

Out-of-sample error estimation for M-estimators with convex penalty

Pierre C Bellec

Rutgers University.

1

Abstract: A generic out-of-sample error estimate is proposed for M -estimators $\hat{\beta}$ regularized with a convex penalty in high-dimensional linear regression where (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) is observed and p, n are of the same order. If ψ is the derivative of the data-fitting loss ρ , the estimate depends on the observed data only through the residuals $\hat{\psi} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta})$ and the derivatives $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}$ and $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$ for fixed \mathbf{X} .

The out-of-sample error estimate enjoys a relative error of order $n^{-1/2}$ in a linear model with Gaussian covariates and independent noise, either non-asymptotically when $p/n \leq \gamma$ or asymptotically in the high-dimensional asymptotic regime $p/n \rightarrow \gamma' \in (0, \infty)$. General differentiable loss functions ρ are allowed provided that $\psi = \rho'$ is 1-Lipschitz; this includes the least-squares loss as well as robust losses such as the Huber loss and its smoothed versions. The validity of the out-of-sample error estimate holds either under a strong convexity assumption, or for the ℓ_1 -penalized Huber M -estimator and the Lasso under a sparsity assumption and a bound on the number of contaminated observations.

For the square loss and in the absence of corruption in the response, the results additionally yield $n^{-1/2}$ -consistent estimates of the noise variance and of the generalization error. This generalizes, to arbitrary convex penalty and arbitrary covariance, estimates that were previously known for the Lasso.

1. Introduction

Consider a linear model

$$(1.1) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$$

where $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ has iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ rows and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is a noise vector independent of \mathbf{X} . The entries of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ may be heavy-tailed, for instance with infinite second moment, or follow Huber's gross-errors contamination model with ε_i iid with cumulative distribution function (cdf) $F(u) = (1 - q)\mathbb{P}(N(0, \sigma^2) \leq u) + qG(u)$ where $q \in [0, 1]$ is the proportion of corrupted entries and G is an arbitrary cdf chosen by an adversary. Since the seminal work of Huber in [26], a popular means to handle heavily-tails or corruption of certain entries of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is based on robust loss functions $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ to construct M -estimators $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ by minimization of optimization problems of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{b})$$

¹Research partially supported by the NSF Grants DMS-1811976 and DMS-1945428.

where $(\mathbf{x}_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ are the rows of \mathbf{X} . Robustness against corruption of the above estimator typically requires the convex loss ρ to grow linearly at $\pm\infty$ and a well-studied example is the Huber loss $\rho_H(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \min(t, 1) dt$.

As we are interested in the high-dimensional regime where p is potentially larger than n , we also allow for convex penalty functions to leverage structure in the signal β and fight the curse of dimensionality. The central object of the present paper is thus a penalized robust M -estimator of the form

$$(1.3) \quad \widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{b}) + g(\mathbf{b}) \right)$$

where $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex differentiable loss function, and $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex penalty. We may write simply $\widehat{\beta}$ for $\widehat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ if the context is clear.

The main contribution of the present paper is the introduction of a generic out-of-sample error estimate for penalized M -estimators of the form (1.3). Here, the out-of-sample error refers to the random quantity

$$(1.4) \quad \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2 = \mathbb{E}[\left((\widehat{\beta} - \beta)^\top \mathbf{x}_{new}\right)^2 \mid (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})]$$

where \mathbf{x}_{new} is independent of the data (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) with the same distribution as any row of \mathbf{X} . Our goal is to develop such out-of-sample error estimate for $\widehat{\beta}$ in (1.3) with little or no assumption on the robust loss ρ and the convex penalty g , in order to allow broad choices by practitioners for (ρ, g) . Our goal is also to allow for non-isotropic design with $\Sigma \neq \mathbf{I}_p$.

We consider the high-dimensional regime where p and n are of the same order. The results of the present paper are non-asymptotic and assume that $p/n \leq \gamma \in (0, \infty)$ for some fixed constant γ independent of n, p . Although non-asymptotic, these results are applicable in the regime where n and p diverge such that

$$(1.5) \quad p/n \rightarrow \gamma',$$

simply by considering a constant $\gamma > \gamma'$. The analysis of the performance of convex estimators in the asymptotic regime (1.5) has received considerable attention in the last few years in the statistics, machine learning, electrical engineering and statistical physics communities. Most results available in the $p/n \rightarrow \gamma'$ literature regarding M -estimators are either based on Approximate Message Passing (AMP) [1, 19, 10, 41, 11, 24] following the pioneering work [20] in compressed sensing problems, on leave-one-out methods [23, 3, 27, 22], or on the Gordon's Gaussian min-max theorem (GMT) [35, 36, 37, 32]. The goal of these techniques is to summarize the performance and behavior of the M -estimator $\widehat{\beta}$ by a system of nonlinear equations with up to six unknown scalars (e.g., the system of [23] with unknowns (r, c) for unregularized robust M -estimators, the system with unknowns (τ, β) of [32, Proposition 3.1] for the Lasso which dates back to [1], the system with unknowns (τ, λ) of [11, Section 4] for permutation-invariant penalties, or recently the system with six unknowns $(\alpha, \sigma, \gamma, \theta, \tau, r)$ of [33] in regularized logistic regression). Solving these

nonlinear equations provide information about the risk $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|$, and in certain cases asymptotic normality results for the coefficients of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ after a bias correction, see [11, e.g., Proposition 4.3(iii)]. These systems of nonlinear equations depend on a prior on the true coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the knowledge of the prior is required to compute the solutions. For Ridge regression, results can be obtained using random matrix theory tools such as the Stieljes transform and limiting spectral distributions of certain random matrices [17, 18]. Our results are of a different nature, as they do not involve solving systems of nonlinear equations or their solutions. Instead, our results relate fully data-driven quantities to the out-of-sample error (1.4). Bypassing the nonlinear equations of previous approaches let us get around any prior assumption on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

Additionally, most of the aforementioned works require isotropic design ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$), although there are notable exceptions for specific examples: isotropy can be relaxed for Ridge regularization [18], in unregularized logistic regression [44] and for the Lasso in sparse linear regression [12]. The techniques developed in the present paper do not rely on isotropy: general $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \neq \mathbf{I}_p$ is allowed without additional complexity.

Contributions

We assume throughout the paper that ρ is differentiable and denote by $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the derivative of ρ . We also assume that ψ is absolutely continuous and denote by ψ' its derivative. The functions ψ, ψ' act componentwise when applied to vectors, for instance $\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))_{i=1, \dots, n}$. Our contributions are summarized below.

- A novel data-driven estimate of the out-of-sample error (1.4) is introduced. The estimate depends on the data only through $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, the vector $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and the derivatives of $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ for fixed \mathbf{X} . For certain choices of (ρ, g) these derivatives have closed forms, for instance in the case of the ℓ_1 -penalized Huber M -estimator when ρ is the Huber loss, the estimator \widehat{R} of the out-of-sample error (1.4) is

$$\widehat{R} = (|\widehat{I}| - |\widehat{S}|)^{-2} \{ \|\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 (2|\widehat{S}| - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 \}$$

where $\widehat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \widehat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ is the active set and $\widehat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ is the set of inliers. Explicit formulae are also available for the Elastic-Net penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1 + \mu \|\mathbf{b}\|_2$ for any loss ρ . For general choices of (ρ, g) , the derivatives can be approximated by a Monte Carlo scheme.

- The estimate is valid under mild assumptions, namely: ψ is 1-Lipschitz, $p/n \leq \gamma$ for some constant γ independent of n, p and that either (i) the penalty function g is μ -strongly convex, (ii) the loss ρ is strongly convex and $\gamma < 1$, (iii.a) $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the Lasso with square loss with a sparse $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, or (iii.b) $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the ℓ_1 penalized Huber M -estimator together with an additional assumption on the fraction of corrupted observations and sparsity of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. No isotropy assumption is required on $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, and no prior distribution is required on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

- The proof arguments provide new avenues to study M -estimators in the regime $p/n \rightarrow \gamma'$. The results rely on novel moment inequalities that let us directly bound the quantities of interest. These new techniques do not overlap with arguments typically used to analyse M -estimators when $p/n \rightarrow \gamma'$ such as or leave-one-out approaches [23, 27, 22], Approximate Message Passing (AMP) [1, 19, 10, 41, 11, 24], or the Gordon's Gaussian Min-Max Theorem (GMT) [35, 36, 37, 32].
- In the special case of the square loss, our estimate of the out-of-sample error coincides with previous estimates for the Ordinary Least-Squares [29], for the Lasso [1, 2, 32] and for $\hat{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ [16]. Our results can be seen as a broad generalization of these estimates to (a) arbitrary covariance, (b) general loss function, including robust losses, and (c) general convex penalty. For the square loss, our results also yield generic estimates for the noise level and the generalization error $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x}_{new}^\top \hat{\beta} - Y_{new})^2 | (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})]$.

Section 2 is devoted to the out-of-sample estimate \hat{R} , its theoretical properties with a proof sketch and explicit formula for \hat{R} for choices of loss and penalty function commonly used in high-dimensional and robust statistics. Section 3 is devoted to the square loss for which additional results are available regarding estimation of the noise level and the generalization error. Proofs are given in the supplementary material that contains Appendices 4 to 12. References to theorems and equations prefixed with a capital letter, (e.g., Proposition 5.5, Equation (4.1)) refer to this supplementary material.

2. Main result

Throughout, $\hat{\beta}$ is the estimator (1.3) with loss $\rho : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and penalty $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The goal of this section is to develop a generic estimator \hat{R} for the Out-of-sample error $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$.

2.1. Assumptions

Our main result holds under the following assumptions.

Assumption 2.1 (Loss function). *The loss ρ is convex and differentiable, and $\psi = \rho'$ is 1-Lipschitz with derivative ψ' where the derivative exists.*

This allows for a large class of non-robust and robust loss functions, including the square loss $\rho(u) = u^2/2$, the Huber loss $\rho_H(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \min(t, 1) dt$ as well as smoothed versions ρ_H , cf. Tables 2 and 3 below for some concrete examples. Since ψ is 1-Lipschitz, ψ' exist almost everywhere thanks to Rademacher's theorem. Loss functions typically require a scaling parameter that depends on the noise level to obtain satisfactory risk bounds, see [14] and the references therein. For instance we consider in the main result below the loss

$$(2.1) \quad \rho(u) = \Lambda_*^2 \rho_H(\Lambda_*^{-1} u)$$

where ρ_H is the Huber loss and $\Lambda_* > 0$ is a scaling parameter. Since for the Huber loss $\psi_H = \rho'_H$ is 1-Lipschitz, $\psi(u) = \rho'(u) = \Lambda_* \psi_H(\Lambda_*^{-1}u)$ is also 1-Lipschitz. In short, scaling a given loss with a tuning parameter Λ_* as in (2.1) does not change the Lipschitz constant of the first derivative of ρ , and the above assumption does not prevent using a scaling parameter Λ_* . Additionally, if the desired loss is such that ψ is L -Lipschitz for some constant $L \neq 1$, one may replace (ρ, g) by $(L^{-1}\rho, L^{-1}g)$ to obtain a 1-Lipschitz loss without changing the value of $\tilde{\beta}$ in (1.3).

Assumption 2.2 (Probability distribution). *The rows of \mathbf{X} are iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ with Σ invertible, ε is independent of \mathbf{X} , and (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) has continuous distribution.*

The Gaussian assumption is admittedly the strongest assumption required in this work. However arbitrary covariance Σ is allowed, while a large body of related literature requires Σ proportional to identity, see for instance [2, 10, 11, 33]. Allowing arbitrary Σ together with general penalty functions is made possible by developing new techniques that are of a different nature than this previous literature; see the proof sketch in Section 2.9 for an overview. We require that (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) has continuous distribution in order to ensure that derivatives of certain Lipschitz functions of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) exist with probability one, again by Rademacher's theorem. If (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) does not have continuous distribution, one can always replace \mathbf{y} with $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y} + a\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ where a is very small and $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ is sampled independently of $(\varepsilon, \mathbf{X})$. Hence the continuous distribution assumption is a mild technicality.

Assumption 2.3 (Penalty). *Assume either one of the following:*

- (i) $p/n \leq \gamma \in (0, +\infty)$ and the penalty g is $\mu > 0$ strongly convex with respect to Σ , in the sense that for any $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{d} \in \partial g(\mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{d}' \in \partial g(\mathbf{b}')$, inequality $(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{d}')^\top (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}') \geq \mu \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}')\|^2$ holds.
- (ii) The penalty g is only assumed convex, $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$ and ρ is $\mu_\rho > 0$ strongly convex in the sense that $(u - s)(\psi(u) - \psi(s)) \geq \mu_\rho(u - s)^2$ for all $u, s \in \mathbb{R}$.
- (iii) For any constants $\varphi \geq 1, \gamma > 0, \eta, \eta_* \in (0, 1)$ independent of n, p , assume $\text{diag}(\Sigma) = \mathbf{I}_p$, $p/n \leq \gamma \in (0, \infty)$ and $\phi_{\max}(\Sigma)/\phi_{\min}(\Sigma) \leq \varphi$. The penalty is $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ and either
 - (a) The loss is the squared loss $\rho(u) = u^2/2$, the noise is normal $\varepsilon \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $\|\beta\|_0 \leq s_* n$ where $s_* > 0$ is a small enough constant depending on $\{\varphi, \gamma, \eta\}$ only. The tuning parameter is set as $\lambda = \sigma \eta^{-1} (1 + (2 \log \frac{1+\gamma}{s_*})^{\frac{1}{2}}) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.
 - (b) The loss is $\rho(u) = n \lambda_*^2 \rho_H((\sqrt{n} \lambda_*)^{-1} u)$ for ρ_H the Huber loss $\rho_H(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \min(t, 1) dt$ and some tuning parameter λ_* . Furthermore $s_* > 0$ is a small enough constant depending on $\{\varphi, \gamma, \eta, \eta_*\}$ only such that at least $\lceil n(1 - s_*) + \|\beta\|_0 \rceil$ coordinates of ε are iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$. The tuning parameters are set as $\lambda = \sigma \eta^{-1} (1 + (2 \log \frac{1+\gamma}{s_*})^{\frac{1}{2}}) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\lambda_* = \eta_*^{-1} \eta \lambda$.

Here and throughout the paper $\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_* \geq 0$ are constants independent of n, p .

Strong convexity on the penalty (i.e., (i) above) or strong convexity of the loss (i.e., (ii) above) can be found in numerous other works on regularized M -estimators

[19, 11, 43, among others]. In our setting, strong convexity simplifies the analysis as it grants existence of the derivatives of $\hat{\beta}$ with respect to (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) “for free” as we will see in Section 5.1. Assumption (iii.a) above relaxes strong convexity on the penalty and (iii.b) relaxes strong convexity on both the loss and penalty, by instead assuming a specific choice for (ρ, g) . Assumption (iii.a) focuses on the Lasso under a sparsity assumption, while Assumption (iii.b) focuses the Huber loss and ℓ_1 penalty together with an upper bound on the sparsity of β and the number of corrupted components of ε . Indeed, at least $\lceil n(1 - s_*) + \|\beta\|_0 \rceil$ components of ε being iid $N(0, 1)$ is equivalent to the existence of a set $O_* \subset [n]$ with $|O_*| + \|\beta\|_0 \leq s_*n$ and $(\varepsilon_i)_{i \in [n] \setminus O_*}$ being iid $N(0, 1)$. Here, the uncorrupted observations are indexed in $[n] \setminus O_*$ and the corrupted ones are those indexed in O_* . Assumption 2.3(iii.a) and (iii.b) provides non-trivial examples for which our result holds without strong convexity on either the loss or the penalty. Under Assumption 2.3(iii.b), the result holds provided that the corruption is not too strong and the penalty g (here the ℓ_1 norm) is well suited to the structure of β (here, the sparsity).

The generality in Assumption 2.3(i) and (ii) is obtained by leveraging the strong convexity of either the loss or the penalty; this is a particularly nice situation where, for instance, the derivatives of $\hat{\beta}, \hat{\psi}$ exist almost surely “for free”. Assumption 2.3(iii.a) and (iii.b) are more specific and show that without such strong convexity, our results still hold in these specific cases. The proof under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) and (iii.b) leverages the special form of the loss and penalty and requires a case-by-case analysis for these choices of (ρ, g) . Although we expect our main results to hold without strong convexity for other penalty functions than the ℓ_1 norm (e.g., the group Lasso norm or indicator functions of convex sets by developing again case-by-case analysis), a global strategy to characterize the pairs (ρ, g) for which the results hold is currently out of reach.

2.2. Jacobians of $\hat{\psi}, \hat{\beta}$ at the observed data

Throughout the paper, we view the functions

$$(2.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\beta} &: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p, & (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) &\mapsto \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \text{ in (1.3),} \\ \hat{\psi} &: \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, & (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) &\mapsto \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})) \end{aligned}$$

as functions of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , though we may drop the dependence in (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) and write simply $\hat{\beta}$ or $\hat{\psi}$ if the context is clear. Here, recall that ψ acts componentwise on the residuals $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$, so that $\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has components $\psi(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\beta})_{i=1, \dots, n}$. The hat in the functions $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\psi}$ above emphasize that they are data-driven quantities, and since they are functions of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , the directional derivatives of $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\psi}$ at the observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) are also observable quantities, for instance

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \left. \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{X}) \right|_{t=0}.$$

Provided that they exist, the derivatives can be computed approximately by finite-difference or other numerical methods; a Monte Carlo scheme to compute the required

derivatives is given in Section 2.7. We thus assume that the Jacobians

$$(2.3) \quad \frac{\partial \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \left(\frac{\partial \widehat{\psi}_i}{\partial y_l}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right)_{(i,l) \in [n] \times [n]}, \quad \frac{\partial \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \left(\frac{\partial \widehat{\beta}_j}{\partial y_l}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right)_{(j,l) \in [p] \times [n]}$$

are available. Section 5.1 will make clear that the existence of such partial derivatives is granted, under our assumptions, for almost every $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ by Rademacher's theorem (cf. Proposition 5.3 below). For brevity and if it is clear from context, we will drop the dependence in (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) from the notation, so that the above Jacobians $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ as well as their entries $(\partial/\partial y_l)\widehat{\psi}_i$ and $(\partial/\partial y_l)\widehat{\beta}_j$ are implicitly taken at the currently observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) . Next, define

$$(2.4) \quad \widehat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})],$$

let $\widehat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ be the set of detected inliers and $\widehat{O} = [n] \setminus \widehat{I}$ the set of detected outliers. Finally, throughout the paper we denote by $\boldsymbol{\psi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the vector with i -th component $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ the diagonal matrix with the entries of $\boldsymbol{\psi}'$ as diagonal entries, and $\mathbf{h} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the error vector so that the out-of-sample error that we wish to estimate is $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$.

2.3. Main result

Equipped with the above notation $\widehat{\text{df}}$ and the Jacobians $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ at the observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , we are ready to state the main result of the paper.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ be the M-estimator (1.3) and assume that Assumptions 2.1 to 2.3 hold for all n, p as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$. Then almost surely*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \frac{\partial \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n^2} \left\{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\widehat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right\} \right| \\ & \leq |V^*| \left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 \right) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some random variable V^* with $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\} | V^*] \leq C_1(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ for a constant depending on $\{\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*\}$ only and an event Ω with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$.

Additionally, under Assumption 2.3(ii) we have $\mu_\rho(1 - \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \leq 1$ almost surely, and under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) and (iii.b) we have $1 - d_* \leq \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] \leq 1$ in Ω for some constant $d_* \in (0, 1)$ independent of n, p .

The proof is given in Section 8. Recall that the target of estimation is the out-of-sample error $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ which appears on the left of the first line, multiplied by the observable multiplicative factor $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$. Thus, when the right hand side is negligible and $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ is bounded away from 0, this suggests to use the quantity

$$(2.5) \quad \widehat{R} = \left(\text{Tr} \frac{\partial \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right)^{-2} \left\{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\widehat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right\}$$

to estimate $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$. Table 1 provides a summary of the values of $\hat{\text{df}}$ and $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ for some specific choices of (ρ, g) commonly used in high-dimensional and robust statistics.

In the regime of interest here with $p/n \rightarrow \gamma'$, the risk $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ is typically of the order of a constant, see [23, 22, 19, 1, 37, 11] among others. When $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n$ is also of order of a constant, the right hand side in Theorem 2.1 is of order $O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ which is negligible compared to $(\frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ if the multiplicative factor $(\frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ is bounded away from 0.

The inequality in Theorem 2.1 is sharp for the Ordinary Least-Squares (OLS) with normal noise when $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$, i.e., for $\rho(u) = u^2/2$ and $g(\mathbf{b}) = 0$. Assuming $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2\mathbf{I}_n)$, in this case we have

$$(2.6) \quad \hat{\text{df}} = p, \quad \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = n - p, \quad \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = 0, \quad \hat{R}/\sigma^2 = (n - p)^{-2} p \chi_{n-p}^2$$

where $\chi_{n-p}^2 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/\sigma^2 = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2/\sigma^2$ has chi-square distribution with $n - p$ degrees of freedom. Furthermore $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is independent of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $(\hat{R} - \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2)/\sigma^2$ is the sum of two independent random variables, so that its standard deviation is at least the standard deviation of \hat{R}/σ^2 . Since the standard deviation of \hat{R}/σ^2 equals $(n - p)^{-2} p \sqrt{2(n - p)}$ and is equivalent to $(1 - \gamma')^{-1} \gamma' \sqrt{2(1 - \gamma')} n^{-1/2}$ if $p/n \rightarrow \gamma' < 1$, this proves that $(\hat{R} - \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2)$ incurs an unavoidable standard deviation of order $\sigma^2 n^{-1/2}$. This argument valid for the OLS shows that an error term of order $n^{-1/2}$ in the right hand side of Theorem 2.1 is unavoidable at least for this specific example. Theorem 2.1 is thus, in a sense, unimprovable.

The OLS is a simple example for which the inequality $\hat{R} \approx \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ also follows, for instance, using the convergence of the eigenvalues of $\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}/n$ to the Marchenko-Pastur distribution. Similarly, the approximation $\hat{R} \approx \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ can be obtained for Ridge regression, that is, $\rho(u) = u^2/2$ and $g(\mathbf{b}) = \mu\|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, using again the limiting spectral distribution of $\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}/n$. Outside of these cases, the approximation $\hat{R} \approx \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ is unrelated to the spectral distribution of random matrices. The present paper develops the theory to explain the approximation $\hat{R} \approx \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ using simple first and second moment identities described in Section 2.9 along with a proof sketch of Theorem 2.1.

2.4. On the range of the multiplicative factors in \hat{R}

Theorem 2.1 involves the multiplicative factors $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ and $\hat{\text{df}}$. The following result provides the possible range for these quantities.

Proposition 2.2. *Assume that ρ is convex differentiable and that $\psi = \rho'$ is 1-Lipschitz. For every fixed $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ the following holds.*

- For almost every \mathbf{y} , the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is Frechet differentiable at \mathbf{y} , and the Jacobian $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive semi-definite with operator norm at most one so that $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \in [0, n]$.

Loss	Penalty	$\hat{\text{df}}$	$\text{Tr}[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}]$
$u^2/2$ (Square)	$\lambda \ \mathbf{b}\ _1$	$ \hat{S} $	$n - \hat{S} $
$u^2/2$ (Square)	$\lambda \ \mathbf{b}\ _1 + \mu \ \mathbf{b}\ _2^2$	$\text{Tr}[\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}(\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}} + n\mu \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top]$	$n - \hat{\text{df}}$
ρ_H (Huber)	$\lambda \ \mathbf{b}\ _1$	$ \hat{S} $	$ \hat{I} - \hat{S} $
ρ_H (Huber)	$\lambda \ \mathbf{b}\ _1 + \mu \ \mathbf{b}\ _2^2$	$\text{Tr}[\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}(\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}} + n\mu \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \mathbf{D}]$ where $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$	$ \hat{I} - \hat{\text{df}}$
Any	$\lambda \ \mathbf{b}\ _1 + \mu \ \mathbf{b}\ _2^2$	$\text{Tr}[(2.10)]$	$\text{Tr}[(2.11)]$

TABLE 1

Explicit formulae for the factors $\hat{\text{df}}$ and $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ used in the out-of-sample estimate \hat{R} for commonly used penalty functions. Here $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \boldsymbol{\psi}'(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}$ is the set of inliers, $\hat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ is the set of active variables, $\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}$ the submatrix of \mathbf{X} made of columns indexed in \hat{S} . See Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 for more details.

