

STABILITY OF A GENERALIZED DEBIASED LASSO WITH APPLICATIONS TO RESAMPLING-BASED VARIABLE SELECTION

BY JINGBO LIU ^a

Department of Statistics, University of Illinois ^ajingbol@illinois.edu

Suppose that we first apply the Lasso to a design matrix, and then update one of its columns. In general, the signs of the Lasso coefficients may change, and there is no closed-form expression for updating the Lasso solution exactly. In this work, we propose an approximate formula for updating a debiased Lasso coefficient. We provide general nonasymptotic error bounds in terms of the norms and correlations of a given design matrix's columns, and then prove asymptotic convergence results for the case of a random design matrix with i.i.d. sub-Gaussian row vectors and i.i.d. Gaussian noise. Notably, the approximate formula is asymptotically correct for most coordinates in the proportional growth regime, under the mild assumption that each row of the design matrix is sub-Gaussian with a covariance matrix having a bounded condition number. Our proof only requires certain concentration and anti-concentration properties to control various error terms and the number of sign changes. In contrast, rigorously establishing distributional limit properties (e.g. Gaussian limits for the debiased Lasso) under similarly general assumptions has been considered open problem in the universality theory. As applications, we show that the approximate formula allows us to reduce the computation complexity of variable selection algorithms that require solving multiple Lasso problems, such as the conditional randomization test and a variant of the knockoff filter.

1. Introduction. The Lasso is a commonly used method for high-dimensional regression, variable selection, and selective inference (Tibshirani, 1996)(Hastie et al., 2015)(Taylor and Tibshirani, 2015)(Barber and Candès, 2019). In this paper we consider the scenario where the design matrix is changed locally, and study how the corresponding solution changes. Consider two matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ differing only in the j -th column. Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\lambda \in [0, \infty)$. Define

$$(1) \quad \hat{\alpha} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \|Y - A\alpha\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\alpha\|_1 \right\};$$

$$(2) \quad \hat{\beta} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \|Y - B\beta\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1 \right\}.$$

Since B is a locally updated version of A , we might expect that $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ are close in a certain sense. In particular, suppose that a statistic $t(j, B, Y)$ is a function of $\hat{\beta}$ by definition. We are interested in finding a method of efficiently computing $t(j, B, Y)$ (possibly approximately), assuming that $\hat{\alpha}$ is known, without computing $\hat{\beta}$.

One motivation for considering such a problem is to efficiently implement variable selection algorithms based on resampling, such as the knockoff filter and the conditional randomization test (CRT) (Candes et al., 2018)(Tansey et al., 2022)(Bates et al., 2020)(Li,

MSC2020 subject classifications: Primary 62J07, 62E17; secondary 62F12, 62F05.

Keywords and phrases: Lasso, debiased Lasso, inference in high-dimensional regression models, knockoffs, false discovery rate, universality, small ball probability.

2022). Consider, for example, the CRT algorithm, which iteratively updates each feature vector (column of the design matrix) with a conditionally independent sample, and calculates the corresponding test statistics (which is usually a function of the Lasso coefficients). Since the newly sampled columns are conditionally independent of the observation, we can use $t(j, B^1, Y), \dots, t(j, B^K, Y)$ as control variables for estimating the p -value of $t(j, A, Y)$, where B^1, \dots, B^K denote the resampled matrices each differing from A by only the j -th column. By estimating the p -values for each j , one can perform variable selection tasks such as false discovery rate control. Experimentally, CRT often achieves higher power compared to other variable selection methods, such as the knockoff filter (Candes et al., 2018)(Li, 2022). However, “one major limitation of the conditional randomization method is its computational cost” (Candes et al., 2018). Note that the complexity of solving the Lasso problem (via least angle regression, which has the same order of computation cost as a least square fit) is $O(p^3)$ in general (Hastie et al., 2009, p93). The computation complexity of CRT is then $O(p^4 K)$ since we need to solve a Lasso problem for each of the p locally updated design matrix, and K denotes the number of repetitions.

In this paper, we show that under rather general non-Gaussian correlated design settings, the signs of $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ only differ in a vanishing fraction of coordinates. As a consequence, if $t(\cdot)$ is an appropriately constructed statistic based on the debiased Lasso coefficient, then it is indeed possible to approximately compute $t(j, B, Y)$ using $\hat{\alpha}$. Let us first recall the debiased Lasso coefficients in the setting of Javanmard and Montanari (2014b). Suppose that A has i.i.d. rows following the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, and $Y = A\alpha + w$, where w is an independent Gaussian noise vector, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The “number of nonzero coefficients” is defined by

$$(3) \quad k := \|\chi^\alpha\|_0,$$

where

$$(4) \quad \psi^\alpha := \frac{1}{n\lambda} A^\top R, \quad R := Y - A\hat{\alpha},$$

$$(5) \quad \chi_j^\alpha := 1\{\psi_j^\alpha = 1\} - 1\{\psi_j^\alpha = -1\}.$$

Note that ψ^α is the subgradient of the ℓ_1 norm, so $k \geq \|\hat{\alpha}\|_0$, although equality is achieved in most cases. We use the definition (3) instead of $\|\hat{\alpha}\|_0$ since $\hat{\alpha}$ may not be unique, due to the lack of strong convexity of the optimization, whereas ψ^α , and hence χ^α , is always uniquely defined. Similarly χ_j^α can be understood as the ‘essential sign’ of $\hat{\alpha}_j$. Then, the debiased Lasso defined in Javanmard and Montanari (2014b) is

$$(6) \quad \hat{\alpha}^u := \hat{\alpha} + \frac{1}{n-k} \Sigma^{-1} A^\top (Y - A\hat{\alpha}).$$

Under suitable conditions, it has been shown that $\hat{\alpha}^u \approx \alpha + \tau \Sigma^{-1/2} z$, where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and $\tau \in (0, \infty)$ is a constant determined by a set of fixed point equations (Javanmard and Montanari, 2014b). Rigorously establishing such Gaussian limit properties for general non-Gaussian A in the proportional growth regime (p , n , and the sparsity level s have fixed ratios) is challenging; see discussions in the Related work section.

In this work, we introduce a modified definition of the debiased Lasso estimator in (6). Let $A_{\cdot, \setminus j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ denote the matrix obtained by excluding the j -th column of A . Set

$$(7) \quad \check{A}_{\cdot, j} := A_{\cdot, j} - \mathbb{E}[A_{\cdot, j} | A_{\cdot, \setminus j}].$$

Thus in the case of Gaussian A , we have the expression $\check{A}_{\cdot, j} := A_{\cdot, j} - A_{\cdot, \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j, j}$ in terms of the covariance matrix Σ , but this is not necessarily true in the case of non-Gaussian A .

Then we define a modified version of the debiased estimator in (6),

$$(8) \quad \hat{\alpha}_j^U := \hat{\alpha}_j + \left(\frac{1}{n} \check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:j} \right)^{-1} \frac{\check{A}_{:j}^\top R}{n},$$

where

$$(9) \quad \mathcal{A} := \{l \neq j : \chi_l^\alpha \neq 0\},$$

and $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ denotes the projection onto the columns of A corresponding to \mathcal{A} . Again, we adopt the convention in (3) when $\hat{\alpha}$ is not unique. Note that the definition of $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$ uses only (Y, A) and has no reference to B , hence we can use $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$ to build $t(j, A, Y)$.

We will see that $\hat{\alpha}_j^U \approx \hat{\alpha}_j^y$ under certain regularity assumptions on the distribution of the feature vectors. However, our modified definition of the debiased Lasso in (8) allows us to prove an approximate update formula under much more general assumptions. Define $\hat{\beta}_j^U$ similarly to $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$, i.e.,

$$(10) \quad \hat{\beta}_j^U := \hat{\beta}_j + \left(\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} \right)^{-1} \frac{\check{B}_{:j}^\top S}{n},$$

where $\check{B}_{:j} := B_{:j} - \mathbb{E}[B_{:j}|B_{:\setminus j}]$, $S := Y - B\hat{\beta}$, and $P_{\mathcal{B}}$ denotes the projection onto the columns of A (equivalently, columns of B) corresponding to $\mathcal{B} := \{l \neq j : \chi_l^\beta \neq 0\}$. For any given (A, B, Y) , we can show the approximate formula (Theorem 1)

$$(11) \quad \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j^U \approx \check{B}_{:j}^\top R + \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j.$$

If $B_{:j}$ and $A_{:j}$ are independent conditioned on $A_{:\setminus j}$, we can further show that the right side of (11) is approximately $\check{B}_{:j}^\top R$, although the right side of (11) is already computable without using $\hat{\beta}$. Thus, for any given Y , if we define

$$(12) \quad t(j, A, Y) := \check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j^U;$$

$$(13) \quad t(j, B, Y) := \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j^U,$$

then we can compute $t(j, A, Y)$ and (approximately) $t(j, B, Y)$ using only $\hat{\alpha}$ rather than $\hat{\beta}$.

We then specialize the approximation error bound to the case of $Y = A\alpha + w$ and design matrices whose rows are i.i.d. with covariance of bounded max and min eigenvalues and with bounded sub-Gaussian variance proxy. Also assume that $B_{:j}$ and $A_{:j}$ are i.i.d. given $A_{:\setminus j}$. In this setting, we show that the approximation error in (11) vanishes asymptotically for almost all j (see Definition 1 and Theorem 3). Our proof only uses certain concentration and anti-concentration properties to give order-wise control of quantities, rather than more precise calculation of limits, which may require stronger assumptions.

We can show that $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{B}} - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:j}$ is small under the above conditions. If we further assume that $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:j}$ is bounded away from 0, then we have from (11) that

$$(14) \quad \hat{\beta}_j^U \approx \frac{\check{B}_{:j}^\top R + \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j}{\check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:j}}.$$

We can show that this is the case if $\mathbb{E}[|\check{B}_{1j}|^2]$ is bounded away from 0 (see (31)).

Further, if we have

$$(15) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:j} \approx \left(1 - \frac{k}{n}\right) \Sigma_{j|\setminus j},$$

then $\hat{\beta}_j^U \approx \hat{\beta}_j^u$. For example, (15) is true in the case of Gaussian feature vector, as a consequence of concentration of the chi-square distribution. Under more general distribution assumptions however, (15) may no longer be true, since $\mathbb{E}[B_{:,j}|A_{:, \setminus j}] = A_{:, \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j j}$ may not hold (see Remark 10). This is our main motivation for introducing $\hat{\beta}_j^U$.

To see the implication of (11) for CRT, suppose that for each of $j = 1, \dots, p$, we resample the j -th column of A to get a new design matrix $B^{(j)}$, and approximately compute $t_j := t(j, B^{(j)}, Y)$ from (11). We can repeat this process for K times to get t_j^1, \dots, t_j^K . Suppose that we also compute $t_j^0 := t(j, A, Y)$ from (12). Then t^0, \dots, t^K can be used for running CRT. That is, since t_j^0, \dots, t_j^K have the same distribution under the j -th null (by symmetry), we can obtain an estimate of the p -value associated with t_j^0 using the ranking of these $K + 1$ numbers. We can show that running CRT using approximate formula takes only $O(p^3 + p^2 K)$ time, in contrast to the $O(p^4 K)$ time using the exact calculation. As noted in Candès et al. (2018), it is often necessary to choose a large K , say order p , to obtain a good estimate of the tail of the null distribution, in which case the approximate formula gives us order p^2 times speed up.

Since previously the debiased Lasso $\hat{\alpha}^u$ often appears in the literature on asymptotic normality, and asymptotic normality results can be used to directly estimate the p -value of $\hat{\alpha}^u$, one might ask what is the benefit of resampling $B_{:,j}$ and using $\hat{\beta}_j^U$ to estimate the p -values. The answer is that asymptotic normality requires more stringent conditions than the validity of the update formula. One simple example is the limiting case where the Lasso is reduced to a least square problem ($n > p$ and $\lambda \rightarrow 0$). In this case, (11) is in fact *equality* regardless of the distributions and the dimensions, whereas asymptotic normality results may not hold for some distributions. For the general λ case, as mentioned before, our proof of the approximation in (11) only uses certain concentration and anti-concentration properties to control the *order* of the errors, rather than more precise characterization of limits such as Gaussian convergence. Indeed, our Theorem 3 shows asymptotic approximation assuming that the covariance matrix Σ of $B_{1:}$ has bounded conditional numbers, and that $B_{1:}$ is a sub-Gaussian vector. In contrast, a Gaussian limit result for $\hat{\alpha}^u$ in similarly general settings is not available (see discussions in Related work).

Related work.

- Debiasing the Lasso for inference was suggested by Zhang and Zhang (2014), Bühlmann (2013), van de Geer et al. (2014), and Javanmard and Montanari (2014b). The replica analysis heuristic calculation in Javanmard and Montanari (2014b) was perhaps the first to show that β^u in (6) satisfies asymptotic normality in the proportional growth regime, with i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ rows in the design matrix. More specifically, in a suitable sense there is the approximation

$$(16) \quad \hat{\alpha}^u - \alpha \approx \tau \Sigma^{-1/2} z$$

for some $z \in \mathcal{N}(0, I)$, where α is the ground truth, $Y = A\alpha + w$, $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, nI)$, and τ is the solution to a fixed point equation. The replica calculation relies heavily on the assumption of random design with i.i.d. rows, and is not rigorous.

- Leave-one-out analysis is a fruitful approach for establishing limiting distributions or algorithmic properties of regression (El Karoui et al., 2013)(Ma et al., 2018)(Chen et al., 2020), and is closely related to techniques of the present paper. In El Karoui et al. (2013), it is shown using the leave-one-out technique that the M-estimator converges asymptotically to a normal distribution (see also El Karoui (2018) and Lei et al. (2018)). The problem considered there is different from the distribution of the Lasso considered in the present paper: the M-estimation problem concerns the $n > p$ regime, and there is no need for

debiasing; the asymptotic normality follows immediately from the rotation invariance of the distribution. We remark that a duality between M-estimation estimation and penalized least squares was mentioned in [Donoho and Montanari \(2016\)](#). However, the duality only applies when the design matrix of the lasso has orthonormal rows, which does not cover the setting of the present paper.

- A leave-one-out analysis for the Lasso was carried out in [Javanmard and Montanari \(2018\)](#). In addition to bounded singular values of Σ , their analysis requires bounded ℓ_1 norms of the rows of the inverses of the submatrices of Σ (see ([Javanmard and Montanari, 2018](#), Theorem 3.8)). The latter condition can be more restrictive than ours in Definition 1: for example a $k \times k$ random matrix with independent entries of scale $1/\sqrt{k}$ has spectral norm of order $O(1)$, yet the ℓ_1 norm of each of its row has order $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ which is unbounded. Furthermore, ([Javanmard and Montanari, 2018](#), Theorem 3.8) requires a sublinear sparsity level $s_0 = o(n/(\log p)^2)$. In that regime, there is no need for the degrees of freedom adjustment factor $\frac{1}{n-k}$ in (6), and in fact in the approximation formula (11) it suffices to replace R with the noise w (see ([Javanmard and Montanari, 2018](#), eq. (61))). An extension of the analysis was done in [Bellec and Zhang \(2022\)](#), where the role of degrees-of-freedom adjustment was highlighted for sparsity level $s_0 \gg n^{2/3}$, but still $s_0/p \rightarrow 0$ is required. In contrast, the present paper considers the regime of proportional sparsity level.
- It appears that the first asymptotic normality result for debiased Lasso estimates in the proportional regime for correlated designs was derived in [Bellec and Zhang \(2019\)](#) (see the discussions therein). The technique of [Bellec and Zhang \(2019\)](#) (see also [Bellec and Zhang \(2021\)](#)) was based on the *Second Order Stein* theorems bounding the non-Gaussianity of a random variable of the form $z^\top f(z) - \text{div} f(z)$, where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$. To apply it to the debiased Lasso problem, consider given $A_{\cdot, \setminus j}$ (the submatrix of B formed by excluding the j -th column), ground truth α and noise w . Let $A_{\cdot, j} := A_{\cdot, \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j, j} + z \sqrt{(\Sigma^{-1})_{jj}^{-1}}$ and $Y = A\alpha + w$, which are both viewed as functions of z . Let $f(z) := A\hat{\alpha} - Y$. Then it can be verified that $z^\top f(z) - \text{div} f(z)$ is the debiased Lasso estimate up to a linear transform. The method of [Bellec and Zhang \(2019\)](#) made essential uses of the Gaussian random design assumption, e.g. Gaussian integration by parts.
- Gaussian comparison is another powerful approach for deriving the asymptotic distribution of the Lasso. Building on an earlier idea of [Thrampoulidis et al. \(2015\)](#) that constructs a simpler but comparable Gaussian process, [Miolane and Montanari \(2021\)](#) proved asymptotic normality of (6) (in the Wasserstein distance in \mathbb{R}^p) for i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$ rows, and [Celentano et al. \(2023\)](#) extended the result to i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$ rows. By nature, the Gaussian comparison argument strongly relies on the Gaussianity of the design matrix.
- Characterizing the asymptotic distribution of the Lasso for dependent non-Gaussian designs is an open challenge (see comments in [Montanari and Saeed \(2022\)](#) and ([Celentano et al., 2023](#), Remark 4.2)). Proof of universality based on the Lindeberg-type argument typically assumes independent entries ([Han and Shen, 2023](#)) ([Aubin et al., 2020](#)).
- Approximate message passing (AMP) is not only an algorithm but also a method of characterizing asymptotic distributions. The most common approach for analyzing the state evolution of AMP is through a conditioning technique, which shows that vector approximate message passing works for design matrices with a general spectrum but satisfying right-rotational invariance ([Schniter et al., 2016](#))([Fan, 2022](#))([Li et al., 2023](#))([Zhong et al., 2021](#)). In particular, rotation invariance implies that the feature distribution is permutation invariant, which does not subsume our setting. Other representative approaches for AMP analysis ([Bao et al., 2023](#))([Li and Wei, 2024](#)) assume independent matrix entries.
- Traditionally, the most well-known variable selection method with guaranteed false discovery rate (FDR) control is the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure ([Benjamini and](#)

Hochberg, 1995), which typically assumes that the p -values are independent or positively correlated. The knockoff filter (Barber and Candès, 2015)(Candès et al., 2018) is a recently popular approach that controls the FDR without such restrictive dependency assumptions. Intuitively, the knockoff filter creates knockoff features which have the same distribution as the true features, but are conditionally independent of the response, so that the knockoff statistics can be used as a benchmark/control for understanding the p -values. Remarkably, the knockoff filter extends such an intuition by offering provable finite sample FDR control via an elegant martingale analysis (Barber and Candès, 2015). The knockoff filter regresses on $2p$ features, and is often observed to have a lower power than methods such as conditional randomization tests (also known as holdout randomization test (Tansey et al., 2022) or the digital twin test (Bates et al., 2020)) or the Gaussian mirror method, which regresses on only $p + 1$ features each time; see experiments in Xing et al. (2023) Li (2022) Candès et al. (2018). We also provide an analysis in Theorem 10 showing an unavoidable sub-optimality of power when the knockoff filter solves a regression with $2p$ features. Although CRT and Gaussian mirror offer only asymptotic rather than finite sample FDR guarantees, experimentally they offer decent controls. It has been noted that the feature distribution, which is required in the model-X knockoff filter construction, is often not exactly known in practice (Fan et al., 2023)(Barber et al., 2020), so that the finite sample FDR may not be exactly controlled due to the estimation error of the feature distribution.

