Lecture 21
Theory of the Lasso II

02 December 2015

Taylor B. Arnold
Yale Statistics
STAT 312/612

Class Notes

- Midterm II - Available now, due next Monday
- Problem Set 7 - Available now, due December 11th (grace period through the 16th)

Last time

Last class, we started investigating the theory of the lasso estimator.

For the case of $X^t X$ equal to the identity matrix, we were able to quickly establish bounds on the prediction error, estimation of β, and the reconstruction of the support of β.

Last class, we started investigating the theory of the lasso estimator.

For the case of $X^t X$ equal to the identity matrix, we were able to quickly establish bounds on the prediction error, estimation of β, and the reconstruction of the support of β.

For an arbitrary X matrix we were able to calculate a bound on $||X(\widehat{\beta} - \beta)||_2^2$.

Last class, we started investigating the theory of the lasso estimator.

For the case of $X^t X$ equal to the identity matrix, we were able to quickly establish bounds on the prediction error, estimation of β, and the reconstruction of the support of β.

For an arbitrary X matrix we were able to calculate a bound on $||X(\widehat{\beta} - \beta)||_2^2$.

Today's goal is to establish a bound on $||\widehat{\beta} - \beta||_2^2$

The basic starting point from last time was the following decomposition, which had no assumptions beyond linearity of the true model:

$$||X(\beta - b)||_2^2 \leq 2\epsilon^t X(b - \beta) + \lambda \cdot (||\beta||_1 - ||b||_1)$$

Where can think of this decomposition as the loss to be minimized, the empirical part, and the penalty term.

I then defined the set

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{2||\epsilon^t X||_\infty \leq \lambda\right\}$$

And showed that for any $A > 1$ we have $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A} \geq 1 - A^{-1}$ whenever

$$\lambda \geq A \cdot \sqrt{8 \log(2p)\sigma^2}.$$

Today we will motivate a stronger assumption on the model and use these two results to establish bounds on the prediction of β.

Also, it will be helpful to write the set $\mathcal{A}$ as being parameterized by the value of λ_0:

$$\mathcal{A}(\lambda_0) = \left\{2||\epsilon^t X||_\infty \leq \lambda_0\right\}$$

Bounds on estimation error

We already know that on $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_0)$ and with $\lambda > 2 \cdot \lambda_0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b||_1 &\leq 2\epsilon^t X(b-\beta) + \lambda \cdot ||\beta||_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_0 ||b-\beta||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||\beta||_1 \end{aligned}$$

We already know that on $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_0)$ and with $\lambda > 2 \cdot \lambda_0$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b||_1 &\leq 2\epsilon^t X(b-\beta) + \lambda \cdot ||\beta||_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_0 ||b-\beta||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||\beta||_1 \end{aligned}$$

Now, multiplying by two gives:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + 2\lambda \cdot ||b||_1 \leq \lambda ||b-\beta||_1 + 2\lambda \cdot ||\beta||_1$$

Recall that we defined the notation: $S = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0\}$, s is the size of the set S, and v_S is the vector v which has components not in S set to zero.

Notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} ||b||_1 &= ||b_S||_1 + ||b_{S^c}||_1 \\ &\geq ||\beta||_1 - ||b_S - \beta||_1 + ||b_{S^c}||_1 \end{aligned}$$

Using the (reverse) triangle inequality and the fact that β_{S^c} is zero by definition.

Similarly, we have:

$$||b - \beta||_1 = ||b_S - \beta_S||_1 + ||b_{S^c}||_1$$

Where clearly β_S is redundant, but useful to keep the notation straight.

Plugging these in, we now get:

$$\begin{aligned} 2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + 2\lambda \cdot ||\beta_S||_1 - 2\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta||_1 + 2\lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1 \\ \leq \lambda ||b-\beta||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1 + 2\lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1 \end{aligned}$$

Plugging these in, we now get:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + 2\lambda \cdot ||\beta_S||_1 - 2\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta||_1 + 2\lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1$$
$$\leq \lambda||b-\beta||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1 + 2\lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1$$

Which cancels out as:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda||b_{S^c}||_1 \leq 3 \cdot \lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

This result now actually gives two sub-results, as all three terms are positive and therefore each component of the left hand side is individually bounded by the right hand side.

