

Greedy Variance Estimation for the LASSO

Christopher Kennedy* and Rachel Ward†

Department of Mathematics, University of Texas at Austin

March 15, 2019

Abstract

Recent results have proven the minimax optimality of LASSO and related algorithms for noisy linear regression. However, these results tend to rely on variance estimators that are inefficient or optimizations that are slower than LASSO itself. We propose an efficient estimator for the noise variance in high dimensional linear regression that is significantly faster than LASSO, only requiring p matrix-vector multiplications. We prove this estimator is consistent with a good rate of convergence, under the condition that the design matrix satisfies the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP). In practice, our estimator vastly outperforms state of the art methods in terms of speed while incurring only a modest bias.

1 Introduction

The LASSO [22] is a classical algorithm for doing noisy linear regression in the case when the number of regression coefficients is larger than the number of response variables $p > n$. The analysis of LASSO has recently surged with much work on establishing oracle inequalities for ℓ_2 estimation over sparse vectors, and corresponding minimax rates. Typically, such results rely on knowledge of the variance of the noise, which is unknown in practice. The full extent of the literature on LASSO is immense and beyond the scope of this paper, but we point to a few important references on the oracle inequalities and corresponding minimax error rates (see [3], [15], [30], [23], [17], [31], [27], [13], [29], [26], [4]).

A good review of variance estimators for LASSO is given in [19], where variance estimation using cross-validated LASSO is highlighted as particularly strong in many sparsity regimes. This method typically uses 5 or 10-fold cross-validation to train the hyperparameters in LASSO and analysis relies on the restricted eigenvalue condition on the design matrix. The above work was later complemented by a theoretical analysis of a slightly modified variant of cross-validated LASSO in [6] (see also [8] [9], e.g.). The main drawback of existing methods such as cross-validation for variance estimation is that they take multiple LASSO estimators to compute. This is costly when the dimensionality of the data is large. The method of moments (see [7]) is a fast alternative to cross-validated LASSO. It relies on the assumption that the design matrix is Gaussian and exploits statistical properties to formulate an estimator. It is consistent with a good rate of convergence [7], but the design matrix has to be Gaussian which is restrictive. We should also mention a variant of the LASSO - the square-root LASSO (see [2]) - whose penalty level doesn't depend on the variance of the noise. However, the resulting estimator is formulated as a conic programming problem which can be inefficient in practice and is beyond the scope of this work.

1.1 Our Contribution

The main contributions of our a paper are the following:

- We provide an *efficient* variance estimator. In fact, our variance estimator only requires p matrix-vector multiplications. This is a significant improvement over more standard estimators that iterate the LASSO multiple times with various penalty levels. Our method is faster than a single iteration of LASSO.

*Email: ckennedy@math.utexas.edu.

†Email: rward@math.utexas.edu.

- Our estimator is consistent in the sense that it converges in probability to the true variance. We have a quantitative bound on the rate of convergence.
- We only require a deterministic assumption on the design matrix (the Restricted Isometry Property) which holds with high probability over many standard matrix ensembles over appropriate parameter regimes. In particular, the condition holds for any orthonormal design matrix.

Remark 1. Precisely, the term consistent means that for some $\rho, c \geq 0$,

$$\lim_{\substack{n/p \rightarrow \rho \\ n, p \rightarrow \infty}} \sup_{0 \leq \sigma^2 \leq c} \|\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2\| = 0.$$

Moreover, our estimator admits a surprisingly simple theoretical argument for convergence using standard compressed sensing-type results and concentration of measure. We note that we assume the design matrix satisfies the restricted isometry property, which is stronger than the restricted eigenvalue condition typically considered in the literature (see [24] e.g.) but still admits a wide range of random matrix ensembles.

In practice, although our estimator exhibits a higher bias than more standard estimators like cross-validated LASSO, it does well in the high-dimensional regime where the cross-validated LASSO and even the method of moments estimator become prohibitive to compute.

1.2 Notation

For a matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, and a subset $\Omega \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, $X_\Omega \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times |\Omega|}$ will denote the restriction of X to its columns indexed by Ω .

For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$, Ω_v is defined to be the support of v .

For each $j = 1, \dots, p/L$, we use $\Omega_j := \{(j-1)L + 1, \dots, jL\}$ to denote the j th “window” of the signal.