- If additionally Assumption 2.3(i), (ii) or (iii.a) holds then almost surely, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \neq 0$ implies $\hat{\text{df}} \leq |\hat{I}|$ almost everywhere where $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \boldsymbol{\psi}'(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ is the set of inliers.

The proof of Proposition 2.2 is given in Section 11.1. For the square loss, $\hat{\text{df}}$ is no more than the sample size n since for any penalty, $\hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ is the divergence of a 1-Lipschitz function [4]. The second point above states that this inequality is replaced by $\hat{\text{df}} \leq |\hat{I}|$ for general loss functions, i.e., n is replaced by the number of inliers. Regarding the second bullet point above under Assumption 2.3(iii.b), inequality $\hat{\text{df}} \leq |\hat{I}|$ also holds and is proved in Proposition 2.4 below.

2.5. \hat{R} for certain examples of loss functions

2.5.1. Square loss

As a first illustration of the above result, consider the square loss $\rho(u) = u^2/2$. As we will detail in Section 3 devoted to the square loss, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the residuals and $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ by the chain rule so that the inequality of Theorem 2.1 becomes

$$(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 - \hat{R} \leq |V^*| n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2).$$

Here $\hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ is the usual effective number of parameters or effective degrees-of-freedom of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ that dates back to Stein [34], and the estimate \hat{R} becomes

$$\hat{R} = (n - \hat{\text{df}})^{-2} \left\{ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\hat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right\}.$$

This estimator of the out-of-sample error for the square loss was known only for two specific penalty functions g . The first is $g = 0$ [29] in which case $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the Ordinary Least-Squares and $\hat{\text{df}} = p$. The second is $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ [2, 32], in which case $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the

Lasso and $\hat{\text{df}} = |\{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}|$. For g not proportional to the ℓ_1 -norm, the above result is to our knowledge novel, even restricted to the square loss. As we detail in Section 3, the algebraic nature of the square loss leads to additional results for noise level estimation and adaptive estimation of the generalization error. Here, adaptive means without knowledge of Σ .

To our knowledge, the estimate \hat{R} for general loss functions (ρ different than the square loss) is new. The above result is also of a different nature than most results of the literature concerning the performance of M -estimators in the regime $p/n \rightarrow \gamma'$. These works characterize the asymptotic limit in probability of the out-of-sample error $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ by solving systems of nonlinear equations of several scalar unknowns and these equations depend on a prior on the distribution of β (cf. the discussion after (1.5) and the references therein). Here, the out-of-sample error is estimated with data-driven quantities satisfying a non-asymptotic error bound, and no prior distribution is assumed on β .

2.5.2. Huber loss

As a second illustration of the above result, consider the Huber loss

$$(2.7) \quad \rho_H(u) = u^2/2 \text{ for } |u| \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_H(u) = (|u| - 1/2) \text{ for } |u| > 1.$$

By the chain rule, $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = \text{Tr}[\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\mathbf{I}_n - (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})] = |\hat{I}| - \hat{\text{df}}$ (cf. (5.4) below) where $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$. The out-of-sample estimate \hat{R} becomes

$$\hat{R} = (|\hat{I}| - \hat{\text{df}})^{-2} \left\{ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\hat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right\}.$$

This conveniently mimics the estimate available for the square loss, with the sample size n replaced by the number of inliers $|\hat{I}|$. If a scaled version of the Huber loss is used, i.e., with loss $\rho(y) = \Lambda_*^2 \rho_H(\Lambda_*^{-1}u)$ for some scaling parameter $\Lambda_* > 0$, then the previous display still holds.

2.5.3. Smoothed versions of the Huber loss

For loss functions such that ψ' is not valued in $\{0, 1\}$ or $\{0, a\}$ for some $a > 0$, the estimate \hat{R} departs significantly from the above simpler estimates available for the square and Huber losses. For instance, consider the symmetric loss ρ_0 defined in Table 2 or the symmetric loss ρ_1 in Table 3, both of which can be seen as smoothed versions of the Huber loss also displayed in Table 2. For the Huber loss, ψ'_H is the discontinuous step function and ψ'_0, ψ'_1 are smooth approximations, sometimes referred to and implemented as the SMOOTHSTEP functions [42]. The labels 0 and 1 correspond to the degree of smoothness of the smoothstep function, and smoother piecewise polynomial approximations can be obtained [42].

For $\rho = \rho_0$, $\rho = \rho_1$ or other smooth versions of the Huber loss, there is not direct relationship between $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$, $\hat{\text{df}}$ and $|\hat{I}|$. Indeed, by the chain rule (5.4) below,

$$\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\right] = \text{Tr}\left[\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\right] = \sum_{i \in \hat{I}} \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \left\{1 - \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right\}.$$

Unlike the case of the Huber loss, here $\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\right]$ does not simply depend on $|\hat{I}|$ and $\hat{\text{df}}$, due to the weights $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ that continuously vary in $[0, 1]$ among inliers for $\psi' = \psi'_0$ or $\psi' = \psi'_1$.

When is $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]/n$ too small or 0?

We emphasize that the above result does not provide guarantees against all forms of corruption in the data, and \hat{R} may produce incorrect inferences (or be undefined) in certain cases where the multiplicative factor $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ is too small or equal to 0. First, recall that $\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \in [0, 1]$ by Proposition 2.2. To exhibit situations for which $\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ is too close to 0, by the chain rule (5.4) below we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})].$$

Hence the above multiplicative factor is equal to 0 when $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') = \mathbf{0}$, i.e., $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$ for all observations $i = 1, \dots, n$: If all observations are classified as outliers by the minimization problem (1.3) then \hat{R} is undefined and cannot be used. On the other hand, the relationship

$$(2.8) \quad \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]\right)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 - \hat{R} \leq |V^*| n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n)$$

always holds, which suggests that $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ must be bounded away from 0 in order to obtain reasonable upper bounds on $|\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 - \hat{R}|$. If the loss is strongly convex and $\gamma < 1$ as in Assumption 2.3(ii), or under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) or (iii.b) for ℓ_1 penalty with square or Huber loss, the factor $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ is bounded away from 0 as noted in the second claim of Theorem 2.1. However, $(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}])^2$ is not necessarily bounded away from 0 under Assumption 2.3(i): Indeed it is easy to construct an example where $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$ for all $i \in [n]$ with high probability, for instance for the Huber loss $\rho = \rho_H$ defined in (2.7) with penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = K\|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{a}\|^2$ for some large K and some vector $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with large distance $\|\mathbf{a} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|$ (this is a purposely poor choice of penalty function that will induce a large error $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2$). This example highlights that the above result does not provide estimation guarantees against all forms of corruption under Assumption 2.3(i) without further assumption: If the corruption is so strong that all observations are outliers and $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = 0$ then the inequality of Theorem 2.1 is unusable to estimate or bound from above the

out-of-sample error. Finally, to obtain a confidence interval for $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$, the previous display (2.8) implies

$$(2.9) \quad \left| \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 - \hat{R} \right| \leq \frac{|V^*|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{R} + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n)}{\left[\left(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \right)^2 - |V^*|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right]_+}$$

almost surely, where $u_+ = \max(0, u)$ for any u is used in the denominator. Since the expectation of $I\{\Omega\}|V^*|$ is bounded from above by a constant depending on $\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*$ only, Markov's inequality applied to $I\{\Omega\}|V^*|$ combined with the previous display and $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$ yields a confidence interval for the out-of-sample error $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$.

2.6. Closed form expression for specific choices of (ρ, g)

The multiplicative factors $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ and $\hat{d}\mathbf{f} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ have explicit closed form expressions for particular choices of (ρ, g) . We now provide such examples; a summary is provided in Table 1. The next section provides a general method to approximate $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ and $\hat{d}\mathbf{f}$ for arbitrary (ρ, g) when no closed form expressions are available.

Proposition 2.3. *Assume that ψ is 1-Lipschitz and consider an Elastic-Net penalty of the form $g(\mathbf{b}) = \mu\|\mathbf{b}\|^2/2 + \lambda\|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ for $\mu > 0, \lambda \geq 0$. For almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is differentiable at \mathbf{y} and*

$$(2.10) \quad (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}(\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}} + n\mu\mathbf{I}_{|\hat{S}|})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$$

where $\hat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}$ is the submatrix of \mathbf{X} obtained by keeping only the columns indexed in \hat{S} , as well as

$$(2.11) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial\mathbf{y}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}} \left[\mathbf{I}_n - \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}(\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}} + n\mu\mathbf{I}_{|\hat{S}|})^{-1}\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}} \right] \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The proof is given in Section 11.2 and our main result Theorem 2.1 is not dependent on the above proposition. For the Elastic-Net penalty, the factors $\hat{d}\mathbf{f} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ and $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ appearing in the out-of-sample estimate \hat{R} have thus reasonably tractable forms and can be computed efficiently by inverting a matrix of size \hat{S} once the elastic-net estimate $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ has been computed. The above estimates for general loss functions are closely related to the formula for $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ known for the Elastic-Net with square loss [39, Equation (28)] [5, Section 3.5.3], the only difference being several multiplications by the diagonal matrix $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$.

For the Huber loss with ℓ_1 -penalty, these multiplicative factors are even simpler, as shown in the following proposition. We keep using the notation $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ for the set of inliers (the set of outliers being $[n] \setminus \hat{I}$), and $\hat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ for the set of active covariates.

Proposition 2.4. Let $\rho(u) = n\lambda_*^2\rho_H((\sqrt{n}\lambda_*)^{-1}u)$ where ρ_H is the Huber loss and let $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda\|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ be the penalty for λ_* , $\lambda > 0$. For almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , the functions $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{I}$, $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{S}$ and $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$ are constant in a neighborhood of \mathbf{y} and $\hat{\mathbf{Q}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the orthogonal projection onto the column span of $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}$. Furthermore $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ and the multiplicative factors appearing in \hat{R} satisfy for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})

$$\hat{\text{d}}f = \text{Tr}[\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] = |\hat{S}|, \quad \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = |\hat{I}| - |\hat{S}| \geq 0.$$

The proof is given in Section 11.2. Proposition 2.4 implies that for the Huber loss with ℓ_1 -penalty, the out-of-sample error estimate \hat{R} becomes simply

$$(2.12) \quad \hat{R} = (|\hat{I}| - |\hat{S}|)^{-2} \{ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2|\hat{S}| - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \}.$$

For the square-loss and identity covariance, the above estimate was known [2, 32] with $|\hat{I}|$ replaced by n . The extension of this estimate to the Huber loss is rather natural: the sample size should be replaced by the number of observed inliers $|\hat{I}|$.

Propositions 2.3 and 2.4 provide, for specific examples, closed form expressions for the multiplicative factors $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ and $\hat{\text{d}}f$ appearing in \hat{R} . Closed form expressions can also be obtained for different penalty functions, such as the Group-Lasso penalty, by differentiating the KKT conditions as explained in [8] for the square loss.

2.7. Approximation of the multiplicative factors in \hat{R} for arbitrary loss and penalty (ρ, g)

For general penalty function, however, no closed form solution is available. Still, it is possible to approximate the multiplicative factors appearing in \hat{R} using the following Monte Carlo scheme. Since $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ and $\hat{\text{d}}f = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ are the divergence of the vector fields $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ respectively, we can use the following Monte Carlo approximation of the divergence of a vector field, which was suggested at least as early as [30], and for which accuracy guarantees are proved in [5].

Let $\mathbf{F} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be a vector field, and let $\mathbf{z}_k, k = 1, \dots, m$ be iid standard normal random vector in \mathbb{R}^n . Then for some small scale parameter $a > 0$, we approximate the divergence of \mathbf{F} at a point $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by

$$\hat{\text{d}}\text{iv } \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{k=1}^m a^{-1} \mathbf{z}_k^\top [\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k) - \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y})].$$

Computing the quantities $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k)$ at the perturbed response vector $\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k$ for $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ or $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}) = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ require the computation of the M-estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{X})$ at the perturbed response. If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ has already been computed as a solution to (1.3) by an iterative algorithm, one can use $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ as a starting point of the iterative algorithm to compute $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{X})$ efficiently, since for small $a > 0$ and by continuity, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ should provide a good initialization. We refer to [5] for an analysis of the accuracy of this approximation.




Fig 1: Boxplots of $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$ and \hat{R} over 10 repetitions, with $n = 400, p = 500$, the square loss and nuclear norm penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\text{mat}(\mathbf{b})\|_{nuc}$ for different values of the tuning parameter λ . The function $\text{mat} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{20 \times 25}$ maps \mathbb{R}^p to matrices of size 20×25 so that the inverse map is the usual vectorization operator. For the true β , $\text{mat}(\beta)$ is rank 3. The Monte Carlo scheme of Section 2.7 is used to compute $\hat{d}\mathbf{f}$ with $a = 0.01$ and $m = 100$. The full simulation setup is described in Section 2.8.2.

Hence, even in situations where no closed form expressions for the Jacobians $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}$ and $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$ are available, the estimate \hat{R} of the out-of-sample error of the M-estimator $\hat{\beta}$ can be used by replacing the divergences $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}]$ and $\hat{d}\mathbf{f}$ by their Monte Carlo approximations. Figure 1 illustrates the use of this Monte Carlo scheme by showing boxplots \hat{R} and its target $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$ over 10 repetitions for the nuclear norm penalty over a range of tuning parameters.

Although this approximation scheme induces some computational overhead as it requires computation of several $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{z}_k, \mathbf{X})$, we stress that this approximation scheme is not needed for the ℓ_1 and Elastic-Net penalty since explicit formulae are available (cf. Propositions 2.3 and (2.4)). For these two commonly used penalty functions the computational burden of computing $\hat{d}\mathbf{f}$ and $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}]$ is negligible.

2.8. Simulation study

2.8.1. Huber Lasso

We illustrate the above result with a short simulation study. For given tuning parameters $\lambda, \lambda_* > 0$, the M-estimator $\hat{\beta}$ is the Huber Lasso estimator (1.3) with loss ρ and penalty g given in Proposition 2.4, and the estimate \hat{R} is given by (2.12). We set $n = 1001, p = 1000, \Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$ and β has 100 nonzero coefficients all equal to $10p^{-1/2}$. The components of ε are iid with t -distribution with 2 degrees-of-freedom (so that the variance of each component does not exist). Define the sets

$\Lambda = \{0.1n^{-1/2}(1.5)^k, k = 0, \dots, 15\}$ and $\Lambda_* = \{0.1n^{-1/2}(1.5)^k, k = 0, \dots, 8\}$. For each (λ, λ_*) in the discrete grid $\Lambda \times \Lambda_*$, the estimator \hat{R} , its target $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$ and the relative error $|1 - \hat{R}/\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2|$ are reported, over 100 repetitions, in the boxplots in Figure 2. Figure 2 provides also a heatmap of the average of \hat{R} and $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$ over the same 100 repetitions.

The plots show that the estimate \hat{R} accurately estimates $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{\beta} - \beta)\|^2$ across the grid $\Lambda \times \Lambda_*$, at the exception of the lowest value of the Huber loss parameter λ_* coupled with the two lowest values for the penalty parameter λ as seen on the left of the top left boxplot in Figure 2. These low values for (λ, λ_*) lead to small values for $(|\hat{I}| - |\hat{S}|)^2$ in the denominator of (2.12). This provides additional evidence that \hat{R} should not be trusted for low values of $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}]^2/n^2$ (cf. the discussion around (2.9)). These inaccurate estimations for low values for (λ, λ_*) do not contradict the theoretical results, as the inequality of Theorem 2.1 bounds from above $(\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\psi}]/n)^2|\hat{R} - \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2| = (|\hat{I}|/n - |\hat{S}|/n)^2|\hat{R} - \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2|$ and upper bounds on $|\hat{R} - \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{h}\|^2|$ are not guaranteed by Theorem 2.1 when $(|\hat{I}|/n - |\hat{S}|/n)^2$ is close to 0. Furthermore, Figure 2 shows that the estimate \hat{R} is accurate for (λ, λ_*) smaller than the values (λ, λ_*) required in Assumption 2.3(iii.b). This suggests that the validity of \hat{R} may hold for broader choices of loss and penalty than those allowed by Assumption 2.3.

2.8.2. Square loss and nuclear norm penalty

A second simulation study is provided with the square loss $\rho(u) = u^2/2$ and nuclear norm penalty. With $n = 400$, $p = 500$, a linear isomorphism $\text{mat} : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{20 \times 25}$ is fixed so that the inverse map is the usual vectorization operator. The true β is such that $\text{mat}(\beta)$ has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries in the first three columns and zeros in the remaining columns so that $\text{mat}(\beta)$ is rank 3. The covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is defined as $\Sigma = \mathbf{W}/(5p)$ where \mathbf{W} is a Wishart matrix with identity covariance and $5p$ degrees of freedom; Σ is generated once and is the same across the repetitions. The noise ε has iid $N(0, 2)$ entries. For 10 repetitions, (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) are generated and M-estimators with penalty proportional to the nuclear norm, $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda\|\text{mat}(\mathbf{b})\|_{nuc}$, are computed for each value of λ in $\{0.5 \cdot 1.3^k n^{-1/2}, k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 14\}$. For each λ , the estimate \hat{d} is computed with the Monte Carlo scheme of Section 2.7 with $a = 0.01$ and $m = 100$ and used to construct the estimate \hat{R} of the out-of-sample error. The resulting boxplots, over 10 repetitions, are given in Figure 1.

2.9. Proof sketch and a new probabilistic inequality

Preliminaries for the proofs are twofold. First several Lipschitz properties are derived, to make sure that the derivatives used in the proofs exist almost surely. This is done in Section 5.1. Second, without loss of generality we may assume that $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$, replacing

if necessary $(\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\beta}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, g)$ by $(\mathbf{X}^*, \boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^*, g^*)$ as follows,

(2.13)

$$\mathbf{X} \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{X}^* = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad g(\cdot) \rightsquigarrow g^*(\cdot) = g(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\cdot)), \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rightsquigarrow \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^* = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta} \rightsquigarrow \boldsymbol{\beta}^* = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\beta}.$$

This change of variable leaves the quantities $\{\mathbf{y}, \widehat{\mathbf{f}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2\}$ unchanged, so that Theorem 2.1 holds for general $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ if it holds for $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$ after the change of variable in (2.13).

Next, throughout the proof, as in the rest of the paper we consider the scaled version of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and the error vector \mathbf{h} given by

$$(2.14) \quad \mathbf{r} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{h} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

so that $\|\mathbf{r}\|^2$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\|^2$ are of the same order. Define also the quantities

$$(2.15) \quad V_6 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2\frac{1}{n}(p - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}) + \text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial\mathbf{y}}\right]\frac{\mathbf{r}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{h}}{n^{3/2}}}{(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$(2.16) \quad V_8 = \frac{\frac{p}{n}\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial\mathbf{y}}\right]\right)^2\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - 2\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial\mathbf{y}}\right]\frac{\mathbf{r}^\top\mathbf{X}\mathbf{h}}{n^{3/2}}}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

By simple algebra, cancelling the rightmost terms, we find

$$V^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2V_6 + V_8 = \frac{\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2n^{-1}(2\widehat{\mathbf{f}} - p) - \left(\frac{1}{n}\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial\mathbf{y}}\right]\right)^2\|\mathbf{h}\|^2}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

so that the first claim of Theorem 2.1 follows if $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V_6] + \mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V_8] \leq C_2(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ for some constant independent of n, p and some event Ω with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$.

At this point the main ingredients of the proof are threefold. First, the bound $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V_6] \leq C_3(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ is obtained in Proposition 6.4 by a careful application of the following result.

Proposition 2.5. *If $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a matrix with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries and $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are two vector valued functions, with weakly differentiable components η_1, \dots, η_p and ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n , then*

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\eta} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial(\rho_i\eta_j)}{\partial x_{ij}}\right)^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial(\rho_i\eta_j)}{\partial x_{lk}} \frac{\partial(\rho_l\eta_k)}{\partial x_{ij}}\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial(\rho_l\eta_k)}{\partial x_{ij}}\right)^2\right] \end{aligned}$$

provided that the second line is finite, where for brevity we write $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{X})$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X})$, and similarly for the partial derivatives (i.e., omitting the dependence in \mathbf{X}).

The proof is given in Proposition 6.3. The desired bound on $|V_6|$ is obtained by setting

$$(2.18) \quad \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X}) = (\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{-1/2} n^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{X}) = (\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{-1/2} \mathbf{r}$$

with \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{h} defined in (2.14). Proposition 6.3 explains how to evaluate and bound from above quantities of the form (2.17). The equality in (2.17) is a matrix generalization of the result of [5]. Its proof relies on Gaussian integrations by parts and presents no difficulty, although it requires some bookkeeping for the different summation signs and indices. The result of [5], that covers the case $p = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta} = 1$, is recalled in Proposition 6.1; see also [34, Eq. (8.6)]. Although the above matrix formulation is new and particularly useful for our purpose, it is essentially equivalent to the $p = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta} = 1$ case and (2.17) is not a novel probabilistic result given the existing literature.

The second ingredient is the bound $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V_8|] \leq C_4(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \boldsymbol{\eta}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_*)$. It is obtained by developing the following novel probabilistic inequality, which is the main probabilistic contribution of the present paper.

Theorem 2.6. *Assume that \mathbf{X} has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries, that $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is locally Lipschitz and that $\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\| \leq 1$ almost surely. Then*

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| p \|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right| \leq C_5 \left\{ 1 + \left(\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\rho}}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \sqrt{p} + C_5 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\rho}}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|^2$$

where $C_5 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

The proof of Theorem 2.6 is given in Section 7. The upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V_8|]$ is formally proved as a corollary in Proposition 7.3 by taking $\boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{r}(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{-1/2}$ with \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{h} in (2.14). To our knowledge, inequality (2.19) is novel. In the simplest case, if $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is constant with $\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\| = 1$ then (2.19) reduces to $\mathbb{E}|\chi_p^2 - p| \leq C_6 \sqrt{p}$ and the dependence in \sqrt{p} is optimal, so that (2.19) is in a sense unimprovable. The flexibility of inequality (2.19) is that the left hand side of (2.19) is provably of order \sqrt{p} , as in the case of $\mathbb{E}|\chi_p^2 - p|$, as long as the derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ do not vary too much in the sense that $\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| (\partial/\partial x_{ij}) \boldsymbol{\rho} \right\|^2 \leq C_7$ for some constant independent of n, p . This inequality holds for instance for all $(C_7/n)^{1/2}$ -Lipschitz functions $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. In this case, a right-hand side of order \sqrt{p} in (2.19) would be expected if the p terms

$$A_j = \|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 - \left(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2$$

were mean-zero and independent, thanks to $\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j=1}^p A_j)^2] = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[A_j^2]$ by independence. The surprising feature of (2.19) is that such bound of order \sqrt{p} holds despite the intricate, nonlinear dependence between A_j and the $p - 1$ other terms $(A_k)_{k \neq j}$ through the $(C_7/n)^{1/2}$ -Lipschitz function $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and its partial derivatives.

