

A Novel Framework for Online Supervised Learning with Feature Selection

Lizhe Sun

*Department of Statistics
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4330, USA*

LIZHE.SUN@STAT.FSU.EDU

Yangzi Guo

*Department of Mathematics
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4330, USA*

YGUO@MATH.FSU.EDU

Adrian Barbu

*Department of Statistics
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306-4330, USA*

ABARBU@STAT.FSU.EDU

Editor:

Abstract

Current online learning methods suffer issues such as lower convergence rates and limited capability to recover the support of the true features compared to their offline counterparts. In this paper, we present a novel framework for online learning based on running averages and introduce a series of online versions of some popular existing offline methods such as Elastic Net, Minimax Concave Penalty and Feature Selection with Annealing. We prove the equivalence between our online methods and their offline counterparts and give theoretical true feature recovery and convergence guarantees for some of them. In contrast to the existing online methods, the proposed methods can extract models with any desired sparsity level at any time. Numerical experiments indicate that our new methods enjoy high accuracy of true feature recovery and a fast convergence rate, compared with standard online and offline algorithms. We also show how the running averages framework can be used for model adaptation in the presence of model drift. Finally, we present some applications to large datasets where again the proposed framework shows competitive results compared to popular online and offline algorithms.

Keywords: online learning, feature selection, model adaptation

1. Introduction

Online learning is one of the most promising approaches to efficiently handle large scale machine learning problems. Nowadays, the size of datasets is rapidly increasing in various areas such as bioinformatics, medical imaging and computer vision, and one often encounters datasets so large that they cannot fit in the computer memory. Online methods are capable of addressing these issues by constructing the model sequentially, one example at a time. A comprehensive survey of the online learning and online optimization literature has been presented in Hazan (2016).

In this paper, we assume that a sequence of i.i.d observations $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ are generated from an unknown distribution, and the goal is to minimize a loss function

$$L(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}_i) \quad (1)$$

where $f(\cdot; \mathbf{z}_i) : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a per-example loss function.

In online learning, the coefficient \mathbf{w} is estimated sequentially, from $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2, \dots, \mathbf{z}_{i-1}$ is obtained a coefficient vector \mathbf{w}_i . In the theoretical analysis of online learning, it is of interest to obtain an upper bound of the regret,

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{w}_i; \mathbf{z}_i) - \min_{\mathbf{w}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\mathbf{w}; \mathbf{z}_i), \quad (2)$$

which measures what is lost compared to their offline versions, and in a way measuring the speed of convergence of the online algorithms.

Traditional online algorithms are all designed based on a sequential procedure. Zinkevich (2003) proved that under the assumption that $f(\mathbf{w}; z_i)$ is Lipschitz-continuous and convex w.r.t \mathbf{w} , the regret enjoys the upper bound of $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$. Furthermore, if $f(\mathbf{w}; z_i)$ is a strongly convex function, Hazan et al. (2007) showed that the regret has the logarithmic upper bound of $\mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n)$.

However, traditional online algorithms have some limitations. Firstly, they cannot access the full gradient to update the parameter vector in each iteration. Online methods are sequential methods, using one observation or a mini-batch for acceleration (Cotter et al., 2011) in each iteration. As a consequence, online algorithms suffer a lower convergence rate than traditional batch learning algorithms, $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ for general convexity and $\mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n)$ for strongly convex functions (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014). In comparison, offline gradient descent enjoys the convergence rate of $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$. More importantly, the standard online algorithms, such as stochastic gradient descent, are not able to exploit the sparse structure of the feature vector, i.e. they cannot select features and recover the support of the true signal.

In this paper, we introduce a new framework for online learning, related to the statistical query model (Kearns, 1998; Chu et al., 2007). We will give more details about our new framework in Section 2.

1.1 Related Work

Online optimization and regularization. To cope with high dimensional data (e.g. $p > n$), various feature selection methods have been proposed to exploit the sparse structure of the coefficient vector. For instance, the ℓ_1 -regularization has been widely used in linear regression as a sparsity inducing penalty. Also, several algorithms were designed to solve the feature selection problem in the online scenario. For online convex optimization, there are two main lines of research. One is the Forward-Backward-Splitting method (Duchi and Singer, 2009), building a framework for online proximal gradient (OPG). The other one is Xiao's Regularized Dual Averaging method (RDA) (Xiao, 2010), which extended the primal-dual sub-gradient method from Nesterov (2009) to the online case. In addition, some online variants are developed in recent years, such as OPG-ADMM and RDA-ADMM in Suzuki (2013). Independently, Ouyang designed stochastic ADMM in Ouyang et al. (2013), the




Figure 1: The solution path for online OLS-th (Left) and online Lasso (Right) for the Year Prediction MSD dataset.

same algorithm as OPG-ADMM. Besides, truncated online gradient descent and truncated second order methods are proposed in Fan et al. (2018); Langford et al. (2009); Wu et al. (2017).

There is another line of research about online feature selection in the high dimensional case. In Yang et al. (2016), a new framework for online learning is proposed in which features arrive one by one, instead of observations, and we need to decide what features to retain. Unlike the traditional online learning, the disadvantage of this new online scenario is we cannot build a model for prediction until all features are disclosed. In this paper, we assume that one can access observations sequentially with time, so we will not cover algorithms such as Yang et al. (2016) for comparison.

In Hazan et al. (2007), an online Newton method was proposed, which used a similar idea with the running averages to update the inverse of the Hessian matrix. This method enjoys the computational complexity $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$, but they did not address the issues of variable standardization and feature selection.

1.2 Our Contributions

In this paper, we propose a new framework for online learning based on the statistical query model (Kearns, 1998; Chu et al., 2007), and we call the methods under our framework as running averages methods. Many of the methods proposed in our framework enjoy a fast convergence rate and can recover the support of the true signal. Moreover, the proposed methods can address the issue of model selection, which is to obtain models with different sparsity levels and decide on the best model, e.g. using an AIC/BIC criterion. For example in Figure 1 are shown the solution paths obtained by the proposed online least squares with thresholding method, as well as the proposed online Lasso method. A brief summary of the convergence rates and computational complexity of various methods including the proposed methods are shown in Table 1. Here, we summarize the advantages and disadvantages of the proposed running averages algorithms: although the proposed online methods based on running averages sacrifice computational complexity and memory compared with classical online methods, they enjoy a fast convergence rate and high estimation accuracy. More importantly, the proposed methods can select features and recover the support of true

Algorithm	Memory	Computation		Convergence		Feature	True Feature
	Running	Avg.	Algorithms	Coefficients	Regret	Selection	Recovery
SGD	$\mathcal{O}(p)$	-	$\mathcal{O}(np)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$	Slow	No	No
SADMM(Ouyang et al., 2013)	$\mathcal{O}(p)$	-	$\mathcal{O}(np)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$	Slow	Yes	No
SIHT(Fan et al., 2018)	$\mathcal{O}(p)$	-	$\mathcal{O}(np)$	$\mathcal{O}(\log(n)/n)$	Slow	Yes	No
OFSA	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(np^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$	Fast	Yes	Yes
OLS-th	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(np^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(p^3)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{\alpha-1})$	Yes	Yes
OMCP	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(np^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$	Fast	Yes	Yes
OElnet	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(np^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(p^2)$	$\mathcal{O}(n^{-1})$	Fast	Yes	No

Table 1: Comparison between different online methods

features with high accuracy and they can obtain models with any desired sparsity level for model selection at any time.

2. Setup and Notation

In this section, we will provide a general framework about running averages. First, we establish notation and problem settings. We denote vectors by lower case bold letters, such as $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and scalars by lower case letters, e.g. $x \in \mathbb{R}$. A sequence of vectors is denoted by subscripts, i.e. $\mathbf{w}_1, \mathbf{w}_2, \dots$, and the entries in a vector are denoted by non-bold subscripts, like w_j . We use upper case bold letters to denote matrices, such as $\mathbf{M} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, and upper case letters for random variables, like X . Given a vector $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \dots, \gamma_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we define vector norms: $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |\gamma_i|$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^n \gamma_i^2}$.

2.1 Running Averages

The idea of running averages comes from the statistical query model and the issues of standard online methods. In mathematical statistics, given a distribution with unknown parameters θ and the i.i.d random variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n , a sufficient statistic $T(X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n)$ contains all the information necessary for estimating the model parameters.

In big data learning, the large datasets cannot fit in memory, and the online methods in the literature cannot recover the support of true features. Motivated by these concerns, we propose the running averages framework, which contains two modules, a running averages module that is updated online as new data is available, and a model extraction module that can build the model with any desired sparsity from the running averages. A diagram of the framework is shown in Figure 2.

Let (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) , $i = \overline{1, n}$ be observations with $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i1}, x_{i2}, \dots, x_{ip})^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$, and we denote data matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{x}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T)^T$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^T$. The running averages are the cumulative averages over the observations. They are

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i, \quad \mu_y = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i, \\ \mathbf{S}_{xx} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T, \quad \mathbf{S}_{xy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad S_{yy} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n y_i^2 \end{aligned}$$

and the sample size n . The running averages can be updated in an incremental manner, for example




Figure 2: Diagram of the running averages based methods. The running averages are updated as the data is received. The model is extracted from the running averages only when desired.

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^{(n+1)} = \frac{n}{n+1} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^{(n)} + \frac{1}{n+1} \mathbf{x}_{n+1}, \quad (3)$$

similar to the procedure from Chapter 2.5 in Sutton and Barto (1998).

