

Grouping predictors via network-wide metrics

Brandon Woosuk Park¹, Anand N. Vidyashankar², and Tucker S. McElroy³

¹Department of Statistics, Volgencau School of Engineering, George Mason University

²Department of Statistics, Volgencau School of Engineering, George Mason University

³ U.S. Census Bureau

May 7, 2024

Abstract

When multitudes of features can plausibly be associated with a response, both privacy considerations and model parsimony suggest grouping them to increase the predictive power of a regression model. Specifically, the identification of groups of predictors significantly associated with the response variable eases further downstream analysis and decision-making. This paper proposes a new data analysis methodology that utilizes the high-dimensional predictor space to construct an implicit network with weighted edges to identify significant associations between the response and the predictors. Using a population model for groups of predictors defined via network-wide metrics, a new supervised grouping algorithm is proposed to determine the correct group, with probability tending to one as the sample size diverges to infinity. For this reason, we establish several theoretical properties of the estimates of network-wide metrics. A novel model-assisted bootstrap procedure that substantially decreases computational complexity is developed, facilitating the assessment of uncertainty in the estimates of network-wide metrics. The proposed methods account for several challenges that arise in the high-dimensional data setting, including (i) a large number of predictors, (ii) uncertainty regarding the true statistical model, and (iii) model selection variability. The performance of the proposed methods is demonstrated through numerical experiments, data from sports analytics, and breast cancer data.

KEYWORDS: Implicit Network, Partial correlation, Supervised clustering, Post-Selection Inference.

1. INTRODUCTION

High-dimensional data are pervasive in several areas of modern science, and complexities in such data are increasing over time. While some data, such as those from GWAS (Genome-Wide Association Study), are generated from high throughput experiments, newly emerging data may also arise from integrating several “smaller” data sets. While the defining characteristics of variables in different data sets are usually hard to identify, it is, however, expected that they share few attributes or traits. As a general motivating example, in the study of emerging antimicrobial resistance, it is typical that several “atomic level features” are combined to define a macro feature, mainly using data from dry labs. These macro features from various labs are then related to responses from biological experiments from wet labs. Since the macro features tend to share few atomic features and the effect of a macro feature on the responses is unknown, it is an important scientific question to identify groups of macro features with a “similar” effect on the responses.

To resolve problems of this type in real applications, methods such as incorporating an L_2 -penalty or bridge penalty in a regression model tend to be used. However, these methods do not take into account the correlation structure explicitly. Additionally, even if the correlation structure could be integrated into the methodology, what is missing currently is an understanding of the effect of dependent covariates on the response variable after accounting for the remaining variables. The problem is more complicated in the setting when the number of covariates p is much larger than n , the sample size. Thus, again focusing on the widely used regression models, the following question becomes pertinent: should one first group (cluster) the variables and then perform a regression using a reasonable representative of the cluster, or use the regression model to cluster and perform analyses simultaneously?

In this manuscript, we illustrate that the latter approach can be valuable in applications such as sports and health analytics. Additionally, we show that it is feasible to incorporate a learning component into the methodology and use learned clusters for additional downstream data analyses. This, in effect, allows one to account for variable selection uncertainty in the data analyses and estimation of clusters. Specifically, the proposed approach facilitates a supervised clustering of the feature set, that is, a grouping of features that accounts for information about the responses. The grouped feature sets can then be used to perform data analyses to investigate the effect of summary

information from a cluster on the response variable.

The proposed methodology involves the construction of a weighted implicit network and analyzing the network-wide metrics (NWM), which account for the structure of the underlying statistical model. A sequential hypothesis testing procedure is then employed to identify the cluster. The proposed clustering algorithm adopts statistical hypothesis testing to compare the NWMs between two covariates based on their statistical distribution. This generates a statistically associated group of covariates with respect to the response variable. The end product is a pre-determined number of groups (clusters) where the members of a specified cluster have “similar” NWM values. The similarity (based on the NWM values) is evaluated using the association between the response and the covariates; this association is a metric, so that “similar” NWM values of two covariates indicate their proximity in the weighted implicit network. Furthermore, the weights of the implicit network can be chosen to generate other clusters (such as correlation-based, canonical correlation-based, or information theory-based) investigated in the literature. Section 5 details the proposed clustering algorithm and its statistical properties.

A key issue in our methodological development is that the statistical model is unknown. One approach to identification, assuming a linear relationship between the response variable and the feature set is to invoke data-splitting followed by regularization methods. However, this yields a random predictor set. Hence, to reduce the effect of such randomness, we perform the splitting multiple times and refine the recently developed techniques in Khalili and Vidyashankar (2018) to estimate a statistical model. We then construct a weighted implicit network using the random model and investigate the properties of clusters obtained from the proposed supervised algorithm.

Our main contributions in this manuscript are as follows: First, we develop a rigorous approach to constructing a weighted implicit network that explicitly takes into account the structure of the statistical model and analyzes the statistical properties of several NWMs. Second, we use the NWM to describe a new supervised clustering algorithm. The algorithm yields feature sets that can then be utilized to study the effect of the response variable on the summary information from the cluster. As a consequence, the clustering of the feature set yields a dimension-reduction mechanism. Third, under a posited population model, we provide theoretical guarantees for the consistency of the supervised clustering algorithm. We illustrate our contributions with extensive simulations and

data analyses.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces basic concepts of networks, including types of networks and definitions of network-wide metrics. Section 3 describes our methodology to construct the implicit network. Section 4 presents asymptotic distributions of sample network-wide metrics that can be computed from our implicit network. Section 5 describes our method to detect clusters in the network. Section 6 is devoted to Numerical Studies. Section 7 and Section 8 contain the data analyses on major league baseball (MLB) data and breast cancer data. Section D contains a few concluding remarks. Appendix B includes proofs of the theoretical results, while regularity conditions and technical assumptions are provided in Appendix A.

2. NETWORK AND NETWORK-WIDE METRICS

This section provides a brief introduction to networks and network-wide metrics. We begin with the following definition (Crane, 2018):

Definition 1. A **network** is a graph \mathcal{G} with vertices and edges. We denote the vertex set by \mathcal{V} and the edge set by \mathcal{E} .

A critical role in the analysis of network topology is played by the adjacency matrix, which contains information about the edges and vertices of a graph.

Definition 2. An **adjacency matrix** for a network with p vertices, namely $\mathbf{A} \equiv ((a_{ij}))$, is defined as follows: for $i \neq j$, let

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if there exists an edge between vertex } i \text{ and vertex } j \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We do not allow for self-loops (i.e., edges between a vertex and itself), so $a_{ii} = 0$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$. We note that a graph with $a_{ij} = 1$ for all $i \neq j$ is “fully-connected,” and symmetric \mathbf{A} corresponds to an “undirected graph.” Alternatively, one could consider a weighted adjacency matrix (WAM), where $\mathbf{W} = ((w_{ij}))$ and w_{ij} represents the weight on the edge between vertex i and vertex j . Evidently, when w_{ij} equals 0 or 1, the weighted adjacency matrix reduces to the adjacency matrix

given in Definition 2. In this manuscript we consider NWMs based on an undirected weighted fully-connected network with no self-loops.

Network-wide metrics summarize important connectedness properties of a graph. These metrics can be used to characterize a single node, a subset of nodes, or an entire graph. Metrics pertaining to a single vertex or a subset of vertices are called local metrics, whereas those pertaining to the entire graph are called global metrics. We provide the definitions of weighted network-wide metrics, following Opsahl et al. (2010), Lopez-Fernandez et al. (2004), and Antoniou and Tsompa (2008).

Degree Centrality

Degree centrality of a vertex $v \in \mathcal{V}$, denoted by D_v , is the sum of the weights on the edges of nodes linked to v ; that is,

$$D_v = \sum_{u \in \mathcal{V}(v)} w_{vu},$$

where $\mathcal{V}(v) = \{u | w_{vu} > 0\}$. In the above expression for the sum one could replace $\mathcal{V}(v)$ by \mathcal{V} , since the network is fully-connected and there are no self-loops. However, in some applications, it is common to use the standardized degree centrality defined by $|\mathcal{V}(v)|^{-1} D_v$, where $|\mathcal{V}|$ denotes the cardinality of a set \mathcal{V} . Note that $|\mathcal{V}(v)| \neq |\mathcal{V}|$ in general.

Clustering Coefficient

Clustering coefficient measures the tendency of a vertex being in a cluster. It is based on the triangle corresponding to a triplet of vertices. The formal definition of a clustering coefficient of node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ is as follows:

Definition 3. The clustering coefficient of node $v \in \mathcal{V}$ in a weighted graph \mathcal{G} is defined as

$$C_v = \sum_{(u,k) \in \mathcal{N}(v)} \frac{w_{uk}}{r_v(r_v - 1)},$$

where $\mathcal{N}(v) = \{(u, k) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} | u \neq k \neq v\}$ and $r_v = |\mathcal{V}(v)|$.

For the metrics described above, the value of a NWM in a weighted graph that is not fully-connected is the same as that in a fully-connected weighted graph, where the weight is set to 0 on the potential

edges between unconnected vertices. Hence, there is no loss of generality in our restriction to fully-connected networks.

Interpretation of NWM: We now provide an interpretation of the above metrics when the weights represent correlations between the random variables. Specifically, given p random variables X_1, \dots, X_p with $\text{Var}(X_i) = 1$ for all $1 \leq i \leq p$, let the correlations between the variables be denoted by ρ_{ij} , that is,

$$\rho_{ij} = \text{Corr}(X_i, X_j), \quad i, j = 1, 2, \dots, p \text{ and } i \neq j.$$

Then if v_1, \dots, v_p denote the vertices corresponding to X_1, \dots, X_p and $w_{ij} = \rho_{ij}$, then

$$D_{v_i} = \text{Corr}(X_i, \sum_{j \neq i=1}^p X_j) = \sum_{j \neq i=1}^p \text{Corr}(X_i, X_j).$$

Informally, the degree centrality of vertex i measures the sum of all correlations between the i^{th} vertex and all other vertices in the graph. Next, the clustering coefficient of v_i can be expressed in terms of the degree centrality as follows:

$$C_{v_i} = \frac{1}{r_{v_i}(r_{v_i} - 1)} \left(\sum_{u \neq k} \rho_{uk} - 2D_{v_i} \right).$$

Using any of these centralities for clustering is then analogous to using correlation as a similarity measure.

3. MODEL BASED WEIGHTS FOR THE IMPLICIT NETWORK

This section describes the essential ingredients of the manuscript's sparse modeling framework. Consider a collection of n independent and identically distributed random vectors $(Y_i, X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip})$ (for $1 \leq i \leq n$), where the response Y is associated with q of the p ($q < p$) explanatory variables. We begin by constructing a weighted implicit network with vertices corresponding to these explanatory variables. Toward that end, we assume that the association between the response variable and the covariates X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p follows a linear model:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \tag{1}$$

where \mathbf{Y} is a $n \times 1$ vector of response variables, \mathbf{X} is a $n \times p$ design matrix, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a $p \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients, and ϵ is a $n \times 1$ vector of errors. We denote the column vector of \mathbf{X} by $\mathbf{C}_i = (X_{1i}, X_{2i}, \dots, X_{ni})'$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$ and the row vector of \mathbf{X} by $R_j = (X_{j1}, X_{j2}, \dots, X_{jp})$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$. We assume throughout the manuscript that (i) $\text{Var}(\epsilon) = \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}$, where \mathbf{I} is the identity matrix; (ii) the rows of \mathbf{X} are i.i.d random vectors; (iii) $\text{Cov}(X_i, \epsilon) = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, p$; and (iv) $\Sigma_{\mathbf{X}}$, which denote the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} , is positive definite. In the sequel, we will refer to the structure of the data set by (Y, \mathbf{R}) .

3.1 Implicit Weighted Fully-Connected Network

An implicit weighted fully-connected network for a data set (Y, \mathbf{R}) is a weighted graph, where the p covariates X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p in \mathbf{R} correspond to vertices; accordingly the vertex set will be $\{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, where vertex i represents the covariate X_i . The edge set \mathcal{E} is the set of all links between vertices (recall that the network is fully connected). The edge weights are functions of the regression coefficients. These concepts are formally parsed below.

Definition 4. An **implicit weighted fully-connected network** for a data set (Y, \mathbf{R}) is a weighted graph \mathcal{G} with vertex set \mathcal{V} composed of the indices of the covariates, and with a given adjacency matrix \mathbf{W} .

In the rest of the manuscript, we will use the terminology implicit network to mean the implicit weighted fully connected network. To complete the description of the implicit network, we need to describe the weights on the edges of the network. While there are several choices based on the model (1), we focus on (i) weights that are functions of regression coefficients and (ii) partial correlation weights.

3.2 Regression Weights


Let $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a twice continuously differentiable function (on both the coordinates) and set $w_{ij} = f(\beta_i, \beta_j)$. Using the definitions in Section 2, the weighted degree centrality of node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is given by

$$D_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}(i)} w_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{V}(i)} f(\beta_i, \beta_j), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{V}(i) = \{j | w_{ij} > 0\}$. The weighted clustering coefficient of node $i \in \mathcal{V}$ is given by

$$C_i = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{w_{jk}}{r_i(r_i - 1)} = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{(p-1)(p-2)} , \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{(j, k) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} | j \neq k \neq i\}$ and $r_i = |\mathcal{V}(i)|$. Notice that since the implicit network is fully-connected, $r_i = p - 1$ for $i \in \mathcal{V}$. The graph below represents an example of a weighted implicit network with three vertices.



