

On Cross-Validated Lasso in High Dimensions*

Denis Chetverikov[†] Zhipeng Liao[‡] Victor Chernozhukov[§]

Abstract

In this paper, we derive non-asymptotic error bounds for the Lasso estimator when the penalty parameter for the estimator is chosen using K -fold cross-validation. Our bounds imply that the cross-validated Lasso estimator has nearly optimal rates of convergence in the prediction, L^2 , and L^1 norms. For example, we show that in the model with the Gaussian noise and under fairly general assumptions on the candidate set of values of the penalty parameter, the estimation error of the cross-validated Lasso estimator converges to zero in the prediction norm with the $\sqrt{s \log p/n} \times \sqrt{\log(pn)}$ rate, where n is the sample size of available data, p is the number of covariates, and s is the number of non-zero coefficients in the model. Thus, the cross-validated Lasso estimator achieves the fastest possible rate of convergence in the prediction norm up to a small logarithmic factor $\sqrt{\log(pn)}$, and similar conclusions apply for the convergence rate both in L^2 and in L^1 norms. Importantly, our results cover the case when p is (potentially much) larger than n and also allow for the case of non-Gaussian noise. Our paper therefore serves as a justification for the widely spread practice of using cross-validation as a method to choose the penalty parameter for the Lasso estimator.

1 Introduction

Since its invention by Tibshirani (1996), the Lasso estimator has become increasingly important in many fields, and a large number of papers have studied its properties. Many of these papers have been concerned with the choice of the penalty parameter λ required for the implementation of the Lasso estimator. As a result, several methods to choose λ have been proposed and theoretically justified; see Zou et al. (2007), Bickel et al. (2009), and Belloni and Chernozhukov

*This version: August 14, 2019. We thank Mehmet Caner, Matias Cattaneo, Yanqin Fan, Sara van de Geer, Jerry Hausman, James Heckman, Roger Koenker, Andzhey Koziuk, Miles Lopes, Rosa Matzkin, Anna Mikusheva, Whitney Newey, Jesper Sorensen, Vladimir Spokoiny, Larry Wasserman, and seminar participants in many places for helpful comments. Chetverikov's work was partially funded by NSF Grant SES - 1628889. Liao's work was partially funded by NSF Grant SES - 1628889.

[†]Department of Economics, UCLA, Bunche Hall, 8283, 315 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA; E-Mail address: chetverikov@econ.ucla.edu

[‡]Department of Economics, UCLA, Bunche Hall, 8283, 315 Portola Plaza, Los Angeles, CA 90095, USA; E-Mail address: zhipeng.liao@econ.ucla.edu

[§]Department of Economics and Operations Research Center, MIT, 50 Memorial Drive, Cambridge, MA 02142, USA; E-Mail address: vchern@mit.edu

(2013), among other papers. Nonetheless, in practice researchers often rely upon cross-validation to choose λ (see Chatterjee and Jafarov, 2015), and in fact, based on simulation evidence, using cross-validation to choose λ remains a leading recommendation in the theoretical literature (see textbook-level discussions in Bühlmann and van de Geer (2011), Hastie, Tibshirani, and Wainwright (2015), and Giraud (2015)). However, to the best of our knowledge, there exist very few results in the literature about properties of the Lasso estimator when λ is chosen using cross-validation; see a review of existing results below. The purpose of this paper is to fill this gap and to derive non-asymptotic error bounds for the cross-validated Lasso estimator in different norms.

We consider the regression model

$$Y = X'\beta + \varepsilon, \quad \mathbb{E}[\varepsilon \mid X] = 0, \quad (1)$$

where Y is a dependent variable, $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ a p -vector of covariates, ε unobserved scalar noise, and $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)'$ a p -vector of coefficients. Assuming that a random sample of size n , $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n$, from the distribution of the pair (X, Y) is available, we are interested in estimating the vector of coefficients β . We consider triangular array asymptotics, so that the distribution of the pair (X, Y) , and in particular the dimension p of the vector X , is allowed to depend on n and can be larger or even much larger than n . For simplicity of notation, however, we keep this dependence implicit.

We impose a standard assumption that the vector of coefficients β is sparse in the sense that $s = s_n = \|\beta\|_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p 1\{\beta_j \neq 0\}$ is relatively small. Under this assumption, the effective way to estimate β was proposed by Tibshirani (1996), who introduced the Lasso estimator,

$$\hat{\beta}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 + \lambda \|b\|_1 \right), \quad (2)$$

where for $b = (b_1, \dots, b_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|b\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p |b_j|$ denotes the L^1 norm of b , and λ is some penalty parameter (the estimator suggested in Tibshirani's paper takes a slightly different form but over time the version (2) has become more popular, probably for computational reasons). In principle, the optimization problem in (2) may have multiple solutions, but to simplify the presentation and to avoid unnecessary technicalities, we assume throughout the paper that the distribution of X is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^p$, in which case the optimization problem in (2) has the unique solution with probability one; see Lemma 4 in Tibshirani (2013).

To perform the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$, one has to choose the penalty parameter λ . If λ is chosen appropriately, the Lasso estimator attains the optimal rate of convergence under fairly general conditions; see, for example, Bickel et al. (2009), Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011), and Rigollet and Tsybakov (2011). On the other hand, if λ is not chosen appropriately, the Lasso estimator may not be consistent or may have a slower rate of convergence; see Chatterjee (2014). Therefore, it is important to choose λ appropriately. In this paper, we show that K -fold cross-validation indeed provides an appropriate way to choose λ . More specifically, we derive

non-asymptotic error bounds for the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$ being chosen by K -fold cross-validation in the prediction, L^2 , and L^1 norms. Our bounds reveal that the cross-validated Lasso estimator attains optimal rate of convergence up to certain logarithmic factors in all of these norms. For example, when the conditional distribution of the noise ε given X is Gaussian, the L^2 norm bound in Theorem 4.3 implies that

$$\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2 = O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn)} \right),$$

where for $b = (b_1, \dots, b_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\|b\|_2 = (\sum_{j=1}^p b_j^2)^{1/2}$ denotes the L^2 norm of b . Here, $\sqrt{s \log p/n}$ represents the optimal rate of convergence, and the cross-validated Lasso estimator attains this rate up to a small $\sqrt{\log(pn)}$ factor.

Given that cross-validation is often used to choose the penalty parameter λ and given how popular the Lasso estimator is, understanding the rate of convergence of the cross-validated Lasso estimator seems to be an important research question. Yet, to the best of our knowledge, the only results in the literature about the cross-validated Lasso estimator are due to Homrighausen and McDonald (2013, 2014, 2017) and Miolane and Montanari (2018) but all these papers imposed extremely strong conditions and made substantial use of these conditions meaning that it is not clear how to relax them. In particular, Homrighausen and McDonald (2014) assumed that p is much smaller than n , and only showed consistency of the (leave-one-out) cross-validated Lasso estimator. Homrighausen and McDonald (2017), which strictly improves upon Homrighausen and McDonald (2013), assumed that the smallest value of λ in the candidate set, over which cross-validation search is performed, is so large that all considered Lasso estimators are guaranteed to be sparse, but, as we explain below, it is exactly the low values of λ that make the analysis of the cross-validated Lasso estimator difficult.¹ Miolane and Montanari (2018) assumed that p is proportional to n and that the vector X consists of i.i.d. Gaussian random variables, and their estimation error bounds do not converge to zero whenever K is fixed (independent of n). In contrast to these papers, we allow p to be much larger than n and X to be non-Gaussian, with possibly correlated components, and we also allow for very large candidate sets.

Other papers that have been concerned with cross-validation in the context of the Lasso estimator include Chatterjee and Jafarov (2015) and Lecué and Mitchell (2012). Chatterjee and Jafarov (2015) developed a novel cross-validation-type procedure to choose λ and showed that the Lasso estimator based on their choice of λ has a rate of convergence depending on n via $n^{-1/4}$. Their procedure to choose λ , however, is related to but different from the classical cross-validation procedure used in practice, which is the target of study in our paper. Lecué and Mitchell (2012) studied classical cross-validation but focused on estimators that differ from

¹In addition, and equally important, the smallest value of λ in Homrighausen and McDonald (2017) exceeds the Bickel-Ritov-Tsybakov $\lambda = \lambda^*$, and we find via simulations that the cross-validated $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$ is smaller than λ^* , at least with high probability, whenever the candidate set is large enough; see Remarks 4.1 and 4.2 for further details. This suggests that the cross-validated λ based on the Homrighausen-McDonald candidate set will be with high probability equal to the smallest value in the candidate set, which makes the cross-validation search less interesting.

the Lasso estimator in important ways. For example, one of the estimators they considered is the average of subsample Lasso estimators, $K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)$, for $\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)$ defined in (3) in the next section. Although the authors studied properties of the cross-validated version of such estimators in great generality, it is not immediately clear how to apply their results to obtain bounds for the cross-validated Lasso estimator itself. We also emphasize that our paper is not related to Abadie and Kasy (2018) because they do consider the cross-validated Lasso estimator but in a very different setting, and, moreover, their results are in the spirit of those in Lecué and Mitchell (2012).²

Finally, we emphasize that deriving a rate of convergence of the cross-validated Lasso estimator is a non-standard problem. From the Lasso literature perspective, a fundamental problem is that most existing results require that λ is chosen so that $\lambda > 2\|n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i\|_\infty$, at least with high probability, but, according to simulation evidence, this inequality typically does not hold if λ is chosen by cross-validation, meaning that existing results can not be used to analyze the cross-validated Lasso estimator; see Section 4 for more details and Giraud (2015), page 105, for additional complications. Also, classical techniques to derive properties of cross-validated estimators developed, for example, in Li (1987) do not apply to the Lasso estimator as those techniques are based on the linearity of the estimators in the vector of values $(Y_1, \dots, Y_n)'$ of the dependent variable, which does not hold in the case of the Lasso estimator. More recent techniques, developed, for example, in Wegkamp (2003), help to analyze sub-sample Lasso estimators like those studied in Lecué and Mitchell (2012) but are not sufficient for the analysis of the full-sample Lasso estimator considered here. See Arlot and Celisse (2010) for an extensive review of results on cross-validation available in the literature.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we describe the cross-validation procedure. In Section 3, we state our regularity conditions. In Section 4, we present our main results. In Section 5, we describe a novel sparsity bound, which constitutes one of the main building blocks in our analysis of the cross-validated Lasso estimator. In Section 6, we conduct a small Monte Carlo simulation study. In Sections 7 and 8, we provide proofs of our sparsity bound and of the main results on the estimation error bounds, respectively. In Section 9, we give some technical lemmas that are useful for the proofs of the main results.

Notation. Throughout the paper, we use the following notation. For any vector $b = (b_1, \dots, b_p)' \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we use $\|b\|_0 = \sum_{j=1}^p 1\{b_j \neq 0\}$ to denote the number of non-zero components of b , $\|b\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p |b_j|$ to denote its L^1 norm, $\|b\| = (\sum_{j=1}^p b_j^2)^{1/2}$ to denote its L^2 norm, $\|b\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |b_j|$ to denote its L^∞ norm, and $\|b\|_{2,n} = (n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' b)^2)^{1/2}$ to denote its prediction norm. In addition, we denote $X_1^n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$. Moreover, we use $\mathcal{S}^p$ to denote the unit sphere in $\mathbb{R}^p$, that is, $\mathcal{S}^p = \{\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\delta\|_2 = 1\}$. We introduce more notation in the beginning of Section 8, as required for the proofs of the main results.

²The results of Abadie and Kasy (2018) can be applied in the regression setting (1) but the application would require p to be smaller than n and their estimators in this case would differ from the cross-validated Lasso estimator studied here.