Organization. In Section 2, we present our main results on general nonasymptotic error bounds and asymptotic analysis for the sub-Gaussian case. Section 3 gives a simple and clean proof of the nonasymptotic error bound in the approximation formula. In Section 4, we will show that using the approximate formula allows us to implement a “local knockoff filter” and conditional randomization tests (CRT) within $O(p^3)$ time in the proportional growth parameter regime. Section 5 provides synthetic and real data experiment results on the approximation errors, FDR, and power. Section 6 concludes with an outlook for future directions. Omitted proofs are found in Section A-F.

Notations. We use the standard Landau notations such as $O(n)$, $\Omega(n)$, and $\omega(1)$. The notation $\tilde{O}(f(n)) = O(f(n)(\log n)^C)$ indicates an upper bound up to a factor of a polynomial of $\log n$. To emphasize the dependence on a set of parameters \mathcal{P} in the implicit prefactor, we may write $\tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(\cdot)$. The L_2 norm and the operator norm are denoted by $\|\cdot\|_2$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$, whereas $\|\cdot\|_0$ denotes the number of nonzero coefficients. λ_{\max} and λ_{\min} denote the largest and smallest eigenvalues. For $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^p$, write the empirical distribution $\hat{P}_{ab} := \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{(a_j, b_j)}$. We use $A_{\cdot, \setminus j}$ to denote the submatrix of A formed by all except the j -th column. The standard normal distribution in \mathbb{R}^d is written as $\mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$. $\text{diag}(\cdot)$ can denote either a diagonal matrix with diagonals specified by a vector, or the vector formed by the diagonal values of a matrix.

2. Main Results.

2.1. An approximate update formula. Suppose that $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are matrices differing only in the j -th column. Recall that we define $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ as the solutions to (1)-(2) (any choice of the minimizer when the minimizer is not unique), and $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$ and $\hat{\beta}_j^U$ in (8) and (10). Let $\mu_{\cdot, j} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be an arbitrary vector, and define

$$(17) \quad \check{B}_{\cdot, j} := B_{\cdot, j} - \mu_{\cdot, j}.$$

Our main nonasymptotic result is the following:

THEOREM 1. *Let $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary, and let $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ be as defined in (1)-(2). Set $\mathcal{J} := \{l: \chi_l^\alpha \neq \chi_l^\beta\}$, and suppose that*

$$(18) \quad |\mathcal{J}| \leq \varepsilon n;$$

$$(19) \quad \|B_{:,j}\|_2, \|A_{:,j}\|_2 \leq D\sqrt{n};$$

$$(20) \quad \max_{\Delta} \|(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta})\check{B}_{:,j}\|_2 \leq \Gamma\sqrt{n\varepsilon},$$

where $\mathcal{A} := \{l \neq j: \chi_l^\alpha \neq 0\}$, and the max is over $\Delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j\}$ of size at most $n\varepsilon$, and $\Gamma, D > 0$. Then

$$(21) \quad \left| t(j, B, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top R - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right| \leq \Gamma D \sqrt{\varepsilon} (|\hat{\alpha}_j| + |\hat{\beta}_j|).$$

Moreover, if $t(j, B, Y)$ above is replaced by $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:,j} \hat{\beta}_j^U$, we can still bound the left side by $\Gamma D \sqrt{\varepsilon} (|\hat{\alpha}_j| + |\hat{\beta}_j| + |\hat{\beta}_j^U|)$.

The proof the theorem is given in Section 3. Theorem 1 suggests the formula (14) for fast calculation of the debiased estimator when the design matrix is updated by one-column, since the right side only depends on the result of solving (1). Note that Theorem 1 applies to any given B as long as conditions (18)-(20) are satisfied. For deterministic designs, $\mu_{:,j}$ can be taken as *any* vector that ensures (20).

A basic example of Theorem 1 is simply $A = B$, in which case $\varepsilon = 0$ and $\Gamma = 0$. Then (21) simply recovers our definition of the debiased estimator. A more useful example is the case of random designs where A and B are conditionally independent given $A_{:, \setminus j}$. Then, we can take D as a constant independent of n , Γ as a slowly growing function (e.g. polylog of n), and ε vanishing in n . Moreover, let

$$(22) \quad \mu_{:,j} := \mathbb{E}[B_{:,j} | B_{:, \setminus j}] = \mathbb{E}[B_{:,j} | A_{:, \setminus j}],$$

so that (20) is satisfied with high probability when ε is small, because \mathcal{A} is a function of (A, Y) whereas $\check{B}_{:,j}$ is a zero mean vector conditioned on (A, Y) . More precise results will be discussed in Section 2.2.

In contrast to $\hat{\beta}_j^U$, the Lasso estimator (without debiasing) has an update formula in a more restricted setting:

THEOREM 2. *Suppose that for some $\tau \in (0, 1)$, $\Gamma, \check{D} > 0$, we have (18), (20), and*

$$(23) \quad \frac{1}{n} \|\mu_{:,j}\|_2^2 \leq \tau^2;$$

$$(24) \quad \|\check{B}_{:,j}\|_2, \|\check{A}_{:,j}\|_2 \leq \check{D}\sqrt{n}.$$

Then

$$(25) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:,j} \hat{\beta}_j - S_\lambda \left(\frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top R + \frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right) \right| \leq (\tau^2 + 2\tau\Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon\Gamma^2) |\hat{\beta}_j| + (\tau^2 + \tau(\Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \check{D}) + \Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon}\check{D}) |\hat{\alpha}_j|,$$

where $S_\lambda(x) := (x - \lambda)1_{x > \lambda} - (x + \lambda)1_{x < -\lambda}$ is the soft-thresholding function.

The proof the theorem is given in Section 3. Theorem 2 suggests the approximate formula

$$(26) \quad \hat{\beta}_j \approx \left(\frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) B_{:,j} \right)^{-1} S_\lambda \left(\frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top R + \frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right).$$

The approximation is good if $\tau, \varepsilon \rightarrow 0$. Note that $\tau \rightarrow 0$ implies that the features are approximately independent. In the proof of Theorem 1, error terms of the form $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) A_{:,j}$ asymptotically vanishes since $\check{B}_{:,j}$ and $(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) A_{:,j}$ are uncorrelated. On the other hand, in the proof of Theorem 2, error terms of the form $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) A_{:,j}$ arise, and it is not necessarily vanishing unless the features are independent.

2.2. Asymptotic error control. Using Theorem 1, we can show that asymptotically and for most j , the approximation error is negligible, under the following condition:

DEFINITION 1. We say condition $\mathcal{P} = (\delta, \kappa_1, M_2, \sigma^2, C_{\text{sg}})$ is satisfied (for some n) if:

- $p(n) = \lfloor n/\delta \rfloor$, where $\delta \in (0, 1)$;
- $A(n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p(n)}$, where the rows are i.i.d. following a distribution $Q(n)$ with zero mean and covariance $\Sigma(n)$. We have $\max\{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma(n)), \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(\Sigma(n))\} \leq \kappa_1 \in (1, \infty)$, and $Q(n)$ is C_{sg} -sub-Gaussian, i.e., for $v \sim Q(n)$ and any $t \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$(27) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\langle t, v \rangle)] \leq \exp(C_{\text{sg}} \|t\|_2^2);$$

- The noise $w(n) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, n\sigma^2 I_n)$;
- $Y(n) = A(n)\alpha(n) + w(n)$ and $\frac{1}{p} \|\alpha(n)\|_2^2 \leq M_2$.

We will drop the (n) in these notations when there is no confusion. Recall that $O_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ indicates that the hidden constant depends only on \mathcal{P} (otherwise, it may depend on other constants such as λ or κ_2 introduced later).

REMARK 1. The key properties of A needed are (for some $\kappa > 0$ and with high probability), 1) $\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \kappa\sqrt{n}$; 2) $A_{:,j}$ is κ -sub-Gaussian conditioned on $A_{:, \setminus j}$; 3) $\lambda_{\min}(A_{:, \mathcal{S}})$ for all $|\mathcal{S}| \leq \kappa^{-1}n$. The proof only uses concentration inequalities to control the order of the error terms, and small ball probability to lower bound the singular value of a random matrix following [Koltchinskii and Mendelson \(2015\)](#). Moreover, it is expected that the Gaussian noise assumption can be relaxed to more a general small ball probability condition to ensure that not too many subgradients are near the boundary in the proof step (123).

For each j , we generate $B_{:,j}^{(j)}$ by setting $B_{:,j}^{(j)} = A_{:, \setminus j}$, and independently sampling $B_{:,j}^{(j)}$ according to $P_{A_{:,j}|A_{:, \setminus j}}$. For each j , recall $P_{\mathcal{A}}$ and $P_{\mathcal{B}}$ defined around (8) and (10), and set

$$(28) \quad P_j := P_{\mathcal{A}}; \quad P^{(j)} := P_{\mathcal{B}}.$$

Our main asymptotic result is as follows:

THEOREM 3. Suppose that \mathcal{P} is satisfied, and λ is larger than a threshold depending only on \mathcal{P} but not n (see (157)). Then, except for a set of j of expected cardinality $\tilde{O}(pn^{-1/18})$, we have $|t(j, B^{(j)}, Y) - t_j| = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$, where $t(j, B^{(j)}, Y)$ is as in (13),

$$(29) \quad t_j := \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top} R + \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j.$$

In fact, the same asymptotic bound also holds if $\check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j$ is dropped.

The proof is given in Section C. In Theorem 3 we bound the approximation error in computing $t(j, B^{(j)}, Y) = \check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top} (I - P^{(j)}) B_{:,j}^{(j)} \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U}$ from the update formula. A natural question is, what about the approximation error for $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U}$ itself? Note that Theorem 3 suggested that

$$(30) \quad \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} \approx \frac{\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top R + \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (I - P_j) A_{:,j} \hat{\alpha}_j}{\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:,j}^\top (I - P_j) B_{:,j}}.$$

As we will see in Theorem 4, for (30) to hold it suffices make an additional assumption of

$$(31) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\check{B}_{1j}^{(j)}|^2] \geq \kappa_2^{-1}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, p,$$

for some $\kappa_2 > 0$ independent of n . (31) is true, for example, if $\mu_{\cdot j} = A_{\cdot \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j j}$ (i.e., the linear predictor is optimal), under the assumption of \mathcal{P} . In the meantime, this is essentially also necessary: if $\mathbb{E}[|\check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)}|^2] = 0$, the right side of (30) is undefined.

THEOREM 4. *Suppose that \mathcal{P} and (31) are satisfied, and λ is larger than a threshold depending only on \mathcal{P} but not n (see (157)). Then, except for a set of j of expected cardinality $\tilde{O}(p \cdot n^{-1/18})$, the difference between the left and right sides of (30) is at most $\tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$.*

The proof is given in Section D. Theorem 3 and Theorem 4 are useful for variable selection under the false discovery rate (FDR) control, because they bound the approximation error for all but a small fraction of j , and a vanishing fraction of coordinates does not change the asymptotic FDR and power of the selection algorithm. To formalize the notion of “approximation in most coordinates”, recall the notion of Levy-Prokhorov metric which metricizes weak convergence of probability measures (see for example Bobkov (2016)):

DEFINITION 2. Levy-Prokhorov metric, denoted as π , between two probability measures μ and ν on a metric space (X, d) is defined as:

$$\pi(\mu, \nu) = \inf \{ \epsilon > 0 : \mu(A) \leq \nu(A^\epsilon) + \epsilon \text{ and } \nu(A) \leq \mu(A^\epsilon) + \epsilon \text{ for all Borel sets } A \subseteq X \}$$

where $A^\epsilon = \{x \in X : d(x, A) < \epsilon\}$ denotes the ϵ -neighborhood of the set A .

COROLLARY 5. *In the setting of Theorem 3, let $\hat{t} := (t(j, B^{(j)}, Y))_{j=1}^p$ and $\tilde{t} := (t_j)_{j=1}^p$. Then $\mathbb{E}[\pi(\hat{P}_{\hat{t}\alpha}, \hat{P}_{\tilde{t}\alpha})] = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$. Similarly, in the setting of Theorem 4, $\mathbb{E}[\pi(\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}, \hat{P}_{\tilde{\gamma}\alpha})] = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$, where $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ denote the left and the right sides of (30).*

An analysis of the asymptotic impact of the approximation error on variable selection algorithms is given in Section 4.

3. Proof of the Approximate Formula. The goal of this section is to prove Theorem 1, Theorem 2, and some extensions. Recall the optimization problems given in (1)(2). Intuitively an update formula is possible because the Taylor expansion is asymptotically correct; the challenge though lies in the non-differentiability of the objective function and in showing that error is indeed negligible in the high-dimensional setting. Before the proof let us first give a heuristic derivation of the approximate update formula. Let $R := Y - A\hat{\alpha}$ and $S := Y - B\hat{\beta}$ denote the residuals. From the normal equations we have

$$(32) \quad -\frac{1}{n} A_{\cdot \setminus j}^\top R + \lambda \psi_{\setminus j}^\alpha = 0_{p-1},$$

$$(33) \quad -\frac{1}{n} A_{\cdot \setminus j}^\top S + \lambda \psi_{\setminus j}^\beta = 0_{p-1},$$

$$(34) \quad -\frac{1}{n} B_{\cdot j}^\top S + \lambda \psi_j^\beta = 0,$$

where the subdifferential $\psi^\alpha \in [-1, 1]^p$ is intuitively the derivative of (the non-differentiable function) $\|\cdot\|_1$ at $\hat{\alpha}$. Because of the non-differentiability, ψ^α is not a function $\hat{\alpha}$. But as a heuristic argument, we pretend that $\psi^\alpha = \psi(\hat{\alpha})$, where $\psi: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ applies element-wise

the function of the derivative of the absolute value function. We also pretend that $\psi(\cdot)$ is a smooth function so that we can Taylor expand $\psi(\cdot)$ around $\hat{\alpha}$. Now using

$$(35) \quad S - R = A_{:\setminus j}(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) + A_{:j}\hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j}\hat{\beta}_j,$$

and ignoring higher order terms in the Taylor expansion, we obtain

$$(36) \quad \bar{G}(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) + u\hat{\alpha}_j - v\hat{\beta}_j = 0_{p-1},$$

$$(37) \quad -\frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R - v^\top(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) - \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top A_{:j}\hat{\alpha}_j + \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top B_{:j}\hat{\beta}_j + \lambda\psi(\hat{\beta}_j) = 0,$$

where we defined

$$(38) \quad \bar{G} := \frac{1}{n}A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \text{diag}(\psi'(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j}));$$

$$(39) \quad u := \frac{1}{n}A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:j}; \quad v := \frac{1}{n}A_{:\setminus j}^\top B_{:j}.$$

Cancelling $\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}$, we can solve for $\hat{\beta}_j$ to obtain

$$(40) \quad \left(\frac{1}{n}\|B_{:j}\|^2 - v^\top \bar{G}^{-1}v\right)\hat{\beta}_j + \lambda\psi(\hat{\beta}_j) = \left(\frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top A_{:j} - v^\top \bar{G}^{-1}u\right)\hat{\alpha}_j + \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R.$$

Using the matrix inversion formula, we see that \bar{G}^{-1} is nonzero only in the principal submatrix corresponding to the nonzeros of $\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j}$. In the high dimension setting, supposing that the entries of A are i.i.d. with unit variance, we have $(1 - \frac{k}{n})\hat{\beta}_j + \lambda\psi(\hat{\beta}_j) \approx \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R$, therefore $(1 - \frac{k}{n})\hat{\beta}_j^u \approx \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R$, which recovers the known formula of the debiased estimator (6) for i.i.d. features.