This result now actually gives two sub-results, as all three terms are positive and therefore each component of the left hand side is individually bounded by the right hand side.

In particular, we have:

$$||b_{S^c}||_1 \leq 3 \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

Which implies that the amount of error in b can not be too highly concentrated on S^c.

The other sub-result gives:

$$2||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 \leq 3\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

The other sub-result gives:

$$2||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 \leq 3\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

If σ_{min} is the minimum singular value of X, then the left hand side can be bounded below by:

$$2\sigma_{min}^2||b - \beta||_2^2 \leq 3\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

The other sub-result gives:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 \leq 3\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

If σ_{min} is the minimum singular value of X, then the left hand side can be bounded below by:

$$2\sigma_{min}^2||b-\beta||_2^2 \leq 3\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, this becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} 2\sigma_{min}^2||b-\beta||_2^2 &\leq 3\lambda \cdot \sqrt{s}||b_S - \beta_S||_2 \\ ||b-\beta||_2 &\leq \frac{3\lambda\sqrt{s}}{2\sigma_{min}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Which gives a bound on the error of estimating β, which is exactly what we wanted to establish.

Why is this not sufficient for us? Well, in the high dimensional case $p > n$, we will always have σ_{min} equal to 0.

Why is this not sufficient for us? Well, in the high dimensional case $p > n$, we will always have σ_{min} equal to 0.

We can get around this problem by defining a modified version of the minimum eigenvector (or squared singular value) by only considering $b - \beta$ such that:

$$||b_{S^c}||_1 \leq 3 \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1$$

The (minimum) restricted eigenvalue ϕ_S on the set S is defined as:

$$\phi_S = \arg\min_{v \in \mathcal{V}_S} \frac{||Xb||_2}{||b||_2}$$

Where:

$$\mathcal{V}_S = \{v \in \mathbb{R}^p \text{ s.t. } ||v_{S^c}||_1 \leq 3 \cdot ||v_S||_1\}$$

Because we do not know S, it is impossible to calculate ϕ_S in practice. In theoretical work, often one considers **the** restricted eigenvalue ϕ defined as the smallest ϕ_S for all sets S with size bounded by some predefined s_0.

Now, we can bound the following using our prior result:

$$\begin{aligned}
2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \\
&= 2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1 \\
&= 4\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1
\end{aligned}$$

Now, we can bound the following using our prior result:

$$
\begin{aligned}
2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 &+ \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \\
&= 2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1 \\
&= 4\lambda \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_1
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Cauchy-Schartz again, we can change the ℓ_1-norm to an ℓ_2-norm at the cost of a factor of $\sqrt{s}$:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \leq 4\lambda \cdot \sqrt{s} \cdot ||b_S - \beta_S||_2$$

Now, we can bound the following using our prior result:

$$
\begin{aligned}
2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \\
&= 2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b_S-\beta_S||_1 + \lambda \cdot ||b_{S^c}||_1 \\
&= 4\lambda \cdot ||b_S-\beta_S||_1
\end{aligned}
$$

Using Cauchy-Schartz again, we can change the ℓ_1-norm to an ℓ_2-norm at the cost of a factor of $\sqrt{s}$:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \leq 4\lambda \cdot \sqrt{s} \cdot ||b_S-\beta_S||_2$$

Finally, we now use the restricted eigenvalue ϕ to convert from β space to $X\beta$ space:

$$2||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b-\beta||_1 \leq 4\lambda \cdot \sqrt{s} \cdot ||X(b_S-\beta_S)||_2/\phi$$

I am now going to use an inequality trick that is often useful in theoretical statistics derivations. For any u and v, notice that $4uv \leq u^2 + 4v^2$.

For a proof, notice that it is trivially true at zero and negative values of u and v. Then look at the derivatives and notice that the right hand side grows faster than the left hand side in the directions of both u and v.

Setting $u = ||X(b_S - \beta_S)||_2$, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} 2||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b - \beta||_1 &\leq ||X(b_S - \beta_S)||_2 + 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \\ &\leq ||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 + 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \end{aligned}$$

Setting $u = ||X(b_S - \beta_S)||_2$, we then have:

$$\begin{aligned} 2||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b - \beta||_1 &\leq ||X(b_S - \beta_S)||_2 + 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \\ &\leq ||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 + 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \end{aligned}$$

And when canceling one factor of $||X(b - \beta)||_2$:

$$||X(b - \beta)||_2^2 + \lambda \cdot ||b - \beta||_1 \leq 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2$$

Which holds on the entire set $\mathcal{A}(\lambda_0)$.

