

Optimal post-selection inference for sparse signals: a nonparametric empirical Bayes approach

Spencer Woody*

Department of Integrative Biology,
The University of Texas at Austin
and

Oscar Hernán Madrid-Padilla
Department of Statistics, The University of California, Los Angeles
and

James G. Scott
Department of Information, Risk, and Operations Management,
The University of Texas at Austin

November 17, 2020

Abstract

Many recently developed Bayesian methods have focused on sparse signal detection. However, much less work has been done addressing the natural follow-up question: how to make valid inferences for the magnitude of those signals after selection. Ordinary Bayesian credible intervals suffer from selection bias, as do ordinary frequentist confidence intervals, owing to the fact that the target of inference is chosen adaptively. Existing Bayesian approaches for correcting this bias produce credible intervals with poor frequentist properties, while existing frequentist approaches require sacrificing the benefits of shrinkage typical in Bayesian methods, resulting in confidence intervals that are needlessly wide. We address this gap by proposing a nonparametric empirical Bayes approach for constructing optimal selection-adjusted confidence sets. Our method produces confidence sets that are as short as possible on average, while both adjusting for selection and maintaining exact frequentist coverage uniformly over the parameter space. Our main theoretical result establishes an important consistency property of our procedure: that under mild conditions, it asymptotically converges to the results of an oracle-Bayes analysis in which the prior distribution of signal sizes is known exactly. Across a series of examples, the method outperforms existing frequentist techniques for post-selection inference, producing confidence sets that are notably shorter but with the same coverage guarantee.

Keywords: Biased test; Coverage; Post-selection inference; Selection bias; Shrinkage

*Corresponding author. Email to spencer.woody@utexas.edu

1 Introduction

This paper proposes a nonparametric empirical Bayes approach to post-selection inference with an exact coverage guarantee. Our framework and theoretical results here are both very general, but we focus primarily on the commonly encountered setting of inference for a sparse vector of Gaussian means, where $y_i \sim N(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$, and where most θ_i are zero or negligibly small. This model, although simple, is ubiquitous in modern statistical practice.

Much methodological work in this setting has focused on the question of how to find significantly nonzero θ_i 's. Many Bayesian approaches have been based on the two-groups model (e.g. Efron et al., 2001; Scott and Berger, 2006; Efron, 2008), where the prior is a mixture of a point mass at zero and some distribution of nonzero signals, or on global-local shrinkage priors (Polson and Scott, 2011) such as the horseshoe (Carvalho et al., 2010) or the Bayesian lasso (Park and Casella, 2008). But regardless of the particular prior used, an important question that is not adequately addressed in this literature is how to quantify the magnitude of those signals selected for inference after the detection procedure is applied. Previous scholars have differed on whether this poses a problem if one adopts a pure Bayesian perspective (c.f. Dawid, 1994; Yekutieli, 2012). However, even if one does correctly adjust posterior inference for selection when necessary, using posterior credible intervals certainly presents a very stark problem from a frequentist perspective. It is widely known that Bayesian credible sets in general are not valid frequentist confidence sets, except under very specific “matching” priors (e.g. Ghosh, 2011), but rather only retain coverage on average with respect to the prior. Furthermore, in post-selection settings, the departure from nominal coverage is much more severe than is commonly appreciated. For example, we present in §2.3 a simple case where, under a plausible selection mechanism, the coverage of 90% Bayesian credible sets is actually less than 50% for very strong signals.

There is, of course, an active line of recent work on purely frequentist solutions to the post-selection inference problem (e.g. Benjamini and Yekutieli, 2005; Lee et al., 2016; Reid et al., 2014). However, these adjustment procedures do not borrow information across components of the θ vector, and as a result, they produce confidence sets that are needlessly wide. This is particularly problematic in post-selection inference because selective confidence intervals are necessarily wider than their ordinary (non-selective) counterparts. There have been several attempts to create shorter selection-adjusted frequentist intervals (Zhong and Prentice, 2008; Weinstein

et al., 2013), but none of these methods have explicitly incorporated Bayesian ideas to improve the efficiency of inference.

Thus there is a major unmet need for inferential procedures that: (i) correctly adjust for the effects of selection; (ii) maintain valid frequentist coverage, uniformly across the whole parameter space; and (iii) produce confidence sets that are as short as possible. The approach we propose here has all three of these desirable features. As we will illustrate, while our procedure is frequentist in nature, its efficiency gains arise from Bayesian thinking: that is, from positing the existence of a prior that describes the sparsity pattern in the data set, and then estimating that prior nonparametrically using modern empirical Bayes tools.

2 Efficient selection-adjusted inference

2.1 Exchangeable means with known prior

In this section we describe our procedure under the simplifying assumption that the signals θ_i arise from a known prior distribution $\pi(\theta)$. In §3, we will come to the core of our proposal, when we describe a method for the more realistic setting of unknown $\pi(\theta)$.

Our work builds off the “frequentist assisted by Bayes” (FAB) framework, which was articulated in its earliest form by Pratt (1963) and substantially extended by Yu and Hoff (2018). This technique was originally proposed for constructing confidence intervals for group-level means in hierarchical normal models, and has also been extended to constructing confidence intervals for coefficients in a linear regression by Hoff and Yu (2019). Here we generalize the FAB procedure to produce Bayes-optimal confidence sets under post-selection inference. We call this procedure selection-adjusted FAB (saFAB).

Suppose we observe y_1, \dots, y_n independently from the parametric model $y_i \sim f(y_i; \theta_i)$, and we consider inference only for units i such that $y_i \in S$ for some region $S \subset \mathbb{R}$, which we refer to as the selection region or selection event. Conditional on this selection event, y has the truncated density function

$$f_S(y; \theta) = f(y; \theta) \cdot \mathbf{1}(y \in S) / \int_S f(y; \theta) dy, \quad (1)$$

with cumulative density function $F_S(y; \theta)$ and generalized quantile function $F_S^{-1}(p; \theta) = \inf_y \{y : F_S(y; \theta) \geq p\}$. Using (1), one may construct confidence sets that condition on the selection event $y \in S$ via the well-known procedure of inverting a family of α -level tests of point null hypotheses of the form $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ for all $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. The key decision that arises in this procedure, and that we will discuss in detail below, is how to construct this family of tests.

We first remark that the standard choice of an equal-tailed test is the universally most powerful unbiased (UMPU) test and forms the basis of the method proposed by Fithian et al. (2014). In particular, suppose that we condition on $y \in S$, so that $y \sim f_S(y; \theta)$. Then the UMPU test of $H_0 : \theta = \theta_0$ has acceptance region

$$A^S(\theta_0) = \{y : F_S^{-1}(\alpha/2; \theta_0) \leq y \leq F_S^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2; \theta_0)\}.$$

As shown by Fithian et al. (2014), inverting this family of acceptance regions gives the $(1 - \alpha)$ -level uniformly most accurate unbiased (UMA) selection-adjusted confidence interval, of the form $C^S(y) = \{\theta : y \in A^S(\theta)\}$. It is clear this interval will cover the true θ with the correct probability, conditional on the selection event $y \in S$, because $\Pr_\theta(\theta \in C^S(y) \mid y \in S) = \Pr_\theta(y \in A^S(\theta)) = 1 - \alpha$.