REMARK 2. In the case of correlated features, it is tempting to compute $\hat{\beta}_j$ from (40) using soft thresholding, which is the idea in proving Theorem 2. But as we will see the approximation error will not vanish unless the feature correlations are sufficiently small. On the other hand, with some additional algebra, we can show that the approximation error for the debiased estimator vanishes even when features have non-vanishing correlations.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1. To deal with the non-differentiability of ψ in (38), define

$$(41) \quad \Lambda = \text{diag} \left(\left\{ \frac{\psi_l^\alpha - \psi_l^\beta}{\hat{\alpha}_l - \hat{\beta}_l} \right\}_{l \neq j} \right)$$

where the $\frac{0}{0}$ case in (41) is resolved by setting $\frac{\psi_l^\alpha - \psi_l^\beta}{\hat{\alpha}_l - \hat{\beta}_l} = 0$ if $\psi_l^\alpha = \psi_l^\beta \notin (-1, 1)$, and $\frac{\psi_l^\alpha - \psi_l^\beta}{\hat{\alpha}_l - \hat{\beta}_l} = +\infty$ if $\psi_l^\alpha = \psi_l^\beta \in (-1, 1)$. Then set

$$(42) \quad G := \frac{1}{n}A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda\Lambda.$$

From (40) we have

$$(43) \quad \left(\frac{1}{n}\|B_{:j}\|^2 - v^\top G^{-1}v\right)\hat{\beta}_j + \lambda\psi_j^\beta = \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R + \left(\frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top A_{:j} - v^\top G^{-1}u\right)\hat{\alpha}_j.$$

Note that

$$(44) \quad \frac{1}{n}B_{:j}^\top R = \frac{1}{n}\tilde{B}_{:j}^\top R + \frac{1}{n}\mu_{:j}^\top S + \frac{1}{n}\mu_{:j}^\top (R - S),$$

and next we will simplify the last term in (44) using (35) and Proposition 13:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (45) \quad & \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top (R - S) = -\frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top [A_{:\setminus j}(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) + A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j] \\
 (46) \quad & = -\frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} v \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} u \hat{\alpha}_j - \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j + \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j.
 \end{aligned}$$

Collecting terms and using (7) and $\lambda \psi_j^\beta - \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top S = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top S$, we see (43) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
 (47) \quad & \left(\frac{1}{n} \|B_{:j}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top B_{:j} - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} v \right) \hat{\beta}_j + \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top S \\
 & = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top R + \left(\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:j} - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} u \right) \hat{\alpha}_j.
 \end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate the coefficients on the two sides of (47). Define

$$(48) \quad \bar{G}_{\mathcal{A}} := \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \text{diag}(\bar{\Lambda}),$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}_{ll} := 0$ if $l \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_{ll} := +\infty$ otherwise. Define $\bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}$ analogously but with \mathcal{A} above replaced by $\mathcal{B} := \{l \neq j : \chi_l^\beta \neq 0\}$. Then the third term in the coefficient of $\hat{\beta}_j$ is

$$(49) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} v = \frac{1}{n^2} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top B_{:j} + \frac{1}{n^2} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top B_{:j}$$

$$(50) \quad = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top P_{\mathcal{B}} B_{:j} + \frac{1}{n^2} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top B_{:j}$$

where $P_{\mathcal{B}} := \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$ denotes the projection onto the span of the columns corresponding to the indices \mathcal{B} . Therefore the coefficient of $\hat{\beta}_j$ on the left side of (47) differs from $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j}$ by at most

$$(51) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} |\check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top B_{:j}| \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left\| \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top \right\|_2 \|B_{:j}\|_2$$

$$(52) \quad \leq \frac{1}{n} \left\| \check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}) \right\|_2 \|B_{:j}\|_2$$

$$(53) \quad \leq \frac{1}{n} \cdot \Gamma \sqrt{|\mathcal{J}|} \cdot D \sqrt{n},$$

where (52) follows from Lemma 12. Similarly, for one term in the coefficient for $\hat{\alpha}_j$ in (47),

$$(54) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} u - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top P_{\mathcal{A}} A_{:j} \right| = \frac{1}{n^2} \left| \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:j} \right|$$

$$(55) \quad \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left\| \check{B}_{:j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} (G^{-1} - \bar{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top \right\|_2 \|A_{:j}\|_2$$

$$(56) \quad \leq \Gamma D \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

Then (47) yields

$$(57) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j^U - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top R - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right| \leq \Gamma D \sqrt{\varepsilon} (|\hat{\alpha}_j| + |\hat{\beta}_j|).$$

Finally the proof is completed by

$$(58) \quad \frac{1}{n} |\check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A}} - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j}| \leq \frac{D}{\sqrt{n}} \|\check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A}} - P_{\mathcal{B}})\|_2$$

$$(59) \quad \leq D \Gamma \sqrt{\varepsilon}.$$

□

The update formula is closely related to the leave-one-out analysis and the asymptotic normality of debiased Lasso (Javanmard and Montanari, 2018)(Bellec and Zhang, 2019)(Bellec and Zhang, 2022). To see this, observe that by slightly changing the proof of Theorem 1 to allow different observation vector Y in the two Lasso problems, we obtain:

THEOREM 6. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Suppose that A and B differ only in the j -th column. Define*

$$(60) \quad \hat{\beta} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \|A_{:\setminus j} \alpha_{\setminus j} + w - B\gamma\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\gamma\|_1 \right\};$$

$$(61) \quad \hat{\alpha} := \operatorname{argmin}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \|A\alpha + w - A\gamma\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\gamma\|_1 \right\}.$$

Let $\mu_{:j} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be arbitrary, define $\check{A}_{:j} := A_{:j} - \mu_{:j}$, $\mathcal{J} := \{l: \chi_l^\alpha \neq \chi_l^\beta\}$, and suppose that we have (18), (19), and

$$(62) \quad \max_{\Delta} \|(P_{\mathcal{B} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \Delta}) \check{A}_{:j}\|_2 \leq \Gamma \sqrt{n\varepsilon},$$

where $\mathcal{B} := \{l \neq j: \chi_l^\alpha \neq 0\}$, and the max is over $\Delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j\}$ of size at most $n\varepsilon$, for some $\Gamma > 1$ and $D > 1$. Then

$$(63) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) A_{:j} (\hat{\alpha}_j^U - \alpha_j) - \frac{1}{n} \check{A}_{:j}^\top S - \frac{1}{n} \check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j \right| \leq D\Gamma \sqrt{\varepsilon} (|\hat{\beta}_j| + |\hat{\alpha}_j - \alpha_j| + |\hat{\alpha}_j^U - \alpha_j|).$$

PROOF. Similar to Theorem 1, but make changes to (35), (36), (37), (40), (111), (112), (113), by replacing $\hat{\beta}_j$ with $\hat{\beta}_j - \alpha_j$, and switch the notations $A \leftrightarrow B$, $\hat{\alpha} \leftrightarrow \hat{\beta}$. \square

Observe that if A and B are independent conditioned on $A_{:\setminus j}$, (63) suggests that

$$(64) \quad \hat{\alpha}_j^U - \alpha_j \approx \frac{\check{A}_{:j}^\top S}{\check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) A_{:j}} \approx \frac{\check{A}_{:j}^\top S}{(n-k)\Sigma_{j|\setminus j}}$$

which approximately follows $\mathcal{N}(0, (n-k)^{-2}\Sigma_{j|\setminus j}^{-1}\|S\|_2^2)$ under appropriate regularity conditions. This recovers the asymptotic normality of the debiased Lasso previously proved by other methods; see Section 1.

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. Recall that we showed (43). Now

$$(65) \quad v^\top G^{-1}v - \frac{1}{n} B_{:j}^\top P_{\mathcal{A}} B_{:j} = \frac{1}{n} B_{:j}^\top E B_{:j}$$

$$(66) \quad = \frac{1}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top E \mu_{:j} + \frac{2}{n} \mu_{:j}^\top E \check{B}_{:j} + \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top E \check{B}_{:j},$$

where $E := \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} G A_{:\setminus j}^\top - P_{\mathcal{A}}$, and recall that $\mu_{:j} = B_{:j} - \check{B}_{:j}$. As shown in Lemma 12,

$$(67) \quad -(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}) \preceq E, E^2 \preceq P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}$$

where we note that $P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}$ is a projection matrix. Therefore,

$$(68) \quad \left| v^\top G^{-1}v - \frac{1}{n} B_{:j}^\top P_{\mathcal{A}} B_{:j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \|\mu_{:j}\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{n} \|\mu_{:j}\|_2 \|E \check{B}_{:j}\|_2 + \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}) \check{B}_{:j},$$

$$(69) \quad \leq \tau^2 + 2\tau\Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \varepsilon\Gamma^2$$

Similarly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 (70) \quad & \left| v^\top G^{-1} u - \frac{1}{n} B_{:,j}^\top P_A A_{:,j} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n} \|\mu_{:,j}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|\mu_{:,j}\|_2 (\|E\check{B}_{:,j}\|_2 + \|E\check{A}_{:,j}\|_2) + \frac{1}{n} \|E\check{B}_{:,j}\|_2 \|\check{A}_{:,j}\|_2 \\
 (71) \quad & \leq \tau^2 + \tau(\Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon} + \check{D}) + \Gamma\sqrt{\varepsilon}\check{D}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Then the claim follows from (43). \square

4. Application in False Discovery Rate Control.

4.1. *Review of the knockoff filter and its limitation.* Suppose that $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are the observation vector and the feature matrix respectively. In technologies such as genomics, p can be more than thousands, so it is often desirable to perform variable selection by controlling the type I error rate, also known as the false discovery rate (FDR):

$$(72) \quad \text{FDR} := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|H_0 \wedge \hat{H}_1|}{|\hat{H}_1|} \right]$$

where $H_0 \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ is the set of true null variables, and $\hat{H}_1 \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ is the set of selected variables. A good variable selection algorithm is expected to control the FDR below a given budget, while ensuring a large statistical power:

$$(73) \quad \text{POWER} := \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|H_1 \wedge \hat{H}_1|}{|H_1|} \right].$$

The knockoff filter (Barber and Candés, 2015)(Candes et al., 2018) is a recent popular approach for variable selection in the setting of dependent p -values. The knockoff filter creates a knockoff feature matrix \tilde{A} such that (A, \tilde{A}) satisfies an exchangeability condition, but \tilde{A} is conditionally independent of Y . Then we regress Y on the matrix $[A, \tilde{A}]$, so that the test statistics for \tilde{A} can be used to estimate the number of false discoveries. For a full description of the knockoff filter in the case of random designs, see (Candes et al., 2018).

The exchangeability condition may create challenges in the construction of the knockoff distribution, and the increase in the number of features (from p to $2p$) is believed to induce some power loss (Weinstein et al., 2017)(Li, 2022). In this section, we provide a simple example which always suffers from this suboptimality, regardless of the choice of the knockoff distribution (Theorem 10). For simplicity, consider the $p < n$ regime, and we simply use the least squares estimator rather than the Lasso. We recall the following result from Liu and Rigollet (2019) which gives a necessary and sufficient condition for asymptotic consistency of the knockoff filter:

PROPOSITION 7. *[Informal; see Theorem 5 and Proposition 6 in Liu and Rigollet (2019) for precise statements] Let $\text{POWER}^{(n)}$ be the power of the knockoff filter with nominal FDR budget $q \in (0, 1)$ for sample size n . Suppose the standard distributional limit assumption is true. A necessary and sufficient condition for $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{POWER}^{(n)}$ to converge to 1 is that the empirical distribution of $(\Theta_{jj}^{(n)})_{j=1}^{2p}$ converges weakly to a point mass at 0, where $\Theta^{(n)}$ is the inverse covariance (precision) matrix of the true and the knockoff variables.*

The setting of Liu and Rigollet (2019) is to use the debiased Lasso coefficients as test statistics, but when the Lasso regularization $\lambda = 0$ we recover the case of least squares statistics. Moreover, Liu and Rigollet (2019) assumes the existence of the standard distributional

limit defined in [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014b\)](#), so the empirical distribution of $(\underline{\Theta}_{jj}^{(n)})_{j=1}^{2p}$ has a weak limit, and by “ $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{POWER}^{(n)}$ to converge to 1” in Proposition 7 we mean $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{POWER}^{(n)}$ is viewed as a function of this limiting distribution.

The intuition for Proposition 7 is easy to explain: Let $\underline{\alpha} \in \mathbb{R}^{2p}$ be the true coefficients and zero paddings for the knockoff coefficients. There exists $\tau > 0$, bounded above and below, such that

$$(74) \quad \hat{\underline{\alpha}} \approx \underline{\alpha} + \tau \underline{\Theta}^{1/2} z$$

where $z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{2p})$. Therefore if variables are selected based on a threshold test for the coefficients of $\hat{\underline{\alpha}}$, then asymptotic consistency is true only if most diagonal entries of $\underline{\Theta}$ vanish (equivalently, the empirical distribution of the diagonal entries must converge to zero).

For Gaussian knockoff filters, it is known ([Candes et al., 2018](#)) that selecting a knockoff distribution satisfying exchangeability is equivalent to choosing s such that the joint covariance matrix of the true and knockoff variables,

$$(75) \quad \underline{\Sigma} := \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma & \Sigma - \text{diag}(s) \\ \Sigma - \text{diag}(s) & \Sigma \end{pmatrix}$$

is positive semidefinite. Thus we see that the Schur complement $2S - S\Sigma^{-1}S$ plays a key role. We now establish an auxiliary result that will help building a suboptimality example.

LEMMA 8. Set $\Sigma^{-1} := E \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ as the matrix whose entries are all 1 (note that Σ^{-1} is not invertible, but we do not need its inverse here; alternatively, we may perturb it to make it invertible, and then pass the final result to a limit). Suppose that $s \in (0, \infty)^p$, $S := \text{diag}(s)$, and we have $S^{-1} \succeq \frac{1}{2}\Sigma^{-1}$. Let d_1, \dots, d_p be the diagonals of the positive semidefinite matrix $(2S - S\Sigma^{-1}S)^{-1}$. Then $\frac{1}{p}|\{j: d_j > \frac{p}{10}\}| \geq \frac{3}{5}$.

PROOF. Set $a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}S^{1/2}e$ where $e = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$. From $\|s\|_1 = s^\top S^{-1}s \geq \frac{1}{2}s^\top Es = \frac{1}{2}\|s\|_1^2$ we obtain $\|a\|^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|s\|_1 \leq 1$. Moreover,

$$(76) \quad (I - \frac{1}{2}S^{1/2}ES^{1/2})^{-1} = (I - aa^\top)^{-1}$$

$$(77) \quad = I + \frac{1}{1 - \|a\|_2^2}aa^\top.$$

Therefore, the diagonal values of $(2S - S\Sigma^{-1}S)^{-1}$ are

$$(78) \quad \frac{1}{2s_j}(1 + \frac{a_j^2}{1 - \|a\|_2^2}) = \frac{1}{2s_j}(1 + \frac{s_j/2}{1 - \|s\|_1/2})$$

$$(79) \quad = \frac{1}{2s_j} + \frac{1}{4 - 2\|s\|_1}$$

$$(80) \quad > \frac{1}{2s_j}.$$

However, by the Markov inequality we have

$$(81) \quad \frac{1}{p}|\{j: \frac{1}{2s_j} > \frac{p}{10}\}| = 1 - \frac{1}{p}|\{j: s_j \geq \frac{5}{p}\}|$$

$$(82) \quad \geq 1 - \frac{1}{5}\|s\|_1$$

$$(83) \quad \geq \frac{3}{5}.$$

□

DEFINITION 3. Given any statistic $\hat{\alpha}$ (Lasso, debiased Lasso, or OLS), computed using Y and the true feature matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, the *oracle threshold algorithm* selects $\{j: |\hat{\alpha}_j| > t\}$, where t is a deterministic number for which the FDR is exactly the budget q .

The oracle threshold algorithm is not realistic since the threshold is not data-driven. Nevertheless, it serves as a natural benchmark, and has been considered in, e.g. [Ke et al. \(2024\)](#), under the name *prototype method*. We then have the following result, whose proof is omitted since it is analogous to Proposition 7.

PROPOSITION 9. Assume the $p < n$ regime and $\hat{\alpha}$ is the OLS solution. Under the standard distributional limit assumption, a necessary and sufficient condition for asymptotic consistency of the oracle threshold algorithm is that the empirical distribution of $(\Theta_{jj}^{(n)})_{j=1}^p$ converges weakly to a point mass at 0, where $\Theta^{(n)}$ is the precision matrix of the true variables.

By Schur's complement theorem, it is easy to see that the diagonals of $\underline{\Theta}$ dominate the corresponding diagonals of Θ , so the knockoff algorithm is asymptotically consistent only if the oracle threshold algorithm is. Using Lemma 8, we can give an example of strict separation: the knockoff filter is not asymptotically consistent no matter how to choose s in (75), even though using the oracle threshold algorithm is asymptotically consistent.

THEOREM 10. Let $\Sigma^{-1} = a_p E$, where E is as in Lemma 8, and a_p is an arbitrary sequence satisfying $\limsup_{p \rightarrow \infty} a_p = 0$ and $pa_p \geq 1$. Then $\frac{1}{2p} |\{j: (\underline{\Sigma}^{-1})_{jj} > \frac{1}{10}\}| \geq \frac{3}{5}$. In particular, while the diagonals of Σ^{-1} converges to 0, the diagonals of the knockoff precision matrix $\underline{\Sigma}^{-1}$ does not (in the sense of weak convergence of empirical distributions).

PROOF. From the definition of Σ^{-1} it is easy to see that the empirical distribution of its diagonals converges to 0. From the Schur complement theorem we know that the diagonals of $\underline{\Sigma}^{-1}$ is two copies of the diagonals of $(2S - S\Sigma^{-1}S)^{-1}$, which we denote by d_1, \dots, d_p . From Lemma 8 we see that $\frac{1}{p} |\{j: d_j > \frac{pa_p}{10}\}| \geq \frac{3}{5}$, hence $\frac{1}{2p} |\{j: (\underline{\Sigma}^{-1})_{jj} > \frac{1}{10}\}| \geq \frac{3}{5}$. □

4.2. A “local” knockoff filter. In this section we explore an application of the approximation formula in Section 2.1 in designing a variable selection algorithm whose asymptotic power is approximately that of the oracle threshold algorithm in Definition 3.