Upper bounds on (2.17) and inequalities of the form (2.19) involve derivatives with respect to the entries of \mathbf{X} . It might thus be surprising at this point that Theorem 2.1

and the estimate \hat{R} in (2.5) involve the derivatives of $(\hat{\psi}, \hat{\beta})$ with respect to \mathbf{y} only, and no derivatives with respect to the entries of \mathbf{X} . The third major ingredient of the proof is to provide gradient identities between the derivatives of $\hat{\beta}, \hat{\psi}$ with respect to \mathbf{y} and those with respect to \mathbf{X} , by identifying certain perturbations of the data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) that leave $\hat{\beta}$ or $\hat{\psi}$ unchanged. For instance, Corollary 5.7 shows that $\hat{\psi}$ stays the same and $\hat{\beta}$ is still solution of the optimization problem (1.3) if the observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) is replaced by $(\mathbf{y} + \hat{\beta}_j \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{v} \mathbf{e}_j^\top)$ for any canonical basis vector $\mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and any direction $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\psi} = 0$. If $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and $\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ are Frechet differentiable with respect to (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , then this provides identities between the partial derivatives with respect to \mathbf{y} and the partial derivatives with respect to entries of \mathbf{X} . Further relationships between the partial derivatives with respect to \mathbf{y} and the partial derivatives with respect to \mathbf{X} are derived in Section 5.3, including equality

$$(2.20) \quad \psi(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\beta}) \mathbf{e}_m^\top \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\beta}}{\partial \mathbf{y}_l}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{e}_m^\top \mathbf{X} \left[(\mathbf{x}_l^\top \hat{\beta}) \frac{\partial \hat{\beta}}{\partial \mathbf{y}_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \sum_{k=1}^p x_{lk} \frac{\partial \hat{\beta}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \psi'(\mathbf{y}_l - \mathbf{x}_l^\top \hat{\beta})$$

for all $l \in [n], i \in [n]$ and $m \in \hat{I}$, where $\mathbf{e}_m \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the m -th canonical basis vector, as well as

$$(2.21) \quad \psi(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\beta}) \, \text{df} = - \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \left[\hat{\beta}_k \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right],$$

see Lemma 5.9. This identity is particularly useful for the purpose of Theorem 2.1. These relationships on the derivatives are non-random in nature: They hold as long as $\hat{\beta}, \hat{\psi}$ are Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) and for instance do not require that \mathbf{X} is normally distributed.

2.10. Proof sketch in a simple example with explicit derivatives

We illustrate how to combine (2.17) and (2.19) in a simple setting, where explicit formula for the derivatives are available. In this section only and for simplicity, consider the square loss $\rho(u) = u^2/2$, the ℓ_1 penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$, identity covariance $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$ and $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$ which ensure that $\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}) > 0$ almost surely. Since ε and \mathbf{X} are independent, by conditioning assume throughout that ε is fixed and deterministic so that \mathbf{X} is the only random object. In such setting, the derivatives with respect to \mathbf{X} for a fixed ε of the map $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \psi(\mathbf{X})$ where $\psi(\mathbf{X}) = \varepsilon - \mathbf{X}(\hat{\beta}(\varepsilon + \mathbf{X}\beta, \mathbf{X}) - \beta)$ are given almost surely by

$$(2.22) \quad \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X}) = - [\mathbf{X}_S (\mathbf{X}_S^\top \mathbf{X}_S)^\dagger \mathbf{e}_j \psi^\top + h_j (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H})] \mathbf{e}_i \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{H} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{X}_S (\mathbf{X}_S^\top \mathbf{X}_S)^\dagger \mathbf{X}_S$$

where $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are canonical basis vectors and \mathbf{X}_S is the matrix \mathbf{X} with columns indexed in the complement of $\hat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ replaced by zeros, see [7] or [8, Lemma 3.5] where (2.22) is derived. In this setting, the factors $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y}) \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]$ and

$\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]$ that appear in Theorem 2.1 are given almost surely by $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H}] = n - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|$ and $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{H}] = |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|$ respectively (see e.g., [38] or [5, Section 3.4] among others). Hence the approximation obtained in Theorem 2.1 reads

$$(2.23) \quad \|\mathbf{h}\|^2(n - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|)^2 \approx \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2(2|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| - p) + \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2.$$

Applying (2.17) to $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \boldsymbol{\psi}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}$, the quantity on the left hand side of (2.17) is

$$\text{Rem}_{(2.17)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial(\rho_i \eta_j)}{\partial x_{ij}} = \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 - p\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\psi} \psi_i)}{\partial x_{ij}}$$

by using the product rule. Let $\text{Rem}_{(2.19)} = p\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p (\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\rho} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}})^2$ be the quantity inside the absolute values in the left hand side of (2.19). By expanding the square in $\text{Rem}_{(2.19)}$ and using the product rule of differentiation, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Rem}_{(2.19)} + 2\text{Rem}_{(2.17)} \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial x_{ij}} - p\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\psi} \psi_i)}{\partial x_{ij}} \\ &= - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 - p\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}}{\partial x_{ij}} \end{aligned}$$

thanks to cancellations for $p\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2$, $\|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2$ and the cross-terms when expanding the square. We now use the explicit formula (2.22) for $(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\boldsymbol{\psi}$ for the rightmost term:

$$-2 \sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\psi}}{\partial x_{ij}} = +2\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 \text{Tr}[\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta (\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta)^\dagger] + 2\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\psi} = 2\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| + \text{Rem}_3$$

where $\text{Rem}_3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H}) \boldsymbol{\psi}$ is negligible compared to $p\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2$ and $\|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2$ thanks to $\|\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H}\|_{op} \leq 1$. This shows that

$$\text{Rem}_{(2.19)} + 2\text{Rem}_{(2.17)} + \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2(|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| - p) + \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 + \text{Rem}_3.$$

Finally, in the left-hand side $\sum_{i=1}^n (\partial/\partial x_{ij})\rho_i = -h_j(n - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|) - \boldsymbol{\psi}^\top (\mathbf{X}_\delta (\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta)^\dagger) \mathbf{e}_j$. With $\text{Rem}_4 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2(n - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|)\boldsymbol{\psi}^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta (\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta)^\dagger \mathbf{h} + \|(\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta)^\dagger \mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2$, this proves that

$$\text{Rem}_{(2.19)} + 2\text{Rem}_{(2.17)} + \text{Rem}_4 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2(n - |\widehat{\mathcal{S}}|)^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2(2|\widehat{\mathcal{S}}| - p) + \|\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2 + \text{Rem}_3$$

so that the desired approximation (2.23) holds when all remainder terms are negligible. Bounding from above $\text{Rem}_3, \text{Rem}_4$ can be readily achieved using that $\|\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{H}\|_{op} \vee \|\mathbf{H}\|_{op} \leq 1$ and that the eigenvalues of $\mathbf{X}_\delta^\top \mathbf{X}_\delta$ are bounded away from 0. For $\text{Rem}_{(2.19)}$ and $\text{Rem}_{(2.17)}$, bounding from above the right-hand side of (2.19) and (2.17) can

be achieved using the explicit formula (2.22) and the integrability of the smallest eigenvalue of $\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}/n$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}/n)^{-k}] \leq C(k, \gamma)$ for any integer $k > 0$ when $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$. A complication that was overlooked in the above derivation is that (2.19) formally requires $\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\| \leq 1$; this is the reason why in the formal proof of Theorem 2.1, inequality (2.19) is applied to $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ given in (2.18).

In the general case, for the formal proof of Theorem 2.1 given in Section 8, explicit formulae such as (2.22) are not available. We instead resort to relationships such as (2.20) to link derivatives with respect to \mathbf{X} to the derivatives of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ with respect to \mathbf{y} . Some other technicalities are necessary to generalize the above argument to general loss ρ and general convex penalty g : For instance some derivatives do not exist or cannot be controlled on some events of negligible probability, and we leverage to the formulation in Corollary 7.2 to overcome these issues. These technicalities aside, the argument of the previous paragraph outlines the key algebra behind the proof of Theorem 2.1.

3. Square loss

Throughout this section $\rho(u) = u^2/2$ in (1.3) so that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the solution

$$(3.1) \quad \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 / (2n) + g(\mathbf{b}) \right).$$

for some convex penalty $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Here $\psi(u) = \rho'(u) = u$, and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, $\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$ are simply given by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \quad \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = n - \widehat{\text{df}}.$$

Hence $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ is the vector of residuals of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. In regression or sequence model with Gaussian noise, the quantity $\widehat{\text{df}}$ was introduced in [34] where Stein's Unbiased Estimate (SURE) was developed, showing that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})\|^2] = \mathbb{E}[\widehat{\text{SURE}}], \quad \text{where} \quad \widehat{\text{SURE}} = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 + 2\sigma^2 \widehat{\text{df}} - \sigma^2 n$$

when $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ under mild differentiability and integrability assumptions. Numerous works followed with the goal to characterize the quantity $\widehat{\text{df}}$ for estimators of interest, see for instance [46, 39, 28, 21] for the Lasso and the Elastic-Net, [40] for the Group-Lasso, [31] for Slope and submodular regularizers, [13] for projection estimators, among others. A surprise of the present paper is that for general penalty functions, $\widehat{\text{df}}$ is not only useful to estimate the in-sample error in (3.2), but also the out-of-sample error $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})\|_2^2$. Furthermore the estimates of the present do not rely on $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ being normally distributed.

3.1. Estimation of the noise level and generalization error

The simple algebraic structure of the square loss allows us to provide generic estimators of the noise level σ^2 and the generalization error $\sigma^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2$, assuming that

the components of ε are iid with mean zero and variance σ^2 . The quantity $\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ can be seen as the generalization error, since $\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x}_{new}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - Y_{new})^2 | (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]$ where $(\mathbf{x}_{new}^\top, Y_{new})$ is independent of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) with the same distribution as any row of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+1)}$.

When the components of ε are assumed iid, mean-zero with variance σ^2 , the convergence $\|\varepsilon\|^2/n \rightarrow \sigma^2$ holds almost surely by the law of large numbers, and $|\|\varepsilon\|^2/n - \sigma^2| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ by the central limit theorem if the fourth moment of the entries of ε is uniformly bounded as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$. We may thus consider the estimation targets $\sigma_*^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \|\varepsilon\|^2/n$ and $\sigma_*^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ for the noise level and generalization error, respectively. Results for σ^2 and $\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$ can be deduced up to an extra additive error term of order $|\|\varepsilon\|^2/n - \sigma^2|$ which converges to 0 almost surely and that satisfies $|\|\varepsilon\|^2/n - \sigma^2| = O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ under the uniformly bounded fourth moment assumption on the components of ε . Assumption 2.3 specialized to the square loss reduces to the following.

Assumption 3.1 (Penalty). *The loss is $\rho(u) = \frac{u^2}{2}$ and either one of the following holds:*

- (i) $p/n \leq \gamma \in (0, +\infty)$, $\mu > 0$ and the penalty g is μ -strongly convex with respect to Σ , in the sense that for any $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{d} \in \partial g(\mathbf{b})$ and $\mathbf{d}' \in \partial g(\mathbf{b}')$, inequality $(\mathbf{d} - \mathbf{d}')^\top (\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}') \geq \mu \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{b}')\|^2$ holds.
- (ii) $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$ and the penalty g is only assumed convex.
- (iii) For any constants γ, φ, η independent of n, p , assume that $\text{diag}(\Sigma) = \mathbf{I}_p$, $p/n \leq \gamma \in (0, \infty)$, $\phi_{\max}(\Sigma)/\phi_{\min}(\Sigma) \leq \varphi$. The penalty is $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ where $\lambda > 0$ is a tuning parameter. Furthermore, $\varepsilon \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $s_* > 0$ is a small enough constant depending on $\{\varphi, \gamma, \eta\}$ only such that $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 \leq s_* n$. The tuning parameter is set as $\lambda = \sigma \eta^{-1} (1 + (2 \log \frac{1+\gamma}{s_*})^{\frac{1}{2}}) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

Here $\gamma, \mu, \varphi, \eta \geq 0$ are constants independent of n, p .

Theorem 3.1. *Let Assumptions 2.2 and 3.1 be fulfilled. Then almost surely*

$$(3.3) \quad \begin{aligned} |(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2\} - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n| &\leq \text{RHS}, \\ |(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 - n^{-2} \{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\hat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2\}| &\leq \text{RHS}, \\ |(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \sigma_*^2 - n^{-2} \{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (n - (2\hat{\text{df}} - p)) - \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2\}| &\leq \text{RHS} \end{aligned}$$

where $\text{RHS} = V^* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2)$ and V^* is a non-negative random variable with $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}V^*] \leq C_8(\gamma, \mu, \varphi, \eta)$ for some event Ω with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$. Furthermore $0 \leq (1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^{-1} \leq C_9(\gamma, \mu, \varphi, \eta)$ holds in Ω .

The proof is given in Section 10. Theorem 3.1 provides consistent estimates for the out-of-sample error $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2$, the generalization error $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2$, and the noise level $\sigma_*^2 = \|\varepsilon\|^2/n$. More precisely, define the estimators of the generalization error, of the

out-of-sample error and of the noise variance respectively by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\tau}^2 &= (n - \hat{\text{df}})^{-2} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 n, \\ \hat{R} &= (n - \hat{\text{df}})^{-2} \{ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (2\hat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \}, \\ \hat{\sigma}^2 &= (n - \hat{\text{df}})^{-2} \{ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 (n - (2\hat{\text{df}} - p)) - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \}.\end{aligned}$$

The above estimates have been derived for the unregularized Ordinary Least-Squares in [29], for the Lasso with square loss in [1, 2, 32], and for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}$ in [16]. Apart from these works and the specific Lasso penalty, to our knowledge the above estimates for general convex penalty g are new, so that Theorem 3.1 considerably extends the scope of applications of the estimates $\hat{\tau}^2$, \hat{R} and $\hat{\sigma}^2$. The estimate $\hat{\tau}^2$ of the generalization error is of particular interest as it does not require the knowledge of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, and can be used to choose the estimator with the smallest estimated generalization error among a collection of convex regularized least-squares of the form (3.1). Since $\hat{\tau}^2$ estimates the risk for the actual sample size n , this provides a favorable alternative to K -fold cross-validation which provides estimates of the risk corresponding to the biased sample size $(1 - 1/K)n$. In defense of cross-validation, which is known to successfully tune parameters in practice for arbitrary data distribution, the above estimates are valid when the rows of \mathbf{X} are iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and it is unclear if the validity would extend to non-Gaussian designs.

With the above notation, the following asymptotic corollary of Theorem 3.1 holds. The proof is given in Section 10.

Corollary 3.2. *For some fixed value of $\gamma > 0, \mu \geq 0$, consider a sequence of regression problems and penalties with $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ such that for each n, p , the setting and assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled. Then*

$$\max \{ | \{ \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2 \} - \hat{\tau}^2 |, \quad | \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 - \hat{R} |, \quad | \sigma_*^2 - \hat{\sigma}^2 | \} \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \hat{\tau}^2.$$

Consequently, for the generalization error, $\hat{\tau}^2 / \{ \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2 \} \rightarrow^{\mathbb{P}} 1$ in probability.

We conclude by complementing the simulation setup in Section 2.8.2 with the estimates $\hat{\sigma}^2$ and $\hat{\tau}^2$. Boxplots of these estimates and their targets are provided in Figure 3. The quantity of approximation deteriorates for the smallest tuning parameters, which can be explained by the multiplicative factor $1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n$ being close to 0. An interesting phenomenon is visible regarding the empirical variance of the estimate $\hat{\sigma}^2$: the smallest variances are obtained for the tuning parameters with the smallest out-of-sample error. Our theoretical results do not explain this observation; further investigation of this phenomenon is left for future work.

References

- [1] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. The lasso risk for gaussian matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(4):1997–2017, 2012.




Fig 3: Estimators $\hat{\sigma}^2$ and $\hat{\tau}^2$ and their targets for the nuclear norm penalty simulation described in Section 2.8.2. The distribution of the entries of the noises ε are iid $N(0, 2)$.

- [2] Mohsen Bayati, Murat A Erdogdu, and Andrea Montanari. Estimating lasso risk and noise level. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 944–952, 2013.
- [3] Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Nouredine El Karoui, and Bin Yu. Optimal m-estimation in high-dimensional regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14563–14568, 2013.
- [4] Pierre C Bellec and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Bounds on the prediction error of penalized least squares estimators with convex penalty. In *Modern Problems of Stochastic Analysis and Statistics, Selected Contributions In Honor of Valentin Konakov*. Springer, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1609.06675.pdf>.
- [5] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Second order stein: Sure for sure and other applications in high-dimensional inference. *Annals of Statistics*, accepted, to appear, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.04121.pdf>.
- [6] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. De-biasing the lasso with degrees-of-freedom adjustment. *preprint*, 2018.
- [7] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. De-biasing the lasso with degrees-of-freedom adjustment. *arXiv:1902.08885*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.08885.pdf>.
- [8] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Second order poincare inequalities and de-biasing arbitrary convex regularizers when $p/n \rightarrow \gamma$. *arXiv:1912.11943*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.11943.pdf>.
- [9] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [10] Jelena Bradic. Robustness in sparse linear models: relative efficiency based on robust approximate message passing. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10:2, 2015.
- [11] Michael Celentano and Andrea Montanari. Fundamental barriers to high-dimensional regression with convex penalties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10603*, 2019.
- [12] Michael Celentano, Andrea Montanari, and Yuting Wei. The lasso with

- general gaussian designs with applications to hypothesis testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13716*, 2020.
- [13] Xi Chen, Qihang Lin, and Bodhisattva Sen. On degrees of freedom of projection estimators with applications to multivariate nonparametric regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–30, 2019.
- [14] Arnak Dalalyan and Philip Thompson. Outlier-robust estimation of a sparse linear model using ℓ_1 -penalized huber’s m-estimator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 13188–13198, 2019.
- [15] Kenneth R Davidson and Stanislaw J Szarek. Local operator theory, random matrices and banach spaces. *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, 1(317-366): 131, 2001.
- [16] Lee H Dicker. Variance estimation in high-dimensional linear models. *Biometrika*, 101(2):269–284, 2014.
- [17] Lee H Dicker. Ridge regression and asymptotic minimax estimation over spheres of growing dimension. *Bernoulli*, 22(1):1–37, 2016.
- [18] Edgar Dobriban and Stefan Wager. High-dimensional asymptotics of prediction: Ridge regression and classification. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(1):247–279, 2018.
- [19] David Donoho and Andrea Montanari. High dimensional robust m-estimation: Asymptotic variance via approximate message passing. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 166(3-4):935–969, 2016.
- [20] David L Donoho, Arian Maleki, and Andrea Montanari. Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(45):18914–18919, 2009.
- [21] Charles Dossal, Maher Kachour, MJ Fadili, Gabriel Peyré, and Christophe Chesneau. The degrees of freedom of the lasso for general design matrix. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 809–828, 2013.
- [22] Nouredine El Karoui. On the impact of predictor geometry on the performance on high-dimensional ridge-regularized generalized robust regression estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170(1-2):95–175, 2018.
- [23] Nouredine El Karoui, Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Chingway Lim, and Bin Yu. On robust regression with high-dimensional predictors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14557–14562, 2013.
- [24] Cédric Gerbelot, Alia Abbara, and Florent Krzakala. Asymptotic errors for convex penalized linear regression beyond gaussian matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04372*, 2020.
- [25] Math Lover (<https://math.stackexchange.com/users/366404/math-lover>). The lebesgue measure of zero set of a polynomial function is zero. Mathematics Stack Exchange, 2016. URL <https://math.stackexchange.com/q/1920302>. URL:<https://math.stackexchange.com/q/1920302> (version: 2016-09-09).
- [26] Peter J Huber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73–101, 1964.
- [27] Nouredine El Karoui. Asymptotic behavior of unregularized and ridge-regularized high-dimensional robust regression estimators: rigorous results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2445*, 2013.

- [28] Kengo Kato. On the degrees of freedom in shrinkage estimation. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 100(7):1338–1352, 2009.
- [29] Hannes Leeb. Evaluation and selection of models for out-of-sample prediction when the sample size is small relative to the complexity of the data-generating process. *Bernoulli*, 14(3):661–690, 2008.
- [30] Christopher A Metzler, Arian Maleki, and Richard G Baraniuk. From denoising to compressed sensing. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 62(9):5117–5144, 2016.
- [31] Kentaro Minami. Degrees of freedom in submodular regularization: A computational perspective of stein’s unbiased risk estimate. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 175:104546, 2020.
- [32] Léo Miolane and Andrea Montanari. The distribution of the lasso: Uniform control over sparse balls and adaptive parameter tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01212*, 2018.
- [33] Fariborz Salehi, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. The impact of regularization on high-dimensional logistic regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 12005–12015, 2019.
- [34] Charles M Stein. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *The annals of Statistics*, pages 1135–1151, 1981.
- [35] Mihailo Stojnic. A framework to characterize performance of lasso algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.7291*, 2013.
- [36] Christos Thrampoulidis, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. Lasso with non-linear measurements is equivalent to one with linear measurements. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3420–3428, 2015.
- [37] Christos Thrampoulidis, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. Precise error analysis of regularized m -estimators in high dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(8):5592–5628, 2018.
- [38] Ryan J Tibshirani. The lasso problem and uniqueness. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1456–1490, 2013.
- [39] Ryan J. Tibshirani and Jonathan Taylor. Degrees of freedom in lasso problems. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(2):1198–1232, 04 2012. . URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1003>.
- [40] Samuel Vaiter, Charles Deledalle, Gabriel Peyré, Jalal Fadili, and Charles Dossal. The degrees of freedom of the group lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.1481*, 2012.
- [41] Shuaiwen Wang, Haolei Weng, and Arian Maleki. Which bridge estimator is optimal for variable selection? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.08617*, 2017.
- [42] Wikipedia. Smoothstep — Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Smoothstep&oldid=958070398>, 2020. [Online; accessed 26-July-2020].
- [43] Ji Xu, Arian Maleki, Kamiar Rahnama Rad, and Daniel Hsu. Consistent risk estimation in high-dimensional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.01753*, 2019.
- [44] Qian Zhao, Pragya Sur, and Emmanuel J Candes. The asymptotic distribution of the mle in high-dimensional logistic models: Arbitrary covariance. *arXiv preprint*

arXiv:2001.09351, 2020.

- [45] William P Ziemer. *Weakly differentiable functions: Sobolev spaces and functions of bounded variation*, volume 120. Springer-Verlag New York, 1989. .
- [46] Hui Zou, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. On the “degrees of freedom” of the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(5):2173–2192, 10 2007. . URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053607000000127>.

$u \in$		[0, 1]		[1, ∞)		$u \in$		[0, 1]		[1, 2]		[2, +∞)
$\psi'_H(u)$		1		0		$\psi'_0(u)$		1		$2 - u$		0
$\psi_H(u)$		u		1		$\psi_0(u)$		u		$-\frac{1}{2} + 2u - \frac{u^2}{2}$		$\frac{3}{2}$
$\rho_H(u)$		$\frac{u^2}{2}$		$u - \frac{1}{2}$		$\rho_0(u)$		$\frac{u^2}{2}$		$\frac{1}{6} - \frac{u}{2} + u^2 - \frac{u^3}{6}$		$\frac{-7}{6} + \frac{3u}{2}$




TABLE 2

Huber loss $\rho_H(u)$ and its derivatives, as well as its smoothed version $\rho_0(u)$ and its derivatives. In the plots, the loss ρ is shown in brown, $\psi = \rho'$ in red and ψ' in blue.

$u \in$		[0, 1]		[1, 2]		[2, +∞)
$\psi'_1(u)$		1		$2x^3 - 9x^2 + 12x - 4$		0
$\psi_1(u)$		u		$\frac{3}{2} + \frac{(x-2)^3 x}{2}$		$\frac{3}{2}$
$\rho_1(u)$		$\frac{u^2}{2}$		$\frac{x^5}{10} - \frac{3x^4}{4} + 2x^3 - 2x^2 + \frac{3x}{2} - \frac{7}{20}$		$\frac{37}{20} + \frac{3(u-2)}{2}$




TABLE 3

Smooth robust loss $\rho_1(u)$ and its derivatives for $u \geq 0$.

4. Notation and conventions for the proofs

4.1. Conventions for derivatives

As defined in (2.2), we consider the functions $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ as functions of $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. At a point (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) where these functions are Frechet differentiable, the statistician has access to the Jacobians and partial derivatives in (2.3). These two functions, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ are the only functions of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) that we will consider; the hat in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ emphasize that these are functions of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) .

In the proof, we will consider functions of \mathbf{X} only, such as

$$(4.1) \quad \boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{r} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\psi} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{h} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$$

valued in \mathbb{R}^n , \mathbb{R}^n and \mathbb{R}^p respectively. Formally, $\boldsymbol{\psi} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ and we view the functions in (4.1) as functions of \mathbf{X} only while the noise ε is fixed. We may write for example $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{X})$ to recall that convention. We will denote their partial derivatives by $(\partial/\partial x_{ij})$.

