

OBSERVABLE ADJUSTMENTS IN SINGLE-INDEX MODELS FOR REGULARIZED M-ESTIMATORS

PIERRE C BELLEC

ABSTRACT. We consider observations (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) from single index models with unknown link function, Gaussian covariates and a regularized M-estimator $\hat{\beta}$ constructed from convex loss function and regularizer. In the regime where sample size n and dimension p are both increasing such that p/n has a finite limit, the behavior of the empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}$ and the predicted values $\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$ has been previously characterized in a number of models: The empirical distributions are known to converge to proximal operators of the loss and penalty in a related Gaussian sequence model, which captures the interplay between ratio $\frac{p}{n}$, loss, regularization and the data generating process. This connection between $(\hat{\beta}, \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta})$ and the corresponding proximal operators require solving fixed-point equations that typically involve unobservable quantities such as the prior distribution on the index or the link function.

This paper develops a different theory to describe the empirical distribution of $\hat{\beta}$ and $\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$: Approximations of $(\hat{\beta}, \mathbf{X}\hat{\beta})$ in terms of proximal operators are provided that only involve observable adjustments. These proposed observable adjustments are data-driven, e.g., do not require prior knowledge of the index or the link function. These new adjustments yield confidence intervals for individual components of the index, as well as estimators of the correlation of $\hat{\beta}$ with the index. The interplay between loss, regularization and the model is thus captured in a data-driven manner, without solving the fixed-point equations studied in previous works. The results apply to both strongly convex regularizers and unregularized M-estimation. Simulations are provided for the square and logistic loss in single index models including logistic regression and 1-bit compressed sensing with 20% corrupted bits.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Single index model. Consider iid observations $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ with Gaussian feature vectors $\mathbf{x}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$, $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ and response y_i valued in some set \mathcal{Y} following a single index model

$$(1.1) \quad y_i = F(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}, U_i)$$

where $F : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an unknown deterministic function, $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ an unknown index, and U_i is a latent variable independent of \mathbf{x}_i . The index \mathbf{w} is normalized with $\text{Var}[\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}] = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{w}\|^2 = 1$ by convention, since $\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{w}\|$ can be otherwise absorbed in $F(\cdot)$. The triples $(\mathbf{x}_i, U_i, y_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are iid but only $(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are observed. Typical examples that we have in mind for F and U_i in (1.1) include

- *Linear regression:* $F(v, u) = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \beta^*\|v + u$ for some $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $U_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $\mathbf{w} = \beta^* / \|\Sigma^{1/2} \beta^*\|$. Equivalently, $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta^*, \sigma^2)$.
- *Logistic regression:* $F(v, u) = 1$ if $u \leq 1/(1 + e^{-\|\beta^*\|v})$ and 0 otherwise for some $\beta^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $U_i \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ and $\mathbf{w} = \beta^* / \|\Sigma^{1/2} \beta^*\|$. Equivalently, $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\rho'(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta^*))$ where $\rho'(u) = 1/(1 + e^{-u})$ is the sigmoid function.
- *1-bit compressed sensing:* $F(v, u) = \text{sign}(v)$ so that $y_i = \text{sign}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w})$.
- *1-bit compressed sensing with an ϵ -proportion of bits flipped:* $F(v, u) = \text{usign}(v)$ for $U_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}(U_i = -1) = \epsilon$.

Throughout the paper, $\hat{\beta}$ is a regularized M -estimator of the form

$$(1.2) \quad \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b}) + g(\mathbf{b})$$

where $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a convex penalty function and for any $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$, the map $\ell_{y_0} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $t \mapsto \ell_{y_0}(t)$ is a convex loss function. For a fixed y_0 , the derivatives of ℓ_{y_0} are denoted by $\ell'_{y_0}(t)$ and $\ell''_{y_0}(t)$ where these derivatives exist. If $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ or $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ as in logistic regression or 1-bit compressed sensing, one natural loss function is for instance the logistic loss $\ell_{y_i}(t) = \log(1 + e^{-t})$ if $y_i = 1$ and $\ell_{y_i}(t) = \log(1 + e^t)$ if $y_i \neq 1$. This paper focuses on the behavior of estimators of the form (1.2) in the single index model (1.1) when the dimensions and sample sizes are both large and of the same order, as well as confidence intervals for individual components of the index \mathbf{w} .

1.2. Prior works in asymptotic behavior of M-estimators. There is now a rich literature on the behavior of M-estimators in the regime where p/n converges to a constant in linear models [1, 19, 30, 32, 33, 18, 23, 12, 27, 24, among others] and generalized models, including logistic regression [31, 28] and general teacher-student models [22]. To present typical results from this literature, assume in this section that $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ with $n/p \rightarrow \delta$ for some constant $\delta > 0$ and isotropic covariance matrix $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}_p$.

Consider first a linear model with $y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta^* + \varepsilon_i$ for ε_i independent of \mathbf{x}_i and the unregularized estimator $\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathcal{L}(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b})$ for some convex loss $\mathcal{L} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. This corresponds to $g = 0$ and $\ell_{y_i}(u) = \mathcal{L}(y_i - u)$ in (1.2). The works [19, 17, 21, 18] showed that the behavior of $\hat{\beta}$ is characterized by the system of two equations

$$(1.3) \quad \begin{cases} \delta^{-1} \sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[(\operatorname{prox}[\gamma \mathcal{L}](\varepsilon_1 + \sigma Z) - \varepsilon_1 - \sigma Z)^2], \\ 1 - \delta^{-1} = \mathbb{E}[\operatorname{prox}[\gamma \mathcal{L}]'(\varepsilon_1 + \sigma Z)], \end{cases}$$

with two unknowns (σ, γ) , where $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of ε_1 . In (1.3) and throughout the paper, for any convex function $f : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the proximal operator $\operatorname{prox}[f]$ of f is defined as $\operatorname{prox}[f](u) = \operatorname{argmin}_{v \in \mathbb{R}} (u - v)^2/2 + f(v)$, and we denote by $\operatorname{prox}[f]'$ its derivative. While [21] uses notation (r, c) for the two unknowns in (1.3), we use (σ, γ) instead to reveal the connection with the larger systems (1.6) and (1.7) below. The solution $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma})$ to (1.3) is such that $p^{-1} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2 \rightarrow \bar{\sigma}^2$ in probability, and for each fixed component $j = 1, \dots, p$ the convergence in distribution $\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^* \rightarrow^d N(0, \bar{\sigma}^2)$ holds [19], so that the system (1.3) and its solution captures the asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}$. Equipped with the system (1.3) and these results, [2] studied the optimal loss function $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ that minimizes $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2$ for a given $\delta = \lim \frac{n}{p}$ and given noise distribution for $(\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)$. In linear model with normally distributed noise, Bayati and Montanari [1] used Approximate Message Passing to establish a similar phenomenon for the Lasso $\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\mathbf{b}\|^2/2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1$, showing that the empirical distribution of $(\hat{\beta}_j)_{j=1, \dots, p}$ is close in distribution to the empirical distribution of $(\eta(\beta_j^* + \bar{\tau} Z_j; \lambda \frac{\bar{\tau}}{b}))_{j=1, \dots, p}$ where $\eta(x; u) = \operatorname{sign}(x)(|x| - u)_+$ is the soft-thresholding operator and $(\bar{\tau}, \bar{b})$ is solution to a nonlinear system of two equations of a similar nature as (1.3) [1, Theorem 1.5]; the works [24, 27, 13] provides explicit error bounds between functions of the Lasso $\hat{\beta}$ and their prediction from the nonlinear system of two equations. Inspired by early works from Stojnic [30], Thrampoulidis et al. [33] developed the Convex Gaussian Min-max Theorem and obtained analogous systems of equations to characterize the limit of $p^{-1} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2$ for a given loss-penalty pair in linear models, see for instance the system with four unknowns [33, Eq. (15)] for separable loss and penalty.

With the model (1.1), our focus in this note is on nonlinear models. Results of the same nature as in the previous paragraph have been also established. To present some representative existing results, we now turn to logistic regression, a particular case of the single model (1.1). Consider iid observations from the logistic model

$$(1.4) \quad y_i | \mathbf{x}_i \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\rho'(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)) \quad \text{for } \rho'(u) = 1/(1 + e^{-u}),$$

and the M-estimator (1.2) with the logistic loss $\ell_{y_i}(u_i) = \rho(u_i) - y_i u_i$ for $\rho(u) = \log(1 + e^u)$. With no regularization, i.e., $g = 0$, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in (1.2) is the logistic Maximum Likelihood Estimate (MLE). Sur and Candès [31] describe the asymptotic distribution of the MLE as follows. For a sequence of logistic regression problems with $n, p, \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|^2/p \rightarrow \kappa^2$ and $n/p \rightarrow \delta > 0$, the MLE exists with overwhelming probability if $\delta > \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \int \int (z - tv)_+^2 \varphi(z) 2\rho'(\kappa v) \varphi(v) dz dv$ [11] where $\varphi(z) = (\sqrt{2\pi})^{-1} \exp(-z^2/2)$ is the standard normal pdf. In this case, assuming additionally that the components of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ are iid copies of a random variable β , then for any Lipschitz function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$

$$(1.5) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \phi(\hat{\beta}_j - \bar{\alpha} \beta_j^*, \beta_j^*) \rightarrow^{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}[\phi(\bar{\sigma} Z, \beta)]$$

where $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ is independent of β , $\rightarrow^{\mathbb{P}}$ denotes convergence in probability, and $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma})$ is solution of the nonlinear system of 3 equations

$$(1.6) \quad \begin{cases} \delta^{-1} \sigma^2 = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1)(\gamma \rho'(\text{prox}[\gamma \rho](\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)))^2], \\ 0 = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1) Z_1 \gamma \rho'(\text{prox}[\gamma \rho](\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2))], \\ 1 - \delta^{-1} = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1) \text{prox}[\gamma \rho]'(\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)]. \end{cases}$$

Above, $\rho'(u) = 1/(1 + e^{-u})$ is the sigmoid function as in (1.4), $\rho''(u) = \rho'(u)(1 - \rho'(u))$ its derivative, and inside the expectation in the third line $\text{prox}[\gamma \rho]'(u) = 1/(1 + \gamma \rho''(\text{prox}[\gamma \rho](u)))$. Salehi et al. [28] extended such results to the M-estimator (1.2) constructed with the same logistic loss, $\ell_{y_i}(u_i) = \rho(u_i) - y_i u_i$ for $\rho(u) = \log(1 + e^u)$, and separable penalty function of the form $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{j} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{f}(b_j)$ for some convex $\tilde{f} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Assume that the coefficients of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ are iid copies of a random variables β with finite variance, and let $(Z, Z_1, Z_2)^T \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_3)$ be independent of β . Let $\kappa^2 = \mathbb{E}[\beta^2]$ and consider the system of 6 equations

$$(1.7) \quad \begin{cases} \kappa^2 \alpha = \mathbb{E}[\beta \text{prox}[\sigma \tau \tilde{f}(\cdot)](\sigma \tau (\theta \beta + \delta^{-1/2} r Z))], \\ \sqrt{\delta} r \gamma = \mathbb{E}[Z \text{prox}[\sigma \tau \tilde{f}(\cdot)](\sigma \tau (\theta \beta + \delta^{-1/2} r Z))], \\ \kappa^2 \alpha^2 + \sigma^2 = \mathbb{E}[\{\text{prox}[\sigma \tau \tilde{f}(\cdot)](\sigma \tau (\theta \beta + \delta^{-1/2} r Z))\}^2], \\ r^2 \gamma^2 = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1)(\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2 - \text{prox}[\gamma \rho](\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2))^2], \\ -\theta \gamma = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho''(-\kappa Z_1) \text{prox}[\gamma \rho](\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)], \\ 1 - \gamma/(\sigma \tau) = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1) \text{prox}[\gamma \rho]'(\kappa \alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)] \end{cases}$$

with unknowns $(\alpha, \sigma, \gamma, \theta, \tau, r)$. As in the case of the MLE in [31] with (1.6), the system (1.8) captures the interplay between the logistic model (1.4), the penalty and the limit δ of the ratio n/p : The main result of [28] states that if the nonlinear system (1.7) has a unique solution $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\tau}, \bar{r})$ then for any locally Lipschitz function $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$(1.8) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \Phi(\hat{\beta}_j, \beta_j^*) \rightarrow^{\mathbb{P}} \mathbb{E}[\Phi(\text{prox}[\bar{\sigma} \bar{\tau} \tilde{f}(\cdot)](\bar{\sigma} \bar{\tau} (\bar{\theta} \beta + \delta^{-1/2} \bar{r} Z)), \beta)]$$

as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ with $n/p \rightarrow \delta$. An informal interpretation of (1.8) is the approximation

$$(1.9) \quad \hat{\beta}_j \approx \text{prox}[\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\tilde{f}(\cdot)](\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}(\bar{\theta}\beta_j^* + \delta^{-1/2}\bar{\tau}Z_j)),$$

where $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$, and (1.9) holds in an averaged sense over $j = 1, \dots, p$. This approximation means that in order to understand $\hat{\beta}$, it is sufficient to understand the simple estimator $\hat{b}_j = \text{prox}[\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\tilde{f}(\cdot)](\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}y_j^{seq})$ in the Gaussian sequence model $y_j^{seq} \sim N(\bar{\theta}\beta_j^*, \frac{\bar{\tau}^2}{\delta})$, $j = 1, \dots, p$. The works [20, 22] further extend these results to loss and penalty functions that need not be separable, provide a unified theory for the systems (1.3), (1.5) and (1.7), and describe the relationship of these results with predictions from the replica method in statistical physics.

The above system (1.7) may reduce to simpler forms for specific penalty functions. With Ridge penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{\lambda}{2p}\|\mathbf{b}\|^2$, in the isotropic setting with covariance $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p}\mathbf{I}_p$, the system (1.7) reduces to

$$(1.10) \quad \begin{cases} \delta^{-1}\sigma^2 = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1)(\kappa\alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2 - \text{prox}[\gamma\rho](\kappa\alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2))^2], \\ -\delta^{-1}\alpha = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho''(-\kappa Z_1)\text{prox}[\gamma\rho](\kappa\alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)], \\ 1 - \delta^{-1} + \lambda\gamma = 2\mathbb{E}[\rho'(-\kappa Z_1)\text{prox}[\gamma\rho]'(\kappa\alpha Z_1 + \sigma Z_2)], \end{cases}$$

see [28, Eq. (14), (16)]. By integration by parts, (1.10) is equivalent to (1.6) when $\lambda = 0$, and the convergence (1.8) with $\Phi(u, v) = \phi(u - \bar{\alpha}v, v)$ reduces to (1.5) due to the simple form of the proximal operator $\text{prox}[t\tilde{f}](x) = \frac{x}{1+\lambda t}$ where $\tilde{f}(u) = \lambda u^2/2$.

As explained in [31, 28] among others, the systems (1.6), (1.7) and (1.10) combined with the asymptotic results (1.5) and (1.8) are powerful tools to analyze various characteristics of the M-estimator $\hat{\beta}$, for instance the correlation $p^{-1}\hat{\beta}^T\beta^*$ with the true regression vector β^* by using $\Phi(a, b) = ab$ in (1.8), giving $p^{-1}\hat{\beta}^T\beta^* \rightarrow^{\mathbb{P}} \alpha\kappa^2$ by the first line in (1.7). The Mean Squared Error (MSE) $p^{-1}\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2$ is analogously characterized using $\Phi(a, b) = (a - b)^2$ in (1.8). If the penalty is of the form $g = \lambda g_0$ for some tuning parameter $\lambda > 0$, solving the above nonlinear systems for given (λ, δ) provide curves of performance metrics of interest (e.g., correlation $p^{-1}\hat{\beta}^T\beta^*$ or MSE $p^{-1}\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2$) as a function of the tuning parameter and the limit δ of n/p [28]. Plotting such curves by computing the solutions $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\tau}, \bar{r})$ of (1.7) require the knowledge of the distribution β of the components of β^* , or in the case of (1.6) and (1.10) the second moment $\kappa^2 = \mathbb{E}[\beta^2] \approx p^{-1}\|\beta^*\|^2$. Solving the system also requires the knowledge of the single index model: If the Bernoulli parameter in (1.4) is of the form $\tilde{\rho}(\mathbf{x}_i^T\beta^*)$ for $\tilde{\rho} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ different than the sigmoid function ρ , the systems (1.6) and (1.7) require an appropriate modification, and solving the new system requires the knowledge of $\tilde{\rho}$ (see for instance the system in [22, Section B.8]).

In practice, κ^2 and more generally the law of β are typically unknown. In this case the above results are not readily useful since $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\tau}, \bar{r})$ cannot be computed only by looking at the data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) . To illustrate this, given two loss-penalty pairs (ℓ, g) and $(\tilde{\ell}, \tilde{g})$, the practitioner may wish to pick the loss-penalty pair such that the resulting M-estimator in (1.2) has larger correlation with the true logistic coefficient β^* in (1.4). With this application in mind, the above theory suggests to solve the system (1.7) for each loss-penalty pair and to pick the pair with the largest $\bar{\alpha}$ since $\bar{\alpha}$ is the limit of $\hat{\beta}^T\beta^*/\|\beta^*\|^2$. This is feasible only if the law of β in (1.7) is known, [or only if κ^2 is known in (1.5) and (1.10) as by rotational invariance the systems for the MLE and Ridge regularization only depend on the law of β through the second moment]. The drawback that solving the above systems require typically unknown quantities is also present in linear models: (1.3) requires the knowledge of the noise distribution and the systems in [1, 33] additionally require the knowledge of the prior distribution β on the components of β^* .

For the MLE, (1.5)-(1.6) also provide confidence intervals for components β_j^* [31, 39]. Let $z_{\alpha/2} > 0$ be such that $\mathbb{P}(|N(0,1)| > z_{\alpha/2}) = \alpha$. The result (1.5) applied to a smooth approximation of the indicator function $\phi(a, b) = I\{|a| \leq \bar{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}\}$ yields that approximately $(1 - \alpha)p$ covariates $j = 1, \dots, p$ are such that

$$\beta_j^* \in \frac{1}{\alpha}[\hat{\beta}_j - \bar{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}, \hat{\beta}_j + \bar{\sigma}z_{\alpha/2}].$$

This provides a confidence interval in an average sense. Zhao et al. [39] later proved that the same confidence interval is valid not only in this averaged sense, but also for a fixed, given component $j = 1, \dots, p$ under conditions on the amplitude of β_j^* . As in the previous paragraph, such confidence interval can be constructed provided that κ^2 is known so that the solution $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma})$ to the system (1.6) can be computed. This motivated the ProbeFrontier [31] and SLOE [37] procedures to compute approximations of κ^2 and of the solutions $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma})$ of the system (1.6). These procedures [31, 37] to estimate $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\sigma})$ in (1.6) for the logistic MLE require the single-index model (1.1) to be well-specified (i.e., $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ must follow an actual logistic model (1.4)): If the single-index model (1.1) for $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ deviates from the assumed model (1.4) then (1.6)-(1.7) must be modified to account for the generative model of $y_i | \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, as in [22, Section B.8].