In Theorem 10 we saw that the suboptimality of the knockoff filter arises from augmenting the number of variables from p to $2p$, so that the diagonals in the augmented precision matrix $\underline{\Theta}$ is unavoidably larger than that of the original precision matrix Θ . A natural idea to remedy this is to weaken the exchangeability of (A, \tilde{A}) in the knockoff filter to the conditional exchangeability of columns $(A_{\cdot j}, \tilde{A}_{\cdot j})|A_{\cdot \setminus j}$, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Then for each j , one regression Y on $(A_{\cdot j}, A_{\cdot \setminus j})$ and on $(\tilde{A}_{\cdot j}, A_{\cdot \setminus j})$, thus generating a pair of test statistics which have the same distribution if $j \in H_0$. We call the resulting algorithm *local knockoff filter*; see Algorithm 1 for the description in the case of the debiased Lasso test statistic (but other test statistics such as the Lasso coefficients may also be used). To see why the algorithm controls the FDR, note that $|\{j: |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > t\}|$ is the number of selected variables, whereas $|\{j: |\hat{\gamma}_j| > t\}| \geq |\{j \in H_0: |\hat{\gamma}_j| > t\}|$ approximately controls the number of false discoveries.

While such a local knockoff filter is a simple modification of the original knockoff filter ([Candes et al., 2018](#)), and probably has crossed the minds of many other researchers, a

key limitation is computational complexity. Indeed, exactly implementing the local knockoff filter requires solving $2p$ linear regression problems of scale $n \times p$, which has computation complexity $O(p^4)$ in the proportional regime (assuming the LAR algorithm; see e.g. [Hastie et al. \(2009\)](#)). In contrast, the knockoff filter solves one linear regression problem of scale $n \times 2p$, having computation complexity $O(p^3)$. Our key observation here is that by using the approximate update formula (30), we can still implement the local knockoff filter with computation complexity $O(p^3)$, with an asymptotically vanishing error.

The two definitions of the debiased estimator $\hat{\alpha}^u$ and $\hat{\alpha}^U$ ((6) and (8)) should behave similarly in the asymptotic theoretical analysis. We shall use $\hat{\alpha}^U$ since it arises more naturally in the derivations of the update formula and also appears to induce smaller error in numerical experiments. To analyze the computation complexity, note that

- Although the definition of $\hat{\alpha}^U$ may appear to require $O(p^4)$ computation time since each P_j requires $O(p^3)$ computation time directly from the formula of the projection matrix, we can actually compute each P_j in $O(p^2)$ time by the rank one update formula and hence $\hat{\alpha}^U$ in $O(p^3)$ time (see Algorithm 2 and the note in Appendix F). Thus, the computation time for $\hat{\alpha}^U$ is the same order as obtaining $\hat{\gamma}$ using the approximate update formula.
- In the preprocessing step, the conditional means $[\mu_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \mu_{\cdot p}]$ can be calculated in $O(p^3)$ time, if it can be approximated using the linear estimator $-A[\Theta - \text{diag diag } \Theta] \cdot (\text{diag diag } \Theta)^{-2}$, where Θ denotes the precision matrix. Otherwise, they can be estimated by regressing each $A_{\cdot j}$ on $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$.

In summary, the complexity of Algorithm 1 is $O(p^3)$, the same as the knockoff filter.

Algorithm 1 Local Knockoff Filter (Debiased statistics; see footnote for other statistics)

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$, FDR threshold q . Assume known $\mu_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \mu_{\cdot p}$.

Compute the debiased Lasso solution $\hat{\alpha}^U$ for (A, Y) (using Algorithm 2 for fast computation).

Initialize $\hat{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

for $1 \leq j \leq p$ **do**

Sample X from the distribution of $A_{\cdot j} | A_{\cdot \setminus j}$, independently of $A_{\cdot j}$ and Y .

Construct $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ where $B_{\cdot \setminus j} = A_{\cdot \setminus j}$ and $B_{\cdot j} = X$.

Compute the debiased Lasso solution $\hat{\beta}^U$ for (B, Y) (possibly approximately using (14)).

$\hat{\gamma}_j \leftarrow \hat{\beta}_j^U$.

end for

Choose T as the smallest t such that

$$(84) \quad \frac{|\{j: |\hat{\gamma}_j| > t\}|}{|\{j: |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > t\}|} \leq q.$$

Output: Selected set of variables is $\{j: |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T\}$.

* It is possible to use to other statistics. For the Lasso coefficients, we replace $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$ and $\hat{\beta}_j^U$ by $\hat{\alpha}_j$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$. We can also replace $\hat{\alpha}_j^U$ and $\hat{\beta}_j^U$ by $t(j, A, Y)$ in (12) and t_j in (29) if the condition (31) is not satisfied.

Algorithm 2 Computation of $\hat{\alpha}^U$

Input: Data $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$. Assume known $\mu_{:1}, \dots, \mu_{:p}$.

Compute the Lasso solution $\hat{\alpha}$ and the subgradient ψ for (A, Y) . Set $\mathcal{S} := \{j : \psi_j = \pm 1\}$ and $R := Y - A\hat{\alpha}$.

Compute $\Omega := A_{:\mathcal{S}}^\top A_{:\mathcal{S}}$, $\Pi := \Omega^{-1}$, and $P = A_{:\mathcal{S}} \Pi A_{:\mathcal{S}}^\top$.

for $1 \leq j \leq p$ **do**

if $j \in \mathcal{S}$ **then**

 Set $\mathcal{S}_j \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \setminus \{j\}$

 Compute $P_j \leftarrow P - (A_{:\mathcal{S}} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j}) A_{:j}^\top - A_{:j} (\Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top) - A_{:\mathcal{S}_j} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} \Pi_j^{-1} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top$

else

$P_j \leftarrow P$

end if

 Compute $\tilde{A}_{:j} = A_{:j} - \mu_{:j}$.

$\hat{\alpha}_j^U \leftarrow \hat{\alpha}_j + \left(\frac{1}{n} \tilde{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_j) A_{:j} \right)^{-1} \frac{\tilde{A}_{:j}^\top R}{n}$.

end for

Output: $\hat{\alpha}^U$.

We now show that the local knockoff filter guarantees FDR control under certain asymptotic assumptions. In order for the proof to proceed smoothly, we introduce

$$(85) \quad T(\epsilon) := \inf \left\{ t : \frac{|\{j : |\hat{\gamma}_j| > t - \epsilon\}|}{|\{j : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > t\}|} \leq q \right\}.$$

for any given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Note that $T(0) = T$ in Algorithm 1, and the numerator in (85) is an overestimate of the number of false discoveries when $\epsilon > 0$. In practical applications though, it may not be necessary to use $\epsilon > 0$, if the empirical measure of $(\hat{\gamma}_j)$ is not concentrated around one point (consider for example, the setting where the Gaussian limit property (Javanmard and Montanari, 2014b) is true, so that the empirical measure is a Gaussian-smoothed density).

ASSUMPTION 1. Consider a sequence of inputs to Algorithm 1 indexed by n , where $Y = A\alpha + w$, α is deterministic, and A and w are independent. Moreover assume that

1. $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{p} \mathbb{E}[|\{j : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T(\epsilon)\}|] > 0$.
2. The Levy-Prokhorov distance between the empirical measure of $(\hat{\alpha}_j^U, \alpha_j)_{j=1}^p$, denoted $\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U \alpha}$, and its mean, $P_{\hat{\alpha}^U \alpha}$, converges to 0 in probability.
3. Let $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ be the debiased estimator and its approximation for the j -th knockoff, i.e. the left and right sides of (30). The Levy-Prokhorov distance between the empirical distributions $\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma} \alpha}$ and $\hat{P}_{\tilde{\gamma} \alpha}$ converges to 0 in probability. This implies that the Levy-Prokhorov distance between their expectations, $P_{\hat{\gamma} \alpha}$ and $P_{\tilde{\gamma} \alpha}$, converges to 0.
4. $\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma} \alpha}$ converges to $P_{\hat{\gamma} \alpha}$ in probability.

REMARK 3. It is possible to prove the convergence of the empirical measures (Assumption 1 part 2 and 4) under more explicit conditions. For example, if the distributions of the row of the design matrix and the noise satisfy the Poincare inequality, we can control the variance of $\int f d\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma} \alpha}$ for any Lipschitz f by a gradient calculation (see BOBKOV and GÖTZE (2010)). We omit the details here since concentration is expected to hold in broader settings (for example, when the distribution of the row vectors have disconnected support, the Poincare inequality fails, but the concentration of the empirical distribution may still be true).

REMARK 4. It is possible to justify Assumption 1 part 3 by applying Theorem 2, Theorem 3, or Theorem 4, depending on the distributional assumptions or the choice of the test statistics. For example, Theorem 3 implies Corollary 5, which in turn implies $\mathbb{E}[\pi(\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}, \hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha})] = O(n^{-1/18})$.

The following consequence of Algorithm 1 is rather direct:

THEOREM 11. Fix any $\epsilon > 0$, and consider Algorithm 1 with nominal FDR q and with T replaced by $T(\epsilon)$. Under Assumption 1, we have

$$(86) \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{FDR} \leq q.$$

PROOF. Under Assumption 1, with high probability and for large n we have

$$(87) \quad \text{FDR} = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|\{j \in H_0 : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T(\epsilon)\}|}{|\{j : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T(\epsilon)\}|} \right]$$

$$(88) \quad \leq \frac{|\{j \in H_0 : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T(\epsilon) - 0.1\epsilon\}|}{|\{j : |\hat{\alpha}_j^U| > T(\epsilon)\}|}$$

$$(89) \quad = \frac{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - 0.1\epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]}{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U}[(T(\epsilon), \infty)]}$$

$$(90) \quad \leq \frac{P_{\hat{\alpha}^U\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - 0.2\epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]}{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U}[(T(\epsilon), \infty)]}$$

$$(91) \quad = \frac{P_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - 0.2\epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]}{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U}[(T(\epsilon), \infty)]}$$

$$(92) \quad = \frac{P_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - 0.3\epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]}{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U}[(T(\epsilon), \infty)]}$$

$$(93) \quad = \frac{\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - \epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]}{\hat{P}_{\hat{\alpha}^U}[(T(\epsilon), \infty)]}$$

$$(94) \quad \leq q.$$

□

REMARK 5. If ϵ is small and if $\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}\alpha}[(T(\epsilon) - \epsilon, \infty) \times \{0\}]$ is close to $\hat{P}_{\hat{\gamma}}[(T(\epsilon) - \epsilon, \infty)]$ (which is the case if most hypotheses are null), then the bounds in the proof are also essentially tight, which indicates that $T(\epsilon)$ is not selected too conservatively and so the algorithm does not lose too much power compared to the oracle threshold algorithm.

4.3. *Fast conditional randomization test.* Conditional randomization test (Candes et al., 2018) is another resampling-based method for variable selection, which weakens the exchangeability of (A, \tilde{A}) in the knockoff filter to the conditional exchangeability of columns $(A_{\cdot j}, \tilde{A}_{\cdot j})|A_{\cdot \setminus j}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. See Algorithm 3 for a description in the case of debiased Lasso coefficients (other test statistics may also be used, similar to the footnote of Algorithm 1). To quote Candes et al. (2018),

there are power gains, along with huge computational costs, to be had by using conditional randomization in place of knockoffs

Indeed, the complexity of exactly solving CRT is $O(Kp^4)$, assuming that computing each $\hat{\gamma}_j^b$ uses LAR which takes $O(p^3)$ time. Thus it is pK times the complexity of the knockoff filter. To probe the tail probability well, it may be necessary to take K up to the order of p (see discussion in [Candes et al. \(2018\)](#)). Previously, proposals for accelerating CRT include applying dimension reduction on $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$, which is referred to as “distillation” in [Liu et al. \(2022\)](#). It is not clear how to control the asymptotic power loss due to the distillation process.

In this work, we adopt an alternative approach for reducing the computation complexity of CRT, by adopting the approximate update formula (14) in computing $\hat{\gamma}_j^b$. Note that computing $Y - A\hat{\alpha}$ has complexity $O(p^3)$, and then computing the product $\tilde{B}_{\cdot \setminus j}^\top (Y - A\hat{\alpha})$ takes time $O(n) = O(p)$ in the proportion regime. This implies that running CRT approximately takes only $O(p^3 + p^2K)$ time.

Algorithm 3 Conditional Randomization Test (CRT)

Input: $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\lambda > 0$, FDR threshold q , number of repetitions $K \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$. Assume known $\mu_{\cdot 1}, \dots, \mu_{\cdot p}$, and a conditional sampling oracle.

```

Compute the debiased Lasso solution  $\hat{\alpha}^U$  for  $(A, Y)$ .
for  $1 \leq j \leq p$  do
  for  $1 \leq b \leq K$  do
    Sample  $X$  from the distribution of  $A_{\cdot \setminus j} | A_{\cdot \setminus j}$ , independently of  $A_{\cdot j}$  and  $Y$ .
    Construct  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  where  $B_{\cdot \setminus j} = A_{\cdot \setminus j}$  and  $B_{\cdot j} = X$ .
    Compute the debiased Lasso solution  $\hat{\beta}_j^U$  for  $(B, Y)$ , and set  $\hat{\gamma}_j^b \leftarrow \hat{\beta}_j^U$ .
  end for
Set
```

$$(95) \quad p_j := \frac{1}{K+1} \left(1 + \sum_{b=1}^K \mathbf{1}\{|\hat{\alpha}_j^U| \leq |\hat{\gamma}_j^b|\} \right).$$

end for

Output: Select a set of variables by feeding $(p_j)_{j=1}^p$ to the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure at level q .

5. Experiments. Codes can be found in https://github.com/jingboliul/local_change.git Experimental results are generated by running the following files:

- Figure 1 and Figure 2: `localk1_fig1and2.R`.
- Table 1: `FDR_demo_eq_table1.R`
- Table 2: `FDR_demo_eq_table2.R`
- Table 3: `FDR_demo_riboflavin_table3.R`

5.1. Approximation errors in the update formula. Consider the setting where the rows of the design matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{1000 \times 1200}$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$, where

$$(96) \quad \Sigma_{ij} = \rho^{|i-j|}.$$

Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^{1200}$ be such that the first 500 entries are generated i.i.d. according to $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and the remaining entries are 0. Take

$$(97) \quad Y = A\alpha + w$$

where $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 10I_{1000 \times 1000})$ is an independent Gaussian noise.

In Fig. 1, we plot the values of $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U}$ and $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} - \tilde{\gamma}_j$ for $\rho = 0, 0.5, 0.95$, where $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U}$ is the debiased Lasso coefficient computed exactly as in (10), and $\tilde{\gamma}_j$ denotes the value computed

using the approximate formula (30). Fig. 2 compares $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}$ and its approximation error for $\rho = 0, 0.5, 0.95$. In these plots, we only uniformly select 1/12 of all the coordinates, to avoid cluttering of the picture. It can be seen that the approximation error for the debiased estimator is better than the plain Lasso for large ρ (in turns of size of the error relative to the magnitude of the debiased coefficients), which is consistent with the theoretical analysis in Section 2.




FIG 1. Comparison of $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U}$ (cross) and its approximation error $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} - \tilde{\gamma}_j$ (circle) for $\rho = 0, 0.5, 0.95$.




FIG 2. Comparison of $\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}$ (cross) and its approximation error (circle) for $\rho = 0, 0.5, 0.95$.

5.2. FDR control with synthetic data. Consider the setting in Section 4, where $p = 300$, $n = 200$, and the target FDR $q = 0.1$. We take $\Sigma^{-1} = a_p(E + \epsilon I)$, where E denotes the matrix whose entries are all 1, and $a_p, \epsilon > 0$ are parameters to be specified later. Then we have $\Sigma = \frac{1}{a_p \epsilon} \left(I - \frac{\epsilon^{-1}}{1 + \epsilon^{-1} p} E \right)$. We then generate α with a random set of s coordinates equal to A_{val}/\sqrt{n} ($A_{\text{val}} > 0$ being a parameter to be specified), and the rest coordinates equal to 0. The observation is $Y = A\alpha + w$, where $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma I)$.

We compare the performance of 6 variable selection methods in Table 1 and Table 2. For the knockoff method, we will use the eq-knockoff construction of Candès et al. (2018), which is natural in this setting since Σ has equal values for the off-diagonals and for the

diagonals. The max eigenvalue of Σ^{-1} is $a_p(p + \epsilon)$, so the condition $2S^{-1} \succeq \Sigma^{-1}$ in eq-knockoff becomes $S_{11} = \dots = S_{pp} \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma^{-1})} = \frac{2}{a_p(p+\epsilon)}$. To design the knockoff filter, one tries to minimize $|\Sigma_{11} - S_{11}| = \left| \frac{1+\epsilon^{-1}(p-1)}{a_p(\epsilon+p)} - S_{11} \right|$ and so for $0 < \epsilon < p - 1$ the optimal $S_{11} = \frac{2}{a_p(p+\epsilon)}$. For $\epsilon > p - 1$, the optimal $S_{11} = \frac{1+\epsilon^{-1}(p-1)}{a_p(\epsilon+p)}$.

In Table 1, We use $\epsilon = 50$, $a_p = 1/p$, number of nonzero coefficients $s = 20$, and noise standard deviation $\sigma = 1/\sqrt{p}$, and vary the signal strength A_{val} . We see that FDR is controlled at approximately $q = 0.1$ in most cases. As $s = 20$ is relatively small in this setting, there are a few instances of FDR overflow for Knockoff-db, due to fluctuations. Meanwhile, the power achieved by the local knockoff filter and CRT are better than the knockoff filter, with or without debiasing.

