

Conditional variable screening for ultra-high dimensional longitudinal data with time interactions

Andrea Bratsberg^{1*}, Abhik Ghosh², and Magne Thoresen¹

¹Oslo Centre for Biostatistics and Epidemiology, Department of Biostatistics, University of Oslo

²Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata, India

*email: a.m.bratsberg@medisin.uio.no

Abstract

In recent years we have been able to gather large amounts of genomic data at a fast rate, creating situations where the number of variables greatly exceeds the number of observations. In these situations, most models that can handle a moderately high dimension will now become computationally infeasible. Hence, there is a need for a pre-screening of variables to reduce the dimension efficiently and accurately to a more moderate scale. There has been much work to develop such screening procedures for independent outcomes. However, much less work has been done for high-dimensional longitudinal data, in which the observations can no longer be assumed to be independent. In addition, it is of interest to capture possible interactions between the genomic variable and time in many of these longitudinal studies. This calls for the development of new screening procedures for high-dimensional longitudinal data, where the focus is on interactions with time. In this work, we propose a novel conditional screening procedure that ranks variables according to the likelihood value at the maximum likelihood estimates in a semi-marginal linear mixed model, where the genomic variable and its interaction with time are included in the model. This is to our knowledge the first conditional screening approach for clustered data. We prove that this approach enjoys the sure screening property, and assess the finite sample performance of the method through simulations, with a comparison of an already existing screening approach based on generalized estimating equations.

Keywords: Interactions, linear mixed models, longitudinal analysis, sure screening property, ultra-high dimensionality, variable screening

1 Introduction

Emerging omics technologies have allowed us to gather an unprecedented amount of data both efficiently and in high resolution. This often gives us a situation in which the number of variables exceeds the number of observations, the so-called high-dimensional case. In order to take full advantage of the quality and depth of such data, we need suitable statistical methods. A crucial assumption that is often being made in order to make inferences in these situations is that the underlying structure is sparse, meaning that only a few of the variables truly have an effect on the outcome. Hence, it becomes a question of how to select these relatively few important variables out of many possible. Penalization methods such as the LASSO [1], SCAD [2] and the non-negative garrote [3] do variable selection in the sense that some coefficient estimates are set to exactly zero. However, when the number of variables p grows non-polynomially with the number of observations n , we are in the ultra-high dimensional case, and these methods become computationally infeasible. For this reason, Fan and Lv [4] proposed a two-step procedure where the first step is concerned with reducing the dimension drastically and efficiently by considering each covariate's marginal correlation with the response, and only keeping those with high absolute marginal correlation. They called this approach Sure Independence Screening (SIS). In the second step, one can use any suitable regularization method to perform the final variable selection. There have been many extensions and modifications to this idea (see e.g. [5–13]), but they all make the crucial assumption of independent observations.

In medical studies, we are often interested in how the response changes over time, and each subject is observed at different time points. For these longitudinal data sets, observations from the same individual are likely to be more similar than observations from different individuals, which clearly violates the assumption of independent observations made by most screening procedures. One way to deal with this is to introduce latent variables to model aspects of the subjects that are not captured by the observed covariates. This is the approach in mixed models, where latent random effects are included in an otherwise traditional regression model. Only recently has mixed models for high-dimensional data begun to receive attention. For example, Schelldorfer et al. [14] and Ghosh and Thoresen [15] introduced respectively the LASSO and the SCAD penalty for high dimensional linear mixed models. However, in the ultra-high dimensional setting, these methods too become computationally infeasible. Hence, there is a need for a screening procedure in the mixed effects case for ultra-high dimensional data.

An additional issue arises when dealing with longitudinal data. We might be particularly interested in whether there are interactions between the high-dimensional covariates and time, in order to understand variation in time development. This increases the total number of potential effects even further. SIS and many of its extensions only screen for main effects. By only considering main effects in problems in which

we are interested in uncovering possible interactions between variables, we will likely get inaccurate results. Some screening procedures for interactions in high-dimensional data have been developed. In order to avoid the quadratic computational cost of searching among all pairs of possible interactions, most of these rely on some strong assumptions, namely the weak or strong heredity assumption, which says that for an interaction to be included, one or both of the main effects must be important (see for example [16], [17] and [18]). These methods are computationally feasible for ultra-high dimensional data, but they break down if the heredity assumption is violated. Consequently, variables that only appear in pure interactions will be missed by these screening procedures. In our setting, we are interested in a less restrictive method that allows for pure interaction effects, but on the other hand, we are only interested in interactions with time, and thus we do not have to search through all possible pairwise interactions. In principle, it would be straightforward to implement the interaction screening into SIS if we search among all possible interactions, and methods have been developed that do not need this assumption of heredity (see, for example Jiang and Liu [19]). However, we are often interested in non-linear effects of time. A popular approach to analysis of non-linear effects is through dummy variables. If we let the time variable be coded this way, an interaction with time will consequently consist of several parameters. This suggests the need for an extension of the SIS idea to sets of parameters.