3.3 Partial Correlation Weights

Another choice of f that has received attention in the literature is a function of β that yields the partial correlation coefficient. A partial correlation is the strength of relationship between two variables, while controlling the effect of other variables. Here, the partial correlation network represents the association between the covariate and the response variable while accounting for other covariates. Partial correlation networks have been widely used in biology and genetic studies to construct biological networks on genes and proteins. Reverter and Chan (2008) introduced a method to reconstruct the gene co-expression networks using the partial correlation coefficient with information theory to identify gene associations. De la Fuente et al. (2004) constructed approximate undirected dependency graphs of large-scale biochemical data based on the hypothesis testing of partial correlations between two biochemical compounds. In addition, Altenbuchinger et al. (2020) applied Gaussian Graphical models – whose network defines a weight between two nodes as their partial correlation – to genomics data, in order to study the relationship among genes. Hence, the use of partial correlation weights on the network is consistent with other network analysis methods that have been used.

We refer to this network as a weighted partial correlation network. It is well-known that the partial correlation can be computed using the components of a precision matrix (Muirhead, 2009). Specifically, let $\mathcal{Y} = (Y, X_1, \dots, X_p)$, and let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{Y,\mathbf{X}} = (\text{Cov}(Y, X_1), \text{Cov}(Y, X_2), \dots, \text{Cov}(Y, X_p))$ denote a $p \times 1$ vector of covariances between Y and the covariates. Then the covariance matrix of \mathcal{Y} , denoted by Σ , can be expressed as follows:

$$\Sigma = \left(\begin{array}{c|c} \sigma_Y^2 & \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{Y,\mathbf{X}} \\ \hline \boldsymbol{\sigma}'_{Y,\mathbf{X}} & \Sigma_{\mathbf{X}} \end{array} \right) = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_Y^2 & \sigma_{YX_1} & \cdots & \sigma_{YX_p} \\ \sigma_{YX_1} & \ddots & \cdots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \cdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sigma_{YX_p} & \cdots & \cdots & \sigma_{X_p}^2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now using (1), $\sigma_Y^2 = \boldsymbol{\beta}' \Sigma_{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \sigma^2$ and $\sigma_{YX_i} = \boldsymbol{\beta}' \Sigma_{\mathbf{X},i}$, where $\Sigma_{\mathbf{X},i}$ is the i^{th} column of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{X}}$, and the elements of $\Gamma = \Sigma^{-1}$ are function of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Let γ_{ij} denote the $(i, j)^{th}$ element of Γ . Then, $\rho_{i|-i}$, which denotes the partial correlation coefficient between Y and X_i , is given by

$$\rho_{i|-i} = -\frac{\gamma_{1,i+1}}{\sqrt{\gamma_{11}}\sqrt{\gamma_{i+1,i+1}}}.$$

Let \mathfrak{M} denote the space of the class of all precision matrices, and $h : \mathfrak{M} \rightarrow [-1, 1]^p$ be such that $h(A) = \boldsymbol{\theta}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_p)$ and

$$\theta_i = \frac{a_{1,i+1}}{\sqrt{a_{11}a_{i+1,i+1}}}.$$

We study two functions of $\rho_{i|-i}$, viz. $\rho_i = (1 + \rho_{i|-i})/2$, which yields a number between 0 and 1, and $f_1(\rho_i, \rho_j)$ where

$$f_1(x, y) = \sqrt{2(1 - x^2)} + \sqrt{2(1 - y^2)}. \quad (4)$$

It is clear that both ρ_i and $f_1(\rho_i, \rho_j)$ are functions of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, since partial correlation coefficients can be expressed as functions of the precision matrix.

We notice that the description of the implicit network assumes that the regression model, and hence the set of covariates and its dimension p , is known. However, in real applications, especially

those involving clustering (grouping), this assumption is not valid. Additionally, if the model is unknown a priori, then one needs to “estimate” the network, which is equivalent to identifying the set of features associated with the response. These issues occur more frequently in high-dimensional settings, and “regularization” methods are typically used to address these challenges.

3.4 The Case of Categorical Covariates

A data set with categorical variables requires an alternative approach to construct an implicit network, since partial correlations do not exist for categorical variables. Instead of a multiple linear regression model, we assume a fixed effect model with p covariates and their interactions. The model is given by

$$y_{ijkl} = \mu + \alpha_i + \beta_j + \cdots + \gamma_k + \alpha\beta_{ij} + \alpha\gamma_{ik} + \cdots + \beta\gamma_{jk} + \epsilon_{ijkl},$$

where $i = 1, \dots, r_1$, $j = 1, \dots, r_2$, $k = 1, \dots, r_p$, and $l = 1, \dots, n$. Here r_m is the number of levels in X_m for $m = 1, \dots, p$. To take account for the effect of covariates X_i and X_j on Y , we compute $\text{SS}_{ij}/\text{TSS}$, where SS and TSS denote the sum of squares of the interaction between variable i and j and the total sum of squares, respectively, from model (1). We use this quantity as the weight on the edge between i and j .


Implicit Network Construction Let \hat{Y} denote the estimated y from model (1). Then, SS_{ij} and TSS are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\text{SS}_{ij} &= n \sum_{i=1}^{r_1} \sum_{j=1}^{r_2} (\bar{Y}_{ij\cdot} - \bar{Y}_{i\cdot\cdot\cdot} - \bar{Y}_{\cdot j\cdot} + \bar{Y}_{\cdot\cdot\cdot})^2 \\ \text{TSS} &= \sum_{l=1}^n (Y_l - \bar{Y}_{\cdot\cdot\cdot})^2.\end{aligned}$$

We will use these measures to define the weight w_{ij} on the edge between X_i and X_j :

$$w_{ij} = \frac{\text{SS}_{ij}}{\text{TSS}}.$$

Since $0 \leq \text{SS}_{ij} \leq \text{TSS}$, the weights are bounded by one. A graph below illustrates this construction of the implicit network.



Interpretation of NWM: We now provide an interpretation of the above metrics when the weights represent sums of squares of an interaction of two covariates in a fixed effect model. Then for p vertices X_1, \dots, X_p , the degree centrality of X_i is given by

$$D_i = \frac{1}{\text{TSS}} \sum_{j \neq i=1}^p \text{SS}_{ij}.$$

Thus, informally, the degree centrality of vertex i can be described as a quantity that measures the sum of all sums of squares of interaction terms between the i^{th} vertex and all other vertices in the graph. Next, the clustering coefficient of v_i can be expressed in terms of the degree centrality as follows:

$$C_i = \frac{1}{(p-1)(p-2)} \frac{1}{\text{TSS}} \left(\sum_{u \neq k} \text{SS}_{uk} - 2D_i \right).$$

In a fixed effects model, the proportion of variation of the response variable explained by each covariate will work as a similarity measure. Hence, using any of these centralities for clustering assigns covariates with similar effects on the response variable to the same cluster.

3.5 Model Estimation via Regularization

We assume a sparse modeling framework, i.e., in (1) only q ($< p$) of the regression coefficients are non-zero. We denote by

$$\mathcal{S} = \{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\} | \beta_j \neq 0\}$$

the true active predictor set. Let S^c denote the complement of S , and note that $q = |\mathcal{S}|$ (which is unknown). Simultaneous consistent variable selection and parameter vector estimation is possible using regularization methods, as discussed in Fan and Li (2001), Tibshirani (1996), Zhang et al. (2010), and Yuan and Lin (2006). Specifically, let $\hat{\beta}_n$ denote the solution to the optimization problem

$$Q_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})'(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) + p_\lambda(|\boldsymbol{\beta}|), \quad (5)$$

where $p_\lambda(\cdot)$ is a non-concave penalty (Fan and Lv, 2011). It is known, under appropriate regularity conditions (see Appendix A), that the estimated active predictor set

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \{j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\} | \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$$

converges to \mathcal{S} in probability; this in turn implies that $\hat{q}_n \equiv |\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n|$ converges in probability to q under certain regularity conditions. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{\beta_j | j \in \mathcal{S}\}$, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \{\beta_j | j \notin \mathcal{S}\}$, and $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{\mathbf{X}_{j_1}, \mathbf{X}_{j_2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{j_q} | j_i \in \mathcal{S} \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, q\}$. Let $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} = E[\mathbf{X}'_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}}]$ and $\Sigma = \text{diag}\{p''_\lambda(|\beta_1|), \dots, p''_\lambda(|\beta_q|)\}$, where $\text{diag}\{\dots\}$ represents the diagonal matrix. Also, let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} = \{\hat{\beta}_j | j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \{\hat{\beta}_j | j \notin \mathcal{S}\}$. The lemma below describes the properties of regularized estimators, and is due to Fan and Li (2001).

Lemma 1. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Then,

(i) $\mathbf{P}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

(ii) $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + (\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{b}) \leq \mathbf{x}\right) = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1})$ and $\mathbf{b} = (p'_\lambda(|\beta_1|)sgn(\beta_1), \dots, p'_\lambda(|\beta_q|)sgn(\beta_q))'$.

We focus on a fully-connected weighted network on the true active predictor set. Hence, by an abuse of notation, we will use \mathcal{S} (instead of \mathcal{V}) to denote the vertex set as well the true active predictor set. Furthermore, since we are mainly concerned with non-zero weights, we will assume in the rest of the manuscript that $\mathcal{R}(f) = \text{range of } f(\cdot, \cdot) = (0, \infty)$. Our first result is concerned with the joint asymptotic distribution of the estimated degree centralities derived using regularized

estimates of the regression coefficients. To this end, we need additional notations. Following (2) and using the above assumption on $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, D_i and $\hat{D}_{n,i}$ can be expressed as

$$D_i = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f(\beta_i, \beta_j), \quad \hat{D}_{n,i} = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}} f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j).$$

Additionally, set $\mathbf{D} = (D_1, D_2, \dots, D_q)'$ and $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n = (\hat{D}_{n,1}, \hat{D}_{n,2}, \dots, \hat{D}_{n,q})'$. Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q) = (\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{b}$, where \mathbf{b} is as in Lemma 1. Let $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ be a $q \times q$ matrix of gradients whose $(j, k)^{\text{th}}$ element is given by

$$l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}(i)} \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_j} & j = k \\ \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_k} & j \neq k. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

And $\hat{l}_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ can be obtained by evaluating (6) at $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, which is between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Let $\mathbf{H}_i^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \equiv ((H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})))$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,i}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \equiv ((\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})))$ denote the Hessian matrix (the matrix of second partials with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}$) associated with D_i . Here the notation $H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ indicates the $(j, k)^{\text{th}}$ element of $\mathbf{H}_i^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, and the same format is used for the notation $\hat{H}_{n,i}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$.

That is,

$$H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial^2 D_i}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}(i)} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_i^2} & j = k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_i \partial \beta_k} & j = i \text{ and } k \neq i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_j)}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_i} & j \neq i \text{ and } k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_j)}{\partial \beta_j^2} & j = k \neq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and $\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is obtained by evaluating (7) at $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, which is between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Finally, setting $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{H}_1^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}), \dots, \mathbf{H}_q^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,1}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,q}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$, let $\mathbf{B} = -[\mathbf{c}'(\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})')\mathbf{c}]'$. We remark that both $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ are $q \times q \times q$ tensors.

Proposition 1. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{D} + \mathbf{B}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(0, \Sigma_D)$ and

$$\Sigma_D = \sigma^2 [\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]'(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}[\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]$$

is a positive definite matrix.

Our next result is concerned with the joint asymptotic distribution of the estimated clustering coefficients derived using regularized estimates of the regression coefficients. To this end, we introduce additional notations. First recall that,

$$C_i = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{(q-1)(q-2)}, \quad \hat{C}_{n,i} = \sum_{(j,k) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{f(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\beta}_k)}{(\hat{q}_n-1)(\hat{q}_n-2)},$$

where $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{(j, k) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} | j \neq k \neq i\}$. Set $\mathbf{C} = (C_1, C_2, \dots, C_q)'$ and $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n = (\hat{C}_{n,1}, \dots, \hat{C}_{n,\hat{q}_n})'$. Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, c_2, \dots, c_q) = (\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{b}$, where \mathbf{b} is as in Lemma 1. Let $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a $q \times q$ matrix of gradients whose $(j, k)^{th}$ element is given by

$$l_C(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\beta_u, \beta_v)}{\partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} 0 & j = k \\ \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\beta_k, \beta_u)}{\partial \beta_k} & j \neq k, \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

and $\hat{l}_C(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is obtained by evaluating (8) at $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, which is between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Let $\mathbf{H}_i^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \equiv ((H_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})))$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,i}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \equiv ((\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})))$ denote the Hessian matrix associated with C_i . Here the notation $H_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ indicate the $(j, k)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{H}_i(C)(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, and the same format is

applied to $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,i}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. That is,

$$H_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} & j \neq k \neq i \\ \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_k, \beta_u)}{\partial \beta_k^2} & j = k \text{ and } k \neq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (9)$$

and $\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is obtained by evaluating (9) at $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, which is between $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Finally, setting $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = (\mathbf{H}_1^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}), \dots, \mathbf{H}_q^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}))$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,1}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \dots, \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{n,q}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$, let $\mathbf{B} = -[\mathbf{c}'(\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \mathbf{H}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})'\mathbf{c})]'$. Again, both $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ are $q \times q \times q$ tensors.

