

# Bayesian iterative screening in ultra-high dimensional settings

Run Wang, Somak Dutta, and Vivekananda Roy

Department of Statistics, Iowa State University, USA

## Abstract

Variable selection in ultra-high dimensional linear regression is often preceded by a screening step to significantly reduce the dimension. Here a Bayesian variable screening method (BITS) is developed. BITS can successfully integrate prior knowledge, if any, on effect sizes, and the number of true variables. BITS iteratively includes potential variables with the highest posterior probability accounting for the already selected variables. It is implemented by a fast Cholesky update algorithm and is shown to have the screening consistency property. BITS is built based on a model with Gaussian errors, yet, the screening consistency is proved to hold under more general tail conditions. The notion of posterior screening consistency allows the resulting model to provide a good starting point for further Bayesian variable selection methods. A new screening consistent stopping rule based on posterior probability is developed. Simulation studies and real data examples are used to demonstrate scalability and fine screening performance.

*Key words:* Forward regression; Large  $p$  small  $n$ ; Screening consistency; Spike and slab; Sure independent screening; Variable selection.

## 1 Introduction

These days, in diverse disciplines, data sets with hundreds of thousands of variables are commonly arising although only a very few of these variables are believed to be relevant for the response. Thus variable selection in linear regression has been a major topic of research over the last two decades in both frequentist and Bayesian statistics. A common approach to variable selection as well as coefficient estimation is by penalizing a loss function. These shrinkage methods include, but are not limited to, the ridge regression (Hoerl and Kennard, 1970), the popular Lasso (Tibshirani, 1996), the bridge regression (Huang, Horowitz, and Ma, 2008), the SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001), the elastic net (Zou and Hastie, 2005), the Dantzig selector (Candes and Tao, 2007) and the adaptive Lasso (Zou, 2006).

The Lasso estimate can be interpreted as the mode of a posterior density when independent Laplace priors are assumed on the regression coefficients (Tibshirani, 1996). Using a scale mixture of normal distributions representation for the Laplace distribution, a hierarchical Bayesian Lasso model can be formulated (Park and Casella, 2008). Several such Bayes and empirical Bayes penalized regression methods have been developed in the literature. See, for example, Li and Lin (2010), Kyung, Gill, Ghosh, and Casella (2010), Xu and Ghosh (2015) and Roy and Chakraborty (2017). Another approach to Bayesian variable selection is using auxiliary indicator variables (1 indicating presence and 0 indicating absence of the corresponding covariate in the model) to obtain a ‘spike and slab’ prior on the regression coefficients (see e.g. George and McCulloch, 1993; Ishwaran and Rao, 2005; Johnson and Rossell, 2012; Li, Dutta, and Roy, 2020; Liang, Paulo, Molina, Clyde, and Berger, 2008; Mitchell and Beauchamp, 1988; Narisetty and He, 2014; Ročková and George, 2014; Roy, Tan, and Flegal, 2018; Shin, Bhattacharya, and Johnson, 2018; Yuan and Lin, 2005). Here the ‘spike’ corresponds to the probability mass concentrated at zero or around zero for the variables vulnerable to deletion and the ‘slab’ specifies prior uncertainty for coefficients of other variables. We will discuss one such model in details in Section 2.1. Analysis using such models determines (selects) the most promising variables by summarizing the posterior density of the indicator variables and/or the regression coefficients.

In the ultra-high dimensional settings where the number of variables ( $p$ ) is much larger than the sample size ( $n$ ), previously mentioned variable selection methods may not work and the computational cost for large-scale optimization or Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) exploration (in the Bayesian methods) becomes too high to afford. This is why, in practice, a computationally inexpensive screening is performed before conducting a refined model selection analysis. Motivated by these, Fan and Lv (2008) proposed the sure independence screening (SIS) method where marginal Pearson correlations between the response and the variables are used to screen out unimportant variables, and thus rapidly reduce the dimension to a manageable size. The SIS method has been extended to generalized linear models (Fan and Song, 2010) and additive models (Fan, Feng, and Song, 2011) among others. Various other correlation measures as for example general correlation (Hall and Miller, 2009), distance correlation (Li, Zhong, and Zhu, 2012b), rank correlation (Li, Peng, Zhang, and Zhu, 2012a), tilted correlation (Cho and Fryzlewicz, 2012; Lin and Pang, 2014) and quantile partial correlation (Ma, Li, and Tsai, 2017) have also been proposed to rank and screen variables. Chang, Tang, and Wu (2013) discussed a marginal likelihood ratio test, Mai and Zou (2013) used Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic, Xu and Chen (2014) suggested maximum likelihood estimate to remove unimportant variables, respectively. He, Wang, and Hong (2013) discussed a nonparametric screening method, Zhou, Zhu, Xu, and Li (2019) used a divergence based screening method and Mukhopadhyay and

Dunson (2020) proposed the randomized independence screening. Wang (2009) studied the popular forward regression (FR) method (see also Hao and Zhang, 2014) and Wang and Leng (2016) proposed the high dimensional ordinary least squares projection (HOLP) for screening variables in ultra-high dimensional settings. However, currently, there is no available screening method that allows incorporating prior information on the variables. In this paper we develop a Bayesian screening method.

In order to develop a Bayesian screening method, we consider a hierarchical model with zero inflated mixture priors which are special cases of the spike and slab priors. As mentioned earlier, variants of these hierarchical models have previously been used for variable selection and MCMC algorithms are generally used to approximate posterior probabilities. It is known that MCMC chains suffer from slow mixing in high dimensional variable selection models and consequently due to increasing (per iteration) computational cost it may be unfeasible to obtain enough samples to accurately estimate the posterior probabilities. On the other hand, the sequential screening method proposed here called *Bayesian iterative screening* (BITS) does not involve any MCMC sampling. Under the hierarchical model considered here, the marginal posterior density of the latent indicator vector is analytically available up to a normalizing constant. BITS uses this density to iteratively include variables that have maximum posterior inclusion probability conditional on the already selected variables. The computation of the posterior probabilities is done by a one-step delayed Cholesky update. Wang and Leng (2016) mention that there are two important aspects of a successful screening method: computational efficiency and screening consistency property under flexible conditions. Even though BITS allows incorporation of prior information, it is computationally competitive with the frequentist screening methods like HOLP. The hierarchical model on which BITS is based assumes Gaussian errors. But we show that BITS has screening consistency even under the more general  $q$ -exponential tail condition on the errors. Also, we do not assume that the marginal correlations for the important variables are bounded away from zero—an assumption that is often violated in practice but used for showing screening consistency of SIS. Finally, we introduce the notion of posterior screening consistency and discuss its usefulness in Bayesian high dimensional data analysis.

BITS although is similar in spirit with the popular, classical variable screening method, namely forward regression (FR) (Wang, 2009) there are important differences between the two. By introducing the notion of ridge partial correlations, we show that unlike FR, BITS takes into account ridge partial variances to include potential variables. Also, by varying the ridge penalty, BITS can include groups of correlated important variables whereas FR selects only a candidate from each group which is not desirable for a screening method. For deciding the screened model size Wang (2009) considers the extended BIC (EBIC) criterion developed by Chen and Chen (2008). In addition to the use of EBIC and the liberal choice of having a model as large as

the sample size, we construct a new stopping rule based on the posterior probability (PP). Furthermore, we prove that the PP stopping rule is screening consistent again under the general  $q$ -exponential tail condition on the errors. Through examples we demonstrate how the PP criterion can lead to informative screening by specifying suitable prior hyperparameter values.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We describe the hierarchical model and BITS in Section 2. We establish screening consistency properties of BITS in Section 2.3 as well as discuss the notion of posterior screening consistency. In Section 2.4 we emphasize the contrast between the proposed method and FR. In Section 2.5 we describe different possible stopping rules for BITS and establish screening consistency of the proposed PP stopping rule. Section 3 lays out the fast statistical computation algorithm for BITS. Extensive simulation studies are used to study the effect of the hyperparameters on the properties of BITS (Section 4.2) and to highlight the competitiveness of BITS with several other screening methods (Section 4.3). A real data set from a genomewide association studies with more than half a million markers is analyzed in Section 5. Some concluding remarks are given in Section 6. Several theoretical results and proofs of the theorems are given in the Appendix. A supplement document containing the proofs of some of the theoretical results and some additional simulation results is provided with sections referenced here with the prefix ‘S’. The methodology proposed here is implemented as a function named `bits` in an accompanying R package `bravo` (Li, Dutta, and Roy, 2021).

## 2 A Bayesian iterative screening method

### 2.1 A hierarchical Gaussian regression model

Let the vector  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$  denote the  $n \times 1$  vector of responses and the  $n \times p$  matrix  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_p)$  denote the matrix of covariate values with vector of partial regression coefficients  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)$ . The Bayesian variable selection model we consider here assumes latent indicator vector  $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^\top \in \{0, 1\}^p$ , such that  $Z_j$  is included in the linear regression model if and only if  $\gamma_j = 1$  and that the conditional distribution of  $y$  given  $Z, \gamma, \mu, \mu_0 \in \mathbb{R}$  and  $\sigma^2 > 0$  is a multivariate Gaussian distribution given by

$$y|Z, \gamma, \mu_0, \mu, \sigma^2 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(\mu_0 \mathbf{1}_n + Z_\gamma \mu_\gamma, \sigma^2 I_n), \quad (1)$$

where  $Z_\gamma$  is the  $n \times |\gamma|$  sub-matrix of  $Z$  that consists of columns of  $Z$  corresponding to model  $\gamma$ ,  $\mu_\gamma$  is the vector that contains the regression coefficients for model  $\gamma$ , and  $|\gamma| = \sum_{i=1}^p \gamma_i$  is the model size. However, the original covariates may have unbalanced scales and we reparameterize the above model using a scaled

covariate matrix. That is, we let  $X = (Z - 1_n \bar{Z}^\top)D^{-1/2} \equiv (X_1, \dots, X_p)$  where  $\bar{Z}$  is the vector column means of  $Z$  and  $D$  is the  $p \times p$  diagonal matrix whose  $i$ th diagonal entry is the standard deviation of  $Z_i$ . Also let  $\beta = D\mu$  and  $\beta_0 = \mu_0 + \mu^\top \bar{Z}$ . Similarly,  $X_\gamma$  is the  $n \times |\gamma|$  sub-matrix of  $X$  corresponding to model  $\gamma$ . We then assume the Bayesian Gaussian hierarchical model

$$y|\beta_0, \beta, \gamma, \sigma^2 \sim \mathcal{N}_n(1_n\beta_0 + X_\gamma\beta_\gamma, \sigma^2 I_n), \quad (2a)$$

$$(\sigma^2, \beta_0) \sim f(\beta_0, \sigma^2) \propto 1/\sigma^2, \quad (2b)$$

$$\beta_j|\gamma, \sigma^2 \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, \frac{\gamma_j}{\lambda}\sigma^2) \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, q, \quad (2c)$$

$$\gamma|w \sim f(\gamma|w) = w^{|\gamma|}(1-w)^{p-|\gamma|}. \quad (2d)$$

In this hierarchical setup a popular non-informative prior is set for  $(\beta_0, \sigma^2)$  in (2b) and a conjugate independent normal prior is used on  $\beta$  given  $\gamma$  in (2c) with  $\lambda > 0$  controlling the precision of the prior independently from the scales of measurements. Note that under this prior, if a covariate is not included in the model, the prior on the corresponding regression coefficient degenerates at zero. In (2d) an independent Bernoulli prior is set for  $\gamma$ , where  $w \in (0, 1)$  reflects the prior inclusion probability of each predictor. We assume  $\lambda$  and  $w$  are known non-random functions of  $n$  and  $p$ .

Our Bayesian screening method hinges on the fact that given  $\gamma$ , it is possible to integrate out other variable analytically. Indeed, integrating out  $(\beta_\gamma, \beta_0, \sigma^2)$  we derive the following marginal distribution of  $y$  given  $\gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} y|\gamma \sim f(y|\gamma) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{|\gamma|}} f(y|\gamma, \sigma^2, \beta_0, \beta_\gamma) f(\beta_\gamma|\gamma, \sigma^2, \beta_0) f(\sigma^2, \beta_0) d\beta_\gamma d\beta_0 d\sigma^2 \\ &= c_n \lambda^{|\gamma|/2} |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I|^{-1/2} [\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \tilde{\beta}_\gamma^\top (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I) \tilde{\beta}_\gamma]^{-(n-1)/2}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where,  $c_n = \Gamma((n-1)/2)/\pi^{(n-1)/2}$  is a constant depending only on the sample size  $n$ ,  $\tilde{y} = y - \bar{y}1_n$ , and  $\tilde{\beta}_\gamma = (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}$ . The hierarchical Gaussian regression model (2) and its variants have been used extensively and exclusively for variable selection. In particular, several works have established strong model selection consistency results (Narisetty and He, 2014) under the ultra-high dimensional setup that is considered here. In practice, however, these methods are mostly used after reducing the number of covariates using frequentist screening methods that are not driven by the same Bayesian hierarchical model. In the next section we describe the first ever Bayesian screening method based on the hierarchical model (2).

## 2.2 The BITS algorithm

We now describe our proposed screening method. This method uses the posterior density of  $\gamma$ ,  $f(\gamma|y)$  which is available up to a normalizing constant. Indeed, if  $w$  is assumed fixed, then

$$f(\gamma|y) \propto \lambda^{|\gamma|/2} |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I|^{-1/2} [\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \tilde{\beta}_\gamma^\top (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I) \tilde{\beta}_\gamma]^{-(n-1)/2} w^{|\gamma|} (1-w)^{p-|\gamma|}, \quad (4)$$

that is,

$$\begin{aligned} \log f(\gamma|y) = & \text{const} + \frac{|\gamma|}{2} \log \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \log |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I| \\ & - \frac{n-1}{2} \log [\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}] + |\gamma| \log \frac{w}{1-w}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Let  $e_i$  be the  $i$ th  $p$  dimensional canonical basis vector, that is, the  $i$ th element of  $e_i$  is one, and all other elements are zero. In the first step, we select the variable  $i_1$  such that

$$i_1 = \underset{j \in \{1, \dots, p\}}{\text{argmax}} \log P(\gamma = e_j | y). \quad (6)$$

Thus we select the unit vector  $e_j$  with highest posterior probability. In the next step, we select the variable  $i_2$  with

$$i_2 = \underset{j \neq i_1}{\text{argmax}} \log P(\gamma = e_{i_1} + e_j | y).$$

Note that for  $j \neq i_1$ ,

$$P(\gamma_j = 1 | \gamma_{i_1} = 1, \gamma_k = 0, k \neq i_1; y) = \left( 1 + \frac{P(\gamma = e_{i_1} | y)}{P(\gamma = e_{i_1} + e_j | y)} \right)^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

So,  $P(\gamma_j = 1 | \gamma_{i_1} = 1, \gamma_k = 0, k \neq i_1; y)$  and  $P(\gamma = e_{i_1} + e_j | y)$  are maximized at the same  $j \neq i_1$ . Thus, in the second step, we choose the variable which has maximum posterior inclusion probability given that  $i_1$  (the variable selected in the first step) is included in the model. An efficient computational method for calculating  $P(\gamma = e_{i_1} + e_j | y)$  using a fast Cholesky update is given in Section 3. One problem with marginal correlation based screening methods like SIS (Fan and Lv, 2008) is that unimportant variables that are correlated with important variables may get selected. This is not likely to happen in our proposed screening procedure as the only variables that have high (conditional) posterior inclusion probability *after* taking into account the selected variables survive the screening. Let  $\gamma^{(m)} = \sum_{k=1}^m e_{i_k}$  be the  $\gamma$  vector at the  $m$ th step. Below we describe the  $(m+1)$ st iteration of the BITS.

