Econometrics May 8, 2023

## Topic 14: Regularization Methods in Thresholded Parameter Space

by Sai Zhang

**Key points**: The connections and differences of all regularization methods and some interesting phase transition phenomena.

**Disclaimer**: The note is built on Prof. Jinchi Lv's lectures of the course at USC, DSO 607, High-Dimensional Statistics and Big Data Problems.

# 14.1 Model Setup

Now, consider a generalized linear model (GLM) linking a p-dimensional predictor  $\mathbf{x}$  to a scalar response Y. With canonical link, the conditional distribution of Y given  $\mathbf{x}$  has density

$$f(y; \theta, \phi) = \exp \left[ y\theta - b(\theta) + c(y, \phi) \right]$$

where  $\theta = \mathbf{x}'\boldsymbol{\beta}$  with  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  a p-dimensional regression coefficient vector,  $b(\dot{\mathbf{y}})$  and  $c(\cdot, \cdot)$  are know functions and  $\phi$  is dispersion parameter. Again,  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_{0,1}, \cdots, \beta_{0,p})'$  is sparse with many zero components, and  $\log p = O(n^a)$  for some 0 < a < 1.

The penalized negative log-likelihood is

$$Q_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = -n^{-1} \left[ \mathbf{y}' \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{1}' \mathbf{b} (\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right] + \| p_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \|_1$$

where

- $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)', \mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)', \text{ each column of } \mathbf{X} \text{ is rescaled to have } L_2\text{-norm } \sqrt{n}$
- $\mathbf{b}(\theta) = (b(\theta_1), \dots, b(\theta_n))'$  with  $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_n)'$
- $||p_{\lambda}(\boldsymbol{\beta})||_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p p_{\lambda}(|\beta_j|)$

Next, define **robust spark**  $\kappa_c$ 

### **Definition 14.1.1: Robust spark** $\kappa_c$

The robust spark  $\kappa_c$  of the  $n \times p$  design matrix **X** is defined as the smallest possible positive integer s.t. there exists an  $n \times \kappa_c$  submatrix of  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ **X** having a singular value less than a given positive constant c (Zheng et al., 2014), and

$$\kappa_c \leq n+1$$

Bounding sparse model size can control collinearity and ensure model identifiability and stability, and as  $c \to 0+$ ,  $\kappa_c$  approaches the spark. Robust spark can be some large number diverging with n:

### **Proposition 14.1.2: Order of** $\kappa_c$

Assume  $\log p = o(n)$  and that the rows of the  $n \times p$  random design matrix **X** are i.i.d. as  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ , where  $\Sigma$  has smallest eigenvalue bounded from below by some positive constant. Then there exist

positive constants c and  $\tilde{c}$  s.t. with asymptotic probability one,  $\kappa_c \geq \frac{\tilde{c}n}{\log p}$ 

Next, we define a thresholded parameter space

### Definition 14.1.3: Thresholded parameter space

$$\mathcal{B}_{\tau,c} = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 < \frac{\kappa_c}{2}, \text{ and for each } j, \beta_j = 0 \text{ or } |\beta_j| \ge \tau \right\}$$

where  $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)'$ .  $\tau$  is some positive threshold on parameter magnitude:

Here,  $\tau$  is very important:

- $\tau$  is key to distinguishing between important covariates and noise covariates for the purpose of variable selection
- $\tau$  typically needs to satisfy  $\tau \sqrt{n/\log p} \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \infty$

It turns out that the solution to the regularization problem has the (very natural) hard-thresholding property:

### Proposition 14.1.4: Hard-thresholding property

or the  $L_0$ -penalty  $p_{\lambda}(t) = \lambda \mathbf{1}_{t\neq 0}$ , the global minimizer  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = (\hat{\beta}_1, \dots, \hat{\beta}_p)'$  of the regularization problem over  $\mathbb{R}^p$  satisfies that each component  $\hat{\beta}_j$  is either 0 or has magnitude larger than some positive threshold