2 Problem Statement

Suppose $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is s -sparse, and that we are given a noisy, transformed version of this signal:

$$y = X\beta + \eta,$$

where $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has i.i.d. Gaussian entries $\eta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ and $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a known design matrix. For the purpose of analysis, we define a notion of a well-behaved design matrix X . We will assume that the matrix X satisfies the Restricted Isometry Property (RIP), which was introduced in [5] and is a common property used in Compressed Sensing. It guarantees that a matrix is a near-isometry on sparse vectors. Specifically, we say X satisfies the RIP of order s and level $\delta > 0$ if for all z such that $\|z\|_0 \leq s$,

$$(1 - \delta)\|z\|_2^2 \leq \|Xz\|_2^2 \leq (1 + \delta)\|z\|_2^2.$$

With high probability, RIP is obtained with

$$s = s(m, N) := O(n/\log(p/n)) \tag{1}$$

on an $n \times p$ matrix X whose entries $X_{i,j}$ are independent realizations of a subgaussian random variable, such as a Gaussian or Bernoulli random variable [1]. The Restricted Isometry Property is obtained with high probability on many classes of structured random matrices, such as random partial Fourier matrices [18, 20], but with a slightly smaller (by factors of $\log(p)$) constant s .

It is in general nontrivial to recover the true signal β . We consider here the standard LASSO algorithm [22] to return a denoised version of β :

$$\hat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \|X\beta - y\|_2^2 + 2\lambda\|\beta\|_1. \tag{2}$$

The magnitude of the parameter λ in the objective (2) controls the balance between the ℓ_1 term which promotes sparsity in the recovered signal $\hat{\beta}$, and a mean squared error term $\|X\beta - y\|_2^2$ which promotes consistency with the observed measurements. It is important to balance the two terms appropriately so that one doesn't overfit to the transformed signal y but also doesn't over-enforce sparsity. The standard analysis of the LASSO is conditioned on the event $\{\lambda : \lambda/4 \geq \|X^T \eta\|_\infty/n\}$ (see [3]). In particular, for the case that η is Gaussian with variance σ^2 and X is orthogonal, with high probability we have

$\|X^T\|_\infty/n = \Theta(\sigma^2 \log(n)/n)$. Thus, with the choice $\lambda = 4\sigma^2 \log(n)/n$, the LASSO will provably produce a good estimate β .

However, in applications, the variance σ , and hence a proper choice of λ , is not known a priori. We consider the case where σ is not known in advance, and needs to be estimated from the signal y . It should be clear from the above observations that precision in estimating the parameter σ improves recovery of the true signal.

3 Greedy Variance Estimation – The Orthonormal Case

For the moment we focus on the case where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is an orthonormal matrix ($p = n$) and the problem reduces to recovering the noisy signal $y = \beta + \eta$ (by rotational invariance of the Gaussian). In this regime, the LASSO has the closed form solution

$$\widehat{\beta}_i = \text{sign}(y_i)(|y_i| - \lambda)_+,$$

where $\widehat{\beta}_i = \widehat{\beta}_i(\lambda)$ implicitly depends on λ . A standard approach is to minimize the cross-validation error:

$$\min_{\lambda} \|y - \widehat{\beta}(\lambda)\|_2,$$

which has nice practical and theoretical properties (see [11] e.g.). Moreover, given the optimal λ one can infer a good estimate of the variance as $\|\widehat{\beta} - y\|_2/p$. However, this approach still requires one to compute the LASSO minimizer over a range of λ values, whereas one would like to perform a single computation to estimate the variance (and thus optimal λ). We formulate a method to estimate the variance which only needs a single pass over the input y .

Algorithm 1 Greedy Variance Estimator – Orthonormal Design Matrix

- 1: Compute the window estimators $S_j = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |y_i|^2$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p/L\}$.
 - 2: Let $\widehat{\sigma}^2 = (1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}) \frac{2L}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p/(2L)} S_{(j)}$, where $\{S_{(j)}\}_j$ is a non-decreasing arrangement of $\{S_j\}_j$.
-

The basic idea behind the above algorithm is that we want to capture a noise estimator that avoids the entries of y affected by signal (hence in the second step we take the average of the smaller 50% of the window estimates). We multiply the resulting estimator by $1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}$ to correct the downward bias that results from averaging only over the smallest windows.

