

Bayesian inference in high-dimensional linear models using an empirical correlation-adaptive prior

C. Liu,^{*} Y. Yang,^{*} H. Bondell,[†] and R. Martin^{*}

October 2, 2018

Abstract

In the context of a high-dimensional linear regression model, we propose the use of an empirical correlation-adaptive prior that makes use of information in the observed predictor variable matrix to adaptively address high collinearity, determining if parameters associated with correlated predictors should be shrunk together or kept apart. Under suitable conditions, we prove that this empirical Bayes posterior concentrates around the true sparse parameter at the optimal rate asymptotically. A simplified version of a shotgun stochastic search algorithm is employed to implement the variable selection procedure, and we show, via simulation experiments across different settings and a real-data application, the favorable performance of the proposed method compared to existing methods.

Keywords and phrases: Collinearity; empirical Bayes; posterior convergence rate; stochastic search; variable selection.

1 Introduction

Consider the standard linear regression model

$$Y = X\beta + \varepsilon,$$

where Y is a $n \times 1$ vector of response variables, X is a $n \times p$ matrix of predictor variables, β is a $p \times 1$ vector of regression coefficients, and ε is a vector of iid $N(0, \sigma^2)$ errors. We are interested in the high-dimensional case, where $p \gg n$. Furthermore, it is assumed that the true β is sparse, i.e., only a small subset of the β coefficients are nonzero.

There are a variety of methods available for estimating β under a sparsity constraint. This includes regularization-based methods like the lasso (Tibshirani 1996), the adaptive lasso (Zou 2006), the SCAD (Fan and Li 2001), and MCP (Zhang 2010); see Fan and Lv (2010) for a review. From a Bayesian point of view, varieties of priors for regression coefficients and the model space have been developed, leading to promising selection properties. For the regression coefficients, β , the normal mixture prior is specified in

^{*}Department of Statistics, North Carolina State University; cliu22@ncsu.edu, yyang44@ncsu.edu, rgmarti3@ncsu.edu

[†]School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne; howard.bondell@unimelb.edu.au

George and McCulloch (1993); George and Foster (2000) introduce empirical Bayes ideas; Ishwaran and Rao (2005) use spike-and-slab priors; Bondell and Reich (2012) estimate β as the “most sparse” among those in a suitable posterior credible region; Polson and Scott (2012) consider a horseshoe prior; Narisetty and He (2014) use shrinking and diffusing priors; and Martin et al. (2017) consider an empirical Bayes version of spike-and-slab.

Collinearity is unavoidable in high-dimensional settings, and methods such as lasso tend to smooth away the regression coefficients of highly collinear predictors, and hence deter correlated covariates to be included in the model simultaneously. This motivated Krishna et al. (2009) to propose an adaptive powered correlation prior that lets the data itself weigh in on how collinear predictors are to be handled. However, their suggested generalized Zellner’s prior is not applicable in the $p > n$ scenario. To overcome this, we use an empirical Bayes approach, and propose an *empirical correlation-adaptive prior* (ECAP) to this framework. In Section 2, we present our empirical Bayes model and a motivating example illustrating the effect of correlation-adaptation in the prior. Asymptotic posterior concentration properties are derived in Section 3, in particular, adaptive minimax rates are established for estimation of the mean response. In Section 4, we recommend a shotgun stochastic search approach for computation of the posterior distribution over the model space. Simulation experiments are presented in Section 5, and we demonstrate the benefits of adaptively varying the correlation structure in the prior for variable selection compared to existing methods. The real-data illustration in Section 6 highlights the improved predictive performance that can be achieved using the proposed correlation-adaptive prior. Proofs of the theorems are deferred to the Appendix.

2 Model specification

2.1 The prior

Under assumed sparsity, it is natural to decompose β as (S, β_S) , where $S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$ is the set of non-zero coefficients, called the *configuration* of β , and β_S is the $|S|$ -vector of non-zero values, with $|S|$ denoting the cardinality of S . We will write X_S for the sub-matrix of X corresponding to the configuration S . With this decomposition of β , a hierarchical prior is convenient, i.e., a prior for S and a conditional prior for β_S , given S .

First, for the prior $\pi(S)$ for S , we follow Martin et al. (2017) and write

$$\pi(S) = \pi(S \mid |S| = s) f_n(s),$$

where $f_n(s)$ is a prior on $|S|$ and $\pi(S \mid |S| = s)$ is a conditional prior on S , given $|S|$. Based on the recommendation in Castillo et al. (2015), we take

$$f_n(s) \propto c^{-s} p^{-as}, s = 0, 1, \dots, R, \quad (1)$$

where a and c are positive constants, and $R = \text{rank}(X) \leq n$. It is common to take $\pi(S \mid |S| = s)$ to be uniform, but here we break from this trend to take collinearity into account. Let $D(S) = |X_S^\top X_S|$ denote the determinant of $X_S^\top X_S$, and consider the geometric mean of the eigenvalues, $D(S)^{1/|S|}$, as a measure of the “degree of collinearity” in model S . We set

$$\pi_\lambda(S \mid |S| = s) = \frac{D(S)^{-\lambda/(2s)} \mathbf{1}\{\kappa(S) < Cp^r\}}{\sum_{S:|S|=s} D(S)^{-\lambda/(2s)} \mathbf{1}\{\kappa(S) < Cp^r\}}, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2)$$

where $\kappa(S)$ is the condition number of $X_S^\top X_S$, and r and C are positive constants specified to exclude models with extremely ill-conditioned $X_S^\top X_S$. The constant λ is an important feature of the proposed model, and will be discussed in more detail below. Because of the dependence on λ above, we will henceforth write $\pi_\lambda(S)$ for the prior of S .

Second, as the prior for β_S , given S , we take

$$(\beta_S | S, \lambda) \sim \mathbf{N}(\phi \hat{\beta}_S, \sigma^2 g k_S (X_S^\top X_S)^\lambda). \quad (3)$$

Here $\hat{\beta}_S$ is the least squares estimator corresponding to configuration S and design matrix X_S , $\phi \in (0, 1)$ is a shrinkage factor to be specified, g is a parameter controlling the prior spread, $(X_S^\top X_S)^\lambda$ is an adaptive powered correlation matrix, and

$$k_S = \text{tr}\{(X_S^\top X_S)^{-1}\} / \text{tr}\{(X_S^\top X_S)^\lambda\}$$

is a standardizing factor as in Krishna et al. (2009) designed to control for the scale corresponding to different values of λ . This data-driven prior centering is advantageous because we can use a conjugate normal prior, which has computational benefits, but without sacrificing on theoretical posterior convergence rate properties (Martin et al. 2017). Let $\pi_\lambda(\beta_S | S)$ denote this prior density for β_S , given S .

The power parameter λ on the prior covariance matrix can encourage or discourage the inclusion of correlated predictors. When $\lambda > 0$, the prior shrinks the coefficients of correlated predictors towards each other; when $\lambda < 0$, they tend to be kept apart, with $\lambda = -1$ being the most familiar; and, finally, $\lambda = 0$ implies prior independence. Therefore, positive λ would prefer larger models by capturing as many correlated predictors as possible, while negative λ tends to select models with less collinearity; see Krishna et al. (2009) for additional discussion of this phenomenon. Our data-driven choice of λ , along with that of the other tuning parameters introduced here and in the next subsection, will be discussed in Section 4.2.

2.2 The posterior distribution

For this standard linear regression model, the likelihood function is

$$L_n(\beta) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} e^{-\frac{1}{2\sigma^2} \|Y - X\beta\|^2}, \quad \beta \in \mathbb{R}^p.$$

It would be straightforward to include σ^2 as an argument in this likelihood function, introduce a prior for σ^2 , and carry out a full Bayesian analysis. However, our intention is to use a plug-in estimator for σ^2 in what follows and, hence, we do not include the error variance as an argument in our likelihood function.

Given a prior and a likelihood, we can combine the two via Bayes's formula to obtain a posterior distribution for (S, β_S) or, equivalently, for the coefficient vector β . To put a minor twist on this standard formulation, we follow a recent trend (e.g., Grünwald and van Ommen 2017; Martin and Walker 2014; Syring and Martin 2017) and use a power likelihood instead of the likelihood itself. That is, our posterior for (S, β_S) is defined as

$$\pi_\lambda^n(S, \beta_S) \propto L_n(\beta_{S+})^\alpha \pi_\lambda(\beta_S | S) \pi_\lambda(S),$$

where β_{S^+} is the p -vector obtained by filling in around β_S with zeros in the entries corresponding to S^c , and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ is a regularization factor. Then the posterior distribution for β , denoted by Π_λ^n , is obtained by summing over all configurations S , i.e.,

$$\Pi_\lambda^n(A) \propto \int_{\{\beta_S: \beta_{S^+} \in A\}} \sum_S \pi_\lambda^n(S, \beta_S) d\beta_S, \quad A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p.$$

Since one of our primary objectives is variable selection, it is of interest that we can obtain a closed-form expression for the posterior distribution of S , up to a normalizing constant, a result of our use of a conjugate normal prior for β_S , given S . That is, we can integrate out β_S above to get a marginal likelihood for Y , i.e.,

$$m_\lambda(Y | S) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-n/2} \prod_{i=1}^s (1 + \alpha g k_S d_{S,i}^{\lambda+1})^{-1/2} \\ \times \exp \left[-\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \left\{ \|y - \hat{y}_S\|^2 + (1 - \phi)^2 \sum_{i=1}^s \frac{d_{S,i}}{1 + \alpha g k_S d_{S,i}^{\lambda+1}} \theta_{S,i}^2 \right\} \right], \quad (4)$$

where $d_{S,i}$ is the i^{th} eigenvalue of $X_S^\top X_S$; also, $\Gamma_S \Lambda_S \Gamma_S^\top$ is the spectral decomposition of $X_S^\top X_S$, with $\Lambda_S = \text{diag}(d_{S,1}, \dots, d_{S,s})$, and $\theta_{S,i}$ is the i^{th} element of $\theta_S = \Gamma_S^\top \hat{\beta}_S$. Then it is straightforward to get the posterior distribution for S :

$$\pi_\lambda^n(S) \propto m_\lambda(Y | S) \pi_\lambda(S). \quad (5)$$

The variable selection method described in Section 4 and illustrated in Sections 5–6 is based on this posterior distribution.

