

Robust Sure Independence Screening for Non-polynomial dimensional Generalized Linear Models

Abhik Ghosh¹, Erica Ponzi², Torkjel Sandanger³ and Magne Thoresen^{2*}

¹ Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

² University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway

³ UiT, The Arctic University of Norway, Tromsø, Norway.

January 13, 2022

Abstract

We consider the problem of variable screening in ultra-high dimensional generalized linear models (GLMs) of non-polynomial orders. Since the popular SIS approach is extremely unstable in the presence of contamination and noise, we discuss a new robust screening procedure based on the minimum density power divergence estimator (MDPDE) of the marginal regression coefficients. Our proposed screening procedure performs well under pure and contaminated data scenarios. We provide a theoretical motivation for the use of marginal MDPDEs for variable screening from both population as well as sample aspects; in particular, we prove that the marginal MDPDEs are uniformly consistent leading to the sure screening property of our proposed algorithm. Finally, we propose an appropriate MDPDE based extension for robust conditional screening in GLMs along with the derivation of its sure screening property. Our proposed methods are illustrated through extensive numerical studies along with an interesting real data application.

Keywords: Sure Independence Screening; Density power Divergence; DPD-SIS; High-dimensional Statistics; Conditional Screening; Robustness.

*Corresponding Author. Email: magne.thoresen@medisin.uio.no

1 Introduction

The class of generalized linear models (GLMs) is a rich class of parametric regression models that allows to study a wide range of relationship structures for different types of response data, which makes the GLMs one of the most popular statistical tools for real-life applications across many disciplines. Let us consider the GLM in its canonical form: given a set of p predictor variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_p , the scalar response variable Y follows a distribution from the exponential family having density

$$f(y; \theta) = \exp \{y\theta - b(\theta) + c(y)\}, \quad (1)$$

for some appropriate (known) functions $b(\cdot)$ and $c(\cdot)$ and the unknown canonical parameter θ . For simplicity, we do not consider a dispersion parameter in the model (e.g., logistic or Poisson regression) although it can easily be incorporated in all our methodological discussions and the theories derived throughout the paper with slight modifications. We concentrate on the mean regression model for θ given by

$$E[Y|\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}] = b'(\theta) = g^{-1}(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbf{X} = (X_0 = 1, X_1, \dots, X_p)^T$, $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_0, \beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{p+1}$ is the vector of unknown regression coefficients and g is a monotone differentiable link function. Given independent and identically distributed (IID) data (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, our objective is to fit a GLM by efficiently estimating $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and use it for subsequent inference.

Commonly, the regression coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is estimated through likelihood based approaches (or suitable extensions) under the classical low dimensional set-up ($n < p$). However, recent advancements of technologies across disciplines generates data on a large

number of possible covariates with limited observations leading to $p \gg n$, known as the high-dimensional set-up. In this paper, we consider ultra-high dimensional GLMs with the number of covariates being of non-polynomial (NP) order of n , i.e., $\log(p) = O(n^l)$ for some $0 < l < 1$. However, to perform meaningful inference in such situations, we need to assume sparsity of the model — only $s \ll n$ covariates (out of the vast pool of p covariates) are actually important to explain the variability in the response. There are several statistical procedures like LASSO or other regularized approaches (Fan and Li, 2001; Bühlmann and Van De Geer, 2011; Hastie et al., 2015; Giraud, 2014; Ghosh and Majumdar, 2020) to simultaneously select these important variables and estimate the corresponding (non-zero) regression coefficients. Although they often work reasonably well in moderately high dimensions, their computation becomes highly extensive in ultra-high dimensional set-ups. Therefore, it is more efficient to first reduce the set of all covariates to a sufficiently small size (maybe $< n$) through some initial screening procedure. Among these, the most popular is the sure independence screening (SIS) proposed by Fan and Lv (2008) for the linear regression model and later extended to GLMs by Fan and Song (2010). The SIS has become extremely popular for its simplicity, elegance, computational speed as well as the theoretical guarantees for sure screening of the true model, asymptotically with probability tending to one. Subsequently, SIS has been extended to different types of data and associated statistical problems; see, e.g., Barut et al. (2016); Zhao and Li (2012); Luo et al. (2014); Saldana and Feng (2018) among many others.

The SIS is commonly applied, besides other applications, in the context of omics data which generally include different types of noise and outliers; the same issue of data contamination also often arises in other real-life applications involving extremely large number of features. However, the SIS procedure and its extensions are mainly based on the Pearson correlation or the maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of the marginal

regression coefficients, both of which are non-robust against possible outliers in the data. This non-robustness of SIS was, in fact, first noted in the discussion of the original paper itself by Gather and Guddat (2008). They proposed an alternative robust SIS using the Gnanadesikan-Kettenring correlation in place of the usual correlation while ranking the covariates in a linear regression model. Subsequently, several other robust versions of SIS, mostly non-parametric in nature, were proposed for the high-dimensional linear regression model only (Hall and Miller, 2009; Li et al., 2012a,b; Mu and Xiong, 2014; Wang et al., 2017). Although these non-parametric versions of SIS can potentially be applied to the GLMs as well (possibly with appropriate modulation), they were never theoretically studied in the literature. Thus, there is a need for a robust variable screening procedure for the ultra-high dimensional GLM with proper theoretical guarantees of its sure screening property. We aim to fill this gap in the literature by developing a robust sure screening procedure for the general class of GLMs.

Compared to any non-parametric robust procedure, a parametric robust approach is known to provide significantly higher efficiency when the assumed model is valid for a majority of the data except for the noise/contamination part (e.g., Hampel et al., 1986). Recently, a robust parametric version of SIS, namely the DPD-SIS, has been proposed for ultra-high dimensional linear regression models by Ghosh and Thoresen (2020). This DPD-SIS is empirically studied and found to have significantly improved performance compared to the other existing non-parametric SIS procedures under data contamination, although no theoretical guarantees are provided in Ghosh and Thoresen (2020). They have proposed to use the marginal regression approach as in Fan and Song (2010) but to estimate the marginal regression slopes by the robust minimum density power divergence estimator (MDPDE) instead of the MLE. These MDPDEs were first proposed by Basu et al. (1998) as a robust generalization of the MLE for simple IID problems. Due to their

high robustness along with their high efficiency and simple computation, the MDPDEs are subsequently extended to more complex statistical models. For linear regression models, the MDPDEs are studied by, e.g., Ghosh and Basu (2013). For different GLMs as well, the MDPDEs are seen to provide highly efficient and robust parameter estimates under the classical low dimensional set-ups (Basu et al., 2011; Ghosh and Basu, 2016; Basu et al., 2017, 2018; Ghosh, 2019). In this paper, we utilize the MDPDEs under the marginal regression approach to develop a robust variable screening procedure for ultra-high dimensional GLMs, as an extension of the robust DPD-SIS of Ghosh and Thoresen (2020). Additionally, we prove that the proposed procedure satisfies the sure screening property and can also control the selection of false positive under appropriate assumptions.

Further, we also extend our proposed DPD-SIS to develop a robust conditional screening procedure under NP-dimensional GLMs, which we will refer to as the conditional DPD-SIS. The conditional SIS (CSIS), proposed by Barut et al. (2016), has been a natural extension of the usual SIS that can take care of additional information (whenever available) about some previously chosen important variables. Among several advantages, most importantly, CSIS helps to select the hidden important variables. However, just like usual SIS, the CSIS is also extremely non-robust under data contamination, and there is no literature available on its (parametric) robust version. Our proposed conditional DPD-SIS serves this purpose. Its population-level justifications as well as the sample-level sure screening property are also derived rigorously under reasonably practical assumptions.

We illustrate the proposed DPD-SIS through appropriate simulation studies of ultra-high dimensional logistic regression models, in addition to an interesting real data application involving the search for biomarkers in lung cancer. For simplicity in presentation, all proofs are deferred to the Online Supplement.

2 The Proposed DPD-SIS for NP-dimensional GLMs

Let us consider the GLM described in (1)-(2) with ultra-high dimensional covariates; for simplicity in presentation, throughout the rest of the paper we will assume canonical link function so that $b' = g^{-1}$ and hence $\theta = \mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ in (2). Suppose that the true value of the regression coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is denoted by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = (\beta_{00}, \beta_{01}, \dots, \beta_{0p})^T$. We assume that the true model, denoted as $\mathcal{M}_0 = \{1 \leq j \leq p : \beta_{0j} \neq 0\}$, is sparse with model size $s = |\mathcal{M}_0| < n$. Our aim is to perform an initial screening of the covariates in a robust manner such that it includes all the truly important variables corresponding to \mathcal{M}_0 ; this property is referred to as the sure screening property in the literature.