To tackle the aforementioned challenges, we propose a novel screening approach based on linear mixed models that in particular screen for interactions with time by retaining the variables that have the largest likelihood values when both main effects and interactions are included in the model. This way, we are able to screen based on the set of interaction terms by defining a semi-marginal linear mixed model for each covariate that includes the covariate both as a main effect and as interaction with time, in addition to other possible covariates that we wish to keep out of the screening step. To our knowledge, no existing screening procedure is able to screen groups of variables while in addition allowing for conditioning on variables that should be kept out of the screening procedure (specifically, time in our case), in the setting of correlated data. Zhou et al. [20] developed a similar likelihood-based screening procedure for two-way interactions, but they assume independent outcomes. We show that the procedure enjoys the sure screening property, meaning that with a probability tending to one, the method will capture the true active set of main effects and interactions. We assess the finite sample performance of the method through simulated examples, and compare the performance with the generalized estimation equations (GEEs) screening approach of [21]. This is a screening approach for high-dimensional time course data, via generalized estimating equations, which takes dependent observations into account by specifying a correlation structure within each subject. We show that for capturing groups of interaction parameters, screening on the likelihood yields the best recovery rate of the true interactions, across a wide range of settings. Finally, we apply the proposed method to real data

from a longitudinal study on measured serum triglyceride over the course of six hours, with measured mRNA on a targeted set of genes as our high-dimensional set of covariates. In this example, the ability to perform conditional screening becomes critically important.

Notation: Throughout the paper, we use (x_1, \dots, x_n) to denote a tuple of, e.g., scalars or matrices, while we use the notation $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, \dots, x_n]^T$ to denote a column vector of length n , where T (in superscript) denotes the transpose. Furthermore, the ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ norms are denoted by $\|\cdot\|$ and $\|\cdot\|_\infty$, respectively. For matrices, we denote by $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1$ the maximum absolute column sum of a matrix \mathbf{A} . Also, let $\mathbf{1}_m$ denote the m -vector with all entries equal to one. The rest of the notation is standard

2 Models and Methods

Assume that we have observed n subjects and that subject i is measured at m_i time points, giving a total of $N = \sum_{i=1}^n m_i$ observations. Denote by \mathbf{y}_i the m_i -dimensional response vector of subject i , and by \mathbf{X}_i the $m_i \times (\tilde{p} + 1)$ design matrix of covariates, where the first column corresponds to the intercept and \tilde{p} is the total number of covariates. The individuals are assumed to be independent from each other, while the measurements from the same individual are likely to be correlated. Linear mixed models allow for dependence between observations by assuming that each subject differs from each other randomly through a random effects term $\mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{b}_i$, where \mathbf{Q}_i is the design matrix for the random effects, and \mathbf{b}_i is a vector of random effects, assumed to be $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{G})$ -distributed for a positive definite covariance matrix \mathbf{G} . We assume that \mathbf{G} can be fully parameterized by a vector of variance parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, so that $\mathbf{G} = \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$. In general, for a linear mixed model, the response for each subject i is modeled as

$$\mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{b}_i + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i, \tag{1}$$

where the error term $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbb{I}_{m_i})$ and \mathbb{I}_{m_i} is the $m_i \times m_i$ identity matrix and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is the fixed effects coefficient vector. Under this model, we know that the response vector \mathbf{y}_i follows a Gaussian marginal distribution, i.e.

$$\mathbf{y}_i | \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta})),$$

where $\mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{G}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) \mathbf{Q}_i^T + \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbb{I}_{m_i}$. Hence, the log-likelihood function for the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ is given by

$$l(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{y}_i) = -\frac{m_i}{2} \log(2\pi) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{V}_i(\boldsymbol{\eta})| - \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)^T \mathbf{V}_i^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{X}_i \boldsymbol{\beta}^*). \quad (2)$$

The maximum likelihood estimator (MLE) of the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \boldsymbol{\eta})$ is found by maximizing the empirical average of the likelihood over n observations. Throughout the article, we will assume for simplicity that all subjects are measured m times so that $m_i = m$ for all subjects i and the total number of measurements becomes $N = nm$.

2.1 Likelihood screening

In the setting introduced above, the observations $\{(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{X}_i, \mathbf{Q}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d realizations of the random variable $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Q})$. Moving forward, we focus on the conditional approach and assume that \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Q} are given and omit explicit conditioning on these for simplicity. Our main interest is the response profile as a function of time and potential interactions with time. Thus, it makes sense to screen based on a model that captures exactly this feature. In order to achieve this, we partition the design matrix for the fixed effects \mathbf{X} into three separate design matrices; $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{M}}$ corresponding to the high-dimensional covariates, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}}$ corresponding to the time variable and $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}}$ corresponding to the interactions between the covariates and time. Similarly, we may partition (without loss of generality) the coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ into corresponding vectors $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}}^* = [\beta_1^*, \dots, \beta_p^*]^T$, for the main effects, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}}^* = [\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}1}^{*T}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}p}^{*T}]^T$ for interactions, where each $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}^*$, $k = 1, \dots, p$ is the vector of interaction coefficients corresponding to variable k , and $\boldsymbol{\tau}^*$ for the time variable. The first element of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is β_0^* for the intercept. Thus, the model (1) for a random variable \mathbf{y} can be written as