In Table 2, we change the sparsity level to $s = 60$. Again the FDR is controlled at approximately $q = 0.1$ in most cases, while local knockoff filter and CRT achieve higher power than the knockoff filter. Note that in contrast to Table 1, the power for the debiased versions are noticeably better than without debiasing in Table 2, which is expected since s increased. For correlated designs, the debiased coefficients are generally better statistics than coefficients without debiasing in the $s > p/2$ regime.

TABLE 1
Experimental Results for CRT and Knockoffs

Method	A_{val}	FDR Average	Power Average
Knockoff	0.1	0.09266273	0.476
	0.2	0.1309883	0.974
	0.5	0.1303479	1
Knockoff-db	0.1	0.4191	0.158
	0.2	0.300968	0.434
	0.5	0.1283717	0.96
approx-local-knockoff	0.1	0.1222533	0.673
	0.2	0.1259715	0.998
	0.5	0.1241513	1
approx-local-knockoff-db	0.1	0.1822	0.687
	0.2	0.1111665	0.998
	0.5	0.1059581	1
approx-CRT	0.1	0.08235843	0.529
	0.2	0.09038103	1
	0.5	0.08639233	1
approx-CRT-db	0.1	0.07372347	0.455
	0.2	0.09356313	1
	0.5	0.09016392	1

5.3. *FDR control with Riboflavin data.* We use the riboflavin dataset, available in the supplemental materials of Bühlmann et al. (2014), which was widely used in FDR control experiments (Javanmard and Montanari, 2014a)(Bühlmann et al., 2014)(Huang, 2017). It contains a $p_0 = 4088$ by $n = 71$ matrix of the logarithm of the expression levels, and a response vector Y of the logarithm of the riboflavin production rate. The original measurement matrix contains measurements of many similar (highly correlated) genes, so we use the `findCorrelation` function in R to remove the highly correlated columns with cut-off $\rho = 0.5$. We normalize the means and variance of the columns, and use graphical Lasso function `glasso` to estimate the covariance matrix Σ of the features. Then we use the best linear estimator $A_{\cdot,j} \Sigma_{\cdot,j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\cdot,jj}$ for the $\mu_{\cdot,j}$ in the definition of the debiased estimator. The FDR and power cannot be precisely evaluated since we do not know the ground truth. To tackle

TABLE 2
Experimental Results for CRT and Knockoffs

Method	A_{val}	FDR Average	Power Average
Knockoff	0.2	0.1885708	0.06233333
	0.4	0.1053955	0.4033333
	0.6	0.09942364	0.8623333
Knockoff-db	0.2	0.1161885	0.218
	0.4	0.1535242	0.4206667
	0.6	0.1279221	0.5473333
approx-local-knockoff	0.2	0.09007134	0.223
	0.4	0.04435575	0.9666667
	0.6	0.04446117	1
approx-local-knockoff-db	0.2	0.04598692	0.4506667
	0.4	0.0454128	0.984
	0.6	0.04566024	1.000
approx-CRT	0.2	0.03237107	0.1313333
	0.4	0.04356834	0.966
	0.6	0.04103702	1
approx-CRT-db	0.2	0.0404832	0.379
	0.4	0.04051158	0.9823333
	0.6	0.03975411	1

TABLE 3
Riboflavin

Method	FDR Average	Power Average
Knockoff	0.07862957	0.3866667
Knockoff-db	0.03701082	0.1774359
approx-local-knockoff	0.04449921	0.5117949
approx-local-knockoff-db	0.1293922	0.5835897
approx-CRT	0.03975572	0.4820513
approx-CRT-db	0.1938958	0.6492308

this issue, we first use cross-validated Lasso to obtain α for the observed Y , and then generate new $Y = A\alpha + w$, where the noise level is estimated using the norm of the residual in the previous Lasso regression, so that we can calculate the FDR and power using the new Y and α . Previously, a similar approach for testing FDR control methods on real datasets was adopted in the literature; see for example [Javanmard and Lee \(2020\)](#). The results of the FDR and power values are shown in Table 3. We see an increase in the power by using local knockoffs or CRT, while roughly controlling the FDR in most cases.

6. Conclusion and Future Work. Through a simple nonasymptotic calculation for a given design matrix, we showed that a certain debiased Lasso coefficient is stable with respect to perturbation in one column (Theorem 1). Then by general concentration and anti-concentration machineries, vanishing approximation error in most coordinates was established under mild assumptions (Theorem 3). As a consequence, several FDR control algorithms based on feature resampling can be implemented quickly with asymptotically zero impact.

We expect that the asymptotic error control in Theorem 3 can be extended to even more general matrix classes. In the variable selection literature, a common assumption for the design matrix is the *factor model* ([Fan et al., 2020](#)). We expect that Theorem 3 can be extended to the setting of $A = QU$, where $Q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$ is a deterministic matrix with bounded singular values, and U is a random matrix from the class of Definition 1.

More broadly, we expect that some of our stability type analysis can be adapted to other related problems. For example, *algorithmic stability* ([Bousquet and Elisseeff, 2000](#)) is de-

defined as the stability of a function of the training data when one data point is removed, which implies desirable generalization properties and predictive inference guarantees (Zrnic and Jordan, 2023) (Kim and Barber, 2023). Our approximation error bounds for debiased Lasso based on the number of sign changes may be adapted to establish algorithmic stability or differential privacy guarantees. Furthermore, while the original definition of the debiased coefficients may be non-differentiable in (A, Y) , its approximation formula is piecewise differentiable. This suggests the possibility of establishing concentration or Gaussian limit results for the empirical distribution of the debiased Lasso through the leave-one-out type analysis leveraging the Poincare inequality or Stein’s method, under conditions more general than (or at least not covered by) existing approaches based on vector approximate message passing (Li and Sur, 2023)(Venkataramanan et al., 2022) or Lindeberg’s universality argument (Han and Shen, 2023).

Finally, the recent work of Bao et al. (2023) also showcased the power and generality of the leave-one-out approach, by applying it in deriving nonasymptotic error bounds for the AMP state evolution, which differs from the previous proofs using the conditioning technique that require rotational invariance. While Bao et al. (2023) focused on the case of independent matrix entries, it may be that an extension to the vector sub-Gaussian case is possible by combining techniques in our paper.

REFERENCES

- Aubin, B., Krzakala, F., Lu, Y., and Zdeborová, L. (2020). Generalization error in high-dimensional perceptrons: Approaching bayes error with convex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:12199–12210.
- Bao, Z., Han, Q., and Xu, X. (2023). A leave-one-out approach to approximate message passing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.05911*.
- Barber, R. F. and Candès, E. J. (2015). Controlling the false discovery rate via knockoffs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(5):2055–2085.
- Barber, R. F. and Candès, E. J. (2019). A knockoff filter for high-dimensional selective inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2504–2537.
- Barber, R. F., Candès, E. J., and Samworth, R. J. (2020). Robust inference with knockoffs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1409–1431.
- Bates, S., Sesia, M., Sabatti, C., and Candès, E. (2020). Causal inference in genetic trio studies. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(39):24117–24126.
- Bellec, P. C. and Zhang, C.-H. (2019). De-biasing convex regularized estimators and interval estimation in linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.11943*.
- Bellec, P. C. and Zhang, C.-H. (2021). Second-order stein: Sure for sure and other applications in high-dimensional inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(4):1864–1903.
- Bellec, P. C. and Zhang, C.-H. (2022). De-biasing the lasso with degrees-of-freedom adjustment. *Bernoulli*, 28(2):713–743.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal statistical society: series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300.
- BOBKOV, S. and GÖTZE, F. (2010). Concentration of empirical distribution functions with applications to non-iid models. *Bernoulli*, 16(4):1385–1414.
- Bobkov, S. G. (2016). Proximity of probability distributions in terms of fourier–stieltjes transforms. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 71(6):1021.
- Böröczky, K. and Wintsche, G. (2003). Covering the sphere by equal spherical balls. *Discrete and Computational Geometry: The Goodman–Pollack Festschrift*, pages 235–251.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). Inequalities. a nonasymptotic theory of independence.
- Bousquet, O. and Elisseeff, A. (2000). Algorithmic stability and generalization performance. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 13.
- Bühlmann, P. (2013). Statistical significance in high-dimensional linear models. *Bernoulli*, pages 1212–1242.
- Bühlmann, P., Kalisch, M., and Meier, L. (2014). High-dimensional statistics with a view toward applications in biology. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1:255–278.
- Candes, E., Fan, Y., Janson, L., and Lv, J. (2018). Panning for gold: model-x knockoffs for high dimensional controlled variable selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 80(3):551–577.

- Celentano, M., Montanari, A., and Wei, Y. (2023). The lasso with general gaussian designs with applications to hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(5):2194–2220.
- Chen, Y., Chi, Y., Fan, J., Ma, C., and Yan, Y. (2020). Noisy matrix completion: Understanding statistical guarantees for convex relaxation via nonconvex optimization. *SIAM journal on optimization*, 30(4):3098–3121.
- Donoho, D. and Montanari, A. (2016). High dimensional robust m-estimation: Asymptotic variance via approximate message passing. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 166:935–969.
- El Karoui, N. (2018). On the impact of predictor geometry on the performance on high-dimensional ridge-regularized generalized robust regression estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170:95–175.
- El Karoui, N., Bean, D., Bickel, P. J., Lim, C., and Yu, B. (2013). On robust regression with high-dimensional predictors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14557–14562.
- Fan, Y., Gao, L., and Lv, J. (2023). Ark: Robust knockoffs inference with coupling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.04400*.
- Fan, Y., Lv, J., Sharifvaghefi, M., and Uematsu, Y. (2020). Ipad: stable interpretable forecasting with knockoffs inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(532):1822–1834.
- Fan, Z. (2022). Approximate message passing algorithms for rotationally invariant matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(1):197–224.
- Han, Q. and Shen, Y. (2023). Universality of regularized regression estimators in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(4):1799–1823.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. H., and Friedman, J. H. (2009). *The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction*, volume 2. Springer.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Wainwright, M. (2015). *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*. CRC press.
- Huang, H. (2017). Controlling the false discoveries in lasso. *Biometrics*, 73(4):1102–1110.
- Javanmard, A. and Lee, J. D. (2020). A flexible framework for hypothesis testing in high dimensions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 82(3):685–718.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014a). Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2869–2909.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014b). Hypothesis testing in high-dimensional regression under the gaussian random design model: Asymptotic theory. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(10):6522–6554.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2018). Debiasing the lasso: Optimal sample size for gaussian designs. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6A):2593–2622.
- Ke, Z. T., Liu, J. S., and Ma, Y. (2024). Power of knockoff: The impact of ranking algorithm, augmented design, and symmetric statistic. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(3):1–67.
- Kim, B. and Barber, R. F. (2023). Black-box tests for algorithmic stability. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(4):2690–2719.
- Koltchinskii, V. and Mendelson, S. (2015). Bounding the smallest singular value of a random matrix without concentration. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, 2015(23):12991–13008.
- Lei, L., Bickel, P. J., and El Karoui, N. (2018). Asymptotics for high dimensional regression m-estimates: fixed design results. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 172:983–1079.
- Li, G. and Wei, Y. (2024). A non-asymptotic distributional theory of approximate message passing for sparse and robust regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.03923*.
- Li, S. (2022). *Causal and Selective Inference in Complex Statistical Models*. Department of Statistics, Stanford University.
- Li, Y., Fan, Z., Sen, S., and Wu, Y. (2023). Random linear estimation with rotationally-invariant designs: Asymptotics at high temperature. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*.
- Li, Y. and Sur, P. (2023). Spectrum-aware adjustment: A new debiasing framework with applications to principal components regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07810*.
- Liu, J. (2023). From soft-minoration to information-constrained optimal transport and spiked tensor models. In *2023 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 666–671. IEEE.
- Liu, J. and Rigollet, P. (2019). Power analysis of knockoff filters for correlated designs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- Liu, J., Van Handel, R., and Verdú, S. (2020). Second-order converses via reverse hypercontractivity. *Mathematical Statistics and Learning*, 2(2):103–163.
- Liu, M., Katsevich, E., Janson, L., and Ramdas, A. (2022). Fast and powerful conditional randomization testing via distillation. *Biometrika*, 109(2):277–293.
- Ma, C., Wang, K., Chi, Y., and Chen, Y. (2018). Implicit regularization in nonconvex statistical estimation: Gradient descent converges linearly for phase retrieval and matrix completion. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3345–3354. PMLR.
- Miolane, L. and Montanari, A. (2021). The distribution of the lasso: Uniform control over sparse balls and adaptive parameter tuning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(4):2313–2335.

- Montanari, A. and Saeed, B. N. (2022). Universality of empirical risk minimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4310–4312. PMLR.
- Schniter, P., Rangan, S., and Fletcher, A. K. (2016). Vector approximate message passing for the generalized linear model. In *2016 50th Asilomar conference on signals, systems and computers*, pages 1525–1529.
- Tansey, W., Veitch, V., Zhang, H., Rabadan, R., and Blei, D. M. (2022). The holdout randomization test for feature selection in black box models. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 31(1):151–162.
- Taylor, J. and Tibshirani, R. J. (2015). Statistical learning and selective inference. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 112(25):7629–7634.
- Thrampoulidis, C., Oymak, S., and Hassibi, B. (2015). Regularized linear regression: A precise analysis of the estimation error. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1683–1709. PMLR.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1):267–288.
- van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y., and Dezeure, R. (2014). On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202.
- Van Handel, R. (2014). Probability in high dimension. *Lecture Notes (Princeton University)*.
- Venkataramanan, R., Kögler, K., and Mondelli, M. (2022). Estimation in rotationally invariant generalized linear models via approximate message passing. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 22120–22144. PMLR.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press.
- Weinstein, A., Barber, R., and Candes, E. (2017). A power and prediction analysis for knockoffs with lasso statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.06465*.
- Xing, X., Zhao, Z., and Liu, J. S. (2023). Controlling false discovery rate using gaussian mirrors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(541):222–241.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014). Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1):217–242.
- Zhong, X., Wang, T., and Fan, Z. (2021). Approximate message passing for orthogonally invariant ensembles: Multivariate non-linearities and spectral initialization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.02318*.
- Zrnic, T. and Jordan, M. I. (2023). Post-selection inference via algorithmic stability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(4):1666–1691.

APPENDIX A: ERRORS IN THE PROJECTION MATRICES

Recall G , \bar{G}_A and \bar{G}_B defined around (42) and (48). Their inverses may not be well defined as matrices since the diagonal values may be $+\infty$. However, the inverses can be defined as linear operators on the column space of $A_{:\setminus j}$. That is, we observe that the following map

$$(98) \quad a \mapsto A_{:\setminus j}(A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} + \text{diag}(a))^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$$

is well-defined from $[0, +\infty]^{p-1}$ to the set of positive semidefinite matrices, since the minimum eigenvalue of $A_{:\setminus j}^\top A_{:\setminus j} + \text{diag}(a)$ as an operator on the column space of $A_{:\setminus j}$ is positive and hence admits an inverse. Since our final bounds will only depend on G^{-1} through $A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$ (and similarly for \bar{G}_A and \bar{G}_B), we can write G^{-1} with the understanding that it is well-defined restricted to subspace. We now show that $\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} G^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$ is close to the projection matrices $P_A := \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} \bar{G}_A^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$ and $P_B := \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} \bar{G}_B^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top$.

LEMMA 12. Let $\mathcal{A} := \{l \neq j : \psi_l^\alpha = \pm 1\}$, $\mathcal{B} := \{l \neq j : \psi_l^\beta = \pm 1\}$, and $\mathcal{J} := \{l \neq j : \chi_l^\alpha \neq \chi_l^\beta\}$. We have

$$(99) \quad -(P_{A \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{J}}) \preceq \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} (\bar{G}_A^{-1} - G^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top \preceq P_A - P_{A \setminus \mathcal{J}}$$

Consequently,

$$(100) \quad \left[\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} (\bar{G}_A^{-1} - G^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^\top \right]^2 \preceq P_{A \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{A \setminus \mathcal{J}}.$$

We also have

$$(101) \quad \left[\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} (\bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1} - G^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} \right]^2 \preceq P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}}.$$

PROOF. Recall that $\bar{\Lambda} \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-1) \times (p-1)}$ is the diagonal matrix where $\bar{\Lambda}_{ll} = 0$ if $l \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\bar{\Lambda}_{ll} = +\infty$ if otherwise. Note that Λ is a diagonal matrix with nonnegative entries where $\Lambda_{ll} = \bar{\Lambda}_{ll}$ unless $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Define Λ^+ as the diagonal matrix with $\Lambda_{ll}^+ = 0$ iff $j \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}$ and $+\infty$ otherwise. Then from the rule of resolving the $\frac{0}{0}$ case around (41), we see that Λ^+ dominates Λ , so

$$(102) \quad \begin{aligned} \bar{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} - G^{-1} &= \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \bar{\Lambda} \right)^{-1} - \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \Lambda \right)^{-1} \\ &\preceq \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \bar{\Lambda} \right)^{-1} - \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \Lambda^+ \right)^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Define Λ^- as the diagonal matrix with $\Lambda_{ll}^- = 0$ iff $l \in \mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}$ and $+\infty$ otherwise. Then we see that Λ^- dominated by Λ , so

$$(103) \quad \bar{G}_{\mathcal{A}}^{-1} - G^{-1} \succeq \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \bar{\Lambda} \right)^{-1} - \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \Lambda^- \right)^{-1}.$$

Then (100) follows from Lemma 14. By the same argument we also have

$$(104) \quad \left[\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j} (\bar{G}_{\mathcal{B}}^{-1} - G^{-1}) A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} \right]^2 \preceq P_{\mathcal{B} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{B} \setminus \mathcal{J}} = P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \mathcal{J}} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \mathcal{J}},$$

where the last equality can be verified using the definition of \mathcal{J} . \square

PROPOSITION 13. For Λ defined in (41), we have

$$(105) \quad A_{:\setminus j} (\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) = A_{:\setminus j} \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \Lambda \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{v \hat{\beta}_j - u \hat{\alpha}_j}{\sqrt{n}} \right)$$

where inverse is taken in the subspace of $A_{:\setminus j}$ (see comment around (98)).