However, following the logic that both Pratt (1963) and Yu and Hoff (2018) apply to the task of ordinary (non-selection-adjusted) inference, we need not restrict ourselves to confidence sets based on the unbiased test using equal-tail probability regions in $F_S(y; \theta)$. In fact, we may generally choose a biased test with acceptance region.

$$A_w^S(\theta_0) = \{y : F_S^{-1}(\alpha w; \theta_0) \leq y \leq F_S^{-1}(\alpha w + 1 - \alpha; \theta_0)\}, \quad (2)$$

where $w \in [0, 1]$ controls how α , the total probability mass that falls outside the acceptance region, is split between the two tails of $f_S(y; \theta)$. This leads to confidence sets of the form $C_w^S(y) = \{\theta : y \in A_w^S(\theta)\}$, which will retain nominal coverage by construction. We note that the choice $w = 0.5$ recovers the equal-tailed UMPU test and thus the confidence sets from Fithian et al. (2014); any other choice will put different probabilities in the left versus right tail. In fact, we are free to choose a different value of w for each θ_0 in Eq. (2), and may tune these choices to reflect our prior knowledge. Specifically, we will find a form of w to give the shortest confidence

sets for θ , in expectation under a prior $\pi(\theta)$. The result will be a function $w : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that gives a different optimal w for each θ , yielding a family of acceptance regions $A_{w(\theta)}^S$ and confidence set procedure $C_{w(\theta)}^S$. Following Yu and Hoff (2018), we call $w(\theta)$ the spending function, as it dictates how the acceptance region allocates, or spends, the Type I error rate α .

The Bayes-optimal spending function is found as follows. First, following Pratt (1961) and Yu and Hoff (2018), define the frequentist risk $R(\theta; w)$ of a confidence-set procedure for θ to be the expected Lebesgue measure of that confidence region under $f_S(y; \theta)$. That is,

$$R(\theta; w) = \int \int \mathbf{1}(y \in A_w^S(\tilde{\theta})) f_S(y; \theta) d\tilde{\theta} dy.$$

Then, upon introducing a prior $\theta \sim \pi(\theta)$, we may compute the Bayes loss of a confidence set C_w^S procedure as

$$\begin{aligned} L(\pi, w) &= \int R(\theta; w) \pi(\theta) d\theta = \int \left[\int \int \mathbf{1}(y \in A_w^S(\tilde{\theta})) f_S(y; \theta) d\tilde{\theta} dy \right] \pi(\theta) d\theta \\ &= \int \left[\int \int \mathbf{1}(y \in A_w^S(\tilde{\theta})) f_S(y; \theta) \pi(\theta) dy d\theta \right] d\tilde{\theta} = \int \Pr(Y \in A_w^S(\tilde{\theta})) d\tilde{\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The final integrand in Eq. (3) is the marginal probability that y falls in the acceptance region, integrating out θ under the prior. Intuitively, confidence procedures that yield shorter intervals, on average under the marginal distribution of selected observations, have smaller Bayes loss. Let $m_S(y)$ denote the density of this marginal distribution, whose form we discuss in the following subsection, with corresponding cumulative density function $M_S(y)$. We may rewrite the integrand in (3) as

$$H(w; \theta) \equiv \Pr(Y \in A_w^S(\theta)) = M_S [F_S^{-1}(\alpha w + 1 - \alpha; \theta)] - M_S [F_S^{-1}(\alpha w; \theta)]. \quad (4)$$

This defines an objective whose minimization gives the Bayes-optimal spending function,

$$w^*(\theta) = \arg \min_{w \in [0, 1]} H(w; \theta).$$

Generally, there is no closed-form solution to solve this optimization problem. Therefore we implement a numerical approach whereby the spending function is approximated pointwise by

solving the minimization problem along a grid of θ values. After the optimal spending function is calculated, the Bayes-optimal confidence set for selected observations is obtained by inverting the resulting acceptance region, $C_{w^*(\theta)}^S = \{\theta : y \in A_{w^*(\theta)}^S\}$.

We note that $w(\theta)$ must be a monotonic function to ensure that the produced confidence sets are intervals. This is sometimes not the case, as in the toy example presented later in this section. Thus, the returned confidence set will occasionally be a set of disjoint intervals, in which case the size of the set is equal to the Lebesgue measure. However, this rarely happens in all our applications. If such a confidence set is produced, one may create an interval by taking the minimum and maximum of the set, and then the size of this interval would be given by the difference. Such a procedure will produce confidence intervals with conservative coverage and which will often still be more efficient than the UMAU intervals.

2.2 Influence of the selection mechanism on the spending function

We observe from Eq.(4) that calculating the optimal spending function requires knowing two parts of the overall model: the truncated sampling model $f_S(y; \theta)$ and the marginal density of selected signals $m_S(y)$. As we shall see, this marginal density depends both on the prior $\pi(\theta)$ as well as the specific mechanism by which selection occurs.

A very useful distinction between two different types of selection mechanisms—joint selection versus conditional selection—was drawn by Yekutieli (2012). This distinction is best explained by example. To understand joint selection, imagine a genomics study that seeks to understand the differences in gene expression across two experimental conditions. Suppose the data arise as follows. For each gene $i = 1, \dots, N$: (i) draw $\theta_i \sim \pi(\theta)$, representing a true effect size for gene i ; (ii) observe data $y_i \sim N(\theta_i, 1)$, representing the observed effect size for gene i , (iii) select the (y_i, θ_i) pairs where $y_i \in S$ (e.g. $|y_i| > 2$), and perform inference only for those selected θ_i 's. Under such a scenario, the selected y and θ have the joint distribution

$$p_S^{(J)}(\theta, y) = \pi(\theta) \cdot f(y; \theta) \cdot \mathbf{1}(y \in S) / \Pr(S), \quad (5)$$

where $\Pr(S) = \int \int_S f(y; \theta) \pi(\theta) dy d\theta$ is the marginal probability of selection. In this case, the marginal density of selected signals is proportional to the ordinary marginal density $m(y) =$

$\int f(y; \theta)\pi(\theta)d\theta$, truncated to S :

$$m_S^{(J)}(y) = \int \mathbf{1}(y \in S)\pi(\theta) f(y; \theta) / \Pr(S) d\theta = m(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}(y \in S) / \Pr(S). \quad (6)$$

We use the term “joint selection” rather than Yekutieli’s term “random parameter selection” to describe such a setting, to emphasize that the selection mechanism applies to (y_i, θ_i) pairs jointly.

Now turning to conditional selection, imagine a scientific field with many open questions ($i = 1, 2, \dots$), where journals publish results only for observed effect sizes $y \in S$. For each open question i , published results are generated as follows: (i) sample $\theta_i \sim \pi(\theta)$, representing the true effect size for question i ; (ii) many labs ($k = 1, 2, \dots$) observe $y_i^{(k)} \sim N(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$; (iii) the first lab that observes $y_i^{(k)} \in S$ publishes its results. Now let y_i denote the published estimate for θ_i ; by construction, this is a sample from $N(\theta_i, \sigma^2)$ truncated to S , taken by rejection sampling. We refer to this mechanism as “conditional selection”, rather than Yekutieli’s term of “fixed parameter” selection, to emphasize that the selection mechanism applies to draws for y_i , conditional upon a specific value of θ_i , which is itself assumed to be a random draw from a prior.

Under conditional selection, the joint distribution of (θ, y) for selection signals is now

$$p_S^{(C)}(\theta, y) = \pi(\theta) \cdot f(y; \theta) \cdot \mathbf{1}(y \in S) / \Pr(S | \theta), \quad (7)$$

where $\Pr(S | \theta) = \int_S f(y; \theta)d\theta$ is the probability of selection conditional on θ . This implies that the marginal density of the data is

$$m_S^{(C)}(y) = \mathbf{1}(y \in S) \int \pi(\theta) f(y | \theta) / \Pr(S | \theta) d\theta. \quad (8)$$

Unlike in the case of joint selection, this marginal is no longer equivalent to the usual marginal density truncated to S , because of the term $\Pr(S | \theta)$ appearing inside the integral over θ .

Thus we see that the optimal spending function depends on four factors: the parametric model $f(y; \theta)$, the selection set S , the prior $\pi(\theta)$, and the selection mechanism itself.




Figure 1: Spending function from the toy example, which determines the degree of bias in acceptance region calculations as a function of θ . Inversion of these acceptance regions gives the Bayes-optimal confidence sets. The spending function depends on (i) the sampling distribution of observations, (ii) the selection set, (iii) the selection mechanism, and (iv) the prior for signals.