$$\mathbf{y} = \beta_0^* \mathbf{1}_m + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{M}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}}^* + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}}^* + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}} \boldsymbol{\tau}^* + \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{b} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{1}_m$ is the m -vector of ones. A crucial assumption that is often being made is that the true active set of main effects and interactions, defined as $\mathcal{B} = \{1 \leq k \leq p : |\beta_k^*| \neq 0 \text{ or } \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}^*\| \neq 0\}$, is sparse, i.e. $s = |\mathcal{B}| \ll p$. We aim to estimate this set through variable screening by specifying a semi-marginal model for each covariate $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$, that includes both the main effect of the covariate k , the effect of time, and the interaction effect between variable k and time. Let $\mathbf{x}_k \in \mathbb{R}^m$ be the random vector corresponding to the k th main variable. The time variable can be assumed to be dummy coded with $m - 1$ dummy variables corresponding to the m different time points, so that $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m-1}$. The interaction between variable k

and time is then denoted by the $m \times (m - 1)$ matrix $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}k}$. We may note that if we have a linear effect of time, the time variable becomes the vector \mathbf{x}_τ with corresponding scalar regression coefficient τ , but we will focus on the more general case with time dummy variables in the following theoretical derivations.

Under this set-up, we define the semi-marginal MLE for each $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ by

$$(\widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \widehat{\tau}_k, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k) = \arg \max_{(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}, \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k)} \mathbb{P}_n[l(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}, \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k | \mathbf{y})], \quad (4)$$

where \mathbb{P}_n denotes the empirical average based on n observations and $l(\cdot)$ is the log-likelihood function in (2).

Let us define the population parameter values corresponding to the semi-marginal MLEs as

$$(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \bar{\tau}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k) = \arg \max_{(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}, \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k)} \mathbb{E}[l(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}, \tau_k, \boldsymbol{\eta}_k | \mathbf{y})]. \quad (5)$$

Moving forward, we will omit the dependence of $\boldsymbol{\eta}_k$ unless explicitly needed, and let $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \mathbf{V}$. We will show that the theory holds when $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is simultaneously estimated with the regression coefficients, so that we do not need to assume that $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is given.

Since the log-likelihood function is differentiable, (5) satisfies the score equations

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_m & \mathbf{x}_k & \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}k} & \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1}_m + \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k} \mathbf{x}_k + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}k} \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}} \bar{\tau}_k) \right] \\ = \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1}_m & \mathbf{x}_k & \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}k} & \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the MLEs in (4) also satisfy (6) but with the model expectation replaced by the empirical average \mathbb{P}_n . The resulting equations are called estimating equations for $(\beta_{0k}, \beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}, \tau_k)$. The proposed likelihood screening procedure retains both the main effect and the interaction effect corresponding to the variables $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$ that yield the highest log-likelihood values \widehat{L}_k , defined as

$$\widehat{L}_k = \mathbb{P}_n[l(\widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \widehat{\tau}_k | \mathbf{y})],$$

where $(\widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \widehat{\tau}_k)$ is defined as in (4). We then select the variables that give the highest likelihood values when both the main effect and its interaction with time are included, leading to the screening set

$$\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \{1 \leq k \leq p : \widehat{L}_k \geq \tilde{\nu}_n\}, \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{\nu}_n$ is a predefined threshold value. This method ranks the covariates according to how much each covariate contributes to the magnitude of the likelihood function, similar to the likelihood ratio screening procedure in [5]. The screening set $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ estimates the true active set \mathcal{B} . In fact, Theorem 3 shows that the screening set $\widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ is a superset of \mathcal{B} , with probability tending to one.

2.2 Sure screening properties

To establish the sure screening property of the likelihood screening procedure, we make use of the ideas of the conditional screening approach of Barut et al. [6]. The idea is to condition on a specific set of variables which prior to screening is known to be important. Thus, the same set of variables is conditioned on in each marginal model. Since we have no interest in screening the time variable, we will condition on this variable in the semi-marginal model corresponding to variable k . Note that while we focus on interactions with time only, \mathbf{X}_τ may consist of all possible variables that we wish to keep out of the screening step. However, we assume that the number of columns in \mathbf{X}_τ is small compared to the number of covariates. To show the sure screening property of the screening procedure (7), we must first show that the population parameters $(\bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k})$ are useful probes for the true marginal coefficients $(\beta_{\mathcal{M}k}^*, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}^*)$. Then, we need to show that the semi-marginal MLEs $(\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k})$ are uniformly close to $(\bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k})$. We start with the sure screening properties of the population parameters. In order to derive such theoretical properties, we define a conditional mixed linear expectation, following the same idea from Barut et al. [6], as

$$E_L(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{H}) := \alpha_0 \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \quad (8)$$

where $(\alpha_0, \boldsymbol{\alpha})$ is the solution to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{H} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\alpha_0 \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\alpha}) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{1} & \mathbf{H} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right], \quad (9)$$

where $\mathbf{V} = \text{Var}(\mathbf{y})$. Here, $E_L(\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{H})$ is thus the best linearly fitted regression. Now, in order to show the theoretical results, we need to define a reference level for the likelihood value. We may note that the likelihood screening approach is equivalent to a likelihood ratio screening, where we select those variables that give the largest increase in the likelihood value compared to the intercept and time effect model, i.e., $\widehat{\mathcal{B}} = \{1 \leq k \leq p : \widehat{L}_k^R \geq \nu_n\}$, where \widehat{L}_k^R is defined as

