# AMP for SLOPE

Bartłomiej Polaczyk
02 July 2020

#### Abstract

The aim of this project is to investigate the the approximate message passing algorithm for SLOPE regularization problem based on (Bu et al. 2019) and compare it with classical convex optimization methods. Some numerical experiments regarding the cases that do not fit into the theoretical framework of (Bu et al. 2019) are also performed and analyzed.

# Theoretical bacground

#### Introduction

We are interested in solving the standard linear inverse problem

$$y = Ax + w, (1)$$

where  $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  and  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  are known parameters of the model,  $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a random noise vector and  $x \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is an unknown vector of parameters we wish to estimate. We assume  $p \gg n$ , i.e. the number of features is much greater than the size of the sample data and whence there might be many potential solutions to the problem (1).

To resolve this issue and prevent overfitting, we introduce a penalty function  $\phi$  which faforizes sparse solutions of (1), i.e. now we are looking among the minimizers of the following form

$$\widehat{x} = \underset{x}{\operatorname{argmin}} \{ \|Ax - y\|_{2}^{2} + \phi(x) \}.$$
 (2)

The usual choices of  $\phi$  are scaled  $l^2$  penalty (Tikhonov regularization) and  $l^1$  penalty (LASSO). This note concerns SLOPE regularization, introduced for the first time in (Bogdan et al. 2015), which assumes  $\phi$  to be the sorted  $l^1$  penalty, i.e.

$$\phi(x) = \phi_{\theta}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \theta_{i} x_{i}^{\downarrow}, \tag{3}$$

where  $x_1^{\downarrow} \geq x_2^{\downarrow} \geq \ldots \geq x_n^{\downarrow}$  is the ordered permutation of the vector  $(|x_1|, |x_2|, \ldots, |x_n|)$  and  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$  is a hyperparameter of the model. Such a choice is a generalization of the  $l^1$  regularization, as can be seen by taking  $\theta_i = \text{const.}$ 

The fact that  $\phi_{\theta}$  is non-separable makes the analysis of its teoretical properties much more onerous than in case of classical (separable) models, cf. (Bogdan et al. 2015, Bu et al. (2019)). Nonetheless, it turns out that SLOPE has two advantages over other regularization methods such as LASSO and knocoffs, namely:

- 1. it achieves certain minimax estimation properties under particular random designs without requiring any knowledge of the sparsity degree of  $\hat{x}$ , cf. (Bellec, Lecué, and Tsybakov 2018);
- 2. it controls the false discovery rate in the case of independent predictors, cf. (Bogdan et al. 2015).

Since the objective function in (2) is convex but not smooth, one can not apply directly gradient descent

#### AMP

Donoho, Maleki, and Montanari (2009), Bu et al. (2019), Zdeborová and Krzakala (2016), Bayati and Montanari (2011).

## Convex optimization methods

# Numerical experiments

### Comparison with convex optimization methods

## References

Bayati, M., and A. Montanari. 2011. "The Dynamics of Message Passing on Dense Graphs, with Applications to Compressed Sensing." *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory* 57 (2): 764–85. doi:10.1109/TIT.2010.2094817.

Bellec, P. C., G. Lecué, and A. B. Tsybakov. 2018. "Slope Meets Lasso: Improved Oracle Bounds and Optimality." *Ann. Statist.* 46 (6B): 3603–42. doi:10.1214/17-AOS1670.

Bogdan, M., E. van den Berg, C. Sabatti, W. Su, and E. J. Candès. 2015. "SLOPE—adaptive Variable Selection via Convex Optimization." *Ann. Appl. Stat.* 9 (3): 1103–40. doi:10.1214/15-AOAS842.

Bu, Z., J. Klusowski, C. Rush, and W. Su. 2019. "Algorithmic Analysis and Statistical Estimation of Slope via Approximate Message Passing." In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 9366–76. http://par.nsf.gov/biblio/10163278.

Donoho, D., A. Maleki, and A. Montanari. 2009. "Message-Passing Algorithms for Compressed Sensing." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 106 (45). National Acad Sciences: 18914–9. doi:https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0909892106.

Zdeborová, L., and F. Krzakala. 2016. "Statistical Physics of Inference: Thresholds and Algorithms." Advances in Physics 65 (5). Taylor & Francis: 453–552. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/00018732.2016.1211393.