

ℓ_0 -Regularized High-dimensional Accelerated Failure Time Model

Xingdong Feng, Jian Huang, Yuling Jiao, and Shuang Zhang *

February 11, 2020

Abstract

We develop a constructive approach for ℓ_0 -penalized estimation in the sparse accelerated failure time (AFT) model with high-dimensional covariates. Our proposed method is based on Stute's weighted least squares criterion combined with ℓ_0 -penalization. This method is a computational algorithm that generates a sequence of solutions iteratively, based on active sets derived from primal and dual information and root finding according to the KKT conditions. We refer to the proposed method as AFT-SDAR (for support detection and root finding). An important aspect of our theoretical results is that we directly concern the sequence of solutions generated based on the AFT-SDAR algorithm.

*Xingdong Feng is Professor and Shuang Zhang is PhD candidate, School of Statistics and Management, Shanghai University of Finance and Economics, Shanghai 200433, China (email: feng.xingdong@mail.shufe.edu.cn). Jian Huang is Professor, Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa 52246, USA (email: jian-huang@uiowa.edu). Yuling Jiao is Associate Professor, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Wuhan University, Wuhan 430000, China (email: yulingjiao-math@whu.edu.cn). This work was supported by NSF grant DMS-1916199, National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 11971292, No. 11690012 and No.11871474), and Program for Innovative Research Team of SUFE.

We prove that the estimation errors of the solution sequence decay exponentially to the optimal error bound with high probability, as long as the covariate matrix satisfies a mild regularity condition which is necessary and sufficient for model identification even in the setting of high-dimensional linear regression. We also proposed an adaptive version of AFT-SDAR, or AFT-ASDAR, which determines the support size of the estimated coefficient in a data-driven fashion. We conduct simulation studies to demonstrate the superior performance of the proposed method over the lasso and MCP in terms of accuracy and speed. We also apply the proposed method to a real data set to illustrate its application.

Key Words: Censored data; ℓ_0 -penalization; KKT condition; primal and dual information; support detection

1 Introduction

In survival analysis, an attractive alternative to the widely used proportional hazards model (Cox, 1972) is the accelerated failure time (AFT) model (Koul et al., 1981; Wei, 1992; Kalbfleisch and Prentice, 2011). The AFT model is a linear regression model in which the response variable is usually the logarithm or a known monotone transformation of the failure time. Let T_i be the failure time and \mathbf{x}_i be a p -dimensional covariate vector for the i th subject in a random sample of size n . The AFT model assumes

$$\ln(T_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the underlying regression coefficient vector, ϵ_i 's are random error terms. When T_i is subject to right censoring, we only observe $(Y_i, \delta_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$, where $Y_i = \min\{\ln(T_i), \ln(C_i)\}$, C_i is the censoring time, and $\delta_i = 1_{\{T_i \leq C_i\}}$ is the censoring indicator. Assume that a random sample of i.i.d. observations $(Y_i, \delta_i, \mathbf{x}_i)$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, is available. To estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ when the distribution of the error terms is unspecified, several approaches have been proposed in the literature. One approach is the Buckley-James estimator (Buckley and James, 1979), which

adjusts for censored observations using the Kaplan-Meier estimator. The second approach is the rank-based estimator (Ying, 1993), which is motivated by the score function of the partial likelihood. Another interesting alternative is the weighted least squares approach (Stute et al., 1993; Stute, 1996), which involves the minimization of a weighted least squares objective function.

In this paper, we focus on the high-dimensional AFT model, where the dimension of the covariate vector can exceed the sample size. In the high-dimensional AFT model, many researchers have proposed methods for parameter estimation and variable selection. For example, Huang et al. (2006) considered the LASSO (Tibshirani, 1996) in the AFT model, based on the weighted least squares criterion; Johnson (2008) and Johnson et al. (2008) applied the SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001) penalty to the rank-based estimator and Buckley-James estimator; Cai et al. (2009) proposed the rank-based adaptive LASSO (Zou, 2006) method; Huang and Ma (2010) used the bridge penalization for the regularized estimation and variable selection; Hu and Chai (2013) extended the MCP (Zhang et al., 2010) penalty to the weighted least square estimation; Khan and Shaw (2016) used the adaptive and weighted elastic net methods (Zou and Zhang, 2009; Hong and Zhang, 2010) based on the weighted least squares criterion.

We propose an ℓ_0 -penalized method for estimation and variable selection in the high-dimensional AFT model. We extend the support detection and root finding (SDAR) algorithm (Huang et al., 2018) for linear regression model to the AFT model. For convenience, we refer to the proposed method as AFT-SDAR. In the same spirit as the SDAR method, AFT-SDAR is a constructive approach to estimating the sparse and high-dimensional AFT model. This approach is a computational algorithm motivated from the KKT conditions for the ℓ_0 -penalized weighted least squares solution, and generates a sequence of solutions iteratively, based on support detection using primal and dual information and root finding. Theoretically, we show that the ℓ_∞ -norm of the estimation errors of the solution sequence decay exponentially to the optima order $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}})$ with high probability, as long as the covariate matrix satisfies the

weakest regularity condition that is necessary and sufficient for model identification. Moreover, the estimated support coincides with the true support of the underlying vector regression coefficients if the minimum absolute value of the nonzero entries of the target is above the detectable order.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we described the ℓ_0 -penalized criterion for the AFT model. In Section 3, we give the KKT conditions for the ℓ_0 -penalized weighted least squares solutions and describe the proposed AFT-SDAR algorithm. In Section 4, we first establish the finite-step and deterministic error bounds for the solution sequence generated by the AFT-SDAR algorithm. As a consequence of these deterministic error bounds, we provide nonasymptotic error bounds for the solution sequence. We also show that the proposed method recovers the support of the underlying regression coefficient vector in finite iterations with high probability. In Section 5, we describe AFT-ASDAR, the adaptive version of AFT-SDAR that selects the tuning parameter in a data driven fashion. In Section 6, we assess the finite sample performance of the proposed method with different simulation studies and a real case study on a breast cancer gene expression data set. Concluding remarks are given in Section 7. Proofs for all the lemmas and theorems are deferred to Appendix. An R package implementing the proposed method is available at <https://github.com/Shuang-Zhang/ASDAR/>.

2 AFT regression with ℓ_0 -penalization

Let $Y_{(1)}, \dots, Y_{(n)}$ be the order statistics of Y_i 's. Let $\delta_{(1)}, \dots, \delta_{(n)}$ be the associated censoring indicators and let $\mathbf{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{(n)}$ be the associated covariates. In the weighted least squares method, the weights $w_{(i)}$'s are the jumps in Kaplan-Meier estimator based on $(Y_{(i)}, \delta_{(i)})$, $i =$

$1, \dots, n$, which can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} w_{(1)} &= \frac{\delta_{(1)}}{n}, \\ w_{(i)} &= \frac{\delta_{(i)}}{n-i+1} \cdot \prod_{j=1}^{i-1} \left(\frac{n-j}{n-j+1} \right)^{\delta_{(j)}}, i = 2, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

The weighted least squares criterion is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(i)} (Y_{(i)} - \mathbf{x}_{(i)}^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2.$$

In the low-dimensional settings with $n \gg p$, this criterion leads to a consistent and asymptotically normal estimator under appropriate conditions (Stute et al., 1993; Stute, 1996). However, in the high-dimensional settings when $p \gg n$, regularization is needed to ensure a unique solution in minimizing $\mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta})$.