2.3 Toy example

To demonstrate the mechanics and advantages of our method, we first show how it performs on a toy example where θ follows the two-groups model,

$$\pi(\theta) = p \cdot N(\theta; 0, \tau^2) + (1 - p) \cdot \delta_0(\theta), \quad (9)$$

a mixture of a point mass at 0 and a zero-centered Gaussian with variance τ^2 . For this example we set $p = 0.1$ and $\tau^2 = 3$. We generate $n = 10,000$ samples of θ_i from this distribution, and then sample each y_i from $N(\theta_i, 1)$. The selection region is chosen to be $S = \{y : |y| > 2\}$ and we operate under the joint selection mechanism. That is, (θ_i, y_i) are sampled jointly and a confidence set is constructed for θ_i only if $|y_i| > 2$.

Figure 1 shows the resulting optimal spending function for this particular combination of prior, sampling model, selection region, and selection mechanism. This spending function defines the family of selective hypothesis tests to create the Bayes-optimal confidence sets. For comparison, we also calculated the UMAU confidence sets from Fithian et al. (2014) which correspond to the flat spending function $w_{\text{saUMA}}(\theta) = 1/2$.

Figure 2 shows the sizes of each procedure's confidence sets $C(y)$ as a function of y . For reference, we have also plotted the marginal distribution of y for the selected signals. Notably,

the saFAB procedure gives a smaller confidence set for values of y that are most frequently observed: for approximately 90% of the observations in this example, saFAB returns a smaller confidence set. For values of y larger than approximately 3.6, saFAB give a wider confidence set than the intervals from Fithian et al. (2014), but observing a y_i this large is relatively rare. As a result, the saFAB intervals are 12% shorter on average than the UMAU intervals.

Finally, Figure 3 shows the coverage of our saFAB method in comparison to two alternative methods: the non-selection adjusted confidence sets (“non-sa UMAU”) and selection-adjusted Bayesian credible intervals (“saBayes”). Following Yekutieli (2012), the selection-adjusted posterior distribution is identical to the ordinary posterior distribution because of the mechanism of joint selection. Since the θ_i are drawn from the mixture in Eq. (9), we consider the two cases of $\theta = 0$ and $\theta \neq 0$. The unadjusted confidence intervals have poor coverage, with nearly zero coverage for θ values equal to and near 0, owing to selection bias. On the other hand, the selection-adjusted Bayesian credible intervals have correct coverage on average across all signals, but this coverage is highly non-uniform in θ . In particular, since the credible interval nearly always includes 0 due to the presence of the point mass in the posterior, the coverage for $\theta = 0$ is nearly 1, while coverage is much lower for all other values of θ . In the supplemental material, we show how this problem of poor coverage of credible intervals for nonzero θ is exacerbated when even greater prior mass is assigned for $\theta = 0$. Our saFAB procedure, on the other hand, provides nominal coverage uniformly across the entire parameter space. Although not shown, the usual selection-adjusted UMAU confidence sets of Fithian et al. (2014) also exhibit the same uniform coverage; they are simply wider on average.

3 Nonparametric empirical Bayes procedure

3.1 Estimating the prior

In the previous section we introduced the saFAB procedure for situations where the prior $\pi(\theta)$ had a known parametric form. In cases where $\pi(\theta)$ is not known, however, it may not be desirable to specify a parametric form or elicit a subjective choice. For this situation, we propose a method for post-selection inference where a prior need not be fully specified but rather is estimated from the data using a nonparametric empirical Bayes approach. Throughout, we still assume that both the




Figure 2: Comparison of sizes of selection-adjusted UMAU confidence sets (saUMA) and our selection-adjusted FAB confidence sets as a function of observation size. For most observations (around 90% of the marginal density), saFAB returns a smaller confidence set, resulting in confidence sets that are 12% smaller on average.




Figure 3: Results for toy example, comparing coverage rates for non-selection adjusted confidence sets (non-sa UMAU), selection-adjusted Bayesian posterior credible intervals (saBayes), and our selection-adjusted FAB confidence sets (saFAB). We delineate the two cases of $\theta = 0$ (left) and $\theta \neq 0$ (right). Non-selection adjusted confidence sets have poor coverage throughout and selection-adjusted credible intervals only have correct coverage on average across the prior. saFAB confidence sets have uniform nominal coverage.

sampling model $f(y; \theta)$ and the selection mechanism are known, and that the selection rule S has also been pre-specified. Our main theoretical result establishes that, under mild regularity conditions and with selection occurring jointly on (θ, y) , our nonparametric method gives a consistent estimate of the true optimal spending function. In addition, our empirical results show that this data-driven strategy for constructing a spending function offers substantial efficiency improvements over the UMAU intervals, while losing very little compared to a hypothetical oracle-Bayes analysis in which the prior is known.

Recall that the optimal spending function $w^*(\theta)$ is calculated by minimizing the objective function $H(w; \theta)$ in Eq. (4), which involves the marginal density of selected observations $m_S(y)$. This marginal density in turn depends on both the selection mechanism, which is known, as well as the prior, which is unknown. The intuition of our approach is that if we are able to specify a prior whose corresponding marginal distribution matches the data well, we should also be able to recover a good estimate of the optimal spending function. Our nonparametric empirical Bayes approach exploits this fact by using a plug-in estimate $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$ for the prior distribution.

One challenge that arises in constructing such an estimate $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$ is that it must adapt to the data, yet still ensure valid post-selection sets. As implied by Proposition 7 from Yu and Hoff (2018), in order to retain nominal coverage of the procedure, the spending function—and therefore the estimate of the prior—cannot depend on the same data that we use to construct confidence sets. Otherwise, there is the potential for selection bias to be re-introduced via the mechanism of an overly optimistic prior. As an example, consider the data-dependent prior that concentrates all its probability mass on the observed value of y : $\pi(\theta_i) = \delta_{y_i}$. It is easy to show that, if we use our procedure to construct the optimal spending function under such an aggressively data-dependent prior, the resulting confidence sets will not retain nominal coverage.

To avoid a more subtle version of this pitfall, in practice we use a K -fold data-splitting approach, whereby the data are split into K non-overlapping subsets y_1, \dots, y_K . To construct confidence sets for the data points in fold 1, we first use the data in folds 2 through K to form an estimate of the prior $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$. This gives us an estimate of the optimal spending function $\hat{w}(\theta)$, which we use to construct Bayes-optimal saFAB confidence sets for the data points in fold 1. Note that the data in the other folds are used only to estimate the spending function, but the actual confidence interval for a single θ_i is constructed using this spending function and only the

single observation y_i . We then repeat this process for each fold, always holding out the data from that fold when we estimate the prior. This ensures that the independence condition from Proposition 7 of Yu and Hoff (2018) is met. To actually form the estimate $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$, we use the method of predictive recursion from Newton (2002). We provide details of this approach in Algorithm 1 of Appendix A.