To illustrate the above definitions, the function $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{X})$ is related to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ by $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon, \mathbf{X})$ so that if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ is Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) we have

$$(4.2) \quad \begin{aligned} \sqrt{n}(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{X}) &= (\partial/\partial x_{ij})\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{X}) \\ &= [(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \beta_j(\partial/\partial y_i)\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})] \\ &= [(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \hat{\beta}_j(\partial/\partial y_i)\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) - h_j(\partial/\partial y_i)\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]. \end{aligned}$$

We will apply some versions of Stein's formula to the functions of \mathbf{X} in (4.1) conditionally on ε . The derivatives with respect to \mathbf{X} of the functions in (4.1) that appear in these Stein's formulae bring the derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ by (4.2). Existence of the Frechet derivatives is proved in Proposition 5.3 below.

For the result on the square loss, we will also consider functions $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. If $\mathbf{g} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a function of \mathbf{z} , we denote by $\nabla \mathbf{g}$ the gradient of \mathbf{g} where \mathbf{g} is Frechet differentiable, so that $(\nabla \mathbf{g})_{ik} = \frac{\partial g_k}{\partial z_i}$ and $(\nabla \mathbf{g})^\top$ is the Jacobian of \mathbf{g} . The notation ∇ will be used only for vector fields, i.e., functions $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ (or $\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ for some $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$) for some n . The notation ∇ will be avoided for functions that take as input matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ such as those in the two previous paragraphs.

4.2. Norms and matrices

Let \mathbf{I}_d be the identity matrix of size $d \times d$. For any $p \geq 1$, let $[p]$ be the set $\{1, \dots, p\}$. Let $\|\cdot\|$ be the Euclidean norm and $\|\cdot\|_q$ the ℓ_q norm of vectors. Let $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ be the operator norm (largest singular value), $\|\cdot\|_F$ the Frobenius norm. If \mathbf{M} is positive semi-definite we also use the notation $\phi_{\max}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\phi_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$ for the largest and smallest eigenvalue. For any event Ω , denote by $I\{\Omega\}$ its indicator function. For $a \in \mathbb{R}$, $a_+ = \max(0, a)$. Throughout the paper, we use C_{10}, C_{11}, \dots to denote positive absolute constants, $C_{12}(\gamma), C_{13}(\gamma), \dots$ to denote constants that depend on γ only and for instance $C_{14}(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ to denote a constant that depend on $\{\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*\}$ only.

4.3. Canonical basis vectors and indices

Canonical basis vectors are denoted by $(e_i)_{i=1,\dots,n}$ or $(e_l)_{l=1,\dots,n}$ for the canonical basis in \mathbb{R}^n , and by $(e_j)_{j=1,\dots,p}$ or $(e_k)_{k=1,\dots,p}$ for the canonical basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^p . Indices i and l are used to loop or sum over $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$ only, while indices j and k are used to loop or sum over $[p] = \{1, \dots, p\}$ only. This lets us use the notation e_i, e_l, e_j, e_k for canonical basis vectors in \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{R}^p as the index reveals without ambiguity whether the canonical basis vector lies in \mathbb{R}^n or \mathbb{R}^p .

5. Derivatives of M-estimators

5.1. Lipschitz properties

Proposition 5.1. *Let ρ be a loss function such that ψ is L -Lipschitz, where $\psi = \rho'$. Then for any fixed design matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, the mapping $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is L -Lipschitz.*

Proof. let $\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be two response vectors, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \mathbf{X})$ and $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. The KKT conditions read

$$\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} \in n\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{X}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in n\partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

where $\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ denotes the subdifferential of g at $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Multiplying by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and taking the difference of the two KKT conditions above, we find

$$\begin{aligned} & n(\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + [\{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \\ (5.1) \quad & \ni [\mathbf{X}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) + [\{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \\ & = [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}). \end{aligned}$$

By the monotonicity of the subdifferential, $(\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))^\top (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \subset [0, \infty)$. We now lower bound the second term in the first line for each term indexed by $i = 1, \dots, n$. Since $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is nondecreasing and L -Lipschitz, $\psi(u) - \psi(v) \leq L(u - v)$ holds for any $u > v$, as well as $(\psi(u) - \psi(v))^2 \leq L(u - v)(\psi(u) - \psi(v))$ since $\psi(u) - \psi(v) \geq 0$ by monotonicity. Applying this inequality for each i to $u = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $v = \tilde{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, we obtain

$$L^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \leq [\{\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \leq [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}).$$

The Cauchy-Schwarz inequality completes the proof. \square

Proposition 5.1 generalizes the result of [4] to general loss functions. The following proposition uses a variant of (5.1) to derive Lipschitz properties with respect to (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) .

Proposition 5.2. *Assume that ψ is L -Lipschitz. Let $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be fixed. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ be the estimator in (1.3) with observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) and*

let $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}_i - \mathbf{e}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{b}) + g(\mathbf{b})$, i.e., the same M-estimator as (1.3) with the data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) replaced by $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$. Set $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ as well as $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \psi(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. Then

$$(5.2) \quad \begin{aligned} & n\mu \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + \max(L^{-1}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}\|^2, \mu_\rho \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}\|^2) \\ & \leq (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently

- (i) The map $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$ is Lipschitz on every compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ if $\mu > 0$ as in Assumption 2.3(i).
- (ii) The map $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}), \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$ is Lipschitz on every compact subset of $\{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \phi_{\min}(\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}) > 0\}$ if $\mu_\rho > 0$ as in Assumption 2.3(ii).
- (iii) If $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y}$, we must have $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$. This means that if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ are two distinct solutions of the optimization problem (1.3), then $\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ must hold.

Proof. The KKT conditions for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ read $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in n\partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} \in n\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. If $D_g = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ then

$$(5.3) \quad \begin{aligned} & nD_g + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}) \\ & \supseteq (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}) + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y} + \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}) \\ & = (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}). \end{aligned}$$

Since for any reals $u > s$ inequality $(u - s)(\psi(u) - \psi(s)) \geq L^{-1}(\psi(u) - \psi(s))^2$ holds when ψ is L -Lipschitz and non-decreasing, the first line is bounded from below by $(n \inf D_g + L^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2)$. If Assumption 2.3(ii) is satisfied for some $\mu_\rho > 0$, we also have $(u - s)(\psi(u) - \psi(s)) \geq \mu_\rho(u - s)^2$ so that the first line is bounded from below by $\mu_\rho \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}\|^2$. We also have $\inf D_g \geq \mu \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ by monotonicity of the subdifferential and strong convexity of g with respect to Σ . This proves (5.2).

For (i), by bounding from above the right hand side of (5.2) we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \min(\mu, L^{-1})(\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\| + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\| + \|\Sigma^{1/2}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|). \end{aligned}$$

By taking a fixed \mathbf{X} , e.g. $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{0}_{n \times p}$, this implies that the supremum $S(K) = \sup_{(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \in K} (\|\Sigma^{1/2}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)$ is finite for every compact K . If $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}), (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \in K$ the right hand side is bounded from above by $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\| + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}S(K)$ which proves that the map is Lipschitz on K .

For (ii), we use that on the left hand side of (5.2),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \{\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}\|^2 & = \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + 2[\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(-\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})]^\top [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] \\ & \quad + \|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combined with (5.2) this implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \min \left\{ \mu_\rho \phi_{\min} \left(\frac{1}{n} \Sigma^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \Sigma^{-1/2} \right), L^{-1} \right\} (n \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2) \\ & \leq (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}) \\ & \quad - 2[\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(-\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})]^\top [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]. \end{aligned}$$

The same argument as in (i) applies on every compact where the eigenvalues of $n^{-1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \Sigma^{-1/2}$ are bounded away from 0 and $+\infty$. Finally, (iii) directly follows from (5.2). \square

Proposition 5.3. *Assume that $\psi = \rho'$ is M-Lipschitz. Let Assumption 2.3(i) or Assumption 2.3(ii) be fulfilled. Then the maps $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in (2.2) are Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) . Furthermore the chain rule*

$$(5.4) \quad (\partial/\partial \mathbf{y}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') [\mathbf{I}_n - (\partial/\partial \mathbf{y}) \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]$$

holds for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) .

If instead Assumption 2.3(iii.a) or (iii.b) holds, then there exists an open set $\bar{U} \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with $\mathbb{P}((\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \bar{U}) \rightarrow 1$ such that the maps $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in (2.2) are Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) for almost every $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in U$ and (5.4) holds almost everywhere in \bar{U} .

Proof. For Lebesgue almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , provided that either Assumption 2.3(i) or (ii) holds, there exists an open set $U \ni (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and a compact K with $U \subset K \subset \bar{U}$ where $\bar{U} = \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) : \phi_{\min}(\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}) + \mu > 0\}$. By Proposition 5.2 the maps $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in (2.2) are Lipschitz on K so that the Frechet derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ exist almost everywhere by Rademacher's theorem.

The validity of the chain rule (5.4) boils down to the chain rule for

$$\psi \circ u_i \quad \text{where} \quad u_i : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \quad (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$$

for all $i \in [n]$. Since $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz and u_i is Lipschitz in U , [45, Theorem 2.1.11] implies that $(\partial/\partial y_l) \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \psi'(u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})) (\partial/\partial y_l) u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ almost everywhere in U . (This version of the chain rule is straightforward at points (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) where $\psi'(u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$ and $(\partial/\partial y_l) u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ both exist, as well as at points (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) where $(\partial/\partial y_l) u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = 0$ thanks to $t^{-1} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y} + t \mathbf{e}_l, \mathbf{X}) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})| \leq M t^{-1} |u_i(\mathbf{y} + t \mathbf{e}_l, \mathbf{X}) - u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})|$ in which case $(\partial/\partial y_l) \hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = 0$ and $\psi'(u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$ needs not exist. The non-trivial part is to prove that $\{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in U : \psi'(u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})) \text{ fails to exist and } (\partial/\partial y_l) u_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \neq 0\}$ has Lebesgue measure 0.)

Under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) or (iii.b), we set $\bar{U} = \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) : (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}) \in \Omega_L\}$ where Ω_L is the open set defined in Proposition 12.1. By Proposition 12.1(i), the maps (2.2) are Lipschitz in every compact subset of \bar{U} and the conclusion follows by the same argument. \square

5.2. Lipschitz properties for a given, fixed ε

In this subsection, ε is fixed and we consider functions of $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ as defined in the following Lemma.

Lemma 5.4. *Let $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be fixed and $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ be two design matrices. Define $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon, \mathbf{X})$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\varepsilon + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\varepsilon + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ as well as $\mathbf{r} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\psi}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{r}} = n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$, $\mathbf{h} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{h}} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Let also $D = (\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\tilde{D} = (\|\tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. If for some constant L_* and some open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, for every $\{\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\} \subset U$*

$$(5.5) \quad (\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}L_*(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holds, then we also have the Lipschitz properties

$$(5.6) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h}D^{-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\tilde{D}^{-1})\| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}2L_*$$

$$(5.7) \quad \|\mathbf{r}D^{-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\tilde{D}^{-1}\| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}2L_*$$

$$(5.8) \quad n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\frac{\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{D} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{r}}}{\tilde{D}})\| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}(1 + 2L_*\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}),$$

$$(5.9) \quad |D^{-1} - \tilde{D}^{-1}| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}L_*\tilde{D}^{-1}.$$

Our proof relies in major ways on the Lipschitz property (5.5). The constant L_* and the set U are given for Assumption 2.3(i) in Proposition 5.5 below, and for Assumption 2.3(ii) in Proposition 5.6.

Proof of Lemma 5.4. Assume that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$ without loss of generality, by performing the variable change (2.13) if necessary. By the triangle inequality, $\|\mathbf{h}D^{-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\tilde{D}^{-1}\| \leq \|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| |D^{-1} - \tilde{D}^{-1}| + D^{-1}\|\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|$. Then $D^{-1}\|\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op}L_*$ for the second term by (5.5). For the first term, $\|\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\| |D^{-1} - \tilde{D}^{-1}| \leq D^{-1}|D - \tilde{D}| \leq D^{-1}(\|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ by the triangle inequality, and another application of (5.5) provides (5.6). The exact same argument provides (5.7) since the roles of \mathbf{h} and \mathbf{r} are symmetric in (5.5). For (5.8), we use

$$\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}D^{-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\tilde{D}^{-1}\| \leq \|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op}(\|\mathbf{r}\|D^{-1}) + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op}\|\mathbf{r}D^{-1} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\tilde{D}^{-1}\|.$$

Combined with (5.7) and $\|\mathbf{r}\|D^{-1} \leq 1$, this provides (5.8). For the fourth inequality, by the triangle inequality $|D^{-1} - \tilde{D}^{-1}| \leq (D\tilde{D})^{-1}|D - \tilde{D}| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{L_*}\tilde{D}$ thanks to (5.5). \square

Proposition 5.5. *Let Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.3(i) be fulfilled. Consider the notation of Lemma 5.4 for $\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{h}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \tilde{\mathbf{r}}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$. Then by (5.2) we have*

$$(5.10) \quad \begin{aligned} & \mu\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2 \\ &= \mu\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n \\ &\leq [(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{h})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} + \mathbf{h}^\top (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi})]/n \\ &\leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{h})\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.5) holds for $L_* = \max(\mu^{-1}, 1)$ and all $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$.

Proof. This follows by (5.2) with $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$. The last inequality in (5.10) is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Inequality (5.5) with the given L_* is obtained by dividing by $(\|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. \square

Proposition 5.6. *Let Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.3(ii) be fulfilled. Consider the notation of Lemma 5.4 for $\mathbf{X}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \mathbf{r}, \mathbf{h}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \tilde{\mathbf{r}}, \tilde{\mathbf{h}}$. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \min(1, \mu_\rho \phi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} / n)) \max(\|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2) \\ & \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} [\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{h})\| \vee \|\tilde{\mathbf{r}} - \mathbf{r}\|] [\|\mathbf{r}\| + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\| (1 + 2\mu_\rho \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op})]. \end{aligned}$$

Hence (5.5) holds with $L_* = \max(1, \mu_\rho^{-1}((1 - \gamma)/2)^{-1} 6 \max(1, 2\mu_\rho(2 + \sqrt{\gamma}))$ for all $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in U$ where

$$U = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : (1 - \sqrt{\gamma})/2 \leq \phi_{\min}(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq \phi_{\max}(\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \leq 2 + \sqrt{\gamma}\}.$$

Proof. By (5.2) we have

$$\max(\|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2, \mu_\rho \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^2 / n) \leq [(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{h})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathbf{h}^\top (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi})] / n.$$

We also have $\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\mathbf{h}}\|^2 = \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 + 2[\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})]^\top (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\mathbf{h} + \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\mathbf{h}\|^2$, so that the previous display implies

$$\begin{aligned} & \max(\|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2, \mu_\rho \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 / n) \\ & \leq [(\tilde{\mathbf{h}} - \mathbf{h})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} - \mathbf{h}^\top (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}) - 2\mu_\rho [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})]^\top (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\mathbf{h}] / n \end{aligned}$$

and the desired conclusion holds by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and properties of the operator norm. \square

5.3. Gradient identities

Corollary 5.7. *Let the setting and assumptions of Proposition 5.2 be fulfilled. If $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j \mathbf{v}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{v} \mathbf{e}_j^\top$ for any direction $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} = 0$ and index $j \in [p]$, then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \boldsymbol{\psi}$ and the solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of the optimization problem (1.3) is also solution of the same optimization problem with (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) replaced by $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$. If additionally $\mu > 0$, then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ must hold.*

Proof. The right hand side of (5.2) is 0 for the given $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X}$. This proves that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \boldsymbol{\psi}$. Furthermore, the KKT conditions for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ read $\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} \in n \partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, and we have $\mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}$, and $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. This implies that $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in n \partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is solution to the optimization problem with data $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, even if $\mu = 0$. The claim $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for $\mu > 0$ follows by unicity of the minimizer of strongly convex functions. \square

Proposition 5.8. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ be the M-estimator (1.3) with convex loss ρ and μ -strongly convex penalty g . For a given value of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , assume that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') = \text{diag}(\psi'_1, \dots, \psi'_n)$ where $\psi'_i = \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\boldsymbol{\psi}^0 = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)$. Then for every $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$,

$$\mathbf{b}(t) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{U}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0 - t\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0, \mathbf{X} + t\mathbf{U}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X} \right)$$

satisfies $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{b}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mu \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{b}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ when $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is continuously differentiable.

If $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is only 1-Lipschitz (but not necessarily everywhere differentiable) and additionally the function $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is Lipschitz in some bounded open set U , then $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{b}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ still holds for almost every $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in U$.

Proof. For $t \in \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathbf{y}(t) = \mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{U}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0 - t\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0$ and $\mathbf{X}(t) = \mathbf{X} + t\mathbf{U}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}$ so that $\mathbf{b}(t) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}(t), \mathbf{X}(t))$. Set $\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) = \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y}(t) - \mathbf{X}(t)\mathbf{b}(t))$ where as usual $\boldsymbol{\psi} = \rho'$ acts componentwise. The KKT conditions at t and 0 read

$$\mathbf{X}(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(t) \in n\partial g(\mathbf{b}(t)), \quad \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(0) \in n\partial g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0).$$

By multiplying the difference of these KKT conditions by $(\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)$ and using the strong convexity of g with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, we find $n\mu \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)^\top [\mathbf{X}(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(t) - \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0]$ or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} & n\mu \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)\|^2 + (\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0) \\ & \leq (\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)^\top [\mathbf{X}(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(t) - \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0 + \mathbf{X}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0)]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\dot{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\dot{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{U}\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}$ be the derivatives at 0 uniquely defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\psi}(t) - \boldsymbol{\psi}^0 = t\dot{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + o(t), \quad \mathbf{b}(t) - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0 = t\dot{\mathbf{b}} + o(t), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{X}(t) - \mathbf{X} = t\dot{\mathbf{X}} + o(t).$$

Then $\dot{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')[-\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0 - \mathbf{X}\dot{\mathbf{b}}]$ by the chain rule if $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is continuously differentiable, and $\frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{X}(t)^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{X}^\top \dot{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}^0$. This implies that the right hand side of the previous display is $o(t^2)$, as all terms proportional to t and t^2 cancel out. Dividing by t^2 and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$ proves the claim.

The second claim, where $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is only assumed to be 1-Lipschitz, follows from [45, Theorem 2.1.11] which proves the validity of the chain rule almost everywhere in U for compositions of the form $\boldsymbol{\psi} \circ u$ where $\boldsymbol{\psi} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $u : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are Lipschitz. See also the discussion in the proof of (5.4). \square

We now collect a useful identity as a consequence of Proposition 5.8. First, note that $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{b}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ if and only if $\mathbf{P}\mathbf{X} \frac{d}{dt} \mathbf{b}(t) \Big|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ where $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix with $P_{ii} = 1$ if $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0$ and $P_{ii} = 0$ if $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$. For

every $i, l \in [n]$, with $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_l^\top$ for two canonical vectors in \mathbb{R}^n , and using the notation $\psi_i = \psi(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\psi'_i = \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ for brevity, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_i \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial y_l}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) &= \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \left[(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^0) \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \sum_{k=1}^p x_{lk} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \psi'_i \\ (5.11) \quad &= \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \hat{\beta}_k + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') \mathbf{e}_l. \end{aligned}$$

This proves (2.20). Multiplying to the left by \mathbf{e}_l^\top and summing over $l \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we get

$$\psi_i \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] = \sum_{k=1}^p \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') \mathbf{X} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \hat{\beta}_k + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \right]$$

where we used $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{U}\mathbf{V}] = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}\mathbf{U}]$ and $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{P} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$. In the right hand side, since the quantity inside the trace is a scalar, the trace sign can be omitted. Finally, we relate the right hand side to the derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$. By the chain rule (5.4) we have

$$(\partial/\partial y_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') [\mathbf{e}_i - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial y_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}], \quad (\partial/\partial x_{ik}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') [-\mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_k - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial x_{ik}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$$

so that $\hat{\beta}_k (\partial/\partial y_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + (\partial/\partial x_{ik}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = -\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') \mathbf{X} [\hat{\beta}_k (\partial/\partial y_i) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + (\partial/\partial x_{ik}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}]$ and the previous display can be rewritten as

$$(5.12) \quad \psi_i \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] = - \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \left[\hat{\beta}_k \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

We now prove that in the left-hand side, $\psi_i \text{Tr}[\mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})] = \psi_i \text{d}\hat{\mathbf{f}}$, i.e., multiplication by \mathbf{P} can be omitted.

Lemma 5.9. *Let Assumption 2.3(i), (ii) or (iii.a) be fulfilled. Let $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix with $P_{ii} = 1$ if $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0$ and $P_{ii} = 0$ if $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$. Then for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) and each $i \in [n]$,*

$$(5.13) \quad \psi_i \text{d}\hat{\mathbf{f}} = \psi_i \text{Tr} \left[\mathbf{P} \mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] = - \sum_{k=1}^p \mathbf{e}_k^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \left[\hat{\beta}_k \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right].$$

Under Assumption 2.3(iii.b) and the setting of Proposition 12.1, (5.13) holds for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) in the open set Ω_L of Proposition 12.1.

Proof. Under Assumption 2.3(ii) and (iii.a), $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_n$ so that (5.12) is equivalent to (5.13).

Under Assumption 2.3(i), from (5.12) and the commutation property of the trace, it is sufficient to prove that when $\psi_i \neq 0$ equality $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = (\partial/\partial \mathbf{y}) \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mathbf{P}$ holds, that is, $(\partial/\partial y_l) \boldsymbol{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{0}$ for each l such that $\psi'(y_l - \mathbf{x}_l^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$. Since $\mu > 0$ under Assumption 2.3(i), Proposition 5.8 with $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_l^\top$ implies $(\partial/\partial y_l) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{0}$ if $\psi'(y_l - \mathbf{x}_l^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$, hence (5.13) follows.

Under Assumption 2.3(iii.b), for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) in the open set Ω_L from Proposition 2.4, the discrete sets $\hat{S} = \text{supp}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ are locally constant by the reasoning in the proof Proposition 2.4, and the matrix $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^{1/2} \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}$ is of rank $|\hat{S}|$ by the argument in the proof of Proposition 12.1. Proposition 5.8 with $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top$ again yields $\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y} - t \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{X})_{\hat{S}}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ when $\psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$, while $\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y} - t \mathbf{e}_i, \mathbf{X})_{\hat{S}^c}|_{t=0} = \mathbf{0}$ holds as well because \hat{S} is locally constant. \square

5.4. Deterministic gradient inequalities

Proposition 5.10. *Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a constant vector. Consider a minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of (1.3), assume that the function $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$ is Frechet differentiable at (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) and denote its partial derivatives by $(\partial/\partial x_{ij})$ and $(\partial/\partial y_i)$. We also consider the function $\mathbf{r} : \mathbf{X} \mapsto n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X})$.*

(ii) $\forall j \in [p]$, the quantity $\delta_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr}[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}] h_j + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X})$ satisfies

$$(5.14) \quad |\delta_j| \leq \frac{|h_j|}{\sqrt{n}} + \max_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\mathbf{u}\|=1} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|.$$

(iii) Consequently by the triangle inequality

$$(5.15) \quad \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \delta_j^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. (ii) Since \mathbf{r} is a function of \mathbf{X} given by $\mathbf{r}(\mathbf{X}) = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X})$, taking the directional derivative of \mathbf{r} in a direction $\mathbf{v} \mathbf{e}_j^\top$ with $\mathbf{v}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$ (i.e., by considering $\mathbf{X} + t \mathbf{v} \mathbf{e}_j^\top$ and letting $t \rightarrow 0$) gives

$$\begin{aligned} h_j \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \mathbf{v} + \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X}) & \stackrel{(i)}{=} h_j \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \mathbf{v} + \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \left[\beta_j \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \left[\hat{\beta}_j \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) + \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \right] \\ & \stackrel{(iii)}{=} \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y} + t \mathbf{v} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j, \mathbf{X} + t \mathbf{v} \mathbf{e}_j^\top) \Big|_{t=0} \\ & \stackrel{(iv)}{=} 0 \end{aligned}$$

where (i) follows by the chain rule (4.2), (ii) using $[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}] \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i=1}^n v_i \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i}$ and $h_j + \beta_j = \hat{\beta}_j$, (iii) by the relationship between directional and Frechet derivatives, and (iv) by Corollary 5.7. This implies that the matrix $\mathbf{M}^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ with entries $M_{ki}^{(j)} = \sqrt{n} (\partial/\partial x_{ij}) r_k(\mathbf{X})$ satisfies $\mathbf{M}^{(j)} \mathbf{v} + h_j [\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}] \mathbf{v}$ for all \mathbf{v} with $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{r} = 0$. Hence the nullspace

of the matrix $\mathbf{M}^{(j)} + h_j \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ contains the hyperplane $\{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n : \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{r} = 0\}$ and $\mathbf{M}^{(j)} + h_j \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ has rank is at most one, so that

$$|\operatorname{Tr}[\mathbf{M}^{(j)} + h_j \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}]| \leq \|\mathbf{M}^{(j)} + h_j \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{M}^{(j)}\|_{op} + \|\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\|_{op} |h_j|.$$

Since $\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ has operator norm at most one by Proposition 5.1 when ψ is 1-Lipschitz, we obtain (5.14).