2 Cross-Validation

As explained in the Introduction, to choose the penalty parameter λ for the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$, it is common practice to use cross-validation. In this section, we describe the procedure in details. Let K be some strictly positive (typically small) integer, and let $(I_k)_{k=1}^K$ be a partition of the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$; that is, for each $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, I_k is a subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$, for each $k, k' \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ with $k \neq k'$, the sets I_k and $I_{k'}$ have empty intersection, and $\cup_{k=1}^K I_k = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For our asymptotic analysis, we will assume that K is a constant that does not depend on n . Further, let Λ_n be a set of candidate values of λ . Now, for $k = 1, \dots, K$ and $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$, let

$$\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \left(\frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 + \lambda \|b\|_1 \right) \quad (3)$$

be the Lasso estimator corresponding to all observations excluding those in I_k where $n_k = |I_k|$ is the size of the subsample I_k . As in the case with the full-sample Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ in (2), the optimization problem in (3) has the unique solution with probability one under our maintained assumption that the distribution of X is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^p$. Then the cross-validation choice of λ is

$$\hat{\lambda} = \arg \min_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} (Y_i - X_i' \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda))^2. \quad (4)$$

The cross-validated Lasso estimator in turn is $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$. In the literature, the procedure described here is also often referred to as K -fold cross-validation. For brevity, however, we simply refer to it as cross-validation. Below we will study properties of $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$.

We emphasize one more time that although the properties of the estimators $\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda})$ have been studied in great generality in Lecué and Mitchell (2012), there are very few results in the literature regarding the properties of $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$, which is the estimator used in practice.

3 Regularity Conditions

Recall that we consider the model in (1), the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ in (2), and the cross-validation choice of λ in (4). Let c_1 , C_1 , a , and q be some strictly positive numbers where $a < 1$ and $q \geq 8$. Also, let $r \geq 0$ be an integer and let $(\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\Gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be sequences of positive numbers, possibly growing to infinity. In addition, denote

$$M_n = (E[\|X\|_\infty^q])^{1/q}. \quad (5)$$

Finally, throughout the paper, we assume that $s \geq 1$. Otherwise, one has to replace s by $s \vee 1$. To derive our results, we will impose the following regularity conditions.

Assumption 1 (Covariates). *The random vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ is such that for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$, we have $c_1 \leq (E[|X'\delta|^2])^{1/2} \leq C_1$ and $(E[|X'\delta|^4])^{1/4} \leq \Gamma_n$. In addition, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} (E[|X_j|^4])^{1/4} \leq$*

γ_n . Moreover, the distribution of X is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}^p$.

The first part of Assumption 1 means that all eigenvalues of the matrix $E[XX']$ are bounded from above and below from zero. It may be possible to relax this condition by focusing on restricted eigenvalues but we prefer not to do so in order to better focus on the main arguments. The second part, that is, the condition that $(E[|X'\delta|^4])^{1/4} \leq \Gamma_n$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$, is often assumed in the literature with $\Gamma_n \leq C$ for some constant C ; see Mammen (1993) for an example. Similarly, the third part, that is, the condition that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} (E[|X_j|^4])^{1/4} \leq \gamma_n$, is often assumed in the literature either with $\gamma_n \leq C$ or with γ_n slowly growing to infinity. The last part, about absolute continuity of the distribution of X , is only imposed to simplify the presentation and to avoid unnecessary technicalities. To develop some intuition about Assumption 1, we consider two examples.

Example 1 (Gaussian covariates). Suppose that the vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ consists of independent standard Gaussian random variables. Then the first and the fourth parts of Assumption 1 hold trivially. Also, for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$, the random variable $X'\delta$ is standard Gaussian as well, and so the condition that $(E[|X'\delta|^4])^{1/4} \leq \Gamma_n$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$ is satisfied with $\Gamma_n = 3^{1/4}$. Similarly, the condition that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} (E[|X_j|^4])^{1/4} \leq \gamma_n$ holds with $\gamma_n = 3^{1/4}$. ■

Example 2 (Bounded covariates). Suppose that the vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ consists of independent zero-mean bounded random variables. In particular, suppose for simplicity that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_j| \leq 1$ almost surely. In addition, suppose that the variance of each X_j is bounded away from zero. Then the first and the fourth parts of Assumption 1 hold trivially. Also, for all $t > 0$ and $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$, we have $P(|X'\delta| > t) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/2)$ by Hoeffding's inequality. Therefore, the condition that $(E[|X'\delta|^4])^{1/4} \leq \Gamma_n$ for all $\delta \in \mathcal{S}^p$ is satisfied with $\Gamma_n = 2$ by standard calculations. Also, the condition that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} (E[|X_j|^4])^{1/4} \leq \gamma_n$ is satisfied with $\gamma_n = 1$. ■

Assumption 2 (Growth conditions). We have $sn^{6/q}M_n^6 \log^4 p \leq C_1 n^{1-c_1}$, $\gamma_n^4 s^2 \log p \leq C_1 n^{1-c_1}$, and $\Gamma_n^4 \leq C_1 n^{1-c_1}$.

Assumption 2 is a mild growth condition restricting some moments of X , the number of non-zero coefficients in the model s and the number of parameters in the model p . In Example 1 above, Assumption 2 reduces to

$$s \log^7 p + s^2 \log p \leq C_1 n^{1-c_1}$$

since in this case, we have $M_n \leq \sqrt{C_q \log p}$ for all $q > 2$ and some constant C_q depending only on q . In Example 2, Assumption 2 reduces to

$$s \log^4 p + s^2 \log p \leq C_1 n^{1-c_1}$$

since in this case, we have $M_n \leq 1$ for all $q > 2$.

Assumption 3 (Noise). *There exists a standard Gaussian random variable e that is independent of X and a function $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is twice continuously differentiable with respect to the second argument such that $\varepsilon = Q(X, e)$,*

$$c_1 < \frac{\partial Q(X, e)}{\partial e} \leq C_1(1 + |e|^r) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{\partial^2 Q(X, e)}{\partial e^2} \right|^{q/2} \mid X \right] \leq C_1^{q/2}$$

almost surely.

By the Skorohod representation theorem, there always exist a standard Gaussian random variable e and a function $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is increasing with respect to its second argument and is such that $\varepsilon = Q(X, e)$. Assumption 3 thus only imposes the restrictions that, with respect to its second argument, this function is sufficiently smooth, does not grow too fast, and is not only increasing but in fact strictly increasing, with the derivative bounded away from zero. Note that Assumption 3 holds with $r = 0$ if the conditional distribution of ε given X is Gaussian.

Assumption 4 (Candidate set). *The candidate set Λ_n takes the following form: $\Lambda_n = \{C_1 a^l: l = 0, 1, 2, \dots; a^l \geq c_1/n\}$.*

It is known from Bickel et al. (2009) that the optimal rate of convergence of the Lasso estimator is achieved when λ is of order $(\log p/n)^{1/2}$. Since under Assumption 2, we have $\log p = o(n)$, it follows that our choice of the candidate set Λ_n in Assumption 4 makes sure that there are some λ 's in the candidate set Λ_n that would yield the Lasso estimator with the optimal rate of convergence in the prediction norm. Note also that Assumption 4 allows for a rather large candidate set Λ_n of values of λ ; in particular, the largest value, C_1 , can be set arbitrarily large and the smallest value, c_1/n , converges to zero rather fast. In fact, the only two conditions that we need from Assumption 4 is that Λ_n contains a “good” value of λ , say $\bar{\lambda}_0$, such that the subsample Lasso estimators $\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)$ satisfy the bound (18) in Lemma 8.1 with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$ and that $|\Lambda_n| \leq C \log n$, where c and C are some constants. Thus, we could for example set $\Lambda_n = \{a^l: l = \dots, -2, -1, 0, 1, 2, \dots; a^{-l} \leq n^{C_1}, a^l \leq n^{C_1}\}$.

Assumption 5 (Dataset partition). *For all $k = 1, \dots, K$, we have $n_k/n \geq c_1$.*

Assumption 5 is mild and is typically imposed in the literature on K -fold cross-validation. This assumption ensures that the subsamples I_k are balanced in the sample size.

4 Main Results

Recall that for $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we use $\|b\|_{2,n} = (n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' b)^2)^{1/2}$ to denote the prediction norm of b . Our first main result in this paper derives a non-asymptotic estimation error bound for the cross-validated Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$ in the prediction norm.

Theorem 4.1 (Prediction Norm Bound). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 – 5 hold. Then for any $\alpha \in (0, C_1/\log^{c_1} n)$,*

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n} \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n}$$

with probability at least $1 - \alpha - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$, where c and C are constants depending only on c_1, C_1, K, a, q , and r .

Remark 4.1 (Near-rate-optimality of cross-validated Lasso estimator in prediction norm). The results in Bickel et al. (2009) imply that under the assumptions of Theorem 4.1, setting $\lambda = \lambda^* = (C \log p/n)^{1/2}$ for sufficiently large constant C , which depends on the distribution of ε , gives the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*)$ satisfying $\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*) - \beta\|_{2,n} = O_P((s \log p/n)^{1/2})$, and it follows from Rigollet and Tsybakov (2011) that this is the optimal rate of convergence (in the minimax sense) for the estimators of β in the model (1). Therefore, Theorem 4.1 implies that the cross-validated Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})$ has the fastest possible rate of convergence in the prediction norm up to the small $(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)^{1/2}$ factor. Note, however, that implementing the cross-validated Lasso estimator does not require knowledge of the distribution of ε , which makes this estimator attractive in practice. In addition, simulation evidence suggests that $\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})$ often outperforms $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*)$ (see Section 6 for details), which is the main reason why cross-validation is typically recommended as a method to choose λ . The rate of convergence following from Theorem 4.1 is also very close to the oracle rate of convergence, $(s/n)^{1/2}$, that could be achieved by the OLS estimator if we knew the set of covariates having non-zero coefficients; see, for example, Belloni et al. (2015a). ■

Remark 4.2 (On the proof of Theorem 4.1). One of the ideas in Bickel et al. (2009) is to show that outside of the event

$$\lambda < c \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \varepsilon_i \right|, \quad (6)$$

where $c > 2$ is some constant, the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)$ satisfies the bound $\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \leq C\lambda\sqrt{s}$, where C is a constant. Thus, to obtain the Lasso estimator with a fast rate of convergence, it suffices to choose λ such that it is small enough but the event (6) holds with at most small probability. The choice $\lambda = \lambda^*$ described in Remark 4.1 satisfies these two conditions. The difficulty with cross-validation, however, is that, as we demonstrate in Section 6 via simulations, it typically yields a rather small value of λ , so that the event (6) with $\lambda = \widehat{\lambda}$ holds with non-trivial (in fact, large) probability even in large samples, and little is known about properties of the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)$ when the event (6) does not hold, which is perhaps one of the main reasons why there are only few results on the cross-validated Lasso estimator in the literature. We therefore take a different approach. First, we use the fact that $\widehat{\lambda}$ is the cross-validation choice of λ to derive bounds on $\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|$ and $\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n}$ for the subsample Lasso estimators $\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda})$ defined in (3). Second, we use the “degrees of freedom estimate” of Zou et al. (2007) and

Tibshirani and Taylor (2012) to show that these estimators are sparse and to derive a bound on $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1$. Third, we use the two point inequality

$$\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda) - b\|_{2,n}^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 + \lambda \|b\|_1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \hat{\beta}(\lambda))^2 - \lambda \|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_1, \quad \text{for all } b \in \mathbb{R}^p,$$

which can be found in van de Geer (2016), with $b = (K-1)^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K (n - n_k) \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda})/n$, a convex combination of the subsample Lasso estimators $\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda})$, and derive a bound for its right-hand side using the definition of estimators $\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda})$ and bounds on $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|$ and $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1$. Finally, we use the triangle inequality to obtain a bound on $\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n}$ from the bounds on $\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda) - b\|_{2,n}$ and $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n}$. The details of the proof, including a short proof of the two point inequality, can be found in Section 8. $\blacksquare$

Next, in order to obtain bounds on $\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1$ and $\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2$, we derive a sparsity bound for $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$, that is, we show that the estimator $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$ has relatively few non-zero components, at least with high-probability. Even though our sparsity bound is not immediately useful in applications itself, it will help us to translate the result in the prediction norm in Theorem 4.1 into the result in L^1 and L^2 norms in Theorem 4.3.