For regularized logistic regression with *non-smooth* penalty, even if the solution $(\bar{\alpha}, \bar{\sigma}, \bar{\gamma}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{\tau}, \bar{r})$ were known, constructing confidence intervals for β_j^* from (1.8) alone is typically not possible since $\text{prox}[\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\tilde{f}]$ is not injective (e.g., for the non-smooth penalty $\tilde{f}(u) = |u|$, the proximal of \tilde{f} is the soft-thresholding operator which is not injective). The lack of injectivity comes from the multi-valued nature of the subdifferential: $x = \text{prox}[uf](z)$ holds if and only if $\frac{x-z}{u} \in \partial f(x)$, but (x, u) alone are not sufficient to recover z if the subdifferential $\partial f(x)$ is multi-valued. Even if the value

$$(1.11) \quad \text{prox}[\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}\tilde{f}(\cdot)](\bar{\sigma}\bar{\tau}(\bar{\theta}\beta_j^* + \delta^{-1/2}\bar{r}Z_j))$$

were known exactly (or approximately through $\hat{\beta}_j$ as in (1.9)), recovering β_j^* from the value (1.11) still requires to choose a specific element of the subdifferential of \tilde{f} at (1.11), and results such as (1.8)-(1.9) are not informative regarding which element of the subdifferential of \tilde{f} at (1.11) should be used. Because of this difficulty, in general nonlinear models such as (1.4) with non-smooth penalty, confidence intervals for components of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ are lacking.

1.3. A peek at our results. This paper develops a different theory to provide proximal approximations, confidence intervals as well as data-driven estimates of the bias of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and of the correlation $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{w}$ with the index \mathbf{w} . If $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}_p$ and $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{f}(b_j)$ as in the previous subsection, a by-product of this paper is the approximation

$$(1.12) \quad \hat{\beta}_j \approx \text{prox}\left[\frac{1}{\hat{v}}\tilde{f}\right]\left(\pm w_j \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{v}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\delta}} \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j\right)$$

for $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\pm w_j$ the j -th component of the index \mathbf{w} in (1.1) up to an unidentifiable sign, where $(\hat{v}, \hat{t}, \hat{r})$ are observable scalars defined below in (3.8). The informal approximation (1.12) is made rigorous in Corollary 4.2. The approximation (1.12) mimics (1.9) with $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ replaced by the normalized index \mathbf{w} , with the important difference that the adjustments $(\hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{t})$ of the previous display are observable from the data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , while the deterministic adjustments $(\bar{\sigma}, \bar{\tau}, \bar{\theta}, \bar{r})$ in (1.9) requires the knowledge of κ^2 and of the distribution of the components of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ to solve the system (1.7). This means that the rich information contained in the system (1.7) and the limiting result (1.8) can be captured from the data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) by computing $(\hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{t})$ in a data-driven fashion, bypassing solving (1.8) and the theory described in the previous subsection.

Some of the techniques used below to derive results of the form (1.12) have been used previously to derive asymptotic normality results in linear models for penalized least-squares estimators [7, 5] and robust/regularized M-estimators [4, 8]. We build upon these techniques to tackle single-index models. While the factor \hat{r}/\hat{v} of the Gaussian part Z_j in (1.12) is reminiscent of the construction of confidence intervals for linear models in [7, 5, 8], this paper introduces the new adjustments $(\hat{t}, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ —defined in (3.8) below— which captures the interplay between the non-linearity of the model (1.1) and the M-estimator (1.2).

1.4. Organization. Section 2 lists our working assumptions. Section 3 obtains formula for the derivatives of $\hat{\beta}$ with respect to \mathbf{X} and defines the observable adjustments and related notation that will be used throughout the paper. Section 4 states the main results in the paper regarding confidence intervals, proximal mapping representations for $\hat{\beta}$ the predicted values $\mathbf{X}\hat{\beta}$, and estimation of the correlation of $\hat{\beta}$ with the index. Section 5 develops similar results for unregularized M-estimation. Section 6 presents some examples and simulations. Most proofs are delayed to Section 7.

2. ASSUMPTIONS

We now come back to the single index model (1.1) with unknown function F . That is, we assume from now on

$$y_i = F(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}, U_i), \quad U_i \text{ independent of } \mathbf{x}_i, \quad \text{Var}[\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}] = \mathbf{w}^T \Sigma \mathbf{w} = 1.$$

Each of our results will require a subset of the following assumptions. Let $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ be the set of allowed values for y_i , i.e., a set such that $\mathbb{P}(y_i \in \mathcal{Y}) = 1$. For instance, $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}$ in linear regression and $\mathcal{Y} = \{\pm 1\}$ or $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$ in binary classification.

Assumption 1. Let $\delta, \kappa \geq 1$ be constants independent of n, p . Consider the model (1.1) for some unknown nonrandom $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\text{Var}[\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}] = 1$. Assume that $0.01 \leq p/n \leq \delta^{-1}$, that \mathbf{X} has iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ rows for Σ with $\|\Sigma\|_{op} \|\Sigma^{-1}\|_{op} \leq \kappa$, that $\ell_{y_0}(\cdot), g(\cdot)$ are convex with $\ell'_{y_0}(\cdot)$ 1-Lipschitz for all $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Assumption 2. For all $\mathbf{b}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ we have $g(\mathbf{0}) \leq g(\mathbf{b})$ and for some constant $\tau > 0$ independent of n, p ,

$$(2.1) \quad (\mathbf{b} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}})^T (\mathbf{d} - \tilde{\mathbf{d}}) \geq \tau \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{b} - \tilde{\mathbf{b}})\|^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{d} \in \partial g(\mathbf{g}), \tilde{\mathbf{d}} \in \partial g(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}).$$

Here, $\partial g(\mathbf{b}) = \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \forall \tilde{\mathbf{b}}, g(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) \geq g(\mathbf{b}) + \mathbf{d}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{b}} - \mathbf{b})\}$ denotes the subdifferential of g at \mathbf{b} .

Assumption 3. Assume $p/n \leq \delta^{-1} < 1$ and that the penalty is $g = 0$.

Assumption 4. Assume that ℓ_{y_0} is twice continuously differentiable for all $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$, that $\sup_{u \in \mathbb{R}} \max_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} |\ell'_{y_0}(u)| \leq 1$, and that the maps $u \mapsto \min_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} (\ell'_{y_0}(u))^2$ and $u \mapsto \min_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} \ell''_{y_0}(u)$ are both positive and continuous. Here, the loss ℓ (as a function $\mathcal{Y} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$) is assumed independent of n, p .

3. DERIVATIVES AND OBSERVABLE ADJUSTMENTS

Let us define some notation used throughout. Denote by $\partial g(\mathbf{b}) \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ the subdifferential of a convex function $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ at a point $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. The KKT conditions of the minimization problem (1.2) with convex penalty g and convex loss ℓ_{y_i} read

$$(3.1) \quad \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in n \partial g(\hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response vector with components y_1, \dots, y_n , \mathbf{X} is the design matrix with rows $\mathbf{x}_1^T, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n^T$, and $\hat{\psi}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ has components $\hat{\psi}_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = -\ell'_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}))$. The minus sign here is used so that, in the special case of linear models with the square loss

$\ell_{y_i}(u) = (y_i - u)^2/2$, the usual i -th residual is $\psi_i(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Similarly to $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ in (1.2), we view $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ as a function of (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) , i.e., $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$. We let ℓ' act componentwise and denote by $\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{u}) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the vector with components $\ell'_{y_i}(u_i)$ for every $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, so that

$$(3.2) \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = -\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})).$$

Similarly, ℓ'' acts componentwise on vectors in \mathbb{R}^n so that $\ell''_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{u})$ has components $[\ell''_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{u})]_i = \ell''_{y_i}(u_i)$ for $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and each $i = 1, \dots, n$. This notation highlights that derivatives will always be with respect to \mathbf{u} for a fixed value of \mathbf{y} . If the context is clear, we write simply $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$; in this case the functions $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ are implicitly taken at the observed data (\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) .

The observable adjustments (\hat{t}, \hat{v}) in (1.12) are constructed from the derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ with respect to \mathbf{X} . The following proposition provides the structure of these derivatives, extending the corresponding result for linear models [4, Theorem 1] to the present setting.

Proposition 3.1. *Assume that ℓ'_{y_0} is 1-Lipschitz for all $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and that (2.1) holds for some $\tau > 0$ and positive definite $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Then for any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ the function $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ is differentiable almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with derivatives*

$$(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_j)$$

where $\mathbf{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\ell''_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ and some matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with

$$(3.3) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\|_{op} \leq (n\tau)^{-1}$$

and such that the following holds: If $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq \hat{\text{df}} &\leq n & \text{where } \hat{\text{df}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}], \\ \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}]/(1 + \hat{c}) &\leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] & \text{where } \mathbf{V} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{c} = \frac{1}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2$, while if $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ we have the slightly weaker

$$(3.5) \quad -\hat{c} \leq \hat{\text{df}} \leq n + \hat{c},$$

$$(3.6) \quad -4\hat{c} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}]/(1 + \hat{c}) \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] + 4\hat{c}.$$

If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \neq \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, which we expect to happen in practice, (3.5)-(3.6) become the simpler bounds in (3.4), which shows that $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]$ are of the same order. It is unclear why the special case $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ needs to be handled separately, and we believe that it is an artefact of the proof. If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ we can still obtain (3.5)-(3.6) with \hat{c} of constant order by (7.24) below, which is sufficient for the purpose of our results.

By Proposition 3.1, since $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ in (3.2) is given by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = -\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ we find by the chain rule $(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \mathbf{D}[-\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D})\mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_j]$. Summarizing the derivatives of both $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ side by side, for all $i \in [n], j \in [p]$,

$$(3.7) \quad \begin{aligned} (\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) &= \hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_j, \\ (\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) &= -\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_j. \end{aligned}$$

Equipped with these derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, our main result requires the following scalar adjustments to correct the bias and scaling of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for estimation and confidence interval about components

of the index \mathbf{w} . Define the scalars $(\hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ by

$$(3.8) \quad \begin{cases} \hat{v} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}], \\ \hat{r} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2)^{1/2}, \\ \hat{\gamma} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\hat{\text{d}}\mathbf{f}}{n\hat{v}} = \frac{\hat{\text{d}}\mathbf{f}}{\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]}, \end{cases} \quad \begin{cases} \hat{t}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n^2} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 + \frac{2\hat{v}}{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \frac{\hat{v}^2}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \frac{p}{n} \hat{r}^2, \\ \hat{a}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{t}^{-2} (\frac{\hat{v}}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 + \frac{1}{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{r}^2)^2, \\ \hat{\sigma}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \hat{a}^2. \end{cases}$$

Next, for each covariate index $j \in [p]$, define the de-biased estimate $\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)}$ by

$$(3.9) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{\beta}_j + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \\ &= \hat{\beta}_j + \hat{v}^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j^T (n\boldsymbol{\Sigma})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{e}_j is the j -th canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^p . Finally, let $\Omega_{jj} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1})_{jj}$ be the j -th diagonal element of $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$.

Alternatively to the adjustments $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ in (3.8), the quantities $\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2$ and $\hat{\gamma}$ in the expressions for $(\hat{t}, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ in (3.8) may be replaced by $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ and $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$ thanks to the approximations $\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \approx \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ and $\hat{\gamma} \approx \gamma_*$ justified in Theorem 4.4 below. This gives the alternative estimates

$$(3.10) \quad \begin{cases} \tilde{t}^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}/n + \hat{v} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - (p/n) \hat{r}^2, \\ \tilde{a}^2 = \tilde{t}^{-2} (\hat{v} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 + \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}/n - \gamma_* \hat{r}^2)^2, \\ \tilde{\sigma}^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - \tilde{a}^2. \end{cases}$$

The expressions $(\hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ in (3.8) are preferred when the covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is unknown, as $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ only occurs in (3.8) in the expression of \hat{t}^2 . For unregularized M -estimation (penalty $g = 0$), the term $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ in \hat{t} is equal to 0 by the optimality conditions of the optimization problem (1.2), so that $(\hat{r}, \hat{v}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ are all computable without any knowledge of the covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. The special form of $(\hat{r}, \hat{v}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\text{d}}\mathbf{f})$ in unregularized M -estimation is detailed in Section 5.

4. MAIN RESULTS WITH STRONG CONVEXITY

4.1. Confidence intervals for individual components of the index.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled. Then for all $j = 1, \dots, p$, there exists $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ such that*

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{r}} w_j \right) - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_1(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{\sqrt{p}}$$

where \pm denotes the sign of the unknown scalar $t_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w}^T (\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})/n$, and $\hat{t} = \max(0, \hat{t}^2)^{1/2}$. If additionally Assumption 4 holds then for some event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow 1$,

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\Omega_{jj}} \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left| \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{v}} w_j \right) - \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} Z_j \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_2(\delta, \tau, \kappa, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

In the single index model (1.1), the sign of \mathbf{w} is not identifiable as replacing \mathbf{w} with $-\mathbf{w}$ and F with $(a, u) \mapsto F(-a, u)$ in (1.1) leaves \mathbf{y} unchanged. Consequently, for each covariate $j = 1, \dots, p$ we focus on confidence intervals for w_j up to an unidentifiable sign.

Unpacking the proof of Theorem 4.1 reveals that (4.1) is a consequence of

$$(4.2) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{t_*}{\hat{r}} w_j \right) - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_3(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{p},$$

$$(4.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{r}^2} |t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2| \right] \leq \frac{C_4(\delta, \tau)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

The first line is of the same form as (4.1) with $\pm \hat{t}$ replaced by t_* and a right-hand side of order $\frac{1}{p}$, much smaller than the right-hand side of (4.1). The right-hand side of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}$ in (4.1) is paid due to the approximation $t_*^2 \approx \hat{t}^2$ in (4.3), which features an error term of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{p}}$. The approximation (4.3) is only used in the terms of (4.1) for which $w_j \neq 0$, so that if $\mathcal{N} = \{j = 1, \dots, p : w_j = 0\}$ denotes the set of null covariates, (4.2) implies the bound

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} \right) - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_5(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{p}$$

with a right-hand side of order $\frac{1}{p}$.

We now describe the confidence intervals that stem from Theorem 4.1. By (4.1), for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exist at most $\sqrt{p}C(\delta, \tau, \kappa)/\varepsilon$ covariates $j \in [p]$ such that $W_2(N(0, 1), \Omega_{jj}^{-1/2} \sqrt{n}(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{r}} \pm w_j)) > \varepsilon$ where W_2 is the Wasserstein distance. This justifies the approximation

$$(4.4) \quad \sqrt{n}(\hat{v} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \pm \hat{t} w_j) \approx \hat{r} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} Z_j.$$

Since convergence in 2-Wasserstein distance implies weak convergence, for all $j \in [p] \setminus J_p$ for some set J_p with cardinality $|J_p| \leq \sqrt{p}C_6(\delta, \tau, \kappa, \alpha, \varepsilon)$ we thus have

$$\sup_{j \in J_p} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{t}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{t}} \frac{z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \leq \pm w_j \leq \frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{t}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} + \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{t}} \frac{z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \right) - (1 - \alpha) \right| \leq \varepsilon$$

where $\mathbb{P}(|N(0, 1)| > z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}) = \alpha$. This provides a confidence interval for the j -th component w_j of the index \mathbf{w} , up to the unknown sign $\pm = \text{sign}(t_*)$. To perform an hypothesis test of

$$H_0 : w_j = 0 \quad \text{against} \quad H_1 : |w_j| > 0$$

at level $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the test that rejects H_0 if

$$(4.5) \quad \frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \sqrt{n} |\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)}| > z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2}$$

has type I error at most $\alpha + \varepsilon$ for all components $j \in [p] \setminus J_p$.

By the same argument and taking $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_{n,p}$ depending on n, p and converging to 0, for instance $\varepsilon_{n,p} = 1/\log n$, we obtain

$$\sup_{j \in J_{n,p}} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{t}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{t}} \frac{z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \leq \pm w_j \leq \frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{t}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} + \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{t}} \frac{z_{\frac{\alpha}{2}}}{\sqrt{n}} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \right) - (1 - \alpha) \right| \rightarrow 0$$

for some set $J_{n,p} \subset [p]$ with cardinality at least $p - \sqrt{p}C_7(\delta, \tau, \kappa)/\varepsilon_{n,p}$.

4.2. Proximal mapping representation for $\hat{\beta}_j$. For isotropic designs with $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p/n$, the de-biased estimate (3.9) reduces in vector form to $\hat{\beta}^{(d)} = \hat{\beta} + \hat{v}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi}$ with $\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} \in n \partial g(\hat{\beta})$, where $\partial g(\hat{\beta})$ is the subdifferential of the penalty g at $\hat{\beta}$. By the definition of the proximal operator in \mathbb{R}^p , we thus have for any $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\hat{\beta} + \hat{v}^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} = \mathbf{b} \quad \text{iff} \quad \hat{\beta} = \text{prox}[(n/\hat{v})g](\mathbf{b}).$$

That is, in this isotropic setting, Theorem 4.1 lets us express $\hat{\beta}$ as a proximal operator of the penalty function g scaled by n/\hat{v} . The following result makes such proximal approximation precise in the case of separable penalty.

Corollary 4.2. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled and set $\Sigma = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{I}_p$. Assume that the penalty g is separable, of the form $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p g_j(b_j)$ for convex functions $g_j : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Then*

$$(4.6) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{v}^2}{\hat{r}^2} \left| \hat{\beta}_j - \text{prox} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{v}} g_j \right] \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j + \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{v}} w_j \right) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_8(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{\sqrt{p}}$$

where $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ for each $j \in [p]$ and $\pm = \text{sign}(t_*)$ as in Theorem 4.1.