We consider the ℓ_0 -regularized method for variable selection and estimation in AFT based on the weighted least squares criterion. The ℓ_0 -penalized estimator is given by

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}^\circ = \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ is a tuning parameter, and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0$ denotes the number of nonzero elements of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$.

To facilitate computation, we rewrite the weighted least squares loss as a standard least squares loss as follows. Let the design matrix be $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{(n)})^T$ and let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_{(1)}, \dots, Y_{(n)})^T$.

Define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathbf{X}} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{w_{(1)}}, \dots, \sqrt{w_{(n)}}) \cdot \mathbf{X}, \\ \tilde{\mathbf{Y}} &= \text{diag}(\sqrt{w_{(1)}}, \dots, \sqrt{w_{(n)}}) \cdot \mathbf{Y}. \end{aligned}$$

Without loss of generality, assume that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j\|_2 > 0$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, hold throughout this paper, where $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j$ is the j th column of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$. Let

$$D = \text{diag}\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1\|_2}, \dots, \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p\|_2}\right).$$

Define $\boldsymbol{\eta} = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}D$. Then each column of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ is \sqrt{n} -length and $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$, where $\text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \{j : \beta_j \neq 0, j = 1, \dots, p\}$. Let

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2.$$

Define

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond = \min_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}) + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_0, \quad (3)$$

Then the estimator of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ defined in (2) can be obtained as $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond = D\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$.

3 AFT-SDAR Algorithm

We first introduce some notation used throughout the paper. Let $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^p |\eta_i|^q)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ be the usual q ($q \in [1, \infty]$) norm of the vector $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_p)^T \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Let $|A|$ denote the cardinality of the set A . Denote $\boldsymbol{\eta}_A = (\eta_i, i \in A) \in \mathbb{R}^{|A|}$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}|_A \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with its i th element $(\boldsymbol{\eta}|_A)_i = \eta_i 1(i \in A)$, where $1(\cdot)$ is the indicator function. Let $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{T, \infty}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_{\min}$ be the T th largest elements (in absolute value) and the minimum absolute value of $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, respectively. Let $\|M\|_\infty$ denote the maximum value (in absolute value) of the matrix M . Let $\nabla \mathcal{L}$ denote the gradient of function \mathcal{L} . Denote $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_A = (\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j, j \in A) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times |A|}$, where $\bar{\mathbf{x}}_j$ is a column of a matrix $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$. Let $\sigma_{\min}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_A^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_A)$ be the minimum eigenvalue of the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_A^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_A$ and $\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_A\|_2$ be the spectrum norm of the matrix $\bar{\mathbf{X}}_A$. Denote $\sigma_{(\min, 2T)} = \min\{\sigma_{\min}(\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{2T}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{2T}) : \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{2T} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 2T} \text{ consists of } 2T \text{ columns of } \bar{\mathbf{X}}\}$.

The following lemma gives the KKT conditions of the minimizer of (3).

Lemma 1. *If $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a minimizer of (3), then $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ satisfies*

$$\begin{cases} \mathbf{d}^\diamond = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)/n, \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond = H_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{d}^\diamond), \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where the i th element of $H_\lambda(\cdot)$ is defined by

$$(H_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}))_i = \begin{cases} 0, & |\eta_i| < \sqrt{2\lambda}, \\ \eta_i, & |\eta_i| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}. \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Conversely, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ and \mathbf{d}^\diamond satisfy (4), then $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a local minimizer of (3), and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond = D\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a local minimizer of (2).

Our proposed AFT-SDAR algorithm is based on solving the KKT equations (4) iteratively. Let $A^\diamond = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)$ and $I^\diamond = (A^\diamond)^c$. Based on (4) and by the definition of $H_\lambda(\cdot)$, we have

$$A^\diamond = \{i : |\eta_i^\diamond + d_i^\diamond| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}\}, \quad I^\diamond = \{i : |\eta_i^\diamond + d_i^\diamond| < \sqrt{2\lambda}\},$$

and

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{I^\diamond}^\diamond = 0 \\ \mathbf{d}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond = 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond})^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond}^T \bar{\mathbf{Y}} \\ \mathbf{d}_{I^\diamond}^\diamond = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{I^\diamond}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond) / n \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond = D\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond. \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

We solve these equations iteratively. Let $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^k, \mathbf{d}^k\}$ be the values at the k th iteration, and let $\{A^k, I^k\}$ be the active and inactive sets based on $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^k, \mathbf{d}^k\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} A^k &= \{i : |\eta_i^k + d_i^k| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}\}, \\ I^k &= \{i : |\eta_i^k + d_i^k| < \sqrt{2\lambda}\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Then based on (6), we calculate the updated values

$$\{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{I^k}^{k+1}, \mathbf{d}_{A^k}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k}^{k+1}, \mathbf{d}_{I^k}^{k+1}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{k+1}\},$$

as follows:

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{I^k}^{k+1} = 0 \\ \mathbf{d}_{A^k}^{k+1} = 0 \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k}^{k+1} = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k})^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k}^T \bar{\mathbf{Y}} \\ \mathbf{d}_{I^k}^{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{I^k}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k}^{k+1}) / n \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}^{k+1} = D\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Suppose that $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_0 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_0 = K \leq T$ for some $T \geq 1$, where $\boldsymbol{\eta}^* = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$. At the k th iteration, we set

$$\sqrt{2\lambda} = \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k + \mathbf{d}^k\|_{T,\infty} \quad (9)$$

in (7). Hence $|A^k| = T$ in every iteration due to this λ . Note that the tuning parameter λ is expressed in terms of T . We will use a data-driven procedure to tune the cardinality T in Section 5.

Let $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$ be an initial value, then we get a sequence of solutions $\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^k, k \geq 1\}$ by using (7) and (8) with the value of λ given in (9). We introduce a step size $0 < \tau \leq 1$ in the definitions of the active and inactive sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A^k &= \{i : |\eta_i^k + \tau d_i^k| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}\}, \\ I^k &= \{i : |\eta_i^k + \tau d_i^k| < \sqrt{2\lambda}\}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

with $\sqrt{2\lambda} = \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k + \tau\mathbf{d}^k\|_{T,\infty}$. The step size τ plays the role of weighing the importance of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$ and \mathbf{d}^k in determining the active and inactive sets.