Theorem 4.2 (Sparsity Bound). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 – 5 hold. Then for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

$$\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})\|_0 \leq s \times \frac{(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)}{\alpha}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(\alpha + n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$, where c and C are constants depending only on c_1 , C_1 , K , a , q , and r .

Remark 4.3 (On the sparsity bound). Belloni and Chernozhukov (2013) showed that outside of the event (6), the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ satisfies the bound $\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \leq Cs$, for some constant C , so that the number of covariates that have been mistakenly selected by the Lasso estimator is at most of the same order as the number of non-zero coefficients in the original model (1). As explained in Remark 4.2, however, cross-validation typically yields a rather small value of λ , so that the event (6) with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$ holds with non-trivial (in fact, large) probability even in large samples, and it is typically the case that smaller values of λ lead to the Lasso estimators $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ with a larger number of non-zero coefficients. We therefore should not necessarily expect that the inequality $\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})\|_0 \leq Cs$ holds with large probability. In fact, it is well-known (from simulations) in the literature that the cross-validated Lasso estimator typically satisfies $\|\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})\|_0 \gg s$. Our theorem, however, shows that even though the event (6) with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$ may hold with large probability, the number of non-zero components in the cross-validated Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\hat{\lambda})$ may exceed s only by the small $(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)$ factor. $\blacksquare$

With the help of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2, we immediately obtain the following bounds on the L^1 and L^2 norms of the estimation error of the cross-validated Lasso estimator, which is our second main result in this paper.

Theorem 4.3 (L_1 and L_2 Norm Bounds). *Suppose that Assumptions 1 – 5 hold. Then for any $\alpha \in (0, C_1/\log^{c_1} n)$,*

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs^2 \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)^2/\alpha}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(\alpha + n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$, where c and C are constants depending only on c_1, C_1, K, a, q , and r .

Remark 4.4 (Near-rate-optimality of cross-validated Lasso estimator in L^1 and L^2 norms). Like in Remark 4.1, the results in Bickel et al. (2009) imply that under the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, setting $\lambda = \lambda^* = (C \log p/n)^{1/2}$ for sufficiently large constant C gives the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*)$ satisfying $\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*) - \beta\|_2 = O_P((s \log p/n)^{1/2})$ and $\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda^*) - \beta\|_1 = O_P((s^2 \log p/n)^{1/2})$, and one can use the methods from Rigollet and Tsybakov (2011) to show that these rates are optimal. Therefore, the cross-validated Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})$ has the fastest possible rate of convergence both in L^1 and in L^2 norms, up to small logarithmic factors. ■

Remark 4.5 (On case with Gaussian noise). Recall that whenever the conditional distribution of ε given X is Gaussian, we can take $r = 0$ in Assumption 3. Thus, it follows from Theorems 4.1 and 4.3 that, in this case, we have

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n} \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn)}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn)}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(\alpha + n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$ for any $\alpha \in (0, C_1/\log^{c_1} n)$ and some constant $C > 0$. Theorems 4.2 and 4.3 can also be used to obtain the sparsity and L^1 norm bounds in this case as well. However, the sparsity and L^1 norm bounds here can be improved using recent results in Bellec and Zhang (2018). In particular, assuming that the conditional distribution of ε given X is $N(0, \sigma^2)$ for some constant $\sigma^2 > 0$ and imposing Assumption 1, it follows from Theorem 4.3 in Bellec and Zhang (2018) that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\text{Var}(\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n) \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] \left(3 + 4 \log \left(\frac{ep}{\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n]} \right) \right),$$

and thus, under our assumptions, using Chebyshev's inequality and the same arguments as those in the proofs of Theorems 4.2 and 4.3, we have

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0 \leq s \times \frac{(\log^2 p) \log(pn)}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$$

and

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\frac{Cs^2 \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \frac{(\log p) \log(pn)}{\alpha^{1/4}}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(\alpha + n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$. ■

5 General Sparsity Bound

As we mentioned in Remark 4.2, our analysis of the (full-sample) cross-validated Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})$ requires understanding sparsity of the sub-sample cross-validated Lasso estimators $\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda})$, that is, we need a sparsity bound showing that $\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, are sufficiently small, at least with high probability. Unfortunately, existing sparsity bounds are not good enough for our purposes because, as we discussed in Remark 4.3, they only apply outside of the event (6) and this event holds with non-trivial (in fact, large) probability if we set $\lambda = \widehat{\lambda}$. We therefore have to develop a novel sparsity bound, which we present in this section. The crucial feature of our bound is that it applies for all values of λ , both large and small, independently of whether (6) holds or not. Roughly speaking, the bound shows that for any $\lambda > 0$, under mild conditions, the Lasso estimator $\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)$ has to be sparse, at least on average, whenever it has small expected value of the estimation error in the prediction norm.

Theorem 5.1 (General Sparsity Bound). *Let $c_\epsilon, C_\epsilon > 0$ be some constants and suppose that Assumptions 1, 2, and 3 hold. Then there exist constants $c, C > 0$ depending only on $c_1, C_1, c_\epsilon, C_\epsilon, q$, and r such that for all $\lambda > 0$, the probability that both*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] > s + C(\log p)(nR_n(\lambda)^2 + \log^r n) \quad \text{and} \quad n^{2/q} M_n^2 R_n(\lambda) \log p \leq C_\epsilon n^{-c_\epsilon} \quad (7)$$

hold is at most Cn^{-c} , where $R_n(\lambda) = \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n]$.

6 Simulations

In this section, we present results of our simulation experiments. The purpose of the experiments is to investigate finite-sample properties of the cross-validated Lasso estimator. In particular, we are interested in (i) comparing the estimation error of the cross-validated Lasso estimator in different norms to the Lasso estimator based on other choices of λ ; (ii) studying sparsity properties of the cross-validated Lasso estimator; and (iii) estimating probability of the event (6) for $\lambda = \widehat{\lambda}$, the cross-validation choice of λ .

We consider two data generating processes (DGPs). In both DGPs, we simulate the vector of covariates $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)'$ from the Gaussian distribution with mean zero and variance-covariance matrix given by $E[X_j X_k] = 0.5^{|j-k|}$ for all $j, k = 1, \dots, p$. Also, we set $\beta = (1, -1, 2, -2, 0_{1 \times (p-4)})'$. We simulate ε from the standard Gaussian distribution in DGP1 and from the uniform distribution on $[-3, 3]$ in DGP2. For both DGPs, we take ε to be independent of X . Further, for each DGP, we consider samples of size $n = 100$ and 400 . For each DGP and each sample size, we consider $p = 40, 100$, and 400 . To construct the candidate set Λ_n of values of the penalty parameter λ , we use Assumption 4 with $a = 0.9$, $c_1 = 0.005$ and $C_1 = 500$. Thus, the set Λ_n contains values of λ ranging from 0.0309 to 500 when $n = 100$ and from 0.0071 to 500 when $n = 400$, that is, the set Λ_n is rather large in both cases. In all experiments, we use 5-fold cross-validation ($K = 5$). We repeat each experiment 5000 times.

As a comparison to the cross-validated Lasso estimator, we consider the Lasso estimator with λ chosen according to the Bickel-Ritov-Tsybakov rule:

$$\lambda = 2c\sigma n^{-1/2}\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/(2p)),$$

where $c > 1$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ are some constants, σ is the standard deviation of ε , and $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse of the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution; see Bickel et al. (2009). Following Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011), we choose $c = 1.1$ and $\alpha = 0.1$. The noise level σ typically has to be estimated from the data but for simplicity we assume that σ is known, so we set $\sigma = 1$ in DGP1 and $\sigma = \sqrt{3}$ in DGP2. In what follows, this Lasso estimator is denoted as P-Lasso and the cross-validated Lasso estimator is denoted as CV-Lasso.

Figure 5.1 contains simulation results for DGP1 with $n = 100$ and $p = 40$. The first three (that is, the top-left, top-right, and bottom-left) panels of Figure 5.1 present the mean of the estimation error of the Lasso estimators in the prediction, L^2 , and L^1 norms, respectively. In these panels, the dashed line represents the mean of estimation error of the Lasso estimator as a function of λ (we perform the Lasso estimator for each value of λ in the candidate set Λ_n ; we sort the values in Λ_n from the smallest to the largest, and put the order of λ on the horizontal axis; we only show the results for values of λ up to order 32 as these give the most meaningful comparisons). This estimator is denoted as λ -Lasso. The solid and dotted horizontal lines represent the mean of the estimation error of CV-Lasso and P-Lasso, respectively.

From these three panels of Figure 5.1, we see that estimation error of CV-Lasso is only slightly above the minimum of the estimation error over all possible values of λ not only in the prediction and L^2 norms but also in the L^1 norm. In comparison, P-Lasso tends to have much larger estimation error in all three norms.

The bottom-right panel of Figure 5.1 depicts the histogram for the the number of non-zero coefficients of the cross-validated Lasso estimator. Overall, this panel suggests that the cross-validated Lasso estimator tends to select too many covariates: the number of selected covariates with large probability varies between 5 and 30 even though there are only 4 non-zero coefficients in the true model.

For all other experiments, the simulation results on the mean of estimation error of the Lasso estimators can be found in Table 5.1. For simplicity, we only report the minimum over $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ of mean of the estimation error of λ -Lasso in Table 5.1. The results in Table 5.1 confirm findings in Figure 5.1: the mean of the estimation error of CV-Lasso is very close to the minimum mean of the estimation errors of the λ -Lasso estimators under both DGPs for all combinations of n and p considered in all three norms. Their difference becomes smaller when the sample size n increases. The mean of the estimation error of P-Lasso is much larger than that of CV-Lasso in most cases and is smaller than that of CV-Lasso only in L^1 -norm when $n = 100$ and $p = 400$.

Table 5.2 reports model selection results for the cross-validated Lasso estimator. More precisely, the table shows probabilities for the number of non-zero coefficients of the cross-validated Lasso estimator hitting different brackets. Overall, the results in Table 5.2 confirm findings in Figure 5.1: the cross-validated Lasso estimator tends to select too many covariates.

The probability of selecting larger models tends to increase with p but decreases with n .

Table 5.3 provides information on the finite-sample distribution of the ratio of the maximum score $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \varepsilon_i|$ over $\hat{\lambda}$, the cross-validation choice of λ . More precisely, the table shows probabilities for this ratio hitting different brackets. From Table 5.3, we see that this ratio is above 0.5 with large probability in all cases and in particular this probability exceeds 99% in most cases. Hence, (6) with $\lambda = \hat{\lambda}$ holds with large probability, meaning that deriving the rate of convergence of the cross-validated Lasso estimator requires new arguments since existing arguments only work for the case when (6) does not hold; see discussion in Remark 4.2 above.

7 Proofs for Section 5

In this section, we prove Theorem 5.1. Since the proof is long, we start with a sequence of preliminary lemmas in Subsection 7.1 and give the actual proof of Theorem 5.1 in Subsection 7.2.