---

Iteration  $m + 1$  of the screening algorithm:

Given  $\gamma^{(m)}$ , let

$$i_{m+1} = \operatorname{argmax}_{j \notin \gamma^{(m)}} \log P(\gamma = \gamma^{(m)} + e_j | y). \quad (8)$$

Set  $\gamma^{(m+1)} = \gamma^{(m)} + e_{i_{m+1}}$ .

---

Using the same argument as (7), the  $i_{m+1}$ st variable has the highest posterior probability of being included given that  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_m$  have already been included in the model. BITS although is not guaranteed to produce the posterior mode, or any other standard summary measures of the posterior distribution  $f(\gamma|y)$ , in the next section we show that it enjoys screening consistency.

**Remark 1.** *Since,*

$$P(\gamma = e_j | y) \propto \left[ 1 - \frac{r_j^2}{1 + \lambda/n} \right]^{-(n-1)/2},$$

with  $r_j = X_j^\top \tilde{y}$ , the first step of the BITS algorithm, given in (6), selects the variable with largest marginal correlation as in Fan and Lv's (2008) SIS algorithm.

**Remark 2.** *Under the Bernoulli prior (2d) on  $\gamma$  the selection path  $i_1, i_2, i_3, \dots$  does not depend on the hyperparameter  $w$  because the prior is only a function of  $|\gamma|$ . However, as we shall see later in Sections 2.5 and 4.2,  $w$  has an effect on some stopping rules and the screening performance under these rules.*

### 2.3 Screening consistency of BITS

Ideally, as the sample size increases we would like all the important variables to be included in  $\gamma^{(m)}$  after a reasonable number of  $m (< n)$  steps. The notion of frequentist screening consistency (Fan and Lv, 2008; Wang, 2009) states that if  $E(y) = X_t \beta_t$ , for some subset  $t \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$  then  $P(t \in \gamma^{(m)})$  for some  $m \leq n$  should converge to 1 as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , under some regularity conditions. In order to state the assumptions and the results more rigorously, we use the following notations. Abusing notation, we interchangeably use a model  $\gamma$  either as a  $p$ -dimensional binary vector or as a set of indices of non-zero entries of the binary vector. For models  $\gamma$  and  $s$ ,  $\gamma^c$  denotes the complement of the model  $\gamma$ , and  $\gamma \vee s$  ( $\gamma \wedge s$ ) denote the union (intersection) of  $\gamma$  and  $s$ . For  $1 \leq i \leq p$ , we say  $i \in \gamma$  if  $\gamma_i = 1$  and  $i \notin \gamma$  if  $\gamma_i = 0$ . For two real sequences  $\{a_n\}$  and  $\{b_n\}$ ,  $a_n \sim b_n$  means  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow c$  for some constant  $c > 0$ ;  $a_n \succeq b_n$  (or  $b_n \preceq a_n$ ) means  $b_n = O(a_n)$ ;  $a_n \succ b_n$  (or  $b_n \prec a_n$ ) means  $b_n = o(a_n)$ . Also for any matrix  $A$ , let  $\alpha_{\min}(A)$  and  $\alpha_{\max}(A)$  denote its minimum and maximum eigenvalues, respectively, and let  $\alpha_{\min}^*(A)$  be its minimum nonzero eigenvalue.

Again, abusing notations, for two real numbers  $a$  and  $b$ ,  $a \vee b$  and  $a \wedge b$  denote  $\max(a, b)$  and  $\min(a, b)$ , respectively. Finally, let  $\beta_+ = \min_{i \in t} |\beta_i|$ .

### 2.3.1 Orthogonal design with Gaussian errors

We first explore the notion of frequentist screening consistency in the simple case where  $p \leq n$  and the design matrix  $X$  is orthogonal, i.e.,  $X^\top X = nI_p$ . The following theorem shows that under a Gaussianity assumption and some mild conditions on the effects sizes, BITS include all and only the important variables in the first  $|t|$  steps.

**Theorem 1.** *Suppose  $X^\top X = nI_p$ ,  $y = \beta_0 1_n + X_t \beta_t + \sigma \epsilon$  where  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_n)$ ,  $|t| = O(n^a)$ , for some  $a < 1$ , and  $n\beta_+^2 \succ \log n$ . Then for any  $\lambda > 0$ ,  $P(\gamma^{(|t|)} = t) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

Such a strong conclusion holds for the orthogonal design because the variables are uncorrelated and hence the marginal correlations are asymptotically ordered by the magnitudes of the regression coefficients (Fan and Lv, 2008). Furthermore, the orthogonality restricts  $p$  to be at most  $n$ . Thus, it is unrealistic to expect the same conclusion to hold in general situations. In particular, note that the first variable included is the one with the highest absolute marginal correlation with the response (Remark 1). There are ample examples of realistic designs (Fan and Lv, 2008; Wang, Dutta, and Roy, 2021) where an unimportant variable has the highest absolute marginal correlation with the response.

### 2.3.2 Screening consistency in more general cases

Although BITS is developed under the Gaussianity assumption on  $y$  for computational tractability, we would like to establish screening consistency even under more general tail conditions. As we shall see, the tail behavior of the error distribution plays a crucial role in proving screening consistency. To that end, we consider the family of distributions with  $q$ -exponential tail condition (Wang and Leng, 2016) given below.

**Definition 1** ( $q$ -exponential tail condition). *A zero-mean distribution  $F$  is said to have  $q$ -exponential tail, if there exists a function  $q : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that for any  $N \geq 1$ ,  $\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F$ ,  $\ell \in \mathcal{R}^N$  with  $\|\ell\| = 1$ , and  $\zeta > 0$  we have  $P(|\ell^\top \eta| > \zeta) \leq \exp\{1 - q(\zeta)\}$  where  $\eta = (\eta_1, \dots, \eta_N)$ .*

This tail condition is assumed by Wang and Leng (2016) in establishing screening consistency of their HOLP screening method. In particular, as shown in Vershynin (2012), for standard normal distribution,  $q(\zeta) = \zeta^2/2$ , when  $F$  is sub-Gaussian  $q(\zeta) = c_F \zeta^2$  for some constant  $c_F > 0$  depending on  $F$ , and when  $F$  is sub-exponential distribution  $q(\zeta) = c'_F \zeta$  for some constant  $c'_F > 0$  depending on  $F$ . Finally, when only first  $2k$  moments of  $F$  are finite,  $q(\zeta) - 2k \log(\zeta) = O(1)$ .



We assume the following set of conditions:

C1  $y = \beta_0 1_n + X_t \beta_t + \sigma \epsilon$  where  $t$  is the true model,  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)$ ,  $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} F_0$  which has  $q$ -exponential tail with unit variance.

C2  $|\log \lambda| = O(\log n)$  and  $\|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+ = O(1)$  where  $\delta^+$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $X_t^\top X_t/n$ .

C3 There exist  $K_n$  and  $0 < \delta < 1/\sigma$  such that  $(K_n + 1)|t| \leq n$ ,

$$\frac{|t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n}{\tau_+^2 \beta_+^4} \prec K_n \preceq n \log n \min \left\{ \frac{\tau_+}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{|\log(1/w - 1)|} \right\}$$

$$q(s_n \delta) - K_n |t| \log p - \log |t| \rightarrow \infty$$

where  $s_n = \sqrt{n} \tau_+ \beta_+^2 / (\|\beta_t\| \sqrt{|t|})$  and  $\tau_+$  is the smallest nonzero eigenvalue of  $X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma/n$  with  $|\gamma| \leq (K_n + 1)|t|$ .

Although our assumption on  $p$  is related only to the tail behavior of the error distribution, it is evident that under sub-Gaussian or sub-exponential tailed  $F_0$ , BITS is screening consistent in the ultra-high dimensional setting. For example, suppose  $\|\beta_t\| = O(1)$ ,  $\tau_+ \sim n^{-h_1}$ ,  $\beta_+ \sim n^{-h_2}$ ,  $\log p \sim n^{h_3}$ ,  $|t| \sim n^{h_4}$ ,  $w = n^{-h_5}$ , for some  $h_i > 0, i = 1, \dots, 5$ , and  $K_n = |t| \tau_+^{-2} \beta_+^{-4} (\log n)^2$ . Also, suppose  $\lambda = n^{h_6}$  for some constant  $h_6$ . When  $F_0$  is sub-Gaussian, simple calculations show that a sufficient condition for (C1)–(C3) is that  $4h_1 + 8h_2 + h_3 + 3h_4 + h_6 < 1$  if  $h_1 + h_6 > 0$  and  $4h_1 + 8h_2 + h_3 + 3h_4 < 1$  if  $h_1 + h_6 \leq 0$ . If  $F_0$  is subexponential, a sufficient condition is  $6h_1 + 12h_2 + 2h_3 + 5h_4 + h_6 < 1$  if  $h_1 + h_6 > 0$  and  $6h_1 + 12h_2 + 2h_3 + 5h_4 < 1$  if  $h_1 + h_6 \leq 0$ , which is slightly more stringent than the sub-Gaussian case. We now present the screening consistency result.

**Theorem 2.** *Under conditions (C1)–(C3), there exists  $c > 0$  such that for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,*

$$P(\gamma^{(K_n |t|)} \supseteq t) \geq 1 - \exp(1 - q(s_n \delta) + K_n |t| \log p + \log |t|) - P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n),$$

where  $u_n = \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 K_n / (c |t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n)$ .

Note that, the limit of  $\|\tilde{y}\|^2/n$  is bounded above by  $\|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+ + \sigma^2$  almost everywhere which is bounded by C2. Thus it is easy to see from C3 that  $P(\gamma^{(K_n |t|)} \supseteq t) \rightarrow 1$ . That is, with overwhelmingly large probability, the true model is included in at most  $K_n |t|$  many steps. However, when higher order moments of  $\epsilon_1$  exist, further lower bounds to  $P(\gamma^{(K_n |t|)} \supseteq t)$  can be obtained as described in the following corollary.

**Corollary 1.** *Suppose conditions (C1)–(C3) holds. If further,  $E(\epsilon_1^6) < \infty$  then with  $\kappa = \text{Var}(\epsilon_1^2)$ ,  $v_n = u_n - \|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+ - 1$  and a constant  $c_1 > 0$ , for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,*

$$P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n) < \frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{\kappa}}{\sqrt{2n\pi v_n}} \exp\left(-\frac{nv_n^2}{2\sigma^4 \kappa}\right) + \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{4\sigma^4 \|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+}{n}.$$

### 2.3.3 Posterior screening consistency

The screening consistency considered in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 are in the frequentist sense and therefore are not guaranteed to be fidelitous to the posterior inference. In this section we discuss the concept of posterior screening consistency (see also Song and Liang, 2015, Theorem 3). We start with the following definition.

**Definition 2.** *A sequence of models  $\{\gamma^{[n]}\}$ , with  $|\gamma^{[n]}| \leq n$  is said to be posterior screening consistent if*

$$P\left(\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_t(\gamma^{[n]}|y)\right) \equiv \sum_{t \subseteq \gamma \subseteq \gamma^{[n]}} f(\gamma|y) \rightarrow 1 \quad (9)$$

*in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $\mathcal{P}_t(\gamma^{[n]})$  is the set of all sub-models of  $\gamma^{[n]}$  containing  $t$ .*

In other words, with probability tending to 1, the posterior mass of  $\gamma$  is entirely supported on  $2^{(|\gamma^{[n]}|-|t|)}$  models which are sub-models of  $\gamma^{[n]}$ . Considering that there are originally  $2^p$  possible models, this can be a great reduction in the search space for models with high posterior probabilities. Typically Bayesian variable selection algorithms search for the posterior mode and other high-posterior probability models. Many competitive algorithms are available to search for the best model including, but surely not limited to, the stochastic shotgun algorithm (Hans, Dobra, and West, 2007), simplified stochastic shotgun algorithm (Shin et al., 2018), shotgun with embedded screening (Li et al., 2020), Gibbs sampling (Narisetty and He, 2014) and Metropolis-Hastings algorithm (Zhou and Guan, 2019). Since the size ( $2^p$ ) of the model space grows exponentially with the number of variables, due to computational cost and convergence issues of these iterative algorithms, when dealing with high dimensional data sets, generally a screening step is performed before applying a Bayesian variable selection algorithm. For example, Narisetty and He (2014), in their real data example, use SIS to reduce the number of variables from 22,575 to 400 before applying their variable selection algorithm. One important aspect of posterior screening consistency is that the best model (in terms of posterior probability) for variable selection can be searched among a much smaller number of models instead of among the humongous number ( $2^p$ ) of all possible models. Thus a posterior screening consistent model can serve as an excellent starting point for implementing further Bayesian variable selection methods.