2.3 A motivating example

We now give a simple example to illustrate the effects of incorporating λ into (2) and (3). Consider a case with $n = p = 5$ and let $X = X_{n \times p}$ have iid rows, each with a standard multivariate normal with first-order autoregressive dependence and correlation parameter ρ . Given X , the conditional distribution of the response is determined by the linear model

$$y_i = x_{i1} + 0.8x_{i2} + \varepsilon_i, \quad \text{where } \varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_5 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathbf{N}(0, 1).$$

The black, blue, and red curves in Figure 1 represent $\lambda \mapsto \log \pi_\lambda^n(S)$, for three different S configurations, namely, the true configuration $S^* = \{1, 2\}$, $S^- = \{1\}$, and $S^+ = \{1, 2, 3\}$, respectively. Panel (a) corresponds to a high correlation case, $\rho = 0.8$, we see that the ECAP-based posterior would prefer S^* for suitably large λ ; compare this to the choice $\lambda \equiv -1$ in Martin et al. (2017) which would prefer the smaller configuration S^- . On the other hand, when the correlation is relatively low, as in Panel (b), we see that large positive λ would encourage larger configuration while the true configuration would be preferred for sufficiently large negative values of λ . The take-away message is that, by allowing λ to vary, the ECAP-based model has the ability to adjust to the correlation structure, which can be beneficial in identifying the relevant variables.




Figure 1: Plot of $\lambda \mapsto \log \pi_\lambda^n(S)$ for three different S and two different ρ .

3 Posterior convergence properties

3.1 Setup and assumptions

We will stick with the standard notation given previously, but it will help to keep in mind that $Y^n = (Y_1^n, Y_2^n, \dots, Y_n^n)$ and $X^n = ((X_{ij}^n))$ are better understood as triangular arrays. Therefore, we can have p , s^* , and R all depend on n . We assume throughout that $s^* \leq R \leq n \ll p$; more precise conditions given below. We also assume that λ , g , and σ^2 are fixed constants in this setting, not parameters to be estimated/tuned. Therefore, to simplify the notation here and in the proofs, we will drop the subscript λ and simply write Π^n for the posterior for β instead of Π_λ^n .

For the fundamental problem of estimating the mean response, the minimax rate does not depend on the correlation structure in X , so we cannot expect any improvements in the rate by incorporating this correlation structure in our prior distribution. Therefore, our goal here is simply to show that the minimax rates can still be achieved while leaving room to adjust for collinearity in finite-samples. The finite-sample benefits of the correlation-adaptive prior will be seen in the numerical results presented in Section 5.

We start by stating the basic assumptions for all the results that follow, beginning with two simple-to-state assumptions about the asymptotic regime. In particular, relative to n , the true configuration is not too complex.

Assumption 1. $s^* = o(n)$.

The next assumption puts a very mild size condition on the non-zero regression coefficients as well as on the user-specified shrinkage factor $\phi = \phi_n$ in the prior.

Assumption 2. The true β^* satisfies $s^* \{n \|\beta_{S^*}^*\|\}^{-1} \rightarrow 0$ and, moreover, the factor $\phi_n \in (0, 1)$ satisfies $1 - \phi_n = O(s^* \{n \|\beta_{S^*}^*\|\}^{-1})$.

The condition on β^* above basically says that $\min_{j \in S^*} |\beta_j^*| > s^{*1/2} n^{-1}$, which is typically much weaker than the usual *beta-min* condition—see (10) in Section 3.5—that is

required for variable selection consistency. Note, however, that one would need to know $\|\beta_{S^*}^*\|$ to check this assumption about ϕ_n , and we present a data-driven choice of ϕ_n that satisfies this condition in Section 4.2.3.

Finally, we need to make some assumptions on the $n \times p$ design matrix X . For a given configuration S , let $\lambda_{\min}(S)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(S)$ denote the smallest and the largest eigenvalues of $n^{-1}X_S^\top X_S$, respectively. Next, define

$$\ell(s) = \min_{S:|S|=s} \lambda_{\min}(S) \quad \text{and} \quad u(s) = \max_{S:|S|=s} \lambda_{\max}(S).$$

Recall that these depend (implicitly) on n because of the triangular array formulation. It is also clear that $\ell(s)$ and $u(s)$ are non-increasing and non-decreasing functions of the complexity s , respectively. If $\kappa(S) = \lambda_{\max}(S)/\lambda_{\min}(S)$ is the condition number of $n^{-1}X_S^\top X_S$, then we can define

$$\omega(s) = \max_{S:|S|=s} \kappa(S),$$

and get the relation $\omega(s) \leq u(s)/\ell(s)$.

Assumption 3. $0 < \liminf_n \ell(s^*) < \limsup_n u(s^*) < \infty$.

This assumption says, roughly, that every submatrix X_S , for $|S| \leq s^*$, is full rank, and is implied by, for example, the sparse Riesz condition of order s^* in Zhang and Huang (2008). More general results can surely be derived, i.e., with weaker conditions on X , but at the expense of more complicated statements and assumptions.

3.2 Rates under prediction error loss

Define the set

$$B_\varepsilon = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|X\beta - X\beta^*\|^2 > \varepsilon\}, \quad \varepsilon > 0, \quad (6)$$

which contains those β that would do a relatively poor job of estimating the mean $X\beta^*$ or, equivalently, of predicting the response Y . We, therefore, hope that the posterior Π_λ^n assigns asymptotically negligible mass there. The following theorem makes this precise. Recall the definitions of the prior and, in particular, the quantities a and r .

Theorem 1. *Under Assumptions 1–3, there exists a constant M such that*

$$\sup \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(B_{M\varepsilon_n})\} \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the supremum is over all β^* such that $|S_{\beta^*}| = s^*$,

$$\varepsilon_n = \max\{q(R, \lambda, r, a), s^* \log(p/s^*)\},$$

and

$$q(R, \lambda, r, a) = \begin{cases} R\{r(1 + \lambda) - a\} \log p & \text{if } \lambda \in [0, \infty) \\ R(r - a) \log p & \text{if } \lambda \in [-1, 0) \\ R(-r\lambda - a) \log p & \text{if } \lambda \in (-\infty, -1). \end{cases}$$

Proof. See Appendix A.2. □

In the so-called ordinary high-dimensional regime (e.g., Rigollet and Tsybakov 2012), $s^* \log(p/s^*)$ is the minimax concentration rate. So the take-away message here is, as long as the (a, r) in (1) and (2) are chosen to satisfy

$$a > r \max\{1 + \lambda, 1 - \lambda\},$$

the ECAP posterior attains the minimax optimal rate.

3.3 Effective posterior dimension

Theorem 1 suggests that the posterior for β concentrates near the true β^* in some sense. However, since β^* is sparse, it would be beneficial, for the sake of parsimony, etc, if the posterior also concentrated on a roughly s^* -dimensional subset of \mathbb{R}^p . This does not follow immediately from the prediction loss result but, the following theorem reveals that the effective dimension of the posterior Π^n for β is approximately s^* .

Theorem 2. *Suppose $f_n(s)$ has (a, r) that satisfy $a > r \max\{1 + \lambda, 1 - \lambda\}$, and define*

$$\rho_0 = \frac{a + 1}{a - r \max\{1 + \lambda, 1 - \lambda\}} > 1. \quad (7)$$

Then, under Assumptions 1–3, we have $\sup \mathbf{E}_{\beta^} \{\Pi^n(U_n)\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where the supremum is over all s^* -sparse β^* and $U_n = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : |S_\beta| \geq \rho s^*\}$ for any $\rho > \rho_0$.*

Proof. See Appendix A.3. □

Aside from the economical benefits of having an effectively low-dimensional posterior distribution, Theorem 2 is useful in the proofs of all the remaining results.

