

Bayes Factor Asymptotics for Variable Selection in the Gaussian Process Framework

*Minerva Mukhopadhyay and Sourabh Bhattacharya*¹

¹*Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Indian Institute of Technology, Kanpur and Interdisciplinary Statistical Research Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata 700108. Corresponding e-mail: minervam@iitk.ac.in.*

Abstract

Although variable selection is one of the most popular areas of modern statistical research, much of its development has taken place in the classical paradigm compared to the Bayesian counterpart. Somewhat surprisingly, both the paradigms have focused almost primarily on linear models, in spite of the vast scope offered by the model liberation movement brought about by modern advancements in studying real, complex phenomena.

In this article, we investigate general Bayesian variable selection in models driven by Gaussian processes, which allows us to treat linear, non-linear and nonparametric models, in conjunction with even dependent setups, in the same vein. We consider the Bayes factor route to variable selection, and develop a general asymptotic theory for the Gaussian process framework in the “large p , large n ” settings even with $p \gg n$, establishing almost sure exponential convergence of the Bayes factor under appropriately mild conditions. The fixed p setup is included as a special case.

To illustrate, we apply our result to variable selection in linear regression, Gaussian process model with squared exponential covariance function accommodating the covariates, and a first order autoregressive process with time-varying covariates. We also follow up our theoretical investigations with ample simulation experiments in the above regression contexts and variable selection in a real, riboflavin data consisting of 71 observations but 4088 covariates. For implementation of variable selection using Bayes factors, we develop a novel and effective general-purpose transdimensional, transformation based Markov chain Monte Carlo algorithm, which has played a crucial role in our simulated and real data applications.

Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Contents | 1 |
| 1 Introduction | 2 |
| 2 General setup for Bayes factor based variable selection | 5 |
| 2.1 The Gaussian process prior | 5 |
| 2.2 The true model | 6 |
| 2.3 The Bayes factor for covariate selection | 6 |
| 3 Almost sure convergence of the log-Bayes factor | 6 |
| 4 Illustrations | 11 |
| 4.1 Linear regression | 11 |
| 4.2 Gaussian process with squared exponential kernel | 13 |
| 5 The case with unknown error variance | 15 |
| 6 Convergence of integrated Bayes factor | 17 |
| 7 Bayes factor asymptotics for correlated errors | 20 |
| 7.1 Illustration 3: Autoregressive model | 21 |
| 8 Variable selection using Bayes factors in misspecified situations | 25 |
| 9 An overview of our simulation and real data experiments | 26 |
| 9.1 A briefing on our simulation studies for direct theory validation | 26 |
| 9.2 Simulation experiments with Bayes factor oriented TTMCMC | 27 |
| 9.3 Overview of our real data experiment | 28 |
| 10 Summary, conclusion and future direction | 28 |
| S-1 Direct validation of the theoretical results using simulation experiments | 30 |
| S-1.1 Linear regression | 30 |
| S-1.2 Gaussian process with squared exponential kernel | 30 |
| S-1.3 Autoregressive model | 31 |
| S-1.4 Misspecified models | 31 |
| S-2 A generic TTMCMC sampler for variable selection | 32 |
| S-3 Bayes factor computation using TTMCMC realizations | 41 |
| S-4 Proof of convergence of the TTMCMC algorithm | 42 |
| S-4.1 Proof of detailed balance | 42 |
| S-4.1.1 Additive transformation | 42 |

| | |
|--|-----------|
| S-4.1.2 Multiplicative transformation | 43 |
| S-4.2 Irreducibility and aperiodicity | 45 |
| S-5 Bayes factor based variable selection experiments with TTMC | 45 |
| S-5.1 Linear regression | 45 |
| S-5.1.1 Data generation with random sets of covariates | 45 |
| S-5.1.2 Bayesian linear regression model and prior specification for variable selection using TTMC and Bayes factors | 45 |
| S-5.1.3 TTMC implementation for Bayesian linear regression | 46 |
| S-5.1.4 Parallelization | 47 |
| S-5.1.5 Results of the linear regression simulation experiments | 48 |
| S-5.2 Gaussian process regression | 49 |
| S-5.2.1 Results of the Gaussian process regression simulation experiments | 51 |
| S-5.3 AR(1) regression | 52 |
| S-5.3.1 Results of the AR(1) regression simulation experiments | 52 |
| S-6 Variable selection in a real riboflavin dataset | 54 |
| S-6.1 Results for the linear regression model | 54 |
| S-6.2 Results for the Gaussian process regression model | 56 |
| S-6.3 Comparison of the results for the linear regression and the Gaussian process regression models | 56 |
| S-7 Appendix | 57 |
| Bibliography | 60 |

1 Introduction

The importance of variable selection is undeniable, since most statistical procedures involve a large number of observed variables, or covariates, only a few of which are expected to have significant influence on the experiment and future prediction. It is thus important to judiciously select those few important covariates from a relatively large pool of available covariates. This task involves multiple challenges. Even in the simple classical linear regression setup, false inclusion or exclusion of the variables may lead to false inclusion or exclusion of correlated variables. That, in turn, can influence the variance of predictions and hence root mean square error (RMSE), and bias of the predictions. The most popular methods developed in the classical paradigm, the penalty based methods such as the Akaike Information Criterion and the Bayesian Information Criterion, are not immune to these problems, the former having the ill reputation of preferring models consisting of relatively large number of variables. The latter employs a more appropriate penalty and is preferable, but in practice, can lead to underfitting. The popular LASSO method (see, for example, [Tibshirani \(1996\)](#)) often has the effect of drastically reducing RMSE, but at the cost of increasing prediction errors. See [Heinze *et al.* \(2018\)](#) for a relatively recent review regarding several of these issues; see also [Draper and Smith \(2005\)](#), [Weisberg \(2005\)](#). Asymptotic theory of the variable selection criterion in multiple regression has been considered in [Nishii \(1996\)](#) and [Shao \(1997\)](#); see also

Eubank (1999) and Giraud (2015) for various issues regarding asymptotic variable selection in linear models. Since even for simple linear regression models the variable selection issues can be of significant concern, it is well imaginable how grave the issues can be in the case of more realistically complex models such as nonlinear and nonparametric regression.

Apart from some of the issues touched upon, all the classical methods of variable selection have the major drawback of selecting a single set of variables without quantifying the uncertainty associated with such selection. This calls for the Bayesian paradigm of variable selection, which is also rich in its repertoire of philosophies and methodologies. One philosophy is Bayesian model averaging, which recommends a mixture of all possible models for better prediction (see Fragoso *et al.* (2018) for a review). The mixture weights ensure that important sets of covariates receive substantial weights compared to less significant sets. Another philosophy is to infer from the posterior distribution of the regression coefficients (see, for e.g., Ishwaran and Rao (2005)). Another philosophy is to obtain the posterior distribution of the subsets of the covariates, and from a single posterior that encapsulates all the relevant information including the possibility of all the covariates. Covariate selection in this case proceeds by stochastic search variable selection methods, which often involve variable-dimensional Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) procedures (see O’Hara and Sillanpää (2009) for a review). Even though these methods are usually computationally demanding, most of them avoid the problems faced by the classical variable selection ideas. For details regarding various ideas on Bayesian model and variable selection along with relevant computational strategies, see, for example, Gilks and Roberts (1996), DiCiccio *et al.* (1997), Han and Carlin (2001), Fernández *et al.* (2001), Moreno and Girón (2008), Casella *et al.* (2009), Ando (2010), Bayarri *et al.* (2012), Johnson and Rossell (2012), Hong and Preston (2012), Marin *et al.* (2014), Dawid and Musio (2015). Asymptotic theories on Bayesian variable selection can be found in Moreno *et al.* (2010), Shang and Clayton (2011), Moreno *et al.* (2015), Mukhopadhyay *et al.* (2015). However, most of these theories are developed in the linear regression setup.

However, perhaps the most principled way of comparing the subsets of covariates is offered by Bayes factors, through the ratio of the posterior and prior odds associated with the competing models, which follows directly from the coherent procedure of Bayesian hypothesis testing of preferring one model compared to other. The idea is also closely related to the aforementioned principle of obtaining posterior distributions of the covariate subsets. For a general account of Bayes factors and its numerous advantages, see, for example, Kass and Raftery (1995). However, careless use of Bayes factors can lead to selecting the more parsimonious but wrong model in large samples even in very simple setups for ill-chosen priors, as the well-known Jeffreys-Lindley-Bartlett paradox demonstrates (see Jeffreys (1939), Lindley (1957), Bartlett (1957), Robert (1993), Villa and Walker (2015) for details). It is thus of utmost importance to carefully investigate the asymptotic theory of Bayes factors in different setups and construct appropriate priors that ensure consistency in the sense that the Bayes factor selects the correct set of covariates asymptotically. Note that priors that ensure consistency of posterior distributions need not guarantee consistency of Bayes factors, which is again demonstrated by the Jeffreys-Lindley-Bartlett and information paradox (see, for example, Section 2.3 of Liang *et al.* (2008)). Here, the prior ensures posterior consistency, but not Bayes factor consistency. Thus, the asymptotic theory of Bayes factors does not follow from the asymptotic theory of posterior distributions.

Compared to the asymptotic theory of posterior distributions, that of Bayes factors for general model selection have seen relatively slow development. Indeed, most of the theory for variable selection using Bayes factors have hitherto concentrated around nested linear regression models; see, for example, [Guo and Speckman \(1998\)](#), [Liang *et al.* \(2008\)](#), [Moreno *et al.* \(2010\)](#), [Rousseau and Choi \(2012\)](#), [Wang and Sun \(2014\)](#), [Kundu and Dunson \(2014\)](#), [Choi and Rousseau \(2015\)](#). But see also [Wang and Maruyama \(2016\)](#) for a non-nested setup. This seems to be a very restrictive setup for the Bayesian framework, particularly in light of the current advancement in research on highly complex physical phenomena, where simplistic models are untenable. For a general account of advancements in the area of Bayes factor asymptotics, see [Chib and Kuffner \(2016\)](#), which also asserts the same fact.

Although variable selection has been considered in nonlinear and nonparametric frameworks such as generalized linear models, generalized additive models, additive partial linear models, generalized additive partial linear models, semiparametric additive partial linear models, additive nonparametric regression models (see, for example, [Chen *et al.* \(1999\)](#), [Huang *et al.* \(2010\)](#), [Liu *et al.* \(2011\)](#), [Marra and Wood \(2011\)](#), [Meyer and Laud \(2002\)](#), [Ntzoufras *et al.* \(2003\)](#), [Reich *et al.* \(2009\)](#), [Shively *et al.* \(1999\)](#), [Wang *et al.* \(2011\)](#), [Wang and George \(2007\)](#), [Banerjee and Ghosal \(2014\)](#)), Bayes factor is not the selection criterion for the existing approaches.

It is thus crucially important to build appropriate asymptotic theory for Bayes factors with respect to variable selection in general setups.

Recognizing this requirement, our endeavor in this paper is to establish consistency of Bayes factors for variable selection in models driven by Gaussian processes. The Gaussian process framework enables us to consider linear and nonlinear, parametric as well as nonparametric models including appropriate dependence structures, under the same umbrella, allowing the usage of a general body of mathematical apparatus to establish our asymptotic theory. Encouragingly, such a treatment allowed us to guarantee almost sure exponential convergence of the Bayes factor in favour of the true set of covariates under reasonably mild, verifiable assumptions, not only as the sample size increases indefinitely, but also as the total number of available covariates increase with the sample size, possibly at faster rates, defining the so-called “large p , large n ” paradigm, which also includes the fixed p situation as a special case. We are not aware of any asymptotic theory of Bayes factors in the “large p , large n ” scenario.

We follow up our general Bayes factor convergence result with both theoretical and simulation based illustrations of asymptotic variable selection in linear regression model, nonparametric Gaussian process model where the exponential covariance function encapsulates the covariates to be selected, and a first order autoregressive model consisting of time-varying covariates.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. We introduce our general setup for Bayes factor based variable selection in [Section 2](#). [Section 3](#) shows almost sure convergence of the Bayes factor of any model with respect to the true model. [Section 4](#) provides illustrations of our main result with variable selection in linear regression and in a Gaussian process model with squared exponential covariance function. Generalization of our results to the case of unknown error variance is provided in [Section 5](#), using a conjugate prior. [Section 6](#) provides further generalization of our result, assuming arbitrary priors on compact spaces for all other parameters and hyperparameters. In [Section 7](#) we treat the case of correlated errors

and present the problem of time-varying covariate selection in a first order autoregressive model as an illustration, establishing almost sure exponential convergence of the relevant Bayes factor. The important case of misspecification is dealt with in Section 8, where again almost sure exponential convergence of Bayes factor in favour of selection of the best possible subset of covariates, is established. In Section 9 an overview of our simulation and real data experiments are provided; complete details are relegated to the supplement. Finally, we summarize our work, make concluding remarks, and provide future directions in Section 10.

2 General setup for Bayes factor based variable selection

Let y_i and \mathbf{x}_i denote the i -th response variable and the associated vector of covariates, $i = 1, \dots, n$. We assume that the covariate \mathbf{x} consists of p (> 1) components, and that it is required to select a subset of the p components that best explains the response variable y . We allow p to grow with n at a rate $p = O(n^r)$, $r > 0$.

Let \mathbf{s} denote any subset of the indices $\mathbf{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$, and $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}$ denote the co-ordinates of \mathbf{x} associated with \mathbf{s} . To relate $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}$ to y we consider the following nonparametric regression setup:

$$y = f(\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}) + \epsilon, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2)$ is the random error and the function $f(\cdot)$ is considered unknown. We assume that $f : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{X} = \cup_{\ell=1}^p \mathbb{R}^{\ell}$.

By assuming this framework we include the possibility that the domain of f can range from one to p -dimensional. We further assume that there exists a true set of regressors, \mathbf{x}_0 , which influences the dependent variable y . Our problem is to identify \mathbf{x}_0 , i.e., the set of active regressors. Note that we do not consider any specific form of the function. Irrespective of the functional form, we are interested in identifying the set of active regressors.

2.1 The Gaussian process prior

We assign a Gaussian process prior for $f(\cdot)$ which leads, for any given subset \mathbf{s} and covariate values $\{\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}}; i = 1, \dots, n\}$, to the joint multivariate normal distribution of $(f(\mathbf{x}_{1,\mathbf{s}}), \dots, f(\mathbf{x}_{n,\mathbf{s}}))^T$ with mean and variance-covariance matrix as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}} &= (\mu(\mathbf{x}_{1,\mathbf{s}}), \dots, \mu(\mathbf{x}_{n,\mathbf{s}}))^T; \\ \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{s}} &= ((Cov(f(\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}}), f(\mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}}))); \quad i = 1, \dots, n; \quad j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

The marginal distribution of $\mathbf{y}_n = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ is then the n -variate normal, given by

$$\mathbf{y}_n \sim N_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}}, \sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{n,\mathbf{s}}),$$

where I_n is the identity matrix of order n . We denote this marginal model by $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$. It will be increasingly evident as we proceed, that this relatively simple consideration is the key to unlocking a sufficiently general asymptotic theory of Bayes factors for variable selection that allows handling of wide range of situations including parametric, nonparametric, independence and dependence, using the same basic concept and mathematical manoeuvre.

2.2 The true model

We assume that there exists exactly one particular subset \mathbf{s}_0 of \mathbf{S} which is actually associated with the data generating process of y , which is termed as the *true* subset. The evaluation procedure of the proposed set of model selection basically rests on its ability to identify this true subset, irrespective of the form of the function f .

We denote the mean vector and the covariance matrix of the Gaussian process prior associated with the true model by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}^t$ and $\Sigma_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}^t$, respectively, and denote the corresponding marginal distribution of \mathbf{y}_n as $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$. For notational simplicity we drop the suffix n from $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}^t$, $\Sigma_{n,\mathbf{s}}$ and $\Sigma_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}^t$.

2.3 The Bayes factor for covariate selection

It follows from the general model setup and the Gaussian process prior that the Bayes factor of any model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$ to the true model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$ associated with the data is given by

$$BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}(\mathbf{y}_n)}{\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t(\mathbf{y}_n)} = \frac{|\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}|^{-1/2}}{|\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t|^{-1/2}} \times \frac{\exp\left\{-\left(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}}\right)^T \left(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}}\right) / 2\right\}}{\exp\left\{-\left(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right)^T \left(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right) / 2\right\}}, \quad (2.3)$$

which is the ratio of the marginal likelihoods of the observed data \mathbf{y}_n , under the model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$ to the true model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$. This is the same as the ratio of the posterior odds and prior odds for \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{s}_0 , for any prior on the models. If the models for \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{s}_0 have the same prior distribution, then (2.3) is the same as the posterior odds.

The main aim of this paper is to establish that (2.3) converges to zero exponentially fast as $n \rightarrow \infty$, if $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s}_0$. We shall begin with known σ_ϵ^2 and other parameters, but will subsequently generalize our theory when such quantities are unknown, and almost arbitrary, albeit sensible priors, are assigned to them. In the next two sections we establish our main result on almost sure convergence of the log-Bayes factor.

3 Almost sure convergence of the log-Bayes factor

In this section we investigate Bayes factor consistency of Gaussian process regression in strong sense. We will show that for $\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s}_0$, there exists an $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$, and $\delta_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} \log BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

The quantities $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$, for $\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$, as we shall make precise in the applications, is related to the sparsity conditions of the underlying model \mathbf{s}_0 and the competing model \mathbf{s} . One way to interpret $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$ is to set $O(p^{\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}) = O(n^{r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$ as the difference in effective dimensionality of the true model \mathbf{s}_0 and competing model \mathbf{s} . Thus, when the effective dimensionality of the models

indexed by \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{s}_0 remain bounded, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, then $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} = 0$. Note that depending upon the value of $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$, we can compare models of different dimensionalities.

We first state the assumptions under which the result holds.

(A1) Let $\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)$. We assume that for any $\mathbf{s} \subseteq \mathbf{S}$, for some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$ and $\xi_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$,

$$\liminf_n \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} \Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}} = \xi_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

Define $A_{n,\mathbf{s}} = (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1}$. We further assume the following:

(A2) Let $\lambda_1 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_n > 0$ be the eigenvalues of $A_{n,\mathbf{s}}$, then for $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$ defined in (A1), $\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) = O(p^{2\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}) = O(n^{2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$.

(A3) Finally we assume that for all \mathbf{s} , and for $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$ defined in (A1),

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 = O(n^{1+b} p^{2\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}) = O(n^{1+b+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}), \text{ for some } b < 1/2.$$

We will show that, the quantity $\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}}$ in (A1) is asymptotically equivalent to the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence between the marginal density of \mathbf{y}_n under \mathbf{s} and that under \mathbf{s}_0 , in most of the frameworks including linear model. Thus requiring (A1) is same as requiring positive KL divergence between $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$ after proper scaling. Assumptions (A2) and (A3) are reasonable and verifiable restrictions.

In our illustrations with linear and Gaussian process regression, we will show that $p^{\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}$ can be interpreted essentially as the cardinality of set difference of \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{s}_0 . Further, with our illustration with a first-order autoregressive regression model, we demonstrate that if $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}}\|^2 = O(n\|\mathbf{s}\|^2)$, then $p^{\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}$ may be interpreted essentially as $\max\{|\mathbf{s}|, |\mathbf{s}_0|\}$.

Our first result shows that limit supremum of the expected log Bayes factor of any model and the true model is negative, when scaled by $n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}$.

Result 1. *Assume (A1) holds for some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$. Then for some $\delta_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$ depending upon \mathbf{s} ($\neq \mathbf{s}_0$),*

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} \log BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n \right) = -\delta_{\mathbf{s}},$$

for the same choice of $\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$ as given in (A1).

Proof. From (2.3) we find that the expectation of logarithm of the Bayes factor is given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log (BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} \log \frac{|\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t|}{|\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}|} \\ & \quad - \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left[(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}})^T (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}}) \right] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left[(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

To evaluate the first part in the above equation, note that

$$\frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \log \frac{|\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{s_0}^t|}{|\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s|} = \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \log |A_{n,s}| = \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \sum_{j=1}^n \log \lambda_j(A_{n,s}).$$

For the second term of (3.1) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{s_0} \left[(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) \right] \\ &= \text{tr}(A_{n,s}) + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) = \text{tr}(A_{n,s}) + \Delta_{n,s}. \end{aligned}$$

The last term of (3.1) is given by

$$E_{s_0} \left[(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{s_0}^t)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) \right] = n.$$

Using the above facts and from (3.1) observe that

$$2E_{s_0} [\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n)] + \Delta_{n,s} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\log \lambda_i - \lambda_i + 1).$$

Note that $g(x) = \log x - x + 1$ is an increasing function on $(0, 1]$ and decreasing function on $(1, \infty)$, having maximum at 0. Thus $\sum_i (\log \lambda_i - \lambda_i + 1) \leq 0$.

Thus, combining the above facts and (A1) we write

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} E_{s_0} [\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n)] \leq -\xi_s/2.$$

Hence, there exists $\delta_s > 0$ depending upon \mathbf{s} such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} E_{s_0} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \log BF_{s,s_0}^n \right) = -\delta_s.$$

□

□

Next we will prove L_4 convergence of $\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n) / n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ towards its expectation, which in turn would imply L_2 convergence.