We follow the marginal regression approach of Fan and Song (2010) to consider the GLM for Y based on X_j (plus an intercept term) separately for each $j = 1, \dots, p$; let us denote the associated regression coefficients for these marginal models by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^M = (\beta_{j0}^M, \beta_j^M)$, respectively. In this context, we also assume that the covariates are standardized so that $E(X_j) = 0$ and $E(X_j^2) = 1$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$. However, instead of using the MLE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^M$ as in Fan and Song (2010), we propose to use their MDPDEs. Note that each marginal GLM is of low dimension, having only two parameters in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^M$. Hence, we can follow Ghosh and Basu (2016) to define their MDPDE as the minimizer of an appropriately defined average DPD measure between the observed data (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) , $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the assumed GLM density (1). After simplifications, the MDPDE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^M$ with (given) tuning parameter $\alpha > 0$ is defined as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha} = \left(\widehat{\beta}_{j0}^{M\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right) = \arg \min_{\beta_{j0}, \beta_j} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n l_\alpha(y_i, \beta_{j0} + \beta_j x_{ij}), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i = (1, x_{i1}, \dots, x_{ip})^T$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $l_\alpha(y, \theta) = \int f(s; \theta)^{1+\alpha} ds - (1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}) f(y; \theta)^\alpha + \frac{1}{\alpha}$. The tuning parameter α in the definition of the MDPDE is known

to control the trade-off between the efficiency under pure data and the robustness against data contamination. In fact, $l_0(y, \theta) := \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} l_\alpha(y, \theta) = -\log f(y, \theta)$ so that the MDPDE at $\alpha = 0$ (in a limiting sense) is nothing but the most efficient and highly non-robust MLE. For $\alpha > 0$, the MDPDE provides a robust extension of the MLE having increasing robustness with a slight loss in efficiency as α increases (Ghosh and Basu, 2016). For any given $\alpha \geq 0$, each MDPDE $\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ can also be obtained by solving the corresponding estimating equation $\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_\alpha(y_i, \beta_0 + \beta_j x_{ij}) [1, x_{ij}]^T = \mathbf{0}_2$, and

$$\psi_\alpha(y, \theta) = (y - b'(\theta))f(y; \theta)^\alpha - \xi_\alpha(\theta), \quad (4)$$

where $\xi_\alpha(\theta) = \int (y - b'(\theta))f(y; \theta)^{1+\alpha} dy$. Note that $\xi_0(\theta) = 0$ and hence $\psi_0(y, \theta) = (y - b'(\theta))$, the usual score function, which again leads to the MLE.

Based on the MDPDEs $\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ for the marginal regression coefficients, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, and a given $\alpha > 0$, we choose a suitable pre-defined threshold γ_n and select the variables in the set

$$\widehat{M}_\alpha(\gamma_n) = \left\{ 1 \leq j \leq p : \left| \widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right| \geq \gamma_n \right\}. \quad (5)$$

By choosing γ_n appropriately, we can reduce the number of covariates from a large p to any smaller target, say $d < n$, so that the subsequent computation becomes feasible. With these d variables selected in $\widehat{M}_\alpha(\gamma_n)$, we can then fit any appropriate low-dimensional estimation procedure or regularized approach to get the estimated coefficient vector, say $\widehat{\beta}_d = (\widehat{\beta}_{d0}, \widehat{\beta}_{d1}, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{dd})^T$ and subsequently the final model $\widehat{\mathcal{M}} = \left\{ 1 \leq j \leq p : \widehat{\beta}_{dj} \neq 0 \right\}$.

In our DPD-SIS, we suggest to choose γ_n from the target of attaining a fixed model size. However, in practice, it may be chosen in several other ways, e.g., controlling the false positives, or prediction error, etc. (see Section 3 for an optimal rate of γ_n). Note that the case $\alpha = 0$ reduces to the ordinary SIS. Along the same lines, we will show the sure

screening property of our proposed DPD-SIS, so that asymptotically $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}_\alpha(\gamma_n)$ contains the true model \mathcal{M}_0 with probability tending to one, for any given $\alpha > 0$.

Remark 2.1. *The robustness of the proposed DPD-SIS procedure under data contamination follows directly from those of the marginal MDPDEs $\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$. Since the existing theory of MDPDE (Basu et al., 2011; Ghosh and Basu, 2016) yields their increasing robustness for the increasing value of $\alpha > 0$, the same is also expected for the proposed DPD-SIS with any $\alpha > 0$. See similar discussions for linear regressions in Ghosh and Thoresen (2020).*

3 Sure Screening property of the DPD-SIS

We are considering the GLM in (1)-(2) with the canonical link function and the true sparse parameter value β_0 having support \mathcal{M}_0 of size $s = |\mathcal{M}_0| < n$, as described in previous sections. Recall that, under the ultra-high dimensional set-up considered here, the number of covariates $p = p_n$ is assumed to grow exponentially with the sample size n ; we also allow the true model size $s = s_n$ to depend on n . Further we assume that the data (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i) , for $i = 1, \dots, n$, are IID from a true joint distribution $\Pi(dy, d\mathbf{x}) = F_{\beta_0}(dy|\mathbf{x})Q(d\mathbf{x})$, where F_{β_0} is the (conditional) distribution corresponding to the GLM in (1)–(2) and Q is the marginal distribution of the covariates (for which no model is assumed). Then, it is straightforward from the definition of ψ_α in (4) that, for any $\alpha \geq 0$,

$$E[\psi_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{x}^T \beta_0) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}] = E[\psi_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{x}_1^T \beta_{01}) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}] = \mathbf{0}, \quad (6)$$

where we have used the notation $\mathbf{x}_1 = (x_j : j \in \mathcal{M}_0)^T$ and $\beta_{01} = (\beta_{0j} : j \in \mathcal{M}_0)^T$. Without loss of generality, let us assume $\mathcal{M}_0 = \{1, 2, \dots, s\}$ and consider the partitions $\mathbf{x}^T = (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2)$, $\beta_0^T = (\beta_{01}^T, \beta_{02}^T)^T$, $\mathbf{x}_i^T = (\mathbf{x}_{i1}, \mathbf{x}_{i2})$, $\beta^T = (\beta_1, \beta_2)$ and so on for any

p -vectors, where the first partitions (e.g., $\mathbf{x}_1, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{01}, \mathbf{x}_{i1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_1$, etc.) are of length s .

3.1 Population level results

We first investigate the proposed DPD-SIS at population level. The population version (functional) of the marginal MDPDE $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha}$, defined in (3), is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} = (\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha}, \beta_j^{M\alpha}) = \arg \min_{\beta_{j0}, \beta_j} E[l_\alpha(Y, \beta_{j0} + \beta_j X_j)]. \quad (7)$$

This marginal MDPDE functional $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ then satisfies the estimating equations

$$E[\psi_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j)] = 0, \quad E[\psi_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j) X_j] = 0. \quad (8)$$

Let us denote $B_\alpha(v(\mathbf{x})) = b'(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - E[\psi_\alpha(Y, v(\mathbf{x})) | \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}]$. Clearly $B_\alpha(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = b'(\mathbf{x}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ but $B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} x_j)$ do not necessarily equal $b'(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} x_j)$. However, at $\alpha = 0$ we always have $B_0(v(\mathbf{x})) = b'(v(\mathbf{x}))$ for any $v(\mathbf{x})$. Using equations (6) and (8), we have proved the following two theorems. They show why the proposed DPD-SIS is expected to have the targeted sure screening property, at population level.

Theorem 3.1. *For a given $\alpha \geq 0$, and for any $j = 1, \dots, p$, the marginal MDPDE functional $\beta_j^{M\alpha} = 0$ if and only if $\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j) = \text{Cov}(Y, X_j) = 0$.*

Theorem 3.2. *Given any $\alpha \geq 0$, along with the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 on $B_\alpha(\cdot)$, let us additionally assume that either $B'_\alpha(\cdot)$ is bounded or $G_\alpha(|x|) = \sup_{|u| \leq |x|} |B_\alpha(u)|$ satisfies*

$$E[G(a|X_j)|X_j|I(|X_j| \geq n^\eta)] \leq dn^{-\kappa}, \quad (9)$$

for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$ and constants $a, d > 0$, $\eta \in (0, \kappa)$. If there exists a constant $c_1 > 0$ such

that $|\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j)| \geq c_1 n^{-\kappa}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$, then we have $\min_{j \in \mathcal{M}_0} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq c_2 n^{-\kappa}$, for some constant $c_2 > 0$.

The above two theorems are similar to Theorems 2 and 3 of Fan and Song (2010) from the context of SIS, although the assumptions in our Theorem 3.2 are required on the quantity $B_\alpha(\cdot)$ instead of $b'(\cdot)$ which coincide at $\alpha = 0$. For any $\alpha \geq 0$, one can indeed show that $B'_\alpha(\cdot)$ is bounded for the normal and the logistic regression models.

In the same spirit of Fan and Song (2010), Theorem 3.1 implies that if the set of unimportant covariates $\{X_j : j \notin \mathcal{M}_0\}$ is independent of the set of important covariates $\{X_j : j \in \mathcal{M}_0\}$ then $\beta_j^{M\alpha} = 0$ for all $j \notin \mathcal{M}_0$ and all $\alpha \geq 0$. Further, note that, an important covariate X_j having non-zero correlation with the response has a marginal regression coefficient $\beta_j^{M\alpha} \neq 0$. These together indicate the existence of a threshold γ_n satisfying $\min_{j \in \mathcal{M}_0} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq \gamma_n$ and $\max_{j \notin \mathcal{M}_0} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| = 0$. This forms the theoretical basis for the model selection consistency of the proposed DPD-SIS with any $\alpha \geq 0$ and justifies our proposal as an authenticate screening criterion.