Proof. By the KKT conditions, with $\Sigma = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{I}_p$ and separable penalty g , $\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} \in \hat{\beta}_j + \hat{v}^{-1} \partial g_j(\hat{\beta}_j)$. Since $\Omega_{jj} = n$, Theorem 4.1 gives that $\hat{\beta}_j + \hat{v}^{-1} \partial g_j(\hat{\beta}_j) \ni \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j + (\pm \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{v}}) w_j + \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \text{Rem}_j$ where $\partial g_j(\hat{\beta}_j)$ is the subdifferential of g_j at $\hat{\beta}_j$ and Rem_j are such that $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[\text{Rem}_j^2] \leq C_9(\delta, \tau, \kappa)/\sqrt{p}$. Equivalently, $\hat{\beta}_j = \text{prox}[\hat{v}^{-1} g_j](\frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j + (\pm \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{v}}) w_j + \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \text{Rem}_j)$ by definition of the proximal operator. Since $x \mapsto \text{prox}[h](x)$ is 1-Lipschitz for any convex, proper lower semi-continuous function h , the left-hand side of Corollary 4.2 is bounded from above by $\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E}[(\text{Rem}_j)^2]$. \square

Corollary 4.2 provides the proximal approximation

$$(4.7) \quad \hat{\beta}_j \approx \text{prox} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{v}} g_j \right] \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j + \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{v}} w_j \right)$$

for $\hat{\beta}_j$, in an averaged sense over $j \in [p]$. If $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p}\mathbf{I}_p$ is used (instead of $\Sigma = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{I}_p$ in Corollary 4.2) and the penalty is $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \tilde{f}(b_j)$, the same argument yields (1.12), which is analogous to (1.9) from [28, 20] with the important difference that the adjustments $(\hat{r}, \hat{v}, \hat{t}^2)$ are observable and computed from the data, while the deterministic adjustments in (1.9) are not observable. We note in passing that Theorem 4.1 is more informative than Corollary 4.2 because the subgradient is explicit: If $\Sigma = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{I}_p$ and $g(\mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^p g_j(b_j)$, Theorem 4.1 provides

$$\hat{\beta}_j + \frac{1}{\hat{v}} \mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \approx \pm w_j \frac{\hat{t}}{\hat{v}} + Z_j \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in \partial g_j(\hat{\beta}_j).$$

On the other hand, the information that $\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ is the subgradient of g_j at $\hat{\beta}_j$ appearing in the KKT conditions of the proximal operator is not visible from results such as (4.7).

In Corollary 4.2 the index \mathbf{w} is nonrandom. If $g_j = g_0$ for all $j \in [p]$ and some function $g_0 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, and if \mathbf{w} is random independent of \mathbf{X} with exchangeable entries then

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, p} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\hat{v}^2}{\hat{r}^2} \left| \hat{\beta}_j - \text{prox} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{v}} g_0 \right] \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j + \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{v}} w_j \right) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{10}(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

Indeed, by exchangeability the expectation inside the maximum is the same for all $j = 1, \dots, p$, so that the maximum over $[p]$ is equal to the average over $[p]$. The previous display is thus a consequence of Corollary 4.2 conditionally on \mathbf{w} , followed by integrating with respect to the probability measure of \mathbf{w} .

4.3. Proximal mapping representation for predicted values. The same techniques as Theorem 4.1 provide a proximal representation for the predicted value $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for a fixed $i \in [n]$.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled. Define $a_* = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\sigma_*^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - a_*^2$ and $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$. Then*

$$(4.8) \quad \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{r}^2} \left| \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \text{prox}[\gamma_* \ell_{y_i}(\cdot)](a_* U_i + \sigma_* Z_i) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{11}(\delta, \tau)}{n}$$

where $U_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}$ and Z_i are independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables.

Inequality (4.8) justifies the approximation $\mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \approx \text{prox}[\gamma_* \ell_{y_i}(\cdot)](a_* U_i + \sigma_* Z_i)$, or equivalently by definition of the proximal operator,

$$\mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \gamma_* \ell'_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \approx a_* U_i + \sigma_* Z_i.$$

This provides a clear description of the predicted value $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, although $(\gamma_*, a_*^2, \sigma_*^2)$ is not observable. The topic of the next subsection is the estimation of these quantities by $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$.

4.4. Correlation estimation. Recall that $a_* = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\sigma_*^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - a_*^2$ and $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$ as in Theorem 4.3, and let t_* be defined as in Theorem 4.1. While the adjustments $(\hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{t})$ for the proximal representation (4.6) are observable from the data, the quantities (a_*, σ_*) in (4.8) are not. Estimation of the quantity a_* is of interest in itself: An estimate \hat{a}^2 with $\hat{a}^2 \approx a_*^2$ would allow the Statistician to estimate the correlation $a_*/\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|$ up to a sign, or other performance metrics for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. The following result shows that $(a_*^2, \sigma_*^2, \gamma_*, t_*^2)$ can be estimated by $(\hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2)$.

Theorem 4.4. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $(\hat{r}, \hat{v}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ be as in (3.8), and let (t_*, a_*, σ_*) be as in Theorems 4.1 and 4.3. Then*

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\hat{v}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*)|] \leq C_{12}(\delta, \tau) n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\hat{r}^2} |\hat{t}^2 - t_*^2|\right] \leq C_{13}(\delta, \tau) n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.11) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\hat{v}|}{\hat{r}^2} \left| \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \right|\right] \leq C_{14}(\delta, \tau) n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{v}^2 \hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^4} (|\hat{a}^2 - a_*^2| + |\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_*^2|)\right] \leq C_{15}(\delta, \tau) n^{-1/2}.$$

If additionally Assumption 4 holds, then there exists an event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow 1$ such that

$$(4.13) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[I_E \left(\left| \hat{\gamma} - \gamma_* \right| + \left| \hat{t}^2 - t_*^2 \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \right| \right) \right] \leq C_{16}(\delta, \tau, \ell) n^{-1/2}.$$

Theorem 4.4 justifies the approximations $\hat{\gamma} \approx \gamma_*$, $\hat{t}^2 \approx t_*^2$, $\hat{a}^2 \approx a_*^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}^2 \approx \sigma_*^2$, so that the quantities $(\gamma_*, a_*^2, \sigma_*^2)$ appearing in the proximal representation for $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in Theorem 4.3 are estimable by $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$. We focus on estimation of a_*^2 here instead of a_* , because the sign of $a_* = \mathbf{w}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is unidentifiable in the single index model (1.1) as any sign change can be absorbed into $F(\cdot)$.

5. MAIN RESULTS FOR UNREGULARIZED M -ESTIMATION

For unregularized M -estimation with $p < n$, the optimality conditions of the optimization problem (1.2) read $\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = 0$. In this case, the adjustments $(\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ in (3.8) reduce to the simpler forms

$$(5.1) \quad \hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} = p, \quad \hat{\gamma} = \frac{p/n}{\hat{v}}, \quad \hat{a}^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2}{n} - \frac{p}{n} \left(1 - \frac{p}{n}\right) \frac{\hat{r}^2}{\hat{v}^2}, \quad \hat{t}^2 = \hat{a}^2 \hat{v}^2, \quad \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{p}{n} \left(\frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}}\right)^2.$$

Here, the fact that $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} = p$ justifies the notation $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ for the quantity defined in Proposition 3.1: In unregularized M -estimation $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ is the number of parameters, or degrees of freedom of the estimator. A similar justification for the notation $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ will be given for L1 regularized M -estimation in Section 6.4.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 be fulfilled so that the penalty is $g = 0$.*

(i) *Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be fixed. If a minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ exists at $(\mathbf{y}, \bar{\mathbf{X}})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}$ is invertible, then there exists a neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ exists in this neighborhood, the map $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ restricted to this neighborhood is continuously differentiable, and (3.7) holds with $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mathbf{x}_i^T)^{-1}$.*

(ii) *Assume $\mathbb{P}(\text{minimizer } \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \text{ in (1.2) exists and } \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \leq K) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some constants $K, \varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - \varepsilon - o(1)$ as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ and standard normal $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$ such that, with the adjustments $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{a}^2)$ in (5.1),*

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} (\hat{\beta}_j - \pm \hat{a} w_j) - Z_j \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{17}(\delta, \kappa, K, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}},$$

with $a_* = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{w}$ and $\pm = \text{sign}(a_*)$. For $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$ we have

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left(\left| \hat{\gamma} - \gamma_* \right| + \left| \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right| + \left| a_*^2 - \hat{a}^2 \right| \right) \right] \leq \frac{C_{18}(\delta, K, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

6. EXAMPLES AND SIMULATIONS

6.1. Linear models: Square loss and Huber loss. It is first instructive to specialize Theorem 4.1 to loss functions usually used in linear models. For the square loss $\ell_{y_i}(u_i) = \frac{1}{2}(y_i - u_i)^2$ and convex penalty g in (1.2) we have $\ell''_{y_0}(u) = 1$ for all $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and

$$(6.1) \quad \hat{v} = 1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}, \quad \hat{\gamma} = \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n - \hat{\text{df}}} = \frac{1}{\hat{v}} - 1, \quad \hat{r}^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2}{n}$$

where $\hat{\text{df}}$ is defined in (3.4), and the quantity $\hat{\text{df}}$ equals $\text{Tr}[\frac{\partial}{\partial \mathbf{y}} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})]$ by [4, Theorem 2.1]. Thus, $\hat{\text{df}}$ is the usual notion of degrees-of-freedom of the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ in linear models as introduced in Stein [29], and $\hat{v} = 1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n$ captures the difference between sample size and degrees-of-freedom. On the other hand, $n\hat{r}^2$ is the usual residual sum of squares.

If the Huber loss $H(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \min(1, v) dv$ is used and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is the estimate (1.2) with $\ell_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b}) = H(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b})$ and convex penalty g , then

$$(6.2) \quad \hat{v} = \frac{\hat{n} - \hat{\text{df}}}{n}, \quad \hat{\gamma} = \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{\hat{n} - \hat{\text{df}}}, \quad \hat{r}^2 = \frac{\|H'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2}{n}$$

where $\hat{I} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{i = 1, \dots, n : |y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}| \leq 1\}$ and $\hat{n} = |\hat{I}|$ denotes the number of residuals that fall within the interval $[-1, 1]$ where the loss $H(\cdot)$ is quadratic. The estimate \hat{r}^2 is the averaged of the squared residuals clipped to $[-1, 1]$, since here the derivative H' of the Huber loss is $H'(u) = \max(-1, \min(1, u))$. The integer $\hat{n} = |\hat{I}|$ represents the effective sample size, since observations $i \notin \hat{I}$ do not participate in the fit of (1.2) in the sense that $\frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = 0$ for $i \notin \hat{I}$ [4]. Similarly to the square loss case, $n\hat{v} = \hat{n} - \hat{\text{df}}$ captures the effective sample size left after subtracting the degrees-of-freedom of the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

For the square loss, both $(n - \hat{\text{df}})$ and $\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ are expected to appear in the confidence interval about β_j^* for regularized least-squares [5], while $(\hat{n} - \hat{\text{df}})$ and $\|H'(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ are expected to appear in confidence intervals about β_j^* for the Huber loss [8]. In Theorem 4.1 on the other hand, the confidence interval is about the component w_j of the normalized index \mathbf{w} . This is where \hat{t} enters the picture: the role of \hat{t} is to bring the index \mathbf{w} (which is normalized with $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{w}\| = 1$) on the same scale as $\hat{v} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. The following proposition makes this precise.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled and additionally assume a linear model where observations $y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon_i$ are iid with additive noise ε_i independent of \mathbf{x}_i . Set $\mathbf{w} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^* / \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$, and assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$ equals a constant independent of n, p . Then*

$$\hat{t} = \hat{v} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + n^{-1/2} O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) [\hat{r} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|].$$

Above, $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ denotes a random variable W such that for any $\eta > 0$ there exists a constant K depending on $(\eta, \delta, \tau, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|)$ only such that $\mathbb{P}(|W| > K) \leq \eta$.

Proposition 6.1 justifies the approximation $\hat{t} \approx \hat{v} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$, and combined with (4.4), $\sqrt{n} \hat{v} (\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \beta_j^*) \approx \hat{r} \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} Z_j$ with $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$. This recovers the asymptotic normality result proved for regularized least-squares in [5] and for some robust loss functions in [8]. Proposition 6.1 illustrates that \hat{t} brings the normalized index \mathbf{w} on the scale as $\hat{v} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ and $\hat{v} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(d)}$ in this linear model setting.

We note in passing that Proposition 6.1 justifies the use of \hat{t}/\hat{v} to estimate the signal strength $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$, when an initial M-estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is provided to estimate to high-dimensional parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$. For $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}$ (which can be seen as a special case of (1.2) with penalty satisfying $g(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ and $g(\mathbf{b}) = +\infty$ for $\mathbf{b} \neq \mathbf{0}$), the quantity \hat{t}^2/\hat{v}^2 reduces to the estimator of the signal strength in [16]. Table 1 reports experiments demonstrating the accuracy of Proposition 6.1. The approximate normality of $\hat{t}/\hat{v} - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$ observed in the QQ-plot of Table 1 is not currently proved theoretically.



Estimate	Signal strength
\hat{t}/\hat{v}	$\ \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\ $
2.071 ± 0.122 (average \pm std)	2.000
	
	

TABLE 1. Estimate \hat{v}/\hat{v} of the signal strength $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$ in a linear model $y_i + \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon_i$ with standard Cauchy noise ε_i independent of \mathbf{x}_i , with $n = 1500, p = 1501$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_0 = 200$ with all non-zero coordinates equal to the same value. The M-estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is chosen with $\ell_{y_i}(u) = H(u - y_i)$ for the Huber loss $H(u) = \int_0^{|u|} \min(1, v) dv$ and Elastic-Net penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = n^{-1/2} \|\mathbf{b}\|_1 + 0.05 \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2$. Average, standard deviation, histogram and QQ-plot of \hat{t}/\hat{v} were computed over 100 independent realizations of the dataset. Over the 100 repetitions, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ has False Negatives 47.4 ± 7.3 , False Positives 271.36 ± 13.4 and True Positives 152.6 ± 7.3 .

In summary, for the square loss and Huber loss,

- \hat{r}^2 is a generalization of the residual sum of squares,

- \hat{v} is the difference of an effective sample size minus the degrees-of-freedom of $\hat{\beta}$, and
- \hat{t}/\hat{v} brings the normalized index \mathbf{w} on the same scale as $\hat{\beta}$.

6.2. Least-squares with nonlinear response. Let $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$. We now focus on the square loss, $\ell_{y_i}(u) = (y_i - u)^2$ with no penalty ($g = 0$ in (1.2)), so that $\hat{\beta}$ is the least-squares estimate $\hat{\beta} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$. We emphasize that here, \mathbf{y} does not follow a linear model: y_i is allowed to depend non-linearly on $\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}$ as in the single index model (1.1). In this setting, $\hat{r}^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|^2$ is the residual sum of squares as in (6.1), $\hat{v} = 1 - \frac{p}{n}$ since the degrees-of-freedom $\hat{\text{d}}\mathbf{f}$ equals p , and (\hat{a}, \hat{t}) defined in (5.1) satisfy

$$\frac{\hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^2 \hat{v}^2} = \frac{\hat{a}^2}{\hat{r}^2} = \frac{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2} - \frac{p}{n-p}.$$

Assuming $p/n \leq \gamma < 1$, Theorem 5.1 yields the approximation

$$(6.3) \quad \frac{n-p}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left[\frac{\hat{\beta}_j}{\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|} - \frac{\pm w_j}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|^2}{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2} - \frac{p}{n-p} \right)_+^{1/2} \right] \approx N(0, 1)$$

where \pm is the sign of $\mathbf{w}^T \Sigma \hat{\beta}$. If Σ is unknown, the quantity Ω_{jj} is linked to the noise variance in the linear model of regressing $\mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j$ onto \mathbf{X}_{-j} : Ω_{jj} can be estimated using

$$\Omega_{jj} \left\| [\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{X}_{-j} (\mathbf{X}_{-j}^T \mathbf{X}_{-j})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{-j}^T] \mathbf{X} \mathbf{e}_j \right\|^2 \sim \chi_{n-p+1}^2$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{-j} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p-1)}$ has the j -th column removed. While (6.3) does not formally follow from Theorem 5.1 because the square loss fails to satisfy Assumption 4, the argument of the proof of Theorem 5.1 only requires minor modifications to obtain (5.2) and (6.3) for the square loss (thanks to $\ell''_{y_0} = 1$, the proof for the square loss is actually much simpler than for the logistic loss and other loss functions covered by Theorem 5.1).

For fixed p and $n \rightarrow +\infty$, asymptotic normality and confidence intervals for the least-squares in single index models with Gaussian covariates dates back to at least Brillinger [10]. High-dimensional estimation performance of the least-squares and penalized least-squares is studied in [38, 26, 25]. With $\Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$ to simplify comparison, asymptotic normality in [10] concerns the random variable $\hat{\beta} - \mu \mathbf{w}$ and the estimation bounds in [38, 26, 25] bounds the estimation error of $\|\hat{\beta} - \mu \mathbf{w}\|$ where $\mu = \mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0,1)} [g F(g, U_i)]$ where F is the function defining the single index model in (1.1). The scaled vector $\mu \mathbf{w}$ appears here because it is the minimizer of the population minimization problem $\min_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b} - y_i)^2]$. The constant μ is typically unknown. A major difference with these previous results is that the multiplicative coefficient of w_j in (6.3) is an estimate from the data.

We illustrate the normal approximation (6.3) in Table 2 with $n = 3000, p = 2400$ and four different models: linear, logistic, Poisson, and 1-Bit compressed sensing with a 20% probability of flipped bits ($\mathbb{P}(u_i = -1) = 0.2 = 1 - \mathbb{P}(u_i = 1)$) with u_i independent of \mathbf{x}_i).