PROOF. Note that from (32), (33), and (35),

$$(106) \quad \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} (\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) + \lambda (\psi_{\setminus j}^{\alpha} - \psi_{\setminus j}^{\beta}) = \frac{v \hat{\beta}_j - u \hat{\alpha}_j}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Therefore for any $\delta, \Delta \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$,

$$(107) \quad \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} (\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j} + \delta) + \lambda (\psi_{\setminus j}^{\alpha} - \psi_{\setminus j}^{\beta} + \Delta) = \frac{v \hat{\beta}_j - u \hat{\alpha}_j}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} \delta + \lambda \Delta.$$

Then defining $\Lambda_{\delta, \Delta}$ as the diagonal matrix whose diagonal values are $\frac{\psi_l^{\alpha} - \psi_l^{\beta} + \Delta_l}{\hat{\alpha}_l - \hat{\beta}_l + \delta_l}$, $l \neq j$, we have

$$(108) \quad \hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j} + \delta = \left(\frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} + \lambda \Lambda_{\delta, \Delta} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{v \hat{\beta}_j - u \hat{\alpha}_j}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^{\top} A_{:\setminus j} \delta + \lambda \Delta \right)$$

whenever δ, Δ are such that the above matrix inverse is defined. Now we can take a particular sequence of (δ, Δ) such that the coordinates of $\Lambda_{\delta, \Delta}$ converges to coordinates of Λ on the extended real line. It is easy to see that the map (98) is continuous, so (105) follows. \square

LEMMA 14. Suppose that P is the projection matrix onto a subspace in \mathbb{R}^n . If $A \in \mathbb{R}^2$ is a symmetric matrix satisfying $-P \preceq A \preceq P$, then $A^2 \preceq P$.

PROOF. Without loss of generality, assume that $P = \begin{pmatrix} I_{r \times r} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, for some $r \leq n$. If $A = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} \end{pmatrix}$, where $A_{11} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$, we claim that A_{12} , A_{21} , A_{22} are zero. Indeed, let $u \in \mathbb{R}^r$ and $v \in \mathbb{R}^{n-r}$ be arbitrary row vectors. We have

$$(109) \quad (u, v)A(u, v)^\top = uA_{11}u^\top + 2uA_{12}v^\top + vA_{22}v^\top$$

which, by our assumption, is bounded between $\|u\|_2^2$ and $-\|u\|_2^2$ for all u and v , so it follows that A_{12} , A_{21} , A_{22} are zero. Moreover A_{11} must have all eigenvalues between -1 and 1 , so $A^2 \preceq P$ follows. \square

APPENDIX B: SIGN STABILITY

B.1. Control of change of residual. The residual change $R - S$ is easier to control than $\hat{\alpha} - \hat{\beta}$. From (32)-(33) we have

$$(110) \quad \frac{1}{n} A_{:\setminus j}^\top (S - R) + \lambda \Lambda(\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}) = 0.$$

If $0 \cdot \infty$ is encountered in (110), we can add perturbations as in (13), and pass to a limit in the end. Solving $\hat{\alpha}_{\setminus j} - \hat{\beta}_{\setminus j}$ and plugging it in (35), we have

$$(111) \quad S - R = -\frac{1}{\lambda n} A_{:\setminus j} \Lambda^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top (S - R) + A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j.$$

Therefore

$$(112) \quad S - R = \left[I + \frac{1}{\lambda n} A_{:\setminus j} \Lambda^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top \right]^{-1} (A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j).$$

Since the eigenvalues of $\left[I + \frac{1}{\lambda n} A_{:\setminus j} \Lambda^{-1} A_{:\setminus j}^\top \right]^{-1}$ are upper bounded by 1, we have

$$(113) \quad \|S - R\|_2 \leq \|A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j\|_2.$$

B.2. Control of ψ^α near the edge. For a given A , define $\psi()$ and $\chi()$ as the subgradient and the signs as functions of Y , similar to (4) and (5). In this section we prove sufficient conditions under which $\psi_m(Y) \in (-1, -1 + \epsilon] \cup [1 - \epsilon, 1)$ with small probability whenever $\epsilon > 0$ is small.

LEMMA 15. Let $\epsilon, \delta_0 \in (0, 1)$, $k, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, and $\kappa, \Gamma \in (0, \infty)$. Let A be deterministic, and $Y \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, n\sigma^2 I_n)$ for some $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let Ω_1 be the set of y such that $|\{l: \chi_l(y) \neq 0\}| \leq k$. Let Ω_2 be the set of y satisfying $\frac{1}{n} \langle y - \mu, A_{:m} \rangle \geq -\sigma^2 \Gamma$. Now suppose that

$$(114) \quad \frac{1}{n} \inf_P A_{:m}^\top (I - P) A_{:m} \geq \kappa$$

where the infimum is over projection P onto the span of k columns of A excluding the m -th column; and that

$$(115) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[Y \pm U \frac{2\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa} A_{:m} \notin \Omega_1 \right] \leq \delta_0$$

where U is a uniform random variable on $[0, 1]$ independent of Y ; and that

$$(116) \quad \frac{1}{n} \|A_{:,m}\|^2 \leq 2(\ln 3 - 1)\Gamma^2 \sigma^2;$$

$$(117) \quad P_Y[\Omega_2^c] \leq \delta_0.$$

Then

$$(118) \quad \mathbb{P}[1 - |\psi_m(Y)| \in (0, \epsilon)] \leq \frac{12\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa}\Gamma + 6\delta_0.$$

REMARK 6. To fix ideas, we can think of the proportional growth regime and let k also be linear in n (but with a possibly small slope). Then we can bound κ on the order of a constant using the restricted singular value of A . We can take Γ to be slowly growing with n , say $\text{polylog}(n)$. Also suppose that $\|\mu\|_2 = O(n)$ and then take λ sufficiently large. Then δ_0 vanishes in n quickly.

PROOF. In this proof we assume without loss of generality that $m = 1$. For any y , set $\mathcal{Z}(y) := \{l = 1 \dots, p: \psi_l(y) \in (-1, 1)\}$. We may omit the argument y when there is no ambiguity. The normal equation can be written as

$$(119) \quad -\frac{1}{n} A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top (y - A\hat{\alpha}) + \lambda \psi_{\mathcal{Z}^c} = 0;$$

$$(120) \quad -\frac{1}{n} A_{:, \mathcal{Z}}^\top (y - A\hat{\alpha}) + \lambda \psi_{\mathcal{Z}} = 0,$$

from which we obtain

$$(121) \quad \hat{\alpha}_{\mathcal{Z}^c} = (A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c})^{-1} (A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top y - n\lambda \psi_{\mathcal{Z}^c});$$

$$(122) \quad \lambda \psi_{\mathcal{Z}} = \frac{1}{n} A_{:, \mathcal{Z}}^\top (I - A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c} (A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c})^{-1} A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top) y + \lambda A_{:, \mathcal{Z}}^\top A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c} (A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c})^{-1} \psi_{\mathcal{Z}^c}.$$

In the proof we only need to study ψ , which is uniquely determined by y (even though $\hat{\alpha}$ may not). We observe that \mathbb{R}^n is partitioned into polyhedra (intersection of open or closed half spaces) according to the value of $\chi(\cdot)$, and within each such polyhedron, ψ is a linear function, hence differentiable.

$$(123) \quad \mathcal{B}_0 := \{y: \psi_1(y) \in [1 - \epsilon, 1)\},$$

and let $y_0 \in \mathcal{B}_0$ be arbitrary, and let $y_t := y_0 - tA_{:,1}$. If for a neighborhood of t , the vector $\chi(y_t)$ does not change, then note that $\psi_{\mathcal{Z}^c}(y_t)$ is a vector consisting of ± 1 which does not change in such a neighborhood. As long as $1 \in \mathcal{Z}(y_t)$, we have

$$(124) \quad \frac{d}{dt}(\lambda \psi_1) = -\frac{1}{n} A_{:,1}^\top (I - A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c} (A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c})^{-1} A_{:, \mathcal{Z}^c}^\top) A_{:,1} \leq 0,$$

so that $\psi_1(y_t)$ monotonically decreases along t . Next we want to show that ψ_1 decreases sufficiently fast along (y_t) . Set $T := \frac{2\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa}$ and define

$$(125) \quad \mathcal{G} := \left\{ y: \mathbb{P}[y - TUA_{:,1} \in \Omega_1] > \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Then we have

$$(126) \quad \delta_0 \geq \mathbb{P}[Y - TUA_{:,1} \notin \Omega_1]$$

$$(127) \quad = \int \mathbb{P}[y - TUA_{:,1} \notin \Omega_1] dP_Y(y)$$

$$(128) \quad \geq \frac{1}{2} P_Y[\mathcal{G}^c]$$

Now if $y_0 \in \mathcal{G} \wedge \mathcal{B}_0$, we see that $\psi_1(y_T) \leq 1 - \epsilon$; for if otherwise, for at least half of the time while $t \in [0, T]$, we have $\frac{d}{dt}\psi_1 \leq -\frac{\kappa}{\lambda}$ (by the definitions of \mathcal{G} and Ω_1), so that $\psi_1(y_T) \leq \psi_1(y_0) - \frac{T\kappa}{2\lambda} \leq 1 - \epsilon$, a contradiction. Since $\psi_1(y_0) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ and since $\psi_1(y_t)$ is continuous in t , there is some $t \in [0, T]$ such that $y_t = 1 - \epsilon$. This shows that $\mathcal{B}_0 \wedge \mathcal{G}$ is contained in

$$(129) \quad \mathcal{B}'_0 := \{y : \psi_1(y) = 1 - \epsilon\} + TA_{:1}.$$

To conclude the proof it suffices to upper bound the probability of \mathcal{B}'_0 . Define the sets

$$(130) \quad \mathcal{B}'_l := \mathcal{B}'_0 \wedge \Omega_2 - lTA_{:1}$$

$l = 1, \dots$, Then $\mathcal{B}'_0 \wedge \mathcal{G}, \mathcal{B}'_1, \dots$ are non-overlapping. Let

$$(131) \quad D := 2(\ln 3 - 1)\Gamma^2.$$

Then for $y \in \Omega_2$ and $l \leq \frac{1}{T\Gamma}$, we have

$$(132) \quad \frac{f(y - lTA_{:1})}{f(y)} = \exp\left(-\frac{\|y - \mu - lTA_{:1}\|^2}{2n\sigma^2} + \frac{\|y - \mu\|^2}{2n\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$(133) \quad = \exp\left(-\frac{l^2T^2\|A_{:1}\|^2}{2n\sigma^2} + \frac{\langle y - \mu, lTA_{:1} \rangle}{n\sigma^2}\right)$$

$$(134) \quad \geq \exp\left(-\frac{D}{2\Gamma^2} - 1\right)$$

so that $P_Y[\mathcal{B}'_l] \geq \exp(-\frac{D}{2\Gamma^2} - 1)P_Y[\mathcal{B}'_0 \wedge \Omega_2]$, and

$$(135) \quad 1 \geq \frac{1}{T\Gamma} \exp\left(-\frac{D}{2\Gamma^2} - 1\right)P_Y[\mathcal{B}'_0 \wedge \Omega_2]$$

Then it follows that

$$(136) \quad P_Y[\mathcal{B}_0] \leq P_Y[\mathcal{B}_0 \wedge \mathcal{G}] + P_Y[\mathcal{G}^c]$$

$$(137) \quad \leq P_Y[\mathcal{B}'_0] + P_Y[\mathcal{G}^c]$$

$$(138) \quad \leq P_Y[\mathcal{B}'_0 \wedge \Omega_2] + P_Y[\Omega_2^c] + P_Y[\mathcal{G}^c],$$

or equivalently,

$$(139) \quad \mathbb{P}[1 - \psi_1(Y) \leq \epsilon] \leq T\Gamma \exp\left(1 + \frac{D}{2\Gamma^2}\right) + 2\delta_0.$$

Finally, applying a similar argument after the substitution $A_{:1} \leftarrow -A_{:1}$, we obtain (118) via the union bound. \square

B.3. Control of change of signs.

COROLLARY 16. *Suppose that deterministic A and B differ only in j -column. For a given $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, let $\hat{\alpha}$ and $\hat{\beta}$ be computed from (1)-(2). Suppose that the assumption in Lemma 15 holds for all $m = 1, \dots, p$ and for both A and B and some $\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)$. Then*

$$(140) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}|\{m : \chi_m^\alpha \neq \chi_m^\beta\}| &\leq 4 + 2p \left(\frac{12\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa} \Gamma + 6\delta_0 \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{4}{n^2\lambda^2\epsilon^2} \|A\|_2^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{:j} \hat{\beta}_j \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

PROOF. The cardinality in question is decomposed into $|\{m: \chi_m^\alpha = 0, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0\}| + |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha \neq 0, \chi_m^\beta = 0\}| + |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha > 0, \chi_m^\beta < 0\}| + |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha < 0, \chi_m^\beta > 0\}|$ and we proceed by bounding the 4 terms separately. First, we have

$$(141) \quad |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha = 0, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0\}| \leq |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha = 0, 1 - |\psi_m^\alpha| \leq \epsilon\}| + |\{m: 1 - |\psi_m^\alpha| > \epsilon, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0\}|$$

where $m \in \{1, \dots, p\}$. The expectation of the first term on the right side of (141) is bounded by $p \left(\frac{12\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa} \Gamma + 6\delta_0 \right)$ according to Lemma 15; to bound the second term, note that $1 - |\psi_m^\alpha| > \epsilon, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0$ implies $|\psi_m^\alpha - \psi_m^\beta| \geq \epsilon$, so

$$(142) \quad |\{m: 1 - |\psi_m^\alpha| > \epsilon, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0\}| \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \|\psi_{\setminus j}^\alpha - \psi_{\setminus j}^\beta\|_2^2 + 1.$$

But from (32)-(33) and (113), we have

$$(143) \quad \|\lambda(\psi_{\setminus j}^\alpha - \psi_{\setminus j}^\beta)\|_2 = \frac{1}{n} \|A_{\setminus j}^\top (R - S)\|_2$$

$$(144) \quad \leq \frac{1}{n} \|A\|_2 \left\| A_{\cdot j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{\cdot j} \hat{\beta}_j \right\|_2.$$

Therefore,

$$(145) \quad \mathbb{E}|\{m: \chi_m^\alpha = 0, \chi_m^\beta \neq 0\}| \leq 1 + p \left(\frac{12\epsilon\lambda}{\kappa} \Gamma + 6\delta_0 \right) + \frac{1}{n^2 \lambda^2 \epsilon^2} \|A\|_2^2 \mathbb{E} \left\| A_{\cdot j} \hat{\alpha}_j - B_{\cdot j} \hat{\beta}_j \right\|_2^2$$

We bound $|\{m: \chi_m^\alpha \neq 0, \chi_m^\beta = 0\}|$ by the same argument. Moreover, since $\chi_m^\alpha > 0$ and $\chi_m^\beta < 0$ imply $|\psi_m^\alpha - \psi_m^\beta| \geq 2$, we have

$$(146) \quad |\{m: \chi_m^\alpha > 0, \chi_m^\beta < 0\}| \leq \frac{1}{4} \|\psi_{\setminus j}^\alpha - \psi_{\setminus j}^\beta\|_2^2 + 1.$$

The same bound holds for $|\{m: \chi_m^\alpha < 0, \chi_m^\beta > 0\}|$, and the proof is finished by using (144). \square

APPENDIX C: THE CASE OF SUB-GAUSSIAN DESIGNS

In this section we prove Theorem 3.

C.1. Anticoncentration. In this section we prove auxiliary results that will be used in justifying the conditions in Corollary 16. The following Lemma is a consequence of (Koltchinskii and Mendelson, 2015, Theorem 3.1), which lower bounds the minimum singular values of a random matrix with i.i.d. rows, under the assumption that the projection of a row in each direction has bounded (both from the above and below) L_1 and L_2 norms.

LEMMA 17. *Assuming that condition \mathcal{P} is satisfied. There exist $c > 0$ (depending only on \mathcal{P}) such that the following holds: For all $n \geq 1/c$, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have*

$$(147) \quad \min_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}: |\mathcal{S}| \leq cn} \lambda_{\min}(A_{\mathcal{S}}) > c.$$

In particular, (147) implies that for each j ,

$$(148) \quad \frac{1}{n} \inf_P A_{\cdot j}^\top (I - P) A_{\cdot j} \geq c^2,$$

where the infimum is over projection P onto the span of no more than $cn - 1$ columns of A excluding the j -th column.

