretic optimal rate and investigate the asymptotic selection accuracy of best subset selection (BSS) and marginal screening (MS) procedures under independent Gaussian design. Despite of the ideal setup, somewhat surprisingly, marginal screening can fail to achieve exact recovery with probability converging to one in the presence of heterogeneous signals, whereas BSS enjoys model consistency whenever the minimum signal strength is above the information-theoretic threshold. To mitigate the computational issue of BSS, we also propose a surrogate two-stage algorithm called ETS (Estimate Then Screen) based on iterative hard thresholding and gradient coordinate screening, and we show that ETS shares exactly the same asymptotic optimality in terms of exact recovery as BSS. Finally, we present a simulation study comparing ETS with LASSO and marginal screening. The numerical results echo with our asymptotic theory even for realistic values of the sample size, dimension and sparsity.

Keywords: Variable Selection; High-Dimensional Statistics; Model Consistency; Heterogeneous Signals; Marginal Screening; Iterative Hard Thresholding.

1 Introduction

Consider n independent observations $(x_i, y_i)_{i \in [n]}$ of a random pair (x, y) drawn from the following linear regression model:

$$\begin{aligned} (x, \varepsilon) &\sim \mathcal{P}_x \times \mathcal{P}_\varepsilon, \\ y &= x^\top \beta + \varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where \mathcal{P}_x is the p -dimensional isotropic Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}_p(0, I_p)$, and \mathcal{P}_ε is the standard Gaussian distribution on \mathbb{R} . In matrix notation, the observations can be represented as

$$Y = X\beta + E,$$

where $Y = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^\top$, $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)^\top$ and $E = (\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \dots, \varepsilon_n)^\top$. The vector β is unknown but sparse in the sense that $\|\beta\|_0 := \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{1}(\beta_j \neq 0) = s$, which is much smaller than p . Denote by $\mathcal{S}(v)$ the set of non-zero coordinates of a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Lastly we denote by $\mathbb{P}_{\beta_0}(\cdot)$ and $\mathbb{E}_{\beta_0}(\cdot)$ the probability measure and the expectation with $\beta = \beta_0$ respectively. In this paper, we focus on the variable selection problem, i.e., identifying $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$. We primarily use the 0-1 loss, i.e., $\mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathcal{S}(\hat{\beta}) \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta))$, to assess the quality of the selected model $\mathcal{S}(\hat{\beta})$. The isotropic Gaussian design has been widely used to conduct precise analysis of variable selection procedures (Fletcher et al., 2009; Genovese et al., 2012; Ndaoud and Tsybakov, 2020; Su et al., 2017). Specifically, these works either derived the necessary and sufficient condition for exact model recovery (Fletcher et al., 2009), or established tight asymptotic bounds of model selection error (Genovese et al., 2012; Ndaoud and Tsybakov, 2020; Su et al., 2017). The isotropic Gaussian design is also used in compressed sensing to generate a measurement matrix (Candès et al., 2006; Candès and Tao, 2006; Donoho, 2006), so that one can sense the sparse signals with few measurements of the high-dimensional signal.

Recently there has been growing interest in the variable selection problem in the presence of *weak* and *rare* signals (Genovese et al., 2012; Ji et al., 2012). This regime is ubiquitous in modern data analytics such as those in Genome-Wide Association Study (GWAS). There the genes that exhibit detectable association with the trait of interest can be extremely few with weak effects (Consortium et al., 2007; Martinen et al., 2013). Moreover, the number of subjects n typically ranges in thousands, while the number of features p can range from tens of thousands to hundreds of thousands. Such a high dimension further adds to the difficulty of identifying the weak signals. Weak and rare signals also arise in multi-user detection problems (Arias-Castro et al., 2011) where one typically uses linear model of the form (1). There the j th column of X , denoted by X_j , is the channel impulse response for user j . The signal received from user j is $\beta_j X_j$. Thus $\beta_j = 0$ means that j th user is not sending any signal. It is a common practice to model the mixing matrix X as random with i.i.d. entries. Under the presence of strong noise, one might be interested in knowing whether information is being transmitted or not. Typically, in some applications it is reasonable to assume that a very few numbers of users are sending signals. Also due to strong noise environment the signals become quite weak, making them harder to detect. Therefore, from an application point of view, understanding variable selection in *weak* and *rare* signal regimes is crucial. Despite its importance, the problem remains fairly underexplored. Typically most of the popular methods including LASSO (Tibshirani, 1996), SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001), MC+ (Zhang, 2010), etc. have been extensively analyzed in terms of 0-1 loss when the signals are uniformly strong (Zhao and Yu, 2006; Guo et al., 2015; Zhang, 2010) in the sense that

$$\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\beta_j| \gg \left(\frac{\log p}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

However, very little is known about the variable selection problem in the presence of weak and rare signals.

Besides the weakness and rarity of signals, heterogeneity in the signal *strength* is another important feature of modern data applications that has not yet received sufficient attention. One limitation of the existing literature on variable selection in the *weak* and *rare* signals regime is that it typically assumes that the true signals are homogeneous (Genovese et al., 2012; Ji et al., 2012; Jin et al., 2014). Ji et al. (2012) refer to this setup as the *Asymptotically Rare and Weak* (ARW)

signal regime. Many popular approaches have been shown to enjoy satisfactory variable selection properties under the ARW regime. For instance, [Genovese et al. \(2012\)](#) showed that both LASSO and marginal screening enjoy model consistency in terms of Hamming loss under independent random design. [Ji et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Jin et al. \(2014\)](#) investigated the same problem under sparsely correlated design. They proposed two-stage screen and clean algorithms that also exhibit model consistency in terms of Hamming loss. However, their theory heavily relies on homogeneous signals and does not extend to the heterogeneous case that is of interest to us. In reality, the ARW setup seldom occurs: the signals almost always have different strengths ([Li et al., 2019](#)). It is not yet fully understood whether one can achieve exact support recovery in the presence of weak, rare and heterogeneous signals.

To underscore the contrasting effects of homogeneous and heterogeneous signals in terms of exact model recovery, we study the variable selection property of marginal screening (see Section 3). We show that under the presence of strong heterogeneity in the signal, marginal screening fails to recover the exact model with probability converging to 1, whereas under homogeneous signal it can recover the exact model asymptotically ([Genovese et al., 2012](#)). It turns out that due to heterogeneity, the spurious correlations become large and create impediment to selecting the exact model. In correlated design, a different problem known as *unfaithfulness* ([Wasserman and Roeder, 2009](#); [Robins et al., 2003](#)) prevents marginal screening from achieving model consistency. Specifically, due to “correlation cancellation”, marginal correlation between Y and X_j becomes negligible even when β_j is large and this ultimately leads to *false negatives*. In this paper, we study independent random design model in which correlation cancellation does not occur. Instead, we identify a different source of problem under the presence of signal heterogeneity that affects exact variable selection performance of marginal screening.

On the computational side, modern methods like LASSO, SCAD, MC+ were initially motivated as alternatives to Best Subset Selection (BSS). BSS is in general an NP-hard optimization problem and was believed to be practically intractable even for p as small as 30. Thanks to recent advancements in algorithms and hardware, the optimal solution to the BSS problem can now be computed, sometimes with approximations, for some practical settings. [Jain et al. \(2014\)](#) showed that a wide family of iterative hard thresholding (IHT) algorithms can approximately solve the BSS problem, in the sense that they can achieve similar goodness of fit with the best subset with slight violation of the sparsity constraint. [Liu and Foygel Barber \(2020\)](#) studied the optimal thresholding operator for such iterative thresholding algorithms, which manages to exploit fewer variables than IHT to achieve the same goodness fit as BSS. [Bertsimas et al. \(2016\)](#) viewed the BSS problem through the lens of mixed integer optimization (MIO) and showed that for n in 100s and p in 1000s, the MIO algorithm can obtain a near optimal solution reasonably fast. More recently, [Bertsimas and Van Parys \(2020\)](#) developed a new cutting plane method that solves to provable optimality the Tikhonov-regularized ([Tikhonov, 1943](#)) BSS problem with n and p in the 100s and 1000s respectively. A recent work ([Zhu et al., 2020](#)) proposed an iterative splicing method called Adaptive Best Subset Selection (ABESS) to solve the BSS problem. They also showed that ABESS enjoys both statistical accuracy and polynomial computational complexity when the design matrix satisfies sparse Reisz condition and minimum signal strength is of order $\Omega\{(s \log p \log \log n/n)^{1/2}\}$.

Given these recent advances in solving BSS, there has been growing acknowledgement that BSS enjoys significant statistical superiority over the aforementioned alternative methods. [Bertsimas et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Bertsimas and Van Parys \(2020\)](#) numerically demonstrated higher predictive power and lower false discovery rate (FDR) respectively of the BSS solution compared to LASSO.

Fan et al. (2020) and Zhu and Wu (2021) reported that the approximate BSS solutions provided by IHT have much fewer false discoveries than LASSO, SCAD and SIS, especially in the presence of highly correlated design. They also theoretically showed that the model selection behavior of BSS does not explicitly depend on the restricted eigenvalue condition for the design (Bickel et al., 2009; Van De Geer and Bühlmann, 2009), a condition which appears unavoidable (assuming a standard computational complexity conjecture) for any polynomial-time method (Zhang et al., 2014). This suggests that BSS is robust against design collinearity in terms of model selection.

In this paper, we mainly focus on the *precise* asymptotic bound, i.e., the bound with the optimal constant, for the minimum signal strength that allows BSS to achieve model consistency. Under a specific asymptotic setup, we show that BSS achieves asymptotic exact recovery of the true model once the minimum signal strength is above the information theoretic lower bound, meaning that BSS is optimal in terms of the requirement on the signal strength. In contrast, previous works such as Wainwright (2009) and Fan et al. (2020) analyze BSS from a non-asymptotic perspective: they show that BSS can achieve model consistency under the optimal rate of the sample complexity. But their analyses are tight only up to a multiplicative constants.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the Asymptotically Ultra-Rare and Weak Minimum signal (AURWM) regime that accommodates heterogeneous signal strengths. Section 3 shows that in the presence of strong heterogeneity of the signal strength, marginal screening procedures fail to achieve model consistency under the AURWM regime with probability converging to 1. In Section 4, we derive the asymptotic minimax 0-1 loss under the AURWM regime and show that BSS is optimal in terms of the requirement on the minimum signal strength. In Section 5, we propose a computationally tractable two-stage algorithm that also enjoys model consistency under essentially the same condition as BSS. Finally, in Section 6, we carry out simulation studies and numerically demonstrate the superiority of our method over other competing methods.