Remark 2. (Total variation denoising) Suppose we receive image-type data and instead of taking the LASSO minimizer we want to instead want to regularize by the total variation seminorm:

$$\widehat{\beta} = \arg \min_{\beta} \|\beta - y\|_2^2 + 2\lambda \text{TV}(\beta), \tag{3}$$

where $\text{TV}(\beta) := \sum_n \|\beta_n - \beta_{n-1}\|$. The typical assumption in this model is that the discrete derivative of true signal is sparse, which is promoted by the above objective. In this case, we can apply our estimator to the discrete derivative (which as observed is essentially a sparse signal plus noise) to get a reasonable estimate of the variance of the noise in this setting. This approach originally appeared in [21] and statistical guarantees on the resulting estimator $\widehat{\beta}$ have been developed in [14], [16], [28], culminating most recently in [10]. These papers give a framework that allows one to generalize the estimator (3) to when the signal is 2-D image data. We note that our estimators can also be easily adapted to 2-D image data by replacing window estimates with box estimates.

We have the following result which guarantees accuracy of the estimator $\widehat{\sigma}^2$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $y = X\beta + \eta$ where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is orthonormal, $\eta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ are independent, and β is s -sparse. Consider window size $L \geq \log^3(p)$, and suppose that $s \leq \frac{p}{2L}$. Then the Greedy Variance Estimator produced by Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \frac{6}{\log p} \sigma^2,$$

with probability $1 - \frac{2}{p}$.

4 Greedy Variance Estimation – RIP Design Matrix

We now turn to the more general case where the design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is possibly underdetermined $n \leq p$, but satisfies the Restricted Isometry Property with the appropriate constants (indeed this is a more general case, as an orthonormal matrix satisfies the RIP with constant $\delta = 0$). We define the regularized design matrix as $Z := [Z_{\Omega_1}, \dots, Z_{\Omega_{p/L}}]$ where each $Z_{\Omega_i} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times L}$,

$$Z_{\Omega_i} := U_i I_{n \times L} V_i \quad \text{such that} \quad (4)$$

$$X_{\Omega_i} = U_i \Sigma_i V_i \text{ is the SVD of } X_{\Omega_i}.$$

Then, we run a conditioning step based on the (block orthonormal) matrix Z and then run the algorithm similar to the orthonormal case: In practice, we use the matrix X instead of Z , however using Z allows

Algorithm 2 Greedy Variance Estimator

- 1: Compute $\tilde{y} = Z^T y$.
 - 2: Compute the window estimators $S_j = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\tilde{y}_i|^2$, $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, n/L\}$.
 - 3: Let $\widehat{\sigma}^2 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}\right) \frac{2L}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p/(2L)} S_{(j)}$, where $\{S_{(j)}\}_j$ is a non-increasing arrangement of the window estimators $\{S_j\}_j$.
-

us to do a more streamlined theoretical analysis. To see why this should work intuitively, assume that we precondition just on X that satisfies RIP for a large enough sparsity level s_0 . Note that $X^T y = X^T X \beta + X^T \eta$, so the obstruction to estimating the noise is the $X^T X$ term. Then, $\|X \beta\|_2 = \|X_{\Omega_\beta} \beta\|_2 \approx \|\beta\|_2$, and if we assume our window set Ω_j is disjoint from Ω_β , RIP implies the restricted matrices $X_{\Omega_j}^T, X_{\Omega_\beta}$ satisfy $\|X_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_\beta}\| \leq \delta$ for $\delta > 0$ small. Thus, for a “good” window estimator, we only see the noise $X^T \eta$.

Theorem 4. *Suppose $y = X \beta + \eta$ where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ has the RIP of order s and level δ , $\eta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ are i.i.d., and β is s -sparse. Assume that $L \geq \log^3(p)$, $n \geq L$, $s \leq \frac{n}{2L}$, and that X satisfies (RIP) with order $s = 2 \max\{L, s\}$ and level $\delta > 0$. Then, the variance estimator from the above algorithm satisfies*

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}\right) \left(2\delta \frac{\|\beta\|_2^2}{L} + \frac{6\sigma^2}{\log(p)} + \frac{1}{L} \max\left(4\sigma^2 \log(p), 8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2^2 \sqrt{\log(p)}\right)\right)$$

with probability $1 - \frac{4}{p}$.

Remark 5. The constants in Theorem 4 are chosen for neatness of presentation and are in no way optimized.