On the other hand, Theorem 3.2 provides the conditions to yield $\min_{j \in \mathcal{M}_0} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq O(n^{-\kappa})$ for some $\kappa < 1/2$, which can be interpreted as the marginal signals being stronger than the maximum stochastic noise level. It is an intuitive necessity for the proposed DPD-SIS, the sample version (5), to have the sure screening property. Other than the α -dependent assumption, one crucial condition in Theorem 3.2 is $|\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j)| \geq c_1 n^{-\kappa}$ which is the same as required by the usual SIS in Fan and Song (2010); it can be further simplified for jointly Gaussian covariates following Proposition 1 of Fan and Song (2010) and the discussion thereafter. This theorem also provides the necessary framework to achieve the sparsity in the final selected model (5).

3.2 Sample level results

We first show that the marginal MDPDEs $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, are uniformly consistent at an exponential rate which leads to the sure screening property (sample level) of our proposed DPD-SIS. In this regard, let us note that the marginal MDPDE functional $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ is unique and is an interior point of the parameter space by convexity of the DPD loss function $l_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j)$ in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j = (\beta_{0j}, \beta_j)$ for each j . So, we can restrict the minimization of the marginal DPD loss function over the compact set $\mathcal{B} = \{|\beta_{j0}| \leq B, |\beta_j| \leq B\}$ for some large enough constant $B > 0$ such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ is also an interior point of \mathcal{B} . For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, let $\mathbf{X}_j = (1, X_j)^T$ and define the matrices

$$\mathbf{J}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j) = E[\nabla^2 l_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j)] = (1 + \alpha)E[\Gamma_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{X}_j^T], \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{K}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j) &= E[(\nabla l_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j)) (\nabla l_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j X_j))^T] \\ &= (1 + \alpha)^2 E[\{\Gamma_{2\alpha}(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - \xi_\alpha^2(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j)\} \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{X}_j^T], \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\Gamma_\alpha(\theta) = \int (y - b'(\theta))^2 f(y; \theta)^{1+\alpha} dy$. Then, the following assumptions are needed for our subsequent theoretical investigation of the DPD-SIS; here $\alpha \geq 0$ is a fixed given tuning parameter and $\Lambda_{\min}[\cdot]$ and $\Lambda_{\max}[\cdot]$, respectively, denote the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of its argument matrix.

(A1) The GLM is such that the density f^α in (1) is bounded (say, by $L_\alpha > 0$) and the function $b''(\cdot)$ is continuous and positive. Also, $|\xi_\alpha(\cdot)|$ is non-decreasing.

(A2) For all $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B}$, there exists some constant $V > 0$ such that $\Lambda_{\min}[\mathbf{J}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)] \geq V$ uniformly over $j = 1, \dots, p$.

(A3) $\mathbf{K}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha})$ is finite and positive definite for each $j = 1, \dots, p$. Also, the norm

$\|\mathbf{K}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)\|_{\mathcal{B}} = \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B}, \|\mathbf{u}\|=1} \|\mathbf{K}_{j,\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)^{1/2}\mathbf{u}\|$ is bounded from above for each j .

(A4) There exist an $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and a large constant $K_n > 0$, such that

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B}: \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}\| \leq \epsilon_1} E [|B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j)| \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 I(|X_j| > K_n)] \leq o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad \text{for all } j = 1, 2, \dots, p.$$

(A5) The distribution of the covariate X_j is such that, for sufficiently large $t > 0$ and some positive constants m_0, m_1, m_2, m_3 and τ , we have $P(|X_j| > t) = (m_1 - m_2)e^{-m_0 t^\tau}$, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, and

$$E [\exp(b(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + m_3) - b(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))] + E [\exp(b(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - m_3) - b(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0))] \leq m_2.$$

(A6) $\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ is bounded both from below and above by finite positive constants.

(A7) Either $b''(\cdot)$ is bounded or $\widetilde{\mathbf{X}} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^T$ follows an elliptically contoured distribution with variance Σ_1 and $|E[b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \beta_{00})]|$ is bounded.

Note that Assumptions (A1)–(A6) are appropriate extensions of the assumptions made by Fan and Song (2010) to prove the sure screening property of the usual SIS; they coincide at $\alpha = 0$ since $L_0 = 1$, $\xi_0 \equiv 0$, $\mathbf{J}_{j,0} = \mathbf{K}_{j,0} = E[b''(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) \mathbf{X}_j \mathbf{X}_j^T]$ and $B_0(v(\mathbf{x})) = b'(v(\mathbf{x}))$ for any $v(\mathbf{x})$. For any $\alpha > 0$, Assumption (A1) clearly holds for most common examples of GLM including the normal, Poisson and logistic regression models; other assumptions are also valid for these GLMs under mild sufficient conditions. Interestingly, Assumptions (A5)–(A7) are independent of the choice of α and are exactly the same as Assumptions (D), (F) and (G) of Fan and Song (2010), respectively. In particular, Assumption (A5) ensures that the covariates and the response variable have

light tails; it implies, via Lemma 1 of Fan and Song (2010), that

$$P\left(|Y| \geq \frac{m_0}{m_3} t^\tau\right) \leq m_2 e^{-m_0 t^\tau}, \quad \text{for any } t > 0. \quad (12)$$

Assumption (A6), on the other hand, implies that the variance of the response Y is bounded. In fact, denoting the variance of \mathbf{X} by $\Sigma = \text{Diag}\{0, \Sigma_1\}$, Assumption (A6) states that $\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T \Sigma \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = O(1)$. Note that the maximum eigenvalue of Σ_1 in Assumption (A7) is the same as $\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$, which is a positive finite number by Assumption (A6). Further, Assumptions (A6)-(A7) along with the positiveness of $b''(\cdot)$ from Assumption (A1) imply that for any $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ in the interior of \mathcal{B} (and hence in particular for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j\|_2^2 = O(\|\Sigma \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2^2) = O(\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)) = O(\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_1)). \quad (13)$$

Here, the first equality is as shown in the proof of Theorem 5 of Fan and Song (2010) while the remaining equalities are argued above.

Now, under Assumptions (A1)–(A5), we have the exponential convergence result for the marginal MDPDE as presented in the following Lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Suppose that (A1)–(A5) hold for a given $\alpha \geq 0$. Then, for any $t > 0$,*

$$P\left(\sqrt{n} \left| \widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} - \beta_j^{M\alpha} \right| \geq \frac{16k_n^{(\alpha)}}{V} (1+t)\right) \leq e^{-\frac{2t^2}{\kappa_n^2}} + nm_1 e^{-m_0 K_n^\tau}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (14)$$

where $k_n^{(\alpha)} = (1 + \alpha) \left[\frac{m_0}{m_3} K_n^2 L_\alpha + |b'(K_n B + B)| L_\alpha + \xi_\alpha(K_n B + B) \right]$.

Note that the constant bounds involved in the above Lemma are independent of the index j leading to the uniform convergence of all the marginal regression models through

union bound. We will utilize this fact to derive the sure screening property of the proposed DPD-SIS along with its rate of false positive control (based on (13)), which is presented in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.4. *Let Assumptions (A1)–(A5) hold for a given $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\frac{n^{1-2\kappa}}{(k_n K_n)^2} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $k_n = k_n^{(\alpha)}$ is as defined in Lemma 3.3. Then the following results hold.*

(a) *For any given $c_3 > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$P\left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} - \beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq c_3 n^{-\kappa}\right) \leq pR_n, \quad (15)$$

$$\text{where } R_n = \left[e^{-\frac{n^{1-2\kappa}C}{(k_n K_n)^2}} + nm_1 e^{-m_0 K_n^\tau} \right].$$

(b) *If additionally the assumptions of Theorem 3.2 hold, then taking $\gamma_n = c_4 n^{-\kappa}$ with $c_4 \leq c_2/2$, we have $P\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n) \supset \mathcal{M}_0\right) \geq 1 - sR_n$.*

(c) *If additionally Assumptions (A6)–(A7) hold, taking $\gamma_n = c_4 n^{-2\kappa}$, $c_4 > 0$, we get*

$$P\left(|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n)| \leq O(n^{2\kappa} \Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma))\right) \geq 1 - pR_n.$$

It is important to note that the bound R_n in the above theorem is exactly the same (except for the value of $k_n = k_n^{(\alpha)}$) as obtained by Fan and Song (2010) for usual SIS and it will be exponentially small for standard GLMs with appropriate choices of K_n ; see discussions in Fan and Song (2010). Thus, along with the additional robustness property, our proposed DPD-SIS at any $\alpha > 0$ also enjoys the same optimal rate of convergence and false discovery control as well as the similar sure screening property as the usual SIS under slightly modified assumptions. This is the most striking benefit of our proposal in the context of robust variable screening under high-dimensionality. Additionally, the sure

screening property of the DPD-SIS, as stated in Theorem 3.4(b), does not depend on the variance and the correlation structure of the covariates for any choices of $\alpha \geq 0$. However, higher correlation among covariates may surely increase the false positive selection which can be seen by the dependence of the size of $\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n)$ selected via the DPD-SIS on Σ or more precisely on $\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$ [Theorem 3.4(c)]. As we have less correlation among covariates and hence smaller values of $\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$, the number of variables selected via our DPD-SIS reduces, leading to less false positives due to its sure independence property. As in the usual SIS, we can also achieve model selection consistency for DPD-SIS at any $\alpha \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$P\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n) = \mathcal{M}_0\right) = 1 - o(1),$$

under appropriate assumptions on $\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)$ along with proper control of K_n . As a particular (extreme) example, it holds with the choice of γ_n as in Theorem 3.4(b) if we have $|\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j)| = o(n^{-\kappa})$ for all $j \notin \mathcal{M}_0$, along with the other necessary conditions of the theorem depending on $\alpha \geq 0$.

