

Valid Inference for L_2 -Boosting

David Rügamer

and

Sonja Greven

Department of Statistics, LMU Munich

November 20, 2022

Abstract

We review several recently proposed post-selection inference frameworks and assess their transferability to the component-wise functional gradient descent algorithm (CFGD) under normality assumption for model errors, also known as L_2 -Boosting. The CFGD is one of the most versatile toolboxes to analyze data, as it scales well to high-dimensional data sets, allows for a very flexible definition of additive regression models and incorporates inbuilt variable selection. Due to the iterative nature, which can repeatedly select the same component to update, an inference framework for component-wise boosting algorithms requires adaptations of existing approaches; we propose tests and confidence intervals for linear, grouped and penalized additive model components estimated using the L_2 -boosting selection process. We apply our framework to the prostate cancer data set and investigate the properties of our concepts in simulation studies.

Keywords: Bootstrap, Functional Gradient Descent Boosting, Post-Selection Inference, Selective Inference

1 Introduction

Inference for Boosting. In this work we review and adapt recently proposed inference techniques to the component-wise functional gradient descent algorithm (CFGD; see, e.g., Hothorn et al. 2010), which emerged from the field of machine learning (c.f. Friedman 2001), but has since also become an algorithm used to estimate statistical models (see, e.g., Mayr et al. 2017, Melcher et al. 2017, Rügamer et al. 2018, Brockhaus et al. 2018). A commonly used and well studied special CFGD algorithm is L_2 -Boosting (Bühlmann & Yu 2003). Apart from Luo & Spindler (2017), who study uncertainty for treatment effects when selecting control variables via L_2 -Boosting in instrumental variable models, which require additional assumptions for all the variables in the model, no general inferential concepts in the sense of classical statistical inference have been proposed for L_2 -Boosting yet, though ad-hoc solutions such as a non-parametric bootstrap are often used to quantify the uncertainty of boosting estimates (see e.g. Brockhaus et al. 2015, Rügamer et al. 2018). In many research areas such an uncertainty quantification is indispensable. We therefore propose a framework for conducting valid inference for regression coefficients in models fitted with L_2 -Boosting by conditioning on the selected covariates. We adapt recent research findings on *selective inference*, which transfers classical statistical inference to algorithms that rely on a preceding selection of model terms as is the case for CFGD algorithms. Compared to existing approaches for sequential regression procedures including forward stepwise regression (Tibshirani et al. 2016) inference for L_2 -Boosting carries additional challenges due to an iterative procedure that can repeatedly select the same model term.

Suitable inference concepts. The necessity for an explicit inference framework for methods with preceding selection is due to the invalidity of inference after model selection. This invalidity has been mentioned by many authors throughout the last decades (see, e.g., Berk et al. 2013). Different approaches for inference in high-dimensional regression models have emerged over the past years, including data splitting (Wasserman & Roeder 2009). Apart from these techniques, post-selection inference (PoSI; Berk et al. 2013) attracts growing interest. Initiated by the proposal for valid statistical inference after arbitrary selection procedures by Berk et al. (2013), many new findings and adoptions of post-

selection inference to known statistical methods have been published in the last years.

We here focus on *selective inference*, which provides inference statements conditional on the observed model selection. Similar to data splitting, selective inference separates the information in the data, which is used for the model selection, from the information, which is used to infer about parameters post model selection. In contrast to the original PoSI idea of providing simultaneous inference for every possible model selection, selective inference is designed to yield less conservative inference statements.

Apart from general theory described in Fithian et al. (2014), which transfers the classical theory to selective inference in exponential family models following any type of selection mechanism, different explicit frameworks for several selection methods have been derived (see e.g. Lee et al. 2016, for selective inference after Lasso selection or Rügamer & Greven 2018, for selective inference after likelihood- and test-based model selection). Recent publications, which are particularly relevant for this work, aim for valid inference in forward stepwise regression (Tibshirani et al. 2016, Loftus & Taylor 2014, 2015). Whereas Tibshirani et al. (2016) build a framework for any sequential regression technique resulting in a limitation to the space for inference, which can be characterized by a polyhedral set, Loftus & Taylor (2014, 2015) extend the idea to a more general framework, for which the inference space is given by quadratic inequalities and coincides with the polyhedral approach in special cases. A continuation of Loftus & Taylor (2015) is given by Yang et al. (2016). With the objective to build a selective inference framework for the group Lasso (Yuan & Lin 2006), Yang et al. describe an importance sampling algorithm that circumvents the problem of having to explicitly define the space, to which the inference is restricted after conditioning.

Resampling for uncertainty quantification. Uncertainty quantification by the use of resampling methods is as error-prone as classical inference when applied to models after a certain model selection procedure. We therefore will shortly address this issue by the example of bootstrap as one of the most commonly used techniques.

Let us first consider the parametric bootstrap. When generating new samples of the response from the selected model and proceeding as in unadjusted inference post model-

selection, the selected model is treated as the true model and this can incorrectly lead effects to be (non-)zero. A non-parametric bootstrap on the other hand is accompanied by its own problems. First, when drawing pairs of response and covariates, we (implicitly) assume that the underlying data model is based on a random design in contrast to many regression model settings, where the covariates are assumed to be fixed. If we ignore this issue, we still face the problem of either neglecting the uncertainty of model selection, if we refit the initially selected model for the resampled data, or the problem of having to aggregate over different models when integrating the model selection process into our resampling procedure. If estimates are aggregated over different models, uncertainty quantification of parameters is based on different selected models with different interpretations of the estimated coefficients and thus does not correspond to a meaningful single null hypothesis.

An additional difficulty arises when using the bootstrap for boosted regression models, in which the estimated coefficients exhibit a bias due to the shrinkage effect of boosting. Hence, bootstrap intervals are not centered around the true value and thus yield a quantification of variability rather than a measure of deviation from the truth.

Contribution of this work. In this work, we adapt and extend several existing approaches for selective inference, thereby addressing the following issues:

1. We explicitly derive the space restriction of the response given by the L_2 -Boosting path and thereby allow for inference as proposed in Tibshirani et al. (2016).
2. We propose a new conditional inference concept for L_2 -Boosting and potentially other slow learning algorithms by conditioning on a set of possible selection paths.
3. We combine the work of Tibshirani et al. (2016) and Yang et al. (2016) to allow for the computation of p-values and confidence intervals using test statistics, which lie in a union of polyhedra and therefore have a (conditional) normal distribution with potentially multiple truncation limits.
4. We explain how the proposed inference concept can easily be extended to account for cross-validation, stability selection (Shah & Samworth 2013) and similar sub-sampling methods.