6.3. Ridge regularized M -estimation. Consider now an isotropic design with $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}_p$ and the Ridge penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 / (2p)$ as for the fixed-point equations (1.10) of [28]. The optimality conditions of the optimization problem (1.2) are

$$(6.4) \quad \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} = (n/p) \lambda \hat{\beta}$$

so that the terms $\hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} / n$ and $\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi}\|^2 / n^2$ in (3.8) and (3.10) reduce to

$$(6.5) \quad \hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} / n = \lambda \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 / p, \quad \|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi}\|^2 / n^2 = \lambda^2 \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 / p.$$

Computing explicitly $(\partial / \partial x_{ij}) \hat{\beta}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ in Proposition 3.1 for this Ridge penalty yields $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} + \lambda \frac{n}{p} \mathbf{I}_p)^{-1}$. This implies that $\gamma_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}[\Sigma \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$ satisfies $n \lambda \gamma_* + \hat{\text{d}}\mathbf{f} = p$ by definition





	Linear	Logistic $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$	1-bit $y_i \in \{\pm 1\}$	Poisson
$y_i \mathbf{x}_i$	$y_i \sim N(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}, 0.5)$	$\mathbb{E}[y_i \mathbf{x}_i] = \frac{e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}}}{1 + e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}}}$	$y_i = u_i \text{sign}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w})$	$y_i \mathbf{x}_i \sim \text{Poisson}(e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}})$
\hat{a}	.999 \pm .021	.407 \pm .072	.475 \pm .05	1.629 \pm .163
a_*	.999 \pm .027	-.413 \pm .033	.483 \pm .037	1.637 \pm .141
QQplot				

TABLE 2. Quantile-quantile plots of the left-hand side of (6.3) for $n = 3000, p = 2400, \Sigma = \mathbf{I}_p$ and $\hat{\beta} = (\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}$. For each model, the QQ-plot features the quantities (6.3) for all $j = 1, \dots, p$ for a single realization of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) . For the 1-Bit compressed sensing model, $\mathbb{P}(u_i = -1) = 0.2 = 1 - \mathbb{P}(u_i = 1)$ and u_i is independent of \mathbf{x}_i . The quantity $a_* = \mathbf{w}^T \Sigma \hat{\beta}$ and its estimate \hat{a} are computed over 100 independent realizations of the data (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) ; the corresponding columns in the table show the average and standard error over these 100 repetitions.

of $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ in Proposition 3.1, and (4.9) provides $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}/n = \hat{v}\gamma_* + O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$ so that $(\lambda + \hat{v})\gamma_* = \frac{p}{n} + O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$. This justifies replacing γ_* by $\frac{p}{n}(\lambda + \hat{v})^{-1}$ in the expression of \tilde{a}^2 , which provides the approximations

$$\begin{cases} \hat{t}^2 = (\hat{v} + \lambda)^2 \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 - (p/n)\hat{r}^2, \\ \tilde{a}^2 \approx \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 - \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v} + \lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2 = \frac{\hat{t}^2}{(\hat{v} + \lambda)^2}, \\ \tilde{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 - \tilde{a}^2 \approx \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v} + \lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2 \approx \frac{n}{p} \gamma_*^2 \hat{r}^2. \end{cases}$$

In this setting, the normal approximation (4.4) from Theorem 4.1 becomes

$$(6.6) \quad \frac{(n/p)^{1/2}}{\hat{r}} [(\hat{v} + \lambda)\hat{\beta}_j - \pm \hat{t}w_j] \approx Z_j \quad \text{with } Z_j \sim N(0, 1).$$

We illustrate these results for Ridge regularized M-estimation with the simulation study in Table 3 with the logistic loss in logistic model.

Because the simple structure of the matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ and the KKT conditions (6.4), for isotropic design the estimation error $a_*^2 = \mathbf{w}^T \Sigma \hat{\beta}$ and of $\sigma_*^2 = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\beta}\|^2 - a_*^2$ can be improved compared to the estimation error in (4.12). With $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p} \Sigma$ as in the present subsection, we have $\gamma_* = \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}]$, $a_* = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{w}^T \hat{\beta}$ and $\sigma_*^2 = \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 - a_*^2$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let Assumption 1 be fulfilled with $\Sigma = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}_p$. Let $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2/p$ be the penalty in (1.2). If additionally $\sup_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} |\ell'_{y_0}| \leq 1$ then*

$$(6.7) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\sigma_*^2 - \frac{\gamma_* \hat{r}^2}{\lambda + \hat{v}} \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{19}(\delta, \lambda)}{p}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(a_*^2 - \left\{ \frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\beta}\|^2 - \frac{\gamma_* \hat{r}^2}{\lambda + \hat{v}} \right\} \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{20}(\delta, \lambda)}{p}.$$

The proof of Theorem 4.4 for general penalty functions actually encompasses (6.7). We give here a short proof of (6.7), in order to present techniques that are representative of the proof of the more general Theorem 4.4 in the appendix.

Proof of Proposition 6.2. By rotational invariance and without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{w} = p^{1/2} \mathbf{e}_1$ where \mathbf{e}_1 is the first canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^p . Let $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^T}{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2} =$

$\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T$. Proposition 7.4 applied to the Gaussian matrix $(p^{1/2}x_{ij})_{i \in [n], j=2, \dots, p}$, $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ and $\mathbf{f} = (\hat{\beta}_j/\sqrt{p})_{j=2, \dots, p}$ gives

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \sum_{j=2}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p} \frac{\partial(\hat{\beta}_j \hat{\psi}_i)}{\partial x_{ij}} \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \frac{\|\mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2}{p} + \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p^2} \left\| \frac{\partial(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{P})}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|_F^2 \right].$$

In the left-hand side, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{X} \mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \frac{\lambda n}{p} \|\mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ by (6.4). By (3.7) we also have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\psi}_i \sum_{j=2}^p \frac{\partial \hat{\beta}_j}{\partial x_{ij}} &= \text{Tr}[\mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{A}}] \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}, \\ \sum_{j=2}^p \hat{\beta}_j \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial \psi_i}{\partial x_{ij}} &= -\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \|\mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{P} \hat{\mathbf{A}}] = \text{Tr}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}] - \hat{A}_{11}$, moving the terms involving \hat{A}_{11} and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ to the right-hand side, this proves

$$\begin{aligned} &n^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left((\lambda + \hat{v}) \sigma_*^2 - \gamma_* r^2 \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{(\lambda n + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]) \|\mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2}{p} - \frac{\text{Tr}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}]}{p} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq C_{21} \mathbb{E} \left[\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \left[\frac{\hat{A}_{11}^2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{p^2} + \left(\frac{1}{p} + \frac{\|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}}\|_{op}^2}{p^2} \right) \|\mathbf{P} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \right] + \sum_{i=2}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{p^2} \left\| \frac{\partial(\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{P})}{\partial x_{ij}} \right\|_F^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We further bound the right-hand side using $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \leq \frac{p}{\lambda n} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ by (6.5), $\|\mathbf{D}\|_{op} \leq 1$ by Assumption 1, $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \leq n$ granted by the additional assumption $\max_{y_0} |\ell'_{y_0}| \leq 1$, inequality $\|\hat{\mathbf{A}}\|_{op} \leq \frac{p}{\lambda n}$, the derivatives formula in (3.7) for the rightmost term, and $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^c] \leq C_{22}(\delta, c)$ for any numerical constant $c > 0$ by (7.24). The conclusion (6.7) is then obtained by dividing by $n^2(\lambda + \hat{v})$. \square

6.4. L1 regularized M-estimation. The last example concerns L1 regularized M-estimation, with penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|_1/p$. Let $\hat{S} = \{j \in [p] : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0\}$ be the set of active covariates of the corresponding L1 regularized M-estimator in (1.2). Then, by now well-understood arguments for the Lasso (cf. [35, 34][6, Proposition 3.10],[3, Proposition 2.4]), the KKT conditions of (1.2) hold strictly with probability one, and the formulae (3.7) hold true with $\hat{\mathbf{A}}$ symmetric and diagonal by block with $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{S}, \hat{S}} = (\mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}_{\hat{S}})^{-1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{S}, \hat{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}$. This implies that $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ defined in (3.4) is simply

$$\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} = \text{Tr}[\hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}] = \text{Tr}[\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{S}, \hat{S}} (\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{\hat{S}, \hat{S}})^{-1}] = |\hat{S}|$$

for almost every \mathbf{X} if the diagonal matrix \mathbf{D} has at least $|\hat{S}|$ positive entries. This motivates the notation $\hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f}$ for the effective degrees-of-freedom of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, following tradition on the Lasso in linear regression [40, 35] in the context of Stein's Unbiased Risk Estimate [29].

7. PROOFS

7.1. Derivatives.







λ	0.01	0.10	1.00
$\frac{1}{n} \ \mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\ ^2 - \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$	0.621942±0.160021	0.168159±0.043360	0.016483±0.004789
$\frac{1}{p} \ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\ ^2 - \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$	0.630087±0.167536	0.170862±0.039237	0.016765±0.003354
$a_*^2 = \frac{1}{p} \frac{(\mathbf{w}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^2}{\ \mathbf{w}\ ^2}$	0.610240±0.039087	0.164714±0.009765	0.016184±0.000914
(6.6) for $j : w_j = 0$			
(6.6) for $j : w_j \neq 0$			
$\frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$	8.540738±0.265670	2.105677±0.047351	0.185784±0.001738
$\sigma_*^2 = \frac{1}{p} \ (\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\mathbf{w}\mathbf{w}^T}{\ \mathbf{w}\ ^2})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\ ^2$	8.560584±0.110858	2.111824±0.014522	0.186364±0.001680

TABLE 3. In the logistic model $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$, $\mathbb{P}(y_i = 1) = 1/(1 + \exp(-\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}))$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ and isotropic covariance $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \frac{1}{p} \mathbf{I}_p$, the M-estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is constructed with logistic loss $\ell_{y_i}(u) = \log(1 + e^u) - y_i u$ and Ridge penalty $g(\mathbf{b}) = \lambda \|\mathbf{b}\|^2/p$. Dimension and sample size are $(n, p) = (5000, 10000)$ and the three tuning parameters $\lambda \in \{0.01, 0.1, 1.0\}$. For a_*^2 , its estimates $\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$ and $\frac{1}{p} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - \frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$, as well as σ_*^2 and its estimate $\frac{p/n}{(\hat{v}+\lambda)^2} \hat{r}^2$, we report the average \pm standard deviation over independent 50 repetitions of the dataset. The index \mathbf{w} has $s = 100$ entries equal to $\sqrt{p/s}$ and $p - s$ entries to 0. Middle rows show standard normal QQ-plots of $\{\hat{r}^{-1}(n/p)^{1/2}[(\hat{v} + \lambda)\hat{\beta}_j - \pm \hat{t}w_j]\}_{j=1, \dots, p}$ (as in (6.6)) for the null covariates ($j \in [p] : w_j = 0$) collected over the 50 repetitions (the QQ-plot thus featuring $50(p - s)$ points), and for the non-nulls ($j \in [p] : w_j \neq 0$) (the QQ-plot thus featuring 50s points).

Proposition 3.1. Assume that $\ell_{y_0}^l$ is 1-Lipschitz for all $y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}$ and that (2.1) holds for some $\tau > 0$ and positive definite $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. Then for any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ the function $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \cdot)$ is differentiable almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with derivatives

$$(\partial/\partial x_{ij})\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) = \hat{\mathbf{A}}(\mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\beta}_j)$$

where $\mathbf{D} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{diag}(\ell_{\mathbf{y}}''(\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ and some matrix $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with

$$(3.3) \quad \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\|_{op} \leq (n\tau)^{-1}$$

and such that the following holds: If $\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ we have

$$(3.4) \quad \begin{aligned} 0 \leq \hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} \leq n & \quad \text{where } \hat{\mathbf{d}}\mathbf{f} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}], \\ \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}]/(1 + \hat{c}) \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] & \quad \text{where } \mathbf{V} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{c} = \frac{1}{n\tau} \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2$, while if $\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ we have the slightly weaker

$$(3.5) \quad -\hat{c} \leq \text{df} \leq n + \hat{c},$$

$$(3.6) \quad -4\hat{c} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}]/(1 + \hat{c}) \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] + 4\hat{c}.$$

Proof of Proposition 3.1. Throughout, let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be fixed. Let $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with corresponding minimizers $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}), \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}})$, for the same response vector $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Let also $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ be the counterpart of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ for $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$. The KKT conditions read $\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in n \partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \in n \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. Multiplying by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and taking the difference we find

$$(7.1) \quad \begin{aligned} & n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) + (\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) \\ &= (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T [\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}] + (\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \\ &= (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}). \end{aligned}$$

Note that by convexity of g and of ℓ , the two terms in the first line are non-negative. If g is strongly convex ($\tau > 0$), the first term on the first line is bounded from below as follows: $\mu \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \leq n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ for some constant $\mu > 0$ (e.g, $\mu = \phi_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma})\tau n$ works). For the second term in the first line of (7.1),

$$(7.2) \quad \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 = \|\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2 \leq (\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$$

since ℓ'_{y_0} is increasing and 1-Lipschitz for all $y_0 \in \mathbb{R}$. Using $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^T (\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) \leq \|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)$ we find

$$\mu \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \leq \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \|\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| + \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|.$$

Since $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is continuous as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is the unique minimizer, by strong convexity, of the continuous objective function $L_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b}) + g(\mathbf{b})$, by continuity $\sup_{\mathbf{X} \in K} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})\| + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})\|$ is bounded for any compact K . This proves that $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is Lipschitz in any compact and differentiable almost everywhere in $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ by Rademacher's theorem.

Now assume that $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is differentiable at \mathbf{X} and we study the directional derivative in some fixed direction $\dot{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$. Let $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \frac{d}{dt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}})|_{t=0}$. Then we have $\frac{d}{dt} (\mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}})|_{t=0} = \mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\frac{d}{dt} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}})|_{t=0} = -\mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ by the chain rule. By bounding $n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T (\partial g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \partial g(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}))$ from below by $n\tau \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|^2$ in (7.1) for $\tilde{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X} + t \dot{\mathbf{X}})$, dividing by t^2 and taking the limit as $t \rightarrow 0$, we find

$$\tau n \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 + (\mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \leq \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{D}(\mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

Equivalently, noting that the terms $(\dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})^T \mathbf{D}(\dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + \mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ cancel out,

$$(7.3) \quad \tau n \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \leq \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) = \dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.$$

The matrix $n\tau \boldsymbol{\Sigma} + \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}$ is positive definite thanks to $\tau > 0$. Thus $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = 0$ for every direction $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \dot{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = 0$. We have established the inclusion of kernel of linear mappings $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$

$$\ker(\dot{\mathbf{X}} \mapsto \mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}})) \subset \ker(\dot{\mathbf{X}} \mapsto \dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}}).$$

This implies the existence of $\hat{\mathbf{A}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with $\ker(\hat{\mathbf{A}})^\perp \subset \text{Range}(\mathcal{L}(\cdot)) = \{\mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}), \dot{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}\}$ such that $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}})$. The choice $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_j^T$ for canonical basis vectors $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ gives the desired formula for $(\partial/\partial x_{ij}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$.

Inequality (7.3) implies that for all $\mathbf{u} \in \text{Range}(\mathcal{L}(\cdot)) \supset \ker(\hat{\mathbf{A}})^\perp$,

$$(7.4) \quad \tau n \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{u}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{u}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{u}^T \hat{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{u}.$$

Let \mathbf{v} with $\|\mathbf{v}\| = 1$ such that $\|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op} = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{v}\|$ and $\mathbf{v} \in \ker(\hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2})^\perp$. Then $\mathbf{u} = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{v}$ satisfies $\|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op} = \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{u}\|$ and $\mathbf{u} \in \ker(\hat{\mathbf{A}})^\perp$ with $\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{u}\| = 1$, so that the previous display gives

$$\tau n \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op}^2 \leq \mathbf{u}^T \hat{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{u} \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op}$$

which proves (3.3).

We now bound $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]$ from below. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we would like to find some $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ with $\mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}$. Consider $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ of the form $\mathbf{S} \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X}$ for symmetric $\mathbf{S} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$. Then $\mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{S} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. Since for any two vectors \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} of the same dimension, there exists a symmetric \mathbf{S} such that $\mathbf{S} \mathbf{a} = \mathbf{b}$, if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ then we can always find some $\dot{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v} = \mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}})$ and

$$\tau n \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}\|^2 \leq \mathbf{v}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}}^T \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}.$$

The LHS is further lower bounded by $(\tau n \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1) \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}\|^2$. Since for any $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we can find $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{v}' = \mathbf{D} \mathbf{v}$, this shows that

$$(\tau n \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1) \|\mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}'\|^2 \leq \mathbf{v}'^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}' \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|_{op} \|\mathbf{v}'\|^2 \quad \text{for } \mathbf{M} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}^{1/2}.$$

This proves $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{op} \leq (\tau n \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1)^{-1}$. Thus

$$\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{M} \mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}}] = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{D}^{\frac{1}{2}}] \geq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] (1 - (\tau n \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1)^{-1})$$

for $\mathbf{M}^s = \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{M} + \mathbf{M}^T)$ the symmetric part. We have established the desired lower bound on $\text{Tr} \mathbf{V}$ in the case $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \mathbf{0}$. The previous displays also show that \mathbf{M}^s is psd, so that $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] \leq n$ and $0 \leq \hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}^s] \leq n$ also hold in this case.

The situation is more delicate if $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}$. In this case, $\mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) = (\dot{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} - \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \dot{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{0}$ then $\ker(\hat{\mathbf{A}})^\perp \subset \text{Range}(\mathcal{L}) = \{\mathbf{0}\}$ implies that $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = \mathbf{0}$ and all stated results (3.3)-(3.4) hold trivially. Now assume $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and Denote by \dagger the pseudo-inverse. Define the subspace $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v}' \in \mathbb{R}^n : \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T (\mathbf{D}^{1/2})^\dagger \mathbf{v}' = 0\}$. For any $\mathbf{v}' \in \mathcal{V}$, let $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{D}^{1/2})^\dagger \mathbf{v}'$ so that $\mathbf{D} \mathbf{v} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{v}'$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{v} = 0$. Set $\dot{\mathbf{X}} = \mathbf{v} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^{-2}$ so that $\mathcal{L}(\dot{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{v}'$. By (7.4) and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}^{1/2}$ we find $(\tau n \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1) \|\mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}'\|^2 \leq \mathbf{v}'^T \mathbf{M} \mathbf{v}'$. If $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ is the orthogonal projector onto \mathcal{V} with rank at least $n - 1$, this proves that the symmetric matrix $\mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is positive semi-definite with eigenvalues at most $(\tau n \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1)^{-1}$, so that

$$0 - \|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op} \leq \hat{\text{df}} = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{M}^s] \leq (n - 1) + \|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op}.$$

For \mathbf{V} we find

$$\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{D}^{1/2}] = -\text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}^{1/2} (\mathbf{M}^s - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}}) \mathbf{D}^{1/2}].$$

The matrix $\mathbf{M}^s - \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}}$ is rank at most 2 and operator at most $2\|\mathbf{M}^s\|$. Thus the absolute value of the RHS is at most $4\|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op}$. Since $\mathbf{0}_{n \times n} \preceq \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \mathbf{M}^s \mathbf{P}_{\mathcal{V}} \preceq (\tau n \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1)^{-1} \mathbf{I}_n$, we find the following upper and lower bounds on $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] &\geq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] (1 - (\tau n \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^{-2} + 1)^{-1}) - 4\|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op} = \frac{1}{1+\hat{c}} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] - 4\|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op}, \\ \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] &\leq \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] + 4\|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op}. \end{aligned}$$

We conclude with $\|\mathbf{M}^s\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{M}\|_{op} \leq \hat{c} = (\tau n)^{-1} \|\mathbf{D}^{1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2$ thanks to (3.3). \square

7.2. Rotational invariance, change of variable. In several proofs, the following change of variable will be useful to transform the correlated design problem to an isotropic one such that the index is concentrated on the first component. With this in mind, let $\mathbf{Q} \in O(p)$ be any rotation such that $\mathbf{Q}^T \mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{Q}^T = \mathbf{I}_p$ and $\mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_1$ is the first canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^p . Define

$$(7.5) \quad \mathbf{G} = \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q}^T, \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G}) = \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \underset{\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_{y_i}(\mathbf{g}_i^T \boldsymbol{\theta}) + h(\boldsymbol{\theta})$$

where $h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = g(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{Q}^T \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is convex and where $\mathbf{g}_i = \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{e}_i$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ are the rows of \mathbf{G} . Then \mathbf{G} has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries, $\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$, $h(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) = g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$, $(\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^T (\partial h(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \partial h(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) \geq \tau \|\boldsymbol{\theta} - \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2$ for all $\boldsymbol{\theta}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ thanks to (2.1). Since $\mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_1$ is the first canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^p , the matrix $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T)$ is independent of $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w}$ and thus $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T)$ is independent of \mathbf{y} . Furthermore, by the chain rule we can deduce the derivatives of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ with respect to the entries of \mathbf{G} for a fixed \mathbf{y} from the derivatives (3.7) of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ with respect to the entries of \mathbf{X} :

$$(7.6) \quad \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\partial g_{ij}} = \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\theta}_j, \quad \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{ij}} = -\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_j \hat{\psi}_i - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\theta}_j$$

where $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{Q} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \mathbf{Q}^T$ and the quantities

$$(7.7) \quad \begin{aligned} \mathbf{D} &= \operatorname{diag}(\ell''_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})) &&= \operatorname{diag}(\ell''_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})), \\ \mathbf{V} &= \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{X} \hat{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D} &&= \mathbf{D} - \mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{D}, \\ \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} &= -\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) &&= -\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) \end{aligned}$$

are unmodified by the change of variable. The bound (3.3) then reads $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{op} \leq 1/(n\tau)$.