The running averages have the following advantages: a) they cover all necessary sample information for model estimation, b) the dimension of the running averages will not increase with sample size n , c) they can be used in the online learning setting because they can be updated one example at one time.

2.2 Data Standardization

Data standardization is an important procedure in real data analysis, especially for feature selection, because a feature could have an arbitrary scale (unit of measure) and the scale should not influence its importance in the model. For this purpose, the data matrix \mathbf{X} and the response vector \mathbf{y} are usually standardized by removing the mean, and \mathbf{X} is further standardized by making all columns on the same scale. However, because we discard the data and only use the running averages, we will need to standardize the running averages.

Denote $\mathbf{1}_n = [1, 1, \dots, 1]^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$, and by σ_{x_j} the sample standard deviation for the random variable X_j . By running averages, we can estimate the standard deviation:

$$\sigma_{x_j} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{S}_{xx})_j - (\boldsymbol{\mu}_x)_j^2},$$

in which $(\mathbf{S}_{xx})_j$ is the j -th diagonal entry for $p \times p$ matrix \mathbf{S}_{xx} . Then, denote by $\mathbf{\Pi} = \text{diag}(\sigma_{x_1}, \dots, \sigma_{x_p})^{-1}$ the $p \times p$ diagonal matrix containing the inverse of standard deviation σ_{x_j} on the diagonal. Denoting by $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ the standardized data matrix \mathbf{X} , and $\tilde{\mathbf{y}}$ as the centralized \mathbf{y} , we can standardize data as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = (\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{1}_n \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^T) \mathbf{\Pi}, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{y}} = (\mathbf{y} - \mu_y \mathbf{1}_n)$$

From these equations we obtain the running averages of the standardized dataset:

$$\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{x}\tilde{y}} = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} - \mu_y \mathbf{\Pi} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x = \mathbf{\Pi} \mathbf{S}_{xy} - \mu_y \mathbf{\Pi} \boldsymbol{\mu}_x \quad (4)$$

$$\mathbf{S}_{\tilde{x}\tilde{x}} = \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{\Pi} \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}}{n} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_x \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^T \right) \mathbf{\Pi} = \mathbf{\Pi} (\mathbf{S}_{xx} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_x \boldsymbol{\mu}_x^T) \mathbf{\Pi} \quad (5)$$

For convenience, hereinafter, we will still use \mathbf{S}_{xx} and \mathbf{S}_{xy} to represent the running averages after standardization.

3. Algorithms

In this section, we propose several running averages-based online algorithms. First, we design online least squares based on running averages, which can be used for feature selection by thresholding. We also propose the online feature selection with annealing (OFSA) to solve the constrained least squares problem. Then we consider some regularization models, such as Lasso, Elastic Net, and Minimax Concave Penalty. To simplify notation, we denote OLS to represent online least squares, OLSth for online least squares with thresholding, OLasso for online Lasso, OElnet for online elastic net, and OMCP for online minimax concave penalty.

3.1 Preliminaries

Before we start introducing the running averages-based algorithms, we prove that these online algorithms are equivalent to their offline counterparts. Actually, in our running averages framework, we share the same objective loss function with offline learning, which is the key point to prove their equivalence.

Proposition 1 *Consider the following penalized regression problem:*

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 + \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \lambda), \quad (6)$$

in which $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the coefficient vector and $\mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \lambda) = \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{P}(\beta_j; \lambda)$ is a penalty function. It is equivalent to the online optimization problem based on running averages.

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{S}_{xx} \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{S}_{xy} + \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \lambda), \quad (7)$$

Proof The loss function (6) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 + \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \lambda) &= \frac{1}{2n} (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta})^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \mathbf{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \lambda) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y}}{2n} - \frac{\boldsymbol{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}}{n} + \boldsymbol{\beta}^T \frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}}{2n} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{P}(\beta_j; \lambda), \end{aligned}$$

in which $S_{yy} = \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{y} / n$, $\mathbf{S}_{xy} = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y} / n$, and $\mathbf{S}_{xx} = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} / n$ are running averages. Thus, the offline learning problem is equivalent to our running averages online learning problem. ■

3.2 Online Least Squares

In OLS, we need to find the solution for the equations $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$. Since $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$ can be computed by using running averages, we obtain:

$$\mathbf{S}_{xx} \boldsymbol{\beta} = \mathbf{S}_{xy}. \quad (8)$$

Thus, online least squares is equivalent to offline least squares.

3.3 Online Least Squares with Thresholding

The OLSth is aimed at solving the following constrained minimization problem:

$$\min_{\beta, \|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2. \quad (9)$$

It is a non-convex and NP-hard problem because of the sparsity constraint. Here, we propose a three step procedure to solve it: first, we use the online least squares to estimate $\hat{\beta}$, then we remove unimportant variables according to the coefficient magnitudes $|\beta_j|$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. Finally, we use least squares to refit the model on the subset of selected features. The prototype algorithm is described in Algorithm 1. In the high dimensional case ($p > n$), we can use the ridge regression estimator in the first step.

Algorithm 1 OLS with Thresholding

Input: Training running averages $\mathbf{S}_{xx}, \mathbf{S}_{xy}$ and sample size n , sparsity level k .

Output: Trained regression parameter vector β with $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k$.

- 1: Find $\hat{\beta}$ by OLS.
 - 2: Keep only the k variables with largest $|\hat{\beta}_j|$.
 - 3: Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.
-

3.4 Online Feature Selection with Annealing

Unlike OLSth, OFSA is an iterative thresholding algorithm. The OFSA algorithm can simultaneously solve the coefficient estimation problem and the feature selection problem. The main ideas in OFSA are: 1) uses an annealing plan to lessen the greediness in reducing the dimensionality from p to k , 2) removes irrelevant variables to facilitate computation. The algorithm starts with an initialized parameter β , generally $\beta = 0$, and then alternates two basic steps: one is updating the parameters to minimize the loss $L(\beta)$ by gradient descent

$$\beta = \beta - \eta \frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta},$$

and the other one is a feature selection step that removes some variables based on the ranking of $|\beta_j|$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, p$. In the second step, we design an annealing schedule to decide the number of features M_t we keep in each time period t ,

$$M_t = k + (p - k) \max\{0, \frac{T - t}{t\mu + T}\}, t = 1, 2, \dots, T.$$

More details are shown in Barbu et al. (2017) about the offline FSA algorithm, such as applications and theoretical analysis. For the square loss, the computation of

$$\frac{\partial L}{\partial \beta} = -\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}}{n} + \frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \beta}{n} = \mathbf{S}_{xx} \beta - \mathbf{S}_{xy}, \quad (10)$$

falls into our running averages framework. Thus, we derive the OFSA which is equivalent to the offline FSA in Barbu et al. (2017). The algorithm is summarized in Algorithm 2.

3.5 Online Regularization Methods

Penalized methods can also be used to select features, and we can map them into our running averages framework. A popular one is the Lasso estimator (Tibshirani, 1996), it solves the convex optimization problem

Algorithm 2 Online FSA

Input: Training running averages $\mathbf{S}_{xx}, \mathbf{S}_{xy}$ and sample size n , sparsity level k .**Output:** Trained regression parameter vector β with $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k$.Initialize $\beta = 0$.**for** $t = 1$ to T^{iter} **do** Update $\beta \leftarrow \beta - \eta(\mathbf{S}_{xx}\beta - \mathbf{S}_{xy})$ Keep only the M_t variables with highest $|\beta_j|$ and renumber them $1, \dots, M_t$.**end for**Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.

$$\arg \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2 + \lambda \sum_{j=1}^p |\beta_j|, \quad (11)$$

in which $\lambda > 0$ is a tuning parameter.

Besides Lasso, the SCAD(Fan and Li, 2001), the Elastic Net(Zou and Hastie, 2005) and the MCP(Zhang, 2010) were proposed to deal with the variable selection and estimation problem. Here, we use the gradient-based method with a thresholding operator $\Theta(t; \lambda)$ to solve the regularized loss minimization problems (She et al., 2009). For instance, in Lasso and Elastic net, Θ is the soft thresholding operator, and in MCP,

$$\Theta(t; \lambda) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 0 \leq |t| \leq \lambda, \\ \frac{t - \lambda \text{sign}(t)}{1 - 1/b} & \text{if } \lambda < |t| \leq b\lambda, \\ t & \text{if } |t| > b\lambda, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

in which b is a constant. The general algorithm is given in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Online Regularized Methods by GD

Input: Training running averages $\mathbf{S}_{xx}, \mathbf{S}_{xy}$, sample size n , penalty parameter λ .**Output:** Trained sparse regression parameter vector β .Initialize $\beta = 0$.**for** $t = 1$ to T^{iter} **do** Update $\beta \leftarrow \beta - \eta(\mathbf{S}_{xx}\beta - \mathbf{S}_{xy})$ Update $\beta \leftarrow \Theta(\beta; \eta\lambda)$ **end for**Fit the model on the selected features by OLS.

3.6 Online Classification Methods

The aforementioned algorithms not only can select features for regression, but can also be used for classification, even though these algorithms are based on the ℓ_2 loss. In fact, for the two class problem with labels $+1$ and -1 , the coefficient vector for classification from linear least squares is proportional to the coefficient vector by linear discriminant analysis without intercept(Friedman et al., 2001). Besides, one can use the Lasso method to select variable for classification under some assumptions(Neykov et al., 2016). We will give the theoretical guarantees in Section 4.