5. We extend the idea of the selective inference framework to models including L_2 -penalized additive effects, such as smooth effects.

In the following, we describe the L_2 -Boosting algorithm in section 2 and recapitulate the concept of selective inference for sequential regression procedures in section 3. In section 4 we investigate the challenges accompanying a new inference framework for L_2 -Boosting and propose several solutions. In section 5 we present simulation results and analyze the prostate cancer data using our new approach in section 6. We discuss limitations and further extensions of the approach in section 7. An add-on R-package to the model-based boosting R package `mboost` is available at <https://github.com/davidruegamer/iboost>, which can be used to conduct inference for boosted models and to reproduce the results of section 5 and 6. Supplementary materials including further simulation results are available at https://github.com/davidruegamer/inference_boosting.

2 L_2 -Boosting

We now present the L_2 -Boosting algorithm as a special generic CFGD algorithm. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be a fixed set of covariates and \mathbf{y} a realization of the random response variable $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. The goal is to minimize a loss function $\ell(\cdot, \mathbf{y})$ for the given realization \mathbf{y} with respect to an additive model $\mathbf{f} := \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(\mathbf{X}_j)$, where function evaluations of g_j are evaluated row-wise. The functions $g_j(\cdot)$, the so called base-learners, are defined for column subsets $\mathbf{X}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p_j}$ of \mathbf{X} with $1 \leq p_j \leq p$ and can be fitted to some vector $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, which yields $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j$ as estimate for $g_j(\mathbf{X}_j)$. We estimate \mathbf{f} by $\hat{\mathbf{f}}$ using the component-wise functional gradient descent algorithm:

- (1) Initialize an offset value $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. If \mathbf{y} is centered, a natural choice is $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(0)} = (0, \dots, 0)^\top$. Define $m = 0$.
- (2) Do the following for $m = 1, \dots, m_{stop}$:
 - (2.1) Compute the pseudo-residuals $\mathbf{u}^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of step m as $\mathbf{u}^{(m)} = - \left. \frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{f}} \ell(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{y}) \right|_{\mathbf{f}=\hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(m-1)}}$.
 - (2.2) Approximate the negative gradient vector with $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j$ by fitting each of the base-learners $g_j(\cdot), j = 1, \dots, J$ to the pseudo-residuals and find the base-learner $j^{(m)}$, for which $j^{(m)} = \operatorname{argmin}_{1 \leq j \leq J} \|\mathbf{u}^{(m)} - \hat{\mathbf{g}}_j\|_2^2$ holds.

(2.3) Update $\hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(m)} = \hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(m-1)} + \nu \cdot \hat{\mathbf{g}}_{j^{(m)}}$, where $\nu \in (0, 1]$ is the so called *step-length* or *learning rate*.

When defining $\ell(\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{f}\|_2^2$ with quadratic L_2 -Norm $\|\cdot\|_2^2$, L_2 -Boosting is obtained, which corresponds to mean regression using the model $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{Y}|\mathbf{X}) = \sum_{j=1}^J g_j(\mathbf{X}_j)$. The vector $\mathbf{u}^{(m)}$ then corresponds to the residuals $\mathbf{y} - \hat{\mathbf{f}}^{(m)}$. In the framework of additive regression models, each base-learner $g_j(\cdot)$ constitutes a partial effect and is represented as linear effect of a covariate or of a basis evaluated at that covariate vector, i.e., $\mathbf{g}_j(\mathbf{X}_j) = \mathbf{X}_j \boldsymbol{\beta}_j$. $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ is estimated using ordinary or penalized least squares. The model fit $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j^{(m)}$ of each base-learner in the m th step is therefore given by $\hat{\mathbf{g}}_j^{(m)} = \mathbf{H}_j \mathbf{u}^{(m)} = \mathbf{X}_j (\mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{X}_j + \lambda_j \mathbf{D}_j)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_j^\top \mathbf{u}^{(m)}$, where the hat matrix \mathbf{H}_j is defined by the corresponding design matrix \mathbf{X}_j , a penalty matrix \mathbf{D}_j and a pre-specified smoothing parameter $\lambda_j \geq 0$ controlling the penalization. As only one base-learner is chosen in each iteration, the final effective degrees of freedom of the j th base-learner depend on the number of selections.

As L_2 -Boosting scales well to large data sets due to its component-wise fitting nature and is particularly suited for the estimation of structured additive regression models, it is often used as an estimation algorithm for a statistical additive model (see, e.g., Mayr et al. 2017). It has the additional advantage of being able to handle $n < p$ -settings and conducting variable selection, as not all J model terms are necessarily selected in at least one iteration. However, when constructing a measure of uncertainty for regression coefficients, the preceding variable selection has to be accounted for. As for other variable selection procedures, the iterative nature of L_2 -Boosting restricts the space of \mathbf{Y} and thereby the space of estimated parameters.

3 A Review of Selective Inference for Sequential Regression Procedures

We first define the considered model framework and some necessary notations before reviewing existing selective inference approaches we build on in Section 4. Let $\mathbf{Y} = \boldsymbol{\mu} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ with $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ and n -dimensional identity matrix \mathbf{I}_n . Furthermore, assume that σ^2 is known and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is an unknown parameter of interest. In particular, we do not assume

any true linear relationship between $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and covariates, but estimate $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ with a “working model”, which is of additive nature based on fixed covariates $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, for which p potentially exceeds n . Furthermore, define the selection procedure or selection event $\mathcal{S}: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathcal{P}(\{1, \dots, p\})$, $\mathbf{y} \mapsto \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{y})$ with power set function $\mathcal{P}(\cdot)$. For the given realization \mathbf{y} of \mathbf{Y} , we denote $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{y}) =: \mathcal{A}$, for which we assume $|\mathcal{A}| \leq n$.