Let B_{s_0} be the appropriate matrix associated with the Cholesky factorization of $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{s_0}^t$, i.e., $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{s_0}^t = B_{s_0} B_{s_0}^T$, and $C_{n,s} = B_{s_0}^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} B_{s_0}$. Then $\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t = B_{s_0} \mathbf{z}_n$, with $\mathbf{z}_n \sim N_n(\mathbf{0}, I_n)$. Then

$$(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{s_0}^t)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) = \mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n,$$

and $(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) = \mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n$. Note further that $A_{n,s}$ and $C_{n,s}$ have the same eigenvalues. Thus, by assumption (A2),

$$\lambda_{\max}(C_{n,s}) = O(n^{2r\omega_s}). \quad (3.2)$$

Result 2. Assume (A2) and (A3) hold for some $\omega_s \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$n^{-1-2r\omega_s} \left\{ \log (BF_{s,s_0}^n) - E_{s_0} [\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n)] \right\} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Proof. For convenience, we write $\tilde{E}_n := E_{s_0} [\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n)]$. Now note that for $A_{n,s}$, \mathbf{z}_n , B_{s_0} and $C_{n,s}$ as defined above

$$\begin{aligned} & 2E_{s_0} \left[\log (BF_{s,s_0}^n) - \tilde{E}_n \right]^4 \\ = & E_{s_0} \left[-\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n + E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n) + 2\mathbf{z}_n^T B_{s_0}^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) + \right. \\ & \left. \mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n - n \right]^4 \\ \leq & C \left[E_{s_0} \left| \mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n - \text{tr}(C_{n,s}) \right|^4 + E_{s_0} \left| \mathbf{z}_n^T B_{s_0}^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t) \right|^4 \right. \\ & \left. + E_{s_0} \left| \mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n - n \right|^4 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where C is a positive constant. The above result follows by repeated application of the inequality $(a+b)^q \leq 2^{q-1}(a^q + b^q)$, for non-negative a, b , where $q \geq 1$.

We first obtain the asymptotic order of the first term of (3.3). Note that for any n vector \mathbf{z}_n and any $n \times n$ matrix C_n

$$\begin{aligned} E \left\{ \mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n - E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) \right\}^4 &= E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n)^4 \\ &\quad - 4E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n)^3 E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) + 6E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n)^2 \left\{ E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) \right\}^2 \\ &\quad - 4E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) \left\{ E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) \right\}^3 + \left\{ E (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_n \mathbf{z}_n) \right\}^4. \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

To evaluate (3.4), we make use of the following results (see, for example, Magnus (1978), Kendall and Stuart (1947)).

$$\begin{aligned} E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n) &= \text{tr} (C_{n,s}); \\ E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n)^2 &= [\text{tr} (C_{n,s})]^2 + 2\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^2); \\ E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n)^3 &= [\text{tr} (C_{n,s})]^3 + 6\text{tr} (C_{n,s}) \text{tr} (C_{n,s}^2) + 8\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^3); \\ E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n)^4 &= [\text{tr} (C_{n,s})]^4 + 32\text{tr} (C_{n,s}) \text{tr} (C_{n,s}^3) + 12 [\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^2)]^2 \\ &\quad + 12 [\text{tr} (C_{n,s})]^2 \text{tr} (C_{n,s}^2) + 48\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^4). \end{aligned}$$

Substituting the above expressions in (3.4) we obtain

$$E_{s_0} \left\{ \mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n - E_{s_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_n) \right\}^4 = 12 [\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^2)]^2 + 48\text{tr} (C_{n,s}^4).$$

If $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ are the eigenvalues of $C_{n,s}$, then $\lambda_1^k, \dots, \lambda_n^k$ are the eigenvalues of $C_{n,s}^k$, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Therefore the above quantity reduces to

$$12 \left(\sum_i \lambda_i^2 \right)^2 + 48 \sum_i \lambda_i^4 \leq Cn \sum_i \lambda_i^4 = O(n^{2+8r\omega_s}), \quad (3.5)$$

due to (3.2) and the fact that $(\sum_{i=1}^n a_i)^2 \leq n \sum_{i=1}^n a_i^2$.

Let us now obtain the asymptotic order of second term of (3.3). Note that, the random variable $\mathbf{z}_n^T B_{\mathbf{s}_0}^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)$ is univariate normal with mean zero and variance

$$\hat{\sigma}_n^2 = (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t).$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_{\max} \left[(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \right] \\ & \leq \lambda_{\max} \left[(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \right] \lambda_{\max} \left[(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \right] \\ & = \frac{\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}})}{\lambda_{\min}(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})} \leq \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} \lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}), \end{aligned}$$

by Result S-1 (in Section S-7 of the supplement). Hence,

$$(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \leq \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} \lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) I_n.$$

Therefore, $\hat{\sigma}_n^2 \leq \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} \lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 = O(n^{1+b+4r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$, due to (A2) and (A3). Hence it follows that

$$E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left| \mathbf{z}_n^T B_{\mathbf{s}_0}^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \right|^4 = 3\hat{\sigma}_n^4 = O(n^{2+2b+8r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}). \quad (3.6)$$

Finally, we deal with the third term of (3.3). As $\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n - n = \sum_{i=1}^n (z_i^2 - 1)$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $z_i^2 \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \chi_1^2$. By Lemma B of (Serfling, 1980, p. 68), it follows that

$$E_{\mathbf{s}_0} (\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n - n)^4 = O(n^2). \quad (3.7)$$

Substituting (3.5), (3.6) and (3.7) in (3.3) we obtain

$$E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left[\log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) - \tilde{E}_n \right]^4 = O(n^{2+2b+8r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}). \quad (3.8)$$

Chebyshev's inequality, in conjunction with (3.8) guarantees that for any $\eta > 0$,

$$\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} P_{\mathbf{s}_0} \left(\left| \log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) - \tilde{E}_n \right| > n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}\eta} \right) < \infty,$$

as $b < 1/2$, proving almost sure convergence of $n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \left\{ \log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) - \tilde{E}_n \right\}$ to 0, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. □ □

Now we state the main theorem, the proof of which follows as an application the above result, and Result 1.

Theorem 1 (Main theorem). *Suppose the assumptions (A1)–(A3) hold for some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$, and $\delta_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$ depending upon \mathbf{s} ($\neq \mathbf{s}_0$), then*

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

Remark 1. Recall that p^{ω_s} is related to the effective dimensionality of the model indexed by \mathbf{s} . When p is fixed, then p^{ω_s} , which can also be interpreted essentially as the difference in the set of covariates under \mathbf{s} and \mathbf{s}_0 , is zero. Indeed, keeping p fixed and proceeding exactly in the same way as the proof of Theorem 1, and setting $\omega_s = 0$ in assumptions (A1)–(A3), would yield the result

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_s.$$

Further, if p were fixed, then the number of models $2^p - 1$, would be finite. In that case, under assumptions (A1)–(A3) (with $\omega_s = 0$ for all $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbf{S}$), there would exist $\delta > 0$, such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s}_0} \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta.$$

Remark 2. One can establish a relatively weaker version of consistency result,

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n^{1-\epsilon+2r\omega_s}} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_s, \quad \epsilon < 1/4,$$

under a weaker variant of assumption (A1): (A1*) $\liminf_n n^{-1+\epsilon-2r\omega_s} \Delta_{n, \mathbf{s}} = \xi_s$. However, assumption (A3) should be replaced by (A3*) : $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 = O(np^{2\omega_s}) = O(n^{1+2r\omega_s})$, for all \mathbf{s} , which, nonetheless, remains a mild assumption. When $r\omega_s$ is large, this version of consistency becomes more appropriate than the traditional one.

Remark 3. Note that Theorem 1 remains valid even for nested models \mathcal{M}_s and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}$ where one model has $O(p^{\omega_s})$ number of covariates more than the other, where $\omega_s \in (0, 1]$.

4 Illustrations

This section provides illustrations of our main result in two different regression contexts, linear regression and Gaussian process regression with squared exponential covariance function.

4.1 Linear regression

For illustration of our Bayes factor theory let us first consider the linear regression. Let $y_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}_s^T \mathbf{x}_{i, s} + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s}, g_n \sigma_\beta^2 (X_s^T X_s)^{-1})$. Let $\mathbf{s}_0 (\subseteq \mathbf{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, p\})$ be the set of indices of the true set of covariates, and $p = O(n^r)$ ($r > 0$). Zellner’s g -prior assigns $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s} = \mathbf{0}$. We instead make our prior more flexible by assuming that for all \mathbf{s} , $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s}\|_{L_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{s}|} |\beta_{0, j}| = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. We further assume that $g_n = O(p^{\omega_s})$.

We assume that the space of covariates is compact, which, as we show, is sufficient to ensure (A1)–(A3). Observe that Zellner’s g_n -prior induces a Gaussian process prior on the function $f(\mathbf{x}_{i, s}) = \mathbf{x}_{i, s}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_s$ with mean function

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}_{i, s}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s}^T \mathbf{x}_{i, s} = \boldsymbol{\mu}_s,$$

and the covariance between $\beta_s^T \mathbf{x}_{i,s}$ and $\beta_s^T \mathbf{x}_{j,s}$ is given by

$$Cov(\beta_s^T \mathbf{x}_{i,s}, \beta_s^T \mathbf{x}_{j,s}) = \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \mathbf{x}_{i,s}^T (X_s^T X_s)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{j,s}.$$

Therefore, $\Sigma_s = \sigma_\beta^2 g_n X_s^T (X_s^T X_s)^{-1} X_s = \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s}$, where $P_{n,s}$ is the projection matrix on the space of X_s .

We verify assumptions (A1)–(A3) under this setup. To see that assumption (A1) holds, we first calculate the Kullback-Leibler divergence between the marginal density of \mathbf{y}_n under \mathbf{s} and that under \mathbf{s}_0 , $\mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0)$, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0) &\propto tr(A_{n,s}) - \log |A_{n,s}| - n \\ &\quad + (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,s_0}^t)^T (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s})^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,s_0}^t) \\ &= tr(A_{n,s}) - \log |A_{n,s}| - n + \Delta_{n,s}. \end{aligned}$$

As the eigenvalues of a projection matrix can only be zero or one, and the traces of P_{n,s_0} and $P_{n,s}$ are $|\mathbf{s}_0|$ and $|\mathbf{s}|$, respectively, we have

$$\begin{aligned} tr(A_{n,s}) &= tr \left[(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s})^{-1} (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s_0}) \right] \\ &= tr \left[I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s})^{-1} (P_{n,s_0} - P_{n,s}) \right] \\ &= n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n tr(D_{n,s}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $D_{n,s} = (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s})^{-1} (P_{n,s_0} - P_{n,s})$. By Result S-2 we have

$$(\sigma_\epsilon^2)^{-1} I_n \geq (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n P_{n,s})^{-1} \geq (\sigma_\epsilon^2 + g_n \sigma_\beta^2)^{-1} I_n,$$

so that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|}{\sigma_\epsilon^2 + g_n \sigma_\beta^2} \leq tr(D_{n,s}) \leq \frac{|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}.$$

Substituting the above in (4.1) yields

$$n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \frac{|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|}{\sigma_\epsilon^2 + g_n \sigma_\beta^2} \leq tr(A_{n,s}) \leq n + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \frac{|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}.$$

As $|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}| \leq |\mathbf{s} \Delta \mathbf{s}_0|$, assuming that $|\mathbf{s} \Delta \mathbf{s}_0| \leq O(p^{\omega_s}) = O(n^{r\omega_s})$, in conjunction with the assumption that $g_n = O(p^{\omega_s})$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{tr(A_{n,s})}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \omega_s = 0; \\ 0 & \text{if } \omega_s \in (0, 1]. \end{cases}$$

Further

$$|A_{n,s}| = \frac{|I + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} P_{n,s_0}|}{|I + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} P_{n,s}|} = \left(1 + \frac{\sigma_\beta^2 g_n}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} \right)^{|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|}.$$

Therefore, $\log |A_{n,s}| / n^{1+2r\omega_s} = (|\mathbf{s}_0| - |\mathbf{s}|) \log \left(1 + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n / \sigma_\epsilon^2 \right) / n^{1+2r\omega_s} \rightarrow 0$, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Combining the above facts, we get, for all $\omega_s \in [0, 1]$,

$$\frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \{tr(A_{n,s}) - \log |A_{n,s}| - n\} \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

Thus

$$\liminf_n \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0) = \liminf_n \frac{\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}}}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}}.$$

Thus assumption (A1) is implied by $\liminf_n n^{-(1+2r\omega_s)} \mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0) > 0$, which is a natural assumption. Bounded, positive eigenvalues of $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ and the second part of Result S-2 (see Section S-7 of the supplement) imply that $\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}}$ is of the same order as $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2$, which again, is $O(n^{1+2r\omega_s})$, as we show below. Viewing the requirement of (A1) from this perspective, it seems natural to demand that the mean functions of the competing and the true models be distinct in the sense that $\liminf_n \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2/n^{1+2r\omega_s} > 0$.

To check assumption (A2) note that for positive definite Hermitian matrices A and B , $\lambda_{\max}(AB) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A)\lambda_{\max}(B)$. Using this fact and as $\sigma_\beta^2 g_n \sigma_\epsilon^{-2} = O(p^{\omega_s})$, it is easily seen that

$$\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) \leq (1 + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \sigma_\epsilon^{-2}) = O(p^{\omega_s}).$$

Finally we check (A3). Note that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 \leq \|X_{\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2,$$

as the prior mean of the j -th covariate $\beta_{0,j}$ remains same accross different models which include the j -th covariate.

Further, recall that for any \mathbf{s} , $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. Since the covariates lie on a compact space, it follows that $\|X_{\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0})^2 = O(np^{2\omega_s}) = O(n^{1+2r\omega_s})$, if $|\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0| = O(p^{\omega_s})$. Thus (A3) holds.

Thus Theorem 1 holds for the linear regression setup. This result is summarized in the form of the following theorem.

Theorem 2. *Consider the linear regression model $y_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}, g_n \sigma_\beta^2 (X_{\mathbf{s}}^T X_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1})$, where $1 \leq |\mathbf{s}| \leq p$ and $p = O(n^r)$, $r > 0$. Assume that the space of covariates is compact, and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{s}|} |\beta_{0,j}| = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. Further, if there exists some $\omega_s \in [0, 1]$ such that $|\mathbf{s}\Delta\mathbf{s}_0| = O(p^{\omega_s})$, and $\mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0)/(n^{1+2r\omega_s}) > 0$, then for $g_n = O(p^{\omega_s})$ the statement of Theorem 1 holds.*

4.2 Gaussian process with squared exponential kernel

We now consider the problem of variable selection in nonparametric model of the form $y = \mathbf{x}_s^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_s + f(\mathbf{x}_s) + \epsilon$, where f belongs to a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} . Let $f(\mathbf{x}_s)$ be modeled by a zero-mean Gaussian process with squared exponential covariance kernel of the form

$$\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{x}_s), f(\mathbf{x}'_s)) = \sigma_f^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{x}'_s)^T D_s (\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{x}'_s) \right\}. \quad (4.2)$$

Here σ_f^2 can be interpreted as the process variance, and the diagonal elements of D_s can be interpreted as the smoothness parameters. As in the case of linear regression, we consider

the Zellner's g -prior for $\beta_{\mathbf{s}}$. Thus, the mean function $\mu_{\mathbf{s}}$ here is of the same form as in the linear regression case.

We denote the covariance matrix by $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$, as before. Note that the (i, j) -th element of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ here is

$$\sigma_{\beta}^2 g_n \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}}^T (X_{\mathbf{s}}^T X_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}} + \sigma_f^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}})^T D_{\mathbf{s}} (\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}}) \right\}.$$

4.2.0.1 True model As before we indicate a particular subset of $\mathbf{S} = \{1, \dots, p\}$ as the true set of regressors \mathbf{s}_0 . The corresponding mean vector and variance matrices are denoted by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$, respectively.

4.2.0.2 Assumption Before verifying assumption (A1)–(A3), we state the following assumption on the design matrix.

(A4) We assume that $\{\mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}} : j = 1, 2, \dots\}$ are such that for all $i \geq 1$,

$$\sum_{j \neq i=1}^n \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}})^T D_{\mathbf{s}} (\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} - \mathbf{x}_{j,\mathbf{s}}) / 2 \right\} = K_{\mathbf{s}} = O(1),$$

where $K_{\mathbf{s}}$ (> 0) may depend upon \mathbf{s} .

Verification of the assumptions

We verify assumptions (A1)–(A3) under this setup and assuming (A4) holds.

First note that assumption (A3) is satisfied in the same way as in the linear regression case.

Before verifying (A1), note that by Gerschgorin's circle theorem, every eigenvalue λ of any $n \times n$ matrix A with (i, j) -th element a_{ij} satisfies $|\lambda - a_{ii}| \leq \sum_{j \neq i} |a_{ij}|$, for at least one $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ (see, for example, [Lange \(2010\)](#)). In our case it then follows by (A4) that the maximum eigenvalue of the covariance matrix associated with $f(\cdot)$ is bounded above by $K_{\mathbf{s}}$. Also, the covariance matrix associated with the linear part $\mathbf{x}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}$ is essentially the projection matrix, with maximum eigenvalue 1. Hence, using the second part of Result [S-2](#), we conclude that the maximum eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ is bounded above by finite $\tilde{K}_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$.

To verify (A1), note that $(\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \succ (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + \tilde{K}_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} I_n$ by the first part of Result [S-2](#). Hence,

$$n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}} > (\sigma_{\epsilon}^2 + \tilde{K}_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2. \quad (4.3)$$

Now, if we wish to enforce distinguishability of only the mean functions of the competing models in the sense that

$$\liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 > 0, \quad (4.4)$$

then it is clear from [\(4.3\)](#) that (A1) holds.

Next we check (A2). By (A4) the maximum eigenvalue of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}$, $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \leq \tilde{K}_{\mathbf{s}_0}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) &= \lambda_{\max} \left[(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \right] \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda_{\max}(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)}{\lambda_{\min}(\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})} \leq \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2 + \tilde{K}_{\mathbf{s}_0}}{\sigma_\epsilon^2} = O(1),\end{aligned}$$

showing that (A2) holds.

Therefore, we have established the following theorem:

Theorem 3. Consider the regression model $y_i = \beta_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} + f(\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}}) + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Let $\beta_{\mathbf{s}} \sim N(\beta_{0,\mathbf{s}}, g_n \sigma_\beta^2 (X_{\mathbf{s}}^T X_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1})$, where $1 \leq |\mathbf{s}| \leq p$ and $p = O(n^r)$, $r > 0$. Let $f(\cdot)$ be a zero-mean Gaussian process with a squared exponential covariance kernel of the form (4.2). Assume that the space of covariates is compact, and $\|\beta_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. If there exists some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$ such that $|\mathbf{s}\Delta_{\mathbf{s}_0}| = O(p^{\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$, and $\liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \|\mu_{\mathbf{s}} - \mu_{\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2 > 0$, and further if (A4) holds, then for $g_n = O(p^{\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$ the statement of Theorem 1 holds.

Additionally, consider the following remarks.

Remark 4. The condition in (4.3) also implies that $\liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0) = \liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \{tr(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) - \log |A_{n,\mathbf{s}}| - n + \Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}}\} > 0$, since $tr(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) - \log |A_{n,\mathbf{s}}| - n \geq 0$. Recall that even in the linear regression setup we had replaced the KL-divergence $\liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \mathcal{KL}^n(\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0) > 0$ with the above mean divergence condition (4.3) to verify (A1), since the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ in that setup are also bounded.

Remark 5. The linear regression term in the mean function can be replaced by any function $\mu_{\mathbf{s}}$ subject to the condition $\|\mu_{\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = O(np^{2\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}) = O(n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$, where $0 \leq \omega_{\mathbf{s}} \leq 1$. It is easy to verify assumptions (A1) and (A3) under the aforementioned restriction on $\mu_{\mathbf{s}}$.

5 The case with unknown error variance

So far we have assumed that the error variance σ_ϵ^2 is known. In reality, this may also be unknown and we need to assign a prior on the same. For our purpose, for any $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \in \mathfrak{X}$, we now set $Cov(f(\mathbf{x}_i), f(\mathbf{x}_j)) = \sigma_\epsilon^2 c(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$, where $c(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})$ is some appropriate correlation function, $i, j = 1, \dots, n$. Thus, we set the process variance of $f(\cdot)$ to be the same as the error variance. Although this might seem somewhat restrictive from the inference perspective, for Bayes factor based variable selection this is quite appropriate, as we establish almost sure exponential convergence of the resultant Bayes factor associated with this prior, in favour of the true set of covariates.

With the aforementioned modification, we assign the conjugate inverse-gamma prior on σ_ϵ^2 with parameters α, β as follows:

$$\pi(\sigma_\epsilon^2) = \frac{\beta^\alpha}{\Gamma(\alpha)} \sigma_\epsilon^{-2(\alpha+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{\beta}{\sigma_\epsilon^2}\right), \quad \alpha > 2, \beta > 0. \quad (5.1)$$

Under the same prior setup on f , the marginal of $\mathbf{y}_n = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ given σ_ϵ^2 is the n -variate normal, given by

$$\mathbf{y}_n \sim N_n(\boldsymbol{\mu}_s, \sigma_\epsilon^2 (I_n + \Sigma_s)), \quad (5.2)$$

where Σ_s is as given in (2.2). After marginalizing σ_ϵ^2 the marginal of \mathbf{y}_n is

$$m_s(\mathbf{y}_n) \propto |I + \Sigma_s|^{-1/2} \left\{ (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) + 2\beta \right\}^{-(\alpha+n/2)+1},$$

which is proportional to the density of multivariate t distribution with location parameter $\boldsymbol{\mu}_s$, covariance matrix $\beta (I_n + \Sigma_s) / (\alpha - 1)$, and degrees of freedom $2(\alpha - 1)$. Thus, $E(\mathbf{y}_n) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_s$, and $Var(\mathbf{y}_n) = \beta (I_n + \Sigma_s) / (\alpha - 2)$, under \mathcal{M}_s .