3.2 Constructing the spending function

We now assume that $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$ is given, and we use it to obtain an estimate of the optimal spending function $\hat{w}^*(\theta)$ as follows. First, from the estimated prior $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$, we derive the corresponding marginal distribution of the data under selection, $\hat{m}_S(y)$, which is calculated by substituting $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$ in for $\pi(\theta)$ in either Eq. (6) or Eq. (8), depending on the selection mechanism. That is, the estimated selection-adjusted marginal is either

$$\hat{m}_S^{(J)}(y) = \int \mathbf{1}(y \in S) \hat{\pi}(\theta) f(y; \theta) / \hat{\Pr}(S) d\theta = \hat{m}(y) \cdot \mathbf{1}(y \in S) / \hat{\Pr}(S). \quad (10)$$

for joint selection, where $\hat{\Pr}(S) = \int \int_S f(y; \theta) \hat{\pi}(\theta) dy d\theta$ and $\hat{m}(y) = \int f(y; \theta) \hat{\pi}(\theta) d\theta$, or

$$\hat{m}_S^{(C)}(y) = \mathbf{1}(y \in S) \int \hat{\pi}(\theta) f(y | \theta) / \Pr(S | \theta) d\theta, \quad (11)$$

for conditional selection. This then defines the surrogate objective function

$$\hat{H}(w; \theta) = \hat{M}_S [F_S^{-1}(\alpha w + 1 - \alpha; \theta)] - \hat{M}_S [F_S^{-1}(\alpha w; \theta)], \quad (12)$$

which serves as a proxy for the true (unknown) objective function $H(\theta; w)$ in Eq. (4). Minimization of this objective function in turn gives the estimated optimal spending function $\hat{w}^*(\theta) = \arg \min_{w \in [0,1]} \hat{H}(w; \theta)$. We then use this estimate of the optimal spending function to calculate confidence sets, in the manner described in §2. \square

3.3 Main consistency result

The key statistical question that arises from our procedure is whether the minimizer of the surrogate objective $\hat{H}(w; \theta)$ is a good estimate for the minimizer of the true, unknown objective

$H(w; \theta)$. We now turn to our main theoretical result, which establishes that, under mild conditions, the answer is yes, at least in the case of joint selection. Our proof builds upon the foundation laid by Tokdar et al. (2009), who give conditions under which predictive recursion will yield an estimate $\hat{m}(y)$ that converges to the true marginal density $m(y)$. From their result, it is easy to demonstrate that the estimated selection-adjusted marginal density for joint selection, $\hat{m}_S^{(J)}(y)$ in Eq. (10) also converges to the true density $m_S^{(J)}$ in Eq. (6). Our theorem hinges on using this fact to show that the worst-case distance from any minimizer $\hat{w}^*(\theta)$ of the surrogate objective function $\hat{H}(\cdot; \theta)$ to the set of minimizers of $H(\cdot; \theta)$ converges to zero in probability; see Eq. (13) below. Thus, for any minimizer $\hat{w}^*(\theta)$ of $\hat{H}(\cdot; \theta)$ there exists a minimizer $w^*(\theta)$ of $H(\cdot; \theta)$ which is close to $\hat{w}^*(\theta)$. Furthermore, we show that the value of $H(\cdot; \theta)$ at any minimizer of $\hat{H}(\cdot; \theta)$ converges to the optimal value of $H(\cdot; \theta)$. These results require the same conditions in Tokdar et al. (2009) that are necessary to ensure the Kullback-Leibler convergence of the predictive-recursion estimator. The explicit assumptions are given in Appendix B. The first condition has to do with the choice of the weights in the predictive recursion algorithm, whereas the remaining are regularity assumptions on the model. These include an identifiability condition of the mixing density when the likelihood is $f(\cdot; \theta)$; the requirement that $f(y; \theta)$ is bounded and continuous as a function of θ ; and two boundedness properties involving the behavior of f . As shown in Tokdar et al. (2009) these conditions all hold for the Gaussian model.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that the selection region is $S = \{y : |y| > t\}$ for some $t > 0$ with selection occurring jointly on (θ, y) , and that $f(\cdot; \theta)$ has as support the real line. Also suppose that the estimated prior $\hat{\pi}(\theta)$ is calculated using predictive recursion as outlined in Algorithm 1 using a subset of the data that grows with n . If Assumptions A1-A5 from Tokdar et al. (2009) are met by f (see Appendix B), then for a fixed θ the following statements hold:*

- *Let Ω_0 be the set of minimizers of $H(\cdot; \theta)$, and $\hat{\Omega}$ the set of minimizers of $\hat{H}(\cdot; \theta)$. Assume that $\Omega_0 \neq \emptyset$. If $q := F_S(t, \theta) \leq \alpha$ and $q/\alpha \notin \Omega_0$ then we require that $\lim_{w \rightarrow (q/\alpha)^+} H(w; \theta) > \min_{\tilde{w} \in [0,1]} H(\tilde{w}; \theta)$. Then for every $\epsilon > 0$ we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pr \left(\sup_{\hat{w}^* \in \hat{\Omega}} \inf_{w^* \in \Omega_0} |\hat{w}^* - w^*| \geq \epsilon \right) = 0. \quad (13)$$

Thus, the worst-case distance from $\hat{\Omega}$ to Ω_0 converges to zero in probability.

- Almost surely, if $\hat{w}^* \in \hat{\Omega}$ then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} H(\hat{w}^*; \theta) = H(w^*; \theta), \quad (14)$$

for some $w^* \in \Omega_0$.

Proof 1 See Appendix C.

We notice that when $q = F_S(t; \theta) \leq \alpha$ and $q/\alpha \notin \Omega_0$ the conclusion (13) requires an extra condition. If such condition is violated, thus,

$$\lim_{w \rightarrow (q/\alpha)^+} H(w; \theta) = \min_{w \in [0,1]} H(w; \theta), \quad (15)$$

then (13) will hold replacing Ω_0 with $\Omega_0 \cup \{q/\alpha\}$. This is reasonable since when (15) holds even minimization of H over a finite grid of points in $[0, 1]$ could lead to points that are arbitrarily close to q/α as the grid size grows.

An important implication of Theorem 1 has to do with constructed confidence sets. In particular, let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$ fixed points in the real line. If all the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold for each θ_j and $F_S(t; \theta_j)/\alpha$ is not a minimizer of $H(\cdot; \theta_j)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N$, then for each j there exists a $w^*(\theta_j)$ minimizer of $H(\cdot; \theta_j)$ such that for all $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\text{pr} \left[\max_{j=1, \dots, N} \nu \left\{ \left(A_{\hat{w}^*(\theta_j)}^S \setminus A_{w^*(\theta_j)}^S \right) \cup \left(A_{w^*(\theta_j)}^S \setminus A_{\hat{w}^*(\theta_j)}^S \right) \right\} \geq \epsilon \right] \rightarrow 0, \quad (16)$$

where ν is the Lebesgue measure. Thus, the acceptance regions for the grid points based on the estimated spending function will be closed to those based on the true spending function. Consequently, if a new data point is collected then the confidence set based on the estimated spending function and the grid of points will be equals to that based on the same grid and the true spending function, with probability approaching one (see Corollary 1 in Appendix D). If instead (15) holds for some θ_j or $F_S(t; \theta_j)/\alpha$ is a minimizer of $H(\cdot; \theta_j)$, then such θ_j would have to be excluded from the statement in (16) and from that of Corollary 1. This is due to the discontinuity of $F_S^{-1}(\cdot; \theta_j)$ at $F_S(t; \theta_j)$.

On another note, we restrict ourselves to selective inference with a selection region of the form $S = \{y : |y| > t\}$ for $t > 0$. However, because this result mostly hinges on convergence

of \hat{m} to m , it also holds for asymmetric and one-sided selection regions. In fact, for one sided regions the extra regularity condition on q is not needed for Theorem 1. Similarly, in such setting (16) and Corollary 1 hold without conditions on q . Theorem 1 also applies when constructing non-selective confidence sets, including the situation studied in Yu and Hoff (2018). A similar result is more difficult to show for conditional selection, as the selection-adjusted marginal in this case has the much less tractable form given in Eq. (11).

We also note that the procedure comes in with a built-in form of robustness. Even if the prior is not well estimated for a given sample, by construction the procedure will still give confidence sets that retain nominal coverage, as long as the spending function is not data-dependent. In other words, prior misspecification can mitigate the efficiency of confidence sets, but not their coverage.