We focus on estimating the best linear projection of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ into the space spanned by the variables given by \mathcal{A} after model selection. We therefore run the selection procedure defined by \mathcal{S} , select the subset $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ of \mathbf{X} defined by the selected column indices $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{A}$ and estimate regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}}$ by projecting \mathbf{y} into the linear subspace $\mathbf{W}_{\mathcal{A}} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by the columns of $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$. With the goal to infer about $\beta_j, j \in \mathcal{A}$, in $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{A}}$, we test the hypothesis $H_0: \beta_j = 0$. This is equivalent to testing

$$H_0: \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} := \mathbf{e}_j^\top (\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} = 0 \quad (1)$$

with \mathbf{e}_j the unit vector selecting $j \in \mathcal{A}$ (see, e.g., Tibshirani et al. 2016).

3.1 Inference based on a Polyhedral Space Characterization

In a classical statistical approach without selection, (1) is tested by using $\tilde{R} := \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{Y}$, which follows a normal distribution with expectation $\tilde{\rho} = \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and variance $\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}$ under the null. However, after model selection, the space of \mathbf{Y} is restricted to $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{y} : \mathcal{S}(\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{A}\}$, which we call the *inference region*. Many of the proposed methods for selective inference then describe this space restriction mathematically and derive the distribution of $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{G}$. For sequential regression procedures such as Forward Stepwise Regression (*FSR*) or the Least Angle Regression (*LAR*, Efron et al. 2004), Tibshirani et al. (2016) characterize the restricted region of the on-going selection mechanism as a polyhedral set $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{y} : \Gamma \mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{b}\}$ with $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{\varkappa \times n}$, $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^{\varkappa}$ for some $\varkappa \in \mathbb{N}$ and an inequality \geq which is to be interpreted componentwise. In other words, for *FSR*, *LAR* and also for other algorithms, Γ and \mathbf{b} can be explicitly derived by reformulating inequalities determining the selection in each step. As shown in 4, this is also the case for *L₂-Boosting* when conditioning on the selection path. Let $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}$ be the projection onto a linear subspace $\text{span}(\mathbf{W}) \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ defined by $\mathbf{W} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times w}$, $w \geq 1$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^\perp$ be the projection onto the orthogonal complement of this linear subspace. Furthermore, define the direction of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{y}$ as the unit vector $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}) = \frac{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{y}}{\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{y}\|_2}$.

In the framework of Tibshirani et al. (2016), \mathbf{Y} is written as $\tilde{R} \cdot \frac{\mathbf{v}}{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}} + \mathbf{Z}$ with $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{P}_v^\perp \mathbf{Y}$. By construction \mathbf{Z} is independent of \tilde{R} . The selection event $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{G}$ can thus be rewritten

$$\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{Y} \text{ with } \mathcal{V}^{lo}(\mathbf{Z}) \leq \tilde{R} \leq \mathcal{V}^{up}(\mathbf{Z}), \mathcal{V}^0(\mathbf{Z}) \geq 0\}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{V}^{lo} , \mathcal{V}^{up} and \mathcal{V}^0 are functions of \mathbf{Z} as well as of the fixed quantities Γ and \mathbf{v} . By additionally conditioning on the realization \mathbf{z} of \mathbf{Z} as well as on a list of signs for each step similar to those defined in (9) and which will be explained in Section 4, \mathcal{V}^{lo} , \mathcal{V}^{up} are fixed limits for \tilde{R} (see, e.g., Lee et al. 2016) with $\mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{G}$ corresponding to $\tilde{R} \in \mathcal{R}_y := \{\tilde{R} : \mathcal{V}^{lo}(\mathbf{z}) \leq \tilde{R} \leq \mathcal{V}^{up}(\mathbf{z})\}$. Incorporating these boundaries into the distribution of $\tilde{R} \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})$ yields a truncated Gaussian distribution with truncation limits $\mathcal{V}^{lo} = \mathcal{V}^{lo}(\mathbf{z})$, $\mathcal{V}^{up} = \mathcal{V}^{up}(\mathbf{z})$. Let $F_{\tilde{\rho}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{R})$ denote the cumulative distribution function of the truncated normal distribution evaluated at \tilde{R} . Then, for

$$H_0 : \tilde{\rho} \leq 0 \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \tilde{\rho} > 0,$$

the test statistic

$$T = 1 - F_{0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{R})$$

is a valid conditional p-value, conditional on the polyhedral selection, as

$$\mathbb{P}_{H_0}(T \leq \alpha \mid \Gamma \mathbf{Y} \geq \mathbf{b}) = \alpha$$

for any $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. For a two-sided hypothesis

$$H_0 : \tilde{\rho} = 0 \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \tilde{\rho} \neq 0,$$

Tibshirani et al. (2016) define

$$T = 2 \cdot \min \left(F_{0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{R}), 1 - F_{0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{R}) \right)$$

and the validity of inference based on this p-value holds analogously. A valid conditional confidence interval $[\delta_{\alpha/2}, \delta_{1-\alpha/2}]$ can then be derived by inverting the given test, i.e., finding the limits $\delta_{\alpha/2}$ and $\delta_{1-\alpha/2}$, which satisfy $1 - F_{\delta_{\alpha/2}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{r}) = \alpha/2$ and $1 - F_{\delta_{1-\alpha/2}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{r}) = 1 - \alpha/2$ for the observed value $\tilde{R} = \tilde{r}$. Limits in this case are unique due to the monotonicity of the survival function $1 - F_{\gamma, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\tilde{r})$ in the mean γ . For more details, see section 4 and Tibshirani et al. (2016).

The characterization of the inference region as a polyhedral set, however, is only possible if the algorithmic decision in each selection step is a linear restriction on the space of \mathbf{Y} . For example for groups of variables, the underlying inequality for the choice of the covariate is inherent quadratic and no polyhedral representation can be obtained. Loftus & Taylor (2015) therefore introduce a framework for inference after model selection procedures which can be described by affine inequalities.

