

Estimation and inference for transfer learning with high-dimensional quantile regression

Jiayu Huang, Mingqiu Wang, and Yuanshan Wu *

Abstract

Transfer learning has become an essential technique to exploit information from the source domain to boost performance of the target task. Despite the prevalence in high-dimensional data, heterogeneity and heavy tails are insufficiently accounted for by current transfer learning approaches and thus may undermine the resulting performance. We propose a transfer learning procedure in the framework of high-dimensional quantile regression models to accommodate heterogeneity and heavy tails in the source and target domains. We establish error bounds of transfer learning estimator based on delicately selected transferable source domains, showing that lower error bounds can be achieved for critical selection criterion and larger sample size of source tasks. We further propose valid confidence interval and hypothesis test procedures for individual component of high-dimensional quantile regression coefficients by advocating a double transfer learning estimator, which is one-step debiased estimator for the transfer learning estimator wherein the technique of transfer learning is designed again. By adopting data-splitting technique, we advocate a transferability detection approach that guarantees to circumvent negative transfer and identify transferable sources with high probability. Simulation results demonstrate that the proposed method exhibits

*Jiayu Huang is Assistant Professor, School of Mathematics and Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, Hubei 430079, P. R. China (E-mail: huang803@ccnu.edu.cn). Mingqiu Wang is Professor, School of Statistics and Data Science, Qufu Normal University, Qufu, Shandong 273165, P. R. China (E-mail: mqwang@qfnu.edu.cn). Yuanshan Wu, the corresponding author, is Professor, School of Statistics and Mathematics, Zhongnan University of Economics and Law, Wuhan, Hubei 430073, P. R. China (E-mail: wu@zuel.edu.cn).

some favorable and compelling performances and the practical utility is further illustrated by analyzing a real example.

Keywords: Debiased estimator; High-dimensional inference; Non-smooth loss function; Robustness; Uncertainty quantification

1 Introduction

Transfer learning, which aims to enhance the performance of the target task by transferring knowledge learned in different but related source tasks, has been demonstrated to be effective for a wide range of real-world applications and attracted increasing attention in communities of machine learning and statistics. To name a few, specific areas of applications include computer vision (Duan, Xu, and Tsang, 2012; Kulis, Saenko, and Darrell, 2011), natural language processing (Prettenhofer and Stein, 2010; Wang and Mahadevan, 2011; Zhou et al., 2014), online display web advertising (Perlich et al., 2014), drug sensitivity prediction (Turki, Wei, and Wang, 2017), clinical trial (Bellot and van der Schaar, 2019; Wang et al., 2022) and so on. See surveys of transfer learning in Pan and Yang (2010), Weiss, Khoshgoftaar, and Wang (2016), and Zhuang et al. (2021) for more examples and discussions. Furthermore, Taylor and Stone (2009) and Zhu, Lin, and Zhou (2023) surveyed work of embedding transfer learning in reinforcement learning and deep reinforcement learning, respectively.

Due to the complexity of real applications, there may exist heterogeneity in the target domain as well as the source domains. In addition, the outliers or heavy tails in the observations may be encountered in some applications. Totally ignoring or even insufficiently accounting for these potential issues may undermine the performance of transfer learning. Quantile regression (Koenker, 2005; Koenker and Bassett, 1978) is a natural and effective tool for tackling the heterogeneity and heavy-tailed model errors simultaneously.

1.1 Main Contributions

We propose a transfer learning approach to accounting for the heterogeneity and heavy-tailed observations under the framework of quantile regression models. Towards reaching these goals, we made the following specific contributions.

We develop the transfer learning procedure for high-dimensional quantile regression models and establish error bounds of the transfer learning estimator, showing that sharper error bounds can be achieved when the sample sizes of the transferable source datasets are much larger than that of the target, a typical scenario in the transfer learning. We further showcase that the proposed transfer learning estimator achieves the nearly weak oracle property of variable selection procedure.

Based on the transfer learning estimator, we construct confidence interval and hypothesis test procedures for individual component of high-dimensional quantile regression coefficients by advocating a double transfer learning estimator, which is the one-step debiased estimator for the transfer learning estimator via orthogonal projection onto the high-dimensional nuisance parametric space wherein the technique of transfer learning is designed again. We establish asymptotic normality of the one-step estimator, whose asymptotic variance can be consistently estimated through histogram approximation of the model error density, which is an inherent but unknown quantity involved in the variance of quantile regression parameter estimation. It is common to employ the bootstrap method to estimate the variance, which however may be computationally intensive and extremely challenging to investigate the consistency of bootstrapped estimator in the regimes of transfer learning and high dimensions. As a useful alternative, we adopt nonparametric approach to directly estimating the model error density and show the consistency of the resulting variance estimation.

It is critical in transfer learning to decide which source datasets are transferable and thus helpful for performance enhancement of high-dimensional quantile regression in the target task. We evaluate the similarity between the target and source tasks via the difference

of their quantile regression coefficients and obtain the transferable source datasets if the corresponding difference is less than a delicately designed level by temporally assuming that these coefficients were known. Consequently, the transferable source datasets are allowed to be varying with different quantile levels, a more flexible scenario in practice while aiming to address the heterogeneity. We further propose a procedure to identify the transferable source datasets. By properly choosing the level of difference, we show the consistency of detection procedure and conclude that the detected transferable sources are contained in the truly transferable ones with probability tending to one. As a result, the proposed transfer learning procedure can be applied in practice with theoretical guarantee.

1.2 Related Literature

Recently, there are substantial advances in theoretical understanding on the transfer learning on the high-dimensional regression models. Bastani (2021) studied transfer learning approach to high-dimensional linear regression models by exploiting a single source dataset, unnecessitating the detection of transferable source datasets among candidate ones. Li, Cai, and Li (2022) proposed a two-step method for estimation and prediction of transfer learning on high-dimensional linear regression models. Specifically, a detection algorithm for consistently identifying the transferable but unknown source datasets was developed and then a contrast regularized estimator anchoring the target task was proposed. Li, Cai, and Li (2023) further extended the two-step method to transfer learning on the Gaussian graphical models with false discovery rate control. Tian and Feng (2022) studied transfer learning on high-dimensional generalized linear models and constructed the corresponding confidence interval for individual regression parameter. Yang et al. (2020) utilized the two-layer linear neural network to combine both source and target datasets and derived the precise asymptotic limit of the prediction risk of transfer learning on the high-dimensional linear models. Cai and Wei (2021) established an adaptive and minimax method for nonparametric classi-

fication in the regime of transfer learning. Xu and Bastani (2021) proposed a novel robust multi-task estimator that improves the efficiency of downstream decisions by leveraging better predictive models with lower sample complexity. Li, Cai, and Duan (2021) proposed a two-way data fusion strategy that integrates heterogeneous data from diverse populations and from multiple healthcare institutions via a federated transfer learning approach. Zhou et al. (2022) proposed the doubly robust transfer learning to accommodate the label scarcity and covariate shift in the binary regression with low-dimensional predictors in the target task. Wang et al. (2022) studied a transfer learning approach to time-to-event data under high-dimensional Cox proportional hazards models by borrowing summary information from a set of health care centers without sharing patient-level information. He et al. (2022) considered transfer learning problem in estimating undirected semi-parametric graphical model. Lin and Reimherr (2022) studied transfer learning on the functional linear regression models and established the optimal convergence rates for excess risk.

Despite the prevalence in high-dimensional data, heterogeneity and heavy tails tend to be insufficiently accounted for by current transfer learning approaches and thus may lead to downstream performances in practice. Quantile regression, naturally offering a convenient approach to modelling the heterogenous impact of covariates on the conditional distribution of response in a comprehensive way as well as hedging against the possible outliers and heavy-tailed model errors, is widely used in applications. On the other hand, although there is a large body of literature on the least squares methods with ℓ_1 -regularization (Tibshirani, 1996) in the past two decades, the advance in ℓ_1 -penalized high-dimensional quantile regression is relatively lagging, mainly due to that the piecewise linear quantile loss is non-smooth and has curvature concentrated at the origin point and thus demanding alternatively different analyzing tools. Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011) established error bounds for ℓ_1 -penalized estimator of high-dimensional quantile regression models, which is further elaborated via adaptively weighted ℓ_1 -penalty (Zheng, Peng, and He, 2015). Alquier, Cottet, and Lecué

(2019) established estimation bounds and sharp oracle inequalities of regularized procedures with Lipschitz loss functions, which include the piecewise linear quantile loss function as a special case. For statistical inference and confidence interval for individual parameter in high-dimensional quantile regression models, Bradic and Kolar (2017) advocated a debiased method wherein the asymptotic variance is estimated via regression rank scores from the perspective of dual problem of quantile loss function. Belloni, Chernozhukov, and Kato (2019) developed an inference procedure based on post-selection estimator and orthogonal score functions to make effect of the estimation of nuisance parameter negligible. This work aims to provide thorough studies on the transfer learning for high-dimensional quantile regression models, including the error bounds for prediction and asymptotic distribution theory for inference.

1.3 Organization and Notation

Section 2 introduces the transfer learning method for high-dimensional quantile regression models when the transferable source datasets are known and establishes error bounds of the transfer learning estimator. We construct confidence interval and hypothesis test procedures in Section 3 and propose the procedure to identify the transferable source datasets in Section 4. We conduct the extensive simulations in Section 5. A real example is analyzed in Section 6, and Section 7 concludes with some remarks. In the Supplementary Material, we gather the proofs of the theoretical results, supporting lemmas, in Appendices A–C, and report additional simulation results in Appendix D.

For ease of exposition, let ℓ_0 -norm $|\cdot|_0$ denote the number of nonzero components of a vector, and $|\cdot|_r$ denote the ℓ_r -norm with $1 \leq r \leq \infty$. Let $\|\cdot\|_1$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denote the 1-norm and ∞ -norm of a matrix, respectively, and let $\|\cdot\|_{\max}$ denote the maximum absolute value among the entries of a matrix. Set the operators $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ as the minimum and maximum eigenvalues of a symmetric matrix, respectively. For a vector \mathbf{v} and an index set \mathcal{I} , let $\mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{I}}$

denote the subvector consisting of the components of \mathbf{v} with their indices in \mathcal{I} . Similarly, for a matrix \mathbf{A} and two index sets \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 , let $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{I}_1\mathcal{I}_2}$ denote the submatrix consisting of the rows and columns of \mathbf{A} with their indices in \mathcal{I}_1 and \mathcal{I}_2 , respectively. In addition, for any vector \mathbf{v} , let v_j denote the j -th component of \mathbf{v} and \mathbf{v}_{-j} denote the subvector formed by the remaining components. For a matrix \mathbf{A} , we can analogously define A_{j_1,j_2} , $\mathbf{A}_{j_1,-j_2}$, \mathbf{A}_{-j_1,j_2} and $\mathbf{A}_{-j_1,-j_2}$ for a row index j_1 and a column index j_2 . Let $\Gamma_{k,\theta}(\mathbf{v})$ denote the vector obtained by inserting a scalar θ between the $(k-1)$ -th and k -th components of a vector \mathbf{v} whereas the trivial case with k equal to 1 or the length of \mathbf{v} can be accordingly defined. For two positive series d_n^\dagger and d_n^* , denote $d_n^\dagger \lesssim d_n^*$ if there exists a universal positive constant $c > 0$ such that $d_n^\dagger \leq cd_n^*$. Denote $d_n^\dagger \asymp d_n^*$ if $d_n^\dagger \lesssim d_n^*$ and $d_n^* \lesssim d_n^\dagger$. Set $I(\cdot)$ as the indicator function. With a slight abuse of notation, let $|\mathcal{A}|$ denote the cardinality of set \mathcal{A} . Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ denote the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal variable, $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ the inverse function of $\Phi(\cdot)$, and $\phi(\cdot)$ the corresponding probability density function. Let $\xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}}$ denote the convergence in distribution.

2 Transfer Learning for Quantile Regression

In the target population, let Y_0 denote the response variable of interest which is associated with a p -vector covariate \mathbf{Z}_0 . For $\tau \in (0, 1)$ fixed, the τ -th conditional quantile function of the response variable Y_0 given \mathbf{Z}_0 is defined by

$$Q_\tau(Y_0 | \mathbf{Z}_0) = \inf\{t \in \mathbb{R} : P(Y_0 \leq t | \mathbf{Z}_0) \geq \tau\}.$$

We consider the linear quantile regression model that takes the form

$$Q_\tau(Y_0 | \mathbf{Z}_0) = \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ is the unknown regression coefficient of interest. For notational simplicity, we suppress the dependence of quantile regression parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ on the specific quantile level

τ throughout the paper but we should keep in mind that related statistical conclusion is τ -dependent, thus providing comprehensive and global interpretation by varying τ over $(0, 1)$. Assume that the target samples $(Y_{0i}, \mathbf{Z}_{0i}), i = 1, \dots, n_0$, are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) according to the target population (Y_0, \mathbf{Z}_0) .

We consider the multiple source transfer learning problem based on quantile regression for the heterogeneous datasets. Specifically, for $k = 1, \dots, K$, let (Y_k, \mathbf{Z}_k) denote the k -th source population and its i.i.d. copies with size of n_k be denoted by $(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}), i = 1, \dots, n_k$. We further consider the linear quantile regression model for the source populations

$$Q_\tau(Y_k | \mathbf{Z}_k) = \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k,$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ is the p -vector of unknown regression coefficients. In the high-dimensional realm, the dimension p is much larger than the sample sizes $n_k, k = 0, 1, \dots, K$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = (\beta_{01}, \dots, \beta_{0p})^\top$ and $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{j : \beta_{0j} \neq 0, 1 \leq j \leq p\}$. The cardinality of set \mathcal{S}_0 is denoted by s_0 , i.e., $|\mathcal{S}_0| = |\boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_0 = s_0$.

If the k -th source quantile regression model enjoys a certain level of similarity to the target one, it may have the benefit of accommodating the target task via properly transferring and exploiting the k -th source dataset. We consider the sparsity of the difference between $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ as a criterion to capture the informative level of the k -th source. Specifically, let the k -th contrast be $\boldsymbol{\delta}_k = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k$, and the k -th source data is viewed as h -transferable if $|\boldsymbol{\delta}_k|_1 \leq h$, where h is a non-negative constant to be specified. Denote the index set of all h -transferable source datasets as $\mathcal{T}_h = \{k : |\boldsymbol{\delta}_k|_1 \leq h, 1 \leq k \leq K\}$. In general, if h is taken to be large, negative transfer tends to happen as some non-transferable sources may be recruited. On the contrary, more restrictive h takes the risk of excluding some transferable sources. Consequently, striking a balance between h and $|\mathcal{T}_h|$ is required by properly choosing h .

For ease of exposition, we define a total loss function for the combined datasets as

$$L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{T}) = \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \rho_{\tau}(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

for any set $\mathcal{T} \subset \{0, 1, \dots, K\}$, where $n_{\mathcal{T}} = \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}} n_k$ and $\rho_{\tau}(t) = t\{\tau - I(t \leq 0)\}$ for $t \in \mathbb{R}$ is the piecewise linear quantile loss function.

We first introduce an oracle transfer learning estimator when \mathcal{T}_h is temporarily assumed to be known. It is motivated by the algorithms in Bastani (2021), Li, Cai, and Li (2022), and Tian and Feng (2022). Specifically, we first develop an initial ℓ_1 -penalized quantile regression estimator which is defined by

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \{L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_{\beta} |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where λ_{β} is the tuning parameter. Although $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ is very crude estimator, it is obtained by combining the target and h -transferable source datasets and beneficial to estimating the target model parameter if properly utilized. Second, we adopt the empirical quantile loss for the target data only to make $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ anchor to the target via correcting the contrast as follows,

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\delta}} \left\{ L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 \right\}, \quad (2.2)$$

where λ_{δ} is the tuning parameter. Thus, we propose the transfer learning estimator for $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ in the target quantile regression model by using $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$. Before we establish the convergence rate of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$, we need to examine to which $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ should converge and what the rate is. Based on the estimating equation theory and by choosing suitable tuning parameter λ_{β} , the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ in (2.1) converges to its probabilistic limit $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$, which is defined via the expected subgradient equation

$$E \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \right\} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (2.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{T}) = \nabla L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{T}) = -\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \left\{ \tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) \right\}$$

for any $\mathcal{T} \subset \{0, \dots, K\}$.

We study the rate of convergence for the estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$. Let $F_k(y | \mathbf{z})$ and $f_k(y | \mathbf{z})$ denote the conditional distribution and density functions of Y_k given $\mathbf{Z}_k = \mathbf{z}$ for $k = 0, \dots, K$, respectively. The domain of \mathbf{Z}_k is \mathcal{Z}_k . Let $\dot{f}_k(y | \mathbf{z})$ denote the derivative of $f_k(y | \mathbf{z})$ with respect to y .

Assumption 1. *There exists a positive constant m_0 such that*

$$\max_{0 \leq k \leq K} \left\{ \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_k} f_k(y | \mathbf{z}), \sup_{y \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_k} \left| \dot{f}_k(y | \mathbf{z}) \right| \right\} \leq m_0.$$

Assumption 2. $|\mathbf{Z}_k|_\infty$ is bounded by some constant B with probability one and the largest eigenvalue of $E(\mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top)$ is also bounded by B^2 for $k = 0, \dots, K$.

Assumption 3. *There exists a positive constant κ_0 such that*

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})} \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top E \{ f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k | \mathbf{Z}_k) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \} \boldsymbol{\delta}}{|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_2^2} \geq \kappa_0 \text{ and } \inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})} \frac{|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_2^3}{E(|\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}|^3)} \geq \kappa_0,$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$ with some positive quantity a_n and index set \mathcal{S} to be specified, where

$$\mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S}) = \{ \mathbf{u} : |\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{S}^c}|_1 \leq 3|\mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + a_n \}.$$

Assumption 4. *Set $\pi_k = n_k / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)$ and denote*

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) | \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right]$$

and

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k = E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) | \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right].$$

Assume that $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^{-1} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k\|_1 \leq C$ for some constant $C > 0$.

Assumption 1 concerns the boundedness and smoothness of density function of model error, which is satisfied with a large class of distributions, including the light-tailed normal distributions, the heavy-tailed Cauchy distributions, and the skewed extreme value distributions. Assumption 2 states the boundness of covariates in the target and source populations,

a common and just a technique condition in high-dimensional data analysis (Ning and Liu, 2017; Yu, Bradic, and Samworth, 2021). It can be replaced with a tail condition by assuming the sub-Gaussian covariates (Li, Cai, and Li, 2022) with extra derivations involved. Indeed, in our simulations in Section 5, we explore setting that \mathbf{Z}_k is multivariate normal distribution and thus $|\mathbf{Z}_k|_\infty$ is not bounded with probability one. Assumption on the bounded maximum eigenvalue of covariance matrix is a basic assumption in high-dimensional data analysis. Assumption 3 imposes a generalized version of restricted eigenvalue condition and restricted nonlinear impact in a more flexible form. Distinctive index set \mathcal{S} and a_n are adaptive to the theoretical results of estimators in different steps. If $a_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n_0, n_k, p \rightarrow \infty$ for $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, assumption 3 approximately mimics the classical restricted eigenvalue condition and restricted nonlinear impact. In addition, we use common lower bounds κ_0 and upper bounds B as well for notational simplicity. Assumption 4 makes sure that the probabilistic limit $\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$ falls in the ℓ_1 -ball centered at β_0 with radius Ch . In the case of linear mean model with homogeneous design \mathbf{Z}_k , it can be simplified to the non-singularity of the covariance matrix of covariates, a very mild assumption. While considering the cases of linear mean regression (Li, Cai, and Li, 2022), generalized linear model (Tian and Feng, 2022), or quantile regression model with heterogeneous covariates, assumption 4 is needed to characterize the differences between the target and source covariates if a faster convergence rate is desired, which is measured by the constant C in the considered quantile regression model. Unless otherwise stated, the limits are taken as $(n_0, n_1, \dots, n_K, p) \rightarrow \infty$.

Theorem 2.1. (Convergence rate of $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$) *Under assumptions 1–4 with $a_n = 4Ch$ and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0$ in assumption 3, if $\lambda_\beta = C_\beta B \sqrt{\log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$ with $C_\beta \geq 4$ and*

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}$$

and

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1 \lesssim s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h$$

with probability tending to one.

We propose the estimator $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ in (2.1) by leveraging the target dataset as well as the h -transferable source ones. Its probabilistic limit $\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$ is a pooled version of parameters $\{\beta_k\}_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h}$. Even if h could be small sufficiently, the inevitable bias arises from the source datasets, which is sparsely corrected in (2.2). The error bounds of the resulting transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\beta}_0$ are established as follows.

Theorem 2.2. (Convergence rate of $\widehat{\beta}_0$ with assumption 4) *Set $\lambda_\beta = C_\beta B(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)^{-1/2} \sqrt{\log p}$ and $\lambda_\delta = C_\delta B \sqrt{\log p / n_0}$ with $C_\beta \geq 4$ and $C_\delta \geq 4$. Under assumptions 1–4 with*

$$a_n = 20Ch + \frac{(192 + 72C_\beta)Bs_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 24 \sqrt{\frac{(4 + 2C_\beta)BChs_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}$$

and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0$ in assumption 3, if

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \quad (2.4)$$

and

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \lesssim s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h, \quad (2.5)$$

with probability tending to one.

Actually, assumption 4 is not a necessary condition to establish the convergence of $\widehat{\beta}_0$. When assumption 4 is absent, we also show the convergence with the sacrifice of a slower

convergence rate and a potential larger order of the tuning parameter. The reason lies in the circumvention of the pooled version of the parameter $\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$, since it may no longer be close to β_0 enough. The specific statement is concluded as follows.

Theorem 2.3. (Convergence rate of $\widehat{\beta}_0$ without assumption 4) *Under assumptions 1-3 with*

$$a_n = 4h + \frac{1344Bs_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 48\sqrt{\frac{3Bhs_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \\ + \frac{1152m_0B^2s_0h}{\kappa_0} + 48\sqrt{\frac{2m_0s_0}{\kappa_0}} Bh$$

and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0$ in assumption 3, if $\lambda_\beta = 4B\sqrt{\log p/(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} + 4m_0B^2h$, $\lambda_\delta = 4B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0h} \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0h} \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \lesssim s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + s_0h \quad (2.6)$$

and

$$\left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{s_0h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \quad (2.7)$$

with probability tending to one.

It is worth noting that when $h = o\left(s_0\sqrt{\log p/n_0}\right)$ and $n_0 = o(n_{\mathcal{T}_h})$, the results in Theorems 2.2 indicate faster convergence rates than the error bounds of the classical ℓ_1 -penalized quantile regression parameter estimator without help of the source datasets (Belloni and Chernozhukov, 2011). Moreover, when $h = o\left(\sqrt{\log p/n_0}\right)$ and $n_0 = o(n_{\mathcal{T}_h})$, Theorems 2.3 elucidates that the source datasets truly improve the theoretical performance of the transfer learning estimator even assumption 4 is not imposed. Obviously, the rate enhancement is mainly due to the size of transferable source datasets $n_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ which can offset the similarity level

h . In addition, $n_0 = o(n_{\mathcal{T}_h})$ is a typical scenario in transfer learning and the rate of h can be tuned.

We further investigate the nearly weak oracle property of the proposed quantile regression transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\beta}_0$. We introduce the population versions for the Hessian-type matrices of the loss functions. Denote

$$\mathbf{H}_0(\beta) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \beta} E \{ \mathbf{S}(\beta; \{0\}) \} = E \{ f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \beta \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \}.$$

Analogously, denote

$$\mathbf{H}_k(\beta) = E \{ f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \beta \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \}, \quad k = 1, \dots, K$$

and

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\beta) = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \mathbf{H}_k(\beta).$$

For ease of exposition, briefly denote $\mathbf{H}_0^* = \mathbf{H}_0(\beta_0)$ and $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* = \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*)$. Some regular assumptions are required to support the nearly weak oracle property.

Assumption 5. *There exists an index set $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}| \leq s'$ and $\left| \beta_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_1 \leq h'$ with $h' = o(1)$.*

Assumption 6. *Assume that*

$$\max \left\{ \left\| \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty, \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \right\} < 1 - \gamma$$

for some constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, where $\bar{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \cup \mathcal{S}_0$.