7.3. Probabilistic tools.

Lemma 7.1 (Variant of [5]). *Let $\mathbf{z} \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ and $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ be weakly differentiable. Then $Z = \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})]\|^{-1} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})] \sim N(0, 1)$ is such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) - \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})\| Z \right)^2 \right] \leq 15 \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \left(\frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_l}(\mathbf{z}) \right)^2 \right].$$

Proof. Variants of the following argument were developed in [6, 8]. A short proof is provided for completeness, and because the exact statement in Lemma 7.1 slightly differ from previous results. Let $Z = \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})]\|^{-1} \mathbf{z}^T \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})] \sim N(0, 1)$, $\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})]$ and $W = \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})\| - \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})]\|$. Then the square root of the left-hand side is $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) - W Z)^2]^{1/2}$ which is smaller than $\sqrt{E_1} + \sqrt{E_2}$ by the triangle inequality, where $E_1 = \mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{z}^T \mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial g_i}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}))^2]$ and $E_2 = \mathbb{E}[Z^2 W^2]$. For E_1 , by [6] applied to \mathbf{g} we find

$$E_1 = \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z})]\|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \frac{\partial f_l}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}) \right] \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial z_i} \right\|^2$$

by the Gaussian Poincaré inequality [9, Theorem 3.20] for the first term and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the second. For E_2 , by the triangle inequality $E_2 \leq \mathbb{E}[Z^2 \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2]$.

Write $Z = \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i z_i$ for some $\sigma_i \geq 0$ with $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i^2 = 1$. By Stein's formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[Z^2 \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2\right] &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma_i z_i Z \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2\right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sigma_i^2 \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2] + \sigma_i \mathbb{E}\left[Z \frac{\partial}{\partial z_i} (\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2)\right] \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2] + 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma_i Z g_l(\mathbf{z}) \frac{\partial g_l}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z})\right] \\ &\leq RHS + 2 \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\sigma_i^2 (Z g_l(\mathbf{z}))^2\right] \right)^{1/2} (RHS)^{1/2} \end{aligned}$$

where $RHS = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(\frac{\partial g_l}{\partial z_i}(\mathbf{z}))^2]$ thanks to $\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2] \leq RHS$ by the Gaussian Poincaré inequality for the first term and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the second term. By completing the square, $(\mathbb{E}[Z^2 \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2])^{1/2} - (RHS)^{1/2} \leq 2RHS$ and $E_2 \leq \mathbb{E}[Z^2 \|\mathbf{g}(\mathbf{z})\|^2] \leq (1 + \sqrt{2})^2 RHS$. Hence $\sqrt{E_1} + \sqrt{E_2} \leq (\sqrt{2} + 1 + \sqrt{2})(RHS)^{1/2}$. \square

Corollary 7.2. *Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ with iid $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ rows with invertible Σ . If $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a weakly differentiable function then for some $Z \sim N(0, 1)$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\left\| \mathbf{a}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p a_k \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) - \|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}\| Z \|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\| \right\|^2 \right] \leq 15 \mathbb{E}_0 \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p a_k \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|^2$$

where \mathbb{E}_0 is either the conditional expectation given $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_p - \frac{\Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T}{\mathbf{a}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a}})$ or the unconditional expectation.

Consequently if \mathbf{w} is such that $\text{Var}[\mathbf{w}^T \mathbf{x}_i] = \mathbf{w}^T \Sigma \mathbf{w} = 1$ and $(\mathbf{X} \mathbf{w}, \mathbf{y})$ is independent of $\mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1}(\mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^T)$ as in the single index model (1.1), then for $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^T$ and $\mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we have

$$(7.8) \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left\| \mathbf{a}^{(j)T} \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X}) - \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p a_k^{(j)} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) - Z_j \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\| \right\|^2 \right]$$

$$(7.9) \quad \leq 15 \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p a_k^{(j)} \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[Z_j^2 \|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\|^2 \right] \left| \|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}^{(j)}\| - \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \right|^2$$

$$(7.10) \quad \leq 15 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{P} \right\|_F^2 + \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[Z_j^2 \|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\|^2 \right] w_j^2$$

where $\Omega_{jj} = \mathbf{e}_j^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{e}_j$ where $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is either the conditional expectation given $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X} \mathbf{w})$ or the unconditional expectation.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $\mathbf{a}^T \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} = 1$. Following the notation and conditioning technique in [7, 5], $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a}$ is independent of $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T)$ so that the conditional distribution of \mathbf{z} given $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T)$ is $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$. The proof is completed by application of Lemma 7.1 to \mathbf{z} conditionally on $\mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T)$ with $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{z} \mathbf{a}^T + \mathbf{X}(\mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{a}^T))$.

Inequality (7.8) is then obtained by application of the first part of the theorem to $\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j$, and the second term in (7.9) appears due to the triangle inequality when replacing $\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{a}^{(j)}\|$ by $\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}$ in the term $Z_j \|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\|$ in (7.8). To obtain (7.10) from (7.9), for the first term $a_k^{(j)} = \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{a}^{(j)} = \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j$, while for the second term $|\|\Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j\| - \Omega_{jj}^{1/2}| \leq \|\Sigma^{-1/2}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_j\|$ by the triangle inequality and $\Sigma^{-1/2}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{P}) \mathbf{e}_j = \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{w} w_j$ has squared euclidean norm equal to w_j^2 thanks to $\|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{w}\| = 1$. \square

7.4. Proofs: Approximate normality and proximal representation for $\hat{\beta}_j$.

Theorem 4.1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled. Then for all $j = 1, \dots, p$, there exists $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ such that*

$$(4.1) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{r}} w_j \right) - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{23}(\delta, \tau, \kappa)}{\sqrt{p}}$$

where \pm denotes the sign of the unknown scalar $t_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w}^T (\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]\Sigma\hat{\beta} + \mathbf{X}^T\hat{\psi})/n$, and $\hat{t} = \max(0, \hat{t}^2)^{1/2}$. If additionally Assumption 4 holds then for some event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow 1$,

$$\frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{1}{\Omega_{jj}} \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left| \sqrt{n} \left(\hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{v}} w_j \right) - \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} Z_j \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{24}(\delta, \tau, \kappa, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.1. We have $\frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} \left[\frac{\hat{\psi}}{\|\hat{\psi}\|} \right] = \|\hat{\psi}\|^{-1} (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\psi}\hat{\psi}^T}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^2}) \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ij}} \hat{\psi}$ by the product rule. Define for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\text{Rem}_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] e_j^T \mathbf{P}^T \hat{\beta}}{\|\hat{\beta}\|} + \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p P_{kj} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{ik}} \left(\frac{\hat{\psi}_i}{\|\hat{\psi}\|} \right) = - \frac{(e_j^T \mathbf{P}^T \hat{\beta}) \hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{V} \hat{\psi}}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^3}$$

where the last equality follows from the derivatives in (3.7). Notice that $\sum_{j=1}^p \text{Rem}_j^2 \leq \|\mathbf{P}^T \hat{\beta}\|^2 \|\mathbf{V}\|_{op}^2 / \|\hat{\psi}\|^2$. With $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X}) = \hat{\psi} / \|\hat{\psi}\|$ in Corollary 7.2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \Omega_{jj} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{e_j^T \mathbf{P}^T (\Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} + \hat{\beta} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}])}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \|\hat{\psi}\|} - \frac{\text{Rem}_j}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \\ & \leq 15 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^2} \left\| \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\psi}\hat{\psi}^T}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}}{\partial x_{ik}} e_k^T \mathbf{P} \right\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \quad \text{by (7.8)-(7.10)} \\ & = 15 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^2} \left\| \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\psi}\hat{\psi}^T}{\|\hat{\psi}\|^2} \right) (\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\hat{\psi}_i + \mathbf{V}e_i\hat{\beta}^T) \mathbf{P} \right\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \quad \text{using (3.7)} \\ & \leq 30 \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}\|_F^2 + 30\|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{P}^T \hat{\beta}\|^2 / \|\hat{\psi}\|^2] + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

thanks to $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{M}e_i\|^2 = \|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2$ for the last inequality. We further use $\min_{k=1, \dots, p} \Omega_{kk} \leq \Omega_{jj}$ and $\Omega_{jj} \frac{u_j}{2} - \text{Rem}_j^2 \leq \Omega_{jj} (u_j - \frac{\text{Rem}_j}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}})^2$ to lower bound the first line, so that

$$(7.11) \quad \text{Rem}_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{e_j^T \mathbf{P}^T (\Sigma^{-1} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} + \hat{\beta} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}])}{\|\hat{\psi}\|} - Z_j \right)^2 \right]$$

$$(7.12) \quad \leq C_{25} \left(\min_{j=1, \dots, p} \Omega_{jj} \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{P}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2 \|\mathbf{P}^T \hat{\beta}\|^2 / \|\hat{\psi}\|^2] + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \right).$$

The matrices inside the Frobenius norms have rank at most n and we bound their operator norm as follows: $\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}$ has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries, $\|\Sigma^{1/2}\hat{\mathbf{A}}\Sigma^{1/2}\|_{op} \leq (n\tau)^{-1}$ by (3.3) and $\|\mathbf{D}\|_{op} \leq 1$ since ℓ'_{y_0} is assumed 1-Lipschitz. By (2.1) and since $\mathbf{0} \in \text{argmin}_{\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p} g(\mathbf{b})$ we have $\mathbf{0} \in \partial g(\mathbf{0})$ and $\hat{\beta}^T \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\psi} = n\hat{\beta}^T \partial g(\hat{\beta}) = n(\hat{\beta} - \mathbf{0})^T (\partial g(\hat{\beta}) - \mathbf{0}) \geq n\tau \|\Sigma^{1/2}\hat{\beta}\|^2$ so that

$$(7.13) \quad n \|\Sigma^{1/2}\hat{\beta}\|^2 / \|\hat{\psi}\|^2 \leq \|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2 / \tau^2.$$

This implies that (7.12) is bounded from above by

$$C_{26} \left(\frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\frac{\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}}{n^{1/2}}\|_{op}^2] \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{P}\|_{op}^2}{\tau^2 \min_{j=1, \dots, p} \Omega_{jj}} + \frac{\mathbb{E} [\|\frac{\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}}{n^{1/2}}\|_{op}^6] \|\mathbf{P}^T \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2}{\tau^4 \min_{j=1, \dots, p} \Omega_{jj}} + \frac{\|\mathbf{w}\|^2}{\min_{j=1, \dots, p} \Omega_{jj}} \right).$$

We then use $\max_{j=1,\dots,p} \Omega_{jj}^{-1} \leq \|\Sigma\|_{op}$ as well as $\|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \leq \|\Sigma^{-1}\|_{op}$ thanks to $\|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{w}\| = 1$, and $\|\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{P}\|_{op}^2 = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{P}\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2 \leq \|\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^2$ since $\Sigma^{-1/2}\mathbf{P}\Sigma^{1/2}$ is an orthogonal projection. Combined with $\mathbb{E}[\|n^{-1/2}\mathbf{X}\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}^6] \leq C_{27}(\delta)$ due to $p/n \leq \delta^{-1}$ (cf. (7.24) below) we have proved that

$$\text{Rem}_* = (7.11) = \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{t_*}{\hat{r}} \right) w_j - Z_j \right)^2 \leq C_{28}(\delta) \kappa (\tau^{-2} + \tau^{-4} + 1).$$

Finally, using $\frac{1}{2}(a+b)^2 \leq a^2 + b^2$ we have with $\hat{t} = (\max(0, \hat{t}^2))^{1/2}$

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\frac{\hat{v}}{\hat{r}} \hat{\beta}_j^{(d)} - \frac{\pm \hat{t}}{\hat{r}} \right) w_j - Z_j \right)^2 \leq 2\text{Rem}_* + 2\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{n(\hat{t} - |t_*|)^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right] \sum_{j=1}^p \frac{w_j^2}{\Omega_{jj}^2}.$$

Since $\text{Var}[\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}] = 1$ and $\max_{j \in [p]} (\Omega_{jj}^{-1}) \leq \|\Sigma\|_{op}$ we find $\sum_{j=1}^p \frac{w_j^2}{\Omega_{jj}^2} \leq \|\Sigma\|_{op} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 \leq \kappa$. Since \pm is the sign of t_* , $|t_*| = \pm t_*$ and the basic inequality $|\pm t_* - \hat{t}|^2 \leq |t_*^2 - \max(0, \hat{t}^2)| \leq |t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2|$ and $\mathbb{E}[n|t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2|/\hat{r}^2] \leq C_{29}(\delta, \tau)\sqrt{p}$ from Theorem 4.4 completes the proof. \square

7.5. Proofs: $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ estimate $(\gamma_*, t_*^2, a_*^2, \sigma_*^2)$. Before reading the following arguments, we recommend to first go through Proposition 6.2 and its short proof. The techniques there are used in a simpler and more restricted setting than the general setting of the present section, but are still representative of the arguments below.

7.5.1. Notation and deterministic preliminary. Consider the change of variable and notation defined in Section 7.2. Next, define

$$(7.14) \quad \tilde{t}^2 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{n^2} \|\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\psi} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \hat{\theta}\|^2 - \frac{p}{n^2} \|\hat{\psi}\|^2$$

and consider $\Gamma_1^*, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_5^*, \Gamma_6^*, \Gamma_7$ defined by the equalities

$$(7.15) \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \frac{\hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\theta}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} - \gamma_* = \Gamma_1^*, \\ \frac{-\hat{t}^2 + t_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} = \Gamma_2, \\ -\hat{v}^2 \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} - \hat{v} \frac{\hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\theta}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \hat{\gamma} = \Gamma_3 + \Gamma_2, \\ \frac{\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\theta}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} - \gamma_* \frac{\hat{\psi}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\theta}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \hat{\gamma} \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} = \Gamma_5^*, \\ \frac{\hat{\theta}_1 (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1)^\top (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\theta} - \gamma_* \hat{\psi})}{n\hat{r}^2} = \Gamma_6^*, \\ \hat{v} \frac{\hat{\theta}_1^2 (\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1\|^2 - n)}{n\hat{r}^2} = \Gamma_7 \end{array} \right.$$

The quantities Γ_i and Γ_i^* will be proved to be of order $n^{-1/2}$ in Lemma 7.5 below, so that each right-hand side is of negligible order. Before proving that the Γ_i, Γ_i^* are at most of order $n^{-1/2}$ under our working assumptions, which follows from techniques already developed in the linear model [4], we explain how well-chosen weighted combinations of the above quantities provide the desired relationships (4.9)-(4.12). We have

$$(7.16) \quad \hat{v}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*) = \Gamma_1^* \hat{v} + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3.$$

Thus, in order to prove (4.9), it is enough to show that moments of $\Gamma_1^*, \Gamma_2, \Gamma_3$ are at most of order $n^{-1/2}$. If the previous display is of negligible order, then $\hat{v} \hat{\gamma} \approx \hat{v} \gamma_*$: This means that after multiplication by \hat{v} , we can replace γ_* by $\hat{\gamma}$ in (7.15) without significantly enlarging

the right-hand sides in the three equations involving $\Gamma_1^*, \Gamma_5^*, \Gamma_6^*$. With this in mind, define $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_5, \Gamma_6$ by

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} - \hat{\gamma} \right) &= \hat{v} \Gamma_1^* + (\gamma_* - \hat{\gamma}) \hat{v} && \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_1, \\ \hat{v} \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} - \hat{\gamma} \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \hat{\gamma} \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right) &= \hat{v} \Gamma_5^* + (\gamma_* - \hat{\gamma}) \hat{v} \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} && \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_5, \\ \hat{v} \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1 (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1)^T (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})}{n\hat{r}^2} &= \hat{v} \Gamma_6^* + (\gamma_* - \hat{\gamma}) \hat{v} \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1 (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{n\hat{r}^2} && \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_6. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_5, \Gamma_6$ are the analogous of $\Gamma_1^*, \Gamma_5^*, \Gamma_6^*$ after multiplication by \hat{v} and replacing γ_* by $\hat{\gamma}$ in the left-hand side of (7.15). Completing the square, we find using Γ_5, Γ_1 and $\hat{\gamma}^2 \hat{r}^2 = \|\hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n$

$$\hat{v} \left[\frac{\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right] = \Gamma_5 - \hat{\gamma} \Gamma_1.$$

Expanding now the square with $\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = (\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}) + \mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1 \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1$ and $a_*^2 = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1^2$,

$$(7.17) \quad \hat{v} \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \frac{\sigma_*^2 + a_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right) = (\Gamma_5 - \hat{\gamma} \Gamma_1) + \Gamma_7 + 2\Gamma_6 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_8.$$

This will justify the approximation $\hat{v} \|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n \approx \hat{v} (\sigma_*^2 + a_*^2) = \hat{v} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2$ when the right-hand side of the previous display is of negligible order.

We now focus on \hat{t}^2 in (7.14), \hat{t}^2 in (3.8), and $t_* = \frac{(\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{n} + \hat{v} a_*$ as defined in Theorem 4.1. We have by simple algebra and the definition of Γ_8 ,

$$(7.18) \quad \frac{\hat{t}^2 - \hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^2} = -\hat{v} \Gamma_8, \quad \frac{t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^2} = \Gamma_2 - \hat{v} \Gamma_8.$$

This will justify the approximation $\hat{t}^2 \approx t_*^2$ in (4.10) when the right-hand sides are negligible. With Γ_1 defined above and using $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1 a_*$, we find $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/n - t_* a_* = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/n - \hat{v} a_*^2$ so that

$$\hat{v} \left[\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \frac{\|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \hat{\gamma} - \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2} \right] = \hat{v}^2 \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \frac{a_*^2 + \sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right) + \Gamma_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma_9$$

with $\Gamma_9 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{v} \Gamma_8 + \Gamma_1$. If the right-hand side is small, this means that the approximation $\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \frac{\|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \hat{\gamma} \approx \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2}$ holds and one can estimate the product $\frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2}$ by the left-hand side of the approximation.