Apart from a different characterization of the space restriction, a different test statistic must be used for groups of variables. For testing the j th group variable coefficient $\beta_{\mathcal{A},j} \in \mathbb{R}^w$ in the best linear approximation $\beta_{\mathcal{A}} = \arg \min \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}\beta\|_2^2]$, Loftus & Taylor (2015), Yang et al. (2016) rewrite the null hypothesis $\beta_{\mathcal{A},j} = \mathbf{0}$ as $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0} \Leftrightarrow$

$$H_0 : \rho := \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 = 0 \quad (3)$$

with $\mathbf{W} = \mathbf{P}_{\bar{\mathcal{X}}_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}}^{\perp} \mathbf{X}_j$, where $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}\setminus j}$ denotes $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{A}}$ without the p_j columns corresponding to the j th group variable. In other words we want to test the correlation of \mathbf{X}_j and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ after adjusting for all other predictors $\mathcal{A}\setminus j$ in the selected model \mathcal{A} . Using $R := \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{Y}\|_2$ as test statistic, the authors then conduct inference. Under the null and when additionally conditioning on the direction $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$, R follows a truncated χ -distribution and truncation limits of R can again be derived analytically. With the goal to also facilitate the computation of confidence intervals, Yang et al. (2016) note that R and $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$ are not independent for $\rho \neq 0$ and as a consequence, the χ -conditional distribution of R as derived in Loftus & Taylor (2015) for (3) when $\rho = 0$ no longer holds for more general hypotheses.

Similar to (2), Yang et al. (2016) decompose \mathbf{Y} as $R \cdot \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{Y}) + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{Y}$ and condition on $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{Y}) = \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$ as well as on $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y}$. Then, the only variation left is in R and the selection \mathcal{A} can be equally written as $R \in \mathcal{R}_y$ with

$$\mathcal{R}_y = \{R > 0 : \mathcal{S}(R \cdot \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}) + \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y}) = \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Yang et al. (2016) then derive the conditional distribution of R , conditional on $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$ as well as on $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y}$. The corresponding density is

$$f(R) \propto R^{w-1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} (R^2 - 2R \cdot \langle \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}), \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle) \right\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y\} \quad (4)$$

with indicator function $\mathbb{1}\{\cdot\}$. (4) can be used to conduct inference on the inner product $\langle \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}), \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle$. As for the quantity of interest $\rho = \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_2 \geq \langle \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}), \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle$ holds, (4) can

also be used to construct a lower bound for ρ . As a byproduct of generalizing the idea of Loftus & Taylor (2015), the authors additionally bypass the problem of having to define the selection region analytically. We describe this idea in the following in more detail.

3.2 Inference without explicit inference region definition

Whereas most approaches for selective inference require an explicit definition of the space \mathcal{G} , to which \mathbf{Y} is restricted by the selection procedure, a mathematical description of \mathcal{G} is not always feasible. However, as pointed out by Fithian et al. (2014), Yang et al. (2016), such a characterization is not mandatory when sampling from the conditional distribution of \mathbf{Y} is possible. In the following, we describe the idea of Yang et al. (2016), who use an importance sampler when conducting inference for (3).

Theorem 1 in Yang et al. (2016) states that, conditional on $\text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$, $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y}$ and the selection event, inference can be conducted using

$$\varsigma(t) = \frac{\int_{R \in \mathcal{R}_y, R > \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{y}\|_2} R^{w-1} e^{-(R^2-2Rt)/2\sigma^2} dR}{\int_{R \in \mathcal{R}_y} R^{w-1} e^{-(R^2-2Rt)/2\sigma^2} dR} \quad (5)$$

as $\varsigma(t_Y)$, a p-value for $\langle \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}), \boldsymbol{\mu} \rangle = t_Y$, is Uniform[0, 1]-distributed. Here, $\varsigma(\cdot)$ can also be seen as the survival function derived from the density defined in (4). In order to circumvent an explicit definition of the selection region \mathcal{R}_y , the authors note that (5) is equal to

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \sigma\chi_w}(e^{Rt/\sigma^2} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y, R > \|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{y}\|_2\})}{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \sigma\chi_w}(e^{Rt/\sigma^2} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y\})}, \quad (6)$$

which can be approximated by the ratio of empirical expectations computed with a large number of samples $r^b \sim \sigma \cdot \chi_w, b = 1, \dots, B$. In particular, to evaluate the argument of both expectations in (6) for some $r^b, r^b \in \mathcal{R}_y$ must be checked. To this end, note that the only variation of $(\mathbf{Y} \mid \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y}), \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y})$ is in R . We therefore define $\mathbf{y}^b = \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}^{\perp}\mathbf{y} + r^b \cdot \text{dir}_{\mathbf{W}}(\mathbf{y})$ and rerun the algorithm to check whether $\mathcal{S}(\mathbf{y}^b) = \mathcal{A}$, or equivalently, whether $r^b \in \mathcal{R}_y$. Drawing samples from the $\sigma\chi_w$ -distribution, however, is less promising when $\|\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{W}}\mathbf{y}\|_2$ is large. In this case, $\mathbb{P}(R \in \mathcal{R}_y)$ may be very small and an excessively large number of samples is needed to obtain a good approximation of $\varsigma(t)$. Yang et al. (2016) therefore suggest an importance sampling algorithm, which draws new samples r^b from a proposal

distribution \mathcal{F}_{prop} such as $\mathcal{N}(\|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}\|_2, \sigma^2)$ with density f_{prop} and then approximates (6) by

$$\zeta(t) \approx \hat{\zeta}(t) = \frac{\sum_b w_b \cdot e^{r^b t / \sigma^2} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{r^b \in \mathcal{R}_Y, r^b > \|\mathbf{P}\mathbf{w}\mathbf{y}\|_2\}}{\sum_b w_b \cdot e^{r^b t / \sigma^2} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{r^b \in \mathcal{R}_Y\}} \quad (7)$$

with sampling weights $w_b = f_{\sigma\chi_w}(r^b) / f_{prop}(r^b)$.

4 Selective Inference concepts for L_2 -Boosting

4.1 Polyhedron representation-based inference for L_2 -Boosting

Consider using L_2 -Boosting with only linear base-learners to fit a linear regression model. Following Tibshirani et al. (2016) we can derive a polyhedron representation $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathbf{y} : \Gamma\mathbf{y} \geq \mathbf{b}\}$ in a similar fashion to other stepwise regression procedures **for the given selection path** $j^{(1)}, \dots, j^{(m_{\text{stop}})}$ of L_2 -boosting.