Notation. Let \mathbb{R} and \mathbb{R}_+ denote the set of real numbers and the set of non-negative real numbers respectively. Denote by \mathbb{R}^p the p -dimensional Euclidean space and by $\mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ the space of real matrices of order $p \times q$. For a positive integer K , denote by $[K]$ the set $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$.

Regarding vectors and matrices, for a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote by $\|v\|_2$ the ℓ_2 -norm of v . We use $I_p \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ to denote the p -dimensional identity matrix. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, we denote by A_j and a_j the j th column and the transposed j th row of A respectively. We let $\text{tr}(A) = \sum_{j=1}^p A_{jj}$ denote the trace of A .

Throughout the paper, let $O(\cdot)$ (respectively $\Omega(\cdot)$) denote the standard big-O (respectively big-Omega) notation, i.e., we say $a_n = O(b_n)$ if there exists a universal constant $C > 0$, such that $a_n \leq Cb_n$ (respectively $a_n \geq Cb_n$) for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Sometimes for notational convenience, we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ in place of $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ in place of $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$. We write $a_n \sim b_n$ if $a_n = O(b_n)$ and $a_n = \Omega(b_n)$. We denote by $\Omega_{\mathbb{P}}$ the big-Omega in probability: for a set of random variables Z_n and a set of constants a_n , $X_n = \Omega_{\mathbb{P}}(a_n)$ means that for any $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, there exist $C_{\varepsilon_0} > 0$ and $n_{\varepsilon_0} \in \mathbb{N}$, both of which depend on ε_0 , such that

$$\mathbb{P}(|X_n/a_n| < C_{\varepsilon_0}) \leq \varepsilon_0, \quad \forall n \geq n_{\varepsilon_0}.$$

We use $\xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}}$ and \xrightarrow{d} to denote convergence in probability and distribution respectively. Also we say $X \stackrel{d}{=} Y$ for two random variables X, Y if their distributions are equal. We denote by $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ the indicator function.

Finally, regarding probabilistic distributions, we use $N(0, 1)$ to denote the standard Gaussian distribution. We use $N_p(0, \Sigma)$ to denote the p -dimensional Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. We denote by $\text{Ber}(\pi)$ the Bernoulli distribution with success probability $\pi \in [0, 1]$.

2 Ultra rare and weak minimum signal regime

In this section, we focus on a specific asymptotic setup that allows *heterogeneity* among the sparse signals in high dimension. Throughout our paper, we consider the following signal class:

$$\mathcal{M}_s^a := \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\beta\|_0 = s, \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\beta_j| \geq a\}.$$

Here a denotes the minimum signal strength of β . Note that the signal class \mathcal{M}_s^a only imposes a lower bound for the minimum signal strength and thus allows arbitrarily large magnitudes across the true signals. This implicitly accommodates heterogeneity in the signal, which is in sharp contrast with the homogeneous signal setup considered by [Genovese et al. \(2012\)](#).

Now we are in a position to introduce the *Asymptotically Ultra Rare and Weak Minimum signal regime* (AURWM), in which we mainly consider the signal class above with

$$a = \left(\frac{2r \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad s = O(\log p). \quad (2)$$

Besides, we set the sample size n as

$$n = \lfloor p^k \rfloor, \quad 0 < k < 1.$$

The assumption that $s \lesssim \log p$ characterizes the ultra-rarity of the signals, which is common in genetic studies such as GWAS ([Yang et al., 2020](#)). Unless stated otherwise, from now on our statistical analysis follows the scalings of n, p, s, a in this AURWM regime. We say a support estimator $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ achieves *asymptotic consistent recovery* in the AURWM regime if

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)) = 0. \quad (3)$$

This paper mainly focuses on the criterion (3) to measure the quality of exact recovery performance for an estimator $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$.

It is also worth mentioning that a relevant but different asymptotic setup is studied by [Genovese et al. \(2012\)](#) and [Ji et al. \(2012\)](#). There the authors assumed a Bayesian model such that all the signals are independent and identically distributed and that the sparsity $s \sim p^{1-\vartheta}$ for some $\vartheta \in (0, 1)$. Under such a setup they obtained asymptotically tight phase transition boundaries with respect to Bayesian Hamming risk, which partitions the r - ϑ plane into three regions: (a) Region of exact recovery, (b) Region of almost recovery, (c) Region of no recovery. We skip the details of these results for brevity. The major differences between their setup and ours are twofold: (1) They essentially assume homogeneous signals; (2) They assume s to grow in a polynomial fashion with respect to p .

3 Marginal screening under heterogeneous signal

Marginal screening (MS) is one of the most widely used variable selection methods in practice. It selects the variables with top absolute marginal correlation with the response. Formally, for any $j \in [p]$, write $\mu_j := X_j^\top Y/n$. Given any possibly data-driven threshold $\tau(X, Y)$, define the marginal screening estimator as follows:

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau := \{j \in [p] : |\mu_j| \geq \tau(X, Y)\}. \quad (4)$$

Note that μ_j is essentially equivalent to the marginal correlation between X_j and Y because of isotropy of X . Marginal screening has been applied in various fields for feature selection and dimension reduction, including biomedicine (Huang et al., 2019; Lu, 2005; Leisenring et al., 1997), survival data analysis (Hong et al., 2018; Li et al., 2016), economics and econometrics (Wang et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2014).

Besides the broad applications, marginal screening has been shown to enjoy some desirable statistical properties. Fan and Lv (2008) established the sure screening property of marginal screening under an ultra-high dimensional setup, which serves as theoretical justification for MS to be used for dimension reduction in many applications. Later, Genovese et al. (2012) showed that MS enjoys the minimax optimal rate under Hamming loss with homogeneous signals. Nevertheless, as mentioned in Section 1, precise asymptotic characterization of the 0-1 loss of MS remains fairly underexplored under high dimension, especially in the presence of heterogeneity in signal strength.

3.1 Failure of MS in the AURWM regime

In this section, we study the 0-1 risk of the MS estimator. Define $\mathcal{T} := \{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \mid \tau : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+\}$, which is the class of all possible marginal screening estimators. Perhaps surprisingly, under the AURWM regime, we show that MS fails to achieve exact model recovery in the minimax sense.

Theorem 1 *Under the AURWM regime, none of the MS estimators of form (4) can achieve asymptotic exact recovery, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)) = 1.$$

To understand the main message of this theorem, it is instructive to compare it with the parallel result in Genovese et al. (2012) with homogeneous signal. Specifically, Genovese et al. (2012) consider a Bayesian setup where all the signal coefficients are independent and identically distributed Bernoulli random variables (up to a universal constant). Under the AURWM regime, $s = O(\log p)$, which implies that $\vartheta = 1$ in Theorem 10 of Genovese et al. (2012). Then Theorem 10 in Genovese et al. (2012) says that when $r > 1$, MS enjoys consistency in terms of Hamming risk and thus 0-1 risk too. In contrast, when we broaden the signal class to \mathcal{M}_s^a that embraces possibly heterogeneous signals, the same model consistency fails to hold any more for MS as shown in Theorem 1. This comparison clearly reveals the curse of signal heterogeneity on MS.

To see how signal heterogeneity hurts MS, for any $j \in [p]$, write μ_j as

$$\mu_j = \frac{\beta_j \|X_j\|_2^2}{n} + \frac{X_j^\top (\sum_{\ell \neq j} X_\ell \beta_\ell + E)}{n} =: \mu_j^{(1)} + \mu_j^{(2)}. \quad (5)$$

Here $\mu_j^{(1)} = n^{-1}\beta_j \|X_j\|_2^2$ represents the marginal contribution from β_j to μ_j , and $\mu_j^{(2)}$ represents the random error of μ_j due to the cross covariance between X_j and the other signals and noise. Suppose there are spiky signals among $\{\beta_\ell\}_{\ell \neq j}$. Though $\mathbb{E}(\mu_j^{(2)}) = 0$ regardless of the magnitude of β , the spiky signals may incur large variance of $\mu_j^{(2)}$ and overwhelm the magnitude of $\mu_j^{(1)}$, which is the essential indicator of the significance of β_j . Consequently, one cannot tell if β_j is a true variable based on only μ_j in the presence of spiky signals.

4 Best subset selection

Now we shift our focus to BSS, one of the most classical variable selection approaches. With the oracle knowledge of true sparsity s , BSS solves for

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{best}} \in \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|\beta\|_0 = s} \|Y - X\beta\|_2^2.$$

Define $P_{\mathcal{D}} := X_{\mathcal{D}}(X_{\mathcal{D}}^\top X_{\mathcal{D}})^{-1}X_{\mathcal{D}}^\top$, which is the orthogonal projection operator onto the column space of $X_{\mathcal{D}}$. The BSS above can be alternatively viewed as solving for

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{best}} := \arg \min_{\mathcal{D} \subseteq [p]: |\mathcal{D}|=s} \frac{Y^\top (I_n - P_{\mathcal{D}})Y}{n} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{D} \subseteq [p]: |\mathcal{D}|=s} \frac{Y^\top P_{\mathcal{D}}Y}{n}. \quad (6)$$

Using a union bound as in [Wainwright \(2009\)](#) or [Fan et al. \(2020\)](#), one can show that there exists a universal positive constant φ (approximately equal to 0.618) such that whenever $r > 4/(1 - \varphi)$, BSS achieves model consistency, i.e.,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^g} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{best}} \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)) = 0.$$

We emphasize that the requirement on r here is more stringent than needed: we will show that BSS achieves model consistency whenever $r > 1$, which turns out to be necessary for any approach to obtain exact support recovery.

4.1 Exact support recovery of BSS

In the following theorem, we show that $r > 1$ is sufficient for BSS to achieve asymptotic exact recovery. Recall that $n = \lfloor p^k \rfloor$ with $0 < k < 1$.

Theorem 2 *Let $r > 1$ and write $\delta = r - 1$. Then there exists a universal positive constant C_0 such that whenever*

$$s < C_0 \min \left\{ 2k, \frac{4\delta}{1 + \delta}, \frac{\delta^2}{\{(1 + 0.75\delta)^{1/2} + (1 + 0.5\delta)^{1/2}\}^2} \right\} \log p,$$

we have

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^g} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{\text{best}} \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)) = 0.$$

In order for BSS to achieve model consistency, we need to ensure that the maximum spurious correlation, i.e., correlation between the spurious variables and the response, is well controlled so that the best subset does not involve any false discovery. One important ingredient of our analysis is the asymptotic distribution of the maximum spurious correlation due to [Fan et al. \(2018\)](#), based on which we can derive the sharp constant in the minimum signal strength for BSS to be model-consistent. It is worth emphasis that pursuing the exact asymptotic distributions is crucial to obtain constant-sharp results; typically, standard non-asymptotic analysis can only yield optimal rates rather than optimal constants.