Remark 6. Although the right hand side of Theorem 4 contains factors involving $\|\beta\|_2$ (as opposed to $\|\beta\|_1$ which one finds in typical LASSO results), we do not expect this to be a problem in practice. In particular, one can assume $c\sigma \leq |\beta_j| \leq C\sigma$ for all j and some absolute constants $C, c > 0$. If the $|\beta_j|$ are below this threshold, they are essentially noise and difficult to detect in general (this is called the beta-min assumption). On the other hand, one can naturally expect the entries of β to have a uniform upper bound even as the problem size goes to infinity. Since $\|\beta\|_2 \leq s\sqrt{C\sigma}$, we just need that $\delta < \frac{1}{s}$ which will hold for our sparsity regime and standard matrix models (i.i.d. normalized Gaussian entries, for example) with high probability.

5 Experiments

Our experimental methodology is based off of the results in [19]. In particular, we generate a design matrix $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with i.i.d. entries $X_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, n^{-1/2})$ so that X satisfies RIP with sufficiently small constants with high probability. The sparsity level $s = \lceil n^\alpha \rceil$, with $\alpha < 1$, and the non-zero entries of β (chosen uniformly at random) are distributed according to a Laplace(1) distribution. The resulting β is scaled to have the specified norm. The experiments are over the following grid of parameter values, where $n = 100$ in all experiments.

- $p = 100, 200, 500, 1000$,
- $\|\beta\|_2 = 0.1, 1, 2, 5, 10$,
- $\alpha = 0.1, 0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9$.

We use the following estimators in our analysis:

- oracle: the oracle estimator $\hat{\beta} = \|\eta\|_2/\sqrt{n}$.
- window: the standard window estimator with the transformation $\tilde{y} = X^T y$.
- window-svd: the theoretical window estimator with the transformation $\tilde{y} = Z^T y$ where Z is given by (4).
- cv-lasso: 10-fold cross-validated LASSO.
- moment: method of moments estimator (see [7]).

We include the cross-validated LASSO because it was shown to be the most robust to changes in sparsity/dimension by [19] and the method of moments estimator because it is a fast alternative. The window size is chosen based on an inflection point in the values of the estimator for a specific set of parameters as the window size varies.

As we can see in Figure 1, the window and window-svd estimators have reasonable performance compared to the cv-LASSO with slightly larger biases. In particular, we do quite well for $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 1$, performing similarly to cv-Lasso, and with a much smaller variance than the method of moments.

Remark 7. We only include results for $\alpha = 0.1$ because the algorithm performs similarly for $\alpha \leq 0.5$. Moreover our theory only covers up to roughly $\alpha = 0.5$ for reasonable choices of window size. The performance for dense signal $\alpha = 0.9$ is covered in its own section below.

It is important to note that our estimators are significantly faster to compute than cv-LASSO. The method of moments estimator is generally accurate but has unreasonably high variance for large p . We now report computation times for each estimator averaged over 100 trials with $n = 100$, $\alpha = 0.9$, $\beta = 1$, $p = 100, 1000, 10000, 100000$. These experiments were run on an Intel i5 3.80 GHz, 4 core CPU with 16 GB of ram. As expected, the window and window-svd estimators scale incredibly well, whereas the

	p			
	100	1000	10000	100000
window	0.0049	0.0048	0.0433	0.4227
window-svd	0.1559	1.3158	11.8787	135.1963
moment	0.0387	3.2771	1.1632e+03	N/A
cv-lasso	556.5134	186.1420	N/A	N/A

Table 1: Computation times for each estimator averaged over 100 trials.

method of moments estimator is fast for small scale problems but does not scale beyond $p = 10000$ and the cv-lasso does not scale beyond $p = 1000$.

5.1 Optimal Window Size

It is notable to see how well our method can perform when the window size is optimized. Here, we give some representative plots (Figure 2) to show what happens to performance when replacing the window size with the optimal window size using prior knowledge of the variance. In all experiments, $n=100$ and $p=1000$. For the low SNR regimes, we see a similar downward bias to the oblivious choice of window size, although with a smaller bias. Similarly, for high SNR, the upward bias is also smaller than when choosing an oblivious window size. In table 2 we report the optimal window size for various values of α and $\|\beta\|_2$. The optimal window size was found by a grid search over all possible window sizes using knowledge of the true variance.

5.2 High Dimension

In this section we highlight the regime in which our estimator is most useful - when $p \gg n$ is large. In particular, we chose $n = 100$, $p = 100000$ in all experiments. In this setting all other estimators cannot be computed efficiently. In this regime, it is inefficient to even compute an optimal box size based on an inflection point in the value of the estimator, so instead the choice $L = 25$ was fixed for all experiments. The results are shown in Figure 3. Although the bias remains, the estimator performs well, especially in low SNR regimes. This is likely due to the strength of the compressed sensing properties for the design matrix as the dimension grows.




