STAT 620: Asymptotic Statistics

Spring 2022

Lecture: Apr 26

Lecturer: Xianyang Zhang

theorem

1 Theorem

Let $Y \sim N_p(\mu, \sigma^2 I_p)$ and recall from the previous lecture that the ideal risk is given by

$$R^{I}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \min \left(\mu_i^2, \sigma^2\right).$$

Let $\widehat{\mu}$ be hard-thresholding or soft-thresholding estimator, that is $\widehat{\mu} = \eta_S(Y, \lambda)$ or $\widehat{\mu} = \eta_H(Y, \lambda)$ with $\lambda = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log p}$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 \le (2 \log p + \delta) (\sigma^2 + R^I(\mu)),$$

where

$$\delta = \begin{cases} 1.0 & \text{for soft-thresholding,} \\ 1.2 & \text{for hard-thresholding.} \end{cases}$$

2 Proof

We shall give the proof of the theorem for soft-thresholding estimator and the case of hard-thresholding estimator can be derived in a similar fashion.

WLOG, we let $\sigma = 1$. The risk for each coordinate is

$$r_s(\lambda, \mu) = \mathbb{E}(\eta_S(Y, \lambda) - \mu)^2, Y \sim N(\mu, 1).$$

Claim 1

$$r_s(\lambda, \mu) \leq \min(r_s(\lambda, 0) + \mu^2, 1 + \lambda^2) \leq r_s(\lambda, 0) + \min(\mu^2, 1 + \lambda^2).$$

Proof of Claim 1: The second inequality follows easily. Here we shall show the steps to derive the first inequality. Note

$$r_{s}(\lambda,\mu) = \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} (y-\lambda-\mu)^{2} \phi(y-\mu) \, dy + \int_{-\infty}^{-\lambda} (y+\lambda-\mu)^{2} \phi(y-\mu) \, dy + \mu^{2} \, \mathbb{P}(-\lambda-\mu \le Z \le \lambda-\mu)$$
$$= \int_{\lambda-\mu}^{\infty} (u-\lambda)^{2} \phi(u) \, du + \int_{-\infty}^{-\lambda-\mu} (u+\lambda)^{2} \phi(u) \, du + \mu^{2} \, \mathbb{P}(-\lambda-\mu \le Z \le \lambda-\mu)$$

where $u = y - \mu$ and $Z \sim N(0, 1)$. Thus we get

$$0 \le \frac{\partial r_s(\lambda, \mu)}{\partial \mu} = 2 \mu \mathbb{P}(-\lambda - \mu \le Z \le \lambda - \mu) \le 2 \mu$$

which implies that

$$r_s(\lambda, \mu) \leq \lim_{\mu \to \infty} r_s(\lambda, \mu) = 1 + \lambda^2.$$

Also, note that

$$r_s(\lambda, \mu) - r_s(\lambda, 0) = \int_0^{\mu} \frac{\partial r_s(\lambda, u)}{\partial u} du \le \int_0^{\mu} 2 u du = \mu^2$$

which indicates that $r_s(\lambda, \mu) \leq r_s(\lambda, 0) + \mu^2$.

Claim 2:

$$r_s(\lambda, 0) \leq \frac{2 \phi(\lambda)}{\lambda}.$$

Proof of Claim 2:

$$r_s(\lambda, 0) = 2 \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} (y - \lambda)^2 \phi(y) dy$$

= $2\lambda^2 \mathbb{P}(Z > \lambda) + 2 \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y^2 \phi(y) dy - 4\lambda \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y \phi(y) dy.$

As $\phi'(y) = -y \phi(y)$, we have

$$\lambda \, \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y \, \phi(y) \, dy = -\lambda \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} d\phi(y) \ = \lambda \, \phi(\lambda).$$

Moreover using integration by parts, we have

$$\int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y^{2} \phi(y) dy = -\int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y d\phi(y)$$
$$= \lambda \phi(\lambda) + \int_{\lambda}^{\infty} \phi(y) dy$$
$$= \lambda \phi(\lambda) + \mathbb{P}(Z > \lambda).$$

Also,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z > \lambda) = \mathbb{E}\Big[\mathbf{1}\big\{Z > \lambda\big\}\Big] \le \mathbb{E}\Big[\frac{Z}{\lambda}\mathbf{1}\big\{Z > \lambda\big\}\Big] = \frac{1}{\lambda}\int_{\lambda}^{\infty} y\,\phi(y)\,dy = \frac{\phi(\lambda)}{\lambda}.$$

Then,

$$r_s(\lambda,0) = 2(1+\lambda^2) \mathbb{P}(Z > \lambda) - 2\lambda \phi(\lambda) \leq 2(1+\lambda^2) \frac{\phi(\lambda)}{\lambda} - 2\lambda \phi(\lambda) = \frac{2\phi(\lambda)}{\lambda}.$$