Proposition 2. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n - \mathbf{C} + \mathbf{B}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(0, \Sigma_C)$ and

$$\Sigma_C = \sigma^2 [\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]'(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_S(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}[\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]$$

is a positive definite matrix.

The proofs of Propositions 1 and 2 are provided in Appendix B. We notice that the asymptotic properties depend on the unknown \mathcal{S} , which hinders the routine use of this methodology for inferential and clustering problems. In such situations, it is reasonable to replace \mathcal{S} by $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. However, the dimension of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ and \mathcal{S} can be different. This difference causes technical difficulties in providing theoretical guarantees concerning the properties of clusters that are derived in Sections 4.2 and 5. To address this, we refine the data-splitting and dimension-matching technique described in Khalili and Vidyashankar (2018); the resulting post-selection estimator of the degree centrality \mathbf{D} and the clustering coefficient \mathbf{C} do not involve the asymptotic bias \mathbf{B} as in Proposition 1.

4. POST-SELECTION ESTIMATORS OF NETWORK-WIDE METRICS

In this section we provide post-selection estimators of NWMs and describe their asymptotic properties. We begin with a brief description of the data-splitting and dimension-matching methods.

4.1 Data-splitting and dimension-matching methods

We first divide the data set into two parts of approximately equal size ($\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$), viz. \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} , respectively. Using \mathcal{D}_{1n} , we estimate the active predictor set as follows: first, estimate the true active predictor set \mathcal{S} using a consistent regularization method and then perform a hypothesis test to check if the selected regression coefficients are zero, using the same data \mathcal{D}_{1n} . Let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)}$ denote the estimated active predictor set obtained minimizing (5), and let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)}$ denote the estimated active predictor set obtained from the hypothesis test using \mathcal{D}_{1n} , i.e.,

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} = \{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \mid |t_{n,j}| > c_{\alpha_n}\}.$$

Here $t_{n,j}$ is the t-statistic for testing $H : \beta_j = 0$ vs. $K : \beta_j \neq 0$, i.e.,

$$t_{n,j} = \frac{\hat{\beta}_j}{se(\hat{\beta}_j)} \quad \text{for } j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)},$$

where $\hat{\beta}_j$ is the least square estimate of β_j and $se(\hat{\beta}_j)$ is its standard error. Let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n(\mathcal{D}_{1n}) = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \cap \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)}$ denote the estimate of \mathcal{S} that results after the two-step procedure. We write $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ for $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n(\mathcal{D}_{1n})$ and \hat{q}_n for $\hat{q}_n(\mathcal{D}_{1n})$. As a next step, use $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ and \mathcal{D}_{2n} for inference and clustering the covariates. We note here that, conditioned on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, the model is well-specified. However, the suggested model from the first stage is a random model. Its variability appears in the inferential and clustering part in the form of a random index set.

Dimension-Matching Technique: Since $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is a random set, its dimension \hat{q}_n may not equal q , the dimension of \mathcal{S} . However, to establish theoretical guarantees, one needs to compare $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$. To handle this issue we use the dimension-matching technique: supposing that $j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \cap \mathcal{S}^c$, we set $\beta_j = 0$; on the other hand, if $j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \cap \mathcal{S}$, then the true value is β_j . Hence, for every $j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, the true value of β_j is defined and this yields a new vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_{\hat{q}_n})'$, which is referred to as the dimension-adjusted vector of regression coefficients. In general, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, we will

denote by \mathbf{x}_n the dimension-adjusted version of \mathbf{x} . In the theoretical results presented below we compare $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$, which is obtained by minimizing

$$Q_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{D}_{2n}} (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i \boldsymbol{\beta})^2. \quad (10)$$

Since the post-selection estimator of NWMs are based on $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$, theoretical investigation in the following sections require their asymptotic behavior. Our first theorem addresses this issue, and is similar in spirit to Theorem 1 in Khalili and Vidyashankar (2018).

Theorem 1. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Then,

[1] $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is a weakly consistent estimator of \mathcal{S} ; that is,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) = 1.$$

[2] Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and \mathbf{x}_n denote the dimension-adjusted version of \mathbf{x} . Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1})$ and $\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} = E[\mathbf{X}'_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}}]$.

The proof of the Theorem is in Appendix B. Notice that the key difference between Theorem 1 and Lemma 1 is the bias term $(\mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}} + \Sigma)^{-1} \mathbf{b}$. The bias term in Theorem 1 is removed, since we split the data into two independent data sets, use one set to select significant variables in (1), and use the other to estimate them. In addition, the weak consistency of $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ facilitates the theoretical result without the bias. Theoretical results regarding the limit distributions of NWMs and consistency of clustering will be based on Theorem 1.

4.2 Post-selection estimators of NWM and their asymptotic properties

In this section, we describe post-selection estimators of the NWM described in Section 2. We begin with weighted degree centrality.

Weighted degree centrality: We recall from Section 3 that for $i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ the weighted degree centrality D_i is given by (2), where $\mathcal{V}(i) = \{j | w_{ij} > 0\} \subset \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. By the properties of f , it follows

that $f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j) > 0$ for each $(i, j) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. Furthermore, since the network is fully-connected and $f(\beta_i, \beta_j) = 0$ for $i = j$, we can estimate $\mathcal{V}(i)$ by $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. We notice here that the estimate of $\mathcal{V}(i)$ is independent of i due to the use of the post-selection approach. This choice reduces the computational burden in high-dimensional problems by \hat{q}_n^2 computations, which is the required number of computations to compute $\mathcal{V}(i)$. Hence, the post-selection estimator of the weighted degree centrality is given by

$$\hat{D}_{n,i} = \sum_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \hat{w}_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j),$$

where $\hat{\beta}_i$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$ are the minimizers of (10). Let $\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n = (\hat{D}_{n,1}, \hat{D}_{n,2}, \dots, \hat{D}_{n,\hat{q}_n})$ denote the estimated vector of degree centralities of the vertices in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, derived using data from \mathcal{D}_{2n} . Also, let $\mathbf{D}_n = (D_{n,1}, D_{n,2}, \dots, D_{n,\hat{q}_n})$, where

$$D_{n,i} = \sum_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} w_{ij} = \sum_{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} f(\beta_i, \beta_j).$$

Our next result is concerned with the joint limiting distribution of the vector of weighted degree centralities.

Theorem 2. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension-adjusted version. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{D}_n) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D = \sigma^2 \mathbf{L}'_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{V}_\mathcal{S}^{-1} \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a positive-definite matrix, and $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a $q \times q$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{\text{th}}$ element is given by

$$l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_j} & j = k \\ \frac{\partial f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_k} & j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

Partial Correlation Weights: When the weights on the edges of the network are taken as partial correlations, f depends not just on β_i and β_j but on the entire vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. Analyses of these

post-selection estimates of partial correlation coefficients then require investigation of their limiting distribution, which is of independent interest. Our next theorem is concerned with this matter. Let $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_1, \rho_2, \rho_3, \dots, \rho_q)'$ denote the vector of population transformed (i.e., $\rho_i = (1 + \rho_{i| -i})/2$) partial correlation coefficients, and let $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}$ be the corresponding dimension-adjusted vector. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{S}_n}$ denote the post-selection estimated vector of partial correlation coefficients. Recall that $h(\cdot)$ yields a vector of partial correlation coefficients and is defined on the space \mathfrak{M}_n of all precision matrices with dimension $(\hat{q}_n + 1) \times (\hat{q}_n + 1)$. Our goal is to work with the vectorized version of the precision matrix; however, since the precision matrix is symmetric, vectorization will lead to duplicates in the vector, leading to additional collinearity challenges in downstream analyses. For this reason, following Neudecker and Wesselman (1990), we introduce the elimination matrix denoted by \mathbf{K}_n . To define \mathbf{K}_n , let E_{ij} be a $(\hat{q}_n + 1) \times (\hat{q}_n + 1)$ matrix with one in its $(i, j)^{th}$ position and zeros elsewhere. Also let u_{ij} be the unit vector of length $(\hat{q}_n + 1)(\hat{q}_n + 2)/2$ with unity in its $[(j - 1)(\hat{q}_n + 1) + i - j(j - 1)/2]^{th}$ element. Then, the $(\hat{q}_n + 1)(\hat{q}_n + 2)/2 \times (\hat{q}_n + 1)^2$ elimination matrix is defined to be

$$\mathbf{K}_n = \sum_{i \geq j} u_{ij} (\text{vec} E_{ij})',$$

where $\text{vec}(E_{ij})$ is $(\hat{q}_n + 1)^2 \times 1$ vector obtained by vectorizing E_{ij} . Then, for a matrix $\mathbf{M}_n \in \mathfrak{M}_n$, we define

$$v(\mathbf{M}_n) = \mathbf{K}_n \text{vec}(\mathbf{M}_n),$$

and hence $v(\mathbf{M}_n)$ is a vector of dimension $(\hat{q}_n + 1)(\hat{q}_n + 2)/2 \times 1$ representing the lower triangular submatrix of \mathbf{M} . Hence, by an abuse of notation, the mapping $h(\cdot)$ that yields the partial correlation coefficients can be modified to be a mapping from $v(\mathfrak{M}_n) = \{v(\mathbf{M}) : \mathbf{M} \in \mathfrak{M}_n\}$. With such a modification the vector of partial derivatives of $h(\cdot)$ with respect to the elements of the vector is well-defined and is denoted by ∇h_n , which is a $\hat{q}_n \times (\hat{q}_n + 1)(\hat{q}_n + 2)/2$ matrix. We first describe the joint limiting distribution of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{S}_n}$, which is a key step required in the proof of our second main result.

Theorem 3. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n

denote its dimension-adjusted version. Then the following holds:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$ and $\Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \nabla h(v(\Gamma_S)) \mathbf{K} \mathbf{L}'_S \Delta_S \mathbf{L}_S \mathbf{K}' \nabla h(v(\Gamma_S))'$. Here $\mathbf{L}_S = -\Gamma_S \otimes \Gamma_S$, $\Delta_S = E[(\mathcal{Y}'_S \mathcal{Y}_S) \otimes (\mathcal{Y}'_S \mathcal{Y}_S)] - \text{vec}(\Sigma) \text{vec}(\Sigma)'$, \mathbf{K} is the elimination matrix, and $\nabla h(v(\Gamma_S))$ is the partial derivatives of $h(v(\Gamma_S))$ with respect to the elements of $v(\Gamma_S)$ defined on the space \mathfrak{M} of precision matrices of dimension $(q+1) \times (q+1)$.

Our next main result concerns the joint limiting distribution of degree centralities when the weights are a function of the partial correlation coefficients. Specifically, let $\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ denote the vector of degree centralities obtained using partial correlation weights, and let $\mathcal{D}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ denote the corresponding dimension-adjusted population vector of degree centralities.

Theorem 4. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension-adjusted version. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\mathcal{D}}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho}) - \mathcal{D}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_D(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$, $\Sigma_D(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, $\Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ is the limiting covariance matrix in Theorem 3, and $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is a $q \times q$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{\text{th}}$ element is given by

$$l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial f(\rho_j, \rho_r)}{\partial \rho_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial f(\rho_j, \rho_r)}{\partial \rho_j} & j = k \\ \frac{\partial f(\rho_j, \rho_k)}{\partial \rho_k} & j \neq k. \end{cases}$$

We now investigate the properties of the clustering coefficient. As described previously, the post-selection estimator of the weighted clustering coefficient of $i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is given by

$$\hat{C}_{n,i} = \frac{1}{(\hat{q}_n - 1)(\hat{q}_n - 2)} \sum_{(j,k) \in \hat{\mathcal{N}}_n(i)} f(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\beta}_k),$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{N}}_n(i) = \{(j, k) \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \times \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n | j \neq k \neq i\}$ and $\hat{q}_n = |\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n|$. The population version is given by

$$C_{n,i} = \frac{1}{(\hat{q}-1)(\hat{q}-2)} \sum_{(j,k) \in \hat{\mathcal{N}}_n(i)} f(\beta_j, \beta_k).$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n = (\hat{C}_{n,1}, \hat{C}_{n,2}, \dots, \hat{C}_{n,\hat{q}_n})'$ denote the vector of estimated clustering coefficients, and let $\mathbf{C}_n = (C_{n,1}, C_{n,2}, \dots, C_{n,\hat{q}_n})'$ denote the dimension-adjusted vector of population-clustering coefficients. Our next result is concerned with the joint asymptotic behavior of a vector of clustering coefficients.

Theorem 5. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension-adjusted version. Then,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n - \mathbf{C}_n) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_C)$, $\Sigma_C = \sigma^2 \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})' \mathbf{V}_S^{-1} \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a positive definite matrix, and \mathbf{L}_C is a $q \times q$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{th}$ element is given by

$$l_C(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\beta_u, \beta_v)}{\partial \beta_k} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} 0 & j = k \\ \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\beta_k, \beta_u)}{\partial \beta_k} & j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{(j, k) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} | j \neq k \neq i\}$.