This can easily be proven by regarding the residual vector $\mathbf{u}^{(m)}$ of step m as a function of \mathbf{y} . The selection condition for the m th chosen base-learner

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{u}^{(m)}\|^2 &\leq \|\mathbf{u}^{(m)}\|^2 \quad \forall j \neq j^{(m)} \\ \Leftrightarrow \left(s_m \mathbf{X}_{j^{(m)}}^\top / \|\mathbf{X}_{j^{(m)}}\|_2 \pm \mathbf{X}_j^\top / \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 \right) \mathbf{u}^{(m)} &\geq 0 \quad \forall j \neq j^{(m)}, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

with $s_m = \text{sign}(\mathbf{X}_{j^{(m)}}^\top \mathbf{u}^{(m)})$, can be written as affine restriction on \mathbf{y} by plugging

$$\mathbf{u}^{(m)} = \left[\prod_{l=1}^{m-1} (\mathbf{I} - \nu \mathbf{H}_{j^{(m-l)}}) \right] \mathbf{y} =: \Upsilon^{(m)} \mathbf{y}$$

into (8). This yields the polyhedron representation \mathcal{G} for a given selection path and list of signs $s_m, m = 1, \dots, m_{\text{stop}}$ with corresponding $(2 \cdot (p-1) \cdot m_{\text{stop}}) \times n$ matrix Γ as stacked matrix of n -dimensional row vectors, where the rows $\Gamma_{[(\tilde{m}+2j-1):(\tilde{m}+2j),]}$ with $\tilde{m} = 2 \cdot (p-1) \cdot (m-1)$ are given by

$$\left(s_m \mathbf{X}_{j^{(m)}}^\top / \|\mathbf{X}_{j^{(m)}}\|_2 \pm \mathbf{X}_j^\top / \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2 \right) \Upsilon^{(m)} \quad \forall j \neq j^{(m)}. \quad (9)$$

As for other procedures described in the post-selection inference literature, this representation only holds if the columns of \mathbf{X} are in general position, which however, is not a very stringent assumption (see, e.g., Tibshirani et al. 2016, section 4).

By showing that the L_2 -Boosting path results in a space restriction for \mathbf{Y} , which can be described as a polyhedral set, quantities of interest $\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$ can be tested based on the conditional distribution of $\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{Y} \mid \mathbf{Y} \in \mathcal{G}$ as proposed by Tibshirani et al. (2016). To this end, we have to condition on the selection path. If we do not additionally condition on the list of signs, \mathcal{G} is a union of polyhedra (cf. Lee et al. 2016).

4.2 Choice of the Conditioning Event for Slow Learners

For the selection approaches discussed in Section 3, conditioning on the selection path is equivalent to conditioning on the selected model, which helps in deriving the corresponding conditional distribution. For boosting and other slow learners that can repeatedly select the same base-learner, conditioning on the selection path and thus on variable selection decisions in each algorithmic step will result in a loss of power. In fact, such a conditional inference will have almost no power in most practically relevant situations, as we show empirically for the polyhedron approach in the simulation section. In order to avoid excessive conditioning, we propose to condition only on the set of selected covariates, i.e., on the selected statistical model.

Conditioning only on the selected covariates, however, means that the mathematical description of the inference region becomes far more difficult. For L_2 -Boosting with linear base-learners, this would result in a union of not necessarily overlapping polyhedra for the different selection paths leading to the same selected model. In particular for L_2 -Boosting, we do not think that an analytical description of the inference region is possible. We thus circumvent this problem using a Monte Carlo approximation, adapting and extending the existing approaches presented in Section 3.

4.3 Powerful Inference for L_2 -Boosting with Linear Base-learners

We now combine the ideas of Section 3.1 and 3.2 to practically realize the idea of the previous Section 4.2. We base inference on the potentially multiply truncated Gaussian distribution of $R = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{Y}$ conditional on $\mathbf{P}_v^\perp \mathbf{y}$ and the selection $R \in \mathcal{R}_y$. Then, the

truncated normal density of R is given by

$$f(R) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}} (R - \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu})^2 \right\} \cdot \mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y\},$$

where \mathcal{R}_y is a union of polyhedra. Let $r_{\text{obs}} = \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{y}$. Then, analogous to Yang et al. (2016) we can define a p-value by

$$P = \frac{\int_{R > r_{\text{obs}}, R \in \mathcal{R}_y} e^{-(2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} R^2} dR}{\int_{R \in \mathcal{R}_y} e^{-(2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} R^2} dR}$$

for $H_0 : \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$ and since the truncated Gaussian distribution with potentially multiple truncation limits is monotone increasing in its mean ρ (see, e.g., Rügamer & Greven 2018), we can find unique values $\rho_{\alpha/2}, \rho_{1-\alpha/2}$ for any $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, such that

$$\zeta(\rho_a) = \frac{\int_{R > r_{\text{obs}}, R \in \mathcal{R}_y} e^{-(2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} (R^2 - 2R\rho_a)} dR}{\int_{R \in \mathcal{R}_y} e^{-(2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} (R^2 - 2R\rho_a)} dR} = a, \quad a \in \{\alpha/2, 1 - \alpha/2\}$$

to construct a confidence interval $[\rho_{\alpha/2}, \rho_{1-\alpha/2}]$. Note that $P = \zeta(0)$, and $\zeta(\rho_a)$ can then be rewritten as

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})} \left[\mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y, R > r_{\text{obs}}\} \cdot e^{(\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} R \rho_\alpha} \right]}{\mathbb{E}_{R \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})} \left[\mathbb{1}\{R \in \mathcal{R}_y\} \cdot e^{(\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})^{-1} R \rho_\alpha} \right]},$$

which allows for an empirical approximation as in (7).