$$\widehat{L}_k^R = \mathbb{P}_n \left[l(\widehat{\beta}_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M | \mathbf{y}) - l(\widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k | \mathbf{y}) \right],$$

and $(\widehat{\beta}_0^M, \widehat{\tau}^M) = \arg \min_{(\beta_0^M, \tau^M)} \mathbb{P}_n[l(\beta_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \tau^M | \mathbf{y})]$, so that $\nu_n = \mathbb{P}_n l(\widehat{\beta}_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \widehat{\tau}^M | \mathbf{y}) + \widetilde{\nu}_n$. Clearly, the population version of \widehat{L}_k^R is

$$L_k^R = \mathbb{E}[l(\bar{\beta}_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \bar{\tau}^M | \mathbf{y}) - l(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}, \bar{\tau}_k | \mathbf{y})],$$

where

$$(\bar{\beta}_0^M, \bar{\tau}^M) = \arg \min_{(\beta_0^M, \tau^M)} \mathbb{E}[l(\beta_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \tau^M | \mathbf{y})].$$

For a more general notation, we will now define the matrices $\mathbf{Z}_k = [\mathbf{x}_k, \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}k}]$ and $\mathbf{Z}_{-k} = \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{T}}$, and corresponding coefficient vector $\zeta_k = [\beta_{\mathcal{M}k}, \beta_{\mathcal{I}k}^T]^T$. We first show the relationship between the population version of \widehat{L}_k^R and the conditional mixed linear expectation in the following theorem. For brevity in presentation, its proof is given in Appendix B.1; the required regularity conditions A.1 – A.10 are presented in Appendix A.

Theorem 1 *Assume that the solution to (6) is unique and Condition A.2 and A.8 hold. Then for $k \in \{1, \dots, p\}$,*

$$L_k^R = 0 \text{ if and only if } E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) = E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k})$$

A necessary condition to ensure sure screening property at the population level is that the minimum marginal signal strength is larger than the estimation error. In the following theorem, we show that this is possible under some conditions. Its proof is in Appendix B.2.

Theorem 2 *Suppose that Condition A.2 and A.8 holds and that there exist constants c_0 and $M > 0$ such that*

$$\max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k]\|_1 \leq M, \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \{E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) - E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k})\}]\|_1 \geq \frac{c_0 \sqrt{m}}{n^\kappa}, \quad (10)$$

where κ is as in Condition A.10. Then there exists a positive constant $c_1 > 0$ such that

$$\min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} |L_k^R| \geq c_1 m n^{-2\kappa}.$$

In the following theorem, the sure screening property of the proposed method is stated. While we assume that the covariance structure is given, we do not need to assume that $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is known. In fact, by utilizing Theorem 1 of [22], we are able to show that the sure screening property of the likelihood screening will hold when $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is estimated simultaneously with the regression coefficients. This also implies that while the

estimated covariance matrix \mathbf{V} will depend on k , the result will still hold. The proof of the following theorem is given in Appendix B.3.

Theorem 3 *Assume that Conditions A.1–A.10 and the conditions in Theorem 2 hold for any $k = 1, \dots, p$, and assume that $n^{1-2\kappa}k_n^{-2}K_n^{-2} \rightarrow \infty$. Then, by taking $\nu_n = c_3mn^{-2\kappa}$ for a sufficiently small positive constant c_3 , there exists a constant $c_4 > 0$ such that*

$$\Pr(\mathcal{B} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{B}}) \geq 1 - s \exp(c_4n^{1-2\kappa}(k_nK_n)^{-2}) + snr_1 \exp(-r_0K_n^\alpha) + r_2 \exp(-r_3n),$$

where $s = |\mathcal{B}|$.

3 Numerical results

3.1 Threshold value

A common challenge for all screening procedures is to select the threshold value $\tilde{\nu}_n$ such that the dimension of the fixed design matrix is reduced from the potentially very large number p to a more moderate scale d . The threshold can be chosen in different ways, for example by controlling the false positives etc. However, in practice it is common to retain a fixed number of predictors, for example $n/\log(n)$ or $(n-1)$. Our preferred approach is to use such a hard thresholding rule followed by a regularized regression procedure where false positives can be controlled by, for example, stability selection. In the setting of longitudinal data, it is more interesting to look at the effective sample size, which is smaller than the total number of observations since the observations from the same subject are correlated. Hence, in the following simulation examples, we set d equal to the effective sample size n_e , given by

$$n_e = \frac{m}{1 + \text{ICC} \cdot (m-1)} \cdot n, \tag{11}$$

where ICC is the intraclass correlation coefficient. In our simulations, the ICC is estimated by a simple variance component model.