Our next main result concerns the joint limiting distribution of clustering coefficients when the weights are a function of the transformed partial correlation coefficients ρ_i . Specifically, let $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ denote the vector of clustering coefficients obtained using partial correlation weights, and let $\mathcal{C}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ denote the corresponding dimension-adjusted population vector of clustering coefficients.

Theorem 6. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension-adjusted version. Then,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\mathcal{C}}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho}) - \mathcal{C}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho})) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P} (\mathbf{Z} \leq \mathbf{x}),$$

where $\mathbf{Z} \sim \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_C(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$, $\Sigma_C(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, with $\Delta_S(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ being the limiting co-

variance matrix in Theorem 3, and $L_C(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ is a $q \times q$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{\text{th}}$ element is given by

$$l_C(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \sum_{(u,v) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\rho_u, \rho_v)}{\partial \rho_k} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} 0 & j = k \\ \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(j)} \frac{\partial f(\rho_k, \rho_u)}{\partial \rho_k} & j \neq k, \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{N}(i) = \{(j, k) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} | j \neq k \neq i\}$.

4.3 Examples

In this section, we consider two functions f and describe the asymptotic results of the previous subsection. Specifically, working with the transformed partial correlation, consider $f_1 : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ defined by (4). A simple calculation shows that $f_1(\cdot, \cdot)$ is a semi-metric. For this choice of $f_1(\cdot, \cdot)$, the limiting covariance matrix of the degree centrality is given by $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, where the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ element of $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, denoted by $l_D(j, k; \boldsymbol{\rho})$, is given by

$$l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \beta_j} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho_j}{\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ -\frac{\sqrt{2}(q-1)\rho_i}{\sqrt{1-\rho_i^2}} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

The limiting covariance matrix of the cluster coefficient is given by $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, where the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ element of $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, denoted by $l_C(i, j; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, is given by

$$l_C(i, j; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial \beta_j} = \begin{cases} -\frac{\sqrt{2}\rho_j}{(q-1)\sqrt{1-\rho_j^2}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

Another interesting choice of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is given by $f_2(x, y) = \sqrt{x^2 + y^2}$. Simple algebra shows that

$$f_1^2(x, y) = 4 \left(1 + \sqrt{1 - f_2^2(x, y) - \frac{1}{2}(f_2^2(x^2, y^2) - f_2^4(x, y))} \right) - 2f_2(x, y).$$

However, this expression does not help in deriving the covariance matrix of NWM from that given by the function $f_1(x, y)$. It can be seen that the limiting covariance of the degree centrality is $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, where the $(i, j)^{\text{th}}$ element of $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, denoted by $l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$, is given by

by

$$l_D(j, k; \mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial D_i}{\partial \beta_j} = \begin{cases} \frac{\rho_j}{\sqrt{\rho_i^2 + \rho_j^2}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ \sum_{k \in \mathcal{S}(i)} \frac{\rho_i}{\sqrt{\rho_k^2 + \rho_i^2}} & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

The limiting covariance matrix of the cluster coefficient is given by $\mathbf{L}_C(\boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_C(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, where the $(i, j)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{L}_C(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, denoted by $l_C(i, j; \boldsymbol{\rho})$, is given by

$$l_C(i, j; \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial C_i}{\partial \beta_j} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} \sum_{u \in \mathcal{S}(i) \setminus \{j\}} \frac{\rho_j}{\sqrt{\rho_j^2 + \rho_u^2}} & \text{if } i \neq j \\ 0 & \text{if } i = j. \end{cases}$$

4.4 Estimating the Limiting Covariance Matrix of NWM

We now turn to estimating the limiting covariance matrix in Theorems 2 through 5. Below, we show consistency of $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, which is obtained by replacing the parameter values in the formula for $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ by the post-selection estimators.

Theorem 7. Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Then the following hold:

- [1] $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges to $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.
- [2] Let $\Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ denote the dimension-adjusted matrix of $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. Then, $\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges to $\Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ in probability as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

5. DETECTION OF THE CLUSTERS

In this section, we introduce a new method to detect clusters of covariates that have similar association (to be made precise below) with the response variable. The proposed method uses the estimates of NWMS of the graph and their joint asymptotic behavior.

5.1 Shortcomings of Unsupervised grouping Methods

Before introducing our grouping algorithm, we discuss the limitations of unsupervised clustering methods. Recall that our objective is to detect clusters of covariates with respect to the response variable. Hence, it is important to account for the response variable when grouping vari-

ables. However, it is well-known that the difference between supervised learning and unsupervised learning (as in supervised and unsupervised clustering) is the availability of the output, which is a response variable in a regression setting. Unsupervised clustering methods – such as K-mean clustering or spectral clustering, adapted to our context – use distances and/or similarity measures between covariates, and detects clusters of covariates based on them. However, unlike clustering observations, clustering covariates raises two issues: (i) how the distance between two covariates is defined, and (ii) how this distance measure incorporates the response variable. Even if we can find a metric to define the distance between two covariates, it is still difficult to account for the response variable. Hence, an unsupervised clustering method cannot give clusters that take into account the association between the response variable and covariates. On the other hand, the weighted implicit network uses the regression coefficient to define the weights; that is, the network already incorporates the association between each covariate and the response variable into the weight between two covariates. Hence, if an appropriate clustering algorithm is established, the weighted implicit network can address this challenge. The next subsection introduces our clustering (grouping) algorithm, which detects the clusters of covariates with respect to the response variable.

5.2 Definitions of Clusters

We begin by introducing the definition of clusters of covariates in \mathcal{S} in terms of degree centrality. Clusters based on the clustering coefficients can be defined in a similar manner. Let K denote the number of clusters and τ denote the tuning parameter that determines the size of clusters. There is no statistically rigorous method to choose an appropriate number of clusters, but one common way is to use Intra-Cluster Correlation Coefficient (ICC), which measures the similarity of clustered data by accounting for the within-cluster and between-cluster variances. In Section 6.2, we provide a numerical study to identify the number of groups using the intra-cluster correlation coefficient. Additionally, let $D_1^* = \max_{i \in \mathcal{S}} D_i$. Let v_1^* denote an index for which the maximum is achieved. Then, the first cluster, which is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(1)}$, is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(1)} = \{j | |D_1^* - D_j| \leq \tau \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Now let $D_2^* = \max_{i \in \mathcal{S} - \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(1)}} D_i$, and let v_2^* denote an index for which the maximum is achieved. The second cluster, which is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(2)}$, is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(2)} = \{j | |D_2^* - D_j| \leq \tau \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S} - \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(1)}\}.$$

In the same manner, the remaining $K - 2$ clusters can be defined with the corresponding maxima D_i^* and maximizers v_i^* . However, the underlying issue is that we do not know \mathcal{S} , the true active predictor set. Hence, as described in Section 4.1, we split the data randomly into two parts and obtain $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ from the first part of the data by using a consistent regularization method. We estimate the network-wide metrics for all covariates in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ from \mathcal{D}_{2n} . Based on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, we now define the clusters in the population. Now we let $D_{n,1}^* = \max_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} D_i$; also let $v_{n,1}^*$ denote an index where this maximum is achieved. Then, the first cluster in the population, which is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(1)}$, is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(1)} = \{j | |D_{n,1}^* - D_j| \leq \tau \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{S}\}.$$

Now let $D_{n,2}^* = \max_{i \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n - \mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(1)}} D_i$. The second cluster, which is denoted by $\mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(2)}$, is given by

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(2)} = \{j | |D_{n,2}^* - D_j| \leq \tau \text{ for } j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n - \mathcal{C}_{n,\tau}^{(1)}\}.$$

In the same manner, the rest of $K - 2$ clusters based on $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ can be defined. We denote the corresponding maxima by $D_{n,i}^*$ and the corresponding maximizers by $v_{n,i}^*$.

5.3 Sequential testing-based clustering

The basic idea of the method is as follows. First we set the number of clusters in the feature set by thresholding the NWM. As an example based on weighted degree centrality, given a vertex i and $\tau > 0$ we set all covariates j whose degree centralities satisfy $|D_i - D_j| < \tau$ to belong to the same cluster. This defines a cluster in the population. Thus, the number of clusters in the population is determined by the thresholding parameter τ . Now, to identify the clusters in the data, we perform several hypothesis tests $H_{ij} : |D_i - D_j| \leq \tau$ for $1 \leq j \leq q$ using a student-type

statistic. Specifically, set

$$t_{ij,n} = \frac{|\hat{D}_i - \hat{D}_j| - \tau}{\hat{\sigma}_P},$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_P$ is an estimate of the standard deviation obtained from Theorem 2. Hence, it follows from Theorem 2 that as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $t_{ij,n}$ converges in distribution to a standard normal random variable. Based on the asymptotic distribution, if we reject H_{ij} we assign i and j to different clusters; otherwise, under non-rejection, we assign them to the same cluster.

Operationally, we start with a vertex with the largest (smallest) network-wide metric. We seek to find all those vertices that are within τ units of the maximum (minimum). It is a calibrator, and it controls the number of vertices in the cluster. Instead of τ , we can alternatively use a desired type I error of the hypothesis test, which is denoted by α , to control the size of the cluster. The sequential testing based clustering algorithm can be described as follows:

Algorithm 1 Sequential testing-based clustering using degree centrality

Step 1: Choose the desired number of clusters K , and set $k = 0$, $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(0)} = \emptyset$.

Step 2: Set $\mathcal{C}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k)} = \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n - \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(k)}$.

Step 3: Let $v^* = \operatorname{argmax}_{i \in \mathcal{C}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}} D_i$.

Step 4: Test the hypothesis $H_{v^*j} : |D_{v^*} - D_j| \leq \tau$ at level α using the statistic $t_{v^*j,n}$ for $j \in \mathcal{C}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}$.

Step 5: Increment k by 1, i.e., $k \rightarrow k + 1$. Define the k^{th} cluster as follows:

$$\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k+1)} = \{j \in \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k)} | H_{v^*j} \text{ is not rejected at level } \alpha\}.$$

Step 6: If $k < K$ then set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(k)} = \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k+1)}$ and go to Step 2. Else stop.

In the above algorithm, one can replace degree centrality by clustering coefficient. Our next result establishes that for all these choices of NWM, the sequential testing method consistently estimates all the true clusters. Before we state the main result, we introduce one more notation. Let $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}$ denote the k^{th} cluster estimated from the above algorithm using the estimated active predictor set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. We also denote by $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}$ the k^{th} cluster estimated using the above algorithm by the oracle; that is, $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}$ is estimated using the above algorithm, replacing $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ by \mathcal{S} . Note that $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha}^{(k)}$ is a

random set, and consists of those estimated regression coefficients whose NWM are “close” based on the threshold τ . Finally, let $\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)}$ denote the k^{th} true cluster in the population.

Theorem 8. (Consistency of clustering under the sequential testing method) Assume that the assumptions (A1)-(A3) and (P1)-(P6) hold. Let $\tau > 0$ be fixed. Let $K = K(\tau)$ be the number of clusters and $\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}$ denote the k^{th} true cluster and k^{th} estimated cluster, where $k = 1, \dots, K$. Assume that $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$. Then,

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)}) \rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$. That is, the probability of detecting all the K clusters converges to one.

6. NUMERICAL STUDIES

In this section, we describe our simulations and provide the results. We show how our sequential clustering algorithm outperforms unsupervised clustering algorithms; we also show how well our proposed clustering algorithm can identify clusters in high-dimensional settings. Besides these numerical studies, we present additional simulations studies of computational time to estimate $\Delta_S(\rho)$ in Theorem 3, and regarding the asymptotic behavior of NWMs. Before we present the numerical study results, we begin with a discussion about the computational complexity in the covariance formula in Theorem 3.

Computational Complexity: Using the formula in Theorem 3, the above estimate of $\Delta_S(\rho)$ involves the computation of precision matrices and Kronecker products along with derivatives of these functions. Each Kronecker product involves at least \hat{q}_n^4 computations; estimation of $\Delta_S(\rho)$ requires a product of two Kronecker products of matrices, as well as a couple of products of $\hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n$ matrices. The process involves at least \hat{q}_n^{10} computations. For large \hat{q}_n , this can be computationally expensive. To facilitate computation we propose to use the following Model-Estimated Post-Selection Resampling (MEPSRS) to estimate the limiting covariance matrices of the centralities. MEPSRS first splits the data into two parts, \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} . We use \mathcal{D}_{1n} to estimate the active predictor set, viz. $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, and resample $\mathcal{Y}(\mathcal{D}_{2n})$ m times. Using the resampled data, we fit the model to the feature set $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ and compute the weighted degree centralities based on bootstrap

estimates of the transformed partial correlation coefficients. Let $\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}^{(j)}$ denote an estimated vector of transformed partial correlation coefficients of dimension \hat{q}_n using the resampled data, and let $\mathbf{D}_{n,j}^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}^{(j)})$ denote the corresponding vector of degree centralities. Then the bootstrap estimate of the covariance matrix of the vector of degree centralities, denoted by $\hat{\Sigma}_D^B$, is given by

$$\hat{\Sigma}_D^B = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B (\mathbf{D}_{n,j}^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}^{(j)}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_D^B)(\mathbf{D}_{n,j}^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}^{(j)}) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_D^B)',$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_D^B = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{j=1}^B \mathbf{D}_{n,j}^*(\boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{S}_n}^{(j)})$. The above algorithm is described succinctly as follows:

Algorithm 2 Bootstrap procedure

Step 1: With \hat{q}_n selected covariates from variable selection, let $(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i^{\hat{S}_n})$ denote the row vector of the response variable and selected covariates for $i = 1, \dots, n/2$.