In practice, importance sampling from $\Pi = \mathcal{N}(r_{\text{obs}}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v})$ works well if truncation limits around r_{obs} are fairly symmetric, yielding the weights $w_b = \exp((2r^b r_{\text{obs}} - r_{\text{obs}}^2)/(-2\sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}))$ for the importance sampler. A refinement of the sampling routine is necessary to also work well in more extreme cases. An example frequently encountered in practice is given when r_{obs} is rather large and at the same time lies very close to one truncation limit, yielding an insufficient amount of samples $r^b \in \mathcal{R}_y$ to approximate the truncated distribution well. We therefore propose a more efficient sampling routine, motivated by and applicable to selection procedures, for which the support of the truncated distribution is known to be a single interval $[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]$. In this case, we do not even need to characterize the space empirically since the distribution of interest is known with the exception of the interval limits (the variance is assumed to be known and the null distribution determines the mean ρ). By employing a line search, we can find $\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}$ and conduct inference based on the truncated normal distribution function $F_{\rho, \sigma^2 \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{v}}^{[\mathcal{V}^{lo}, \mathcal{V}^{up}]}(\cdot)$. We use such a corresponding line search here to

refine the importance sampling. By searching through the space of potential values $R \in \mathcal{R}_y$, a preliminary interval $[\tilde{R}^{lo}, \tilde{R}^{up}]$ covering \mathcal{R}_y can be found with negligible computational cost by, e.g., successively checking extreme quantiles of Π for their congruency with respect to \mathcal{R}_y . By checking extremely small and large values of R and defining $\tilde{R}^{lo}, \tilde{R}^{up}$ such that both limits include all values, for which $R \in \mathcal{R}_y$, we can find a superset of the support of R up to numerical precision. We then draw from a uniform distribution with support $[\tilde{R}^{lo}, \tilde{R}^{up}]$. In comparison to the approach, which simply draws samples from Π , finding preliminary truncation limits $[\tilde{R}^{lo}, \tilde{R}^{up}]$ to refine the sampling space prior to the actual sampling proves to notably enhance accuracy and efficiency due the increased amount of accepted samples.

4.4 Further extensions

The ideas of section 4.2 and 4.3 can be extended to allow for computations in further relevant settings. An obvious extension is that to groups of variables. analogous to Yang et al. (2016). We additionally discuss four practically important extensions in the following.

Inference for groups of variables. In order to test groups of variables, the approach by Yang et al. (2016) described in Subsection 3.2 can almost directly be applied. To this end, we define \mathcal{S} based on the set of chosen variables and use the sampling approach proposed in Subsection 4.3 for the χ -distribution on \mathbb{R}^+ , such that $\tilde{R}^{lo} \geq 0$.

Incorporating cross-validation and other sub-sampling techniques. One of the most common ways to choose a final stopping iteration for the boosting algorithm is by using a resampling technique such as k -fold cross-validation and estimating the prediction error of the model in each step. By choosing the model with the smallest estimated prediction error, we again exploit information from the data, which we have to discard in the following inference. For the sampling approach described in 4.3 the extension is straightforward as we simply incorporate the cross-validation conditions in the space definition of \mathcal{R}_y . In order to check the congruency with the selection event \mathcal{R}_y , we keep the folds fixed and identical to the original fit when rerunning the algorithm with a new sample \mathbf{y}^b . In fact, this approach is

not only restricted to resampling methods. Stability selection (Shah & Samworth 2013) or other possibilities to choose an “optimal” number of iterations, as for example, by selection criteria such as the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC, Akaike 1974) can be incorporated into the inference framework in the same manner.

Unknown error variance. If the true error variance is unknown, we may use a consistent estimator instead. Judging by our simulation results, the effect of plugging in the empirical variance of the boosting model residuals is negligible in many cases and may also be a better (less anti-conservative) choice than the analogous estimator given by ordinary least squares estimation in the selected model due to the shrinkage effect. In cases with smaller signal-to-noise ratio, however, the plug-in approach may also yield invalid p-values under the null as shown in our simulation section. Tibshirani et al. (2015) present a plug-in as well as a bootstrap version of the test statistic, which yield asymptotically conservative p-values for $\mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu} = 0$. The bootstrap approach, however, can only be conducted efficiently if truncation limits of the test statistic are known. In the simulation section, we investigate the first suggestion by Tibshirani et al. (2015) – using the empirical variance of \mathbf{y} as a conservative estimate for σ^2 – which better suits the presented framework.

Smooth effects. The given approach can also be used for additive models when the linear predictor $\eta_i = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ in the working model $y_i = \eta_i + \varepsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ is extended by additive terms of the form $g(c_i)$ for some covariate $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)^\top$. For the ease of presentation, we assume only one covariate \mathbf{c} that is incorporated as an additive term. We therefore use a basis representation $g(c_i) = \mathbf{B}(c_i)\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \sum_{\varpi=1}^M \mathbf{B}_\varpi(c_i)\gamma_\varpi$ with M basis function $B_\varpi(\cdot)$ evaluated at the observed value c_i , basis coefficients γ_ϖ , $\mathbf{B}(c_i) = (B_1(c_i), \dots, B_M(c_i))$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_M)^\top$. When \mathbf{X}_A is the composed matrix of all covariates, which are assumed to have a linear effect, and of the evaluated basis functions $\tilde{\mathbf{B}} = (\mathbf{B}(c_1)^\top, \dots, \mathbf{B}(c_n)^\top)^\top$ of \mathbf{c} , we again might be interested in testing the best linear approximation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ in the space spanned by a given design matrix \mathbf{X}_A . To this end, we can perform a point-wise test $H_0 : \mathbf{g}(c) = 0$ for \mathbf{g} the true function in the basis space resulting from the best linear approximation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ by the given model. This can be done by using the proposed framework

with test vector $\mathbf{v}^\top = \mathbf{B}^0(c)(\mathbf{X}_A^\top \mathbf{X}_A)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_A^\top$ as $\mathbf{g}(c) = \mathbf{v}^\top \boldsymbol{\mu}$, where $\mathbf{B}^0(c)$ is defined as \mathbf{X}_A for which all columns but those corresponding to $\mathbf{B}(c)$ are set to zero. Instead of a point-wise test, the whole function can be tested

$$H_0 : \mathbf{g}(\cdot) \equiv \mathbf{0} \tag{10}$$

by regarding the columns in $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$ as groups of variables and setting \mathbf{W} in (3) to $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{X}_{A \setminus j}}^\perp \tilde{\mathbf{B}}$, where $\mathbf{X}_{A \setminus j}$ denotes \mathbf{X}_A without the p_j columns of $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}$.

The proposed tests and testvectors can also be used when smooth effects are estimated using a penalized base-learner.