Note also that [Theorem 2](#) requires s to grow slowly. Given that we have at least $\binom{p-s}{s}$ spurious models and that this number increases with respect to s when s is small, a larger s implies higher maximum spurious correlation due to randomness and thus thinner chance for the best subset to remain the true model.

In the next section, we show that $r > 1$ is the weakest possible requirement on the minimum signal strength for any approach to achieve asymptotic model consistency.

4.2 Necessary condition for exact recovery

In this section, we show that under the AURWM regime, $r = 1$ is the information theoretic boundary of the minimum signal strength for exact model recovery. In other words, if $r < 1$, then no method can achieve model consistency. Towards this end, we study the minimax 0-1 loss

$$\inf_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)),$$

where the infimum is taken over the class of all possible measurable functions $\widehat{\mathcal{S}} : (X, Y) \rightarrow \{\mathcal{D} \subseteq [p] : |\mathcal{D}| = s\}$. The next theorem establishes a lower bound of the above minimax 0-1 loss.

Theorem 3 (Necessary Condition) *Under the AURWM regime, when $r < 1$, there exists a universal positive constant c such that*

$$\liminf_{p \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}(\beta)) \geq c.$$

[Theorem 3](#) suggests that $r \geq 1$ is a necessary condition for consistent support recovery. Combining this with [Theorem 2](#), we can see that BSS is optimal in terms of requirement on the minimum signal strength to achieve exact model recovery. The proof of [Theorem 3](#) leverages [Theorem 1](#) in [Wang et al. \(2010\)](#) and detailed proof can be found in [Section 9.1](#) of the supplementary material.

5 Achieving statistical optimality with computational efficiency

In spite of the optimality of BSS in terms of model selection, its NP-hardness seriously restricts its practical applicability. To address the computational issue, we propose a two-stage algorithm called ETS (Estimate then Screen) that combines the well-known IHT algorithm ([Blumensath and Davies, 2009](#); [Jain et al., 2014](#)) with a follow-up coordinate screening step. We show that in the AURWM regime, ETS enjoys the same selection optimality as BSS in terms of the requirement on the minimum signal strength.

5.1 The ETS algorithm

In this section we introduce our ETS algorithm (Algorithm 2) in detail. Given a partition parameter $0 < \gamma < 1$, ETS first splits the full sample $(x_i, Y_i)_{i \in [n]}$ into two subsamples $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2$ of respective sizes $n_1 = \lfloor \gamma n \rfloor$ and $n_2 = n - n_1$. Then ETS performs two main steps on these two sub-samples respectively. It applies IHT to \mathcal{D}_1 to obtain an estimator $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ of the true signal vector β . Then ETS performs a coordinatewise screening based on \mathcal{D}_2 and $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ to select the true variables. To be self-contained, in Algorithm 1 we give the pseudo-code of the IHT algorithm. Let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \theta \mapsto f(\theta)$ be a differentiable objective function and $P_{\hat{s}}^0(\cdot)$ be the projection operator that projects a vector onto the space of \hat{s} -sparse vectors by selecting the \hat{s} largest elements in magnitude.

Algorithm 1: IHT

Input: Objective function f , sparsity level \hat{s} , step size h ;

$\beta^{(0)} = 0$;

$t = 0$;

while not converged do

$\beta^{(t+1)} = P_{\hat{s}}^0(\beta^{(t)} - h \nabla_{\theta} f(\beta^{(t)}))$;

$t \leftarrow t + 1$

end

Output: $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}} = \beta^{(t)}$.

For $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, let $X^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell} \times p}$ and $Y^{(\ell)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\ell}}$ denote the design matrix and the response vector of the ℓ th sub-sample respectively. ETS computes $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ based on the first sub-sample $(X^{(1)}, Y^{(1)})$ with the square loss as the objective function:

$$f_{n_1}(\theta; X^{(1)}, Y^{(1)}) := \frac{1}{n_1} \|Y^{(1)} - X^{(1)}\theta\|_2^2. \quad (7)$$

Next comes the screening step of ETS. For each $i \in [p]$, define

$$\Delta_i := \frac{X_i^{(2)\top} \left(Y^{(2)} - \sum_{j \neq i} X_j^{(2)} \hat{\beta}_j^{\text{iht}} \right)}{\|X_i^{(2)}\|_2} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\kappa_{\varsigma}(u) := \frac{a \|u\|_2}{2} + \frac{\varsigma^2 \log p}{a \|u\|_2}, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \quad (9)$$

where $\varsigma > 0$ is specified later. ETS selects the i th variable if and only if $|\Delta_i| > \kappa_{\varsigma}(X_i^{(2)})$. To see why we can screen variables based on $\{\Delta_i\}_{i \in [p]}$, note that

$$\Delta_i = \beta_i \|X_i^{(2)}\|_2 + \frac{X_i^{(2)\top} \left(\sum_{j \neq i} X_j^{(2)} (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j^{\text{iht}}) + E \right)}{\|X_i^{(2)}\|_2}. \quad (10)$$

Some probability argument shows that conditioned on \mathcal{D}_1 and $X_i^{(2)}$, Δ_i is distributed as:

$$\Delta_i | (\mathcal{D}_1, X_i^{(2)}) \stackrel{d}{=} \beta_i \|X_i^{(2)}\|_2 + \left\{ 1 + \sum_{j \neq i} (\beta_j - \hat{\beta}_j^{\text{iht}})^2 \right\}^{1/2} g_i,$$

where $g_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and is independent of $X_i^{(2)}$. If IHT performs well in the sense that $\|\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}} - \beta\|_2$ is small, then for all $i \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)$, $\beta_i \|X_i^{(2)}\|_2$ becomes the dominant term in Δ_i . In contrast, for all $i \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)$, $\beta_i \|X_i^{(2)}\|_2 = 0$ and we thus expect Δ_i to be small. This suggests the existence of a threshold $t(\cdot)$ on $(\Delta_i)_{i \in [p]}$ that distinguishes the true support $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ from the irrelevant variables. We follow [Ndaoud and Tsybakov \(2020\)](#) to choose the threshold function in (9), which is shown to be a reasonable choice to identify the true variables.

For each $i \in [p]$, define $\hat{\eta}_i(X, Y) := \mathbb{1}\{|\Delta_i| > \kappa_\varsigma(X_i^{(2)})\}$ and write

$$\hat{\eta}(X, Y) := (\hat{\eta}_1(X, Y), \dots, \hat{\eta}_p(X, Y))^\top.$$

The selector $\hat{\eta}(X, Y)$ is the final estimate of the support $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ produced by the ETS algorithm. Algorithm 2 shows the detailed steps of the ETS algorithm. Next, we define the binary decoder of

Algorithm 2: ETS

Input: Data $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, sparsity level \hat{s} , step size h , partition parameter γ , threshold parameter ς ;

1. Randomly partition the whole dataset \mathcal{D} into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{D}_1 = (X^{(1)}, Y^{(1)})$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = (X^{(2)}, Y^{(2)})$;
2. Run IHT (Algorithm 1) with the objective function $f_{n_1}(\theta; X^{(1)}, Y^{(1)})$ in (7) and compute $\hat{\beta}_{\text{iht}}$;
3. Construct the statistics $\{\Delta_i\}_{i=1}^p$ and thresholds $\{\kappa_\varsigma(X_i^{(2)})\}_{i=1}^p$ using (8)-(9);
4. Finally compute the selector $\hat{\eta}(X, Y)$;

Output: The selector $\hat{\eta}(X, Y)$.

the true support $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ as $\eta_\beta := (\mathbb{1}\{\beta_1 \neq 0\}, \dots, \mathbb{1}\{\beta_p \neq 0\})^\top$. The next theorem shows that ETS can achieve exact recovery under suitable choices of the tuning parameters.

Theorem 4 *Assume $r > 1$ and write $\delta = r - 1$. Then there exist universal positive constants A_1, A_2 and suitable choices of tuning parameters \hat{s}, h such that with IHT iteration count $t \geq \log\{A_1(1 + \|\beta\|_2^2)/\delta\}$, $\gamma \in (0, \delta/(8 + 8\delta))$ and $\varsigma = (1 + A_2\delta)^{1/2}$, we have that $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_a^s} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\eta} \neq \eta_\beta) = 0$.*

Note that as the signal strength parameter r approaches the information-theoretic boundary, i.e., as δ approaches 0, ETS requires more iterations to achieve model consistency. This is not surprising: intuitively, weaker signals are harder to identify than strong ones.

Besides, ETS does not require the knowledge of the true sparsity s , but requires the knowledge of a in the second stage for accurate screening. If the true sparsity s is known, then we can enforce ETS to select exactly s features as follows. Let $|\Delta|_{(m)}$ denote the m th largest value of $\{|\Delta_i|\}_{i \in [p]}$. For each $i \in [p]$, define

$$\hat{\eta}_i(X, Y; s) = \mathbb{1}\{|\Delta_i| \geq |\Delta|_{(s)}\}. \quad (11)$$

Hence $\hat{\eta}(s) := (\hat{\eta}_1(s), \dots, \hat{\eta}_p(s))^\top$ selects exactly s features. The following corollary shows that under the same conditions of Theorem 4, $\hat{\eta}(s)$ achieves model consistency.

Corollary 1 Assume $r > 1$ and write $\delta = r - 1$. If $t \geq \log\{A_1(1 + \|\beta\|_2^2)/\delta\}$ with the same A_1 in Theorem 4 and $\gamma \in (0, \delta/(8 + 8\delta))$, we have that

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\eta}(s) \neq \eta_\beta) = 0. \quad (12)$$

Detailed proofs of Theorem 4 and Corollary 1 can be found in Section 9.2 and Section 9.3 of supplementary materials respectively. Besides, the sparsity level \hat{s} and the step-size h are chosen based on certain geometric properties of $f_{n_1}(\theta)$ and details can be found in Section 9.2 of the supplementary materials.


6 Numerical experiments

In this section, we first numerically investigate the probability for MS to achieve exact recovery of the true model with growing ambient dimension p under both homogeneous and heterogeneous signal setup. Our results show that while MS exhibits model consistency under the homogeneous signal regime, it completely fails to do so under the heterogeneous signal regime, which is consistent with Theorem 1. We then conduct simulation experiments to demonstrate superiority of ETS over competing methods including LASSO and MS as signal strength grows or signal heterogeneity grows. To this end, we mention that we do not numerically compare *exact* BSS in this section mainly due to computational issues. In most of our simulation setups we consider p in thousands and BSS generally suffers from high computational costs in such regimes, even with the help of modern optimization tools such as Gurobi (Hastie et al., 2020). Instead, we focus on LASSO and ETS, both of which are two different computational surrogates of the BSS problem.