Figure 1: Window size chosen based on inflection point, $p = 1000$. Signal-less ($\|\beta\| = 0$), low SNR ($\alpha = 0.1$, $\|\beta\| = 1$), medium SNR ($\alpha = 0.1$, $\|\beta\| = 5$), high SNR ($\alpha = 0.1$, $\|\beta\| = 10$) respectively, left to right, top to bottom.




Figure 2: Optimal window size, $p = 1000$. Left to right, top to bottom: Signal-less ($\|\beta\| = 0$), low SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 1$), medium SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 5$), high SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 10$) respectively.




Figure 3: High-dimensional regime, $p = 100000$ $L = 25$. Left to right, top to bottom: Signal-less ($\|\beta\| = 0$), low SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 1$), medium SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 5$), high SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 10$) respectively.

		$\ \beta\ _2$				
		0.1	1	2	5	10
α	0.1	100	100	100	20	4
	0.3	100	100	100	22	4
	0.5	100	100	100	18	4
	0.7	100	100	100	18	4
	0.9	100	100	100	14	3

Table 2: Optimal window sizes as a function of α and $\|\beta\|_2$ for $p = 200$. We note that the optimal window size is generally decreasing as a function of both the signal to noise ratio and the sparsity. Moreover, choosing the maximal window size is optimal in modest regimes.

5.3 Orthogonal Design Matrix

We find our estimator performs quite well in the case where the design matrix is orthogonal, as shown in Figure 4. In all experiments, $p = n = 200$ and the window size is chosen via inflection point in the value of the estimator. The method of moments still performs reasonably well, but suffers a strong upwards bias for large SNR. We note that in all regimes, our estimator performs better than cross-validated LASSO. Moreover, it is more robust to changes in SNR than when the design matrix is RIP (but not necessarily orthogonal).

5.4 Dense Signal

Our theory does not cover high sparsity levels ($\alpha \geq 0.9$), but nonetheless our estimator performs well. Although more prone to high levels of SNR, we are still competitive with cv-LASSO in low SNR regimes as seen in Figure 5.

6 Future Work

Our estimator has been shown to be a useful tool to use in high dimensional variance estimation, and comes with nice theoretical properties that leverage results from the compressed sensing literature. Moreover, it is extremely fast and is competitive with cv-LASSO in most parameter regimes. Based on our experimental/theoretical results there are some obvious directions to go in the future:

- Develop an efficient estimator that has theoretical guarantees for a more general design matrix, in particular that satisfies the restricted eigenvalue condition.
- Find a choice of box size that is more robust to sparsity and SNR, which is still efficient to compute.
- Find an efficient estimator that has similar robustness to cross-validated LASSO but also scales past $p > 10000$.

Although this estimator is by no means a replacement for existing estimators in typical regimes, it scales extremely well into high dimensions and performs as well if not better when $p \gg n$. This regime seems the most interesting for developing more robust estimators.

Acknowledgments

We thank Abhinav Nellore for discussions on parameter selection in high dimensional problems which motivated this work. R. Ward and C. Kennedy were partially supported during this work by NSF CAREER grant #1255631.

References

- [1] Richard Baraniuk, Mark Davenport, Ronald DeVore, and Michael Wakin. A simple proof of the restricted isometry property for random matrices. *Constructive Approximation*, 28(3):253–263, 2008.
- [2] Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, and Lie Wang. Square-root lasso: pivotal recovery of sparse signals via conic programming. *Biometrika*, 98(4):791–806, 2011.




Figure 4: Orthogonal design matrix, $p = 200$. Left to right, top to bottom: Signal-less ($\|\beta\| = 0$), low SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 1$), medium SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 5$), high SNR ($\alpha = 0.1, \|\beta\| = 10$) respectively.




Figure 5: Dense signal, $p = 200$. Left to right, top to bottom: Low SNR ($\alpha = 0.9$, $\|\beta\| = 1$), medium SNR ($\alpha = 0.9$, $\|\beta\| = 5$), high SNR ($\alpha = 0.9$, $\|\beta\| = 10$), respectively.