(iii) For (5.15) we sum the squares of (5.14) and used $(a + b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$. For the second term, for any $\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(p)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ each with norm one,

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^{(j)} \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n u_i^{(j)} \frac{\partial r_l}{\partial x_{ij}} \right]^2 \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial r_l}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2$$

by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, where we omitted the dependence in \mathbf{X} for the partial derivatives of \mathbf{r} for brevity. This proves (5.15). \square

6. Inequalities for functions of standard multivariate normals

Proposition 6.1 ([5]). *If $\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ has weakly differentiable components then*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - \sigma^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}))^2] &= \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|^2] + \sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\operatorname{Tr}((\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}))^2)] \\ (6.1) \quad &\leq \sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|^2] + \sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2] \end{aligned}$$

$$(6.2) \quad \leq \sigma^2 \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]\|^2 + 2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2],$$

provided that the last line is finite. If $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})] = \mathbf{0}$ then

$$(6.3) \quad \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - \sigma^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}))^2] \leq 2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2].$$

The first equality in (6.1) is the identity studied in [5] and (6.1) follows by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The second inequality is a consequence of the Gaussian Poincaré inequality [9, Theorem 3.20] applied to each component of \mathbf{f} . The variant (6.5) below will be useful.

Proposition 6.2. *Let $\mathbf{f}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{y}$ be as in Proposition 6.1. Then there exist random variables Z, T, \tilde{T} with $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}^2] \vee \mathbb{E}[T^2] \leq 1$ such that*

$$(6.4) \quad |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - \sigma^2 \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})| \leq \sigma |Z| \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]\| + \sigma^2 2|T| \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

$$(6.5) \quad \leq \sigma |Z| \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\| + \sigma^2 (2|T| + |Z\tilde{T}|) \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Define $\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]$, $Z = \sigma^{-1} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})] / \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]\| \sim N(0, 1)$ and

$$T^2 = (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y}) - Z\sigma \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]\|)^2 / (2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2]).$$

Since $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y})] = 0$, by (6.2) applied to \mathbf{F} we have

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2] \mathbb{E}[T^2] &= \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}) - \operatorname{div} \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y}))^2] \\ &\leq 2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{F}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2] = 2\sigma^4 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2] \end{aligned}$$

so that $\mathbb{E}[T^2] \leq 1$. Next, let $\tilde{T} = [\sigma^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|_F^2]^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})]\| - \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{y})\|]$, which satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}^2] \leq 1$ by the Gaussian Poincaré inequality. By construction of T and \tilde{T} , we obtain (6.5). \square

6.1. Functions of $n \times p$ independent standard normals

Proposition 6.3. *If $\mathbf{X} = (x_{ij}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a matrix with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries and $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ are two vector valued functions, with weakly differentiable components η_1, \dots, η_p and ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n , then*

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial(\rho_i \eta_j)}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial(\rho_i \eta_j)}{\partial x_{lk}} \frac{\partial(\rho_l \eta_k)}{\partial x_{ij}} \\ (6.6) \quad &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial(\rho_i \eta_j)}{\partial x_{lk}} \right)^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^n \left[2\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|^2 \left\| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\rho}}{\partial x_{lk}} \right\|^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|^2 \left\| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\eta}}{\partial x_{lk}} \right\|^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

provided that (6.6) is finite, where for brevity we write $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \boldsymbol{\rho}(\mathbf{X})$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\eta}(\mathbf{X})$, and similarly for the partial derivatives (i.e., omitting the dependence in \mathbf{X}).

Furthermore, if for some open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ we have (i) $\max(\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|, \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|) \leq K$ in U , (ii) $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ is L -Lipschitz on U and (iii) $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is M -Lipschitz on U , then

$$(6.7) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \left(\boldsymbol{\rho}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\eta} - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial(\rho_i \eta_j)}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] \leq K^4 + 2K^2(nL^2 + pM^2).$$

Proof. The first inequality is inequality (6.1) applied by vectorizing \mathbf{X} into a standard normal vector of size np , applied to the function $\mathbb{R}^{np} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{np}$ whose (i, j) -th component is $\rho_i \eta_j$.

For the second claim, by Kirszbraun's theorem, there exists an L -Lipschitz function $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ on U , and an M -Lipschitz function $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ on U . By projecting $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ onto the Euclidean ball of radius K if necessary, we may assume without loss of generality that $\max\{\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}\|, \|\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}\|\} \leq K$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. Since U is open, the derivatives of $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$) coincide on U , so that the left hand side of the second claim is equal to the same expression with $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ replaced by $\bar{\boldsymbol{\rho}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ replaced by $\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$. Since the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the Jacobian of an L -Lipschitz function valued in \mathbb{R}^n is at most $L\sqrt{n}$ (resp. the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the Jacobian of an M -Lipschitz function valued in \mathbb{R}^p is at most $M\sqrt{p}$), the claim is proved. \square

6.2. Application to regularized robust M-estimators

Proposition 6.4. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be fulfilled with $\Sigma = I_p$ and $p/n \leq \gamma$. Additionally, assume that (5.5) holds for all $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ where U is an open set possibly depending on ε and $L_* > 0$ a constant, and assume that $\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in U} \|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op} \leq 2 + \sqrt{\gamma}$. Then*

$$V_6 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \frac{1}{n} (p - \hat{\text{df}}) + \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \frac{\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{n^{3/2}}}{(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} V_6^2] \leq C(\gamma, L_*)$.

The set U and constant L_* are given in Proposition 5.5 under Assumption 2.3(i) and Proposition 5.6 under Assumption 2.3(ii).

Note that in the case of the square loss, $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') = I_n$ and $\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} = I_n - \frac{\partial \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}$ so that V_6 is equal to

$$(6.8) \quad V_5 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \frac{p - \hat{\text{df}}}{n} + (1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}) n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. We apply Proposition 6.3 to $\boldsymbol{\rho} = \mathbf{r} D^{-1}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r} n^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^{-1}$ where $D = (\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Thanks to Lemma 5.4, the functions $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ are Lipschitz on the open set U with Lipschitz constants $L = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2L_*$ and $M = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} 2L_*(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})$. Furthermore, on U inequality $\max\{\|\boldsymbol{\rho}\|, \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|\} \leq K$ for $K = 2 + \sqrt{\gamma}$, so that the right hand side of (6.7) is bounded from above by $C_{15}(\gamma, L_*)$.

We now compute the divergence term that appears in the left hand side of (6.7), i.e.,

$$(6.9) \quad \begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial (D^{-2} r_i \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{ij}} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \underbrace{\frac{r_i}{D^2} \frac{\partial (\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{ij}}}_{(i)} + \underbrace{\frac{\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{D^2} \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}}}_{(ii)} + \underbrace{r_i \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r} \frac{\partial D^{-2}}{\partial x_{ij}}}_{(iii)}. \end{aligned}$$

For (ii), with $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with components $\delta_j = \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] h_j / \sqrt{n} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}}$ the random vector studied in (5.14) we find

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{n^{\frac{1}{2}} D^2} \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}} = -\text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \frac{\mathbf{h}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{n D^2} + \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{n^{\frac{1}{2}} D^2}.$$

Above in the right hand side, the first term appears in V_6 as desired, while we will show below that the second term is negligible. We now focus on term (i). By the product rule

$\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}) = r_i + \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}$ so that

$$(6.10) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\sqrt{n}D^2} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{\partial(\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r})}{\partial x_{ij}} = \frac{p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{\sqrt{n}D^2} + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{\sqrt{n}D^2} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}.$$

By the chain rule (4.2) we obtain almost surely

$$(6.10) \quad \begin{aligned} &= \frac{p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{\sqrt{n}D^2} - \frac{\mathbf{r}^\top \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{nD^2} + \frac{1}{nD^2} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial x_{ij}} + \hat{\beta}_j \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial y_i} \right] \\ &= \frac{p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2}{\sqrt{n}D^2} - \frac{\mathbf{r}^\top \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{nD^2} - \frac{1}{nD^2} \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \psi_i \hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} \end{aligned}$$

thanks to (5.13) for the last equality. For term (iii), we have

$$\text{Rem}_{(iii)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{r_i \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial(D^{-2})}{\partial x_{ij}} = 2D^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{r_i \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}}{\sqrt{n}} \frac{\partial(D^{-1})}{\partial x_{ij}}.$$

By (5.9), the Jacobian of the map $\mathbf{X} \mapsto D^{-1}$ has operator norm at most $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}L_*D^{-1}$. Hence the absolute value of the previous display is bounded from above as

$$(6.11) \quad \begin{aligned} |\text{Rem}_{(iii)}| &\leq 2L_*n^{-1}D^{-2}(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p r_i^2(\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r})^2)^{1/2} \\ &= 2L_*n^{-1}D^{-2}\|\mathbf{r}\|\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\| \\ &\leq 2L_*n^{-1}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}. \end{aligned}$$

In summary, we have shown that

$$(6.9) = \frac{p - \hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}}{\sqrt{n}D^2}\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \frac{\text{Tr}\left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\right]}{nD^2}\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h} + \text{Rem} + \text{Rem}_{(iii)}$$

where $\text{Rem} = D^{-2}(-n^{-1}\mathbf{r}^\top \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h} + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r})$. To conclude it remains to show that Rem and $\text{Rem}_{(iii)}$ are negligible. Using that $\|\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}\|_{op} \leq 1$ by Proposition 5.1 as well as the bound (5.15) on $\|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|$, almost surely we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Rem}| &\leq n^{-1}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + \|\boldsymbol{\delta}\|\|\mathbf{X}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}/D \\ &\leq 2n^{-1}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{X}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}/D. \end{aligned}$$

By (5.5), the Jacobian of the map $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \mathbf{r}(\mathbf{X})$ has operator norm at most $n^{-\frac{1}{2}}L_*D$, so that its Hilbert-Schmidt norm that appears in the previous display is at most L_*D . Hence $|\text{Rem}| \leq 2n^{-1}\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + \|\mathbf{X}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}L_*$ which is uniformly bounded from above by a constant $C_{16}(\gamma, L_*)$ in U . The same conclusion holds for $\text{Rem}_{(iii)}$ thanks to (6.11). \square

7. χ^2 type bounds under dependence

The main result of this section is the following, which is a restatement of Theorem 2.6.

Theorem 7.1. *Assume that \mathbf{X} has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries, that $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is locally Lipschitz and that $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$ almost surely. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left| p \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right| \\ & \leq C_{17} \left\{ 1 + \left(\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\} \sqrt{p} + C_{18} \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

We first provide consequences of this result for regularized M-estimators.

Corollary 7.2. (i) *If $\rho : U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is L -Lipschitz on an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $\|\rho\| \leq 1$ on U , then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \left| p \|\rho\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\rho^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right| \right] \leq C_{19} \left\{ 1 + \sqrt{nL^2} \right\} \sqrt{p} + C_{20} nL^2.$$

(ii) *If additionally $\mathbf{a} = (a_j)_{j \in [p]}$ is random, then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \left| p \|\rho\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\rho^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j - a_j \right)^2 \right| \right] \leq C_{21} (\{1 + \sqrt{\Xi}\} \sqrt{p} + \Xi)$$

where $\Xi = nL^2 + \mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \sum_{j=1}^p (a_j - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}})^2]$.

Proof. By Kirszbraun's theorem, there exists an L -Lipschitz function $\mathbf{r} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\rho = \mathbf{r}$ on U . By projecting \mathbf{r} onto the unit ball if necessary (i.e., replacing \mathbf{r} by $\pi \circ \mathbf{r}$ where $\pi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is the projection onto the unit ball), we may assume without loss of generality that $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$ on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. Since U is open, the derivatives of ρ and \mathbf{r} also coincide on U , so that the left hand side of the first claim is equal to the same expression with ρ replaced by \mathbf{r} . By applying Theorem 7.1 to \mathbf{r} , it is enough to bound from above $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \|(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbf{r}\|^2]$, which is the Hilbert-Schmidt norm (or Frobenius norm) of the Jacobian of \mathbf{r} (by vectorizing the input space of \mathbf{r} , this Jacobian is a matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times (np)}$). Since the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of the Jacobian of an L -Lipschitz function valued in \mathbb{R}^n is at most $L\sqrt{n}$, this proves the first claim.

For the second claim, if $\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have on U

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| |p \|\rho\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}\|^2| - |p \|\rho\|^2 - \|\mathbf{c}\|^2| \right| \\ & \leq |(\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c})^\top (\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c})| \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}\| \|\mathbf{b} + \mathbf{c}\| \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}\| \left\{ \sqrt{|\|\mathbf{b}\|^2 - p \|\rho\|^2|} + \sqrt{|\|\mathbf{c}\|^2 - p \|\rho\|^2|} + 2\sqrt{p} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

thanks to $\|\rho\| \leq 1$ on U . Using $xy \leq x^2/2 + y^2/2$, we eventually obtain

$$(1/2)\left|p\|\rho\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}\|^2\right| \leq (3/2)\left|p\|\rho\|^2 - \|\mathbf{c}\|^2\right| + \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b} - \mathbf{c}\|2\sqrt{p}.$$

We obtain the desired result by setting $b_j = \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\rho} - a_j$ and $c_j = \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\rho} - \sum_{i=1}^n (\partial/\partial x_{ij})\rho_i$, multiplying by the indicator $I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}$ and taking expectations. \square

7.1. Consequences of Theorem 7.1

Proposition 7.3. *Let Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 be fulfilled with $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$ and $p/n \leq \gamma$. Additionally, assume that (5.5) holds for all $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in U \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ where U is an open set possibly depending on ε and $L_* > 0$ a constant. Then*

$$V_8 = \frac{1}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)\sqrt{n}} \left[p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] h_j \right)^2 \right]$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}|V_8|] \leq C(\gamma, L_*)$ for some constant depending only on $\{\gamma, L_*\}$. Furthermore, by expanding the square,

$$(7.1) \quad V_8 = \frac{\frac{p}{n}\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - \left(\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right]\right)^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - 2 \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] \frac{\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{n^{3/2}}}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Note that for the square loss, V_8 is equal to

$$(7.2) \quad V_9 = \frac{\frac{p}{n}\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - \left(1 - \frac{df}{n}\right)^2 \|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - 2\left(1 - \frac{df}{n}\right)n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h}}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Proof. We apply Corollary 7.2 to $\boldsymbol{\rho} = D^{-1}\mathbf{r}$ where $D^{-1} = (\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $a_j = -D^{-1}n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] h_j$ so that the left hand side of Corollary 7.2(ii) is $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}n^{\frac{1}{2}}|V_8|]$. The function $\boldsymbol{\rho} : \mathbf{X} \mapsto D^{-1}\mathbf{r}$ is L -Lipschitz for $L = 2n^{-\frac{1}{2}}L_*$ by (5.7), so that the quantity Ξ in Corollary 7.2 is bounded from above as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi &\leq 4L_*^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(D^{-1}n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] h_j + \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \rho_i}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= 4L_*^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(D^{-1}\delta_j + \sum_{i=1}^n r_i \frac{\partial(D^{-1})}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq 4L_*^2 + \mathbb{E} \left[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \sum_{j=1}^p 2\left(D^{-1}\delta_j\right)^2 + 2\left(\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \frac{\partial(D^{-1})}{\partial x_{ij}}\right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\delta_j = n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{Tr} \left[\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \right] h_j + \sum_{i=1}^n (\partial/\partial x_{ij})r_i$ is the quantity defined in (5.14). By (5.15) and $\|\mathbf{h}\| \leq D$ we have $\sum_{j=1}^p D^{-2}\delta_j^2 \leq 2/n + 2D^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \|(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbf{r}\|^2$. Thanks to (5.5),

the operator norm of the Jacobian of $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \mathbf{r}$ is bounded from above by $L_* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} D$ so that $D^{-2} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \|(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbf{r}\|^2 \leq L_*^2$ by viewing the Jacobian of \mathbf{r} as a matrix of size $n \times (np)$ of rank at most n . This shows that $\sum_{j=1}^p D^{-1} \delta_j^2 \leq 2/n + 2L_*^2$. Furthermore, by (5.9), the operator norm of the Jacobian of D^{-1} is bounded from above by $L_* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^{-1}$, and the Hilbert-Schmidt norm of this Jacobian by $L_* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} D^{-1}$ as well since D^{-1} is scalar valued. Hence by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, $\sum_{j=1}^p (\sum_{i=1}^n r_i \frac{\partial(D^{-1})}{\partial x_{ij}})^2 \leq \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n (\frac{\partial(D^{-1})}{\partial x_{ij}})^2 \leq L_*^2 \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 n^{-1} D^{-2} \leq L_*^2 n^{-1}$.

In summary, the previous display is bounded from above by $4L_*^2 + 4/n + L_*^2 + L_*^2/n$ and the proof is complete. \square

The remaining subsections give a proof of Theorem 7.1.

7.2. A correlation lemma

In the proof of Theorem 7.1, we need to control the correlation between the two mean-zero random variables

$$(7.3) \quad (\mathbf{z}_j^\top f(\mathbf{z}_k))^2 - \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2 \quad \text{and} \quad (\mathbf{z}_k^\top h(\mathbf{z}_j))^2 - \|h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2$$

where $\mathbf{z}_j, \mathbf{z}_k$ are independent standard normal random vectors and f, h are functions $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. If f, h are constant, then the correlation between these two random variables is 0 by independence. If f, h are non-constant, the following gives an exact formula and an upper bound for the correlation of the two random variables in (7.3).

Lemma 7.4. *Let $\mathbf{z}_j, \mathbf{z}_k$ be independent $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ random vectors. Let $f, h : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ deterministic with weakly differentiable components and define the random matrices $\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ by*

$$\mathbf{A} = (\mathbf{z}_j^\top f(\mathbf{z}_k) + f(\mathbf{z}_k) \mathbf{z}_j^\top) \nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)^\top, \quad \mathbf{B} = (\mathbf{z}_k^\top h(\mathbf{z}_j) + h(\mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{z}_k^\top) \nabla h(\mathbf{z}_j)^\top$$

Assume that

$$(7.4) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^4] + \mathbb{E}[\|h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^4] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2] + \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{B}\|_F^2] < +\infty.$$

Then equality

$$(7.5) \quad \mathbb{E}[\{(\mathbf{z}_j^\top f(\mathbf{z}_k))^2 - \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2\} \{(\mathbf{z}_k^\top h(\mathbf{z}_j))^2 - \|h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2\}] = \mathbb{E}[\text{Tr}\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\}],$$

holds. Furthermore,

$$\mathbb{E}|\text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}]| \leq 4\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|_F^2 \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|_F^2 \|h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2]^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Proof. Define $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ with $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{z}_j^\top, \mathbf{z}_k^\top)^\top$ as well as $F, H : \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ by $F(\mathbf{z}_j, \mathbf{z}_k) = (f(\mathbf{z}_k) f(\mathbf{z}_k)^\top \mathbf{z}_j, \mathbf{0}_{\mathbb{R}^n})$ and $H(\mathbf{z}_j, \mathbf{z}_k) = (\mathbf{0}_{\mathbb{R}^n}, h(\mathbf{z}_j) h(\mathbf{z}_j)^\top \mathbf{z}_k)$, where with some abuse of

notation we denoted by $(\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ the vertical concatenation of two columns vectors $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The Jacobians of F, H are the $2n \times 2n$ matrices

$$\nabla F(\mathbf{z})^\top = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} f(\mathbf{z}_k)f(\mathbf{z}_k)^\top & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \\ \hline \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \end{array} \right], \quad \nabla H(\mathbf{z})^\top = \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & \mathbf{B} \\ \hline \mathbf{0}_{n \times n} & h(\mathbf{z}_j)h(\mathbf{z}_j)^\top \end{array} \right].$$

Thus the left hand side in (7.5) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{z}^\top F(\mathbf{z}) - \text{div} F(\mathbf{z}))(\mathbf{z}^\top H(\mathbf{z}) - \text{div} H(\mathbf{z}))]$$

with F, H being weakly differentiable with $\mathbb{E}[\|F(\mathbf{z})\|^2 + \|H(\mathbf{z})\|^2 + \|\nabla H(\mathbf{z})\|_F^2 + \|\nabla F(\mathbf{z})\|_F^2] < +\infty$ thanks to (7.4). The last display is equal to $\mathbb{E}[F(\mathbf{z})^\top H(\mathbf{z}) + \text{Tr}\{\nabla F(\mathbf{z})H(\mathbf{z})\}]$ by Section 2.2 in [5]. Here $F(\mathbf{z})^\top H(\mathbf{z}) = 0$ always holds by construction of F, H and the matrix product by block gives $\text{Tr}\{\nabla H(\mathbf{z})\nabla F(\mathbf{z})\} = \text{Tr}\{\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}\}$.

Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we have $\mathbb{E}|\text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}]| \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{A}\|_F\|\mathbf{B}\|_F] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2]^{1/2}\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{B}\|_F^2]^{1/2}$. By definition of \mathbf{A} and properties of the operator norm,

$$\|\mathbf{A}\|_F \leq \|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|_F |z_j^\top f(\mathbf{z}_k)| + \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\| \|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)z_j\|.$$

By the triangle inequality and independence we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2]^{1/2} &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|_F^2 (z_j^\top f(\mathbf{z}_k))^2]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)z_j\|^2 \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2]^{1/2} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|_F^2 \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2]^{1/2} + \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|_F^2 \|f(\mathbf{z}_k)\|^2]^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

thanks to $\mathbb{E}[z_j z_j^\top | z_k] = \mathbf{I}_n$ and $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)z_j\|^2 | z_k] = \text{Tr}(\nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k)^\top \nabla f(\mathbf{z}_k) \mathbb{E}[z_j z_j^\top | z_k])$. Similarly, $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{B}\|_F^2]^{1/2} \leq 2\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|_F^2 \|h(\mathbf{z}_j)\|^2]$ which completes the proof. \square

7.3. Proof of Theorem 7.1

Proof of Theorem 7.1. Let $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{X}e_j$. Let also $\xi_j = z_j^\top (\mathbf{r} - \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]) - d_j$ where $\mathbb{E}_j[\cdot]$ is the conditional expectation $\mathbb{E}_j[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \mathbf{X}_{-j}]$ and $d_j = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial r_i}{\partial x_{ij}}$ so that $\mathbb{E}_j[\xi_j] = 0$ by Stein's formula. Writing $z_j^\top \mathbf{r} - d_j = \xi_j + z_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]$ and expanding the square, we find

$$\begin{aligned} W &= \sum_{j=1}^p (z_j^\top \mathbf{r} - d_j)^2 - p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^p (\xi_j + z_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}])^2 - p\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^p \left[\underbrace{\xi_j^2}_{(i)} + \underbrace{2\xi_j z_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]}_{(ii)} + \underbrace{(z_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}])^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2}_{(iii)} + \underbrace{\|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2}_{(iv)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This decomposition gives rise to 4 terms that we will bound separately.

(i) $\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \xi_j^2 \leq 2\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \|\frac{\partial r}{\partial x_{ij}}\|^2$ by (6.3) applied with respect to z_j conditionally on \mathbf{X}_{-j} for each $j \in [p]$.