In order to bound the estimation error of the sequences generated by AFT-SDAR, we need some regularity conditions on the covariate matrix. Thanks to this step size τ , we can replace the sparse Riesz condition used in Huang et al. (2018) in analyzing the SDAR to the weakest condition possible, which is necessary and sufficient for model identification even in high-dimensional linear regression, see Section 4 for detail.

We describe the AFT-SDAR algorithm in detail in Algorithm 1.

In Algorithm 1, we terminate the computation when $A^k = A^{k+1}$ for some k , because the solution sequence generated by AFT-SDAR will not change afterwards. In Section 4, we provide sufficient conditions under which $A^k = A^{k+1} = A^*$ with high probability, where $A^* = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$, that is, the support of the underlying regression coefficient can be recovered in finite many steps.

Algorithm 1 AFT-SDAR

- 1: **Input:** $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$, $\mathbf{d}^0 = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T(\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)/n$, τ , \mathbf{T} ; $k = 0$
 - 2: **for** $k = 0, 1, \dots$, **do**
 - 3: $A^k = \{j : |\eta_j^k + \tau d_j^k| \geq \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k + \tau \mathbf{d}^k\|_{T, \infty}\}$, $I^k = (A^k)^c$.
 - 4: $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{I^k}^{k+1} = 0$.
 - 5: $\mathbf{d}_{A^k}^{k+1} = 0$.
 - 6: $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k}^{k+1} = (\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k})^{-1} \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k}^T \bar{\mathbf{Y}}$.
 - 7: $\mathbf{d}_{I^k}^{k+1} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{I^k}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^k} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k}^{k+1})/n$.
 - 8: $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{k+1} = D\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}$.
 - 9: **if** $A^k = A^{k+1}$, **then**
 - 10: Stop and denote the last iteration $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{A}}, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{I}}, \mathbf{d}_{\hat{A}}, \mathbf{d}_{\hat{I}}$.
 - 11: **else**
 - 12: $k = k + 1$
 - 13: **end if**
 - 14: **end for**
 - 15: **Output:** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = D \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{A}}^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{I}}^T)^T$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{A}}^T, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\hat{I}}^T)^T$ as the estimates of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ respectively.
-

4 Theoretical Properties

In this section, we consider the finite-step error bound for the solution sequence computed based on Algorithm 1. We also study the probabilistic and nonasymptotic ℓ_∞ error bound for the solution sequence.

We first consider the deterministic error bounds for the solution sequence generated based on AFT-SDAR. We choose the step size τ satisfies

$$0 < \tau < \frac{1}{\sqrt{TU}} \quad (11)$$

with $U \geq \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2/n$, and let L be a constant satisfying

$$0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma_{(\min, 2T)}}{n\sqrt{2T}}. \quad (12)$$

Theorem 1. *Suppose $T \geq K$ and set $\beta^0 = 0$ in Algorithm 1. Suppose (11) and (12) hold. For the solution at the k th iteration in Algorithm 1, we have*

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2}{L} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty, \quad (13)$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^k - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty \leq \|D\|_\infty^2 \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2\|D\|_\infty^2}{L} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty, \quad (14)$$

where $\xi = 1 - \frac{2\tau L(1-\tau\sqrt{TU})}{\sqrt{T}(1+K)} \in (0, 1)$.

We observe that the error bound consists of two terms as indicated in Theorem 1. For any given values of observations, the first term converges to zero exponentially. The magnitude of the second term is determined by $\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$ in (13) and $\nabla \mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ in (14), which are given by the gradient of the weighted least squares criterion at the underlying parameter value. Therefore, under the model assumption, their expected values are zero and should be concentrated in a small neighborhood of zero.

To study the probabilistic and nonasymptotic error bounds of the solution sequences $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^k$, we make the following assumptions.

(C1) There exists a constant $b \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\|D\|_\infty \leq b$.

(C2) The error terms $\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n$ are independent and identically distributed with mean zero and finite variance σ^2 . Furthermore, they are subgaussian, in the sense that there exist some constants $K_1, K_2 > 0$ such that $P(|\epsilon_i| > C) \leq K_2 \exp(-K_1 C^2)$ for all $C \geq 0$ and all i .

(C3) The covariates are bounded, that is, there exists a constant $B > 0$ such that $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p} |x_{ij}| \leq B$.

(C4) The error terms $(\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)$ are independent of the Kaplan-Meier weights (w_1, \dots, w_n) .

(C5) There exists some positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that $\|\beta_{A^*}^*\|_{\min} \geq \frac{3b^2}{L}\epsilon_1$, where

$$\epsilon_1 = C_1 \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2C_2 \log(p)}{n}} + \frac{4 \log(2p)}{n} + C_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Remark 1. Condition (C1) constrains the maximum absolute value of the matrix D . Condition (C2) on the subgaussian tails of the error terms is standard in high-dimensional regression models. Condition (C3) is assumed for technical convenience. It can be relaxed to $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq p} |x_{ij}| \leq B$ with high probability. Moreover, conditions (C2)-(C4) are assumed to ensure that $\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_1(\beta^*)\|_{\infty}$ is small. Condition (C5) assumes that the signal is not too small, which is needed for the target signal to be detectable.

Theorem 2. Suppose $T \geq K$ and set $\beta^0 = 0$ in Algorithm 1. Suppose (11) and (12) hold. If (C1)-(C5) hold, then with probability at least $1 - [(\log p)/n]^{1/4}$,

$$\|\beta^k - \beta^*\|_{\infty} \leq b^2 \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)} (\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\beta^*\|_{\infty} + \frac{2b^2}{L} \epsilon_1.$$

Therefore,

$$\|\beta^k - \beta^*\|_{\infty} \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \right)$$

with high probability if $k \geq \mathcal{O} \left(\log_{\frac{1}{\xi}} \frac{n}{\log(p)} \right)$.

To derive the sharp estimation error bound in Theorem 2, we need $\xi \in (0, 1)$. This is guaranteed by choosing τ stratifying (11) and L satisfying (12), which only requires $\sigma_{(\min, 2T)} > 0$. This is a weakest possible condition even in high-dimensional linear regression model $\bar{\mathbf{Y}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}\beta^* + \epsilon$, where, $\|\beta^*\|_0 \leq T$, since $\sigma_{(\min, 2T)} > 0$ is equivalent to the condition that the linear model is identifiable. To be precise, let $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} = \bar{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\beta}^* + \epsilon$ and $\|\tilde{\beta}^*\|_0 \leq T$. If we wish to derive $\beta^* = \tilde{\beta}^*$ from $\tilde{\mathbf{Y}} = \bar{\mathbf{Y}}$, i.e., from $\bar{\mathbf{X}}(\beta^* - \tilde{\beta}^*) = 0$, we need $\sigma_{(\min, 2T)} > 0$, which is a sufficient and necessary condition. However, in the analysis of SDAR algorithm (Huang et al.,

2018), the authors assumed stronger conditions, i.e., sparse Riesz condition (SRC) (Zhang and Huang, 2008) to obtain the estimation error bound. The condition $\sigma_{(\min, 2T)} > 0$ is also weaker than the kinds of restricted strong convexity conditions used in bounding the estimation error for the global solutions in penalized convex and nonconvex regressions, see Zhang and Zhang (2012), Wainwright (2019) and the references therein.