3.4 Rates under estimation error loss

Define the set

$$V_\delta = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|\beta - \beta^*\|^2 > \delta\}, \quad \delta > 0. \quad (8)$$

Just like in Section 3.2, we hope that, for suitable δ , the posterior Π^n will assign asymptotically negligible mass to this set of undesirable β s.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $f_n(s)$ has (a, r) that satisfy $a > r \max\{1 + \lambda, 1 - \lambda\}$. Under Assumptions 1–3, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $\sup \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(V_{M\delta_n})\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where the supremum is over all s^* -sparse β^* ,*

$$\delta_n = \frac{s^* \log(p/s^*)}{n\ell((\rho + 1)s^*)}, \quad (9)$$

and ρ is greater than ρ_0 in (7).

Proof. See Appendix A.4. □

Under Assumption 1 and 3, $\ell((\rho + 1)s^*)$ is bounded with probability 1. Hence, our rate is $n^{-1}s^* \log(p/s^*)$, better than the rate $n^{-1}s^* \log p$ for lasso (Zhang et al. 2008).

3.5 Variable selection consistency

One of our primary objectives in introducing the λ -dependent prior distribution that accounts for collinearity structure in the design matrix is for the purpose of more effective variable selection. So it is imperative that we can demonstrate theoretically that, at least asymptotically, our posterior distribution will concentrate on the correct configuration S^* . The following theorem establishes this variable selection consistency property.

Theorem 4. *In addition to Assumptions 1–3, assume that the constant a in the prior is such that $a > 1$ and $p^a \gg s^* e^{G s^*}$, where*

$$G = \alpha + \frac{1}{2} \log\{1 + \alpha g \kappa(S^*)^{\max\{\lambda+1, 1, -\lambda\}}\} = O(1).$$

Then

$$\sup \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} [\Pi^n(\{\beta : S_\beta \supset S_{\beta^*}\})] \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty,$$

where the supremum is over all β^* that are s^* -sparse. Furthermore, if

$$\min_{j \in S^*} |\beta_j^*| \geq \varrho_n := \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{\ell(s^*)}} \left\{ \frac{2M}{n\alpha(1-\alpha)} \log p \right\}^{1/2}, \quad (10)$$

where $M > a + 1$ and $p^{M-(a+1)} \gg m^{s^*}$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} [\Pi^n(\{\beta : S_\beta \not\supseteq S_{\beta^*}\})] \rightarrow 0, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

If both sets of conditions hold, then variable selection consistency holds, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} [\Pi^n(\{\beta : S_\beta = S_{\beta^*}\})] \rightarrow 1, \quad n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. See Appendix A.5. □

The extra conditions on (p, s^*) in Theorem 4 effectively require that the true configuration size, s^* , is small relative to $\log p$ and, furthermore, that the constant a in (1) is large enough that $f_n(s)$ concentrates on comparatively small configurations. Also, the non-zero β^* values are more difficult to detect if their magnitudes are small. This is intuitively clear, and also shows up in our simulation results for Cases 1–2 in Section 5. Theorem 4 gives a mathematical explanation of this intuition, stating that variable selection based on our empirical Bayes posterior will be correct asymptotically if the true signals have magnitude greater than the threshold ϱ_n in (10). This is the so-called *beta-min* condition; see, e.g., Bühlmann and van de Geer (2011) or Arias-Castro and Lounici (2014).

4 Implementation details

4.1 Stochastic search of the configuration space

In order to compute the posterior probability, we need to evaluate $\pi_\lambda(S \mid |S| = s)$ as defined in (2). The difficulty comes from the denominator of (2), i.e.,

$$\sum_{S: |S|=s} D(S)^{-\lambda/2s} \mathbf{1}\{\kappa(S) < Cp^r\},$$

where, again, $D(S) = |X_S^\top X_S|$ is the determinant. Since C and r could be chosen large enough so that only extremely ill-conditioned cases would be excluded, there are approximately $\binom{p}{s}$ terms in the above summation. So brute-force computation can be done only for relatively small p . Given that the eigenvalues are bounded from above and below for a given predictor matrix X , $D(S)^{1/s}$ is too, so it is not unreasonable to approximate the above summation by $\binom{p}{s}$. This approximation is exact in the case of $\lambda = 0$ if all S are included, and numerical experiments suggest that it is stable across a range of p , s , and λ . Therefore, using this approximation, the posterior distribution for S that we use is given by

$$\pi_\lambda^n(S) \propto m_\lambda(Y | S) D(S)^{-\frac{\lambda}{2|S|}} \binom{p}{|S|}^{-1} f_n(|S|). \quad (11)$$

Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods can be used to compute this posterior but this tends to be inefficient in high-dimensional problems. As an alternative, we employ the simplified shotgun stochastic search algorithm with screening (S5, Shin et al. 2018), a simplified version of shotgun stochastic search (SSS, Hans et al. 2007), to explore our posterior distribution. Different from traditional MCMC method, SSS does not attempt to approximate the posterior probability; instead, it only tries to explore high posterior probability regions as thoroughly as possible.

Here is a summary of our SSS algorithm. Let S be a configuration of size s , with $\pi_\lambda^n(S)$, its corresponding (unnormalized) posterior. Define the neighborhood of S as $\text{nbrd}(S) = \{S^+, S^0, S^-\}$, where S^+ is the set containing all $(s + 1)$ dimensional configurations that include S , S^0 is the set containing all s -dimensional configurations that only have one variable different from variables in S , and S^- is the set containing all $(s - 1)$ -dimensional configurations that are nested in S . The t^{th} iteration of SSS goes as follows:

1. Given S^t , compute $\pi_\lambda^n(S)$ for all $S \in \text{nbrd}(S^t) = \{S^{t+}, S^{t0}, S^{t-}\}$.
2. Sample S_1^t, S_2^t, S_3^t respectively from S^{t+}, S^{t0}, S^{t-} , with probabilities $\propto \pi_\lambda^n(S^t)$.
3. Sample S^{t+1} from $\{S_1^t, S_2^t, S_3^t\}$ with probabilities proportional to $\pi_\lambda^n(S^{t+})$, $\pi_\lambda^n(S^{t0})$, and $\pi_\lambda^n(S^{t-})$, obtained by summing.

All visited configurations are recorded, and the final chosen configuration can be the maximum *a posteriori* model, median probability model (the model including those variables of which marginal inclusion probability is not less than 0.5), or something else. For our simulations in Section 5, the selected configuration \hat{S} is the median probability model.

While SSS has the ability to explore many more high posterior configurations than MCMC, it is still computationally expensive, especially in high-dimensional case. For this reason, we adopt the S5 algorithm, which uses a screening technique to significantly decrease the computational cost.

4.2 Choice of tuning parameters

4.2.1 Choice of λ

An “ideal” value λ^* of λ is one that minimizes the Kullback–Leibler divergence of the marginal distribution $m_\lambda(y) = \sum_S m_\lambda(y | S) \pi_\lambda(S)$ from the true distribution of Y or,




Figure 2: Black lines are $\lambda \mapsto \log m_\lambda(Y)$ for different Y samples, and the red line is the point-wise average, which approximates $\lambda \mapsto \mathbf{E}\{\log m_\lambda(Y)\}$.

equivalently, one that maximizes the expected log marginal likelihood, i.e.,

$$\lambda^* = \arg \max_{\lambda} \mathbf{E}\{\log m_\lambda(Y)\}.$$

Unfortunately, the ideal value λ^* is not available because we do not know the true distribution of Y , nor can we estimate it with an empirical distribution. However, a reasonable estimate of this ideal λ is

$$\hat{\lambda} = \arg \max_{\lambda} \log m_\lambda(Y).$$

Indeed, Figure 2 shows $\log m_\lambda(Y)$ for several different Y samples, along with an approximation of $\mathbf{E}\{\log m_\lambda(Y)\}$ based on point-wise averaging. Notice that the individual log marginal likelihoods are maximized very close by where the expectation is maximized.

There is still one more obstacle in obtaining $\hat{\lambda}$, namely, that we cannot directly compute the summation involved in $m_\lambda(Y)$ due to the large number of configurations S . Fortunately, we can employ an importance sampling strategy to overcome this. Specifically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} m_\lambda(Y) &= \frac{\sum_S m_\lambda(Y | S) D(S)^{-\lambda/2|S|} f_n(|S|) \binom{p}{|S|}^{-1}}{\sum_S D(S)^{-\lambda/2|S|} f_n(|S|) \binom{p}{|S|}^{-1}} \\ &\approx \frac{\sum_{\ell=1}^N m_\lambda(Y | S_\ell) D(S_\ell)^{-\lambda/2|S_\ell|}}{\sum_{\ell=1}^N D(S_\ell)^{-\lambda/2|S_\ell|}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{S_\ell : \ell = 1, \dots, N\}$ are samples from $\pi_0(S) \propto f_n(|S|) \binom{p}{|S|}^{-1}$. In our numerical results that follow, we use this $m_\lambda(Y)$ to estimate $\hat{\lambda}$ defined above.

As discussed in Section 2.3, λ plays an important role in both model prior and coefficient prior. That is, for a fixed size s , a positive λ favors model including predictors with relatively high correlation; a negative λ favors model including predictors with relatively low correlation; λ equals zero actually put equal mass on each model regardless of their predictors' correlation structure. The λ in the conditional prior for β_S , given S , has a




Figure 3: Expected log marginal likelihood versus λ , for $\phi = 0$, under different correlation structure of true configurations S^* ; see definition of S_1^* and S_2^* in the text.

similar effect; see Krishna et al. (2009). Thus, a “good” estimate of λ should be such that it reflects the correlation structure in X .