4 Results on simulated and real data

4.1 Case of well-specified prior

We now investigate the performance of our saFAB procedure to the usual selective confidence set, i.e. the UMAU confidence sets developed by Reid et al. (2014), at the $\alpha = 0.1$ level. Specifically, we will check that nominal coverage is maintained, and also compare the efficiency (size) of the confidence sets. We consider saFAB confidence sets from three variants of constructing the spending function: (i) the “oracle” case where we know the parametric form and the hyperparameters of the prior, (ii) the “parametric empirical Bayes” (PEB) case where we assume a parametric form of the prior, and estimate hyperparameters via maximum marginal likelihood estimation using five-fold data-splitting, and (iii) the “nonparametric empirical Bayes” (NPEB) case as described in the §3, where estimate the prior $\pi(\theta)$ from the data via the predictive recursion algorithm of Newton (2002), using five-fold data-splitting.

We sample θ_i from several considered distributions, and generate data y_i from the Gaussian distribution centered on θ_i with unit variance. The sampling variance is assumed known for each method of constructing confidence sets.

First we consider signals generated from the point mass-Gaussian mixture in Eq. (9) for the toy example in §2.3 with the hyperparameters set to $p = 0.2$ and $\tau^2 = 3$. We simulate 2,000,000

Method	Coverage	Average size	Relative average size
Oracle	0.8990 (0.0095)	3.3493 (0.0014)	0.8956 (0.0004)
PEB	0.8990 (0.0095)	3.3510 (0.0014)	0.8960 (0.0004)
NPEB	0.8995 (0.0095)	3.3555 (0.0014)	0.8972 (0.0004)
UMAU	0.8993 (0.0095)	3.7399 (0.0016)	1.0000 (0.0004)

Table 1: Comparison of performance for the well specified prior case under joint selection. We consider saFAB when the prior is assumed known (oracle), saFAB when the prior form is known and hyperparameters are estimated from the data (parametric empirical Bayes, PEB), saFAB when no prior form is assumed but is rather estimated from the data using predictive recursion (NPEB), and the existing selective confidence sets resulting from inverting unbiased tests (UMAU).

Method	Coverage	Average size	Relative average size
Oracle	0.9005 (0.0095)	3.5138 (0.0021)	0.9385 (0.0006)
PEB	0.9004 (0.0095)	3.5113 (0.0021)	0.9378 (0.0006)
NPEB	0.8999 (0.0095)	3.5123 (0.0021)	0.9381 (0.0005)
UMAU	0.8998 (0.0095)	3.7441 (0.0016)	1.0000 (0.0004)

Table 2: Comparison of performance for the well specified prior case under conditional selection

total signals, structured in 1000 batches as follows. For each batch we make $n = 2000$ draws from the mixture model for θ_i and generate y_i from $N(\theta_i, 1)$. For conditional selection, these θ_i are generated once and used for each batch, while for the joint selection case they are generated anew each time. The selection rule for determining the θ_i for which to construct confidence sets is $S = \{y : |y| > 2\}$. For these selected θ_i we construct 90% confidence sets under the four considered methods, and then for each method we calculate the proportion of confidence sets which cover the true θ_i , as well as the average size of the confidence sets.

Tables 1 and 2 show the results for joint and conditional selection, respectively. The coverage of each method hems closely to the nominal rate. The oracle saFAB procedure, however, gives confidence sets that are on average approximately 10% (joint selection) and 6% (conditional selection) more efficient than the existing selective confidence set procedure (UMAU). The efficiency of the parametric empirical Bayes saFAB procedure closely hems to that of the oracle. Notably, the nonparametric empirical Bayes variant of saFAB also comes very close to the oracle, even though it makes no assumption of the form of the prior.

4.2 Case of misspecified prior

Now we compare the performance of the nonparametric procedure against the parametric procedure under a misspecified prior. That is, for the parametric procedure we assume the same parametric form of a point mass-Gaussian mixture for the prior, but in reality the θ_i are drawn from a different distribution. We study two different scenarios of misspecification: one where the non-zero θ_i come from a bimodal distribution with both modes separated from zero, that is

$$\theta_i \sim (p/2)\mathcal{N}(-\mu, \tau^2) + (p/2)\mathcal{N}(\mu, \tau^2) + (1-p)\delta_0$$

with $\tau^2 = 1/4$ and $p = 0.2$, and one where they come from a skewed, unimodal nonzero-centered distribution, that is

$$\theta_i \sim p\{\mu + \text{Exponential}(\lambda)\} + (1-p)\delta_0$$

with $\mu = 1$ and $\lambda = 1$.

In both cases, we simulate 1000 batches of $n = 2000$ pairs of (θ_i, y_i) , and we retain the same selection region, $S = \{y : |y| > t\}$. For brevity, we only consider selection acting jointly on (θ_i, y_i) .

Tables 3 and 4 show the results. Again, each method maintains nominal coverage. That this is true for the parametric saFAB procedure shows that even under prior misspecification, saFAB gives correct coverage. For both considered priors, the oracle saFAB gives confidence sets which are about 11–12% more efficient than the UMAU procedure. Interestingly, the parametric and nonparametric saFAB procedures show only minor differences in their efficiency gains, and come close to the oracle. Whereas nonparametric slightly outperforms parametric in the case of the skewed alternative density, this result is reversed for the bimodal alternative density. This latter fact is surprising given that the assumed prior in the parametric procedure is incorrect, and is likely explained by a high estimated variance for the unimodal alternative density.

Method	Coverage	Average size	Relative average size
Oracle	0.9012 (0.0094)	3.3941 (0.0007)	0.8884 (0.0002)
PEB	0.9038 (0.0093)	3.4148 (0.0007)	0.8938 (0.0002)
NPEB	0.9017 (0.0094)	3.4335 (0.0008)	0.8987 (0.0002)
UMAUI	0.8999 (0.0095)	3.8204 (0.0009)	1.0000 (0.0002)

Table 3: Comparison of performance when the prior is misspecified for the parametric empirical Bayes saFAB procedure. The true density for θ is a mixture of a point mass at zero and a bimodal alternative density, and signals are selected under joint selection.

Method	Coverage	Average size	Relative average size
Oracle	0.8940 (0.0097)	3.3149 (0.0011)	0.8808 (0.0003)
PEB	0.8937 (0.0097)	3.3941 (0.0011)	0.9019 (0.0003)
NPEB	0.9070 (0.0092)	3.3672 (0.0019)	0.8947 (0.0005)
UMAUI	0.9002 (0.0095)	3.7635 (0.0014)	1.0000 (0.0004)

Table 4: Comparison of performance when the prior is misspecified for the parametric empirical Bayes saFAB procedure. The true density for θ is a mixture of a point mass at zero and a skewed alternative density, and signals are selected under joint selection.

4.3 Data-dependent thresholding

So far we have so far presumed that the selection set S is specified *a priori*, so that the selection-adjusted sampling model is well-defined. Now we investigate the use of data-adaptive selection sets, where the selection set S is now a random variable and so the truncated sampling model in Eq. (1) is not well-defined. We focus on the popular Benjamini-Hochberg (BH) procedure (Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995) for controlling the false discovery rate (FDR) to decide the selection rule. To briefly summarize the BH procedure, suppose we have m null hypotheses H_{01}, \dots, H_{0m} all with corresponding p -values p_1, \dots, p_m , and let $p_{(k)}$ represent the k th smallest p -value with corresponding null hypothesis $H_{(k)}$. Rejecting all null hypotheses $H_{(1)}, \dots, H_{(k^*)}$ with

$$k^* = \max \{k : p_{(k)}/k \leq q^*/m\} \quad (17)$$

bounds the FDR at q^* , where the FDR is the expected proportion of rejected null hypotheses which are actually true. This is a data-dependent rule for selection because we must calculate the p -values from the data to decide the selection rule. Reid et al. (2014) characterize the BH

Method	Average coverage	Average size	Relative average size
Oracle	0.9028 (0.0094)	3.7088 (0.0019)	0.9158 (0.0005)
PEB	0.9033 (0.0093)	3.7072 (0.0019)	0.9154 (0.0005)
NPEB	0.9032 (0.0093)	3.7084 (0.0022)	0.9157 (0.0005)
UMAU	0.9088 (0.0091)	4.0500 (0.0014)	1.0000 (0.0003)

Table 5: Comparison of performance when using a data-dependent threshold, via the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure, for the selection set, and signals are selected under joint selection.

procedure as an affine linear constraint for use in the selection-adjusted likelihood for constructing UMAU confidence intervals, but here we are interested in investigating the performance of confidence sets constructed by simply treating the BH procedure as a simple data-dependent thresholding problem.