2.1 Back to main proof

Putting $\lambda = \sqrt{2 \log p}$, we have:

$$r_s(\lambda, 0) \le 2 \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \log p}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 \pi}} \frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p \sqrt{\pi \log p}} \le \frac{2 \log p + 1}{p}.$$

Now,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^p \mathbb{E}(\widehat{\mu}_i - \mu_i)^2$$

$$\leq p \, r_s(\lambda, 0) + \sum_{i=1}^p \min(\mu_i^2, \lambda^2 + 1)$$

$$\leq (2 \log p + 1) + \sum_{i=1}^p \min(\mu_i^2, 2 \log p + 1)$$

$$\leq (2 \log p + 1) (1 + R^I(\mu)).$$

3 Risk inflation

Foster and George (1994) proved that

$$\inf_{\widehat{\mu}} \sup_{\mu} \frac{R(\mu, \widehat{\mu})}{\sigma^2 + R^I(\mu)} \ge 2 \log p \left(1 + o(1)\right)$$

where the infimum is over all hard-thresholding estimators:

$$\widehat{\mu}_i^{HT} = \begin{cases} Y_i & \text{if } |Y_i| \ge \lambda, \\ 0 & \text{if } |Y_i| < \lambda. \end{cases}$$

Assuming $\sigma = 1$, then for k-sparse μ , we have

$$R^{I}(\mu) = \sum_{i=1}^{p} \min(\mu_{i}^{2}, 1) \le k \implies \frac{1}{1+k} \le \frac{1}{1+R^{I}(\mu)}$$

It is enough to show that $\forall \lambda \geq 0$,

$$RI(\lambda) = \max_{k} \sup_{\|\mu\|_0 = k} \frac{R(\mu, \widehat{\mu})}{1 + k} \ge 2 \log p \left(1 + o(1)\right).$$

To this end, we note that

$$r_{H}(\lambda,\mu) = \mathbb{E}\Big[(Y-\mu)^{2} \mathbf{1}\{|Y| \geq \lambda\} + \mu^{2} \mathbf{1}\{|Y| < \lambda\}\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\Big[Z^{2} \mathbf{1}\{|Z+\mu| \geq \lambda\} + \mu^{2} \mathbf{1}\{|Z+\mu| < \lambda\}\Big]$$

$$= \mathbb{E}\Big[Z^{2} \mathbf{1}\{|Z+\mu| \geq \lambda\}\Big] + \mu^{2} \mathbb{P}\big(|Z+\mu| < \lambda\big)$$

$$\geq \mu^{2} \mathbb{P}\big(\mu + Z \leq \lambda\big)$$

where $Z \sim N(0,1)$ and $Y \sim N(\mu,1)$. For k-sparse μ , we let

$$f(k) = \sup_{\|\mu\|_0 = k} R(\mu, \widehat{\mu}) = (p - k) r_H(\lambda, 0) + k \sup_{\mu} r_H(\lambda, \mu).$$

Then we have

$$RI(\lambda) = \max_{0 \le k \le p} \frac{f(k)}{1+k} \ge \max\left(f(0), \frac{f(p)}{1+p}\right) = \max\left(p \, r_H(\lambda, 0), \frac{p}{1+p} \sup_{\mu} r_H(\lambda, \mu)\right).$$

Now,

$$r_H(\lambda,0) = \mathbb{E}\Big[Z^2 \mathbf{1}\{|Z| > \lambda\}\Big] = 2 \mathbb{E}\Big[Z^2 \mathbf{1}\{Z > \lambda\}\Big] = 2 \int_{1}^{\infty} y^2 \phi(y) \, dy \approx 2 \lambda \phi(\lambda),$$

where $\lambda = \sqrt{2 \log p}$. Recall from the above that

$$\sup_{\mu} r_H(\lambda, \mu) \ge \sup_{\mu} \mu^2 \mathbb{P}(\mu + Z \le \lambda).$$

Then

$$\sup_{\mu} r_{H}(\lambda, \mu) \geq \sup_{\mu} \mu^{2} \mathbb{P}(\mu + Z \leq \lambda)$$

$$= \sup_{\mu} \mu^{2} \Phi(\lambda - \mu)$$

$$\geq \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \lambda} (\lambda - u)^{2} \Phi(u), \text{ where } u = \lambda - \mu$$

$$= \sup_{0 \leq u \leq \lambda} \left[\lambda^{2} \Phi(u) + u^{2} \Phi(u) - 2 \lambda u \Phi(u) \right]$$

$$\geq \lambda^{2} - 4 \lambda \sqrt{\log \lambda} + o(\lambda \sqrt{\log \lambda}),$$

where we set $u = \sqrt{2 \log \lambda^2}$ to get the last inequality. Finally, we get

$$RI(\lambda) \underset{\sim}{>} \max \left(2\, p\, \lambda\, \phi(\lambda)\,,\, \lambda^2 \right) \sim 2\, \log\, p\, (1+o(1)).$$