In the above we have described important practical consequences of using posterior screening consistent algorithms. We now discuss conditions guaranteeing such consistency. In the context of ultra-high dimensional Bayesian variable selection, under different hierarchical model setups, recently several articles have established strong (posterior) selection consistency, that is,  $f(t|y) \rightarrow 1$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (see e.g. Li et al., 2020; Narisetty and He, 2014; Shin et al., 2018; Yang, Wainwright, and Jordan, 2016). Thus under strong selection consistency, posterior probability of the true model goes to one as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . We have the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *If a sequence of models  $\{\gamma^{[n]}\}$  is screening consistent and strong selection consistency holds then  $\{\gamma^{[n]}\}$  is posterior screening consistent.*

*Proof.* For given  $\delta > 0$ , denoting the events  $\{t \subseteq \gamma^{[n]}\}$  and  $\{f(t|y) > 1 - \delta\}$  by  $A_n$  and  $B_{n,\delta}$  respectively, we have  $P(\sum_{t \subseteq \gamma \subseteq \gamma^{[n]}} f(\gamma|y) > 1 - \delta) \geq P(A_n \cap B_{n,\delta}) \geq P(A_n) + P(B_{n,\delta}) - 1$ . Then the proof follows since  $P(A_n) \rightarrow 1$  and  $P(B_{n,\delta}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .  $\square$

Yang et al. (2016) and Li et al. (2020) derive conditions for strong selection consistency for the model (2). Thus, by Lemma 1 and Theorem 2 we have posterior screening consistency results for BITS.

## 2.4 Contrast with the forward regression method

BITS although is similar in spirit of the forward selection, the step-wise regression method, there are significant differences between BITS and the FR method of Wang (2009). Firstly, under the conditions of Wang (2009), BITS is screening consistent:

**Lemma 2.** *Under the conditions of Wang (2009), that is, with  $\beta_+ \geq \nu_\beta n^{-\xi_{min}}$ ,  $\log p \leq \nu n^\xi$ ,  $|t| \leq \nu n^{\xi_0}$ ,  $\|\beta_t\| \leq C_\beta$  for some finite constant  $C_\beta$ ,  $\tau_+ \geq \tau_{min}$  for some finite constant  $\tau_{min}$ , and  $\xi + 6\xi_0 + 12\xi_{min} < 1$ ,  $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , then C3 holds with  $K_n = n^{\xi_0 + 4\xi_{min}} (\log n)^2$ .*

A proof of Lemma 2 is given in Section S1.1 of the supplement. We indeed prove that the lemma holds under a weaker condition of  $\xi + 3\xi_0 + 8\xi_{min} < 1$ . In order to show the contrasts between BITS and FR, we introduce the notion of ridge partial correlations.

**Definition 3.** *For any  $\gamma$  and  $i \notin \gamma$ , the ridge partial correlation between  $y$  and  $X_i$  given  $X_\gamma$  with ridge penalty  $\lambda$  is given by*

$$R_{i,\gamma,\lambda} \equiv R_{iy,\gamma,\lambda} = -v_{iy,\gamma,\lambda} / \{v_{i,\gamma,\lambda} \times v_{y,\gamma,\lambda}\}^{1/2}$$

where

$$v_{i,\gamma,\lambda} = n^{-1} X_i^\top X_i + n^{-1} \lambda - n^{-2} X_i^\top X_\gamma \left( n^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda/nI \right)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_i$$

is the ridge (sample) partial variance of  $X_i$  given  $X_\gamma$ ,

$$v_{iy,\gamma,\lambda} = n^{-1}\tilde{y}^\top X_i - n^{-2}\tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma \left( n^{-1}X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda/nI \right)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_i,$$

and

$$v_{y,\gamma,\lambda} = n^{-1}\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - n^{-2}\tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma \left( n^{-1}X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda/nI \right)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}.$$

**Remark 3.** When  $|\gamma| < n$  and  $\lambda = 0$ ,  $R_{i,\gamma,0}$  is exactly the (sample) partial correlation between  $y$  and  $X_i$  after eliminating the effects of  $X_j, j \in \gamma$ , and the ridge partial sample variances  $v_{i,\gamma,0}$ 's are exactly the (sample) partial variances of  $X_i$ 's given  $X_j, j \in \gamma$ .

In fact, BITS can be reformulated using these ridge sample partial correlations and ridge sample partial variances. To that end, we first show how the log-marginal posterior probability increments depend on the ridge partial correlations and partial variances.

**Lemma 3.** For the model (2), for any  $\gamma$ , and  $i \notin \gamma$ ,

$$\frac{f(\gamma + e_i|y)}{f(\gamma|y)} = \frac{w(n\lambda)^{1/2}}{(1-w)v_{i,\gamma,\lambda}^{1/2}(1-R_{i,\gamma,\lambda}^2)^{(n-1)/2}}.$$

Consequently, under the independent prior, having chosen model  $\gamma^{(m)}$ , the BITS method chooses the candidate index  $i_{m+1}$  that maximizes  $-\frac{1}{2} \log v_{i,\gamma^{(m)},\lambda} - \frac{1}{2}(n-1) \log\{1-R_{i,\gamma^{(m)},\lambda}^2\}$  over  $i \notin \gamma$ . This is clearly different from the forward screening method of Wang (2009) where it only maximizes the absolute partial correlations  $|R_{i,\gamma,0}|$ , ( $i \notin \gamma$ ). In particular, BITS also takes into consideration the (sample) partial variances of each  $X_i$  given the already included variables. Thus, between two candidates which have the same partial correlations with the response given already included variables, the one with smaller conditional variance is preferred. However, if the partial correlations with the response are different then because of the presence of the multiplier  $(n-1)$ , the effect of the conditional variance is practically insignificant. Furthermore, by shrinking the effects using the ridge penalty, BITS can include groups of important variables that are highly correlated among themselves in contrast to FR which would only select a candidate variable from the group. Finally, note that during screening it could be useful to be liberal and include more than  $n$  variables. This however, is not possible by FR because all models of size bigger than  $n-1$  have zero residual sum of squares. BITS, on the other hand, allows to have a screened model of size bigger than  $n$ . In different simulation examples in section 4.3, we demonstrate that BITS performs much better than FR.

## 2.5 Stopping criteria

Note that BITS provide a sequence of predictor indices  $i_1, i_2, \dots$ . A practical question is when to stop the algorithm. Theorem 2 suggests that the first  $K_n|t|$  indices contain the true model with overwhelming probability. However, there is nothing to stop us from being liberal and include the first  $n$  indices  $i_1, i_2, \dots, i_n$ .

The aforementioned rule is not affected by the prior inclusion probability  $w$ . We now propose a *new* stopping rule, called the posterior probability (PP) criterion that depends on  $w$ . As we expect the important variables to be included early, the BITS algorithm is expected to provide a sequence of nested models  $\{\gamma^{(i)}\}$  with increasing posterior probabilities until all the important variables are included. Thus we may stop BITS when the first drop occurs in these posterior probabilities, that is, we stop at iteration

$$\mathcal{T} = \arg \min_{m < K_n|t|} \{f(\gamma^{(m+1)}|y) < f(\gamma^{(m)}|y)\}.$$

Since  $K_n|t| < n$ , the PP criterion never selects more than  $n$  variables. Under the orthogonal design described in Section 2.3.1, we saw that with probability tending to one, BITS include all and only the important variables in the first  $|t|$  steps. In addition, we will now prove that the PP criterion stops right after  $|t|$  steps.

**Theorem 3.** *If the conditions for Theorem 1 hold and in addition, that  $\|\beta_t\| = O(1)$  and that there exists  $1/2 < c < 1$  such that  $w = c'n^{-c}$  for some  $c' > 0$ . Then  $P(\mathcal{T} = |t|) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

However, in general, as we have seen in Section 2.3, BITS may include unimportant variables before it includes all the important variables. Thus it is unrealistic to require that the conclusions of the previous theorem holds in the more general case. However, the following theorem guarantees that  $\gamma^{(\mathcal{T})}$  is screening consistent.

**Theorem 4.** *Under conditions (C1)–(C3), there exists a positive constant  $c^*$  such that for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,*

$$P(\gamma^{(\mathcal{T})} \supseteq t) \geq 1 - \exp(1 - q(s_n\delta) + K_n|t| \log p + \log |t|) - P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^*),$$

where  $u_n^* = \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 K_n / (c^* |t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n)$ .

Later in Section 4.2 we discuss how with proper choices of the hyperparameters, the PP rule can provide an informative screening method using BITS. Alternatively, Wang (2009) and Wang and Leng (2016) also promote the use of EBIC (Chen and Chen, 2008). Under this stopping rule, the screening is stopped at the smallest EBIC, that is, at  $\arg\min_{1 \leq m \leq n-1} \text{EBIC}(m)$  where for  $1 \leq k < n$ ,  $\text{EBIC}(k) = \log \hat{\sigma}_{(k)}^2 + k(\log n +$

$2 \log p)/n$ , and  $n\hat{\sigma}_{(k)}^2$  is the ordinary least squares residual sum of squares from regression of  $y$  on the first  $k$  screened variables. Evidently, due to its ultra-high dimensional penalty, EBIC is expected to be very conservative and yield small screened models. Compared to the PP rule, the EBIC rule is computationally expensive as it requires a model of size  $n - 1$ . On the other hand, a similar variant of the PP criterion can be to choose the model according to the largest drop in the posterior probability among the first  $K_n|t|$  steps, that is, the model size is  $\operatorname{argmax}_{1 \leq m \leq K_n|t|} (f(\gamma^{(m)}|y) - f(\gamma^{(m+1)}|y))$ .

## 2.6 BITS for other priors

A popular alternative to the independent normal prior in (2c) is the Zellner's  $g$ -prior (Zellner, 1986) for  $\beta_\gamma$  indexed by a hyperparameter  $g$  under the assumption that all  $n \times n$  submatrices of  $X$  are non-singular. That is, we also consider the hierarchical model (2) where the prior in (2c) is replaced with  $\beta_\gamma|\gamma, \sigma^2 \sim \mathcal{N}_{|\gamma|}(0, g\sigma^2(X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1})$ , whence the marginal density  $\tilde{f}(y|\gamma)$  becomes

$$\tilde{f}(y|\gamma) = c_n (g + 1)^{-|\gamma|/2} \left[ \tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \frac{g}{g + 1} \tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y} \right]^{-(n-1)/2}.$$

It is evident that the Zellner's  $g$ -prior provides the same screening path as FR because for fixed  $|\gamma|$  the posterior density  $\tilde{f}(\gamma|y)$  under Zellner's prior is a monotonic decreasing function of the regression sum of squares  $\tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}$ . Also, the Zellner's  $g$ -prior does not allow to have screened models of size more than  $n$ .

Similarly, BITS can easily accommodate beta-binomial prior distribution on  $\gamma : p(\gamma|a, b) = \mathcal{B}(|\gamma| + a, p - |\gamma| + b)/\mathcal{B}(a, b)$ , where  $\mathcal{B}$  is the beta function, and  $a, b > 0$ . Since the beta-binomial prior also depend on  $\gamma$  only via  $|\gamma|$ , it does not have any effect on the screening path of BITS for a given  $\lambda$ .

Recently, Kojima and Komaki (2016) have proposed a class of discrete determinantal point process priors on the model space that discourages simultaneous selection of collinear predictors. The founding member of this class of priors is given by  $f_d(\gamma) = |dX_\gamma^\top X_\gamma| / |dX^\top X + I_p|$ , where  $d > 0$  controls the prior expectation of the model size. A value of  $d > 1$  promotes larger models, while  $d \leq 1$  promotes smaller models. Although Kojima and Komaki (2016) have studied the prior when  $p < n$ , it can be also used when  $p > n$ . In particular,  $f_d(\gamma)$  puts zero prior probability on all models of size greater than  $n$ . Notice that this prior is not a function of  $|\gamma|$  and hence  $d$  will have an effect on the BITS screening path.

### 3 Fast statistical computation

In this section we describe how BITS is implemented in practice. One major challenge in BITS is the computation of posterior probabilities of models  $\gamma^{(m)} + e_j$  for all  $j \notin \gamma^{(m)}$  in the  $(m + 1)$ st iteration. We show how these can be computed in minimal computational complexity using a one-step delayed Cholesky updates.

Before delving into the algorithm, let us define the notation  $\odot$  and  $\oslash$  as the element-wise multiplication and division between two vectors. Also when adding or subtracting a scalar to or from each entry of a vector we use the traditional ‘+’ and ‘-’ operators. We also denote by  $r$  the vector  $X^\top \tilde{y}$  which can be simply computed as  $D^{-1/2} Z^\top \tilde{y}$  without having to store  $X$ . Also for greater numerical stability, we scale the vector  $\tilde{y}$  so that  $\|\tilde{y}\|^2 = n$ , although the algorithm is described without this assumption.

In the first iteration,  $i_1 = \arg \max_i r_i$  and thus  $\gamma^{(1)} = \{i_1\}$ . Let  $R_1 \equiv b_1 = \sqrt{n + \lambda}$ , denote the Cholesky factor of  $X_{\gamma^{(1)}}^\top X_{\gamma^{(1)}} + \lambda I_1$ . Also let  $v_1 = r_{i_1}/b_1$  and let

$$\pi_1 = \frac{1}{2} \log \lambda - \log \det R_1 - \frac{1}{2}(n - 1) \log \{ \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - v_1^2 \} + \log(w/(1 - w))$$

denote  $\log f(\gamma^{(1)}|y)$  up to an additive constant. Under the PP stopping rule, we stop if  $\pi_1 < -(n - 1) \log(\|\tilde{y}\|^2)/2$ , the right side being  $\log f(\phi|y)$  up to the same additive constant.

Next, we also add the second index before going into a loop. To that end, let

$$S_1 = D^{-1/2} Z^\top (Z_{i_1} - \bar{Z}_{i_1} 1_n) / D_{i_1}^{1/2}, \quad \zeta_1 = S_1 \odot S_1$$

and  $\omega_1 = \sqrt{n + \lambda - \zeta_1}$  where the square root is computed element-wise. Let  $u_1 = (r - v_1 S_1) \oslash \omega_1$ . Then,

$$i_2 = \arg \max_{i \neq i_1} \left[ -\log \det R_1 - \log \omega_{1,i} - \frac{1}{2}(n - 1) \log \{ \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - v_1^2 - u_{1,i}^2 \} \right].$$

Set  $\gamma^{(2)} = \gamma^{(1)} \cup \{i_2\}$ ,  $b_2 = \omega_{1,i_2}$ ,  $v_2 = (v_1, u_{1,i_2})$ , and compute  $\log f(\gamma^{(2)}|y)$  up to an additive constant as

$$\pi_2 = -\frac{1}{2} 2 \log \lambda - \log \det R_1 - \log b_2 - \frac{1}{2}(n - 1) \log \{ \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - \|v_2\|^2 \} + 2 \log(w/(1 - w)).$$

Under the PP stopping rule, we stop if  $\pi_2 < \pi_1$ .