To help see this, consider a few examples, each with X of dimension $n = 100$ and $p = 500$, having an AR(1) correlation structure with varying correlation ρ and true configuration S^* . In particular, we consider two configurations:

$$S_1^* = \{11, \dots, 15, 31, \dots, 35\}$$

$$S_2^* = \{1, 51, 100, 151, 200, 251, 300, 351, 400, 451\}.$$

Figure 3 shows $\hat{\lambda}$ chosen by maximizing the marginal likelihood in three different cases, and we argue that $\hat{\lambda}$ is at least in the “right direction.” In particular, when the true predictors are highly correlated, as in Panel (a), $\hat{\lambda}$ tends to be positive which encourages highly correlated predictors to be selected; and when the true predictors have low correlation, as in Panel (b), the estimate of λ is close to 0 hence a nearly uniform prior for S . The situation in Panel (c) is different since the true predictors are minimally correlated while unimportant predictors are highly correlated. In this case, $\hat{\lambda}$ tends to be negative which discourages selecting the highly correlated ones that are likely unimportant.

4.2.2 Choice of g

Now, recall that g determines the magnitude of the prior variance of β_S . If g is sufficiently large, the conditional prior for β_S is effectively flat; if g is extremely tiny, then the posterior probability for β_S will concentrate on the prior center $\phi_n \hat{\beta}_S$. Kass and Wasserman (1995) proposed the unit information criteria, which amounts to taking $g = n$ in the regression setting with Zellner’s prior. Foster and George (1994) suggest a choice of $g = p^2$. Here, we use a local empirical Bayes estimator for g . That is, for given S and λ , we choose a g that maximizes the local marginal likelihood, that is,

$$\hat{g}_S = \arg \max_g m_\lambda(y \mid S).$$

In the special case where $\phi_n = 0$ and $\lambda = -1$, and a conjugate prior for σ^2 , Feng et al. (2008) showed that $\hat{g}_S = \max\{F_S - 1, 0\}$, where F_S is the usual F statistic under model S for testing $\beta_S = 0$. In general, our estimator, \hat{g}_S must be computed numerically.

4.2.3 Choice of ϕ

In our choice of $\phi = \phi_n$, we seek to employ a meaningful amount of shrinkage while still maintaining the condition in Assumption 2. Towards this, if we view $\phi\hat{\beta}_{S^*}$ as a shrinkage estimator, then it is possible to choose ϕ_n so that the corresponding James–Stein type estimate has smaller mean square error. In particular, a ϕ_n that achieves this is

$$\phi_n = 1 - \frac{2\mathbf{E}\|\hat{\beta}_{S^*} - \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2}{\|\beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 + \mathbf{E}\|\hat{\beta}_{S^*} - \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2}$$

and, moreover, it can be shown that $1 - \phi_n = O(s^*\{n\|\beta_{S^*}^*\|\}^{-1})$. Unfortunately, this ϕ_n still depends on β^* , so we need to use some data-driven proxy for this. We recommend first estimating S^* by \hat{S} from the adaptive lasso, with $\hat{\beta}_{\hat{S}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2$ the corresponding least squares estimators, and then setting

$$\hat{\phi}_n = \left[1 - \frac{2\hat{\sigma}^2 \text{tr}\{(X_{\hat{S}}^\top X_{\hat{S}})^{-1}\}}{\|\hat{\beta}_{\hat{S}}\|^2 + \hat{\sigma}^2 \text{tr}\{(X_{\hat{S}}^\top X_{\hat{S}})^{-1}\}} \right]^+.$$

In practice, variable selection results are not sensitive to the choice of ϕ unless it is too close to 1. That is, according to Figure 4, we see good curvature in the log marginal likelihood for λ , with roughly the same maximizer, for a range of ϕ . The curves flatten out when ϕ is too close to 1, but that “too close” cutoff gets larger with n , consistent with the assumption that $1 - \phi_n = O(n^{-1})$. To ensure identifiability of λ , we manually keep our estimate of ϕ away from 1, in particular, we take $\tilde{\phi}_n = \min\{\hat{\phi}_n, 0.7\}$.

4.2.4 Specification of remaining parameters

It remains to specify the likelihood power α , the tuning parameters (a, c) , specifying the prior on configuration size, and to specify a plug-in estimator for the error variance σ^2 . As in Martin et al. (2017), we take $\alpha = 0.999$, $a = 0.05$, and $c = 1$. For the error variance, we use the adaptive lasso to select a configuration and set $\hat{\sigma}^2$ equal to the mean square error for that selected configuration.

5 Simulation experiments

Here we investigate the variable selection performance of different methods in five simulated data settings. In each setting, $n = 100$ and $p = 500$ and the error variance σ^2 is set to 1. The first two settings have severe collinearity. We employ the first order autoregressive structure with $\rho = 0.8$ as the covariance structure of the $n \times p$ design matrix X ; and the true configuration S^* includes two blocks of variables that the first block contains the 11th to the 15th variable and the second block contains the 31st to the 35th variable. We explored both large and small signal cases as follows.

CASE 1: $\beta_{S^*} = (0.5, 0.55, 0.6, 0.65, 0.7, 0.75, 0.8, 0.85, 0.9, 0.95)^\top$

CASE 2: $\beta_{S^*} = (1, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0, 3.5, 4.0, 4.5, 5.0, 5.5)^\top$




Figure 4: Approximated log marginal likelihood for different values of ϕ with sample size $n = 100, 500, 1000, 5000$ and $p = 500$, under Scenario 2 as is described in Section 5.

CASE 3: In this case, we consider a block covariance setting, which is the same as the Case 4 in Narisetty and He (2014). In this setting, interesting variables have common correlation $\rho_1 = 0.25$; uninteresting variables have common correlation $\rho_2 = 0.75$; the common correlation between interesting and uninteresting ones is $\rho_3 = 0.5$. The coefficients of the interesting variables are $\beta_{S^*} = (0.6, 1.2, 1.8, 2.4, 3.0)^\top$.

CASE 4: This case is similar to Case 3, but let $\rho_1 = 0.75$, $\rho_2 = 0.25$, and $\rho_3 = 0.4$. Also, a larger $\beta_{S^*} = (1, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5, 3.0)^\top$ is adopted.

CASE 5: This case is a low correlation case, which is set the same as Case 2 in Narisetty and He (2014). All variables are set to have common correlation $\rho = 0.25$ and the coefficients for interesting variables are $\beta_{S^*} = (0.6, 1.2, 1.8, 2.4, 3.0)^\top$.

For each case, 1000 data sets are generated. Denoting the chosen configuration as \hat{S} , we compute $P(\hat{S} = S^*)$ and $P(\hat{S} \supseteq S^*)$ in these 1000 iterations to measure the performance of our method, denoted by ECAP. For comparison purposes, we also consider the lasso (Tibshirani 1996), the adaptive lasso (Zou 2006), the smoothly clipped absolute deviation (SCAD, Fan and Li 2001), the elastic net (EN, Zou and Hastie 2005) and an empirical Bayes approach (EB, Martin et al. 2017). Tuning parameters in the first four methods are chosen by BIC. The results are summarized in Table 1.

Case	Method	$P(\hat{S} = S^*)$	$P(\hat{S} \supseteq S^*)$	Average $ \hat{S} $
1	lasso	0.082	0.996	13.61 (0.09)
	alasso	0.397	0.930	10.73 (0.04)
	EN	0.133	0.983	13.24 (0.20)
	SCAD	0	0.001	12.36 (0.15)
	EB	0.165	0.215	9.56 (0.17)
	ECAP	0.263	0.342	9.65 (0.15)
2	lasso	0.297	1	11.65 (0.05)
	alasso	0.356	0.412	9.33 (0.03)
	EN	0.557	0.816	10.25 (0.07)
	SCAD	0	0	7.93 (0.04)
	EB	0.815	1	11.27 (0.91)
	ECAP	0.994	1	10.00 (0.00)
3	lasso	0	0.874	18.67 (0.12)
	alasso	0.002	0.277	11.26 (0.10)
	EN	0	0.945	19.82 (0.22)
	SCAD	0.882	0.958	5.05 (0.01)
	EB	0.560	0.670	4.69 (0.05)
	ECAP	0.760	0.778	4.90 (0.08)
4	lasso	0.135	1	8.08 (0.09)
	alasso	0.701	0.940	5.34 (0.03)
	EN	0.327	0.997	7.33 (0.13)
	SCAD	0.070	0.148	4.45 (0.04)
	EB	0.793	0.822	4.87 (0.04)
	ECAP	0.861	0.940	5.05 (0.07)
5	lasso	0.001	0.990	17.55 (0.15)
	alasso	0.057	0.693	8.63 (0.11)
	EN	0.005	0.991	17.04 (0.28)
	SCAD	0.419	0.908	5.88 (0.04)
	EB	0.680	0.795	4.82 (0.04)
	ECAP	0.827	0.919	4.95 (0.05)

Table 1: Simulation results for Cases 1–5.