4 Robust Conditional Screening: The DPD-CSIS

Let us now extend the DPD-SIS approach to conditional screening problems in GLMs. Suppose that, along with the set-up and notation of Section 2, information is available to always include a set of q covariates, say $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$ and we need to robustly select variables from the remaining pool of $d := p - q$ variables (say, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{D}}$). For simplicity, in this section, we assume no intercept terms, since that can be easily incorporated within the given $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Further, without loss of generality, we assume that $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}} = (X_1, \dots, X_q)$ so that $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{D}} = (X_{q+1}, \dots, X_p)$; denote $\mathcal{C} = \{1, \dots, q\}$ and $\mathcal{D} = \{q + 1, \dots, p\}$ and hence $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_q)^T \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{D}} = (\beta_{q+1}, \dots, \beta_p)^T \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Now, for a given $\alpha \geq 0$, we may

choose the variables from $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{D}}$ based on the marginal MDPDEs defined as

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{C}j}^{M\alpha} = \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{C}j1}^{M\alpha}, \widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}}, \beta_j} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n l_{\alpha} \left(y_i, \mathbf{x}_{i\mathcal{C}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}} + \beta_j x_{ij} \right), \quad j = q+1, \dots, p, \quad (16)$$

where $l_{\alpha}(y, \theta)$ is as defined in Section 2, and $\mathbf{x}_{i\mathcal{C}}$ is the i -th observation on $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$. Then, as in (5), given a suitable pre-defined threshold γ_n , we may select the variables in the set $\widehat{M}_{\alpha}(\gamma_n | \mathcal{D}) = \left\{ q+1 \leq j \leq p : \left| \widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right| \geq \gamma_n \right\}$. We refer to this extension as the conditional DPD-SIS, or the DPD-CSIS in short. Clearly, the DPD-CSIS again coincides with the usual CSIS of Barut et al. (2016) at $\alpha = 0$ and provides a robust generalization at $\alpha > 0$. Further, when the conditioning variable set $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$ is empty (or contains only the intercept), we are back to our DPD-SIS. We here study the properties of the DPD-CSIS in line with the results derived in Section 3.

4.1 Population-level results: Justifications of DPD-CSIS

Let us continue with the notation of Section 3.1 and additionally assume that $E(X_j | \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}) = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{D}$. We define the population version (functional) of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{C}j}^{M\alpha}$ from (16) as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}j}^{M\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}j1}^{M\alpha}, \beta_j^{M\alpha}) = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}}, \beta_j} E \left[l_{\alpha} \left(Y, \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}} + \beta_j X_j \right) \right], \quad j = q+1, \dots, p. \quad (17)$$

Additionally, let us define the functional for the baseline parameter given only $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}$, without any additional variable, as $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}}^{M\alpha} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}}} E \left[l_{\alpha} \left(Y, \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{C}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}} \right) \right]$. Then, throughout all theoretical discussions of DPD-CSIS, as in Barut et al. (2016), we need to assume that the functionals $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}j}^{M\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{C}}^{M\alpha}$ are unique, i.e., the associated marginal problems are fully identifiable. Now, for DPD-CSIS at any given $\alpha \geq 0$, we consider the random variables

$m_{\alpha,j}$, for each $j = q + 1, \dots, p$, defined as

$$m_{\alpha,j} = \frac{B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_{C_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{C_j}^{M\alpha}) - B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_C^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_C^{M\alpha})}{\mathbf{X}_{C_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{C_j}^{M\alpha} - \mathbf{X}_C^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_C^{M\alpha}}, \quad (18)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{C_j} = (\mathbf{X}_C^T, X_j)^T$ for each j and B_α is as defined in Section 3.1. Denote by $\mathcal{M}_{0\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{M}_0 \cap \mathcal{D}$ the indices of the truly important variables in $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{D}}$. Then, we have the following results, in analogue of Theorems 3.1 and 3.2, that justify our DPD-CSIS algorithm as a reasonable procedure for conditional screening. Here, in analogue of Barut et al. (2016), we define $\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_C) := E[(Y - E_L[Y | \mathbf{X}_C])(X_j - E_L[X_j | \mathbf{X}_C])]$, for any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, where $E_L[\cdot | \mathbf{X}_C]$ denote the best linear regression fit given \mathbf{X}_C ; clearly $E_L[Y | \mathbf{X}_C] = b'(\mathbf{X}_C^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_C^{M\alpha})$.

Theorem 4.1. *For a given $\alpha \geq 0$ and any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, the (conditional) marginal MDPDE functional $\beta_j^{M\alpha}$ in (17) is zero if and only if $\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_C) = 0$.*

Theorem 4.2. *Given any $\alpha \geq 0$, suppose that $E[m_{\alpha,j} X_j^2] \leq c_2$ uniformly in $j \in \mathcal{D}$, for some constant c_2 . If there exist constants $c_1 > 0, \kappa < -1/2$ such that $|\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_C)| \geq c_1 n^{-\kappa}$ for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_{0\mathcal{D}}$, then we have $\min_{j \in \mathcal{M}_{0\mathcal{D}}} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq c_3 n^{-\kappa}$, for another constant $c_3 > 0$.*

4.2 Sample-level properties: Sure Screening via DPD-CSIS

We now extend the results of Section 3.2 for the unconditional DPD-SIS to the case of conditional screening to show the uniform convergence of the associated (conditional) MDPDEs and the resulting sure screening property of the DPD-CSIS. We continue with the notation of Section 3.2 and assume that Assumptions (A1)–(A7) hold with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{C_j} \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{C_j}^{M\alpha}$, respectively, in (A2)–(A4). We also assume the following additional condition.

(A8) There exists $C > 0$ such that $\Lambda_{\min}(E[m_{\alpha,j} \mathbf{X}_{C_j} \mathbf{X}_{C_j}^T]) > C$, uniformly over $j \in \mathcal{D}$.

Note that Assumption (A8) is mild (and regular) if B_α is strictly convex implying $m_{\alpha,j} > 0$ almost surely. Further, we define $\mathbf{Z} = E(E_L[\mathbf{X}_D|\mathbf{X}_C] [\mathbf{X}^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \mathbf{X}_C^T\boldsymbol{\beta}_C^{M\alpha}])$ and $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}|C} = E(\mathbf{X}_D - E_L[\mathbf{X}_D|\mathbf{X}_C])(\mathbf{X}_D - E_L[\mathbf{X}_D|\mathbf{X}_C])^T$. We can show that Assumptions (A6)-(A8) imply the following analogue of (13) for this conditional case, given by

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_D\|_2^2 = O(\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}|C} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T). \quad (19)$$

Then, we have the desired results in analogue to Theorem 3.4 for the present conditional case of the DPD-CSIS which is presented in the following theorem. The proof is similar to that of Theorem 3.4, but using (19) instead of (13), and is hence omitted for brevity.

Theorem 4.3. *Suppose that, for a given $\alpha \geq 0$, Assumptions (A1)–(A5) hold with $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ replaced by $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{Cj} \in \mathbb{R}^{q+1}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{Cj}^{M\alpha}$, respectively, in (A2)–(A4). Also, let $\frac{n^{1-2\kappa}}{(k_n K_n)^2} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where $k_n = k_n^{(\alpha)}$ is as defined in Lemma 3.3. Then, the following results hold.*

(a) *For any given $c_3 > 0$, there exists $C > 0$ such that*

$$P\left(\max_{q+1 \leq j \leq p} |\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} - \beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq c_3 n^{-\kappa}\right) \leq dR_n, \quad (20)$$

where R_n is as defined in Theorem 3.4.