This establishes two simultaneous bounds:

$$\begin{aligned} ||X(b-\beta)||_2^2 &\leq 4\lambda^2 \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \\ ||b-\beta||_1 &\leq 4\lambda \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \end{aligned}$$

Though the first is slightly less satisfying than our result in last class as it relies on ϕ^2, though it no longer requires the norm of β.

Asymptotic analysis

As before, we can convert a more natural re-scaled problem by dividing all of the λ parameters by $\sqrt{n}$

Also, remember that for some $A > 1$, we have $\mathbb{P}\mathcal{A}(\lambda_0) \geq 1 - A^{-1}$ for all $\lambda > A \cdot \sqrt{16n^{-1}\log(2p)\sigma^2}$.

Therefore, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} ||b-\beta||_1 &\leq 4\lambda \cdot s \cdot /\phi^2 \\ &\leq 8 \cdot A\sigma^2/\phi^2 \cdot \frac{s_n^2 \log(2p_n)}{n} \end{aligned}$$

Which is the same result as from the Bickel, Ritov, Tsybakov paper.

To establish consistency of the estimator under constant noise and restricted eigenvalues ϕ^2, we need the following limit to go to zero:

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{s_n^2 \log(2p_n)}{n} = 0$$

Which can happen with a number of different scalings, such as a constant number of non-zero terms but an exponential number of non-zero terms. Or, s_n growing like $n^{1/3}$ and p_n growing linearly with s_n.

Some (personal) closing thoughts on the application of the lasso theory to data analysis:

1. The theory is useful for establishing a rough rule of thumb for how large p_n and s_n can be to have a reasonable chance of reconstructing β or $X\beta$

Some (personal) closing thoughts on the application of the lasso theory to data analysis:

1. The theory is useful for establishing a rough rule of thumb for how large p_n and s_n can be to have a reasonable chance of reconstructing β or $X\beta$
2. The theory also helps guide where to start looking for the optimal λ

Some (personal) closing thoughts on the application of the lasso theory to data analysis:

1. The theory is useful for establishing a rough rule of thumb for how large p_n and s_n can be to have a reasonable chance of reconstructing β or $X\beta$
2. The theory also helps guide where to start looking for the optimal λ
3. We still generally need some form of cross validation however, as the theoretical values tend to overestimate λ in practice; we also do not know σ^2 and in theory need to use an over-estimate for the convergence results to hold

Some (personal) closing thoughts on the application of the lasso theory to data analysis:

1. The theory is useful for establishing a rough rule of thumb for how large p_n and s_n can be to have a reasonable chance of reconstructing β or $X\beta$
2. The theory also helps guide where to start looking for the optimal λ
3. We still generally need some form of cross validation however, as the theoretical values tend to overestimate λ in practice; we also do not know σ^2 and in theory need to use an over-estimate for the convergence results to hold
4. Bounds on $||X(\beta - \widehat{\beta})||_2^2$ are nice to have, however the theoretical bounds on $||\beta - \widehat{\beta}||_2^2$ are difficult to use in practice due to the near-impossible to calculate restricted eigenvalue assumption

Some (personal) closing thoughts on the application of the lasso theory to data analysis:

1. The theory is useful for establishing a rough rule of thumb for how large p_n and s_n can be to have a reasonable chance of reconstructing β or $X\beta$
2. The theory also helps guide where to start looking for the optimal λ
3. We still generally need some form of cross validation however, as the theoretical values tend to overestimate λ in practice; we also do not know σ^2 and in theory need to use an over-estimate for the convergence results to hold
4. Bounds on $||X(\beta - \widehat{\beta})||_2^2$ are nice to have, however the theoretical bounds on $||\beta - \widehat{\beta}||_2^2$ are difficult to use in practice due to the near-impossible to calculate restricted eigenvalue assumption
5. I have always been skeptical of the asymptotic results for the same reason; ϕ likely depends on n, p_n and s_n in complex ways that are not accounted for

For our next (and last) week we will:

1. use the lasso to encode more complex forms of linear sparsity (e.g., outlier detection and the fused lasso)
2. give an alternative approach to solving for the lasso solution at a particular value of λ