3.7 Memory and Computational Complexity

In general, the memory complexity for the running averages is $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ because \mathbf{S}_{xx} is a $p \times p$ matrix. The computational complexity of maintaining the running averages is $\mathcal{O}(np^2)$. And except OLStH, the computational complexity for obtaining the model using the running average-based algorithms is $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ based on the limited number of iterations, each taking $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ time. As for OLStH, it is $\mathcal{O}(p^3)$ if done by Gaussian elimination or $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$ if done using an iterative method that takes much fewer iterations than p . We can conclude that the running averages storage does not depend on the sample size n , and the computation is linear in n . Hence, when $n \gg p$, compared to the batch learning algorithms, the running averages based methods need less memory and have less computational complexity. And they can achieve the same convergence rate as the batch learning algorithms.

3.8 Model Adaptation

Detecting changes in the underlying model and rapidly adapting to the changes are common problems in online learning, and some applications are based on varying-coefficient models (Javanmard, 2017). Our running averages online methods can adapt to coefficients change for large scale data streams. For that the update equation (3) can be regarded in a more general form as

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^{(n+1)} = (1 - \alpha_n)\boldsymbol{\mu}_x^{(n)} + \alpha_n \mathbf{x}_{n+1} \quad (13)$$

where we only show one of the running averages for illustration but the same type of updates are used for all of them.

The original running averages use $\alpha_n = 1/(n + 1)$, which gives all observations equal weight in the running average. For the coefficients-varying models, we use a larger value of α_n that gives more weight to the recent observations. However, too much adaptation is also not good because then the model will not be able to recover weak coefficients that can only be recovered given sufficiently many observations. More details about simulation and application will be covered in Section 5.

4. Theoretical Analysis

In this section we will give the theoretical analysis for our methods. First, because of Prop. 1, we have the equivalence of the online penalized models including Lasso, Elastic Net, SCAD and MCP with their offline counterparts, and thus all their theoretical guarantees of consistency, oracle inequalities, etc., carry over to their online counterparts.

In this section, we will first show that the OLStH and OFSA method can recover the support of the true features with high probability, and then we will provide a regret bound analysis for OLStH. The main idea of our proof come from Yuan et al. (2014). Then we will give a theoretical justification for the support recovery of our method in classification. The proofs are given in the Appendix.

The first result we present is: when the sample size n is large enough, OLStH can recover the support of true features with high probability. In our theorem, the data is not normalized and the features do not have the same scale. Thus, we consider the data normalization in our theoretical analysis. Although the intercept β_0 is necessary in applications, we do not cover it here.

Proposition 2 *Suppose we have the linear model*

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\eta}, \quad \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}),$$

where $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{x}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T]^T$ is the data matrix, in which $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $i = 1, 2, \dots$, are independently drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$. Let $\alpha \in (0, 1]$ and $S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*} = \{j, \beta_j^* \neq 0\}$, $|S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}| = k^*$ and

$$\min_{j \in S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}} |\beta_j^*| > \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}, \text{ for some } \lambda \text{ satisfying } 0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}\right). \quad (14)$$

Then with probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1 n^{1-\alpha}}$, where $C_1 > 1$ is a constant, the index set of top k^* values of $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j|$ is exactly $S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}$.

The Proposition 2 shows theoretical guarantee of true feature recovery for OLSth. We can observe that the probability of true feature recovery does not depend on the true sparsity k^* . We will verify it by numerical experiments in the next section. Here, we also give the theoretical guarantees for the data standardization case.

Remark 3 Denote $\Pi = \text{diag}\{\sigma_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \sigma_{\mathbf{x}_2}, \dots, \sigma_{\mathbf{x}_p}\}^{-1}$, $\hat{\Pi} = \text{diag}\{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_1}, \hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_2}, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{x}_p}\}^{-1}$. Given the conditions $\min_{j \in S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}} |\sigma_{\mathbf{x}_j} \beta_j^*| > \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}}$, for some λ satisfying $0 < \lambda \leq \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n} \Pi \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X} \Pi\right)$, then with high probability the index set of top k^* values of $|\sigma_{\mathbf{x}_j} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j|$ is exactly $S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}$.

Theorem 4 (True feature recovery for OLS-th) With the same notations as Proposition 2, if

$$\min_{j \in S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}} |\beta_j^*| > \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}, \text{ for some } \lambda \text{ s.t. } \sqrt{\lambda} \leq 0.8\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}) - \rho(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}, \quad (15)$$

where $\rho(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ is the largest diagonal value in $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, then with probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1 n^{1-\alpha}} - e^{-n/50}$ the index set of top k^* values of $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j|$ is exactly $S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}$.

Then we consider the theoretical guarantees of true feature recovery for OFSA algorithms. First, we need to give the definition of restricted strong convexity/smoothness.

Definition 5 (Restricted Strong Convexity/Smoothness) For any integer $s > 0$, we say that a differentiable function $f(x)$ is restricted strongly convex (RSC) with parameter m_s and restricted strongly smooth (RSS) with parameter M_s if there exist $m_s, M_s > 0$ such that

$$\frac{m_s}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|^2 \leq f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - f(\boldsymbol{\beta}') - \langle \nabla f(\boldsymbol{\beta}'), \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}' \rangle \leq \frac{M_s}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|^2, \quad \forall \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|_0 \leq s. \quad (16)$$

In the linear regression case, the RSC/RSS conditions are equivalent to the restricted isometric property (RIP):

$$m_s \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}(\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}')\|^2 \leq M_s \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|^2, \quad \forall \|\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}'\|_0 \leq s. \quad (17)$$

And in the low dimensional case, the RIP condition will degenerate to

$$m < \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}}{n}\right) < \lambda_{\max}\left(\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}}{n}\right) < M.$$

Proposition 6 *With the same conditions as Proposition 2, let β^* be an arbitrary k^* -sparse vector, so $\|\beta^*\|_0 = k^*$. Let $\beta^{(t)}$ be the OFSA coefficient vector at iteration t , $S_{\beta^{(t)}}$ be its support, $k = |S_{\beta^{(t)}}| \geq k^*$ and $s = k + k^*$. If f is a differentiable function which is m_s -convex and M_s -smooth, then for any learning rate $0 < \eta < 2m_s/M_s^2$, we have*

$$\|\beta^{(t+1)} - \beta^*\| \leq 1.62\rho\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| + 1.62\eta\sqrt{s}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty,$$

where $\rho = \sqrt{1 - 2\eta m_s + \eta^2 M_s^2} < 1$.

Theorem 7 (Convergence of OFSA) *With the same assumptions as Proposition 6, let $\beta^{(0)} = 0$ and $S_{\beta^{(0)}} = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. Assume we have $M_s/m_s < 1.26$ for any $k^* \leq s \leq p$. Then, with the probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1}$, which $C_1 > 1$ is a constant, the OFSA coefficient vector $\beta^{(t)}$ satisfies*

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^t\|\beta^*\| + \frac{3.24\sigma\eta}{1 - 1.62\rho}\sqrt{\frac{p \log(p)}{n}}.$$

Proof Because for any $k^* \leq s \leq p$ and $\eta \in (0, 2m_s/M_s^2)$, we have $M_s/m_s < 1.26$. Thus, we can get that $\rho < 0.62$ and $1.62\rho < 1$. Then, by using Proposition 6 recursively, we get the upper bound of the $\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\|$ when the dimension of $\beta^{(t)}$ decreases from p to k^* . At the time period t , we have

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq 1.62\rho\|\beta^{(t-1)} - \beta^*\| + 1.62\eta\sqrt{s}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty,$$

and at the time period $t - 1$, we also have

$$\|\beta^{(t-1)} - \beta^*\| \leq 1.62\rho\|\beta^{(t-2)} - \beta^*\| + 1.62\eta\sqrt{s'}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty,$$

in which s and s' are the number of selected features at time period t and $t - 1$, respective. Thus, we have

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^2\|\beta^{(t-2)} - \beta^*\| + 1.62^2\rho\eta\sqrt{s'}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty + 1.62\eta\sqrt{s}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty.$$

Because we have $p \geq s' \geq s$, and $1.62\rho < 1$, we get

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^2\|\beta^{(t-2)} - \beta^*\| + (1.62\rho + 1)1.62\eta\sqrt{p}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty.$$

Applying the same idea repeatedly all the way to $t = 0$ we get

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^t\|\beta^{(0)} - \beta^*\| + [(1.62\rho)^{t-1} + \dots + 1]1.62\eta\sqrt{p}\|\nabla f(\beta^*)\|_\infty.$$

And because $\nabla f(\beta^*) = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T\beta^*) = \frac{\mathbf{X}^T\epsilon}{n}$, then we can use the inequality proved in the proof of Proposition 2

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{\mathbf{X}^T\epsilon}{n}\right\|_\infty \leq 2\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}}\right) \geq 1 - 2p^{1-C_1}.$$

So, with the probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1}$, we have

$$\|\beta^{(t)} - \beta^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^t\|\beta^*\| + \frac{3.24\sigma\eta}{1 - 1.62\rho}\sqrt{\frac{p \log(p)}{n}}.$$

■

Please note that the dimension of the vector $\beta^{(t)}$ will reduce from p to k^* , thus we follow the Proposition 6 recursively with varying $k \geq k^*$. Here, we assume that $\|\beta^{(t)}\|_0 = k^*$. Now we show that the OFSA algorithm can recover the support of true features with high probability.