(b) *If additionally the assumptions of Theorem 4.2 hold, then taking $\gamma_n = c_4 n^{-\kappa}$ with $c_4 \leq c_2/2$, we have $P(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n) \supset \mathcal{M}_0) \geq 1 - sR_n$.*

(c) *If additionally Assumptions (A6)–(A8) hold, taking $\gamma_n = c_4 n^{-2\kappa}$, $c_4 > 0$, we get*

$$P\left(|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n)| \leq O(n^{2\kappa} \Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}|C} + \mathbf{Z}\mathbf{Z}^T))\right) \geq 1 - dR_n. \quad (21)$$

Note that the rate of convergence in the above theorem is exactly the same as in the

unconditional case (Theorem 3.4) and that they are in line with the existing literature on variable screening. In the particular case of the linear regression model, we have $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{0}$, and hence the result (21) in Theorem 4.3 reduces to

$$P\left(|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n)| \leq O\left(n^{2\kappa}\Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{C}})\right)\right) \geq 1 - dR_n. \quad (22)$$

In general, if we additionally assume $\|\mathbf{Z}\|_2^2 = o(\Lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}|\mathcal{C}}))$, as in Condition 3(iii) of Barut et al. (2016), we can also have (22) instead of (21) in Theorem 4.3.


5 Numerical Illustrations for Logistic Regression

To illustrate the finite-sample performance of the proposed DPD-SIS, we have performed extensive simulation studies for the important special case of logistic regression; the results obtained for $p = 5000$, $n = 100$ and $s = 4$ are presented here. We simulate each sample of covariates from a multivariate normal distribution in $(p - 1)$ variables with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and a variance matrix having (i, j) -th element as ρ for all $i \neq j$ and 1 for $i = j$; clearly $\rho = 0$ yields the case of independent covariates whereas a non-zero value of ρ indicates correlated covariates. The intercept term (1) is then added as the first covariate. Then the responses are generated according to the logistic regression model with (true) coefficient value $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = (\beta_{01}, \dots, \beta_{0p})$. Since $s = 4$ (i.e., four covariates are actually related to the response), we choose $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ such that four components (in addition to the first one, the intercept) are non-zero and the rest are zero. Different values of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ in terms of both the position and strength of these four non-zero coefficients are considered along with different values of ρ . For each scenario, the usual SIS and the proposed DPD-SIS are applied to the simulated sample of size $n = 100$ to identify the top $n - 1 = 99$ variables; it is then examined if the true non-zero (significant) covariates are selected. The full process


is repeated 300 times and the number of true positives (number of selected variables having true non-zero coefficients) are studied as a summary measure. Additionally, to examine the robustness, we repeat all these simulations again by contaminating 10% of the observations in 150 non-significant covariates (having true regression coefficient zero) by independent observations (outliers) generated from a normal distribution with mean equal -10 and variance equal 1 . In Figure 1, we present box-plots of the true-positives obtained by the DPD-SIS at different values of α both without and with data contamination.

We observe that for independent covariates and relatively strong signal (larger coefficient values) the DPD-SIS with smaller $\alpha \leq 0.5$ performs exactly similar to the usual SIS under pure data. But, when there is contamination in the data, the performance of the usual SIS deteriorates significantly whereas the proposed DPD-SIS remains stable and yields better variable selection results, ignoring the effect of outliers (see, e.g., Figure 1a). As the signal gets weaker, the DPD-SIS fails to select all true positives but it still performs as good as the usual SIS under pure data; in case of additional contamination, the DPD-SIS remains much more stable even with weaker signal, although the usual SIS gets significantly affected (see, e.g., Figure 1b). However, the performance of the proposed DPD-SIS as well as the usual SIS becomes significantly worse when the covariates are strongly correlated which is expected from our theory as well. In such a case, the effect of outliers may not be so prominent as in the case of independent covariates, but there is still a slight decrease in the number of true positives obtained by the usual SIS under contamination and DPD-SIS again performs robustly as claimed (see, e.g., Figure 1c).


Remark 5.1. *It is important to note that the performance of DPD-SIS for the cases with independent covariates appears to be almost the same for any α in the range $[0.1, 0.5]$. In case of dependent covariates though, their performance can vary significantly. Based on*



(a) Independent Covariates ($\rho = 0$), Strong Signal (non-zero values of β_0 are all 5)



(b) Independent Covariates, Weaker Signal ($\beta_{01}, \beta_{02}, \beta_{06}, \beta_{0,26}, \beta_{0,126}$) = (1, 2, 3, 1, 5)



(c) Dependent Covariates ($\rho = 0.3$), Strong Signal (non-zero values of β_0 are all 5)

Figure 1: The box-plots of true-positives selected by the DPD-SIS at different α for different simulation set-ups with pure data (left panel) and 10% contaminated data (right panel). Here non-zero coefficients of β_0 are in positions 1 (intercept), 2, 6, 26 and 126.

our extensive simulation results not presented here for brevity, along with those seen from Figure 1, we conjecture that the DPD-SIS with an α value around 0.3 performs the best in case of dependent covariates (see, e.g., Figure 1c). Hence, for practical applications, we recommend to apply the proposed DPD-SIS with $\alpha = 0.3$ as an empirical suggestion.

6 An Application: NOWAC Lung Cancer Data

We will apply our DPD-SIS method to a variable selection problem related to the investigation of potential biomarkers for lung cancer. In the Norwegian Women and Cancer (NOWAC) study we have data on 125 lung cancer cases of which 97 had developed metastasis at the time of diagnosis (Lund et al., 2008; Sandanger et al., 2018). For all these women, we have measures of mRNA in blood some time before diagnosis (ranging from 0.3 to 7.9 years before diagnosis, with a median time equal to 4.2 years). The goal is to relate the mRNA measurements to the classification of metastatic vs. non-metastatic cancer cases. The mRNA measurements are based on the microarray technology, and we have data from a total of 11610 probes. Thus, we need to perform some sort of variable selection before running our favorite regression model. Our analysis strategy is as follows: First, we run our DPD-SIS procedure (with $\alpha = 0.3$) and select the top $n - 1$ probes. Next, we run a standard logistic regression model with elastic net penalty (with the mixing parameter fixed at 0.7 and lambda selected by cross-validation) followed by stability selection (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2010) on the selected probes to reach the final set. As a comparison, we run the standard SIS followed by the same standard elastic net logistic regression with stability selection. We compare the initial set of $n - 1$ probes and the final set after stability selection.

Of the 124 initially selected probes, there was an overlap of 101. After stability

selection with a cut-off at a selection probability equal to 0.7 we were left with 10 probes based on the robust screening and 14 probes based on the ordinary SIS screening, which are reported in Table 1. We ran logistic regression with elastic net penalty on these 10 vs. 14 probes and calculated the area under the ROC curve (AUC). The AUC values were 0.96 for the 10 robustly selected probes and 0.98 for the 14 probes selected based on ordinary SIS. Of course, these values are clearly over-optimistic due to overfitting, but they indicate that the predictions based on the robustly selected probes are no worse than those based on the non-robust selection procedure.

Table 1: The estimated regression coefficients in the final models obtained after stability selection while using the proposed DPD-SIS($\alpha = 0.3$) versus the usual SIS. The stability selection probability for each probe is given in the parenthesis.

Probe ID	Gene	DPD-SIS	Usual SIS
x8tTnl6f115xQSV1X4	FER1L5	–	–0.0901 (0.98)
l7tROJgVSRulLNNJ18	SERHL	–	–0.0702 (0.92)
Hul6v6J0kV5qD3PA3U	TMEM105	–0.0974 (0.86)	–0.0728 (0.87)
9Jd97nm3QdLiQXEuzE	INVS	0.1391 (0.99)	0.0817 (0.86)
BWoVQF900KRd2rRTx8	NA	0.0695 (0.89)	0.0800 (0.84)
r15YSrezLzSP97mOnU	SCARNA14	– (0.67)	–0.0520 (0.84)
fnRCld.v151SEwlQqk	ANO7	0.0786 (0.77)	0.1175 (0.79)
rqKhAKFSCyCDqjouI	TBRG1	–	–0.0501 (0.78)
lteivVSVR8WbDmUMBQ	HBZ	– (0.62)	–0.0289 (0.78)
Bizm6pN4NAz3jzFe3s	SNORD113-7	0.0504 (0.71)	0.0767 (0.74)
01_iIjuJFCnq.s7rqo	FLVCR1	– (0.64)	–0.0572 (0.74)
T9XUjiuZBS6556G.gA	MGC23270	– (0.64)	–0.0546 (0.73)
i3urBCqi6u9.0l_cB0	FAM86D	–	0.0582 (0.70)
KA5bqKgpHd7QnntF8U	NA	– (0.60)	–0.0480 (0.70)
EEpIrACOOgruuHCpRo	CCT6A	–0.0612 (0.77)	– (0.69)
ZoXhLA6oEHo3o160B8	EPCAM	0.0614 (0.71)	– (0.61)
cJUifgKWa_kfYgoLog	HRK	–0.0743 (0.72)	– (0.47)
lldNIQXQNde_jgnE0k	ABCB4	–0.0759 (0.91)	–
WS5X9cg9WE7tJTl3uo	UBAP2	–0.0784 (0.87)	–

Five probes were present on both lists; thus, we have 14 non-overlapping probes worthy

of further investigation (see Table 1). We will focus on just a few of them having high stability selection probabilities in the respective procedures. First, it is interesting to observe that the two probes with the most stable selection based on the non-robust list (x8tTnl6f115xQSV1X4 and l7tROJgVSRuLNNJ18) were not selected at all by our DPD-SIS. This indicates a strong influence by outliers and is also supported by the plot of Cook’s distance for the marginal models of these two probes. On the other hand, we also have two probes with high selection probabilities based on DPD-SIS that were not selected by ordinary SIS (lldNIQXQNde_jgnE0k and WS5X9cg9WE7tJTl3uo). An investigation of these two shows that the first probes (lldNIQXQNde_jgnE0k) is related to the ABCB4 gene which is linked to several types of cancer including lung cancer (Kiehl et al., 2014), while the other probes (WS5X9cg9WE7tJTl3uo) is linked to the UBAP2 gene, which is linked to metastasis in several cancers (Bai et al., 2016; Meng et al., 2020). Thus, both of these seem to be very relevant for our example, and they are obviously important to capture although the usual SIS fails to select them.