This result gives nonasymptotic error bound of the solution sequence. In particular, when $\log p = o(n)$, the solution sequence converges to the underlying regression coefficient with high probability.

The following theorem establishes the support recovery property of AFT-SDAR.

Theorem 3. *Suppose $T \geq K$ and set $\beta^0 = 0$ in Algorithm 1. Suppose (11) and (12) hold. If (C1)-(C5) hold, then with probability at least $1 - [(\log p)/n]^{1/4}$, $A^* \subseteq A^k$ if $k > \log_{\frac{1}{\xi}} 9(T + K)(1 + U/L)r^{2b^4}$, where $r = \frac{\|\beta^*\|_\infty}{\|\beta_{A^*}^*\|_{\min}}$ is the ratio of the largest absolute coefficient over the smallest absolute nonzero coefficient of β^* .*

Theorem 3 demonstrates that the estimated support via AFT-SDAR will contain the true support with the cost at most $\mathcal{O}(\log(T))$ number of iterations if the minimum signal strength of β^* is above the detectable threshold $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}})$. Further, if we set $T = K$ in AFT-SDAR, then the stopping condition $A^k = A^{k+1}$ will hold if $k \geq \mathcal{O}(\log(K))$ since the estimated supports coincide with the true support then. As a consequence, the Oracle estimator will be recovered in $\mathcal{O}(\log(K))$ steps.

Finally, we note that an important aspect of the results above is that they directly concern the sequence of solutions generated based on Algorithm 1, rather than a theoretically defined global solution to the nonconvex ℓ_0 -penalized weighted least squares criterion. Thus there is no gap between our theoretical results and computational algorithm.

5 Adaptive AFT-SDAR

In practice, the sparsity level of the true parameter value $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ or $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is unknown. Therefore, we can regard T as a tuning parameter. Let T increase from 0 to Q , which is a given large enough integer. In general, we set $Q = \alpha n / \log(n)$ as suggested by Fan and Lv (2008), where α is a positive constant. Then we can obtain a set of solutions paths: $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(T) : T = 0, 1, \dots, Q\}$, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(0) = 0$. Finally, we use the cross-validation method or HBIC criteria (Wang et al., 2013) to determine \hat{T} , the value of T . Thus we can take $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ with $T = \hat{T}$ as the estimate of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$. We can also run Algorithm 1 until $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}\| < \varepsilon$ by increasing T , where ε is a given tolerance level. Then $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$ can be taken as the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$. Furthermore, we can gradually increase T to run Algorithm 1 until the residual sum of squares is less than a given tolerance level ε , then output $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$ at this time to terminate the calculation. In summary, we get an adaptive AFT-SDAR algorithm as described in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 AFT-ASDAR

- 1: Input: $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^0$, $\mathbf{d}^0 = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T(\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^0)/n$, τ , an integer ϑ , an integer Q , an early stopping criterion (optional). Set $k = 1$.
 - 2: **for** $k = 1, 2, \dots$, **do**
 - 3: Run Algorithm 1 with $T = \vartheta k$ and with initial value $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k-1}$, \mathbf{d}^{k-1} . Denote the output by $\boldsymbol{\eta}^k$, \mathbf{d}^k .
 - 4: **if** the early stopping criterion is satisfied or $T > Q$, **then**
 - 5: stop
 - 6: **else**
 - 7: $k = k + 1$
 - 8: **end if**
 - 9: **end for**
 - 10: Output: $\hat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}(\hat{T})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\hat{T}) = D \cdot \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\hat{T})$ as the estimates of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ respectively.
-

6 Numerical studies

In this section, we conduct simulation studies and real data analysis to illustrate the effectiveness of the proposed method. We compare the simulation results of AFT-SDAR/AFT-ASDAR with those of Lasso and MCP in terms of accuracy and efficiency. We also evaluate the performance in terms of the effect of the model parameters including the sample size n , the variable dimension p , the correlation measure ρ among covariates and the censoring rate $c.r.$. Moreover, we examine the average number of iterations for AFT-SDAR to converge. We also apply AFT-SDAR to a real data set to illustrate its application. We implemented Lasso and MCP for the AFT model using the coordinate descent algorithm (Breheny and Huang, 2011).

6.1 Accuracy and efficiency

We generate a $n \times p$ random Gaussian matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ whose entries are i.i.d. $\sim N(0, 1)$. Then the design matrix \mathbf{X} is generated with $\mathbf{x}_1 = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1$, $\mathbf{x}_p = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_p$, and $\mathbf{x}_j = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_j + \rho(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{j+1} + \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{j-1})$, $j = 2, \dots, p-1$. Here ρ is a measure of the correlation among covariates. The underlying regression coefficient vector β^* with K nonzero coefficients is generated such that the K nonzero coefficients in β^* are uniformly distributed in (m_1, m_2) , where $m_1 = \sigma\sqrt{2 \log p/n}$ and $m_2 = 100 \cdot m_1$. The K nonzero coefficients are randomly assigned to the K components of β^* . For each subject, the responses $\ln(T_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta + \epsilon_i$, where ϵ_i is generated independently from $N(0, \sigma^2)$, and the censoring variable C_i is generated independently from the uniform distribution $U(0, \eta)$, where η controls the censoring rate such that the desired censoring rate can be obtained. We compare AFT-SDAR, AFT-ASDAR with Lasso and MCP on the data generated from these models. In the implementation of AFT-ASDAR, we set $Q = n/\log(n)$, and terminate the computation if the residual $\|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_2$ is smaller than $\varepsilon = \sqrt{n}\sigma$. To examine the effect of the correlation measure ρ , we set $n = 500$, $p = 10000$, $K = 20$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$ and $\rho = 0.3 : 0.3 : 0.9$, i.e., ρ takes a grid of values from 0.3 to 0.9 with a step size 0.3.

Table 1: Numerical results (the averaged relative error, CPU time) on data sets with $n = 500$, $p = 10000$, $K = 20$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$, $\rho = 0.3 : 0.3 : 0.9$.