Assumption 7. *Assume that*

$$\sqrt{s_0} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \max \left\{ h^2, \frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right\}^{1/4} = o \left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} |\beta_{0j}| \right).$$

Assumption 5 supposes the approximate sparsity of the pooled parameter $\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$. Lemma A.1 in the Supplementary Material entails that the ℓ_1 -norm of $\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$ is always bounded under

assumption 4, and thereby we can always find a decomposition in assumption 5. In general, h' is supposed to converge at a faster rate and s' is supposed to be not too large in order to achieve the nearly weak oracle property. Assumption 6 states the strong irrepresentable condition (Zhao and Yu, 2006) in the framework of high-dimensional quantile regression for transfer learning procedure. The minimum signal strength in assumption 7 is a common assumption in high-dimensional signal detection.

Theorem 2.4. *Under assumptions 1-3 and 5-6, with*

$$a_n = 4h', \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\tau_h}$$

and

$$a_n = 0, \quad \mathcal{S} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}$$

in assumption 3, if

$$\lambda_{\beta} \geq \left\{ \frac{8D}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{\log p}} + \frac{32\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n\tau_h + n_0}}$$

and

$$\lambda_{\delta} \geq \left\{ \frac{6\tilde{D}}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{\log p}} + \frac{24\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}},$$

where the positive constants D and \tilde{D} are respectively determined by (A.19) and (A.26) in the Supplementary Material,

$$\sqrt{s'\lambda_{\beta}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{s' \log p}{\lambda_{\beta} (n\tau_h + n_0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \sqrt{(s' + s_0)\lambda_{\delta}} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{(s' + s_0) \log p}{\lambda_{\delta} n_0} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } h' < \frac{\gamma\lambda_{\beta}}{8m_0B^2},$$

then $\hat{\beta}_{0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} = \mathbf{0}$ holds with probability more than $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$.

In viewing conditions in Theorem 2.4, h' in assumption 5 is supposed to be dominated by the tuning parameter λ_{β} . As a trade-off, the approximate sparsity of the pooled parameter $\beta_{\tau_h}^*$ is supposed to be not too large by restricting that $\sqrt{s'\lambda_{\beta}} \rightarrow 0$. If we take

$$\lambda_{\beta} = C_{\beta} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n\tau_h + n_0}} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_{\delta} = C_{\delta} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}$$

for proper constants C_β and C_δ , conditions on tuning parameters and approximate sparse level in Theorem 2.4 can be satisfied.

Theorem 2.5. *Under assumptions 1-3 and 7 with*

$$a_n = 4h + \frac{1344Bs_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 48\sqrt{\frac{3Bhs_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \\ + \frac{1152m_0B^2s_0h}{\kappa_0} + 48\sqrt{\frac{2m_0s_0}{\kappa_0}} Bh$$

and $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_0$ in assumption 3, if $\lambda_\beta = 4B\sqrt{\log p/(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} + 4m_0B^2h$, $\lambda_\delta = 4B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$,

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0}h \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0}h \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$P\left(\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_0\right) \geq 1 - 2p^{-1} - 2p^{-2},$$

where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 = (\widehat{\beta}_{01}, \dots, \widehat{\beta}_{0p})^\top$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{S}}_0 = \{j : \widehat{\beta}_{0j} \neq 0\}$.

Combining Theorems 2.4 and 2.5, it immediately holds

$$\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{S}}_0 \subset \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$$

with probability tending to one, achieving the nearly weak oracle property of variable selection in the proposed transfer learning procedure. This indicates that the performance of the recovery is influenced by the parameters of the h -transferable source datasets. It is worth noting that if the structure of the h -transferable source datasets is similar to that of the target such that $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \subset \mathcal{S}_0$, the weak oracle property can be eventually attained.

3 Confidence Interval and Hypothesis Test

Based on the transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\beta}_0$, we would like to propose a statistical inference procedure to construct confidence interval and hypothesis test of the β_{0m} , the m -th quantile regression coefficient of β_0 . Without loss of generality, rewrite $\beta_0 = (\beta_{0m}, \beta_{0,-m}^\top)^\top$ and accordingly $\mathbf{S}(\beta_0; \{0\}) = (S_m(\beta_0; \{0\}), \mathbf{S}_{-m}^\top(\beta_0; \{0\}))^\top$. Viewing $\beta_{0,-m}$ as the nuisance parameter, an orthogonal function employed to construct the confidence interval can be derived via the theory of semiparametric efficiency theory. By removing the linear projection of $S_m(\beta_0; \{0\})$ onto the plane spanned by $\mathbf{S}_{-m}(\beta_0; \{0\})$, the linear orthogonal score function is denoted by

$$S_{0m}^\circ(\beta_{0m} \mid \beta_{0,-m}) = S_m(\beta_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}_{-m}^\top(\beta_0; \{0\})\gamma_{0m}, \quad (3.1)$$

where γ_{0m} is the projection direction at the population level to be determined as follows. The Neyman orthogonal condition requires the pathwise derivative of $S_{0m}^\circ(\beta_{0m} \mid \beta_{0,-m})$ vanishes to zero along the submodel $t \mapsto \beta_{0,-m} + t(\beta_{-m} - \beta_{0,-m})$ for any $\beta_{-m} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ to ensure the effect of nuisance parameter negligible, which is given by

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} E \{S_{0m}^\circ(\beta_{0m} \mid \beta_{0,-m} + t(\beta_{-m} - \beta_{0,-m}))\} \Big|_{t=0} = 0.$$

As a result, we obtain

$$\gamma_{0m} = (\mathbf{H}_{0,-m,-m}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{0,-m,m}^*. \quad (3.2)$$

Set $\widehat{e}_{ki} = Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_0$, $i = 1, \dots, n_k$, $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h$ as the residuals for the fitted values of the transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\beta}_0$. Set $\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k = (\widehat{e}_{k1}, \dots, \widehat{e}_{kn_k})^\top$. Let $\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k)$ and $\widehat{Q}_\tau(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k)$ denote the sample variance and the lower τ -th sample quantile of $\{\widehat{e}_{ki}\}_{i=1}^{n_k}$, respectively. We employ the approximation technique with the Powell bandwidth b_k (Dai and Kolar, 2021; Koenker, 2005) to estimate $\mathbf{H}_k(\beta_0)$, $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h$, by

$$\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \widehat{f}_{ki} \left(\widehat{\beta}_0 \right) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top,$$

where $\widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = I(|Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}| \leq b_k)/2b_k$ and b_k is the bandwidth. We choose

$$\begin{aligned} b_k &= \left(\Phi^{-1}(\tau + \widetilde{b}_k) - \Phi^{-1}(\tau - \widetilde{b}_k) \right) \min \left\{ \sqrt{\widehat{\text{var}}(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k)}, \frac{\widehat{Q}_{0.75}(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k) - \widehat{Q}_{0.25}(\widehat{\mathbf{e}}_k)}{1.34} \right\}, \\ \widetilde{b}_k &= n_k^{-1/3} \{ \Phi^{-1}(0.975) \}^{2/3} \left(\frac{1.5 \{ \phi(\Phi^{-1}(\tau)) \}^2}{2 \{ \Phi^{-1}(\tau) \}^2 + 1} \right)^{1/3} \end{aligned}$$

in numerical studies.

Set $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_k$, which can be viewed as the combined estimator for \mathbf{H}_0^* by leveraging the transferable source datasets. Mimicking the transfer learning approach and motivated by definition of projection direction in (3.2), we first proposed a crude estimator for γ_{0m} , which is given by

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \boldsymbol{\gamma} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} \boldsymbol{\gamma} + \lambda_m |\boldsymbol{\gamma}|_1 \right\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where λ_m is the tuning parameter. Second, the refined estimator is defined by $\widehat{\gamma}_{0, m} = \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m$, where

$$\begin{aligned} &\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \\ &= \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\zeta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\zeta})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\zeta}) - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, m} (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\zeta}) + \lambda'_m |\boldsymbol{\zeta}|_1 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

with tuning parameter λ'_m . Optimization problems (3.3) and (3.4) can be solved efficiently using the traditional lasso approach. Before establishing the convergence rate of $\widehat{\gamma}_{0, m}$, we show the convergence of $\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ to $\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ as follows.

Theorem 3.1. *Under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumption 4, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} &\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} \\ &= O_P \left(\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left\{ b_k + \frac{1}{b_k} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h + \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} \right) \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, for a special choice of

$$b_k = O \left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} \right),$$

it reduces to

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} = O_P \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right).$$

We analogously define $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = (\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, 1}, \dots, \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, p-1})^\top = (\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^*)^{-1} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m}^*$. Denote $\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = \{j : \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, j} \neq 0\}$ with $s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = |\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|$.

Assumption 8. *There exists a constant $\kappa_{0m} > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})} \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \boldsymbol{\delta}}{|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_2^2} \geq \kappa_{0m}.$$

Assumption 9. *There exists a constant $\kappa_{0m} > 0$ such that*

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})} \frac{\boldsymbol{\delta}^\top \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \boldsymbol{\delta}}{|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_2^2} \geq \kappa_{0m},$$

where $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = \mathcal{S}_0 \cup \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}$.

Assumptions 8 and 9 are mimicking assumption 3 on the restricted eigenvalue conditions for (3.3) and (3.4) to establish the error bounds of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m}$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.2. *Set*

$$b_k = O \left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} \right), \quad k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Assume that

$$(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) = o(1).$$

Under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumptions 4 and 8–9, if

$$\lambda_m \geq 4C_0(1 + r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + (s_0 h)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/8} + h^{1/2} \right)$$

with $r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} = |\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1$ and

$$\lambda'_m \geq 4C' \left(r_{0, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) + \frac{\lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}}{h_0} \right)$$

with $r_{0,m} = |\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_1$ where the positive constants C_0 and C' are respectively specified by (B.3) and (B.6) in the Supplementary Material, then it holds that

$$|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_2 = O_P(\lambda'_m \sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} + \lambda_m \sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}})$$

and

$$|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_1 = O_P(\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}).$$

Having obtained the projection direction estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m}$ for $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}$ and the transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}$ (excluding the m -th entry of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$) for the nuisance parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,-m}$, we define an estimated orthogonal score function of β_{0m} for (3.1) as follows,

$$\widehat{S}_{0m}^\circ(\beta_{0m} \mid \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}) = S_m((\beta_{0m}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}^\top)^\top; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}_{-m}^\top((\beta_{0m}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}^\top)^\top; \{0\}) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0m}. \quad (3.5)$$

Considering $\widehat{\beta}_{0m}$ as an initial estimator for the parameter β_{0m} of interest, the one-step estimator based on (3.5) can be deduced as

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\beta}_{0m} &= \widehat{\beta}_{0m} - \left(\frac{\partial \widehat{S}_{0m}^\circ(\beta_m \mid \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m})}{\partial \beta_m} \Big|_{\beta_m = \widehat{\beta}_{0m}} \right)^{-1} \widehat{S}_{0m}^\circ(\widehat{\beta}_{0m} \mid \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}) \\ &= \widehat{\beta}_{0m} - \widehat{H}_{0,m|-m}^{-1} \widehat{S}_{0m}^\circ(\widehat{\beta}_{0m} \mid \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0,-m}), \end{aligned}$$

where $\partial(\cdot)/\partial\beta_m$ is the subgradient operator and $\widehat{H}_{0,m|-m} = \widehat{H}_{0,m,m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m}$. We advocate the transfer learning technique twice to obtain $\widehat{\beta}_{0m}$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m}$, respectively, based on which the one-step debiased estimator $\widetilde{\beta}_{0m}$ is deduced. Thus, we refer to $\widetilde{\beta}_{0m}$ as the double transfer learning estimator.

We are in a position to derive the asymptotic distribution of $\widetilde{\beta}_{0m}$ if inference procedure for β_{0m} is desirable. For simplicity, denote $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k = \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \tau(1 - \tau)/n_k$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k$, whose population counterparts are denoted by $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k = E(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k)$ and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = E(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h})$, respectively. We pose some similarities between the target and transferable sources.

Assumption 10. *There exists h_1 such that*

$$\max \left\{ |H_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, m}^* - H_{0, m, m}^*|, |(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, -m}^* - \mathbf{H}_{0, m, -m}^*) \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m}| \right\} \leq h_1.$$

Assumption 11. *There exists h_{\max} such that $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0\|_{\max} \leq h_{\max}$.*

Assumptions 10 and 11 are imposed to guarantee the consistency of transfer learning estimator of the asymptotic variance if h_1 and h_{\max} are assumed to be convergent to 0 at certain rates. Note that h_{\max} can be set as 0 if the distributions of covariates across the target and transferable sources are identical. Define $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0, m} = \Gamma_{m, 1}(-\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0, m})$.

Theorem 3.3. *Assume*

$$\frac{s_0 \log p}{\sqrt{n_0}} = o(1), \quad h = o\left(n_0^{-1/4}\right) \quad \text{and} \quad \max\{h_{\max}, h_1\} = o(1).$$

Under conditions in Theorems 2.2 and 3.2 and assumptions 10–11, if

$$\sqrt{n_0} (\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + h \right) = o(1),$$

then it holds

$$\frac{\sqrt{n_0} \widehat{H}_{0, m | -m} (\widetilde{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m})}{\widehat{\sigma}_m} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, 1),$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_m^2 = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0, m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0, m}$.

Consequently, we can construct valid confidence interval and hypothesis test procedures for β_{0m} of interest.

4 Transferability Detection

As yet our (double) transfer learning procedure is based on the knowledge of the transferable set \mathcal{T}_h . In fact, the transferable set is usually unknown in practice. It is therefore imperative to provide a data-derived method to identify the transferable set \mathcal{T}_h . Motivated by Tian and

Feng (2022), we propose an approach to detecting the transferable set \mathcal{T}_h in the framework of high-dimensional quantile regression models. Without loss of generality, suppose n_0 is even and randomly and equally divide the target data into two sub-datasets: one for training denoted by \mathcal{V}_{tr} and the other for test by \mathcal{V}_{te} . Thus $|\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}| = |\mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}| = n_0/2$. Denote the quantile loss function of the target based on observations in $\mathcal{A} \subset \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ as

$$L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{A}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}|} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{A}} \rho_\tau(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

The lasso estimator based solely on the target training dataset \mathcal{V}_{tr} is defined by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \{L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}) + \lambda_0 |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1\},$$

where λ_0 is the tuning parameter. For $k = 1, \dots, K$, viewing the k -th source dataset $\{(\mathbf{Z}_{ki}, Y_{ki}), i = 1, \dots, n_k\}$ as transferable, combining it with the target training dataset $\{(\mathbf{Z}_{0i}, Y_{0i}), i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}\}$, and mimicking the transfer learning procedure in (2.1) to obtain $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$, we can also obtain a crude transfer learning estimator. Specifically, we define

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}, k} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\{ \frac{2n_k}{2n_k + n_0} L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{k\}) + \frac{n_0}{2n_k + n_0} L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k} |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1 \right\},$$

where $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k}$ is the tuning parameter. If the quantile loss on the target test dataset at $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}, k}$ is not substantially greater than that at $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}$, the k -th source can be intuitively considered as transferable. In particular, for a given $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, we thus define

$$\hat{\mathcal{T}} = \left\{ 1 \leq k \leq K : L_0\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}}, k}; \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \leq (1 + \varepsilon_0) L_0\left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}; \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \right\}$$

and use it to estimate the transferable set \mathcal{T}_h . The consistency of detection procedure is established in the Supplementary Material.

5 Simulation Studies

We conduct simulations to evaluate the finite-sample performances of the proposed transfer learning method (Trans) under various combinations of h and $|\mathcal{T}_h|$, wherein the transferable

source datasets are identified through the detection procedure in Section 4. We also fit the ℓ_1 -penalized quantile regression model solely on the target data (Non-Trans) to investigate the potential loss if source datasets, transferable or non-transferable, are discarded. On the contrary, we apply the proposed transfer learning method on all source and target datasets by viewing all sources as transferable (Pooled-Trans); thus utilizing non-transferable sources may be detrimental to the resulting performance. As a benchmark, we apply the proposed transfer learning method on the transferable source (without the need of detection procedure) and target datasets (Oracle-Trans).

The ℓ_1 -penalized quantile regression is implemented via R package `hqreg` (Yi and Huang, 2017). We adopt five-fold cross-validation procedure to select all the tuning parameters and set $\varepsilon_0 = 0.01$ in the recovery of transferable source set. We consider $p = 1000$, $n_0 = 200$, $n_k = 300, k = 1, \dots, K$ with $K = 20$, and $h = 3, 6, 12$ throughout simulations and report the averaged ℓ_2 estimation errors based on 1000 replications.

We consider the following heterogenous high-dimensional quantile regression models from which the target and source datasets were independently generated,

$$Y_k = \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k + Z_{k1}^2 \eta_{k\tau}, k = 0, \dots, K, \quad (5.1)$$

where covariate vector $\mathbf{Z}_0 \sim N(\mathbf{0}, (0.5^{|l-j|})_{l,j=1}^p)$, and $\mathbf{Z}_k \sim N(\mathbf{0}, (0.5^{|l-j|})_{l,j=1}^p + \boldsymbol{\xi}_k \boldsymbol{\xi}_k^\top)$ with $\boldsymbol{\xi}_k \sim N(\mathbf{0}, 0.3^2 \mathbf{I}_p)$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, and \mathbf{I}_p denotes the p -dimensional unit matrix. Z_{k1} is the first component of \mathbf{Z}_k , and $\eta_{k\tau}$ is independent of \mathbf{Z}_k with τ -th quantile zero. We set $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = (3, 3, 3, 3, 3, \mathbf{0}_{p-5}^\top)^\top$ for the target quantile regression parameter of interest and thus $s_0 = 5$. For simplicity, let \mathbf{d}_k denote a random p -vector with every component independently generated from -1 or 1 with probability 0.5 . We further construct h -transferable source datasets and non-transferable source datasets under scenarios $|\mathcal{T}_h| = 0, 5, 10, 15, 20$. In particular, for transferable source datasets, we set $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k = \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + h/p \cdot \mathbf{d}_k$, implying $|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \leq h$. For non-transferable source $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$, we first randomly generated index set \mathcal{I}_k of size s_0 from




Figure 1: Averaged ℓ_2 estimation errors with heterogenous normal model errors.

$\{2s_0 + 1, \dots, p\}$ and set the j -th component of quantile regression coefficient β_k as

$$\beta_{kj} = \begin{cases} 1 + 2h/p \cdot (-1)^{d_{kj}}, & j \in \{s_0 + 1, \dots, 2s_0\} \cup \mathcal{I}_k, \\ 2h/p \cdot (-1)^{d_{kj}}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

where d_{kj} is the j -th element of \mathbf{d}_k . Basic calculations yield $|\beta_k - \beta_0|_1 \geq 2h + 3s_0 - 12s_0h/p$.

We consider heterogenous light-tailed model errors when $\eta_{k\tau}$ were independently from the shifted standard normal distribution with three different quantile levels $\tau = 0.25, 0.5$, and 0.75 to more comprehensively examine covariate effects. Simulation results in Figure 1 show that, across the quartiles, Non-Trans approach indeed exhibits higher ℓ_2 estimation errors if one does not utilize any source dataset especially when it is transferable. On the other hand, Pooled-Trans approach which utilizes all source datasets, whether transferable or non-transferable, leads to remarkably downstream performances while mistakenly using more non-transferable sources. Trans and Oracle-Trans approaches perform equally well, implying that the detection procedure can effectively identify the transferable and non-transferable sources. Meanwhile, the proposed transfer learning method can greatly reduce estimation errors compared to Non-Trans approach due to the benefit of properly exploiting the source datasets. There are considerable decreases in estimation errors of Trans, Oracle-Trans, and Pooled-Trans approaches when the transferable sources increase among the $K = 20$ candidate ones. For each method, the performances are very similar when criterion h is varying from 3, 6, and 12, perhaps due to that h/p is relatively tiny.

We further consider heterogenous heavy-tailed model errors wherein $\eta_{k\tau}$ were independently from the shifted t_2 distribution and heterogenous skewed model errors from the Gumbel. Simulation results are respectively displayed in the Supplementary Material, showing that the proposed transfer learning approach delivers promising performances, a substantial profit from the ability of quantile regression to address the heterogeneous heavy-tailed or skewed model errors as well as the ability of the transfer learning method to leverage the source datasets properly. On the other hand, we also demonstrate the usefulness of the proposed transferability detection procedure which can recover the truly transferable sources




Figure 2: Coverage proportion of confidence interval for the 1-st component of quantile regression coefficients with $\tau = 0.75$.

with very high probability. We postpone the simulation results to the Supplementary Material.

We next assess the finite-sample performance of the proposed (double) transfer learning inference procedure in terms of the coverage proportion among 1000 replications for single component of the high-dimensional quantile regression coefficients. To be concise, we fix the quantile level of τ at 0.75 and consider regression coefficients of the 1-st (signal) and 50-th (non-signal) covariates, respectively, in different scenarios. We only report simulation results for signal case in Figures 2 and defer ones for non-signal case to the Supplementary Material. In general, across different heterogenous model errors, the proposed Trans approach performs

as well as Oracle-Trans approach, and their coverage proportions of the two methods are apparently closer to the nominal 95% than that of Non-Trans approach. As for Pooled-Trans approach, when $|\mathcal{T}_h|$ is relatively smaller, more non-transferable sources are mistakenly exploited in the transfer learning procedure and thus the coverage proportion is farther away from the nominal 95% than the other three methods. As $|\mathcal{T}_h|$ increases to 20, negative transfer is alleviated or even avoided and the coverage proportion becomes closer to the nominal 95%. As for the size and power analysis, we report the simulation results in the Supplementary Material, showing that the proposed Trans approach can achieve higher power while maintaining the size properly. On the contrary, both the Non-Trans approach that does not utilize any sources and the Pooled-Trans approach that utilizes all the sources without discrimination deliver inferior performances.

6 A Real Example

To illustrate the practical utility of the proposed method, we conduct statistical inference on a survey of China Family Panel Studies (<http://www.issp.pku.edu.cn/cfps/>), which aims to investigate the relationship among economy, society, population, education and health in China by respectively collecting data at the individual, family and community levels. The panel studies have finished five rounds of follow-up investigation during 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, and 2018. The nearest raw dataset of individual level in 2018 contains 37355 individuals and 1346 variables.

As an essentially economic and sociological issue concerned by the public, the total individual income is used to measure the quality of daily life. Consequently, we are primarily interested to investigate which factors affect individual income for the adults between 18 and 60 years old in the fifth round of survey in 2018. The total individual income includes total wages and all types of government subsidies in 2018. To mitigate the impact arisen by the apparent wealth inequality, we take the logarithm of the total individual income

Table 1: Sample sizes of source provinces and the transferable sources detected by the proposed method

Source	Sample size	Transferability		
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$
Yunnan	576	✗	✓	✓
Sichuan	790	✓	✓	✓
Hubei	228	✓	✓	✓
Jiangxi	292	✓	✓	✓
Anhui	309	✓	✓	✓
Jiangsu	297	✗	✗	✓
Shanghai	771	✓	✓	✓
Guangdong	1481	✓	✓	✓

as the response. We consider the Hunan province as the target, and view the provinces near the Changjiang River and Zhujiang River as the sources, which consists of Yunnan, Sichuan, Hubei, Jiangxi, Anhui, Jiangsu, Shanghai and Guangdong. We employ the distance correlation learning (Li, Zhong, and Zhu, 2012) and the fused Kolmogorov filter (Mai and Zou, 2015) to select 200 most marginally related covariates, respectively. By merging these 400 selected covariates, we obtain $p = 265$ ones. The sample size of the target Hunan province is $n_0 = 403$. Table 1 shows the sample sizes of source provinces and the transferable sources detected by the proposed method. It can be seen that transferable sources are quantile-adaptive and the income groups at the third quartile are all transferable, showing that there may exist some similarity among the relatively high income groups. On the contrary, the Hunan, Yunnan and Jiangsu provinces possess different geographical conditions such as arable land, flood disaster and transportation, which however are usually viewed as agriculture-related factors that primarily constrain the relatively low income group. Thus, the Yunan and Jiangsu provinces are not detected as transferable sources while inferring the income group at the first quartile in the Hunan province.