This example clearly illustrate that we may miss important variables, probes in our example, by using the standard SIS procedure due to the effect of outliers in the data, and this can sometimes lead to spurious findings. Our proposed robust DPD-SIS can successfully find the most important probes, ignoring any contamination effects present in the data, also without any significant loss in the predictive performance.

7 Discussions

This paper presents a robust extension of the usual SIS and the conditional SIS for variable screening under ultra-high dimensional GLMs using the robust minimum DPD estimators of the marginal regression parameters. We show that the proposed DPD-SIS

and its conditional version (DPD-SSIS) both enjoy the sure screening property under a reasonable set of assumptions, in line of what is required by usual SIS. More importantly, the proposed DPD-SIS is extremely fast with computational times comparable to those of the usual SIS, in addition to being robust against data contaminations. It can be noted that similar robust extensions of SIS can be constructed by other low-dimensional robust estimation procedures for GLMs, but the validity of the sure screening properties is not guaranteed under the same rather simple assumptions and with such a low computational time. A real data application further reveals the advantages of our proposed DPD-SIS over the usual SIS in identifying the truly important variables from noisy data with no loss in the prediction power.

The choice of variable selection criteria is controversial and represents a difficult step in the analysis of high-dimensional data, in particular different omics data. In many cases, it is common to reduce the dimensionality of the data by filtering the variables before performing any analysis. Even when performing LASSO procedures, the data is often filtered beforehand and only a portion of the variables is considered. Several approaches are used for variable filtering, most commonly based on the variance or range of the variables, or alternatively based on the association with the outcome of interest, as well as more ad-hoc criteria. The chosen filtering criteria can clearly impact the analysis, and the results and conclusions might be extremely sensitive to this choice. Therefore, it is especially important to base the variable filtering on a clear, objective method that can be reproduced and justified. When using SIS based procedures, and DPD-SIS in particular, all variables are evaluated and selected based on their marginal regression coefficient. Therefore, DPD-SIS provides a non arbitrary, reproducible choice of the variables to be included in subsequent analysis, and can prove extremely useful in practical applications to, for example, omics data. Additionally, the conditional extension provided in this work

can prove particularly useful in the context of omics data, where it might be relevant to condition on other clinically relevant (non-omics) variables.

We will argue that robust methods, and in particular our robust DPD-based method, are particularly useful in variable filtering situations to avoid the influence of outliers, as traditional checks for outliers become infeasible due to the ultra-high dimensionality.

To control for false discoveries, it is recommendable to perform stability selection in such settings. As we illustrate in the applied example, it is quite straightforward to include a stability selection procedure in the DPD-SIS. The efficient implementation of DPD SIS makes this possible without intense computational efforts.

However, a major problem may arise in applications of DPD-SIS when covariates are highly dependent, just like for most other (one-step) screening methods. This problem can be solved by applying the proposed DPD-SIS (or DPD-CSIS) iteratively by removing, in each step, the variables selected in the previous steps of the iteration, going through the same philosophy as the iterative SIS (Fan and Lv, 2008). The performance of such an iterative DPD-SIS in successfully addressing the dependent covariate problem has been numerically illustrated for the case of linear regression in Ghosh and Thoresen (2020); the same can also be investigated for the logistic or other GLMs in future.

Finally, due to the simplicity of the proposed DPD-SIS along with its excellent robust performance, it would be natural to extend it to variable screening under more general learning models like mixed models or censored regression models with ultra high-dimensional covariates. This may be the focus of our future work.

Acknowledgment: This research is partially supported by the Norwegian Research Council - grant numbers 248804 and 262111. A major part of this research work has been done while the first author (AG) was visiting University of Oslo, Norway. The research of AG is also supported by an INSPIRE Faculty research grant and a grant (No.

SRG/2020/000072) from SERB, both under the Department of Science and Technology, Government of India

References

- Bai, D. S., Wu, C., Yang, L. X., Zhang, C., Zhang, P. F., He, Y. Z., ... and Shi, G. M. (2016). UBAP2 negatively regulates the invasion of hepatocellular carcinoma cell by ubiquitinating and degradating Annexin A2. *Oncotarget*, 7(22), 32946.
- Barut, E., Fan, J., and Verhasselt, A. (2016). Conditional sure independence screening. *J Amer Stat Assoc*, 111(515), 1266-1277.
- Basu, A., Harris, I. R., Hjort, N. L., and Jones, M. C. (1998). Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, **85**, 549–559.
- Basu, A., Shioya, H. and Park, C. (2011). *Statistical Inference: The Minimum Distance Approach*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca de Raton.
- Basu, A., Ghosh, A., Mandal, A., Martin, N. and Pardo, L. (2017) A Wald-type test statistic for testing linear Hypothesis in logistic regression models based on minimum density power divergence estimator. *Electron. J. Stat.*, **11**, 2741–2772.
- Basu, A., Ghosh, A., Mandal, A., Martin, N. and Pardo, L. (2018) Robust Wald-type tests in GLM with random design based on minimum density power divergence estimators. *ArXiv Pre-print*, arXiv:1804.00160v3.
- Buhlmann, P., and Van De Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media.

- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable Selection via Nonconcave Penalized Likelihood and its Oracle Properties. *J Amer Statist Assoc*, 96:1348–1360.
- Fan, J., and Lv, J. (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(5), 849-911.
- Fan, J., and Song, R. (2010). Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with NP-dimensionality. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6), 3567-3604.
- Fu, L., and Wang, Y. G. (2018). Variable selection in rank regression for analyzing longitudinal data. *Stat Methods Med Res*, 27(8), 2447-2458.
- Gather, U., and Guddat, C. (2008). Comment on “Sure Independence Screening for Ultrahigh Dimensional Feature Space” by Fan, JQ and Lv, J. *J Royal Stat Soc B*, 70, 893-895.
- Ghosh, A. (2019). Robust inference under the beta regression model with application to health care studies. *Stat. Method. Med Res*, 28(3), 871–888.
- Ghosh, A., and Basu, A. (2013). Robust estimation for independent non-homogeneous observations using density power divergence with applications to linear regression. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 7, 2420–2456.
- Ghosh, A., and Basu, A. (2016). Robust Estimation in Generalized Linear Models : The Density Power Divergence Approach. *Test*, 25(2), 269–290.
- Ghosh, A. and Majumdar, S. (2020). Ultrahigh-dimensional Robust and Efficient Sparse Regression using Non-Concave Penalized Density Power Divergence. *IEEE Trans. Info. Theory*, 66(12), 7812–7827.

- Ghosh, A. and Thoresen, M. (2020). A Robust Variable Screening procedure for Ultra-high dimensional data. *ArXiv pre-print*, arXiv:2004.14851.
- Giraud, C. (2014). *Introduction to high-dimensional statistics*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Hall, P., and Miller, H. (2009). Using generalized correlation to effect variable selection in very high dimensional problems. *J Comput Graphical Stat*, 18(3), 533-550.
- Hampel, F. R., Ronchetti, E., Rousseeuw, P. J., and Stahel W.(1986). *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. New York, USA: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Wainwright, M. (2015). *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*. CRC press.
- Kiehl, S., Herkt, S. C., Richter, A. M., Fuhrmann, L., El-Nikhely, N., Seeger, W., ..., and Dammann, R. H. (2014). ABCB4 is frequently epigenetically silenced in human cancers and inhibits tumor growth. *Sci. Rep.*, 4(1), 1–9.
- Li, G., Peng, H., Zhang, J., and Zhu, L. (2012a). Robust rank correlation based screening. *Ann Stat*, 40(3), 1846-1877.
- Li, R., Zhong, W., and Zhu, L. (2012b). Feature screening via distance correlation learning. *J Amer Statist Assoc*, 107(499), 1129-1139.
- Lund, E., Dumeaux, V., Braaten, T., Hjartaker, A., Engeset, D., Skeie, G., and Kumle, M. (2008). Cohort profile: the Norwegian women and cancer study—NOWAC—Kvinner og kreft. *Int J Epidemiol.*, 37(1), 36–41.
- Luo, S., Song, R., and Witten, D. (2014). Sure Screening for Gaussian Graphical Models. *Stat*, 1050, 29.4

- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2010). Stability Selection. *J Royal Stat Soc B*, 72, 417-473.
- Meng, L., Jia, X., Yu, W., Wang, C., Chen, J., and Liu, F. (2020). Circular RNA UBAP2 contributes to tumor growth and metastasis of cervical cancer via modulating miR-361-3p/SOX4 axis. *Cancer Cell Int.*, 20(1), 1–13.
- Mu, W., and Xiong, S. (2014). Some notes on robust sure independence screening. *J App Stat*, 41(10), 2092–2102.
- Saldana, D. F., and Feng, Y. (2018). SIS: An R package for sure independence screening in ultrahigh-dimensional statistical models. *J Stat Software*, 83(2), 1–25.
- Sandanger, T. M., Nøst, T. H., Guida, F., Rylander, C., Campanella, G., Muller, D. C., ... and Chadeau-Hyam, M. (2018). DNA methylation and associated gene expression in blood prior to lung cancer diagnosis in the Norwegian Women and Cancer cohort. *Sci. Rep.*, 8(1), 1–10.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint* (Vol. 48). Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, T., Zheng, L., Li, Z., and Liu, H. (2017). A robust variable screening method for high-dimensional data. *J App Stat*, 44(10), 1839-1855.
- Zhao, S. D., and Li, Y. (2012). Principled sure independence screening for Cox models with ultra-high-dimensional covariates. *J Mult Anal*, 105(1), 397-411.
- Zhong, W. (2014). Robust sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional non-normal data. *Acta Mathematica Sinica, English Series*, 30(11), 1885–1896.

8 Supplementary Material: Proof of the Results

8.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

It follows from the Fisher consistency of the MDPDEs (by definition) and the results of Theorem 2 in Fan and Song (2010),

8.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

For $\alpha = 0$ this theorem is identical to Theorem 3 of Fan and Song (2010). We now extend their argument to prove it for any given $\alpha > 0$. Let us fix an $\alpha > 0$ and $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$.

First consider the cases where $B'_\alpha(\cdot)$ is bounded and let D be its upper bound. Then $B_\alpha(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous and hence

$$|\{B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) - B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha})\} X_j| \leq D|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| X_j^2.$$

Taking expectation, we get

$$\begin{aligned} D|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| &\geq |E[\{B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) - B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha})\} X_j]| \\ &= |E[B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) X_j]| = |\text{Cov}(B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j), X_j)|. \end{aligned}$$

But, from the estimating equation in (8), we get

$$E[B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) X_j] = E[b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) X_j],$$

and hence, using $E(X_j) = 0$,

$$\text{Cov}(B_\alpha(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j), X_j) = \text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j). \quad (23)$$

Then, in view of the condition of the theorem, we get $|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq D_1^{-1} c_1 n^{-\kappa}$ completing the proof of the theorem.

Next, we consider the cases where the second assumption, namely Condition (9), holds. Clearly if $|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \geq cn^{-\kappa}$ for a sufficiently large universal constant $c > 0$, the result holds and we are done. So, assume $|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| \leq \tilde{c}_1 n^{-\kappa}$ for some $\tilde{c} > 0$ and let $\beta_0^{M\alpha}$ be a constant such that $B_\alpha(\beta_0^{M\alpha}) = E[Y]$. We first prove the following claim.

Claim 1: $|\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} - \beta_0^{M\alpha}| \leq \tilde{c}_2$ for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$ and some constant $\tilde{c}_2 > 0$.

To prove the claim, we fix a $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$ and consider the marginal MDPDE objective function (population version) as a function of β_0 only as $Q(\beta_0) = E[l_\alpha(Y, \beta_0 + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j)]$ so that we get

$$Q'(\beta_0) = E[Y - B_\alpha(\beta_0 + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j)] = B_\alpha(\beta_0^{M\alpha}) - E[B_\alpha(\beta_0 + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j)].$$

But,

$$\begin{aligned} & |E[B_\alpha(\beta_0 + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j)] - B_\alpha(\beta_0)| \\ & \leq \sup_{|x| \leq \tilde{c}_1 n^{\eta-\kappa}} |B_\alpha(\beta_0 + x) - B_\alpha(\beta_0)| + 2E[G(a|X_j)|X_j|I(|X_j| > n^\eta)] \\ & = o(1) + o(1), \end{aligned}$$

by the continuity of $B_\alpha(\cdot)$ and Condition (9). Therefore, we get $Q'(\beta_0) = B_\alpha(\beta_0^{M\alpha}) - B_\alpha(\beta_0) + o(1)$ and hence, for a $\tilde{c}_2 > 0$, we have $Q'(\beta_0^{M\alpha} - \tilde{c}_2) < 0$ and $Q'(\beta_0^{M\alpha} + \tilde{c}_2) > 0$ since $B_\alpha(\cdot)$ is strictly increasing. Hence $|\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} - \beta_0^{M\alpha}| \leq \tilde{c}_2$ proving our Claim 1.

Finally, to prove the theorem, we note that if $|X_j| \leq n^\kappa$, then Claim 1 ensures that the points $\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha}$ and $(\beta_{j_0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j)$, for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$, belong the interval $I = (\beta_0^{M\alpha} - h, \beta_0^{M\alpha} + h)$ independent of j , where $h = \tilde{c} - 1 + \tilde{c}_2$. Let $\tilde{D} = \max_{x \in I} B'_\alpha(x)$, which is finite by Lipschitz

continuity of $B_\alpha(\cdot)$ in a neighborhood of $\beta_0^{M\alpha}$ and hence, for $|X_j| \leq n^\kappa$, we have

$$|\{B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) - B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha})\}| \leq \tilde{D} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| X_j^2.$$

Taking expectation over the region $\{|X_j| \leq n^\kappa\}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{D} |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| &\geq |E[\{B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j) - B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha})\} X_j I(|X_j| \leq n^\kappa)]| \\ &= |\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j)| - A_0 - A_1, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

by a similar calculation leading to (23), where $A_m = E[B_\alpha(\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j^m) X_j I(|X_j| > n^\kappa)]$ for $m = 0, 1$. But, $|\beta_{j0}^{M\alpha} + \beta_j^{M\alpha} X_j^m| \leq a|X_j|$ for $|X_j| > n^\kappa$ with a sufficiently large n independent of j and m , we get from Condition (9) that

$$A_m \leq E[G(a|X_j|)^m |X_j| I(|X_j| \geq n^\kappa)] \leq dn^{-\kappa},$$

for both $m = 0, 1$. Then, the theorem follows from (24) using the given condition that $|\text{Cov}(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0), X_j)| \geq c_1 n^{-\kappa}$. \square

8.3 Proof of Lemma 3.3

The result in the lemma holds directly by Theorem 1 of Fan and Song (2010), provided we can show that their Conditions (A), (B) and (C) are implied by our Assumptions (A1)–(A5). In this regard, note that Assumption (A3) is indeed a reformulation of Condition (A) of Fan and Song (2010). Further, Assumption (A2) implies Condition (C) of Fan and Song (2010) via a second order Taylor series expansion of $l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j)$ with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ around $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$. Finally it remains to show that Condition (B) of Fan and Song (2010) holds under Assumptions (A1), (A4) and (A5).

Let us define $\Omega_n = \{(X_j, Y) : |X_j| \leq K_n, |Y| \leq K_n^*\}$, where K_n is as in Assumption (A4) and $K_n^* = \frac{m_0}{m_3} K_n^\tau$ with m_0, m_3 and τ being as in Assumption (A5). Then, for our present case, Condition (B) of Fan and Song (2010) becomes equivalent to

$$|l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_j)| I((X_j, Y) \in \Omega_n) \leq k_n^{(\alpha)} |\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_j| I((X_j, Y) \in \Omega_n),$$

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}'_j \in \mathcal{B}, (25)$$

$$\text{and } \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B} : \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}\| \leq \epsilon_1} |E [l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha})] I((X_j, Y) \notin \Omega_n)| \leq o(n^{-1}), (26)$$

where $k_n^{(\alpha)}$ is as defined in the statement of the Lemma and ϵ_1 as in Assumption (A4).

First, to show (25), we use a first order Taylor series expansion to get

$$l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_j) = D(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) [\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}'_j], \quad (27)$$

where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j \in \mathcal{B}$ lies on the line segment joining $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}'_j$ and

$$D(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) = (1 + \alpha) \left[\xi_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) - (Y - b'(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)) f^\alpha(Y; \mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right].$$

But, on Ω_n , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |D(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)| &\leq (1 + \alpha) \left[\left| \xi_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right| + (|Y| + |b'(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)|) \left| f^\alpha(Y; \mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) \right| \right] \\ &\leq (1 + \alpha) \left[\left| \xi_\alpha(K_n B + B) \right| + \left(\frac{m_0}{m_3} K_n^2 + |b'(K_n B + B)| \right) L_\alpha \right] = k_n^{(\alpha)}, \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption (A1), (A5) and the subsequent result (12). Substituting it in (27), we get Condition (25).