PROOF. Consider arbitrary $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$ of cardinality no more than cn . For any unit vector t , let $v_t := \langle t, A_{1\mathcal{S}} \rangle$, and we have

- $\kappa_1^{-1/2} \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[v_t^2]} \leq \kappa_1^{1/2}$;
- Using the Taylor expansion it is easy to see that $e^{-x} + e^x \geq |x|^3/4$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, therefore $\mathbb{E}[|v_t|^3] \leq 8 \exp(C_{\text{sg}})$ and hence

$$(149) \quad \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[v_t^2]} \leq \kappa_1^{3/2} \mathbb{E}[v_t^2]$$

$$(150) \quad \leq \kappa_1^{3/2} \mathbb{E}[|v_t|] \mathbb{E}[|v_t|^3]$$

$$(151) \quad \leq 8\kappa_1^{3/2} \exp(C_{\text{sg}}) \mathbb{E}[|v_t|].$$

Now define $b := 8\kappa_1^{3/2} \exp(C_{\text{sg}})$. The above two itemized verify the condition of (Koltchinskii and Mendelson, 2015, Theorem 3.1), therefore, there exist universal constants c_0, c_1, c_2 such that when $n \geq c_0 b^4 \kappa_1^2 (cn + 1)$ we have the following bound on the singular value

$$(152) \quad \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} A_{:\mathcal{S}}\right) \geq c_2 \kappa_1^{-1/2} b^{-2}$$

with probability at least $1 - \exp(-c_1 b^4 n)$. Now (147) follows by taking the union bound, noting that the number of subsets of no more than cn columns is bounded by $\exp(2nc \log \frac{1}{c} + o(n))$ for small enough $c > 0$.

Now consider any j , and let P be the projection onto the column space of $A_{:\mathcal{S} \setminus \{j\}}$, where \mathcal{S} is an arbitrary subset containing j and of size at most cn . Let $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{S}|-1}$ be a vector such that $(I - P)A_{:j} = A_{:j} - A_{:\mathcal{S} \setminus \{j\}} \theta$. Then (147) implies that

$$(153) \quad \|(I - P)A_{:j}\|_2 \geq \|(1, \theta)\|_2 \lambda_{\min}(A_{:\mathcal{S}})$$

$$(154) \quad \geq c$$

which establishes the second claim. \square

PROPOSITION 18. For the Lasso problem with data (A, Y) , we have

$$(155) \quad K \leq \frac{\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2}{n^2 \lambda^2} \|Y\|_2^2,$$

where K denotes the number of nonzero coefficients in χ (see definition in (3)).

PROOF. From the normal equation $\lambda \psi = \frac{1}{n} A^\top R$, we have

$$(156) \quad \frac{1}{n^2} \|A\|_{\text{op}}^2 \|R\|^2 \geq \lambda^2 \|\psi\|_2^2 \geq \lambda^2 K$$

The claim follows since by the optimality condition we have $\|R\|_2^2 \leq \|Y\|_2^2$. \square

C.2. Expected sign changes. Recall the sign vector χ^α defined in (3), and define $\chi^{\beta(j)}$ analogously. We show that when the Lasso regularization parameter λ is sufficiently large (but independent of n), the expected number of sign changes is $o(n)$.

COROLLARY 19. Consider any set of parameters \mathcal{P} . There exist $c = c_{\mathcal{P}} > 0$, such that for all

$$(157) \quad \lambda^2 \geq \frac{2}{0.9c^3} \left(\frac{4M_2}{c^2\delta} + \sigma^2(1 + 2\sqrt{c} + 2c) \right),$$

there exists a set \mathcal{E} of $A, B^{(1)}, \dots, B^{(p)}$ satisfying

$$(158) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{I}\{m: \chi_m^\alpha \neq \chi_m^{\beta^{(j)}}\} | 1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\inf_{\epsilon \in (0, 1/2)} \left\{ \lambda n \epsilon + \frac{1}{\lambda^2 \epsilon^2} \right\} \right) = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{2/3})$$

and $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \leq (1 + p) \exp(-cn)$ for all $n > n_{\mathcal{P}, \lambda}$.

PROOF. The proof follows from Corollary 16 and Lemma 15. We choose c (depending on \mathcal{P}) small enough, such that for all sufficiently (depending on \mathcal{P}) large n , there exists a set \mathcal{E}_0 of A with probability at most $1 - e^{-cn}$, and the following hold for all $A \in \mathcal{E}_0^c$:

- (147) holds.
- $\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{n}/c$, which is a standard matrix concentration result (see Lipschitz maximal inequality in (Van Handel, 2014, Example 5.10); the argument extends to sub-Gaussian row vectors).
- For each $m \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, $\mathbb{P}[\frac{1}{n} \langle w, A_{:,m} \rangle \geq -\log(n)|A] \geq 1 - e^{-cn}$. This is indeed possible, because $w \sim \mathcal{N}(0, n\sigma^2 I)$, and $\mathbb{P}[\frac{1}{n} \langle w, A_{:,m} \rangle \geq -\log n \|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{n}/c] \geq 1 - e^{-cn}$ for small c and large n .

Since each $B^{(j)}$ has the same distribution as A , the above items remain true if A is replaced by $B^{(j)}$ in the statements, and we define \mathcal{E}_j as the corresponding set of $B^{(j)}$. We see that for $A \in \mathcal{E}_0^c$, the conditions (114)-(117) of Lemma 15 hold for regressing $Y = A\alpha + w$ on A with

$$(159) \quad \Gamma \leftarrow \frac{\log n}{c};$$

$$(160) \quad \delta_0 \leftarrow 2e^{-cn};$$

$$(161) \quad \kappa \leftarrow c^2;$$

$$(162) \quad k \leftarrow cn - 1.$$

Indeed, (114), (116) and (117) follow directly from the itemized above. To verify (115), note that from Proposition 18, if K is the number of nonzero coefficients when solving the Lasso for the data $(A, A\alpha + w \pm U \frac{2\epsilon\lambda}{c^2} A_{:,j})$, we have

$$(163) \quad K \leq \frac{\|A\|_{\text{op}}^2}{n^2 \lambda^2} \|A\alpha + w \pm U \frac{2\epsilon\lambda}{c^2} A_{:,j}\|_2^2$$

$$(164) \quad \leq \frac{2}{n\lambda^2 c^2} \left(\frac{n^2}{c^2\delta} M_2 + \|w\|_2^2 + \lambda O_{\mathcal{P}}(n) \right).$$

Using the concentration of the chi-squared distribution (see for example (Boucheron et al., 2013, p43) or (Liu et al., 2020, p57)), we have

$$(165) \quad \mathbb{P}[K > cn - 1 | A \in \mathcal{E}_0^c] \leq 2e^{-cn}$$

for large (depending on \mathcal{P} and λ) n if λ satisfies (157). Similarly, we can verify that for $B^{(j)} \in \mathcal{B}_j^c$, the conditions (114)-(117) of Lemma 15 hold for regressing $Y = A\alpha + w$ on $B^{(j)}$. Now set $\mathcal{E} := \bigcup_{j=0}^p \mathcal{E}_0$. By the union bound,

$$(166) \quad \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \leq (1 + p) \exp(-cn).$$

By Corollary 16, we obtain that for each j ,

$$(167) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\{m: \chi_m^\alpha \neq \chi_m^{\beta(j)}\}|1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] \leq 4 + 2p\left(\frac{12\epsilon\lambda \log n}{c^2\sigma^2} + 12e^{-cn}\right) + \frac{8}{\lambda^2\epsilon^2c^4}(\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j^2|1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] + \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)2}|1_{\mathcal{E}^c}]).$$

We have

$$(168) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\alpha}\|_2^2 1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] \leq \frac{c^2}{n} \mathbb{E}[\|A\hat{\alpha}\|_2^2 1_{\mathcal{E}^c}]$$

$$(169) \quad \leq \frac{2c^2}{n} \mathbb{E}[(\|Y\|_2^2 + \|R\|_2^2) 1_{\mathcal{E}^c}]$$

$$(170) \quad = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n).$$

Next we will show that $\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)2}|1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] = O(n)$. Fix $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, and define $A(t) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ such that $A_{\cdot \setminus j}(t) = A_{\cdot \setminus j}$ and $A_{\cdot j}(t) = (1-t)A_{\cdot j} + tB_{\cdot j}^{(j)}$. Thus $A(0) = A$ and $A(1) = B^{(j)}$. Let $Y(t) := A(t)\alpha + w$, and let $\hat{\alpha}$ be the Lasso solution for the data $(B^{(j)}, Y(t))$. Thus $\hat{\alpha}(0) = \hat{\beta}^{(j)}$, and $\hat{\alpha}(1)$ has the same distribution as $\hat{\alpha}$ under the event $\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c$ (since $B^{(j)}$ and A are identically distributed). Using (157) and Proposition 18, we see that under the event $\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c$, we have $\|\hat{\alpha}(t)\|_0 \leq cn - 1$ for all $t \in [0, 1]$. Let $\mathcal{S}(t)$ be the set of nonzero entries of $\hat{\alpha}(t)$. From (121), we see that under the event $\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c$, we have

$$(171) \quad \left| \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\alpha}_j(t) \right| \leq e_j^\top (A_{\cdot \mathcal{S}(t)}^\top A_{\cdot \mathcal{S}(t)})^{-1} A_{\cdot \mathcal{S}(t)}^\top (A_{\cdot j} - B_{\cdot j}^{(j)})$$

$$(172) \quad \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-2}(A_{\cdot \mathcal{S}(t)}) \|A_{\cdot \mathcal{S}(t)}\|_{\text{op}} \|A_{\cdot j} - B_{\cdot j}^{(j)}\|_2$$

$$(173) \quad = O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$$

for any $t \in [0, 1]$ and in particular $|\hat{\alpha}_j(0) - \hat{\alpha}_j(1)| = O_{\mathcal{P}}(1)$. Thus

$$(174) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}|^2 1_{\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c}] = \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j(0)|^2 1_{\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c}]$$

$$(175) \quad \leq 2\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j(1)|^2 1_{\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c}] + 2\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j(0) - \hat{\alpha}_j(1)|^2 1_{\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c}]$$

$$(176) \quad \leq 2\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j|^2 1_{\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c}] + O_{\mathcal{P}}(1).$$

Thus using (170) we establish that $\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)2}|1_{\mathcal{E}^c}] = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$. The claim then follows from (167). \square

REMARK 7. From (176), we can see that $\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}|^2] = O(\mathbb{E}[|\hat{\alpha}_j|^2] \vee 1)$. However, we cannot obtain that $|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}|^2 = O(|\hat{\alpha}_j|^2 \vee 1)$; this is because $\hat{\alpha}(1)$ and $\hat{\alpha}$ have the same distribution under the event $\mathcal{E}_0^c \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c$, but they are not equal pointwise.

C.3. Conditioning sub-Gaussians. We establish auxiliary results for controlling $\check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)}$ conditioned on (A, Y) .

LEMMA 20. Suppose that (X, U) is a pair of random variables, where $X \in \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$(177) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{K})] \leq e,$$

e being the natural base of the logarithm, $K > 0$, and U takes values in an arbitrary alphabet. Then for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a set \mathcal{E} of U with probability at most ϵ such that for each $u \in \mathcal{E}^c$,

$$(178) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{4K \ln \frac{e}{\epsilon}})] \leq e.$$

PROOF. Let $\lambda = \sqrt{K \ln \frac{e}{\epsilon}}$ and $L = \frac{K \ln \frac{e}{\epsilon}}{\ln \frac{e}{2}}$. Define \mathcal{E} as the set of u satisfying

$$(179) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{K}) | U = u] > \frac{e}{\epsilon}$$

and hence $\mathbb{P}[U \in \mathcal{E}] \leq \epsilon$ by the Markov inequality. For any $u \in \mathcal{E}^c$,

$$(180) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{L}) 1_{|X| \leq \lambda} | U = u] \leq \exp(\frac{\lambda^2}{L}) \leq \frac{e}{2},$$

and

$$(181) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{L}) 1_{|X| > \lambda} | U = u] \leq \exp(-\frac{\lambda^2}{K} + \frac{\lambda^2}{L}) \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{K}) 1_{|X| > \lambda} | U = u]$$

$$(182) \quad \leq \exp(-\frac{\lambda^2}{K} + \frac{\lambda^2}{L}) \frac{e}{\epsilon}$$

$$(183) \quad \leq \frac{e}{2}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{X^2}{L}) | U = u] \leq e$, and the claim follows. \square

LEMMA 21. Given \mathcal{P} , there exist $c > 0$ such that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, there exist a set \mathcal{E} of $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \leq n^{-10}$ and conditioned on any $A_{\cdot \setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}$, $\check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)} = B_{\cdot j}^{(j)} - \mu_{\cdot j}$ is $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\log n)$ -sub-Gaussian.

PROOF. By Jensen's inequality and using (27),

$$(184) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \mu_{1j})] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \mathbb{E}[A_{1j} | A_{1 \setminus j}])]$$

$$(185) \quad \leq \exp(\lambda \mathbb{E}[A_{1j}])$$

$$(186) \quad \leq \exp(C_{\text{sg}} \lambda^2), \quad \forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}.$$

Therefore both $B_{1j}^{(j)}$ and μ_{1j} are sub-Gaussian, and so is $\check{B}_{1j}^{(j)}$. By the equivalence of definitions of sub-Gaussian (Vershynin, 2018), there exist $K = K_{\mathcal{P}}$ satisfying

$$(187) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{\check{B}_{1j}^{(j)2}}{K})] \leq e.$$

Applying Lemma 20 with $\epsilon = n^{-11}$ and the union bound, we see that there exists \mathcal{E} of $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$ such that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \leq n^{-10}$ and conditioned on any $A_{\cdot \setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}^c$,

$$(188) \quad \mathbb{E}[\exp(\frac{\check{B}_{ij}^{(j)2}}{4K \ln(en^{11})}) | A_{\cdot \setminus j}] \leq e$$

and the claim follows since $\check{B}_{1j}^{(j)2}, \dots, \check{B}_{nj}^{(j)2}$ are independent conditioned on $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$. \square

C.4. Concentration bounds. We need the following auxiliary result to control the projection of $\check{B}_j^{(j)}$ onto small subspaces.

PROPOSITION 22. *[Bound on the maximum norm of sub-Gaussian vectors] Suppose that $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a zero mean random vector satisfying*

$$(189) \quad \mathbb{E}[e^{\langle u, \frac{X}{\sigma} \rangle}] \leq e^{\|u\|^2}, \quad \forall u \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

for some $\sigma > 0$. Let \mathcal{L} be a finite collection of subspaces in \mathbb{R}^n of dimension d . Then for any $r > 0$,

$$(190) \quad \mathbb{P}[\max_{L \in \mathcal{L}} \|P_L X\|_2 \geq r\sigma] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{d}r}{2} + 2d + a_d + \ln|\mathcal{L}|\right),$$

where P_L denotes the projection onto L and $(a_d)_{d=1}^\infty$ is a sequence that converges to 0.

PROOF. To control the norm of $P_L X$, we approximate a ball by a polytope which has not too many facets, and bound the probability that $P_L X$ lies outside the polytope using the Markov inequality and union bound. For any subspace L of dimension d and $\theta \in (0, \pi/2)$, it is well-known that we can find a convex polytope C contained in $\{x: \|x\|_2 \leq r\}$ and containing $\{x: \|x\|_2 \leq r \cos \theta\}$, such that the number of facets is $\frac{1}{\sin^{d+o(d)} \theta}$ (see for example [Böröczky and Wintsche \(2003\)](#) or [\(Liu, 2023, Section 4\)](#)). Then

$$(191) \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\|P_L X\|_2}{\sigma} \geq r\right] \leq \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{P_L X}{\sigma} \notin C\right]$$

$$(192) \quad \leq \sum_u \mathbb{P}[\langle \sqrt{d}u, X/\sigma \rangle \geq \sqrt{d}r \cos \theta]$$

$$(193) \quad \leq \sum_u \exp(-\sqrt{d}r \cos \theta) \mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(\langle \sqrt{d}u, X/\sigma \rangle\right)\right]$$

$$(194) \quad \leq \frac{1}{\sin^{d+o(d)} \theta} \exp(-\sqrt{d}r \cos \theta + d)$$

where the sum is over outward normal unit vectors of C . With the specific choice of $\cos \theta = \frac{1}{2}$ we have $\sin \theta = \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} > e^{-1}$, so that $\mathbb{P}\left[\frac{\|P_L X\|_2}{\sigma} \geq r\right] \leq \exp(-\frac{\sqrt{d}r}{2} + 2d + o(d))$, and the claim follows by taking the union bound. \square

REMARK 8. From the proof of Proposition 22, we can see that we do need the sub-Gaussianity in Definition 1 to get vanishing errors in the approximation formula (sub-exponential is not sufficient).

LEMMA 23. *Given \mathcal{P} and any $\varepsilon \in (0, e^{-2})$, for all sufficiently large n , we have*

$$(195) \quad \max_{\Delta} \|(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)}\|_2 \leq 10\sqrt{c\varepsilon n \log n \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}}$$

for all j with probability at least $1 - n^{-8}$, where $\mathcal{A} := \{l \neq j: \chi_l^\alpha \neq 0\}$, and the max is over $\Delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j\}$ of size at most $n\varepsilon$.

PROOF. For each j , let \mathcal{E} be as in Lemma 21. Note that \mathcal{A} is a function of (A, Y) , and $P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}$ is a projection onto a subspace of dimension at most $n\varepsilon$. For any A such that

$A_{\cdot \setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}^c$ we have that $\check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)}$ is $c \log n$ -sub-Gaussian (for some c depending on \mathcal{P}), and using Proposition 22 we obtain, for any $r > 0$,

(196)

$$\mathbb{P}[\max_{\Delta} \|(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) \check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)}\|_2 \geq r \sqrt{c \log n} \mid A] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\sqrt{n\varepsilon}r}{2} + 2n\varepsilon + a_d + \ln\left(\frac{n}{n\varepsilon}\right)\right),$$

The number of subspaces in the maximum above is upper bounded by $\binom{n}{n\varepsilon} \leq \exp(nh(\varepsilon))$ where $h(\varepsilon) := \varepsilon \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + (1-\varepsilon) \log \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} < 2\varepsilon \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ (for $\varepsilon < e^{-2}$). With $r \leftarrow 10\sqrt{n\varepsilon} \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, (196) is upper bounded by $\exp(-n\varepsilon \ln \frac{1}{\varepsilon})$. The claim then follows by the union bound. \square

REMARK 9. In the proof Lemma 23, it appears that it is essential that we defined $\mu_{\cdot j}$ as the conditional mean, rather than the best linear estimator $A_{\cdot \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j j}$. Indeed, if we took $\mu_{\cdot j} := A_{\cdot \setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus j j}$, then the residual $\check{B}_{\cdot j}^{(j)} := B_{\cdot j}^{(j)} - \mu_{\cdot j}$ would have zero inner product with any linear functions of $A_{\cdot \setminus j}$, but not with general functions, so the left side of (195) might not be small.