Step 2: Resample $(y_i, \mathbf{x}_i^{\hat{S}_n})$ of size $n/2$ with replacement.

Step 3: Using these resampled samples, compute the NWM for each covariate.

Step 4: Repeat Steps 1-3 B times.

6.1 Multiple splits of the data

In real data analysis, when the number of covariates p is too large, the variable selection method and data-splitting method may select more variables than the true model. In this case, different data splits may yield different sets of active covariates, which will distort our clustering results. Hence, instead of doing one split we perform multiple splits of the data. This is an extension of the idea of Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2010) to post-selection clustering problems. Then, we combine results from multiple splits to obtain a cluster. One possible way to combine multiple results is to count the number of appearances of each covariate in multiple splits and assign each covariate to a cluster based on a pre-defined threshold. For example, if the number of multiple splits is 20 and the threshold is 60%, we assign each covariate to a cluster where it appears more than 12 times out of 20 splits. If X_1 appears 14 times in cluster 1 and 6 times in cluster 2, then it is assigned to cluster 1. On the other hand, if X_2 appears 11 times in cluster 2 and 9 times in cluster 3, it cannot be assigned to any cluster because of the threshold. Using multiple splits and

thresholding, we can reduce the probability of selecting wrong variables in our model and clusters. We adopt this idea in the simulation study and data analysis discussed below.

Algorithm 3 Multiple-splitting algorithm

Step 1: Choose the number of multiple splits. Let M denote the desired number of clusters.

Step 2: Split the data into two part. Let $\mathcal{D}_{1n}^{(m)}$ and $\mathcal{D}_{2n}^{(m)}$ denote the two parts of data set in m^{th} split for $m = 1, \dots, M$.

Step 3: Obtain $K^{(m)}$, predefined number of clusters by using Algorithm 1. Let $k^{(m)}$ denote the k^{th} cluster from m^{th} split for $k = 1, \dots, K^{(m)}$.

Step 4: Repeat Steps 2-3 M times.

Step 5: Assign each covariate to a cluster based on the number of appearances out of M splits.

6.2 Numerical Experiments on Supervised Clustering

Comparison of unsupervised and supervised clustering methods:

In this subsection we compare our supervised clustering algorithm with two unsupervised clustering methods, K-means clustering and spectral clustering. Note that in the perspective of detecting groups of variables, the classical unsupervised clustering methods do not exist. Hence, in this context we modify the classical algorithms of K-means clustering and spectral clustering to detect clusters of variables. Both unsupervised clustering algorithms require a pre-specified number of clusters, which is denoted by k . Below is the modified K-means clustering that we will use in numerical studies:

Algorithm 4 Modified K-means Clustering

Step 1: Given a $n \times p$ data matrix, where each row represents an observation of a $1 \times p$ vector, transpose the data matrix. This $p \times n$ matrix contains p observations of a $1 \times n$ vector.

Step 2: Compute the distance, such as Euclidean distance, between all pairs of p observations.

Step 3: Proceed with the classical K-means clustering algorithm.

The modified spectral clustering algorithm is presented below.

Algorithm 5 Modified Spectral Clustering

Step 1: Given a $n \times p$ data matrix, where each row represents an observation of a $1 \times p$ vector, transpose the data matrix. This $p \times n$ matrix contains p observations of a $1 \times n$ vector.

Step 2: Compute the $p \times p$ similarity matrix, denoted by \mathbf{M} , whose element is the similarity measure between two covariates.

Step 3: Compute the $p \times p$ degree matrix, denoted by \mathbf{G} , which is a diagonal matrix whose elements are degrees of covariates.

Step 4: Derive the Laplacian \mathbf{L} , which is defined as $\mathbf{M} - \mathbf{G}$, and compute the first k eigenvectors $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$ of \mathbf{L} .

Step 5: Let $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times k}$ be the matrix with columns $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_k$.

Step 6: Apply K-means clustering to \mathbf{V} to identify clusters among p covariates.

The setting for numerical studies is as follows: the vector of covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)'$ is generated from a p -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and identity covariance matrix, where $p = 9$. To add “similarity” amongst the covariates we make three groups described below. We consider two types of correlations: within-cluster correlation and between-cluster correlation. In this numerical study the within-cluster correlation, denoted by r_w , is set to .5 for all clusters, and the between-cluster correlation, denoted by r_b , is set to six different values. Given \mathbf{x}_i , the response variable Y_i is generated from $\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$ where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (1, -1, 3, 1, 1, 2, -1, 2, -1)$. Based on this setting, there are 9 covariates and 3 true clusters with respect to \mathbf{Y} , which are (X_1, X_4, X_5) , (X_2, X_7, X_9) , and (X_3, X_6, X_8) . For convenience of notation, we denote the group (X_3, X_6, X_8) as Cluster 1, group (X_2, X_7, X_9) as Cluster 2, and group (X_1, X_4, X_5) as Cluster 3. We compare three clustering algorithms, and Table 1 presents the results based on 5000 simulations. The numbers in the table represent the percentage of times the true clusters are detected correctly.

r_b	Modified K-means	Modified Spectral	Sequential Clustering
0	.8624	1	.9104
.1	.8734	.9984	.9148
.2	.9036	.9908	.9082
.3	.869	.9086	.897
.4	.4	.4176	.8932
.5	.0012	.0004	.8574

Table 1: Unsupervised clustering methods vs. Sequential testing method

Both modified unsupervised clustering algorithms perform well when there is very low between-cluster correlation; the spectral clustering algorithm nearly identifies the correct clusters when clusters are independent or have very low correlation. However, as the between-cluster correlation increases, the performance of the modified unsupervised clustering methods suffer correspondingly. Once there is very little difference between within-cluster correlation and between-cluster correlation, neither the modified K-means algorithm nor the modified spectral clustering algorithm can identify true clusters. On the other hand, the sequential testing method maintains its good performance, no matter the degree of between-cluster correlation. It performs similarly when between-cluster correlation is low, and outperforms both modified unsupervised clustering methods as between-cluster correlation gets larger. Figure 1 illustrates the simulation results.




Figure 1: Comparisons among clustering algorithms

Note that in the simulation study above, we assumed that the true number of clusters is known. If the number of clusters is unknown, the modified K-means clustering and spectral clustering will never identify correct clusters. On the other hand, given that the desired number of clusters is wrong, the sequential clustering algorithm can identify correct clusters. That is, if the desired number of clusters is 2, then the sequential testing clustering algorithm will identify the top two clusters that are associated with the response variable. In our example, it will give us Cluster 1 and Cluster 2. Unsupervised clustering will be unlikely to detect the correct clusters, since that method attempts to create two clusters using all the covariates. We performed a numerical study with the same simulation setting, but we set the desired number of clusters to 2 and compared the performance of three clustering algorithms. The results are provided in Appendix C.

We also performed an extensive study of the proposed methods with agglomerative clustering studied in Bühlmann et al. (2013). Based on the analysis (data not included), we noticed that the methods proposed here perform better than those based on canonical correlations. Additionally, the clustering obtained via the use of NWM using implicit network with correlation weights seems

to improve the identification of correct clusters over the use of correlation weights alone, even in the context of unsupervised problems.

Choosing the number of clusters based on the Intra-Cluster Correlation Coefficient (ICC): In this subsection, we demonstrate the performance of the ICC-based algorithm to choose the number of clusters. The vector of covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)'$ is generated from a p -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and identity covariance matrix. We consider a multiple linear regression model without an intercept, setting $p = 9$ and sample size $n = 100$. Given \mathbf{x}_i , the response variable Y_i is generated from $\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$ where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 2, 2, 2)$. Based on this setting, there are 3 true clusters: (X_1, X_2, X_3) , (X_4, X_5, X_6) , and (X_7, X_8, X_9) . We implement the algorithm described in Section 5.3 to identify the number of clusters. Table 2 presents the results based on 5000 simulations. The numbers in the table record how many times the algorithm identified the corresponding number of clusters.

Number of Clusters	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Frequency (Percentage %)	175 (3.5)	4825 (96.5)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table 2: ICC Algorithm choosing the number of clusters

The ICC-based algorithm provides promising results, identifying the correct number of clusters more than 95% of the time. Table 3 provides the results in the case that $\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (.4,.4,.4, -.2,-.2,-.2,.8,.8,.8)$.

Number of Clusters	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Frequency (Percentage %)	329 (6.58)	4208 (84.16)	456 (9.12)	7 (.14)	0 (0)	0(0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Table 3: ICC Algorithm choosing the number of clusters

Clustering based on Supervised Methods: In this subsection, we demonstrate the behavior of our supervised clustering algorithm when $p < n$. The vector of covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)'$ is generated from a p -dimensional multivariate normal distribution with mean zero and identity covariance matrix. We consider multiple linear regression model without an intercept, where the covariate dimension is $p = 20$ and $p = 50$, and sample size $n = 200$. Given \mathbf{x}_i , the response variable

Y_i is generated from $\mathbf{x}_i\boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$ where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (1, 1, 1, -1, -1, -1, 2, 2, 2, 0, \dots, 0)$, which contains $q = 9$ nonzero regression coefficients. Based on this setting, there are 9 truly non-zero covariates and 3 true clusters, which are (X_1, X_2, X_3) (Cluster 2), (X_4, X_5, X_6) (Cluster 3), and (X_7, X_8, X_9) (Cluster 1). For the variable selection, we use the *two-step* procedure with SCAD introduced by Fan and Li (2001) (with tuning parameters chosen by the cross-validation method), and then perform a hypothesis test. Table 4 represents the results based on 5000 simulations. The numbers in the table represent the proportion of times the true clusters are detected correctly. In addition, α in the table represents the significance level of hypothesis tests.

NWM	p	α	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Combined
Degree Centrality	20	.05	.958	.946	.957	.938
		.1	.959	.937	.939	.929
	50	.05	.951	.939	.950	.932
		.1	.954	.935	.938	.927
Clustering Coefficient	20	.05	.944	.958	.983	.944
		.1	.931	.953	.982	.931
	50	.05	.938	.953	.976	.938
		.1	.954	.935	.938	.931

Table 4: Sequential Testing Method

In Table 4, ‘Cluster 1’ indicates the proportion of times that true Cluster 1 is correctly detected. ‘Cluster 2’ and ‘Cluster 3’ are defined similarly. ‘Combined’ indicates that all three true clusters are correctly detected in the same simulation. From the table, we observe that the proposed clustering method performs very well for all values of p . In addition, both degree centrality and clustering coefficient provides similar results, so our clustering algorithm works well regardless of the type of the NWM used.

7. SPORTS ANALYTICS: MAJOR LEAGUE BASEBALL DATA

The data for the analysis is collected from the official MLB (2016) and Baseball-Reference (2016) websites. It contains the statistics of $n = 291$ MLB hitters from 30 major league teams

in the 2016 season. We only choose the hitters who have more than 251 plate appearances. The logic behind the number ‘251’ is that a hitter has to have plate appearances more than $3.1 \times$ the number of games played by his team to be officially ranked. Since each team plays 162 games in one season, the minimum number of plate appearances is 502. Since we consider that any player with more than half of the required number of plate appearances makes a substantial contribution to the team’s performance of the season, we select players with more than 251 plate appearances.

In this data set, the variable of interest is Wins Above Replacement (WAR), which measures a player’s relative performance over replacing players. WAR measures how much better a player is than players who would be available to replace him. WAR is widely used to evaluate a player’s performance, and it is often of interest to find the association between WAR and baseball statistics. Our goal is to detect top clusters that are associated with WAR. The details of the $p = 34$ covariates are described in Table 5.

ID	Variable	Description	ID	Variable	Description
	WAR	Wins above replacement of each player	18	Pitch/PA	Average number of pitches per each plate appearance
1	Age	A player's age in 2016	19	GDP	Number of ground outs made into double plays
2	G	Number of games played by a player	20	HBP	Number of hit-by-pitch
3	AB	Number of At-bats of a player	21	SH	Number of sacrifice hits
4	R	Number of runs made by a player	22	SF	Number of sacrifice flies
5	H	Number of hits	23	IBB	Intentional bases on balls
6	X2B	Number of doubles	24	GO_AO	Ratio of ground outs vs. Fly outs
7	X3B	Number of triples	25	GS	Number of games started
8	HR	Number of home runs	26	INN	Number of innings played in field
9	RBI	Number of runs batted in	27	PO	Number of putouts
10	SB	Number of stolen bases	28	A	Number of assists
11	CS	Number of times a player was caught stealing bases	29	E	Number of errors
12	BB	Number of bases on balls	30	DP	Number of double plays turned by a player
13	SO	Number of strikeouts	31	Field %	Fielding percentage of a player
14	BA	Batting average throughout the season	32	RF.G	Range factor per game Number of outs related to the player
15	OBP	On base percentage of a player	33	BA _RISP	Batting average with runners in scoring position
16	SLG	Slugging percentage of a player	34	Salary	Salary of a player (in million \$)
17	OPS+	OPS = OBP + SLG. OPS+ is adjusted OPS with respect to the ballpark			

Table 5: Variables in the data set

Even though WAR already takes into account some of the baseball statistics (especially offense-type statistics) described in Table 5, it is still worth detecting clusters of them, since it can provide insight into groups of baseball statistics that are more highly associated with WAR. In addition, our analysis provides a way to investigate which factor one has to examine to study the details of WAR. Furthermore, by analyzing both offensive and defensive characteristics of baseball players, we take into account both offensive and defensive performances of players to study the details of WAR.