To be concise, we report the effects of five covariates of interest and the associated p -values on the total income at different quantiles in Table 2, where column “ESE” stands

Table 2: Estimation and hypothesis test for target Hunan province in the China Family Panel Studies

Covariate	τ	Trans				Pooled-Trans				Non-Trans			
		$\hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{\beta}$	ESE	p -value	$\hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{\beta}$	ESE	p -value	$\hat{\beta}$	$\tilde{\beta}$	ESE	p -value
Age	0.25	0.000	0.458	0.171	0.007	-0.001	-0.075	0.100	0.455	0.000	-0.030	0.068	0.656
	0.50	-0.017	-0.027	0.065	0.672	-0.022	0.001	0.060	0.990	0.000	-0.021	0.061	0.728
	0.75	-0.034	-0.079	0.063	0.211	-0.034	-0.079	0.063	0.211	0.000	-0.024	0.059	0.691
Urban	0.25	0.007	0.333	0.116	0.004	0.018	0.305	0.100	0.002	0.000	-0.114	0.092	0.216
	0.50	0.000	-0.082	0.099	0.406	0.001	-0.076	0.103	0.458	0.000	-0.040	0.072	0.580
	0.75	0.004	-0.086	0.123	0.487	0.004	-0.086	0.123	0.487	0.000	0.010	0.092	0.918
Degree	0.25	0.017	0.104	0.030	< 0.001	0.023	0.104	0.028	< 0.001	0.018	0.085	0.042	0.041
	0.50	0.019	0.081	0.027	0.003	0.022	0.084	0.027	0.002	0.018	0.074	0.031	0.018
	0.75	0.018	0.099	0.028	< 0.001	0.018	0.099	0.028	< 0.001	0.018	0.133	0.058	0.022
Reading	0.25	0.000	0.111	0.039	0.004	0.000	-0.087	0.058	0.129	0.007	0.014	0.008	0.071
	0.50	0.000	0.055	0.008	< 0.001	0.000	0.055	0.008	< 0.001	0.007	0.033	0.011	0.002
	0.75	0.000	0.026	0.008	0.002	0.000	0.026	0.008	0.002	0.007	0.048	0.014	< 0.001
Housing	0.25	0.000	-0.087	0.043	0.045	0.000	-0.099	0.040	0.014	0.000	-0.037	0.048	0.437
	0.50	0.000	-0.010	0.041	0.805	0.000	0.005	0.039	0.889	0.000	0.004	0.040	0.918
	0.75	0.000	0.022	0.039	0.571	0.000	0.022	0.039	0.571	0.000	0.039	0.047	0.413

for the estimated standard error based on the double transfer learning approach. For the Trans approach, covariates Degree and Reading have significantly positive effects on the total income crossing three quartiles; higher degree and more reading tend to create more wealth, indicating education is an important avenue to increase income. On the other hand, younger, living in the rural residence and pessimistic attitude to housing exerts significantly negative effects only on the first quartile of the total income. It means that Age, Urban residence and grasping Housing policy make difference for the relatively low income group. For the Pooled-Trans and Non-Trans approaches, although the interpretations are general consistent with that of the Trans approach, there exists some missed significant covariates at different quantile levels. As a conclusion, we advocate the government to develop education to enhance the total income for all individuals and promote some effective policies to accelerate urbanization and reduce the housing burden for individuals whose income lies below the first quartile.

7 Conclusion

Modern complicated high-dimensional data often display heterogeneity due to heteroscedastic variance or inhomogeneous covariate effects. On the other hand, heavy-tailed model error or outlier in the response is another major concern in practice. Heterogeneity and heavy-tailed phenomenon could be even more prevalent in the transfer learning as the target and multiple source domains are involved. Yet these concerns are not addressed sufficiently by current transfer learning approaches and thus may downgrade the resulting performance in practice if they are not properly taken into account. Numerical studies show that the proposed procedure delivers promising and compelling performances.

We have adopted the ℓ_1 distance of coefficient difference between the target and source regression models to measure their similarity. It has been demonstrated as a straightforward and meaningful criterion. The cosine similarity (Gu, Han, and Duan, 2023; Park, Hong,

and Kim, 2020; Xia, Zhang, and Li, 2015), which is free of the magnitude and relatively loose, between regression coefficients of the target and source models could be viewed as an alternative measure and certainly deserves further exploration. Distributionally robust optimization (Chen and Paschalidis, 2020; Zhen, Kuhn, and Wiesemann, 2021) can be considered as an effective approach to enhancing the transferability of model parametric estimation that is robust to distribution perturbation in terms of the Wasserstein distance. Investigations along this direction that utilizes the Wasserstein distance as a criterion to select the source domains in the transfer learning may be merit future research.

Supplement Material

The online supplementary material contains technical proofs of theorems, consistency of the transferability detection procedure, some supporting lemmas, and additional simulation results.

Supplementary material for “Estimation and inference for transfer learning with high-dimensional quantile regression”

Contents

Abstract	1
1 Introduction	2
1.1 Main Contributions	3
1.2 Related Literature	4
1.3 Organization and Notation	6
2 Transfer Learning for Quantile Regression	7
3 Confidence Interval and Hypothesis Test	17
4 Transferability Detection	21
5 Simulation Studies	22
6 A Real Example	27
7 Conclusion	30
A Convergent Rate	33
A.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1	33
A.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2	42
A.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3	47
A.4 Proof of Theorem 2.4	51
A.5 Proof of Theorem 2.5	77

B Asymptotic Distribution	78
B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1	78
B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2	82
B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3	89
C Detection Consistency	94
C.1 Weak Consistency of Detection	94
C.2 Strong Consistency of Detection	96
C.3 Proof of Weak Consistency	97
C.4 Proof of Strong Consistency	105
D Additional Simulations	107
D.1 Simulations for Estimation Errors	107
D.2 Simulations for Transferability Detection	107
D.3 Simulations for Confidence Interval	108
D.4 Simulations for Hypothesis Test	108
References	119

Appendices contain technical proofs of theorems and some supporting lemmas as well as additional simulation results. Specifically, we establish the convergence rate for specific \mathcal{T}_h in Appendix A, confidence interval in Appendix B, and detection consistency in Appendix C. Appendix D displays additional simulation results.

A Convergent Rate

A.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

Lemma A.1. *Under assumptions 1 and 4, we have*

$$|\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \beta_0|_1 \leq Ch.$$

Proof. It follows from the definition of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$ in (2.3) that

$$\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\mathbf{Z}_k \left\{ P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \right] = \mathbf{0},$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\mathbf{Z}_k \left\{ P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \right] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\mathbf{Z}_k \left\{ P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - P(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under assumption 1, it holds by the Newton–Leibniz formula that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ &= \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0). \end{aligned}$$

As a result, following assumption 4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 &= \left| \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right|_1 \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \sup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\| \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^{-1} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k \right\|_1 |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \\ &\leq Ch, \end{aligned}$$

which ends the proof of Lemma A.1. □

Denote

$$\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) = L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \mathbf{u}.$$

Lemma A.2. *Assume $h = o(1)$. Under assumptions 1 and 3–4, it holds that*

$$E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\mathbf{u}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2 \right\}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Moreover, under assumptions 1–4, the sample version satisfies the following inequality

$$\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\mathbf{u}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2 \right\} - L \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\mathbf{u}|_1,$$

with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$, for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$.

Proof. By the Knight equation

$$\rho_\tau(u - v) - \rho_\tau(u) = -v\{\tau - I(u \leq 0)\} + \int_0^v \{I(u \leq z) - I(u \leq 0)\} dz,$$

it holds for any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \\ &= L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \mathbf{u} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left[\rho_\tau(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u})) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \rho_\tau(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) - \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \mathbf{u} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \mathbf{u}} \left\{ I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq z) - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under assumption 1 and based on the Fubini theorem, we can derive that

$$\begin{aligned} & E\{\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)\} \\ &= \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u}} \left\{ I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq z) - I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \right\} dz \right] \\ &= \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u}} \left\{ F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + z \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} dz \right]. \end{aligned}$$

(i) When $\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u} \geq 0$, the integrand has lower bound as

$$\begin{aligned} & F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + z \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \\ &= f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z + \frac{1}{2} \dot{f}_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + z^\dagger \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z^2 \\ &\geq f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z - \frac{1}{2} m_0 z^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $z^\dagger \in [0, z]$.

(ii) When $\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u} \leq 0$, the integrand has upper bound as

$$\begin{aligned} & F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + z \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \\ &= f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z + \frac{1}{2} \dot{f}_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + z^\dagger \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z^2 \\ &\leq f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) z + \frac{1}{2} m_0 z^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $z^\dagger \in [z, 0]$.

As a result, if h is sufficiently small, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \\
& \geq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^\top E \{ f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* | \mathbf{Z}_k) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \} \mathbf{u} - \frac{m_0}{6} E \{ |\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u}|^3 \} \right] \\
& = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^\top E \{ f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 | \mathbf{Z}_k) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \} \mathbf{u} - \frac{m_0}{6} E \{ |\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \mathbf{u}|^3 \} \right] \\
& \quad + \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left[\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{u}^\top E \{ (f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* | \mathbf{Z}_k) - f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 | \mathbf{Z}_k)) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \} \mathbf{u} \right] \\
& \geq \left(\frac{\kappa_0}{2} - \frac{m_0 B^3 C h}{2} \right) |\mathbf{u}|_2^2 - \frac{m_0}{6\kappa_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2^3 \geq \frac{3\kappa_0}{8} |\mathbf{u}|_2^2 - \frac{m_0}{6\kappa_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2^3,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from assumptions 3–4. We define the maximum radius r_0 for the margin condition as

$$r_0 = \sup_{r>0} \left\{ r : \forall \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S}) \cap \{ \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p : |\mathbf{u}|_2 \leq r \}, E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \geq \frac{1}{4} \kappa_0 |\mathbf{u}|_2^2 \right\}.$$

If $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$ and $|\mathbf{u}|_2 \leq 3\kappa_0^2/(4m_0)$, then $\kappa_0 |\mathbf{u}|_2^2/8 - m_0 |\mathbf{u}|_2^3/(6\kappa_0) \geq 0$ and $E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \geq \kappa_0 |\mathbf{u}|_2^2/4$, which implies $r_0 \geq 3\kappa_0^2/(4m_0)$. For any \mathbf{u} such that $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$ and $|\mathbf{u}|_2 > r_0$, then denote $w_0 = r_0/|\mathbf{u}|_2 < 1$. On the other hand, $|w_0 \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{S}^c}|_1 \leq 3|w_0 \mathbf{u}_{\mathcal{S}}|_1 + a_n$. Thus, we have $w_0 \mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$ and thereby $E \{ \delta L(w_0 \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \geq \kappa_0 |w_0 \mathbf{u}|_2^2/4$ by the definition of r_0 . Note that $E \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} = \mathbf{0}$ by definition of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
& E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \\
& = E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} - E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} - E \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \}^\top \mathbf{u} \\
& = E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} - E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the convexity of the objective function $L(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)$, we have

$$E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + w_0 \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \leq w_0 E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} + (1 - w_0) E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} &= E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} - E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \\
&\geq \frac{1}{w_0} [E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + a_0 \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} - E \{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \}] \\
&\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4w_0} |w_0 \mathbf{u}|_2^2 = \frac{\kappa_0 r_0}{4} |\mathbf{u}|_2 \geq \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we conclude that

$$E \{ \delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\mathbf{u}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2 \right\}.$$

On the other hand, under assumption 2, note that

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \mathbf{u}} \{ I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq z) - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \} dz$$

takes value in $[0, B|\mathbf{u}|_1]$, which implies that the integration is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter at most $B|\mathbf{u}|_1/2$ (Wainwright, 2019). Moreover, the Hoeffding inequality entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - E(\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)) \leq -t) \\
&= P\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \int_0^{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \mathbf{u}} \{ I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq z) - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \} dz \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - E \int_0^{\mathbf{z}_k^\top \mathbf{u}} \{ I(Y_k - \mathbf{z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq z) - I(Y_k - \mathbf{z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \} dz \right\} \leq -t \right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{2(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)t^2}{B^2 |\mathbf{u}|_1^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $t = B|\mathbf{u}|_1 \sqrt{\log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$, it concludes that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) &\geq E(\delta L(\mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)) - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\mathbf{u}|_1 \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\mathbf{u}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\mathbf{u}|_2 \right\} - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\mathbf{u}|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$. □

Lemma A.3. *Under assumption 2, it holds that*

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)|_\infty \leq 2B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Moreover, under assumptions 1 and 2, for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)|_\infty \leq 2B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + m_0 B^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k|_1,$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$.

Proof. Denote $\mathbf{Z}_{ki} = (Z_{ki,1}, \dots, Z_{ki,p})^\top$ for $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ with $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h$. Under assumption 2, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we have

$$|\{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j}| \leq B.$$

Following from the Hoeffding inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P(|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)|_\infty > t) \\ &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \geq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - E \left[\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \right] \right|_\infty > t\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{j=1}^p P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. - E \left[\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j} \right] \right| > t\right) \\ &\leq 2p \exp\left(-\frac{(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)t^2}{2B^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Set $t = 2B \sqrt{\log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$ and (A.2) is shown. On the other hand, we have

$$|\{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j}| \leq B,$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Therefore, the Hoeffding inequality implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \right|_\infty > t + m_0 B^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k|_1 \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{z}_{ki} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - E \left[\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{z}_{ki} \right] \right|_\infty \right. \\
& \quad \left. > t + m_0 B^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k|_1 - \left| E \left[\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \{\tau - I(Y_k - \mathbf{z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{z}_k \right] \right|_\infty \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{z}_{ki} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - E \left[\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{z}_{ki} \right] \right|_\infty \right. \\
& \quad \left. > t + \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k [m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k|_1 - |E[\{F_k(\mathbf{z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k | \mathbf{z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{z}_k)\} \mathbf{z}_k]|_\infty] \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - E \left[\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \{\tau - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} Z_{ki,j} \right] \right| > t \right) \\
& \leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)t^2}{2B^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is completed by setting $t = 2B\sqrt{\log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.1

Proof. Denote $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*$. Lemma A.3 implies that the event $\lambda_\beta \geq 2 \left| \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \right|_\infty$

occurs with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$, on which we suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 &\geq \frac{16B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \frac{6}{\kappa_0} \lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_0} + \sqrt{\left(4B \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/2} + 2\lambda_\beta\right) \frac{4Ch}{\kappa_0}} \\ &= \frac{(16 + 6C_\beta)B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{(4 + 2C_\beta)BCh}{\kappa_0} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Since $L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \leq L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1$ and following from Lemma A.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\delta L(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \\ &= L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &\leq -\lambda_\beta |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 + \lambda_\beta |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \\ &= -\lambda_\beta \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 \right) + \lambda_\beta \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0}^* \right|_1 + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}^* \right|_1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \\ &= \lambda_\beta \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0}^* \right|_1 - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 \right) - \lambda_\beta \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}^* \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 \right) + 2\lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}^* \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0}|_1 - \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}|_1 + 2\lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0}|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c}|_1 + 2\lambda_\beta Ch. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Denote

$$G(\mathbf{u}) = L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta (|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \mathbf{u}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1).$$

Since $\delta L(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \geq 0$, then $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \in \mathcal{D}(4Ch, \mathcal{S}_0)$. Thus, there exists $t \in (0, 1]$ such that

$\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = t\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ with

$$|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 = \frac{(16 + 6C_\beta)B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 2\sqrt{\frac{(4 + 2C_\beta)BCh}{\kappa_0} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4}}.$$

The convexity of $G(\mathbf{u})$ entails that

$$G(\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) = G(t\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (1-t)\mathbf{0}) \leq tG(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) + (1-t)G(\mathbf{0}) = tG(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) \leq 0. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\left| \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 = t \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 \leq 3t \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 + 4tCh \leq 3 \left| \widetilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 + 4Ch.$$

Thus, it yields that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \in \mathcal{D}(4Ch, \mathcal{S}_0)$. Consequently, combining Lemmas A.2 and A.3, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) &= L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta (|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1) \\
&= \delta L(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \lambda_\beta (|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1) \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 \right\} - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \\
&\quad - \lambda_\beta (|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*|_1) \\
&\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2^2 - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 - \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c}|_1 - 2\lambda_\beta Ch
\end{aligned}$$

with probability greater than $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$, where the last inequality follows from a similar form of (A.5) and condition

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \rightarrow 0.$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
G(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) &\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2^2 - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} (4\sqrt{s_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 + 4Ch) - \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 - 2\lambda_\beta Ch \\
&= \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2^2 - \left(4 + \frac{3}{2} C_\beta \right) B \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \right\} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 - (4 + 2C_\beta) BCh \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \\
&\geq \sqrt{3\kappa_0 BCh} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 - (4 + 2C_\beta) BCh \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with (A.6) and hence (A.4) does not hold. Therefore, it implies that

$$|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}$$

and

$$|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 = |\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0}|_1 + |\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c}|_1 \leq 4|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0}|_1 + 4Ch \leq 4\sqrt{s_0} |\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0}|_2 + 4Ch \lesssim s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h,$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$. \square

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2.2

For simplicity, we denote $\delta L(\mathbf{v}; \{0\}) = L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{v}; \{0\}) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})^\top \mathbf{v}$.

Lemma A.4. *Under assumptions 1 and 3, it holds that*

$$E(\delta L(\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \right\}.$$

Moreover, under assumptions 1-3, the sample version satisfies the following inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L(\mathbf{v} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \right\} \\ &\quad - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$, for any $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$.

Proof. By the Knight equation, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L(\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) &= L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v}; \{0\}) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left[\rho_\tau(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v})) - \rho_\tau(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \{ \tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{ I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} dz. \end{aligned}$$

An analogous methodology in the proof of Lemma A.2 indicates that

$$E(\delta L(\mathbf{v} + \boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \right\}.$$

On the other hand, note that

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{ I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} dz$$

takes value in $[0, B|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1]$, which implies that the integration is a sub-Gaussian random variable with parameter at most $B|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1/2$ (Wainwright, 2019). Moreover,

the Hoeffding inequality entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(\delta L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - E\{\delta L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})\} \leq -t) \\
&= P\left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} dz \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - E \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} dz \leq -t \right\} \right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{2n_0 t^2}{B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$. Taking $t = B|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \sqrt{\log p/n_0}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$, and it concludes that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta L(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \\
&\geq E\{\delta L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})\} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \\
&\geq \min\left\{\frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2\right\} - B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{v} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1
\end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$. □

Lemma A.5. *Under assumption 2, it holds that*

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})|_\infty \leq 2B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}},$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Moreover, under assumptions 1–2, for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we have

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\})|_\infty \leq 2B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$.

Proof. Under condition 2, for any $j \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, we have

$$|\{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} Z_{0i,j}| \leq B.$$

According to the Hoeffding inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\})|_\infty > t) &= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \right] \right|_\infty > t\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^p P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} Z_{0i,j} \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} Z_{0i,j} \right] \right|_\infty > t\right) \\
&\leq 2p \exp\left(-\frac{n_0 t^2}{2B^2}\right). \tag{A.7}
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\})|_\infty > t + m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1) \\
&\leq P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} - E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \right] \right|_\infty \right. \\
&\quad \left. > t + m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 - \left| E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \right] \right|_\infty \right) \\
&= P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} - E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \right] \right|_\infty \right. \\
&\quad \left. > t + m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 - \left| E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 | \mathbf{Z}_0) - F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{Z}_0)\} \mathbf{Z}_0 \right] \right|_\infty \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^p P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} Z_{0i,j} - E[\{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0)\} Z_{0i,j}] \right| > t\right) \\
&\leq 2p \exp\left(-\frac{n_0 t^2}{2B^2}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Set $t = 2B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$ and the proof is completed. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.2

Proof. When $\lambda_\delta \geq 2|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})|_\infty$, under assumptions 1 and 4, it holds by Lemmas A.1 and

A.5 that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) &= L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) - L \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) - \mathbf{S} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right)^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \right) \\
&= \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1 + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta Ch + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1, \tag{A.8}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Note the fact that $\delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) \geq 0$, and it holds that $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \leq 3Ch + 3 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 &\leq \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \\
&\leq \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \right) + \left(3Ch + 3 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \right) \\
&= 4Ch + 4 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which along with Theorem 1 concludes (2.5). On the other hand, (A.8) also implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \delta \widehat{L}^{(0)} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right) \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\
&= \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 + \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 \\
&\quad - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 \right) - \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \right) \\
&\quad + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c}^* \right|_1 \\
&\quad + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c}^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_\delta Ch + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c}^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 10\lambda_\delta Ch \\
&\quad + \frac{(96 + 36C_\beta)\lambda_\delta B s_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 12\lambda_\delta \sqrt{\frac{(4 + 2C_\beta)BCh s_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 4p^{-1}$ by the contradiction of (A.4) and the fact of $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \in \mathcal{D}(4Ch, \mathcal{S}_0)$, which yields that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D} \left(20Ch + \frac{(192 + 72C_\beta)B s_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 24 \sqrt{\frac{(4 + 2C_\beta)BCh s_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}, \mathcal{S}_0 \right)$$

in probability. Thus, using Lemma A.4, it holds with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-2} - 4p^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \right\} &\leq B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} (4Ch + 4|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1) + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta Ch + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}|_1 \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \right\} = \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2$$

if the sample size is sufficiently large. As a result, the conclusion is drawn by (2.4) that

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}$$

with probability tending to 1. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 2.3

Proof. For any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \{\boldsymbol{\beta} : |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1 \leq h\}$, denote $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Lemma A.3 implies that the event $\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \geq 2|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)|_{\infty}$ occurs with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$, on which we suppose that

$$|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_2 \geq \frac{112B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{3Bh}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{96m_0 B^2 \sqrt{s_0 h}}{\kappa_0} + 4\sqrt{\frac{2m_0}{\kappa_0}} Bh. \quad (\text{A.9})$$

Since $L(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\alpha} + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \leq L(\boldsymbol{\alpha}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\alpha}|_1$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{u}} \\ &\leq -\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\beta} + \widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \\ &= -\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 \right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0}|_1 + |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0^c}|_1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \\ &= \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0}|_1 - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0} \right|_1 \right) - \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left(|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0^c}|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, s_0^c} \right|_1 \right) + 2\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0^c}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0}|_1 - \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0^c}|_1 + 2\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{s_0^c} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0, s_0^c}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0^c}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0}|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{s_0^c}|_1 + 2\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} h \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Denote

$$G_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\mathbf{u}) = L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{u}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} (|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{u}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1).$$

Since $\delta L(\widehat{\mathbf{u}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \geq 0$, then $\widehat{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{D}(4h, \mathcal{S}_0)$. Thus, there exists $t \in (0, 1]$ such that $\widetilde{\mathbf{u}} = t\widehat{\mathbf{u}}$

with

$$|\widetilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 = \frac{112B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{3Bh}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{96m_0 B^2 \sqrt{s_0 h}}{\kappa_0} + 4\sqrt{\frac{2m_0}{\kappa_0}} Bh.$$

The convexity of $G_\beta(\mathbf{u})$ entails that

$$G_\beta(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) = G_\beta(t\hat{\mathbf{u}} + (1-t)\mathbf{0}) \leq tG_\beta(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) + (1-t)G_\beta(\mathbf{0}) = tG_\beta(\hat{\mathbf{u}}) \leq 0 \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for any $t > 0$. On the other hand, we have

$$|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0^c}|_1 = t|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0^c}|_1 \leq 3t|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0}|_1 + 4th \leq 3|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0}|_1 + 4h.$$

Thus, it yields that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}} \in \mathcal{D}(4h, \mathcal{S}_0)$. Mimicking the proof of Lemma A.2, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \tilde{\mathbf{u}} \\ & \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 \right\} - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$. Consequently, coupled with Lemma A.3, for sufficiently large sample size, it holds with probability more than $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} G_\beta(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) &= L(\boldsymbol{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta(|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1) \\ &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 \right\} - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - \lambda_\beta (|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1) \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2^2 - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0^c}|_1 - 2\lambda_\beta h, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is followed from a similar form of (A.10) and the fact that

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0} h \rightarrow 0.$$

As a result, we have with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} G_\beta(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}) &\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2^2 - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} (4\sqrt{s_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 + 4h) - 6\lambda_\beta \sqrt{s_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 - 2\lambda_\beta h \\ &= \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2^2 - 28B \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} - 24m_0 B^2 h \sqrt{s_0} \right\} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 - 12Bh \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} - 8m_0 B^2 h^2 \\ &\geq \left(\sqrt{3\kappa_0 B h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \sqrt{\kappa_0 m_0 B h} \right) |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}|_2 - 12Bh \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} - 8m_0 B^2 h^2 > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which contradicts with (A.11) and hence (A.9) does not hold. Therefore, it implies that

$$|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \sqrt{s_0 h},$$

and

$$|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \leq 4|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0}|_1 + 4h \leq 4\sqrt{s_0}|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{S_0}|_2 + 4h \lesssim s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + s_0 h, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$.