Here the Bayes factor of any model \mathbf{s} to the true model \mathbf{s}_0 is

$$BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n = \frac{|I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t|^{1/2}}{|I_n + \Sigma_s|^{1/2}} \times \left[\frac{(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) + 2\beta}{(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) + 2\beta} \right]^{-(\alpha+n/2)+1}.$$

As before, define $\mathbf{z}_n \sim N(\mathbf{0}, I_n)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n &= (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t), \\ \Delta_{n, \mathbf{s}} &= (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \text{ and} \\ A_{n, \mathbf{s}} &= (I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1}, \\ C_{n, \mathbf{s}} &= (I_n + \Sigma_{n, \mathbf{s}_0}^t)^{1/2} (I_n + \Sigma_{n, \mathbf{s}})^{-1} (I_n + \Sigma_{n, \mathbf{s}_0}^t)^{1/2}. \text{ Therefore,} \\ &(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) = \mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_n + \Delta_{n, \mathbf{s}} \\ &\quad - 2 (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{n \log n} \log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n \\ &= \frac{\log |C_{n, \mathbf{s}}|}{2n \log n} - \frac{1}{\log n} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[\log \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n + 2\beta}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \log \left\{ \frac{\Delta_{n, \mathbf{s}} + 2\beta + \mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_n}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} - 2 \frac{(\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \right\} \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2 \log n} \log \left\{ \frac{tr(C_{n, \mathbf{s}})}{n} \right\} - \frac{1}{\log n} \left(\frac{1 - \alpha}{n} - \frac{1}{2} \right) \left[\log \left(\frac{\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n + 2\beta}{n} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2r\omega_s \log n - \log \left\{ \frac{\Delta_{n, \mathbf{s}} + tr(C_{n, \mathbf{s}}) + 2\beta}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} + \frac{\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_n - tr(C_{n, \mathbf{s}})}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \frac{2}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} (\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_s)^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \right\} \right], \quad (5.3) \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the log-sum inequality. We modify assumption (A1)–(A3) by replacing σ_ϵ^2 by 1, and term them (A1')–(A3').

Next observe the following facts:

- (i) $E [(\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_n - \text{tr}(C_{n,\mathbf{s}}))]^4 = O(n^{2+8r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$ implying that
 $[\mathbf{z}_n^T C_{n,\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_n - \text{tr}(C_{n,\mathbf{s}})] / n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$. One can prove this in exactly similar way as done in Result 2, using assumptions (A1')–(A3').
- (ii) Similarly, it can be shown that $E [(\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n - n)]^4 = O(n^2)$ implying
 $\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n / n \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$.
- (iii) From the above fact, it follows that $\log(\mathbf{z}_n^T \mathbf{z}_n / n) \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0$ by continuous mapping theorem.
- (iv) Applying (A3'), it can be shown that

$$E \left[(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) \right]^4 = O(n^{2+8r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}+2b}),$$
which in turn implies

$$(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t)^T (I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t) / n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$
- (v) Finally, $\text{tr}(C_{n,\mathbf{s}}) = \text{tr}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) \leq n\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}})$, and $\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,\mathbf{s}}) = O(p^{2\omega_{\mathbf{s}}})$.

Using the above facts, it is easy to see that the right hand side of (5.3) has $\limsup -2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}$, which is negative for $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in (0, 1]$.

When $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} = 0$, similar steps as above would lead to the result

$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}$. Consequently, the following result holds:

Theorem 4. *Consider the setup of Theorem 1 except that the error variance σ_{ϵ}^2 is now unknown. Let an inverse gamma prior with parameters α and β be applied to σ_{ϵ}^2 . Assume that (A1')–(A3') hold for some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in (0, 1]$, and some positive constant $\delta_{\mathbf{s}}$ depending upon \mathbf{s} ($\neq \mathbf{s}_0$). Then*

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n \log n} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

For $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} = 0$, the following holds:

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}.$$

Moreover, if the number of models is finite then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{s} \neq \mathbf{s}_0} \limsup_n \frac{1}{n} \log (BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta.$$

6 Convergence of integrated Bayes factor

Let us suppose, as is usual, that the Bayes factor $BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n$ depends on a set of parameters and hyperparameters, denoted by $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. We denote the Bayes factor by $BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ instead of

$BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n$ to indicate its dependence on $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. If $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the prior for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, supported on Θ , then the integrated Bayes factor is given by

$$IBF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n = \int_{\Theta} BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta}.$$

The following convergence result provides conditions under which the integrated Bayes factor converges to zero almost surely.

Theorem 5. *Assume (A1)–(A3) (or, (A1′)–(A3′)) hold for some $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$, and for each $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and that Θ is compact. Let $g(n) = n^{1+2r\omega_{\mathbf{s}}}$ (in the case of (A1)–(A3), for Theorem 1); or $g(n) = n \log n$ and n for $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} = 0$ and $\omega_{\mathbf{s}} \in (0, 1]$, respectively, (in the case of (A1′)–(A3′), for Theorem 4). Also assume the following:*

(i) $\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / g(n))$ is stochastically equicontinuous,

(ii) $E[\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / g(n))]$ is equicontinuous with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and

(iii) The \limsup and \liminf of $E[\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}) / g(n))]$ are upper and lower semicontinuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$, respectively.

Then, there exists $\delta_{\mathbf{s}} > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_n \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}. \quad (6.1)$$

Proof. As assumptions (A1)–(A3) (or (A1′)–(A3′)) hold by hypothesis, Theorem 2 (or Theorem 4) holds. While proving the theorem we have shown

$$\frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - E\left[\frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right] \stackrel{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0 \quad \text{pointwise in } \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta.$$

By conditions (i) and (ii) of Theorem 5, the difference of the above two functions is stochastically equicontinuous. Further, as Θ is compact, by the stochastic Ascoli lemma (see, e.g., Newey (1991)),

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - E\left[\frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right] \right| \stackrel{a.s.}{\rightarrow} 0, \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty.$$

In other words, given any data sequence, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $n_0(\epsilon)$ such that for $n \geq n_0(\epsilon)$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) - E\left[\frac{1}{g(n)} \log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))\right] \right| < \epsilon/2, \quad (6.2)$$

for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$.

Let us now define $\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$ and $\underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$ such that

$-\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \limsup_n E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \{ \log(\overline{BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})} / g(n)) \}$ and

$-\underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \liminf_n E_{\mathbf{s}_0} \{ \log(\underline{BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})} / g(n)) \}$, where $\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}, \underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} > 0$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$. By

our assumption, $\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$ is upper semicontinuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $\underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}$ is lower semicontinuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Now, by compactness of Θ , we have $\Theta \subset \cup_{i=1}^m \tilde{\Theta}_i$, for some finite $m > 0$, where $\tilde{\Theta}_i$ are such that $\sup_{\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \tilde{\Theta}_i} \|\theta_1 - \theta_2\| < \delta$. Here $\delta (> 0)$ is such that

$$\left| E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta_1)) \right\} - E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta_2)) \right\} \right| < \frac{\epsilon}{6}, \quad (6.3)$$

for large n , due to equicontinuity. Now, for any $\theta \in \Theta$, θ must lie in $\tilde{\Theta}_i$ for some $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Let $\theta_i \in \tilde{\Theta}_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, m$. Then, let us write

$$\begin{aligned} & E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta)) \right\} + \overline{\delta_s(\theta)} \\ &= \left[E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta)) \right\} - E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta_i)) \right\} \right] \\ & \quad + \left[E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta_i)) \right\} + \overline{\delta_s(\theta_i)} \right] - (\overline{\delta_s(\theta_i)} - \overline{\delta_s(\theta)}). \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

The first term on the right hand side of (6.4) is less than $\epsilon/6$ due to (6.3), since both $\theta, \theta_i \in \tilde{\Theta}_i$. The second term on the right hand side of (6.4) is less than $\epsilon/6$ for large enough n by definition of limsup. Since m is finite, the requisite $n_1(\epsilon)$ that n needs to exceed, remains finite for all values of θ . The third term is less than $\epsilon/6$ by definition of upper semicontinuity, given that $\theta, \theta_i \in \tilde{\Theta}_i$. In other words, for all $\theta \in \Theta$, there exists $n_1(\epsilon)$, such that $n \geq n_1(\epsilon)$,

$$E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta)) \right\} + \overline{\delta_s(\theta)} < \frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

Similarly, using the definition of equicontinuity, liminf and lower semicontinuity, it follows that there exists $n_2(\epsilon) \geq 1$ for all $\theta \in \Theta$ such that for $n \geq n_2(\epsilon)$,

$$E_{s_0} \left\{ \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta)) \right\} + \underline{\delta_s(\theta)} > -\frac{\epsilon}{2}.$$

From (6.2) and the above facts, we see that for $n \geq n_3(\epsilon) = \max\{n_1(\epsilon), n_2(\epsilon)\}$, and all $\theta \in \Theta$,

$$\begin{aligned} & -\underline{\delta_s(\theta)} - \epsilon < \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta)) < -\overline{\delta_s(\theta)} + \epsilon, \\ \implies & \exp \left\{ -g(n)(\epsilon + \underline{\delta_s(\theta)}) \right\} < BF_{s, s_0}^n(\theta) < \exp \left\{ g(n)(\epsilon - \overline{\delta_s(\theta)}) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Integrating the above with respect to $\pi(\theta)d\theta$, and taking $g(n)^{-1} \log$ we obtain,

$$-\epsilon + \frac{1}{g(n)} \log \underline{I}_n < \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (IBF_{s, s_0}^n) < \epsilon + \frac{1}{g(n)} \log \bar{I}_n,$$

where $\bar{I}_n = \int_{\Theta} \exp \left(-g(n)\overline{\delta_s(\theta)} \right) \pi(\theta)d\theta$, $\underline{I}_n = \int_{\Theta} \exp \left(-g(n)\underline{\delta_s(\theta)} \right) \pi(\theta)d\theta$. Since both \bar{I}_n and \underline{I}_n are less than one, the statement in (6.1) holds. \square \square

Remark 6. Note that a sufficient condition for stochastic equicontinuity of $\log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/g(n)$ is almost sure Lipschitz continuity of the same, with a bounded Lipschitz constant, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Similarly, a sufficient condition of equicontinuity of $E_{\mathbf{s}_0}[\log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/g(n)]$ is Lipschitz continuity. Again, Lipschitz continuity is ensured by boundedness of the partial derivatives. Hence, if the partial derivatives of $\log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/g(n)$ and its expectation with respect to the components of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ exist and are almost surely bounded for large n , then Lipschitz continuity would follow. This would also imply the semicontinuity assumptions on $E_{\mathbf{s}_0}\{\log(BF_{\mathbf{s},\mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))/g(n)\}$. In our applications, we shall often make use of this sufficient condition.

Remark 7. Note that Theorem 5 is applicable to Gaussian process regression setup where the error variance σ_ϵ^2 , the process variance σ_f^2 , or the diagonal elements of $D_{\mathbf{s}}$ are unknown. The relevant priors, however, need to have compact supports. Although for σ_ϵ^2 and σ_f^2 compactly supported prior is not necessary for proving convergence of Bayes factor (as we have shown consistency under an inverse-gamma prior setup with $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = \sigma_f^2$), but very general priors, albeit with compact supports, can be envisaged for these unknown quantities, without any loss of generality of convergence result for the corresponding integrated Bayes factor. In real problems, some other parameters may be assigned compactly supported priors, while the inverse-gamma prior may be allotted to the variance parameters.

For illustration of the method for verifying the conditions of Theorem 5, in Section 7.1 we consider the case of variable selection in an autoregressive regression model with unknown autoregressive parameter.

7 Bayes factor asymptotics for correlated errors

So far we assumed $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$. However, correlated errors play significant roles in time series models. Indeed, except some simple cases, *i.i.d.* errors will not be appropriate for such models. For instance, the problem of time-varying covariate selection in the AR(1) model $y_t = \rho_0 y_{t-1} + \sum_{i=0}^{|s|} \beta_i x_{it} + \epsilon_t$, $t = 1, 2, \dots$, where $\epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$ and ρ_0 is known, admits the same treatment as in linear regression considered in Section 4.1 by treating $z_t = y_t - \rho_0 y_{t-1}$ as the response. However if ρ_0 is unknown, such simple method is untenable.

In general, we must allow correlated errors, that is, for $\epsilon_n = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^T \sim N_n(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n)$, the zero-mean normal distribution with covariance matrix $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n$. Let the correlation matrix under the true model be $\tilde{\Sigma}_n^t$. With these, we then replace the previous notions $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 I_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$ by $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}$ and $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n^t + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$, respectively, and prove similar results with the assumptions on $A_{n,\mathbf{s}}$ and $\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}}$, where $A_{n,\mathbf{s}} = \left(\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n^t + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right) \left(\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}\right)^{-1}$, and $\Delta_{n,\mathbf{s}} = \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right)^T \left(\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n + \Sigma_{\mathbf{s}}\right)^{-1} \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t\right)$.

7.1 Illustration 3: Autoregressive model

Let us consider the time-varying covariate selection problem in the following $AR(1)$ model. Let

$$y_t = \rho y_{t-1} + \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}_{t,\mathbf{s}} + \epsilon_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2), \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, n. \quad (7.1)$$

where $y_0 \equiv 0$ and $|\rho| < 1$. The above model admits the following representation

$$y_t = \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}} + \tilde{\epsilon}_t, \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}} = \sum_{k=1}^t \rho^{t-k} \mathbf{x}_{k,\mathbf{s}} \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\epsilon}_t = \sum_{k=1}^t \rho^{t-k} \epsilon_k.$$

Thus, $\tilde{\epsilon}_t$ is an asymptotically stationary zero mean Gaussian process with covariance

$$Cov(\tilde{\epsilon}_{t+h}, \tilde{\epsilon}_t) \sim \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2 \rho^h}{1 - \rho^2}, \quad \text{where } h \geq 0. \quad (7.2)$$

Let the true model be of the same form as above but with ρ and \mathbf{s} replaced by ρ_0 and \mathbf{s}_0 , respectively, where $|\rho_0| < 1$. As in the linear regression case we allow $p = O(n^r)$ covariates, with $r > 0$, and $\mathbf{s}_0 \subseteq \mathbf{S} = \{1, \dots, p\}$.

Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}, g_n \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 (Z'_{\mathbf{s}} Z_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1})$, where $Z_{\mathbf{s}}$ is the design matrix associated with $\mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}}$; $t = 1, \dots, n$, and $g_n = O(1)$. This is again Zellner's g prior, but modified to suit the $AR(1)$ setup. As before, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}$ is so chosen that $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{s}|} |\beta_{0,j}| = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. We also assume compactness of the covariate space and that the set of covariates $\{x_j : j \in \mathbf{S}\}$ is non-zero. Let $\pi(\rho)$ be any prior for ρ supported on $[-1 + \gamma, 1 - \gamma]$ for some small enough $\gamma > 0$. The reason for choosing this support will become clear as we proceed.

The conditional expectation of $\boldsymbol{\beta}'_{\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}}$ given ρ , for $t = 1, \dots, n$, is

$$\mu(\mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}}) = \boldsymbol{\beta}'_{0,\mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}},$$

and the covariance between $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{z}_{i,\mathbf{s}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{z}_{j,\mathbf{s}}$ given ρ is

$$Cov(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{z}_{i,\mathbf{s}}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}}^T \mathbf{z}_{j,\mathbf{s}}) = \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 g_n \mathbf{z}'_{i,\mathbf{s}} (Z'_{\mathbf{s}} Z_{\mathbf{s}})^{-1} \mathbf{z}_{j,\mathbf{s}}.$$

Let Σ_ϵ be the $AR(1)$ correlation matrix $((\rho^h))$, $\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n$ be the covariance matrix of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ as given in (7.2), i.e., $\tilde{\Sigma}_n = (1 - \rho^2)^{-1} \Sigma_\epsilon$, $H_{n,\mathbf{s}} := (\sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n + \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 g_n P_{n,\mathbf{s}})$ and $H_{n,\mathbf{s}_0} := \sigma_\epsilon^2 \tilde{\Sigma}_n + \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 g_n P_{n,\mathbf{s}_0}$, where $P_{n,\mathbf{s}}$ is the projection matrix onto the column space of $Z_{\mathbf{s}}$. Then $A_{n,\mathbf{s}} = H_{n,\mathbf{s}_0} H_{n,\mathbf{s}}^{-1}$.

We first verify (A1)–(A3) in this setup. For verification of (A3), note that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,\mathbf{s}} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}^t\|^2 = \|Z_{\mathbf{s}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}} - Z_{\mathbf{s}_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2 \leq 2 \left(\|Z_{\mathbf{s}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|^2 + \|Z_{\mathbf{s}_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2 \right).$$

Now, by our assumptions, for any \mathbf{s} , $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|_{L_1} = O(|\mathbf{s}|)$. We further assume that $\max\{|\mathbf{s}|, |\mathbf{s}_0|\} = O(p^{2\omega_s})$, for $0 \leq \omega_s \leq 1$. Also, since the covariates lie on a compact space and $|\rho|$ is less than one, it follows that $\|Z_{\mathbf{s}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}}\|^2 = \sum_{t=1}^n (\mathbf{z}_{t,\mathbf{s}}^T \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}})^2 = O(np^{2\omega_s}) = O(n^{1+2r\omega_s})$. Similarly, since $|\rho_0| < 1$, $\|Z_{\mathbf{s}_0} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\mathbf{s}_0}\|^2 = O(n^{1+2r\omega_s})$. Thus (A3) holds.

Next we verify (A2). Note that by Lemma S-1 (in Section S-7 of the supplement) the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_\epsilon/(1-\rho^2)$ have strictly positive lower and upper bounds, independent of n if $\rho \in [-1+\gamma, 1-\gamma]$. Further, the eigenvalues of $P_{n,s}$ are either 0 or 1. Thus by Result S-2, $\lambda_{\max}(A_{n,s}) = O(p^{\omega_s})$.

Assuming, as before, that $\liminf_n n^{-1-2r\omega_s} \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t\|^2 > 0$, it is seen that (A1) also holds. Thus, (A1)–(A3) holds.

Next we verify conditions (i)–(iii) of Theorem 5. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \log BF_{s,s_0}^n(\rho) \right) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \text{tr} \left[H_{n,s}^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (H_{n,s}) \right] + \frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \left(\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\mu}_s}{\partial \rho} \right)^T H_{n,s}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s)^T H_{n,s}^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (H_{n,s}) H_{n,s}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s). \end{aligned} \quad (7.3)$$

Consider the first term of (7.3). By Lemma S-1 $H_{n,s}$ has positive and bounded eigenvalues.

Define $D_{n,s} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} H_{n,s}$, and note that

$$D_{n,s} = \frac{\sigma_\epsilon^2}{1-\rho^2} A_n(\rho) + \frac{2\sigma_\epsilon^2 \rho}{(1-\rho^2)^2} \Sigma_\epsilon + \sigma_\beta^2 g_n \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} P_{n,s}, \quad (7.4)$$

where $A_n(\rho) = ((a_{i,j}))$ is defined by $a_{i,j} = |i-j|\rho^{|i-j|-1}$. We will show that $D_{n,s}$ has finite eigenvalues. From Lemma S-1 and Lemma S-2, and the fact that $\rho \in [-1+\gamma, 1-\gamma]$, it is evident that the 2nd and 3rd matrices in the RHS of (7.4) have bounded eigenvalues if g_n is bounded. As both the matrices are symmetric, it follows from Result S-2 that the sum of these two matrices have finite eigenvalues. From Gerschgorin's circle theorem, $\lambda_{\max}(A_n(\rho)) \leq \max_j R_{[j]}$, and $\lambda_{\min}(A_n(\rho)) \geq -\max_j R_{[j]}$ where $R_{[j]}$ is the sum of the absolute values of the non-diagonal entries in the $[j]$ -th row of $A_n(\rho)$ and $[j]$ is the highest integer less than or equal to j . Little algebra shows that $\max_j R_{[j]} = R_{[n/2]} = 2 \{1 - |\rho|^{[n/2]} - [n/2]|\rho|^{[n/2]}(1-|\rho|)\} (1-|\rho|)^{-2}$. As n is large $(1-|\rho|)^{-2} < R_{[n/2]} < 2(1-|\rho|)^{-2}$, which implies that the eigenvalues of the 1st matrix of RHS of (7.4) are bounded. Thus, $D_{n,s}$ has bounded eigenvalues by Result S-2.

Let $\alpha_0 > 0$ be such that $\lambda_{\min}(D_{n,s}) > -\alpha_0$. Then $D_{n,s} + \alpha_0 I$ is a symmetric positive definite matrix. Hence, the absolute value on first term of (7.3) is

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \text{tr} (H_{n,s}^{-1} D_{n,s}) \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \text{tr} [H_{n,s}^{-1} (D_{n,s} + \alpha_0 I) - \alpha_0 H_{n,s}^{-1}] \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \left[|\text{tr} H_{n,s}^{-1} (D_{n,s} + \alpha_0 I)| + \alpha_0 |\text{tr} H_{n,s}^{-1}| \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \lambda_1(H_{n,s}^{-1}) \text{tr} (D_{n,s} + \alpha_0 I) \\ & \quad + \frac{\alpha_0}{2n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \text{tr} (H_{n,s}^{-1}) = O(1). \end{aligned}$$

The last equality holds as the eigenvalues of $H_{n,s}$ are positive and bounded, that of $D_{n,s}$ are bounded, and α_0 is finite.

Next consider the third term of (7.3). Let $H_{n,s}^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) = \mathbf{u}_s$, then this term is $\mathbf{u}_{n,s}^T D_{n,s} \mathbf{u}_{n,s} / 2n^{1+2r\omega_s}$. Using Result S-2 we argue that the third term of (7.3) is lower bounded by $\lambda_{\min}(D_{n,s}) \|\mathbf{u}_{n,s}\|^2 / 2n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ and upper bounded by $\lambda_{\max}(D_{n,s}) \|\mathbf{u}_{n,s}\|^2 / 2n^{1+2r\omega_s}$. Using Result S-2, it can also be shown that $\|\mathbf{u}_{n,s}\|^2$ is bounded by $\lambda_{\max}^{-2}(H_{n,s}) \|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2$ and $\lambda_{\min}^{-2}(H_{n,s}) \|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2$.