3.2 Simulation studies

We conducted a number of simulation studies to compare the finite sample performance of the likelihood screening procedure with existing methods, specifically the GEE screening approach by Xu et al. [21]. This

is a screening procedure developed for time course data and is therefore a relevant method for comparison. The GEE screening method is based on marginal models, in contrast to the mixed model approach described in Section 3. In the setting of a linear model with mean zero, the idea of [21] is to define the screening statistics as the p -dimensional vector

$$\hat{\mathbf{g}} = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{X}_i^T \mathbf{A}_i^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_i^{-1/2} \mathbf{y}_i, \quad (12)$$

where \mathbf{A}_i is an $m_i \times m_i$ diagonal matrix with the conditional variance of \mathbf{y}_i given \mathbf{X}_i along the diagonal, and $\hat{\mathbf{R}}_i = \mathbf{R}_i(\hat{\rho})$ is an $m_i \times m_i$ estimated working correlation matrix that depends on a correlation parameter $\hat{\rho}$. The working correlation matrix \mathbf{R}_i needs to be provided, and the estimate $\hat{\rho}$ is obtained via the residual-based moment method. For simplicity, we assume that the working correlation structure is the same for all subjects, so that we may omit the subscript i . Common working correlation structures are compound symmetry and first-order autoregressive correlation, given as follows:

$$\mathbf{R}_{\text{comp}}(\rho) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & \cdots & \rho \\ \rho & 1 & \cdots & \rho \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho & \rho & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{R}_{\text{ar}}(\rho) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho & \cdots & \rho^m \\ \rho & 1 & \cdots & \rho^m \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \rho^m & \rho^{m-1} & \cdots & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

for some correlation parameter ρ and m time points. We may note that for $\mathbf{A}_i^{1/2} \hat{\mathbf{R}}^{-1} \mathbf{A}_i^{-1/2} = \mathbb{I}_m$, the procedure is equivalent to SIS of Fan and Lv [4] for linear models. This approach, which we will refer to as GEES, thus yields the screening set $\hat{\mathcal{B}} = \{1 \leq k \leq p : |\hat{g}_k| > \tilde{\delta}_n\}$ for some predefined threshold $\tilde{\delta}_n$, where \hat{g}_k is the k th entry of $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$.

Example 1

We simulate a random intercept model where the high-dimensional covariates are only measured at baseline, and with linear effect of time and interactions between some of the covariates and time. That is, we simulate n independent samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_n$ of the same length m from the model (3) where the time variable is the vector $\mathbf{x}_\tau = [0, 1, \dots, m-1]^T$ and $\mathbf{b}_i = b_i \mathbf{1}_m$, where $b_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_b^2)$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2 \mathbb{I}_m)$. For the covariates, $X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.4^2)$ and $\mathbf{X}_{i\mathcal{M}}$ consists of the baseline measurements repeated m times. The design matrix $\mathbf{X}_{i\mathcal{I}}$ consists of the interactions between $\mathbf{X}_{i\mathcal{M}}$ and \mathbf{x}_τ . Since we have a random intercept model, the design matrix for the random effects $\mathbf{Q}_i = \mathbf{1}_m$. We set $p = 1000$, $m = 4$ and we do 400 simulations for each method. Denote the true active set of variables by $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ for main effects and $\mathcal{I} = \{2, 3, 4, 5\}$ for

interaction variables, i.e. we have one pure main effect and one pure interaction effect, and the rest are both main and interaction effects. We set the screening threshold such that the top $d = n_e$ variables are retained, where n_e is calculated as in (11). We let $\beta_0^* = 0$, $\tau^* = 0.2$, $\beta_{\mathcal{M}}^* = \mathbf{1}_4$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{I}}^* = 0.5 \cdot \mathbf{1}_4$. We set $\sigma_\epsilon = 0.1$ and let $\sigma_b \in \{0.1, 0.9\}$ and the number of subjects $n \in \{40, 80, 100\}$ to give different challenging scenarios. We compare our method to the GEES method described in the previous section, with three correlation structures; independence, compound symmetry and AR(1), and refer to these as GEES.ind, GEES.cs and GEES.ar1, respectively. As GEES is not formulated for interactions, we implement the method using the design matrix consisting only of the p main effects. For the likelihood screening procedure, we consider two dependency structures; random intercept only, and random intercept together with a random effect of time (a random slope). We call these settings LS.intercept and LS.slope, respectively. The covariance parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} = [\sigma_b^2, \sigma_\epsilon^2]^T$ are estimated by maximum likelihood in each semi-marginal model. Let $r_{\mathcal{M}}$ be the fraction of simulations that identifies all of \mathcal{M} , $r_{\mathcal{I}}$ the fraction of simulations that identifies all of \mathcal{I} , $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ the mean recovery rate of \mathcal{M} , $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$ the mean recovery rate of \mathcal{I} and MMS the minimum model size required to capture all of \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{I} . Table 1 shows the results of these simulations. First, we may note that GEES.ind and GEES.cs gives identical results. This is because when we are only considering the baseline measurements of each covariate, the screening statistic \hat{g} with compound symmetry correlation matrix is simply a scaled version of the screening statistic corresponding to the independence structure. Next, we note that when it comes to interactions, the likelihood screening procedures performs better than GEES across all settings. Finally, the likelihood screening with random intercept and time slope performs significantly better than GEES and LS.intercept when it comes to the main effects, while it performs similarly to LS.intercept with regards to interactions. When looking at the MMS, LS.slope performs significantly better than all other methods across all settings.