When $\lambda_\delta \geq 2|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})|_\infty$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) &= L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) - L \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) - \mathbf{S} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right)^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \\ &\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right|_1 + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta h + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Note the fact that $\delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) \geq 0$, and it holds that $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \leq 3h + 3|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1$.

As a result, we have

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \leq \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 \leq \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right|_1 + |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \right) + (3h + 3|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1) \leq 4h + 4|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1,$$

which along with (A.12) implies (2.6). On the other hand, (A.13) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &\leq \delta L\left(\widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0; \{0\}\right) \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_0 - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 + \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \\
&\quad - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 \right) - \lambda_\delta \left(\left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \right) \\
&\quad + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \\
&\quad + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_\delta h + 2\lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{\mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 \\
&\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\delta \left| \beta_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} - \widehat{\beta}_{0, \mathcal{S}_0^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_\delta h + \frac{672\lambda_\delta B s_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \\
&\quad + 24\lambda_\delta \sqrt{\frac{3Bh s_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{576\lambda_\delta m_0 B^2 s_0 h}{\kappa_0} + 24\lambda_\delta \sqrt{\frac{2m_0 s_0}{\kappa_0}} B h
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 4p^{-1}$ by Lemma A.5, which yields that

$$\widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \in \mathcal{D} \left(4h + \frac{1344B s_0}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + 48 \sqrt{\frac{3Bh s_0}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \frac{1152m_0 B^2 s_0 h}{\kappa_0} + 48 \sqrt{\frac{2m_0 s_0}{\kappa_0}} B h, \mathcal{S}_0 \right)$$

in probability. Thus, using Lemma A.4, it holds with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-2} - 4p^{-1}$

that

$$\begin{aligned}
\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\beta}_0 - \beta_0 \right|_2 \right\} &\leq B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} (4h + 4|\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1) + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta h + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\delta |\widehat{\mathbf{u}}|_1 \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + s_0 h \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + s_0 h \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \rightarrow 0,$$

then

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \right\} = \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2$$

if the sample size is sufficiently large. As a result, the conclusion is drawn by (2.7) that

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{s_0 h} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \left(\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4}.$$

□

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2.4

Denote the oracle estimation of the crude step as $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} &\in \arg \min L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\boldsymbol{\beta}|_1, \\ &\text{subject to } \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}. \end{aligned} \tag{A.14}$$

Lemma A.6. *Under assumptions 1–3 and 5–6, with*

$$a_n = 4h', \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$$

in assumption 3, if

$$\lambda_\beta \geq \left\{ \frac{8D}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{\log p}} + \frac{32\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}},$$

where the positive constant D is determined by (A.19),

$$\sqrt{s' \lambda_\beta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{s' \log p}{\lambda_\beta (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } h' < \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^2},$$

then with probability more than $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ is a solution of problem (2.1).

Proof. According to the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker condition of (2.1), we have

$$\mathbf{S} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) + \lambda_\beta \mathbf{sign} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right) = \mathbf{0}_p, \tag{A.15}$$

where

$$\text{sign}(t) \begin{cases} = -1, & t < 0, \\ \in [-1, 1], & t = 0, \\ = 1, & t > 0, \end{cases}$$

with $\mathbf{sign}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}) = (\text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h,1}), \dots, \text{sign}(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h,p}))^\top$. Thus, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}$ is the solution of (2.1) if and only if it satisfies (A.15), which can be written as

$$\widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) - \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \mathbf{sign}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}) = \mathbf{0}_p.$$

Denote

$$\mathbf{R}_1 = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E [\mathbf{Z}_k \{I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) - I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_2 &= \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \left\{ I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}} \leq 0) - I(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0) \right\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E [\mathbf{Z}_k \{I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) - I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, (A.16) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) + \mathbf{R}_1 + \mathbf{R}_2 + \widehat{\mathbf{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \mathbf{sign}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}}) = \mathbf{0}_p,$$

which is further exhibited in the form of partitioned matrices as

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* & \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \\ \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* & \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \\ \mathbf{0}_{|\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c|} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{1\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} + \mathbf{R}_{2\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \\ \mathbf{R}_{1\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{2\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \end{pmatrix} \\ &+ \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \\ \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\lambda_\beta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{sign}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,\text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}) \\ \widehat{\mathbf{z}} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{z}} \in [-1, 1]^{|S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c|}$. Note that the first part of partition is the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker condition of (A.14) that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h} S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right) - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \\
& + \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} + \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} + \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \\
& = -\lambda_{\beta} \mathbf{sign} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right). \tag{A.16}
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we only need to verify the sufficient form of the second part of partition that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \right) \right|_{\infty} \\
& = \left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right) - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \\
& < \lambda_{\beta}. \tag{A.17}
\end{aligned}$$

Based on (A.16), (A.17) is represented as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h} S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h} S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* - \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \widehat{\mathbf{S}}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \lambda_{\beta} \mathbf{sign} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right) \right) - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* + \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \\
& < \lambda_{\beta}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the contrary, under assumption 6, the probability that (A.17) does not hold can be

controlled by

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right) - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* + \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_{\infty} \geq \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right) \\
\leq & P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \text{sign} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq (1 - \gamma) \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{1S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{2S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
& + P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
= & (I_1) + (I_2) + (I_3) + (I_4) + (I_5) + (I_6) + (I_7) + (I_8) + (I_9),
\end{aligned}$$

where terms (I_1) – (I_9) are self-defined above and will be expired when the proof of this lemma is completed. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
(I_1) &= P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c \right\|_{\max} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_1 \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) \\
&\leq P \left((1 - \gamma) m_0 B^2 h' \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}{8} \right) = 0,
\end{aligned}$$

$$(I_5) = P \left(\lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \text{sign} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq (1 - \gamma) \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right) = 0,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(I_6) &= P \left(\left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \beta_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8} \right) \leq P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right\|_{\max} \left| \beta_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_1 \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8} \right) \\
&\leq P \left(m_0 B^2 h' \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8} \right) = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Moreover, according to (A.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(I_4) &= P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8} \right) \\
&\leq P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8(1-\gamma)} \right) \\
&\leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0) \gamma^2 \lambda_{\beta}^2}{128 B^2 (1-\gamma)^2} \right) \leq 2p^{-1}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$(I_9) = P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left(\beta_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\beta}}{8} \right) \leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0) \gamma^2 \lambda_{\beta}^2}{128 B^2} \right) \leq 2p^{-1},$$

when

$$\lambda_{\beta} \geq \frac{16B(1-\gamma)}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}}.$$

On the other hand, under assumption 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(|\mathbf{R}_1|_\infty \geq t) \\
&= P\left(\left|\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E[\mathbf{Z}_k \{F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* | \mathbf{Z}_k)\}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) \right|_\infty \geq t\right) \\
&= P\left(\left|\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E\left[\mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) | \mathbf{Z}_k) dt\right] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) \right|_\infty \geq t\right) \\
&= P\left(\left|\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E\left[\int_0^1 \{f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) | \mathbf{Z}_k) - f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* | \mathbf{Z}_k)\} dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top\right] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} \right. \\
&\quad \left. (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) \right|_\infty \geq t\right) \\
&\leq P\left(\left|\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k m_0 B \left|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*\right|_1 E[\mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top] (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*) \right|_\infty \geq t\right) \\
&\leq P\left(m_0 B^3 \left|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*\right|_1^2 \geq t\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $t > 0$. Thus, it holds that

$$(I_2) \leq P\left(|\mathbf{R}_1|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8(1-\gamma)}\right) \leq P\left(\left|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*\right|_1^2 \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^3(1-\gamma)}\right)$$

and

$$(I_7) \leq P\left(|\mathbf{R}_1|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8}\right) \leq P\left(\left|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*\right|_1^2 \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^3}\right).$$

Lemma A.3 indicates that

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)|_\infty \leq 2B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Therefore, when $\lambda_\beta \geq 4B \sqrt{\log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$, it holds

that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) \\
& \leq L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) - L \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h)^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right) \\
& \leq -\lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1 + \lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1 \\
& \leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right|_1 + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \right|_1 \\
& \leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \right|_1 + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_\beta h' \tag{A.18}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Since $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \in \mathcal{D}(h', \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h})$, then according to Lemma A.2 and assumption 3, it yields with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^*; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) & \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_2 \right\} \\
& \quad - B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right|_2 \leq \frac{4B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \frac{6}{\kappa_0} \lambda_\beta \sqrt{s'} + \sqrt{\frac{7\lambda_\beta h'}{\kappa_0}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1} - p^{-2}$ by combining (A.18) and mimicking the proof of Theorem 2.1. For sufficiently large $n_{\mathcal{T}_h}, n_0$ and p , it holds that

$$\frac{4B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + \frac{6}{\kappa_0} \lambda_\beta \sqrt{s'} + \sqrt{\frac{7\lambda_\beta h'}{\kappa_0}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^3}}.$$

As a result, we have

$$(I_2) \leq 2p^{-1} + p^{-2} \text{ and } (I_7) \leq 2p^{-1} + p^{-2}.$$

On the other hand, to investigate the tail probability of item \mathbf{R}_2 , we denote the function class $\mathcal{F}_j = \{f_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, j} \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}\}$, where

$$f_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, j}(Y, \mathbf{Z}) = Z_j \{I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) - I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\} - E(Z_j \{I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) - I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \leq 0)\})$$

and Z_j is the j -th component of \mathbf{Z} . Since the Vapnik–Chervonenkis dimension of \mathcal{F}_j is less than s' , then Lemma 19.15 in van der Vaart (1998) entails that

$$\sup_Q N(\epsilon B, \mathcal{F}_j, L_2(Q)) \leq Ms'(16e)^{s'} \epsilon^{1-2s'}$$

for some positive constant $M > 0$, where the covering number $N(t, \mathcal{F}, L_r(Q))$ is the minimal number of $L_r(Q)$ -balls of radius t needed to cover the function class \mathcal{F} . Thus, Lemma 19.35 in van der Vaart (1998) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\{ \sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} f_{\beta, j}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left\{ \sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} f_{\beta, j}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k n_k^{-1/2} BJ(1, \mathcal{F}_j, L_2) \\ & = B \sqrt{\frac{K}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \sup_Q N(\epsilon B, \mathcal{F}_j, L_2(Q))} d\epsilon \\ & \leq DB \sqrt{s'} (n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h})^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{A.19}$$

for some constant $D > 0$. Employing Theorem 3.26 in Wainwright (2019), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(|\mathbf{R}_2|_\infty \geq DB \sqrt{s'} (n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h})^{-1/2} + t \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} f_{\beta, j}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) \right| \geq DB \sqrt{s'} (n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h})^{-1/2} + t \right) \\ & \leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{(n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)t^2}{16B^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By taking $t = 4L \sqrt{2 \log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)}$, we obtain

$$|\mathbf{R}_2|_\infty < DB \sqrt{\frac{s'}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}}} + 4B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$.

As a result, when

$$\lambda_\beta \geq \frac{8DB}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}}} + \frac{32B}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}},$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} (I_3) &= P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^* \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \left| \mathbf{R}_{2\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8} \right) \\ &\leq P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{2\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8(1-\gamma)} \right) \\ &\leq 2p^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(I_8) = P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{2\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8} \right) \leq 2p^{-1}.$$

Combining the pieces, we conclude that (A.17) holds with probability more than $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$, which concludes the proof of Lemma A.6. \square

Lemma A.7. *Under assumptions 1–3 and 5–6, with*

$$a_n = 4h', \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$$

in assumption 3, if

$$\lambda_\beta \geq \left\{ \frac{8D}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{\log p}} + \frac{32\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}},$$

where the positive constant D is determined by (A.19),

$$\sqrt{s' \lambda_\beta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{s' \log p}{\lambda_\beta (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } h' < \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^2},$$

then with probability more than $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$, any solution $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ of problem (2.1) satisfies $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}$.

Proof. From Lemma A.6, the event that the oracle estimator $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ is a solution of (2.1) occurs with probability more than $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$. On this event, to demonstrate that any solution $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ of problem (2.1) satisfies $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}$, it is sufficient to verify that

$$L(\beta; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta|_1 > L \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) + \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1$$

for any β with $\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}_{|S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c|}$. We first show that

$$L(\beta, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta|_1 > L\left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top, \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right) + \lambda_\beta \left|\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}\right|_1$$

for any $\beta \in \mathcal{B}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, r\right)$ with $\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}$, where $\mathcal{B}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, r\right)$ represents the neighbourhood of ℓ_1 -ball with radius r . The Knight equation entails that

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\beta; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) \\ = & L\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right) + \mathbf{S}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right)^\top \left(\beta - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \\ & + \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \int_0^{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top (\beta - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & L\left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right) \\ = & L\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right) + \mathbf{S}\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right)^\top \left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) + \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \\ & \int_0^{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right)} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L(\beta; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta|_1 \right\} - \left\{ L\left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right) + \lambda_\beta \left|\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}\right|_1 \right\} \\ = & \mathbf{S}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h\right)^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} + \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \\ & \int_{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)^\top - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right)}^{\mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top (\beta - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \left(\left(\beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top \right)^\top - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right)}^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top (\beta - \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \\
&= \left(\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta - Y_{ki} \right) I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta \leq 0 \right) - \left(\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} - Y_{ki} \right) I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) \\
&\quad - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z \right) dz - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \\
&\quad + \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Denote $F_{k, \beta}(\cdot)$ as the distribution function of $Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta$ and $\widetilde{F}_{k, \beta}(\cdot)$ as the empirical distribution function of $\{F_{k, \beta}(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta)\}_{i=1}^{n_k}$. Set $\widehat{\Psi}_{k, \beta}(t) = n_k^{1/2} \left(\widetilde{F}_{k, \beta}(t) - t \right)$. Since

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \geq 0,$$

Theorem 1.2 in van Zuijlen (1978) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz \right. \\
& > \left. \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k t_k \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{1}{\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz > t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \frac{1}{\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1} \left(\int_0^B \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 + \int_0^{-B} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left\{ I\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\right)\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}\right) \leq F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z)\right\} \\
& \quad \left. - I\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\right)\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}}\right) \leq F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0)\right\} dz > t_k \right) \\
& = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1} \left(\int_0^B \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 + \int_0^{-B} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left\{ \tilde{F}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z)\right) - \tilde{F}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0)\right) \right\} dz > t_k \right) \\
& = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1} \left(\int_0^B \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 + \int_0^{-B} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \right) \left\{ \left\{ F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z) - F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0) \right\} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. + \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0)\right) \right\} dz > n_k^{1/2} t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(m_0 B^2 r + \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1} \left(\int_0^B \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 + \int_0^{-B} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \right) \right. \\
& \quad \left\{ \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}^{(k)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0)\right) \right\} dz > n_k^{1/2} t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1 \leq r} \sup_{z \in [-Br, Br]} \left| \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}\left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}, \mathbf{0}^\top)}(0)\right) \right| > \frac{n_k^{1/2} t_k}{2B} - \frac{m_0 B r}{2} \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{8MB^3 r}{(n_k^{1/2} t_k - m_0 B^2 r)^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant M . Taking $t_k = n_k^{-1/2} m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}$ whereas $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h$, for a sufficiently small positive constant η , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz\right. \\
& \quad \left. > \frac{K m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}}{\sqrt{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1\right) \\
& \leq P\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz\right. \\
& \quad \left. > \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} \sqrt{n_k}}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \right|_1\right) \\
& \leq \frac{8KM r^{2\eta}}{m_0^2 B (1 - r^{1/2+\eta})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, using the Markov inequality and Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right\} \right| > t\right) \\
& \leq E\left\{\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left\{ I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right\}\right)^2\right\} / t^2 \\
& \leq E\left\{\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left(\mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c}\right)^2\right)\right. \\
& \quad \left.\left(\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left| I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \right|\right)\right\} / t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq -Br\right) \leq I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top\right)\right)\right) \\
& = I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0\right) \leq I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq Br\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq -Br\right) \leq I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0\right) \leq I\left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^\top}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq Br\right),$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \right| \\ & \leq I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq Br \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq -Br \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} \right| > t \right) \\ & \leq \frac{B^2 \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1^2}{t^2} E \left[\frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq Br \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq -Br \right) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{B^2 \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1^2}{t^2} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left(F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top} (Br) - F_{k, (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top} (-Br) \right) \\ & \leq 2m_0 B^3 r \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1^2 / t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $t = m_0 L^2 r^{1/2-\eta} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1$ for a sufficiently small positive constant η , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} \right| \right. \\ & \quad \left. > m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{2r^{2\eta}}{m_0 B}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, Lemma A.6 implies that (A.17) holds with probability at least $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$.

Denote $S_j(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{T})$ as the j -th component of $\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{T})$ for some index set $\mathcal{T} \subset \{1, \dots, K\}$. As

a result, we can always find a sufficient small $r > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta} \right|_1 \right\} - \left\{ L \left(\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top \right)^\top; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) + \lambda_\beta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \right|_1 \right\} \\ & > \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \left(S_j \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h \right) + \left(\lambda_\beta - m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} - \frac{K m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}}{\sqrt{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} \right) \text{sign}(\beta_j) \right) \beta_j \\ & > 0, \end{aligned}$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2} - 8KMr^\eta / (m_0^2 B(1 - r^{1/2+\eta})^2) - 2r^{2\eta} / (m_0 B)$. Furthermore, for any β with $\beta_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}$, there exists a vector $\beta^\ddagger = s\beta + (1 - s)\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ with $\beta^\ddagger \in \mathcal{B}(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, r)$. The convexity of the object function in (2.1) entails that

$$\begin{aligned} & s(L(\beta; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta|_1) + (1 - s) \left(L(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1 \right) \\ & \geq L(\beta^\ddagger; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta^\ddagger|_1. \end{aligned}$$

The above inequality implies that β is not the solution of (2.1) since

$$\begin{aligned} & L(\beta; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta|_1 \\ & \geq \frac{1}{s} \left\{ L(\beta^\ddagger; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta^\ddagger|_1 - (1 - s) \left(L(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1 \right) \right\} \\ & \geq L(\beta^\ddagger; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta |\beta^\ddagger|_1 > L(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h) + \lambda_\beta \left| \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof, implying that all the solutions of (2.1) satisfies $\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}$ with probability at least $1 - 12p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$. \square

The oracle estimation of the refined step can be defined as

$$\widehat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \in \arg \min_{\delta: \delta_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}} L(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \delta; \{0\}) + \lambda_\delta |\delta|_1. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

Lemma A.8. *Under assumptions 1-3, 5, and 6, with*

$$a_n = 4h', \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$$

and

$$a_n = 0, \quad \mathcal{S} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}$$

in assumption 3, if

$$\lambda_\beta \geq \left\{ \frac{8D}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{\log p}} + \frac{32\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}}$$

and

$$\lambda_\delta \geq \left\{ \frac{6\tilde{D}}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{\log p}} + \frac{24\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}},$$

where the positive constant \tilde{D} is determined by (A.26),

$$\sqrt{s'\lambda_\beta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{s' \log p}{\lambda_\beta (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \sqrt{(s' + s_0)\lambda_\delta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{(s' + s_0) \log p}{\lambda_\delta n_0} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } h' < \frac{\gamma \lambda_\beta}{8m_0 B^2},$$

then with probability more than $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$, $\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ is a solution of problem (2.2).

Proof. According to the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker condition of (2.2), we have

$$\mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta \mathbf{sign} \left(\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Thus, $\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ is the solution of (2.2) if and only if it satisfies (A.21), which can be written as

$$\mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \right) - \mathbf{S}(\beta_0; \{0\}) + \mathbf{S}(\beta_0; \{0\}) + \lambda_\delta \mathbf{sign} \left(\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

In the following, we denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_3 &= E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \left\{ I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \beta) \leq 0 \right\} - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \beta_0 \leq 0) \right] \Bigg|_{\beta = \hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} \\ &\quad - \mathbf{H}_0^* \left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \beta_0 \right) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{R}_4 &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \beta_0 \leq 0 \right) \right\} \\ &\quad - E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \left\{ I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \beta) \leq 0 \right\} - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \beta_0 \leq 0) \right] \Bigg|_{\beta = \hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, (A.22) can be rewritten as

$$\mathbf{H}_0^* \left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \beta_0 \right) + \mathbf{R}_3 + \mathbf{R}_4 + \mathbf{S}(\beta_0; \{0\}) + \lambda_\delta \mathbf{sign} \left(\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) = \mathbf{0},$$

which is further exhibited in the form of partitioned matrices as

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}\bar{S}}^* & \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}\bar{S}^c}^* \\ \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* & \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}^c\bar{S}^c}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} + \hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} - \beta_{0, \bar{S}} \\ \mathbf{0} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}} \\ \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c} \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\beta_0; \{0\}) \\ \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\beta_0; \{0\}) \end{pmatrix} \\ &= -\lambda_\delta \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{sign}_{\bar{S}} \left(\hat{\delta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \\ \tilde{\mathbf{z}} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in [-1, 1]^{|\bar{S}^c|}$. Note that the first part of partition is the Karush–Kuhn–Tucker condition of (A.20) that

$$\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\bar{S}} \right) + \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}} + \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) = -\lambda_\delta \mathbf{sign}_{\bar{S}} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Consequently, we only need to verify the sufficient form of the second part of partition that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \right) \right|_\infty \\ &= \left| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0\bar{S}} \right) + \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \\ &< \lambda_\delta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.24})$$

Using (A.23), (A.24) is rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \left(-\mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}} - \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}} - \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \lambda_\delta \mathbf{sign}_{\bar{S}} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty < \lambda_\delta. \end{aligned}$$

On the contrary, under assumption 6, the probability that (A.24) does not hold can be controlled by

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(\left| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}, \bar{S}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\bar{S}} \right) + \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c} + \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \geq \lambda_\delta \right) \\ &\leq P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \left| \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &+ P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \left| \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &+ P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &+ P \left(\lambda_\delta \left\| \mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \left| \mathbf{sign}_{\bar{S}} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \right|_\infty \geq (1 - \gamma)\lambda_\delta \right) \\ &+ P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{3\bar{S}^c} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &+ P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c} \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &+ P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \\ &= (I_1) + (I_2) + (I_3) + (I_4) + (I_5) + (I_6) + (I_7), \end{aligned}$$

where terms (I_1) – (I_7) are self-defined above and will be expired when the proof of this lemma is completed. Note that

$$(I_4) = P \left(\lambda_{\delta} \left\| \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}^c \bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S} \bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{sign}_{\bar{S}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq (1 - \gamma) \lambda_{\delta} \right) = 0.$$

Moreover, according to (A.7), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (I_3) &= P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S}^c \bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0, \bar{S} \bar{S}}^* \right)^{-1} \right\|_{\infty} \left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\delta}}{6} \right) \\ &\leq P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\delta}}{6(1 - \gamma)} \right) \\ &\leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{n_0 \gamma^2 \lambda_{\delta}^2}{72 B^2 (1 - \gamma)^2} \right) \leq 2p^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$(I_7) = P \left(\left| \mathbf{S}_{\bar{S}^c}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_{\infty} \geq \frac{\gamma \lambda_{\delta}}{6} \right) \leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{n_0 \gamma^2 \lambda_{\delta}^2}{72 B^2} \right) \leq 2p^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P \left(\left| \mathbf{R}_3 \right|_{\infty} \geq t \right) \\ &= P \left(\left| E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \{ I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} \right] \right|_{\beta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbf{H}_0^* \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq t \Big) \\ &= P \left(\left| E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \int_0^1 f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \right] \right|_{\beta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \mathbf{H}_0^* \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq t \Big) \\ &= P \left(\left| E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \int_0^1 \{ f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) - f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) \} dt \right] \right|_{\beta = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq t \Big) \\ &\leq P \left(\left| m_0 B \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^{\top} \right] \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \right|_{\infty} \geq t \right) \\ &\leq P \left(m_0 B^3 \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1^2 \geq t \right) \end{aligned}$$

for any $t > 0$. Thus, it holds that

$$(I_1) \leq P \left(|\mathbf{R}_3|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6(1-\gamma)} \right) \leq P \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1^2 \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6m_0B^3(1-\gamma)} \right)$$

and

$$(I_5) \leq P \left(|\mathbf{R}_3|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6} \right) \leq P \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1^2 \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6m_0B^3} \right).$$

Lemma A.5 indicates that

$$|\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})|_\infty \leq 2B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Therefore, when $\lambda_\delta \geq 4B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\} \right) \\ & \leq L \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \right) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right) \\ & \leq -\lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1 + \lambda_\delta \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \\ & \leq \frac{3}{2}\lambda_\delta \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$. Since $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(0, \bar{\mathcal{S}})$, then according to Lemma A.4, it yields with probability more than $1 - p^{-2}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \delta \widehat{L}^{(0)} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \\ & \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \right|_2 \right\} \\ & \quad - B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \right|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \leq \frac{4B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{(s_0 + s') \log p}{n_0}} + \frac{6}{\kappa_0} \lambda_\delta \sqrt{s' + s_0}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1} - p^{-2}$ by combining (A.25) and mimicking the proof of Theorem 2.1. For sufficiently large $n_{\mathcal{T}_h}, n_0$ and p , it holds that

$$\frac{4B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{(s_0 + s') \log p}{n_0}} + \frac{6}{\kappa_0} \lambda_\delta \sqrt{s' + s_0} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6m_0B^3}}.$$

As a result, we have

$$(I_1) \leq 2p^{-1} + p^{-2} \text{ and } (I_5) \leq 2p^{-1} + p^{-2}.$$

Denote $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j = \{\tilde{f}_{\delta,j} \mid \delta_{\bar{s}c} = \mathbf{0}\}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{\delta,j}(Y, \mathbf{Z}) &= Z_j \left\{ I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top (\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \delta) \leq 0) - I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \beta_0 \leq 0) \right\} \\ &\quad - E \left(Z_j \left\{ I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top (\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \delta) \leq 0) - I(Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \beta_0 \leq 0) \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since the Vapnik–Chervonenkis dimension of $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j$ is less than $s_0 + s'$, then Lemma 19.15 in van der Vaart (1998) entails that

$$\sup_Q N(\epsilon B, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j, L_2(Q)) \leq \tilde{M}(s_0 + s')(16e)^{s_0 + s'} \epsilon^{1 - 2s_0 - 2s'}$$

for some positive constant $\tilde{M} > 0$. Thus, Lemma 19.35 in van der Vaart (1998) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\{ \sup_{\delta: \delta_{\bar{s}c} = \mathbf{0}_{|\bar{s}c|}} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \tilde{f}_{\delta,j}(Y_{0i}, \mathbf{Z}_{0i}) \right\} \\ & \leq n_0^{-1/2} BJ(1, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j, L_2) \\ & = \frac{B}{\sqrt{n_0}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \sup_Q N(\epsilon B, \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_j, L_2(Q))} d\epsilon \\ & \leq \tilde{D}B \sqrt{s_0 + s'} n_0^{-1/2} \end{aligned} \tag{A.26}$$

for some constant $\tilde{D} > 0$. Employing Theorem 3.26 in Wainwright (2019), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & P(|\mathbf{R}_4|_\infty \geq \tilde{D}B \sqrt{s_0 + s'} n_0^{-1/2} + t) \\ & \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_0} \sup_{\delta: \delta_{\bar{s}c} = \mathbf{0}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \tilde{f}_{\delta,j}(Y_{0i}, \mathbf{Z}_{0i}) \right| \geq n_0^{-1/2} \tilde{D}B \sqrt{s_0 + s'} + t \right) \\ & \leq 2p \exp \left(-\frac{n_0 t^2}{16B^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By taking $t = 4B \sqrt{2 \log p / n_0}$, we obtain

$$|\mathbf{R}_2|_\infty < \tilde{D}B \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_0}} + 4B \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{n_0}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$.