We perform a simulation study to see if nominal coverage is still upheld using this approach. We generate data in an identical way as done in §4.1. We only consider the case of joint selection. Each two-sided p -value for the point null hypothesis $H_{0i} : \theta_i = 0$ is then given by $p_i = 2\Phi(-|y_i|)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the standard normal cumulative density function. We use the BH rule in Eq. (17) to choose which θ_i to be considered for inference. The selection set for constructing the selection-adjusted likelihood is now considered to be $S = \{y : |y| > |y_{(k^*+1)}|\}$, i.e. the threshold is determined by the largest y_i in magnitude of those not chosen by the BH procedure. We use $q^* = 0.2$ as the target FDR for the decision rule, and again construct 90% confidence sets for each method, performing 1000 simulations.

The results are presented in Table 5. We appear to recover nominal coverage for each method. This suggests that using the BH procedure as a data-dependent selection rule will still give valid confidence sets for the saFAB procedure.

4.4 Analysis of neural synchrony data

Finally, we apply the nonparametric saFAB procedure to a real dataset to show how, with minimal assumptions about the prior, we may still construct confidence sets which have significant gains in efficiency over the UMAU confidence sets. To do so, we analyze the neural synchrony data published in Smith and Kohn (2008) and Kelly et al. (2010), and re-analyzed by Scott et al. (2015). The goal of this application is to identify fine-time-scale neural interactions (“synchrony”) among




Figure 4: Comparison of confidence intervals from saFAB and UMAU. Our saFAB procedure gives confidence intervals that are 11.3% shorter on average, with 85% of constructed intervals being shorter.

many neurons recorded simultaneously by a multi-electrode array. The experiment from which the data are drawn produced thousands of pairwise test statistics, each representing the magnitude of interaction between a single pair of neurons.

Kelly et al. (2010) provide full details of the data and the experiment. For our purposes, the relevant fact is that the data for each neuron pair can be assumed to take the form $z_i \sim N(\theta_i, 1)$ (we use i to index pairs, which can be thought of as edges in a network). Here θ_i can be interpreted as a log rate ratio: that is, e^{θ_i} represents how much more often, in multiplicative terms, the two neurons in pair i fire together, compared to the rate one would expect if they were firing independently. Thus if $\theta_i \approx 0$, the two neurons are plausibly independent, while if θ_i is substantially larger than zero, they exhibit an interesting pattern of fine-time-scale synchronous firing. The case $\theta_i < 0$ is less well understood scientifically, but potentially interesting as well.

In our analysis, we assume no parametric form of the prior for θ , preferring instead to use the nonparametric saFAB procedure outlined in §3 to estimate the prior via predictive recursion. We use $S = \{y : |y| > 2\}$ as a very liberal selection region. Here selection acts jointly on θ_i and y_i , since we will form confidence sets only for those θ_i that meeting an initial screen of significance. Figure 4 shows the saFAB confidence sets as compared to the selection-adjusted UMAU confidence sets. The asymmetry in these intervals reflects that fact that most signals in the data set corresponding to presumed cases where $\theta_i > 0$ (synchrony enhancement), rather than

$\theta_i < 0$ (synchrony suppression). Indeed, there are clear scientific reasons to suspect that many neuron pairs will have $\theta_i > 0$, but the case $\theta_i < 0$ would be unusual. Our analysis detects this fact without having to assume it, and adapts to it via the choice of the spending function.

For the large majority selected test statistics, about 85%, our saFAB method produces a shorter interval than the UMAU method. The saFAB intervals are considerably more efficient; the average width of the saFAB intervals is 3.38, about 11.3% smaller than the average width of UMAU intervals, which is 3.81. While the saFAB intervals are wider for some of the larger test statistics, these observations are relatively few. Indeed, because the marginal distribution of selected test statistics is tightly concentrated near the boundary of the selection region, these are the intervals which receive the efficiency gains of our procedure by design. Having tighter intervals for these observations is important since there is a greater chance of them being false positives.

We emphasize that our analysis complements, rather than competes with, the analyses in Kelly et al. (2010) and Scott et al. (2015). In those papers, the goal was to discover interesting pairs of neurons, i.e. to test which pairs have $\theta_i \neq 0$. Our analysis takes such a test as a starting point. Using the techniques developed here, we are able to conduct valid frequentist inference for the discovered θ_i 's, while exploiting their probabilistic structure via a prior, and simultaneously controlling for post-selection inference. Because θ_i has a useful neurophysiological interpretation as a log relative rate, quantifying uncertainty about its magnitude can in this manner add substantially to the analyses conducted by previous authors.

5 Discussion

The central argument of this paper has been that the use of a prior can play a decisive and favorable role in constructing optimal selection-adjusted confidence sets. Here we identify three open questions. First, an interesting future line of work would be to undertake a formal investigation of the performance of the saFAB method under data-dependent thresholding, such as the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure. Our simulation-based results suggest that the performance is excellent, while theoretical investigations of the UMAU method show that coverage does indeed hold because the selection rule satisfies a key polyhedral condition (e.g. Lee et al., 2016). But more theoretical work is necessary to merge these lines of reasoning. Second, it may be of interest to create intervals which have minimum expected size with respect to the marginal distribution of

selected signals (i.e. $\pi_S(\theta)$ in the notation of Yekutieli, 2012) rather than with respect to the entire distribution of signals, i.e. $\pi(\theta)$. We leave avenue this to future work. Finally, there is much research left to be done in this direction of merging Bayesian and frequentist thinking in other areas of inference where selection takes place. Current ongoing work extends our methods to regression, spatial hotspot detection, and subgroup identification in causal inference. Preliminary results show promising improvements in these areas.

A Predictive recursion

For the nonparametric saFAB procedure, we assume that the data arise from the model

$$y_i \sim f(y_i; \theta_i), \quad \theta_i \sim \pi(\theta)$$

where the sampling density $f(y; \theta)$ is known, and the prior $\pi(\theta)$ is to be estimated. To do so, we use predictive recursion method of Newton (2002) to estimate the mixing density $\pi(\theta)$ from the observations y_1, \dots, y_n .

We begin with an initial guess $\pi^{[0]}$ and a sequence of weights $\gamma^{[i]} \in (0, 1)$. For $i = 1, \dots, n$, we recursively compute the update

$$m^{[i-1]}(y_i) = \int_{\mathbb{R}} f(y_i; u) \pi(du) \tag{18}$$

$$\pi^{[i]}(du) = (1 - \gamma^{[i]}) \pi^{[i-1]}(du) + \gamma^{[i]} \frac{f(y_i; \theta) \pi^{[i-1]}(du)}{m^{[i-1]}(y_i)}.$$

Algorithm 1 details our implementation. We sweep through the data 10 times, each time randomizing the sweep order over the data. In practice, the prior $\pi(\theta)$ is computed on a grid, and the integral in Eq. (18) is computed using the trapezoid rule. Tokdar et al. (2009) give conditions on the weights $\gamma^{[i]}$ to lead to almost-sure weak convergence of the PR estimate to the true mixing distribution. In the case that the mixture model is misspecified, they show that the PR estimate converges in total variation to the mixing density that minimizes the Kullback-Leibler divergence to the truth. Specifically, the conditions for convergence are satisfied by $\gamma^{[i]} = (i + 1)^{-a}$, and we use the default value $a = 0.67$ recommended by Tokdar et al. (2009).