7.1 Preliminary Lemmas

Here, we collect preliminary lemmas that help to prove Theorem 5.1 from the main text. Throughout all lemmas in this subsection (Lemmas 7.1 – 7.4), we impose Assumptions 1 – 3 but we do so implicitly to avoid repetitions.

Lemma 7.1. *For all $\lambda > 0$, the Lasso estimator $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ given in (2) based on the data $(X_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^n = (X_i, X_i' \beta + \varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^n$ has the following property: the function $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^n \mapsto (X_i' \hat{\beta}(\lambda))_{i=1}^n$ mapping $\mathbb{R}^n$ to $\mathbb{R}^n$ for any fixed value of $X_1^n = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ is well-defined and is Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant one. Moreover, $\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \leq n$ almost surely.*

Proof. All the asserted claims in this lemma can be found in the literature. Here we give specific references for completeness. The fact that the function $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^n \mapsto (X_i' \hat{\beta}(\lambda))_{i=1}^n$ is well-defined follows from Lemma 1 in Tibshirani (2013), which shows that even if the solution $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ of the optimization problem (2) is not unique, $(X_i' \hat{\beta}(\lambda))_{i=1}^n$ is the same across all solutions. The Lipschitz property then follows from Proposition 2 in Bellec and Tsybakov (2017). Moreover, under Assumption 1, by discussion in Section 2.2 in Tibshirani (2013), the solution $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ is unique almost surely and whenever it is unique, it satisfies $\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \leq n$. ■

Lemma 7.2. *Let $Q^{-1}: \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be the inverse of $Q: \mathbb{R}^p \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with respect to the second argument. Then for all $\lambda > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\psi_i X_i' (\hat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta) \mid X_1^n], \quad (8)$$

where

$$\psi_i = \frac{e_i}{Q_2(X_i, e_i)} + \frac{Q_{22}(X_i, e_i)}{Q_2(X_i, e_i)^2} \text{ and } e_i = Q^{-1}(X_i, \varepsilon_i), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

Remark 7.1. Here, the inverse Q^{-1} exists because by Assumption 3, Q is strictly increasing and continuous with respect to its second argument. $\blacksquare$

Proof. Fix $\lambda > 0$. By results in Tibshirani and Taylor (2012),

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial(X'_i(\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta))}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \mid X_1^n \right]; \quad (9)$$

see, in particular, the proof of Theorem 1 in that paper. Also, for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, under Assumption 3, conditional on X_1^n , the random variable ε_i is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with continuously differentiable pdf χ_i defined by

$$\chi_i(Q(X_i, e)) = \frac{\phi(e)}{Q_2(X_i, e)}, \quad e \in \mathbb{R},$$

where ϕ is the pdf of the $N(0, 1)$ distribution. The function χ_i satisfies the following condition:

$$Q(X_i, e)\chi_i(Q(X_i, e)) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{as } e \rightarrow \infty.$$

In addition,

$$\chi'_i(Q(X_i, e))Q_2(X_i, e) = -\frac{e\phi(e)}{Q_2(X_i, e)} - \frac{\phi(e)Q_{22}(X_i, e)}{(Q_2(X_i, e))^2}, \quad e \in \mathbb{R},$$

and so

$$\frac{\chi'_i(\varepsilon_i)}{\chi_i(\varepsilon_i)} = \frac{\chi'_i(Q(X_i, e_i))}{\chi_i(Q(X_i, e_i))} = -\frac{e_i}{Q_2(X_i, e_i)} - \frac{Q_{22}(X_i, e_i)}{(Q_2(X_i, e_i))^2} = -\psi_i.$$

Therefore, by Lemmas 7.1 and 9.4,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\partial(X'_i(\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta))}{\partial \varepsilon_i} \mid X_1^n \right] = \mathbb{E}[\psi_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta) \mid X_1^n], \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (10)$$

Combining (9) and (10) gives the asserted claim. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 7.3. For all $\kappa \geq 1$, $n \geq e^\kappa$, and $\lambda > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} - \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n] \right| > t \right) \leq \left(\frac{C\kappa \log^r n}{t^2 n} \right)^{\kappa/2} \quad (11)$$

for some constant $C > 0$ depending only on C_1 and r .

Proof. Fix $\kappa \geq 1$, $n \geq e^\kappa$, and $\lambda > 0$. Also, let ξ be a $N(0, 1)$ random variable that is independent of the data and let C be a constant that depends only on C_1 and r but whose value can change from place to place. Then by Lemma 7.1, the function $(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^n \mapsto (X'_i \widehat{\beta}(\lambda))_{i=1}^n$ is Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant one, and so is

$$(\varepsilon_i)_{i=1}^n \mapsto \left(\sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \right)^{1/2} = \sqrt{n} \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}.$$

Therefore, applying Lemma 9.5 with $u(x) = (x \vee 0)^\kappa$ and using Markov's inequality and Assumption 3 shows that for any $t > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} - \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n] > t \mid X_1^n\right) \\
& \leq \left(\frac{C_1\pi}{2t\sqrt{n}}\right)^\kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (1 + |e_i|^r)^\kappa\right] \mathbb{E}[|\xi|^\kappa] \\
& \leq \left(\frac{C}{t\sqrt{n}}\right)^\kappa \mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |e_i|^{r\kappa}\right] \mathbb{E}[|\xi|^\kappa] \leq \left(\frac{C}{t\sqrt{n}}\right)^\kappa \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} |e_i|^{r \log n}\right]\right)^{\kappa/\log n} \mathbb{E}[|\xi|^\kappa] \\
& \leq \left(\frac{Cn^{1/\log n} (r \log n)^{r/2} \sqrt{\kappa}}{t\sqrt{n}}\right)^\kappa = \left(\frac{C\sqrt{\kappa \log^r n}}{t\sqrt{n}}\right)^\kappa = \left(\frac{C\kappa \log^r n}{t^2 n}\right)^{\kappa/2}.
\end{aligned}$$

This gives one side of the bound (11). Since the other side follows similarly, the proof is complete. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 7.4. *Let $\ell_n = sn^{4/q+c_1/2} M_n^4 \log^3 p$. Then*

$$c \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i \theta)^2 \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i \theta)^2 \leq C$$

with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$, where $c, C > 0$ are some constants depending only on c_1, C_1 , and q .

Proof. In this proof, $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ are constants that depend only on c_1, C_1 , and q but their values can change from place to place. By Jensen's inequality and the definition of M_n in (5),

$$K_n = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}|^2\right]\right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}|^q\right]\right)^{1/q} \leq n^{1/q} M_n.$$

Thus, by Assumption 2,

$$\delta_n = \frac{K_n \sqrt{\ell_n \log p}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + (\log \ell_n)(\log^{1/2} n)\right) \leq Cn^{-c}.$$

Therefore, it follows from Lemma 9.2 and Assumption 1 that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X' \theta)^2]\right|\right] \leq Cn^{-c}.$$

In addition, by Lemma 9.2, for any $t > 0$,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X' \theta)^2]\right| > 2\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X'_i \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X' \theta)^2]\right|\right] + t$$

with probability at most

$$\begin{aligned}
& \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{3 \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \mathbb{E}[(X' \theta)^4]}\right) + \frac{C\mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} |X'_i \theta|^q]}{(nt)^{q/2}} \\
& \leq \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{3\Gamma_n^4}\right) + \frac{Cn\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_\infty^q \ell_n^{q/2}]}{(nt)^{q/2}} = \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{3\Gamma_n^4}\right) + \frac{CnM_n^q \ell_n^{q/2}}{(nt)^{q/2}}
\end{aligned}$$

by Assumption 1 and the definition of M_n . Conclude that

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell_n} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X' \theta)^2] \right| \leq Cn^{-c}$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$ by selecting t appropriately and using Assumption 2. Combining this bound with Assumption 1 gives the asserted claim and completes the proof of the lemma. $\blacksquare$

7.2 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Fix $c_\epsilon > 0$, $C_\epsilon > 0$, and $\lambda > 0$ and let $c > 0$ and $C > 0$ be constants depending only on c_1 , C_1 , c_ϵ , C_ϵ , q , and r but whose values can change from place to place. Also, in this proof, let $a_n \lesssim b_n$ mean that there exists $C > 0$ such that $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for all $n \geq 1$.

Denote

$$J_n = \frac{Cn^{1-2/q-c_\epsilon \wedge (1/6)}}{M_n^2 \log p}$$

for some C to be chosen later. Then by Lemma 7.4 and Assumption 2,

$$c \leq \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq J_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' \theta)^2 \leq \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq J_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' \theta)^2 \leq C \quad (12)$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Also, by Assumption 2 and Chebyshev's inequality,

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \|X_i\|_\infty^{q/2} \right)^{2/q} \leq (2n)^{2/q} M_n \quad (13)$$

with probability at least $1 - n^{-1}$. Thus, the probability that both (12) and (13) hold is at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Therefore, to prove the asserted claim, it suffices to show that whenever (12), (13), and

$$n^{2/q} M_n^2 R_n(\lambda) \log p \leq C_\epsilon n^{-c_\epsilon \wedge (1/6)} \quad (14)$$

all hold, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] \leq s + C(\log p)(nR_n(\lambda)^2 + \log^r n),$$

which is what we do below.

Assume that (12), (13), and (14) hold and denote $\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ and $\hat{s} = \|\hat{\beta}\|_0$. Then by Lemma 7.2,

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{s} \mid X_1^n] = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\psi_i X_i' (\hat{\beta} - \beta) \mid X_1^n] = \mathcal{I}_1 + \mathcal{I}_2,$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\psi_i X_i' (\hat{\beta} - \beta) 1 \left\{ \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq C \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \right\} \mid X_1^n \right], \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\psi_i X_i' (\hat{\beta} - \beta) 1 \left\{ \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 > C \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \right\} \mid X_1^n \right], \quad (16)$$

where $C = \sqrt{1/c}$ for c as on the left-hand side of (12). We bound $\mathcal{I}_1$ and $\mathcal{I}_2$ in turn. To bound $\mathcal{I}_1$, note that by the triangle inequality and Fubini's theorem,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}^4 \mid X_1^n] &\lesssim R_n(\lambda)^4 + \mathbb{E}\left[(\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} - R_n(\lambda))^4 \mid X_1^n\right] \\ &= R_n(\lambda)^4 + \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}\left(\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} - R_n(\lambda) > t^{1/4} \mid X_1^n\right) dt \\ &\lesssim R_n(\lambda)^4 + \left(\frac{\log^r n}{n}\right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Lemma 7.3 applied with $\kappa = 5$ (for example). Also, by (12) and (13), Lemma 9.1 and Assumptions 2 and 3,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \mid X_1^n\right] \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} + n^{2/q} M_n \log p \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p}$$

and by Proposition A.1.6 in van der Vaart and Wellner (1996),

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty^4 \mid X_1^n\right]\right)^{1/4} &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \mid X_1^n\right] + \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|\psi_i X_i\|_\infty^4 \mid X_1^n\right]\right)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} + n^{2/q} M_n \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} \end{aligned}$$

since $q \geq 8$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_1 \mathbf{1}\left\{\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq C\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}\right\} \mid X_1^n\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 (\hat{s} + s)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}\left\{\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq C\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}\right\} \mid X_1^n\right] \\ &\lesssim \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} (\hat{s} + s)^{1/2} \mathbf{1}\left\{\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 \leq C\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}\right\} \mid X_1^n\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} (\hat{s} + s)^{1/2} \mid X_1^n\right] \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty^2 \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 \mid X_1^n\right] \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n]\right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last line follows from Hölder's inequality. In turn,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty^2 \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 \mid X_1^n\right]\right)^{1/2} &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i X_i\right\|_\infty^4 \mid X_1^n\right] \mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}^4 \mid X_1^n]\right)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} \left(\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}^4 \mid X_1^n]\right)^{1/4} \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} \left(R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{I}_1 \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} \left(R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}}\right) (\mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n])^{1/2}. \quad (17)$$