According to these results, ECAP performs significantly better than lasso, SCAD, and EN in terms of the probability of choosing the true configuration. It also has uniformly better performance compared with EB, which is expected since the new ECAP method takes the correlation information into account. However, when considering $P(\hat{S} \supseteq S^*)$, ECAP is not always the highest, e.g., Case 1. Note that $P(\hat{S} = S^*)$ and $P(\hat{S} \supseteq S^*)$ for ECAP are always close to each other, which is not the case for lasso or EN. This is because the ECAP method is more likely to shrink the coefficients of unimportant predictors to zero, which is desirable if the goal is to find the true S^* .

Method	PEPCK		GPAT	
	MSPE	Model Size	MSPE	Model Size
ECAP ($p = 2000$)	1.02 (0.07)	5.04 (0.19)	2.26 (0.18)	8.34 (0.33)
lasso ($p = 2000$)	3.03 (0.19)	7.70 (0.96)	5.03 (0.42)	3.30 (0.79)
BCR.joint ($p = 2000$)	2.03 (0.14)	9.60 (0.46)	3.83 (0.34)	4.20 (0.43)
BCR.marginal ($p = 2000$)	1.84 (0.14)	23.3 (0.67)	5.33 (0.41)	21.8 (0.72)
SIS+SCAD ($p = 22575$)	2.82 (0.18)	2.30 (0.09)	5.88 (0.44)	2.60 (0.10)
ECAP ($p = 22575$)	0.72 (0.07)	4.93 (0.30)	1.66 (0.52)	7.92 (0.73)

Table 2: Mean square prediction error (MSPE) and average configuration size in the real example of Section 6; numbers in parentheses are standard errors. Simulation results except for ECAP are from Bondell and Reich (2012)

6 Real-data illustration

In this section, we examine our method in a real data example and evaluate its performance against other prevalent approaches including lasso, SCAD and the penalized credible region approach in Bondell and Reich (2012). We use the data from an experiment conducted by Lan et al. (2006) that studies the genetics of two inbred mouse populations (B6 and BTBR). The data include 22575 gene expressions of 31 female and 29 male mice. Some phenotypes, including phosphoenopiruvate (PEPCK) and glycerol-3-phosphate acyltransferase (GPAT) were also measured by quantitative real-time PCR. The data are available at Gene Expression Omnibus data repository (<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo>; accession number GSE3330).

We choose PEPCK and GPAT as response variables. Given that this is an ultra-high dimensional problem, we use marginal correlation based screening method, to screen down from 22575 genes to 1999 genes. Combining the screened 1999 genes with the sex variable, the final dimension of the predictor matrix is $p = 2000$. After screening, we apply our method to the data and select a best subset of predictors \hat{S} . Then we use the posterior mean of β_S as the estimator for β , for given \hat{S} and y . The posterior distribution for β_S is normal with

$$\text{mean} = (X_{\hat{S}}^\top X_{\hat{S}} + V_{\hat{S}}^{-1})^{-1} (X_{\hat{S}}^\top y + \phi V_{\hat{S}}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{\hat{S}}) \quad \text{and} \quad \text{cov} = \sigma^2 (X_{\hat{S}}^\top X_{\hat{S}} + V_{\hat{S}}^{-1})^{-1},$$

where $V_{\hat{S}} = gk_{\hat{S}}(X_{\hat{S}}^\top X_{\hat{S}})^\lambda$. For hyperparameters λ , ϕ and g , we can plug in their corresponding estimators which can be obtained in the same way as in Section 4.

In order to evaluate the performance of our approach, we randomly split the sample into a training data set of size 55 and a test set of 5. First, we apply our variable selection method to the training set and obtain the selected variables. Then conditioning on this model, we estimate the regression coefficients using the above method. Based on the estimated regression coefficient, we predict the remaining 5 observations and calculate the prediction loss. This process is repeated 100 times, and an estimated mean square prediction error (MSPE) along with its standard error can be computed; see Table 2.

In Table 2, BCR.joint and BCR.marginal denote methods using joint credible sets and marginal credible sets respectively, for details, see Bondell and Reich (2012). The first four methods, ECAP, lasso, BCR.joint and BCR.marginal are implemented on the

screened data with dimension $p = 2000$. The fifth row is the results of sure independence screening (SIS) combined with SCAD applied to the full data $p = 22575$ and the last row is the outcomes from directly applying ECAP to unscreened dataset. The stopping rules of lasso, SCAD, BCR.joint and BCR.marginal are based on BIC.

In terms of MSPE, ECAP outperforms all the other methods significantly in both PEPCK and GPAT cases, given the estimated standard errors. Moreover, the MSPE from ECAP is even smaller for the full dataset compared with the screened data. And for the model size, on average, ECAP, lasso, BCR.joint and SIS+SCAD select models with comparable sizes while BCR.marginal always chooses larger models. Overall, ECAP performs very well in this real data example compared to these other methods in terms of both MSPE and model size.

Acknowledgments

The work presented herein is partially supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation, grant DMS-1737933.

A Technical details

A.1 Preliminary lemmas

Before getting to the proofs of the main theorems, we need to suitably lower-bound the posterior denominator and upper-bound the posterior numerator, the latter depending on the type of neighborhood being considered. In particular, for a generic measurable subset A of the parameter space, write

$$\Pi^n(A) = \frac{N_n(A)}{D_n} = \frac{\int_A \sum_S \pi(S) R_n(\beta_{S+}, \beta^*)^\alpha \pi_\lambda(\beta_S | S) d\beta_S}{\int \sum_S \pi(S) R_n(\beta_{S+}, \beta^*)^\alpha \pi_\lambda(\beta_S | S) d\beta_S},$$

where $R_n(\beta_{S+}, \beta^*) = L_n(\beta_{S+})/L_n(\beta^*)$ is the likelihood ratio, with β_{S+} the p -vector corresponding to β_S with zeros filled in around the indices in S . Lemma 1 gives a general lower bound on the denominator D_n .

In what follows, β^* will denote the true and sparse coefficient vector in \mathbb{R}^p , with $S^* = S_{\beta^*}$ the corresponding configuration of complexity $s^* = |S^*|$.

Lemma 1. *Given $(\alpha, g, \lambda, \sigma^2)$, define*

$$c = c(\alpha, g, \lambda, \sigma^2) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \log\{1 + \alpha g \kappa(S^*)^{1+\lambda}\}, & \text{if } \lambda \in [0, \infty) \\ \frac{1}{2} \log\{1 + \alpha g \kappa(S^*)\}, & \text{if } \lambda \in [-1, 0) \\ \frac{1}{2} \log\{1 + \alpha g \kappa(S^*)^{-\lambda}\}, & \text{if } \lambda \in (-\infty, -1), \end{cases}$$

where $\kappa(S^*)$ is the condition number of $X_{S^*}^\top X_{S^*}$. Then under Assumptions 1-4, the denominator D_n satisfies $\mathbb{P}_{\beta^*}\{D_n < \pi(S^*)e^{-cs^*}\} \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Proof. Since D_n is a sum of non-negative terms, we get the trivial bound

$$\begin{aligned} D_n &> \pi(S^*) \int R_n(\beta_{S^*}, \beta_{S^*}^*)^\alpha \mathbf{N}(d\beta_{S^*} \mid \phi \hat{\beta}_{S^*}, \sigma^2 g k_{S^*} (X_{S^*}^\top X_{S^*})^\lambda) \\ &= \pi(S^*) \prod_{i=1}^{s^*} (1 + \alpha g k_{S^*} d_{S^*,i}^{1+\lambda})^{-1/2} \exp\left\{\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} (A_n - B_n)\right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$A_n = n(\hat{\beta}_{S^*} - \beta_{S^*}^*)^\top (n^{-1} X_{S^*}^\top X_{S^*}) (\hat{\beta}_{S^*} - \beta_{S^*}^*), \quad B_n = (1 - \phi)^2 \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}$$

are both non-negative, and the Q_S matrix is defined as

$$Q_S = (X_S^\top X_S)^{-1} + \alpha g k_S (X_S^\top X_S)^\lambda, \quad S \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, p\}. \quad (12)$$

From the well-known sampling distribution of $\hat{\beta}_{S^*}$, we have

$$A_n \sim \sigma^2 \text{ChiSq}(s^*) = O_p(s^*).$$

Next, for B_n , under Assumption 3, it can be verified that the maximal eigenvalue of $Q_{S^*}^{-1}$ is $O(n)$. Therefore, $B_n \lesssim n(1 - \phi)^2 \|\hat{\beta}_{S^*}\|^2$. Since

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{S^*}\|^2 \lesssim \|\hat{\beta}_{S^*} - \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 + \|\beta_{S^*}^*\|^2,$$

and the first term is $O_p(s^*/n)$, it follows from Assumptions 1 and 2 that $B_n = o_p(s^*)$. This implies that $\mathbf{P}_{\beta^*}(A_n \leq B_n) \rightarrow 0$ which, in turn, implies that the exponential term in the lower bound for D_n is no smaller than 1. Therefore,

$$D_n > \pi(S^*) \prod_{i=1}^{s^*} (1 + \alpha g k_{S^*} d_{S^*,i}^{1+\lambda})^{-1/2}$$

and the product can be lower-bounded by e^{-cs^*} for c as defined above. Finally, we have that $D_n \leq \pi(S^*) e^{-cs^*}$ with vanishing \mathbf{P}_{β^*} -probability, as was to be shown. \square

Next is an upper bound on the posterior numerator, $N_n = N_n(B_{\varepsilon_n})$, where $B_{\varepsilon_n} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is the complement of a neighborhood like that in (6), relevant to Theorem 1.