ρ	Method	ReErr (10^{-2})	Time(s)
0.3	Lasso	10.49	10.57
	MCP	1.10	11.55
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 1$)	0.51	4.44
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 1$)	0.52	4.60
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	0.51	4.46
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	0.52	4.72
0.6	Lasso	11.07	12.95
	MCP	2.10	10.91
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 1$)	2.01	4.32
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 1$)	2.02	4.53
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	1.93	4.62
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	1.93	4.89
0.9	Lasso	11.40	10.78
	MCP	1.08	11.45
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 1$)	0.65	4.42
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 1$)	0.65	4.63
	AFT-SDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	0.47	4.72
	AFT-ASDAR ($\tau = 0.5$)	0.47	5.01

Table 1 shows the results based on 100 independent replications of AFT-SDAR, AFT-ASDAR, Lasso and MCP. In Table 1, the first column gives the values of ρ , the second column depicts the methods, the third column shows the averaged relative error ($\text{ReErr} = \frac{1}{100} \sum \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| / \|\beta^*\|$), and the fourth column shows the averaged CPU time.

It is clear from Table 1 that both AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR tend to have smaller relative errors (ReErr) than those of Lasso and MCP. When $\rho = 0.6$ and 0.9 , AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR have smaller relative errors at $\tau = 0.5$ than at $\tau = 1$. In terms of the speed, AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR are more than twice as fast as Lasso and MCP for each ρ and τ , respectively. For a wide range of the correlation measure ρ and the step size τ , AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR perform well in terms of relative error and computational speed. In addition, for data with high correlations, choosing a step size less than the default value 1 can lead to smaller relative errors.

6.2 Support recovery

We now assess the support recovery performance of AFT-ASDAR, Lasso and MCP. In AFT-ASDAR, we set the largest size of the support $Q = n/\log(n)$ and the step size $\tau = 1$, and use the HBIC criteria to choose the cardinality T . In the data generating models, the rows of the $n \times p$ design matrix \mathbf{X} are i.i.d. $N(0, \Sigma)$, where $\Sigma_{ij} = \rho^{|i-j|}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. Let $R = m_2/m_1$, where $m_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{A^*}^*\|_{\max}$ and $m_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{A^*}^*\|_{\min} = 1$. The underlying regression coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is generated in such a way that the K nonzero coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ are uniformly distributed in (m_1, m_2) , and A^* is a randomly chosen subset of $\{1, \dots, p\}$ with $|A^*| = K < n$. The responses $\ln(T_i) = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i$, where ϵ_i 's are independently drawn from the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2)$. The censoring variable C_i is generated independently from the uniform distribution $U(0, \eta)$ as in Sect. 6.1. All the simulation results reported below are based on 100 independent replications.

6.2.1 Influence of the sample size n

We set $n = 100 : 50 : 400$, $p = 550$, $K = 6$, $R = 10$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$ and $\rho = 0.3$ in the data generating models. The top left panel of Fig. 1 shows the influence of the sample size n on the percentage of exact recovery of A^* based on 100 replications. In these examples, AFT-ASDAR tends to have the percentage of recovery close to 100%, while the percentage




Figure 1: The numerical results of the influence of sample size n (top left panel), variable dimension p (top right panel), correlation ρ (bottom left panel) and censoring rate $c.r$ (bottom right panel) on the probability of exact recovery of the true support sets

of Lasso is significantly less than 100%, and the percentage of MCP is less than 100% except when the sample size $n = 400$.

6.2.2 Influence of the variable dimension p

We set $n = 100$, $p = 200 : 100 : 1000$, $K = 6$, $R = 10$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$ and $\rho = 0.3$ in the models. The top right panel of Fig. 1 shows the influence of the variable dimension p on the percentage of exact recovery of A^* . The percentage of AFT-ASDAR is always close to 100% as the variable dimension p increases, but those of both Lasso and MCP are always less than 100%. These results suggest that AFT-ASDAR performs better in selecting variables with an

increasing variable dimension p .

6.2.3 Influence of the correlation ρ

We set $n = 150$, $p = 500$, $K = 6$, $R = 10$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$ and $\rho = 0.1 : 0.1 : 0.8$. The bottom left panel of Fig. 1 shows the influence of the correlation ρ on the percentage of exact recovery of A^* . AFT-ASDAR has nearly 100% probability in support recovery except when $\rho > 0.6$. When $\rho = 0.8$, the recovery percentage of AFT-ASDAR is smaller than but still comparable with MCP.

6.2.4 Influence of the censoring rate $c.r$

We set $n = 200$, $p = 500$, $K = 6$, $R = 10$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.1 : 0.1 : 0.7$ and $\rho = 0.3$ to generate the data. The bottom right panel of Fig. 1 shows the influence of the censoring rate $c.r$ on the probability of exact recovery of A^* . As the censoring rate $c.r$ increases, the percentage of recovery of AFT-ASDAR is stable and remains close to 1, while the recovery percentages of Lasso and MCP are less than 1.

6.3 Number of iterations

To examine the convergence properties of AFT-SDAR, we conduct simulations to obtain the average number of iterations of AFT-SDAR with $K=T$ in Algorithm 1. We generate the data in the same way as described in Section 6.2. Figure 2 shows the average number of iterations of AFT-SDAR with $\tau = 1$ based on 100 independent replications on data set: $n = 500$, $p = 1000$, $K = 2 : 2 : 50$, $R = 3$, $\sigma = 1$, $c.r = 0.3$, $\rho = 0.3$.

As shown in Fig. 2, the average number of iterations of the AFT-SDAR algorithm increases as the number of important variables K increases from 2 to 50. This is expected since it will take more iterations for the algorithm to converge when the model size increases. However, even when $K = 50$, it only take six iterations for the algorithm to converge. This shows that AFT-SDAR has fast convergence in the simulation models considered here.




Figure 2: The average number of iterations of AFT-SDAR as K increases

6.4 Real data example

In this section, we illustrate the proposed approach by analyzing the breast cancer data set nki70 from the study of [Van De Vijver et al. \(2002\)](#). The nki70 data set includes 144 lymph node positive breast cancer patients on metastasis-free survival, 5 clinical risk factors, and gene expression measurements of 70 genes found to be prognostic for metastasis-free survival in an earlier study, and the censoring rate is about 66.67%. We fit this data set with the AFT model. Further, we compare the estimation of the proposed approaches with that of Lasso and MCP. We set $T = 0.5 * n / \log(n)$ in AFT-SDAR, and implement AFT-ASDAR with $Q = 0.5 * n / \log(n)$. Set $\tau = 0.01$ in AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR. The results are showed

in Table 2.

In Table 2, AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR yield the same results, that is, they select the same set of genes and give the same estimated regression coefficients. Lasso selects the largest number of genes, and MCP selects the fewest number of genes. The coefficients of the common selected genes for these four methods have same sign. Especially, AFT-SDAR and AFT-ASDAR yield similar values of the estimated coefficients to those of Lasso for genes SLC2A3 and C20orf46, and yield the similar value of the estimated coefficient with MCP for gene MMP9.