To bound $\mathcal{I}_2$, denote

$$A_1 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \psi_i^2} \quad \text{and} \quad A_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n (X_i'(\hat{\beta} - \beta))^2} = \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n}$$

and observe that by Hölder's inequality,

$$\mathcal{I}_2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left[A_1 A_2 1 \left\{ \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 > C \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \right\} \mid X_1^n \right] \leq \mathcal{I}_{2,1} + \mathcal{I}_{2,2},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{2,1} &= \mathbb{E} \left[A_1 A_2 1 \left\{ A_1 A_2 > \bar{C} \left(n R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{n \log^{r+1} n} \right) \right\} \mid X_1^n \right], \\ \mathcal{I}_{2,2} &= \bar{C} \left(n R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{n \log^{r+1} n} \right) \mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 > C \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n \right), \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\bar{C}$ to be chosen later. To bound $\mathcal{I}_{2,1}$, note that

$$\mathbb{P}(A_1 > \sqrt{\bar{C}n} \mid X_1^n) \lesssim 1/n$$

by Chebyshev's inequality and Assumption 3 if $\bar{C}$ is large enough. Also, by Lemma 7.3 applied with $\kappa = \log n$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(A_2 / \sqrt{n} > R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\bar{C} \log^{r+1} n / n} \mid X_1^n \right) \lesssim 1/n$$

if $\bar{C}$ is large enough. Hence, if we set $\bar{C}$ in the definition of $\mathcal{I}_{2,1}$ and $\mathcal{I}_{2,2}$ large enough (note that $\bar{C}$ can be chosen to depend only on C_1 and r), it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{2,1} &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}[A_1^2 A_2^2 \mid X_1^n] \right)^{1/2} \left(\mathbb{P} \left(A_1 A_2 > \bar{C} \left(n R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{n \log^{r+1} n} \right) \mid X_1^n \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \left(\mathbb{E}[A_1^4 \mid X_1^n] \mathbb{E}[A_2^4 \mid X_1^n] \right)^{1/4} \\ &\quad \times \left(\mathbb{P}(A_1 > \sqrt{\bar{C}n} \mid X_1^n) + \mathbb{P} \left(A_2 / \sqrt{n} > R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\bar{C} \log^{r+1} n / n} \mid X_1^n \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim n \left(R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\log^r n / n} \right) / \sqrt{n} \lesssim \sqrt{n} R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\log^r n} \end{aligned}$$

and by (12) and Markov's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2 > C \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{s} + s > J_n \mid X_1^n \right) \leq J_n^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n],$$

so that

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,2} \lesssim \frac{n R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{n \log^{r+1} n}}{J_n} \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n],$$

and so

$$\mathcal{I}_{2,2} \leq 3^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n]$$

by (14) and Assumption 2 if C in the definition of J_n is large enough.

Combining all inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} \mid X_1^n] &\leq C \sqrt{n \log p} \left(R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}} \right) (\mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n])^{1/2} \\ &\quad + C \left(\sqrt{n} R_n(\lambda) + \sqrt{\log^r n} \right) + 3^{-1} \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} + s \mid X_1^n], \end{aligned}$$

and so

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] = \mathbb{E}[\hat{s} \mid X_1^n] \leq s + C(\log p)(n R_n(\lambda)^2 + \log^r n).$$

This completes the proof of the lemma. ■

8 Proofs for Section 4

In this section, we prove Theorems 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Since the proofs are long, we start with a sequence of preliminary lemmas in Subsection 8.1 and give the actual proofs of the theorems in Subsections 8.2, 8.3, and 8.4, respectively.

For convenience, we use the following additional notation. For $k = 1, \dots, K$, we denote

$$\|\delta\|_{2,n,k} = \left(\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i \delta)^2 \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\delta\|_{2,n,-k} = \left(\frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i \delta)^2 \right)^{1/2}$$

for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We use c and C to denote constants that can change from place to place but that can be chosen to depend only on c_1 , C_1 , K , a , q , and r . We use the notation $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if $a_n \leq Cb_n$. Moreover, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $M \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, we use δ_M to denote the vector in $\mathbb{R}^{|M|}$ consisting of all elements of δ corresponding to indices in M .

8.1 Preliminary Lemmas

Here, we collect preliminary lemmas that help to prove Theorems 4.1–4.3 from the main text. Throughout all lemmas in this subsection (Lemmas 8.1 – 8.6), we impose Assumptions 1 – 5 but we do so implicitly to avoid repetitions.

Lemma 8.1. *There exists $\bar{\lambda}_0 = \bar{\lambda}_{n,0} \in \Lambda_n$, possibly depending on n , such that for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, we have*

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n} \quad \text{and} \quad \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_1^2 \lesssim \frac{s^2 \log(pn)}{n} \quad (18)$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$.

Remark 8.1. The result in this lemma is essentially well-known but we provide a short proof here for completeness.

Proof. Let $T = \text{supp}(\beta) = \{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \beta_j \neq 0\}$ and $T^c = \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus T$. Fix $k = 1, \dots, K$ and denote

$$Z_k = \frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} X_i \varepsilon_i \quad \text{and} \quad \kappa_k = \inf \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{s} \|\delta\|_{2,n,-k}}{\|\delta_T\|_1} : \delta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|\delta_{T^c}\|_1 < 3\|\delta_T\|_1 \right\}.$$

To prove the first asserted claim, we will apply Theorem 1 in Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011) that shows that for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$, on the event $\lambda \geq 4\|Z_k\|_\infty$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} \leq \frac{3\lambda\sqrt{s}}{2\kappa_k}.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that there exist $c > 0$, $C > 0$, and $\bar{\lambda}_0 = \bar{\lambda}_{n,0} \in \Lambda_n$, possibly depending on n , such that

$$P(\kappa_k < c) \leq Cn^{-c}, \quad P(\bar{\lambda}_0 < 4\|Z_k\|_\infty) \leq Cn^{-c}, \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\lambda}_0 \lesssim \left(\frac{\log(pn)}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (19)$$

To prove the first claim in (19), note that

$$1 \lesssim \|\delta\|_{2,n,-k} \lesssim 1 \quad (20)$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$ uniformly over all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\|\delta\|_2 = 1$ and $\|\delta_{T^c}\|_0 \leq s \log n$ by Lemma 7.4 and Assumption 5. Hence, the first claim in (19) follows from Lemma 10 in Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011) applied with m there equal to $s \log n$ here.

To prove the second and the third claims in (19), note that

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i \notin I_k} \mathbb{E}[|X_{ij}\varepsilon_i|^2] \lesssim n$$

by Assumptions 1 and 3. Also,

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}\varepsilon_i|^2 \right] \right)^{1/2} \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}\varepsilon_i|^q \right] \right)^{1/q} \lesssim n^{1/q} M_n.$$

Thus, by Lemma 9.1 and Assumption 2,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(n - n_k) \|Z_k\|_\infty \right] \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} + n^{1/q} M_n \log p \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p}.$$

Hence, applying Lemma 9.2 with $t = (n \log n)^{1/2}$ and Z there replaced by $(n - n_k) \|Z_k\|_\infty$ here and noting that $n M_n^q / (n \log n)^{q/2} \leq Cn^{-c}$ by Assumption 2 implies that

$$\|Z_k\|_\infty \lesssim \left(\frac{\log(pn)}{n} \right)^{1/2}$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Hence, noting that $\log^4(pn) \leq Cn$ by Assumption 2, it follows from Assumption 4 that there exists $\bar{\lambda}_0 \in \Lambda_n$ such that the second and the third claims in (19) hold.

Further, to prove the second asserted claim, note that using (19) and (20) and applying Theorem 2 in Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011) with $m = s \log n$ there shows that $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_0 \lesssim s$ with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Hence, with the same probability,

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_1^2 \lesssim s \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_2^2 \lesssim s \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s^2 \log(pn)}{n},$$

where the second inequality follows from (20), and the third one from the first asserted claim. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 8.2. *We have for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that*

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}$$

with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$ for $\bar{\lambda}_0$ defined in Lemma 8.1.

Proof. Fix $k = 1, \dots, K$ and denote $\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 - \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \right| &= \left| (\widehat{\beta} - \beta)' \left(\frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} X_i X_i' - \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} X_i X_i' \right) (\widehat{\beta} - \beta) \right| \\
&\leq \left| (\widehat{\beta} - \beta)' \left(\frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} X_i X_i' - \mathbb{E}[X X'] \right) (\widehat{\beta} - \beta) \right| \\
&\quad + \left| (\widehat{\beta} - \beta)' \left(\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} X_i X_i' - \mathbb{E}[X X'] \right) (\widehat{\beta} - \beta) \right| \\
&\leq \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_1^2 \max_{1 \leq j, l \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} X_{ij} X_{il} - \mathbb{E}[X_j X_l] \right| \\
&\quad + \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_1^2 \max_{1 \leq j, l \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} X_{ij} X_{il} - \mathbb{E}[X_j X_l] \right|
\end{aligned}$$

by the triangle inequality. Further, by Lemma 8.1, $\|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_1^2 \lesssim s^2 \log(pn)/n$ with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$ and by Lemma 9.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq j, l \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} X_{ij} X_{il} - \mathbb{E}[X_j X_l] \right| \right] &\lesssim \left(\frac{\gamma_n^4 \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{M_n^2 \log p}{n^{1-2/q}}, \\
\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq j, l \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} X_{ij} X_{il} - \mathbb{E}[X_j X_l] \right| \right] &\lesssim \left(\frac{\gamma_n^4 \log p}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{M_n^2 \log p}{n^{1-2/q}},
\end{aligned}$$

since $1/n_k \lesssim 1/n$ and $1/(n - n_k) \lesssim 1/n$ by Assumption 5 and

$$\max_{1 \leq j, l \leq p} \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}^2 X_{il}^2] \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}^4] \leq \gamma_n^4$$

by Hölder's inequality and Assumption 1. Noting that

$$\gamma_n^4 s^2 (\log p)/n \leq Cn^{-c} \quad \text{and} \quad s M_n^2 (\log p)/n^{1-2/q} \leq Cn^{-c},$$

which hold by Assumption 2, and combining presented inequalities implies that

$$\left| \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 - \|\widehat{\beta} - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \right| \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}$$

with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Combining this result with Lemma 8.1 gives the asserted claim. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 8.3. *We have for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that*

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$.