Corollary 8 (True feature recovery for OFSA) *Under the conditions of Theorem 7, let*

$$\beta_{\min} := \min_{j \in S_{\beta^*}} |\beta_j| > \frac{4\sigma\eta}{1 - 1.62\rho} \sqrt{\frac{p \log(p)}{n}}.$$

Then after $t = \lceil \frac{1}{1.62\rho} \log(\frac{10\|\beta^*\|}{\beta_{\min}}) \rceil + 1$ iterations, the OFSA algorithm will output $\beta^{(t)}$ satisfying $S_{\beta^*} = S_{\beta^{(t)}}$ with probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1}$, where $C_1 > 1$ is a constant.

Finally, we consider the regret bound for the OLS and OLSth algorithms. In fact, all the feature selection algorithms we mentioned will degenerate to OLS if the true features are selected. First, we define the regret for a sparse model with sparsity levels $\|\beta\|_0 \leq k^*$:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\beta_i; \mathbf{z}_i) - \min_{\beta, \|\beta\|_0 \leq k^*} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\beta; \mathbf{z}_i), \quad (18)$$

in which β_i is the coefficient vector at step i and $\mathbf{z}_i = (\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$.

Observe that for $\forall i > 0$, the loss functions f from (18) are twice continuously differentiable. We denote $\beta_{n+1} = \arg \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(\beta)$ and $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$. We will need the following assumptions:

Assumption 1 *Given $n > p$, then we have $0 < m < M$ satisfy*

$$0 < m < \lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n) < \lambda_{\max}(\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n) < M.$$

Assumption 2 *Given $n > p$, there exist constants D and G such that $\|\beta_i - \beta_j\| < D, \forall i, j > n$ and $\|\nabla f(\beta_i)\| \leq G, \forall i \geq n$.*

Proposition 9 *Given $n > p$, under Assumptions 1, 2, the regret of OLS satisfies:*

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_i)^2 - \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta)^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(n)}{n}\right).$$

Theorem 10 (Regret of OLS-th) *With the Assumptions 1, 2 holding for $\mathbf{X}_{S_{\beta^*}}$, there exists a constant $C_1 > 0$ such that if the true β^* satisfies*

$$\min_{j \in S_{\beta^*}} |\beta_j^*| > \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{\sqrt{n}}}, \text{ for some } \lambda > 0 \text{ satisfying } \sqrt{\lambda} < 0.8\lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Sigma}) - \sqrt{\frac{p}{n_0}}. \quad (19)$$

where $n_0 = \max(p + 1, 100 \log(n), \frac{1}{C_1^2} \left(\frac{2 \log(n)}{\log(p)} + 1 \right)^2) > p$, then with probability at least $1 - 3/n$ the regret of OLSth satisfies:

$$R_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta_i)^2 - \min_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta)^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^2(n)}{n}\right).$$

Theoretical guarantees for feature selection in classification. Proposition 2.3.6 and Remark 2.3.7 from Neykov et al. (2016) show that the least squares Lasso algorithm (therefore the Online Lasso) can recover the support of true variables for the discrete Y under some assumptions.

Theorem 11 (True support recovery) *Consider the special case of a single index model, $\mathbf{y} = G\{h(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*) + \epsilon\}$, in which $\mathbf{X} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ satisfies the irrerepresentable condition. If G, h are known strictly increasing continuous functions and under the assumptions from Neykov et al. (2016), the least squares Lasso algorithm can recover the support of true features correctly for discrete response \mathbf{y} .*

The proof and more mathematical details can be found in Neykov et al. (2016). Based on Theorem 11, we have theoretical guarantees for support recovery for some of our running averages-based online classification methods.

5. Experiments

In this section we evaluate the performance of our proposed algorithms and compare them with offline learning methods and some standard stochastic algorithms. First, we present the results of numerical experiments on synthetic data, comparing the performance on feature selection and prediction. We also provide regret plots for the running averages based algorithms and compare them with classical online algorithms. Finally, we present an evaluation on real data. All simulation experiments are run on a desktop computer with Core i5 - 4460S CPU and 16Gb memory.

5.1 Experiments for Simulated Data

Here, we generate the simulated data with uniformly correlated predictors: given a scalar α , we generate $z_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, then we set

$$\mathbf{x}_i = \alpha z_i \mathbf{1}_{p \times 1} + \mathbf{u}_i, \text{ with } \mathbf{u}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p).$$

Finally we obtain the data matrix $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1^T, \mathbf{x}_2^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N^T]^T$. It is easy to verify that the correlation between any pair of predictors is $\alpha^2/(1 + \alpha^2)$. We set $\alpha = 1$ in our experiments, thus the correlation between any two variables is 0.5. Given \mathbf{X} , the dependent response \mathbf{y} is generated from the following linear models, for regression and respectively classification,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\eta}, \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n), \quad (20)$$

$$\mathbf{y} = \text{sign}(\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\eta}), \text{ with } \boldsymbol{\eta} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_n), \quad (21)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is a p -dimensional sparse parameter vector. The true coefficients $\beta_j^* = 0$ except $\beta_{10j^*}^* = \beta$, $j^* = 1, 2, \dots, k$, where β is signal strength value. Observe that the classification data cannot be perfectly separated by a linear model.

The simulation is based on the following data parameter setting: $p = 1000$ and $k = 100$. We consider the signal strength $\beta \in \{0.01, 1\}$ (weak and strong signals). The sample size n varies from 1000 to 10^6 for both regression and classification settings. For regression, we compare with our algorithms with SADMM(Ouyang et al., 2013) and the offline Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996). We also implemented the following truncated stochastic gradient descent (TSGD) (Fan et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2017):

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(n)} = \text{Truncate}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(n-1)} + \eta(y_n - \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(n-1)}) \mathbf{x}_n, k),$$

n	Variable Detection Rate (%)								RMSE						Time (s)								
	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLStH	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet	RAVE	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLStH	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet	RAVE	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLStH	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{strong signal } \beta = 1$																							
10^3	32.14	11.22	18.10	77.40	99.81	73.71	32.12	11.63	23.15	95.05	5.592	1.136	6.282	11.61	4.332	0.007	5.326	0.052	0.289	15.49	9.648	0.026	
$3 \cdot 10^3$	46.05	11.22	41.23	100	100	98.02	45.19	9.464	13.45	93.50	1.017	1.017	1.745	9.557	26.91	0.019	15.73	0.051	0.288	13.86	7.113	0.076	
10^4	72.40	11.22	65.78	100	100	100	72.42	6.07	13.34	94.92	1.003	1.003	1.003	6.042	47.32	0.065	51.80	0.051	0.288	6.508	5.885	0.246	
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{weak signal } \beta = 0.01$																							
10^3	14.09	10.89	13.53	10.11	12.40	15.55	14.08	1.128	1.027	1.363	1.069	1.169	1.049	1.124	5.353	0.006	6.703	0.052	0.288	13.20	9.741	0.026	
10^4	31.58	10.89	19.80	22.48	32.47	32.32	31.54	1.009	1.007	1.370	1.025	1.006	1.005	1.006	48.13	0.067	67.82	0.051	0.287	14.98	4.961	0.249	
10^5	81.93	10.89	11.30	80.55	85.14	84.86	81.80	1.001	1.010	1.382	1.003	1.003	1.003	1.003	452.2	0.672	679.7	0.051	0.287	15.93	5.120	2.458	
$3 \cdot 10^5$	98.66	10.89	10.80	98.94	99.27	99.26	98.71	0.999	1.008	1.383	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	1172	2.001	2044	0.051	0.287	13.96	3.749	7.326	
10^6	-	10.89	-	100	100	100	100	-	1.005	-	0.996	0.996	0.996	0.996	-	6.651	-	0.051	0.288	7.352	1.726	24.36	

Table 2: Comparison between running averages method and the other online and offline methods for regression, averaged 100 runs

n	Variable Detection Rate (%)								AUC						Time (s)										
	FOFS	SOFS	OPG	RDA	OFSA	OLStH	OLasso	OMCP	FOFS	SOFS	OPG	RDA	OFSA	OLStH	OLasso	OMCP	FOFS	SOFS	OPG	RDA	OFSA	OLStH	OLasso	OMCP	RAVE
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{strong signal } \beta = 1$																									
10^4	10.64	10.19	10.46	10.97	38.89	30.30	34.70	41.54	0.995	0.992	0.992	0.990	0.995	0.990	0.996	0.996	0.001	0.001	0.490	0.848	0.005	0.001	0.080	0.160	0.247
3×10^4	10.64	9.95	10.42	10.34	67.67	59.32	56.18	67.52	0.994	0.992	0.992	0.989	0.998	0.996	0.997	0.998	0.003	0.004	1.471	2.210	0.005	0.001	0.083	0.158	0.742
10^5	10.64	9.95	10.43	11.08	94.95	93.21	86.90	94.77	0.994	0.992	0.992	0.990	1.000	1.000	0.999	1.000	0.010	0.015	4.900	6.118	0.005	0.001	0.079	0.159	24.78
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{strong signal } \beta = 0.01$																									
10^4	13.40	10.19	10.00	10.37	19.41	15.93	22.55	23.81	0.827	0.829	0.828	0.828	0.824	0.815	0.829	0.830	0.001	0.001	0.494	0.815	0.005	0.001	0.073	0.148	0.249
3×10^4	15.86	9.95	10.23	10.34	34.46	27.35	35.14	37.70	0.827	0.829	0.829	0.829	0.831	0.827	0.832	0.832	0.003	0.004	1.481	2.093	0.005	0.001	0.074	0.152	0.743
10^5	17.36	9.95	10.32	10.91	64.84	56.42	61.07	64.95	0.830	0.831	0.831	0.830	0.834	0.833	0.834	0.834	0.010	0.015	4.935	5.827	0.005	0.001	0.078	0.161	2.472
3×10^5	17.13	9.23	10.32	10.37	91.55	88.91	88.69	91.58	0.826	0.828	0.828	0.827	0.833	0.833	0.833	0.833	0.030	0.044	14.81	17.31	0.005	0.001	0.073	0.164	7.446
10^6	17.72	9.91	-	-	99.97	99.94	99.88	99.97	0.828	0.829	-	-	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.834	0.100	0.146	-	-	0.005	0.001	0.039	0.110	24.85

Table 3: Comparison between running averages methods and the other online methods for classification, averaged 100 runs

where the operator "Truncate" keeps the k largest $|\tilde{\beta}_j^{(n)}|$.