5 Simulations

We now provide evidence for the validity of our method for linear and spline base-learners based on $B = 1000$ samples. We also show the performance of the proposed method in comparison to the polyhedron approach in a relevant setting and investigate the effect of different variance values. For linear regression with linear base-learners the true underlying model is given by

$$y_i = \eta_i + \varepsilon_i = \mathbf{X}_{[i,1:4]} \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{11}$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (4, -3, 2, -1)$, $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with σ defined such that the signal-to-noise ration $\text{SNR} \in \{1, 4\}$ and $[i, 1 : 4]$ indicates the rows and columns of \mathbf{X} , respectively. We construct four linear base-learners for the four covariates $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_4$ in $\mathbf{X}_{[1:4]}$ and additionally build $p_0 \in \{4, 22\}$ base-learners based on noise variables for $n \in \{25, 100\}$ observations, where the columns in \mathbf{X} are independently drawn from a standard normal distribution (empirical correlations range from -0.53 to 0.48). Figure 1 shows the observed p-values versus the expected quantiles of the standard uniform distribution for settings, in which either the true model or a model larger than the true model with all four signal variables is selected. This corresponds to selection events, in which the null hypothesis (1) holds for $j > 4$ and thus p-values of inactive variables should exhibit uniformity given the selection event \mathcal{A} . The mixture of uniform $U[0, 1]$ p-values when aggregating across selected models again results in $U[0, 1]$ p-values.




Figure 1: Observed p-values vs. expected quantiles across different covariates (rows) as well as different number of boosting iterations, number of noise variables and iterations, SNR and methods (columns) after boosting with a step-length of 0.1 using different variance types (colors), and a total of 1000 simulation iterations in settings with $n = 25$. p-values are shown for simulation iterations, in which either the true model or a model larger than the true model is selected.

Results: p-values for effects of “true effect” variables show deviations from the angle bisecting line, indicating the ability of the proposed procedure to correctly infer about the significance of the effects. The power decreases for a smaller number of observations (not shown), a smaller SNR and a larger number of noise variables. The polyhedron approach yields correct p-values under the null, but shows undesirable properties for non-noise variables. p-values for the proposed approach are uniform under the null when using the true variance, with more conservative results when using the empirical variance of the response and slightly non-uniform p-values when using a plugin estimator. In this respect, the em-

pirical variance of boosting residuals is more favorable than that of an OLS refit, but can also lead to deviations. However, note that the empirical approximation of p-values is not very accurate in the settings where specific selection events are rather unlikely, as only a small number of samples $r^b \in \mathcal{R}_y$ can be used. This, in particular, is the case for the setting with $m_{\text{stop}} = 150$ iterations and 26 covariates, where the selection probabilities for each path are rather small due to the large number of possible paths, and this may be the reason for deviations from the angle bisecting line for noise variables. Furthermore, corresponding confidence intervals of the proposed test procedure reveal approximately $1 - \alpha\%$ coverage. Results for $\alpha = 0.05$ are given in Table 1. Deviations from the ideal coverage of 95% are primarily due to numerical imprecision when inverting the hypothesis test and more accurate results can be obtained by increasing the number of samples B .

| | <u>p_0, number of iterations, SNR</u> | | | | |
|---------------------------|--|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|
| | 4, 40, 1 | 4, 80, 1 | 4, CV, 1 | 22, 40, 1 | 22, 40, 4 |
| coverage noise variables | 0.9566 | 0.9571 | 0.9618 | 0.9485 | 0.9211 |
| coverage signal variables | 0.9699 | 0.9559 | 0.9326 | 0.9444 | 0.9429 |

Table 1: Estimated coverage of selective confidence intervals obtained by the proposed sampling approach for $n = 25$ observations when using the true variance in different settings (columns).

In the supplementary material, we additionally provide results for other settings of the previous simulation study as well as results for additive models using spline base-learners, where the true underlying function is given by $y_i = \sin(2X_{[i,1]}) + \frac{1}{2}X_{[i,2]}^2 + \varepsilon_i, i = 1, \dots, 300$, $\varepsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ with σ defined such that the signal-to-noise ration $\text{SNR} \in \{0.5, 1\}$ and 13 further covariates $\mathbf{X}_{[3:15]}$. All covariate effects are represented using penalized B-splines (P-spline; Eilers & Marx 1996) with B-Spline basis of degree 3, 5 knots and second order differences penalty. Tests for the whole function are performed as proposed in (10). Results suggest very high power and uniformity of p-values for noise variables, supporting the conclusion that the proposed test also works well for additive terms.

6 Application

We now apply our framework to the *prostate cancer data set* (Stamey et al. 1989) to model logarithmic PSA level (*lpsa*) of patients having prostate cancer. This data set has already been analyzed with regard to post-selection inference by, for example, Tibshirani et al. (2016) using forward stepwise regression and testing after a prespecified number of steps. In contrast to previous approaches, we do not enforce effects of continuous covariates to be linear but assume a more flexible additive model

$$lpsa_i = \beta_0 + \sum_{j=1}^7 g_j(X_{[i,j]}) + \sum_{j=1}^4 I(gleason_i = j)\beta_j + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, 97,$$

with 7 metric variables $\mathbf{X}_j, j = 1, \dots, 7$ and categorical variable *gleason*. In order to estimate the smooth effects, we fit the model using P-spline base-learners with difference penalties. To facilitate a fair base-learner selection (Hofner et al. 2011), we split up effects of continuous covariates into a linear effect and a non-linear deviation from the corresponding linear effect. The optimal stopping iteration $m_{\text{stop}} = 47$ for the boosting algorithm with step-length $\nu = 0.1$ is found by using 10-fold cross-validation, which is incorporated into the selection mechanism \mathcal{S} . After 47 iterations, five effects are selected by the boosting procedure, including two non-linear deviations for the covariate *lbph* (logarithmic benign prostatic hyperplasia amount) and the covariate *pgg45* (percentage Gleason scores 4 or 5). The two covariates reveal a U-shaped effect, which is shown in the supplementary material. The following table shows the results for componentwise tests of linear and additive terms for hypothesis tests based on the proposed sampling approach with 5000 samples. Testing additive terms, which have been split up into a linear part and a non-linear deviation, can be done by defining \mathbf{B} as concatenated matrix of the covariate vector itself and the corresponding matrix of evaluated basis functions orthogonalized to the linear effect. The logarithmic cancer volume (*lvacol*) is found to be the only variable having a significant influence on the response for the given model.

| | lbph (NL) | pgg45 (NL) | lcavol (L) | lweight (L) | svi (L) |
|-------------|-----------|------------|------------|-------------|---------|
| magnitude | 2.3319 | 2.8518 | 4.0992 | 2.2067 | 1.9520 |
| lower limit | 0 | 0 | 2.4859 | 0 | 0 |
| p-value | 0.3452 | 0.2467 | 0.0004 | 0.3752 | 0.1212 |

Table 2: Magnitude of linear (L) and non-linear (NL) projections $\|\mathbf{P}_w \mathbf{y}\|_2$ for the selected model terms *lbph* (logarithmic benign prostatic hyperplasia amount), *pgg45* (percentage Gleason scores 4 or 5), *lcavol* (logarithmic cancer volume), *lweight* (logarithmic prostate weight) and *svi* (seminal vesicle invasion) as well as corresponding lower confidence interval limits and p-values.