(ii) Since $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}])^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2] \leq 1$ by Jensen's inequality, the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^p a_j b_j] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^p a_j^2]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\sum_{j=1}^p b_j^2]^{1/2}$ yields

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^p |\xi_j \mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]|\right] \leq \sqrt{p} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^p \xi_j^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sqrt{p} \left(2\mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

where the second inequality follows from the inequality derived for term (i).

(iii) For the third term, set $\chi_j = (\mathbf{z}_j^\top \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}])^2 - \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2$ and note that $\mathbb{E}[(\sum_{j=1}^p \chi_j)^2] = \mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k=1}^p \chi_j \chi_k$. For the diagonal terms, $\mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^p \chi_j^2 = 2\mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^4 \leq 2p$ because $\mathbf{z}_j \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_n)$ is independent of $\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]$ and $\mathbb{E}[(Z^2 - s^2)^2] = 2s^4$ if $Z \sim N(0, s^2)$.

For the non-diagonal terms we compute $\mathbb{E}[\chi_j \chi_k]$ using Lemma 7.4 with $f^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{z}_k) = \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]$ and $h^{(j,k)}(\mathbf{z}_j) = \mathbb{E}_k[\mathbf{r}]$ conditionally on $(\mathbf{z}_l)_{l \notin \{j,k\}}$. Thanks to $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$ this gives

$$\mathbb{E}[\chi_j \chi_k] \leq C_{22} \mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\left\|\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_k[\mathbf{r}]}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2 + \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]}{\partial x_{ik}}\right\|^2\right] \leq C_{22} \mathbb{E}\sum_{i=1}^n \left[\mathbb{E}_k\left[\left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2\right] + \mathbb{E}_j\left[\left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ik}}\right\|^2\right]\right],$$

where the second inequality follows by dominated convergence for the conditional expectation (i.e., $(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbb{E}_k[\mathbf{r}] = \mathbb{E}_k[(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\mathbf{r}]$ almost surely) and Jensen's inequality. Finally, summing over all pairs $j \neq k$ we find

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \left(\sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^p \mathbb{E}[\chi_j \chi_k]\right) \leq C_{22} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(p \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2\right) + \left(p \sum_{k=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ik}}\right\|^2\right)\right] = 2p C_{22} \mathbb{E}\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2.$$

(iv) For the last term, using $|\|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2| \leq \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}] - \mathbf{r}\| \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}] + \mathbf{r}\|$ and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left|\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}]\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2\right| &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}] - \mathbf{r}\|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^p \|\mathbb{E}_j[\mathbf{r}] + \mathbf{r}\|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\|\frac{\partial \mathbf{r}}{\partial x_{ij}}\right\|^2\right]^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{4p} \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from $\|\mathbf{r}\| \leq 1$ and the Gaussian Poincaré inequality [9, Theorem 3.20] with respect to $\mathbf{z}_j = \mathbf{X}e_j$ conditionally on $(\mathbf{z}_k)_{k \in [p] \setminus \{j\}}$, which gives $\mathbb{E}_j[(r_l - \mathbb{E}_j[r_l])^2] \leq \mathbb{E}_j \sum_{i=1}^n (\frac{\partial r_l}{\partial x_{ij}})^2$ for every $l = 1, \dots, n$. \square

8. Proofs of the main result: General loss function

Proof of Theorem 2.1. The proof follows the steps described in Section 2.9, with the change of variable (2.13) to reduce the problem to \mathbf{X} with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries, and with the definition of V_6, V_8 in (2.15)-(2.16) so that $V^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2V_6 + V_8$. Proposition 6.4 yields

the desired bound on $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}|V_6|]$ and Proposition 7.3 the desired bound on $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}|V_9|]$, provided that that, under each assumption, we can prove that

$$(5.5) \quad (\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{h} - \tilde{\mathbf{h}})\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} L_* (\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

holds for some constant $L_* = C(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ and all $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in U$ for some open set U possibly depending on ε . All notation in (5.5) is defined in Lemma 5.4.

We set $\Omega = \{\mathbf{X} \in U\}$ and the existence of the open set U and constant L_* are established under each assumption as follows.

- (i) Under Assumption 2.3(i), the constant L_* is given in Proposition 5.5 and we define the open set U as $U = \{\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} < 2 + \sqrt{\gamma}\}$. Then $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \notin U) \leq e^{-n/2}$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \in U) \rightarrow 1$ by [15, Theorem II.13].
- (ii) Under Assumption 2.3(ii), U and L_* are given in Proposition 5.6. Here, $\gamma < 1$ and $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{X} \notin U) \leq e^{-n/2} + e^{-(1-\sqrt{\gamma})^2 n/8}$ again by [15, Theorem II.13] so that $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$ holds.
- (iii) (a) Under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) for the Lasso, choose any $d_* \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that both (12.20) and (12.4) hold, and define s_* as a function of $d_*, \gamma, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*$ by Lemma 12.3. The set U and constant L_* are given by combining Proposition 12.1 and Lemma 12.3, that is, set $U = \{\mathbf{X} : (\varepsilon, \mathbf{X}) \in \Omega_L\}$ for the open set Ω_L in Proposition 12.1.
- (b) Under Assumption 2.3(iii.b) for the Huber loss with ℓ_1 penalty, choose any $d_* \in (0, 1)$ small enough such that both (12.20) and (12.4) hold, and define s_* as a function of $d_*, \gamma, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*$ by Lemma 12.2 (more specifically (12.11)). The set U and constant L_* are given by combining Proposition 12.1 and Lemma 12.2. Specifically we set $U = \{\mathbf{X} : (\varepsilon, \mathbf{X}) \in \Omega_L\}$ for the open set Ω_L in Proposition 12.1.

The constant L_* thus only depends on $\{\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*\}$, so that $\mathbb{E}[I\{\mathbf{X} \in U\}(|V_6| + |V_9|)] \leq C(\gamma, \mu, \mu_g, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*)$ by Propositions 6.4 and 7.3.

For the second claim, inequality $\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \leq 1$ holds by Proposition 5.1 with $L = 1$ and it remains to prove the lower bounds on $\frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}]$. Under Assumption 2.3(ii), for a fixed \mathbf{X} and any $\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ with $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p}$ we have by (5.1) and by strong convexity of ρ , with the notation of Proposition 5.1,

$$\mu_\rho \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \leq [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}]^\top [\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \quad \text{provided that } (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p}.$$

Since $(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{X}$ is zero, this can be equivalently rewritten as

$$\mu_\rho (\|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{X}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2) \leq [\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}]^\top [\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \quad \text{provided that } (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{y})^\top \mathbf{X} = \mathbf{0}_{1 \times p}.$$

The map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is Frechet differentiable at \mathbf{y} for almost every \mathbf{y} and $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ is positive semi-definite by Proposition 2.2. Let $(\mathbf{u}_1, \dots, \mathbf{u}_{n-p})$ be an orthonormal family of vectors of size n in the complement of the column space of \mathbf{X} . For almost every \mathbf{y} ,

since the divergence of a Frechet differentiable vector field can be computed in any orthonormal basis,

$$\mathrm{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \geq \sum_{k=1}^{n-p} \mathbf{u}_k^\top \frac{d}{dt} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{u}_k, \mathbf{X}) \Big|_{t=0} \geq (n-p)\mu_\rho \geq n(1-\gamma)\mu_\rho$$

where the second inequality follows by setting $\widetilde{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y} + t\mathbf{u}_k$ in the previous display.

It remains to prove $\frac{1}{n} \mathrm{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \geq 1 - d_*$ in Ω under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) or (iii.b). For the d_* chosen in the list item (iii.a) two paragraphs above, we have $\widehat{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{f} = \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n$ by Lemma 12.3 so that $1 - \widehat{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{f}/n = \frac{1}{n} \mathrm{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \geq 1 - d_*$ holds in Ω . For the d_* chosen in the list item (iii.b) two paragraphs above, we have $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n$ in Ω by Lemma 12.2 with the notation $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ defined in (11.1). By Proposition 2.4 we have $\mathrm{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] = |\widehat{I}| - |\widehat{S}|$ where $|\widehat{I}| = n - \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0$ so that $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n$ can be rewritten $\mathrm{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \geq n - d_*n$ as desired. \square

9. Rotational invariance of regularized least-squares

The crux of the following proposition is that if \mathbf{X} has iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ rows then \mathbf{X} has the same distribution as $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}$ where $\mathbf{R} \in O(n)$ is a random rotation such that $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{u}$ is uniformly distributed on the sphere for any deterministic \mathbf{u} with $\|\mathbf{u}\| = 1$. Consequently if $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is a penalized M-estimator with square loss as in (3.1) then $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}) = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X})$ because $\|\mathbf{R}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b})\|^2 = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}\|^2$ for all $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Thus the distribution of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is unchanged if the noise $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is replaced by $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} = \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_2 \mathbf{v}$ where \mathbf{v} is uniformly distributed on the sphere of radius 1, as long as $(\mathbf{v}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X})$ are mutually independent.

Proposition 9.1. *Let $\rho(u) = u^2/2$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in (3.1), $\widehat{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{f}$ in (2.4) and let $\mathbf{r} = n^{-1/2}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. Assume that \mathbf{y} has continuous distribution with respect to the Lebesgue measure. Assume that \mathbf{X} has iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ rows and that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is independent of \mathbf{X} . Then*

$$(9.1) \quad V_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{n} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 (1 - \frac{\widehat{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{f}}{n})}{(\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2/n + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\| n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathbf{r}\|) n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}[|V_1|] \leq C_{23}$.

Since $\mathbf{y} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}$, the assumption that \mathbf{y} has continuous distribution is satisfied when $\boldsymbol{\beta} \neq \mathbf{0}$ or $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ has continuous distribution.

Proof. We consider $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ deterministic without loss of generality (if necessary, by replacing all probability and expectation signs in the following argument by the conditional probability and conditional expectation given $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$). Note that V_1 can be rewritten as

$$V_1 = n^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 (1 - \widehat{\mathrm{d}}\mathbf{f}/n)}{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\| \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|}.$$

Throughout, let $\mathbf{R} \in O(n) \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ be a random rotation (i.e., \mathbf{R} satisfies $\mathbf{R}^\top \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{I}_n$) such that $\mathbf{R}\mathbf{v}$ is uniformly distributed on the sphere S^{n-1} for every $\mathbf{v} \in S^{n-1}$, and such that \mathbf{R} is independent of \mathbf{X} . Then, write

$$\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})^\top (\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) - \boldsymbol{\beta})).$$

Let $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^{-1}\rho$ where $\rho^2 \sim \chi_n^2$ is independent of $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{R})$. Then $\mathbf{g} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $\rho^2 = \|\mathbf{g}\|^2$. Since \mathbf{X} has iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ rows, by rotational invariance of the normal distribution, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}$ has also iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ rows and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ is independent of \mathbf{R} , and $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$ is independent of \mathbf{g} (this independence is the key). By definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, since \mathbf{R} preserves the Euclidean norm we have

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} + \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}\mathbf{g} + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}).$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{g}\|\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^{-1}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{X}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) - \boldsymbol{\beta})) \\ (9.2) \quad &= \mathbf{g}^\top (\mathbf{R}\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}\mathbf{g} + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) - \boldsymbol{\beta})) \\ &= \mathbf{g}^\top (f \circ h(\mathbf{g})) \end{aligned}$$

where $f(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}))$ and $h(\mathbf{g}) = \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}\mathbf{g} + \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are two vectors fields $\mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. With $(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon})$ being fixed, the function f is 1-Lipschitz [4] and Frechet differentiable almost everywhere by Rademacher's theorem. At a point \mathbf{z} where f is Frechet differentiable, the partial derivatives of f with respect to $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_n)^\top$ are given by

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{I}_n - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$$

and the partial derivatives of h are given by $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{g})h(\mathbf{g}) = \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^\top \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2})$ for $\mathbf{g} \neq \mathbf{0}$. Since $h(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}$, the random vector $h(\mathbf{g})$ has continuous distribution with respect to the Lebesgue measure and f is Frechet differentiable at $h(\mathbf{g})$ with probability one. Hence with probability one, if $\mathbf{J} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \mathbf{z}}(h(\mathbf{g}))$, the Jacobian of $f \circ h$ is obtained by the chain rule

$$(9.3) \quad \frac{\partial (f \circ h)}{\partial \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{J} \frac{\partial h}{\partial \mathbf{g}}(\mathbf{g}) = \mathbf{J} \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^\top}{\|\mathbf{g}\|^2} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}.$$

Since f is 1-Lipschitz, it follows that the operator norm of the Jacobian of $f \circ h$ is bounded by $\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}$, and the Frobenius norm of the Jacobian of $f \circ h$ is bounded by $\sqrt{n}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}$. Inequality (6.5) from Proposition 6.2 applied to the vector field $f \circ h$ yields that for some random variables Z, T as in Proposition 9.1, we have

$$|\mathbf{g}^\top \{f \circ h(\mathbf{g})\} - \text{Tr}[\nabla(f \circ h)(\mathbf{g})]| \leq |Z| \|f \circ h(\mathbf{g})\| + (|Z\tilde{T}| + 2|T|) \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 n \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2}]}$$

Using (9.2), the identity $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2}] = 1/(n-2)$ and (9.3) and $\|f(\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|\mathbf{g})\| = \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})\|$, the previous display can be rewritten

$$\begin{aligned} & |\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^\top \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2})]| \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\| \left(|Z| \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})\| + (|Z\tilde{T}| + 2|T|) \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2 n / (n-2)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since \mathbf{J} has operator norm at most one, we have $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}] \leq n$ as well as

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}]/n - \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{g}\mathbf{g}^\top \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2})]| &\leq \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} + \|\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} - 1/n| \text{Tr} \mathbf{J} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} + |n\|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2} - 1| \\ &= \|\mathbf{g}\|^{-2}(1 + |n - \|\mathbf{g}\|^2|). \end{aligned}$$

Assume that $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}] = (n - \hat{\text{df}})$ always holds—this will be proved in the next paragraph. Combining the two previous displays yields that almost surely

$$|V_1| \leq \frac{n^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\mathbf{g}\|} \left(|Z| + (|Z\tilde{T}| + 2|T|) \sqrt{\frac{n}{n-2}} \right) + n^{1/2} \frac{1 + |n - \|\mathbf{g}\|^2|}{\|\mathbf{g}\|^2}$$

and the right hand side has expectation at most C_{24} by Hölder's inequality, properties of the χ_n^2 distribution, $\mathbb{E}[T^2] \vee \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}^2] \leq 1$ and $Z \sim N(0, 1)$.

It remains to show that $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{J}] = (n - \hat{\text{df}})$, i.e., to explain the relationship between the Jacobian \mathbf{J} of f at $h(\mathbf{g})$ and the Jacobian of $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$. Since equality $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X})$ always holds, by differentiation with respect to \mathbf{y} we obtain, where the directional derivatives exist, that

$$\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial y_i}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \sum_{l=1}^n R_{li} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial y_l}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}) \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X})\mathbf{R},$$

where $\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and $\frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X})$ are row vectors. Since $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X}$ and $f(\mathbf{z}) = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{z}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, this implies that

$$\mathbf{X} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \mathbf{R}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{\partial \mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{R}\mathbf{X})\mathbf{R}$$

and $n - \hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})] = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{z})f(h(\mathbf{g}))]$ using that for any matrix \mathbf{M} , $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{R}^{-1}\mathbf{M}\mathbf{R}] = \text{Tr} \mathbf{M}$. \square

10. Proofs of the main result: Square loss

Proof of Theorem 3.1. Without loss of generality we may assume that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$ as explained in Section 2.9. We set $\Omega = \{\mathbf{X} \in U\} \cap \{\|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{\gamma} + 2\}$ for the same open set U as for general loss in the proof of Theorem 2.1 in Section 8. Since $\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{\gamma} + 2) \rightarrow 1$ by [15, Theorem II.13], this proves $\mathbb{P}(\Omega) \rightarrow 1$.

We first prove the first inequality in (3.3). Define V_1, V_5, V_9 by

$$(6.8) \quad V_5 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 \frac{p-\hat{\text{df}}}{n} + (1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n})n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{h}}{(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$(7.2) \quad V_9 = \frac{\frac{p}{n}\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{r}\|^2 - (1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n})^2\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 - 2(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n})n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{h}}{(\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{h}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$(9.1) \quad V_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{r}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{h} - \frac{1}{n}\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n})}{(\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2/n + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{r}\|)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Now let $\text{LHS}_A = (1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \{ \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2 \} - \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n$ be the quantity appearing in the left hand side of (3.3). Then we have

$$-\text{LHS}_A = (V_5 + V_9)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2) + V_1n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)(\|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2/n + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathbf{r}\|).$$

It follows by the triangle inequality and $|1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n| \leq 1$ that

$$|\text{LHS}_A| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(|V_5| + |V_9| + 2|V_1|)(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2/n).$$

Now let $\text{LHS}_B = (1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 - n^{-2} \{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2(2\hat{\text{df}} - p) + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \}$ be the quantity from the left hand side of the second line of (3.3). Then similarly to the proof of Theorem 2.1 we have

$$\begin{aligned} -\text{LHS}_B &= (2V_5 + V_9)(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ |\text{LHS}_B| &\leq (2|V_5| + |V_9|)(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, for $\text{LHS}_C = (1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2 \sigma_*^2 - n^{-2} \{ \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2(n - (2\hat{\text{df}} - p)) - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \}$ we have the decomposition $\text{LHS}_C = \text{LHS}_A - \text{LHS}_B$ so that $|\text{LHS}_C| \leq (3|V_5| + 2|V_9| + 2|V_1|)(\|\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|^2/n)n^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ holds. To conclude we set $V^* = 3|V_5| + 2|V_9| + 2|V_1|$ so that each inequality in (3.3) holds. Propositions 9.1, 6.4 and 7.3 show that $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V^*|] \leq C(\mu, \gamma, \varphi, \eta)$.

It remains to prove that $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^{-1}$ is bounded from above uniformly in Ω .

- (i) If $\mu > 0$ (i.e., the penalty is strongly convex with respect to $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$), in Ω we have $\|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})$. In this event, the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is L -Lipschitz with $L = (1 + \mu(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})^{-2})^{-1} < 1$. Indeed if \mathbf{X} is fixed and $\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ are two response vectors, multiplying by $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ the KKT conditions $\mathbf{X}^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in \partial g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\mathbf{X}^\top(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and taking the difference, we find

$$(10.1) \quad n(\partial g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \|\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 \ni (\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}})^\top \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

Since the infimum of $(\partial g(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is at least $\mu \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ by strong convexity of g , this proves that $(\mu(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})^{-2} + 1)\|\mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}})^\top \mathbf{X}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ in Ω . Thus the operator norm of $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is bounded by $L = (\mu(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})^{-2} + 1)^{-1} < 1$. It follows that $\hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] \leq nL$ and $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^{-1} \leq (1 - L)^{-1}$.

- (ii) If $\gamma < 1$ then $\hat{\text{df}}/n \leq \gamma$ and $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^{-1} \leq (1 - \gamma)^{-1}$ because $\hat{\text{df}}$ is the trace of a matrix with operator norm at most one [4] and rank at most p .
- (iii) Under Assumption 3.1(iii) for the Lasso, recall that s_* is defined as follows: First pick some $d_* \in (0, 1)$ small enough to satisfy (12.20) and then define s_* as a function of d_*, η, φ . Then $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n$ holds in Ω by Lemma 12.3 so that $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^{-1} \leq (1 - d_*)^{-1}$.

□

Proof of Corollary 3.2. Recall that $(1 - \hat{d}f/n)^{-1} \leq C_*$ for some constant C_* depending only on $\{\gamma, \mu, \varphi, \eta\}$. The first inequality in (3.3) thus yields on Ω

$$\begin{aligned} C_*^{-2} |\hat{\tau}^2 - (\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2)| &\leq V^* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2), \\ (C_*^{-2} - V^* n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) |\hat{\tau}^2 - (\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2)| &\leq V^* n^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n + \hat{\tau}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n) = (1 - \hat{d}f/n)^2 \hat{\tau}^2 \leq \hat{\tau}^2$ this implies

$$(10.2) \quad |\hat{\tau}^2 - (\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{h}\|^2 + \sigma_*^2)| / \hat{\tau}^2 \leq \frac{2|V^*|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{C_*^{-2} - |V^*|n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}$$

thanks to $\mathbb{E}[I\{\Omega\}|V^*] \leq C_{25}(\gamma, \mu, \varphi, \eta)$ and the right hand side of (10.2) is $O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ by properties of V^* given in Theorem 3.1. The two other inequalities are obtained similarly. \square

11. Proofs of auxiliary results

11.1. Proof of some properties of the Jacobian $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$

We will prove the following proposition that encompasses the claims of Proposition 2.2.

Proposition 11.1. *Assume that ρ is convex differentiable and that $\psi = \rho'$ is 1-Lipschitz. Then $\rho(u) = \min_{v \in \mathbb{R}} \{(u - v)^2/2 + h(v)\}$ for some convex function h . Consider*

$$(11.1) \quad (\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} - \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 / (2n) + g(\mathbf{b}) + \sum_{i=1}^n h(\theta_i) / n.$$

Then for every solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to the optimization problem (1.3), there exists a solution $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ to the optimization problem (11.1) such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\mathbf{b}}$ and $\psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$. Furthermore for every fixed \mathbf{X} ,

- (i) For almost every \mathbf{y} , the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is Frechet differentiable at \mathbf{y} ,
- (ii) For almost every \mathbf{y} , the Jacobian $(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is symmetric positive semi-definite with operator norm at most one and consequently

$$\text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] \in [0, n],$$

- (iii) If additionally Assumption 2.3(i), (ii) or (iii.a) holds then

$$\boldsymbol{\psi} \neq \mathbf{0} \quad \text{implies} \quad \hat{d}f = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{P}(\partial/\partial \mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] \leq |\hat{I}|$$

almost everywhere where $\hat{I} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) > 0\}$ is the set of inliers and $\mathbf{P} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal matrix with $P_{ii} = 1$ for $i \in \hat{I}$ and $P_{ii} = 0$ for $i \notin \hat{I}$.

Proof of Proposition 2.2. If $\psi = \rho'$ is 1-Lipschitz then $f(u) = u^2/2 - \rho$ is convex and 1-smooth (in the sense that f' is again 1-Lipschitz), so that its Fenchel conjugate $f^*(v) = \max_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \{uv - f(u)\}$ is 1-strongly convex (in the sense that $v \mapsto f^*(v) - v^2/2$ is convex). Let $h(v) = f^*(v) - v^2/2$. For this choice of h , we have thanks to $f^{**} = f$

$$\min_{v \in \mathbb{R}} \left\{ \frac{(u-v)^2}{2} + h(v) \right\} = \frac{u^2}{2} - \max_{v \in \mathbb{R}} \{uv - f^*(v)\} = \frac{u^2}{2} - \left(\frac{u^2}{2} - \rho(u) \right) = \rho(u).$$

If ρ is the Huber loss (2.7) this construction was already well studied and in this case $h(v) = |v|$, see for instance [19, Section 6] or [14] and the references therein.

Next consider the M -estimator with square loss and design matrix $[\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+n)}$ defined by (11.1). The KKT conditions are given by

$$(11.2) \quad \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \in n\partial g(\hat{\mathbf{b}}), \quad y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\theta}_i \in \partial h(\hat{\theta}_i), \quad i \in [n]$$

where ∂g and ∂h denote the subdifferentials of g and h . That is, $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is solution to (11.1) if and only if (11.2) holds. We claim that one solution of the optimization problem (11.1) is given by $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is any solution in (1.3). Indeed, the first part in (11.2) holds by the optimality conditions $\mathbf{X}^\top \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in n\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ as a solution to the optimization problem (1.3); it remains to check that $y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\theta}_i \in \partial h(\hat{\theta}_i)$ holds for all $i \in [n]$, or equivalently that

$$(11.3) \quad \psi(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \in \partial h(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \psi(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$$

by definition of $\hat{\theta}_i$. By additivity of the subdifferential, $v + \partial h(v) = \partial f^*(v)$. Furthermore $u \in \partial f^*(v)$ if and only if $f^{**}(u) + f^*(v) = uv$ by property of the Fenchel conjugate, where here we have $f^{**}(u) = f(u) = u^2/2 - \rho(u)$ since here f is convex and finite valued. We also have $v \in \partial f(u)$ iff $f(u) + f^*(v) = uv$, and here $\partial f(u) = \{u - \psi(u)\}$ is a singleton. Combining these pieces together, for any $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} v = u - \psi(u) &\text{ iff } v \in \partial f(u) \\ &\text{ iff } f(u) + f^*(v) = uv \\ &\text{ iff } f^{**}(u) + f^*(v) = uv \\ &\text{ iff } u \in \partial f^*(v) \\ &\text{ iff } u - v \in \partial h(v). \end{aligned}$$

Hence taking $u = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $v = u - \psi(u)$, the previous sentence implies that $\psi(u) \in \partial h(u - \psi(u))$ and the previous display (11.3) must hold for all $i \in [n]$. This proves that the given $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is solution to (11.1).