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we consider the ℓ_0 -penalized method for estimation and variable selection in the high-dimensional AFT models. We extend the SDAR algorithm for the linear regression to the AFT model with censored survival data based on a weighted least squares criterion. The proposed AFT-SDAR algorithm is a constructive approach for approximating ℓ_0 -penalized weighted least squares solutions. In theoretical analysis, we establish ℓ_∞ nonasymptotic error bounds for the solution sequence generated by AFT-SDAR algorithm under appropriate conditions weaker than those in the existing works on nonconvex penalized regressions (Zhang and Zhang, 2012; Huang et al., 2018; Wainwright, 2019), and the key condition only relies on the identifiability of the AFT model. We also study the oracle support recovery property of AFT-SDAR. Simulation studies and real data analysis demonstrate superior performance of the AFT-SDAR in terms of relative estimation error, support recovery and computational efficiency in comparison with the lasso and MCP methods. Therefore, AFT-SDAR can be a useful tool in addition to the existing methods for analyzing high-dimensional censored survival data.

It would be interesting to apply the proposed method to other important survival analysis models such as the Cox model. For the Cox model, we can consider ℓ_0 -penalized partial likelihood criterion. Conceptually, the computational algorithm can be developed similarly

Table 2: The estimation results of nki70

Gene name	Number	Lasso	MCP	AFT-SDAR	AFT-ASDAR
ALDH4A1	6	-1.37	-	-3.01	-3.01
DIAPH3.2	12	-	-	1.50	1.50
C16orf61	14	-	-	-1.36	-1.36
EXT1	16	1.86	-	3.89	3.89
FLT1	17	0.13	-	1.47	1.47
GNAZ	18	0.09	-	-	-
MMP9	20	-2.57	-3.48	-3.73	-3.73
CDC42BPA	27	-	-	1.77	1.77
GSTM3	30	-0.72	-	-0.93	-0.93
PECI	36	-	-	0.99	0.99
MTDH	37	-0.77	-	-1.14	-1.14
Contig40831_RC	38	-0.03	-0.10	-	-
SLC2A3	47	1.23	2.48	1.20	1.20
RFC4	50	-	-	-1.64	-1.64
CDCA7	51	-0.35	-	-	-
AP2B1	55	0.26	-	-	-
PALM2.AKAP2	62	0.47	-	-	-
LGP2	63	0.13	-	0.85	0.85
CENPA	66	-0.78	-0.59	-	-
C20orf46	70	-0.89	-	-0.85	-0.85

based on the idea of support detection and root finding. However, the theoretical analysis of the convergence properties of the solution sequence is more challenging if the loss function is not quadratic and requires further work.

Appendix

A Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Let $\bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}\|_0$, and $\tilde{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_{(i)} (Y_{(i)} - \mathbf{x}_{(i)}^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0$.

Suppose $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a minimizer of \bar{L}_λ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_i^\diamond &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \bar{L}_\lambda(\eta_1^\diamond, \dots, \eta_{i-1}^\diamond, t, \eta_{i+1}^\diamond, \dots, \eta_p^\diamond) \\ \Rightarrow \eta_i^\diamond &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond - \bar{\mathbf{Y}} + (t - \eta_i^\diamond)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i\|_2^2 + \lambda |t|_0 \\ \Rightarrow \eta_i^\diamond &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} (t - \eta_i^\diamond)^2 + (t - \eta_i^\diamond)\bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^T (\bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond - \bar{\mathbf{Y}})/n + \lambda |t|_0 \\ \Rightarrow \eta_i^\diamond &\in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \frac{1}{2} [t - (\eta_i^\diamond + \bar{\mathbf{x}}_i^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)/n)]^2 + \lambda |t|_0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathbf{d}^\diamond = \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)/n$. By the definition of $H_\lambda(\cdot)$ in (5), we have

$$\eta_i^\diamond = H_\lambda(\eta_i^\diamond + d_i^\diamond) \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, p,$$

which shows (4) holds.

Conversely, if $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ and \mathbf{d}^\diamond satisfy (4), then we will show that $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a local minimizer of (3), and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond = D \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a local minimizer of (2) too. We can assume \mathbf{h} is small enough and $\|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty < \sqrt{2\lambda}$. Then we will show $\bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}) \geq \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)$ in two case respectively.

Case1: $\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond} \neq 0$.

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}\|_0 = \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_0 + \|\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond}\|_0,$$

$$\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_0 = \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_0 + \lambda \|\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond\|_0.$$

Because $|\eta_i^\diamond| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}$ for $i \in A^\diamond$ and $\|\mathbf{h}\|_\infty < \sqrt{2\lambda}$, we have

$$\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond\|_0 = 0,$$

$$\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_0 = \lambda \|\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond}\|_0 > \lambda.$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}) - \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond) \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond}\|_0 \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \left[\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{h}\|_2^2 - 2(\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond)^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}\mathbf{h} \right] + \lambda \|\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond}\|_0 \\
&\geq \lambda - \langle \mathbf{d}^\diamond, \mathbf{h} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

The last inequality $\lambda - \langle \mathbf{d}^\diamond, \mathbf{h} \rangle \geq 0$ holds for any small enough vector \mathbf{h} , so we obtain $\bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}) - \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond) \geq 0$.

Case2: $\mathbf{h}_{I^\diamond} = 0$.

$$\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_0 = \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond\|_0.$$

As $|\eta_i^\diamond| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}$ for $i \in A^\diamond$ and $\|\mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_\infty < \sqrt{2\lambda}$, then we have

$$\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_0 = \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond}\|_0 - \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond\|_0 = 0.$$

Due to $\mathbf{d}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond = \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond}^T (\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond) / n = 0$, then we can get

$$\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond} \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond - \bar{\mathbf{Y}}\|_2^2.$$

Thus, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}) - \bar{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond) \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond + \mathbf{h})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond\|_2^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond + \mathbf{h}_{A^\diamond})\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{2n} \|\bar{\mathbf{Y}} - \bar{\mathbf{X}}_{A^\diamond} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^\diamond}^\diamond\|_2^2 \\
&\geq 0.
\end{aligned}$$

In summary, $\boldsymbol{\eta}^\diamond$ is a local minimizer of \bar{L}_λ . Let $\bar{\mathbf{h}} = D \cdot \mathbf{h}$, then $\tilde{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond + \bar{\mathbf{h}}) - \tilde{L}_\lambda(\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond) \geq 0$ holds if the vector \mathbf{h} is sufficiently small, thus $\boldsymbol{\beta}^\diamond$ is also a local minimizer of (2). \square \square

Lemma 2. *There exists constants $0 < L \leq U < \infty$ with $0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma(\min, 2T)}{n\sqrt{2T}}$ and $\frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2}{n} \leq U < \infty$ such that for all different p -dimensional vectors $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2$ with $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_0 \leq 2T$,*

$$0 < L \leq \frac{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)}{n \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_\infty} \leq U < \infty. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Proof. Since $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_\infty \geq \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_2^2$, we have

$$\frac{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)}{n \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_\infty} \leq \frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2}{n}.$$

Hence, there exist $U \in \left[\frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2}{n}, \infty \right)$ such that the right hand side of (A.1) holds. Moreover, since $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{2T} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_2^2$, we have

$$\frac{(\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)^T \cdot \bar{\mathbf{X}}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}} \cdot (\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)}{n \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 - \boldsymbol{\eta}_2\|_\infty} \geq \frac{\sigma_{(\min, 2T)}}{n\sqrt{2T}}.$$

Thus, there exists $L \in \left(0, \frac{\sigma_{(\min, 2T)}}{n\sqrt{2T}} \right]$ such that the left hand side of (A.1) holds. \square \square

Lemma 3. Assume $0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma_{(\min, 2T)}}{n\sqrt{2T}}$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_0 = K \leq T$. Denote $B^k = A^k \setminus A^{k-1}$. Then,

$$\|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_1 \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_\infty \geq 2L\zeta[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)],$$

where $\zeta = \frac{|B^k|}{|B^k| + |A^* \setminus A^{k-1}|}$.