For classification, we cover four methods for comparison: the OPG (Duchi and Singer, 2009) and RDA (Xiao, 2010) frameworks for elastic net, the first order online feature selection (FOFS) method (Wu et al., 2017) and the second order online feature selection (SOFS) method (Wu et al., 2017).

For each method, the sparsity controlling parameters are tuned to obtain k variables. This can be done directly for OFSA and OLStH, and indirectly through the penalty parameter for the other methods. In RDA, OPG and SADMM, we used 200 values of λ on an exponential grid and chose the λ that induces the \hat{k} non-zero features, where \hat{k} is the largest number of non-zeros features smaller than or equal to k , the number of true features.

The following criteria are used in the numerical experiments: the true variable detection rate (DR), the root of mean square error (RMSE) on the test data for regression, the area under ROC curve (AUC) on the test data in classification setting, and running time (Time) of the algorithms.

The variable detection rate DR is defined as the average number of true variables that are correctly detected by an algorithm divided by the number of true variables. So if S_β is the set of detected variables and S_{β^*} are the true variables, then

$$DR = \frac{E(|S_\beta \cap S_{\beta^*}|)}{|S_{\beta^*}|}.$$

The results are presented in Tables 2 and 3. We replicate the experiments 100 times and present the average results. Compared to the batch learning method Lasso, in regression, the running averages online methods enjoy low memory complexity. Also, the larger datasets cannot fit in memory, hence we cannot obtain the experimental results for Lasso for the large datasets. In our methods, we input the running averages rather than data matrix. The memory complexity for running averages is $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$, which is better than $\mathcal{O}(np)$ for batch learning in the setting of $n > p$.

From the numerical experiments, we can draw the conclusion that none of the online methods we tested (RDA, OPG, SADMM, FOFS and SOFS) do not perform very well in true feature recovery. Only the offline Lasso and the proposed running averages based online methods can recover the true signal with high probability. When the signal is weak ($\beta = 0.01$), although the running averages methods need a large sample size n to recover the weak true signal, they outperform the batch learning methods and the other online methods in our experiment.

In prediction, most methods do well except in regression the existing methods (Lasso, TSGD and SADMM) don't work well when the signal is strong. In contrast, the proposed running averages perform very well in prediction regardless whether the signal is weak or strong, in both regression and classification.

Finally, we know that the computational complexity for obtaining the model from the running averages does not depend on the sample size n , but the time to update the running averages, shown as RAVE in Tables 2 and 3, does increase linearly with n . Indeed, we observe in Tables 2 and 3 that the running time of OFSA and OLSth does not have significant changes. However, because of the need to tune the penalty parameters in OLasso, OElnet, and OMCP, it takes more time to run these algorithms. The computational complexity for traditional online algorithms will increase with sample size n . This is especially true for OPG, RDA, and SADMM, which take a large amount of time to tune the parameters to select k features. When the sample size n is very large, running these algorithms takes more than a day.

5.2 Theoretical and Experimental Bounds

In this section we conduct a series of experiments to compare the theoretical bounds we obtained in section 4 with the reality obtained from simulations.

5.2.1 TRUE FEATURE RECOVERY ANALYSIS

In this section we experimentally evaluate the tightness of the bounds for OLS-th from Proposition 2 and Theorem 4. For that, we use the regression data from Section 5.1 and find the experimental β_{min} such that all variables are correctly detected in at least 99 of 100 runs and compare it with the corresponding bounds given by Equations (14) and (15). In most cases we used $\alpha = 1$ in Equations (14) and (15). However, when $p \leq 128$, we chose α as low as 0.97 to obtain a theoretical probability of at least 0.99 in Proposition 2 and Theorem 4.

The results are shown in Figure 3. We see that the bound of Prop 2 is tighter than the one from Theorem 4. We also see that indeed, the β_{min} does not depend on the sparsity level k^* and that the bounds become tighter as n increases.

5.2.2 REGRET ANALYSIS

In this section, we present results about the regret of the different online methods in regression settings. In traditional online learning, the theoretical analysis of upper bound for the regret was studied in Hazan et al. (2007) and Zinkevich (2003). Here, we focus on comparing the regret of the running averages-based online algorithms with the state of the art online algorithms.




Figure 3: Comparison of the experimental β_{min} for OLS-th with the bounds from Eq. (14) of Proposition 2 and Eq. (15) of Theorem 4. Left: β_{min} vs. p , for $n = 4096, k^* = 16$. Middle: β_{min} vs. n , for $p = 256, k^* = 32$. Right: β_{min} vs. k^* , for $n = 4096, p = 512$.




Figure 4: Regret vs. n for TSGD, SADMM and running averages based online algorithms, averaged over 20 runs. Left: strong signal ($\beta = 1$), middle: medium signal($\beta = 0.1$), right: weak signal($\beta = 0.01$).

Figure 4 shows the curve of the regret for $\beta = 1$ (left), $\beta = 0.1$ (middle), $\beta = 0.01$ (right). The sample size n varies from 1000 to 10^6 . The regret of the stochastic ADMM method does not converge when we control the number of selected features to at most k . We compare slopes to see the difference in convergence rates. The convergence rate for the running averages methods is close to $O(n^{-1})$. TSGD seems to also have the same convergence rate but starts off with a plateau where the regret does not converge. The SADMM does not converge at all in our experiments.

5.3 Model Adaptation

In this section we present two simulations for linear regression models where the coefficients drift in time. In the first one, we followed the data generation method in the simulation part to generate data and we used the parameter setting: $p = 100$ and $k = 10$. But here we assume each nonzero β_j is varying:

$$\beta_{tj} = a \sin\left\{2\pi \frac{(t - 100j)}{T}\right\} + b, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, k, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, T, \quad (22)$$

in which T is an unknown period. In our simulation, we have $a = 0.4, b = 0.6$ and $T = 1000$. In each time period, we generated 1000 observations. We used model adaptation based on equation (13) with the model adaptation rate $\alpha_n = 0.01$.




Figure 5: Model adaptation experiment. From left to right: true signal, parameters without adaptation, parameter with adaption, RMSE for prediction.

According to Figure 5, our model adaptation method can track the varying coefficients and perform better in prediction then without model adaptation. In Table 4 are shown the RMSE for last a few hundreds time steps, averaged over 20 independent runs. One can see that the RMSE with model adaptation is close to the best RMSE possible (1.0) and without model adaptation the prediction is quite poor.

	With model adaptation	Without adaptation
RMSE	1.028	2.280

Table 4: RMSE for adapted model and non-adapted model, averaged over 20 independent runs.

In the second numerical experiment, we simulated a high dimensional dynamic pricing and demand problem (Qiang and Bayati, 2016). Here we assume the demand D_t follows a linear combination of price and the other covariates. Hence we consider a simple model as

$$D_t = \beta_0 + \gamma p_t + \mathbf{x}_t \boldsymbol{\beta}_t + \epsilon_t, \quad t = 1, 2, \dots, \quad (23)$$

in which $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ is coefficient for price at time period t , $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ is parameter vector for the other covariates, and we have $\gamma < 0$ in the model. The parameter γ , β_0 , $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ are unknown for seller and need to be estimated. And here we assume $\boldsymbol{\beta}_t$ is sparse and varying with time. The above model is commonly used in economic community to disclose the relationship between the demand and the price. More details about the model of demand and price are in Qiang and Bayati (2016).

For the true price parameter we have $\gamma = -0.5$, and $p_t \sim \mathcal{U}[10, 20]$. For the other covariates ($\beta_{jt}, j = 2, 3, \dots, k$), we still used the equation (22), with $a = 0.2, b = 0.4, T = 2000$. For each time period t , we generated 200 observations and the model adaptation rate was also $\alpha_n = 0.01$. Our simulation discloses the relationship between demand and




Figure 6: Model adaptation for dynamic pricing with feature selection. From left to right: true signal, parameters without adaptation, parameter with adaption, RMSE for prediction.

price in a varying marketplace. Here we assume that the marketplace vary slowly in a very long period. Our simulation setting is better than Qiang and Bayati (2016) because we consider continuous varying-coefficients and true feature recovery in our setting, which is

more complex. However, we did not discuss the theoretical analysis here, which is left for a future study.