We consider a multiple linear regression model with sparsity. For the variable selection, we applied the multiple-splitting scheme with the two-stage variable selection procedure (SCAD and

t-test). The number of splits is 20 and each split contains two sub-samples each of size 156 and 155. Based on 20 splits, we assign each variable to a cluster if it appears at least 50% of the time. The desired number of cluster is equal to 3. We set $\tau = 0$ for all 3 clusters. For the hypothesis tests in the sequential testing method, we set α , the significance level, equal to .1 with the Bonferroni adjustment.

There are in total 23 covariates that are selected more than 50% of the time. The set of estimated active predictors, denoted by $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \{ & R, H, X2B, X3B, HR, RBI, AB, CS, OBP, Age, SO, SF, \\ & IBB, SB, BB, OPS+, HBP, A, SLG, GDP, GS, E, DP \}.\end{aligned}$$

From Table 6, we observe that only 16 out of 23 covariates are in the clusters using sequential testing. Variables that are selected more than 50% of the time from the variable selection procedure – but are not assigned more than 50% of the time in any cluster – are labeled as ‘Not in a cluster’. In addition, the initial number of clusters is 3, but we detect 2 clusters. The role of τ and α make a difference in the results. One possible interpretation of the analysis is as follows: those baseball statistics in the same cluster share a similar level of association with the WAR. Summarizing the information in these clusters, one may reduce the number of variables that are relevant to WAR and provide a simpler model with few predictors. Or one can choose one variable from each cluster and use them to fit a model with other predictors that do not belong to any cluster.

NWM	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Not in a cluster
Degree Centrality	R, H, X2B, X3B, HR, RBI, SB, BB, OPS+, HBP, A	AB, CS, OBP, SLG, GDP	Age, SO, SF, IBB, GS, E, DP
Clustering Coefficient	R, H, X2B, X3B, HR, RBI, SB, BB, OPS+, HBP, A	AB, CS, OBP, SLG, GDP	Age, SO, SF, IBB, GS, E, DP

Table 6: Clusters based on Network-wide Metrics

8. BREAST CANCER DATA

We next apply our methods to a regression problem involving gene expression data. The data set originates from breast cancer tissue samples from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) project. It contains the gene expression levels of 17,814 genes from 536 patients. The response variable in this data set is the gene expression level of the *BRCA1* gene that is identified to increase the risk of early onset of breast cancer. Since the *BRCA1* gene is likely to interact with other genes, our goal is to identify groups of genes that have similar association with *BRCA1*.

As done by Kim et al. (2008), we first select 3000 genes with the largest variance in their gene expression level. Then, we use the top 500 genes that have the largest absolute correlation with *BRCA1* amongst the 3000 genes. Among 536 observations, we randomly select half of the observations for variable selection performed using SCAD and t-test. SCAD has two tuning parameters, which are usually denoted by λ and a . We fix a at 3.7 and choose λ by using cross-validation. Using the remaining half, we identify clusters. The number of splits is 20 and the threshold percentage of appearances out of 20 splits is 50%. The number of bootstrap samples is 500 and the desired number of clusters is 3. We use .05 as a significance level for each hypothesis test in the proposed sequential testing method, and apply Bonferroni's correction to adjust the significance level of each test in multiple hypothesis tests. We also choose τ , the tuning parameter that controls the size of clusters, to be equal to 0 so that we assign genes to the same cluster only if their network-wide metrics are not significantly different. The set of estimated active predictors $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \{ & \text{ABCAB, ABHD2, ACTO4, ACTR10, ACTR3B, ADCK1,} \\ & \text{ADH1C, ADORA2A, AGA, AKR1CL2, ALG5}\}.\end{aligned}$$

Table 7 shows the clusters detected by using our methods (the gene expressions are reported as their indices).

	Cluster 1	Not in cluster
Degree	ADCK1, AKR1CL2, ALG5	ABCAB, ABHD2, ACTO4, ACTR10, ACTR3B
Centrality		ADH1C, ADORA2A, AGA
Clustering	ADCK1, AKR1CL2, ALG5	ABCAB, ABHD2, ACTO4, ACTR10, ACTR3B
Coefficient		ADH1C, ADORA2A, AGA

Table 7: Sequential testing based Clustering

Appendices:

Grouping predictors via network-wide metrics

A. REGULARITY CONDITIONS AND ASSUMPTIONS

In this section, we describe the assumptions that facilitate the theoretical results. The first set of assumptions concerns the function $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, which provides the weight on the edge of an implicit network.

Assumptions on $f(\cdot, \cdot)$

(A1) $f(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$.

(A2) $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ and $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ are non-zero matrices.

(A3) $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ is twice continuously differentiable.

Now, we describe the assumptions on the penalty function and tuning parameters in (11). Let $p'_\lambda(\theta)$ denote the first derivative of $p_\lambda(\theta)$. We consider a class of penalties that satisfies the following conditions (Kim and Kwon, 2012):

(P1) $p'_\lambda(\cdot)$ is nonnegative, nonincreasing, and continuous over $(0, \infty)$.

(P2) There exists $a > 0$ such that $\lim_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} p'_\lambda(\theta) = \lambda$, $p'_\lambda(\theta) \geq \lambda - \theta/a$ ($0 < \theta < a\lambda$), and $p'_\lambda(\theta) = 0$ ($\theta \geq a\lambda$).

This class contains the SCAD penalty (Fan and Li, 2001) and the MCP (Zhang et al., 2010). Notice that for the MCP penalty (Zhang et al., 2010), the derivative is given by

$$p'_\lambda(\theta) = \frac{(a\lambda - \theta)_+}{a}$$

for $a > 1$ while, for the SCAD penalty the derivative is given by

$$p'_\lambda(|\theta|) = \lambda \left\{ I(\theta \leq \lambda) + \frac{(a\lambda - \theta)_+}{(a-1)\lambda} I(\theta > \lambda) \right\}$$

for some $a > 2$ and $\theta \geq 0$. In case of using SCAD, the tuning parameter λ must be chosen such that the following additional assumptions hold:

(P3) $p_\lambda(\theta)$ has a second order continuous derivative at nonzero components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and is nonnegative with $p_\lambda(0) = 0$.

(P4) $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \liminf_{\theta \rightarrow 0^+} p'_{\lambda_n}(\theta)/\lambda_n > 0$.

(P5) $\lambda_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n}\lambda_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

(P6) Let $b_n = \max\{|p''_\lambda(|\beta_j|)| : \beta_j \neq 0\}$. Then, $b_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

B. PROOFS

In this section, we provide detailed proofs of results presented in the previous sections. We begin with the proof of Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 1

Using multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of degree centralities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{D}) &= \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2) + \mathbf{B} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where

$$J_n(1) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})' [\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\mathbf{c}] \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$J_n(2) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\mathbf{B} = -\sqrt{n}\mathbf{c}' [\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\mathbf{c}] . \quad (\text{A.4})$$

We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D$, and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and using the continuous mapping theorem. Also, by Lemma 11, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with

mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_S(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}$. In addition, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and using the continuous mapping theorem. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_D = \sigma^2[\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]'(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_S(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}[\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(D)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]$. Next turning to $J_n(2)$: by (ii) in Lemma 1 and the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Proposition 2

The proof of this proposition proceeds in the same manner as that of Proposition 11. We only provide it here to make the paper self-contained. By multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of clustering coefficients as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n - \mathbf{C}) &= \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2) + \mathbf{B}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.5})$$

where

$$J_n(1) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})' [\hat{\mathbf{L}}_{C,\mathcal{S}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\mathbf{c}] \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$J_n(2) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$\mathbf{B} = -\sqrt{n}\mathbf{c}' [\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\mathbf{c}]. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C$, and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and using the continuous mapping theorem. Also, by Lemma 11, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} + \mathbf{c})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_S(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}$. In addition, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C = \sigma^2[\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]'(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}\mathbf{V}_S(\mathbf{V}_S + \Sigma)^{-1}[\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{H}^{(C)'}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})\mathbf{c}]$. Next

turning to $J_n(2)$: by (ii) in Lemma 11 and by the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \hat{\beta})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \beta)$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of [1] : Recall that we use a two-step procedure for the variable selection; one is the regularization method and the other is the t-statistic for testing $H : \beta_j = 0$ vs. $K : \beta_j \neq 0$ for $j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)}$, where $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)}$ denotes the estimated active predictor set obtained using regularization. Also, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} = \mathcal{S}) = 1$. And let $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)}$ denote the estimated active predictor set obtained from the hypothesis test using \mathcal{D}_{1n} ; that is

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} = \{j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \mid |t_{n,j}| > c_{\alpha_n}\},$$

where $t_{n,j}$ is the t-statistic for testing $H : \beta_j = 0$ vs. $K : \beta_j \neq 0$. Also if $\alpha_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}) = 1$. To see this, note that

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \neq \mathcal{S}) \leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}) + \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{S} \subsetneq \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)}).$$

We first notice that

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}) \leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \subsetneq \mathcal{S}) + \mathbf{P}([\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} = \mathcal{S}] \cap [\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \neq \mathcal{S}]).$$

By the consistency of the regularization method, the first term on the RHS of the above equation converges to 0. As for the second term, notice that

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \cap \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \neq \mathcal{S}) \leq \mathbf{P}(t_{n,j} > c_{\alpha_n} \text{ for some } j \in \mathcal{S}),$$

and the RHS converges to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the consistency of the t -test. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \cap \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} = \mathcal{S} \text{ and } \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} = \mathcal{S}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= 1 - \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \neq \mathcal{S} \text{ or } \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \neq \mathcal{S}) \\
&\geq 1 - \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(1)} \neq \mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n^{(2)} \neq \mathcal{S}) \\
&\rightarrow 1 \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of [2] : Notice that $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{1n} and $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{2n} . We will use the independence of \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} in the proof. First notice that,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \\
&\quad + \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \\
&= J_n(1) + J_n(2).
\end{aligned}$$

We will show that $J_n(1) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n)$ and $J_n(2) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. To this end, note that

$$\begin{aligned}
J_n(1) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \\
&= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}} - \beta_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \\
&\rightarrow \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}) \leq \mathbf{x}), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line follows from the independence of \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} , and the last convergence comes from the standard theory of ordinary least squares estimator (Amemiya, 1985). Next turning to $J_n(2)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
J_n(2) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \\
&\leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

by estimation consistency. This completes the proof. ■

Proof of Theorem 2

By multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of degree centralities as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n - \mathbf{D}) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \quad (\text{A.9}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2)\end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is a $\hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{th}$ element is given by

$$\hat{l}_D(j, k; \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial f(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\beta}_r)}{\partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial f(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\beta}_r)}{\partial \beta_j} & j = k \\ \frac{\partial f(\hat{\beta}_j, \hat{\beta}_k)}{\partial \beta_k} & j \neq k \end{cases}, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where

$$\frac{\partial f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j)}{\partial \beta_j} = \left. \frac{\partial f(\beta_i, \beta_j)}{\partial \beta_j} \right|_{\beta_j^* \in (\min(\hat{\beta}_j, \beta_j), \max(\hat{\beta}_j, \beta_j))}.$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is a $\hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{D} defined by $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. And $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a $q \times q \times q$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{D} defined by $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in \mathcal{S} . The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is given by

$$H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_r)}{\partial \beta_i^2} & j = k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_i \partial \beta_k} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_j)}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_i} & j = i \text{ and } k \neq i, \text{ or } j \neq i \text{ and } k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_j)}{\partial \beta_j^2} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_i, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_k^2} & j = k \neq i \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases},$$

Similarly, The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})$ is given by

$$\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta}) = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{D}_{n,i}}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_r)}{\partial \beta_i^2} & j = k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_k)}{\partial \beta_i \partial \beta_k} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j)}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_i} & j = i \text{ and } k \neq i, \text{ or } j \neq i \text{ and } k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_j)}{\partial \beta_j^2} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\beta}_i, \hat{\beta}_k)}{\partial \beta_k^2} & j = k \neq i \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

And $J_n(1) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})'$ and $J_n(2) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$. We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Σ_D , and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \beta)$ by the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$ and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \xrightarrow{p} \mathcal{S}$ by [1] in Theorem 1. Also, by (ii) in Theorem 11, $\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}$. In addition, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \beta)$ in probability by the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_D)$, where $\Sigma_D = \sigma^2 \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \beta)' \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \beta)$. Next turning to $J_n(2)$, recall that $J_n(2) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \mathbf{H}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})(\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \beta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$. By Theorem 11 and the continuous mapping theorem using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\beta})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \beta)$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of the Theorem involves several steps. The first step is to verify that the limiting distribution of sample covariance of \mathcal{Y} is Gaussian with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\mathbf{K} \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{K}'$. This is achieved in Lemma 2 below. The second step is concerned with the limiting distribution of the post-selection estimate of the precision matrix. This is dealt with in Lemma 4. Finally, we use these results to derive the joint limit distribution of the sample partial correlation coefficients.