Proof. Obviously, this lemma holds if $A^k = A^{k-1}$ or $\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) \leq \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$. So, we only prove the lemma by assuming $A^k \neq A^{k-1}$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) > \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)$. As $0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma_{(\min, 2T)}}{n\sqrt{2T}}$, the left hand side of (A.1) holds. It implies that

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k), \boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k \rangle \geq \frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_\infty.$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k), \boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k \rangle \\ &= \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k), -\boldsymbol{\eta}^* \rangle \\ &\geq \frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_\infty + \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \\ &\geq \sqrt{2L} \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_\infty} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)}. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of A^k , B^k contains the first $|B^k|$ -largest elements (in absolute value) of $\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)$ and

$$\text{supp}(\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)) \cap \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) = A^* \setminus A^{k-1}.$$

Thus, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k), -\boldsymbol{\eta}^* \rangle \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^* \setminus A^{k-1}}^*\|_2 \\
& = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_2 \|(\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k)_{A^* \setminus A^{k-1}}\|_2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_2 \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \sqrt{\|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_1 \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_\infty} \cdot \sqrt{\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^* - \boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_\infty}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sqrt{2L} \sqrt{\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\zeta}} \sqrt{\|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_1 \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_\infty}.$$

In summary,

$$\|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_1 \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_\infty \geq 2L\zeta[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)].$$

□

□

Lemma 4. Assume $\tau < \frac{1}{\sqrt{TU}}$ with $\frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{x}}\|_2^2}{n} \leq U < \infty$ and $0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma(\min, 2T)}{n\sqrt{2T}}$, and set $K \leq T$ in Algorithm 1. Then before Algorithm 1 terminates, the following inequality holds for all $k \geq 0$:

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \leq \xi[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)],$$

where $\xi = 1 - \frac{2\tau L(1-\tau\sqrt{TU})}{\sqrt{T}(1+K)} \in (0, 1)$.

Proof. Let $\Delta^k = \boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \tau \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)$. The right hand side of (A.1) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}_2(\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) \\
& \leq \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1} \rangle + \frac{U}{2} \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}\|_1 \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

On one hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1} \rangle \\
& = \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} \rangle \\
& = \langle \nabla_{A^{k+1}} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta_{A^{k+1}}^{k+1} \rangle \\
& = \langle \nabla_{A^{k+1} \setminus A^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta_{A^{k+1} \setminus A^k}^{k+1} \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}\|_1 \\
&= \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} + \Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}|_{A^k\setminus A^{k+1}}\|_1 \\
&= \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_1 + \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k}^{k+1} - \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k}^{k+1}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k\setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_1 \\
&= \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k\setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}\|_\infty \\
&= \|\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} + \Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}\cap A^k} - \boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}|_{A^k\setminus A^{k+1}}\|_\infty \\
&= \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k\setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_\infty,
\end{aligned}$$

where $c \vee d = \max\{c, d\}$. On the other hand, by the definition of A^k , A^{k+1} and $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}$, we know that

$$|A^k \setminus A^{k+1}| = |A^{k+1} \setminus A^k|, \quad \Delta_{A^k \setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1} = \boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k \setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}.$$

By the definition of A^{k+1} , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\Delta_{A^k \setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k \setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_1 \leq \|\Delta_{A^{k+1} \setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_1, \\
& \|\Delta_{A^{k+1} \setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_\infty \vee \|\boldsymbol{\eta}_{A^k \setminus A^{k+1}}^{k+1}\|_\infty = \|\Delta_{A^{k+1} \setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Due to $-\nabla_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) = \frac{1}{\tau} \Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}$ and $\tau < \frac{1}{\sqrt{TU}}$, hence we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}_2(\Delta^{k+1}|_{A^{k+1}}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) \\
&\leq \langle \nabla_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}), \Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1} \rangle + U \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_1 \|\Delta_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k}^{k+1}\|_\infty \\
&\leq - \left(\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{T}} - U\tau^2 \right) \|\nabla_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1})\|_1 \cdot \|\nabla_{A^{k+1}\setminus A^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1})\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) \\
&\leq \mathcal{L}_2(\Delta^k|_{A^k}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) \\
&\leq - \left(\frac{\tau}{\sqrt{T}} - U\tau^2 \right) \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_1 \|\nabla_{B^k} \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k)\|_\infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, $\frac{|A^* \setminus A^{k-1}|}{|B^k|} \leq K$. By Lemma 3, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) \leq -\frac{2\tau L(1 - \tau\sqrt{T}U)}{\sqrt{T}(1+K)}[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)].$$

Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \leq \xi[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)],$$

where $\xi = 1 - \frac{2\tau L(1 - \tau\sqrt{T}U)}{\sqrt{T}(1+K)} \in (0, 1)$. □ □

Lemma 5. Assume $0 < L \leq \frac{\sigma(\min, 2T)}{n\sqrt{2T}}$ and $\frac{\|\bar{\mathbf{X}}\|_2^2}{n} \leq U < \infty$. Suppose that $\boldsymbol{\eta}^*$ is an arbitrary sparse vector with $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_0 = K \leq T$, $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k\|_0 = T$ and $\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \leq \xi[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)]$ for all $k \geq 0$, where $0 < \xi < 1$. Then,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{(1 + U/L) \cdot (K + T)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2}{L} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Proof. If $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty < \frac{2\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty}{L}$, then (A.2) holds, so we only concentrate on the case that $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \geq \frac{2\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty}{L}$. On one hand, by the left hand side of (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \\ & \geq \langle \nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^* \rangle + \frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \\ & \geq -\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 + \frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$(\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty) \left(\frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty - \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty \right) \geq 0.$$

Then, we can get

$$\frac{L}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty^2 - \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty - [\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)] \leq 0,$$

which is one univariate quadratic inequality about $\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|$. Therefore, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty + \sqrt{\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty^2 + 2L[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)]}}{L}.$$