Next, to prove (26), we again consider the expansion (27) with $\boldsymbol{\beta}'_j = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}$ and by

taking expectation we get

$$\begin{aligned} & |E [l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha})]| = E \left| D(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) [\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}] \right| \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha) \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}\|_2 E \left[\left| B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) - B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}) \right| \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

by an application of the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B}: \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}\| \leq \epsilon_1} |E [l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) - l_\alpha(Y, \mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha})] I((X_j, Y) \notin \Omega_n)| \\ & \leq (1 + \alpha) \epsilon_1 \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathcal{B}: \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}\| \leq \epsilon_1} E \left[|B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)| \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 + |B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha})| \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 \right] I(|X_j| > K_n), \\ & \leq o(n^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

by Assumption (A4), and this completes the proof. \square

8.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

Part (a):

We start with Lemma 3.3 and take $(1 + t) = c_3 V n^{\frac{1}{2} - \kappa} (16k_n^{(\alpha)})^{-1} > 0$ to get

$$P \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right| \geq c_3 n^{-\kappa} \right) \leq e^{-\frac{n^{1-2\kappa}}{K_n^2 K_n^2} C} + n m_1 e^{-m_0 K_n^\tau} = R_n, \quad j = 1, \dots, p, \quad (28)$$

Then, the uniform convergence result in Part (a) of the theorem holds from the relation (28) via union bound of probabilities.

Part (b):

Let us consider the event $\mathcal{E}_n = \left\{ \max_{j \in \mathcal{M}_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} \right| \leq c_2 n^{-\kappa} / 2 \right\}$.

By Theorem 3.2, on \mathcal{E}_n , we then have $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j^{M\alpha} \right| \geq c_2 n^{-\kappa} / 2$ for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_0$. Therefore, for the

choice of γ_n as given in the statement of the theorem, we have $\mathcal{M}_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{M}}_\alpha(\gamma_n)$ on \mathcal{E}_n , and hence

$$P\left(\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n) \supset \mathcal{M}_0\right) \geq P(\mathcal{E}_n) = 1 - P(\mathcal{E}_n^c).$$

But, since \mathcal{M}_0 has s elements, by a union bound of probability, we get from (28) that $P(\mathcal{E}_n^c) \leq sR_n$ completing the proof of Part (b).

Part (c):

The proof is based on the result (13) evaluated at $\beta_j = \beta_j^{M\alpha}$, which implies that the number of variables having $|\beta_j^{M\alpha}| > \epsilon n^{-\kappa}$ cannot exceed $O(n^{2\kappa} \Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma))$ for any given $\epsilon > 0$. Now, let us consider the event

$$\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n = \left\{ \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha} - \beta_j^{M\alpha}| \leq \epsilon n^{-\kappa} \right\}.$$

Then, on the event $\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n$, we have

$$\left| \left\{ j : |\widehat{\beta}_j^{M\alpha}| > 2\epsilon n^{-\kappa} \right\} \right| \leq \left| \left\{ j : |\beta_j^{M\alpha}| > 2\epsilon n^{-\kappa} \right\} \right| \leq O(n^{2\kappa} \Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma)).$$

Hence, taking $\epsilon = c_5/2$ for the choice of γ_n as given in the statement of the theorem, we get

$$P\left(|\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(\gamma_n)| \leq O(n^{2\kappa} \Lambda_{\max}(\Sigma))\right) \geq P(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n) = 1 - P(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n^c).$$

But, by Part (a) of the theorem, we have $P(\tilde{\mathcal{E}}_n^c) \leq pR_n$ completing the proof. \square

8.5 Proofs of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2

We note that, for each $j \in \mathcal{D}$, the quantity $\beta_{c_j}^{M\alpha}$, defined in (17), satisfies the estimating equations given by

$$E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \beta_{c_j}^{M\alpha}) \mathbf{X}_c] = 0, \quad E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \beta_{c_j}^{M\alpha}) X_j] = 0. \quad (29)$$

On the other hand, the baseline quantity $\beta_c^{M\alpha}$ satisfies

$$E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_c^T \beta_c^{M\alpha}) \mathbf{X}_c] = 0. \quad (30)$$

Further, for any $j \in \mathcal{D}$, using $E[X_j | \mathbf{X}_c] = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_c) &= E [(Y - E[Y | \mathbf{X}_c]) X_j] = E [Y X_j] \\ &= E [E(Y | \mathbf{X}) X_j] = E [b'(\mathbf{X}^T \beta_0) X_j], \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

and hence, invoking the definitions of ψ_α and B_α , we get

$$\begin{aligned} E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_c^T \beta_c^{M\alpha}) X_j] &= E [(B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_c^T \beta_c^{M\alpha}) - b'(\mathbf{X}^T \beta_0)) X_j] \\ &= EE [(B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_c^T \beta_c^{M\alpha}) - b'(\mathbf{X}^T \beta_0)) X_j | \mathbf{X}_c] \\ &= -E [b'(\mathbf{X}^T \beta_0) X_j] \\ &= -\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_c). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

8.5.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

Firstly, if $\beta_j^{M\alpha} = 0$ for some $j \in \mathcal{D}$, from (29) we get

$$E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_{j1}}^{M\alpha}) \mathbf{X}_c] = 0, \quad E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_{j1}}^{M\alpha}) X_j] = 0. \quad (33)$$

Combining the first equation with (30) and the uniqueness of its solution we have $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_{j1}}^{M\alpha} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha}$ and hence the second equation in (33) becomes

$$E [\psi_\alpha (Y, \mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha}) X_j] = 0. \quad (34)$$

This leads to the desired condition $\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_c) = 0$ by (32).

On the other hand, if $\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_c) = 0$ for some $j \in \mathcal{D}$, then by (32), the equation in (34) hold. Combining (34) with (30), we see that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_j}^{M\alpha} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha}, 0)^T$ is a solution of the estimating equations in (29), leading to $\beta_j^{M\alpha} = 0$. \square

8.5.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Fix any $j \in \mathcal{M}_{0\mathcal{D}}$ and define $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_j = E [m_{\alpha,j} \mathbf{X}_{c_j} \mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T]$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\Delta,j} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_{j1}}^{M\alpha} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha})$. Consider a partition of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_j$ as given by

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_j = \begin{bmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11,j} & \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12,j} \\ \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{21,j}^T & \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22,j} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} E [m_{\alpha,j} \mathbf{X}_c \mathbf{X}_c^T] & E [m_{\alpha,j} \mathbf{X}_c X_j] \\ E [m_{\alpha,j} X_j \mathbf{X}_c^T] & E [m_{\alpha,j} X_j^2] \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now, from the estimating equations (29) and (30), along with the definitions of B_α

and $m_{\alpha,j}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= E \left[(B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_j}^{M\alpha}) - B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha})) \mathbf{X}_c \right] \\
&= E \left[m_{\alpha,j} (\mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_j}^{M\alpha} - \mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha}) \mathbf{X}_c \right] \\
&= E \left[m_{\alpha,j} (\mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\Delta,j} + X_j \beta_j^{M\alpha}) \mathbf{X}_c \right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by solving, we get $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\Delta,j} = -\Omega_{11,j}^{-1} \Omega_{12,j} \beta_j^{M\alpha}$. Further, note that, for any integrable function $h(\mathbf{X}_c)$, we have

$$E[h(\mathbf{X}_c)X_j] = EE[h(\mathbf{X}_c)X_j|\mathbf{X}_c] = E[h(\mathbf{X}_c)E(X_j|\mathbf{X}_c)] = 0.$$

Hence, by (31), (29), and the definition of $m_{\alpha,j}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Cov}_L(Y, X_j | \mathbf{X}_c) &= E \left[b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) X_j \right] = E \left[(b'(\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha})) X_j \right] \\
&= E \left[(B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_j}^{M\alpha}) - B_\alpha(\mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha})) X_j \right] \\
&= E \left[m_{\alpha,j} (\mathbf{X}_{c_j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{c_j}^{M\alpha} - \mathbf{X}_c^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_c^{M\alpha}) X_j \right] \\
&= \Omega_{12,j}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\Delta,j} + \Omega_{22,j} \beta_j^{M\alpha} \\
&= \left[\Omega_{22,j} - \Omega_{12,j}^T \Omega_{11,j}^{-1} \Omega_{12,j} \right] \beta_j^{M\alpha}.
\end{aligned}$$

Now, taking absolute value in the above and using the assumptions of the theorem, we get

$$c_1 n^{-\kappa} \leq c_2 |\beta_j^{M\alpha}|.$$

Since this holds for all $j \in \mathcal{M}_{0\mathcal{D}}$, taking minimum over all such j we get the desired conclusion of the theorem with $c_3 = c_1/c_2$. \square