Table 1: Table of $r_{\mathcal{M}}$, $r_{\mathcal{I}}$, $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$ for 400 simulations, together with the 50%, 75%, and 95% percentiles of the minimum model size and the average runtime in seconds in Example 1. Simulations were run on a 2.10 GHz Intel Xeon Platinum 8160 CPU, and the Likelihood screening run in parallel across 12 cores.

n	Method	$r_{\mathcal{M}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$	$r_{\mathcal{I}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$	Time	50%	75%	95%
$\sigma_b = 0.1$									
40	GEES.ind	0.38	0.8206	0.2325	0.7794	0.0005	276	587	916
	GEES.cs	0.38	0.8206	0.2325	0.7794	0.0010	276	587	916
	GEES.ar1	0.375	0.8194	0.235	0.7800	0.0014	270	591	919
	LS.intercept	0.0875	0.73	0.675	0.91	0.0392	248	359	485
	LS.slope	0.6725	0.91	0.6725	0.91	0.0482	18	66	278
80	GEES.ind	0.8625	0.9656	0.575	0.8938	0.0011	90	218	728
	GEES.cs	0.8625	0.9656	0.575	0.8938	0.0022	90	218	728
	GEES.ar1	0.8625	0.9656	0.5775	0.8944	0.0037	90	216	728
	LS.intercept	0.3725	0.84	0.9975	1	0.0407	125	187	269
	LS.slope	0.9975	1	0.9975	1	0.0531	5	5	16
100	GEES.ind	0.93	0.9825	0.7575	0.9394	0.0013	48	152	585
	GEES.exch	0.93	0.9825	0.7575	0.9394	0.0032	48	152	585
	GEES.ar1	0.93	0.9825	0.76	0.9400	0.0058	48	153	588
	LS.intercept	0.6175	0.90	1	1	0.0415	94	144	219
	LS.slope	1	1	1	1	0.0563	5	5	6
$\sigma_b = 0.9$									
40	GEES.ind	0.155	0.6788	0.0975	0.6506	0.0005	405	688	930
	GEES.cs	0.155	0.6788	0.0975	0.6506	0.0005	405	688	930
	GEES.ar1	0.1525	0.6794	0.0975	0.6506	0.0014	408	684	923
	LS.intercept	0.08	0.71	0.6225	0.90	0.0393	289	437	707
	LS.slope	0.325	0.77	0.545	0.87	0.0499	88	220	534
80	GEES.ind	0.705	0.9244	0.42	0.8525	0.0010	184	441	850
	GEES.cs	0.705	0.9244	0.42	0.8525	0.0010	184	441	850
	GEES.ar1	0.705	0.9250	0.42	0.8525	0.0035	186	444	846
	LS.intercept	0.26	0.81	0.995	1	0.0406	167	264	450
	LS.slope	0.9225	0.98	0.985	1	0.0556	8	18	129
100	GEES.ind	0.8425	0.9606	0.5725	0.8912	0.0012	120	340	859
	GEES.exch	0.8425	0.9606	0.5725	0.8912	0.0028	120	340	859
	GEES.ar1	0.8425	0.9606	0.575	0.8919	0.0067	120	337	858
	LS.intercept	0.4325	0.86	1	1	0.0414	136	220	376
	LS.slope	0.975	0.99	1	1	0.0593	5	9	52

Example 2

In Example 1, we only considered the baseline measurement of the covariates. When a covariate is time-invariant like this, its effect becomes a purely between-subject effect. In order to assess performance in situations with a time-varying covariate, we now simulate X_{i1}, \dots, X_{ip} independently from a multivariate normal distribution with mean 0 and AR(1) covariance matrix with marginal variance 0.4^2 and autocorrelation coefficient 0.8. In addition, we let the slopes of the time variable vary randomly, so that $\mathbf{b}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \sigma_b^2 \mathbb{I}_2)$ and $\mathbf{Q}_i = [\mathbf{1}_m, \mathbf{x}_\tau]$. The rest of the setup is as in Example 1. Table 2 shows the results of these simulations. Similarly to Example 1, the two likelihood screening procedures performs best when it comes to capturing

the interactions across all settings, and LS.slope also performs best when it comes to capturing the main effects. We observe an impressive effect of including a random slope in the screening, in particular for high σ_b . In this example, we see the benefits of incorporating the within-subject correlation, as the GEES.cs and GEES.ar1 methods performs significantly better than GEES.ind, when focusing on both main effects and interactions.