Input : Data y_1, \dots, y_n ; sampling model $y_i \sim f(y_i; \theta_i)$; intial guess $\pi^{[0]}(\theta)$.
for $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

$$g^{[i]}(\theta) = f(y_i; \theta) \pi_1^{[i-1]}(\theta) \quad (\text{discrete grid})$$

$$m^{[i]} = \int_{\mathbb{R}} g^{[i]}(\theta) d\theta \quad (\text{trapezoid rule})$$

$$\pi^{[i]}(\theta) = (1 - \gamma^{[i]}) \cdot \pi_1^{[i-1]}(\theta) + \gamma^{[i]} \cdot \left(\frac{f(y_i; \theta) \pi^{[i-1]}(\theta)}{m^{[i]}} \right)$$

Output: Estimate $\hat{\pi}(\theta) = \pi^{[n]}(\theta)$.

Algorithm 1: Predictive recursion algorithm for estimating the prior, which is then used for estimating the optimal spending function as outlined in §3.

B Assumptions for main result

Here we state the assumptions from Tokdar et al. (2009) that are required for Theorem 1.

A1. The weights $\{\gamma^{[i]}\}_{i=1}^{\infty}$ in Algorithm 1 are chosen to satisfy $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \gamma^{[i]} = \infty$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} (\gamma^{[i]})^2 < \infty$.

A2. The map $F \rightarrow \int f(y; \theta) F(d\theta)$ is injective.

A3. For each y , the map $\theta \rightarrow f(y; \theta)$ is bounded and continuous.

A4. For all $\epsilon > 0$, and \mathcal{X}_0 compact set, there exists a compact set Θ_0 such that $\int_{\mathcal{X}_0} f(y; \theta) dy < \epsilon$ for all $\theta \notin \Theta_0$.

A5. There exists a constant $B < \infty$ such that for all θ_1, θ_2 and θ_3 we have that

$$\int \left\{ \frac{f(y; \theta_1)}{f(y; \theta_2)} \right\}^2 f(y; \theta_3) dy < B.$$

C Proof of main result

Throughout we drop the dependence on θ and simply refer to $H(\cdot, \theta)$ as H . To prove Theorem 1, we first notice that

$$\sup_{y \in \mathcal{R}} |M_S(y) - \hat{M}_S(y)| \leq \int |m_S(y) - \hat{m}_S(y)| dy \xrightarrow{a.s} 0,$$

by Theorem 2 from Tokdar et al. (2009). Hence, $\hat{H} \rightarrow H$ uniformly, almost surely.

Next, we observe that the function M_S is continuous everywhere as by Fubini's theorem

$$M_S(y) = \int_{-\infty}^y m_S(u) du = \int_{-\infty}^y \int f_S(u; \theta) \pi(d\theta) du = \int \int_{-\infty}^y f_S(u; \theta) du \pi(d\theta) = \int F_S(y; \theta) \pi(d\theta).$$

Furthermore, the function F_S^{-1} is continuous everywhere except at $q = F_S(-t; \theta) = F_S(t; \theta)$, a point where F_S^{-1} is left continuous. Therefore, H is continuous everywhere except perhaps in a set Λ containing at most two different points. Additionally, H is left continuous everywhere.

With the above in mind, the proof of (13) uses Wald's argument, in the spirit of Theorem 5.14 from van der Vaart (1998), or the original paper Wald (1949). We start by taking $w_0 \in (0, 1)$ minimizer of H . We also set

$$\mathcal{T} := [0, 1] \setminus (\Omega_0 \cup \Lambda),$$

where Λ is the set of discontinuities of H . Then $\Lambda \subset \{(q+\alpha-1)/\alpha, q/\alpha\}$. If $w = (q+\alpha-1)/\alpha \in [0, 1)$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tilde{w} \rightarrow w^+} H(\tilde{w}) &= M_S \left[\lim_{\tilde{q} \rightarrow q^+} F_S^{-1}(\tilde{q}) \right] - M_S[F_S^{-1}(q + \alpha - 1)] \\ &> M_S[F_S^{-1}(q)] - M_S[F_S^{-1}(q + \alpha - 1)] \\ &= H(w) \\ &\geq \inf_{\tilde{w} \in [0, 1]} H(\tilde{w}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by our assumption on q (when $q \leq \alpha$), we have that

$$\min_{w \in \Lambda \setminus \Omega_0} \lim_{\tilde{w} \rightarrow w^+} H(\tilde{w}) - \inf_{w \in [0, 1]} H(w) > 0.$$

Hence, for $\epsilon > 0$ is small enough it holds that

$$\min_{w \in \Lambda \setminus \Omega_0} \lim_{\tilde{w} \rightarrow w^+} H(\tilde{w}) - \inf_{w \in [0, 1]} H(w) > 2\epsilon. \quad (19)$$

Next, let $w \in \mathcal{T}$ be fixed, and let U_l be a decreasing sequence of intervals around w , with

diameter(U_l) converging to zero. Let

$$H(U) = \inf_{\tilde{w} \in U} H(\tilde{w}),$$

for $U \subset [0, 1]$. Notice that $H(U_l) \geq H(w_0)$ for all l . Suppose that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} H(U_l) = H(w_0)$. Then there exists a sequence $\{w_l\}$ with $w_l \in U_l$ such that $H(w_l) \rightarrow H(w_0)$. Hence, by the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem, we have that for a subsequence of $\{w_l\}$, say $\{w_{l_k}\}$ it holds that $w_{l_k} \rightarrow w'$ for some $w' \in [0, 1]$. However, since U_{l_k} converges to w , it must be the case that $w' = w$. Hence,

$$H(w) = H(w') = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H(w_{l_k}) = H(w_0), \quad (20)$$

which contradicts $w \in \mathcal{T}$. Therefore, for all $w \in \mathcal{T}$ we have that $H(U_w) > H(w_0)$ for some small enough neighborhood U_w of w .

If $\Lambda \setminus \Omega_0 \neq \emptyset$, let $w \in \Lambda \setminus \Omega_0$ and let U_l be a decreasing sequence of intervals around w , with diameter(U_l) converging to zero. Suppose that $\lim_{l \rightarrow \infty} H(U_l) = H(w_0)$. Then there exists a sequence $\{w_l\}$ with $w_l \in U_l$ such that $H(w_l) \rightarrow H(w_0)$. Hence, by the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem, we have that for a subsequence of $\{w_l\}$, say $\{w_{l_k}\}$ it holds that $w_{l_k} \rightarrow w$, and either $w_{l_k} \geq w$ for all k or $w_{l_k} \leq w$ for all k . If $w_{l_k} \geq w$ for all k then

$$\lim_{\tilde{w} \rightarrow w^+} H(\tilde{w}) = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} H(w_{l_k}) = H(w_0),$$

which contradicts (19). On the other hand if, $w_{l_k} \leq w$ for all k , then by the left continuity of H we arrive at (20) which once again contradicts (19). Therefore, for all $w \notin \Omega_0$ we have that $H(U_w) > H(w_0)$ for some small enough neighborhood U_w of w .