We begin with the limiting distribution of $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}$, which is the limiting covariance of the sample

covariance of \mathcal{Y} , denoted by $\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$, as follows (Neudecker and Wesselman, 1990):

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}} - \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K} \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{K}') \leq \mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{A.12})$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}} = E[\mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S}} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S}}] - \text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})'$ and \mathbf{K} is defined in the statement of Theorem 3. Then, we can establish the following Lemma.

Lemma 2. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension adjusted version. Then,

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K} \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{K}') \leq \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Proof. Notice that $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{1n} and $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{2n} . We use the independence of \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} for the proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \right) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &\quad + \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $J_n(1) \rightarrow \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K} \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{K}') \leq \mathbf{x}_n)$ and $J_n(2) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $J_n(1)$ can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_n(1) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}} - \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) \\ &\rightarrow \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{K} \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{K}') \leq \mathbf{x}) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

where the last convergence follows from (A.12). We will next show $J_n(2)$ converges to 0. To this end,

$$J_n(2) = \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} v(\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Sigma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \leq \mathbf{x}_n \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S})$$

$$\leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Before we prove Theorem 33, we first establish some properties of functions defined on the space of positive definite symmetric matrices \mathcal{A} endowed with Frobenius norm. The following lemma describes the derivative of an inverse of a invertible matrix (Petersen et al., 2008).

Lemma 3. Let $z : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $z(A) = A^{-1}$. Then $z(\cdot)$ is continuous. Furthermore,

$$\frac{\partial v(z(A))}{v(A)} = -(z(A) \otimes z(A)) \equiv \mathbf{L}(A). \quad (\text{A.14})$$

We now state an extended version of the delta method which plays a critical role in several proofs.

Proposition 3. Let $\{A_n : n \geq 1\}$ be a collection of matrices in \mathcal{A} such that $\sqrt{n}(v(A_n) - v(A)) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \mathfrak{D})$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}(\sqrt{n}(v(z(A_n)) - v(z(A))) \leq \mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \mathfrak{D}_z^*) \leq \mathbf{x}) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

where $\mathfrak{D}_z^* = \mathbf{L}(A)' \mathfrak{D} \mathbf{L}(A)$.

We are now ready to prove Lemma 4 concerning the limit distribution of the post-selection estimator of the precision matrix.

Lemma 4. For any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^q$, let \mathbf{x}_n denote its dimension adjusted version. Then, the following will hold:

[1]

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}) - v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})) \leq \mathbf{x}\right) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}^*) \leq \mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{A.16})$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}^* = \mathbf{K} \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \mathbf{K}'$ and $\mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) = -(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})$.

[2]

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P}\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) - v(\Gamma_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})) \leq \mathbf{x}_n\right) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}^*) \leq \mathbf{x}). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Proof. Let $z : \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $z(A) = A^{-1}$. Then by continuity of $z(\cdot)$, it follows that $z(\hat{\Sigma}_S)$ converges in probability to $z(\Sigma_S)$. Now, we apply Proposition 3 to (A.12) we get, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, that

$$\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \left(v(z(\hat{\Sigma}_S)) - v(z(\Sigma_S)) \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}^*). \quad (\text{A.18})$$

Now by another application of Lemma 3 and (A.12), it follows that $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}^* = \mathbf{K}L'(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}L(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})\mathbf{K}'$. The proof for [2] follows by the conditioning argument as before. \square

Now we introduce the limiting distribution of $\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{S}}$. The $(i, j)^{th}$ element of $\nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))$, denoted by $h_{ij}(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))$, is given by

$$h_{ij}(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})) = \frac{\partial h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))}{\partial \gamma_{v,j}} = \begin{cases} -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_{v,i+1}}}{\gamma_{v,1}^{3/2} \sqrt{\gamma_{v,k}}} & i = 1, \dots, q \text{ and } j = 1 \\ \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma_{v,i+1}} \sqrt{\gamma_{v,1}} \sqrt{\gamma_{v,k}}} & i = 1, \dots, q \text{ and } j = i + 1 \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\sqrt{\gamma_{v,i+1}}}{\sqrt{\gamma_{v,1}} \gamma_{v,k}^{3/2}} & i = 1, \dots, q \text{ and } j = k, \end{cases}$$

where $\gamma_{v,i}$ is the i^{th} element of $v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})$ and $k = \sum_{l=0}^i (q-l) + 1$. Then, by applying the multivariate delta method, we have the following result:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{P} \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\rho}_{\mathcal{S}} - \rho_{\mathcal{S}}) \leq \mathbf{x} \right) = \mathbf{P}(N(\mathbf{0}, \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\rho)) \leq \mathbf{x}), \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\rho) = \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})) \mathbf{K}L(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}L(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})\mathbf{K}' \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))'$. By using the conditioning argument as before, the proof of Theorem 33 is completed. ■

Proof of Theorem 4

By multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of clustering coefficients as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\mathbf{D}}_n(\rho) - \mathbf{D}(\rho)) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} \hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\rho})(\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \rho_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}} (\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \rho_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\rho})(\hat{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \rho_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ is a $\hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n$ matrix whose $(j, k)^{th}$ element is given by

$$\hat{l}_D(j, k; \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) = \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial f(\hat{\rho}_j, \hat{\rho}_r)}{\partial \rho_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial f(\hat{\rho}_j, \hat{\rho}_r)}{\partial \rho_j} & j = k \\ \frac{\partial f(\hat{\rho}_j, \hat{\rho}_k)}{\partial \rho_k} & j \neq k. \end{cases}, \quad (\text{A.21})$$

where

$$\frac{\partial f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_j)}{\partial \rho_j} = \left. \frac{\partial f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_j)}{\partial \rho_j} \right|_{\rho_j^* \in (\min(\hat{\rho}_j, \rho_j), \max(\hat{\rho}_j, \rho_j))}.$$

Let $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ is a $\hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n \times \hat{q}_n$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{D} defined by $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. And $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is a $q \times q \times q$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{D} defined by $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in \mathcal{S} . The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is given by

$$H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial^2 D_i(\boldsymbol{\rho})}{\partial \rho_j \partial \rho_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \mathcal{S}} \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_i, \rho_r)}{\partial \rho_i^2} & j = k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_i, \rho_k)}{\partial \rho_i \partial \rho_k} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_i, \rho_j)}{\partial \rho_j \partial \rho_i} & j = i \text{ and } k \neq i, \text{ or } j \neq i \text{ and } k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_i, \rho_j)}{\partial \rho_j^2} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_i, \rho_k)}{\partial \rho_k^2} & j = k \neq i \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases},$$

Similarly, The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ is given by

$$\hat{H}_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}) = \frac{\partial^2 \hat{D}_{n,i}(\boldsymbol{\rho})}{\partial \rho_j \partial \rho_k} = \begin{cases} \sum_{r \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_r)}{\partial \hat{\rho}_i^2} & j = k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_k)}{\partial \hat{\rho}_i \partial \hat{\rho}_k} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_j)}{\partial \hat{\rho}_j \partial \hat{\rho}_i} & j = i \text{ and } k \neq i, \text{ or } j \neq i \text{ and } k = i \\ \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_j)}{\partial \hat{\rho}_j^2} \text{ or } \frac{\partial^2 f(\hat{\rho}_i, \hat{\rho}_k)}{\partial \hat{\rho}_k^2} & j = k \neq i \\ 0 & otherwise \end{cases}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma_D(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that

$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Also, by Theorem 33, $\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. In addition, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_D(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_D(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$, where $\Sigma_D(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_D(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$. Next turning to $J_n(2)$, recall that $J_n(2) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$. By Theorem 33 and the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(D)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Theorem 5

The proof of this theorem proceeds in the same manner as that of Theorem 22. We only provide it here to make the paper self-contained. By multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of clustering coefficients as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n - \mathbf{C}) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \quad (\text{A.23}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2) \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ are obtained by replacing the function of degree centrality in (A.10) and (A.11) with the function of clustering coefficient. Let $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}_n, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is a $q \times q \times q$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{C} defined by $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ in \mathcal{S} . The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ is given by

$$H_{i,jk}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{\partial^2 C_i}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_j, \beta_k)}{\partial \beta_j \partial \beta_k} & j \neq k \neq i \\ \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{\partial^2 f(\beta_k, \beta_u)}{\partial \beta_k^2} & j = k \text{ and } k \neq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix Σ_C , and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continu-

ity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Also, by Theorem 11, $\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\sigma^2 \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1}$. In addition $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C)$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C = \sigma^2 \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})' \mathbf{V}_{\mathcal{S}}^{-1} \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$. Next turning to $J_n(2)$, recall that $J_n(2) = \sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$. By Theorem 11 and the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Theorem 6

The proof of this theorem proceeds in the same manner as that of Theorem 44. We only provide it here to make the paper self-contained. By multivariate Taylor expansion (Apostol, 1969), one can express the vector of clustering coefficients as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\mathbf{C}}_n(\boldsymbol{\rho}) - \mathbf{C}(\boldsymbol{\rho})) &= \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ and $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ are obtained by replacing the function of degree centrality in (A.21) and (A.22) with the function of clustering coefficient. Let $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is a $q \times q \times q$ Hessian matrix associated with \mathbf{C} defined by $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ in \mathcal{S} . The $(i, jk)^{th}$ element of $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ is given by

$$H_{i,jk}^{(D)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho}) = \frac{\partial^2 C_i(\boldsymbol{\rho})}{\partial \rho_j \partial \rho_k} = \frac{1}{(q-1)(q-2)} \begin{cases} \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_j, \rho_k)}{\partial \rho_j \partial \rho_k} & j \neq k \neq i \\ \sum_{(k,u) \in \mathcal{N}(i)} \frac{\partial^2 f(\rho_k, \rho_u)}{\partial \rho_k^2} & j = k \text{ and } k \neq i \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

We will first show that $J_n(1)$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_C(\boldsymbol{\beta})$, and $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. To this end, observe that

$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges in probability to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Also, by Theorem 33, $\sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$ converges to a multivariate normal distribution with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. In addition, $\hat{\mathbf{L}}_C(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ converges to $\mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ in probability by the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$. Hence, by multivariate Slutsky's Theorem (Van der Vaart, 2000) it follows that as $n \rightarrow \infty$ $J_n(1) \xrightarrow{d} N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_C(\boldsymbol{\rho}))$, where $\Sigma_C(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{L}_C(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$. Next turning to $J_n(2)$, recall that $J_n(2) = \sqrt{\frac{n}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})' \hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})(\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \boldsymbol{\rho}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n})$. By Theorem 33 and the continuous mapping theorem, using the continuity of $f(\cdot, \cdot)$, consistency of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ and convergence of $\hat{\mathbf{H}}_n^{(C)}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n, \hat{\boldsymbol{\rho}})$ to $\mathbf{H}^{(C)}(\mathcal{S}, \boldsymbol{\rho})$ in probability, it follows that $J_n(2)$ converges to 0 in probability. ■

Proof of Theorem 7

Proof of [1]. We can represent $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ as a product of matrices as follows:

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))' \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})).$$

where $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}$ is the covariance matrix of $\text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})$, $\mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) = -(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})$, and $\nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))$ is the partial derivatives of $h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))$. Let the estimate of $\Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, denoted by $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, be represented as follows:

$$\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \nabla h_n(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}))' \hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}} \hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}) \nabla h_n(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}})).$$

We will show that the estimate of each term in $\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}$ converges to the true value and then it will complete the proof by applying the property of convergence in probability (Gut, 2013). Recall that $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S}} = (\mathbf{Y}, \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}})$ and let $\mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i} = (Y_i, R_{\mathcal{S},i})$. Then,

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{S}} = E[\mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i} \otimes \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i}] - \text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \text{vec}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})'$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i} \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}} \text{ and} \\ &\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i} \otimes \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i}) \xrightarrow{p} E[\mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i} \otimes \mathcal{Y}'_{\mathcal{S},i} \mathcal{Y}_{\mathcal{S},i}] \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{p} \Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Let z denote a function that is defined in Lemma 3. Then, by continuous mapping theorem and Lemma 3, $\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} = z(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}) \xrightarrow{p} z(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) = \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$. Then, by the continuous mapping theorem and the property of convergence in probability, the estimate of $\mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})$, which is denoted by $\hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}})$, also converges to $\mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})$; that is

$$\hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}) = -\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}} \xrightarrow{p} -\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} \otimes \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

By Assumption (A3) and the continuous mapping theorem, $\nabla h_n(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}})) \xrightarrow{p} \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Then, using the property of convergence in probability gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}}(\rho) &= \nabla h_n(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}}))' \hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}})' \hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}} \hat{\mathbf{L}}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{S}}) \nabla h(v(\hat{\Gamma}_{\mathcal{S}})) \\ &\xrightarrow{p} \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}))' \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}})' \Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{L}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{S}}) \nabla h(v(\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}})) = \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}(\rho) \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$ by the convergence of each element and the continuity of the product of random variables. The proof is completed. ■