Table 2: Table of $r_{\mathcal{M}}$, $r_{\mathcal{I}}$, $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$ for 400 simulations, together with the 50%, 75%, and 95% percentiles of the minimum model size and the average runtime in seconds in Example 2. Simulations were run on a 2.10 GHz Intel Xeon Platinum 8160 CPU, and the Likelihood screening run in parallel across 12 cores.

n	Method	$r_{\mathcal{M}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$	$r_{\mathcal{I}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$	Time	50%	75%	95%
$\sigma_b = 0.1$									
40	GEES.ind	0.6625	0.9138	0.4425	0.8588	0.0005	162	356	782
	GEES.cs	0.7175	0.9288	0.5625	0.8888	0.0011	88	257	748
	GEES.ar1	0.8325	0.9581	0.6625	0.9156	0.0010	47	159	604
	LS.intercept	0.6475	0.91	0.76	0.94	0.0395	59	175	489
	LS.slope	0.945	0.99	0.8175	0.95	0.0436	14	51	213
80	GEES.ind	0.9625	0.9906	0.82	0.9550	0.0010	29	105	564
	GEES.cs	0.99	0.9975	0.8975	0.9744	0.0030	12	44	225
	GEES.ar1	0.995	0.9988	0.945	0.9862	0.0024	9	26	165
	LS.intercept	0.98	1	0.985	1	0.0404	9	20	96
	LS.slope	1	1	0.995	1	0.0466	5	6	25
100	GEES.ind	0.9925	0.9981	0.9175	0.9794	0.0014	13	49	253
	GEES.cs	1	1	0.9625	0.9906	0.0047	7	17	110
	GEES.ar1	1	1	0.9775	0.9944	0.0037	6	13	85
	LS.intercept	1	1	0.9975	1	0.0414	6	9	30
	LS.slope	1	1	1	1	0.0492	5	5	7
$\sigma_b = 0.9$									
40	GEES.ind	0.1175	0.6162	0.0625	0.5850	0.0006	484	736	934
	GEES.cs	0.12	0.6306	0.0925	0.6094	0.0013	508	714	958
	GEES.ar1	0.2175	0.7212	0.12	0.6850	0.0011	402	668	936
	LS.intercept	0.0625	0.57	0.1125	0.61	0.0391	440	680	922
	LS.slope	0.8075	0.95	0.6675	0.92	0.0439	50	160	510
80	GEES.ind	0.57	0.8844	0.37	0.8319	0.0010	280	559	904
	GEES.cs	0.6575	0.9069	0.4525	0.8519	0.0037	218	496	829
	GEES.ar1	0.7775	0.9419	0.54	0.8825	0.0025	163	367	849
	LS.intercept	0.535	0.88	0.575	0.89	0.0405	193	394	813
	LS.slope	0.995	1	0.95	0.99	0.0473	6	13	131
100	GEES.ind	0.785	0.9450	0.5125	0.8731	0.0014	206	468	906
	GEES.cs	0.83	0.9562	0.585	0.8919	0.0059	142	350	870
	GEES.ar1	0.89	0.9725	0.6425	0.9100	0.0040	98	265	746
	LS.intercept	0.79	0.95	0.7575	0.94	0.0415	114	288	670
	LS.slope	1	1	0.985	1	0.0499	5	7	34

Example 3

In order to assess the performance of the methods in a situation with non-linear effects of time, we simulate from a random intercept model as in Example 1, but now the time variable is a dummy variable,

$$\mathbf{X}_\tau = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

for each subject, while \mathbf{Q}_i , \mathbf{b}_i , σ_ϵ , \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{I} are as in Example 1. We set $\beta_0^* = 0$ and $\beta_{\mathcal{M}}^* = \beta_{\mathcal{I}}^* = \boldsymbol{\tau}^* = \mathbf{1}_4$. We consider only baseline measurements of the high-dimensional covariates as in Example 1. As seen in Example 1, GEES with compound symmetry correlation structure is equivalent to that of an independence structure. Thus, we omit the results for GEES.cs here. The results are given in Figure 3. Again focusing on the interactions, we observe that the likelihood screening approach outperforms GEES across all settings, suggesting that screening on the likelihood value is a good approach in cases where we have a set of interaction parameters. Similarly to Example 1 and 2, we see the benefits of incorporating a random slope in the likelihood screening for capturing the main effects.

Table 3: Table of $r_{\mathcal{M}}$, $r_{\mathcal{I}}$, $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$ for 400 simulations, together with the 50%, 75%, and 95% percentiles of the minimum model size and the average runtime in seconds in Example 3. Simulations were run on a 2.10 GHz Intel Xeon Platinum 8160 CPU, and the Likelihood screening run in parallel across 12 cores.

n	Method	$r_{\mathcal{M}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{M}}$	$r_{\mathcal{I}}$	$\bar{R}_{\mathcal{I}}$	Time	50%	75%	95%
$\sigma_b = 0.1$									
40	GEES.ind	0.3825	0.8212	0.2425	0.7825	0.0005	276	587	916
	GEES.ar1	0.42	0.8350	0.2	0.7694	0.0011	306	607	909
	LS.intercept	0.0875	0.73	0.67	0.91	0.0396	251	361	480
	LS.slope	0.5025	0.86	0.765	0.94	0.0467	49	84	261
80	GEES.ind	0.865	0.9663	0.5825	0.8956	0.0010	90	218	728
	GEES.ar1	0.905	0.9762	0.51	0.8775	0.0024	112	276	835
	LS.intercept	0.3775	0.84	0.9975	1	0.0411	125	186	271
	LS.slope	0.995	1	0.995	1	0.0512	7	11	28
100	GEES.ind	0.93	0.9825	0.765	0.9412	0.0012	48	152	585
	GEES.ar1	0.9575	0.9894	0.66	0.9150	0.0034	66	186	659
	LS.intercept	0.625	0.91	1	1	0.042	92	144	219
	LS.slope	1	1	1	1	0.0546	6	7	13
$\sigma_b = 0.9$									
40	GEES.ind	0.155	0.6812	0.0975	0.6538	0.0006	405	688	930
	GEES.ar1	0.16	0.6769	0.0825	0.6350	0.0011	432	690	952
	LS.intercept	0.0725	0.71	0.6175	0.90	0.0398	286	436	723
	LS.slope	0.175	0.74	0.67	0.91	0.0475	144	320	665
80	GEES.ind	0.705	0.9250	0.4225	0.8531	0.0010	184	441	850
	GEES.ar1	0.7375	0.9319	0.3475	0.8319	0.0028	230	517	884
	LS.intercept	0.275	0.82	0.9925	1	0.0412	166	263	455
	LS.slope	0.785	0.94	0.9925	1	0.0523	36	76	237
100	GEES.ind	0.8425	0.9606	0.575	0.8919	0.0013	120	340	859
	GEES.ar1	0.8625	0.9656	0.4625	0.8638	0.0035	168	429	878
	LS.intercept	0.4425	0.86	1	1	0.0423	132	216	383
	LS.slope	0.9075	0.98	1	1	0.0556	19	47	164