6.1 Exact recovery performance of MS

In Figure 1, we demonstrate the asymptotics of MS under both homogeneous and heterogeneous signal patterns. We consider $p \in \{1000, 2000, \dots, 8000\}$ and signal strength parameter $r \in \{2, 3, 4, 5, 6\}$. We set $s = \lfloor 2 \log p \rfloor$ and $n = \lfloor p^{0.9} \rfloor$. We let $\tau(X, Y)$ in (4) be equal to the s th largest value of $\{|\mu_1|, \dots, |\mu_p|\}$, so that MS always chooses a model of size s . For the homogeneous signal setup, we consider β with $\|\beta\|_0 = s$ and $\beta_j = a$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)$, where a is defined in (2). This implies that the SNR varies between 0.19 and 2.15 across different choices of (r, p) . For the heterogeneous signal setup, we consider β with $(s - 1)$ active coordinates equal to a and one “spiky” coordinate equal to $\{10 - (s - 1)a^2\}^{1/2}$. This ensures that the SNR is fixed at 10 for all choices of r, p .

Figure 1(a) shows that under homogeneous signal MS is able to recover the exact model with probability converging to 1 as p grows. In contrast, Figure 1(b) shows that under heterogeneous signal MS never achieves exact model recovery: plots for all values of r are at level 0. Such a contrast corroborates Theorem 1: signal spikes can give rise to substantial spurious correlation and jeopardize the accuracy of MS.



(a) Proportion of exact recovery under weak homogeneous signal. ($0.19 \leq \text{SNR} \leq 2.15$)

(b) Proportion of exact recovery under heterogeneous signal. ($\text{SNR} = 10$)

Figure 1: Asymptotics of MS with growing dimension p .

6.2 Effect of growing signal strength

Here we numerically compare the probability of exact support recovery of ETS with those of LASSO and MS as signal strength parameter r grows. We investigate both homogeneous and heterogeneous signal patterns. We set $p = 2000$, $s \in \{13, 52\}$ and $n = \lfloor p^{0.9} \rfloor = 935$. We set signal strength parameter $r \in \{1.5, 2, 2.5, \dots, 9\}$ in (2). The support \mathcal{S} is chosen uniformly over all the size- s subsets of $[p]$, and each support coordinate of β is chosen as follows:

$$\beta_j = (1 - b_j)(1 + Z_j^2/n)^{1/2}a + b_j r^{1/2} \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{S},$$


where $(Z_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and where $(b_j)_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Ber}(\pi)$ with $\pi \in \{0, 0.2\}$. $\pi = 0$ corresponds to the homogeneous signal pattern, and $\pi = 0.2$ corresponds to the heterogeneous signal pattern, where spiky signals are present with probability 0.2. Each entry x_{ij} of the design matrix X is generated independently from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

In this experiment, we grant all the approaches with the knowledge of s , so that the comparison is fair. Using this oracle knowledge, we only look at the solutions of the aforementioned three methods with sparsity exactly equal to s . Specifically, for LASSO, we look at the solution path and select the model of size exactly equal to s . For MS, we just select the top s variables corresponding to the largest absolute values of μ 's. For ETS, we do not split data for estimation and screening separately; instead we use the full data in both steps. Specifically, we replace $X^{(1)}$ and $Y^{(1)}$ with X and Y respectively in (7) and replace $X^{(2)}$ and $Y^{(2)}$ with X and Y respectively in (8). We set gradient step size $h = 0.5$ in IHT. We choose projection size \hat{s} by cross validation in terms of mean squared prediction error. Lastly, for selecting exactly s features we use (11) in the screening stage of ETS. It is worthwhile to mention that from an application point of view, incorporating data splitting in ETS is not necessary as we are only interested in identifying the active signals, which is akin to point estimation. Also, given the fact that $n \ll p$ in high dimensional regime, using full sample in both the estimation and screening step delivers greater sample efficiency and provides better inference.


Next, for each choice of r , we run LASSO, MS and ETS over 200 independent Monte Carlo experiments to compute the empirical probability of exact recovery. Figure 2 presents the results.

We make the following important observations:


1. All the three methods enjoy higher chance of exact support recovery as the signal strength grows;
2. MS completely fails to achieve exact support recovery when s becomes large (compare panels (a) and (c)) or the signal becomes heterogeneous (compare panels (a) and (b)).
3. LASSO and ETS are insensitive to heterogeneity of the signal. However, LASSO suffers from larger sparsity, while ETS is much more robust against it.
4. Overall, ETS is the best among all the three methods in terms of exact support recovery.




(a) Homogeneous signal pattern ($\pi = 0, s = 13$)



(b) Heterogeneous signal pattern ($\pi = 0.2, s = 13$)



(c) Homogeneous signal pattern ($\pi = 0, s = 52$)



(d) Heterogeneous signal pattern ($\pi = 0.2, s = 52$)

Figure 2: Plot of proportion of exact recovery for varying r .

6.3 Effect of growing heterogeneity

In this numerical experiment we study the effect of growing heterogeneity on ETS, LASSO and MS. We set $p = 2000, s = 13, n = \lfloor p^{0.9} \rfloor = 935$ and $r \in \{2, 6\}$ in (2). Next, we introduce n_{spike} ,

the number of “spiky” signals in \mathcal{S} . We vary n_{spike} in $\{0\} \cup [6]$. The case $n_{\text{spike}} = 0$ corresponds to the homogeneous signal setup where the true signals are set as a uniformly. For $n_{\text{spike}} > 0$, we randomly set $(s - n_{\text{spike}})$ signals in \mathcal{S} to be equal to a and the remaining signals to be equal to a_{spike} , which is defined as

$$a_{\text{spike}} := \left\{ \frac{(2 - sa^2)}{n_{\text{spike}}} + a^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Such a choice of a_{spike} ensures that the SNR always equals 2 whenever $n_{\text{spike}} > 0$. We again perform ETS, LASSO and MS over 200 Monte Carlo simulations for each choice of r and n_{spike} to obtain the empirical probability of exact support recovery. Similarly to the previous sections, we assume that the true sparsity s is known and we apply the three methods in the same fashion as before.

Figure 3 shows again the detrimental effect of heterogeneity on MS in terms of exact recovery. In both panels we see a significant drop in the proportion of exact recovery for MS when n_{spike} changes from 0 to 1. This is consistent with the theory in Section 3. However, in Figure 3(b) we see that the proportion of exact recovery is slowly increasing as n_{spike} grows from 1 to 6. This is because as n_{spike} increases, a_{spike} monotonically decreases, so that the signals become more homogeneous. MS is then able to recover the exact model more frequently. We do not see a similar phenomenon in Figure 3(a) because a_{spike} is too large. Another important observation is that while ETS and LASSO are both performing nearly perfectly when $r = 6$, ETS significantly outperforms both LASSO and MS when $r = 2$. Therefore, ETS is again the overall winner.




Figure 3: Plot of proportion of exact recovery with varying n_{spike} .

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we study exact support recovery in high-dimensional sparse linear regression with independent Gaussian design. We focus on the AURWM regime that not only accommodates *rare* and *weak* signals as the ARW regime does, but also allows *heterogeneity* in the signal strength. Our first theoretical result (Theorem 1) shows that marginal screening fails to achieve exact support recovery under the AURWM regime. The main reason is that the presence of “spiky” signals increases the maximum spurious marginal correlation, thereby blinding the marginal screening

procedure to weak signals. Therefore, one needs to be cautious with usage of marginal screening for variable selection in practice.

In contrast, we show that BSS is robust to signal spikes and is able to achieve model consistency under the AURWM regime with the optimal requirement on signal strength (Theorem 2). The primary reason behind this is that unlike MS, BSS takes into account multiple features simultaneously and thus selects variables based on their capability of fitting the residualized responses given the other variables rather than the responses themselves. Therefore, spiky signals do not affect BSS: They are very likely to be in plausible candidate models in the first place and their effect on the response has been removed in the residualization procedure. Given the recent computational advancements in solving BSS, our positive result on BSS makes it more appealing from an application point of view.

However, it is worth mentioning that even with modern advances in optimization, BSS suffers from high computational costs when the ambient dimension is high. To address this issue, we propose a computationally tractable two-stage method ETS that delivers essentially the same optimal exact recovery performance as BSS (Theorem 4). Similar to BSS, ETS seeks for the features that exhibit high explanation power for the residuals from the model that excludes these features themselves (see (8)). Therefore, ETS is robust to spiky signals. This fact together with the slowly growing sparsity condition in (2) yields the optimal exact recovery accuracy of ETS.

Our work naturally raises several important questions for future research. One question is whether similar optimality results hold for BSS and ETS when the sparsity s grows faster than $\log p$. The same question can also be asked for *correlated* random design. Another direction of our interest is studying the problem of exact recovery in a *distributed* setting where data are stored at different places and communication between them is restricted.

8 Proofs

In this section we collect the proofs of some important results of this paper. Specifically, we present the proofs of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2. The first one shows that marginal screening fails to achieve exact recovery in the AURWM regime, whereas BSS achieves model consistency under optimal requirement on the signal strength.

8.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Consider a MS procedure $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \in \mathcal{T}$. To start with note that

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau = \mathcal{S}(\beta)) = \mathbb{P}_\beta\left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\mu_j| < \tau(X, Y) \leq \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} |\mu_j|\right) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} |\mu_j| < \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} |\mu_j|\right).$$

Recall that for $j \in [p]$ we have

$$\mu_j = \begin{cases} \beta_j \|X_j\|_2^2/n + \omega_j \|X_j\|_2 g_j/n & \text{if } j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta) \\ \omega_j \|X_j\|_2 g_j/n & \text{if } j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta), \end{cases}$$

where $\omega_j^2 = 1 + \sum_{k \neq j} \beta_k^2$ and $g_j = X_j^\top (\sum_{k \neq j} X_k \beta_k + E) / (\omega_j \|X_j\|_2) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau = S) \leq \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{j \in S^c} \omega_j \|X_j\|_2 |g_j| / (2n \log p)^{1/2} < \min_{j \in S} |\beta_j| \|X_j\|_2^2 + \omega_j \|X_j\|_2 |g_j| / (2n \log p)^{1/2} \right). \quad (13)$$

Right hand side of Equation (13) does not depend on $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau$ hence the above inequality is valid uniformly over the class \mathcal{T} . Now choose a sequence $\{c_p\}_{p=1}^\infty$ such that $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} c_p^2/r \geq 1$. Next construct a sequence of $\beta^{(p)}$ in the following manner,

- Consider the set $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{1, \dots, s\} \subseteq [p]$ with $s = O(\log p)$.
- Set $\beta_1^{(p)} = c_p$. For all other $i \in \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \{1\}$ set $\beta_i^{(p)} = a = (2r(\log p)/n)^{1/2}$.
- Set $\beta_i^{(p)} = 0$ if $i \notin \mathcal{S}_0$.