Now, notice that the set B is compact, where

$$B := \left\{ w \in [0, 1] : \inf_{\tilde{w} \in \Omega_0} |w - \tilde{w}| \geq \epsilon \right\}.$$

Clearly, B can be covered by the intervals $\{U_w : w \in B\}$. Hence, there exists $U_{w^{(1)}}, \dots, U_{w^{(p)}}$ that cover B . Therefore,

$$\inf_{w \in B} \hat{H}(w) \geq \inf_{w \in \bigcup_{j=1}^p U_{w^{(j)}}} \hat{H}(w) \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \inf_{w \in \bigcup_{j=1}^p U_{w^{(j)}}} H(w) > H(w_0), \quad (21)$$

where the limit follows from the, almost sure, uniform convergence of \hat{H} to H . However, if $\hat{w}^* \in B \cap \hat{\Omega}_n$, then

$$\inf_{w \in B \cap \hat{\Omega}_n} \hat{H}(w) = \inf_{w \in B} \hat{H}(w) = \inf_{w \in [0,1]} \hat{H}(w) \leq \inf_{w \in [0,1]} H(w) + o_P(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\{ \hat{w}^* \in B \cap \hat{\Omega}_n \right\} \subset \left\{ \inf_{w \in B} \hat{H}(w) \leq H(w_0) + o_P(1) \right\},$$

but, according to (21), the event on the right has probability that converges to zero as $n \rightarrow 0$.

This proves (13). To prove (14), notice that

$$0 \leq H(\hat{w}^*) - H(w^*) \leq \hat{H}(\hat{w}^*) - \hat{H}(w^*) + 2 \sup_{\tilde{w} \in [0,1]} |H(\tilde{w}) - \hat{H}(\tilde{w})| \leq 2 \sup_{\tilde{w} \in [0,1]} |H(\tilde{w}) - \hat{H}(\tilde{w})| \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} 0,$$

and so, $H(\hat{w}^*) \rightarrow H(w^*)$ almost surely, where $w^* \in \Omega_0$.

D Additional result

Corollary 1 *Let z be a random variable with probability density function bounded by above. Let $\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N$ be fixed points in the real line. Suppose that all the assumptions in Theorem 1 hold for each θ_j and the set $\{0, F_S(t; \theta_j)/\alpha, 1\}$ contains no minimizer of $H(\cdot; \theta_j)$ for all $j = 1, \dots, N$. Then for each j and $\hat{w}^*(\theta_j)$ minimizer of $\hat{H}(\cdot; \theta_j)$ there exists a $w^*(\theta_j)$ minimizer of $H(\cdot; \theta_j)$ such that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \text{pr} \left(\left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{w^*(\theta_j)}^S, j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} = \left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{\hat{w}^*(\theta_j)}^S, j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} \right) = 1.$$

Proof 2 *First, it is immediate from Theorem 1 that (16) holds. Next, let g be the probability*

density function of g . Then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} pr \left(\left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{w^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} = \left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{\hat{w}^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} \right) \\
&= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int pr \left(\left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{w^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} = \left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{\hat{w}^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} \middle| z \right) g(z) dz \\
&= \int \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} pr \left(\left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{w^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} = \left\{ \theta_j : z \in A_{\hat{w}^*}^S(\theta_j), j \in \{1, \dots, N\} \right\} \middle| z \right) g(z) dz \\
&= 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the second and third inequalities follow from the dominated convergence theorem and (16).

References

- Yoav Benjamini and Yosef Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 57(1):289–300, 1995. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2346101>.
- Yoav Benjamini and Daniel Yekutieli. False discovery rate-adjusted multiple confidence intervals for selected parameters. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100(469):71–81, 2005. doi: 10.1198/016214504000001907. URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214504000001907>.
- Carlos M. Carvalho, Nicholas G. Polson, and James G. Scott. The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals. *Biometrika*, 97(2):465–480, 2010. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asq017. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asq017>.
- A. P. Dawid. Selection paradoxes of Bayesian inference. *Lecture Notes-Monograph Series*, 24:211–220, 1994. ISSN 07492170. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4355805>.
- B. Efron, R. Tibshirani, J.D. Storey, and V. Tusher. Empirical Bayes analysis of a microarray experiment. *Journal of American Statistical Association*, 96:1151–60, 2001.
- Bradley Efron. Microarrays, empirical Bayes and the two-groups model (with discussion). *Statistical Science*, 1(23):1–22, 2008.

- W. Fithian, D. Sun, and J. Taylor. Optimal Inference After Model Selection. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2014.
- Malay Ghosh. Objective priors: An introduction for frequentists. *Statistical Science*, 26(2): 187–202, 2011. ISSN 08834237. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23059978>.
- Peter Hoff and Chaoyu Yu. Exact adaptive confidence intervals for linear regression coefficients. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 13(1):94–119, 2019. doi: 10.1214/18-EJS1517. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJS1517>.
- Ryan C. Kelly, Matthew A. Smith, Robert E. Kass, and Tai Sing Lee. Local field potentials indicate network state and account for neuronal response variability. *Journal of Computational Neuroscience*, 29(3):567–579, Dec 2010. ISSN 1573-6873. doi: 10.1007/s10827-009-0208-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10827-009-0208-9>.
- Jason D. Lee, Dennis L. Sun, Yuekai Sun, and Jonathan E. Taylor. Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 44(3):907–927, 06 2016. doi: 10.1214/15-AOS1371. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/15-AOS1371>.
- A. Newton. On a nonparametric recursive estimator of the mixing distribution. *Sankhyā Ser. A*, pages 306–322, 2002.
- Trevor Park and George Casella. The Bayesian lasso. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103(482):681–686, 2008. doi: 10.1198/016214508000000337. URL <https://doi.org/10.1198/016214508000000337>.
- Nicholas G. Polson and James G. Scott. Shrink globally, act locally: sparse Bayesian regularization and prediction (with discussion). In J. M. Bernardo, M. J. Bayarri, J. O. Berger, A. P. Dawid, D. Heckerman, A. F. M. Smith, and M. West, editors, *Proceedings of the 9th Valencia World Meeting on Bayesian Statistics*, pages 501–38. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- John W Pratt. Length of confidence intervals. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 56(295):549–567, 1961.

- John W. Pratt. Shorter confidence intervals for the mean of a normal distribution with known variance. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 34(2):574–586, 06 1963. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177704170. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177704170>.
- Stephen Reid, Jonathan Taylor, and Robert Tibshirani. Post-selection point and interval estimation of signal sizes in gaussian samples. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 45, 04 2014.
- James G. Scott and James O. Berger. An exploration of aspects of Bayesian multiple testing. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 136(7 SPEC. ISS.):2144–2162, 7 2006. ISSN 0378-3758. doi: 10.1016/j.jspi.2005.08.031.
- James G. Scott, Ryan C. Kelly, Matthew A. Smith, Pengcheng Zhou, and Robert E. Kass. False discovery rate regression: An application to neural synchrony detection in primary visual cortex. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(510):459–471, 2015. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2014.990973. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2014.990973>.
- Matthew A. Smith and Adam Kohn. Spatial and temporal scales of neuronal correlation in primary visual cortex. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 28(48):12591–12603, 2008. ISSN 0270-6474. doi: 10.1523/JNEUROSCI.2929-08.2008. URL <http://www.jneurosci.org/content/28/48/12591>.
- Surya T. Tokdar, Ryan Martin, and Jayanta K. Ghosh. Consistency of a recursive estimate of mixing distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(5A):2502–2522, 2009. ISSN 00905364. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30243713>.
- A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1998. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511802256.
- Abraham Wald. Note on the consistency of the maximum likelihood estimate. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 20(4):595–601, 12 1949. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177729952. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177729952>.
- Asaf Weinstein, William Fithian, and Yoav Benjamini. Selection adjusted confidence intervals with more power to determine the sign. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108

(501):165–176, 2013. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2012.737740. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2012.737740>.

Daniel Yekutieli. Adjusted Bayesian inference for selected parameters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 74(3):515–541, 2012. ISSN 1467-9868. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.01016.x. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.01016.x>.

C Yu and P D Hoff. Adaptive multigroup confidence intervals with constant coverage. *Biometrika*, 105(2):319–335, 2018. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asy009. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asy009>.

Hua Zhong and Ross L. Prentice. Bias-reduced estimators and confidence intervals for odds ratios in genome-wide association studies. *Biostatistics*, 9(4):621–634, 02 2008. ISSN 1465-4644. doi: 10.1093/biostatistics/kxn001. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxn001>.