Next, we write $\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0} = H_{n,s_0}^{1/2} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n \sim N(\mathbf{0}, I_n)$. It then follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 \\ &= \|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t\|^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 + 2(\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t)^T (\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) \\ &\leq \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n^T H_{n,s_0} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\| \sqrt{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n^T H_{n,s_0} \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n} + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(H_{n,s_0}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n\|^2 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\| \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(H_{n,s_0}) \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n\| + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}^t - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the facts that $\lambda_{\max}(H_{n,s_0})$ is bounded, $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n^T \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_n / n \rightarrow 1$ almost surely as $n \rightarrow \infty$, $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_s - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{s_0}\|^2 / n^{1+2r\omega_s} = O(1)$, and since $|\rho_0|, |\rho| < 1 - \gamma$, almost surely, it follows that $\|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 / n^{1+2r\omega_s} = O(1)$, almost surely. In other words, the third term of (7.3) is $O(1)$ almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

For the second term of (7.3), note that

$$\left| \left(\frac{d\boldsymbol{\mu}_s}{d\rho} \right)^T H_{n,s}^{-1} (\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s) \right| \leq \sqrt{\left(\frac{d\boldsymbol{\mu}_s}{d\rho} \right)^T \left(\frac{d\boldsymbol{\mu}_s}{d\rho} \right)} \times \|\mathbf{u}_s\|.$$

Note that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \boldsymbol{\mu}_s = \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}^T \mathbf{z}_{1,s}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}^T \mathbf{z}_{n,s})^T$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \boldsymbol{\mu}_s \right)^T \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \boldsymbol{\mu}_s \right) &= \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}^T \mathbf{z}_{t,s} \right)^2 = \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}^T \sum_{k=1}^t \rho^{t-k} \mathbf{x}_{k,s} \right)^2 \\ &= \sum_{t=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} (t-k) \rho^{t-k-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}^T \mathbf{x}_{k,s} \right\}^2 \\ &\leq M_n \sum_{t=1}^n \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{t-1} (t-k) \rho^{t-k-1} \right\}^2, \\ &\leq M_n \sum_{t=1}^n \left\{ \frac{1 - \rho^{t-1}(t - t\rho + \rho)}{(1 - \rho)^2} \right\}^2. \end{aligned}$$

for some appropriate $M_n = O(p^{2\omega_s})$ as $\mathbf{x}_{k,s}$ is uniformly bounded for all k , and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}\|^2 = O(\|\mathbf{s}\|^2) = O(p^{2\omega_s})$. As $|\rho| < 1 - \gamma$, the last expression is $O(n)$. Moreover, as $\lambda_{\max}[H_{n,s}^{-2}]$ is bounded and $\|\mathbf{y}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 / n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ is $O(1)$ almost surely, it follows that the second term of (7.3) is $O(1)$ almost surely.

In other words, all the three terms of (7.3) are $O(1)$ almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$. That is, almost surely, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\frac{d}{d\rho} \left(\frac{1}{n^{1+2r\omega_s}} \log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho) \right) = O(1). \quad (7.5)$$

Thus, for any given data sequence in the relevant non-null set, the function $\log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho)/n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ is Lipschitz continuous in ρ . Importantly, (7.5) shows that there exists $n_0 \geq 1$, such that for $n \geq n_0$, the Lipschitz constant for $\log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho)/n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ remains the same. In the same way, it can be shown that $E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho)/n^{1+2r\omega_s}]$ is also Lipschitz in ρ , with bounded Lipschitz constant, as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Further, assuming that the limsup and liminf of $E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho)/n^{1+2r\omega_s}]$ are upper and lower semicontinuous, respectively, and appealing to Theorem 5, we see that (6.1) holds.

We summarize this in the form of the following theorem.

Theorem 6. *Consider the model selection problem in the AR(1) model (7.1) with $p = O(n^r)$, with $r > 0$. Suppose a prior π supported on $[-1 + \gamma, 1 - \gamma]$ is assigned on ρ , and ρ_0 is the true value of ρ , where $|\rho_0| < 1 - \gamma$, for some $\gamma > 0$. Let $\mathbf{s}_0, \mathbf{s} (\subseteq \mathbf{S} = \{1, 2, \dots, p\})$ be the set of indices of the true set of covariates, and a competing model. Assume that $\max\{|\mathbf{s}_0|, |\mathbf{s}|\} = O(p^{\omega_s})$, for some $0 \leq \omega_s \leq 1$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s \sim N(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}, g_n \sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 (Z_s' Z_s)^{-1})$, where $g_n = O(1)$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,s}\|_{L_1} = O(p^{\omega_s})$. If the space of covariates is compact, and the set of covariates $\{x_j : j \in \mathbf{S}\}$ is non-zero, then provided that the limsup and liminf of $E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\rho)/n^{1+2r\omega_s}]$ are upper and lower semicontinuous, respectively, (6.1) holds.*

Note that for simplicity we have assumed σ_{ϵ}^2 to be known in the proof of Theorem 6. However, as the following corollary shows, this is not necessary.

Corollary 1. *Due to Theorem 4, the result of Theorem 6 continues to hold with $n^{1+2r\omega_s}$ replaced with $n \log n$ if we set $\sigma_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^2 = \sigma_{\epsilon}^2$ and assign the conjugate inverse-gamma prior (5.1) to σ_{ϵ}^2 .*

Remark 8. Before proceeding further, it is important to understand the role of ω_s in the results obtained so far. It is evident that ω_s is related to the effective dimensionality of \mathcal{M}_s and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}^t$. When the mean function of the Gaussian process, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_s$, is linear (or, a smooth function of the linear combination of covariates in $|\mathbf{s}|$), and the coefficient of the j -th covariate is associated with same prior across different models \mathcal{M}_s involving it, then $|\mathbf{s} \Delta \mathbf{s}_0| = p^{\omega_s}$. We observed this in the linear regression and Gaussian process regression with squared exponential kernel. However, if this simplification is not available, and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_s$ is any function satisfying $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_s\|^2 = O(n|\mathbf{s}|^2)$, then $\max\{|\mathbf{s}|, |\mathbf{s}_0|\} = p^{\omega_s}$, which is observed in the AR(1) illustration. Finally, if the dimensions of the competing models do not grow with n , then $\omega_s = 0$. Although the role of ω_s varies with the problems setups, existence of an ω_s for which (A1)–(A3) hold, is certain. Consequently, strong Bayes factor consistency is achieved at the rate $n^{1+2r\omega_s}$.

8 Variable selection using Bayes factors in misspecified situations

So far we have investigated consistency of the Bayes factor for variable selection when the true model $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}$ is present in the space of models being compared. However, for a large number of covariates such an assumption need not always be realistic. Indeed, in practice, for a large number available covariates, it is usually not feasible to compare all possible models. As the true subset \mathbf{s}_0 is unknown, it is not unlikely to exclude it from the set of models being considered for comparison. In such cases of omissions, it makes sense to select the best subset \mathbf{s} from the available class of subsets using Bayes factors. Result 3, which may be viewed as an adaptation of Theorem 5 for comparing models that are not necessarily correct, establishes the usefulness of Bayes factors even in the face of such misspecifications.

First consider a simple case. Let $\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2 \subseteq \mathbf{S}$ be two competing models of similar order, in the sense that either $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1}, \omega_{\mathbf{s}_2} > 0$, or $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1} = \omega_{\mathbf{s}_2} = 0$. The following result holds in this setup.

Result 3. *Consider the setup of Section 6 with the error variance σ_ϵ^2 unknown. Let there exist $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1}, \omega_{\mathbf{s}_2}$, such that (A1')–(A3') hold for models $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}, \mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$, respectively, for each $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, where Θ is compact. Assume that, $g(n) = n$ if $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1} = \omega_{\mathbf{s}_2} = 0$, and $g(n) = n \log(n)$ if $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1}, \omega_{\mathbf{s}_2} \in (0, 1]$. Also assume the following:*

- (i) $\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) / g(n)$ is stochastically equicontinuous,
- (ii) $E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) / g(n)]$ is equicontinuous with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$, and
- (iii) The limit of $E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) / g(n)]$ exists and is continuous in $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

If \mathbf{s}_1 and \mathbf{s}_2 are not equal to \mathbf{s}_0 , then there exist $\delta_{\mathbf{s}_1}, \delta_{\mathbf{s}_2} > 0$ associated with models $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$ such that

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -(\delta_{\mathbf{s}_1} - \delta_{\mathbf{s}_2}). \quad (8.1)$$

Proof. Using similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 5, under the assumptions (i)–(iii), one can show that for any \mathbf{s} ,

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{s}}), \quad (8.2)$$

where, due to (iii), $\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})} = \delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \lim_n E_{\mathbf{s}_0} [\log(BF_{\mathbf{s}, \mathbf{s}_0}^n(\boldsymbol{\theta})) / g(n)]$, is continuous for all $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{s}} \in \Theta$ such that by the mean value theorem for integrals,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{I}_n &= \int_{\Theta} \exp\left(-g(n)\overline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = \exp\left(-g(n)\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{s}})\right) \\ &= \int_{\Theta} \exp\left(-g(n)\underline{\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})}\right) \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}) d\boldsymbol{\theta} = I_n. \end{aligned}$$

Noting that

$$\frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_2}^n) = \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_0}^n) - \frac{1}{g(n)} \log(IBF_{\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{s}_0}^n), \quad (8.3)$$

the proof is completed by taking limits of both sides of (8.3), applying (8.2) on the two terms on the right hand side, and denoting $\delta_{\mathbf{s}}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{\mathbf{s}})$ by $\delta_{\mathbf{s}}$ for all \mathbf{s} . \square \square

Remark 9. From Result 3 it follows that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ is the better model than $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$ if $\delta_{\mathbf{s}_1} < \delta_{\mathbf{s}_2}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$ is to be preferred over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ if $\delta_{\mathbf{s}_1} > \delta_{\mathbf{s}_2}$. The Bayes factor converges exponentially fast to infinity and zero, respectively, in these cases. Hence, asymptotically with respect to the Bayes factor, the best subset \mathbf{s} is the one that minimizes $\delta_{\mathbf{s}}$.

Remark 10. Let $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_1} = 0$ and $\omega_{\mathbf{s}_2} > 0$. In this case, it is evident that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ is closer to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}$ than $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$, in the sense that, either $|\mathbf{s}_0 \Delta \mathbf{s}_1| / |\mathbf{s}_0 \Delta \mathbf{s}_2| \rightarrow 0$, or $\max\{|\mathbf{s}_1|, |\mathbf{s}_0|\} / \max\{|\mathbf{s}_2|, |\mathbf{s}_0|\} \rightarrow 0$ (see Remark 8), i.e., $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$ has significantly large number of covariates than $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_0}$, compared to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$. Taking $g(n) = n \log(n)$, and following the steps of Result 3, one can show that

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{g(n)} \log (IBF_{\mathbf{s}_2, \mathbf{s}_1}^n) \stackrel{a.s.}{=} -\delta_{\mathbf{s}_2}.$$

Thus, the Bayes factor favors $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ over $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$, and Bayes factor converges to 0 at an exponentially fast rate.

9 An overview of our simulation and real data experiments

We consider two sets of simulation experiments. In the first set, we provide direct validation of our theoretical results by fixing a true set of covariates and comparing it with specifically chosen incorrect sets of covariates using Bayes factor as the sample size is increased. We demonstrate the validity of our results in the linear regression, Gaussian process regression, as well as in the AR(1) regression context.

In the second simulation scenario, our goal is to identify, using Bayes factors, the true set of data-generating covariates from amongst the set of $2^p - 1$ available subsets of covariates, given any value of p and n . To this end, we devise a novel and efficient variable-dimensional MCMC algorithm for general-purpose variable selection using Bayes factors, in the framework of Transdimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TTMCMC) introduced by [Das and Bhattacharya \(2019\)](#).

Not only do we demonstrate the effectiveness of our strategy with simulation studies involving linear, Gaussian process and AR(1) regressions, but also very successfully apply our procedure to the variable selection problem in a real riboflavin data consisting of $p = 4088$ covariates and $n = 71$ data points, using both linear and Gaussian process regression.

9.1 A briefing on our simulation studies for direct theory validation

In this section σ^2 is assumed to be unknown, and is assigned an Inverse-Gamma(1, 1) prior. The covariates are generated from scaled $t_{(3)}$ distribution, with an AR(1) structured scale matrix Σ_0 , where ρ varies from 0.1–0.25. The total number of covariates p is fixed at 100, where n varies from 150 to 600. Three choices of $|\mathbf{s}_0|$ are taken, viz. $|\mathbf{s}_0| = 10, 40, 70$.

As per our result, we expect the Bayes factor of the true model against any other model to converge to zero as $n \rightarrow \infty$. We pre-select two competing models which are closest to the true model, in appropriate sense. First, a supermodel having k additional covariates, is considered. Second, we choose a model which has the same cardinality as the true model, and exactly k variables are different from the true model. For illustration 1 (linear model) and 3 (AR(1) model) we choose $k = 1$, and for illustration 2 (GP with squared exponential kernel), we choose $k = 5$. We fix the true σ^2 at 1.

We also consider the case for misspecified models in linear regression and GP regression framework. In both the cases we consider two supermodels of the true model, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$, having k_1 and k_2 extra covariates, and $\mathbf{s}_1 \subset \mathbf{s}_2$. Clearly, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$ is closer to the true model than $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_2}$. The simulation set up is kept the same as before. For linear regression we choose $k_1 = 1$, $k_2 = 5$, and for GP regression we choose $k_1 = 5$, $k_2 = 15$.

Finally, for each pair (p, n) and each example, data-generation procedure is repeated 100 times to reduce randomness, and the mean Bayes factor is reported. Very encouraging results are obtained with our strategies in each of the regression scenarios considered. For misspecified models, it is clearly observed that Bayes factor chooses the better model, i.e., $\mathcal{M}_{\mathbf{s}_1}$, at a growing rate with n . The complete details are provided in Section S-1.

9.2 Simulation experiments with Bayes factor oriented TTMCMC

Although a plethora of methods are available for Bayesian variable selection (see, for example, O’Hara and Sillanpää (2009) for a review), including variable-dimensional solutions in the linear and generalized linear regression contexts (see, for example, Sillanpää and Arjas (1998), Lunn *et al.* (2006), Sillanpää *et al.* (2004), Chevalier *et al.* (2020)), implementation of variable selection in the nonparametric Gaussian process regression setup, to the best of our knowledge, is nonexistent in the literature. Therefore, it is imperative to develop new methodologies for practical variable selection implementation in this framework.

Note that when the available number of covariates is even reasonably large, evaluation of the marginal density of the data needed for Bayes factor, even if available in closed form, is infeasible to compute for all possible covariate subsets. Thus, direct comparison of all possible covariate subsets with respect to the marginal density of the data is generally infeasible, and hence suitable MCMC approaches are necessary.

The traditional MCMC approaches are not valid in the model selection scenario. Indeed, different competing models may consist of sets of parameters with varying cardinalities, which would render the fixed-dimensional MCMC methods invalid. In the variable selection setup, at least the regression coefficients of the competing models associated with different subsets of covariates, are variable-dimensional. Thus, variable-dimensional MCMC methods are necessary to handle the Bayesian model selection paradigm. Although reversible jump MCMC (RJMCMC) (Green, 1995) is a valid model-jumping MCMC method, its effectiveness with respect to practical implementation is often very doubtful, with poor mixing properties being the integral part. Thus, considerably more innovative and effective variable-dimensional MCMC procedures are necessary to meet the challenges of complex variable-dimensional problems, such as model selection, among many others.

As such, we shall offer a generic and effective variable-dimensional, Bayes factor oriented solution to any variable selection problem. We employ the novel TTMCMC methodol-

ogy of Das and Bhattacharya (2019) for general variable-dimensional problems, which is a generalization of the fixed-dimensional Transformation based Markov Chain Monte Carlo (TMCMC) of Dutta and Bhattacharya (2014). The most important feature of TMCMC is facilitation of updating all the variables in question simultaneously using appropriate deterministic transformations of even a singleton random variable. This general strategy leads to remarkable improvement of acceptance rates and mixing properties, even in high dimensions. These key features are inherited by TTMCMC in the transdimensional context.

Here we devise a novel TTMCMC algorithm for generic variable selection problems using mixtures of additive and multiplicative transformations of singleton variables, further supplemented with another deterministic transformation step to enhance mixing. The algorithm is available as Algorithm S-2.1 in Section S-2 of the supplement. An important aspect of the algorithm is to propose a new covariate in the “birth move” by Bayes Information Criterion (BIC), given a set of existing covariates. The method of computation of Bayes factors using TTMCMC samples is detailed in Section S-3 of the supplement. In Section S-4 of the supplement we provide the proof of its convergence.

The proposed TTMCMC strategy leads to quite effective variable selection, while exhibiting good mixing properties. We demonstrate this with simulation experiments in linear regression, Gaussian process regression and time series regression setups (see Section S-5 of the supplement).

9.3 Overview of our real data experiment

For real data application of our Bayes factor oriented variable selection procedure, we consider a dataset on riboflavin (vitamin B_2) production rate, where the response variable is the log-transformed riboflavin production rate and the covariates are the logarithms of 4088 gene expression levels. There are only $n = 71$ data points in the data (thus, a *bona fide* real example of the “large p , small n ” setup). This data, made publicly available by Bühlmann *et al.* (2014), has been analyzed by various research groups using traditional classical methods in the linear regression framework. We model this data as linear regression, as well as Gaussian process regression, and using our Bayes factor based covariate selection, obtain very interesting and insightful results as compared to the existing results (see Section S-6 of the supplement).

10 Summary, conclusion and future direction

This work is an effort to establish an asymptotic theory of variable selection using Bayes factor in a general Gaussian process framework that encompasses linear, nonlinear, parametric, nonparametric, independent, as well as dependent setups involving a set of covariates, the size of which is allowed to increase even at much faster rates than the sample size. The setup also includes the special case where the available number of covariates is considered fixed. That even in such a general setup it has been possible to establish almost sure exponential convergence of the Bayes factor in favour of the correct subset of covariates, seems to be quite encouraging. The illustrations in the case of linear regression, Gaussian process model with squared exponential covariance function containing the covariates, and a

first order autoregressive model with time-varying covariates, vindicate the wide applicability of our asymptotic theory. Besides, it has been possible to adapt our main results on Bayes factor consistency to misspecified cases, where the true set of covariates is not included in the subsets of covariates to be compared using Bayes factor. As already explained, misspecification has high likelihood in practice, and from this perspective, the result on almost sure exponential convergence even for misspecifications, seems to be a pleasant one. Recalling the predominance of linear or additive model based Bayes factor asymptotics, and “in probability” convergence of the Bayes factor, our efforts in this work attempt to provide a significant advancement.

Furthermore, we have conducted ample simulation experiments to supplement our theoretical investigations. Indeed, not only have we provided direct validation of our theoretical results; with an eye to variable selection in practical problems, we have devised a generic Bayes factor oriented TTMCMC algorithm for such purpose, demonstrating its efficacy in detecting the true set of covariates from among a very large pool (size $2^p - 1$) of available subsets of covariates, in linear, Gaussian process and AR(1) regression setups. Our TTMCMC strategy also yielded very interesting (and perhaps quite important) variable selection results in the case of a real riboflavin dataset consisting of 4088 covariates and 71 samples, exemplifying an authentic “large p , small n ” real-life scenario.

It is easy to discern that our results and the methods of our proofs can be generalized without substantial modifications to situations where parts of the models are also necessary to select from among a set of possibilities, besides the best set of covariates. For example, in our linear regression example, choice might be necessary between linear and some specified nonlinear regression functions which also encapsulate the covariates in appropriate forms. In our Gaussian process example with squared exponential covariance function, the form of the covariance function may itself be questionable, and needs to be chosen from a set of plausible covariance forms, associated with various stationary and nonstationary Gaussian processes. In the first order autoregressive model example, the order of the autoregression may itself need to be selected. Our primary calculations confirm that our Bayes factor asymptotics admit extension to simultaneous selection of these model parts and the covariates, with additional mild assumptions. These findings, with details, will be communicated elsewhere.

Acknowledgment

We are sincerely grateful to the Associate Editor and the two referees whose comments have led to significant improvement of our article.

Supplementary Material

This document is an addendum to the theory developed in the main manuscript (MB). This supplementary material is organized as follows.

In Section S-1, we numerically validate the results of MB, in the contexts of linear regression (LR), Gaussian process regression (GPR) and AR(1) process regression (AR-1).

Next we consider the problem of Bayes factor based variable selection from among $2^p - 1$ available covariates. In this regard, in Section S-2 we introduce our TTMC MC sampler for general Bayesian variable selection problems. The method of computation of Bayes factors using TTMC MC samples is detailed in Section S-3. In Section S-4 we provide the proof of convergence of our TTMC MC sampler.

In Section S-5 we provide the details of our TTMC MC based variable selection experiments in the contexts of LR, GPR, and AR-1.

In Section S-6 we address variable selection among a set of 4088 covariates in a real, riboflavin dataset, using our Bayes factor oriented TTMC MC methodology, considering both linear and Gaussian process regression, and obtain interesting insights with respect to existing results on variable selection in the same dataset obtained using linear regression and classical methods.

Finally, in Section S-7, we provide the proof of the lemmas and results stated in the MB.