- [3] Peter J Bickel, Ya'acov Ritov, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1705–1732, 2009.
- [4] Emmanuel J Candes and Mark A Davenport. How well can we estimate a sparse vector? *Applied and Computational Harmonic Analysis*, 34(2):317–323, 2013.
- [5] Emmanuel J Candes and Terence Tao. Decoding by linear programming. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 51(12):4203–4215, 2005.
- [6] Sourav Chatterjee and Jafar Jafarov. Prediction error of cross-validated lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1502.06291*, 2015.
- [7] Lee H Dicker. Variance estimation in high-dimensional linear models. *Biometrika*, 101(2):269–284, 2014.
- [8] Jianqing Fan, Shaojun Guo, and Ning Hao. Variance estimation using refitted cross-validation in ultrahigh dimensional regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(1):37–65, 2012.
- [9] Darren Homrighausen and Daniel McDonald. The lasso, persistence, and cross-validation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1031–1039, 2013.
- [10] Jan-Christian Hütter and Philippe Rigollet. Optimal rates for total variation denoising. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1115–1146, 2016.
- [11] Ron Kohavi. A study of cross-validation and bootstrap for accuracy estimation and model selection. In *Ijcai*, volume 14, pages 1137–1145, 1995.
- [12] Beatrice Laurent and Pascal Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 1302–1338, 2000.
- [13] Karim Lounici, Massimiliano Pontil, Sara Van De Geer, Alexandre B Tsybakov, et al. Oracle inequalities and optimal inference under group sparsity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(4):2164–2204, 2011.
- [14] Enno Mammen, Sara van de Geer, et al. Locally adaptive regression splines. *The Annals of Statistics*, 25(1):387–413, 1997.
- [15] Nicolai Meinshausen and Bin Yu. Lasso-type recovery of sparse representations for high-dimensional data. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 246–270, 2009.
- [16] Deanna Needell and Rachel Ward. Near-optimal compressed sensing guarantees for total variation minimization. *IEEE transactions on image processing*, 22(10):3941–3949, 2013.
- [17] Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over ℓ_q -balls. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 57(10):6976–6994, 2011.
- [18] Holger Rauhut. Compressive sensing and structured random matrices. *Theoretical foundations and numerical methods for sparse recovery*, 9:1–92, 2010.
- [19] Stephen Reid, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. A study of error variance estimation in lasso regression. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 35–67, 2016.
- [20] Mark Rudelson and Roman Vershynin. On sparse reconstruction from fourier and gaussian measurements. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 61(8):1025–1045, 2008.
- [21] Leonid I Rudin, Stanley Osher, and Emad Fatemi. Nonlinear total variation based noise removal algorithms. *Physica D: nonlinear phenomena*, 60(1-4):259–268, 1992.
- [22] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- [23] Sara A Van de Geer. High-dimensional generalized linear models and the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 614–645, 2008.
- [24] Sara A Van De Geer, Peter Bühlmann, et al. On the conditions used to prove oracle results for the lasso. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 3:1360–1392, 2009.
- [25] Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.
- [26] Nicolas Verzelen et al. Minimax risks for sparse regressions: Ultra-high dimensional phenomenons. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:38–90, 2012.

- [27] Martin J Wainwright. Information-theoretic limits on sparsity recovery in the high-dimensional and noisy setting. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 55(12):5728–5741, 2009.
- [28] Yu-Xiang Wang, James Sharpnack, Alex Smola, and Ryan Tibshirani. Trend filtering on graphs. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1042–1050, 2015.
- [29] Fei Ye and Cun-Hui Zhang. Rate minimaxity of the lasso and dantzig selector for the lq loss in l_r balls. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Dec):3519–3540, 2010.
- [30] Cun-Hui Zhang and Jian Huang. The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1567–1594, 2008.
- [31] Tong Zhang et al. Some sharp performance bounds for least squares regression with l1 regularization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5A):2109–2144, 2009.

A Proof Ingredients

Proposition 8. (Lemma 1 in [12]) Suppose Z has a chi-squared distribution with d degrees of freedom. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}[d - 2\sqrt{dt} \leq Z \leq d + 2\sqrt{dt} + 2t] \geq 1 - 2e^{-t} \quad \forall t \geq 0. \quad (5)$$

Proposition 9. (Proposition 2.5 in [18]) Suppose $\Omega_u \cap \Omega_v = \emptyset$, and that $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ satisfies RIP of order s_0 and level $\delta > 0$ with $s_0 = |\Omega_u| + |\Omega_v|$. Then,

$$\|X_{\Omega_u}^T X_{\Omega_v}\|_{2 \rightarrow 2} \leq \sqrt{\delta} \quad (6)$$