For  $k \geq 3$ , until stopping we

– Compute  $\alpha_{k-1} = R_{k-2}^{-\top} D_{\gamma^{(k-2)}}^{-1/2} Z_{(k-2)}^\top (Z_{i_{k-1}} - \bar{Z}_{i_{k-1}} 1_n) / D_{i_{k-1}}^{1/2}$ , where

$Z_{(k-2)} = [Z_{i_1}, Z_{i_2}, \dots, Z_{i_{k-2}}]$ . The order of the columns is important because the Cholesky factor is

computed according the screening path.

- The Cholesky factor of  $X_{\gamma^{(k-1)}}^\top X_{\gamma^{(k-1)}} + \lambda I_{k-1}$ , up to an ordering of the columns, is given by

$$R_{k-1} = \begin{pmatrix} R_{k-2} & \alpha_{k-1} \\ 0 & b_{k-1} \end{pmatrix}$$

- Update  $\log \det R_{k-1} = \log \det R_{k-2} + \log b_{k-1}$ .
- Set  $\eta_{k-1} = b_{k-1}^{-1} D^{-1/2} Z^\top D_{\gamma^{(k-2)}}^{-1/2} R_{k-2}^{-1} \alpha_{k-1}$ .
- Update  $\zeta_{k-1} = \zeta_{k-2} + \eta_{k-1} \odot \eta_{k-1}$  and set  $\omega_{k-1} = \sqrt{n + \lambda - \zeta_{k-1}}$ .
- Update  $u_{k-1} = (u_{k-2} \odot \omega - u_{k-2, i_{k-1}} \eta_{k-1}) \oslash \omega_{k-1}$ .
- Set  $\gamma^{(k)} = \gamma^{(k-1)} \cup \{i_k\}$ ,  $b_k = \omega_{k-1, i_k}$ ,  $v_k = (v_{k-1}, u_{k-1, i_k})$ , where

$$i_k = \arg \max_{i \notin \gamma^{(k-1)}} \left[ -\log \omega_{k-1, i} - \frac{1}{2}(n-1) \log \{ \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - \|v_{k-1}\|^2 - u_{k-1, i} \} \right]$$

- Compute  $\log f(\gamma^{(k)} | y)$  up to an additive constant as

$$\pi_k = -\frac{k}{2} \log \lambda - \log \det R_{k-1} - \log b_k - \frac{n-1}{2} \log \{ \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - \|v_k\|^2 \} + k \log \frac{w}{1-w}.$$

As before, under the PP stopping criterion, we stop at the  $k$ th iteration and return  $\gamma^{(k-1)}$  if  $\pi_k < \pi_{k-1}$ .

Overall, the computational complexity in the  $k$ th iteration is  $O(k^2 + kn + np)$ . Assuming the worse case scenario when the number of iterations is  $O(n)$ , the total computational cost is  $O(n^3 + n^2p)$ . If  $Z$  is sparse, then this reduces to  $O(n^3 + n\|Z\|_0)$  where  $\|Z\|_0$  is the number of non-zero entries in  $Z$ . This is same as the computational complexity of HOLP as it computes  $\hat{\beta}_{HOLP} = X^\top (XX^\top)^{-1}y$ , where computing  $XX^\top$  incurs a cost of  $O(n^2p)$  and computing  $(XX^\top)^{-1}y$  incurs a cost of  $O(n^3)$ . Also the computational complexity of robust rank correlation screening (Li et al., 2012a) is  $O(n^2p)$ . In contrast, the computational complexities of iterated sure independence screening (Fan and Lv, 2008) and tilting procedures (Cho and Fryzlewicz, 2012; Lin and Pang, 2014) are much higher. Furthermore, the memory requirement of BITS, in addition to storing the original matrix  $Z$ , is  $O(n^2)$ , mainly for storing the Cholesky factors  $R'_k$ 's. This is same as the memory requirement of HOLP even if the matrix  $X$  is not explicitly stored. The complexity of the FR method as implemented in the github repository ‘screening’<sup>1</sup> by Wang and Leng (2016) in the  $k$ th

<sup>1</sup><https://github.com/wwrechar/screening>



iteration is  $O((k^3 + k^2n)p)$  although a faster implementation of FR can be achieved by the delayed Cholesky update proposed here.

## 4 Simulation studies

In this section we provide results from extensive simulation studies with high dimensional examples to study performance of the BITS algorithm. In section 4.2 we present results showing how hyperparameters values affect the screening properties. This, in turn, shows how informative screening can be performed by appropriately choosing these values. In section 4.3, we compare BITS with some other popular screening methods in the context of a variety of simulation settings described in Section 4.1. In particular, we compare BITS with SIS (Fan and Lv, 2008), forward regression (Wang, 2009) and HOLP (Wang and Leng, 2016). We also compare different stopping rules for BITS.

### 4.1 Simulation settings

We consider our numerical study in the context of seven simulation models described below. For these examples E.1–E.7, the rows of  $X$  are generated from multivariate normal distributions with mean zero and different covariance structures, that is, rows of  $X$ 's are iid  $\mathcal{N}_p(0, \Sigma)$  with  $\Sigma$  mentioned in the example. Three values of theoretical  $R^2$  are assumed ( $R^2 = 0.5, 0.7, 0.9$ ).

**E.1 Independent predictors**  $\Sigma = I_p$ . We set  $\beta_i = 2$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 9$  and  $\beta_i = 0$  for  $i \geq 10$ .

**E.2 Compound symmetry** In this example,  $\Sigma = \rho \mathbf{1}_p \mathbf{1}_p^\top + (1 - \rho)I_p$ . The value of  $\rho$  is set to be equal to 0.5. The values of  $\beta_j$ 's are same as in example E.1.

**E.3 Autoregressive correlation** The auto regression, correlation structure among covariates is appropriate when there is an ordering (say, based on time) in covariates, and variables further apart are less correlated. We use the AR(1) structure where the  $(i, j)$ th entry of  $\Sigma$  is  $\rho^{|i-j|}$ . We set  $\rho = 0.5$ . The values of  $\beta_j$ 's are same as in example E.1.

**E.4 Factor models** This example is from Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006) and Wang and Leng (2016). Fix  $k = 10$ . Let  $F$  be a  $p \times k$  matrix whose entries are iid  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . We then let  $\Sigma = FF^\top + I_p$ . The values of  $\beta_j$ 's are same as in example E.1.

**E.5 Group structure** This special correlation structure arises when variables are grouped together in the sense that the variables from the same group are highly correlated. This example is similar to

example 4 of Zou and Hastie (2005) where 15 true variables are assigned to 3 groups. We generate the predictors as  $X_m = z_1 + \zeta_{1,m}$ ,  $X_{5+m} = z_2 + \zeta_{2,m}$ ,  $X_{10+m} = z_3 + \zeta_{3,m}$  where  $z_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_n(0, I_n)$ ,  $\zeta_{i,m} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_n(0, 0.01I_n)$  and  $z_i$ 's and  $\zeta_{i,m}$ 's are independent for  $1 \leq i \leq 3$  and for  $m = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ . The regression coefficients are set as  $\beta_j = 2$  for  $j \in \{1, 2, \dots, 15\}$  and  $\beta_j = 0$  otherwise.

**E.6 Extreme correlation** We modify Wang's (2009) challenging Example 4 to make it more complex.

Let  $\beta_j = 2$  for all  $j \leq 9$ , and  $\beta_j = 0$  for  $j > 9$ . Simulate  $Z_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_n(0, I)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, p$ , and  $W_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_n(0, I)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 9$ . Set  $X_i = (Z_i + W_i)/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 9$  and  $X_i = (Z_i + \sum_{i=1}^9 W_i)/2$  for  $i = 10, \dots, p$ . The marginal correlation between the response and any unimportant variable is  $(2.5/\sqrt{3})$  times) larger in magnitude than the same between the response and the true predictors.

**E.7 Sparse factor models** This example is a sparse version of E.4. Let  $f_{ij}$  denotes the  $(i, j)$ th entry of  $F$ . In this example, for each fixed  $1 \leq j \leq 5$ ,  $f_{ij} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  if  $5(j-1) + 1 \leq i \leq 5j$ , and  $f_{ij} = 0$  otherwise. Also,  $\Sigma = FF^\top + 0.01I_p$ . Finally,  $\beta_j = 3$  for  $1 \leq j \leq 25$  and 0 for  $j > 25$ .

For each simulation setup considered here, a total of 100 replications were performed and the estimates were averaged over the replications. Let  $\hat{\gamma}^{(i)}$  be the model chosen in the  $i$ th replication for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 100$ . The coverage probability is calculated by  $CP = \sum_{i=1}^{100} \mathbb{I}(\hat{\gamma}^{(i)} \supseteq t)/100$ . This measures whether *all* important variables are discovered by the screening method or not. We also calculate the true positive rate (TPR) defined as  $TPR = (1/100) \sum_{i=1}^{100} |\hat{\gamma}^{(i)} \cap t|/|t|$ . In order to compare the posterior probability based stopping rules for BITS, we also calculate the median model size based on the 100 repetitions.

As in Wang (2009) and Wang and Leng (2016) we let the error  $\epsilon \sim N(0, 1)$  and  $\sigma^2$  vary to achieve different values of theoretical  $R^2$  ( $\equiv \text{Var}(X^\top \beta)/\text{Var}(Y)$ ). As in Wang and Leng (2016), we use either  $R^2 = 50\%$  for low,  $R^2 = 70\%$  for moderate or  $R^2 = 90\%$  for high signal to noise ratio. We consider  $p = 100,000$  and  $n = 500$ .

## 4.2 Effects of hyperparameters

In order to study the effects of  $\lambda$  and  $w$  on the screening performance under the PP stopping rule, we choose two scenarios: the iid setup (Section E.1) and the group structure (Section E.5) both with theoretical  $R^2 = 0.5$ . However, the nonzero  $\beta$ -values for the iid setup were taken to be an increasing sequence  $1.5, 2.5, \dots, 9.5$ . We use 10 values of  $w$  between  $1/p$  and 0.1, equally spaced on the log-scale and  $\lambda \in \{n/p, 0.1, 1, n/\log p, n/5, p/n\}$  where the first three numbers are negligible compared to  $n$  and correspond to low shrinkage and the last three numbers correspond to high shrinkage. We focus on the PP




Figure 1: Effect of hyperparameters for iid structure. The true  $\beta$  values for variable 1, 2, 3 are 1.5, 2.5, 3.5.




Figure 2: Effect of hyperparameters for group structure. The true  $\beta$  values for variable 1, 2, 3 are 2.

Table 1: Simulation results (in %) for  $R^2 = 0.7$ , the numbers in the parentheses are the mean model sizes.

Method	Correlation Structure													
	IID		Compound		Group		AR		Factor		ExtrmCor		SparseFactor	
	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP
<b>BITS1</b>														
$n$	100	100	60.4	2	100	100	100	100	57.6	4	100	100	78.1	5
PP	100	100	36.2	0	100	100	99.9	99	7.6	0	100	100	53.2	0
			(45.74)		(49.37)		(48.46)		(14.04)		(12.03)		(56.38)	
EBIC	100	100	14.0	0	33.3	0	64.4	1	0	0	97	97	14	0
			(9.00)		(5.01)		(3.00)		(2.37)		(10.98)		(3.50)	
<b>BITS2</b>														
$n$	100	100	50.9	0	100	100	100	100	57.4	5	100	100	79.1	10
PP	100	100	28.1	0	99.9	99	98.7	91	21.8	2	100	100	49.0	0
			(68.74)		(85.31)		(80.80)		(34.88)		(33.69)		(86.96)	
EBIC	100	100	14.3	0	33.3	0	65.1	1	0.3	0	100	100	14.2	0
			(9.00)		(5.00)		(3.00)		(2.35)		(10.68)		(3.55)	
<b>BITS3</b>														
$n$	100	100	22.7	0	100	100	97.7	81	16.0	1	100	100	75.9	4
PP	100	100	21.7	0	35.4	0	90	45	1.3	0	100	100	16.7	0
			(172.99)		(155.34)		(132.30)		(3.81)		(179.14)		(156.60)	
EBIC	100	100	14.0	0	33.3	0	64.2	0	0.3	0	100	100	14.5	0
			(9.00)		(5.00)		(3.01)		(2.29)		(10.27)		(3.63)	
<b>BITS(ALL)</b>														
$n$	100	100	65.2	3	100	100	100	100	63.2	10	100	100	81	13
			(1353.45)		(1289.17)		(1355.48)		(1209.98)		(1156.41)		(1340.00)	
PP	100	100	40.2	0	100	100	99.9	99	23.4	2	100	100	56.2	0
			(254.90)		(256.95)		(231.60)		(44.79)		(198.01)		(264.00)	
<b>HOLP</b>														
$n$	100	100	67.0	3	100	100	100	100	48.6	3	100	100	71.5	5
EBIC	97.9	81	18.7	0	71.8	0	91.6	51	5	0	99.8	98	22.4	0
			(9.05)		(5.07)		(6.46)		(4.43)		(9.01)		(5.59)	
<b>FR</b>														
$n$	100	100	23.4	0	36.1	0	89.6	44	17.1	1	100	100	18.6	0
EBIC	100	100	14.0	0	33.3	0	64.1	0	0.3	0	100	100	14.5	0
			(9.00)		(5.00)		(3.01)		(2.28)		(10.27)		(3.63)	
<b>SIS</b>														
	100	100	50.2	0	100	100	100	100	5.6	0	0	0	71.9	0

stopping rule because it is the only stopping rule that is impacted by  $w$ . In Figures 1 and 2 we summarize the model sizes and TPRs in addition to the logarithm of the ratio of the posterior probabilities of the screened model to the true model.

Several features stand out from these simulation studies. First, when the important predictors are highly correlated, larger values of  $\lambda$  (higher shrinkage) yield better screening accuracy in terms of TPR. In contrast, in the Independent setting, the smaller values of  $\lambda$  (lower shrinkage) yield better TPR. In either case, the model size, as well as TPR and the variability in the model size increase with  $w$ , however, even a 10% prior inclusion probability yields models with reasonable size. Second, we see an interaction between  $\lambda$  and  $w$  as a ‘sprouting effect’ on the model size. In particular, although the model sizes are smaller for low shrinkage than the same for high shrinkage when  $w$  is small, the situation reverses as  $w$  increases. Third, logarithm of the posterior probability ratios increase slowly with  $w$  when the shrinkage is high, while they increase rapidly with  $w$  when the shrinkage is low. Finally, from the coverage proportions of the first three variables given in Section S3 of the supplement, we observe that the regression coefficients of smaller magnitudes tend to be over penalized and the corresponding variables are excluded when  $\lambda$  is large and  $w$  is small but these are eventually included as  $w$  increases.