S-1 Direct validation of the theoretical results using simulation experiments

S-1.1 Linear regression

Here we assume $y_i = \beta_{\mathbf{s}_0}^T \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}_0} + \epsilon_i$ where $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$. As stated above the covariates are generated from scaled t_3 distribution, where scale matrix Σ_0 is AR(1) structured, with $\rho = 0.25$. We assign Zellner's g -prior on the regression coefficients $\beta_{\mathbf{s}}$, with $\beta_{0,\mathbf{s}} = (1/p, \dots, 1/p)$, $\sigma_{\beta}^2 = 1$ and $g = 10$. As set of $|\mathbf{s}_0|$ covariates are chosen at random, and the values of the corresponding coefficients are chosen from an Uniform(0, 1) distribution.

The results are summarized in Figure S-1. Note that, the *supermodel* has exactly one extra variable and the *altered model* has exactly one variable different from the true model. Even for such small changes, the Bayes factor identifies the true model efficiently. Further, as the size of the true model increases, Bayes factor becomes more efficient.

S-1.2 Gaussian process with squared exponential kernel

Next we generate data from Gaussian process with squared exponential kernel as given in (4.2). We choose $D_{\mathbf{s}} = \text{diag}\{10, \dots, 10\}$ for all \mathbf{s} , and $\sigma_f^2 = 1$. We choose a constant mean function, $\mu_{\mathbf{s}} = \text{logistic}(\mathbf{x}'_{\mathbf{s}} \beta_{\mathbf{s}})$ for all \mathbf{s} . Note that, the assumptions (A1)-(A3) are satisfied by these choices of the parameters. The coefficients, $\beta_{\mathbf{s},j}$, are generated randomly from independent Uniform(-0.5, 0.5) distributions.

As before the covariates are generated from scaled t_3 distribution, where scale matrix Σ_0 is AR(1) structured, with $\rho = 0.1$. In this case the *supermodel* has $k = 5$ more covariates,




Figure S-1: Line diagram showing how the Bayes factors decrease as sample sizes increase in linear regression when $|s_0| = 10$ (left panel), $|s_0| = 40$ (middle panel), and $|s_0| = 40$ (right panel)

and the *altered model* has $k = 5$ different covariates than the true model. These covariates are randomly selected from the pool of $p - |s_0|$ covariates. Figure S-2 shows the performance of the Bayes factor as n grows. Observe that, unlike both linear regression and AR(1) regression, the Bayes factor detects the true model much faster when some covariates are altered, than a supermodel.

S-1.3 Autoregressive model

The response is now generated from AR(1) model (7.1) with $\rho = 0.25$. The distribution of the covariates, choice of prior on β_s , and the definition of *supermodel* and *altered model* are same as that in Section S-1.1.

As the true value of ρ is not known, we numerically find the integrated marginal likelihood of the true model and the competing model, considering an Uniform($-1, 1$) prior on ρ . The integrated Bayes factor is the ratio of the integrated likelihood of the competing and the true model.

The results are summarized in Figure S-3. As in the case of linear model, Bayes factor efficiently captures the true model even when the competing model is the closest one to the truth.

S-1.4 Misspecified models

Now we compare two nested supermodels of the true model, $\mathcal{M}_{s_1} \subset \mathcal{M}_{s_2}$, with dimensions $|s_1| = k_1$ and $|s_2| = k_2$, respectively. Clearly, the supermodel with lower dimension, \mathcal{M}_{s_1} , is closer to the true model, and the theory suggests that the Bayes factor $\log BF_{s_2, s_1}$ decays with growing n . The linear regression and Gaussian process regression with squared exponential kernel is considered.

In the linear regression, we choose $k_1 = 1$ and $k_2 = 5$. Everything else is kept same as in Section S-1.1, expect here we choose $\beta_{0,s} = (1/2, \dots, 1/2)$. In the Gaussian process




Figure S-2: Line diagram showing how the Bayes factors decrease as sample sizes increase in GP with squared exponential kernel when $|\mathbf{s}_0| = 10$ (left panel), $|\mathbf{s}_0| = 40$ (middle panel), and $|\mathbf{s}_0| = 40$ (right panel)

regression, we choose $k_1 = 5$ and $k_2 = 15$. Everything is kept same as in Section S-1.2. The results are summarized in Figure S-4.

Observe that for both the cases we observe a sharp linear decrease of log Bayes factors as n increases, which validates our theoretical results.

S-2 A generic TTMC MC sampler for variable selection

Here we devise a novel TTMC MC algorithm for generic variable selection problems using mixtures of additive and multiplicative transformations of singleton variables, further supplementing with a deterministic transformation step to enhance mixing. Given a set of existing covariates, we propose a new covariate in the “birth move” by Bayes Information Criterion (BIC). We compute Bayes factors from the available TTMC MC realizations to compare subsets of the covariates. Interestingly, the acceptance ratios of neither TTMC MC, nor TTMC MC, depend upon the proposal distributions, even if they are not symmetric, and even for dimension-changing moves. Thus, these approaches are novel compared to the traditional fixed-dimensional Metropolis-Hastings and the variable-dimensional RJMC MC approach.

We provide our general TTMC MC sampler for variable selection in the form of Algorithm S-2.1. We assume that $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}, \boldsymbol{\vartheta})$ is the set of parameters associated with the model, $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ being the k -dimensional regression coefficients associated with the chosen covariates, where k is a random variable. The parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}$ consists of other sets of parameters, and may even contain several other parameter vectors associated with the covariates, having the same (variable) dimension k as $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. For instance, in a Gaussian process regression, the mean function may be modeled by a linear regression with regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and the covariance function may be modeled by a squared exponential kernel consisting of smoothness parameters having the same random dimension k as $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. We shall denote by $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{s}, k)$ as




Figure S-3: Line diagram showing how the Bayes factors decrease as sample sizes increase in autoregressive model when $|s_0| = 10$ (left panel), $|s_0| = 40$ (middle panel), and $|s_0| = 40$ (right panel)

proportional to the product of the prior and the likelihood, where \mathbf{s} and k , the random subset of covariate indices and its cardinality, are also considered unknown and suitable priors are envisaged for the same. Thus, with abuse of notation for convenience and simplicity, we write the posterior $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, k)$ as

$$\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \mathbf{s}, k) \propto L(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}, k)\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}, k)\pi(\mathbf{s}|k)\pi(k), \quad (\text{S-1})$$

where $\pi(k)$ denotes the prior for k , $\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}, k)$ stands for the prior for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given \mathbf{s} and k , $\pi(\mathbf{s}|k)$ is the prior for \mathbf{s} given k and $L(\boldsymbol{\theta}|\mathbf{s}, k)$ is the likelihood for $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ given \mathbf{s} and k . Given k , we set the uniform prior for \mathbf{s} :

$$\pi(\mathbf{s}|k) = \frac{1}{\binom{p}{k}}, \text{ for } k = 1, \dots, p. \quad (\text{S-2})$$

Algorithm S-2.1. General TTMC algorithm for variable selection.

- Let the initial value be $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(0)} = (\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)}, \boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(0)})$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{k^{(0)}}$, are the coefficients of the $k^{(0)}$ covariates in the current regression model, and $\boldsymbol{\vartheta}^{(0)}$ consists of the initial values of the other model parameters, which may even include other $k^{(0)}$ -dimensional parameters associated with the covariates in the model. Also let $\mathbf{s}^{(0)}$ denote the initial choice for the subset of indices for the covariates associated with the model.
- For $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots$
 1. Generate $u = (u_1, u_2, u_3) \sim \text{Multinomial}(1; w_{b,k^{(t)}}, w_{d,k^{(t)}}, w_{nc,k^{(t)}})$, where $w_{b,k^{(t)}}, w_{d,k^{(t)}}, w_{nc,k^{(t)}}$ are birth, death and no-change probabilities, given $k^{(t)}$. Hence, $w_{b,k^{(t)}}, w_{d,k^{(t)}}, w_{nc,k^{(t)}}$ are non-negative and $w_{b,k^{(t)}} + w_{d,k^{(t)}} + w_{nc,k^{(t)}} = 1$. Also, $w_{b,k^{(t)}} = 0$ if $k^{(t)} = |\mathbf{S}|$ and $w_{d,k^{(t)}} = 0$ if $k^{(t)} = 1$.




Figure S-4: Line diagram showing how the Bayes factor favors the better model as sample sizes increase in the misspecified models setup, in linear regression (top row), and Gaussian process regression (bottom row), when $|s_0| = 10$ (left panel), $|s_0| = 40$ (middle panel), and $|s_0| = 70$ (right panel).

2. If $u_1 = 1$ (increase dimension by selecting a new covariate), generate $U \sim U(0,1)$ and do the following:
- (a) If $U \leq \tilde{p}$, where $\tilde{p} \in [0,1]$ (use additive transformation for dimension change),
- i. Given $\mathbf{s}^{(t)}$, the current subset of covariates and the current set of parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$, select a new covariate $\{x_{ir} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $r \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{s}^{(t)}$, by minimizing $BIC(u)$, for $u \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{s}^{(t)}$. Here $BIC(u)$ stands for the BIC when the model consists of the covariates indexed by $\{\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, u\}$. Let $\mathbf{s}' = \{\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, r\}$.
 - ii. Randomly select a co-ordinate from $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)})$ assuming uniform probability $1/k^{(t)}$ for each co-ordinate. Let j denote the chosen co-ordinate.
 - iii. Generate $\epsilon_1 \sim N(0,1)$ and propose the following birth move:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j-1}^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} + a_{\beta,j}|\epsilon_1|, \beta_j^{(t)} - a_{\beta,j}|\epsilon_1|, \beta_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$

Here $a_{\beta,j}$ is the appropriate positive scaling constant associated with the j -th co-ordinate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. In general, $a_{\theta,j}$ will stand for the appropriate positive scaling constant associated with the j -th co-ordinate of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$.

- iv. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ as $(\beta'_1, \beta'_2, \dots, \beta'_{k^{(t)+1}})$.
 - A. If there is another set of real-valued variable-dimensional parameters, say, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, associated with the covariates, then also generate $\epsilon_2 \sim N(0,1)$ and propose
$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = (\gamma_1^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_j^{(t)} + a_{\gamma,j}|\epsilon_2|, \gamma_j^{(t)} - a_{\gamma,j}|\epsilon_2|, \gamma_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$
 - B. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ as $(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \dots, \gamma'_{k^{(t)+1}})$.
 - C. Repeat the procedure for further sets of variable-dimensional parameters related to the covariates.
 - D. Keep all other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ unchanged, and refer to the entire set of proposed parameter values as $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$.
- v. If $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the only variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the birth move is:

$$a_b = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k^{(t)} + 1} \times \frac{w_{d,k^{(t)+1}}}{w_{b,k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times 2a_{\beta,j} \right\}.$$

- A. If $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is another real-valued variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the birth move is:

$$a_b = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k^{(t)} + 1} \times \frac{w_{d,k^{(t)+1}}}{w_{b,k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times 2a_{\beta,j} \times 2a_{\gamma,j} \right\},$$

that is, $2a_{\gamma,j}$ must also be multiplied to the acceptance ratio.

B. For further real-valued variable-dimensional parameter associated with the covariates, the process must be continued by further multiplying twice the scaling constant of the relevant parameter to the acceptance ratio.

vi. Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1) & \text{with probability } a_b \\ (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)}) & \text{with probability } 1 - a_b. \end{cases}$$

- (b) If $U > \tilde{p}$ (use multiplicative transformation for dimension change),
- i. Given $\mathbf{s}^{(t)}$, the current subset of covariates and the current set of parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$, select a new covariate $\{x_{ir} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$, where $r \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{s}^{(t)}$, by minimizing $BIC(u)$, for $u \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{s}^{(t)}$. Let $\mathbf{s}' = \{\mathbf{s}^{(t)}, r\}$.
 - ii. Randomly select a co-ordinate from $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)})$ assuming uniform probability $1/k^{(t)}$ for each co-ordinate. Let j denote the chosen co-ordinate.
 - iii. Generate $\epsilon_1 \sim U(-1, 1)$ and propose the following birth move:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j-1}^{(t)}, \beta_j^{(t)} \epsilon_1, \beta_j^{(t)} / \epsilon_1, \beta_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$

- iv. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ as $(\beta'_1, \beta'_2, \dots, \beta'_{k^{(t)+1}})$.
 - A. If there is another set of real-valued variable-dimensional parameters, say, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, associated with the covariates, then also generate $\epsilon_2 \sim U(-1, 1)$ and propose

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = (\gamma_1^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_j^{(t)} \epsilon_2, \gamma_j^{(t)} / \epsilon_2, \gamma_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$

- B. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ as $(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \dots, \gamma'_{k^{(t)+1}})$.
 - C. Repeat the procedure for further sets of variable-dimensional parameters related to the covariates.
 - D. Keep all other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ unchanged, and refer to the entire set of proposed parameter values as $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$.
- v. If $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the only variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the birth move is:

$$a_b = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k^{(t)} + 1} \times \frac{w_{d, k^{(t)+1}}}{w_{b, k^{(t)}}} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{|\beta_j^{(t)}|}{|\epsilon_1|} \right\}.$$

- A. If $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is another real-valued variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the birth move is:

$$a_b = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k^{(t)} + 1} \times \frac{w_{d, k^{(t)+1}}}{w_{b, k^{(t)}}} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{|\beta_j^{(t)}|}{|\epsilon_1|} \times \frac{|\gamma_j^{(t)}|}{|\epsilon_2|} \right\}.$$

B. For further variable-dimensional parameter associated with the covariates, noting that the process must be continued by further multiplying the ratio of the absolute value of the current parameter value and the relevant ϵ , to the acceptance ratio.

vi. Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} + 1) & \text{with probability } a_b \\ (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)}) & \text{with probability } 1 - a_b. \end{cases}$$

3. If $u_2 = 1$ (decrease dimension by deleting an existing covariate), generate $U \sim U(0, 1)$ and do the following:

(a) If $U \leq \tilde{p}$ (use additive transformation for dimension change),

i. Randomly select a co-ordinate j from $\{1, \dots, k^{(t)}\}$ assuming uniform probability $1/k^{(t)}$ for each co-ordinate, and randomly select a co-ordinate j' from $\{1, \dots, k^{(t)}\} \setminus \{j\}$ with probability $1/(k^{(t)} - 1)$. Assuming $j < j'$, let $\beta_j^* = (\beta_j^{(t)} + \beta_{j'}^{(t)})/2$. Replace $\beta_j^{(t)}$ with β_j^* and delete $\beta_{j'}^{(t)}$.

ii. Delete $\{x_{ij'} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s}^{(t)} \setminus \{j'\}$.

iii. Propose the following death move:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j-1}^{(t)}, \beta_j^*, \beta_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j'-1}^{(t)}, \beta_{j'+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$

iv. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ as $(\beta'_1, \beta'_2, \dots, \beta'_{k^{(t)}-1})$.

A. If there is another set of real-valued variable-dimensional parameters, say, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, associated with the covariates, then propose

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = (\gamma_1^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_j^*, \gamma_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j'-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_{j'+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}),$$

where $\gamma_j^* = (\gamma_j^{(t)} + \gamma_{j'}^{(t)})/2$.

B. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ as $(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \dots, \gamma'_{k^{(t)}-1})$.

C. Repeat the procedure for further sets of variable-dimensional parameters related to the covariates.

D. Keep all other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ unchanged, and refer to the entire set of proposed parameter values as $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$.

v. If $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the only variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the death move is:

$$a_d = \min \left\{ 1, k^{(t)} \times \frac{w_{b, k^{(t)}-1}}{w_{d, k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{1}{2a_{\beta, j}} \right\}.$$

A. If $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ is another real-valued variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the death

move is:

$$a_d = \min \left\{ 1, k^{(t)} \times \frac{w_{b,k^{(t)}-1}}{w_{d,k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{1}{2a_{\beta,j}} \times \frac{1}{2a_{\gamma,j}} \right\},$$

that is, $1/(2a_{\gamma,j})$ must also be multiplied to the acceptance ratio.

B. For further real-valued variable-dimensional parameter associated with the covariates, the process must be continued in the above manner.

vi. Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1) & \text{with probability } a_d \\ (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)}) & \text{with probability } 1 - a_d. \end{cases}$$

- (b) If $U > \tilde{p}$ (use multiplicative transformation for dimension change),
- i. Randomly select a co-ordinate j from $\{1, \dots, k^{(t)}\}$ assuming uniform probability $1/k^{(t)}$ for each co-ordinate, and randomly select a co-ordinate j' from $\{1, \dots, k^{(t)}\} \setminus \{j\}$ with probability $1/(k^{(t)}-1)$. Assuming $j < j'$, let $\beta_j^* = \sqrt{|\beta_j^{(t)} \beta_{j'}^{(t)}|}$ with probability $1/2$ and set $\beta_j^* = -\sqrt{|\beta_j^{(t)} \beta_{j'}^{(t)}|}$ with the remaining probability. Replace $\beta_j^{(t)}$ with β_j^* and delete $\beta_{j'}^{(t)}$.
 - ii. Delete $\{x_{ij'} : i = 1, \dots, n\}$. Let $\mathbf{s}' = \mathbf{s}^{(t)} \setminus \{j'\}$.
 - iii. Propose the following death move:

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}' = (\beta_1^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j-1}^{(t)}, \beta_j^*, \beta_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{j'-1}^{(t)}, \beta_{j'+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \beta_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}).$$

- iv. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}'$ as $(\beta'_1, \beta'_2, \dots, \beta'_{k^{(t)}-1})$.
 - A. If there is another set of real-valued variable-dimensional parameters, say, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$, associated with the covariates, then propose

$$\boldsymbol{\gamma}' = (\gamma_1^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_j^*, \gamma_{j+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{j'-1}^{(t)}, \gamma_{j'+1}^{(t)}, \dots, \gamma_{k^{(t)}}^{(t)}),$$

where $\gamma_j^* = \sqrt{|\gamma_j^{(t)} \gamma_{j'}^{(t)}|}$ or $-\sqrt{|\gamma_j^{(t)} \gamma_{j'}^{(t)}|}$ with equal probabilities.

- B. Re-label the elements of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}'$ as $(\gamma'_1, \gamma'_2, \dots, \gamma'_{k^{(t)}-1})$.
 - C. Repeat the procedure for further sets of variable-dimensional parameters related to the covariates.
 - D. Keep all other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ unchanged, and refer to the entire set of proposed parameter values as $\boldsymbol{\theta}'$.
- v. If $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the only variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the death move is:

$$a_d = \min \left\{ 1, k^{(t)} \times \frac{w_{b,k^{(t)}-1}}{w_{d,k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{1}{|\beta_{j'}^{(t)}|} \right\}.$$

- A. If γ is another real-valued variable-dimensional parameter related to the covariates, then the acceptance probability of the death move is:

$$a_d = \min \left\{ 1, k^{(t)} \times \frac{w_{b,k^{(t)}-1}}{w_{d,k^{(t)}}} \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times \frac{1}{|\beta_{j'}^{(t)}|} \times \frac{1}{|\gamma_{j'}^{(t)}|} \right\},$$

that is, $1/|\gamma_{j'}^{(t)}|$ must also be multiplied to the acceptance ratio.

- B. For further real-valued variable-dimensional parameter associated with the covariates, the process must be continued in the above manner.

vi. Set

$$(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = \begin{cases} (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k^{(t)} - 1) & \text{with probability } a_d \\ (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)}) & \text{with probability } 1 - a_d. \end{cases}$$

4. If $u_3 = 1$ (dimension remains unchanged), then given that there are d dimensions in the current iteration, generate $U \sim U(0,1)$.

(a) If $U \leq \tilde{p}$, then do the following:

- (i) For parameters β , γ , etc. associated with the covariates, for $j = 1, \dots, k^{(t)}$, set $\tilde{a}_{\beta,j} = ca_{\beta,j}$, $\tilde{a}_{\gamma,j} = ca_{\gamma,j}$, etc. where $c \in (0,1)$ is some appropriate constant. For all other parameter co-ordinates θ_j , let $\tilde{a}_{\theta,j} = a_{\theta,j}$.

- (ii) Generate $\varepsilon \sim N(0,1)$, $b_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(\{-1,1\})$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$, and set $\theta'_j = \theta_j^{(t)} + b_j \tilde{a}_{\theta,j} |\varepsilon|$, for $j = 1, \dots, d$.

(iii) Evaluate

$$\alpha_1 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \right\}.$$

- (iv) Set $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})$ with probability α_1 , else set $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})$.

(b) If $U > \tilde{p}$, then do the following:

- (i) Generate $\varepsilon \sim U(-1,1)$, $b_j \stackrel{iid}{\sim} U(\{-1,0,1\})$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$, and set $\theta'_j = \theta_j^{(t)} \varepsilon$ if $b_j = 1$, $\theta'_j = \theta_j^{(t)} / \varepsilon$ if $b_j = -1$ and $\theta'_j = \theta_j^{(t)}$ if $b_j = 0$, for $j = 1, \dots, d$. Calculate $|J| = |\varepsilon|^{\sum_{j=1}^d b_j}$.

(ii) Evaluate

$$\alpha_2 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})} \times |J| \right\}.$$

- (iii) Set $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})$ with probability α_2 , else set $(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k^{(t)})$.

5. (*Mixing-enhancement step*) Assume that there are d dimensions in the current iteration after implementing either of the birth, death and no-change steps. Generate $U \sim U(0, 1)$.

(a) If $U \leq \tilde{q}$, where $\tilde{q} \in (0, 1)$, then do the following

(i) For parameters β , γ , etc. associated with the covariates, for $j = 1, \dots, k^{(t+1)}$, set $\tilde{a}_{\beta,j} = ca_{\beta,j}$, $\tilde{a}_{\gamma,j} = ca_{\gamma,j}$, etc. where $c \in (0, 1)$ is some appropriate constant. For all other parameter co-ordinates θ_j , let $\tilde{a}_{\theta,j} = a_{\theta,j}$.