As a result, when

$$\lambda_\delta \geq \frac{6\tilde{D}B}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_0}} + \frac{24B}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{2\log p}{n_0}},$$

we have

$$(I_2) = P\left(\left\|\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}^c\bar{S}}^* \left(\mathbf{H}_{0,\bar{S}\bar{S}}^*\right)^{-1}\right\|_\infty |\mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}}|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6}\right) \leq P\left(|\mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}}|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6(1-\gamma)}\right) \leq 2p^{-1}$$

and

$$(I_6) = P\left(|\mathbf{R}_{4\bar{S}^c}|_\infty \geq \frac{\gamma\lambda_\delta}{6}\right) \leq 2p^{-1}.$$

Combining the pieces, we conclude that (A.24) holds with probability more than $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$, which concludes the proof of Lemma A.8. \square

Lemma A.9. *Under assumptions 1-3, 5, and 6, with*

$$a_n = 4h', \quad \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$$

and

$$a_n = 0, \quad \mathcal{S} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}$$

in assumption 3, if

$$\lambda_\beta \geq \left\{ \frac{8D}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s'}{\log p}} + \frac{32\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}},$$

and

$$\lambda_\delta \geq \left\{ \frac{6\tilde{D}}{\gamma} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{\log p}} + \frac{24\sqrt{2}}{\gamma} \right\} B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}},$$

where the positive constant \tilde{D} is determined by (A.26),

$$\sqrt{s'\lambda_\beta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{s' \log p}{\lambda_\beta (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)} \rightarrow 0, \quad \sqrt{(s' + s_0)\lambda_\delta} \rightarrow 0, \quad \frac{(s' + s_0) \log p}{\lambda_\delta n_0} \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{and } h' < \frac{\gamma\lambda_\beta}{8m_0B^2},$$

then with probability more than $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$, any solution $\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ of problem (2.2) satisfies

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} = \mathbf{0}.$$

Proof. From Lemma A.8, when $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ is an oracle solution, the event that the oracle estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ is a solution of (2.2) occurs with probability more than $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$. On this event, to demonstrate that any solution $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}$ of problem (2.2) satisfies $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} = \mathbf{0}$, it is sufficient to verify that

$$L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 > L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right|_1$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ with $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}$. We first show that

$$L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 > L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}^{\top})^{\top}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}|_1$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathcal{B}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, r\right)$ with $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}$. The Knight equation entails that

$$\begin{aligned} & L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}\right) \\ = & L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right) + \mathbf{S}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right)^{\top} \left(\boldsymbol{\delta} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \\ & + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{\delta} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right\} dz \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}^{\top})^{\top}; \{0\}\right) \\ = & L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right) + \mathbf{S}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right)^{\top} \left((\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}_{|\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c|}^{\top})^{\top} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left((\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}^{\top})^{\top} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right)} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 \right\} - \left\{ L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}^{\top})^{\top}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\delta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}|_1 \right\} \\ = & \mathbf{S}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right)^{\top} \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}^c} + \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \\ & \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left((\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}}, \mathbf{0}^{\top})^{\top} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right)}^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top}(\boldsymbol{\delta} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^{\top} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right\} dz. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top ((\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})}^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\boldsymbol{\delta} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}})} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \\
&= \left(\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta} \right) - Y_{0i} \right) I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta} \right) \leq 0 \right) \\
&\quad - \left(\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} - Y_{0i} \right) I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) \\
&\quad - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}} I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq z \right) dz - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \\
&= \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \\
&\quad + \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \geq 0,$$

Theorem 1.2 in van Zuijlen (1978) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \bar{S}^c \delta_{\bar{S}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \delta_{\bar{S}} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \delta_{\bar{S}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz > t\right) \\
\leq & P\left(\hat{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h, S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}\right) + P\left(\sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sup_{\delta: |\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} \left(\int_0^{B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} + \int_0^{-B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1}\right) \right. \\
& \left. \left\{ I\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \beta - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \delta_{\bar{S}}\right) \leq F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z)\right) \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. - I\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \beta - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \delta_{\bar{S}}\right) \leq F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0)\right) \right\} dz > t\right) \\
= & 12p^{-1} + 2p^{-2} + P\left(\sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sup_{\delta: |\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \frac{1}{|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} \left(\int_0^{B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} + \int_0^{-B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1}\right) \right. \\
& \left. \left\{ \tilde{F}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z)\right) - \tilde{F}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0)\right) \right\} dz > t\right) \\
= & P\left(\sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sup_{\delta: |\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} \left(\int_0^{B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} + \int_0^{-B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1}\right) \left\{ \left\{ F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z) - F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0) \right\} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0)\right) \right\} dz > n_0^{1/2} t\right) + 12p^{-1} + 2p^{-2} \\
\leq & P\left(m_0 B^2 r + \sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sup_{\delta: |\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \leq r} \frac{1}{|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} \left(\int_0^{B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1} + \int_0^{-B|\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1}\right) \right. \\
& \left. \left\{ \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0)\right) \right\} dz > n_0^{1/2} t\right) + 12p^{-1} + 2p^{-2} \\
\leq & P\left(\sup_{\beta: \beta_{S_{\mathcal{T}_h}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sup_{\delta: |\delta_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \leq r} \sup_{z \in [-Br, Br]} \right. \\
& \left. \left| \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(z)\right) - \hat{\Psi}_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\left(F_{0, \beta+}(\delta_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)(0)\right) \right| > \frac{n_0^{1/2} t}{2B} - \frac{m_0 Br}{2}\right) \\
& + 12p^{-1} + 2p^{-2} \\
\leq & \frac{8MB^3 r}{(n_0^{1/2} t - m_0 B^2 r)^2} + 12p^{-1} + 2p^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

for some positive constant M . Taking $t = n_0^{-1/2} m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}$ for a sufficiently small positive

constant η , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq z\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0\right) \right\} dz\right. \\
& \left. > \frac{m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}}{\sqrt{n_0}} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1\right) \\
& \leq \frac{8Mr^{2\eta}}{m_0^2 B(1-r^{1/2+\eta})^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, it follows from the Markov inequality and Cauchy–Schwarz inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\left|\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right\}\right| > t\right) \\
& \leq E\left\{\left(\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \left\{ I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right\}\right)^2\right\} / t^2 \\
& \leq E\left\{\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left(\mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}\right)^2\right\} \\
& \quad \times \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left| I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right| / t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
& I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq -Br\right) \leq I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} - (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)\right)\right) \\
& = I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \leq I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq Br\right)
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
& I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq -Br\right) \leq I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq 0\right) \\
& \leq I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq Br\right),
\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq 0\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}\right) \leq 0\right) \right| \\
& \leq I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq Br\right) - I\left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \leq -Br\right)
\end{aligned}$$

for any $i = 1, \dots, n_k$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \right\} \right| > t \right) \\
& \leq \frac{B^2 |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1^2}{t^2} E \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq Br \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq -Br \right) \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \frac{B^2 |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1^2}{t^2} \left(F_{0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top}(Br) - F_{0, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top}(-Br) \right) \\
& \leq 2m_0 L^3 r |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1^2 / t^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Taking $t = m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1$ for a sufficiently small positive constant η , we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}^c}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{z}_{0i, \bar{S}}^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}} \leq 0 \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{z}_{0i}^\top \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}} \right) \leq 0 \right) \right\} \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. > m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c}|_1 \right) \\
& \leq \frac{2r^{2\eta}}{m_0 B}.
\end{aligned}$$

Besides, Lemma A.8 implies that (A.24) holds with probability at least $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$.

As a result, we can always find a sufficient small $r > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\{ L \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 \right\} - \left\{ L \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}}^\top, \mathbf{0}^\top)^\top; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta |\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}}|_1 \right\} \\
& > \sum_{j \in \bar{S}^c} \left(S_j \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\text{ora}}; \{0\} \right) + \left(\lambda_\delta - m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta} - \frac{m_0 B^2 r^{1/2-\eta}}{\sqrt{n_0}} \right) \text{sign}(\delta_j) \right) \delta_j \\
& > 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which holds with probability at least $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2} - 8Mr^\eta / (m_0^2 B (1 - r^{1/2+\eta})^2) - 2r^{2\eta} / (m_0 B)$. Furthermore, for any $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ with $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\bar{S}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}$, there exists a vector $\boldsymbol{\delta}^\ddagger = s\boldsymbol{\delta} + (1-s)\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}$ with $\boldsymbol{\delta}^\ddagger \in \mathcal{B} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}, r \right)$. The convexity of the object function in (2.2) entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
& s \left(L \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta |\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 \right) + (1-s) \left(L \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta |\hat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}|_1 \right) \\
& \geq L \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^\ddagger; \{0\} \right) + \lambda_\delta |\boldsymbol{\delta}^\ddagger|_1.
\end{aligned}$$

The above inequality implies that $\boldsymbol{\delta}$ is not the solution of (2.2) since

$$\begin{aligned}
& L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 \\
& \geq \frac{1}{s} \left\{ L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^\dagger; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}|\boldsymbol{\delta}^\dagger|_1 - (1-s) \left(L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}|_1 \right) \right\} \\
& \geq L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^\dagger; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}|\boldsymbol{\delta}^\dagger|_1 > L\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}; \{0\}\right) + \lambda_{\boldsymbol{\delta}}|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \text{ora}}|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof, implying that all the solutions of (2.2) satisfies $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\delta}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, \mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}$ with probability at least $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 2.4

Proof. It follows directly from Lemmas A.6–A.9 and thus is omitted. \square

A.5 Proof of Theorem 2.5

Proof. Note that

$$P\left(\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{S}}\right) = P\left(\widehat{\beta}_{0j} \neq 0, j \in \mathcal{S}_0\right).$$

Under assumptions 1–3 and 7, and using Theorem 2.3, for any $j \in \mathcal{S}_0$, there exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0j} \right| = \left| \beta_{0j} + \widehat{\beta}_{0j} - \beta_{0j} \right| \geq \left| \beta_{0j} \right| - \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0j} - \beta_{0j} \right| \geq \left| \beta_{0j} \right| - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \\
& \geq \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} |\beta_{0j}| - c\sqrt{s_0} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_0} \right)^{1/4} \max \left\{ h^2, \frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right\}^{1/4} > 0
\end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}$. Therefore, it yields that

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\mathcal{S}_0 \subset \widehat{\mathcal{S}}\right) &= P\left(\widehat{\beta}_{0j} \neq 0, j \in \mathcal{S}_0\right) = P\left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} \left| \widehat{\beta}_{0j} \right| > 0\right) \\
&\geq P\left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} \left| \beta_{0j} \right| - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 > 0\right) \\
&\geq P\left(\min_{j \in \mathcal{S}_0} \left| \beta_{0j} \right| - c\sqrt{s_0} \max\{h^2, \log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)\}^{1/4} > 0,\right. \\
&\quad \left. \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{s_0} \max\{h^2, \log p / (n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0)\}^{1/4}\right) \\
&\geq 1 - 2p^{-1} - 2p^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

\square

B Asymptotic Distribution

B.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

Lemma B.1. *Under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumption 4, it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \widehat{f}_{ki}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\|_{\max} \\ &= O_P \left(\sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\pi_k}{b_k} \left\{ \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) + \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} \right\} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We conduct our demonstration on the event that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}$, which occurs with probability at least $1 - 24p^{-1} - 4p^{-2}$ following from Lemma A.8. Note that

$$2b_k \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0) - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right) = I \left(-b_k \leq Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 \leq b_k \right) - I \left(-b_k \leq Y_{ki} - \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq b_k \right).$$

Denote $\mathcal{G}_{k,jl} = \{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y, \mathbf{Z}) \mid \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}\}$, where

$$g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y, \mathbf{Z}) = \frac{Z_j Z_l}{2b_k} \left\{ I \left(-b_k \leq Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq b_k \right) - I \left(-b_k \leq Y - \mathbf{Z}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq b_k \right) \right\}.$$

Since the Vapnik–Chervonenkis dimension of $\mathcal{G}_{k,jl}$ is less than $s_0 + s'$, then Lemma 19.15 in van der Vaart (1998) entails that

$$\sup_Q N(\epsilon B^2, \mathcal{G}_{k,jl}, L_2(Q)) \leq M_0 (s_0 + s') (16e)^{s_0 + s'} \epsilon^{1 - 2s_0 - 2s'}$$

for some positive constant $M_0 > 0$. Thus, Lemma 19.35 in van der Vaart (1998) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & E \left\{ \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} [g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) - E \{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y_k, \mathbf{Z}_k)\}] \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left\{ \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} [g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) - E \{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta},k,jl}(Y_k, \mathbf{Z}_k)\}] \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\pi_k B^2}{2b_k \sqrt{n_k}} J(1, \mathcal{G}_{k,jl}, L_2) \\ & = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\pi_k B^2}{2b_k \sqrt{n_k}} \int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \sup_Q N(\epsilon B^2, \mathcal{G}_{k,jl}, L_2(Q))} d\epsilon \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \frac{\pi_k D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $D_0 > 0$. Employing Theorem 3.26 in Wainwright (2019), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \widehat{f}_{ki}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\} \right. \right. \\
& \quad \left. \left. - \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left\{ \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0} \right\|_{\max} \geq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left(\frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + t_k \right) \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\bar{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} [g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k, jl}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) - E \{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k, jl}(Y_k, \mathbf{Z}_k)\}] \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. \geq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left(\frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + t_k \right) \right) + P(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \bar{S}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}) \\
& \leq \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{l=1}^p \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_k} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}: \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\bar{S}^c} = \mathbf{0}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} [g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k, jl}(Y_{ki}, \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) - E \{g_{\boldsymbol{\beta}, k, jl}(Y_k, \mathbf{Z}_k)\}] \right| \geq \frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + t_k \right) \\
& \quad + P(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{0, \bar{S}^c} \neq \mathbf{0}) \\
& \leq 2Kp^2 \exp \left(-\frac{n_k b_k^2 t_k^2}{4B^4} \right) + 24p^{-1} + 4p^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

By taking

$$t_k = \frac{4B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}},$$

we obtain with probability greater than $1 - 24p^{-1} - (4 + 2K)p^{-2}$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left\| \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0) - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left\{ \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\beta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0} \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\
& < \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left(\frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + \frac{4B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| E \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right) \right| &= \left| \frac{1}{2b_k} E \left\{ F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} + b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} - b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \frac{1}{2b_k} E \left\{ F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \right| \\
&\leq \frac{m_0 B}{b_k} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1,
\end{aligned}$$

by combining Theorem 2.2, it implies that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\hat{\beta}_0) - \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \right) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\ & < \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left\{ \frac{cm_0 B^3}{b_k} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) + \frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + \frac{4B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 26p^{-1} - (6 + 2K)p^{-2}$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.1

Proof. We derive an upper bound of $\left\| \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\beta_0) \right\|_{\max}$ as follows. Specifically,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\beta_0) \right\|_{\max} \\ & = \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \hat{f}_{ki}(\hat{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left(f_k(\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\ & \leq \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \hat{f}_{ki}(\hat{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\|_{\max} \\ & \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\ & \quad + \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ E \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) - E \left(f_k(\mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \beta_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_{ki}) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} \quad (\text{B.1}) \end{aligned}$$

Combining Lemma B.1, it is sufficient to dominate the last two terms of (B.1) to show

Theorem 3.1. It follows from the Hoeffding inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} & P \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} > \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k t_k \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} > t_k \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{m=1}^p \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) Z_{ki,m} Z_{ki,j} - E \left(\hat{f}_{ki}(\beta_0) Z_{ki,m} Z_{ki,j} \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} > t_k \right) \\ & \leq 2p^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \exp \left(-\frac{8n_k b_k^2 t_k^2}{B^4} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By taking

$$t_k = \frac{B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{2n_k}},$$

we arrive at

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top - E \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \frac{B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{2n_k}}$$

with probability more than $1 - 2Kp^{-2}$.

On the other hand, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ E \left(\widehat{f}_{ki}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right) - E \left(f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right) \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left\{ \left(\frac{F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - b_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k)}{2b_k} - f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right) \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \right\} \right\|_{\max} \\ &\leq m_0 B^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k b_k. \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} \\ &\leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \left\{ \frac{B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{2n_k}} + m_0 B^2 b_k + \frac{cm_0 L^3}{b_k} \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) + \frac{D_0 B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}} + \frac{4B^2}{b_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} \right\} \end{aligned}$$

with probability more than $1 - 26p^{-1} - (6 + 4K)p^{-2}$. Further, when

$$\begin{aligned} b_k &= O \left(\sqrt{\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k}} + \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h \right) + \sqrt{\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}}} \right) \\ &= O \left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} \right), \end{aligned}$$

the error bound of $\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max}$ achieves a faster convergence rate that

$$\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} \leq O_P \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right).$$

□

B.2 Proof of Theorem 3.2

Lemma B.2. *Set*

$$b_k = O\left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_k}\right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k}\right)^{1/4}\right), \quad k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Assume that

$$s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) = o(1).$$

Then under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumptions 4 and 8, there exists a positive constant κ_m such that

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})} \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} \geq \kappa_m$$

holds with probability approaching to one.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})$, we have

$$|\mathbf{v}|_1 = \left| \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}^c} \right|_1 + \left| \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 \leq 4 \left| \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \left| \mathbf{v}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_2 \leq 4\sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} |\mathbf{v}|_2.$$

Note that under assumption 4, Lemma A.1 entails that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} \\ & \leq \left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} \\ & = \left\| \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k E \left[\left\{ f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* | \mathbf{Z}_k) - f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 | \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] \right\|_{\max} \\ & \leq m_0 B^3 Ch. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, based on Theorem 3.1, for some positive constant c , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\frac{|\mathbf{v}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^*) \mathbf{v}|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} > 16cs_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\frac{|\mathbf{v}|_1^2 \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \right\|_{\max}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} > 16cs_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} > \frac{c}{2} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \right) \\
& \quad + P \left(\left\| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\|_{\max} > \frac{c}{2} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \right) \\
& \leq 26p^{-1} + (6 + 4K)p^{-2},
\end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^*) \mathbf{v}|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} = O_P \left(s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \right).$$

As

$$s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) = o(1),$$

when n and p are large enough, it holds that

$$\frac{|\mathbf{v}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^*) \mathbf{v}|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} \leq \frac{\kappa_{0m}}{4}$$

with probability tending to 1. Hence, following the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} \geq \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} - \frac{|\mathbf{v}^\top (\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^*) \mathbf{v}|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} \geq \frac{3}{4} \kappa_{0m},$$

which completes the proof by taking $\kappa_m = 3\kappa_{0m}/4$. \square

Lemma B.3. *Set*

$$b_k = O \left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_k} \right)^{1/4} \right), \quad k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h.$$

Assume that

$$s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) = o(1).$$

Under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumptions 4 and 8, if

$$\lambda_m \geq 4C_0(1 + r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right),$$

where the positive constant C_0 is specified by (B.3), then it holds that

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_2 = O_P(\lambda_m \sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}})$$

and

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 = O_P(\lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}).$$

Proof. By the definition of $\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}$ in (3.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - 2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, -m} \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \lambda_m |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 \\ & \leq (\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - 2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \lambda_m |\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1. \end{aligned}$$

By some basic algebra, we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} & (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \\ & \leq 2(\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) + \lambda_m (|\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 - |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_\infty \\ & \leq \left| \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m}^* - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_\infty + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m}^* \right|_\infty \\ & \quad + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_\infty \\ & \leq 0 + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m}^* \right|_\infty + \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m}^* \right\|_{\max} |\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 \\ & \leq C_0(1 + r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

with probability more than $1 - 26p^{-1} - (6 + 4K)p^{-2}$ for some constant $C_0 > 0$ and if

$$\lambda_m \geq 4C_0(1 + r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right),$$

(B.2) entails that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq 2(\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) + \lambda_m (|\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 - |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1) \\ &\leq 2|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_\infty + \lambda_m (|\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 - |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_m |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 + \lambda_m (|\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 - |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}^c} \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 + \lambda_m \left| \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 \\ &\quad - \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 - \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}^c} \right|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}^c} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}^c} \right|_1, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

which implies that $\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})$. As a consequence, it follows from Lemma B.2 and (B.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\kappa_m |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_2^2 \\ &\leq (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} (\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \\ &\leq 2|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, -m, -m} \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_\infty + \lambda_m (|\gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 - |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1) \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_m |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 \\ &\leq 6\lambda_m \sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} |\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_2 \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 26p^{-1} - (6 + 4K)p^{-2}$. Therefore, it concludes that

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_2 = O_P(\lambda_m \sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}})$$

and

$$|\widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}|_1 = O_P(\lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}).$$

□

Lemma B.4. *Set*

$$h_0 = O\left(\left(\frac{\log p}{n_0}\right)^{1/4} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} + \left(\frac{s_0 + s'}{n_0}\right)^{1/4}\right).$$

Assume that

$$(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2}\right) = o(1).$$

Under conditions in Theorem 2.4 and assumptions 4 and 9, if

$$\lambda_m \geq 4C_0(1 + r_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2}\right),$$

where the positive constant C_0 is specified by (B.3), then there exists a positive constant κ_m such that

$$\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})} \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \mathbf{v}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} \geq \kappa_m$$

holds with probability approaching to one.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})$, we have

$$|\mathbf{v}|_1 = \left| \mathbf{v}_{(\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m})^c} \right|_1 + \left| \mathbf{v}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 \leq 4 \left| \mathbf{v}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \left| \mathbf{v}_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} \right|_2 \leq 4\sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}} |\mathbf{v}|_2.$$