Proof. By the definition of $\widehat{\lambda}$ in (4),

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}))^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0))^2$$

for $\bar{\lambda}_0$ defined in Lemma 8.1. Therefore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^K n_k \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^K n_k \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 + 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i (\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)).$$

Further, for all $k = 1, \dots, K$, denote $D_k = (X_i, Y_i)_{i \notin I_k}$ and

$$Z_k = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \left| \frac{\sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i (\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0))}{\sqrt{n_k} \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}} \right|.$$

Then by Lemma 9.1 and Assumption 3,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Z_k \mid D_k] &\lesssim \sqrt{\log \log n} + (\log \log n) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \max_{i \in I_k} \frac{(\varepsilon_i X'_i (\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)))^2}{n_k \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}^2} \mid D_k \right] \right)^{1/2} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\log \log n} + (\log \log n) \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \max_{i \in I_k} \frac{(\varepsilon_i X'_i (\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)))^4}{n_k^2 \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}^4} \mid D_k \right] \right)^{1/4} \\ &\lesssim \sqrt{\log \log n} + (\log \log n) (\log^{1/4} n) \lesssim \sqrt{\log n}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 9.2, $Z_k \lesssim \sqrt{s \log(pn)}$ and

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i (\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)) \right| \lesssim \sqrt{sn \log(pn)} \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$. Therefore, since $n_k/n \geq c_1$ by Assumption 5, we have with the same probability that

$$\sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 + \sqrt{\frac{s \log(pn)}{n}} \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k},$$

and thus, by the triangle inequality,

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,\hat{k}}^2 \lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 + \sqrt{\frac{s \log(pn)}{n}} \|\hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,\hat{k}},$$

where $\hat{k}$ is a $k = 1, \dots, K$ that maximizes $\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}$. Therefore, by Lemma 8.2, with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$,

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,\hat{k}}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n} + \sqrt{\frac{s \log(pn)}{n}} \|\hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,\hat{k}},$$

and thus, for all $k = 1, \dots, K$,

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{-k}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-k}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}^2 \leq \|\hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\hat{\lambda}) - \hat{\beta}_{-\hat{k}}(\bar{\lambda}_0)\|_{2,n,k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}.$$

The asserted claim now follows from combining this bound with the triangle inequality and Lemma 8.2. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 8.4. *We have for all $k = 1, \dots, K$ that*

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$.

Proof. Fix $k = 1, \dots, K$. For $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$, let $\delta_\lambda = (\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) / \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_2$. Observe that conditional on $D_k = (X_i, Y_i)_{i \notin I_k}$, $(\delta_\lambda)_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n}$ is non-stochastic. Therefore, $\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \sum_{i \in I_k} \mathbb{E}[(X'_i \delta_\lambda)^4 | D_k] \lesssim \Gamma_n^4 n$ by Assumption 1. In addition,

$$\left(\mathbb{E} \left[\max_{i \in I_k} \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} (X'_i \delta_\lambda)^4 \mid D_k \right] \right)^{1/2} \leq \Gamma_n^2 \cdot (n |\Lambda_n|)^{1/2}.$$

So, by Lemma 9.1,

$$R_k = \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \left| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} \left((X'_i \delta_\lambda)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X'_i \delta_\lambda)^2 \mid D_k] \right) \right|$$

satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[R_k \mid D_k] \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_n^4 \log |\Lambda_n|}{n}} + \frac{\Gamma_n^2 \cdot (n |\Lambda_n|)^{1/2} \log |\Lambda_n|}{n} \leq C n^{-c}$$

by Assumption 2 since $|\Lambda_n| \lesssim \log n$ by Assumption 4. Moreover, by Assumption 1, for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_2^2 &\lesssim \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} \mathbb{E}[(X'_i (\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \mid D_k] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i (\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 + R_k \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_2^2 \\ &= \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 + R_k \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$,

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2^2 \lesssim \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n},$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 8.3. The asserted claim follows. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 8.5. *Fix $k = 1, \dots, K$ and denote*

$$\Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, T) = \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda_n : \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} \mid X_1^n] \leq T \right\}, \quad T > 0. \quad (21)$$

Then $\widehat{\lambda} \in \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, T_n)$ with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$, where $T_n = \sqrt{Cs \log(pn)/n}$.

Proof. Fix $k = 1, \dots, K$. Using the same argument as that in the proof of Lemma 7.4 with $\ell_n = n + s$ shows that by Lemmas 9.2 and 9.3 and Assumptions 1 and 5,

$$\sup_{\theta \in S^p : \|\theta\|_0 \leq n+s} \left| \frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X'_i \theta)^2] \right| \lesssim n^{2/q+c_1/2} M_n^2 (\log p) (\log^3 n),$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. In addition, by Lemma 7.1, $\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0 \leq n$ almost surely. Combining these inequalities with Lemma 8.4 shows that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 > \widetilde{T}_n\right) \leq Cn^{-c} + Cs^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn), \quad (22)$$

where we denoted

$$\widetilde{T}_n = \left(\frac{Csn^{2/q+c_1/4} M_n^2 \log^2(pn)(\log^3 n)}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\lambda} \notin \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, 2\widetilde{T}_n)\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} > \widetilde{T}_n\right) \\ &+ \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n} \left| \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} - \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} \mid X_1^n] \right| > \widetilde{T}_n\right). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first term on the right-hand side is at most $C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$ by (22), and the second term is at most Cn^{-c} by Lemma 7.3 applied with $\kappa = 1$ (for example) and the union bound. Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\widehat{\lambda} \notin \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, 2\widetilde{T}_n)\right) \leq Cn^{-c} + Cs^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn). \quad (23)$$

Also, since $n^{2/q} M_n^2 \widetilde{T}_n \log p \leq Cn^{-c}$ by Assumption 2, it follows from Theorem 5.1, Assumption 4, and the union bound that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, 2\widetilde{T}_n)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] \lesssim s + (\log p)(n\widetilde{T}_n^2 + \log^r n) \lesssim (\log p)(n\widetilde{T}_n^2 + \log^r n)$$

with probability $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Thus, by Markov's inequality and the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, 2\widetilde{T}_n)} \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 > J_n\right) \leq Cn^{-c}, \quad (24)$$

where we denoted

$$J_n = n^{c_1/4} (\log p)(n\widetilde{T}_n^2 + \log^r n).$$

Now, (23) and (24) imply that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0 > J_n\right) \leq C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn)).$$

Also, by Lemma 7.4 and Assumptions 2 and 5,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p: \|\theta\|_0 \leq J_n + s} \frac{1}{n - n_k} \sum_{i \notin I_k} (X_i' \theta)^2 \lesssim 1$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Combining these bounds with Lemma 8.4 shows that

$$\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 \lesssim \frac{s \log(pn)}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$. The asserted claim now follows from this bound by using the same argument as that leading to (23) from (22). This completes the proof of the lemma. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 8.6. For all $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - b\|_{2,n}^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 + \lambda \|b\|_1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}(\lambda))^2 - \lambda \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_1.$$

Proof. The result in this lemma is sometimes referred to as the two point inequality; see van de Geer (2016). Here we give a short proof of this inequality using an argument similar to that of Lemma 5.1 in Chatterjee (2015). Fix $\lambda \in \Lambda_n$ and denote $\widehat{\beta} = \widehat{\beta}(\lambda)$. Take any $t \in (0, 1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})^2 + \lambda \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' (tb + (1-t)\widehat{\beta}))^2 + \lambda \|tb + (1-t)\widehat{\beta}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta} + tX_i'(\widehat{\beta} - b))^2 + t\lambda \|b\|_1 + (1-t)\lambda \|\widehat{\beta}\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$t\lambda (\|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 - \|b\|_1) \leq t^2 \|\widehat{\beta} - b\|_{2,n}^2 + \frac{2t}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})(X_i' \widehat{\beta} - X_i' b),$$

and so

$$\lambda (\|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 - \|b\|_1) \leq t \|\widehat{\beta} - b\|_{2,n}^2 + \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})(X_i' \widehat{\beta} - X_i' b).$$

Since $t \in (0, 1)$ is arbitrary, we obtain

$$\lambda (\|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 - \|b\|_1) \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})(X_i' \widehat{\beta} - X_i' b).$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\beta} - b\|_{2,n}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b - (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)(Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' \widehat{\beta} - X_i' b)(Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' b)^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i' \widehat{\beta})^2 - \lambda (\|\widehat{\beta}\|_1 - \|b\|_1). \end{aligned}$$

The asserted claim follows. ■

8.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1

We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. For any random variable Z and any number α , let $Q_\alpha(Z \mid X_1^n)$ denote the α th quantile of the conditional distribution of Z given X_1^n . In this step, we show that for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{1/2}(n\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 \mid X_1^n) &\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \mid X_1^n \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \mid X_1^n \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right). \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

To do so, fix any $\lambda > 0$ and denote

$$b(\lambda) = \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n - n_k}{n} \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda). \tag{26}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X'_i \widehat{\beta}(\lambda))^2 + n\lambda \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_1 &= \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i \widehat{\beta}(\lambda))^2 + (n - n_k)\lambda \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_1 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \left(\sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda))^2 + (n - n_k)\lambda \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_1 \right) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda))^2 + n\lambda \|b(\lambda)\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second line follows from the definition of $\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)$'s and the third one from the triangle inequality. Also,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda))^2 \\
&\geq \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} \left((Y_i - X'_i b(\lambda))^2 + 2(Y_i - X'_i b(\lambda))(X'_i b(\lambda) - X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X'_i b(\lambda))^2 + \frac{2}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i b(\lambda))(X'_i b(\lambda) - X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, by Lemma 8.6,

$$n\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - b(\lambda)\|_{2,n}^2 \leq \frac{2}{K-1} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} (Y_i - X'_i b(\lambda))(X'_i \widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - X'_i b(\lambda)).$$

Substituting here $Y_i = X'_i \beta + \varepsilon_i$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and the definition of $b(\lambda)$ in (26) and using the triangle inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}
n \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 &\lesssim n \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - b(\lambda)\|_{2,n}^2 + n \|b(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 \\
&\lesssim \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| + \sum_{k=1}^K \left| \sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right|. \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

The claim of this step, inequality (25), follows from (27) and Lemma 9.6.

Step 2. Denote

$$\Lambda_n(X_1^n, T) = \cap_{k=1}^K \Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, T), \quad T > 0,$$

for $\Lambda_{n,k}(X_1^n, T)$ defined in (21) of Lemma 8.5. In this step, we show that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1/2}(n \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n}^2 \mid X_1^n) > C(\log p)(s \log(pn) + \log^r n)\right) \leq Cn^{-c}, \quad (28)$$

where T_n is the same as in Lemma 8.5.

To do so, we apply the result in Step 1 and bound all terms on the right-hand side of (25) in turn. To start, fix $k = 1, \dots, K$. Then for any $\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_{1-1/(8K)}\left(\sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \mid X_1^n\right) &= Q_{1-1/(8K)}\left(\left(\sum_{i \notin I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2\right)^{1/2} \mid X_1^n\right)^2 \\
&= Q_{1-1/(8K)}\left(\sqrt{n} \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} \mid X_1^n\right)^2 = n Q_{1-1/(8K)}\left(\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k} \mid X_1^n\right)^2 \\
&\leq 8Kn \left(\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 \mid X_1^n]\right)^2 \leq 8Kn T_n^2 \lesssim s \log(pn), \quad (29)
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality in the third line follows from Markov's inequality.

Next, since $n^{2/q} M_n^2 T_n \log p \leq Cn^{-c}$ by Assumption 2, it follows from Theorem 5.1 and the union bound that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] \lesssim s + (\log p)(n T_n^2 + \log^r n) \lesssim (\log p)(s \log(pn) + (\log^r n))$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Thus, with the same probability, by Lemma 7.4 and Assumptions 2 and 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1-1/(8K)}\left(\sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \mid X_1^n\right) \\
&\lesssim \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1-1/(16K)}\left(n \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_2^2 \mid X_1^n\right) \\
&\lesssim \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1-1/(32K)}\left(n \|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n,-k}^2 \mid X_1^n\right) \lesssim s \log(pn), \quad (30)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the same argument as in (29).

Next, proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 5.1, with ψ_i 's replaced by ε_i 's, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right] \\
& \lesssim \sqrt{n \log p} \left(T_n + \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}} \right) \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} (\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 + s \mid X_1^n])^{1/2} \\
& \quad + \sqrt{n} T_n + \sqrt{\log^r n} + \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda)\|_0 + s \mid X_1^n] \\
& \lesssim s + (\log p)(nT_n^2 + \log^r n) \lesssim (\log p)(s \log(pn) + \log^r n)
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$, where the second inequality follows from Theorem 5.1. Hence, by Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right) \\
& \leq 8K \max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right] \lesssim (\log p)(s \log(pn) + \log^r n)
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$.