This hard-thresholding property is shared by many other penalties such as SICA penalties. This property guarantees sparcity of the model: weak signals are generally difficult to stand out comparing to noise variables due to impact of high dimensionality

# 14.2 Asymptotic Equivalence of Regularization Methods

For a universal  $\lambda = c_0 \sqrt{\log p/n}$  with  $c_0 > 0$  and p implicitly as  $n \vee p$ , consider 2 key events:

$$\mathcal{E} = \left\{ \|n^{-1} \mathbf{X}' \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_{\infty} \le \lambda/2 \right\} \qquad \qquad \mathcal{E}_0 = \left\{ \|n^{-1} \mathbf{X}'_{\alpha_0} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}\|_{\infty} \le c_0 \sqrt{\log n/n} \right\}$$

where  $\epsilon = \mathbf{y} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{y}$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_{\alpha}$  is a submatrix of  $\mathbf{X}$  consisting of columns in  $\alpha$ . Here, let  $\alpha_0 = \operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$  (non-zero variables in the true model).

For this setting, consider the following technical conditions:

- C1 **Error tail distribution**:  $Pr(\mathcal{E}^c) = O(p^{-c_1})$  and  $Pr(\mathcal{E}^c_0) = O(n^{-c_1})$  for some positive constant  $c_1$  that can be sufficiently large for large enough  $c_0$
- C2 **Bounded variance**:  $b(\theta)$  satisfies that  $c_2 \le b''(\theta) \le c_2^{-1}$  in its domain, where  $c_2$  is some positive constant
- C3 **Concave penalty function**:  $p_{\lambda}(t)$  is increasing and concave in  $t \in [0, \infty)$  with  $p_{\lambda}(0) = 0$ , and is differentiable with  $p'_{\lambda}(0+) = c_3\lambda$  for some positive constant  $c_3^1$
- C4 Ultra-high dimensionality:  $\log p = O(n^a)$  for some constant  $a \in (0, 1)$

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$ A wide class of penalties, including  $L_{1}$ -penalty in Lasso, SCAD, MCP and SICA, satisfy this condition.

C5 **True parameter vector**:  $s = o(n^{1-a})$  and  $\exists c > 0$  s.t. the **robust spark**  $\kappa_c > 2s$ . Moreover,  $\min_{1 \le j \le s} |\beta_{0,j}| \gg \sqrt{\log p/n}$ 

Given these 5 conditions, we have that the global minimizer  $\hat{\beta} = \arg\min_{\beta \in \mathcal{B}_{\tau}} Q_n(\beta)$  exists and satisfies oracle inequalities:

### Theorem 14.2.1: Oracle Inequalities

Assume that Condition 1-5 hold and  $\tau$  is chosen s.t.  $\tau < \min_{1 \le j \le s} |\beta_{0,j}|$  and  $\lambda = c_0 \sqrt{\log p/n} = o(\tau)$ , then the global minimizer exists, and any such global minimizer satisfies that with probability at least  $1 - O(p^{-c_1})$ , it holds simultaneously that

• False sign:

$$FS(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \le \frac{Cs\lambda^2\tau^{-2}}{1 - C\lambda^2\tau^{-2}}$$

Estimation losses:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_q &\leq C\lambda s^{1/q} (1 - C\lambda^2 \tau^{-2})^{-1/q} & \forall q \in [1, 2] \\ \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_{\infty} &\leq C\lambda s^{1/2} (1 - C\lambda^2 \tau^{-2})^{-1/2} & \end{aligned}$$

Prediction loss:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \| \mathbf{X} \left( \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \|_2 \le C \lambda s^{1/2} (1 - C \lambda^2 \tau^{-2})^{-1/2}$$

where *C* is some positive constant.