Thus, we can get

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{\frac{2 \max\{\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*), 0\}}{L}} + \frac{2\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty}{L}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

On the other hand, based on the right hand side of (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \\ & \leq \langle \nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^* \rangle + \frac{U}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \langle \nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*), \boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^* \rangle + \frac{U}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \\ & \leq \|\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 + \frac{U}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \\ & \leq (K + T) \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty (\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty + \frac{U}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty). \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \\ & \leq \xi [\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k-1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)] \\ & \leq \xi^k [\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^0) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)] \\ & \leq \xi^k (K + T) \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty (\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty + \frac{U}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty) \\ & \leq \frac{\xi^k (K + T)(L + U)}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, by (A.3), we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{(K + T)(1 + U/L)} (\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2}{L} \|\nabla\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty.$$

This completes the proof. \square \square

Lemma 6. (Lemma 1 of [Huang and Ma \(2010\)](#)). Suppose that conditions (C2)-(C5) hold, then

$$\begin{aligned} & E(\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty) \\ & \leq C_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log(p)}{n}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2C_2 \log(p)}{n}} + \frac{4 \log(2p)}{n} + C_2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where C_1 and C_2 are two finite positive constants. In particular, when $n \gg \log(p)$,

$$E(\|\nabla\mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty) = o(1).$$

B Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. By Lemma 4, we have

$$\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^{k+1}) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*) \leq \xi[\mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k) - \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)],$$

where $\xi = 1 - \frac{2\tau L(1-\tau\sqrt{TU})}{\sqrt{T}(1+K)} \in (0, 1)$. Therefore, the conditions of Lemma 5 are satisfied.

Taking $\boldsymbol{\eta}^0 = D^{-1}\boldsymbol{\beta}^0 = 0$, then we can get

$$\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \leq \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2}{L} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_2(\boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

By condition (C1) and (B.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^k - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty \\ &= \|D(\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*)\|_\infty \\ &\leq b\|\boldsymbol{\eta}^k - \boldsymbol{\eta}^*\|_\infty \\ &\leq b^2 \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2b^2}{L} \|\nabla \mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square \square

C Proof of Theorems 2

Proof. By Lemma 6 and Markov inequality, we have

$$P(\|\nabla \mathcal{L}_1(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_\infty \geq \varepsilon_1) \leq \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}},$$

where

$$\varepsilon_1 = C_1 \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2C_2 \log(p)}{n}} + \frac{4 \log(2p)}{n} + C_2\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - \left(\frac{\log(p)}{n}\right)^{\frac{1}{4}}$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^k - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty \leq b^2 \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)}(\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_\infty + \frac{2b^2}{L} \varepsilon_1 \quad (\text{C.1})$$

This completes the proof. \square \square

D Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. By (C.1) and condition (C5), some algebra show that

$$\|\beta^k - \beta^*\|_\infty \leq b^2 \sqrt{(K+T)(1+U/L)} (\sqrt{\xi})^k \|\beta^*\|_\infty + \frac{2}{3} \|\beta_{A^*}^*\|_{\min} < \|\beta_{A^*}^*\|_{\min},$$

if $k > \log_{\frac{1}{\xi}} 9(T+K)(1+U/L)r^2b^4$. This implies that $A^* \subseteq A^k$. □ □

References

- Breheny, P. and Huang, J. (2011), “Coordinate descent algorithms for nonconvex penalized regression, with applications to biological feature selection,” *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5, 232.
- Buckley, J. and James, I. (1979), “Linear regression with censored data,” *Biometrika*, 66, 429–436.
- Cai, T., Huang, J., and Tian, L. (2009), “Regularized estimation for the accelerated failure time model,” *Biometrics*, 65, 394–404.
- Cox, D. R. (1972), “Regression models and life-tables,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 34, 187–202.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), “Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 96, 1348–1360.
- Fan, J. and Lv, J. (2008), “Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 70, 849–911.
- Hong, D. and Zhang, F. (2010), “Weighted elastic net model for mass spectrometry imaging processing,” *Mathematical Modelling of Natural Phenomena*, 5, 115–133.

- Hu, J. and Chai, H. (2013), “Adjusted regularized estimation in the accelerated failure time model with high dimensional covariates,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 122, 96–114.
- Huang, J., Jiao, Y., Liu, Y., and Lu, X. (2018), “A constructive approach to ℓ_0 penalized regression,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19, 403–439.
- Huang, J. and Ma, S. (2010), “Variable selection in the accelerated failure time model via the bridge method,” *Lifetime data analysis*, 16, 176–195.
- Huang, J., Ma, S., and Xie, H. (2006), “Regularized estimation in the accelerated failure time model with high-dimensional covariates,” *Biometrics*, 62, 813–820.
- Johnson, B. A. (2008), “Variable selection in semiparametric linear regression with censored data,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 70, 351–370.
- Johnson, B. A., Lin, D., and Zeng, D. (2008), “Penalized estimating functions and variable selection in semiparametric regression models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103, 672–680.
- Kalbfleisch, J. D. and Prentice, R. L. (2011), *The statistical analysis of failure time data*, vol. 360, John Wiley & Sons.
- Khan, M. H. R. and Shaw, J. E. H. (2016), “Variable selection for survival data with a class of adaptive elastic net techniques,” *Statistics and Computing*, 26, 725–741.
- Koul, H., Susarla, V. v., Van Ryzin, J., et al. (1981), “Regression analysis with randomly right-censored data,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 9, 1276–1288.
- Stute, W. (1996), “Distributional convergence under random censorship when covariables are present,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 461–471.

- Stute, W., Wang, J.-L., et al. (1993), “The strong law under random censorship,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 21, 1591–1607.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 58, 267–288.
- Van De Vijver, M. J., He, Y. D., Van’t Veer, L. J., Dai, H., Hart, A. A., Voskuil, D. W., Schreiber, G. J., Peterse, J. L., Roberts, C., Marton, M. J., et al. (2002), “A gene-expression signature as a predictor of survival in breast cancer,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, 347, 1999–2009.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019), *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, vol. 48, Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, L., Kim, Y., and Li, R. (2013), “Calibrating non-convex penalized regression in ultra-high dimension,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 2505.
- Wei, L.-J. (1992), “The accelerated failure time model: a useful alternative to the Cox regression model in survival analysis,” *Statistics in Medicine*, 11, 1871–1879.
- Ying, Z. (1993), “A large sample study of rank estimation for censored regression data,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 76–99.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Huang, J. (2008), “The sparsity and bias of the Lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 36, 1567–1594.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, T. (2012), “A general theory of concave regularization for high-dimensional sparse estimation problems,” *Statistical Science*, 27, 576–593.
- Zhang, C.-H. et al. (2010), “Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 894–942.

Zou, H. (2006), “The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 1418–1429.

Zou, H. and Zhang, H. H. (2009), “On the adaptive elastic-net with a diverging number of parameters,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 37, 1733.