Hence, mimicking Theorem 3.1, for some positive constant C_0 , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & P\left(\frac{\left| \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \right) \mathbf{v} \right|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} > 16C_0 (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right)\right) \\ & \leq P\left(\frac{|\mathbf{v}|_1^2 \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max}}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} > 16C_0 (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right)\right) \\ & \leq P\left(\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} > C_0 \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right)\right) \\ & \leq 26p^{-1} + 10p^{-2}, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\frac{\left| \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \right) \mathbf{v} \right|}{|\mathbf{v}|_2^2} = O_P\left((s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right)\right).$$

As

$$(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) = o(1),$$

when n and p are large enough, it holds that

$$\frac{\left| \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \right) \mathbf{v} \right|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} \leq \frac{\kappa_{0m}}{4}$$

with probability tending to 1. Hence, following the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} \geq \frac{\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \mathbf{v}}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} - \frac{\left| \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} - \mathbf{H}_{0, -m, -m}^* \right) \mathbf{v} \right|}{\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2} \geq \frac{3}{4} \kappa_{0m},$$

which completes the proof by taking $\kappa_m = 3\kappa_{0m}/4$. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.2

Proof. Using the definition of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m$ in (3.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right) - 2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right) + \lambda'_m \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right|_1 \\ & \leq \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) \\ & \quad - 2\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) + \lambda'_m \left| \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_1, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right)^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) \quad (\text{B.5}) \\ & \leq 2 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right)^\top \left\{ \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) \right\} \\ & \quad + \lambda'_m \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_1 - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right|_1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) \right|_\infty \\ & \leq \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0, m} \right|_\infty + \left| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0, -m, -m} \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right) \right|_\infty \\ & \leq (1 + r_{0, m}) \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} + \frac{B^2}{2b_0} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} \right|_1 \\ & \leq C' \left(r_{0, m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) + \frac{\lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}}{b_0} \right), \quad (\text{B.6}) \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $C' > 0$, then if

$$\lambda'_m \geq 4C' \left(r_{0,m} \left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2} \right) + \frac{\lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}}{b_0} \right),$$

using the arguments similar to (B.4) yields that

$$\frac{3}{2} \lambda'_m \left| (\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m})_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda'_m \left| (\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m})_{\bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}^c} \right|_1 \geq 0,$$

which entails that

$$\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \in \mathcal{D}(0, \bar{\mathcal{S}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}).$$

Thus, following Lemma B.4 and (B.5), it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \kappa_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right|_2^2 \\ & \leq (\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m})^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,-m} (\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) \\ & \leq 2 (\widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m})^\top \left\{ \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,m} - \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,-m} (\gamma_{0,m} + \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) \right\} \\ & \quad + \lambda'_m \left(|\gamma_{0,m} - \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}|_1 - \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_m \right|_1 \right) \\ & \leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda'_m \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right|_1 \\ & \leq 6 \lambda'_m \sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} \left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right|_2, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right|_2 = O_P \left(\lambda'_m \sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} \right)$$

and

$$\left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} - \widehat{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + \gamma_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right|_1 = O_P \left(\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) \right).$$

Consequently, we can conclude that

$$\left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} \right|_2 = O_P \left(\lambda'_m \sqrt{s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} + \lambda_m \sqrt{s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}} \right)$$

and

$$\left| \widehat{\gamma}_{0,m} - \gamma_{0,m} \right|_1 = O_P \left(\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} \right).$$

□

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Lemma B.5. *Assume*

$$\frac{s_0 \log p}{\sqrt{n_0}} = o(1) \text{ and } h = o\left(n_0^{-1/4}\right)$$

as $n_0, p \rightarrow +\infty$. Under conditions in Theorem 2.2, it holds

$$\sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{H}_0^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} = o_P(1),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} = \Gamma_{m,1}(-\gamma_{0,m})$.

Proof. For any $\boldsymbol{\delta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{H}_0^* \boldsymbol{\delta} \} \\ = & \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top [\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - E \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \} \\ & + E \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \} - \mathbf{H}_0^* \boldsymbol{\delta}]. \end{aligned}$$

We first show

$$\sqrt{n} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top [\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - E \{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = o_P(1) \quad (\text{B.7})$$

by utilizing the Hoeffding inequality and Theorem 3 of Chen, Linton, and van Keilegom (2003). As conditions (3.1) and (3.3) of Theorem 3 in Chen, Linton, and van Keilegom (2003) are automatically satisfied, we only verify condition (3.2). Under assumption 2 and for any $t > 0$ as long as $|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 < t$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq -Bt) \leq I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\delta}) \\ = & I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0) \leq I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq Bt) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq -Bt) \leq I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \leq I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq Bt).$$

Hence, it holds

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\boldsymbol{\delta}:|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 < t} |I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)| \\ & < I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq Bt) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq -Bt). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from assumptions 1 and 3 and some basic calculations that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ E \left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\delta}:|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 < t} |\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{Z}_0 \{I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\}|^2 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \leq (1 + r_{0,m}) BE \left\{ E \left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\delta}:|\boldsymbol{\delta}|_1 < t} \{I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\}^2 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \leq (1 + r_{0,m}) BE \{E(\{I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq Bt) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq -Bt)\} \mid \mathbf{Z}_0)\}^{1/2} \\ & \leq (1 + r_{0,m}) BE \{F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + Bt \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) - F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 - Bt \mid \mathbf{Z}_0)\}^{1/2} \\ & \leq (1 + r_{0,m}) B(2Bm_0t)^{1/2} \\ & = \sqrt{2}B^{3/2} (1 + r_{0,m}) m_0^{1/2} \sqrt{t}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, condition (3.2) of Theorem 3 in Chen, Linton, and van Keilegom (2003) is satisfied, which implies with probability at least $1 - p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right\} \\ & = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^n \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \left\{ I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 \leq 0) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \right\} \\ & = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top E \left[\mathbf{Z}_0 \{I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}) \leq 0) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} \right] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0-\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}}\right) \\ & = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top E \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right\} \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0-\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} + o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

by setting

$$t = O\left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}} + h\right) = o(1).$$

On the other hand, it follows from the Taylor expansion and Theorem 2.2 that

$$\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top [E\{\mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\delta}; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})\} - \mathbf{H}_0^* \boldsymbol{\delta}] \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\delta}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0-\boldsymbol{\beta}_0} = o_P\left(\left|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right|_2\right) = o_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}}\right),$$

which along with (B.7) concludes Lemma A.5. \square

Lemma B.6. *Assume*

$$\frac{s_0 \log p}{\sqrt{n_0}} = o(1) \text{ and } h = o\left(n_0^{-1/4}\right)$$

as $n_0, p \rightarrow +\infty$. Under conditions in Theorem 2.2 and 3.2, if

$$\sqrt{n_0} (\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_{h,m}}) + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_{h,m}}) \left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + h \right) = o(1),$$

then we have

$$\frac{\sqrt{n_0} \left(\tilde{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m} \right) H_{0,m|-m}^*}{\sigma_m} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{L}} N(0, 1),$$

where $H_{0,m|-m}^* = H_{0,m,m}^* - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{H}_{0,-m,m}^*$ and $\sigma_m^2 = \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}$.

Proof. Utilizing the definition of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}$, we derive the decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{n_0} \left(\tilde{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m} \right) H_{0,m|-m}^* \\ = & \sqrt{n_0} \left(\hat{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m} \right) H_{0,m|-m}^* - \sqrt{n_0} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) \\ & - \sqrt{n_0} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) \left(\hat{H}_{0,m|-m}^{-1} H_{0,m|-m}^* - 1 \right) \\ = & -\sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \sqrt{n_0} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \right)^\top \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \\ & - \left[\sqrt{n_0} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right\} - \sqrt{n_0} \left(\hat{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m} \right) H_{0,m|-m}^* \right] \\ & - \sqrt{n_0} \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S} \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\} \right) \left(\left(\hat{H}_{0,m|-m} \right)^{-1} H_{0,m|-m}^* - 1 \right). \end{aligned} \tag{B.8}$$

Combining Lemma A.5 and Theorem 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{n_0} \left| \left(\hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \right)^\top \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right| & \leq \sqrt{n_0} \left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \right|_1 \left| \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \\ & = O_P \left(\lambda'_m (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_{h,m}}) \sqrt{\log p} + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_{h,m}} \sqrt{\log p} \right) \\ & = o_P(1). \end{aligned} \tag{B.9}$$

On the other hand, for any $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, since under assumption 2, it holds

$$\left| \mathbf{Z}_{0i} \left\{ I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \mathbf{v}_1 \right) - I \left(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \mathbf{v}_2 \right) \right\} \right|_\infty \leq B,$$

then the Hoeffding inequality yields that

$$P(|\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{v}_1; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{v}_2; \{0\}) - E\{\mathbf{S}(\mathbf{v}_1; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\mathbf{v}_2; \{0\})\}|_\infty \geq t) \leq 2p \exp\left(-\frac{n_0 t^2}{2B^2}\right).$$

By taking $t = 2B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$, it holds with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty &\leq 2B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + |E\{\mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\})\}|_\infty \\ &\leq 2B\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + m_0 B^2 |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_1. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the definition of $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}$, Lemmas A.5 and B.5 and Theorem 3.2 entail that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \sqrt{n_0} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right\} - \sqrt{n_0} (\widehat{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m}) H_{0,m|-m}^* \right| \\ &= \left| \sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{H}_0^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} \right. \\ &\quad + \left(\sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{H}_0^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) - \sqrt{n_0} (\widehat{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m}) H_{0,m|-m}^* \right) \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{n_0} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m})^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right\} \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \left\{ \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{H}_0^* (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} \right| + 0 \\ &\quad + \sqrt{n_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}|_1 \left| \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) - \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \\ &= o_P(1) + \sqrt{n_0} O_P(\lambda'_m(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) O_P\left(s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + h\right) \\ &= o_P(1). \end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \widehat{H}_{0,m|-m} - H_{0,m|-m}^* \right| \\ &\leq \left| \widehat{H}_{0,m,m} - H_{0,m,m}^* \right| + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,m} + \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{0,-m,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{H}_{0,-m,m}^* \right| \\ &\leq (1 + |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_1) \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 \right\|_{\max} + r_{0,m} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} \\ &\leq (1 + |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_1) \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} + \left\| \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|_1 + r_{0,m} \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_0 - \mathbf{H}_0^* \right\|_{\max} \\ &= O_P\left(\lambda'_m(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda'_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m} + s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + h^{1/2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sqrt{n_0} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) \left(\left(\widehat{H}_{0,m|-m} \right)^{-1} H_{0,m|-m}^* - 1 \right) \right| \\
& \leq \sqrt{n_0} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}|_1 \left| \mathbf{S}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0; \{0\}) \right|_\infty \left| \left(\widehat{H}_{0,m|-m} \right)^{-1} H_{0,m|-m}^* - 1 \right| \\
& = O_P \left(\sqrt{n_0} \lambda_m'^2 (s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m}) + \sqrt{n_0} \lambda_m'^2 s_{\mathcal{T}_h, m} + s_0^{1/2} \sqrt{n_0} \lambda_m' \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \sqrt{n_0} \lambda_m' h^{1/2} \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

Combining (B.9), (B.10) and (B.11), (B.8) is reduced to

$$\sqrt{n_0} \left(\widetilde{\beta}_{0m} - \beta_{0m} \right) H_{0,m|-m}^* = -\sqrt{n_0} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0; \{0\}) + o_P(1),$$

which concludes the proof by using the asymptotic normality of the U -statistic. \square

Proof of Theorem 3.3

Proof. Recall that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \mathbf{Z}_{ki} \mathbf{Z}_{ki}^\top \tau (1 - \tau) \text{ and } \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k,$$

for $k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h$. The Hoeffding inequality entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(\left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right\|_{\max} > \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} P \left(\left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_k \right\|_{\max} > t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \sum_{j=1}^p \sum_{m=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} Z_{ki,j} Z_{ki,m} - E(Z_{ki,j} Z_{ki,m}) \right| > t_k \right) \\
& \leq \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} 2p^2 \exp \left(-\frac{n_k t_k^2}{2B^4} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

By taking $t_k = 2B^2 \sqrt{2 \log p / n_k}$, we obtain that

$$\left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right\|_{\max} \leq 2B^2 \sum_{k \in \{0\} \cup \mathcal{T}_h} \pi_k \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{n_k}} = O_P \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}}} \right)$$

with probability more than $1 - 2Kp^{-2}$. Thus, combining Theorem 3.2, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\sigma}_m^2 - \sigma_m^2 &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \\
&= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_0 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \\
&\quad + \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m} \\
&\leq |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m}|_1 \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right\|_{\max} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}|_1 + |\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}|_1 \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} \right\|_{\max} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\varphi}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}|_1 \\
&\quad + |\boldsymbol{\varphi}_{0,m}|_1^2 \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_0 \right\|_{\max} \\
&\leq O_P(\lambda'_m(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda'_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0 + n_{\mathcal{T}_h}}}\right) + O_P(h_{\max}) \\
&= o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, assumption 10, Theorems 3.1 and 3.2 imply that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\widehat{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m|-m} - H_{0,m|-m}^* \\
&= \left(\widehat{H}_{m,m}^{\mathcal{T}_h} - H_{m,m}^{*\mathcal{T}_h} \right) - \left(\widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m}^* \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} \right) + \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m}^* \widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m}^* \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m} \right) \\
&\quad + \left(H_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,m}^* - H_{0,m,m}^* \right) + \left(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m}^* \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m} - \mathbf{H}_{0,m,-m}^* \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m} \right) \\
&\leq O_P\left(\left\| \widehat{\mathbf{H}}_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h}^* \right\|_{\max}\right) + O_P\left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_{0,m} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}\|_{\max}\right) \\
&\quad + O\left(\max\{|H_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,m}^* - H_{0,m,m}^*|, |(\mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{T}_h,m,-m}^* - \mathbf{H}_{0,m,-m}^*) \boldsymbol{\gamma}_{0,m}|\}\right) \\
&\leq O_P\left(s_0^{1/2} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/4} + (s_0 h)^{1/4} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_{\mathcal{T}_h} + n_0}\right)^{1/8} + h^{1/2}\right) \\
&\quad + O_P(\lambda'_m(s_0 + s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + \lambda'_m s_{\mathcal{T}_h,m}) + O(h_1) \\
&= o_P(1).
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, Theorem 3.3 follows immediately from the Slutsky theorem. \square

C Detection Consistency

C.1 Weak Consistency of Detection

Denote $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*$ as the pooled version of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, which is the solution of equation

$$E \left\{ \frac{2n_k}{2n_k + n_0} \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*; \{k\}) + \frac{n_0}{2n_k + n_0} \mathbf{S}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*; \{0\}) \right\} = \mathbf{0}.$$

We need some assumptions to recover the h -transferable set \mathcal{T}_h with high probability.

Assumption 12. (*Identifiability condition of \mathcal{T}_h*) Denote $\mathcal{T}_h^c = \{1, \dots, K\} \setminus \mathcal{T}_h$. Assume that there exists a positive constant $\underline{\lambda}$ such that

$$\inf_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c} \lambda_{\min} \left(E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*)) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k \right] dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right) = \underline{\lambda} > 0.$$

Assumption 13. For any $k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$ and for some s' and $h' > 0$, it holds

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k|_0 \leq s'$$

and there exist index sets $\mathcal{S}_k \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, $k = 1, \dots, K$, such that $|\mathcal{S}_k| \leq s'$ and $\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c}^* \right|_1 \leq h'$ with $h' = o(1)$.

Assumption 12 guarantees that for $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$ there exists a uniformly sufficient large gap between $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$. The gap between the parameters can be transmitted to the loss function, thereby identifying whether the source datasets are in the h -transferable set \mathcal{T}_h . Assumption 13 imposes a sparsity condition on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k$ and a weak sparsity condition on $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*$ for $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$, which is analogous to assumption 5.

Theorem C.1. (Weak consistency of detection) Under assumptions 1–3 and 12–13, for any $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$ with $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}_k \cup \mathcal{S}_0$ and $a_n = 4h'$ in assumption 3, if $\log p/n_0 = o(1)$ and

$$\max \left\{ \frac{(s_0 + s') \log p}{n_0}, h' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}, \varepsilon_0 \right\} \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{n_k^2 h^2}{(n_0^2 + n_k^2)(s_0 + s')}, \frac{n_k h}{(n_0 + n_k) \sqrt{s_0 + s'}} \right\}, \quad (\text{C.1})$$

it holds that

$$P \left(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{T}_h \right) \rightarrow 1,$$

when $\lambda_0 = O \left(\sqrt{\log p/n_0} \right)$ and $\lambda_{\beta, k} = 4B \sqrt{2 \log p / (2n_k + n_0)}$.

It is evident that the detected transferable sources are contained in the truly transferable ones with high probability, revealing that the negative transfer can be effectively circumvented. Furthermore, a necessary condition to ensure $P(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow 1$ is that

$$\frac{(s' + s_0)(n_k + n_0)}{n_k} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \lesssim h.$$

Therefore, when $s' \asymp s_0$ and $n_0 \lesssim n_k$, h can attain the rate $s_0 \sqrt{\log p/n_0}$, which concludes that the convergence rate of the proposed transfer learning estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0$ is not worse than the classical lasso estimator. The reason lies in the compromise of replacing the true parameter $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ by its classical lasso estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}$ to measure the distance between the candidate source datasets and the target. Actually, restriction (C.1) entails that h can not be too small from the perspective of identification. Otherwise, h would be less than the rate of $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}$ converging to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ and thus the transferable set is unidentifiable.

C.2 Strong Consistency of Detection

Furthermore, the strong consistency of detection can be achieved under additional assumptions.

Assumption 14. *For any $k \in \mathcal{T}_h$, it holds that*

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \lesssim \frac{h}{\sqrt{s' + s_0}}.$$

Assumption 15. *There exists a positive constant C^* such that $\sup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k^{*-1} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k\|_1 \leq C^*$, where*

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_k^* &= \frac{2n_k}{2n_k + n_0} E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{n_0}{2n_k + n_0} E \left[\int_0^1 f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Assumption 15 is similar to assumption 4, under which we have the theorem below.

Theorem C.2. (Strong consistency of detection) *Under conditions in Theorem C.1 and assumptions 14–15, if*

$$\max \left\{ h' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}, \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}, \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2 \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

then it holds

$$P(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}_h) \rightarrow 1.$$

In fact, (C.1) also requires a proper rate of ε_0 in $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ to control the false positive sources while (C.2) to control the false negative sources. Actually, when these two conditions hold simultaneously, Theorem C.2 implies that $\widehat{\mathcal{T}}$ can exactly recover \mathcal{T}_h with probability tending to one. Hence, the proposed (double) transfer learning procedure and corresponding inference procedure can be applicable in practice when the transferable sources are unknown.

C.3 Proof of Weak Consistency

Denote $l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = E\{\rho_\tau(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})\}$, then for any $\mathcal{A} \subset \{1, \dots, n_0\}$, $E\{L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \mathcal{A})\} = l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ based on the i.i.d. observations.

Lemma C.1. *Under assumption 2, it holds that*

$$|\{L_0(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - L_0(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathcal{V}_{te})\} - \{l_0(\mathbf{v}_1) - l_0(\mathbf{v}_2)\}| \leq 4B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} |\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2|_1 \quad (\text{C.3})$$

for any $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with probability at least $1 - 4p^{-1}$.

Proof. By the Knight equation, note that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_0(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{te}) \\ &= \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{te}} \{\rho_\tau(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \mathbf{v}_1) - \rho_\tau(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\} \\ &= \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{te}} \left[-\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} dz \right]. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the same expansion of $L_0(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{te})$ entails that

$$\begin{aligned} & L_0(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - L_0(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathcal{V}_{te}) \\ &= \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{te}} \left[-\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \{\tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\mathbf{v}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top (\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0)\} dz \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Under assumption 2, it holds that

$$\left| -\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \{ \tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} \right| \leq B |\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2|_1$$

and

$$\left| \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{ I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} dz \right| \leq B |\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2|_1.$$

Exploiting the Hoeffding inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P(|L_0(\mathbf{v}_1, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - L_0(\mathbf{v}_2, \mathcal{V}_{te}) - \{l_0(\mathbf{v}_1) - l_0(\mathbf{v}_2)\}| > t) \\ \leq & P\left(\left| -\frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{te}} \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2) \{ \tau - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} - 0 \right| > t/2\right) \\ & + P\left(\left| \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{te}} \int_{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}^{\mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top(\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{ I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_{0i} - \mathbf{Z}_{0i}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} dz \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - E \left\{ \int_{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\mathbf{v}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top(\mathbf{v}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \{ I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \} dz \right\} \right| > t/2\right) \\ \leq & 4 \exp\left(-\frac{n_0 t^2}{16B^2 |\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2|_1^2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Take $t = 4B\sqrt{\log p/n_0} |\mathbf{v}_1 - \mathbf{v}_2|_1$ and (C.3) is concluded. \square

Lemma C.2. Under assumptions 1-3, for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ if $\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$, it holds that

$$\min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \right\} \leq l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2.$$

Proof. Under assumptions 1 and 3, following the similar procedures to show (A.1) in Lemma A.2, we can conclude that

$$l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \right\},$$

for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(a_n, \mathcal{S})$. On the other hand, under assumptions 1 and 2, the Knight

equation implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) &= E \left\{ \rho_\tau(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) - \rho_\tau(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} \\
&= E \left\{ \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \left\{ I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq z) - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \leq 0) \right\} dz \right\} \\
&= E \left\{ \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} \left\{ F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + z \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) - F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) \right\} dz \right\} \\
&\leq E \left\{ \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)} m_0 z dz \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} |\boldsymbol{\beta} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which concludes Lemma C.2. \square

Lemma C.3. *Under assumptions 1–3, and 12–13, for any $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$, it holds that*

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \geq \frac{2n_k \underline{\lambda} h}{(n_0 m_0 B^2 + 2n_k \underline{\lambda}) \sqrt{s_0 + s'}}.$$

Proof. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*$ is the solution of the equation

$$\frac{n_0}{2} E \left(\left\{ \tau - I(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) \right\} \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) + n_k E \left(\left\{ \tau - I(Y_k - \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq 0) \right\} \mathbf{Z}_k \right) = \mathbf{0}. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Since $\tau = F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) = F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k)$, then (C.4) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n_0}{2} E \left(\left\{ F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) - F_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) \right\} \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) \\
&+ n_k E \left(\left\{ F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) - F_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) \right\} \mathbf{Z}_k \right) \\
&= \mathbf{0}.
\end{aligned}$$

The Newton–Leibniz formula entails that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{n_0}{2} E \left[\int_0^1 f_0(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \\
&= n_k E \left[\int_0^1 f_k(\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, under assumption 12, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& n_k \underline{\lambda} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*|_2 \\
\leq & n_k \left| E \left[\int_0^1 f_k (\mathbf{Z}_k^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* + t \mathbf{Z}_k^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) \mid \mathbf{Z}_k) dt \mathbf{Z}_k \mathbf{Z}_k^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) \right|_2 \\
= & \left| \frac{n_0}{2} E \left[\int_0^1 f_0 (\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \right] (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right|_2 \\
\leq & \frac{n_0}{2} \lambda_{\max} \left(E \left[\int_0^1 f_0 (\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \right] \right) |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \\
\leq & \frac{n_0}{2} \left\| E \left[\int_0^1 f_0 (\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + t \mathbf{Z}_0^\top (\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \mid \mathbf{Z}_0) dt \mathbf{Z}_0 \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \right] \right\|_{\max} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \\
\leq & \frac{n_0}{2} m_0 B^2 |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \leq |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*|_2 + |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \leq \frac{n_0 m_0 B^2 + 2n_k \underline{\lambda}}{2n_k \underline{\lambda}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2.$$

Moreover, for any $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$, it holds that

$$|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \geq \frac{2n_k \underline{\lambda}}{n_0 m_0 B^2 + 2n_k \underline{\lambda}} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2 \geq \frac{2n_k \underline{\lambda} h}{(n_0 m_0 B^2 + 2n_k \underline{\lambda}) \sqrt{s_0 + s'}}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem C.1