(ii) Generate $\tilde{U} \sim U(0, 1)$ and $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$. If $\tilde{U} < 1/2$, set $\theta_j'' = \theta_j^{(t+1)} + \tilde{a}_{\theta,j}|\varepsilon|$, for $j = 1, \dots, d$; else, set $\theta_j'' = \theta_j^{(t+1)} - \tilde{a}_{\theta,j}|\varepsilon|$, for $j = 1, \dots, d$.

(iii) Letting $\boldsymbol{\theta}'' = (\theta_1'', \dots, \theta_d'')$, evaluate

$$\alpha_3 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}'', \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})} \right\}.$$

(iv) Set $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'', \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})$ with probability α_3 , else set $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})$.

(b) If $U > \tilde{q}$, then

(i) Generate $\varepsilon \sim U(-1, 1)$ and $\tilde{U} \sim U(0, 1)$. If $\tilde{U} < 1/2$, set $\theta_j'' = \theta_j^{(t+1)}\varepsilon$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $|J| = |\varepsilon|^d$, else set $\theta_j'' = \theta_j^{(t+1)}/\varepsilon$ for $j = 1, \dots, d$ and $|J| = |\varepsilon|^{-d}$.

(ii) Evaluate

$$\alpha_4 = \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}'', \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})} \times |J| \right\}.$$

(iii) Set $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}'', \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})$ with probability α_4 , else set $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)}) = (\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t+1)}, k^{(t+1)})$.

• End for

• Store $\{(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(0)}, \mathbf{s}^{(0)}, k^{(0)}), (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{(1)}, \mathbf{s}^{(1)}, k^{(1)}), \dots\}$ for Bayesian inference.

The main strategies proposed in the general TTMCMC Algorithm S-2.1 for variable selection require some elucidation. In this regard, a few remarks are in order.

First, we propose a mixture of additive and multiplicative transformations in all the steps of the algorithm, since it has been observed in Dey and Bhattacharya (2016) that such mixture proposal induces better mixing than either additive or multiplicative transformations using the localised moves of the additive transformation and the non-localised (“random dive”) moves of the multiplicative transformation (see also Dutta (2012) for some theoretical details on random dive).

In the dimension-changing steps 2. and 3. of Algorithm S-2.1, except for the parameters associated with increase or decrease of the dimension, we have proposed to keep all the

remaining parameters fixed. Fixing the other parameters is not necessary for the validity of TTMC; indeed, [Das and Bhattacharya \(2019\)](#) proposed to update all the parameters even in the dimension-changing steps. However, in our variable selection experiments, fixing the remaining parameters led to significantly improved acceptance rates of the birth and death steps compared to the strategy of updating all the unknowns simultaneously. The choice of the positive scales $a_{\theta,j}$ in the additive transformation part plays important role here. To elucidate, note that it is natural to expect high acceptance rates with sufficiently small scales in fixed-dimensional problems, but in our variable-dimensional setup, observe that the acceptance ratios for the birth and death steps depend upon the scales of the parameters selected for birth and death. If the scales are generally chosen to be small, then the acceptance rate for the birth move would be small as well. On the other hand, if the scales are generally chosen to be relatively large, then the acceptance rate for the entire dimension-changing move would be small, for a relatively large number of parameters. With these small or large scale choices, the acceptance ratios in the no-change (fixed-dimensional) step 4. and the mixing-enhancement step 5. would also be small.

We attempt to solve all the above problems with the strategy of choosing somewhat large scales $a_{\theta,j}$ and by fixing the parameters in the birth and death steps that are not involved in dimension-change. The relatively large scales would ensure adequate acceptance rate for the birth move; note that the scales should not be so large as to reduce the death rate significantly. Now, these large scales would also diminish the acceptance rates in the no-change and the mixing-enhancement steps. To counter this, we multiply the scales of the parameters associated with the covariates by $c \in (0, 1)$ in those steps, which is a valid mathematical strategy in the sense of satisfying detailed balance. Further discussion regarding these will be provided in course of the applications of Algorithm [S-2.1](#).

The fixed-dimensional mixing-enhancement step has parallels with [Liu and Sabatti \(2000\)](#) (see also the supplement of [Dutta and Bhattacharya \(2014\)](#) and Algorithm 2 of [Roy and Bhattacharya \(2020\)](#)). Indeed, it has been observed that the strategy can often drastically improve the mixing properties in fixed-dimensional setups.

Finally, note that \mathbf{s} and k are not updated in the no-change and mixing enhancing steps, so that $\pi(\mathbf{s}|k)\pi(k)$ gets cancelled in the corresponding acceptance ratios.

S-3 Bayes factor computation using TTMC realizations

Assuming that there are N realizations of TTMC stored for Bayesian inference after discarding a suitable burn-in period, the Bayes factors associated with the distinct subsets of the covariates featuring in the TTMC samples can be calculated as follows.

Let there be \tilde{N} ($< N$) distinct subsets $\{\mathbf{s}_1^*, \mathbf{s}_2^*, \dots, \mathbf{s}_{\tilde{N}}^*\}$ in the TTMC sample, each subset consisting of distinct indices of a set of covariates which is a subset of the entire pool of covariates indexed by \mathbf{S} . Thus, the TTMC sample consists of \tilde{N} distinct subsets of covariates out of a total $2^p - 1$ possibilities, $p = |\mathbf{S}|$ being the total available number of covariates. The subsets of covariates that did not feature in the TTMC sample will be interpreted as having negligible posterior probabilities and will be not be considered any

further for our Bayesian analyses.

For $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$, assuming that \mathbf{s}_i^* is repeated N_i times in the TTMC sample, so that $\sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{N}} N_i = N$, we estimate its posterior probability by $\tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{s}_i^*) = N_i/N$. Let $k_i^* = |\mathbf{s}_i^*|$ be the cardinality of \mathbf{s}_i^* . Note that the prior for the model associated with any subset \mathbf{s} consisting of k covariates is uniform over all $\binom{p}{k}$ possibilities, given by (S-2). Hence, the marginal prior probability of \mathbf{s} with $|\mathbf{s}| = k$ is

$$\pi(\mathbf{s}) = \sum_{j=1}^p \pi(\mathbf{s}|j)\pi(j) = \pi(\mathbf{s}|k)\pi(k) = \frac{\pi(k)}{\binom{p}{k}}, \quad (\text{S-1})$$

since $\pi(\mathbf{s}|j) = 0$ if $j \neq k$. In the above, $\pi(k)$ denotes the prior for k .

Using (S-1), we compute for each $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$,

$$B_i = \frac{\tilde{\pi}(\mathbf{s}_i^*)}{\pi(\mathbf{s}_i^*)} = \frac{N_i}{N} \times \frac{\binom{p}{k_i^*}}{\pi(k_i^*)}. \quad (\text{S-2})$$

For any $i, j \in \{1, \dots, \tilde{N}\}$, the (approximate) Bayes factor of the model associated with \mathbf{s}_i^* against that associated with \mathbf{s}_j^* is given by

$$BF_{ij} = B_i/B_j. \quad (\text{S-3})$$

Thus, the best model is the one with the largest B_i ; $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$. Note that B_i is proportional to the marginal density of the data, given the i -th model, where the proportionality constant is the same for all the competing models.

S-4 Proof of convergence of the TTMC algorithm

To prove convergence of Algorithm S-2.1 it is sufficient to establish detailed balance, irreducibility and aperiodicity of the algorithm, which we undertake step-by-step in this section. For simplicity, let us assume that $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the only parameter vector associated with the covariates. The extension is trivial for other parameter vectors associated with the covariates.

S-4.1 Proof of detailed balance

S-4.1.1 Additive transformation

Let us first consider the case of the additive transformation, which we select with probability \tilde{p} . To see that detailed balance is satisfied for the birth and death moves, note that associated with the birth move, the probability (essentially) of transition $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \mapsto (\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)$, with $k = |\mathbf{s}^{(t)}|$ and $k+1 = |\mathbf{s}'|$ (so that $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)} \in \mathbb{R}^k$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}' \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1}$), while the other elements

of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are held fixed, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \times \tilde{p} \times \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times N(\epsilon : 0, 1) \\
& \quad \times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k+1} \times \frac{w_{d,k+1}}{w_{b,k}} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)} \times \left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \epsilon)} \right| \right\} \\
& = \tilde{p} \times N(\epsilon : 0, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k+1) \times \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \times w_{d,k+1} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times \left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon)} \right| \right\}, \tag{S-1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $N(\epsilon : 0, 1)$ is the density of the normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 1, evaluated at ϵ . Assuming that $\beta_j^{(t)}$ was selected, and was split into $\beta_j^{(t)} + a_{\beta,j}\epsilon$ and $\beta_j^{(t)} - a_{\beta,j}\epsilon$, $\left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \epsilon)} \right| = 2a_{\beta,j}$.

At the reverse death move we must be able to return to $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)$ from $(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)$, while the other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are held fixed. We select β'_j with probability $1/(k+1)$, then select β'_{j+1} without replacement with probability $1/k$, and take the resultant average.

Let ϵ^* be such that $\beta_j^{(t)} + a_{\beta,j}\epsilon^* = \beta'_j$ and $\beta_j^{(t)} - a_{\beta,j}\epsilon^* = \beta'_{j+1}$, so that $\epsilon^* = (\beta'_j - \beta'_{j+1})/2$. The transition probability of the death move is hence given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times \tilde{p} \times w_{d,k+1} \times N(\epsilon, 0, 1) \times \frac{1}{k+1} \times \frac{1}{k} \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)} \right| \\
& \quad \times \min \left\{ 1, (k+1) \times \frac{w_{b,k}}{w_{d,k+1}} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)} \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)} \right| \right\} \\
& = \tilde{p} \times N(\epsilon : 0, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times w_{d,k+1} \times \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)} \right|, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \right\} \\
& = \tilde{p} \times N(\epsilon : 0, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times w_{d,k+1} \times \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \times 2a_{\beta,j}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \right\}. \tag{S-2}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, (S-1) = (S-2), showing that detailed balance holds for the birth and the death moves. The proof of detailed balance for the no-change move type where the dimension remains unchanged is the same as that of TCMC, and has been proved in the supplement of [Dutta and Bhattacharya \(2014\)](#).

S-4.1.2 Multiplicative transformation

Now let us consider the multiplicative transformation, which we select with probability $1 - \tilde{p}$. For the birth move, the probability (essentially) of the transition $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \mapsto (\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{s}, k+1)$,

while the other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are held fixed, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \times (1 - \tilde{p}) \times \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times U(\epsilon : -1, 1) \\
& \quad \times \min \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{k+1} \times \frac{w_{d,k+1}}{w_{b,k}} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)} \times \left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon)} \right| \right\} \\
& = (1 - \tilde{p}) \times U(\epsilon : -1, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \times \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k}, \right. \\
& \quad \left. \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \times w_{d,k+1} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times \frac{1}{2} \times \left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon)} \right| \right\}, \tag{S-3}
\end{aligned}$$

where $U(\epsilon : -1, 1)$ is the density of the uniform distribution on $[-1, 1]$, evaluated at ϵ . Assuming that $\beta_j^{(t)}$ was selected, and was split into $\beta_j^{(t)}\epsilon$ and $\beta_j^{(t)}/\epsilon$, $\left| \frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}'}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon)} \right| = 2|\beta_j^{(t)}|/|\epsilon|$.

At the reverse death move we must be able to return to $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)$ from $(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)$, while the other elements of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are held fixed. We select β'_j with probability $1/(k+1)$, then select β'_{j+1} without replacement with probability $1/k$, and take $\sqrt{|\beta'_j \beta'_{j+1}|}$ or $-\sqrt{|\beta'_j \beta'_{j+1}|}$ with equal probabilities.

Let ϵ^* be such that $\beta'_j \epsilon^* = \beta'_j$ and $\beta'_j / \epsilon^* = \beta'_{j+1}$, so that $\epsilon^* = \pm \sqrt{|\beta'_j \beta'_{j+1}|}$. The transition probability of the death move is hence given by:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times (1 - \tilde{p}) \times w_{d,k+1} \times U(\epsilon, -1, 1) \times \frac{1}{k+1} \times \frac{1}{k} \times \frac{1}{2} \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)} \right| \\
& \quad \times \min \left\{ 1, (k+1) \times \frac{w_{b,k}}{w_{d,k+1}} \times \frac{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k)}{\pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1)} \times 2 \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)} \right| \right\} \\
& = (1 - \tilde{p}) \times U(\epsilon : -1, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times w_{d,k+1} \times \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \times \frac{1}{2} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times \left| \frac{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}', \epsilon)}{\partial(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(t)}, \epsilon^*, \epsilon)} \right|, \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \right\} \\
& = (1 - \tilde{p}) \times U(\epsilon : -1, 1) \times \min \left\{ \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}', \mathbf{s}', k+1) \times w_{d,k+1} \times \frac{1}{k(k+1)} \right. \\
& \quad \left. \times |\beta'_{j'}|, \frac{1}{k} \times w_{b,k} \times \pi(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}, \mathbf{s}^{(t)}, k) \right\}. \tag{S-4}
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that $|\beta'_{j'}| = |\beta_j^{(t)}|/|\epsilon|$, it is seen that (S-3) = (S-4); that is, detailed balance holds for the birth and the death moves with respect to the multiplicative transformation. Again, the proof of detailed balance for the no-change move type where the dimension remains unchanged is the same as that of TMCMC.

Also, the proof of detailed balance of the mixing-enhancement step (Step 5. of Algorithm S-2.1) is the same as that of TMCMC.

S-4.2 Irreducibility and aperiodicity

The proof of irreducibility and aperiodicity of Algorithm S-2.1 follows easily from the general arguments provided in the supplements of [Das and Bhattacharya \(2019\)](#) and [Dutta and Bhattacharya \(2014\)](#).

S-5 Bayes factor based variable selection experiments with TTMC

We now provide details of our simulation studies with respect to variable selection. We consider linear regression (Section 4.1 of MB), Gaussian process regression with squared exponential covariance kernel (Section 4.2 of MB) as well as autoregressive regression (Section 7.1 of MB) for our purpose.

S-5.1 Linear regression

S-5.1.1 Data generation with random sets of covariates

As in Section 4.1 of MB, we consider the model of the form $y_i = \beta_{\mathbf{s}}' \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}} + \epsilon_i$, where $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$. For the true, data-generating model, we set $\sigma_\epsilon^2 = 0.1$, and set, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $j = 1, \dots, p = |\mathbf{S}|$, $x_{ij} = 5/j + \eta_{ij}$, where $\eta_{ij} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\eta^2)$, with $\sigma_\eta^2 = 0.1$. For generating the data, we randomly select a subset \mathbf{s} from the set \mathbf{S} associated with p covariates, construct $\mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}}$ and simulate the elements of the regression coefficient vector $\beta_{\mathbf{s}}$ independently from $N(0, \sigma_b^2)$, with $\sigma_b^2 = 5$. We also consider an intercept α in our data-generating model, which we simulate as $\alpha \sim N(\mu_\alpha, \sigma_\alpha^2)$, with $\mu_\alpha = 1$ and $\sigma_\alpha^2 = 0.1$. Abusing notation for convenience, we shall assume that α is the first element of $\beta_{\mathbf{s}}$ and that the vector of ones is the first column of the design matrix $X_{\mathbf{s}}$. With this setup, we then generate the data from the resulting true regression model.

For data generation, we consider three scenarios. Setting $p = 10, 20, 30$, we generate $n = 25, 25, 35$ data-points for the respective values of p . We repeat the data-generation procedure 1000 times for each pair (p, n) , so that for every (p, n) , we have 1000 datasets, each consisting of n data-points and a random subset of covariates selected from the possible p covariates. For each of the 1000 simulated datasets, we attempt to select the best subset of covariates using Bayes factor obtained through TTMC. The Bayesian model and prior specifications that we used for the purpose is detailed next.

S-5.1.2 Bayesian linear regression model and prior specification for variable selection using TTMC and Bayes factors

Then assuming that the model for the simulated data y_i is normal linear regression (with intercept) on an unknown subset of covariates of the complete set of p covariates, and with all parameters unknown, we attempt to select the best subset of covariates, using our TTMC algorithm (Algorithm S-2.1) and Bayes factors resulting from TTMC, as detailed in

Section S-3. For the prior on β_s , we consider the same form of Zellner’s g prior considered in Section 4.1 of MB; here we assume the following equivalent form:

$$\beta_s \sim N\left(\mathbf{0}, \exp(\phi - g)(X_s'X_s)^{-1}\right), \quad (\text{S-1})$$

where g and ϕ are real-valued parameters. Rather than fixing g and ϕ , we consider them as random variables, to be updated in TTMC. Thus, priors are needed on these parameters. As in the case of Zellner-Siow prior (Zellner and Siow (1980); see also Liang *et al.* (2008) for further discussion), we assume that *a priori*, $\exp(g) \sim \text{Gamma}(1/2, n/2)$, so that the log-prior for g is given, after ignoring an additive constant, by

$$\log \pi(g) = -\frac{n}{2} \exp(g) + \frac{g}{2}. \quad (\text{S-2})$$

We also assume that

$$\pi(\phi) \propto 1. \quad (\text{S-3})$$

As regards the prior for σ_ϵ^2 , we re-parameterize this as $\exp(-\tau)$, and assume that $\exp(\tau) \sim \text{Gamma}(a_\tau, b_\tau)$, so that the log-prior, after ignoring an additive constant, is given by

$$\log \pi(\tau) = -b_\tau \exp(\tau) + a_\tau \tau. \quad (\text{S-4})$$

We set $a_\tau = b_\tau = 0.01$.

We put a discrete normal prior on $k = |\mathbf{s}|$, given by

$$\pi(k) \propto \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2\sigma_k^2}(k - \mu_k)^2\right\}; \quad k = 1, 2, \dots, p. \quad (\text{S-5})$$

Note that although the Poisson distribution is commonly used for specifying priors on the dimension in variable-dimensional problems, the above discrete normal prior is more flexible, since it can control both the mean and variance of the dimensionality, unlike the Poisson prior which has the same mean and variance.

In (S-5) we set $\mu_k = 8, 16, 24$, respectively, when $p = 10, 20, 30$, and fix $\sigma_k^2 = 1$ for all the chosen values of p . These relatively large values of μ_k with respect to p are chosen to avoid the Lindley’s paradox which creates the tendency among Bayes factors to select parsimonious models, irrespective of the truth. The variance $\sigma_k^2 = 1$ is expected to disallow significant drift of the dimension towards small values, unless the data dictates so.

S-5.1.3 TTMC implementation for Bayesian linear regression

For TTMC implementation, we set $w_{b,k} = w_{d,k} = w_{nc,k} = 1/3$ for all $k = 2, \dots, p - 1$; for $k = 1$ and $k = p$, we set $w_{d,k} = 0$ and $w_{b,k} = 0$, respectively. For the latter two cases, we set $w_{b,k} = w_{nc,k} = 1/2$ and $w_{d,k} = w_{nc,k} = 1/2$, respectively.

We also set $\tilde{p} = \tilde{q} = 1/2$, so that we select additive and multiplicative transformations with equal probabilities. We set the scales $a_{\beta,j} = 0.5$, for $j = 1, \dots, p$, and $a_{\theta,j} = 0.05$ for the remaining parameters. However, when p is as large as 20 and 30, we set $a_{\theta,j} = 0.005$ for the remaining parameters to make the acceptance rates reasonably large. For the no-change

and mixing-enhancement steps, we set $c = 0.01$. Recall from the discussion in Section S-2 that the goal of this strategy is to improve acceptance rates of the birth moves as well as of the no-change and mixing-enhancing moves, induced by the additive transformation. Indeed, note that with the additive transformation, the acceptance ratio of the birth move depends significantly on twice $a_{\beta,j}$, so that relatively large value of $a_{\beta,j}$ would lead to higher acceptance probability. However, too large $a_{\beta,j}$ would of course lead to increased rejection rate, since $\beta_j^{(t)} + a_{\beta,j}|\epsilon_1|$ and $\beta_j^{(t)} - a_{\beta,j}|\epsilon_1|$ may take the new β -vector too far from the current $\beta^{(t)}$ -vector. Thus, relatively large, but adequate choices of $a_{\beta,j}$ s are necessary. This also ensures that the acceptance rate of the death move, which depends upon inverse of $a_{\beta,j}$, is not too small.

Now, relatively large choice of $a_{\beta,j}$ s would make the acceptance rates associated with the no-change and the mixing-enhancing steps induced by the additive transformation too small, since in those steps, all the unknown quantities are updated simultaneously. To avoid this undesirable situation, we multiply $a_{\beta,j}$ s by $c = 0.01$, so that they are rendered adequately small in these steps. Detailed balance is easily seen to hold with respect to this multiplication by c , in the same way as in fixed-dimensional TMCMC.

We standardize all the available covariates so that their empirical means and variances are 0 and 1, respectively. Now note that minimizing $BIC(u)$ in the linear regression case reduces to minimizing the residual sum of squares $\sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \hat{\beta}'_{\mathbf{s}^{(t)}} \mathbf{x}_{i,\mathbf{s}^{(t)}} - \hat{\beta}_u x_{i,u})^2$ with respect to $u \in \mathbf{S} \setminus \mathbf{s}^{(t)}$, where $(\hat{\beta}_{\mathbf{s}^{(t)}}, \hat{\beta}_u)$ is the least squares estimator associated with the current covariate index subset $\mathbf{s}^{(t)}$.