The results of our dynamic pricing simulation are shown in Figure 6. One can see again that the model adaptation works quite well in following the drifting coefficients, and the RMSE is much smaller than without adaptation. Here we also see the model selection power of the running averages in practice. In the plot of the coefficients with adaptation, the smallest non-zero coefficient (blue line) oscillates between being in the model and being zero until sufficient data is available, then it is permanently added to the model.

5.4 Real Data Analysis

In real data analysis, we applied the running averages based methods to some real world datasets. The first dataset is about age estimation from a single image. Age estimation is a regression problem, as the age has a continuous range of values. The dataset is called Wikiface (Rothe et al., 2015, 2016), containing 53,040 face images of actors from Wikipedia and their age. The faces are cropped and resized to 224×224 pixels. From each face image a 4096 dimensional feature vector is extracted using the pre-trained VGG-16 (Simonyan and Zisserman, 2014) convolutional neural network (CNN). A linear regression model is used to estimate the age from the 4096 dimensional feature vector.

The second dataset is the Year Prediction MSD dataset, from the UCI Machine Learning Repository (Lichman, 2013). This dataset, with 90 features and 463,715 observations, is about the prediction of the release year of a song from audio features. In this dataset, we show how to extend the linear model to a polynomial model by using running averages: we generate new features as products of all pairs of the 90 features, obtaining a 4185 dimensional feature vector. Then we compute the running averages and input them into OLStH or OFSA. Here, we will compare the R^2 of the linear model with the nonlinear model.

We also analyzed some classification datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository. In the real data analysis, the results are shown as the average of 20 random splits of 87.5% training and 12.5% test data for the first dataset, 80% training and 20% test data for the second dataset. For each method, multiple models are trained using various values of the tuning parameters and sparsity levels k . Then the parameter combination with the largest average test R^2 over 20 random splits is reported in Table 5.

Table 5: Regression results on real data. The average R^2 for regression and AUC for classification obtained over 20 random splits.

Dataset	n	p	OLStH	OFSA	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM
Regression data							
WIKIFace	53040	4096	0.547	0.545	0.503	0.400	0.487
Year Prediction MSD (nonlinear)	463715	4185	0.303	0.298	-	0	0
Year Prediction MSD	463715	90	0.237	0.237	0.237	0.157	0.183
	n	p	OLStH	OFSA	Lasso	FOFS	SOFS
Classification data							
Gisette	7000	5000	0.990	0.997	0.993	0.566	0.502
Dexter	600	20000	0.936	0.971	0.940	0.499	0.499

From Table 5 we can see that offline Lasso cannot handle the large size of the Year Prediction MSD data with pairwise interactions, and some online methods obtain an R^2 of 0. In contrast, our running averages based methods not only can be used to build the non-linear model, but also they have better performance than the linear model.

6. Summary and Discussion

In this paper, we proposed a new framework for online learning based on running averages. As one type of sufficient statistic, we define the running averages to replace the data matrix, and we show how to normalize the data in the running averages and design a series of feature selection algorithms based on them.

In contrast to the standard online methods, the proposed framework can be used for model selection, in the sense that different models with different sparsity levels can be built at the same time, without seeing the data again. This is especially useful when the number of observations increases and more complex models can be extracted from the data.

The running averages based methods enjoy good convergence rate and a low computation complexity. More importantly, they can recover the support of the true signal with high probability. We give theoretical guarantees for OLStH and OFSA that they can recover the support of the true signal in the setting of $n \gg p$.

In numerical experiments, we have demonstrated that the running averages based methods outperform traditional stochastic learning algorithms and batch learning methods in prediction and feature selection. Moreover, the regret of the running averages methods diminish faster than the traditional online algorithms.

The running averages based methods could have a wide variety of applications, for example for detecting environmental changes and for anomaly detection. And in signal processing, they could detect and recover the true weak signal.

However, we also need to pay attention to the weaknesses of the running averages-based methods, as they cannot address ultra-high dimensional datasets, the case of $p \gg n$, or $p \rightarrow \infty$ with $n \rightarrow \infty$. The memory complexity and computational complexity for the running averages methods both are $\mathcal{O}(p^2)$. A very large p will be an issue since the running averages would not fit in the computer memory in this case.

Acknowledgment

This work was partially supported by DARPA ARO grant W911NG-16-1-0579.

Appendix A. Proofs

In this part, we build our theory starting from a series of lemmas. The proof of Lemma 12 can be found in the textbook Wainwright (2019), and the others can be found in the literature.

Lemma 12 *If X is a Gaussian random variable $X \sim N(0, \sigma)$, then for all $t > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P}(|X| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\{-t^2/2\sigma^2\}$$

Lemma 13 *(From Tropp et al. (2015)) Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be a data matrix drawn from $\mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma)$. Then when $n > p$, for all $\delta > 0$, the minimum singular value satisfies the lower deviation inequality*

$$P\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\Sigma})(1 - \delta) - \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(\Sigma)}{n}}\right) \leq e^{-n\delta^2/2},$$

in which $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})$ is the smallest singular value of matrix \mathbf{X} .

Lemma 14 *(From Nesterov (2013)) Assume that a differentiable function f is restricted strongly convex/smooth with parameter m_s/M_s . For any index set S with cardinality $|S| \leq s$ and any β, β' with $S_\beta \cup S_{\beta'} \subset S$, if the learning rate $\eta \in (0, 2m_s/M_s^2)$, then*

$$\|\beta - \beta' - \eta \nabla f(\beta) + \eta \nabla f(\beta')\| \leq \sqrt{1 - 2\eta m_s + \eta^2 M_s^2} \|\beta - \beta'\|,$$

and $\sqrt{1 - 2\eta m_s + \eta^2 M_s^2} < 1$.

Lemma 15 *(From Shen and Li (2017)) Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be an arbitrary d -dimensional vector, and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be any k^* -sparse vector. Thus $\|\mathbf{x}\|_0 = k^* \leq k$. Then, we have the following bound*

$$\|\Theta_k(\mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x}\| \leq \sqrt{\nu} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{x}\|, \quad \nu = 1 + \frac{\gamma + \sqrt{(4 + \gamma)\gamma}}{2}, \quad \gamma = \frac{\min\{k^*, d - k\}}{k - k^* + \min\{k^*, d - k\}}.$$

In particular, it is easy to verify that $\sqrt{\nu_{\min}} \leq 1.62$.

Proof of Proposition 2. We have $\hat{\beta} = \beta^* + (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \epsilon$ with $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I})$.

This it is equivalent to

$$|\hat{\beta}| = |\beta^* + \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}}{n}\right)^{-1} \frac{\mathbf{X}^T \epsilon}{n}|.$$

Then by using the Lemma 12, for $\forall j = 1, 2, \dots, p$ and $\forall t > 0$ we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\mathbf{x}_j^T \epsilon}{n}\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-\frac{n^2 t^2}{2\sigma^2 \|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2}\right\},$$

in which $\frac{\mathbf{x}_j^T \epsilon}{n}$ has the normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \cdot \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2}{n})$ for the given \mathbf{x}_j . In general, we can assume that $\|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2/n, \forall j = 1, 2, \dots, p$, is bounded by a constant C . Here we assume

that $0 < C < 2$, and it is easy to verify that $C = 1$ if we standardize the data. Then, let $t = 2\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}$, so we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{n}\right| \geq 2\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}\right) \leq 2\exp\left\{-\frac{2n^{2-\alpha}\log(p)}{\|\mathbf{x}_j\|_2^2}\right\} \leq 2\exp\left\{-\frac{2n^{1-\alpha}\log(p)}{C}\right\}, \text{ for } j = \overline{1, p}.$$

Let $C_1 = \frac{2}{C}$, and we use the union bound of the above inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{n}\right\|_\infty \leq 2\sigma\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}\right) \geq 1 - 2p\exp\{-C_1 n^{1-\alpha} \log(p)\} = 1 - 2p^{1-C_1 n^{1-\alpha}}.$$

Therefore, with probability $1 - 2p^{1-C_1 n^{1-\alpha}}$, for $\forall j \notin S_{\beta^*}$ we have

$$|\hat{\beta}_j| \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})} \left\|\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{n}\right\|_\infty \leq \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}} \leq \frac{2\sigma}{\lambda} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n^\alpha}}.$$

where we used the fact $\frac{1}{\lambda} \geq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})}$. Thus we get our conclusion. ■

Proof of Theorem 4. According to Lemma 13, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})(1 - \delta) - \sqrt{\frac{\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})}{n}}\right) > 1 - \exp\{-n\delta^2/2\},$$

From here since $\text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \leq p\rho^2(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})(1 - \delta) - \rho(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}\right) > 1 - \exp\{-n\delta^2/2\}.$$

Taking $\delta = 1/5$ and since $0 < \sqrt{\lambda} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\sqrt{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}})(1 - \delta) - \rho(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})}{\sqrt{n}} \geq \sqrt{\lambda}\right) > 1 - \exp\{-n/50\}$$

Because $(\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X})/\sqrt{n})^2 = \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})/n$, thus we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{X})}{n} \geq \lambda\right) > 1 - \exp\{-n/50\}.$$

Thus, combining with Proposition 2 and Lemma 13, we complete the proof. ■

Proof of Proposition 6. Let $S = S_{\beta^{(t)}} \cup S_{\beta^*}$. Consider the following vector

$$\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(t+1)} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \eta \nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}),$$