Proof. Make the decomposition of $L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}})$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) \\
= & \left\{ L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - l_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}) + l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) \right\} + \left\{ l_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) \right\} \\
& - \left\{ L_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - l_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}) + l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} - \left\{ l_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} \\
& + \left\{ L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) + l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} + \left\{ l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*) - l_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \right\} \\
= & (I_1) + (I_2) - (I_3) - (I_4) + (I_5) + (I_6),
\end{aligned}$$

where terms (I_1) – (I_6) are self-explained. We plan to show that the main gap is due to (I_6) , and the other terms are ignorable compared with (I_6) . Lemma C.1 entails that

$$P \left(|(I_1)| > 4B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 \right) \leq 4p^{-1},$$

$$P \left(|(I_3)| > 4B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \right) \leq 4p^{-1},$$

and

$$P \left(|(I_5)| > 4B \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \right) \leq 4p^{-1}.$$

On the other hand, based on the fact that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathcal{D}(h', \mathcal{S}_k \cup \mathcal{S}_0)$, Lemma C.2 implies that

$$|(I_4)| \leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2$$

and

$$|(I_6)| \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 \right\}.$$

Furthermore, to bound (I_2) , by the Knight equation we have

$$\begin{aligned} |(I_2)| &= \left| \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}} E \left\{ \rho_\tau \left(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} \right) - \rho_\tau \left(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right) \right\} \right| \\ &= \left| \frac{2}{n_0} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}} E \left[-\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right) \left\{ \tau - I \left(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \leq 0 \right) \right\} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right)} \left\{ I \left(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \leq z \right) - I \left(Y_0 - \mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \leq 0 \right) \right\} dz \right] \right| \\ &\leq \left| E \left[-\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right) \left\{ F_0 \left(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \mid \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) - F_0 \left(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k \mid \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) \right\} \right] \right| \\ &\quad + \left| E \left[\int_0^{\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right)} \left\{ F_0 \left(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* + z \mid \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) - F_0 \left(\mathbf{Z}_0^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \mid \mathbf{Z}_0 \right) \right\} dz \right] \right| \\ &\leq m_0 B^2 \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_2 \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2 + \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we need to evaluate the rates of $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_2$ and $\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2$. Denote

$$\widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{2n_k}{2n_k + n_0} L(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \{k\}) + \frac{n_0}{2n_k + n_0} L_0(\boldsymbol{\beta}; \nu_{\text{tr}})$$

and $\widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \nabla \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$. The Knight equation implies that

$$\widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\right) - \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right)^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) \geq 0.$$

Therefore, by denoting $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_k = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\right) - \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) - \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right)^\top \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) \\ &\leq -\lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} \right|_1 + \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 \\ &= -\lambda_{\beta,k} \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}, \mathcal{S}_k} \right|_1 + \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}, \mathcal{S}_k^c} \right|_1 \right) + \lambda_{\beta,k} \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k}^* \right|_1 + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c}^* \right|_1 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}, \mathcal{S}_k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k}^* \right|_1 - \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}, \mathcal{S}_k^c} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c}^* \right|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 + 2\lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c}^* \right|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k} \right|_1 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k} \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c} \right|_1 + 2\lambda_{\beta,k} h', \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is a parallel conclusion of Lemma A.3 that

$$\left| \widetilde{\mathbf{S}}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) \right|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta,k}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-1}$ when $\lambda_{\beta,k} = 4B\sqrt{2\log p/(2n_k + n_0)}$. As a result, $\widehat{\mathbf{u}}_k \in \mathcal{D}(4h', \mathcal{S}_k)$ with probability more than $1 - 2p^{-1}$ as

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c} \right|_1 \leq 3 \left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k} \right|_1 + 4h'.$$

Set

$$\widetilde{G}_k(\mathbf{u}) = \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* + \mathbf{u}\right) - \widetilde{L}_{\nu_{\text{tr},k}}\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^*\right) + \lambda_{\beta,k} \left(\left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* + \mathbf{u} \right|_1 - \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_1 \right).$$

Suppose that

$$\left| \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_k \right|_2 > \frac{40B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{2\log p}{2n_k + n_0}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{3Bh'}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{2\log p}{2n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4}.$$

Then there exists $t \in [0, 1]$ such that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k = t\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k$ with

$$|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2 = \frac{40B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{3Bh'}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4}.$$

Note that $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k \in \mathcal{D}(4h', \mathcal{S}_k)$. Along with the fact that $\tilde{G}_k(\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k) \leq 0$, the convexity of $\tilde{G}_k(\cdot)$ implies that $\tilde{G}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k) \leq 0$. As a consequence, when n_k, n_0, p are sufficiently large, a parallel conclusion of Lemma A.2 yields with probability at least $1 - p^{-2}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k) &\geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2 \right\} - B\sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_1 \\ &\quad - \frac{3}{2} \lambda_{\beta, k} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k}|_1 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\beta, k} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k^c}|_1 - 2\lambda_{\beta, k} h' \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2^2 - B\sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} (4 |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k}|_1 + 4h') \\ &\quad - 6B\sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_{k, \mathcal{S}_k}|_1 - 8B\sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} h' \\ &\geq \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2^2 - 10B\sqrt{\frac{2s' \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} |\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2 - 12B\sqrt{\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} h' \\ &> 0, \end{aligned}$$

which results in the contradiction. Therefore, we have

$$|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2 \leq \frac{40B}{\kappa_0} \sqrt{\frac{2s' \log p}{2n_k + n_0}} + 4\sqrt{\frac{3Bh'}{\kappa_0}} \left(\frac{2 \log p}{2n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4}$$

and

$$|\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k|_1 \leq 4\sqrt{s'} |\hat{\mathbf{u}}_k|_2 + 4h' \lesssim s' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}} + h'.$$

Belloni and Chernozhukov (2011) derived that there exist constants $c_1, c_2 > 0$ such that

$$\left| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 \leq c_1 s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \quad (\text{C.5})$$

with probability more than $1 - c_2 p^{-2}$. Therefore, combining the pieces, for any $k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c$, there

exists a constant $c > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P \left(L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr},k}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) - L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \leq \varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \geq |(I_6)| - |(I_1)| - |(I_2)| - |(I_3)| - |(I_4)| - |(I_5)| \right) \\
& \leq P \left(\varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \geq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{4} |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{16m_0} |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2 \right\} \right. \\
& \quad - c_3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \sqrt{h'} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \right) |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2 \\
& \quad - c_3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \sqrt{h'} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}} \right)^2 \\
& \quad \left. - c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(s' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}} + h' + s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_1 \right) \right) \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{p^2} + \frac{14 + 2C_2}{p}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the rates of h and ε_0 satisfy

$$\max \left\{ \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}, s' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}}, h' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}, \varepsilon_0 \right\} \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{n_k^2 h^2}{(n_0^2 + n_k^2)(s_0 + s')}, \frac{n_k h}{(n_0 + n_k) \sqrt{s_0 + s'}} \right\}$$

and

$$\sqrt{\frac{(s' + s_0) \log p}{n_0}} \lesssim \min \left\{ \frac{n_k h}{(n_0 + n_k) \sqrt{s_0 + s'}}, 1 \right\}$$

under conditions in Theorem C.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& c_3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \sqrt{h'} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4} \right) |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2 \\
& + c_3 \left(\sqrt{\frac{s' \log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \sqrt{h'} \left(\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0} \right)^{1/4} + \sqrt{\frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}} \right)^2 \\
& + c_3 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left(s' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}} + h' + s_0 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} + |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_1 \right) + \varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \\
& \leq \min \left\{ \frac{\kappa_0}{8} |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{32m_0} |\beta_k^* - \beta_0|_2 \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

when n_k, n_0, p are sufficiently large. As a result, it holds according to Lemma C.3 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \leq \varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right) \\
& \leq P\left(\varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \geq \min\left\{\frac{\kappa_0}{8}|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2, \frac{3\kappa_0^3}{32m_0}|\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2\right\}\right) + \frac{1}{p^2} + \frac{14 + 2C_2}{p} \\
& \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

□

C.4 Proof of Strong Consistency

Lemma C.4. *Under assumptions 1–3 and 15, if*

$$\max\left\{h' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}, \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}, \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0|_2^2\right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0,$$

we have

$$P\left(\mathcal{T}_h \subset \widehat{\mathcal{T}}\right) \rightarrow 1,$$

when $\lambda_0 = O\left(\sqrt{\log p/n_0}\right)$, $\lambda_{\beta,k} \geq 4B\sqrt{\log p/(n_k + n_0)} + 2m_0 B^2 h$ and $\lambda_{\delta,k} \geq 4B\sqrt{\log p/n_0}$.

Proof. Make the decomposition of $L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)$ as

$$\begin{aligned}
& L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \\
& = \left\{L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - l_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}\right) + l_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)\right\} + \left\{l_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}\right) - l_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right)\right\} \\
& \quad + \left\{l_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right) - l_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}\right)\right\} + \left\{l_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}\right) - l_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right) + L_0\left(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right\} \\
& = (I_1) + (I_2) + (I_3) + (I_4),
\end{aligned}$$

where terms (I_1) – (I_4) are self-explained and will be explained when the proof of this lemma is completed. Lemma C.1 entails that

$$P\left(|(I_1)| > 8Bt \left|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right|_1\right) \leq 4 \exp(-2n_0 t^2)$$

and

$$P\left(|(I_4)| > 8Bt \left|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\right|_1\right) \leq 4 \exp(-2n_0 t^2).$$

Besides, (I_2) and (I_3) can be bounded based on Lemma C.2 as

$$|(I_2)| \leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |(I_3)| \leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2.$$

Under assumption 15, a parallel result of Theorem 2.1 entails that

$$\begin{aligned} |(I_2)| &\leq \frac{m_0 B^2}{2} \left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 \leq m_0 B^2 \left(\left| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* \right|_2^2 + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 \right) \\ &\lesssim \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_k + n_0} + h \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

with probability at least $1 - 2p^{-2} - 2p^{-1}$ and (C.5) yields that

$$|(I_3)| \lesssim \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}$$

with probability greater than $1 - c_2 p^{-2}$. Combining the pieces, under assumption 14, there exists a constant c_4 such that

$$\begin{aligned} &P \left(L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) - L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \geq \varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \right) \\ &\leq P \left(\varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \leq c_4 \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_1 + \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_k + n_0} + h \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_k + n_0}} + \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 + \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0} \right) \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{2}{p^2} + \frac{10 + 2c_2}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from

$$\max \left\{ h' \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_0}}, \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}, \max_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left| \boldsymbol{\beta}_k^* - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \right|_2^2 \right\} \lesssim \varepsilon_0$$

that

$$P \left(L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) - L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \geq \varepsilon_0 L_0 \left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}} \right) \right) \rightarrow 0.$$

□

Proof of Theorem C.2

Proof. Following from Theorem C.1 and Lemma C.4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \neq \mathcal{T}_h) &= P\left(\bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} \left\{L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \geq \varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right\}\right. \\
&\quad \left.\bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c} \bigcup_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c} \left\{L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \leq \varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right\}\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h} P\left(L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \geq \varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k \in \mathcal{T}_h^c} P\left(L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{V}_{\text{tr}},k}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) - L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right) \leq \varepsilon_0 L_0\left(\widehat{\beta}_{\text{lasso}}, \mathcal{V}_{\text{te}}\right)\right) \rightarrow 0,
\end{aligned}$$

which immediately completes the proof. \square

D Additional Simulations

D.1 Simulations for Estimation Errors

The averaged ℓ_2 estimation errors with heterogenous t_2 and Gumbel model errors are depicted in Figures D.1 and D.2, respectively. Simulation results show that the proposed transfer learning approach also delivers favorable performances.

D.2 Simulations for Transferability Detection

We further report the frequency of the detected transferable sources that exactly match the truly transferable ones in Table D.1. It can be seen that the proposed transferability detection procedure can recover the truly transferable sources with very high probability. Admittedly, a larger h tends to result in a lower accuracy of detection as a looser criterion is adopted to measure the similarity between the target and source regression parameters. Nevertheless, we observe that the frequency of event $\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}} \subset \mathcal{T}_h\}$ that happened among 1000 replications is one in each configuration considered with simulation results omitted for brevity. As a result, the proposed transferability detection procedure kicks all the non-transferable sources out by adopting a conservative strategy to avoid potential effect of the negative transfer. Meanwhile, as show in Table D.2, the averaged size of detected transferable sources is very close to that

of \mathcal{T}_h , showing that the proposed transferability detection procedure substantially utilizes the truly transferable sources.

D.3 Simulations for Confidence Interval

We conduct additional simulations to evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed Trans approach in terms of confidence interval for the non-signal coefficient. It is evident from Figure D.3 that the coverage proportions of the proposed Trans approach are closer to the nominal 95% than that of Non-Trans approach for different heterogenous model errors.

D.4 Simulations for Hypothesis Test

We further examine the size and power of hypothesis test for individual regression parameter based on Theorem 3.3. Setting the significance level as 5% and quantile level as $\tau = 0.75$, we specifically consider hypothesis test

$$H_0 : \beta_{0,1} = 3 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \beta_{0,1} = a_1 \quad (a_1 \neq 3) \quad (\text{D.1})$$

for the signal covariate. It can be seen from Tables D.3, D.4 and D.5 that when $\mathcal{T}_h = \emptyset$, i.e., all sources are non-transferable, Oracle-Trans (reduced to Non-Trans) and Trans approaches deliver slightly inflated type I errors. On the contrary, Oracle-Trans and Trans approaches perform equally well and both can control the type I errors with test sizes being close to 5% in all scenarios considered when $\mathcal{T}_h \neq \emptyset$, i.e., some sources are transferable. Accordingly, the powers are substantially enhanced and eventually arrive at one when the gaps between null and alternative hypothesis are gradually enlarged. The test size of Pooled-Trans approach is larger than 5% when $|\mathcal{T}_h|$ is smaller, i.e., more non-transferable sources are utilized.

We also consider hypothesis test

$$H_0 : \beta_{0,50} = 0 \quad \text{versus} \quad H_1 : \beta_{0,50} = a_{50} \quad (a_{50} \neq 0) \quad (\text{D.2})$$

for the non-signal covariate. Analogous conclusions can be drawn from Tables D.6, D.7 and D.8.

Table D.1: The frequency of event $\{\widehat{\mathcal{T}} = \mathcal{T}_h\}$ that happened among 1000 replications

h	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Normal			t_2			Gumbel		
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$
3	0	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	5	0.974	0.978	0.973	0.980	0.984	0.981	0.975	0.975	0.986
	10	0.946	0.959	0.947	0.965	0.969	0.970	0.966	0.970	0.966
	15	0.953	0.945	0.950	0.964	0.966	0.967	0.950	0.942	0.967
	20	0.936	0.943	0.939	0.955	0.957	0.957	0.945	0.946	0.948
6	0	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	5	0.933	0.930	0.934	0.966	0.965	0.982	0.927	0.949	0.963
	10	0.911	0.902	0.896	0.937	0.949	0.954	0.895	0.918	0.947
	15	0.886	0.874	0.875	0.930	0.925	0.932	0.873	0.900	0.924
	20	0.869	0.859	0.869	0.937	0.916	0.918	0.849	0.893	0.915
12	0	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
	5	0.780	0.773	0.765	0.902	0.875	0.906	0.739	0.816	0.868
	10	0.700	0.685	0.678	0.872	0.818	0.852	0.670	0.734	0.838
	15	0.648	0.622	0.640	0.844	0.778	0.826	0.623	0.708	0.821
	20	0.597	0.582	0.589	0.827	0.766	0.808	0.571	0.648	0.786

Table D.2: Averaged size of sources identified as transferable based on 1000 replications

h	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Normal			t_2			Gumbel		
		$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$
3	0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	5	4.964	4.967	4.967	4.975	4.981	4.977	4.968	4.967	4.982
	10	9.901	9.937	9.914	9.941	9.941	9.951	9.941	9.955	9.957
	15	14.902	14.888	14.902	14.921	14.923	14.948	14.896	14.894	14.935
	20	19.840	19.871	19.866	19.908	19.924	19.924	19.881	19.895	19.903
6	0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	5	4.887	4.898	4.904	4.954	4.956	4.978	4.890	4.929	4.945
	10	9.816	9.789	9.829	9.912	9.916	9.930	9.782	9.857	9.881
	15	14.718	14.692	14.705	14.852	14.820	14.867	14.727	14.779	14.837
	20	19.596	19.634	19.616	19.859	19.780	19.842	19.568	19.700	19.755
12	0	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
	5	4.524	4.605	4.550	4.834	4.808	4.829	4.488	4.702	4.773
	10	9.115	9.144	9.095	9.699	9.594	9.632	9.088	9.386	9.586
	15	13.585	13.657	13.585	14.570	14.427	14.468	13.560	14.074	14.447
	20	17.979	18.197	18.147	19.374	19.264	19.315	17.943	18.778	19.183

Table D.3: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous normal model errors for hypothesis test (D.1) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power							
				$a_1 = 1.7$	$a_1 = 2.0$	$a_1 = 2.3$	$a_1 = 2.7$	$a_1 = 3.3$	$a_1 = 3.7$	$a_1 = 4.0$	$a_1 = 4.3$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.075	0.998	0.996	0.940	0.314	0.666	0.987	0.999	1.000
		5	0.044	1.000	0.996	0.906	0.219	0.609	0.989	0.998	1.000
		10	0.051	0.999	0.991	0.893	0.215	0.595	0.983	0.997	1.000
		15	0.051	1.000	0.993	0.897	0.241	0.578	0.975	0.999	1.000
		20	0.042	1.000	0.990	0.888	0.231	0.558	0.973	0.997	1.000
	Trans	0	0.075	0.998	0.998	0.929	0.280	0.676	0.991	0.999	1.000
		5	0.049	1.000	0.995	0.899	0.202	0.617	0.988	0.998	1.000
		10	0.062	1.000	0.986	0.898	0.223	0.603	0.977	0.997	1.000
		15	0.053	0.999	0.993	0.888	0.235	0.585	0.977	0.998	1.000
		20	0.053	1.000	0.990	0.896	0.246	0.556	0.971	0.998	0.999
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.174	0.999	0.987	0.897	0.505	0.123	0.550	0.889	0.976
		5	0.200	1.000	0.989	0.951	0.569	0.170	0.685	0.946	0.993
		10	0.140	1.000	0.995	0.958	0.550	0.238	0.820	0.980	1.000
		15	0.030	0.999	0.994	0.915	0.257	0.447	0.962	1.000	1.000
		20	0.051	0.999	0.990	0.891	0.240	0.568	0.973	0.997	1.000
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.097	1.000	0.995	0.938	0.318	0.677	0.994	0.999	1.000
		5	0.051	0.993	0.990	0.893	0.227	0.631	0.985	0.999	1.000
		10	0.054	0.999	0.991	0.897	0.246	0.594	0.981	0.996	0.999
		15	0.051	0.999	0.988	0.911	0.249	0.588	0.973	0.995	1.000
		20	0.058	0.997	0.992	0.897	0.259	0.569	0.971	0.994	1.000
	Trans	0	0.096	0.996	0.994	0.938	0.302	0.673	0.993	0.998	1.000
		5	0.056	0.998	0.993	0.899	0.225	0.617	0.984	0.997	1.000
		10	0.063	0.997	0.990	0.897	0.246	0.601	0.981	0.996	1.000
		15	0.055	0.998	0.992	0.905	0.251	0.586	0.975	0.995	1.000
		20	0.060	0.996	0.996	0.900	0.261	0.569	0.973	0.996	0.999
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.157	0.994	0.988	0.922	0.510	0.117	0.569	0.881	0.970
		5	0.195	0.998	0.995	0.956	0.609	0.165	0.695	0.935	0.985
		10	0.157	0.998	0.996	0.970	0.589	0.226	0.816	0.976	0.996
		15	0.031	0.996	0.995	0.901	0.258	0.471	0.974	1.000	1.000
		20	0.060	0.996	0.989	0.899	0.269	0.564	0.970	0.997	1.000
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.088	0.998	0.996	0.931	0.318	0.676	0.986	1.000	1.000
		5	0.050	1.000	0.990	0.905	0.240	0.603	0.984	0.997	0.999
		10	0.051	1.000	0.991	0.888	0.262	0.560	0.966	0.999	1.000
		15	0.049	0.998	0.994	0.892	0.262	0.530	0.966	0.997	1.000
		20	0.053	0.996	0.989	0.899	0.275	0.528	0.959	0.999	0.999
	Trans	0	0.098	1.000	0.994	0.929	0.312	0.686	0.994	0.999	1.000
		5	0.054	0.999	0.994	0.906	0.248	0.584	0.976	0.998	1.000
		10	0.055	0.998	0.990	0.891	0.263	0.573	0.973	0.995	0.999
		15	0.057	0.998	0.991	0.896	0.276	0.547	0.966	1.000	0.999
		20	0.058	0.998	0.992	0.909	0.266	0.520	0.964	0.993	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.175	0.998	0.984	0.914	0.512	0.123	0.556	0.883	0.977
		5	0.221	1.000	0.995	0.953	0.596	0.188	0.675	0.925	0.992
		10	0.196	0.998	0.997	0.963	0.572	0.215	0.809	0.973	0.994
		15	0.051	1.000	0.993	0.915	0.272	0.446	0.970	0.998	1.000
		20	0.057	0.998	0.991	0.912	0.267	0.526	0.962	0.996	0.999

Table D.4: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous t_2 model errors for hypothesis test (D.1) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power							
				$a_1 = 1.7$	$a_1 = 2.0$	$a_1 = 2.3$	$a_1 = 2.7$	$a_1 = 3.3$	$a_1 = 3.7$	$a_1 = 4.0$	$a_1 = 4.3$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.074	0.927	0.800	0.530	0.114	0.403	0.866	0.972	0.996
		5	0.047	0.896	0.748	0.410	0.058	0.314	0.852	0.972	0.995
		10	0.049	0.903	0.744	0.427	0.069	0.313	0.839	0.961	0.990
		15	0.054	0.889	0.741	0.412	0.064	0.311	0.830	0.963	0.991
		20	0.053	0.895	0.726	0.410	0.068	0.328	0.828	0.965	0.989
	Trans	0	0.069	0.932	0.819	0.531	0.114	0.400	0.860	0.979	0.995
		5	0.045	0.909	0.742	0.433	0.066	0.333	0.838	0.972	0.999
		10	0.046	0.903	0.758	0.421	0.064	0.324	0.850	0.960	0.991
		15	0.049	0.896	0.739	0.412	0.068	0.322	0.831	0.964	0.995
		20	0.058	0.897	0.739	0.406	0.076	0.324	0.829	0.967	0.991
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.113	0.920	0.791	0.608	0.279	0.085	0.302	0.573	0.779
		5	0.140	0.933	0.841	0.660	0.303	0.098	0.358	0.623	0.831
		10	0.116	0.936	0.841	0.662	0.289	0.112	0.426	0.719	0.896
		15	0.037	0.900	0.759	0.455	0.080	0.176	0.723	0.934	0.988
		20	0.048	0.901	0.745	0.409	0.077	0.331	0.825	0.970	0.985
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.086	0.926	0.815	0.501	0.132	0.394	0.872	0.973	0.991
		5	0.036	0.902	0.751	0.421	0.078	0.303	0.854	0.968	0.992
		10	0.040	0.905	0.759	0.410	0.082	0.311	0.828	0.963	0.988
		15	0.038	0.898	0.754	0.409	0.085	0.321	0.832	0.957	0.987
		20	0.045	0.904	0.771	0.409	0.090	0.303	0.828	0.957	0.989
	Trans	0	0.086	0.931	0.811	0.485	0.129	0.388	0.883	0.970	0.995
		5	0.038	0.909	0.761	0.412	0.088	0.298	0.841	0.969	0.989
		10	0.035	0.906	0.759	0.410	0.076	0.308	0.850	0.965	0.991
		15	0.037	0.905	0.756	0.402	0.079	0.312	0.833	0.957	0.988
		20	0.041	0.891	0.756	0.395	0.084	0.304	0.837	0.955	0.987
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.122	0.915	0.819	0.602	0.288	0.084	0.296	0.577	0.801
		5	0.136	0.924	0.841	0.665	0.304	0.106	0.349	0.638	0.829
		10	0.109	0.948	0.851	0.648	0.314	0.116	0.437	0.725	0.879
		15	0.024	0.910	0.766	0.422	0.097	0.179	0.721	0.940	0.984
		20	0.037	0.911	0.753	0.410	0.090	0.305	0.830	0.955	0.988
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.086	0.923	0.783	0.522	0.120	0.676	0.890	0.961	0.996
		5	0.043	0.897	0.742	0.428	0.078	0.603	0.847	0.953	0.992
		10	0.042	0.889	0.741	0.443	0.079	0.560	0.833	0.937	0.987
		15	0.037	0.886	0.741	0.433	0.080	0.530	0.827	0.937	0.995
		20	0.041	0.892	0.742	0.424	0.076	0.528	0.823	0.924	0.987
	Trans	0	0.081	0.920	0.779	0.505	0.114	0.686	0.883	0.963	0.994
		5	0.042	0.891	0.746	0.439	0.085	0.584	0.851	0.952	0.992
		10	0.044	0.898	0.746	0.425	0.076	0.573	0.825	0.937	0.989
		15	0.040	0.888	0.727	0.432	0.079	0.547	0.827	0.934	0.991
		20	0.039	0.888	0.738	0.426	0.083	0.520	0.821	0.927	0.986
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.104	0.899	0.801	0.618	0.280	0.123	0.285	0.550	0.774
		5	0.119	0.928	0.829	0.642	0.330	0.188	0.352	0.624	0.829
		10	0.098	0.925	0.833	0.647	0.287	0.215	0.446	0.699	0.900
		15	0.024	0.882	0.760	0.443	0.091	0.446	0.745	0.917	0.986
		20	0.035	0.887	0.738	0.431	0.092	0.526	0.826	0.929	0.989