To find an estimate for $a_*^2 = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1^2$, let $W = \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{n\hat{r}^2} + \hat{v} \frac{\|\mathbf{G} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2} - \hat{\gamma}$ so that $\hat{v} (W - \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2}) = \Gamma_9$. Expanding the square $(\hat{v} W)^2 = (\hat{v} \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2} + \Gamma_9)^2$ and noticing that $W^2 = \frac{\hat{t}^2 \hat{a}^2}{\hat{r}^4}$ by definition of $(\hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{r}^2)$, we obtain

$$(7.19) \quad \begin{aligned} \hat{v}^2 \frac{\hat{t}^2 \hat{a}^2}{\hat{r}^4} &= \hat{v}^2 \frac{a_*^2 t_*^2}{\hat{r}^4} + 2\hat{v} \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2} \Gamma_9 + \Gamma_9^2 \\ \hat{v}^2 \frac{\hat{t}^2 (\hat{a}^2 - a_*^2)}{\hat{r}^4} &= \hat{v}^2 \frac{a_*^2 (t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2)}{\hat{r}^4} + 2\hat{v} \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2} \Gamma_9 + \Gamma_9^2 = \hat{v}^2 \frac{a_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} (\Gamma_2 - \hat{v} \Gamma_8) + 2\hat{v} \frac{a_* t_*}{\hat{r}^2} \Gamma_9 + \Gamma_9^2 \end{aligned}$$

by subtracting $\hat{v} \frac{a_*^2 \hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^4}$ on both sides for the last line. This will justify the approximation $\hat{a}^2 \approx a_*^2$ when $\Gamma_2, \Gamma_8, \Gamma_9$ have negligible order and $\hat{v}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{r}^2, a^*$ all have constant order.

7.5.2. All Γ_i, Γ_i^* are of order at most $n^{-1/2}$. Controlling the terms Rem_i relies on the two following probabilistic propositions developed for analysing M-estimators in linear models.

Proposition 7.3. [Theorem 2.6 in [3]] Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times Q}$ be a matrix with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries. Let $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}^{K \times Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ be weakly differentiable such that $\|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Z})\| \leq 1$ almost surely. Then, with \mathbf{e}_q the q -th canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^Q ,

$$(7.20) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| Q \|\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Z})\|^2 - \sum_{q=1}^Q \left(\mathbf{e}_q^T \mathbf{Z}^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Z}) - \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\partial u_k}{\partial z_{kq}}(\mathbf{Z}) \right)^2 \right| \leq C_{30} (\sqrt{Q} (1 + \Xi^{1/2}) + \Xi)$$

where $\Xi = \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^Q \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial z_{kq}}(\mathbf{Z}) \right\|^2$.

Proposition 7.4. [Proposition 2.5 in [3]] Let $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times Q}$ be a matrix with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries. Let $\mathbf{f} : \mathbb{R}^{K \times Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^Q$, $\mathbf{u} : \mathbb{R}^{K \times Q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^K$ be weakly differentiable. Then, omitting the dependence on \mathbf{Z} in $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Z})$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{Z})$ and their derivatives,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f} - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\partial (f_q u_k)}{\partial z_{kq}} \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \|\mathbf{f}\|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^Q \left\| \mathbf{f} \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}^T}{\partial z_{kq}} + \left(\frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial z_{kq}} \right) \mathbf{u}^T \right\|_F^2 \right].$$

Lemma 7.5. Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled. Then $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_1^{*2} + \Gamma_3^2 + \Gamma_5^{*2} + \Gamma_6^{*2} + \Gamma_7^2] \leq C_{31}(\delta, \tau)/n$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_2|] \leq C_{32}(\delta, \tau)/\sqrt{n}$.

Let us recall some bounds that will be useful throughout the proof:

$$(7.21) \quad \|\mathbf{V}\|_{op} \leq 1 + \|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / \tau \quad [\text{by (3.3) and def. of } \mathbf{V} \text{ in (3.4)}],$$

$$(7.22) \quad |\hat{v}| = \left| \frac{\text{Tr} \mathbf{V}}{n} \right| \leq n(1 + \|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / \tau) \quad [\text{by (7.21) or (3.6)}],$$

$$(7.23) \quad \frac{n \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} = \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\hat{r}^2} \leq \|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / \tau^2 \quad [\text{see (7.13)}],$$

$$(7.24) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|n^{-1/2} \mathbf{G}\|_{op}^c] \leq C_{33}(\delta, c)$$

for any absolute constant $c \geq 1$. Here the last line follows, for instance, from [36, Corollary 7.3.3] or [15, Theorem II.13]. The bound on $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_2|]$ follows from Proposition 7.3 while the bounds $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_1^{*2}]$, $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_3^2]$, $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_5^{*2}]$, $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_6^{*2}]$ are consequences of Proposition 7.4.

Proof of Lemma 7.5. Proof of $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_7^2] \leq C_{34}(\delta, \tau)/n$. By the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, with $\|\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1\|^2 \sim \chi_n^2$ we have $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_7^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[(\chi_n^2 - n)^4]^{1/2} \mathbb{E}[\hat{v}^4 \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_1^8 / \hat{r}^8]^{1/2} / n^2$. Next, $\mathbb{E}[(\chi_n^2 - n)^4]^{1/4} \leq C_{35} \sqrt{n}$ by concentration properties of the χ_n^2 distribution, and $\mathbb{E}[\Gamma_7^2] \leq C_{36}(\delta, \tau)/n$ is obtained by combining (7.22)-(7.24). \square

Proof of $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_2|] \leq C_{37}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2}$. We apply Proposition 7.3 with respect to the Gaussian matrix \mathbf{G} with the first column removed. By construction, since \mathbf{y} is independent of the submatrix of \mathbf{G} made of columns indexed in $\{2, \dots, p\}$, we are in a position to apply Proposition 7.3 conditionally on $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1)$ where \mathbf{e}_1 is the first canonical basis vector in \mathbb{R}^p . The choice $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} / \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ in Proposition 7.3 yields

$$(7.25) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| (p-1) - \sum_{j=2}^p (\mathbf{e}_j^T \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{u} - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial g_{ij}})^2 \right| \leq C_{38}(1 + \sqrt{\Xi}) \sqrt{p} + C_{39} \Xi$$

where $\Xi = \mathbb{E} \sum_{j=2}^p \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{u}}{\partial g_{ij}} \right\|^2$. By (7.6) and the chain rule,

$$(\partial / \partial g_{ij}) \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \right) = (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}) [-D \mathbf{G} \tilde{\mathbf{A}} \mathbf{e}_j \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_i - \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j]$$

so that

$$(7.26) \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial u_i}{\partial g_{ij}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ij}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_i}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \right) = - \frac{\text{Tr}[(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}) \mathbf{V}] \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_j}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|}$$

in the left-hand side of (7.25). In the right-hand side of (7.25),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=2}^p \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ij}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \right) \right\|^2 &\leq \frac{1}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=2}^p \left\| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{ij}} \right\|^2 \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=2}^p \left(\frac{\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\mathbf{e}_j\|^2 \hat{\psi}_i^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} + \frac{\|\mathbf{V}\mathbf{e}_i\|^2 \hat{\theta}_j^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \right) \\
(7.27) \qquad \qquad \qquad &\leq 2(\|\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}\tilde{\mathbf{A}}\|_F^2 + n\|\mathbf{V}\|_{op}^2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2 / \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Using inequalities (7.21)-(7.23) we find

$$\Xi \leq 2\mathbb{E}[n\|\mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / (n\tau)^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[(1 + \|n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / \tau)^2 \|n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G}\|_{op}^2 / \tau^2] \leq C_{40}(\delta, \tau).$$

Thanks to (7.24) this yields

$$(7.28) \quad \mathbb{E} \left| (p-1) - \frac{\|\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} + \frac{(\mathbf{e}_1^T \mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]\mathbf{e}_1^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \right| \leq C_{41}(\delta, \tau) \sqrt{p}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = (\mathbf{I}_n - \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T / \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2)\mathbf{V}$. We have $\mathbf{e}_1^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^T \boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1 = \mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \mathbf{X}\mathbf{w}$ and $\|\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\| = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2} \mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|$ since $\mathbf{Q} \in O(p)$ is a rotation. Note that $p-1$ can be replaced by p in the left-hand side by changing the right-hand side constant if necessary. It remains to show that we can replace $\text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]$ by $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]$ in (7.28). Thanks to $\|\mathbf{a}\|^2 - \|\mathbf{b}\|^2 = 2(\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b})^T(\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b})$ we have with $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1\mathbf{e}_1^T$

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\|\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\|^2 - \|\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})\|^2) / \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \\
&= (\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{V} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^T \mathbf{P} (2\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + (\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] + \text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}])\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})) / \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^4
\end{aligned}$$

which is smaller in absolute value than $2\|\mathbf{V}\|_{op}(\|\mathbf{G}\|_{op}\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| + n\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2)$. Thanks to the bounds (7.21)-(7.23) and $\mathbb{E}[\|n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G}\|_{op}^6] \leq C_{42}(\delta)$, by the triangle inequality $\text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}]$ in (7.28) can be replaced by $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]$. We have thus established

$$n\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{t^2 - t_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \right| = \mathbb{E} \left| p - \frac{\|\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} + \frac{(\mathbf{e}_1^T \mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]\mathbf{e}_1^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}})^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \right| \leq C_{43}(\delta, \tau) \sqrt{p}$$

or equivalently $\mathbb{E}|\Gamma_2| \leq C_{44}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2}$. \square

Proof of $\mathbb{E}[\|\Gamma_6^*\|^2] \leq C_{45}(\delta, \tau)/n$. Let $K = n, Q = p-1$ and let \mathbf{Z} be the matrix \mathbf{G} with the first column removed. Then \mathbf{Z} is independent of $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1)$ and Proposition 7.4 is applicable conditionally on $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1)$. Chose $\mathbf{f} = (\frac{\hat{\theta}_j}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|})_{j=2, \dots, p}$ valued in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1$ valued in \mathbb{R}^n . Here, \mathbf{u} has zero derivatives with respect to \mathbf{Z} , and for the denominator in \mathbf{f} we have $\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ij}}(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-1}) = -\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-3} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{ij}}$. Then in the left-hand side, using the derivatives in (7.6) we have $\mathbf{u}^T \mathbf{Z} \mathbf{f} - \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{q=1}^Q \frac{\partial (f_q u_k)}{\partial z_{kq}} = \text{Rem}_6 + \text{Rem}'_6 + \text{Rem}''_6$ where $\text{Rem}_6 = \sqrt{n} \Gamma_6^* \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{\theta}_1} = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-1} [(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1)^T (\mathbf{G}\mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}]\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}})]$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Rem}'_6 &= \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-1} [\mathbf{A}_{11}(\mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1)^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^T \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \mathbf{A} \mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1] \\
\text{Rem}''_6 &= \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-3} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T (\mathbf{D}\mathbf{G}\mathbf{A}\mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T + \mathbf{V}\|\mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2) \mathbf{G}\mathbf{e}_1].
\end{aligned}$$

Here, Rem''_6 comes from differentiation of the denominator in \mathbf{f} . Now, Rem'_6 and Rem''_6 both have second moment bounded by $C_{46}(\delta, \tau)$ thanks to (7.23), (3.3) and (7.24). In the right-hand side of Proposition 7.4, $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \|\mathbf{f}\|^2$ has expectation smaller than $C_{47}(\delta, \tau)$ again thanks to (7.23) and (7.24). The derivative term in the right-hand side of Proposition 7.4 is bounded by $C_{48}(\delta, \tau)$ by explicitly computing the derivatives using (7.6) and using again (7.23), (3.3). \square

Bounds on $\Gamma_1^*, \Gamma_3, \Gamma_5^*$ are obtained similarly by the following applications of Proposition 7.4. As the precise calculations using (3.3)-(7.24) follow the same arguments as for Γ_2, Γ_6^* above, we omit the details.

Proof of $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_1^*|^2] \leq C_{49}(\delta, \tau)/n$. The bound on Γ_1^* is obtained similarly using Proposition 7.4 with the same \mathbf{Z} , this time with \mathbf{f} valued in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} with components $f_j = \sqrt{n}\hat{\theta}_j/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ for each $j = 2, \dots, p$ and $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$.

Proof of $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_3|^2] \leq C_{50}(\delta, \tau)/n$. The bound on Γ_3 is obtained similarly using Proposition 7.4 with the same \mathbf{Z} , this time with \mathbf{f} valued in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} with components $f_j = e_j^T(n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G})^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ for each $j = 2, \dots, p$ and $\mathbf{u} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$.

Proof of $\mathbb{E}[|\Gamma_5^*|^2] \leq C_{51}(\delta, \tau)/n$. The bound on Γ_5^* is obtained similarly using Proposition 7.4 with the same \mathbf{Z} , this time with \mathbf{f} valued in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} with components $f_j = \sqrt{n}\hat{\theta}_j/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ for each $j = 2, \dots, p$ and $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{G}\mathbf{P}_1^\perp\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$. \square

Theorem 4.4. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 hold. Let $(\hat{r}, \hat{v}, \hat{\gamma}, \hat{t}^2, \hat{a}^2, \hat{\sigma}^2)$ be as in (3.8), and let (t_*, a_*, σ_*) be as in Theorems 4.1 and 4.3. Then*

$$(4.9) \quad \mathbb{E}[|\hat{v}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*)|] \leq C_{52}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.10) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{\hat{r}^2}|\hat{t}^2 - t_*^2|\right] \leq C_{53}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.11) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{|\hat{v}|}{\hat{r}^2}\left|\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2\right|\right] \leq C_{54}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2},$$

$$(4.12) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{\hat{v}^2\hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^4}(|\hat{a}^2 - a_*^2| + |\hat{\sigma}^2 - \sigma_*^2|)\right] \leq C_{55}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2}.$$

If additionally Assumption 4 holds, then there exists an event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \rightarrow 1$ such that

$$(4.13) \quad \mathbb{E}\left[I_E\left(|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*| + |\hat{t}^2 - t_*^2| + \left|\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2\right|\right)\right] \leq C_{56}(\delta, \tau, \ell)n^{-1/2}.$$

Proof of Theorem 4.4. Using (3.3) and (7.21)-(7.23), we have almost surely

$$(7.29) \quad \max\{|\hat{\gamma}|, |\gamma_*|, |\hat{v}|, \left|\frac{\hat{\theta}^2}{\hat{r}^2}\right|, \left|\frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2}\right|, \frac{\|\mathbf{G}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2}, \frac{\|\mathbf{G}\mathbf{P}_1^\perp\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{n\hat{r}^2}, \frac{t_*^2 + \hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^2}\} \leq C_{57}(\delta, \tau)(1 + \|\frac{\mathbf{G}}{\sqrt{n}}\|_{op}^2)^c$$

for some numerical constant $c \geq 1$. The event $\bar{E} = \{\|n^{-1/2}\mathbf{G}\|_{op} \leq 2 + \delta^{-1/2}\}$ has exponentially large probability, $\mathbb{P}(\bar{E}^c) \leq e^{-n/2}$, by [15, Theorem II.13]. Let

$$\text{Rem} = |\hat{v}(\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*)| + \frac{1}{\hat{r}^2}|\hat{t}^2 - t_*^2| + \frac{|\hat{v}|}{\hat{r}^2}\left|\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma}\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2\right| + \frac{\hat{v}^2\hat{t}^2}{\hat{r}^4}|\hat{a}^2 - a_*^2|.$$

Using (7.16), (7.17), (7.18) and (7.19) for the first term and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the second, we find

$$\mathbb{E}\text{Rem} \leq \mathbb{E}[I_{\bar{E}}\text{Rem}] + \mathbb{E}[I_{\bar{E}^c}\text{Rem}] \leq C_{58}(\gamma, \tau)\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\Gamma}| + \mathbb{P}(\bar{E}^c)^{1/2}E[\text{Rem}^2]^{1/2}$$

where $\tilde{\Gamma} = \max\{|\Gamma_1^*|, |\Gamma_2|, |\Gamma_3|, |\Gamma_5^*|, |\Gamma_6^*|, |\Gamma_7|\}$. Lemma 7.5 shows that $\mathbb{E}|\tilde{\Gamma}| \leq C_{59}(\delta, \tau)n^{-1/2}$. By (7.29) and (7.24) we have $\mathbb{E}\text{Rem}^2 \leq C_{60}(\delta, \tau)$ so that the exponential small probability of \bar{E}^c completes the proof of (4.9)-(4.12).