By using the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(t+1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| &= \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \eta \nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| \\ &\leq \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^* - \eta \nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}) - \eta \nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\| + \eta \|\nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\| \\ &\leq \rho \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + \eta \sqrt{k + k^*} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty,\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from lemma 14 and the fact $\|\nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\| \leq \sqrt{k + k^*} \|\nabla_S f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty$. Then we also have $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t+1)} = \Theta_k(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(t+1)})$, thus by following the lemma 15, we can get

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t+1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| \leq 1.62\rho \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + 1.62\eta \sqrt{k + k^*} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty.$$

■

Proof of Corollary 8. From Theorem 7 we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^t \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + \frac{1.62\eta\sqrt{p}}{1 - 1.62\rho} \|\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty.$$

We know that $\nabla f(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*) = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^T (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) = \frac{\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{n}$. Then from the inequality proved in the proof of Prop. 2

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\frac{\mathbf{X}^T \boldsymbol{\epsilon}}{n}\right\|_\infty \leq 2\sigma \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}}\right) \geq 1 - 2p^{1-nC_1},$$

we obtain that with probability $1 - 2p^{1-nC_1}$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| \leq (1.62\rho)^t \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + \frac{3.24\sigma\eta\sqrt{p}}{1 - 1.62\rho} \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}}.$$

After $t = \lceil \frac{1}{1.62\rho} \log\left(\frac{10\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|}{\beta_{\min}}\right) \rceil + 1$ iterations, we can show that $(1.62\rho)^t \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| < \frac{1}{10} \beta_{\min}$. Thus, with probability $1 - 2p^{1-nC_1}$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| < \beta_{\min}.$$

And thus $S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*} = S_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}}$ must hold. ■

Proof of Proposition 9. According to our OLS algorithm, we have the following equations:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (24)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (25)$$

Here we have $\boldsymbol{\beta}_1 = 0$.

Add $\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n$ to both sides of (24), obtaining

$$(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n \boldsymbol{\beta}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n. \quad (26)$$

where again we denoted by $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$. Subtracting (26) from (25) we obtain:

$$(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n) = y_n \mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n = -\nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n),$$

in which we denote $f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) = \frac{1}{2}(y_n - \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n)^2$. Hence we have the iterative formula in n -th ($n \geq n_0$) iteration:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_n - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n). \quad (27)$$

For $\forall \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n),$$

thus we have the following equation:

$$(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \quad (28)$$

Multiplying by the transpose of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ on both sides of (28) we get

$$(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \quad (29)$$

We plug (27) into (29):

$$\begin{aligned} & (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \\ &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n))^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n))^T \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \\ &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - 2 \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n)^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms, we have for $\forall n \geq n_0$:

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n)^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \\ & (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n) \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

For $\forall n > n_0$, we sum equation (30) from $(n_0 + 1)$ to n on both sides,

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &= \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i (\boldsymbol{\beta}_i - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \\ & - \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{i+1} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \\ & + \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \end{aligned}$$

After rearranging the formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 2 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\beta_i - \bar{\beta}) &= \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) \\
 &\quad + (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{n_0+1} (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=n_0+2}^n (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})^T ((\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{i-1}) (\beta_i - \bar{\beta}) - (\beta_{n+1} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\beta_{n+1} - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &\leq \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{n_0+1} (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=n_0+2}^n (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})^T ((\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i - (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{i-1}) (\beta_i - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &= \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{n_0+1} (\beta_{n_0+1} - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &\quad + \sum_{i=n_0+2}^n (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T) (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})
 \end{aligned}$$

The inequality holds because $(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n$ is positive definite, hence we have:

$$(\beta_{n+1} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_n (\beta_{n+1} - \bar{\beta}) \geq 0.$$

Then we denote

$$Q_i = \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\beta_i - \bar{\beta}) - \frac{1}{2} (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T) (\beta_i - \bar{\beta})$$

By rearranging the formula and taking $\bar{\beta} = \beta_{n+1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
 \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n Q_i &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_{n_0} - \bar{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{n_0} (\beta_{n_0} - \bar{\beta}) \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{n_0} \|\beta_{n_0} - \bar{\beta}\|_2^2 \\
 &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} M n_0 D^2
 \end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used Assumptions 1 and 2. Because $f_i(\beta) = \frac{1}{2} (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta)^2$ is second order differentiable, according to its Taylor expression, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 f_i(\bar{\beta}) &= f_i(\beta_i) + \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i)^T \nabla^2 f_i(\zeta) (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i) \\
 &= f_i(\beta_i) + \nabla f_i(\beta_i)^T (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i) + \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i)^T \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T (\bar{\beta} - \beta_i)
 \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have $\sum_{i=n_0+1}^n (f_i(\beta_i) - f_i(\bar{\beta})) = \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n Q_i$ and we get

$$\sum_{i=n_0+1}^n (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)^T (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i^{-1} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) + Mn_0 D^2$$

Based on Assumptions 1 and 2, we have $0 < m < \lambda_{\min}(\frac{1}{i}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i)$ and $\|\nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)\|_2 \leq G$, so we have

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i)^T ((\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_i)^{-1} \nabla f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) \leq \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \frac{1}{2mi} G^2 = \frac{G^2}{2m} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n \frac{1}{i} \leq \frac{G^2}{2m} \log(n)$$

So we get

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^n (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} \frac{1}{n} + \frac{Mn_0 D^2}{2n}$$

Then, we consider the regret bound for the first n_0 observations.

For $i = 1$ to n_0 , we use online ridge regression to replace online least squares, considering the equations for any $\lambda > 0$:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (31)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i \mathbf{x}_i, \quad (32)$$

Add $\mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n$ to both sides of (31), we obtain

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n + \lambda \boldsymbol{\beta}_n = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} y_i \mathbf{x}_i + \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n. \quad (33)$$

Then we use (32) subtract (33), and we have:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n) + \lambda (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_n) = y_n \mathbf{x}_n - \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_n \quad (34)$$

Thus, we can get

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{n+1} = \boldsymbol{\beta}_n - \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right)^{-1} \nabla f_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_n)$$

Because it is easy to find real values m_0 and M_0 satisfy

$$0 < m_0 < \lambda_{\min} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right) < \lambda_{\max} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T + \lambda \mathbf{I} \right) < M_0 < \infty,$$

using the similar technique by replacing $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T$ to $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^T + \lambda \mathbf{I}$ and considering that n_0 is a given scalar, we obtain that there is a constant $C > 0$ satisfying

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n_0} (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq C n_0$$

Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq \frac{Cn_0}{n} + \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} + \frac{MD^2 n_0}{2n} = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(n)}{n}\right)$$

■

Proof of Theorem 10. According to Theorem 4 with $\alpha = 1/2$, the probability for true feature selection for sample size $i \geq n_0$ is greater than

$$1 - 2p^{1-C_1\sqrt{i}} - e^{-i/50} \geq 1 - 2p^{1-C_1\sqrt{n_0}} - e^{-n_0/50}.$$

Using the union bound we get that the true features are selected for all sample sizes i , with $n_0 \leq i \leq n$ with probability at least

$$\begin{aligned} 1 - 2np^{1-C_1\sqrt{n_0}} - ne^{-n_0/50} &\leq 1 - 2npe^{-C_1\sqrt{n_0}\log(p)} - ne^{-2\log(n)} \\ &\leq 1 - 2/n - n^{-1} = 1 - 3/n \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $(\sqrt{n_0}C_1 - 1)\log(p) > 2\log(n)$ and $n_0 \geq 100\log(n)$.

Thus with this probability the true features are selected for all sample sizes i with $n \geq i \geq n_0$, and the OLSth algorithm degenerates to the OLS algorithm on the features from S_{β^*} . Assumption 1 is

$$0 < m < \lambda_{\min}\left(\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{S_{\beta^*}}\right) < \lambda_{\max}\left(\frac{1}{n}(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})_{S_{\beta^*}}\right) < M.$$

Following the proof of Proposition 9, we obtain

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq \frac{Cn_0}{n} + \frac{G^2 \log(n)}{2m} + \frac{Mn_0 D^2}{2n}. \quad (35)$$

From (35) since $n_0 = \mathcal{O}(\log^2(n))$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (f_i(\boldsymbol{\beta}_i) - f_i(\bar{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log^2(n)}{n}\right)$$

Thus we get the conclusion. ■

Appendix B. All experimental results for regression

The simulation is based on two settings: (1): $p = 1000$ and $k = 100$; (2): $p = 10000$ and $k = 1000$. In each data parameter setting, we consider the signal strength $\beta \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1\}$ (weak, medium and strong signals). The sample size n varies from 10^3 to 10^6 for both parameter settings. Stochastic ADMM (Ouyang et al., 2013) and TSGD (Fan et al., 2018) are used to compare with our algorithms. Besides, we cover Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996) as a offline learning method for comparison.