For our TTMCMM implementation, we discard the first $10^4 \times 150$ iterations as burn-in, and store one in every 150 iterations in the next $5 \times 10^4 \times 150$ iterations, to obtain 5×10^4 iterations for our Bayesian inference. We initialise our TTMCMM algorithm with only one covariate, $\{x_{i1}; = 1, \dots, n\}$.

S-5.1.4 Parallelization

Recall that for every pair (p, n) , 1000 datasets are generated and TTMCMM must be implemented for variable selection in each of the 1000 datasets. Thus, 1000 TTMCMM implementations are necessary for each pair (p, n) . For Bayesian linear regression, a single typical TTMCMM run in our *C* code implementation on each core (with 2.8 GHz CPU speed) of our VMWare (about 2 TB memory) takes about 2 minutes, 4 minutes and 11 minutes, respectively, for $(p = 10, n = 25)$, $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$. Hence, for completing our simulation experiments in reasonable times, parallelization of our computations is indispensable.

Although our VMWare that we use for our current research consists of 80 single-threaded cores, using only the best 50 of them yields the optimum performance. As such, using shell scripting language, we parallelise the 1000 *C* code based TTMCMM runs for each (p, n) combination into 50 cores, so that 50 TTMCMM runs are simultaneously implemented for each (p, n) ; each core implementing only 20 TTMCMM runs. This parallelization strategy allowed us to obtain the results for all our simulation experiments in very reasonable times, as is obvious from the aforementioned timings for the single TTMCMM runs.

A typical TTMCMM run for the $(p = 10, n = 25)$ case yields the overall acceptance rate

0.193, birth rate 0.064, death rate 0.081 and no-change rate 0.410. For $(p = 20, n = 25)$, these rates are 0.191, 0.039, 0.039 and 0.496, respectively, and for $(p = 30, n = 35)$, these are 0.234, 0.101, 0.101 and 0.498, respectively. These rates are computed on the basis of the entire TTMC MC run, not just on the stored samples. That is, these rate computations are based on $10^4 \times 150 + 5 \times 10^4 \times 150 = 9 \times 10^6$ TTMC MC realizations.

S-5.1.5 Results of the linear regression simulation experiments

After every TTMC MC run in each processor of our VMWare, we implement an R code that computes B_i given by (S-2), for $i = 1, \dots, \tilde{N}$. The R code selects that set of covariates indexed by \mathbf{s}_{best} which corresponds to $B_{\max} = \max\{B_1, \dots, B_{\tilde{N}}\}$. We also consider a binary vector $V = (v_1, \dots, v_p)$, where, for $j = 1, \dots, p$, $v_j = 1$ or 0 accordingly as $j \in \mathbf{s}_{best}$ or $j \notin \mathbf{s}_{best}$. Also, let V_0 denote the binary vector associated with \mathbf{s}_0 , the set of indices of the data-generating covariates. The R code also computes the Hamming distance between the binary vectors V and V_0 , which, simply put, is the total number of position-wise mismatches in the two vectors consisting of p positions. Thus, the Hamming distance is zero if and only if $V = V_0$, that is, when the best model obtained is the same as the true model. The Bayes factor of the best model against the true, data-generating model is also computed in the R code using the formula (S-3), provided that the true model appears in the stored TTMC MC sample. Furthermore, we also compute the rank of the true model based on the B_i values, again provided that the true model features in the stored TTMC MC sample.

For each (p, n) , these results for all the 1000 TTMC MC runs are combined to yield the proportions of times the Hamming distance takes the values $0, 1, \dots, p - 1$, among the 1000 runs. We also compute the average log-Bayes factor of the best model against the true model and the average rank of the true model, the averaging done over those TTMC MC samples which consist of the true model and Hamming distance value r , for $r = 0, 1, \dots, p - 1$. These results are depicted in Figure S-1. Panel (a) of the figure shows that for $p = 10, n = 25$, the Hamming distance gives the highest probability (about 0.527) to 0, that is, the true set of covariates is selected with the highest probability, which is also significantly higher compared to the other values of the Hamming distance. The average log-Bayes factor, as shown in panel (b), is the highest when the Hamming distance is 5, while for Hamming distance 7, 8 and 9, the average log-Bayes factor is not available since the true set of covariates did not appear in the TTMC MC samples in those cases. Note that the average log-Bayes factor is not increasing with the Hamming distance, which is indeed not to be expected in general. The average true model rank, displayed in panel (c), is increasing with the Hamming distance, but again, is unavailable for the values 7, 8 and 9 of the Hamming distance since the true set of covariates has probability zero with respect to the respective TTMC MC samples.

The scenario when $p = 20, n = 25$, is not significantly different from the $p = 10, n = 25$ case. Panel (d) shows that the Hamming distance gives the highest probability 0.143 to both 0 and 1, which is again significantly higher than those for the other values. The highest probability is of course much less than in the corresponding $(p = 10, n = 25)$ scenario, which is expected, since the number of covariate subsets to search for the true covariate subset is far greater than in the previous case. Since $n = 25$ is also the same as before, the information about the true covariate set is not increased either. But that in spite of these issues the true covariate sets are found with the highest probability, vindicates the efficacy of our variable

selection theory and the TTMCMC based methodology. The average log-Bayes factor is the highest when the Hamming distance is 9 and the average true model rank is the highest for Hamming distance 7. Note that unlike the case of $(p = 10, n = 25)$, the true model rank is not increasing with the Hamming distance in this case, and this is to be expected in general

The case of $p = 30, n = 35$ is the most challenging situation among all the (p, n) pairs considered, as searching for the true set of covariates from among a set of $2^{30} - 1 = 1073741823$ possible subsets is akin to looking for a needle in a haystack! Yet, as panel (g) of Figure S-1 shows, the Hamming distance gives significant probability to 0, while the value 2 gets the highest probability. This performance of our TTMCMC based Bayes factor should not be considered unsatisfactory at all. Note that the average log-Bayes factor is the highest when the Hamming distance is 10, but the average model rank is the worst when the Hamming distance is as small as 5, relative to $p - 1 = 29$. In other words, even for Hamming distance 5, there are many models that perform better than the true model on a average, in terms of Bayes factor. Since for most of the larger values of the Hamming distance the true sets of covariates have probabilities zero with respect to TTMCMC, it is clear that for most values of the Hamming distance, the true, data-generating model is outperformed by the other models. It must also be remarked that for a limited TTMCMC sample size, reliably measuring the performances of many important models among a set of such a huge number of models, is infeasible.

S-5.2 Gaussian process regression

We now consider simulation experiments with Gaussian process regression as described in Section 4.2 of MB. That is, now the model that we consider is of the form $y = f(\mathbf{x}_s) + \epsilon$, where $f(\cdot)$ is modeled by a Gaussian process with mean function $\mu(\mathbf{x}_s)$ and squared exponential covariance kernel of the form

$$\text{Cov}(f(\mathbf{x}_s), f(\mathbf{x}'_s)) = \sigma_f^2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{x}'_s)^T D_s (\mathbf{x}_s - \mathbf{x}'_s) \right\},$$

where σ_f^2 is the process variance and the diagonal elements of D_s are the smoothness parameters.

Here the data are modeled as $y_i = f(\mathbf{x}_{i,s}) + \epsilon_i$, where, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2)$. As before, we reparameterize σ_ϵ^2 as $\exp(-\tau)$; we also reparameterize σ_f^2 as $\exp(-\tau_f)$, where τ and τ_f are real parameters. But unlike the linear regression case, here we assume that *a priori*, $\tau \sim N(\mu_\tau, \sigma_\tau^2)$ and $\tau_f \sim N(\mu_{\tau_f}, \sigma_{\tau_f}^2)$, with $\mu_\tau = \mu_{\tau_f} = 0$, $\sigma_\tau^2 = 0.5$ and $\sigma_{\tau_f}^2 = 0.1$, the variances reflecting the belief that uncertainty about the process variance is less than that of the noise variance.

For $i = 1, \dots, |\mathbf{s}|$, we reparameterize the i -th diagonal element of D_s as $\exp(-\gamma_i)$, where we assume *a priori* that $\gamma_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\gamma^2)$, with $\sigma_\gamma^2 = 2$.

We model the mean function $\mu(\mathbf{x}_s)$ as linear regression containing the intercept, that is, we set $\mu(\mathbf{x}_s) = \beta'_s \mathbf{x}_s$, assuming that the first element of \mathbf{x}_s is 1. We consider the same Zellner-Siow prior form for β_s as in Section S-5.1. As before, we standardize all the available covariates for model implementation with TTMCMC.




Figure S-1: Simulation study: Bayesian linear regression variable selection results.

Letting $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$ denote the vector of smoothness parameters, note that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$ are both variable-dimensional vectors, the dimensions of which must be increased or decreased simultaneously. Recall that such updating provision is of course considered in our TTMC MC algorithm (Algorithm S-2.1). The prior for k remains the same as in the linear regression setup.

The data simulation principle from the true model consisting of random sets of covariates and the formation of the covariates remain the same as in the linear regression case; here (y_1, \dots, y_n) is generated from the joint multivariate normal model dictated by the above Gaussian process setup, given $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s$, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$, τ and τ_f . We set $\tau = -\log(0.1)$ and $\tau_f = -\log(0.2)$, and simulate the elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s$ and $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$ from the zero mean normal distribution with variance 5.

As before, we consider the settings $(p = 10, n = 25)$, $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$ for evaluating our Bayes factor based variable selection obtained via TTMC MC. The TTMC MC algorithm in this Gaussian process setup is similar to that for linear regression, with the extra variable-dimensional parameter $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$ and the fixed-dimensional variable τ_f being accounted for. The procedure for updating these remain the same as before, in accordance with the details provided in Algorithm S-2.1.

As regards computation of $BIC(u)$ in this Gaussian process setup, we first obtain the least squares estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_s$ corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_s$ pretending a linear regression context, and substitute $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_s$ in the Gaussian process likelihood. Also, in the Gaussian process likelihood, we set $\hat{\gamma}_i = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, |\mathbf{s}|$, corresponding to $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_s$. Finally, we substitute the current values $\tau^{(t)}$ and $\tau_f^{(t)}$ for τ and τ_f in the likelihood, and proceed to compute the BIC version with these substitutions. As we shall demonstrate, our experiments reveal that this method yields quite reliable propositions for the new covariates. However, computation of $BIC(u)$ is quite demanding in this setup due to the requirement of $n \times n$ -order matrix inversions for every u . Thus, in this setup, for p even moderately large, our TTMC MC takes considerably more implementation time than for linear regression. Indeed, for $(p = 10, n = 25)$ the time taken is about 26 minutes for a typical run, and for $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$, the respective run times are about 46 minutes and 2 hours 22 minutes. We parallelise our simulation experiments consisting of 1000 TTMC MC runs for each (p, n) pair in the same way as in the linear regression setup.

The overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate and the no-change rate for a typical TTMC MC run in the $(p = 10, n = 25)$ case are about 0.182, 0.014, 0.014 and 0.518, respectively. For $(p = 20, n = 25)$, these numbers are 0.217, 0.065, 0.065 and 0.522, while in the $(p = 30, n = 35)$ scenario, the respective rates are 0.201, 0.046, 0.046 and 0.511. Again, these rates are computed on the basis of 9×10^6 TTMC MC realizations.

S-5.2.1 Results of the Gaussian process regression simulation experiments

The results of our variable selection method in the Gaussian process setup are encapsulated in Figure S-2. Note that although for $(p = 10, n = 25)$ the Hamming distance assigns significantly higher probability to 0 compared to all the other values, in the other two more challenging scenarios $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$, this good performance is not kept up. This observation is in line with the average log-Bayes factors and the average true model ranks, as displayed in Figure S-2. Thus, compared to the linear regression setup,

our variable selection methods in the Gaussian process regression setup seems to be less robust with respect to increasing dimensions. This is, however, not unexpected due to the structured dependence in the Gaussian process regression datasets.

S-5.3 AR(1) regression

Now let us consider the variable selection problem in the following AR(1) context, the Bayes factor asymptotics of which is detailed in Section 7.1:

$$y_t = \rho y_{t-1} + \beta'_s \mathbf{x}_{t,s} + \epsilon_t, \quad \text{and} \quad \epsilon_t \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2), \quad \text{for } t = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $y_0 \equiv 0$ and $|\rho| < 1$. We reparameterize ρ as $\rho = -1 + 2 \exp(\tilde{\rho}) / (1 + \exp(\tilde{\rho}))$, and assume that $\tilde{\rho} \sim N(0, 1)$. As before we consider the Zellner-Siow prior for β_s and reparameterize σ_ϵ^2 as $\exp(-\tau)$ and use the log-prior form (S-4), with $\alpha_\tau = \lambda_\tau = 0.01$. For data generation, we generate ρ from $U(-1, 1)$.

To form the likelihood, we considered the product $\prod_{t=1}^n [y_t | y_{t-1}]$, where $[y_t | y_{t-1}]$ stands for the distribution (7.1) of MB. We did not consider the correlated error form $y_t = \beta'_s \mathbf{z}_{t,s} + \tilde{\epsilon}_t$ considered in Section 7.1 for likelihood formation as this would involve a multivariate normal distribution which would require $n \times n$ matrix inversions in each step of TTMC MC.

For $BIC(u)$, first note that given the value of ρ at the current TTMC MC iteration, y_1 and $y_t - \rho y_{t-1}$ for $t \geq 2$ has a linear regression form, using which we compute the least squares estimator of the regression coefficients. The rest of the $BIC(u)$ minimization procedure is the same as in the linear regression setup.

Indeed, the remaining methodological and implementation details are also akin to the linear regression situation. In this case, typical TTMC MC runs for $(p = 10, n = 25)$, $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$ took about 9 minutes, 14 minutes and 36 minutes, respectively. The overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate and no-change rates in the first case was about 0.553, 0.552, 0.564 and 0.544, respectively. In the second and third scenarios they were (0.582, 0.602, 0.601, 0.543) and (0.580, 0.605, 0.605, 0.533), respectively.

S-5.3.1 Results of the AR(1) regression simulation experiments

Figure S-3 displays the results of our variable selection experiments in the AR(1) context. Note that for $(p = 10, n = 25)$, the Hamming distance gives the highest probability to 0, which is also significantly higher than those for the other values. However, as in the Gaussian process regression experiments, here also the situation deteriorates for $(p = 20, n = 25)$ and $(p = 30, n = 35)$, as the Hamming distance concentrates around larger and larger values for the latter two scenarios. This gradual worsening of the performance is also reflected in the respective average log-Bayes factors and the average true model ranks, demonstrating that compared to linear regression, variable selection in time series regression is a much more delicate problem, with marked sensitivity with respect to larger dimensions.

At the first glance, this lack of robustness with respect to dimension might seem surprising since the structure of AR(1) regression closely resembles that of linear regression. However, recall from Section 7.1 of MB that although the data y_t can be written in a linear regression form with modified covariate structures involving ρ , the regression errors in such as case




Figure S-2: Simulation study: Bayesian Gaussian process regression variable selection results.

are correlated, rendering the AR(1) setup a Gaussian process structure. Hence, it is not surprising that our AR(1) regression results are much more in resemblance with our Gaussian process regression results, as compared to the linear regression results, when $p = 20$ and 30 .

S-6 Variable selection in a real riboflavin dataset

Let us now apply our TTMC MC based variable selection procedure to a real dataset on riboflavin (vitamin B_2) production rate, which has been made public by [Bühlmann *et al.* \(2014\)](#). The response variable in this dataset is the log-transformed riboflavin production rate corresponding to $p = 4088$ possible covariates measuring the logarithm of the expression level of 4088 genes. The sample size is $n = 71$. Covariate selection of this dataset using classical methods based on linear regression model has been performed by [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#) who report two significant genes YXLD_at and YXLE_at. [Meinshausen *et al.* \(2009\)](#) on the other hand, found only YXLD_at to be significant, while the method of [Bühlmann \(2013\)](#) found no significant gene. Thus, based on linear regression models and classical methods of variable selection employed so far, either no gene, one gene or two genes, are found to be significant.

We apply our Bayes factor based covariate selection technique using TTMC MC to this dataset, considering both linear and Gaussian process regression. We consider the same setups as in our simulation experiments, with the same models and priors, with some variation in the prior for k , to account for the uncertainty with respect to the large number of available covariates. Specifically, with the same discrete normal prior for k , we consider the choices of (μ_k, σ_k^2) to be $(25, 10)$ and $(40, 10)$, respectively. We allow a maximum of 50 covariates in the model, since, as is clear from the aforementioned past analyses of this dataset, too many genes can not be significant. In keeping with this, the maximum number of covariates in our posterior simulations turned out to be less than 10 in all our setups for this real data.

As in the simulation experiments, we discard the first $10^4 \times 150$ TTMC MC realizations as burn-in and store every 150-th realization in the next $5 \times 10^4 \times 150$ iterations, to obtain 5×10^4 TTMC MC realizations for our inference. For the additive transformation, the scales $a_{\theta,j}$ and the constant c in the mixing-enhancing step are chosen in the same way as in the simulation studies in the $p = 30$ setups. Since for Gaussian process regression minimization of $BIC(u)$ in the TTMC MC step is computationally too demanding for $p = 4088$ covariates, we replace this $BIC(u)$ with that used for linear regression. Theoretically, this is a perfectly valid procedure, and our TTMC MC results demonstrate very reasonable final selection of the covariates via Bayes factor.

S-6.1 Results for the linear regression model

For the linear regression model with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$, the overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate, no-change rate turned out to be $(0.187, 0.002, 0.003, 0.497)$, and the implementation time is about 12 hours and 11 minutes. Our Bayes factor computation based on TTMC MC yielded the following best set of 4 covariates: (ARGB_at, EXOA_at, SIGY_at, YOAB_at).




Figure S-3: Simulation study: Bayesian AR(1) regression variable selection results.

When $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$, the overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate, no-change rate are (0.175, 0.001, 0.001, 0.496) and the time taken is about 11 hours 33 minutes. In this case, the following set of 7 covariates turned out to be the best: (ARGB_at, YDAR_at, YHDZ_at, YJIA_at, YOAB_at, YUZF_at, YXLD_at). The covariates common to both $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$ and $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$ are (ARGB_at, YOAB_at), which does not contain the covariates found significant by [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#) or [Meinshausen *et al.* \(2009\)](#). More specifically, although the case $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$ contains YXLD_at, which has been found to be significant by both [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#) and [Meinshausen *et al.* \(2009\)](#), none of the cases $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$ or $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$ finds YXLE_at, declared as significant by [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#).

S-6.2 Results for the Gaussian process regression model

For the Gaussian process regression model with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$, the implementation time is about 8 hours 47 minutes and the overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate, no-change rate are (0.185, 0.012, 0.012, 0.530). The following 4 covariates are selected as the best by our TTMCMB based Bayes factor: (ARGB_at, YHDZ_at, YOAB_at, YXLD_at).

For $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$, the implementation time was about 9 hours 56 minutes and the overall acceptance rate, birth rate, death rate, no-change rate are (0.193, 0.024, 0.024, 0.529). Remarkably, here we obtain exactly the same set of covariates (ARGB_at, YHDZ_at, YOAB_at, YXLD_at), as for $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$, as the best set of covariates, which exhibits considerable robustness of the Gaussian process regression model with respect

S-6.3 Comparison of the results for the linear regression and the Gaussian process regression models

The results demonstrate that compared to the linear regression model for this data, the Gaussian process regression is far more robust with respect to the prior for k ; moreover, it leads to much parsimony compared to linear regression, as can be easily seen from the cardinalities of the best covariate sets.

Note that YOAB_at is common to all our linear regression and Gaussian process regression implementations and hence we consider this to be an important discovery. Also, YXLD_at is common to our Gaussian process and linear regression implementations with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$. Since this gene is found to be significant by [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#) and [Meinshausen *et al.* \(2009\)](#) as well, it seems that this may also be an important discovery. But the YXLE_at gene, although declared significant by [Javanmard and Montanari \(2014\)](#), did not appear in the best set of covariates in any of our linear regression or Gaussian process regression analysis.

Now, the question arises that which of the four implementations of linear and Gaussian process regression yields the best result in terms of Bayes factor. In this regard, we first note that the maximum values of the log of B_i given by (S-2) associated with the linear regression models for $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$ and $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$ are given by 51.925 and 94.697, respectively, while the same for the Gaussian process regression counterpart are 46.085 and 91.147. Thus, in this regard, the linear regression model with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$

given its Bayes factor guided best possible set of covariates, is the best model, followed by Gaussian process regression with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (40, 10)$, given its best set of covariates. The next best models, given their respective best set of covariates with respect to Bayes factors, in order, are provided by the linear regressions model with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$ and the Gaussian process regression model with $(\mu_k, \sigma_k^2) = (25, 10)$.

Note that the genes YOAB_at and YXLD_at are common to the best two models, which once again vindicates their importance.

S-7 Appendix

In this section we provide the proofs of all the lemmas stated in the paper. Before proving the lemmas, we state some results which are useful in proving the lemmas.

Result S-1. *Let $\mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$ denote the vector space of all $m \times n$ matrices. If $G, H \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times n}$ are positive semidefinite Hermitian matrices and $1 \leq i_1 < \dots < i_k \leq n$, then the following two inequalities hold:*

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=1}^k \lambda_{i_t}(GH) &\leq \sum_{t=1}^k \lambda_{i_t}(G) \lambda_t(H) \\ \sum_{t=1}^k \lambda_t(GH) &\geq \sum_{t=1}^k \lambda_{i_t}(G) \lambda_{n-i_t+1}(H). \end{aligned}$$

A proof of this result can be found in [Wang and Zhang \(1992\)](#).