Proof of [2]. Notice that $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{1n} and $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}$ is estimated from \mathcal{D}_{2n} . We use the independence of \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} for the proof. For $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon \right) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) + \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2). \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $J_n(1) \rightarrow 0$ and $J_n(2) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. $J_n(1)$ can be represented as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} J_n(1) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P} \left(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S} \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\mathcal{S}} - \Delta_{\mathcal{S}}\| > \epsilon \right) \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the penultimate line comes from the independence of \mathcal{D}_{1n} and \mathcal{D}_{2n} . Now we will show $J_n(2)$

converges to 0.

$$\begin{aligned} J_n(2) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\|\hat{\Delta}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n} - \Delta_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n}\| > \epsilon \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S} \right) \mathbf{P} (\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P} (\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof is completed. ■

Proof of Theorem 8

We begin by recalling the notations needed for studying the properties of estimated clusters of covariates in \mathcal{S} and $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$. Let $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}$ denote the k^{th} cluster of covariates in \mathcal{S} , and it can be obtained by replacing $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n$ with \mathcal{S} in Algorithm 1. Then, the proof consists of two parts: we will show that (i) $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}$ converges to $\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in probability and (ii) for each $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$, the symmetric difference between $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}$ converges to \emptyset , an empty set, as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in probability. For (i), we will show that the symmetric difference between the true cluster and estimated cluster converges to \emptyset with probability tending to 1. We recall that the symmetric difference between a set \mathcal{A} and a set \mathcal{B} is given by

$$\mathcal{A} \triangle \mathcal{B} = (\mathcal{A} - \mathcal{B}) \cup (\mathcal{B} - \mathcal{A}).$$

Now, notice that for any $k = 1, 2, \dots, K$

$$\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} = \emptyset) = \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} - \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} = \emptyset) + \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} - \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset). \quad (\text{A.25})$$

We will show that the above quantity converges to one as $n \rightarrow \infty$. The proof relies on the consistency of the hypothesis test used in the clustering algorithm. That is, since the type 1 error, α_n , is converging to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$, it follows that the power β_n of the hypothesis test converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} - \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} &= \{j \in \mathcal{S} : j \in \mathcal{C}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \text{ and } j \notin \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)}\} \\ &= \{j \in \mathcal{S} : t_{j,v_k^*} \leq t_{\alpha_n}^* \text{ and } |D_j - D_k^*| > \tau\} \end{aligned}$$

By the consistency of the t-test, $\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} - \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} = \emptyset) \rightarrow 1$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Next, we note that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} - \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} &= \{j \in \mathcal{S} : j \in \mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} \text{ and } j \notin \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)}\} \\ &= \{j \in \mathcal{S} : t_{j,v_k^*} > t_{\alpha_n}^* \text{ and } |D_j - D_k^*| \leq \tau\}\end{aligned}$$

Hence, once again by the consistency of the t-test, $\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{C}_\tau^{(k)} - \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. This completes the proof that the LHS of (A.25) converges to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and hence the proof of (i) is complete.

Now we turn to the proof of (ii). To this end, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset) &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) + \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \\ &= J_n(1) + J_n(2).\end{aligned}$$

We will show that $J_n(1) \rightarrow 1$ and $J_n(2) \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Now observe that

$$\begin{aligned}J_n(1) &= \mathbf{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}\right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \\ &= \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n = \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 1 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where the last convergence follows from the consistency of variable selection. Now we will show $J_n(2)$ is equal to 0.

$$\begin{aligned}J_n(2) &= \mathbf{P}\left(\hat{\mathcal{C}}_{n,\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} \triangle \hat{\mathcal{C}}_{\tau,\alpha_n}^{(k)} = \emptyset \middle| \hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}\right) \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_n \neq \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of (ii) and that of the Theorem. ■

C. ADDITIONAL NUMERICAL STUDIES

In this section, we provide the additional numerical studies described in Section 6.

Numerical Experiments on Computational Time

We provide a small simulation study to compare the bias and the running time of the bootstrap algorithm and the plug-in estimates of the covariance matrix of the estimated precision matrix, which is denoted by Δ^* . We perform this study with 10 variables without the regularization. We generate 100 i.i.d observations from a multivariate normal with mean $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix \mathbf{I} , which is an identity matrix. Because of the computational feasibility, we perform 1000 simulation studies. The average computational time of 1000 simulations of using the exact formula is 6.239 minutes and that of using bootstrap is .116 minutes. And the mean of $\|\hat{\Delta}_E - \Delta\|_F$, where $\hat{\Delta}_E$ is $\hat{\Delta}$ obtained by using the exact formula and $\|\cdot\|_F$ is the Frobenius norm of a matrix, is 14.450 and the mean of $\|\hat{\Delta}_B - \Delta\|_F$, where $\hat{\Delta}_B$ is $\hat{\Delta}$ obtained by using bootstrap, is 14.688. In addition, the mean of $\|\hat{\Delta}_E^* - \Delta^*\|_F$ is 19.067 while the mean of $\|\hat{\Delta}_B^* - \Delta^*\|_F$ is 14.540. According to these numerical experiments, the exact formula is 50 times more expensive than the bootstrap approach. In terms of their accuracy in estimating Δ , the exact formula and bootstrap based estimate are not very different in estimating Δ and Δ^* . Hence we will use the bootstrap approach to estimate the limiting covariance matrix in Theorem 2 through Theorem 5.

Numerical Experiments on Centralities

We now demonstrate the behavior of network-wide metrics of our implicit network. The vector of covariates $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p)'$ is generated from a multivariate normal distribution (p -dimensional) with mean vector zero and covariance matrix is a p -dimensional identity matrix. We consider multiple linear regression model without an intercept with the covariate dimension $p = 10$, and sample size 100 and 300. Given \mathbf{x}_i , the response variable Y_i is generated from $\mathbf{x}_i\beta + \epsilon_i$ where $\epsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $\sigma^2 = 1$, and $\beta' = (1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 2, 2)$. The implicit network was constructed based on the function (ii) in Section 3.3. The true value of the degree centrality and the clustering coefficient of our implicit network is 9.748 and .545, respectively. Based on the 1000 simulations, the bias of degree centrality at $n = 100$ and $n = 300$ are -.008 (.323) and -.014 (.001), respectively. Numbers in parentheses are the standard errors. The bias of clustering coefficient at $n = 100$ and $n = 300$ are -.014 (.180) and -.001 (.003), respectively. The following histograms represent the distribution of the degree centrality and clustering coefficient. Among the 10 covariates, we choose X_1 to provide histograms.




Figure 2: Network-wide metrics with $n = 100$




Figure 3: Network-wide metrics with $n = 300$

The histograms above shows that the degree centrality and clustering coefficient both follow a normal distribution, which corresponds with the Theorem 2 and Theorem 5 in Section 4.2.

Numerical Experiments with a wrong number of clusters

We repeat the same numerical study described in Section 6.2, but here we set the desired number of clusters to 2 and 4 instead of 3. In this numerical study, we will compare the performance of three clustering algorithms, which are the modified K-means clustering, the spectral clustering, and

the sequential testing clustering algorithm, when we give a wrong number of clusters to detect. The simulation setting is same as that in Section 6.2, but the number of simulations is now set to 1000. If the desired number of cluster is 2, then a clustering algorithm must identify the top two clusters that are associated with the response variable. In case of 4, a clustering algorithm must detect all three true clusters and the fourth clusters must be empty. The table in the below represents the proportion of times that each clustering algorithm identifies the correct clusters.

r_b	Number of Clusters	Modified K-means	Modified Spectral	Sequential Clustering
0	2	0	0	.901
		0	0	.894
		0	0	.894
		0	0	.872
		0	0	.875
		0	0	.867
.1	4	0	0	.91
		0	0	.9
		0	0	.9
		0	0	.878
		0	0	.887
		0	0	.858

From the table above, we observe that unsupervised clustering methods cannot identify correct clusters when the true number of clusters is unknown. On the other hand, the sequential testing clustering algorithm identifies the true clusters even though the number of clusters is not known in advance. When the pre-specified number of clusters is larger than the true number of clusters, it can identify all correct clusters. If the pre-specified number of clusters (let's say it is k) is smaller than the truth, it can identify first k clusters. Hence, the proposed clustering algorithm outperforms unsupervised clustering algorithms when the true number of clusters is unknown.

While eleven genes were selected in the estimated active predictor set, the sequential testing

method detected one cluster with 3 variables, using both degree centrality and clustering coefficient. One may now summarize the information contained in the detected cluster and use it to provide a model with other genes that are not in the cluster.

D. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We propose a new method to group predictors that have a similar association with the response variable of interest. Our method uses the properties of the network-wide metrics on the implicit network, and a sequential hypothesis testing procedure to define clusters. Under a population model for groups, conditions are provided that guarantee detection of clusters with probability tending to one as the sample size diverges to infinity. Additionally, the proposed method takes into account model-selection uncertainty in the detection of clusters of predictors, which seems to be first such result in the literature. A model-assisted bootstrap approach – with reduced computational burden – to assess uncertainty in the estimates of network-wide metrics is also provided and illustrated numerically. The numerical experiments also show that adoption of NWM for clustering even in the context of unsupervised problems may yield improved results. The proposed methods are illustrated with examples from sports analytics and the study of breast cancer.

While detailed computations are provided for partial correlation weights, other weight functions such as Pearson’s correlation, distance correlation, and mutual information can also be used as weights. Asymptotic theory related to these weights is left for future research.

Disclaimer: This report is released to inform interested parties of research and to encourage discussion. The views expressed on statistical issues are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Census Bureau.

REFERENCES

- Altenbuchinger, M., Weihs, A., Quackenbush, J., Jörgen, G. H., and Zacharias, H. (2020), “Gaussian and Mixed Graphical Models as (multi-) omics data analysis tools,” *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Gene Regulatory Mechanisms*, 1863.
- Amemiya, T. (1985), *Advanced econometrics*, Harvard university press.

Antoniou, I. and Tsompa, E. (2008), “Statistical analysis of weighted networks,” *Discrete dynamics in Nature and Society*, 2008.

Apostol, T. M. (1969), “Calculus, Volume II: Multi-variable calculus and linear algebra, with applications to differential equations and probability. Blaisdell Publishing Co., Ginn and Co., Waltham, Mass,” *Toronto, Ont.*

Baseball-Reference (2016), “Baseball Reference 2016 Regular Season Stats,” <https://www.baseball-reference.com/>.

Bühlmann, P., Rütimann, P., van de Geer, S., and Zhang, C.-H. (2013), “Correlated variables in regression: clustering and sparse estimation,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 143, 1835–1858.

Crane, H. (2018), *Probabilistic foundations of statistical network analysis*, Chapman and Hall/CRC.

De la Fuente, A., Bing, N., Hoeschele, I., and Pedro, M. (2004), “Discovery of meaningful associations in genomic data using partial correlation coefficients,” *Bioinformatics*, 20, 3565–3574.

Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), “Variable Selection via Nonconcave Penalized Likelihood and its Oracle Properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1348.

Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2011), “Nonconcave penalized likelihood with NP-dimensionality,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57, 5467–5484.

Gut, A. (2013), *Probability: a graduate course*, vol. 75, Springer Science & Business Media.

Khalili, A. and Vidyashankar, A. (2018), “Hypothesis Testing in Finite Mixture of Regressions: Sparsity and Model Selection Uncertainty,” *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 46, 429–457.

Kim, Y., Choi, H., and Oh, H.-S. (2008), “Smoothly clipped absolute deviation on high dimensions,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103, 1665–1673.

Kim, Y. and Kwon, S. (2012), “Global optimality of nonconvex penalized estimators,” *Biometrika*, 99, 315–325.

Lopez-Fernandez, L., Robles, G., Gonzalez-Barahona, J. M., et al. (2004), “Applying social network analysis to the information in CVS repositories,” in *International workshop on mining software repositories*, IET, pp. 101–105.

Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2010), “Stability selection,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72, 417–473.

MLB (2016), “MLB 2016 Regular Season Stats,” <https://www.mlb.com/>.

Muirhead, R. J. (2009), *Aspects of multivariate statistical theory*, vol. 197, John Wiley & Sons.

Neudecker, H. and Wesselman, A. M. (1990), “The asymptotic variance matrix of the sample correlation matrix,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 127, 589–599.

Opsahl, T., Agneessens, F., and Skvoretz, J. (2010), “Node centrality in weighted networks: Generalizing degree and shortest paths,” *Social networks*, 32, 245–251.

Petersen, K. B., Pedersen, M. S., et al. (2008), “The matrix cookbook,” *Technical University of Denmark*, 7, 510.

Reverter, A. and Chan, E. K. (2008), “Combining partial correlation and an information theory approach to the reversed engineering of gene co-expression networks,” *Bioinformatics*, 24, 2491–2497.

Tibshirani, R. (1996), “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 267–288.

Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000), *Asymptotic statistics*, vol. 3, Cambridge university press.

Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2006), “Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68, 49–67.

Zhang, C.-H. et al. (2010), “Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty,” *The Annals of statistics*, 38, 894–942.