7 Discussion

In this paper we review several recently proposed selective inference frameworks and transfer and adapt them to the L_2 -Boosting algorithm. As far as we know, there are no previous general methods available to quantify uncertainty of boosting estimates in a classical statistical manner when variable selection is performed. We propose tests and confidence intervals for linear base-learners as well as for group variable and penalized base-learners. We apply our framework to the prostate cancer data set and in contrast to published analyses of this data also allow for non-linear partial effects. Using simulation studies with a range of settings, we verify the properties of our approach.

This work opens up a variety of future research topics, including a mathematical description of the space restriction of test statistics given by the boosting algorithm.

An extension to generalized linear models (GLMs) and beyond, however, proves to be difficult since conditions involving \mathbf{y} might imply conditioning on \mathbf{y} itself if the response is discrete (see Fithian et al. 2014, for more details on selective inference for GLMs). It would also be interesting to investigate whether asymptotic results of Tian & Taylor (2017) can be used to construct inference for CFGD algorithms other than L_2 -Boosting.

References

- Akaike, H. (1974), ‘A new look at the statistical model identification’, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **19**(6), 716–723.
- Berk, R., Brown, L., Buja, A., Zhang, K., Zhao, L. et al. (2013), ‘Valid post-selection inference’, *The Annals of Statistics* **41**(2), 802–837.
- Brockhaus, S., Fuest, A., Mayr, A. & Greven, S. (2018), ‘Signal regression models for location, scale and shape with an application to stock returns’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* **67**(3), 665–686.
- Brockhaus, S., Scheipl, F., Hothorn, T. & Greven, S. (2015), ‘The functional linear array model’, *Statistical Modelling* **15**(3), 279–300.
- Bühlmann, P. & Yu, B. (2003), ‘Boosting with the L₂ loss: regression and classification’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **98**(462), 324–339.
- Efron, B., Hastie, T., Johnstone, I., Tibshirani, R. et al. (2004), ‘Least angle regression’, *The Annals of Statistics* **32**(2), 407–499.
- Eilers, P. H. C. & Marx, B. D. (1996), ‘Flexible smoothing with B-splines and penalties’, *Statistical Science* **11**(2), 89–121.
- Fithian, W., Sun, D. & Taylor, J. (2014), ‘Optimal Inference After Model Selection’, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1410.2597*.
- Friedman, J. H. (2001), ‘Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine’, *Annals of statistics* pp. 1189–1232.
- Hofner, B., Hothorn, T., Kneib, T. & Schmid, M. (2011), ‘A framework for unbiased model selection based on boosting’, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **20**(4), 956–971.
- Hothorn, T., Bühlmann, P., Kneib, T., Schmid, M. & Hofner, B. (2010), ‘Model-based boosting 2.0’, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **11**(Aug), 2109–2113.

- Lee, J. D., Sun, D. L., Sun, Y. & Taylor, J. E. (2016), ‘Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso’, *The Annals of Statistics* **44**(3), 907–927.
- Loftus, J. R. & Taylor, J. E. (2014), ‘A significance test for forward stepwise model selection’, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1405.3920* .
- Loftus, J. R. & Taylor, J. E. (2015), ‘Selective inference in regression models with groups of variables’, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1511.01478* .
- Luo, Y. & Spindler, M. (2017), ‘L2-boosting for economic applications’, *American Economic Review* **107**(5).
- Mayr, A., Hofner, B., Waldmann, E., Hepp, T., Meyer, S. & Gefeller, O. (2017), ‘The evolution of boosting algorithms’, *Computational and Mathematical Methods in Medicine* **2017**.
- Melcher, M., Scharl, T., Luchner, M., Striedner, G. & Leisch, F. (2017), ‘Boosted structured additive regression for escherichia coli fed-batch fermentation modeling’, *Biotechnology and Bioengineering* **114**(2), 321–334.
- Rügamer, D., Brockhaus, S., Gentsch, K., Scherer, K. & Greven, S. (2018), ‘Boosting factor-specific functional historical models for the detection of synchronization in bioelectrical signals’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series C (Applied Statistics)* **67**(3), 621–642.
- Rügamer, D. & Greven, S. (2018), ‘Selective inference after likelihood- or test-based model selection in linear models’, *Statistics and Probability Letters* . To appear.
- Shah, R. D. & Samworth, R. J. (2013), ‘Variable selection with error control: Another look at stability selection’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **75**(1), 55–80.
- Stamey, T. A., Kabalin, J. N., Mcneal, J. E., Johnstone, I. M., Freiha, F., Redwine, E. A. & Yang, N. (1989), ‘Prostate specific antigen in the diagnosis and treatment of adenocarcinoma of the prostate. ii. radical prostatectomy treated patients’, *The Journal of Urology* **141**(5), 1076 – 1083.

- Tian, X. & Taylor, J. (2017), ‘Asymptotics of selective inference’, *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **44**(2), 480–499.
- Tibshirani, R. J., Rinaldo, A., Tibshirani, R. & Wasserman, L. (2015), ‘Uniform Asymptotic Inference and the Bootstrap After Model Selection’, *arXiv e-prints arXiv:1506.06266* .
- Tibshirani, R. J., Taylor, J., Lockhart, R. & Tibshirani, R. (2016), ‘Exact post-selection inference for sequential regression procedures’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **111**(514), 600–620.
- Wasserman, L. & Roeder, K. (2009), ‘High dimensional variable selection’, *The Annals of Statistics* **37**(5A), 2178–2201.
- Yang, F., Barber, R. F., Jain, P. & Lafferty, J. (2016), Selective inference for group-sparse linear models, *in* ‘Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems’, pp. 2469–2477.
- Yuan, M. & Lin, Y. (2006), ‘Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **68**(1), 49–67.