Result S-2. (a) *For matrices A_1 and A_2 , let $A_1 \preceq A_2$ imply that $A_2 - A_1$ is nonnegative definite. Then for any symmetric matrix A ,*

$$\lambda_{\min}(A)I \preceq A \preceq \lambda_{\max}(A)I,$$

(b) *For symmetric matrices A_1 and A_2 ,*

$$\lambda_{\min}(A_1) + \lambda_{\min}(A_2) \leq \lambda_{\min}(A_1 + A_2) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A_1 + A_2) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A_1) + \lambda_{\max}(A_2).$$

Lemma S-1. *Consider the setup of Section 7.1. The eigenvalues $\text{Cov}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{t+h}, \tilde{\epsilon}_t) = \sigma_\epsilon^2(1 - \rho^2)^{-1}\Sigma_\epsilon$ are all positive, and bounded.*

Proof. Let $\text{Cov}(\tilde{\epsilon}_{t+h}, \tilde{\epsilon}_t) = \sigma_\epsilon^2(1 - \rho^2)^{-1}\Sigma_\epsilon$. We first find the highest and lowest eigenvalues of Σ_ϵ . It can be shown that the inverse of Σ_ϵ is a tridiagonal matrix as follows:

$$(1 - \rho^2) \Sigma_\epsilon^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\rho & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ -\rho & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho & 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\rho & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho & \dots & 0 & 0 \\ & \dots & & \dots & & \dots & \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & 1 + \rho^2 & -\rho \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & -\rho & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

Stroeker (1983) shows that the approximations of the eigenvalues of $(1 - \rho^2) \Sigma_\epsilon^{-1}$ (arranged in increasing order if $\rho > 0$ and in decreasing order if $\rho < 0$) are

$$\lambda_k \left((1 - \rho^2) \Sigma_\epsilon^{-1} \right) \approx 1 - 2\rho \cos \frac{k\pi}{n+1} + \rho^2 - \frac{4}{n+1} \rho^2 \left(\sin \frac{k\pi}{n+1} \right)^2,$$

with corresponding error bound

$$\xi_k = \frac{2\rho^2}{\sqrt{n+1}} \sin \frac{k\pi}{n+1}, \quad \text{for } k = 1, \dots, n.$$

Combining the above facts, it can be seen that the eigenvalues of $(1 - \rho^2) \Sigma_\epsilon^{-1}$ are bounded by $\min\{(1 + \rho)^2, (1 - \rho)^2\} + o(1)$ and $\max\{(1 + \rho)^2, (1 - \rho)^2\} + o(1)$. Thus the eigenvalues of $(1 - \rho^2)^{-1} \Sigma_\epsilon$ are bounded by $\{(1 - |\rho|)^2 + o(1)\}^{-1}$ and $\{(1 + |\rho|)^2 + o(1)\}^{-1}$. Thus all the eigenvalues of Σ_ϵ are finite. As $|\rho| < 1 - \gamma$ for some small enough γ , clearly for sufficiently large n all the eigenvalues of $(1 - \rho^2) \Sigma_\epsilon^{-1}$ are positive. Also the highest eigenvalue is less than $2/\gamma^2$. \square

Lemma S-2. Consider the setup in Section 7.1. Let $P_{n,s}$ be the orthogonal projection matrix onto the column space of $Z_{n,s}$. Then the eigenvalues of $\partial P_{n,s}/\partial \rho$ are uniformly bounded.

Proof. For simplicity we write Z instead of $Z_{n,s}$. Recall $P_{n,s} = Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T$. Thus,

$$\frac{\partial P_{n,s}}{\partial \rho} = \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T - Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial (Z^T Z)}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T + Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial Z^T}{\partial \rho} \quad (\text{S-1})$$

First note that the t -th row of Z , $\mathbf{z}_{t,s} = \sum_{k=1}^t \rho^{t-k} \mathbf{x}_{k,s}$. Thus,

$$Z^T Z = n \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{k_1=1}^t \sum_{k_2=1}^t \rho^{2t-k_1-k_2} \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_{k_1,s} \mathbf{x}_{k_2,s}^T}{n} \right). \quad (\text{S-2})$$

Since the covariates lie in a compact space, the elements of the $|\mathbf{s}| \times |\mathbf{s}|$ matrices $\mathbf{x}_{k_1,s} \mathbf{x}_{k_2,s}^T$ in (S-2) are uniformly bounded. Further note that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \sum_{k_1=1}^t \sum_{k_2=1}^t \rho^{2t-k_1-k_2} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t=1}^n \left(\sum_{k_1=1}^t |\rho|^{t-k_1} \right)^2 = \frac{1}{n(1-|\rho|)^2} \sum_{t=1}^n (1-|\rho|^t)^2 \\ &= (1-|\rho|)^{-2} \left[1 - 2 \frac{|\rho| (1-|\rho|^n)}{n(1-|\rho|)} + \frac{\rho^2 (1-\rho^{2n})}{n(1-|\rho|^2)} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As $\rho \in [-1 + \gamma, 1 - \gamma]$, the above facts imply $Z^T Z = nB_n$, where B_n is a $|\mathbf{s}| \times |\mathbf{s}|$ matrix whose elements are uniformly bounded. It follows that $(Z^T Z)^{-1} = n^{-1} B_n^{-1} = n^{-1} C_{n,s}$, where the elements of $C_{n,s}$ are uniformly bounded.

Let $\partial Z/\partial \rho = H_n$. Then the t -th row of H_n is $\mathbf{h}_{t,s} = \sum_{k=1}^t (t-k) \rho^{t-k-1} \mathbf{x}_{k,s}$. then the first term of (S-1),

$$D := \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T = n^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{h}_{1,s}^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_{1,s} & \dots & \mathbf{h}_{1,s}^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_{n,s} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots \\ \mathbf{h}_{n,s}^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_{1,s} & \dots & \mathbf{h}_{n,s}^T C_{n,s} \mathbf{z}_{n,s} \end{pmatrix}.$$

The (t_1, t_2) -th element of D is

$$\begin{aligned} d_{t_1, t_2} &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{h}_{t_1, \mathbf{s}}^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{z}_{t_2, \mathbf{s}} = \frac{1}{n} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{t_1} (t_1 - k) \rho^{t_1 - k - 1} \mathbf{x}_{k, \mathbf{s}}^T \right] C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \left[\sum_{k=1}^{t_2} \rho^{t_2 - k} \mathbf{x}_{k, \mathbf{s}} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k_1=1}^{t_1} \sum_{k_2=1}^{t_2} (t_1 - k_1) \rho^{t_1 - k_1 - 1 + t_2 - k_2} \mathbf{x}_{k_1, \mathbf{s}}^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}_{k_2, \mathbf{s}}. \end{aligned}$$

Next note that $\mathbf{x}_{k_1, \mathbf{s}}^T C_{n, \mathbf{s}} \mathbf{x}_{k_2, \mathbf{s}} = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{s}|} \sum_{l=1}^{|\mathbf{s}|} C_{j, l} x_{k_1, j} x_{k_2, l}$. As elements of $C_{n, \mathbf{s}}$, as well as, the covariate space are uniformly bounded, the above quadratic is bounded for any (k_1, k_2) .

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k_1=1}^{t_1} \sum_{k_2=1}^{t_2} (t_1 - k_1) \rho^{t_1 - k_1 - 1 + t_2 - k_2} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{k_1=1}^{t_1} (t_1 - k_1) |\rho|^{t_1 - k_1 - 1} \right) \left(\sum_{k_2=1}^{t_2} \rho^{t_2 - k_2} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \frac{1 - |\rho|^{t_1} (t_1 + |\rho| - t_1 |\rho|)}{(1 - |\rho|)^2} \right\} \left(\frac{1 - |\rho|^{t_2}}{1 - |\rho|} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S-3})$$

By Gerschgorin circle theorem the maximum eigenvalue of D is bounded by

$$\max_{t_1 \in \{1, \dots, n\}} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \frac{1 - |\rho|^{t_1} (t_1 + |\rho| - t_1 |\rho|)}{(1 - |\rho|)^2} \right\} \sum_{t_2=1}^n \left(\frac{1 - |\rho|^{t_2}}{1 - |\rho|} \right) \leq (1 - |\rho|)^{-3},$$

and the minimum eigenvalue is bounded below by $-(1 - |\rho|)^{-3}$. As $\rho \in [-1 + \gamma, 1 - \gamma]$, eigenvalues of D are uniformly bounded.

Next note that A and A^T have same eigenvalues. As the third term of (S-1) is the transpose of the first term, the third term also has finite eigenvalues.

Next consider the second term of (S-1). Note that,

$$Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial (Z^T Z)}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T = P_{n, \mathbf{s}} \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T + Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial Z^T}{\partial \rho} P_{n, \mathbf{s}}.$$

Recall, for two square matrices A and B , AB and BA have same eigenvalues. Thus eigenvalues of $P_{n, \mathbf{s}} \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T$ is same as eigenvalues of $\frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T P_{n, \mathbf{s}} = \frac{\partial Z}{\partial \rho} (Z^T Z)^{-1} Z^T$, and eigenvalues of $Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial Z^T}{\partial \rho} P_{n, \mathbf{s}}$ is same as that of $P_{n, \mathbf{s}} Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial Z^T}{\partial \rho} = Z (Z^T Z)^{-1} \frac{\partial Z^T}{\partial \rho}$, as $P_{n, \mathbf{s}} Z = Z$.

Finally, note that for any matrix A , $\lambda_{\max}(A + A^T)$ is bounded above by $2\lambda_{\max}(A)$, and $\lambda_{\min}(A + A^T)$ is bounded below by $2\lambda_{\min}(A)$. Hence the second term of (S-1) has finite eigenvalues. Similarly, the sum of first and third term of (S-1) has bounded eigenvalues.

Combining the above results, note that the RHS of (S-1) can written as sum of two symmetric matrices, and eigenvalues of each of them are bounded. Using the result that for symmetric matrices A and B ,

$$\lambda_{\min}(A) + \lambda_{\min}(B) \leq \lambda_{\min}(A + B) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A + B) \leq \lambda_{\max}(A) + \lambda_{\max}(B),$$

the result follows. \square

Bibliography

- Ando, T. (2010). *Bayesian Model Selection and Statistical Modeling*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Banerjee, S. and Ghosal, S. (2014). Bayesian Variable Selection in Generalized Additive Partial Linear Models. *Stat*, **3**, 363–378.
- Bartlett, M. (1957). A Comment on D. V. Lindley’s Statistical Paradox. *Biometrika*, **44**, 533–534.
- Bayarri, M. J., Berger, J. O., Forte, A., and García-Donato, G. (2012). Criteria for Bayesian Model Choice With Application to Variable Selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 1550–1577.
- Bühlmann, P. (2013). Statistical Significance in High-Dimensional Linear Models. *Bernoulli*, **19**(4), 1212–1242.
- Bühlmann, P., Kalisch, M., and Meier, L. (2014). High-Dimensional Statistics With a View Toward Applications in Biology. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, **1**(1), 255–278.
- Casella, G., Giron, F. J., Martinez, M. L., and Moreno, E. (2009). Consistency of Bayesian Procedures for Variable Selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, **37**, 1207–1228.
- Chen, M.-H., Ibrahim, J. G., and Yiannoutsos, C. (1999). Prior Elicitation, Variable Selection and Bayesian Computation for Logistic Regression Models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **61**, 223–242.
- Chevalier, A., Fearnhead, P., and Sutton, M. (2020). Reversible Jump PDMP Samplers for Variable Selection. arXiv:2010.11771v1.
- Chib, S. and Kuffner, T. A. (2016). Bayes Factor Consistency. Available at arXiv:1607.00292.
- Choi, T. and Rousseau, J. (2015). A Note on Bayes Factor Consistency in Partial Linear Models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **166**, 158–170.
- Das, M. and Bhattacharya, S. (2019). Transdimensional Transformation Based Markov Chain Monte Carlo. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, **33**(1), 87–138.
- Dawid, A. P. and Musio, M. (2015). Bayesian Model Selection Based on Proper Scoring Rules. *Bayesian Analysis*, **10**, 479–499.
- Dey, K. K. and Bhattacharya, S. (2016). On Geometric Ergodicity of Additive and Multiplicative Transformation Based Markov Chain Monte Carlo in High Dimensions. *Brazilian Journal of Probability and Statistics*, **30**, 570–613.
- DiCiccio, T. J., Kass, R. E., Raftery, A. E., and Wasserman, L. (1997). Computing Bayes Factors by Combining Simulation and Asymptotic Approximations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **92**, 903–915.

- Draper, N. R. and Smith, H. (2005). *Applied Regression Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, New York. Third Edition.
- Dutta, S. (2012). Multiplicative Random Walk Metropolis-Hastings on the Real Line. *Sankhya. Series B*, **74**, 315–342. Also available at arXiv.
- Dutta, S. and Bhattacharya, S. (2014). Markov Chain Monte Carlo Based on Deterministic Transformations. *Statistical Methodology*, **16**, 100–116. Also available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1106.5850>. Supplement available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1306.6684>.
- Eubank, R. (1999). *Nonparametric Regression and Spline Smoothing*. Marcel Dekker, New York, NY. Second Edition.
- Fernández, C., E, L., and Steel, M. F. J. (2001). Benchmark Priors for Bayesian Model Averaging. *Journal of Econometrics*, **100**, 381–427.
- Fragoso, T. M., Bertoli, W., and Louzada, F. (2018). Bayesian model averaging: a systematic review and conceptual classification. *Int. Stat. Rev.*, **86**(1), 1–28.
- Gilks, W. R. and Roberts, G. O. (1996). Strategies for improving MCMC. In W. Gilks, S. Richardson, and D. Spiegelhalter, editors, *Markov Chain Monte Carlo in Practice*, Interdisciplinary Statistics, pages 89–114, London. Chapman and Hall.
- Giraud, C. (2015). *Introduction to High-Dimensional Statistics*. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL.
- Green, P. J. (1995). Reversible jump Markov chain Monte Carlo computation and Bayesian model determination. *Biometrika*, **82**, 711–732.
- Guo, R. and Speckman, P. (1998). Bayes Factor Consistency in Linear Models. In *2009 International Workshop on Objective Bayes Methodology*, Philadelphia.
- Han, C. and Carlin, B. P. (2001). Markov Chain Monte Carlo Methods for Computing Bayes Factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **96**, 1122–1132.
- Heinze, G., Wallisch, C., and Dunkler, D. (2018). Variable Selection – Review and Recommendations for the Practicing Statistician. *Biometrical Journal*, **60**, 431–449.
- Hong, H. and Preston, B. (2012). Bayesian Averaging, Prediction and Nonnested Model Selection. *Journal of Econometrics*, **167**, 358–369.
- Huang, J., Horowitz, J. L., and Wei, F. (2010). Variable Selection in Nonparametric Additive Models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 2282–2313.
- Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005). Spike and slab variable selection: frequentist and Bayesian strategies. *Ann. Statist.*, **33**(2), 730–773.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014). Confidence Intervals and Hypothesis Testing for High-Dimensional Regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **15**, 2869–2909.

- Jeffreys, H. (1939). *Theory of Probability*. 1st edition. The Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Johnson, V. E. and Rossell, D. (2012). Bayesian Model Selection in High-Dimensional Settings. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **107**, 649–660.
- Kass, R. E. and Raftery, R. E. (1995). Bayes factors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **90**(430), 773–795.
- Kendall, M. G. and Stuart, A. (1947). *The Advanced Theory of Statistics*. Charles Griffin & Co., London. Volume I, 3rd Edition.
- Kundu, S. and Dunson, D. B. (2014). Bayes Variable Selection in Semiparametric Linear Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **109**, 437–447.
- Lange, K. (2010). *Numerical Analysis for Statisticians*. Springer, New York. Second Edition.
- Liang, F., Paulo, R., Molina, G., Clyde, M. A., and Berger, J. O. (2008). Mixtures of g Priors for Bayesian Variable Selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **103**(481), 410–423.
- Lindley, D. (1957). A Statistical Paradox. *Biometrika*, **44**, 187–192.
- Liu, J. S. and Sabatti, S. (2000). Generalized Gibbs Sampler and Multigrid Monte Carlo for Bayesian Computation. *Biometrika*, **87**, 353–369.
- Liu, X., Wang, L., and Liang, H. (2011). Estimation and Variable Selection for Semiparametric Additive Partial Linear Models. *Statistica Sinica*, **21**, 1225–1248.
- Lunn, D. J., Whittaker, J. C., and Best, N. (2006). A Bayesian Toolkit for Genetic Association Studies. *Genetic Epidemiology*, **30**, 231–247.
- Magnus, J. R. (1978). The Moments of Products of Quadratic Forms in Normal Variables. *Statistica Neerlandica*, **32**, 201–210.
- Marin, J. M., Pillai, N. S., Robert, C. P., and Rousseau, J. (2014). Relevant Statistics for Bayesian Model Choice. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **76**, 833–859.
- Marra, G. and Wood, S. N. (2011). Practical Variable Selection for Generalized Additive Models. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, **55**, 2372–2387.
- Meinshausen, N., Meier, L., and Bühlmann, P. (2009). p-Values for High-Dimensional Regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **104**(488), 1671–1681.
- Meyer, M. C. and Laud, P. W. (2002). Predictive Variable Selection in Generalized Linear Models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **97**, 859–871.
- Moreno, E. and Girón, F. J. (2008). Comparison of Bayesian Objective Procedures for Variable Selection in Linear Regression. *TEST*, **17**, 472–490.
- Moreno, E., Girón, F. J., and Casella, G. (2010). Consistency of Objective Bayes Factors as the Model Dimension Grows. *The Annals of Statistics*, **38**, 1937–1952.

- Moreno, E., Girón, F. J., and Casella, G. (2015). Posterior Model Consistency in Variable Selection as the Model Dimension Grows. *Statistical Science*, **30**, 228–241.
- Mukhopadhyay, M., Samanta, T., and Chakrabarti, A. (2015). On Consistency and Optimality of Bayesian Variable Selection Based on g -Prior in Normal Linear Regression Models. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, **67**, 963–997.
- Newey, W. K. (1991). Uniform Convergence in Probability and Stochastic Equicontinuity. *Econometrica*, **59**, 1161–1167.
- Nishii, R. (1996). Asymptotic Properties of Criteria for Selection of Variables in Multiple Regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, **12**(2), 758–765.
- Ntzoufras, I., Dellaportas, P., and Forster, J. J. (2003). Bayesian Variable and Link Determination for Generalised Linear Models. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **111**, 165–180.
- O’Hara, R. B. and Sillanpää, M. J. (2009). A review of Bayesian variable selection methods: what, how and which. *Bayesian Anal.*, **4**(1), 85–117.
- Reich, B. J., Storlie, C. B., and Bondell, H. D. (2009). Variable Selection in Bayesian Smoothing Spline ANOVA Models: Application to Deterministic Computer Codes. *Technometrics*, **51**, 110–120.
- Robert, C. P. (1993). A Note on Jeffreys-Lindley Paradox. *Statistica Sinica*, **3**, 601–608.
- Rousseau, J. and Choi, T. (2012). Bayes Factor Consistency in Regression Problems. Unpublished report.
- Roy, S. and Bhattacharya, S. (2020). Function Optimization with Posterior Gaussian Derivative Process. arXiv:2010.13591v1.
- Serfling, R. J. (1980). *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Shang, Z. and Clayton, M. K. (2011). Consistency of Bayesian Linear Model Selection With a Growing Number of Parameters. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **141**, 3463–3474.
- Shao, J. (1997). An Asymptotic Theory for Linear Model Selection. *Statistica Sinica*, **7**, 221–264. with discussion.
- Shively, T. S., Kohn, R., and Wood, S. (1999). Variable Selection and Function Estimation in Additive Nonparametric Regression Using a Data-Based Prior. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **94**, 777–806.
- Sillanpää, M. J. and Arjas, E. (1998). Bayesian Mapping of Multiple Quantitative Trait Loci from Incomplete Inbred Line Cross Data. *Genetics*, **148**, 1373–1388.

- Sillanpää, M. J., Gasbarra, D., and Arjas, E. (2004). Comment on “On the Metropolis-Hastings Acceptance Probability to Add or Drop a Quantitative Trait Locus in Markov Chain Monte Carlo-Based Bayesian Analyses”. *Genetics*, **167**, 1037.
- Stroeker, R. (1983). Approximations of the eigenvalues of the covariance matrix of a first-order autoregressive process. *Journal of Econometrics*, **22**(3), 269–279.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B*, **58**, 267–288.
- Villa, C. and Walker, S. (2015). On the Mathematics of the Jeffreys-Lindley Paradox. Available at arXiv:1503.04098.
- Wang, B. and Zhang, F. (1992). Some Inequalities for the Eigenvalues of the Product of Positive Semidefinite Hermitian Matrices. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, **160**, 113–118.
- Wang, L., Liu, X., and Carroll, R. J. (2011). Estimation and Variable Selection for Generalized Additive Partial Linear Models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**, 1827–1851.
- Wang, M. and Maruyama, Y. (2016). Consistency of Bayes Factor for Nonnested Model Selection When the Model Dimension Grows. *Bernoulli*, **22**(4), 2080–2100.
- Wang, M. and Sun, X. (2014). Bayes Factor Consistency for Nested Linear Models With a Growing Number of Parameters. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, **147**, 95–105.
- Wang, X. and George, E. I. (2007). Adaptive Bayesian Criteria in Variable Selection for Generalized Linear Models. *Statistica Sinica*, **17**, 667–690.
- Weisberg, S. (2005). *Applied Linear Regression*. Wiley-Interscience, New York. Third Edition.
- Zellner, A. and Siow, A. (1980). Posterior Odds Ratios for Selected Regression Hypotheses. In J. M. Bernardo, M. H. DeGroot, D. V. Lindley, and A. F. M. Smith, editors, *Bayesian Statistics: Proceedings of the First International Meeting Held in Valencia*, pages 585–603, Valencia, Spain. University of Valencia Press.