Lemma 2. *There exists a constant $d = d(\alpha, \sigma^2)$ such that*

$$\sup_{\beta^*} \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}(N_n) \leq e^{-d\varepsilon_n} \sum_{S: |S| \leq R} \psi(|S|)^{|S|} \pi_\lambda(S),$$

where

$$\psi(s)^2 = \begin{cases} \omega(s)^{2(\lambda+1)} \left[1 + \frac{q\phi^2}{g} \omega(s)^{-(\lambda+1)}\right]^{1-\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } \lambda \in [0, \infty) \\ \omega(s)^2 \left[1 + \frac{q\phi^2}{g} \omega(s)^{-1}\right]^{1-\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } \lambda \in [-1, 0) \\ \omega(s)^{-2\lambda} \left[1 + \frac{q\phi^2}{g} \omega(s)^\lambda\right]^{1-\frac{1}{q}} & \text{if } \lambda \in (-\infty, -1), \end{cases}$$

where $q = (h - 1)/h$ and $h > 1$ depends only on α .

Proof. Let us consider the expectation of N_n , given the true distribution of y , i.e. $y \sim \mathbf{N}(X\beta^*, \sigma^2 I)$. Then by Hölder's inequality, for constants $h > 1$ and $q = \frac{h-1}{h}$, we can find an upper bound for $\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}(N_n)$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}(N_n) \leq \sum_S \pi(S) \int_{B_{\epsilon_n}} J_n(\beta_S)^{\frac{1}{h}} K_n(\beta_S)^{\frac{1}{q}} d\beta_S, \quad (13)$$

where

$$J_n(\beta_S) = \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \left[\left\{ \frac{\mathbf{N}(y \mid X_S \beta_S, \sigma^2 I)}{\mathbf{N}(y \mid X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*, \sigma^2 I)} \right\}^{h\alpha} \right]$$

$$K_n(\beta_S) = \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \left[\mathbf{N}^q(\beta_S \mid \phi \hat{\beta}_S, \sigma^2 g k_S (X_S^\top X_S)^\lambda) \right].$$

If $h\alpha < 1$, then the Renyi divergence formula gives that

$$J_n(\beta_S) = e^{-\frac{\alpha(1-h\alpha)}{2\sigma^2} \|X\beta_{S^+} - X\beta^*\|^2} \leq e^{-[\alpha(1-h\alpha)/2\sigma^2]\epsilon_n}, \quad \forall \beta_{S^+} \in B_{\epsilon_n}, \quad (14)$$

where the p -dimensional vector β_{S^+} is an augmented form of β_S with $\beta_{S^+,i} = 0$ if $i \notin S$. Next, for K_n , after factoring out the non-stochastic terms in the multivariate normal density, there is an expectation of exponential quadratic form to be dealt with, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \left[\exp \left\{ -\frac{q}{2\sigma^2 g k_S} Z \right\} \right], \quad (15)$$

where $Z = (\beta_S - \phi \hat{\beta}_S)^\top (X_S^\top X_S)^{-\lambda} (\beta_S - \phi \hat{\beta}_S)$ and $\hat{\beta}_S$ is the least square estimator under configuration S . Let $\beta_{S^*}^*$ denote the mean of $\hat{\beta}_S$, then $\beta_{S^*}^* = (X_S^\top X_S)^{-1} X_S^\top X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*$. Applying a spectral decomposition on $X_S^\top X_S$ in Z , we have,

$$Z/(\sigma^2 \phi^2) = \nu_S^\top \Lambda_S^{-(\lambda+1)} \nu_S,$$

where $\nu_S = \Lambda_S^{1/2} \Gamma_S^\top (\beta_S - \phi \hat{\beta}_S) / (\sigma \phi)$. Λ_S is a diagonal matrix whose diagonal elements are the corresponding eigenvalues, and Γ_S is a matrix with columns being corresponding eigenvectors. It is not difficult to show,

$$\nu_S \sim \mathbf{N} \left(\Lambda_S^{1/2} \Gamma_S^\top (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*) / (\sigma \phi), I \right),$$

which implies $\nu_{S,i}$ are iid $\mathbf{N}(d_{S,i}^{1/2} \Gamma_{S,i}^\top (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*) / (\sigma \phi), 1)$, where $d_{S,i}$ is the i^{th} eigenvalue of $X_S^\top X_S$ and $\Gamma_{S,i}$ is the i^{th} eigenvector. Hence, $\nu_{S,i}^2$ has a non-central ChiSq(1) distribution with non-centrality parameter $\mu_{S,i} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2 \phi^2} (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*)^\top \Gamma_{S,i} d_{S,i} \Gamma_{S,i}^\top (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*)$. By taking advantage of the independence of $\nu_{S,i}^2$'s and using the moment generating function of the non-central chi-square distribution, (15) can be written as,

$$\prod_{i=1}^s (1 - 2t_{S,i})^{-\frac{1}{2q}} \exp \left\{ \frac{\mu_{S,i}}{2q} \left(\frac{1}{1 - 2t_{S,i}} - 1 \right) \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $t_{S,i} = -q\phi^2 d_{S,i}^{-(1+\lambda)} / 2gk_S < 1/2$. It is clear that (16) is a non-decreasing function with respect to $t_{S,i}$. And when $\lambda \geq 0$, $t_{S,i} \leq t_S := -\frac{\phi^2 q}{2g} \omega(s)^{-(\lambda+1)}$. Then $\forall \beta_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$, we can obtain an upper bound for (15) by replacing $t_{S,i}$ with t_S in (16),

$$U(\beta_S) = (1 - 2t_S)^{-\frac{s}{2q}} \exp \left\{ \left(\frac{2t_S}{1 - 2t_S} \right) \frac{1}{2q\sigma^2 \phi^2} (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*)^\top (X_S^\top X_S) (\beta_S - \phi \beta_{S^*}^*) \right\} \quad (17)$$

For $\lambda < -1$ and $-1 \leq \lambda < 0$, we can get the same expression of $U_n(\beta_S)$ with $t_S = -\phi^2 q\omega(s)/2g$ and $t_S = -\phi^2 q\omega(s)^\lambda/2g$ respectively. Therefore,

$$K_n(\beta_S) \leq (2\pi\sigma^2 g k_S)^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}} D(S)^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}} U_n(\beta_S) \quad (18)$$

Since $J_n(\beta_S)$ and $K_n(\beta_S)$ are non-negative, we upper-bound the integral in (13) by

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{|S|}} J_n(\beta_S)^{\frac{1}{h}} K_n(\beta_S)^{\frac{1}{q}} d\beta_S \quad (19)$$

By plugging (18) and (14) into (19), and integrating out β_S , we bound $\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}(N_n)$ by,

$$e^{-[\alpha(1-h\alpha)/2\sigma^2]\epsilon_n} \sum_{S:|S|\leq R} \psi(|S|)^s \pi(S)$$

where function $\psi(s)$ is defined as above. □

A.2 Proof of Theorem 1

With Lemmas 1 and 2, the expectation of posterior probability of event $B_n = B_{M\epsilon_n}$, which is defined in (6), can be bounded by,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(B_n)\} \leq e^{cs^* - dM\epsilon_n} \frac{\sum_{S:s\leq R} \psi(s)^s \pi(S)}{\pi(S^*)} = e^{cs^* - dM\epsilon_n} \frac{\sum_{s=1}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s)}{\pi(S^*)}.$$

While for the prior, if $\lambda \geq 0$, we can get,

$$\pi(S^*) \geq \omega(s^*)^{-\lambda/2} f_n(s^*) \binom{p}{s^*}^{-1}.$$

Therefore the upper bound for the posterior probability can be written as,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(B_n)\} \leq e^{cs^* - dM\epsilon_n} \xi_n,$$

where

$$\xi_n = \frac{\omega(s^*)^{\lambda/2} \binom{p}{s^*}}{f_n(s^*)} \sum_{s=1}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s).$$

Taking logarithm on both sides, we get

$$\log \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(B_n)\} \leq \left(\frac{cs^*}{\epsilon_n} - Md + \frac{\log \xi_n}{\epsilon_n} \right) \epsilon_n. \quad (20)$$

We require ϵ_n to have a certain rate such that the upper bound for posterior probability can vanish. A preliminary requirement for ϵ_n is $s^*/\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$, in order make $e^{cs^* - d\epsilon_n}$ as $o(1)$. In addition, ϵ_n should satisfy $\log \xi_n = O(\epsilon_n)$. Therefore, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $cs^*/\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\log(\xi_n)/\epsilon_n \rightarrow K$. Thus, for any M satisfying $Md > K$, we will have

$$\log \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(B_n)\} \rightarrow -\infty.$$