These results suggest that a large  $\lambda$  is very helpful when the important predictors are correlated and a small  $\lambda$  is preferred otherwise. Also, a reasonably large  $w$  helps in obtaining good screening accuracy without producing unreasonably large screened models. Thus prior knowledge on the nature of dependence among the predictors could be incorporated through  $\lambda$  and  $w$ . Even if no such prior knowledge is available, these simulation studies suggest uniting the models from BITS with different  $\lambda$  values should have a good screening accuracy.

### 4.3 Comparison against other screening methods

In this section, we summarize the simulation results. We consider three distinct values of  $\lambda$ , namely  $p/n$  (BITS1),  $n \log n/p$  (BITS2) and  $n/p$  (BITS3). We consider three screening model sizes obtained by the stopping rules mentioned in Section 2.5, that is,  $n$  (denoted by  $n$ ), the EBIC and the PP stopping rule with  $w = 0.1$ . In addition, we also consider a union based rule denoted by BITS(ALL) which consists of the union of the models obtained in BITS1, BITS2 and BITS3 using a screening size of  $n$  or the PP rule. For SIS, we simply look at the top  $n$  variables. In Table 1 we present the results for theoretical  $R^2 = 0.7$ . Additional simulation results are given in Section S2 of the supplementary document.

In general, BITS perform better when the first  $n$  variables are included than when the PP rule is used. The PP criterion also results in a much smaller screened model size suggesting that it is very conservative.

Also, BITS with higher shrinkage typically performs better in terms of TPR particularly when the variables are highly correlated among themselves. The EBIC based stopping rule is even more conservative than the PP and results in very low screening accuracy. Finally, BITS(ALL) with union of three size  $n$  models performs the best among all the BITS methods in terms of screening accuracy. Although, it results also in significantly large screened model size it is encouragingly smaller than  $3n \ll p$ , suggesting that quite a few variables are common among the models from BITS1, BITS2 and BITS3.

BITS(ALL) also beats other methods in terms of TPR, albeit being more liberal in terms of the model size. In particular, because FR does not shrink the coefficient estimates it ends up picking a single candidate from each group in the group structure setting, thus having a TPR only about  $3/9$ . For the same reason, FR also performs poorly in the compound symmetry and the two factor covariance settings. Thus, despite having some philosophical similarities with FR, BITS has a superior performance. In general, performance of HOLP closely follows BITS(ALL).


## 5 Real data example

We compare the screening methods using a real data set from (Cook, McMullen, Holland, Tian, Bradbury, Ross-Ibarra, Buckler, and Flint-Garcia, 2012) on a genomewide association study for maize starch, protein and oil contents. The original field trial at Clayton, NC in 2006 consisted of more than 5,000 inbred lines and check varieties primarily coming from a diverse panel consisting of 282 founding lines. The response from the field trials are typically spatially correlated, thus we use a random row-column adjustment to obtain the adjusted phenotypes of the varieties. However, marker information of only  $n = 3,951$  of these varieties are available from the panzea project (<https://www.panzea.org/>) which provides information on 546,034 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNP) markers after removing duplicates and SNPs with minor allele frequency less than 5%. We use the starch content as our phenotype for conducting the association study. Because the inbred varieties are bi-allelic, we store the marker information in a sparse format by coding the minor alleles by one and major alleles by zero.

In this study, we do a cross-validation by randomly splitting the whole data set with training set of size  $n = 3,200$  and testing set of size 751. We run BITS with PP stopping rule with  $w$  fixed at 0.1 but with three distinct values of  $\lambda$ :  $p/n$  (BITS1),  $n \log(n)/p$  (BITS2) and  $n/p$  (BITS3). We also consider the union of these models. We compare these methods with HOLP and FR. The EBIC stopping criterion is also applied to all these methods for comparison. We repeat the process 100 times. In order to be able to use least squares estimates of the regression coefficients, we do not use screened model size same as  $n$ . However,

HOLP and FR result in very small screened models (Figure 3) under EBIC based stopping rule. Indeed, out of 100 repetitions, 44 times HOLP with EBIC results in a null model and the numbers for HOLP (EBIC) in Figure 3 are based on the remaining 56 repetitions. In order to keep the comparison fair, we also use HOLP and FR with same model size as the union of models from the BITS1, BITS2 and BITS3. For each of the three BITS methods, we use both the ordinary least squares estimates of the regression coefficients (denoted by LM) and the ridge estimates with the associated  $\lambda$  because they are the posterior mode of the regression coefficient given the screened model.

From the boxplots in Figure 3, it can be seen that models selected by BITS and FR with EBIC stopping rule yield very good prediction accuracies. In particular, BITS with lowest shrinkage (BITS3) yield more accurate predictions than other BITS methods on an average. The HOLP with EBIC stopping rule appears to be overtly conservative and also the method with lowest prediction accuracy. Surprisingly, the union of the BITS methods yields very good correlation (between observed and predicted) values, but somewhat larger mean squared prediction error (MSPE) values, perhaps because the MSPE is affected more by a few outlying values in the test set than the correlation coefficient is.



Method	BITS1	BITS2	BITS3	BITS(ALL)	HOLP(EBIC)	FR(EBIC)
Mean (SE)	182.9 (16.3)	46.5 (6.4)	32.1 (5.6)	213.2 (18.0)	1.18 (0.47)	8.96 (1.09)

Figure 3: Prediction accuracy on the test sets: correlation (top left), MSPE (top right). The mean model sizes and the their standard errors are shown in the table.

## 6 Discussion

In this paper, we propose a Bayesian iterative screening (BITS) method for screening variables in an ultra-high dimensional regression model that can accommodate prior information on the effect size and the model size. Despite being built on a Gaussian model assumption, BITS has been shown to be screening consis-

tent even when the family is misspecified. In contrast to SIS, BITS does not require strong assumptions on marginal correlations. Compared to the frequentist iterative screening method FR, BITS naturally accommodates penalization on the effect size enhancing screening accuracy, particularly when important predictors are correlated among themselves. The proposed PP stopping rule, which is shown to be screening consistent, can provide informative screening by incorporating prior knowledge on the hyperparameters. BITS is implemented by a sophisticated algorithm that attains the same computational complexity as HOLP and allows fast statistical computations in ultra-high dimensional problems. Finally, BITS has been shown to have much better performance than several other competing methods by uniting results from different shrinkages. Thus, in practice, it could be useful to take union of models from BITS using various degrees of shrinkage. Then Bayesian or other variable selection algorithms may find it easier to discover useful models.

BITS can be extended to accommodate larger class of models, for example generalized linear regression models. In theory, the iterative algorithm (8) is quite general and does not require Gaussianity assumption. We may use Laplace approximations to achieve fast statistical computations in generalized linear models. Also, our future projects include developing Bayesian screening methods for non-linear, partial linear and functional linear models.

**Supplemental materials** The supplemental materials contain proofs of some of the theoretical results stated in the paper and some additional simulation results.

## Appendices

### A Some useful notations and results

We use the following notations:

- $\tau^+$  denotes the largest eigenvalue of  $X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma/n$  for all  $|\gamma| \leq K_n|t|$ .
- $\Phi$  and  $\phi$  denote the standard normal distribution and density function, respectively.

For any model  $\gamma$  with  $|\gamma| < n$ ,

- $\tilde{\beta}_\gamma = (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}$  and  $H_\gamma = X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top$ .
- $\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) = \tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}$ .
- $\text{RSS}(\gamma) = \tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} - \tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y} = \tilde{y}^\top (I - H_\gamma) \tilde{y}$ .



- $\Omega(\gamma) = -\frac{|\gamma|}{2(n-1)} \log \lambda + \frac{1}{2(n-1)} \log |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I| + \frac{1}{2} \log \text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) - \frac{|\gamma|}{n-1} \log w - \frac{p-|\gamma|}{n-1} \log(1-w)$  which is equal to  $-\log f(\gamma|y)/(n-1)$  up to an additive constant that does not depend on  $\gamma$ .

First we state some useful results whose proofs are given in Section S1 of the supplement. These results are used in the proofs of Theorems 2 and 4.

**Lemma 4.** *For any model  $\gamma$  with  $|\gamma| < n$ , and any  $i \notin \gamma$ ,*

$$\text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_i) = \frac{\{X_i^\top \tilde{y} - X_i^\top H_\gamma \tilde{y}\}^2}{n - X_i^\top H_\gamma X_i}.$$

**Lemma 5.** *For any model  $\gamma$  and  $j \notin \gamma$ ,  $\log |X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I| - \log |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I|$  lies between  $\log \lambda$  and  $\log(n + \lambda)$  where  $\gamma' = \gamma \cup j$ .*

**Lemma 6.** *Under conditions C2 and C3, there exists  $c' > 0$  and  $c'' > 0$  such that for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,*

$$\log(1 + nK_n|t|/\lambda) \leq 2c' \log n, \text{ and} \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{K_n \lambda}{2n\tau_+} + \frac{K_n \log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} - \frac{K_n \log \lambda}{2(n-1)} \leq c'' \log n. \quad (11)$$

**Lemma 7.** *Suppose  $|\gamma| < K_n|t|$  and  $\gamma \not\supseteq t$  then*

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \{\Omega(\gamma) - \Omega(\gamma + e_k)\} &\geq \\ \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \{\text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k)\} &- \frac{\lambda}{2n\tau_+} - \frac{\log(n/\lambda + 1)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w}. \end{aligned}$$

**Lemma 8.** *Suppose  $|\gamma| < K_n|t|$  and  $\gamma \not\supseteq t$ , then with  $s_n$  given in C3,*

$$\max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} (X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t)^2 \geq ns_n^2.$$

**Corollary 2.** *Suppose  $|\gamma| < K_n|t|$ ,  $\gamma \not\supseteq t$ , and  $\sigma \Upsilon_n < s_n$ . Let*

$$a_{\gamma', l} = (I - H_{\gamma'}) X_l / \|(I - H_{\gamma'}) X_l\| \text{ and } \Upsilon_n = \max_{l \in t} \max_{\gamma': |\gamma'| < K_n|t|} |a_{\gamma', l}|.$$

*Then  $\max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \{\text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k)\} \geq (s_n - \sigma \Upsilon_n)^2$ .*

## B Proofs of theorems

*Proof of Theorem 1.* Under the orthogonal design,

$$f(\gamma + e_i|y) > f(\gamma + e_j|y) \iff (X_i^\top \tilde{y})^2 > (X_j^\top \tilde{y})^2,$$

which does not depend on  $\gamma$ . Now, for each  $i \in t$ , suppose  $A_i$  denotes the event  $\{(X_i^\top \tilde{y})^2 > \max_{j \notin t} (X_j^\top \tilde{y})^2\}$ .

Then the theorem will be proved if  $P(\cap_{i \in t} A_i) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , for which it is sufficient to show that

$\sum_{i \in t} P(A_i^c) \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To that end, assume without loss that true  $\sigma^2 = 1$  and notice that for  $1 \leq l \leq p$ ,  $U_l := n^{-1/2} X_l^\top \epsilon$  are iid standard normal because  $X^\top X = nI_p$ . Thus for all  $i \in t$  and  $j \notin t$ ,  $X^\top \mathbf{1} = 0$  implies that  $X_i^\top \tilde{y} = n\beta_i + \sqrt{n}U_i$  and  $X_j^\top \tilde{y} = \sqrt{n}U_j$ . Thus,  $A_i = \{(\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i)^2 > \max_{j \notin t} U_j^2\}$ .

Consequently, since  $U_i$ 's are iid standard normal, we have,

$$\begin{aligned} P(A_i^c) &= 1 - P(A_i) = 1 - E \prod_{j \notin t} P(|U_j| \leq |\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i| \mid U_i) \\ &= 1 - E(2\Phi(|\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i|) - 1)^{(p-t)} \leq 1 - E(2\Phi(|\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i|) - 1)^n \\ &= E \left[ \{1 - (2\Phi(|\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i|) - 1)^n\} I(|U_i| > \sqrt{2 \log n}) \right] + \\ &\quad E \left[ \{1 - (2\Phi(|\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i|) - 1)^n\} I(|U_i| \leq \sqrt{2 \log n}) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Because  $2\Phi(|\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i|) - 1 < 1$ , the first term on the right side of (12) is at most

$$P(|U_i| > \sqrt{2 \log n}) \leq 2/(n\sqrt{4\pi \log n}) \quad (13)$$

because for all  $x > 0$ ,  $1 - \Phi(x) \leq \phi(x)/x$ .

Next, since  $\sqrt{n}\beta_+ \succ \sqrt{\log n}$ , for all sufficiently large  $n$ ,  $\sqrt{n}\beta_+ - \sqrt{2 \log n} > c_n := 2\sqrt{\log n}$ . Thus, the second term on the right side of (12) is at most

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[ \{1 - (2\Phi(\sqrt{n}|\beta_i| - |U_i|) - 1)^n\} I(|U_i| \leq \sqrt{2 \log n}) \right] &\leq 1 - (2\Phi(\sqrt{n}\beta_+ - \sqrt{2 \log n}) - 1)^n \\ &\leq 1 - (2\Phi(c_n) - 1)^n = 1 - \{1 - 2(1 - \Phi(c_n))\}^n \leq 1 - \{1 - 2n(1 - \Phi(c_n))\} \\ &\leq 2n[1 - \Phi(c_n)]/c_n \leq \frac{1}{n \log n \sqrt{8\pi}} \leq \frac{2}{n\sqrt{8\pi \log n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where the third last inequality holds because  $(1 - x)^n \geq 1 - nx$ , for  $x \leq 1$ .