By [8, Proposition J.1] applied to $(\hat{\mathbf{b}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ with design matrix $[\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{I}_n]$, the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is 1-Lipschitz on \mathbb{R}^n , and for almost every $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ this map has symmetric positive semi-definite Jacobian. Since $\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{b}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \psi(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, this proves (i) and (ii).

For (iii), for a given \mathbf{X} the map $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is Lipschitz by (5.2) and thus differentiable almost everywhere. Let $\mathbf{S} = (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$. By the chain rule [45, Theorem 2.1.11] we have $\mathbf{S} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\mathbf{I}_n - (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ where \mathbf{S} is symmetric with eigenvalues in $[0, 1]$ by (ii). It follows that $\mathbf{P}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{P} - \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^\dagger \mathbf{S}$ where $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^\dagger$ is the Moore-Penrose pseudo inverse of $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$. Since $\text{Tr}[\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^\dagger \mathbf{S}] = \text{Tr}[(\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{S} (\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')^\dagger)^{\frac{1}{2}}] \geq 0$ because the matrix inside the latter trace is positive semi-definite, the claim $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{P}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] \leq |\widehat{I}|$ is proved. It remains to prove that $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{P}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] = \widehat{df}$, i.e., multiplication by the matrix \mathbf{P} can be omitted. Under Assumption 2.3(ii) or (iii.a), there is nothing to prove as $\boldsymbol{\psi}' \geq \mu_\rho > 0$ and $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_n$ (we can always modify $\boldsymbol{\psi}'$ in a set of measure 0 to ensure that Assumption 2.3(ii) implies $\boldsymbol{\psi}' \geq \mu_\rho > 0$). Under Assumption 2.3(i) for $\mu > 0$, Proposition 5.8 with $\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top$ shows that $\psi_i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = 0$ if $\boldsymbol{\psi}'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0$ so that by the commutation property of the trace $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{P}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] = \text{Tr}[(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\mathbf{P}] = \widehat{df}$ if $\psi_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in [n]$. \square

11.2. Elastic-Net penalty and Huber Lasso

Proof of Proposition 2.3. The KKT conditions read $\mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - n\mu \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in n\lambda \partial \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1$ where $\partial \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$ denotes the sub-differential of the ℓ_1 norm at $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We first prove that the KKT conditions hold strictly with probability one, in the sense that

$$\mathbb{P}(\forall j \in [p], j \notin \widehat{S} \text{ implies } \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in (-n\lambda, n\lambda)) = 1.$$

Let j_0 be fixed and let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ be the solution to the same optimization problem as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, with the additional constraint that the j_0 -th coordinate is always set to 0. Then $\{j_0 \notin \widehat{S}\} = \{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}$ as the solution of each optimization problem is unique thanks to $\mu > 0$. Let \mathbf{X}_{-j_0} be \mathbf{X} with j_0 -th column removed. The conditional distribution of $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{e}_{j_0}$ given $(\mathbf{X}_{-j_0}, \mathbf{y})$ is continuous because (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) has continuous distribution. Hence $\mathbf{e}_{j_0}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})$ also has continuous distribution conditionally on $(\mathbf{X}_{-j_0}, \mathbf{y})$ when $\boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, so that $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{e}_{j_0}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\psi}(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) \in \{-n\lambda, n\lambda\} | \mathbf{X}_{-j_0}, \mathbf{y}) = 0$ because a continuous distribution has no atom. The unconditional probability is also 0 by the tower property. This shows that $\mathbb{P}(j_0 \notin \widehat{S} \text{ and } \mathbf{e}_{j_0}^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \{-n\lambda, n\lambda\}) = 0$ for all j_0 . The union bound over all $j_0 \in [p]$ proves that the KKT conditions hold strictly with probability one, as desired.¹

The maps $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ are Lipschitz continuous on every compact by Proposition 5.2(i) as $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is invertible. At a point $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ where the KKT conditions hold strictly, the KKT conditions stay strict and \widehat{S} stay the same in a neighborhood of $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ because the continuity of $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - n\mu \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$ ensure that $\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - n\mu \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$ stay bounded away from $\{-n\lambda, n\lambda\}$ for every $j \in [p]$ not in the active set at $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$. Furthermore, by (5.2) there exists an open set $U \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with $U \ni (\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ such that the maps $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \mapsto \widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ are Lipschitz in U , and the chain rule

¹Similar arguments to prove that the KKT conditions hold strictly are used in [5, Proposition 3.9] for the Lasso or [8, Lemma L.1] for the Group-Lasso. The above argument is provided for completeness.

(5.4) yields $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ for almost every $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in U$. In a neighborhood of a point $(\mathbf{y}_0, \mathbf{X}_0)$ where the KKT conditions hold strictly and where the aforementioned chain rule holds, since \widehat{S} is locally constant we have $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}_{\widehat{S}^c \times [n]}$ as well as

$$\mathbf{X}_{\widehat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')[\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}] - n\mu(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}_{\widehat{S} \times [n]}.$$

By simple algebra, this implies $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\widehat{S}} = (\mathbf{X}_{\widehat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}_{\widehat{S}} + \mu n \mathbf{I}_{|\widehat{S}|})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\widehat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$ and the desired expressions for $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2.4. For the Huber loss with ℓ_1 -penalty, the M-estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ satisfies

$$(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \arg \min_{(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R}^n} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \kappa\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 / (2n) + \lambda(\|\mathbf{b}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1)$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is some constant, see e.g. [14] and the references therein or Proposition 11.1 with $h(\cdot)$ proportional to $|\cdot|$ for the Huber loss. Let $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$. Then $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is a Lasso solution with data $(\mathbf{y}, \bar{\mathbf{X}})$ where the design matrix is $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X} | \kappa \mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}$.

In this paragraph, we show that if \mathbf{X} has continuous distribution then $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ satisfies Assumption 3.1 of [5] with probability one. That assumption requires that for any $(\delta_j)_{j \in [p+n]} \{-1, +1\}^{p+n}$ and any columns $\mathbf{c}_{j_1}, \dots, \mathbf{c}_{j_{n+1}}$ of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ with $j_1 < \dots < j_{n+1}$, the matrix

$$(11.4) \quad \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{c}_{j_1} & \cdots & \mathbf{c}_{j_{n+1}} \\ \delta_{j_1} & \cdots & \delta_{j_{n+1}} \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{(n+1) \times (n+1)}$$

has rank $n + 1$. We reorder the columns so that any column of the form \mathbf{c}_{p+i} , $i \in [n]$ is the i -th column after reordering, and note that $\mathbf{c}_{p+i} = \kappa \mathbf{e}_i$. Then there exists a value of $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ such that the above matrix, after reordering the columns, is equal to

$$\left(\begin{array}{ccc|c} \kappa \mathbf{I}_n & & & \mathbf{0}_{n \times 1} \\ \delta_{k_1} & \cdots & \delta_{k_n} & \delta_{k_{n+1}} \end{array} \right)$$

for some permutation (k_1, \dots, k_{n+1}) of (j_1, \dots, j_{n+1}) . Since the previous display has nonzero determinant $\kappa^n \delta_{k_{n+1}}$, the determinant of matrix (11.4), viewed as a polynomial of the coefficients of \mathbf{X} , is a non-zero polynomial. Since non-zero polynomials have a zero-set of Lebesgue measure 0 [25], this proves that (11.4) is rank $n + 1$ with probability one.

Hence with probability one, by Proposition 3.9 in [5], the solution $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ is unique, $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq n$ and the KKT conditions of the optimization problem of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ hold strictly almost everywhere in (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) (see [38] for related results). This shows that the sets \widehat{S} and \widehat{I} , viewed as a function of \mathbf{y} while \mathbf{X} is fixed, are constant in a neighborhood of \mathbf{y} for almost every (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) . Now the set of $\{i \in [n] : \widehat{\theta}_i \neq 0\}$ exactly correspond to the outliers $\{i \in [n] : \boldsymbol{\psi}'(\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0\} = [n] \setminus \widehat{I}$ and $\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq n$ holds if and

only if $|\hat{S}| + (n - |\hat{I}|) \leq n$. This proves that $|\hat{S}| \leq |\hat{I}|$ almost surely. Furthermore, almost surely in (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , the derivative of $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \kappa\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ exists and is equal to the orthogonal projection onto the linear span of $\{\mathbf{e}_i, i \in [n] \setminus \hat{I}\} \cup \{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{e}_j, j \in \hat{S}\}$. We construct an orthonormal basis of this linear span as follows: First by considering the vectors $\{\mathbf{e}_i, i \in [n] \setminus \hat{I}\}$ and then completing by a basis $(\mathbf{u}_k)_{k \in \hat{S}}$ of the orthogonal complement of $\{\mathbf{e}_i, i \in [n] \setminus \hat{I}\}$. Note that this orthogonal complement is exactly the column span of $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}$. The orthogonal projection onto the linear span of $\{\mathbf{e}_i, i \in [n] \setminus \hat{I}\} \cup \{\mathbf{X}\mathbf{e}_j, j \in \hat{S}\}$ is thus $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus \hat{I}} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^\top + \sum_{k \in \hat{S}} \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_k^\top$. Since $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$ is constant in a neighborhood of \mathbf{y} and $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')$ zeros out all rows corresponding to outliers,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} &= (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ &= (\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')\bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \\ &= \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}')(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\bar{\mathbf{X}}\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sum_{k \in \hat{S}} \mathbf{u}_k \mathbf{u}_k^\top \end{aligned}$$

which is exactly the orthogonal projection $\hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ defined in the proposition, as desired. The almost sure identity $(\partial/\partial\mathbf{y})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\psi}') - \hat{\mathbf{Q}}$ is obtained by the chain rule: Here $\boldsymbol{\psi}$ is differentiable at $y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for all $i \in [n]$ with probability one since the fact that the KKT conditions of $\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ hold strictly imply that no $y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is a kink of $\boldsymbol{\psi}$. \square

12. Huber Lasso: Proofs

This section provides the necessary lemmas to prove the main result under Assumption 2.3(iii.a) and (iii.b). Assumption (iii.b) corresponds to the ℓ_1 penalty combined with a scaled Huber loss is used as the loss function: for tuning parameters λ_*, λ ,

$$(12.1) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_*^2 \rho_H \left((\sqrt{n}\lambda_*)^{-1} (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{b}) \right) + \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1 \right)$$

where ρ_H is the Huber loss (2.7). We let $\hat{O} = \{i \in [n] : \boldsymbol{\psi}'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0\}$ be the set of outliers.

To control the sparsity and number of outliers of the M -estimator with Huber loss and ℓ_1 penalty (12.1), the following equivalent definition of the estimator will be useful. The M -estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is equal to the first p components of the solution $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n}$ of the optimization problem

$$(12.2) \quad (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = \arg \min_{(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n}} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\boldsymbol{\theta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 / (2n) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 + \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1.$$

This representation of the Huber Lasso $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is well known in the study of M -estimators based on the Huber loss, cf. [19, Section 6] or [14] and the references therein. Since (12.2) reduces to a Lasso optimization problem in \mathbb{R}^{p+n} with design matrix

$[\mathbf{X}|\sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+n)}$ and response \mathbf{y} , any Lasso solver can be used to compute the robust penalized estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

Assumption 2.3(iii.b) requires that $\lfloor n(1-s_*) + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 \rfloor$ components of $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ are iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$. In this case, as explained in [14] we rewrite \mathbf{y} as

$$(12.3) \quad \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\boldsymbol{\theta}^* + \sigma\mathbf{z}$$

where $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_0 \leq \lfloor s_*n \rfloor - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0$ and $\mathbf{z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$. The non-zero components of the unknown vector $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ represent the contaminated responses and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^*$ is not independent of \mathbf{z} . The sparsity of the unknown regression vector in the above linear model with design matrix $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X}|\sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\mathbf{I}_n]$ is $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_0 \leq s_*n$, and the support of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ is exactly the set of outliers $\widehat{O} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 0\}$. Lemma 12.2 below shows that $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0$ can be controlled with high probability when $s_* \in (0, 1)$ is a small enough constant. In order to achieve this, given that (12.2) is a Lasso problem, we may leverage existing results (such as Lemma 12.6 below) to control the sparsity of the Lasso. This requires a control on the sparse condition number of $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X}|\sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\mathbf{I}_n]$ (cf. Lemma 12.5 below) and a control of the noise in the linear model (12.3) (cf. Lemma 12.4 below).

Proposition 12.1 (Lipschitz properties, Huber Lasso). *Consider $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ as the underlying probability space for $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X})$ equipped with the Lebesgue sigma algebra. Let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ the Huber Lasso estimate in (12.1). We allow $\lambda_* = +\infty$ in which case $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ reduces to the Lasso with square loss and $\mathbb{P}(\widehat{O} = \emptyset) = 1$. Assume that for some event Ω^* we have $\Omega^* \subset \{|\widehat{O}| + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n\}$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^*) \rightarrow 1$ and $\Omega^* \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is open, where*

$$(12.4) \quad (1 - \sqrt{2d_*}) - \sqrt{4d_* \log(e(\gamma + 1)/(2d_*))} > 0$$

for some $d_* \in (0, 1)$ independent of n, p . Then there exists an open subset $\Omega_L \subset \Omega_* \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with $\mathbb{P}((\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}) \in \Omega_L) \rightarrow 1$ such that the following holds.

(i) Let $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X})$ and $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. Set $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$ and define $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ as in Proposition 5.2. If $\{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\} \subset \Omega_L$ then

$$\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| \vee (\sqrt{n}\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2) \leq [\|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\| + \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\| + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|)]M(d_*, \gamma)$$

for some constant $M(d_*, \gamma)$ depending on $\{d_*, \gamma\}$ only.

(ii) Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, and let $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\psi}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \mathbf{r}, \tilde{\mathbf{r}}$ be the corresponding quantities as in Lemma 5.4. Let also $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$. If $\{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\} \subset \Omega_L$ then

$$(12.5) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\| \vee \|\mathbf{r} - \tilde{\mathbf{r}}\| \leq n^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}(\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{r}\|^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}L(d_*, \gamma)$$

for some constant $L(d_*, \gamma)$ depending on $\{d_*, \gamma\}$ only.

Proof. We first prove the result for the Huber Lasso with $\lambda_* < +\infty$. Since $D_g \subset [0, +\infty)$ in (5.3) and using the argument leading to (5.2) with $L = 1$, we have $\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \leq \Xi$ where

$$\Xi \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^\top \boldsymbol{\psi} + (\tilde{\mathbf{y}} + (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \mathbf{y})^\top (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi})$$

as well as

$$(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top (\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \leq \Xi.$$

The left-hand side can be rewritten $\sum_{i=1}^n [\psi(u_i) - \psi(\tilde{u}_i)](u_i - \tilde{u}_i)$ with $u_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{u}_i = \tilde{y}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \mathbf{e}_i$. Each term in the sum is non-negative by convexity of ρ and monotonicity of the subdifferential. For all terms in the sum such that both $\psi'(u_i) = 1$ and $\psi'(\tilde{u}_i) = 1$ hold, we have $\psi'(v) = 1$ for all $v \in [u_i, \tilde{u}_i]$ so that $[\psi(u_i) - \psi(\tilde{u}_i)](u_i - \tilde{u}_i) = (u_i - \tilde{u}_i)^2$ by the fundamental theorem of calculus. If $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the diagonal projector matrix $\mathbf{Q} = \text{diag}(\psi'(u_i)\psi'(\tilde{u}_i))_{i=1,\dots,n}$, this implies $\|\mathbf{Q}[\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{y}]\|^2 \leq \Xi$ which can be rewritten, by expanding the square in the left-hand side, as

$$\|\mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 + \|\mathbf{Q}[(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{y}]\|^2 \leq \Xi - 2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \mathbf{Q}[(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{y}]$$

The next step is to bound $\|\mathbf{Q}\tilde{\mathbf{X}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ from below by $n\tau^2\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ for a constant τ to be specified. It will be useful to consider the two sets \hat{A}, \hat{B} defined by $\hat{B} = \text{supp}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \cup \text{supp}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \subset [p]$ and

$$(12.6) \quad \hat{A} = \{i \in [n] : \psi'(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \psi'(\tilde{y}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = 1\},$$

which satisfies $|\hat{B}| + |[n] \setminus \hat{A}| \leq 2d_*n$ when $\{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\} \subset \Omega^*$. Let

$$(12.7) \quad \check{\phi}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \min_{A \subset [n], B \subset [p]: |B| + (n - |A|) \leq 2d_*n} \left[\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset B, \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in A} \frac{(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{u})^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{u}\|^2} \right) \right].$$

If $B \subset [p], A \subset [n]$ are fixed, by [15, Theorem II.13] applied to submatrix of the Gaussian matrix $\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ multiplied on the left by an orthogonal projection of rank $|A|$ and multiplied to the right by an orthogonal projection of rank $|B|$, we find

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \text{supp}(\mathbf{u}) \subset B, \mathbf{u} \neq \mathbf{0}} \left(\sum_{i \in A} \frac{(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{u})^2}{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{u}\|^2} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > \sqrt{|A|} - \sqrt{|B|} - \sqrt{2x} \right] \geq 1 - e^{-x}$$

for all $x > 0$. In the right hand side inside the probability sign, using $|B| + (n - |A|) \leq 2d_*n$ we find

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{|A|} - \sqrt{|B|} &= (|A| - |B|) / (\sqrt{|A|} + \sqrt{|B|}) \\ &\geq \sqrt{n}(1 - 2d_*) / (1 + \sqrt{2d_*}) = \sqrt{n}(1 - \sqrt{2d_*}) \end{aligned}$$

using the loose bounds $|A| \leq n$ and $|B| \leq 2d_*n$ to bound the denominator. There are $\binom{n+p}{\lfloor 2d_*n \rfloor}$ pairs of sets (A, B) with $A \subset [n], B \subset [p]$ and $|A| + |B| \leq 2d_*n$. Hence by the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(\check{\phi} > (1 - \sqrt{2d_*}) - \sqrt{4d_* \log(e(\gamma + 1)/(2d_*)) + 2x/n}) \geq 1 - e^{-x}$$

where we used the classical bound $\log \binom{q}{d} \leq d \log \frac{eq}{d}$. Finally, with τ defined by $2\tau = (1 - \sqrt{2d_*}) - \sqrt{4d_* \log(e(\gamma+1)/(2d_*))}$, using $\sqrt{a+2x/n} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{2x/n}$ and setting $x = \frac{n}{2}\tau^2$ we find $\mathbb{P}(\check{\phi} > \tau) \geq 1 - e^{-n\tau^2/2}$. Since $\tau > 0$ by assumption (12.4), this implies that $\check{\phi}$ is bounded from 0 with probability approaching one. Finally, $\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} < \sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})) \geq e^{-n/2}$ by another application of [15, Theorem II.13] so that the event

$$(12.8) \quad \Omega_L = \Omega^* \cap \{\check{\phi} > \tau\} \cap \{\|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} < \sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})\}$$

satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_L) \rightarrow 1$. Furthermore, Ω_L viewed as a subset of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is open as a finite intersection of open sets. In summary, we have proved that if $\{(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\} \subset \Omega_L$ then

$$(12.9) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \vee (n\tau^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2) \leq |\Xi| + |2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^\top \mathbf{Q}[(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}} + \mathbf{y}]|.$$

To prove (i), by simple algebra to bound the right hand side, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \vee (n\tau^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2) &\leq \|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mathbf{y}}\| (\|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| + 2\sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma}) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|) \\ &\quad + \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \{ \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\| \|\boldsymbol{\psi}\| \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma}) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \} + \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \boldsymbol{\psi}\| \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing by the square root of the left-hand side provides the desired inequality.

To prove (ii), if $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X}), (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \in \Omega_L$, using $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \tilde{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}}$ to bound the right hand side in (12.9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \vee (n\tau^2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2) &\leq \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op} \{ \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\| \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| \\ &\quad + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\| (\|\boldsymbol{\psi}\| + 2\sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma}) \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{h}\|) \}. \end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by $\max\{\sqrt{n}\tau \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|, \|\boldsymbol{\psi} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|\}$ we obtain (12.5).

For the Lasso with square loss (that is, the limiting case $\lambda_* = +\infty$), the above argument is simplified as \hat{A} in (12.6) is simply $[n]$. It is sufficient to bound from below the sparse eigenvalue $\tilde{\phi}^2 = \min_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{u}\|_0 \leq 2d_* n} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{u}\|^2/n$ instead of (12.7). Since $\tilde{\phi} \geq \check{\phi}$, the previously defined event Ω_L in (12.8) satisfies the requirements. \square

Lemma 12.2 (Sparsity of the Huber Lasso). *For any $\varphi \geq 1$, constants $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $d_* \in (0, 1)$ satisfying (12.20) below, there exists a sparsity proportion $s_* = s_*(d_*, \gamma, \varphi, \eta, \eta_*) \in (0, d_*)$ such that if*

$$(12.10) \quad \frac{\phi_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})}{\phi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \leq \varphi, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_0 \leq s_* n, \quad \lambda = \frac{\sigma}{\eta\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{\gamma+1}{s_*}}\right), \quad \lambda_* = \frac{\eta\lambda}{\eta_*}$$

then there exists an event Ω^* of probability approaching one such that $\Omega^* \subset \{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0 \leq d_* n\}$.

If the probability space for $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X})$ is chosen as $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ equipped with the Lebesgue sigma algebra, then $\Omega^* \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ can be chosen as an open set.

Proof. Since we can view $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ as the solution of a Lasso problem, we can use existing results on the Lasso, such as Lemma 12.6, to control the sparsity $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0$. We apply Lemma 12.6 with $\bar{p} = n + p$, matrix $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ defined by block as $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X}|\sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\mathbf{I}_n] = [\mathbf{X}|\sqrt{n}(\eta_*/\eta)\mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y}$ as explained in the discussion following Lemma 12.6. We have to verify that (12.28), (12.29), (12.30) and (12.31) all hold for certain $m, \bar{\eta}, \lambda$.