C.5. Convergence in most coordinates.

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Define

$$(197) \quad \mathcal{I}_3(j, l) = 1\{\chi_l^\alpha \neq \chi_l^{\beta(j)}\};$$

$$(198) \quad \mathcal{I}_4(j) := 1\left\{\frac{1}{n} \sum_l \mathcal{I}_3(j, l) > \varepsilon\right\}.$$

It follows from Corollary 19 that

$$(199) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1, l}^p \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_3(j, l)] = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{2/3}).$$

Then (writing $\bar{\mathcal{I}} := 1 - \mathcal{I}$),

$$(200) \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{p} \sum_j \mathcal{I}_4(j) > \delta_1\right] \leq \frac{1}{p\delta_1} \sum_j \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_l \mathcal{I}_3(j, l) > \varepsilon\right]$$

$$(201) \quad \leq \frac{1}{\delta_1 \varepsilon p n} \sum_{j, l} \mathbb{E}[\mathcal{I}_3(j, l)]$$

$$(202) \quad \leq \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/3} \delta_1^{-1} \varepsilon^{-1})$$

where ε and δ_1 will be optimized later (see (210)). Let c be as in Corollary 19, and let

$$(203) \quad \mathcal{I}_8 := 1\{\|A\|_{\text{op}} > \sqrt{n}/c \text{ or (195) fails for some } j\}.$$

Applying Theorem 1 with $D = \frac{1}{c}$ and $\Gamma = 10\sqrt{c \log n} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, we see that under the event $\mathcal{I}_4(j) = \mathcal{I}_8 = 0$,

$$(204) \quad |t(j, B^{(j)}, Y) - t_j| \leq 10\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{c}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \cdot \sqrt{\varepsilon}(|\hat{\alpha}_j| + |\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}|).$$

To finish the proof, we will control the right side of (204). Let

$$(205) \quad \mathcal{I}_6(j) := 1\{\max\{|\hat{\alpha}_j|, |\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}|\} > \delta_3^{-1/2}\},$$

and next we will show that $\mathcal{I}_6(j) = 0$ for most j . Using (176) and the Markov inequality, we have that for any $\delta_3 > 0$,

$$(206) \quad \max \left\{ \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}[|\hat{\alpha}_j| > \delta_3^{-1/2}], \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{P}[|\hat{\beta}_j^{(j)}| > \delta_3^{-1/2}] \right\} = \tilde{O}(\delta_3)$$

and

$$(207) \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{p} \sum_j \mathcal{I}_6(j) > \delta_1\right] = \tilde{O}(\delta_3/\delta_1).$$

Returning to (204), we see that under the event $\mathcal{I}_4(j) = \mathcal{I}_8 = \mathcal{I}_6(j) = 0$ we have

$$(208) \quad |t(j, B^{(j)}, Y) - t_j| = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_3}} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \right).$$

From (202), (207) and Lemma 23, we have

$$(209) \quad \mathbb{P}\left[\frac{1}{p} \sum_j \mathcal{I}_4(j) \vee \mathcal{I}_6(j) > 2\delta_1 \text{ or } \mathcal{I}_8\right] = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/3}\delta_1^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1}) + \tilde{O}(\delta_3/\delta_1) + n^{-8}.$$

The values of δ_1 , δ_3 , and ε can be optimized; here we specify them in way that the Levy-Prokhorov error in Corollary 5 will be minimized. Thus we will set (208), $2\delta_1$, and the right side of (209) to be the same order (up to log factors), which gives

$$(210) \quad \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{\delta_3}} = \delta_1 = p^{-1/3}\delta_1^{-1}\varepsilon^{-1} = \frac{\delta_3}{\delta_1},$$

yielding $\delta_1 = p^{-1/18}$, $\varepsilon = p^{-2/9}$, and $\delta_3 = p^{-1/9}$. which yields the claimed convergence rate.

It remains to show the claim about further simplification when $B_{:,j}^{(j)}$ and $A_{:,j}$ are independent of $A_{\setminus j}$. Since $(I - P_j)A_{:,j}$ is a function of (A, Y) , and $\check{B}^{(j)}$ is $\tilde{O}(1)$ -sub-Gaussian conditioned on a set of A with probability $1 - O(n^{-10})$, we see that $|\frac{1}{n}\check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top}(I - P_j)A_{:,j}\hat{\alpha}_j| = \tilde{O}((n\delta_3)^{-1/2})$ (which is smaller than (210)) with $1 - O(n^{-10})$ probability for $j: \mathcal{I}_6(j) = 0$. Thus the $\tilde{O}(n^{-1/18})$ rate bound also holds when the term $\check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top}(I - P_j)A_{:,j}\hat{\alpha}_j$ is dropped from (29). \square

APPENDIX D: THE CASE OF NON-VANISHING $\mathbb{E}[|\check{B}_{1j}^{(j)}|^2]$

In this section we prove Theorem 4, which is essentially based on showing that the denominator in (30) is bounded below. We need a few lemmas:

LEMMA 24. *Assuming \mathcal{P} and (31), there exists $c > 0$ such that the following holds: For all $n \geq 1/c$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-cn)$ we have*

$$(211) \quad \frac{1}{n} \inf_P \check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)\top} (I - P) \check{B}_{:,j}^{(j)} \geq c^2,$$

where the infimum is over projection P onto the span of no more than $cn - 1$ columns of A excluding the j -th column.

PROOF. Let us assume without loss of generality that $j = 1$. The assumption of the optimality of the linear prediction implies that the covariance matrix of

$$(212) \quad [\check{B}_{11}^{(1)}, A_{12}, \dots, A_{1p}]$$

is a block-diagonal matrix with diagonal blocks $\mathbb{E}[|\check{B}_{11}^{(1)}|^2] \in (\kappa_2^{-1}, \kappa_1)$, and $\Sigma_{\setminus 1}$. In particular, the max and min eigenvalues of such a covariance matrix is bounded between κ_1 and $(\kappa_1 \vee \kappa_2)^{-1}$. Moreover, note that both $A_{1\cdot}$ and μ_{11} are C_{sg} -sub-Gaussian (the latter can be seen by Jensen's inequality). Therefore using Cauchy-Schwarz we see that (212) is $4C_{\text{sg}}$ -sub-Gaussian. Then we establish the claim by following the same proof as Lemma 17, but replacing A with $[\check{B}_{1\cdot}^{(1)}, A_{2\cdot}, \dots, A_{p\cdot}]$. \square

LEMMA 25. Assuming \mathcal{P} and (31), and λ large enough (i.e. satisfying (157)), there exists $c_1 > 0$ (depending on \mathcal{P}) such that with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-10})$, we have

$$(213) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} > c_1, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, p,$$

for large enough (depending on \mathcal{P} and λ) n .

PROOF. Let $c > 0$ be as in Corollary 19. As shown in (165), with probability at least $1 - 3e^{-cn}$, P_j is a projection onto a subspace of dimension at most $cn - 1$, and hence

$$(214) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)} > c^2$$

by Lemma 24 (note that $B^{(j)}$ and A have the same distribution). Moreover, let \mathcal{E} be as in Lemma 21. Conditioned on any $A_{\setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}$ we have that $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) \mu_{:j}$ is $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{n^2} \|\mu_{:j}\|_2^2 \log n)$ -sub-Gaussian and, since $\mu_{:j}$ is C_{sg} -sub-Gaussian (which follows by sub-Gaussianity of $B_{:j}^{(j)}$ and Jensen's inequality), we have $\|\mu_{:j}\|_2^2 = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n)$ with probability at least $1 - e^{-\omega(n)}$. It follows that $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) \mu_{:j}$ is $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{n} \log n)$ -sub-Gaussian conditioned on $A_{\setminus j}$ in a set of probability at least $1 - \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] - e^{-\omega(n)} = 1 - n^{-10} - e^{-\omega(n)}$. Then, without conditioning on $A_{\setminus j}$, we have $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) \mu_{:j} = O_{\mathcal{P}}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log n})$ with probability at least $1 - O(n^{-10})$. Then the claim follows from (214), $B_{:j}^{(j)} = \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)} + \mu_{:j}$, and $c_1 := c^2/2 < c^2 - O_{\mathcal{P}}(\sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log n})$ for large n . \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 4. Recall that in (208) and with the choice of parameters in (210), we established that

$$(215) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} R - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right| = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$$

for a set of j of size at most $2n^{-1/18}p$, under the event

$$(216) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_j \mathcal{I}_4(j) \vee \mathcal{I}_6(j) \leq 2\delta_1 \text{ and } \mathcal{I}_8 = 0$$

which has probability $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$. Now by Lemma 21, there exists a set \mathcal{E} of $A_{\setminus j}$, $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \leq n^{-10}$, such that conditioned on any (A, Y) satisfying $A_{\setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}$, $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} R$ is sub-Gaussian with variance proxy $O_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{n^2} \|R\|_2^2 \log n) \leq O_{\mathcal{P}}(\frac{1}{n^2} \|Y\|_2^2 \log n)$. Thus conditioned on any $A_{\setminus j} \in \mathcal{E}$, $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} R = O_{\mathcal{P}}(\log n)$ with probability $1 - e^{-\omega(n)}$. Thus unconditionally,

$$(217) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} R = O_{\mathcal{P}}(\log n)$$

with probability $1 - O(n^{-10})$. Under the event of (216), by a similar argument, we have

$$(218) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \delta_3^{-1/2}\right)$$

with probability $1 - O(n^{-10})$. Moreover, from (216) and Lemma 23 we see that with probability $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$,

$$(219) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (P^{(j)} - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} = o(1)$$

for all j except for a set of size $\tilde{O}(pn^{-1/18})$. Then using (213) we have that with probability $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$,

$$(220) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P^{(j)}) B_{:j}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} - o(1) = \Omega(1)$$

for all j except for a set of size $\tilde{O}(pn^{-1/18})$. Thus under (216), (217) and (218), from (215) we see that

$$(221) \quad \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} = O_{\mathcal{P}}(\log n)$$

and hence

$$(222) \quad \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} R - \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) A_{:j} \hat{\alpha}_j \right| \leq \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(n^{-1/18}\right) + \left| \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (P^{(j)} - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)} \hat{\beta}_j^{(j)U} \right|$$

$$(223) \quad \leq \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}\left(n^{-1/18}\right).$$

The claim then follows by dividing both sides by $\frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)\top} (I - P_j) B_{:j}^{(j)}$, and noting that (216), (217) and (218) hold simultaneously with probability at least $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/18})$. \square

APPENDIX E: THE CASE OF GAUSSIAN DESIGNS

In this section we show that our definition of the debiased estimator (8) asymptotically matches the traditional definition (6) in the case of Gaussian designs.

THEOREM 26. *Consider the setting of Definition 1, where the row distribution $Q = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/18})$, there is a set of j of cardinality at least $p(1 - p^{-1/18})$, such that*

$$(224) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^{\top} (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} = \Sigma_{j|\setminus j} (1 - k/n) + O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/9}),$$

(where $P_{\mathcal{B}} = P^{(j)}$) and consequently,

$$(225) \quad |\hat{\beta}_j^{U(j)} - \hat{\beta}_j^{u(j)}| = O_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/9})$$

where $k := \|\hat{\beta}^{(j)}\|_0$.

PROOF. Recall (202) with parameters chosen in (210) states that

$$(226) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\frac{1}{p} \sum_j \mathcal{I}_4(j) > p^{-1/18} \right] \leq \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/18}).$$

Thus with probability at least $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/18})$, there is a set of j of cardinality at least $p(1 - p^{-1/18})$, for which

$$(227) \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_l 1\{\chi_l^\alpha \neq \chi_l^{\beta(j)}\} \leq p^{-2/9},$$

and hence by Lemma 23,

$$(228) \quad \max_{\Delta} \|(P_{\mathcal{A} \cup \Delta} - P_{\mathcal{A} \setminus \Delta}) \check{B}_{:j}^{(j)}\|_2 \leq \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{\frac{7}{18}}),$$

where $\mathcal{A} := \{l \neq j: \chi_l^\alpha \neq 0\}$, and the max is over $\Delta \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{j\}$ of size at most $np^{-2/9}$. Now in the Gaussian case, $\check{B}_{:j}$ is independent of the rest of the columns, and $\mu_{:j} = A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}$. We have

$$(229) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) B_{:j} = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{B}}) (\check{B}_{:j} + A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}).$$

Then we see that with probability $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/18})$,

$$(230) \quad \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) (\check{B}_{:j} + A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}) = \frac{1}{n} \check{B}_{:j}^\top (I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) \check{B}_{:j} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)$$

$$(231) \quad = \Sigma_{j|\setminus j} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\alpha}\|_0\right) + O(n^{-2/9})$$

$$(232) \quad = \Sigma_{j|\setminus j} \left(1 - \frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\beta}^{(j)}\|_0\right) + O(n^{-2/9})$$

where (230) follows since with probability $1 - e^{-\omega(n)}$, $(I - P_{\mathcal{A}}) A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}$ has norm $O(\sqrt{n})$, and $\check{B}_{:j}$ is independent of it with norm $O(\sqrt{n})$. (232) follows from concentration of the Chi-square distribution. (232) follows from (227). Moreover, with probability $1 - \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(p^{-1/18})$, we also have the error bound

$$(233) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} |\check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A}} - P_{\mathcal{B}}) (\check{B}_{:j} + A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj})| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} |\check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A}} - P_{\mathcal{B}}) \check{B}_{:j}| + \frac{1}{n} |\check{B}_{:j}^\top (P_{\mathcal{A}} - P_{\mathcal{B}}) A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}| \end{aligned}$$

$$(234) \quad = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-2/9}) + \frac{1}{n} \cdot \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{7/18}) \cdot O(\sqrt{n})$$

$$(235) \quad = \tilde{O}_{\mathcal{P}}(n^{-1/9})$$

where we used (228). This establishes (224). Then (225) follows from Lemma 25. \square

REMARK 10. In proving Theorem 26, the key properties we used include (224), and the fact that the linear estimator is optimal (i.e. $\mu_{:j} := A_{:\setminus j} \Sigma_{\setminus j}^{-1} \Sigma_{\setminus jj}$). Thus it is plausible that the result may be extended to a more general class of (possibly non-Gaussian) distributions. We conjecture that the result can be generalized to distributions for which property \mathcal{P} holds and the linear estimator is optimal (in which case (31) must be true).

APPENDIX F: A NOTE ON COMPUTATION OF $\hat{\alpha}^U$

Recall that $\hat{\alpha}^U$ defined in (8):

$$(236) \quad \hat{\alpha}_j^U = \hat{\alpha}_j + \left(\frac{1}{n} \check{A}_{:j}^\top (I - P_j) A_{:j} \right)^{-1} \frac{\check{A}_{:j}^\top R}{n}$$

where P_j denotes the projection onto the column space of $A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}$, $\mathcal{S}_j := \{l \neq j : \hat{\alpha}_l \neq 0\}$, and $\Theta := \Sigma^{-1}$ which can be computed in time $O(n^3)$. If we use the formula $P_j = A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}(A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top A_{:\mathcal{S}_j})^{-1}A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top$, then computing P_j takes time $O(n^3)$, so that computing $\hat{\alpha}^U$ takes time $O(pn^3) = O(n^4)$. However, it is possible to efficiently compute the P_j 's using a “rank-one-update” formula so that the time of computing $\hat{\alpha}^U$ is $O(n^3)$: First set

$$(237) \quad \Omega := A_{:\mathcal{S}}^\top A_{:\mathcal{S}}$$

and $\Pi = \Omega^{-1}$, which can be computed in time $O(n^3)$. Then for each j , note that by the Schur complement theorem,

$$(238) \quad (A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top A_{:\mathcal{S}_j})^{-1} = \Omega_{\mathcal{S}_j}^{-1} = \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} - \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j j} \Pi_j^{-1} \Pi_{j \mathcal{S}_j}.$$

We can compute $\check{A}_{:j} = A_{:j} + A_{:\setminus j} \Theta_{\setminus j j} \Theta_j^{-1}$ in time $O(n^2)$. Since $\Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j j}$ is a vector, we can compute $\check{A}_{:j}^\top \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j j} \Pi_j^{-1} \Pi_{j \mathcal{S}_j} A_{:j}$ in time $O(n^2)$. We can also compute

$$(239) \quad A_{:\mathcal{S}_j} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j} A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top = A_{:\mathcal{S}} \Pi A_{:\mathcal{S}}^\top - (A_{:\mathcal{S}} \Pi_{\mathcal{S}_j}) A_{:j}^\top - A_{:j} (\Pi_{j \mathcal{S}_j} A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top)$$

in time $O(n^2)$. Then $P_j = A_{:\mathcal{S}_j} (A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top A_{:\mathcal{S}_j})^{-1} A_{:\mathcal{S}_j}^\top$ can be computed in time $O(n^2)$ for each j . Hence $\hat{\alpha}^U$ is computed in $O(n^3)$ time.