Thus, from (12), (13) and (14) we have, for all sufficiently large  $n$ , that

$$\sum_{i \in t} P(A_i^c) \leq \sum_{i \in t} \left\{ \frac{2}{n\sqrt{4\pi \log n}} + \frac{2}{n\sqrt{8\pi \log n}} \right\} = \frac{2(\sqrt{2} + 1)|t|}{n\sqrt{8\pi \log n}}.$$

The right hand side  $\rightarrow 0$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  because  $|t| = O(n^a)$  for some  $a < 1$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* Let  $\theta_0 = 0$  and  $\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_{|t|}$  denote the random inclusion times of the variables in  $t$  in the models  $\gamma^{(1)}, \gamma^{(2)}, \dots$ . That is,  $\theta_1 = \arg \min_{i \geq 1} \{\gamma^{(i)} \cap t \neq \emptyset\}$  and for  $j \geq 2$ ,

$$\theta_j = \arg \min_{i > \theta_{j-1}} \{(\gamma^{(i)} \setminus \gamma^{(\theta_{j-1})}) \cap t \neq \emptyset\}.$$

We note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \{\gamma^{(K_n|t)} \not\subseteq t\} &= \{\theta_{|t|} > K_n|t|\} \subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{|t|-1} \{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n\} \\ &= \biguplus_{j=0}^{|t|-1} \{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \text{ and } \theta_{i+1} - \theta_i \leq K_n \forall 0 \leq i < j\} \\ &\subseteq \bigcup_{j=0}^{|t|-1} \{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where  $\biguplus$  denotes union of disjoint sets. We now analyze the  $j$ th event  $\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\}$ . Note that,  $\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n$  implies that for each  $i = \theta_j, \theta_j + 1, \dots, \theta_j + K_n - 1$ , it must be that a variable outside of  $t$  was selected in the  $(i + 1)$ st iteration, that is, for each such  $i$ ,  $\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i+1)}) > \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma^{(i)}} \{\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)\}$ ; and also that  $i < K_n|t|$  and  $\gamma^{(i)} \not\subseteq t$ .

Thus using Lemma 7, Corollary 2, and (11), we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\} \cap \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} \left( \Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i+1)}) \right) \geq \sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma^{(i)}} \left( \Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k) \right) \right\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} \left( \Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i+1)}) \right) \geq \frac{K_n}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} |s_n - \sigma\Upsilon_n|^2 - c'' \log n + \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

However, on the other hand, on  $\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\}$  we have using Lemma 5

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i+1)})) &\leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} (\log(\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(i)})) - \log(\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(i+1)}))) + \\
&\quad \sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} \left\{ \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} - \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \right\} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log(\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(\theta_j)})) - \log(\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(\theta_j+K_n)})) \right\} + \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\
&< \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log \|\tilde{y}\|^2 - \log(\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(\theta_j+K_n)})) \right\} + \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2} \log(1 + nK_n|t|/\lambda) + \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w}
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

because  $\tau^+ \leq K_n|t|$  and

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma^{(\theta_j+K_n)}) &= \tilde{y}^\top \left( I + \frac{1}{\lambda} X_{\gamma^{(\theta_j+K_n)}} X_{\gamma^{(\theta_j+K_n)}}^\top \right)^{-1} \tilde{y} \geq \|\tilde{y}\|^2 (1 + n\tau^+/\lambda)^{-1} \\
&\geq \|\tilde{y}\|^2 (1 + nK_n|t|/\lambda)^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus applying (10) from (17) we get

$$\sum_{i=\theta_j}^{\theta_j+K_n-1} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i+1)})) \leq c' \log n + \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w}. \tag{18}$$

Hence, with  $c = 2(c' + c'')$ , using (16), (18) and condition C3, for sufficiently large  $n$ , for all  $j \leq |t|$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\} \cap \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\} \\
&\subseteq \left\{ c' \log n \geq \frac{K_n}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} (s_n - \sigma\Upsilon_n)^2 - c'' \log n \right\} \cap \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\} \\
&\subseteq \left\{ \frac{K_n}{\|\tilde{y}\|^2} (s_n - \sigma\Upsilon_n)^2 \leq c \log n \right\} \cap \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\} \subseteq \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2/(nu_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $u_n = \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 K_n / (c|t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n)$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\} &\subseteq \{\{\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j > K_n, \theta_j \leq jK_n\} \cap \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\}\} \cup \{\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\} \\
&\subseteq \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2/(nu_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n \right\} \cup \{\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\} \\
&= \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2/(nu_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since for all sufficiently large  $n$ , the above is true for all  $j$ , we have from (15) that

$$\{\theta_{|t|} > K_n |t|\} \subseteq \left\{ \sigma \Upsilon_n \geq s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n)} \right) \right\}. \quad (19)$$

Thus, for all sufficiently large  $n$ , using the union bound,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\theta_{|t|} > K_n |t|) &\leq P\left(\sigma \Upsilon_n \geq s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n)} \right)\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\sigma \Upsilon_n \geq s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n)} \right), \|\tilde{y}\|^2 \leq nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2\right) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq P(\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\delta) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in t} \sum_{\gamma: |\gamma| < K_n |t|} P\left(|a_{\gamma, l}^\top \epsilon| > s_n\delta\right) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in t} \sum_{\gamma: |\gamma| < K_n |t|} e^{1-q(s_n\delta)} + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \exp(1 - q(s_n\delta)) + K_n |t| \log p + \log |t| + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n(1 - \sigma\delta)^2). \end{aligned}$$

This proves the theorem.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Assume without loss that the true  $\sigma^2 = 1$ . First we shall show that  $P(\mathcal{T} \geq |t|) \rightarrow 1$ . As in the proof of Theorem 1 note that for any  $i \in t$ ,  $(X_i^\top \tilde{y})^2 = (n\beta_i + \sqrt{n}U_i)^2$  where  $U_i$ 's are i.i.d  $N(0, 1)$  variables. Thus for any  $\gamma \subset t$ , and  $i \in t \wedge \gamma^c$ ,  $f(\gamma + e_i | y) < f(\gamma | y)$  is equivalent to,

$$\begin{aligned} \log a_n + (n-1) \log(RSS_\lambda(\gamma)) &< (n-1) \left\{ \log \left( RSS_\lambda(\gamma) - \frac{(X_i^\top \tilde{y})^2}{n+\lambda} \right) \right\} \\ \iff \frac{(\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i)^2}{\log n} &< \frac{1}{\log n} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} RSS_\lambda(\gamma) \left( 1 - a_n^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $a_n = \lambda w^2 / ((n+\lambda)(1-w)^2)$ . But,  $RSS_\lambda(\gamma) \leq \|\tilde{y}\|^2 = n\|\beta_t\|^2 + 2\beta_t^\top X_t^\top \epsilon + \|\epsilon\|^2$  and hence  $\|\tilde{y}\|^2/n \rightarrow \|\beta_t\|^2 + 1$  almost surely. Recall that as in Theorem 1,  $\lambda$  is assumed fixed here. Also,  $\log a_n / \log n \rightarrow -(2c+1)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} RSS_\lambda(\gamma) \left( 1 - a_n^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \right) \leq \frac{\|\tilde{y}\|^2}{n-1} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} \frac{\log a_n}{\log n} \frac{(1 - e^{(\log a_n)/(n-1)})}{(\log a_n)/(n-1)} \rightarrow (2c+1)(\|\beta_t\|^2 + 1),$$

in probability. Hence,  $P(A_0) \rightarrow 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  where

$$A_0 = \left\{ \max_{\gamma \subseteq t} \frac{1}{\log n} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} RSS_\lambda(\gamma) \left( 1 - a_n^{\frac{1}{n-1}} \right) < c'' \right\}$$

for some constant  $c'' > 0$ . Next denote  $A = \bigcap_{i \in t} A_i$  where  $A_i$ 's are defined in the proof of Theorem 1. Then  $P(A) \rightarrow 1$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $\gamma^{(j)} \subset t$  for  $1 \leq j \leq |t|$  on  $A$ .

Since  $\sqrt{n}\beta_+ \succ \sqrt{\log n}$ , we have  $\sqrt{n}\beta_+ - \sqrt{c'' \log n} > \sqrt{2 \log n}$  for all large  $n$ . Hence, from (20) note that for  $1 \leq j < |t|$ , and  $i \in t \setminus \gamma^{(j)}$ , we have, by symmetry of  $U_i$

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left( A_0 \cap A \cap \left\{ \max_{i \in t \setminus \gamma^{(j)}} f(\gamma^{(j)} + e_i | y) < f(\gamma^{(j)} | y) \right\} \right) \leq P((\sqrt{n}\beta_i + U_i)^2 < c'' \log n) \\
& \leq P(U_i > \sqrt{n}|\beta_i| - \sqrt{c'' \log n}) \\
& \leq P(U_i > \sqrt{n}\beta_+ - \sqrt{c'' \log n}) \\
& \leq P(U_i > \sqrt{2 \log n}) \leq \frac{1}{n\sqrt{4\pi \log n}}. \tag{21}
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Thus from (20) and (21) we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{T} < |t|) & \leq P \left( A_0 \cap A \cap \bigcup_{j=1}^{|t|-1} \left\{ \max_{i \in t \setminus \gamma^{(j)}} f(\gamma^{(j)} + e_i | y) < f(\gamma^{(j)} | y) \right\} \right) + P(A_0^c) + P(A^c) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^{|t|-1} P \left( A_0 \cap A \cap \left\{ \max_{i \in t \setminus \gamma^{(j)}} f(\gamma^{(j)} + e_i | y) < f(\gamma^{(j)} | y) \right\} \right) + P(A_0^c) + P(A^c) \\
& \leq |t|/(n\sqrt{4\pi \log n}) + P(A_0^c) + P(A^c),
\end{aligned}$$

so that  $\lim P(\mathcal{T} < |t|) = 0$ .

Next, we show that  $P(\mathcal{T} \geq |t| + 1) \rightarrow 0$ . To that end, suppose  $j \notin t$ . Then the probability of stopping the iteration exactly at  $|t|$  is  $P(\max_{j \notin t} f(t + e_j | y) < f(t | y))$ . Since for any  $j \notin t$ ,  $(X_j^\top \tilde{y})^2 = nU_j^2$  where  $U_j$ 's are i.i.d  $N(0, 1)$  variables,  $\max_{j \notin t} f(t + e_j | y) < f(t | y)$  is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \log a_n + (n-1) \log(RSS_\lambda(t)) < (n-1) \min_{j \notin t} \left\{ \log \left( RSS_\lambda(t) - \frac{(X_j^\top \tilde{y})^2}{n+\lambda} \right) \right\} \\
\iff & \max_{j \notin t} \frac{U_j^2}{\log n} < \frac{1}{\log n} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} RSS_\lambda(t) \left( 1 - \frac{1}{a_n^{\frac{1}{n-1}}} \right), \tag{22}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $a_n = \lambda w^2 / ((n+\lambda)(1-w)^2)$  is as defined before. We will now show that the left side is less than 2 with probability tending to 1 and the right side converges to  $2c + 1 > 2$  in probability. This will complete the proof.

First, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$P(\max_{j \notin t} U_j^2 > 2 \log n) \leq \sum_{j \notin t} P(U_j^2 > 2 \log n) \leq 2n \left(1 - \Phi(\sqrt{2 \log n})\right) \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi \log n}} \rightarrow 0.$$

Then, note that under the orthogonal design, for any  $\gamma \subseteq t$ ,

$$RSS_\lambda(t) = RSS(t) + \frac{\lambda}{n(n+\lambda)} \tilde{y}^\top X_t X_t^\top \tilde{y},$$

and  $RSS(t)/n \rightarrow 1$ , in probability, so that  $RSS_\lambda(t)/(n-1) \rightarrow 1$  in probability. Consequently, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ ,

$$\frac{1}{\log n} \frac{n+\lambda}{n} RSS_\lambda(t) \left(1 - a_n^{\frac{1}{n-1}}\right) = \frac{n+\lambda}{n} \frac{RSS_\lambda(t)}{n-1} \frac{(1 - e^{(\log a_n)/(n-1)}) \log a_n}{(\log a_n)/(n-1)} \frac{1}{\log n} \rightarrow 2c + 1 > 2,$$

in probability. This completes the proof. □

*Proof of Theorem 4.* Let

$$B_i = \left\{ \max_{k \notin \gamma^{(i)}} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)) < 0 \right\} \cap \{\gamma^{(i)} \not\supseteq t\}.$$

Thus BITS is stopped *prematurely* by the posterior probability criterion without including all variables in  $t$  iff  $B_i$  happens for some  $i$ . However, note that

$$\cup B_i = \left\{ \cup_{i=1}^{K_n|t|} B_i \right\} \cup \left\{ \cup_{i > K_n|t|} B_i \right\}.$$

We first analyze  $\cup_{i=1}^{K_n|t|} B_i$ . To that end, note that when  $\gamma^{(i)}$  does not contain  $t$ ,

$$\max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma^{(i)}} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)) \leq \max_{k \notin \gamma^{(i)}} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)).$$

Consequently, for  $i \leq K_n|t|$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} B_i \cap \{\sigma \Upsilon_n < s_n\} &\subseteq \left\{ \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma^{(i)}} (\Omega(\gamma^{(i)}) - \Omega(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)) < 0 \right\} \cap \{\sigma \Upsilon_n < s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma^{(i)}} (\text{RSS}(\gamma^{(i)}) - \text{RSS}(\gamma^{(i)} + e_k)) < \frac{\lambda}{2n\tau_+} + \frac{\log(n+\lambda) - \log \lambda}{2(n-1)} - \frac{\log \frac{w}{1-w}}{n-1} \right\} \cap \\ &\quad \{\sigma \Upsilon_n < s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} |s_n - \sigma \Upsilon_n|^2 < \frac{c'' \log n}{K_n} - \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \right\} \cap \{\sigma \Upsilon_n < s_n\} \end{aligned}$$

which is independent of  $i$ . In the second set inequality above we have used Lemma 7 and the third inequality is due to Corollary 2 and (11). Also, note that

$$c'' \log n - \frac{K_n}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} < c''' \log n$$

by condition C3 for some  $c''' > 0$  for sufficiently large  $n$ . Hence, for sufficiently large  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \cup_{i=1}^{K_n|t|} B_i &\subseteq \left\{ \{\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n\} \cap \cup_{i=1}^{K_n|t|} B_i \right\} \cup \{\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ \frac{K_n}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} |s_n - \sigma\Upsilon_n|^2 < c''' \log n, \sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n \right\} \cup \{\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu'_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n \right\} \cup \{\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n\} \\ &\subseteq \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu'_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $u'_n = \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 K_n / (2c''' |t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n)$ . Note from the (19) that

$$\cup_{i > K_n|t|} B_i \subseteq \{\theta_{|t|} > K_n|t|\} \subseteq \left\{ s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n)} \right) \leq \sigma\Upsilon_n \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Now let  $c^* = \max\{c, 2c'''\}$  and  $u_n^* = \min\{u_n, u'_n\} = \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 K_n / (c^* |t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n)$ . Then, for all sufficiently large  $n$ , combining (23) and (24) we get,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\cup B_i) &\leq P\left(\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n^*)} \right)\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\sigma\Upsilon_n \geq s_n \left( 1 - \sqrt{\|\tilde{y}\|^2 / (nu_n^*)} \right), \|\tilde{y}\|^2 \leq nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2\right) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq P(\Upsilon_n \geq s_n \delta) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in t} \sum_{\gamma: |\gamma| < K_n|t|} P\left(|a_{\gamma, l}^\top \epsilon| > s_n \delta\right) + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \sum_{l \in t} \sum_{\gamma: |\gamma| < K_n|t|} e^{1-q(s_n \delta)} + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2) \\ &\leq \exp(1 - q(s_n \delta)) + K_n|t| \log p + \log |t| + P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n^* (1 - \sigma\delta)^2). \end{aligned}$$

□

## References

Candes, E. and Tao, T. (2007), “The Dantzig selector: Statistical estimation when  $p$  is much larger than  $n$ ,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 35, 2313–2351.