In this setup we have $\omega_j \sim (1 + c_p^2)^{1/2}$ for all $j \neq 1$. Now fix $k_0 \in \mathcal{S}_0 \setminus \{1\}$ (say $k_0 = 2$). From Equation (13) it can be concluded that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta^{(p)}}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau = \mathcal{S}_0) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\beta^{(p)}} \left(\max_{j \in S^c} \omega_j \|X_j\|_2 |g_j| / (2n \log p)^{1/2} < |\beta_{k_0}| \|X_{k_0}\|_2^2 + \omega_{k_0} \|X_{k_0}\|_2 |g_{k_0}| / (2n \log p)^{1/2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

An elementary calculation shows that $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0^c}$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian. Also note that $\omega_j > (1 + c_p^2)^{1/2}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}_0^c$. Using these facts and lemma 3 from [Fletcher et al. \(2009\)](#) we get

$$\frac{1}{(1 + c_p^2)^{1/2}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0^c} \omega_j \frac{\|X_j\|_2 |g_j|}{(2n \log p)^{1/2}} \geq \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0^c} \frac{\|X_j\|_2}{n^{1/2}} \max_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0^c} \frac{|g_j|}{(2 \log p)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{p} 1.$$

But recall that $\beta_{k_0} = \{2r(\log p)/n\}^{1/2}$ and thus we have the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(|\beta_{k_0}| \|X_{k_0}\|_2^2 + \omega_{k_0} \|X_{k_0}\|_2 |g_{k_0}| / \{(1 + c_p^2)(2n \log p)\}^{1/2} < 1) \rightarrow 1.$$

This tells that,

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau = \mathcal{S}(\beta)) \leq \lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau \in \mathcal{T}} \mathbb{P}_{\beta^{(p)}}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_\tau = \mathcal{S}_0) = 0.$$

This finishes the proof.

8.2 Proof of Theorem 2

In this proof we reparametrize δ by $8\delta_0$ for algebraic convenience. The main result can be salvaged by back substituting $8\delta_0$ by δ in all the main equations in this section. Also, for brevity of notation, in this proof we use $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}$ and \mathcal{S} to denote that oracle BSS estimator and $\mathcal{S}(\beta)$ respectively. Recall that BSS is defined as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{S}} = \arg \max_{\mathcal{D}, |\mathcal{D}|=s} \|P_{\mathcal{D}}Y\|_2^2 = \arg \min_{\mathcal{D}, |\mathcal{D}|=s} \|(I_n - P_{\mathcal{D}})Y\|_2^2.$$

Thus from the above definition we have the following equality:

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) = \mathbb{P}\left(\|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2 < \max_{\mathcal{D} \neq \mathcal{S}} \|P_{\mathcal{D}}Y\|_2^2\right).$$

Now we will try to understand how the quantity $\|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2$ behaves asymptotically. First it is easy to see that $P_{\mathcal{S}}Y = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j + P_{\mathcal{S}}E$. Note that $\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j = \|\beta\|_2 \tilde{\varepsilon}$ where $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sim \mathbf{N}_n(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and independent of the noise z . Hence we up with the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2 &= \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j \right\|_2^2 + 2E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j \right) + E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}}E \\ &= \left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j \right\|_2^2 + 2E^\top \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} X_j \beta_j \right) + E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}}E \\ &= \|\beta\|_2^2 \|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_2^2 + 2\|\beta\|_2 E^\top \tilde{\varepsilon} + E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}}E. \end{aligned}$$

Recall that $|\beta_j| \geq \{2r(\log p)/n\}^{1/2}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{S}$. This is presumably the hardest setup as increasing signal strength can only decrease the error probability. Then $\|\beta\|_2^2 \geq (2rs \log p)/n$. also note that $E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}}E \sim \chi_s^2$. Hence we have ,

$$\frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} \geq 2r \frac{\|\tilde{\varepsilon}\|_2^2}{n} + 2 \left(\frac{2r}{s \log p} \right)^{1/2} \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}^\top E}{n^{1/2}} + \frac{E^\top P_{\mathcal{S}}E}{s \log p} \xrightarrow{p} 2r.$$

Thus $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) \leq \mathbb{P}(2r \leq \limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathcal{D} \neq \mathcal{S}} \|P_{\mathcal{D}}Y\|_2^2 / (s \log p))$. The limiting behaviour of the obtained maximal process turns out to be very challenging to analyze and hence we do not directly study this maximal process. Instead we focus on a related maximal process (will be defined shortly) derived from the earlier one and we use the results from [Fan et al. \(2018\)](#) to study its asymptotic behaviour. Now let us denote the set $\mathcal{S} \cap \mathcal{D}$ by \mathcal{I}_0 and $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{S}$ by \mathcal{I}_1 , i.e., $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$. Next define the class $\mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0} = \{\mathcal{I}_1 \subseteq [p] : \mathcal{I}_1 \cap \mathcal{S} = \emptyset, |\mathcal{I}_1 \cup \mathcal{I}_0| = s\}$ for each $\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}$. Note that $0 \leq |\mathcal{I}_0| \leq s - 1$ from the construction (if $|\mathcal{I}_0| = s$ then $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{S}$). The random variable of interest can be rewritten as follows:

$$\max_{\mathcal{D} \neq \mathcal{S}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{D}}Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} = \max_{\mathcal{I}_0: \mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}} \max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}Y\|_2^2}{s \log p}.$$

Using union bound we get,

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) \leq \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} > \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2}{s \log p}\right). \quad (14)$$

Now fix a subset \mathcal{I}_0 of the true support \mathcal{S} . Similar to previous section define $\tilde{Y} = Y - X_{\mathcal{I}_0} \beta_{\mathcal{I}_0}$ and this independent of the features in $\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$. Also we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}Y\|_2^2 &= \left\| P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} \tilde{Y} \right\|_2^2 + \|X_{\mathcal{I}_0} \beta_{\mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2 + 2\beta_{\mathcal{I}_0}^\top X_{\mathcal{I}_0}^\top \tilde{Y}, \\ \|P_{\mathcal{S}}Y\|_2^2 &= \left\| P_{\mathcal{S}} \tilde{Y} \right\|_2^2 + \|X_{\mathcal{I}_0} \beta_{\mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2 + 2\beta_{\mathcal{I}_0}^\top X_{\mathcal{I}_0}^\top \tilde{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus the summands in the right hand side of (14) can be written as the probability of the event $\{\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} g\|_2^2 / (s \log p) > \|P_{\mathcal{S}} g\|_2^2 / (s \log p)\}$, where $g := (1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2)^{-1/2} \tilde{Y}$. Note that $g \sim \mathbf{N}_n(0, I_n)$ and is independent of the features in \mathcal{D} . Now fix a specific \mathcal{I}_0 . In the analysis we encounter the maximal process

$$\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} g\|_2^2}{s \log p},$$

Now consider the set of indices $F_{\mathcal{I}_0} = (\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \mathcal{S}) \cup \mathcal{I}_0$. Hence it is easy to see that $\tilde{p} := |F_{\mathcal{I}_0}| = p - s + |\mathcal{I}_0|$. Without loss of generality, let $F_{\mathcal{I}_0} = \{1, \dots, \tilde{p}\}$. Also define $\tilde{s} := s - |\mathcal{I}_0|$. Let the set $\mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0} = \{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\alpha\|_0 = s, \|\alpha\|_2 = 1, \mathcal{I}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\alpha), \alpha_{F_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c} = 0\}$. Here α_J denotes the sub-vector of α corresponding to the indices in $J \subseteq [p]$. Next we will focus on the random variable,

$$\widehat{L}_n := \widehat{L}_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\alpha^\top(g_i x_i)}{(\alpha^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_n \alpha)^{1/2}}, \quad (15)$$

here $\widehat{\Sigma}_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i x_i^\top$. Now recall that $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1$ for all $\mathcal{D} \neq \mathcal{S}$ with $|\mathcal{D}| = s$. To see the connection, first note that the above optimization problem can be viewed as the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}_n &= \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \max_{\alpha \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}} \frac{\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}^\top (\sum_{i=1}^n g_i x_{i, \mathcal{D}} / n^{1/2})}{\{\alpha_{\mathcal{D}}^\top (\widehat{\Sigma}_{n, \mathcal{D}}) \alpha_{\mathcal{D}}\}^{1/2}} \\ &= \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \left\{ \left(\sum_{i=1}^n g_i x_{i, \mathcal{D}} / n^{1/2} \right)^\top \widehat{\Sigma}_{n, \mathcal{D}}^{-1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n g_i x_{i, \mathcal{D}} / n^{1/2} \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ &= \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \{g^\top X_{\mathcal{D}} (X_{\mathcal{D}}^\top X_{\mathcal{D}})^{-1} X_{\mathcal{D}}^\top g\}^{1/2} \\ &= \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} g\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus it is essential to study the asymptotic property of \widehat{L}_n . Now we define the standardized version of \widehat{L}_n as follows

$$L_n := L_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{1}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha^\top(g_i x_i).$$

Let $\mathbf{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_{\tilde{p}})$ be \tilde{p} -variate Gaussian random variable with covariance matrix $I_{\tilde{p} \times \tilde{p}}$ and define the random variable $T^* := T^*(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) = \sup_{\alpha \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \alpha_{F_{\mathcal{I}_0}}^\top \mathbf{Z}$.

Lemma 1 *There exists universal constants K_0, K_1 such that for any $\delta_1 \in (0, K_0 K_1]$,*

$$|L_n - T^*| \lesssim n^{-1} c_n^{1/2}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) + K_0 K_1 n^{-3/2} c_n^2(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) + \delta_1 \quad (16)$$

holds with probability at least $1 - C \Delta_n(s, \tilde{p}; \delta_1)$ where $c_n(s, \tilde{p}) = s \log(e\tilde{p}/s) \vee \log n$ and

$$\Delta_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}; \delta_1) = (K_0 K_1)^3 \frac{\{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^2}{\delta_1^3 n^{1/2}} + (K_0 K_1)^4 \frac{\{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^5}{\delta_1^4 n}$$

with $b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) = \log(\tilde{p}/\tilde{s}) \vee \log n$.