Finally, by Markov's inequality, for any constants A_1 and A_2 and any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| > \sqrt{A_1 A_2 s \log(pn)} \mid X_1^n \right) \\
& \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 > A_2 s \log(pn) \mid X_1^n \right) \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[1 \left\{ \sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 \leq A_2 s \log(pn) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \times \left. \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\sum_{i \in I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta)\|^2 \mid X_1^n, (Y_i)_{i \notin I_k}]}{A_1 A_2 s \log(pn)} \mid X_1^n \right] \\
& \lesssim \mathbb{P} \left(\sum_{i \in I_k} (X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta))^2 > A_2 s \log(pn) \mid X_1^n \right) + 1/A_1.
\end{aligned}$$

Choosing both A_1 and A_2 here large enough and using the same argument as that in (30) shows that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} Q_{1-1/(8K)} \left(\left| \sum_{i \notin I_k} \varepsilon_i X'_i(\widehat{\beta}_{-k}(\lambda) - \beta) \right| \mid X_1^n \right) \lesssim \sqrt{s \log(pn)} \lesssim s \log(pn)$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Combining all inequalities presented above together gives (28), which is the asserted claim of this step.

Step 3. Here we complete the proof. To do so, note that by Lemma 7.3 applied with $\kappa = 2$, for any $\lambda > 0$,

$$\left| \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} - \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n] \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}}$$

with probability $3/4$, which implies that

$$\left| Q_{1/2}(\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n) - \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n] \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log^r n}{n}}.$$

Combining this inequality with (28) in Step 2 shows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} \mid X_1^n] > \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log p}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n} \right) \leq Cn^{-c}. \quad (31)$$

Thus, applying Lemma 7.3 with $\kappa = \log(1/\alpha)$ and using the union bound together with the fact that $\alpha < C_1/\log^{c_1} n$ shows that

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda) - \beta\|_{2,n} > \sqrt{\frac{Cs \log(p/\alpha)}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n} \right) \leq Cn^{-c}. \quad (32)$$

Finally, by Lemma 8.5 and the union bound,

$$\mathbb{P}(\widehat{\lambda} \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)) \geq 1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn)). \quad (33)$$

Combining the last two inequalities gives the asserted claim and completes the proof of the theorem. $\blacksquare$

8.3 Proof of Theorem 4.2

Define $\Lambda_n(X_1^n, T)$ and T_n as in Step 2 of the proof of Theorem 4.1. Then, given that

$$n^{2/q} M_n^2(\log p) \sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{n}} \times \sqrt{\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n} \leq Cn^{-c}$$

by Assumption 2, it follows from Theorem 5.1 and (31) in the proof of Theorem 4.1 that

$$\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \mid X_1^n] \lesssim s(\log^2 p)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. Thus, by Markov's inequality, the union bound, and Assumption 4, for any $\bar{s} > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\max_{\lambda \in \Lambda_n(X_1^n, T_n)} \|\widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 > \bar{s} \mid X_1^n \right) \lesssim s(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)/\bar{s}$$

with probability at least $1 - Cn^{-c}$. The asserted claim of the theorem follows from combining this bound with (33) in the proof of Theorem 4.1 and substituting

$$\bar{s} = s(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n)/\alpha.$$

This completes the proof of the theorem. $\blacksquare$

8.4 Proof of Theorem 4.3

As in Lemma 7.4, let $\ell_n = sn^{4/q+c_1/2}M_n^4 \log^3 p$. Then applying Theorem 4.2 with $\alpha = n^{-c_1/4}$ and using Assumption 2 shows that

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0 \leq sn^{c_1/4}(\log^2 p)(\log n)(\log(pn) + s^{-1} \log^r n) \leq \ell_n$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$. Thus, by Lemma 7.4 and Assumption 1,

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2 \lesssim \|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_{2,n}$$

with probability at least $1 - C(n^{-c} + s^{-q/2} \log^{1-q/2}(pn))$. The asserted claim regarding $\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2$ follows from this bound and Theorem 4.1.

Also, by the Cauchy-Schwarz and triangle inequalities,

$$\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1 \leq \sqrt{\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_0} \|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda})\|_0 + s} \|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2.$$

The asserted claim regarding $\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_1$ follows from this bound, Theorem 4.2, and the asserted claim regarding $\|\widehat{\beta}(\widehat{\lambda}) - \beta\|_2$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\blacksquare$

9 Technical Lemmas

Lemma 9.1. *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be independent centered random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^p$ with $p \geq 2$. Define $Z = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}|$, $M = \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}|$, and $\sigma^2 = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_{ij}^2]$. Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq K \left(\sigma \sqrt{\log p} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[M^2]} \log p \right)$$

where K is a universal constant.

Proof. See Lemma E.1 in Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2014). $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9.2. *Consider the setting of Lemma 9.1. For every $\eta > 0$, $t > 0$, and $q \geq 1$, we have*

$$P\left(Z \geq (1 + \eta)\mathbb{E}[Z] + t\right) \leq \exp(-t^2/(3\sigma^2)) + K\mathbb{E}[M^q]/t^q$$

where the constant K depends only on η and q .

Proof. See Lemma E.2 in Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Kato (2014). $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9.3. *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be i.i.d. random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^p$ with $p \geq 2$. Also, let $K = (\mathbb{E}[\max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} |X_{ij}^2|])^{1/2}$ and for $\ell \geq 1$, let*

$$\delta_n = \frac{K\sqrt{\ell \log p}}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + (\log \ell)(\log^{1/2} n) \right).$$

Moreover, let $\mathcal{S}^p = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\theta\| = 1\}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p : \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_i' \theta)^2 - \mathbb{E}[(X_1' \theta)^2] \right| \right] \lesssim \delta_n^2 + \delta_n \sup_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}^p : \|\theta\|_0 \leq \ell} \left(\mathbb{E}[(X_1' \theta)^2] \right)^{1/2}$$

up to an absolute constant.

Proof. See Lemma B.1 in Belloni et al. (2015b). See also Rudelson and Vershynin (2008) for the original result. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9.4. *Suppose that $f: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant one and let ε be a random variable that is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on $\mathbb{R}$ with continuously differentiable pdf χ such that $e\chi(e) \rightarrow 0$ as $e \rightarrow \infty$. Then the derivative f' of f exists almost surely (with respect to the Lebesgue measure) and satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}[f'(\varepsilon)] = -\mathbb{E}[f(\varepsilon)\chi'(\varepsilon)/\chi(\varepsilon)].$$

Proof. The proof follows immediately from integration by parts; for example, see Section 13.1.1 in Chen, Goldstein, and Shao (2011). $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9.5. *Let $e = (e_1, \dots, e_n)$ be a standard Gaussian random vector and let $Q_i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ be some strictly increasing continuously differentiable functions. Denote $\varepsilon = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$ where $\varepsilon_i = Q_i(e_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and let $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be Lipschitz-continuous with Lipschitz constant $L > 0$. Then for any convex $u: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$, the random variable*

$$V = f(\varepsilon) = f(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$$

satisfies the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}[u(V - \mathbb{E}[V])] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[u \left(\frac{\pi L}{2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Q'_i(e_i) \xi \right) \right],$$

where ξ is a standard Gaussian random variable that is independent of e .

Proof. To prove the asserted claim, let $\tilde{e} = (\tilde{e}_1, \dots, \tilde{e}_n)$ be another standard Gaussian random vector that is independent of e . Also, define

$$F(x) = F(x_1, \dots, x_n) = f(Q_1(x_1), \dots, Q_n(x_n)), \quad x = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[u(V - \mathbb{E}[V])] &= \mathbb{E}[u(F(e) - \mathbb{E}[F(e)])] = \mathbb{E}[u(F(e) - \mathbb{E}[F(\tilde{e})])] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[u(\mathbb{E}[F(e) - F(\tilde{e}) \mid e])] \leq \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[u(F(e) - F(\tilde{e})) \mid e]] = \mathbb{E}[u(F(e) - F(\tilde{e}))]. \end{aligned}$$

Further, define

$$h(\theta) = F(\tilde{e} \cos(\pi\theta/2) + e \sin(\pi\theta/2)), \quad \theta \in [0, 1],$$

so that $h(1) = F(e)$, $h(0) = F(\tilde{e})$, and for all $\theta \in (0, 1)$,

$$h'(\theta) = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n F_i(\tilde{e} \cos(\pi\theta/2) + e \sin(\pi\theta/2))(e_j \cos(\pi\theta/2) - \tilde{e}_j \sin(\pi\theta/2)) = \frac{\pi}{2} (\nabla F(\widetilde{W}_\theta), W_\theta),$$

where we denoted

$$W_\theta = e \cos(\pi\theta/2) - \tilde{e} \sin(\pi\theta/2) \text{ and } \widetilde{W}_\theta = \tilde{e} \cos(\pi\theta/2) + e \sin(\pi\theta/2).$$

Note that for each $\theta \in (0, 1)$, the random vectors W_θ and $\widetilde{W}_\theta$ are independent standard Gaussian. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[u(F(e) - F(\tilde{e}))\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[u(h(1) - h(0))\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\int_0^1 h'(\theta)d\theta\right)\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 u(h'(\theta))d\theta\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^1 u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(\widetilde{W}_\theta), W_\theta)\right)d\theta\right] = \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(\widetilde{W}_\theta), W_\theta)\right)\right]d\theta \\ &= \int_0^1 \mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(e), \tilde{e})\right)\right]d\theta = \mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(e), \tilde{e})\right)\right].\end{aligned}$$

Next, note that since e and $\tilde{e}$ are independent standard Gaussian random vectors, conditional on e , the random variable $(\nabla F(e), \tilde{e})$ is zero-mean Gaussian with variance

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial e_i}(e)\right)^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\varepsilon)\right)^2 (Q'_i(e_i))^2 \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (Q'_i(e_i))^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \varepsilon_i}(\varepsilon)\right)^2 \leq L^2 \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} (Q'_i(e_i))^2.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, using the fact that u is convex, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(e), \tilde{e})\right)\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}(\nabla F(e), \tilde{e})\right) \mid e\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\left(\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial F}{\partial e_i}(e)\right)^2\right)^{1/2} \xi\right) \mid e\right]\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi L}{2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Q'_i(e_i) \xi\right) \mid e\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[u\left(\frac{\pi L}{2} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} Q'_i(e_i) \xi\right)\right],\end{aligned}$$

where ξ is a standard Gaussian random variable that is independent of the vector e . Combining presented inequalities gives the asserted claim. $\blacksquare$

Lemma 9.6. *Let $X_1, \dots, X_n$ be random variables (not necessarily independent). Then for all $\alpha \in (0, 1)$,*

$$Q_{1-\alpha}(X_1 + \dots + X_n) \leq Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_1) + \dots + Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_n),$$

where for any random variable Z and any number $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $Q_\alpha(Z)$ denotes the α th quantile of the distribution of Z , i.e. $Q_\alpha(Z) = \inf\{z \in \mathbb{R} : \alpha \leq \mathbb{P}(Z \leq z)\}$.