- Chang, J., Tang, C. Y., and Wu, Y. (2013), “Marginal empirical likelihood and sure independence feature screening,” *Annals of statistics*, 41.
- Chen, J. and Chen, Z. (2008), “Extended Bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces,” *Biometrika*, 95, 759–771.
- Cho, H. and Fryzlewicz, P. (2012), “High dimensional variable selection via tilting,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 74, 593–622.
- Cook, J. P., McMullen, M. D., Holland, J. B., Tian, F., Bradbury, P., Ross-Ibarra, J., Buckler, E. S., and Flint-Garcia, S. A. (2012), “Genetic architecture of maize kernel composition in the nested association mapping and inbred association panels,” *Plant Physiology*, 158, 824–834.
- Fan, J., Feng, Y., and Song, R. (2011), “Nonparametric independence screening in sparse ultra-high-dimensional additive models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 544–557.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), “Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle property,” *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 Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 70, 849–911.
- Fan, J. and Song, R. (2010), “Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with NP-dimensionality,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 3567–3604.
- George, E. and McCulloch, R. E. (1993), “Variable selection via Gibbs sampling,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 881–889.
- Hall, P. and Miller, H. (2009), “Using generalized correlation to effect variable selection in very high dimensional problems,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 18, 533–550.
- Hans, C., Dobra, A., and West, M. (2007), “Shotgun stochastic search for “large p” regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 507–516.
- Hao, N. and Zhang, H. H. (2014), “Interaction screening for ultrahigh-dimensional data,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109, 1285–1301.
- He, X., Wang, L., and Hong, H. G. (2013), “Quantile-adaptive model-free variable screening for high-dimensional heterogeneous data,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 342–369.
- Hoerl, A. E. and Kennard, R. W. (1970), “Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems,” *Technometrics*, 12, 55–67.
- Huang, J., Horowitz, J. L., and Ma, S. (2008), “Asymptotic properties of bridge estimators in sparse high-dimensional regression models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 36, 587–613.
- Ishwaran, H. and Rao, J. S. (2005), “Spike and slab variable selection: frequentist and Bayesian strategies,” *Annals of statistics*, 730–773.
- Johnson, V. E. and Rossell, D. (2012), “Bayesian model selection in high-dimensional settings,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 649–660.
- Kojima, M. and Komaki, F. (2016), “Determinantal point process priors for Bayesian variable selection in linear regression,” *Statistica Sinica*, 26, 97–117.
- Kyung, M., Gill, J., Ghosh, M., and Casella, G. (2010), “Penalized Regression, Standard Errors, and Bayesian Lasso,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 5, 369–412.
- Li, D., Dutta, S., and Roy, V. (2020), “Model Based Screening Embedded Bayesian Variable Selection for Ultra-high Dimensional Settings,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.07561*.

- (2021), *bravo: Bayesian Screening and Variable Selection*, r package version 1.0.6.
- Li, G., Peng, H., Zhang, J., and Zhu, L. (2012a), “Robust rank correlation based screening,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 40, 1846–1877.
- Li, Q. and Lin, N. (2010), “The Bayesian Elastic Net,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 5, 151–170.
- Li, R., Zhong, W., and Zhu, L. (2012b), “Feature screening via distance correlation learning,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 1129–1139.
- Liang, F., Paulo, R., Molina, G., Clyde, M. A., and Berger, J. O. (2008), “Mixtures of  $g$  priors for Bayesian variable selection,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103, 410–423.
- Lin, B. and Pang, Z. (2014), “Tilted correlation screening learning in high-dimensional data analysis,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 23, 478–496.
- Ma, S., Li, R., and Tsai, C.-L. (2017), “Variable screening via quantile partial correlation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112, 650–663.
- Mai, Q. and Zou, H. (2013), “The Kolmogorov filter for variable screening in high-dimensional binary classification,” *Biometrika*, 100, 229–234.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006), “High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 34, 1436–1462.
- Mitchell, T. J. and Beauchamp, J. J. (1988), “Bayesian variable selection in linear regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83, 1023–1032.
- Mukhopadhyay, M. and Dunson, D. B. (2020), “Targeted random projection for prediction from high-dimensional features,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115, 1998–2010.
- Narisetty, N. N. and He, X. (2014), “Bayesian variable selection with shrinking and diffusing priors,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 42, 789–817.
- Park, T. and Casella, G. (2008), “The Bayesian Lasso,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 103, 681–686.
- Ročková, V. and George, E. (2014), “EMVS: The EM approach to Bayesian variable selection,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109, 828–846.
- Roy, V. and Chakraborty, S. (2017), “Selection of tuning parameters, solution paths and standard errors for Bayesian lassos,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 12, 753–778.
- Roy, V., Tan, A., and Flegal, J. (2018), “Estimating standard errors for importance sampling estimators with multiple Markov chains,” *Statistica Sinica*, 28, 1079–1101.
- Shin, M., Bhattacharya, A., and Johnson, V. E. (2018), “Scalable Bayesian variable selection using nonlocal prior densities in ultrahigh-dimensional settings,” *Statistica Sinica*, 28, 1053–1078.
- Song, Q. and Liang, F. (2015), “A split-and-merge Bayesian variable selection approach for ultrahigh dimensional regression,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 947–972.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 58, 267–288.
- Vershynin, R. (2012), “Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices,” in *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, eds. Eldar, Y. C. and Kutyniok, G., Cambridge University Press, p. 210–268.
- Wang, H. (2009), “Forward regression for ultra-high dimensional variable screening,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1512–1524.

- Wang, R., Dutta, S., and Roy, V. (2021), “A note on marginal correlation based screening,” *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, 14, 88–92.
- Wang, X. and Leng, C. (2016), “High dimensional ordinary least squares projection for screening variables,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 78, 589–611.
- Xu, C. and Chen, J. (2014), “The sparse MLE for ultrahigh-dimensional feature screening,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 109, 1257–1269.
- Xu, X. and Ghosh, M. (2015), “Bayesian variable selection and estimation for group lasso,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 10, 909–936.
- Yang, Y., Wainwright, M. J., and Jordan, M. I. (2016), “On the computational complexity of high-dimensional Bayesian variable selection,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 44, 2497–2532.
- Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2005), “Efficient empirical Bayes variable selection and estimation in linear models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 100, 1215–1225.
- Zellner, A. (1986), “On assessing prior distributions and Bayesian regression analysis with g-prior distributions,” in *Bayesian inference and decision techniques: Essays in Honor of Bruno de Finetti*, eds. Goel, P. K. and Zellner, A., Elsevier Science, 233–243.
- Zhou, Q. and Guan, Y. (2019), “Fast model-fitting of Bayesian variable selection regression using the iterative complex factorization algorithm,” *Bayesian Analysis*, 14, 573.
- Zhou, T., Zhu, L., Xu, C., and Li, R. (2019), “Model-Free Forward Screening Via Cumulative Divergence,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1–13.
- Zou, H. (2006), “The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101, 1418–1429.
- Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005), “Regularization and variable selection via the Elastic Net,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 67, 301–320.

**Supplement to**  
**“Bayesian iterative screening in ultra-high dimensional settings”**  
**Run Wang, Somak Dutta and Vivekananda Roy**

**S1 Proofs of lemmas and corollaries**

**S1.1 Proof of Lemma 2**

*Proof.* Since  $K_n = n^{\xi_0 + 4\xi_{min}} (\log n)^2$ ,

$$\frac{|t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n}{\tau_+^2 \beta_+^4} \leq \nu \nu_\beta^{-4} \tau_{min}^{-2} C_\beta^2 n^{\xi_0 + 4\xi_{min}} \log n \prec K_n.$$

Also, since  $\lambda$  and  $w$  are fixed here, and  $\tau_+ \geq \tau_{min}$ ,

$$n \log n \min \left\{ \frac{\tau_+}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{|\log(1/w - 1)|} \right\} \geq c_* n \log n$$

for some constant  $c_*$ . Thus, if  $\xi_0 + 4\xi_{min} < 1$ ,

$$\frac{|t| \|\beta_t\|^2 \log n}{\tau_+^2 \beta_+^4} \prec K_n \preceq n \log n \min \left\{ \frac{\tau_+}{\lambda}, \frac{1}{|\log(1/w - 1)|} \right\}.$$

Next, since  $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ ,  $q(\zeta) = \zeta^2/2$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} q(s_n \delta) - K_n |t| \log p - \log |t| &\geq \frac{n \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4 \delta^2}{2 \|\beta_t\|^2 |t|} - K_n |t| \log p - \log |t| \\ &\geq 0.5 \delta^2 \nu^{-1} \nu_\beta^4 \tau_{min}^2 C_\beta^{-2} n^{1 - \xi_0 - 4\xi_{min}} - \nu^2 n^{\xi + 2\xi_0 + 4\xi_{min}} (\log n)^2 - \nu \xi_0 \log n \end{aligned} \tag{S1}$$

Note that (S1)  $\rightarrow \infty$  because  $\xi + 3\xi_0 + 8\xi_{min} < 1$ . □

**S1.2 Proof of Lemma 3**

*Proof.* Note that  $RSS_\lambda(\gamma) = n v_{y, \gamma, \lambda}$ . Suppose  $U_\gamma$  denotes the upper triangular Cholesky factor of  $X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I$ . And let for  $i \notin \gamma$ ,  $\gamma' = \gamma + e_i$ . Then arranging the columns of  $X_{\gamma'}$  appropriately, we can assume that

the Cholesky factor of  $X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I$  is given by

$$U_{\gamma'} = \begin{pmatrix} U_\gamma & s \\ 0 & s_0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ so that } U_{\gamma'}^{-\top} X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y} = \begin{pmatrix} U_\gamma^{-\top} X_\gamma \tilde{y} \\ (X_i^\top \tilde{y} - s^\top U_\gamma^{-\top} X_\gamma \tilde{y}) / s_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} U_\gamma^{-\top} X_\gamma \tilde{y} \\ \sqrt{nv_{iy,\gamma,\lambda}} / \sqrt{v_{i,\gamma,\lambda}} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $s = U_\gamma^{-\top} X_\gamma^\top X_i$  and  $s_0^2 = X_i^\top X_i + \lambda - s^\top s = nv_{i,\gamma,\lambda}$ . Also note that,

$$\begin{aligned} RSS_\lambda(\gamma) - RSS_\lambda(\gamma') &= \|U_{\gamma'}^{-\top} X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y}\|_2^2 - \|U_\gamma^{-\top} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y}\|_2^2 = n\{v_{iy,\gamma,\lambda}\}^2 / v_{i,\gamma,\lambda} \\ \Rightarrow \{RSS_\lambda(\gamma) - RSS_\lambda(\gamma')\} / RSS_\lambda(\gamma) &= R_{i,\gamma,\lambda}^2 \\ \Rightarrow \log RSS_\lambda(\gamma') - \log RSS_\lambda(\gamma) &= \log(1 - R_{i,\gamma,\lambda}^2). \end{aligned}$$

Also,

$$\log |X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I| - \log |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I| = 2 \log s_0 = \log(nv_{i,\gamma,\lambda}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \log f(\gamma'|y) - \log f(\gamma|y) &= \frac{1}{2} \log \lambda - \frac{1}{2} \left( \log |X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I| - \log |X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I| \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{n-1}{2} \left( \log RSS_\lambda(\gamma') - \log RSS_\lambda(\gamma) \right) + \log(w/(1-w)) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \log(n\lambda w^2 / (1-w)^2) - \frac{1}{2} \log v_{i,\gamma,\lambda} - \frac{1}{2} (n-1) \log\{1 - R_{i,\gamma,\lambda}^2\} \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

### S1.3 Proof of Lemma 4

*Proof.* Since

$$RSS(\gamma) - RSS(\gamma + e_i) = (\tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma \tilde{y}^\top X_i) \begin{pmatrix} X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma & X_\gamma^\top X_i \\ X_i^\top X_\gamma & n \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y} \\ X_i^\top \tilde{y} \end{pmatrix} - \tilde{y}^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top \tilde{y},$$

the proof follows from the fact that

$$\begin{pmatrix} X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma & X_\gamma^\top X_i \\ X_i^\top X_\gamma & n \end{pmatrix}^{-1} = \frac{1}{a} \begin{pmatrix} a(X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} + (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_i X_i^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} & -(X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_i \\ -X_i^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $a = n - X_i^\top X_\gamma^\top (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_i$ .  $\square$

### S1.4 Proof of Lemma 5

*Proof.* Note that,

$$\log |X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I| - \log |X_\gamma X_\gamma + \lambda I| = \log(n + \lambda - X_j^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_j),$$

because  $X_j^\top X_j = n$ . Since  $X_j^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_j \geq 0$  (equality holding iff  $X_\gamma^\top X_j = 0$ ) and  $n - X_j^\top X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma + \lambda I)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_j > 0$ , the result follows immediate.  $\square$

### S1.5 Proof of Lemma 6

*Proof.* To prove (10) note that

$$\log(1 + nK_n|t|/\lambda) \leq \max\{\log 2, \log(2nK_n|t|/\lambda)\} = O(\log n),$$

since  $K_n|t| < n$  and  $|\log \lambda| = O(\log n)$ . To prove (11) note that  $K_n\lambda/(n\tau_+) = O(\log n)$  and  $K_n < n$ .  $\square$