Lemma 2 Assume that the sample size satisfies $n \geq C_1(K_0 \vee K_1)^4 c_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})$. then with probability at least $1 - C_2 n^{-1/2} c_n^{1/2}(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})$,

$$\left| \widehat{L}_n - L_n \right| \lesssim (K_0 \vee K_1)^2 K_0 K_1 n^{-1/2} c_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}), \quad (17)$$

where $c_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) = \tilde{s} \log(e\tilde{p}/\tilde{s}) \vee \log n$.

Proof of the above two lemmas are omitted as it is in the same line of the proofs of [Fan et al. \(2018\)](#). Now applying Lemma 1 and 2 with

$$\delta_1 = \delta_1(s, \tilde{p}) = (K_0 K_1)^{3/4} \min[1, n^{-1/8} \{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^{3/8}]$$

yields that with probability at least $1 - C(K_0 K_1)^{3/4} n^{-1/8} \{\tilde{s} b_n(s, \tilde{p})\}^{7/8}$,

$$\left| \widehat{L}_n - T^* \right| \lesssim (K_0 K_1)^{3/4} n^{-1/8} \{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^{3/8}.$$

Together with Lemma 2.3 from [Chernozhukov et al. \(2014\)](#) we can conclude that

$$\sup_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \left| \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}_n \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(T^* \leq t) \right| \lesssim C(K_0 K_1)^{3/4} n^{-1/8} \{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^{7/8}. \quad (18)$$

Next by the definition of T^* it follows that

$$T^{*2} = \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \|\mathbf{Z}_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1}\|_2^2 = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 + \max_{\mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{I}_1} Z_k^2.$$

Let $\mathbf{W} \sim N_{(p-s)}(0, \mathbf{I}_{(p-s)})$ be a Gaussian vector independent of \mathbf{Z} . Thus it follows that

$$T^{*2} \stackrel{d}{=} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 + \sum_{k=p-2s+|\mathcal{I}_0|+1}^{p-s} W_{(k:p-s)}^2 \leq \sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 + (s - |\mathcal{I}_0|) W_{(p-s:p-s)}^2.$$

From Equation (18) it also follows that

$$\sup_{t \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{P}(\widehat{L}_n^2 \leq t) - \mathbb{P}(T^{*2} \leq t) \right| \lesssim C(K_0 K_1)^{3/4} n^{-1/8} \{\tilde{s} b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p})\}^{7/8}. \quad (19)$$

Now from the assumption we have $r = 1 + 8\delta_0$. Assume that

$$s \leq 0.5 \min\left\{\delta_0, \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}\right\} \log p.$$

Hence $|\mathcal{I}_0| \leq s - 1 \leq \delta_0 \log p$. Thus we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(T^{*2} > 2(1 + 4\delta_0)(s - |\mathcal{I}_0|) \log p) \\
&= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 + (s - |\mathcal{I}_0|)W_{(p-s:p-s)}^2 > 2(1 + 4\delta_0)(s - |\mathcal{I}_0|) \log p\right) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 > 4\delta_0(s - |\mathcal{I}_0|) \log p\right) + \mathbb{P}\left((s - |\mathcal{I}_0|)W_{(p-s:p-s)}^2 > 2(1 + 2\delta_0)(s - |\mathcal{I}_0|) \log p\right) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 - |\mathcal{I}_0|}{|\mathcal{I}_0|} > (4\delta_0 \log p - |\mathcal{I}_0|)/|\mathcal{I}_0|\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(W_{(p-s:p-s)}^2 > 2(1 + 2\delta_0) \log p\right) \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{I}_0} Z_j^2 - |\mathcal{I}_0|}{|\mathcal{I}_0|} > (3\delta_0 \log p)/|\mathcal{I}_0|\right) + \mathbb{P}\left(W_{(p-s:p-s)}^2 > 2(1 + 2\delta_0) \log p\right) \\
&\lesssim \exp(-0.75\delta_0 \log p) + (p - s) \mathbb{P}\left(W_1^2 > 2(1 + 2\delta_0) \log p\right) \\
&\lesssim p^{-0.75\delta_0} + C \frac{p^{-2\delta_0}}{\sqrt{\log p}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (a) uses $s - |\mathcal{I}_0| \geq 1$ and inequality (b) uses $|\mathcal{I}_0| < s < \delta_0 \log p$. Now define the event $\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0} := \{\|P_S g\|_2^2 / s \log p > 2(1 + 4\delta_0)R_{\mathcal{I}_0}\}$ where $R_{\mathcal{I}_0} := (s - |\mathcal{I}_0|)/s$. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\|P_S g\|_2^2}{s \log p} &\geq \frac{\left\| \frac{\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0} X_j \beta_j + P_S E}{(1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2)^{1/2}} \right\|_2^2}{s \log p} \\
&\geq \frac{\left\{ \frac{\|\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0} X_j \beta_j\|_2}{(1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2)^{1/2}} - \frac{\|P_S E\|_2}{(1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2)^{1/2}} \right\}^2}{s \log p} = (T_1^{1/2} - T_2^{1/2})^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

where

$$T_1 := \frac{\left\| \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0} X_j \beta_j \right\|_2^2}{(1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2) s \log p} \geq \frac{2r R_{\mathcal{I}_0}}{1 + 2r(s - |\mathcal{I}_0|)(\log p)/n} \frac{V_n}{n},$$

and

$$V_n := \frac{\|\sum_{j \in \mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0} X_j \beta_j\|_2^2}{\|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2}$$

is an χ_n^2 random variable. Also we have

$$T_2 := \frac{\|P_S E\|_2^2}{(1 + \|\beta_{\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{I}_0}\|_2^2) s \log p} \leq V_s / s \log p$$

where $V_s := \|P_S E\|_2^2$ is an χ_s^2 random variable independent of X_S . Next we state the following simple algebraic relationship:

$$(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} - \frac{\delta_0}{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}} \geq (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}.$$

In light of Equation (20) and using the above algebraic inequality we have the following:

$$\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c \subseteq \{T_1 \leq 2(1 + 6\delta_0)R_{\mathcal{I}_0}\} \cup \{T_2 \geq 2\delta_0^2\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^{-2}R_{\mathcal{I}_0}\}$$

Next we have

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1 \leq 2(1 + 6\delta_0)R_{\mathcal{I}_0}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_n}{n} \leq \frac{1 + 6\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0}(1 + 2rs \log p/n)\right).$$

Now choose large n such that $(1 + 6\delta_0)(1 + 2rs \log p/n) < (1 + 7\delta_0)$. Then for large n we have,

$$\mathbb{P}(T_1 \leq 2(1 + 6\delta_0)R_{\mathcal{I}_0}) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(|V_n/n - 1| \geq \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0}\right) \lesssim \exp\left(-C^* \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0}n\right),$$

where C^* is an universal constant. Now we analyze the quantity T_2 . We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(T_2 \geq \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}R_{\mathcal{I}_0}) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(V_s/s \geq \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}R_{\mathcal{I}_0} \log p) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(V_s \geq \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2} \log p) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}(|V_s/s - 1| \geq 0.5 \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}(\log p)/s) \\ & \leq \exp(-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2} \log p) \\ & = p^{-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Ultimately it shows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c) \lesssim \exp\left(-C^* \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0}n\right) + p^{-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}}$. Now we are

ready to show that the error probability goes to 0.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}_\beta(\widehat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) &\leq \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} > \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} > \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p} > \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}} Y\|_2^2}{s \log p}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} g\|_2^2}{s \log p} > \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{S}} g\|_2^2}{s \log p}, \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c) \\
&\leq \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{\mathcal{I}_1: \mathcal{I}_1 \in \mathcal{J}_{\mathcal{I}_0}} \frac{\|P_{\mathcal{I}_0 \cup \mathcal{I}_1} g\|_2^2}{s \log p} > 2(1 + 4\delta_0)R_{\mathcal{I}_0} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\lesssim} \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} \left[\mathbb{P}(T^{*2} > 2(1 + 4\delta_0)sR_{\mathcal{I}_0} \log p) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{I}_0}^c) + C(K_0 K_1)^{3/4} n^{-1/8} \{sb_n(s, p)\}^{7/8} \right] \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \sum_{\mathcal{I}_0: |\mathcal{I}_0|=k} p^{-0.75\delta_0} + C \frac{p^{-2\delta_0}}{\sqrt{\log p}} + \exp\left(-C^* \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0} n\right) + p^{-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1+6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1+4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}} \\
&\quad + n^{-1/8} \{sb_n(s, p)\}^{7/8} \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \binom{s}{k} \left[C_{\delta_0} \frac{p^{-2\delta_0}}{\sqrt{\log p}} + \exp\left(-C^* \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0} n\right) + p^{-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1+6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1+4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}} + n^{-1/8} \{sb_n(s, p)\}^{7/8} \right] \\
&\lesssim 2^s \left[C_{\delta_0} \frac{p^{-2\delta_0}}{\sqrt{\log p}} + \exp\left(-C^* \frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0} n\right) + p^{-C' \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1+6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1+4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2}} + n^{-1/8} \{sb_n(s, p)\}^{7/8} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Inequality (a) uses $\tilde{s}b_n(\tilde{s}, \tilde{p}) \leq sb_n(s, p)$ for large p . Thus if

$$s \lesssim \left(\frac{\delta_0}{1 + 8\delta_0} \wedge \frac{2\delta_0^2}{\{(1 + 6\delta_0)^{1/2} + (1 + 4\delta_0)^{1/2}\}^2} \wedge \frac{k}{16} \right) \log p$$

, then error probability goes to 0 uniformly over $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a$.

References

- Agarwal, A., Negahban, S., and Wainwright, M. J. (2012). Fast global convergence of gradient methods for high-dimensional statistical recovery. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(5):2452–2482.
- Arias-Castro, E., Candès, E. J., and Plan, Y. (2011). Global testing under sparse alternatives: ANOVA, multiple comparisons and the higher criticism. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39:2533–2556.