Next, we establish the rate for $\log \xi_n$. Under Assumption 1 and 2, $\omega(s^*)$ is bounded with probability 1. By Stirlings formula, we have that

$$\log \binom{p}{s^*} \leq s^* \log(p/s^*) \{1 + o(1)\}.$$

Given that $f_n(s) = c^{-s} p^{-as}$, we can also have

$$-\log f_n(s^*) \leq s^* \log(cs^*) + as^* \log(p/s^*) = O(s^* \log(p/s^*)).$$

Since we have ruled out cases with extremely ill-conditioned $X_S^\top X_S$, $\omega(s)$ is bounded above by Cp^r . Thus, for the nonnegative λ case,

$$\sum_{s=1}^R \psi(R)^s f_n(s) \lesssim p^{R[r(1+\lambda)-a]}.$$

Therefore, when $\lambda \geq 0$, the rate of ε_n should be

$$\max\{R[r(1+\lambda) - a] \log p, s^* \log(p/s^*)\}.$$

The proofs for $\lambda < 0$ are similar. Therefore, the rate ε_n then can be rewritten as

$$\varepsilon_n = \max\{q(R, \lambda, r, a), s^* \log(p/s^*)\},$$

where function q has already been defined in Theorem 1.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2

Followed by Lemma 2 and Theorem 1, we can get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/h} \left[\left\{ \frac{\mathbf{N}(y \mid X_S \beta_{S^+}, \sigma^2 I)}{\mathbf{N}(y \mid X_S \beta_{S^*}, \sigma^2 I)} \right\}^{h\alpha} \right] = \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha(1-h\alpha)}{2\sigma^2} \|X \beta_{S^+} - X \beta_{S^*}\|^2 \right\} \leq 1.$$

Then it is not difficult to show that,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{N_n(U_n)\} \leq \sum_{s=\rho s^*}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s).$$

With the help of Lemma 1, the posterior probability of event U_n can be bounded as,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(U_n)\} \leq e^{cs^*} \frac{\omega(s^*)^{\lambda/2} \binom{p}{s^*}}{f_n(s^*)} \sum_{s=\rho s^*}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s) \quad (21)$$

From Theorem 1, we have

$$\log \frac{\omega(s^*)^{\lambda/2} \binom{p}{s^*}}{f_n(s^*)} \leq (a+1+o(1))s^* \log(p/s^*).$$

In addition, for $\lambda \geq 0$, if $a > r(1+\lambda)$, we can get

$$\sum_{s=\rho s^*}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s) \lesssim \exp\{-\rho s^* [a - r(1+\lambda)] \log p\}.$$

When $\lambda \geq 0$, $\rho > \rho_0 = (a+1)\{a - r(1+\lambda)\}^{-1}$, then $\sum_{s=\rho s^*}^R \psi(s)^s f_n(s)$ dominates the other two terms in (21). Therefore, $\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(U_n)\}$ will vanish as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly for $\lambda < 0$, we can get the same result if $\rho > \rho_0$.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Let $|S_{\beta-\beta^*}|$ be the number of non-zero entries of $(\beta - \beta^*)$. Then,

$$\|X(\beta - \beta^*)\|^2 > n\ell(|S_{\beta-\beta^*}|)\|\beta - \beta^*\|^2.$$

If $a > \max\{1 + \lambda, 1, 1 - \lambda\}$ and $\rho > \rho_0$ in (7), by Theorem 2 and monotonicity of $\ell(s)$, we can get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} [\Pi^n(\{\beta : \ell(|S_{\beta-\beta^*}|) \geq \ell((\rho + 1)s^*)\})] \rightarrow 1.$$

If we set δ_n as in (9) and use Theorem 1, we get

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(V_{M\delta_n})\} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(B_{M\ell((\rho+s^*)\delta_n)})\} \rightarrow 0,$$

where B and V are defined in (6) and (8).

A.5 Proof of Theorem 4

We segment the proof¹ of Theorem 4 into two parts. First, under Assumptions 1 and 3, we aim to show that, $\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}[\Pi^n(\{\beta : S_\beta \supset S_{\beta^*}\})] \rightarrow 0$. Second, under the beta-min condition, we prove that $\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}[\Pi^n(\{\beta : S_\beta \not\supseteq S_{\beta^*}\})] \rightarrow 0$. We only consider positive λ case here. The proofs in Parts 1 and 2 below can go through the same way when $\lambda < 0$.

Part 1

Let S be any configuration containing but not equal to the true model S^* , i.e. $S \supset S^*$. Then the posterior for S can be written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi^n(S) &\leq \Pi^n(S)/\Pi^n(S^*) \\ &= F_S R_S \exp \left[-\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \{y^\top (P_{S^*} - P_S)y + (1 - \phi)^2 \hat{\beta}_S^\top Q_S^{-1} \hat{\beta}_S - (1 - \phi)^2 \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}\} \right] \\ &\leq F_S R_S \exp \left[\frac{\alpha}{2\sigma^2} \{y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*})y + (1 - \phi)^2 \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}\} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $F_S = \pi(S)/\pi(S^*)$, Q_S is as in (12), and

$$R_S = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^s (1 + \alpha g k_S d_{S,i}^{\lambda+1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}}{\prod_{i=1}^{s^*} (1 + \alpha g k_{S^*} d_{S^*,i}^{\lambda+1})^{-\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Applying Hölder's inequality with the same constants in (13), $h > 1$ and $q = (h - 1)/h$, we get that $\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*} \{\pi^n(S)\}$ is upper-bounded by

$$F_S R_S \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/h} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{\alpha h}{2\sigma^2} y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*})y \right\} \right] \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/q} \left[\exp \left\{ \frac{\alpha q (1 - \phi)^2}{2\sigma^2} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*} \right\} \right]. \quad (22)$$

First, given that $S \supset S^*$, $(P_S - P_{S^*})$ is idempotent and $(P_S - P_{S^*})X_{S^*} = 0$. Therefore, $y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*})y/\sigma^2$ has a central chi-square distribution $\text{ChiSq}(s - s^*)$. If $h\alpha < 1$, using

¹Some of the arguments presented here refer to Martin et al. (2017), but there are some oversights in the selection consistency results presented in the published version of that paper. The version available at [arXiv:1406.7718](https://arxiv.org/abs/1406.7718) contains corrections of those arguments.

moment generating function of central chi-square, the first expectation term in (22) can be written as,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/h} [\exp\{\frac{h\alpha}{2\sigma^2} y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*}) y\}] = (1 - h\alpha)^{-(s-s^*)/2h}.$$

Second, from the spectral decomposition $X_{S^*}^\top X_{S^*} = \Gamma_{S^*} \Lambda_{S^*} \Gamma_{S^*}^\top$, if $u = \Lambda_{S^*}^{1/2} \Gamma_{S^*}^\top \hat{\beta}_{S^*} / \sigma$, then,

$$\hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*} / \sigma^2 = u^\top (I_s + \alpha g k_{S^*} \Lambda_{S^*}^{\lambda+1})^{-1} u = \sum_{i=1}^{s^*} \frac{1}{1 + \alpha g k_{S^*} d_{S^*,i}^{\lambda+1}} u_i^2.$$

Obviously, $u \sim \mathbf{N}(\Lambda_{S^*}^{1/2} \Gamma_{S^*}^\top \beta_{S^*}^* / \sigma, I_{s^*})$, and this implies $u_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathbf{N}(d_{S^*,i}^{1/2} \Gamma_{S^*,i}^\top \beta_{S^*}^* / \sigma, 1)$. It follows that the u_i^2 s are independent non-central chi-square random variables, with non-centrality parameter $\mu_i = d_{S^*,i}^{1/2} \Gamma_{S^*,i}^\top \beta_{S^*}^* / \sigma$ and degrees of freedom of 1. Using the same argument as in (16)–(17), we get,

$$\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/q} [\exp\{\frac{\alpha q(1-\phi)^2}{2\sigma^2} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}\}] \leq (1-t)^{-\frac{s^*}{2q}} \exp\{\alpha n \|\beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 \lambda_{\max}(S^*) \frac{t}{1-t}\},$$

where $0 < t \lesssim (1-\phi)^2$. Since $t = O(n^{-1}) = o(1/s^*)$, we have

$$(1-t)^{-s^*} = (1 + \frac{t}{1-t})^{s^*} = O(1).$$

Also, by Assumptions 2 and 3, the exponential term is asymptotically bounded by $e^{\alpha s^*}$. Therefore, we can conclude that the second expectation term in (22) is also asymptotically upper-bounded by $e^{\alpha s^*}$.

Next, it is clear that

$$R_S \leq \prod_{i=1}^{s^*} (1 + \alpha g k_{S^*} d_{S^*,i}^{\lambda+1})^{1/2}.$$

Since $k_S d_{S,i}^{\lambda+1}$ satisfies

$$\kappa(S)^{-(\lambda+1)} \leq k_S d_{S,i}^{\lambda+1} \leq \kappa(S)^{\lambda+1},$$

and the lower and upper bounds are stable according to Assumption 3, it follows that R_S is upper-bounded by m^{s^*} , where $m = (1 + \alpha g \kappa(S^*)^{\lambda+1})^{1/2}$.