### S1.6 Proof of Lemma 7

*Proof.* Note that for any  $k \notin \gamma$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \Omega(\gamma) - \Omega(\gamma + e_k) \\ \geq & \frac{1}{2} (\log \text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) - \log \text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma + e_k)) - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \left( \log \frac{\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma)}{\|\tilde{y}\|^2} - \log \frac{\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma + e_k)}{\|\tilde{y}\|^2} \right) - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\ \geq & \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} (\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) - \text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma + e_k)) - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\ = & \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} (\{\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma)\} + \{\text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k) - \text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma + e_k)\}) + \\ & \text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k) - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\ \geq & \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} \left( \{0\} - \frac{\lambda\|\tilde{y}\|^2}{n\tau_+} + \text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k) \right) - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w} \\ = & \frac{1}{2\|\tilde{y}\|^2} (\text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k)) - \frac{\lambda}{2n\tau_+} - \frac{\log(n + \lambda)}{2(n-1)} + \frac{\log \lambda}{2(n-1)} + \frac{1}{n-1} \log \frac{w}{1-w}. \end{aligned}$$

In the above, the first inequality follows from the definition of  $\Omega(\gamma)$  and Lemma 5; the second inequality follows from the facts that  $\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) < \|\tilde{y}\|^2$  for any model  $\gamma$  and that  $\log u - \log v \geq u - v$  for  $0 < v < u < 1$ . Finally, the last inequality follows from the facts that  $\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma) \geq \text{RSS}(\gamma)$  for any  $\gamma$  and that for all  $\gamma'$  of size at most  $(K_n + 1)|t|$  we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{RSS}_\lambda(\gamma') - \text{RSS}(\gamma') &= \tilde{y}^\top X_{\gamma'} \left( (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1} - (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'} + \lambda I)^{-1} \right) X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y} \\
&= \tilde{y}^\top X_{\gamma'} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1/2} \left( I - (I + \lambda (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1})^{-1} \right) (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1/2} X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y} \\
&\leq \lambda \tilde{y}^\top X_{\gamma'} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1/2} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1/2} X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y} \\
&\leq \lambda \tilde{y}^\top X_{\gamma'} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-2} X_{\gamma'}^\top \tilde{y} \leq \frac{\lambda \|\tilde{y}\|^2}{n\tau_+},
\end{aligned}$$

because the nonzero eigenvalues of  $X_{\gamma'} (X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-2} X_{\gamma'}^\top$  and  $(X_{\gamma'}^\top X_{\gamma'})^{-1}$  are the same.  $\square$

## S1.7 Proof of Lemma 8

*Proof.* Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\beta_t\|^2 |t| \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} (X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t)^2 \geq \|\beta_t\|^2 \sum_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} (X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t)^2 \\
&= \|\beta_t\|^2 \sum_{k \in t} (X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t)^2 \\
&\geq \left( \sum_{k \in t} \beta_k X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t \right)^2 \\
&= \{\beta_t^\top X_t^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t\}^2 \\
&= \|(I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t\|^4 = \|X_t \beta_t - X_\gamma (X_\gamma^\top X_\gamma)^{-1} X_\gamma^\top X_t \beta_t\|^4 = \|X_{t \setminus \gamma} \beta_{t \setminus \gamma} + X_\gamma \tilde{b}\|^4 \\
&\geq n^2 \tau_+^2 \beta_+^4,
\end{aligned}$$

for some vector  $\tilde{b}$ , where the first equality follows from the fact that  $(I - H_\gamma) X_k = 0$  for any  $k \in t \cap \gamma$ , the second inequality is the Cauch-Schwarz inequality, and the final inequality follows from the fact that the matrix  $[X_{t \setminus \gamma} \ X_\gamma]$  has less than  $(K_n + 1)|t|$  columns and that  $\|\beta_{t \setminus \gamma}\| \geq \beta_+$ . The proof follows because  $s_n = \sqrt{n\tau_+ \beta_+^2} / (\|\beta_t\| \sqrt{|t|})$ .  $\square$

## S1.8 Proof of Corollary 1

*Proof.* Since  $\tilde{y}^\top \tilde{y} \leq \beta_t^\top X_t^\top X_t \beta_t + \sigma^2 \epsilon^\top \epsilon + 2\sigma \epsilon^\top X_t \beta_t$  and  $\beta_t^\top X_t^\top X_t \beta_t / n \leq \|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\|\tilde{y}\|^2 > nu_n) &\leq P\left(\|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+ + \frac{\sigma^2 \epsilon^\top \epsilon}{n} + \frac{2\sigma \epsilon^\top X_t \beta_t}{n} > u_n\right) \\ &\leq P\left(\frac{\sigma^2 \epsilon^\top \epsilon}{n} > v_n\right) + P\left(\frac{2\sigma \epsilon^\top X_t \beta_t}{n} > 1\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S2})$$

By Berry-Esseen theorem,

$$P\left(\frac{\sigma^2 \epsilon^\top \epsilon}{n} > v_n\right) \leq 1 - \Phi\left(\frac{\sqrt{nv_n}}{\sigma^2 \sqrt{\kappa}}\right) + \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2 \sqrt{\kappa}}{\sqrt{2n\pi} v_n} \exp\left(-\frac{nv_n^2}{2\sigma^4 \kappa}\right) + \frac{c_1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where  $v_n > 0$  for all large  $n$  as the conditions  $C_2$  and  $C_3$  are in force. Since  $\text{Var}(\epsilon^\top X_t \beta_t) = \sigma^2 \beta_t^\top X_t^\top X_t \beta_t$ , the proof follows as by the Chebyshev's inequality we have

$$P\left(\frac{2\sigma \epsilon^\top X_t \beta_t}{n} > 1\right) \leq \frac{4\sigma^4 \beta_t^\top X_t^\top X_t \beta_t}{n^2} \leq \frac{4\sigma^4 \|\beta_t\|^2 \delta^+}{n}.$$

□

## S1.9 Proof of Corollary 2

*Proof.* Let  $\tilde{\epsilon} = (I_n - n^{-1}1_n 1_n^\top) \epsilon$ . Note that  $H_\gamma 1_n = 0$  since  $X^\top 1_n = 0$ . Thus,

$$X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) \tilde{\epsilon} = X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) \epsilon.$$

Consequently, from Lemma 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \{\text{RSS}(\gamma) - \text{RSS}(\gamma + e_k)\} = \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \frac{(X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) \tilde{y})^2}{\|(I - H_\gamma) X_k\|^2} \\ &= \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \frac{\{X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t + \sigma X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) \epsilon\}^2}{\|(I - H_\gamma) X_k\|^2} \\ &\geq \left| \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \frac{|X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) X_t \beta_t|}{\|(I - H_\gamma) X_k\|} - \sigma \max_{k \in t \setminus \gamma} \frac{|X_k^\top (I - H_\gamma) \epsilon|}{\|(I - H_\gamma) X_k\|} \right|^2 \\ &\geq \left| \frac{n\tau_+ \beta_+^2 \|\beta_t\|^{-1} |t|^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{n}} - \sigma \max_{k \in t} \max_{\gamma: |\gamma| < K_n |t|} |a_{\gamma, t}^\top \epsilon| \right|^2 \\ &= |s_n - \sigma \Upsilon_n|^2. \end{aligned}$$



In the above, the first inequality follows from the fact that for any two sequences  $(b_m)$  and  $(c_m)$  of real numbers,  $\max_m |b_m - c_m| \geq |\max_m |b_m| - \max_m |c_m||$ ; the last inequality follows from Lemma 8 and from the assumption that  $\sigma\Upsilon_n < s_n$ .  $\square$

## S2 Further simulation results

In this section we present the comparison results for different simulation settings corresponding to  $R^2 = 0.5$  and  $R^2 = 0.9$ .

Table S1: Additional simulation results for  $R^2 = 0.5$  and 0.9

Method		Correlation Structure													
Theoretical $R^2 = 0.5$															
		IID		Compound		Group		AR		Factor		ExtrmCor		SparseFactor	
		TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP
<b>BITS1</b>															
$n$		99.9	99	24.2	0	100	100	100	100	28.8	1	99.9	99	72.8	4
PP		99.9	99	8.3	0	100	100	96.8	73	2.2	0	99.3	94	43.3	0
		(60.26)		(48.67)		(62.27)		(60.33)		(9.72)		(11.38)		(65.05)	
EBIC		94.7	71	3.6	0	33.3	0	44.3	0	0.1	0	0.2	0	11.5	0
		(8.52)		(3.39)		(3.00)		(3.99)		(1.88)		(1.02)		(2.88)	
<b>BITS2</b>															
$n$		99.9	99	19.7	0	100	100	100	100	28.9	1	100	100	72.0	6
PP		99.9	99	7.2	0	94.8	62	77	6	3.4	0	100	100	39.7	0
		(83.31)		(86.27)		(91.09)		(86.33)		(21.79)		(45.38)		(92.60)	
EBIC		94.7	71	2.9	0	33.3	0	44.8	0	0.2	0	0.8	0	12.6	0
		(8.52)		(3.38)		(3.00)		(4.03)		(1.98)		(1.07)		(3.15)	
<b>BITS3</b>															
$n$		99.8	98	6.0	0	100	100	84.8	18	4.8	0	73.4	59	69.0	5
PP		99.8	98	5.1	0	33.7	0	59.4	0	0.4	0	52.9	40	14.6	
		(185.28)		(114.22)		(136.72)		(159.21)		(2.81)		(107.32)		(155.3)	
EBIC		94.7	71	2.9	0	33.3	0	44.4	0	0.1	0	0.8	0	12.6	0

		(8.52)		(3.37)		(3.00)		(4.00)		(1.98)		(1.07)		(3.15)	
BITS(ALL)															
	<i>n</i>	99.9	99	28.8	0	100	100	100	100	34.3	1	100	100	76.4	8
		(1347.61)		(1289.91)		(1349.22)		(1348.93)		(1210.95)		(1149.66)		(1333.00)	
	PP	99.9	99	10.3	0	100	100	96.9	74	4.4	0	100	100	47.6	0
		(291.60)		(219.43)		(255.16)		(273.41)		(28.89)		(143.93)		(277.60)	
HOLP															
	<i>3n</i>	99.6	96	43.7	0	100	100	100	100	38.4	1	99.6	96	73.7	6
	<i>n</i>	99.2	93	29.4	0	100	100	100	100	24.2	0	99.2	93	68.9	3
	EBIC	76.4	12	3.7	0	68.1	0	48.3	0	0.6	0	91.9	59	12.6	0
		(7.01)		(3.72)		(6.13)		(4.35)		(1.80)		(8.30)		(2.03)	
FR															
	<i>n</i>	99.8	98	5.9	0	36.1	0	59.6	0	6.8	0	84.7	73	16.6	0
	EBIC	94.7	71	2.9	0	33.3	0	44.6	0	0.1	0	0.8	0	12.6	0
		(8.52)		(3.37)		(3.00)		(4.01)		(1.98)		(1.07)		(3.15)	
SIS															
	<i>3n</i>	99.8	98	43.8	0	100	100	100	100	9	0	99.6	96	74.1	8
	<i>n</i>	99.1	92	29.7	0	100	100	100	100	4.8	0	0	0	69.1	4

Theoretical  $R^2 = 0.9$

		IID		Compound		Group		AR		Factor		ExtrmCor		SparseFactor	
		TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP	TPR	CP
BITS1															
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.7	97	100	100	100	100	96.8	78	100	100	84.5	12
	PP	100	100	99.3	94	100	100	100	100	50.3	3	100	100	64.5	0
		(15.79)		(41.33)		(17.72)		(16.93)		(23.58)		(12.98)		(32.34)	
	EBIC	100	100	94.8	60	49.0	0	100	100	3.8	3	100	100	18.6	0
		(9.00)		(9.03)		(4.41)		(9.01)		(4.03)		(11.22)		(4.66)	
BITS2															
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.3	94	100	100	100	100	97.7	86	100	100	87.3	20

	PP	100	100	99.3	94	100	100	100	100	90.7	65	100	100	59.6	0
				(32.63)	(76.32)	(52.61)	(50.60)	(41.04)	(12.31)	(67.68)					
	EBIC	100	100	95	59	48.8	0	100	100	18.3	16	100	100	17.3	0
				(9.00)	(9.03)	(4.39)	(9.01)	(5.97)	(10.35)	(4.33)					
<b>BITS3</b>															
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.1	92	100	100	100	100	83.9	62	100	100	85.2	11
	PP	100	100	99.1	92	66.9	100	100	100	23.9	12	100	100	21	0
				(163.04)	(193.94)	(153.49)	(162.17)	(10.93)	(164.06)	(144.50)					
	EBIC	100	100	94.9	59	49	0	100	100	22.4	17	100	100	17.5	0
				(9.00)	(9.03)	(4.42)	(9.01)	(6.68)	(10.12)	(4.39)					
<b>BITS(ALL)</b>															
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.7	97	100	100	100	100	98.4	89	100	100	88.6	23
				(1360.51)	(1294.21)	(1363.04)	(1359.51)	(1214.20)	(1164.95)	(1346.00)					
	PP	100	100	99.3	94	100	100	100	100	91.2	66	100	100	67.2	0
				(186.94)	(274.42)	(199.41)	(200.89)	(60.45)	(167.88)	(212.50)					
<b>HOLP</b>															
	$3n$	100	100	99.8	98	100	100	100	100	97.0	75	100	100	78.6	7
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.1	92	100	100	100	100	92.2	51	100	100	76.1	5
	EBIC	100	100	82.8	15	78.2	1	100	100	48.7	0	100	100	47.8	0
				(9.08)	(8.08)	(7.04)	(9.00)	(12.83)	(9.00)	(11.96)					
<b>FR</b>															
	<i>n</i>	100	100	99.1	92	65.1	0	100	100	81.8	56	100	100	21.3	0
	EBIC	100	100	94.9	59	49	0	100	100	24.8	19	100	100	17.5	0
				(9.00)	(9.04)	(4.42)	(9.01)	(7.06)	(10.12)	(4.39)					
<b>SIS</b>															
	$3n$	100	100	89.3	33	100	100	100	100	9	0	100	100	78.6	8
	<i>n</i>	100	100	79.3	13	100	100	100	100	4.8	0	0	0	76.0	5

### S3 Additional plots from Section 4.2

This section contains plots of coverage probabilities for some true variables in the examples discussed in section 4.2.




Figure S1: Individual coverage probabilities for iid structure. The true  $\beta$  values for variable 1, 2, 3 are 1.5, 2.5, 3.5.




Figure S2: Individual coverage probabilities for group structure. The true  $\beta$  values for variable 1, 2, 3 are 2.