n	Variable Detection Rate (%)						test RMSE						Time (s)									
	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLSt	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLSt	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet	RAve	Lasso	TSGD	SADMM	OLSt	OFSA	OMCP	OElnet
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{strong signal } \beta = 1$																						
10^3	32.14	11.22	18.10	77.40	99.81	73.71	32.12	11.63	23.15	95.05	5.592	1.136	6.282	11.61	4.332	0.007	5.326	0.052	0.289	15.49	9.648	0.026
$3 \cdot 10^3$	46.05	11.22	41.23	100	100	98.02	45.19	9.464	13.45	93.50	1.017	1.017	1.745	9.557	26.91	0.019	15.73	0.051	0.288	13.86	7.113	0.076
10^4	72.40	11.22	65.78	100	100	100	72.42	6.07	13.34	94.92	1.003	1.003	1.003	6.042	47.32	0.065	51.80	0.051	0.288	6.508	5.885	0.246
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{weak signal } \beta = 0.1$																						
10^3	31.33	10.89	17.53	11.92	76.92	60.78	31.33	1.557	2.522	9.560	1.728	1.201	1.311	1.555	3.989	0.006	5.387	0.051	0.288	15.32	7.706	0.027
$3 \cdot 10^3$	44.85	10.89	40.11	95.57	98.43	89.96	44.11	1.389	1.674	9.392	1.044	1.026	1.075	1.403	27.82	0.018	15.98	0.052	0.288	15.84	6.332	0.076
10^4	70.53	10.89	62.48	100	100	99.98	71.10	1.183	1.663	9.541	1.003	1.003	1.003	1.176	54.50	0.066	53.01	0.051	0.288	10.05	5.814	0.251
$p = 1000, k = 100, \text{weak signal } \beta = 0.01$																						
10^3	14.09	10.89	13.53	10.11	12.40	15.55	14.08	1.128	1.027	1.363	1.069	1.169	1.049	1.124	5.353	0.006	6.703	0.052	0.288	13.20	9.741	0.026
10^4	31.58	10.89	19.80	22.48	32.47	32.32	31.54	1.009	1.007	1.370	1.025	1.006	1.005	1.006	48.13	0.067	67.82	0.051	0.287	14.98	4.961	0.249
10^5	81.93	10.89	11.30	80.55	85.14	84.86	81.80	1.001	1.010	1.382	1.003	1.003	1.003	1.003	452.2	0.672	679.7	0.051	0.287	15.93	5.120	2.458
$3 \cdot 10^5$	98.66	10.89	10.80	98.94	99.27	99.26	98.71	0.999	1.008	1.383	0.998	0.998	0.998	0.998	1172	2.001	2044	0.051	0.287	13.96	3.749	7.326
10^6	-	10.89	-	100	100	100	100	-	1.005	-	0.996	0.996	0.996	0.996	-	6.651	-	0.051	0.288	7.352	1.726	24.36
$p = 10000, k = 1000, \text{strong signal } \beta = 1$																						
10^4	22.79	10.20	24.01	98.09	99.09	24.84	22.76	40.38	42.21	916.7	4.606	3.341	40.09	40.72	759.8	0.773	563.5	18.88	28.40	468.4	1451	12.54
$3 \cdot 10^4$	26.64	10.20	10.22	100	100	39.73	26.48	37.01	42.01	921.7	1.017	1.017	32.19	36.99	2049	2.319	1687	18.81	28.59	462.9	1092	37.62
10^5	-	10.20	8.89	100	100	68.76	34.65	-	41.75	865.4	1.006	1.006	20.44	33.35	-	7.739	5633	19.00	28.49	456.7	983.9	124.8
$p = 10000, k = 1000, \text{weak signal } \beta = 0.1$																						
10^4	22.69	10.22	21.03	14.51	97.65	24.96	22.91	4.188	4.326	92.82	4.351	1.178	4.133	4.194	788.1	0.770	564.3	18.89	28.34	429.9	1241	12.48
$3 \cdot 10^4$	26.69	10.22	8.76	100	100	39.78	26.46	3.833	4.321	93.23	1.017	1.017	3.373	3.838	1887	2.320	1689	18.92	28.64	435.4	859.1	37.41
10^5	-	10.22	8.87	100	100	68.81	34.60	-	4.291	86.55	1.006	1.006	2.272	3.485	-	7.747	5632	18.91	28.64	411.6	884.1	124.5
$p = 10000, k = 1000, \text{weak signal } \beta = 0.01$																						
10^4	21.89	10.21	17.03	10.07	31.16	21.32	21.83	1.104	1.089	9.140	1.144	1.076	1.109	1.105	827.4	0.773	564.6	18.91	28.54	442.1	965.3	12.49
$3 \cdot 10^4$	25.87	10.21	9.30	35.02	52.44	33.22	26.12	1.070	1.086	9.199	1.108	1.046	1.069	1.079	1973	2.327	1693	18.89	28.58	439.6	759.9	37.32
10^5	-	10.21	10.19	77.32	83.73	57.38	33.37	-	1.083	8.423	1.025	1.016	1.035	1.061	-	7.742	5662	18.81	28.55	449.9	681.9	124.8
$3 \cdot 10^5$	-	10.21	9.92	98.53	98.95	85.95	45.66	-	1.082	7.479	1.002	1.001	1.009	1.043	-	23.21	16989	18.98	28.54	440.6	741.6	373.0
10^6	-	10.21	-	100	100	99.55	72.54	-	1.079	-	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.017	-	77.40	-	19.02	28.48	341.3	686.2	124.2

Table 6: Comparison between different online and offline algorithms for regression setting, averaged 20-100 runs

References

- Adrian Barbu, Yiyuan She, Liangjing Ding, and Gary Gramajo. Feature selection with annealing for computer vision and big data learning. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 39(2):272–286, 2017.
- Cheng-Tao Chu, Sang K Kim, Yi-An Lin, YuanYuan Yu, Gary Bradski, Kunle Olukotun, and Andrew Y Ng. Map-reduce for machine learning on multicore. In *NIPS*, pages 281–288, 2007.
- Andrew Cotter, Ohad Shamir, Nati Srebro, and Karthik Sridharan. Better mini-batch algorithms via accelerated gradient methods. In *NIPS*, pages 1647–1655, 2011.
- John Duchi and Yoram Singer. Efficient online and batch learning using forward backward splitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Dec):2899–2934, 2009.
- J. Fan and R. Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001.
- Jianqing Fan, Wenyan Gong, Chris Junchi Li, and Qiang Sun. Statistical sparse online regression: A diffusion approximation perspective. In *AISTATS*, pages 1017–1026, 2018.
- Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. *The elements of statistical learning*, volume 1. Springer series in statistics New York, NY, USA:, 2001.
- Elad Hazan. Introduction to online convex optimization. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization*, 2(3-4):157–325, 2016.
- Elad Hazan, Amit Agarwal, and Satyen Kale. Logarithmic regret algorithms for online convex optimization. *Machine Learning*, 69(2):169–192, 2007.
- Adel Javanmard. Perishability of data: dynamic pricing under varying-coefficient models. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):1714–1744, 2017.
- Michael Kearns. Efficient noise-tolerant learning from statistical queries. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(6):983–1006, 1998.
- John Langford, Lihong Li, and Tong Zhang. Sparse online learning via truncated gradient. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Mar):777–801, 2009.
- M. Lichman. UCI machine learning repository, 2013. URL <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
- Yurii Nesterov. Primal-dual subgradient methods for convex problems. *Mathematical programming*, 120(1):221–259, 2009.
- Yurii Nesterov. *Introductory lectures on convex optimization: A basic course*, volume 87. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- Matey Neykov, Jun S Liu, and Tianxi Cai. L1-regularized least squares for support recovery of high dimensional single index models with gaussian designs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(87):1–37, 2016.

- Hua Ouyang, Niao He, Long Tran, and Alexander Gray. Stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *ICML*, pages 80–88, 2013.
- Sheng Qiang and Mohsen Bayati. Dynamic pricing with demand covariates. 2016.
- Rasmus Rothe, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Dex: Deep expectation of apparent age from a single image. In *ICCV Workshops*, pages 10–15, 2015.
- Rasmus Rothe, Radu Timofte, and Luc Van Gool. Deep expectation of real and apparent age from a single image without facial landmarks. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, pages 1–14, 2016.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Yiyuan She et al. Thresholding-based iterative selection procedures for model selection and shrinkage. *Electronic Journal of statistics*, 3:384–415, 2009.
- Jie Shen and Ping Li. A tight bound of hard thresholding. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):7650–7691, 2017.
- Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- Richard S Sutton and Andrew G Barto. *Reinforcement learning: An introduction*, volume 1. MIT press Cambridge, 1998.
- Taiji Suzuki. Dual averaging and proximal gradient descent for online alternating direction multiplier method. In *ICML*, pages 392–400, 2013.
- Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- Joel A Tropp et al. An introduction to matrix concentration inequalities. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(1-2):1–230, 2015.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Yue Wu, Steven CH Hoi, Tao Mei, and Nenghai Yu. Large-scale online feature selection for ultra-high dimensional sparse data. *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data (TKDD)*, 11(4):48, 2017.
- Lin Xiao. Dual averaging methods for regularized stochastic learning and online optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Oct):2543–2596, 2010.
- Haichuan Yang, Ryohei Fujimaki, Yukitaka Kusumura, and Ji Liu. Online feature selection: A limited-memory substitution algorithm and its asynchronous parallel variation. In *SIGKDD*, pages 1945–1954. ACM, 2016.

Xiaotong Yuan, Ping Li, and Tong Zhang. Gradient hard thresholding pursuit for sparsity-constrained optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 127–135, 2014.

Cun-Hui Zhang. Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *Annals of Statistics*, pages 894–942, 2010.

Martin Zinkevich. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *ICML*, pages 928–936, 2003.

Hui Zou and Trevor Hastie. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 67(2):301–320, 2005.