#### How to understand Thm.14.2.1

- These results hold uniformly over the set of all possible global minimizers
- $c_1$  in probability bound can be chosen arbitrarily large, affecting **only** C
- $FS(\hat{\beta}) = o(s)$  since  $\lambda = o(\tau)$ , while  $\|\hat{\beta}\|_0 = O(\phi_{\text{max}}s)$  where  $\phi_{\text{max}}$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $\frac{1}{n}X'X$
- $\forall q \in [1, 2]$ , the convergence rates of estimation losses

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_q = O\left\{s^{1/q} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}\right\}$$
$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\mathbf{X} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{s \log p}{n}}\right)$$

are consistent with Lasso.

We also have a sign consistency result:

### Theorem 14.2.2: Sign Consistency and Oracle Inequalities

Assume the same conditions of Thm.14.2.1, further assume  $\min_{1 \le j \le s} |\beta_{0,j}| \ge 2\tau$  and  $\lambda = c_0 \sqrt{\log p/n} = o(s^{-1/2}\tau)$ , and  $\gamma_n = o\left(\tau \sqrt{\frac{n}{s \log n}}\right)$ , then any global minimizer  $\hat{\beta}$  defined satisfies that with probability at least  $1 - O(n^{-c_1})$ , it holds simultaneously that

- **Sign consistency**:  $\operatorname{sgn}(\hat{\beta}) = \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_0)$
- **Estimation and prediction losses**: If the penalty function further satisfies  $p'_{\lambda}(\tau) = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$ , then  $\forall q \in [1,2]$ ,

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_q \le C s^{1/q} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \qquad \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_{\infty} \le C \gamma_n^* \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}} \qquad n^{-1} D\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\right) \le C \frac{s \log n}{n}$$

where  $\gamma_n^*$  is a constant showing the behavior of  $\|\begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}'_{\alpha_0} \mathbf{H} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0} \end{bmatrix}^{-1}\|_{\infty}$  in a small neighborhood of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ ,  $D(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  is the Kullback-Leibler divergence, and C is some positive constant

How to understand Thm.14.2.2 Consider a linear model, where

$$\gamma_n^* = \left\| \left( \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0}' \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0} \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \le \sqrt{s} \left\| \left( \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0}' \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0} \right)^{-1} \right\|_{2} \le \frac{\sqrt{s}}{c} \qquad \gamma_n = \sup_{\alpha \subset \{s+1, \dots, p\}, |\alpha| \le s} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}_{\alpha_0}' \mathbf{X}_{\alpha} \right\|_{\infty}$$

when all ture covariates are orthogonal to each other,  $\gamma_n^* = 1$  and

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_{\infty} \le C\sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n}}$$

within a logarithmic factor  $\log n$  or oracle rate. Meanwhile, the penalty function condition  $p'_{\lambda}(\tau) = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$  can be easily satisfied by concave penalties such as SCAD and SICA, having convergence rates improved with  $\log n$  in place of  $\log p$ .

#### 14.2.1 Phase Transition Phenomenon

Combining Thm.14.2.1 and 14.2.2, it's shown that

- for  $p = O(n^a)$ , Lasso and concave regularization methods are **asymptotically equivalent**, having the same convergence rates in the oracle inequalities, with a logarithmic factor of  $\log n$
- for  $\log p = O(n^a)$ , concave regularization methods are **asymptotically equivalent** and still enjoy the same convergence rates in the oracle inequalities, with a logarithmic factor of  $\log n^2$ .

A phase diagram on how the performance of regularization methods, in the thresholded parameter space, evolves with dimensionality and penalty function.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>For Lasso, the condition  $p'_{\lambda}(\tau) = O\left(\frac{\log n}{n}\right)$  and the choice of  $\lambda = c_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}$  are **incompatible** with each other in this ultra-high dimensional case, and the convergence rates for Lasso (of log p) are slower than those for concave regularization methods.

# References

Zemin Zheng, Yingying Fan, and Jinchi Lv. High dimensional thresholded regression and shrinkage effect. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology*, pages 627–649, 2014.