- Bertsimas, D., King, A., and Mazumder, R. (2016). Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):813–852.
- Bertsimas, D. and Van Parys, B. (2020). Sparse high-dimensional regression: Exact scalable algorithms and phase transitions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(1):300–323.
- Bickel, P. J., Ritov, Y., and Tsybakov, A. B. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(4):1705–1732.
- Blumensath, T. and Davies, M. E. (2009). Iterative hard thresholding for compressed sensing. *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 27(3):265–274.
- Candès, E. J., Romberg, J., and Tao, T. (2006). Robust uncertainty principles: Exact signal reconstruction from highly incomplete frequency information. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(2):489–509.
- Candes, E. J. and Tao, T. (2006). Near-optimal signal recovery from random projections: Universal encoding strategies? *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 52(12):5406–5425.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2014). Gaussian approximation of suprema of empirical processes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(4):1564–1597.
- Consortium, W. T. C. C. et al. (2007). Genome-wide association study of 14,000 cases of seven common diseases and 3,000 shared controls. *Nature*, 447(7145):661.
- Donoho, D. L. (2006). Compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 52(4):1289–1306.
- Fan, J., Guo, Y., and Zhu, Z. (2020). When is best subset selection the” best”? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.01478*.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(5):849–911.
- Fan, J., Shao, Q.-M., and Zhou, W.-X. (2018). Are discoveries spurious? Distributions of maximum spurious correlations and their applications. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(3):989.
- Fletcher, A. K., Rangan, S., and Goyal, V. K. (2009). Necessary and sufficient conditions for sparsity pattern recovery. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5758–5772.
- Genovese, C. R., Jin, J., Wasserman, L., and Yao, Z. (2012). A comparison of the lasso and marginal regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13:2107–2143.
- Guo, X., Zhang, H., Wang, Y., and Wu, J.-L. (2015). Model selection and estimation in high dimensional regression models with group SCAD. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 103:86–92.

- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Tibshirani, R. (2020). Best subset, forward stepwise or lasso? analysis and recommendations based on extensive comparisons. *Statistical Science*, 35(4):579–592.
- Hong, H. G., Kang, J., and Li, Y. (2018). Conditional screening for ultra-high dimensional covariates with survival outcomes. *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 24(1):45–71.
- Huang, D., Li, R., and Wang, H. (2014). Feature screening for ultrahigh dimensional categorical data with applications. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 32(2):237–244.
- Huang, T.-J., McKeague, I. W., and Qian, M. (2019). Marginal screening for high-dimensional predictors of survival outcomes. *Statistica Sinica*, 29(4):2105.
- Jain, P., Tewari, A., and Kar, P. (2014). On iterative hard thresholding methods for high-dimensional M-estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27.
- Ji, P., Jin, J., et al. (2012). Ups delivers optimal phase diagram in high-dimensional variable selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(1):73–103.
- Jin, J., Zhang, C.-H., and Zhang, Q. (2014). Optimality of graphlet screening in high dimensional variable selection. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2723–2772.
- Leisenring, W., Pepe, M., and Longton, G. (1997). A marginal regression modelling framework for evaluating medical diagnostic tests. *Statistics in Medicine*, 16(11):1263–1281.
- Li, J., Zheng, Q., Peng, L., and Huang, Z. (2016). Survival impact index and ultrahigh-dimensional model-free screening with survival outcomes. *Biometrics*, 72(4):1145–1154.
- Li, Y., Hong, H. G., Ahmed, S. E., and Li, Y. (2019). Weak signals in high-dimensional regression: Detection, estimation and prediction. *Applied Stochastic Models in Business and Industry*, 35(2):283–298.
- Liu, H. and Foygel Barber, R. (2020). Between hard and soft thresholding: optimal iterative thresholding algorithms. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 9(4):899–933.
- Lu, W. (2005). Marginal regression of multivariate event times based on linear transformation models. *Lifetime Data Analysis*, 11(3):389–404.
- Marttinen, P., Gillberg, J., Havulinna, A., Corander, J., and Kaski, S. (2013). Genome-wide association studies with high-dimensional phenotypes. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 12(4):413–431.
- Ndaoud, M. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2020). Optimal variable selection and adaptive noisy compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(4):2517–2532.
- Robins, J. M., Scheines, R., Spirtes, P., and Wasserman, L. (2003). Uniform consistency in causal inference. *Biometrika*, 90(3):491–515.
- Su, W., Bogdan, M., and Candes, E. (2017). False discoveries occur early on the lasso path. *The Annals of statistics*, pages 2133–2150.

- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 58(1):267–288.
- Tikhonov, A. (1943). On the stability of inverse problems. *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 39:195–198.
- Van De Geer, S. A. and Bühlmann, P. (2009). On the conditions used to prove oracle results for the lasso. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:1360–1392.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2009). Information-theoretic limits on sparsity recovery in the high-dimensional and noisy setting. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5728–5741.
- Wang, C. D., Chen, Z., Lian, Y., and Chen, M. (2022). Asset selection based on high frequency sharpe ratio. *Journal of Econometrics*, to appear.
- Wang, W., Wainwright, M. J., and Ramchandran, K. (2010). Information-theoretic limits on sparse signal recovery: Dense versus sparse measurement matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(6):2967–2979.
- Wasserman, L. and Roeder, K. (2009). High dimensional variable selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5A):2178.
- Yang, S., Wen, J., Eckert, S. T., Wang, Y., Liu, D. J., Wu, R., Li, R., and Zhan, X. (2020). Prioritizing genetic variants in gwas with lasso using permutation-assisted tuning. *Bioinformatics*, 36(12):3811–3817.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(2):894–942.
- Zhang, Y., Wainwright, M. J., and Jordan, M. I. (2014). Lower bounds on the performance of polynomial-time algorithms for sparse linear regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 921–948. PMLR.
- Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of lasso. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:2541–2563.
- Zhu, J., Wen, C., Zhu, J., Zhang, H., and Wang, X. (2020). A polynomial algorithm for best-subset selection problem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(52):33117–33123.
- Zhu, Z. and Wu, S. (2021). On the early solution path of best subset selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06939*.

9 Appendix

9.1 Proof of Theorem 3

We first present a result from Wang et al. (2010) which gives us necessary condition for asymptotic exact recovery.

Theorem 5 (Wang et al. (2010)) Consider the model (1) with the design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be drawn with i.i.d elements from any distribution with zero mean and unit variance. Let $a := \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\beta_j|$, i.e., it denote the minimum signal strength of β . Define the function

$$f_m(p, s, a) := \frac{\log \binom{p-s+m}{m} - 1}{\frac{1}{2} \log \left(1 + ma^2 \left(1 - \frac{m}{p-s+m} \right) \right)}, \quad 1 \leq m \leq s.$$

Then $n \geq \max\{f_1(p, s, a), \dots, f_s(p, s, a), s\}$ is necessary for asymptotic exact recovery.

In the light of Theorem 5 the proof of Theorem 3 is follows immediately. To see this note that if $r < 1$ then there exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $r = 1 - \alpha$. Also recall that $a = \{2r(\log p)/n\}^{1/2}$, $s = O(\log p)$ and $n = \lfloor p^k \rfloor$. Note that $f_1(p, s, a)/n \sim \frac{1}{1-\alpha}$. This shows that asymptotically the necessary condition in above theorem is violated and hence $r \geq 1$ is necessary.

9.2 Proof of Theorem 4

We first introduce some standard assumptions analyzing ETS.

Definition 1 (RSC property) A differentiable function $F : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to satisfy restricted strong convexity (RSC) at sparsity level $s = s_1 + s_2$ with strong convexity constraint ℓ_s if the following holds for all θ_1, θ_2 s.t. $\|\theta_1\|_0 \leq s_1$ and $\|\theta_2\|_0 \leq s_2$:

$$F(\theta_1) - F(\theta_2) \geq \langle \theta_1 - \theta_2, \nabla_{\theta} F(\theta_2) \rangle + \frac{\ell_s}{2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_2^2.$$

Definition 2 (RSS property) A differentiable function $F : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to satisfy restricted strong smoothness (RSS) at sparsity level $s = s_1 + s_2$ with strong smoothness constraint L_s if the following holds for all θ_1, θ_2 s.t. $\|\theta_1\|_0 \leq s_1$ and $\|\theta_2\|_0 \leq s_2$:

$$F(\theta_1) - F(\theta_2) \leq \langle \theta_1 - \theta_2, \nabla_{\theta} F(\theta_2) \rangle + \frac{L_s}{2} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\|_2^2.$$

Now we quote an important theorem from Jain et al. (2014) which quantifies the sub-optimality gap of Algorithm 1.

Theorem 6 (Jain et al. (2014)) Let F has RSC and RSS parameters given by $\ell_{2\hat{s}+s}(F) = \alpha$ and $L_{2\hat{s}+\hat{\pi}}(F) = L$ respectively. Call Algorithm 1 with $\hat{s} \geq 32L^2\ell^{-2}s$ and $h = 2/(3L)$. Also let $\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\theta, \|\theta\|_0 \leq s} F(\theta)$. Then t th iterate of Algorithm 1 for $t = O(L\ell^{-1} \log(F(\beta^{(0)})/\epsilon))$ satisfies:

$$F(\beta^{(t)}) - F(\hat{\beta}) \leq \epsilon.$$

In our setup, the observations $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are coming from i.i.d. mean zero isotropic Gaussian distribution. Thus, lemma 6 from Agarwal et al. (2012) immediately tells that RSC and RSS at any sparsity level m hold for $f_{n_1}(\cdot)$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c_0 n_1)$ with $\ell_m = \frac{1}{2} - c_1(m \log p)/n_1$ and $L_m = 2 + c_1(m \log p)/n_1$, where c_0, c_1 are universal constants. Now set $m = 2\hat{s} + s$ and recall that $n_1 \sim \gamma p^k$. If $n_1 > 4c_1(2\hat{s} + s) \log p$ then we have $\ell_m \geq 1/4$ and $L_m \leq 9/4$, which means that $L_m/(9\ell_m) \leq 1$. Thus to apply Theorem 6 it is enough to choose $\hat{s} = 2592s$. Also by the assumption on n for large p we have $n_1 > 4c_1(2\hat{s} + s) \log p$. Let $f_{n_1}(\theta) := n_1^{-1} \|Y^{(1)} - X^{(1)}\theta\|_2^2$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Note that $f_{n_1}(0) = n_1^{-1} \|Y^{(1)}\|_2^2 \stackrel{d}{=} (1 + \|\beta\|_2^2) V_{n_1}/n_1$, where V_{n_1} is chi-square random variable with n_1 degrees of freedom. Also by Bernstein's type inequality it follows that $|(V_{n_1}/n_1) - 1| \leq 1/2$ with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c_4 n_1)$, where c_4 is a universal positive constant. Thus if $t = O(L_m \ell_m^{-1} \log((1 + \|\beta\|_2^2)/\epsilon))$, then we have $f_{n_1}(\beta^{(t)}) - f_{n_1}(\hat{\beta}) \leq \epsilon$. Thus by Theorem 3 of Jain et al. (2014) it follows that with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c_0 n_1) - \exp(-c_4 n_1) - c_2 p^{-c_3}$ (c_2, c_3 are universal constants) we have

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta\|_2 \leq C \left\{ \left(\frac{s \log p}{n_1} \right)^{1/2} + \epsilon^{1/2} \right\},$$

for some universal positive constant C . In practice one can use the full data in both steps of ETS but for theoretical convenience we use data splitting in the algorithm. The key idea here is to use one subsample for obtaining $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ and the remaining subsample in the screening step. Due to this $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ becomes independent of the second subsample, thus making the analysis of ETS easy.