Under the additional Assumption 4, we have $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n \leq 1$ hence by (7.23) and in \bar{E} , $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2 \leq C_{61}(\delta, \tau)$ and $\|\mathbf{G}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2/n \leq C_{62}(\delta, \tau)$. Hence with $u_i = e_i^T\mathbf{G}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, there exists at least $n/2$ indices $i \in [n]$ such that $|u_i| \leq K$ for some constant $K = C_{63}(\delta, \tau)$. By Assumption 4, continuity and compactness, there exists deterministic constants $c_*, m_* > 0$ depending only on K and the loss ℓ such that $\inf_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}: |u| \leq K} \ell''_{y_0}(u) \geq c_*$ and $\inf_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}: |u| \leq K} \ell'_{y_0}(u)^2 \geq m_*$. Since at least $n/2$ components u_i are such that $|u_i| \leq K$, this implies $\hat{r}^2 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2/n \geq m_*/2$ and $\text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] = \sum_{i=1}^n \ell''_{y_i}(u_i) \geq (n/2)c_*$. The lower bound in (3.6) then yields $n\hat{v} = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \geq C_{64}(\delta, \tau)\text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}] - C_{65}(\delta, \tau) \geq nC_{66}(\delta, \tau, c_*) = nC_{67}(\delta, \tau, \ell)$ for $n \geq C_{68}(\delta, \tau, \ell)$. In this event, $\hat{v} \geq C_{69}(\delta, \tau, \ell) > 0$ and the proof of (4.13) is complete. \square

7.6. Proofs: Proximal representation for predicted values.

Theorem 4.3. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled. Define $a_* = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, $\sigma_*^2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - a_*^2$ and $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$. Then*

$$(4.8) \quad \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{\hat{r}^2} \left| \mathbf{x}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \text{prox}[\gamma_* \ell_{y_i}(\cdot)](a_* U_i + \sigma_* Z_i) \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{70}(\delta, \tau)}{n}$$

where $U_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{w}$ and Z_i are independent $N(0, 1)$ random variables.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Consider the change of variable and notation defined in Section 7.2. Then (4.8) holds if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{r}^{-2} (\mathbf{g}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \text{prox}[\text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}] \ell_{y_i}(\cdot)](a_* U_i + \sigma_* Z_i))^2] \leq C_{71}(\delta, \tau, \kappa) / \sqrt{n}$$

for independent standard normals U_i, Z_i where U_i is the $(i, 1)$ element of the matrix \mathbf{G} . Furthermore the quantities in (3.8) can be expressed in terms of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \mathbf{G}$; we thus work with $\mathbf{G}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}$ and its derivatives instead of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. Next, we have the decomposition

$$\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{g}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = a_* U_i + \hat{r} \mathbf{z}_i^T \mathbf{f}$$

where we define $a_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{e}_1^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \mathbf{w}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, the standard normal $\mathbf{z}_i \sim N(0, \mathbf{I}_{p-1})$ as $\mathbf{z}_i = (g_{ik})_{k=2, \dots, p}$ and $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ as $\mathbf{f} = (\frac{\hat{\theta}_k}{\hat{r}})_{k=2, \dots, p}$. We apply Lemma 7.1 conditionally on $(\mathbf{y}, (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^T) \mathbf{G}, G_{i1})$. Since \mathbf{z} is independent of $(\mathbf{y}, (\mathbf{I}_n - \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^T) \mathbf{G}, G_{i1})$, the expectations in Lemma 7.1 are simply integrals with respect to the Gaussian measure of \mathbf{z} . Rewriting Lemma 7.1 with the notation of the present context yields

$$(7.30) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{z}_i^T \mathbf{f} - \frac{\sigma_*}{\hat{r}} Z_i - \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \left(\frac{\hat{\theta}_k}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| / \sqrt{n}} \right) \right)^2 \right] \leq C_{72} \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=2}^p \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\| / \sqrt{n}} \right) \right\|^2$$

where $\sigma_* = \|\mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|$ for $\mathbf{P}_1^\perp \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T)$. We focus first on the sum in the left-hand side. By the product rule

$$(7.31) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \right) = \frac{1}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \right] - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^3} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \right] \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}},$$

the derivatives (7.6), the definition of γ_*, \hat{r} and $\sum_{k=2}^p \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_k = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{A}] - \mathbf{A}_{11}$,

$$(7.32) \quad \begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\theta}_k}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \right) - \frac{\gamma_*}{\hat{r}} \hat{\psi}_i &= -\frac{\mathbf{A}_{11} \hat{\psi}_i}{\hat{r}} - \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\theta}_k}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^3} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{ik}} \\ &= -\frac{\mathbf{A}_{11} \hat{\psi}_i}{\hat{r}} + \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^3} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \left(\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{P}_1^\perp \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \hat{\psi}_i + \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i \sigma_*^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

For the first term on the right-hand side, all $i = 1, \dots, n$ have a symmetric role so that $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{11}^2 \frac{\hat{\psi}_i^2}{\hat{r}^2}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{11}^2 \frac{\hat{\psi}_l^2}{\hat{r}^2}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{A}_{11}^2]$ since $\hat{r}^2 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 / n$. By a similar symmetry argument for the second term on the right-hand side,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{n \sigma_*^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^4} \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}\|_{op}^2 \hat{\psi}_i^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{n \sigma_*^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^4} \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}\|_{op}^2 \hat{\psi}_l^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\sigma_*^2}{\hat{r}^2} \|\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A}\|_{op}^2 \right]$$

and the third term in the right-hand side, again by symmetry, satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[n \sigma_*^4 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-6} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\sigma_*^4 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-6} \|\mathbf{V}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[\sigma_*^4 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^{-4} \|\mathbf{V}\|_{op}^2].$$

The bounds (3.3), (7.21) and (7.23) thus show that $\mathbb{E}[(7.32)^2] \leq C_{73}(\delta, \tau, \kappa)/n$. It remains to bound from above the right-hand side of (7.30). By symmetry in $i = 1, \dots, n$, the product rule (7.31),

$$\begin{aligned}
(7.33) \quad \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=2}^p \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{ik}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|/\sqrt{n}} \right) \right\|^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n \mathbb{E} \sum_{k=2}^p \left\| \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{lk}} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|/\sqrt{n}} \right) \right\|^2 \text{ (by symmetry)} \\
&= \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=2}^p \left\| \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\partial g_{lk}} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{\sqrt{n} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^3} \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{lk}} \right\|^2 \text{ (chain rule)} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{2n}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \left(\left\| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\partial g_{lk}} \right\|^2 + \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \left\| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{lk}} \right\|^2 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

by $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$. For the first term, using the explicit derivatives in (7.6) and again $(a+b)^2 \leq 2a^2 + 2b^2$,

$$(7.34) \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{1}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \left\| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}{\partial g_{lk}} \right\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{A}\|_F^2 + \frac{\|\mathbf{A}\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{D}\|_F^2 \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}.$$

while $\sum_{l=1}^n \sum_{k=2}^p \frac{1}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \left\| \frac{\partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\partial g_{lk}} \right\|^2$ is already bounded in (7.27). The bounds (3.3), (7.21) and (7.23) completes the proof of (7.30)² \leq (7.33)² $\leq C_{74}(\delta, \tau, \kappa)/n$. \square

7.7. Proof in the unregularized case with $p < n$.

Theorem 5.1. *Let Assumptions 1, 3 and 4 be fulfilled so that the penalty is $g = 0$.*

(i) *Let $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y}^n$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ be fixed. If a minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ exists at $(\mathbf{y}, \bar{\mathbf{X}})$ and $\bar{\mathbf{X}}^T \bar{\mathbf{X}}$ is invertible, then there exists a neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ exists in this neighborhood, the map $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ restricted to this neighborhood is continuously differentiable, and (3.7) holds with $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mathbf{x}_i^T)^{-1}$.*

(ii) *Assume $\mathbb{P}(\text{minimizer } \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \text{ in (1.2) exists and } \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \leq K) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for some constants $K, \varepsilon > 0$. Then there exists an event E with $\mathbb{P}(E) \geq 1 - \varepsilon - o(1)$ as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ and standard normal $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$ such that, with the adjustments $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{v}, \hat{r}, \hat{a}^2)$ in (5.1),*

$$(5.2) \quad \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left| \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} \left(\hat{\beta}_j - \pm \hat{a} w_j \right) - Z_j \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} \right|^2 \right] \leq \frac{C_{75}(\delta, \kappa, K, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}},$$

with $a_* = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{w}$ and $\pm = \text{sign}(a_*)$. For $\gamma_* = \text{Tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\mathbf{A}}]$ we have

$$(5.3) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[I_E \left(\left| \hat{\gamma} - \gamma_* \right| + \left| \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 \right| + \left| a_*^2 - \hat{a}^2 \right| \right) \right] \leq \frac{C_{76}(\delta, K, \ell)}{\sqrt{p}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 5.1. If a minimizer $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of (1.2) exists and $\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X}$ is invertible, the optimality conditions read $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{X}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \mathbf{0}$ for $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell'_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b})$ (for the derivatives in this paragraph, \mathbf{y} is considered a constant). Then the Jacobian $\frac{\partial \boldsymbol{\varphi}}{\partial \mathbf{b}^T} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ is the symmetric matrix $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \mathbf{b}) \mathbf{x}_i^T$ which is continuous and nowhere vanishing. By the implicit function theorem, there exists a continuously differentiable function $\mathbf{b} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ in a neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{X}}$ such that $\boldsymbol{\varphi}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X})) = \mathbf{0}$ in this neighborhood. In other words, in this neighborhood, $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{X})$ is a solution of (1.2) and $\mathbf{X} \mapsto \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X})$ is continuously differentiable. By differentiation of $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell'_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \mathbf{0}$, we obtain (3.7) with $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mathbf{x}_i^T)^{-1}$. This proves (i).

To prove (ii), the gist of the argument is the following lemma.

Lemma 7.6. Assume $(1 - \alpha) > \delta^{-1} \geq p/n \geq 0.01$. For $I \subset [n]$, let $\mathbf{P}_I = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^T$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_*(I) &= \min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{v}\|=1} \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{X} \mathbf{v}\|}{\sqrt{n}}, & \phi^*(I) &= \frac{\|\mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op}}{\sqrt{n}}, \\ c_*(I) &= \min_{u: u^2 \leq 2K/\alpha} \left[\min_{i \in I} \ell''_{y_i}(u) \right], & m_*(I) &= \min_{u: u^2 \leq 2K/\alpha} \left[\min_{i \in I} (\ell'_{y_i}(u))^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{I \subset [n] : |I| = \lceil (1 - \alpha)n \rceil\}$. For any \mathbf{y} define

$$(7.35) \quad U_{\mathbf{y}}^* = \left\{ \mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} : \hat{\beta} \text{ exists, } \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|^2 < K \right\} \cap \bar{U},$$

$$\text{where } \bar{U} \stackrel{def}{=} \left\{ \bar{\phi}_* < \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi_*(I), \bar{\phi}^* > \max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi^*(I), \bar{c}_* < \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}} c_*(I), \bar{m}_* < \min_{I \in \mathcal{I}} m_*(I) \right\}$$

for some nonrandom $\bar{\phi}_*, \bar{\phi}^*, \bar{c}_*, \bar{m}_* > 0$. For the next statements and the proof, we will use the convention

$$(7.36) \quad C_{77}^*, C_{78}^* \dots \text{ denote constants depending on } (\delta, K, \alpha, \bar{c}_*, \bar{\phi}_*, \bar{\phi}^*, \bar{m}_*) \text{ only.}$$

With the above definitions, then for some $Z_j \sim N(0, 1)$ for each $j \in [p]$,

$$(7.37) \quad \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2}} (\hat{\beta}_j - a_* w_j) - \frac{\hat{r}}{\hat{v}} Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \kappa C_{79}^*,$$

$$(7.38) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left(|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma_*| + |t_*^2 - \hat{t}^2| + \left| \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\beta}\|^2 - \frac{\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \hat{\gamma} \hat{\psi}\|^2}{n} \right| \right) \right] \leq C_{80}^* n^{-1/2}$$

as well as $\mathbb{E}[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} |a_*^2 - \hat{a}^2|] \leq C_{81}^* n^{-1/2}$.

Proof of the lemma. If $I \subset [n]$ is such that $c_0 \leq \min_{i \in I, u \in [-M, M]} \ell''_{y_i}(u)$ and $\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ are such that $u_i, v_i \in [-M, M]$ for $i \in I$ then by the mean value theorem $c_0 \sum_{i \in I} (u_i - v_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n (u_i - v_i) (\ell'_{y_i}(u_i) - \ell'_{y_i}(v_i))$.

Let $\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ be two design matrices and $\hat{\beta}, \tilde{\beta}$ the two corresponding minimizers in (1.2). Then $\frac{1}{n} (\|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta}\|^2) < 2K$ by definition of $U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$, so that by Markov's inequality there is a subset $I \subset [n]$ with cardinality larger than $(1 - \alpha)n$ such that $(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta})^2 + (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \tilde{\beta})^2 < 2K/\alpha$. Applying the previous paragraph to $u_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}$, $v_i = \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^T \tilde{\beta}$ and $M = \sqrt{2K/\alpha}$

$$\begin{aligned} c_*(I) \|\mathbf{P}_I (\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta})\|^2 &\leq (\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta})^T (\ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}) - \ell'_{\mathbf{y}}(\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta})) \quad [\text{by previous paragraph}] \\ &\leq (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})^T (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}})^T \hat{\psi} + \hat{\beta}^T (\tilde{\mathbf{X}} - \mathbf{X})^T (\hat{\psi} - \tilde{\psi}) \quad [\text{by (7.1)}]. \end{aligned}$$

By expanding the square, $\|\mathbf{P}_I \tilde{\mathbf{X}} (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta}) + \mathbf{P}_I (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\beta}\|^2 = \|\mathbf{P}_I (\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta})\|^2$, the first line is no smaller than $c_*(I) n \phi_*(I)^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})\|^2 + 2c_*(I) (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})^T \tilde{\mathbf{X}}^T \mathbf{P}_I (\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \hat{\beta}$. Using also (7.2), we find

$$\begin{aligned} &c_*(I) n \phi_*(I)^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})\|^2 + \|\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi}\|^2 \\ &\leq (2 + 2c_*(I) \phi^*(I)) \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op} \left(\|\Sigma^{1/2} (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})\| \vee \frac{\|\hat{\psi} - \tilde{\psi}\|}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \left(\|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\beta}\| \vee \frac{\|\hat{\psi}\|}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Furthermore $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{X} \Sigma^{1/2}) \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\beta}\| \leq \|\mathbf{X} \hat{\beta}\| \leq \sqrt{2K}$, and since for all $i \in I$ we have $(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta})^2 \leq 2K/\alpha$, the lower bound $\frac{1}{n} \|\hat{\psi}\|^2 \geq (1 - \alpha) m_*(I)$, holds by definition of $m_*(I)$. This implies

$$(7.39) \quad \|\Sigma^{1/2} \hat{\beta}\|^2 \leq \lambda_{\min}(n^{-1/2} \mathbf{X} \Sigma^{-1/2})^{-2} \frac{2K}{(1 - \alpha) m_*(I)} \|\hat{\psi}\|^2 / n.$$

We have thus established that that if $\{\mathbf{X}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}\} \subset U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ then

$$(7.40) \quad \sqrt{n} \|\Sigma^{1/2} (\hat{\beta} - \tilde{\beta})\| + \|\tilde{\psi} - \hat{\psi}\| \leq \frac{C_{82}^*}{\sqrt{n}} \|(\mathbf{X} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) \Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op} \|\hat{\psi}\|.$$

This shows that the mapping

$$U_{\mathbf{y}}^* \Sigma^{-1/2} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \quad \mathbf{G} \mapsto \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})\|}$$

is $L n^{-1/2}$ -Lipschitz in $U_{\mathbf{y}}^* \Sigma^{-1/2}$ for $L = 2C_{83}^*$. By Kirzbraun's theorem, there exists there exists a function $\mathbf{h} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X}) = \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|$ for $\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$, and such that $\mathbf{G} \mapsto \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})$ is $L n^{-1/2}$ -Lipschitz and $\sup_{\mathbb{R}^{n \times p}} \|\mathbf{h}(\cdot)\| = 1$. Applying Corollary 7.2 to \mathbf{h} , we find

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p a_k^{(j)} \frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) + Z_j \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \right|^2 \right] \leq 15 \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{P} \right\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$$

since $\|\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})\| = 1$ for $\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ and $\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} = 0$ in the left-hand side by the optimality condition of the optimization problem (1.2). In the left-hand side, $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{X})$ and $\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}$ coincide in the open set $U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ so $\frac{\partial h_i}{\partial x_{ik}} = \frac{\partial(\hat{\psi}_i/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)}{\partial x_{ik}}$. In the right-hand side, the first term is bounded from above by

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \mathbf{e}_k^T \Sigma^{1/2} \right\|_F^2 \left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \right\|_{op}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \sum_{k=1}^p (\Sigma^{1/2})_{jk} \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}(\mathbf{X}) \right\|^2 \left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \right\|_{op}^2.$$

The directional derivative of $\mathbf{G} \mapsto \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})$ with respect to the (i, j) -th entry of \mathbf{G} is $\sum_{k=1}^p (\Sigma^{1/2})_{jk} \frac{\partial \mathbf{h}}{\partial x_{ik}}$ by the chain rule, so that the previous display is equal to $\left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \right\|_{op}^2$ times the squared Frobenius norm of the Jacobian of the map $\mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n, \mathbf{G} \mapsto \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})$. This Jacobian is a matrix with n rows and np columns, has rank at most n and operator norm at most $L n^{-1/2}$ since $\mathbf{G} \mapsto \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{G} \Sigma^{1/2})$ is $L n^{-1/2}$ -Lipschitz. Since $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F^2 \leq \text{rank}(\mathbf{M}) \|\mathbf{M}\|_{op}^2$ for any matrix \mathbf{M} , this proves that the squared Frobenius norm of this Jacobian matrix with n rows and np columns is bounded from above by L^2 . In summary,

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^p a_k^{(j)} \frac{\partial(\hat{\psi}_i/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)}{\partial x_{ik}} + Z_j \Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \right|^2 \right] \leq 15L^2 \left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \right\|_{op}^2 + \|\mathbf{w}\|^2$$

and the right-hand side is bounded by $(15L^2 + 1) \left\| \Sigma^{-1} \right\|_{op}$ thanks to $\left\| \Sigma^{-1/2} \mathbf{P} \Sigma^{1/2} \right\|_{op} \leq 1$ and $\left\| \Sigma^{1/2} \mathbf{w} \right\| = 1$. Finally, in the left-hand side $a_k^{(j)} = \mathbf{e}_k^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j$ for $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{I}_p - \Sigma \mathbf{w} \mathbf{w}^T$ so that $a_k^{(j)} = I_{i=k} - w_j \mathbf{e}_k^T \Sigma \mathbf{w}$. By (3.7) and the product rule $\frac{\partial(\hat{\psi}_i/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)}{\partial x_{ik}} = \frac{1}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}) \frac{\partial \hat{\psi}_i}{\partial x_{ik}}$,

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p a_k^{(j)} \frac{\partial(\hat{\psi}_i/\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|)}{\partial x_{ik}} = -\text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}] \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|} = -\text{Tr}[\tilde{\mathbf{V}}] \frac{\hat{\beta}_j - (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \Sigma \mathbf{w}) w_j}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{V}} = \mathbf{V} (\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2})$. Above in the rightmost term, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \Sigma \mathbf{w} = a_*$. One can replace $\tilde{\mathbf{V}}$ by \mathbf{V} , incurring an additive error of

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left(\frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T \mathbf{V} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^3} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^T \mathbf{P} \mathbf{e}_j) \right)^2 \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \|\mathbf{V}\|_{op}^2 \frac{\|\mathbf{P}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2} \right] \leq \left\| \Sigma^{-1} \right\|_{op} C_{84}^*$$

where the second inequality follows from (7.39) and $\|\mathbf{V}\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{D}\|_{op} \leq 1$ for $\hat{\mathbf{A}} = (\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \mathbf{x}_i^T)^{-1}$ by definition of \mathbf{V} in (3.4) and because ℓ''_{y_i} is 1-Lipschitz. This completes the proof of

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \Omega_{jj} \mathbb{E} \left[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*} \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}}{\Omega_{jj}^{1/2} \hat{r}} (\hat{\beta}_j - a_* w_j) - Z_j \right)^2 \right] \leq \left\| \Sigma^{-1} \right\|_{op} C_{85}^*.$$

Finally $\hat{v} = \frac{1}{n} \text{Tr}[\mathbf{D}^{1/2}(\mathbf{I}_n - \hat{\mathbf{P}})\mathbf{D}^{1/2}]$ where $\hat{\mathbf{P}} = \mathbf{D}^{1/2}\mathbf{X}^T(\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{D}\mathbf{X}^T)^{-1}\mathbf{X}^T\mathbf{D}^{1/2}$ is an orthogonal projector of rank \mathbf{P} . By definition of $c_*(I)$ and since $\mathbf{D} = \text{diag}\{\ell''_{y_i}(\mathbf{x}_i^T\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}$ we have $c_*(I)\mathbf{P}_I \preceq \mathbf{D}$ in the sense of psd matrices. This proves that

$$(7.41) \quad \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \geq c_*(I) \text{Tr}[\mathbf{P}_I(\mathbf{I}_n - \hat{\mathbf{P}})\mathbf{P}_I] \geq c_*(I)(|I| - p) \geq c_*(I)(1 - \alpha - \delta^{-1})n$$

since $|I|/n \geq (1 - \alpha) > \delta^{-1} \geq p/n$. Hence $\hat{v} \geq c_*(I)(1 - \alpha - \delta^{-1})$. Since $|\ell'_{y_0}| \leq 1$ for all y_0 we also have $\hat{r}^2 \leq 1$. This gives $I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}(\frac{\hat{v}^2}{\hat{r}^2}) \geq I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}(\hat{c}_*^2(1 - \alpha - \delta^{-1})^2)$ and (7.37) is proved.