Proposition 10. (Equation (5.5) in [25]) Let X be a Gaussian random variable with mean 0, variance σ . Then,

$$\mathbb{P}[|X| > t] \leq 2e^{-t^2/2\sigma^2}, \quad t \geq 1.$$

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3

Consider the window estimators

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |y_i|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\beta_i + \eta_i|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\beta_i|^2 + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\eta_i|^2 + 2 \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} \beta_i \eta_i. \end{aligned}$$

Set $E_j := \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\eta_i|^2$. E_j is a sum of L independent squares of $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables. Then E_j concentrates strongly around its expected value,

$$\mathbb{E}(E_j) = \sigma^2.$$

Note that E_j has a chi-squared distribution with L degrees of freedom, so by (5) with the choice $t = \log(p)^2$ and after a union bound over all p/L windows, we get that with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{p}$,

$$\left(1 - \frac{5}{\log(p)}\right) \sigma^2 \leq E_j \leq \left(1 + \frac{5}{\log(p)}\right) \sigma^2,$$

holds uniformly for all $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, p/L\}$, assuming that $L \geq \log^3(p)$.

Since $L \leq \frac{p}{2s}$ by assumption, the pigeon hole principle implies that at least $\frac{p}{2L}$ windows do not overlap Ω_β . On any such “good” window k we have $\|\beta_{k:k+L-1}\|_2^2 = 0$ and hence

$$|S_k - \sigma^2| \leq \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)}. \quad (7)$$

Thus, if \bar{S} is the average over a subset of the good windows, then also $|\bar{S} - \sigma^2| \leq \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)}$.

Now, to bound the estimator above on *any* window, we need some control on the cross term $\sum_{i \in \Omega_j} \beta_i \eta_i$. Note that this quantity is just a sum of i.i.d. Gaussians with mean zero and with variance $\|\beta_{\Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta}\|_2^2 \sigma^2$; thus, by concentration, we have that with probability at least $1 - 2/p$, the following holds uniformly over all windows:

$$\sum_{i \in \Omega_j} \beta_i \eta_i \leq \frac{2\sigma \|\beta_{\Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta}\|_2 \sqrt{\log(p)}}{L}. \quad (8)$$

Hence, for any *any* window,

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &\geq \frac{1}{L} \|\beta_{\Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta}\|_2^2 + E_j - \frac{2}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta} \beta_i \eta_i \\ &\geq \frac{1}{L} \|\beta_{\Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta}\|_2^2 + \left(1 - \frac{5}{\log(p)}\right) \sigma^2 - \frac{\|\beta_{\Omega_j \cap \Omega_\beta}\|_2}{\sqrt{L}} \frac{2\sigma \sqrt{\log p}}{\sqrt{L}} \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{5}{\log(p)}\right) \sigma^2 - \frac{\sigma^2 \log(p)}{L} \quad \text{The minimal value of a quadratic } x^2 + b - ax \text{ is } b - a^2/4 \\ &\geq \left(1 - \frac{6}{\log(p)}\right) \sigma^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality holds because $\log^2(p) \leq L$.

Now, consider the surrogate estimator $\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 = \frac{2L}{p} \sum_{j=1}^{p/(2L)} S_{(j)}$. By construction, $\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 \leq \bar{S}$, where \bar{S} is the average over any $p/(2L)$ “good” windows. From the above analysis, we have that with probability exceeding $1 - \frac{4}{p}$,

$$|\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \frac{6}{\log(p)} \sigma^2.$$

Thus, for our final estimator, $\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 = (1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}) \widehat{\sigma}_S^2$, we have

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \left(\frac{7}{\log(p)} + \frac{6}{(\log(p))^2}\right) \sigma^2$$

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4

Recall that $\tilde{y} := Z^T y \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Consider the window estimate

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |\tilde{y}_i|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |(Z^T X \beta)_i|^2 + \frac{1}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} |Z_i^T \eta|^2 + \frac{2}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} (Z^T X \beta)_i (Z^T \eta)_i \\ &= \frac{1}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_\beta} \beta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T \eta\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} (Z^T X \beta)_i (Z^T \eta)_i \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The first term is small if Ω_j and Ω_β have disjoint support, since X has the RIP, the center term gets close to its expectation σ^2 due to standard concentration inequalities, and the third term is also small due to standard concentration inequalities. More concretely, if we assume that S_j is a “good” window, meaning that Ω_j and Ω_β have disjoint support, by equation (6)

$$\frac{1}{L} \|X_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_\beta} \beta\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\delta \|\beta\|_2^2}{L}. \quad (10)$$