Proof. To prove the asserted claim, suppose to the contrary that

$$Q_{1-\alpha}(X_1 + \dots + X_n) > Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_1) + \dots + Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_n).$$

Then by the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned}\alpha &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_n \geq Q_{1-\alpha}(X_1 + \dots + X_n)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1 + \dots + X_n > Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_1) + \dots + Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_n)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(X_1 > Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_1)) + \dots + \mathbb{P}(X_n > Q_{1-\alpha/(2n)}(X_n)) \\ &\leq \alpha/(2n) + \dots + \alpha/(2n) = \alpha/2,\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction. Thus, the asserted claim follows. $\blacksquare$

References

- Abadie, A. and Kasy, M. (2018). Choosing among regularized estimators in empirical economics. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, *forthcoming*.
- Arlot, S. and Celisse, A. (2010). A survey of cross-validation procedures for model selection. *Statistics Surveys*, **4**, 40-79.
- Bellec, P. and Tsybakov, A. (2017). Bounds on the prediction error of penalized least squares estimators with convex penalty. *Modern Problems of Stochastic Analysis and Statistics, Selected Contributions in Honor of Valentin Konakov*, 315-333.
- Bellec, P. and Zhang, C.-H. (2018). Second order Stein: SURE for SURE and other applications in high-dimensional inference. *arXiv:1811.04121*.
- Belloni, A., Chen, D., Chernozhukov, V., and Hansen, C. (2012). Sparse models and methods for optimal instruments with an application to eminent domain. *Econometrica*, **80**, 2369-2429.
- Belloni, A. and Chernozhukov, V. (2011). High dimensional sparse econometric models: an introduction. *Chapter 3 in Inverse Problems and High-Dimensional Estimation*, **203**, 121-156.
- Belloni, A. and Chernozhukov, V. (2013). Least squares after model selection in high-dimensional sparse models. *Bernoulli*, **19**, 521-547.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Hansen, C., and Kato, K. (2018). High-dimensional econometrics and regularized GMM. *Arxiv: 1806.01888*.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2015a). Some new asymptotic theory for least squares series: pointwise and uniform results. *Journal of Econometrics*, **186**, 345-366.
- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Wei, Y. (2015b). Uniformly valid post-regularization confidence regions for many functional parameters in Z-estimation framework. *arXiv:1512.07619*.
- Bickel, P., Ritov, Y., and Tsybakov, A. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *The Annals of Statistics*, **37**, 1705-1732.
- Boucheron, S., Lugosi, G., and Massart, P. (2013). Concentration inequalities: a nonasymptotic theory of independent. *Oxford University Press*.
- Bühlmann, P. and van de Geer, S. (2011). Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory, and applications. *Springer Series in Statistics*.

- Chalfin, A., Danieli, O., Hillis, A., Jelveh, Z., Luca, M., Ludwig, J., and Mullainathan, S. (2016). Productivity and selection of human capital with machine learning. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, **106**, 124-127.
- Chatterjee, S. (2014). A new perspective on least squares under convex constraint. *The Annals of Statistics*, **42**, 2340-2381.
- Chatterjee, S. (2015). High dimensional regression and matrix estimation without tuning parameters. *arXiv:1510.07294*.
- Chatterjee, S. and Jafarov, J. (2015). Prediction error of cross-validated lasso. *arXiv:1502.06292*.
- Chen, L., Goldstein, L., and Shao, Q.-M. (2011). Normal approximation by Stein’s method. *Springer: Probability and Its Applications*.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *Econometrics Journal*, **21**, 1-68.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2013). Gaussian approximations and multiplier bootstrap for maxima of sums of high-dimensional random vectors. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2786-2819.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., and Kato, K. (2014). Central limit theorems and bootstrap in high dimensions. *arXiv:1412.3661*.
- Chetverikov, D. and Wilhelm, D. (2015). Nonparametric instrumental variable estimation under monotonicity. *arXiv:1507.05270*.
- Giraud, C. (2015). Introduction to high-dimensional statistics. *CRC Press*.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Wainwright, M. (2015). Statistical learning with sparsity: The Lasso and generalizations. *CRC Press*.
- Homrighausen, D. and McDonald, D. (2013). The lasso, persistence, and cross-validation. *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, **28**.
- Homrighausen, D. and McDonald, D. (2014). Leave-one-out cross-validation is risk consistent for lasso. *Mach. Learn.*, **97**, 65-78.
- Homrighausen, D. and McDonald, D. (2017). Risk consistency of cross-validation with Lasso-type procedures. *Statistica Sinica*, **27**, 1017-1036.
- Lecué, G. and Mitchell, C. (2012). Oracle inequalities for cross-validation type procedures. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **6**, 1803-1837.

- Li, K. (1987). Asymptotic optimality for C_p , C_L , cross-validation and generalized cross-validation: discrete index set. *The Annals of Statistics*, **15**, 958-975.
- Mammen, E. (1993). Bootstrap and wild bootstrap for high dimensional linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **21**, 255-285.
- Miolane, L. and Montanari, A. (2018). The distribution of the Lasso: uniform control over sparse balls and adaptive parameter tuning. *arXiv: 1811.01212*.
- Mullainathan, S. and Spiess, J. (2017). Machine learning: an applied econometric approach. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, **31**, 87-106.
- Rigollet, P. and Tsybakov, A. (2011). Exponential screening and optimal rates of sparse estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**, 731-771.
- Rudelson, M. and Vershynin, R. (2008). On sparse reconstruction from fourier and gaussian measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, **61**, 1025-1045.
- Sala-I-Martin, X. (1997). I just run two million regressions. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings*, **87**, 178-183.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, **58**, 267-288.
- Tibshirani, R. and Taylor, J. (2012). Degrees of freedom in Lasso problems. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 1198-1232.
- Tibshirani, R. (2013). The Lasso problem and uniqueness. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, **7**, 1456-1490.
- van de Geer, S. (2016). Estimation and testing under sparsity. *Springer: Lecture Notes in Mathematics*.
- van der Vaart, A. and Wellner, J. (1996). Weak convergence and empirical processes. *Springer Series in Statistics*.
- Vershynin, R. (2012). Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *Chapter 5 in Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, Cambridge University Press.
- Wegkamp, M. (2003). Model selection in nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, **31**, 252-273.
- Zou, H., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2007). On the degrees of freedom of the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, **35**, 2173-2192.




Figure 5.1: DGP1, $n = 100$, and $p = 40$. The top-left, top-right, and bottom-left panels show the mean of estimation error of Lasso estimators in the prediction, L^2 , and L^1 norms. The dashed line represents the mean of estimation error of the Lasso estimator as a function of λ (we perform the Lasso estimator for each value of λ in the candidate set Λ_n ; we sort the values in Λ_n from the smallest to the largest, and put the order of λ on the horizontal axis; we only show the results for values of λ up to order 32 as these give the most meaningful comparisons). The solid and dotted horizontal lines represent the mean of the estimation error of the cross-validated Lasso estimator and the Lasso estimator with λ chosen according to the Bickel-Ritov-Tsybakov rule, respectively.

Table 5.1: The mean of estimation error of Lasso estimators

DGP1									
	Prediction norm			L^2 norm			L^1 norm		
	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.1902	0.1765	1.0697	0.6203	0.5738	1.6965	1.8389	1.6986	3.3357
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.2834	0.2606	1.1944	0.8169	0.7569	1.7980	2.6853	2.3876	3.5653
(n, p)=(100, 400)	0.5137	0.4238	1.3545	1.2701	1.1651	1.9302	4.2179	3.5655	3.8927
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.0467	0.0435	0.2903	0.2884	0.2633	0.8649	0.8330	0.7780	1.6872
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.0688	0.0646	0.3422	0.3677	0.3307	0.9410	1.1309	1.0312	1.8374
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.1108	0.1044	0.4208	0.5013	0.4537	1.0461	1.6110	1.3765	2.0449

DGP2									
	Prediction norm			L^2 norm			L^1 norm		
	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso	CV-Lasso	λ -Lasso	P-Lasso
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.5912	0.5255	2.1759	1.1044	0.9915	2.3235	3.1826	2.9263	4.5308
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.8850	0.7690	2.4533	1.4693	1.3092	2.4566	4.3838	3.9265	4.7881
(n, p)=(100, 400)	1.3417	1.1076	2.7829	1.9803	1.8530	2.6102	5.7023	4.7242	5.0990
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.1381	0.1290	0.8518	0.4952	0.4530	1.4815	1.4282	1.3375	2.8924
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.2051	0.1923	0.9827	0.6355	0.5718	1.5926	1.9483	1.7781	3.1136
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.3340	0.3138	1.1466	0.8701	0.7868	1.7205	2.7962	2.3803	3.3735

Table 5.2: Probabilities for the number of non-zero coefficients of the cross-validated Lasso estimator hitting different brackets

DGP1								
	[0, 5]	[6, 10]	[11, 15]	[16, 20]	[21, 25]	[26, 30]	[31, 35]	[36, p]
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.0004	0.0818	0.3660	0.3464	0.1538	0.0388	0.0118	0.0010
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.0000	0.0102	0.0814	0.2164	0.2596	0.1968	0.1210	0.1146
(n, p)=(100, 400)	0.0018	0.0230	0.0552	0.0720	0.0896	0.1234	0.1312	0.5038
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.0010	0.1028	0.3906	0.3392	0.1288	0.0312	0.0058	0.0006
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.0002	0.0192	0.1304	0.2658	0.2636	0.1672	0.0952	0.0584
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.0000	0.0028	0.0236	0.0680	0.1338	0.1680	0.1670	0.4368

DGP2								
	[0, 5]	[6, 10]	[11, 15]	[16, 20]	[21, 25]	[26, p]	[31, p]	[36, p]
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.0164	0.1394	0.3430	0.3134	0.1334	0.0426	0.0096	0.0022
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.0142	0.1116	0.1952	0.2002	0.1818	0.1400	0.0774	0.0796
(n, p)=(100, 400)	0.0300	0.0934	0.1646	0.1728	0.1426	0.1160	0.0778	0.2028
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.0012	0.0988	0.4022	0.3322	0.1304	0.0308	0.0044	0.0000
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.0002	0.0210	0.1360	0.2620	0.2560	0.1802	0.0872	0.0574
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.0000	0.0024	0.0238	0.0766	0.1348	0.1664	0.1592	0.4368

Table 5.3: Probabilities for $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} n^{-1} |\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij} \varepsilon_i| / \hat{\lambda}$ hitting different brackets

DGP1							
	[0, 0.5)	[0.6, 1)	[1, 1.5)	[1.5, 2)	[2, 2.5)	[2.5, 3)	[3, ∞)
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.0000	0.0902	0.3478	0.2852	0.1404	0.0668	0.0696
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.0000	0.1578	0.4446	0.2310	0.0976	0.0360	0.0330
(n, p)=(100, 400)	0.0124	0.3708	0.3426	0.1326	0.0570	0.0284	0.0562
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.0002	0.1164	0.4352	0.2900	0.1072	0.0318	0.0192
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.0000	0.2672	0.5664	0.1456	0.0186	0.0018	0.0004
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.0000	0.5886	0.3956	0.0148	0.0008	0.0002	0.0000

DGP2							
	[0, 0.5)	[0.6, 1)	[1, 1.5)	[1.5, 2)	[2, 2.5)	[2.5, 3)	[3, ∞)
(n, p)=(100, 40)	0.0018	0.1522	0.3474	0.2402	0.1308	0.0600	0.0676
(n, p)=(100, 100)	0.0066	0.3444	0.3732	0.1542	0.0710	0.0260	0.0246
(n, p)=(100, 400)	0.0380	0.6188	0.2250	0.0610	0.0242	0.0122	0.0208
(n, p)=(400, 40)	0.0000	0.1188	0.4450	0.2880	0.0996	0.0306	0.0180
(n, p)=(400, 100)	0.0000	0.2698	0.5764	0.1320	0.0196	0.0018	0.0004
(n, p)=(400, 400)	0.0000	0.5792	0.4028	0.0174	0.0006	0.0000	0.0000