We now focus on (7.38). It is easier to work with the change of variable described in Section 7.2; in the remaining of the proof let the notation of this section be in force. This is equivalent to assuming that $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \mathbf{I}_p$, $\mathbf{w} = \mathbf{e}_1$, $a_* = \hat{\theta}_1$, and we can leverage the results of the previous paragraph proved for general $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$. We will keep the notation of Section 7.2 to emphasize that we now argue in the isotropic setting. By (7.40) and (7.39), for any fixed \mathbf{y} the mapping

$$H : U_{\mathbf{y}}^* \subset \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{p+n}, \quad \mathbf{G} \mapsto \left(\frac{\sqrt{n}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G})}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G})\|}, \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G})}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{G})\|} \right)$$

is $Ln^{-1/2}$ -Lipschitz for some $L = C_{86}^*$, taking values in an L2 ball of \mathbb{R}^{n+p} of radius at most C_{87}^* by (7.39). The Jacobian of H is a matrix with $n + p$ rows and np columns, of rank at most $n + p$ and operator norm at most $Ln^{-1/2}$ so that the Frobenius norm is at most $\sqrt{n+p}Ln^{-1/2}$ and $\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p \left\| \frac{\partial H}{\partial g_{ij}} \right\|^2 \leq \frac{n+p}{n}L^2 \leq 2L^2$ thanks to $p < n$. By Kirzbraun's theorem, there exists an extension \bar{H} of H such that \bar{H} and H are equal in $U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$, \bar{H} has the same Lipschitz constant as H and is valued in the same Euclidean ball of constant radius. We are thus in a position to apply Proposition 7.3 with $\mathbf{u}(\mathbf{Z}) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ being the last n components of \bar{H} and to $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p-1)}$ equal to \mathbf{G} with the first column removed. The previous display ensures that Ξ in Proposition 7.3 is bounded from above by C_{88}^* so that the RHS of Proposition 7.3 is at most $\sqrt{p}C_{89}^*$, and the same algebra as for Lemma 7.5 in the strongly convex case thus provides $\mathbb{E}[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}|\Gamma_2|] \leq C_{90}^*n^{-1/2}$, by using where necessary $\|\mathbf{V}\|_{op} \leq 1$, $\hat{v} = \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}]/n \leq 1$, (7.39) in the event $U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$. Applying Proposition 7.4 as for Lemma 7.5 to the Lipschitz extension \bar{H} given by Kirzbraun's theorem, we similarly obtain $\mathbb{E}[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}(\Gamma_1^{*2} + \Gamma_3^2 + \Gamma_5^{*2} + \Gamma_6^{*2})] \leq C_{91}^*/n$ by the same algebra as in Lemma 7.5. By the same algebra described after (7.15), we thus obtain (7.38). To prove $\mathbb{E}[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}|a_*^2 - \hat{a}^2|] \leq C_{92}^*n^{-1/2}$, we use the simple relationship $\hat{v}^2(\hat{a}^2, a_*^2) = (t^2, t_*^2)$ (this relationship is specific to unregularized case) and the bound $0 < C_{93}^* \leq \hat{v} \leq 1$ in $U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ (cf. (7.41) for the lower bound on \hat{v}). The bound $\mathbb{E}[I_{\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*}|a_*^2 - \hat{a}^2|] \leq C_{94}^*n^{-1/2}$ implies that (7.37) holds with a_* replaced with $\pm \hat{a}$ provided that the right-hand side is enlarged to $C_{95}^*\sqrt{n}$. \square

Equipped with Lemma 7.6, in order to prove Theorem 5.1, it remains to prove that the event $\mathbf{X} \in U_{\mathbf{y}}^*$ has probability at least $1 - \varepsilon - o(1)$. First, the existence of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\frac{1}{n}\|\mathbf{X}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ in an event of probability $1 - \varepsilon$ is assumed in the statement of Theorem 5.1. It remains to prove that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{U}) \rightarrow 1$ for \bar{U} in (7.35). By Assumption 4, since the loss ℓ is independent of n, p and $\min_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} \ell''_{y_0}(u)$ is positive continuous, it is bounded from below uniformly on the compact $[-\sqrt{2K/\alpha}, \sqrt{2K/\alpha}]$ by some constant \bar{c}_* depending on (K, α, ℓ) only. By the same argument,

$$\min_{u \in [-\sqrt{2K/\alpha}, \sqrt{2K/\alpha}]} \min_{y_0 \in \mathcal{Y}} \ell'_{y_0}(u)^2 > \bar{m}_*$$

for a constant \bar{m}_* depending on (K, α, ℓ) only. Similarly

$$\mathbb{P}(\max_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \phi^*(I) \leq \|\mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\|_{op} \leq \|\mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1/2}\|_{op}/\sqrt{n} \leq \bar{\phi}^*) \rightarrow 1$$

for $\bar{\phi}^* = 1.01(\delta^{-1/2} + 1)$ by standard results on the largest singular value of a matrix of size $n \times p$ with iid $N(0, 1)$ entries. Finally, the constant $\bar{\phi}_* > 0$ is given by the following Lemma, which completes the proof, by choosing $1 - \alpha = \delta^{-1/2}$ to ensure $1 - \alpha > \delta^{-1}$ holds (since here we assume $\delta > 1$).

Lemma 7.7. *If $\frac{p}{n} \leq \delta^{-1} < (1 - \alpha)$ for constants $\delta, \alpha > 0$ and $\mathbf{G} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ has iid $N(0, 1)$ entries then for $\mathbf{P}_I = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbf{e}_i \mathbf{e}_i^T$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\min_{I \subset [n], |I| = \lceil (1-\alpha)n \rceil} \lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{G}}{n} \right) < c_0 \right] \leq \sum_{I \subset [n], |I| = \lceil (1-\alpha)n \rceil} \mathbb{P} \left[\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{G}}{n} \right) < c_0 \right] \rightarrow 0$$

as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ for some constant $c_0 = c_0(\delta, \alpha) > 0$ depending on (δ, α) only.

Proof. By [14, proof of Lemma 4.1] (with $\frac{A}{x}$ there equal to $t > 0$ here), if $N = |I|$

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\lambda_{\min} \left(\frac{\mathbf{G}^T \mathbf{P}_I \mathbf{G}}{N} \right) \leq t^2 \right) \leq \frac{(tN)^{N-p+1}}{\Gamma(N-p+1)} \leq \left(\frac{etN}{N-p+1} \right)^{N-p+1} \frac{1}{(2\pi(N-p+1))^{1/2}}$$

where the second inequality follows from the lower bound on $\Gamma(N-p+1)$ given for instance in [14, p10, Proof of Theorem 4.5]. Taking the union bound over $\binom{n}{N}$ possible sets $I \subset [n]$, it is sufficient to show that for a small enough constant $t > 0$,

$$\binom{n}{N} \left(\frac{etN}{N-p+1} \right)^{N-p+1} (2\pi(N-p+1))^{-1/2}$$

converges to 0. First, $\binom{n}{N} \leq \exp(n \frac{N}{n} \log(e \frac{n}{N}))$ by a standard bound on binominal coefficient, so that $\binom{n}{N} \leq \exp(n \log(e(1-\alpha)^{-1})) \leq \exp((N-p+1)C(\delta, \alpha))$ where $C(\delta, \alpha)$ depends on δ, α only. This proves that the previous display converges to 0 exponentially fast in n if $t = c_0(\delta, \alpha)$ is a small enough constant depending only on δ, α . \square

\square

7.8. Proof: \hat{t}/\hat{v} estimates the signal strength in linear models.

Proposition 6.1. *Let Assumptions 1 and 2 be fulfilled and additionally assume a linear model where observations $y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \varepsilon_i$ are iid with additive noise ε_i independent of \mathbf{x}_i . Set $\mathbf{w} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^* / \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$, and assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$ equals a constant independent of n, p . Then*

$$\hat{t} = \hat{v} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| + n^{-1/2} O_{\mathbb{P}}(1) [\hat{r} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|].$$

Above, $O_{\mathbb{P}}(1)$ denotes a random variable W such that for any $\eta > 0$ there exists a constant K depending on $(\eta, \delta, \tau, \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|)$ only such that $\mathbb{P}(|W| > K) \leq \eta$.

Proof of Proposition 6.1. Recall that $t_* \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{w}^T (\mathbf{X}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} / n + \hat{v} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$. It is easier to work with the change of variable of Section 7.2, so that after the change of variable $t_* = \mathbf{e}_1^T (\mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}] \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}) / n$ with $\mathbf{e}_1 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the first canonical basis vector. Let also $\boldsymbol{\Theta}$ be the true regression vector after change of variable, that is, $\boldsymbol{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{G} \boldsymbol{\Theta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ (i.e., $\boldsymbol{\Theta} = \mathbf{e}_1 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|$). We apply Lemma 7.1 to $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1 \sim N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_n)$ conditionally on $\mathbf{G}(\mathbf{I}_p - \mathbf{e}_1 \mathbf{e}_1^T)$ (i.e., conditionally on the last $p-1$ columns of \mathbf{G}), and to the function $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}) = \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}}{(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 + n \Theta_1^*)^{1/2}}$. Here, we have to take into account that \mathbf{y} is not independent of $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1$, and to take into account the derivatives of \mathbf{y} with respect to $\mathbf{G} \mathbf{e}_1$ conditionally on the last $p-1$ columns of \mathbf{G} and the noise $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial z_i} &= \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\text{denom}^2} \right) \frac{1}{\text{denom}} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial g_{i1}} + \Theta_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} \right\} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \\ &= \left(\mathbf{I}_n - \frac{\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}^T}{\text{denom}^2} \right) \frac{1}{\text{denom}} \left[-\mathbf{D} \mathbf{G} \mathbf{A} \mathbf{e}_1 \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}_i + \mathbf{V} \mathbf{e}_i (\Theta_1 - \hat{\theta}_1) \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\text{Denom} = (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2 + n\Theta_1^2)^{1/2}$ for brevity, and the second line follows from [4, Theorem 2.1]. The matrix in the first parenthesis has operator norm at most 1, so that using $(a+b)^2/2 \leq a^2 + b^2$ gives

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \frac{\partial \mathbf{f}}{\partial z_i} \right\|^2 \leq \|\mathbf{DGAe}_1\|^2 \frac{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}}\|^2}{\text{denom}^2} + \|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2 \frac{(\hat{\theta}_1 - \Theta_1)^2}{\text{denom}^2}.$$

By (7.21), (7.23) and (7.24), the expectation of the previous display is at most $C_{96}(\delta, \tau)/n$. We also have that $|\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial f_i}{\partial z_i} + \frac{\text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}](\hat{\theta}_1 - \Theta_1)}{\text{denom}}| \leq C_{97}(\tau, \delta)O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})$ again thanks to (7.21), (7.23) and (7.24). We conclude that, omitting constants depending only on τ, δ ,

$$\|t_* - \hat{v}\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\| = \frac{|\mathbf{e}_1^T \mathbf{G}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\psi}} + \text{Tr}[\mathbf{V}](\hat{\theta}_1 - \Theta_1)|}{n} \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-3/2})\text{denom} \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1})(\hat{r} + \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|).$$

The bound $|\hat{t} - t_*| \leq O_{\mathbb{P}}(n^{-1/2})\hat{r}$ is provided by (4.10) and completes the proof. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. The lasso risk for gaussian matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(4):1997–2017, 2012.
- [2] Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Nouredine El Karoui, and Bin Yu. Optimal m-estimation in high-dimensional regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14563–14568, 2013.
- [3] Pierre C Bellec. Out-of-sample error estimate for robust m-estimators with convex penalty. *arXiv:2008.11840*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2008.11840.pdf>.
- [4] Pierre C Bellec and Yiwei Shen. Derivatives and residual distribution of regularized m-estimators with application to adaptive tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.05143*, 2021.
- [5] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. De-biasing convex regularized estimators and interval estimation in linear models. *arXiv:1912.11943*, 2019. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.11943.pdf>.
- [6] Pierre C. Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Second-order stein: Sure for sure and other applications in high-dimensional inference. *Ann. Statist.*, 49(4):1864–1903, 2021. ISSN 0090-5364. doi: 10.1214/20-AOS2005. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.04121.pdf>.
- [7] Pierre C. Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. De-biasing the lasso with degrees-of-freedom adjustment. *Bernoulli*, 28(2):713–743, 2022. ISSN 1350-7265. doi: 10.3150/21-BEJ1348. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1902.08885.pdf>.
- [8] Pierre C Bellec, Yiwei Shen, and Cun-Hui Zhang. Asymptotic normality of robust m-estimators with convex penalty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.03826*, 2021.
- [9] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.
- [10] David R Brillinger. A generalized linear model with "gaussian" regressor variables. *A Festschrift For Erich L. Lehmann*, page 97, 1982.
- [11] Emmanuel J Candès and Pragma Sur. The phase transition for the existence of the maximum likelihood estimate in high-dimensional logistic regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(1):27–42, 2020.
- [12] Michael Celentano and Andrea Montanari. Fundamental barriers to high-dimensional regression with convex penalties. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.10603*, 2019.
- [13] Michael Celentano, Andrea Montanari, and Yuting Wei. The lasso with general gaussian designs with applications to hypothesis testing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13716*, 2020.
- [14] Zizhong Chen and Jack J Dongarra. Condition numbers of gaussian random matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 27(3):603–620, 2005.

- [15] Kenneth R Davidson and Stanislaw J Szarek. Local operator theory, random matrices and banach spaces. *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, 1(317-366):131, 2001.
- [16] Lee H Dicker. Variance estimation in high-dimensional linear models. *Biometrika*, 101(2):269–284, 2014.
- [17] David Donoho and Andrea Montanari. High dimensional robust m-estimation: Asymptotic variance via approximate message passing. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 166(3-4):935–969, 2016.
- [18] Nouredine El Karoui. On the impact of predictor geometry on the performance on high-dimensional ridge-regularized generalized robust regression estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170(1-2):95–175, 2018.
- [19] Nouredine El Karoui, Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Chingway Lim, and Bin Yu. On robust regression with high-dimensional predictors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14557–14562, 2013.
- [20] Cédric Gerbelot, Alia Abbara, and Florent Krzakala. Asymptotic errors for convex penalized linear regression beyond gaussian matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04372*, 2020.
- [21] Nouredine El Karoui. Asymptotic behavior of unregularized and ridge-regularized high-dimensional robust regression estimators: rigorous results. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1311.2445*, 2013.
- [22] Bruno Loureiro, Cédric Gerbelot, Hugo Cui, Sebastian Goldt, Florent Krzakala, Marc Mézard, and Lenka Zdeborová. Capturing the learning curves of generic features maps for realistic data sets with a teacher-student model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.08127*, 2021.
- [23] Song Mei and Andrea Montanari. The generalization error of random features regression: Precise asymptotics and the double descent curve. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 2019.
- [24] Léo Miolane and Andrea Montanari. The distribution of the lasso: Uniform control over sparse balls and adaptive parameter tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.01212*, 2018.
- [25] Yaniv Plan and Roman Vershynin. The generalized lasso with non-linear observations. *IEEE Transactions on information theory*, 62(3):1528–1537, 2016.
- [26] Yaniv Plan, Roman Vershynin, and Elena Yudovina. High-dimensional estimation with geometric constraints. *Information and Inference*, page iaw015, 2016.
- [27] Cynthia Rush. An asymptotic rate for the lasso loss. In Silvia Chiappa and Roberto Candrandra, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty Third International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 108 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3664–3673. PMLR, 26–28 Aug 2020. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/rush20a.html>.
- [28] Fariborz Salehi, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. The impact of regularization on high-dimensional logistic regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 12005–12015, 2019.
- [29] Charles M Stein. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *The annals of Statistics*, pages 1135–1151, 1981.
- [30] Mihailo Stojnic. A framework to characterize performance of lasso algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1303.7291*, 2013.
- [31] Pragma Sur and Emmanuel J Candès. A modern maximum-likelihood theory for high-dimensional logistic regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(29):14516–14525, 2019.
- [32] Christos Thrampoulidis, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. Lasso with non-linear measurements is equivalent to one with linear measurements. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3420–3428, 2015.

- [33] Christos Thrampoulidis, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. Precise error analysis of regularized m -estimators in high dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(8):5592–5628, 2018.
- [34] Ryan J Tibshirani. The lasso problem and uniqueness. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7:1456–1490, 2013.
- [35] Ryan J. Tibshirani and Jonathan Taylor. Degrees of freedom in lasso problems. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(2):1198–1232, 04 2012. doi: 10.1214/12-AOS1003. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1003>.
- [36] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [37] Steve Yadowlsky, Taedong Yun, Cory McLean, and Alexander D’Amour. Sloe: A faster method for statistical inference in high-dimensional logistic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.12725*, 2021.
- [38] Zhuoran Yang, Krishnakumar Balasubramanian, and Han Liu. High-dimensional non-gaussian single index models via thresholded score function estimation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3851–3860. PMLR, 2017.
- [39] Qian Zhao, Pragya Sur, and Emmanuel J Candes. The asymptotic distribution of the mle in high-dimensional logistic models: Arbitrary covariance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2001.09351*, 2020.
- [40] Hui Zou, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. On the “degrees of freedom” of the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, 35(5):2173–2192, 10 2007. doi: 10.1214/009053607000000127. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/009053607000000127>.