All of the diagonal entries of Σ_j are in the range $[\sqrt{1 - \delta}, \sqrt{1 + \delta}]$, hence by (10)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_\beta} \beta\|_2^2 &\leq \frac{1 + \delta}{L} \|X_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_\beta} \beta\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\delta(1 + \delta) \|\beta\|_2^2}{L} \\ &\leq \frac{2\delta \|\beta\|_2^2}{L} \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For the center term, note that $\|Z_{\Omega_j} \eta\|_2^2 = \|P_L \eta\|_2^2$ where P_L is projection onto the first L coordinates. Next, we know that $\|P_L \eta\|_2^2$ has a chi-squared distribution with L degrees of freedom, so by (5) with $t = \log(p^2)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\left| \|P_L \eta\|_2^2 - L\sigma^2 \right| \leq 2\sigma^2 \left(\sqrt{L \log(p)} + \log(p) \right) \right] \geq 1 - \frac{2}{p^2}.$$

Hence by a union bound, with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{p}$, the following holds uniformly over all windows:

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T \eta\|_2^2 / L - \sigma^2 \right| &= \left| \|P_L \eta\|_2^2 / L - \sigma^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{L}} + 2\sigma^2 \frac{\log(p)}{L} \\ &\leq \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

For the final term in 9, note that $\frac{2}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} (Z^T X \beta)_i (Z^T \eta)_i$ is a Gaussian random variable with variance $2\sigma \|Z_{\Omega_j} X \beta\|_2 / L$. Thus, by Proposition 10 and (11), the following holds uniformly over all windows with probability at least $1 - \frac{1}{p}$:

$$\frac{2}{L} \sum_{i \in \Omega_j} (Z^T X \beta)_i (Z^T \eta)_i \leq \frac{4\sigma \|Z_{\Omega_j} X \beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log(p)}}{L} \quad (13)$$

$$\leq \frac{8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log(p)}}{L}, \quad (14)$$

Thus, averaging over any set of $p/2L$ “good” windows, using (11) (12) and (14) we have

$$\left| \frac{2L}{p} \sum_j S_j - \sigma^2 \right| \leq \frac{2\delta \|\beta\|_2^2}{L} + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log p} + \frac{8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log p}}{L} \quad (15)$$

with probability at least $1 - \frac{4}{p}$. Thus, by construction, the estimator $\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 = \frac{2L}{p} \sum_j S_j$ also satisfies

$$\widehat{\sigma}_S^2 \leq \sigma^2 + \frac{2\delta \|\beta\|_2^2}{L} + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log p} + \frac{8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log p}}{L}$$

It remains to show that the window estimator $\widehat{\sigma}_S^2$ cannot be too small. The inequalities (13) and (12) hold uniformly over all windows, not just good windows; hence, for any window S_j ,

$$\begin{aligned} S_j &\geq \frac{1}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_j} \beta\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T \eta\|_2^2 - \frac{2}{L} \|Z_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_j} \beta\|_2 \|X_{\Omega_j}^T \eta\|_2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{L} \|X_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_j} \beta\|_2^2 + \sigma^2 - \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)} - \frac{8\sigma \|X_{\Omega_j}^T X_{\Omega_j} \beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log p}}{L} \\ &\geq \sigma^2 - \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)} - \frac{4\sigma^2 \log(p)}{L} \end{aligned} \quad \text{The minimal value of a quadratic } x^2 + b - ax \text{ is } b - a^2/4$$

Combining the bounds,

$$-\frac{5\sigma^2}{\log(p)} - \frac{4\sigma^2 \log(p)}{L} \leq \frac{2L}{p} \sum_j S_j - \sigma^2 \leq \frac{2\delta \|\beta\|_2^2}{L} + \frac{5\sigma^2}{\log p} + \frac{8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log p}}{L}$$

For our final estimator $\widehat{\sigma}^2 = (1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)}) \widehat{\sigma}_S^2$, we have

$$|\widehat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma^2| \leq \left(1 + \frac{1}{\log(p)} \right) \left(2\delta \frac{\|\beta\|_2^2}{L} + \frac{6\sigma^2}{\log(p)} + \frac{1}{L} \max \left(4\sigma^2 \log(p), 8\sqrt{\delta}\sigma \|\beta\|_2 \sqrt{\log(p)} \right) \right)$$