Let the constants $\{c^*, d_*\}$ be as in Lemma 12.5 and let Ω_* be defined in Lemma 12.5. Let $\bar{\eta} = \max(\eta, \eta_*)$ and $\bar{\kappa} = \max(\eta_*^2/\eta^2, \eta^2/\eta_*^2)\varphi c^*$. We now define $s_* \in (0, d_*)$ by

$$(12.11) \quad 2s_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{d_*}{(2(1 - \bar{\eta})^2)^{-1}(1 + \bar{\eta})^2\{\bar{\kappa} - 1\} + 1}.$$

Let $\bar{A} \subset [n], \bar{B} \subset [p]$ be two sets that will be specified later and define \bar{S} as the disjoint union $\bar{S} = \bar{B} \cup \{i + n, i \in \bar{A}\}$. With $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_*n - |\bar{S}|$, the condition $\bar{S} \leq 2s_*n$ implies

$$(12.12) \quad |\bar{S}| \leq \frac{d_*n}{(2(1 - \bar{\eta})^2)^{-1}(1 + \bar{\eta})^2\{\bar{\kappa} - 1\} + 1}$$

or equivalently

$$(12.13) \quad |\bar{S}| \leq \frac{2(1 - \bar{\eta})^2(d_*n - |\bar{S}|)}{(1 + \bar{\eta})^2\{\bar{\kappa} - 1\}}.$$

By Lemma 12.5 and observing that the right hand side of (12.22) is bounded from above by $\bar{\kappa}$ thanks to $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \mathbf{I}_p$, in Ω_* inequality $|\bar{S}| \leq 2s_*n$ with $m = d_*n - |\bar{S}|$ thus implies (12.30). It remains to define the sets \bar{A}, \bar{B} , prove that $|\bar{S}| = |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}|$ indeed satisfies $|\bar{S}| \leq 2s_*n$, and prove that (12.28), (12.29), (12.31) all hold. Let

$$B_0 = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cup B_1 \quad \text{where } B_1 = \{j \in [p] : |\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mathbf{z}|/n \geq \bar{\eta}\lambda\},$$

$$A_0 = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \cup A_1 \quad \text{where } A_1 = \{i \in [n] : (\lambda/\lambda_*)|\boldsymbol{\sigma} z_i|/\sqrt{n} \geq \bar{\eta}\lambda\} = \{i \in [n] : |\boldsymbol{\sigma} z_i|/\sqrt{n} \geq \bar{\eta}\lambda_*\}$$

so that (12.29) and (12.28) can be rewritten $\bar{B} \supset B_0$ and $\bar{A} \supset A_0$. Now set $\bar{\eta} = \max(\eta, \eta_*)$. In the event (12.16), with $t + 1 = \sigma^{-1}\eta\lambda\sqrt{n} = \sigma^{-1}\eta_*\lambda_*\sqrt{n}$ by definition of λ, λ_* in (12.10) and the value of t given in Lemma 12.4, we have by definition of A_1, B_1 and $\max(\eta_*, \eta) = \bar{\eta}$

$$\begin{aligned} (|A_1| + |B_1|)(t + 1)^2 &= |A_1|\sigma^{-2}\eta_*^2\lambda_*^2n + |B_1|\sigma^{-2}\eta^2\lambda^2n \\ &\leq |A_1|\sigma^{-2}\bar{\eta}^2\lambda_*^2n + |B_1|\sigma^{-2}\bar{\eta}^2\lambda^2n && \text{thanks to } \max(\eta, \eta_*) = \bar{\eta} \\ &\leq \|\mathbf{z}_{A_1}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{X}_{B_1}^\top \mathbf{z}\|^2/n && \text{by definition of } A_1, B_1 \\ &< (\sqrt{s_*n} + t\sqrt{|A_1| + |B_1|})^2 && \text{in event (12.16)}. \end{aligned}$$

Inequality $|A_1| + |B_1| < s_*n$ must hold, otherwise the previous display leads to $(|A_1| + |B_1|)(t + 1)^2$ being strictly smaller than itself. Since $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}^*\|_0 \leq s_*n$, inequality $|A_0| + |B_0| < 2s_*n$ thus holds in the event (12.16). Next we define the sets $\bar{A} \supset A_0$ and

$\bar{B} \supset B_0$ by adding elements arbitrarily until $|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| \in [s_*n, 2s_*n)$. For (12.31), again in event (12.16) we have thanks to $|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| \geq s_*n$ that

$$\{\|\sigma z_{\bar{A}}\|^2/n + \|\mathbf{X}_{\bar{B}}^\top \sigma z\|^2/n^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sigma n^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\sqrt{s_*n} + t(|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}|)^{\frac{1}{2}}] \leq \eta\lambda(|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}|)^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \bar{\eta}\lambda(|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}|)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence conditions (12.28), (12.29), (12.30) and (12.31) all hold, and

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|_0 \leq |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| + |\text{supp}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \setminus \bar{A}| + |\text{supp}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \setminus \bar{B}| \leq |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| + m \leq d_*n.$$

The previous display holds in the intersection of Ω_* from Lemma 12.5 and the event (12.16). Both these events are open when viewed as subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ so that $\Omega^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega_* \cap \{(12.16)\}$ is open as well (with some abuse of notation, $\{(12.16)\}$ here denotes the high-probability event inside the probability sign in (12.16)). \square

A similar result can be proved for the Lasso with square loss using Lemma 12.6 directly. The proof is simpler than the previous proof as there is no need to control the number of outliers.

Lemma 12.3 (Control of the sparsity of the Lasso). *Assume that $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ in the linear model (1.1). For any $\varphi \geq 1$, constants $\eta \in (0, 1)$ and $d_* \in (0, 1)$ satisfying (12.20) below, there exists a sparsity proportion $s_* = s_*(d_*, \gamma, \varphi, \eta) \in (0, d_*)$ such that if*

$$(12.14) \quad \frac{\phi_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})}{\phi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})} \leq \varphi, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 \leq s_*n, \quad \lambda = \frac{\sigma}{\eta\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1+\gamma}{s_*}}\right)$$

then there exists an event Ω^* of probability approaching one such that $\Omega^* \subset \{\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_0 \leq d_*n\}$ for $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ the Lasso, i.e., defined as (3.1) with $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda\|\mathbf{b}\|_1$. If the probability space for $(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{X})$ is chosen as $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ equipped with the Lebesgue sigma algebra, then $\Omega^* \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ can be chosen as an open set.

Proof. We use the same argument as the proof Lemma 12.2 in the simpler setting with no outliers. Here, set $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = \sigma z$ so that $z \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ by assumption. We apply Lemma 12.6 with $\bar{p} = p$, $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X} \bar{\mathbf{b}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y}$. We have to verify that (12.25), (12.26), (12.27) all hold for certain m, η, λ and set $\bar{S} \subset [p]$.

Let the constants $\{c^*, d_*\}$ be as in Lemma 12.5 and let Ω_* be defined in Lemma 12.5. We now set $\bar{\eta} = \eta_* = \eta$ and define $s_* \in (0, d_*)$ by (12.11) with $\bar{\kappa} = \varphi c^*$. With $m \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_*n - |\bar{S}|$, the condition $\bar{S} \leq 2s_*n$ implies (12.12) or equivalently (12.13) by simple algebra. By Lemma 12.5, in Ω_* inequality $|\bar{S}| \leq 2s_*n$ with $m = d_*n - |\bar{S}|$ thus implies (12.26). It remains to prove that \bar{S} indeed satisfies $|\bar{S}| \leq 2s_*n$, and prove that (12.25), (12.26) and (12.27) all hold. Let $S_0 = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cup S_1$ where $S_1 = \{j \in [p] : |\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \sigma z|/n \geq \eta\lambda\}$, so that (12.25) can be rewritten $\bar{S} \supset S_0$. In the event (12.16) with $A = \emptyset$, since $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 \leq s_*n$ we have

$$|S_1|(t+1)^2 = |S_1|\sigma^{-2}\eta^2\lambda^2n < (\sqrt{s_*n} + t\sqrt{|S_1|})^2.$$

where $t+1 = \sigma^{-1}\eta\lambda\sqrt{n}$ by definition of λ in (12.14) and the definition of t in Lemma 12.4. Inequality $|S_1| < s_*n$ must hold, otherwise the previous display leads

to $|S_1|(t+1)^2$ being strictly smaller than itself. Hence $|S_0| \leq |S_1| + \|\beta\|_0 < 2s_*n$ must hold in the event (12.16). Next we define the set $\bar{S} \supset S_0$ by adding elements arbitrarily until $|\bar{S}| \in [s_*n, 2s_*n)$. For (12.27), again in event (12.16) we have thanks to $|\bar{S}| \geq s_*n$ that $\{\|\mathbf{X}_{\bar{S}}^\top \sigma \mathbf{z}\|^2/n^2\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \leq \sigma n^{-\frac{1}{2}} [\sqrt{s_*n} + t|\bar{S}|^{\frac{1}{2}}] \leq \eta\lambda|\bar{S}|^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Hence conditions (12.25), (12.26), (12.27) all hold, and $\|\hat{\beta}\|_0 \leq |\bar{S}| + |\text{supp}(\hat{\theta}) \setminus \bar{A}| \leq |\bar{S}| + m \leq d_*n$. The previous display holds in the intersection of Ω_* from Lemma 12.5 and the event (12.16). Both these events are open when viewed as subsets of $\mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ so that $\Omega^* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Omega_* \cap \{(12.16)\}$ is open as well. \square

Lemma 12.4 (Control of the noise in the linear model (12.3)). *Let $p/n \leq \gamma$, let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with diagonal entries equal to 1 and let $\varphi \geq \phi_{\max}(\Sigma)/\phi_{\min}(\Sigma)$ be an upper bound on the condition number. Let $\mathbf{z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$, $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries and assume that \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{G} are independent. For some fixed t define*

$$W = \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (|z_i| - t)_+^2 + \sum_{j \in [p]} (|\mathbf{e}_j^\top \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z}\|^{-1} - t)_+^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If $t = \sqrt{2 \log((1+\gamma)/s_*)}$ for some $s_* \in (0, 1)$ then $\mathbb{E}[W^2] \leq s_*n$ and for all $u > 0$,

$$(12.15) \quad \mathbb{P}(W \geq \sqrt{s_{**}n}) \leq e^{-nC(\gamma, s_*)/(2\varphi)}$$

where s_{**} depends on $\{\gamma, s_*\}$ only and is such that $s_{**} < s_*$, and where $C(\gamma, s_*) > 0$ depends on $\{\gamma, s_*\}$ only. For the same value of t , we have as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$

$$(12.16) \quad \mathbb{P} \left[\cap_{A \subset [n], B \subset [p]} \left\{ \|z_A\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|(\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z})_B\|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} < \sqrt{s_*n} + t\sqrt{|A| + |B|} \right] \rightarrow 1.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z}\|\mathbf{z}\|^{-1} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Then \mathbf{g} is independent of \mathbf{z} , for instance because the conditional distribution of \mathbf{g} given \mathbf{z} is always $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p)$. Define

$$f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}) = \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} (|z_i| - t)_+^2 + \sum_{j \in [p]} (|\mathbf{e}_j^\top \Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{g}| - t)_+^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

If $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \tilde{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ then by the triangle inequality for the Euclidean norm and using $|(|a| - t)_+ - (|b| - t)_+| \leq |a - b|$ for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}) - f(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}})| &\leq \left\{ \|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mathbf{g} - \tilde{\mathbf{g}})\|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq (1 \vee \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op}) \left\{ \|\mathbf{z} - \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{g} - \tilde{\mathbf{g}}\|^2 \right\}^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence f is a $(1 \vee \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{op})$ -Lipschitz function of iid standard normal random variables. Since $\text{diag}(\Sigma) = \mathbf{I}_p$ we have $1 \vee \|\Sigma\|_{op} = \|\Sigma\|_{op} \leq \varphi$. By the concentration of Lipschitz functions of standard normal random variables [9, Theorem 5.6], this implies that

$$(12.17) \quad \mathbb{P}(f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}) \geq \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})] + u\sqrt{n}) \leq \exp\left(\frac{-nu^2}{2\varphi}\right).$$

It remains to bound the expectation of $f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})$. Note that $Z_j = \mathbf{e}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z} / \|\mathbf{z}\|$ has $N(0, 1)$ distribution thanks to $\Sigma_{jj} = 1$ for all diagonal entries. By [5, Lemma G.1], the bound $\mathbb{E}[(|Z| - t)_+^2] \leq 4e^{-t^2/2} / ((t^2 + 2)\sqrt{4 + 2\pi t^2})$ holds for $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. For $t = \sqrt{2 \log((1 + \gamma)/s_*)}$ this implies $\mathbb{E}[(|Z| - t)_+^2] \leq (1 + \gamma)^{-1} s_* 4 / ((t^2 + 2)\sqrt{4 + 2\pi t^2})$. Since $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})^2]$ is the sum of $n + p$ terms of the form $\mathbb{E}[(|Z| - t)_+^2]$ and $n + p \leq (1 + \gamma)n$, inequality $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})^2] \leq ns_* 4 / ((t^2 + 2)\sqrt{4 + 2\pi t^2})$ holds. Now choose $u > 0$ in (12.17) as a constant depending on $\{\gamma, s_*\}$ only defined by

$$2u = \sqrt{s_*} - \{s_* 4 / ((t^2 + 2)\sqrt{4 + 2\pi t^2})\}^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and define s_{**} by $\sqrt{s_{**}} = \sqrt{s_*} - u$ so that $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g})^2]^{\frac{1}{2}} + u \leq \sqrt{s_{**}n}$. This proves (12.15).

For (12.16), standard concentration bounds on the χ_n^2 distribution yields $\mathbb{P}(\|\mathbf{z}\| < n^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sqrt{2 \log n}) \geq 1 - 2/n$, and

$$(12.18) \quad n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \|\mathbf{z}\|^{-\frac{1}{2}} (1 + \sqrt{2 \log(n)/n})$$

holds in this event. On the intersection of this event with the complement of (12.15), if $(|v| - t)_+$ denotes the vector with components $\max(|v_i| - t, 0)$ for any vector \mathbf{v} , we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \{ \|\mathbf{z}_A\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \|(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z})_B\|^2 \}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & < t \sqrt{|A| + |B|} + \{ \|((|\mathbf{z}| - t)_+)_A\|^2 + \|((|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{G}^\top \mathbf{z} n^{-\frac{1}{2}}| - t)_+)_B\|^2 \}^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \leq t \sqrt{|A| + |B|} + (1 + \sqrt{2 \log(n)/n}) f(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{g}) \\ & \leq t \sqrt{|A| + |B|} + (1 + \sqrt{2 \log(n)/n}) \sqrt{s_{**}n}. \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to $|x| \leq (|x| - t)_+ + t$ and the triangle inequality, the second follows from (12.18) and the third thanks to the complement of (12.15). Since s_{**}, s_* are both independent of n, p and $s_{**} < s_*$, inequality $(1 + \sqrt{2 \log(n)/n}) \sqrt{s_{**}n} \leq \sqrt{s_*n}$ holds for n large enough. \square

Lemma 12.5 (Sparse condition number for $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+n)}$). *Let $\eta, \eta_* > 0$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X} | \sqrt{n}(\eta_*/\eta) \mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+n)}$ and $d \in [n + p]$. Then for $S(d) = \{(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) : \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \|\mathbf{b}\|_0 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 \leq d, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|^2 + \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 = 1\}$ we have*

$$(12.19) \quad \frac{\max_{(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in S(d)} \|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b} + \sqrt{n}(\eta_*/\eta) \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{\min_{(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in S(d)} \|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b} + \sqrt{n}(\eta_*/\eta) \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2} \leq \frac{\hat{\Phi}_+^2 + 1 + ((\hat{\Phi}_+^2 - 1)^2 + 4\hat{\Phi}_+^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{\hat{\Phi}_-^2 + 1 - ((\hat{\Phi}_-^2 - 1)^2 + 4\hat{\Phi}_-^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Phi} &= \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^n: \|\mathbf{b}\|_0 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 \leq d} \frac{|\boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}| n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\| \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|}, \\ \hat{\Phi}_+ &= \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{b}\|_0 \leq d} \frac{\|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}\| n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|}, \quad \hat{\Phi}_- = \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{b}\|_0 \leq d} \frac{\|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}\| n^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, for any $d_* > 0$ satisfying

$$(12.20) \quad (2d_* \log(e(1 + \gamma)/d_*))^{1/2} + 2\sqrt{d_*} < \sqrt{3/2} - 1,$$

the constants c, c^* defined by

$$(12.21) \quad \begin{aligned} c &= (2d_* \log(e(1 + \gamma)/d_*))^{1/2} + 2\sqrt{d_*}, & c < \sqrt{3/2} - 1, \\ c^* &= \frac{(1 + c)^2 + \sqrt{((1 + c)^2 - 1)^2 + 4c^2}}{(1 - c)^2 + \sqrt{((1 - c)^2 - 1)^2 + 4c^2}} \end{aligned}$$

are such that for any $d \leq d_* n$, event $\Omega_* = \{\hat{\phi} < c, \Phi_+ < (1 + c), \Phi_- < (1 - c)\}$ has probability approaching one, and in Ω_* the right hand side of (12.19) is bounded from above by c^* . Consequently, in Ω_* ,

$$(12.22) \quad \frac{\max_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}: \|\mathbf{v}\|=1, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq d_* n} \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{v}\|^2}{\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}: \|\mathbf{v}\|=1, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq d_* n} \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{v}\|^2} \leq c^* \frac{\max(\frac{\eta_*^2}{\eta^2}, \phi_{\max}(\Sigma))}{\min(\frac{\eta_*^2}{\eta^2}, \phi_{\min}(\Sigma))}.$$

Proof. Let $(\mathbf{b}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in S(d)$. By expanding the square

$$(12.23) \quad \begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \frac{\eta_* \sqrt{n}}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 / n &= \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}\|^2 / n + \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 - 2\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}^\top \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} n^{-1/2} \\ &\geq \hat{\Phi}_-^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\|^2 + \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2 - 2\|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\| \hat{\phi} \\ &= \left(\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\| \quad \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \right) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_-^2 & -\hat{\phi} \\ -\hat{\phi} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\| \\ \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

For the upper sparse eigenvalue, we have similarly

$$(12.24) \quad \frac{\|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b} + \frac{\eta_* \sqrt{n}}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|^2}{n} \leq \left(\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\| \quad \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \right) \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\Phi}_+^2 & \hat{\phi} \\ \hat{\phi} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\| \\ \|\frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}\| \end{pmatrix}.$$

Hence the left hand side of (12.19) is bounded from above by the ratio of the maximal singular value of the 2 by 2 matrix in (12.24) and the minimal singular value of the 2 by 2 matrix in (12.23). Since the minimal eigenvalue of $\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ b & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ is $\frac{1}{2}(a + 1 - \sqrt{(a - 1)^2 + 4b^2})$ and the maximal eigenvalue is $\frac{1}{2}(a + 1 + \sqrt{(a - 1)^2 + 4b^2})$. This proves (12.19).

Let $t = \sqrt{2d_* \log(e(1 + \gamma)/d_*)}$. By Theorem II.13 in [15], for any (A, B) with $B \subset [p], A \subset [n]$ with $|A| + |B| \leq d$, the event

$$\left\{ \max_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \text{supp}(\mathbf{b})=B} \frac{n^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}\|}{\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\|} \geq 1 + \sqrt{|B|/n + t} \right\}$$

has probability at most $\mathbb{P}(N(0, 1) > t\sqrt{n})$, and the same holds for the event

$$\left\{ \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \text{supp}(\mathbf{b})=B} \frac{n^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}\|}{\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{b}\|} \leq 1 - \sqrt{|B|/n - t} \right\}.$$

Again by Theorem II.13 in [15], the event

$$\left\{ \max_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \text{supp}(\mathbf{b})=B, \text{supp}(\theta)=A} \frac{n^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\theta^\top \mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}|}{\|\theta\| \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|} > \sqrt{|A|/n} + \sqrt{|B|/n} + t \right\}$$

has probability at most $\mathbb{P}(N(0, 1) > t\sqrt{n})$. Hence by the union bound and a standard upper bound on the Gaussian tail, the union of the above three events has probability at most $3e^{-t^2 n/2} / (t\sqrt{2\pi n})$. There are $\binom{n+p}{d}$ pairs (A, B) of subsets $A \subset [n], B \subset [p]$ with $|A| + |B| = d$, so by the union bound, the union of all events as above over all pairs (A, B) with $|A| + |B| = d$ has probability at most

$$3 \binom{n+p}{d} \frac{\exp(-t^2 n/2)}{t\sqrt{2\pi n}} \leq e^n \left(\frac{d}{n} \log \frac{e(n+p)}{d} - \frac{t^2}{2} \right) \frac{3}{t\sqrt{2\pi n}} \leq \frac{3}{t\sqrt{2\pi n}} \rightarrow 0$$

using the classical bound $\log \binom{q}{d} \leq d \log \frac{eq}{d}$ on binomial coefficients, the definition of t as well as $d \leq d_* n$. By definition of c in (12.21), this proves that Ω_* has probability approaching one. The fact that c^* bounds from above the right hand side of (12.19) follows follows by applying the bounds in Ω_* on $\hat{\Phi}_+, \hat{\Phi}_i, \hat{\phi}$ to bound the numerator and denominator. Finally, the bound (12.22) on the d -sparse condition number of $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X}]_{\frac{\eta_* \sqrt{n}}{\eta}}^{\eta_* \sqrt{n}} \mathbf{I}_n$ is obtained using

$$(\|\theta\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2) \min\left(\frac{\eta_*}{\eta}, \phi_{\min}(\Sigma)\right) \leq \left\| \frac{\eta_*}{\eta} \theta \right\|^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{b}\|^2 \leq (\|\theta\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}\|^2) \max\left(\frac{\eta_*}{\eta}, \phi_{\max}(\Sigma)\right).$$

□

Bound on the false positives of the Lasso

Lemma 12.6 (Proposition 7.4 in [6]; deterministic result.). *Let $n, \bar{p} \geq 1$ be integers and $m \in [\bar{p}]$. Let $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times \bar{p}}, \bar{\mathbf{y}} \in \mathbb{R}^n, \bar{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}$ and define the Lasso estimate*

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}} = \arg \min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\bar{p}}} \|\bar{\mathbf{X}} \mathbf{b} - \bar{\mathbf{y}}\|^2 / (2n) + \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1.$$

Let $\bar{\eta} \in (0, 1), \lambda > 0$. Let $\bar{S} \subset [\bar{p}]$ be a set with

$$(12.25) \quad \bar{S} \supset \text{supp}(\bar{\mathbf{b}}) \cup \{j \in [\bar{p}] : |e_j^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}^\top (\bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{b}} - \bar{\mathbf{y}})| / n \geq \bar{\eta} \lambda\}.$$

Define the Sparse Riech Condition (SRC) by

$$(12.26) \quad |\bar{S}| < \frac{2(1 - \bar{\eta})^2 m}{(1 + \bar{\eta})^2 \max_{B \subset [\bar{p}]: |B \setminus \bar{S}| \leq m} \{\phi_{\text{cond}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_B^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_B) - 1\}}$$

holds where $\phi_{\text{cond}}(\mathbf{S}) = \phi_{\max}(\mathbf{S}) / \phi_{\min}(\mathbf{S})$ is the condition number of any positive semi-definite matrix \mathbf{S} . Consider also the condition

$$(12.27) \quad \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{\bar{S}}^\top (\bar{\mathbf{y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}} \bar{\mathbf{b}})\|^2 / n^2 \leq \bar{\eta}^2 \lambda^2 |\bar{S}|.$$

If (12.25), (12.26) and (12.27) hold simultaneously then $|\text{supp}(\hat{\mathbf{b}}) \setminus \bar{S}| \leq m$.

In our Huber Lasso problem with $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = [\mathbf{X} | \sqrt{n}(\lambda/\lambda_*)\mathbf{I}_n] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (n+p)}$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+p}$, $\bar{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \sqrt{n}\boldsymbol{\theta}^* + \sigma\mathbf{z}$ and $\bar{p} = n + p$, the above deterministic Lemma can be rewritten as follows. Consider, some sets $\bar{B} \subset [p]$, $\bar{A} \subset [n]$, the conditions

$$(12.28) \quad \bar{B} \supset \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \cup \{j \in [p] : |\mathbf{e}_j^\top \mathbf{X}^\top \sigma \mathbf{z}|/n \geq \bar{\eta}\lambda\},$$

$$(12.29) \quad \bar{A} \supset \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) \cup \{i \in [n] : (\lambda/\lambda_*)|\sigma z_i|/\sqrt{n} \geq \bar{\eta}\lambda\},$$

$$(12.30) \quad |\bar{S}| = |\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}| < \frac{2(1 - \bar{\eta})^2 m}{(1 + \bar{\eta})^2 \max_{B \subset [p]: |B \setminus \bar{B}| \leq m} \{\phi_{\text{cond}}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_B^\top \bar{\mathbf{X}}_B) - 1\}},$$

$$(12.31)$$

$$\|(\lambda/\lambda_*)\sigma \mathbf{z}_{\bar{A}}\|^2/n + \|\mathbf{X}_{\bar{B}}^\top \sigma \mathbf{z}\|^2/n^2 \leq \bar{\eta}^2 \lambda^2 (|\bar{A}| + |\bar{B}|)$$

where $\bar{S} = \bar{B} \cup \{i + n, i \in \bar{A}\}$. If (12.28), (12.29), (12.30) and (12.31) all hold and $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})$ is the solution of (12.2) then $|\text{supp}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \setminus \bar{B}| + |\text{supp}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \setminus \bar{A}| \leq m$.