For notational brevity we write η instead of η_β . Define the event $\mathcal{H} = \left\{ \|\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}} - \beta\|_2 \leq \xi_p \right\}$, where $\xi_p = C \left\{ \left(\frac{s \log p}{n_1} \right)^{1/2} + \epsilon^{1/2} \right\} \leq (A\epsilon)^{1/2}$ (for some universal constant $A > 0$) and $\hat{\beta}^{\text{iht}}$ is based on the subsample \mathcal{D}_1 . From Theorem 3 of Jain et al. (2014), it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^c) \leq \exp(-c_0 n_1) + \exp(-c_4 n_1) + c_2 p^{-c_3}$.

Next, for algebraic convenience we again reparametrize δ as $8\delta_0$ and set $\epsilon = 6\delta_0/A, \varsigma = (1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}$. Now note that for any $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_a^s$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\eta} \neq \eta | \mathcal{D}_1) &\leq \sum_{j:\beta_j=0} \mathbb{P}(\hat{\eta}_j = 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) + \sum_{j:\beta_j \neq 0} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\eta}_j \neq 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^c | \mathcal{D}_1) \\ &= \sum_{j:\beta_j=0} \mathbb{P}_\beta(|\Delta_j| > \kappa_\varsigma(X_j^{(2)}), \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) + \sum_{j:\beta_j \neq 0} \mathbb{P}_\beta(|\Delta_j| \leq \kappa_\varsigma(X_j^{(2)}), \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{H}^c | \mathcal{D}_1), \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that conditionally on $\hat{\beta}$ and X_j , the random variable Δ_j has the same distribution

as (10), we conclude that for all $j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta_j = 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left((1 + \xi_p^2)^{1/2} |g_j| > \frac{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2}{2} + \frac{(1 + A\epsilon) \log p}{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2}, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left((1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} |g_j| > \frac{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2}{2} + \frac{(1 + A\epsilon) \log p}{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2}, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1 \right) \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \bar{\Phi} \left(\frac{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2}{2(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} \log p}{a \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2} \right) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\bar{\Phi}(\cdot)$ denotes the survival function of standard Gaussian random variable. Now note that for each j we have $\|X_j\|_2^2 \stackrel{d}{=} V_{n_2}$, where V_{n_2} is a chi-squared random variable with n_2 degrees of freedom. Thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_j = 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \bar{\Phi} \left(\frac{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}}{2(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}} + \frac{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} \log p}{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}} \right) \right\}.$$

Analogous argument and the fact that $|\beta_j| \geq a$ for all $\beta_j \neq 0$, leads to the fact that for all $j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)$,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_j \neq 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left\{ \bar{\Phi} \left(\max \left\{ \frac{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}}{2(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}} - \frac{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} \log p}{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}}, 0 \right\} \right) \right\}.$$

Now recall that $\epsilon = \frac{6\delta_0}{A}$ and $\gamma \in (0, \frac{\delta_0}{1+8\delta_0})$. With this choice of tuning parameters it is easy to see that $r(1 - \gamma)/(1 + A\epsilon) \geq \frac{1+7\delta_0}{1+6\delta_0} > 1$ and hence as $p \rightarrow \infty$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n_2} &:= \frac{1}{(\log p)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}}{2(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}} - \frac{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} \log p}{aV_{n_2}^{1/2}} \right) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \frac{1}{(2r)^{1/2}} \left\{ r \left(\frac{1 - \gamma}{1 + A\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\frac{1 + A\epsilon}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{1/2} \right\} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

The above display uses the fact that $n_2/n \rightarrow 1 - \gamma$ and $V_{n_2}/n_2 \xrightarrow{p} 1$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. Next let us define the following quantity q :

$$q := q(A, \epsilon, \delta_0, \gamma) = \frac{1}{\{2(1 + 8\delta_0)\}^{1/2}} \left\{ (1 + 8\delta_0) \left(\frac{1 - \gamma}{1 + A\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\frac{1 + A\epsilon}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

Due to choice of ϵ and γ it is easy to show $q > 0$. Now define the event $G_{n_2} := \{W_{n_2} > q/2\}$. Before we proceed it is useful to note the following:

$$W_{n_2} = \frac{1}{(2r)^{1/2}} \left(\frac{r\{V_{n_2}/(n(1 - \gamma))\}^{1/2}(1 - \gamma)^{1/2}}{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}} - \frac{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}}{\{V_{n_2}/(n(1 - \gamma))\}^{1/2}(1 - \gamma)^{1/2}} \right).$$

Next define the function

$$H(u) := \frac{1}{(2 + 16\delta_0)^{1/2}} \left\{ u(1 + 8\delta_0) \left(\frac{1 - \gamma}{1 + A\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{u} \left(\frac{1 + A\epsilon}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{1/2} \right\}, \quad u > 0.$$

As $r = 1 + 8\delta_0$ we have $W_{n_2} = H(\{V_{n_2}/(n(1 - \gamma))\}^{1/2})$. It is also easy to see that $H(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing function on $(0, \infty)$ and $H(1) = q$. Hence $\lambda_{\delta_0} := H^{-1}(q/2) \in (0, 1)$. Now $G_{n_2}^c = \{W_{n_2} \leq q/2\} \subseteq \{H(\{V_{n_2}/(n(1 - \gamma))\}^{1/2}) \leq q/2\}$. Thus a straight forward calculation shows that that,

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n_2}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_{n_2}}{n_2} \leq \frac{n(1 - \gamma)}{n_2} \lambda_{\delta_0}^2\right).$$

Choose p large enough such that $n_2/n > \lambda_{\delta_0}(1 - \gamma)$ and hence we have,

$$\mathbb{P}(G_{n_2}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{V_{n_2}}{n_2} \leq \lambda_{\delta_0}\right) \lesssim \exp(-K_{\delta_0}n_2),$$

where K_{δ_0} is constant depending on δ_0 . Note that $\bar{\Phi}(t) \leq e^{-t^2/2}$ for all $t > 0$. Using this fact we have the following:

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_j = 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left\{ - \left(1 + \frac{W_{n_2}^2}{2} \right) \log p \right\} \mathbb{1}_{G_{n_2}} \right] + \mathbb{P}(G_{n_2}^c) \lesssim p^{-(1+q^2/8)} + \exp(-K_{\delta_0}n_2),$$

for all $j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)$. Similarly,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta_j \neq 1, \mathcal{H} | \mathcal{D}_1) \lesssim p^{-q^2/8} + \exp(-K_{\delta_0}n_2), \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta).$$

Thus marginalizing out \mathcal{D}_1 and summing over all j we get,

$$\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(\hat{\eta} \neq \eta) \lesssim p^{-q^2/8} \log p + p \exp(-K_{\delta_0}n_2) + \exp(-c_0n_1) + \exp(-c_4n_1) + c_2p^{-c_3}.$$

Now taking $p \rightarrow \infty$ we have the result.

9.3 Proof of Corollary 1

Similar to previous proofs, we reparametrize δ by $8\delta_0$ and set $\epsilon = 6\delta_0/A, \varsigma = (1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2}$. Now note that, it is enough to prove the following:

$$\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| < \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| \right) \rightarrow 1$$

as $p \rightarrow \infty$. To this end first define the following quantity:

$$t_p := \frac{\left(\frac{2rn_2 \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2}}{2} + \frac{\varsigma^2 \log p}{\left(\frac{2rn_2 \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2}}.$$

We will show that $\lim_{p \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| > t_p, \max_{j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| \leq t_p \right) \rightarrow 1$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. For convenience let us define the events $G_{\min} := \{ \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| > t_p \}$ and $G_{\max} :=$

$\{\max_{j \notin \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |\Delta_j| \leq t_p\}$. Let \mathcal{H} be the event as defined in Section 9.2. First we will analyze $\mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c)$. Note that $\mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c) \leq \mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c \cap \mathcal{H}) + \mathbb{P}_\beta(\mathcal{H}^c)$. Now the second term goes to 0 uniformly over $\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a$. Also using Equation (10) under the event \mathcal{H} we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c \cap \mathcal{H}) \\ & \leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \left| \beta_j \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2 + (1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} g_j \right| \leq t_p \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \frac{|g_j|}{(\log p)^{1/2}} \geq \frac{1}{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} (\log p)^{1/2}} \left\{ a \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2 - t_p \right\} \right) \\ & \leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \frac{|g_j|}{(\log p)^{1/2}} \geq \frac{1}{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} (\log p)^{1/2}} \left\{ a \min_{j \in [p]} \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2 - t_p \right\} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where $\{g_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)}$ are non i.i.d. standard Gaussian. Note that $|\mathcal{S}(\beta)| = O(\log p)$. Hence $\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} |g_j| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\log \log p)$, which tells that

$$\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \frac{|g_j|}{(\log p)^{1/2}} \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} 0.$$

Also using lemma 3 from Fletcher et al. (2009) we have

$$\frac{1}{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} (\log p)^{1/2}} \left(a \min_{j \in [p]} \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2 - t_p \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbb{P}} \frac{1}{(2r)^{1/2}} \left\{ r \left(\frac{1 - \gamma}{1 + A\epsilon} \right)^{1/2} - \left(\frac{1 + A\epsilon}{1 - \gamma} \right)^{1/2} \right\}.$$

The right hand side of the above display is at least $q(A, \epsilon, \delta_0, \gamma)$ (defined in Section 9.2) which is strictly positive. Again for compactness we use q instead of $q(A, \epsilon, \delta_0, \gamma)$. The above display motivates us to define the following event:

$$\mathcal{E}_p = \left\{ \frac{1}{(1 + A\epsilon)^{1/2} (\log p)^{1/2}} \left(a \min_{j \in [p]} \|X_j^{(2)}\|_2 - t_p \right) \geq q/2 \right\},$$

and it follows that $\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_p^c) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. This leads to the following inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c \cap \mathcal{H}) & \leq \sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta \left(\max_{j \in \mathcal{S}(\beta)} \frac{|g_j|}{(\log p)^{1/2}} \geq q/2 \right) + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_p^c) \\ & \lesssim p^{-q^2/8} \log p + \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{E}_p^c) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\min}^c) \rightarrow 0$. Similarly it can be shown that $\sup_{\beta \in \mathcal{M}_s^a} \mathbb{P}_\beta(G_{\max}^c) \rightarrow 0$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$. These two claims together completes the proof.