For F_S , as in Appendix A.2, we have

$$\pi(S) \leq \binom{p}{s}^{-1} \omega(s)^{\frac{\lambda}{2}} f_n(s) \quad \text{and} \quad \pi(S^*) \geq \binom{p}{s^*}^{-1} \omega(s^*)^{-\frac{\lambda}{2}} f_n(s^*).$$

Now we can bound $\mathbf{E}_{\beta^*} \{\pi^n(S)\}$ above by,

$$e^{Gs^*} \omega(s)^\lambda \binom{p}{s}^{-1} \binom{p}{s^*} \left(\frac{z}{cp^a}\right)^{s-s^*} \times O(1),$$

where $G = \alpha + \log m$ and $z > 0$ is a constant. By Theorem 2, we only need to consider configurations of size no more than ρs^* , where $\rho > \rho_0$ in (7) and $a > r(1+\lambda)$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*} \{\Pi^n(\beta : S_\beta \supset S_{\beta^*})\} &= \sum_{S \supset S^*} \mathbf{E}_{\beta^*} \{\pi^n(S)\} \\ &\leq e^{Gs^*} \omega(\rho s^*)^\lambda \sum_{s=s^*+1}^{\rho s^*} \frac{\binom{p-s^*}{p-s} \binom{p}{s^*}}{\binom{p}{s^*}} \left(\frac{z}{cp^a}\right)^{s-s^*} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Under Assumption 3, $\omega(\rho s^*)$ is bounded, so following the results in Martin et al. (2017), (23) turns out to be,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(\beta : S_\beta \supset S_{\beta^*})\} \leq \frac{e^{Gs^*} s^*}{p^a} \times O(1).$$

So, if p and a are such that $p^a \gg s^* e^{Gs^*}$, then $\mathbb{E}\{\Pi^n(S \supset S^*)\}$ will go to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Part 2

Consider a configuration S satisfying $S \not\supseteq S^*$, in Part 1, we already have (22), which is

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}\{\pi^n(S)\} \leq F_S R_S \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/h} [\exp\{\frac{\alpha h}{2\sigma^2} y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*}) y\}] \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/q} [\exp\{\frac{\alpha q(1-\phi)^2}{2\sigma^2} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}^\top Q_{S^*}^{-1} \hat{\beta}_{S^*}\}].$$

For the first expectation term, if we plug in $y = X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*} + \sigma z$, where $z \sim \mathbf{N}(0, I_n)$, then according to the results in Martin et al. (2017)

$$\begin{aligned} y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*}) y &= -\|(I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 - 2\sigma z^\top (I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^* + \sigma^2 z^\top (P_S - P_{S^*}) z \\ &\leq -\|(I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 - 2\sigma z^\top (I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^* + \sigma^2 z^\top (P_S - P_{S \cap S^*}) z. \end{aligned}$$

Since $z^\top (I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*$ and $z^\top (P_S - P_{S \cap S^*}) z$ are independent, using the moment generating function of normal and chi-square distributions, we can get,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}^{1/h} [\exp\{\frac{\alpha h}{2\sigma^2} y^\top (P_S - P_{S^*}) y\}] \\ \leq (1 - h\alpha)^{-\frac{1}{2h}(|S| - |S \cap S^*|)} \exp\{-\frac{\alpha(1-h\alpha)}{2\sigma^2} \|(I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2\} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

With some algebraic manipulation, we can show that

$$\|(I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2 = \|(I - P_S) X_{S^* \cap S^c} \beta_{S^* \cap S^c}^*\|^2,$$

and then based on Lemma 5 of Arias-Castro and Lounici (2014), we get

$$\|(I - P_S) X_{S^* \cap S^c} \beta_{S^* \cap S^c}^*\|^2 \geq n\ell(s^*) \|\beta_{S^* \cap S^c}^*\|^2.$$

By the beta-min condition (10), it follows that $\|\beta_{S^* \cap S^c}^*\|^2 \geq \varrho_n^2(s^* - |S^* \cap S|)$, and, hence,

$$\exp\{-\frac{\alpha(1-h\alpha)}{2\sigma^2} \|(I - P_S) X_{S^*} \beta_{S^*}^*\|^2\} \leq p^{-M(s^* - |S^* \cap S|)}.$$

Then following the results in Martin et al. (2017), we can get,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(\beta : S_\beta \not\supseteq S_{\beta^*})\} \lesssim e^{Gs^*} \sum_{s=0}^{\rho s^*} \sum_{t=1}^{\min(s, s^*)} \frac{\binom{s^*}{t} \binom{p-s^*}{s-t} \binom{p}{s^*}}{\binom{p}{s}} (cp^a)^{s^*-s} \{(1-h\alpha)p^{-M}\}^{s^*-t}.$$

When $s < s^*$, we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(\beta : S_\beta \not\supseteq S_{\beta^*})\} \lesssim e^{Gs^*} \sum_{s=0}^{s^*-1} (cp^{1+a-M})^{s^*-s} \lesssim \frac{m^{s^*}}{p^{M-(a+1)}}, \quad M > a + 1.$$

When $s \geq s^*$, we have,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\beta^*}\{\Pi^n(\beta : S_\beta \not\supseteq S_{\beta^*})\} \lesssim e^{Gs^*} ((1-h\alpha)p^{1-M}) \sum_{s=s^*}^{\rho s^*} (cp^{a-1})^{s^*-s} \lesssim \frac{e^{Gs^*}}{p^{M-(a+1)}}, \quad a > 1.$$

Furthermore, if $p^{M-(a+1)}$ satisfies $p^{M-(a+1)} \gg e^{Gs^*}$, the two fractions above will finally go to 0 as n and p go to infinity.

References

- Arias-Castro, E. and Lounici, K. (2014). Estimation and variable selection with exponential weights. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 8(1):328–354.
- Bondell, H. D. and Reich, B. J. (2012). Consistent high-dimensional Bayesian variable selection via penalized credible regions. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 107:1610–1624.
- Bühlmann, P. and van de Geer, S. (2011). *Statistics for High-Dimensional Data: Methods, Theory and Applications*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Castillo, I., Schmidt-Hieber, J., and van der Vaart, A. (2015). Bayesian linear regression with sparse priors. *Ann. Statist.*, 43:1986–2018.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001). Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 96:1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2010). A selective overview of variable selection in high dimensional feature space. *Statist. Sinica*, 20:101–148.
- Feng, L., Rui, P., German, M., Merlise, A., and Jim, O. (2008). Mixtures of g priors for Bayesian variable selection. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 103:410–423.
- Foster, D. P. and George, E. I. (1994). The risk inflation criterion for multiple regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 22:1947–1975.
- George, E. I. and Foster, D. P. (2000). Calibration and empirical Bayes variable selection. *Biometrika*, 87:731–747.
- George, E. I. and McCulloch, R. E. (1993). Variable selection via Gibbs sampling. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 88:881–889.
- Grünwald, P. and van Ommen, T. (2017). Inconsistency of Bayesian inference for misspecified linear models, and a proposal for repairing it. *Bayesian Anal.*, 12(4):1069–1103.
- Hans, C., Dobra, A., and West, M. (2007). Shotgun stochastic search for large p regression. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 102:507–517.
- Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005). Spike and slab gene selection for multigroup microarray data. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 100:764–780.
- Kass, R. E. and Wasserman, L. (1995). A reference Bayesian test for nested hypotheses and its relationship to the schwarz criterion. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 90:928–934.
- Krishna, A., Bondell, H., and Ghosh, S. K. (2009). Bayesian variable selection using an adaptive powered correlation prior. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference*, 139:2665–2674.
- Lan, H., Chen, M., Flowers, J. B., Yandell, B. S., Stapleton, D. S., Mata, C. M., Mui, E. T.-K., Flowers, M. T., Schueler, K. L., Manly, K. F., et al. (2006). Combined expression trait correlations and expression quantitative trait locus mapping. *PLoS Genetics*, 2(1):e6.

- Martin, R., Mess, R., and Walker, S. G. (2017). Empirical Bayes posterior concentration in sparse high-dimensional linear models. *Bernoulli*, 23:1822–1847.
- Martin, R. and Walker, S. G. (2014). Asymptotically minimax empirical Bayes estimation of a sparse normal mean vector. *Electron. J. Stat.*, 8:2188–2206.
- Narisetty, N. N. and He, X. (2014). Bayesian variable selection with shrinking and diffusing priors. *Ann. Statist.*, 42:789–817.
- Polson, N. G. and Scott, J. G. (2012). Local shrinkage rules, Lévy processes and regularized regression. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 74(2):287–311.
- Rigollet, P. and Tsybakov, A. B. (2012). Sparse estimation by exponential weighting. *Statist. Sci.*, pages 558–575.
- Shin, M., Bhattacharya, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2018). Scalable Bayesian variable selection using nonlocal prior densities in ultrahigh-dimensional settings. *Statist. Sinica*, 28(2):1053–1078.
- Syring, N. and Martin, R. (2017). Calibrating general posterior credible regions. *Biometrika*, to appear, [arXiv:1509.00922](https://arxiv.org/abs/1509.00922).
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. B. Stat. Methodol.*, 58:267–288.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *Ann. Statist.*, 38:894–942.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Huang, J. (2008). The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 36:1567–1594.
- Zhang, C.-H., Huang, J., et al. (2008). The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, 36(4):1567–1594.
- Zou, H. (2006). The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 101:1418–1429.
- Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005). Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *J. R. Statist. Soc. B*, 67:301–320.