Table D.5: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous Gumbel model errors for hypothesis test (D.1) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power							
				$a_1 = 1.7$	$a_1 = 2.0$	$a_1 = 2.3$	$a_1 = 2.7$	$a_1 = 3.3$	$a_1 = 3.7$	$a_1 = 4.0$	$a_1 = 4.3$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.083	0.996	0.967	0.811	0.272	0.411	0.891	0.989	1.000
		5	0.046	0.995	0.950	0.713	0.163	0.386	0.902	0.989	1.000
		10	0.052	0.987	0.945	0.730	0.170	0.379	0.880	0.985	0.999
		15	0.061	0.993	0.940	0.734	0.175	0.384	0.865	0.981	0.999
		20	0.062	0.990	0.950	0.724	0.181	0.378	0.868	0.984	1.000
	Trans	0	0.033	0.990	0.962	0.805	0.247	0.423	0.901	0.988	1.000
		5	0.045	0.993	0.951	0.735	0.163	0.383	0.903	0.992	1.000
		10	0.054	0.991	0.951	0.718	0.176	0.394	0.884	0.988	1.000
		15	0.063	0.990	0.940	0.715	0.178	0.395	0.858	0.979	0.997
		20	0.061	0.989	0.949	0.711	0.178	0.379	0.872	0.984	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.154	0.987	0.950	0.825	0.443	0.105	0.369	0.709	0.899
		5	0.197	0.993	0.973	0.867	0.514	0.134	0.457	0.794	0.954
		10	0.176	0.994	0.975	0.876	0.481	0.158	0.576	0.872	0.983
		15	0.043	0.991	0.963	0.774	0.207	0.242	0.815	0.981	0.999
		20	0.060	0.988	0.944	0.723	0.182	0.375	0.867	0.982	0.999
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.103	0.995	0.972	0.792	0.286	0.456	0.910	0.992	0.997
		5	0.060	0.993	0.952	0.722	0.151	0.418	0.912	0.991	0.998
		10	0.062	0.991	0.964	0.720	0.172	0.398	0.884	0.988	0.998
		15	0.068	0.991	0.959	0.716	0.192	0.407	0.892	0.985	0.998
		20	0.069	0.991	0.958	0.701	0.187	0.399	0.882	0.987	0.998
	Trans	0	0.113	0.989	0.967	0.778	0.252	0.443	0.915	0.991	1.000
		5	0.054	0.992	0.961	0.714	0.151	0.420	0.911	0.991	0.997
		10	0.064	0.993	0.957	0.711	0.170	0.397	0.892	0.988	0.998
		15	0.062	0.989	0.955	0.711	0.180	0.396	0.892	0.984	0.999
		20	0.066	0.993	0.956	0.704	0.195	0.388	0.881	0.985	0.998
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.195	0.987	0.953	0.806	0.454	0.113	0.401	0.689	0.873
		5	0.238	0.992	0.967	0.879	0.518	0.149	0.476	0.797	0.929
		10	0.188	0.997	0.980	0.884	0.463	0.180	0.582	0.876	0.975
		15	0.051	0.995	0.957	0.743	0.214	0.267	0.839	0.982	0.998
		20	0.069	0.993	0.956	0.710	0.193	0.403	0.882	0.983	0.998
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.088	0.996	0.961	0.806	0.268	0.431	0.896	0.990	0.997
		5	0.050	0.993	0.958	0.741	0.154	0.383	0.896	0.994	0.990
		10	0.051	0.997	0.952	0.730	0.171	0.365	0.885	0.990	0.997
		15	0.049	0.992	0.948	0.727	0.184	0.363	0.872	0.991	0.997
		20	0.053	0.995	0.953	0.735	0.201	0.345	0.865	0.983	0.998
	Trans	0	0.098	0.992	0.965	0.784	0.244	0.418	0.909	0.993	0.997
		5	0.054	0.993	0.963	0.732	0.162	0.376	0.909	0.990	0.997
		10	0.055	0.993	0.956	0.738	0.186	0.362	0.886	0.987	0.997
		15	0.057	0.994	0.948	0.725	0.196	0.358	0.874	0.989	0.997
		20	0.058	0.996	0.950	0.737	0.210	0.348	0.875	0.981	0.996
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.175	0.990	0.945	0.819	0.456	0.120	0.383	0.670	0.889
		5	0.221	0.994	0.973	0.872	0.518	0.157	0.475	0.771	0.932
		10	0.196	0.995	0.973	0.888	0.481	0.160	0.602	0.865	0.974
		15	0.051	0.994	0.953	0.769	0.196	0.256	0.816	0.982	0.996
		20	0.057	0.990	0.958	0.740	0.212	0.333	0.873	0.984	0.997

Table D.6: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous normal model errors for hypothesis test (D.2) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power					
				$a_{50} = -1$	$a_{50} = -0.7$	$a_{50} = -0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.7$	$a_{50} = 1$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.088	1.000	1.000	0.947	0.953	1.000	1.000
		5	0.078	1.000	1.000	0.932	0.940	0.999	1.000
		10	0.089	1.000	0.999	0.930	0.923	0.997	1.000
		15	0.081	1.000	0.999	0.913	0.903	0.998	1.000
		20	0.076	0.998	0.996	0.918	0.911	0.996	1.000
	Trans	0	0.098	1.000	0.999	0.946	0.961	1.000	1.000
		5	0.081	1.000	0.999	0.938	0.946	1.000	1.000
		10	0.076	0.999	0.999	0.939	0.926	0.999	0.999
		15	0.079	1.000	0.998	0.934	0.920	1.000	1.000
		20	0.077	1.000	0.997	0.917	0.913	0.996	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.003	0.953	0.693	0.068	0.074	0.697	0.943
		5	0.005	0.975	0.843	0.142	0.137	0.872	0.980
		10	0.007	0.997	0.937	0.267	0.253	0.949	0.998
		15	0.044	1.000	0.998	0.761	0.760	0.997	1.000
		20	0.072	0.999	0.999	0.917	0.912	0.998	0.999
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.119	1.000	1.000	0.942	0.929	1.000	1.000
		5	0.066	1.000	0.995	0.933	0.938	0.996	1.000
		10	0.071	1.000	0.999	0.932	0.936	0.995	1.000
		15	0.068	0.998	0.999	0.920	0.916	0.998	0.999
		20	0.069	0.999	0.998	0.935	0.913	0.997	1.000
	Trans	0	0.097	1.000	1.000	0.950	0.945	0.999	1.000
		5	0.064	1.000	1.000	0.929	0.939	0.999	1.000
		10	0.059	0.999	1.000	0.935	0.929	0.996	1.000
		15	0.060	0.999	0.996	0.914	0.913	0.998	1.000
		20	0.067	1.000	0.999	0.906	0.908	0.999	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.000	0.951	0.694	0.076	0.086	0.708	0.954
		5	0.003	0.990	0.833	0.144	0.149	0.849	0.981
		10	0.010	0.997	0.932	0.259	0.262	0.942	0.999
		15	0.035	1.000	0.998	0.741	0.746	0.998	0.999
		20	0.074	0.999	0.998	0.923	0.919	0.997	0.999
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.099	1.000	0.999	0.940	0.939	1.000	1.000
		5	0.059	0.999	0.998	0.937	0.931	0.999	1.000
		10	0.044	1.000	1.000	0.934	0.935	0.998	0.999
		15	0.058	0.999	0.999	0.930	0.901	0.997	1.000
		20	0.066	1.000	1.000	0.922	0.905	0.999	1.000
	Trans	0	0.099	1.000	1.000	0.956	0.946	1.000	1.000
		5	0.055	1.000	0.999	0.934	0.925	0.999	1.000
		10	0.057	0.999	1.000	0.944	0.919	0.999	0.999
		15	0.050	1.000	0.999	0.928	0.909	0.997	1.000
		20	0.063	1.000	0.999	0.923	0.911	0.998	0.999
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.002	0.951	0.739	0.070	0.073	0.683	0.939
		5	0.003	0.979	0.849	0.128	0.116	0.825	0.990
		10	0.001	0.996	0.949	0.240	0.243	0.934	0.996
		15	0.033	0.999	0.999	0.736	0.705	0.996	0.999
		20	0.060	0.999	0.999	0.916	0.899	0.999	1.000

Table D.7: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous t_2 model errors for hypothesis test (D.2) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power					
				$a_{50} = -1$	$a_{50} = -0.7$	$a_{50} = -0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.7$	$a_{50} = 1$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.100	0.988	0.971	0.712	0.689	0.970	0.990
		5	0.068	0.986	0.961	0.678	0.656	0.944	0.984
		10	0.063	0.986	0.955	0.679	0.666	0.946	0.983
		15	0.064	0.987	0.954	0.700	0.676	0.957	0.985
		20	0.067	0.983	0.945	0.690	0.668	0.946	0.987
	Trans	0	0.086	0.989	0.960	0.724	0.711	0.963	0.990
		5	0.071	0.984	0.964	0.678	0.667	0.955	0.987
		10	0.072	0.987	0.954	0.695	0.662	0.947	0.982
		15	0.069	0.983	0.943	0.685	0.659	0.949	0.986
		20	0.068	0.985	0.947	0.687	0.660	0.935	0.979
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.004	0.695	0.363	0.031	0.029	0.332	0.679
		5	0.007	0.779	0.479	0.045	0.046	0.396	0.768
		10	0.010	0.832	0.566	0.079	0.085	0.525	0.837
		15	0.038	0.968	0.894	0.399	0.381	0.864	0.971
		20	0.065	0.983	0.944	0.706	0.684	0.939	0.985
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.105	0.992	0.969	0.714	0.711	0.971	0.992
		5	0.057	0.989	0.958	0.668	0.665	0.942	0.989
		10	0.057	0.988	0.965	0.681	0.669	0.949	0.984
		15	0.058	0.987	0.954	0.680	0.673	0.942	0.988
		20	0.054	0.984	0.954	0.674	0.675	0.935	0.983
	Trans	0	0.103	0.992	0.973	0.722	0.715	0.963	0.992
		5	0.056	0.983	0.961	0.678	0.676	0.951	0.987
		10	0.050	0.988	0.962	0.667	0.674	0.949	0.985
		15	0.057	0.985	0.956	0.674	0.659	0.939	0.992
		20	0.063	0.979	0.953	0.675	0.670	0.946	0.987
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.001	0.666	0.343	0.030	0.040	0.330	0.674
		5	0.004	0.743	0.437	0.048	0.490	0.416	0.746
		10	0.008	0.825	0.553	0.082	0.083	0.540	0.818
		15	0.045	0.962	0.876	0.407	0.436	0.867	0.973
		20	0.057	0.983	0.956	0.690	0.679	0.938	0.986
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.096	0.987	0.966	0.716	0.725	0.962	0.989
		5	0.055	0.975	0.953	0.630	0.672	0.942	0.989
		10	0.052	0.977	0.946	0.639	0.674	0.931	0.980
		15	0.046	0.980	0.941	0.668	0.666	0.941	0.987
		20	0.062	0.979	0.948	0.665	0.686	0.933	0.981
	Trans	0	0.105	0.988	0.964	0.731	0.711	0.963	0.987
		5	0.060	0.980	0.955	0.623	0.759	0.923	0.981
		10	0.054	0.976	0.944	0.649	0.664	0.935	0.984
		15	0.061	0.982	0.943	0.665	0.666	0.936	0.978
		20	0.049	0.983	0.942	0.646	0.683	0.936	0.982
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.004	0.681	0.370	0.029	0.029	0.373	0.663
		5	0.003	0.749	0.458	0.058	0.062	0.452	0.734
		10	0.010	0.821	0.551	0.090	0.090	0.542	0.819
		15	0.035	0.956	0.868	0.387	0.404	0.864	0.956
		20	0.054	0.983	0.942	0.655	0.675	0.942	0.978

Table D.8: The size and power under the significance level of 5% with heterogenous Gumbel model errors for hypothesis test (D.2) at the quantile level of $\tau = 0.75$

h	Method	$ \mathcal{T}_h $	Size	Power					
				$a_{50} = -1$	$a_{50} = -0.7$	$a_{50} = -0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.3$	$a_{50} = 0.7$	$a_{50} = 1$
3	Oracle-Trans	0	0.102	1.000	0.997	0.831	0.819	0.999	1.000
		5	0.075	1.000	0.997	0.855	0.862	0.998	1.000
		10	0.076	1.000	0.993	0.844	0.832	0.993	1.000
		15	0.068	0.999	0.993	0.833	0.828	0.996	0.999
		20	0.072	1.000	0.994	0.831	0.807	0.994	1.000
	Trans	0	0.107	0.999	0.997	0.848	0.838	0.996	1.000
		5	0.084	1.000	0.996	0.840	0.854	0.996	1.000
		10	0.076	1.000	0.996	0.849	0.832	0.995	1.000
		15	0.075	1.000	0.994	0.837	0.819	0.996	1.000
		20	0.071	1.000	0.991	0.824	0.812	0.993	0.998
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.001	0.842	0.536	0.050	0.043	0.551	0.873
		5	0.008	0.911	0.688	0.085	0.085	0.697	0.936
		10	0.012	0.978	0.811	0.156	0.153	0.861	0.980
		15	0.039	0.997	0.979	0.590	0.565	0.985	0.999
		20	0.076	0.999	0.991	0.822	0.809	0.996	1.000
6	Oracle-Trans	0	0.091	0.999	0.998	0.852	0.845	1.000	1.000
		5	0.071	0.999	0.997	0.868	0.863	0.995	0.999
		10	0.055	0.999	0.998	0.856	0.832	0.996	1.000
		15	0.050	0.997	0.996	0.831	0.833	0.996	1.000
		20	0.062	0.998	0.994	0.835	0.833	0.991	0.998
	Trans	0	0.096	1.000	0.998	0.864	0.857	0.997	1.000
		5	0.067	0.996	0.996	0.862	0.852	0.997	1.000
		10	0.061	0.998	0.995	0.853	0.833	0.995	0.998
		15	0.050	0.997	0.995	0.831	0.839	0.993	0.999
		20	0.059	0.998	0.995	0.829	0.835	0.993	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.002	0.853	0.545	0.063	0.051	0.547	0.863
		5	0.007	0.926	0.683	0.105	0.092	0.663	0.931
		10	0.008	0.976	0.836	0.172	0.154	0.995	0.981
		15	0.035	0.998	0.970	0.601	0.572	0.993	0.999
		20	0.055	0.997	0.990	0.838	0.828	0.993	1.000
12	Oracle-Trans	0	0.118	1.000	0.998	0.841	0.843	0.997	0.999
		5	0.059	1.000	0.999	0.847	0.836	0.999	1.000
		10	0.057	1.000	0.996	0.845	0.810	0.996	1.000
		15	0.051	1.000	0.995	0.857	0.819	0.990	0.999
		20	0.045	0.999	0.994	0.843	0.820	0.992	0.999
	Trans	0	0.110	0.999	0.998	0.854	0.855	1.000	1.000
		5	0.070	1.000	0.999	0.848	0.847	1.000	0.999
		10	0.060	0.999	0.996	0.859	0.819	0.992	1.000
		15	0.046	1.000	0.994	0.841	0.804	0.994	1.000
		20	0.054	1.000	0.995	0.849	0.818	0.994	1.000
	Pooled-Trans	0	0.002	0.869	0.543	0.056	0.046	0.529	0.850
		5	0.004	0.932	0.684	0.093	0.086	0.663	0.920
		10	0.008	0.982	0.827	0.161	0.148	0.812	0.979
		15	0.039	0.998	0.984	0.590	0.549	0.981	1.000
		20	0.053	0.998	0.996	0.853	0.824	0.992	1.000




Figure D.1: Averaged ℓ_2 estimation errors with heterogenous t_2 model errors.




Figure D.2: Averaged ℓ_2 estimation errors with heterogenous Gumbel model errors.




Figure D.3: Coverage proportion of confidence interval for the 50-th component of quantile regression coefficients with $\tau = 0.75$.

References

- Alquier, P., Cottet, V., and Lecué, G. (2019). Estimation bounds and sharp oracle inequalities of regularized procedures with Lipschitz loss functions. *The Annals of Statistics* **47**, 2117–2144.
- Bastani, H. (2021). Predicting with proxies: Transfer learning in high dimension. *Management Science* **67**, 2964–2984.
- Belloni, A. and Chernozhukov, V. (2011). ℓ_1 -penalized quantile regression in high-dimensional sparse models. *The Annals of Statistics* **39**, 82–130.

- Belloni, A., Chernozhukov, V., and Kato, K. (2019). Valid post-selection inference in high-dimensional approximately sparse quantile regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **114**, 749–758.
- Bellot, A. and van der Schaar, M. (2019). Boosting transfer learning with survival data from heterogeneous domains. In K. Chaudhuri and M. Sugiyama, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 57–65.
- Bradic, J. and Kolar, M. (2017). Uniform inference for high-dimensional quantile regression: linear functionals and regression rank scores. *arXiv preprint* arXiv: 1702.06209.
- Cai, T. T. and Wei, H. (2021). Transfer learning for nonparametric classification: Minimax rate and adaptive classifier. *The Annals of Statistics* **49**, 100–128.
- Chen, R. and Paschalidis, I. C. (2020). Distributionally robust learning. *Foundations and Trends in Optimization* **4**, 1–243.
- Chen, X., Linton, O., and van Keilegom, I. (2003). Estimation of semiparametric models when the criterion function is not smooth. *Econometrica* **71**, 1591–1608.
- Dai, R. and Kolar, M. (2021). Inference for high-dimensional varying-coefficient quantile regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **15**, 5696–5757.
- Duan, L., Xu, D., and Tsang, I. W. (2012). Learning with augmented features for heterogeneous domain adaptation. 667–674. Madison, WI, USA: Omnipress.
- Gu, T., Han, Y., and Duan, R. (2023). Robust angle-based transfer learning in high dimensions. *arXiv preprint* arXiv: 2210.12759v3.

- He, Y., Li, Q., Hu, Q., and Liu, L. (2022). Transfer learning in high-dimensional semi-parametric graphical models with application to brain connectivity analysis. *Statistics in Medicine* **41**, 4112–4129.
- Koenker, R. (2005). *Quantile Regression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Koenker, R. and Bassett, G. (1978). Regression quantiles. *Econometrica* **46**, 33–50.
- Kulis, B., Saenko, K., and Darrell, T. (2011). What you saw is not what you get: Domain adaptation using asymmetric kernel transforms. In *CVPR 2011*, 1785–1792.
- Li, R., Zhong, W., and Zhu, L. (2012). Feature screening via distance correlation learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107**, 1129–1139.
- Li, S., Cai, T., and Duan, R. (2021). Targeting underrepresented populations in precision medicine: a federated transfer learning approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2108.12112*.
- Li, S., Cai, T. T., and Li, H. (2022). Transfer learning for high-dimensional linear regression: Prediction, estimation, and minimax optimality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **84**, 149–173.
- Li, S., Cai, T. T., and Li, H. (2023). Transfer learning in large-scale Gaussian graphical models with false discovery rate control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **118**, 2171–2183.
- Lin, H. and Reimherr, M. L. (2022). On transfer learning in functional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2206.04277*.
- Mai, Q. and Zou, H. (2015). The fused Kolmogorov filter: A nonparametric model-free screening method. *The Annals of Statistics* **43**, 1471–1497.
- Ning, Y. and Liu, H. (2017). A general theory of hypothesis tests and confidence regions for sparse high dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics* **45**, 158–195.

- Pan, S. J. and Yang, Q. (2010). A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* **22**, 1345–1359.
- Park, K., Hong, J. S., and Kim, W. (2020). A methodology combining cosine similarity with classifier for text classification. *Applied Artificial Intelligence* **34**, 396–411.
- Perlich, C., Dalessandro, B., Raeder, T., Stitelman, O., and Provost, F. (2014). Machine learning for targeted display advertising: Transfer learning in action. *Machine Learning* **95**, 103–127.
- Prettenhofer, P. and Stein, B. (2010). Cross-language text classification using structural correspondence learning. In *Proceedings of the 48th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 1118–1127. USA: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Taylor, M. E. and Stone, P. (2009). Transfer learning for reinforcement learning domains: A survey. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **10**, 1633–1685.
- Tian, Y. and Feng, Y. (2022). Transfer learning under high-dimensional generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* preprint.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B* **58**, 267–288.
- Turki, T., Wei, Z., and Wang, J. T. L. (2017). Transfer learning approaches to improve drug sensitivity prediction in multiple myeloma patients. *IEEE Access* **5**, 7381–7393.
- van der Vaart, A. W. (1998). *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- van Zuijlen, M. C. A. (1978). Properties of the empirical distribution function for independent non-identically distributed random vectors. *The Annals of Probability* **10**, 108–123.

- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wang, C. and Mahadevan, S. (2011). Heterogeneous domain adaptation using manifold alignment. 1541–1546. AAAI Press.
- Wang, X., Zhang, H. G., Xiong, X., Hong, C., Weber, G. M., Brat, G. A., et al. (2022). Survmaximin: Robust federated approach to transporting survival risk prediction models. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics* **134**, 104176.
- Weiss, K., Khoshgoftaar, T. M., and Wang, D. (2016). A survey of transfer learning. *Journal of Big data* **3**, 1–40.
- Xia, P., Zhang, L., and Li, F. (2015). Learning similarity with cosine similarity ensemble. *Information Sciences* **307**, 39–52.
- Xu, K. and Bastani, H. (2021). Learning across bandits in high dimension via robust statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2112.14233*.
- Yang, F., Zhang, H. R., Wu, S., Su, W. J., and Ré, C. (2020). Analysis of information transfer from heterogeneous sources via precise high-dimensional asymptotics. *arXiv preprint arXiv: 2010.11750*.
- Yi, C. and Huang, J. (2017). Semismooth newton coordinate descent algorithm for elastic-net penalized huber loss regression and quantile regression. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **26**, 547–557.
- Yu, Y., Bradic, J., and Samworth, R. J. (2021). Confidence intervals for high-dimensional Cox models. *Statistica Sinica* **31**, 243–267.
- Zhao, P. and Yu, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of lasso. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **7**, 2541–2563.

- Zhen, J., Kuhn, D., and Wiesemann, W. (2021). Mathematical foundations of robust and distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint* arXiv: 2105.00760.
- Zheng, Q., Peng, L., and He, X. (2015). Globally adaptive quantile regression with ultra-high dimensional data. *The Annals of Statistics* **43**, 2225–2258.
- Zhou, D., Liu, M., Li, M., and Cai, T. (2022). Doubly robust augmented model accuracy transfer inference with high dimensional features. *arXiv preprint* arXiv: 2208.05134.
- Zhou, J. T., Pan, S. J., Tsang, I. W., and Yan, Y. (2014). Hybrid heterogeneous transfer learning through deep learning. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2213–2219. AAAI Press.
- Zhu, Z., Lin, K., and Zhou, J. (2023). Transfer learning in deep reinforcement learning: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **45**, 13344–13362.
- Zhuang, F., Qi, Z., Duan, K., Xi, D., Zhu, Y., Zhu, H., et al. (2021). A comprehensive survey on transfer learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE* **109**, 43–76.