In the Supplementary material, we have performed the same simulation studies as in Example 1, 2 and 3 for both disjoint sets, i.e. $\mathcal{M} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ and $\mathcal{I} = \{5, 6, 7\}$, and for identical sets $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$. In these results, we see similar trends, that both of the likelihood screening methods performs better than GEES when it comes to capturing the interactions. In addition, LS.slope greatly outperforms both GEES and LS.intercept across many settings with respect to capturing the main effects. This is particularly apparent when considering the MMS. However, LS.slope performs a bit worse with identical sets and the set-up under Example 1 (a random intercept model). This is not surprising as the LS.slope is a misspecification of the correlation structure when the simulated model has only a random intercept.

3.3 Real life data example


Elevated serum triglyceride (TG) levels are known to be associated with the risk of cardiovascular disease (CVD), and the CVD risk reducing effect of marine omega-3 fatty acids is believed to be mainly mediated

by reduction of TG levels. However, it is well known that there is large individual variation with regard to TG response in relation to intake of dietary fat. In this example, we will analyze data from a randomized controlled cross-over trial in $n = 47$ subjects [23]. The subjects were exposed to four different meals with similar fat contents, and the response was serum concentration of TG measured before the meal and 2, 4, and 6 hours after. In addition to the primary exposure (meal), we have measured mRNA on a targeted set of genes before each meal. Our primary interest is if the TG response is related to mRNA, i.e. if there are any interactions between some genes and time. As we have mRNA from a total of 624 genes, it makes sense to perform some variable screening to identify promising candidate genes. The TG response after each meal is typically highly non-linear and a practical solution to the analysis is to introduce dummy variables for time.

We apply our suggested conditional screening method, conditioning on meal in addition to time and include a random intercept and random effect of time, as in the simulation studies. The variance parameters are estimated by MLE. We then retain the top n_e variables, where the effective sample size is now estimated by fitting a random intercept model and conditioning on meal, leading to $n_e \approx 61$.

Notice, in this example, we cannot apply the GEE screening method as a comparison, as this method does not allow for conditional screening, which is necessary in order to take care of the meal effect. In order to investigate the variability of the likelihood screening procedure, we also include a bootstrapping step, where we apply the screening procedure on random subsamples of size n where the sampling is done with replacement. We repeat this 100 times. Figure 1 shows the distribution of the screening frequencies, i.e. the number of times each variable was retained among the top n_e variables, in order to illustrate the variation among the estimated active sets across the samples. In total, 489 variables were retained in at least one subsample, out of 624, indicating the need for a liberal screening threshold.

Figure 1: Sorted histogram of the selected genes in 100 bootstrap samples.



We complete the analysis by performing a final variable selection with the SCAD procedure of Ghosh and Thoresen [15]. We first do a single pre-screening with our proposed method with random intercept and random time slope, and retain the top n_e variables. Then, we fit a SCAD model with a regularization parameter selected through cross-validation based on the screening set. For the final fit, we keep time and meal unpenalized in the model, and fit a random intercept and random time slope model. With the given regularization parameter, stability selection based on complementary pairs [24] was performed, in which we take a random subsample of size $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ of the original data set and perform a variable selection with SCAD on the two disjoint subsets. We performed the resampling 50 times and below we report the interactions and main effects whose estimated coefficients were non-zero in more than 60% of the subsamples (the relative selection frequency in parentheses).

Main variables	Interaction variables
ITGA2B (0.87), LILRA3 (0.83)	FCER1A (0.82),
BLNK (0.80), HLA.DRB1 (0.69), NT5E (0.68),	FCER1A (0.63), GUSB (0.60)
TNFSF12 (0.67), ATG16L1 (0.63), CD80 (0.60)	

We see that nine main effect variables were selected in more than 60% of the subsamples, while two interactions were selected. Of the two selected interaction variables, the FCER1A gene also appears as a main effect, while the GUSB gene only appears through an interaction with time. The interpretation of this is

that the gene has no relation to fasting TG level, but is related to TG response to the given meal. To what extent this is biologically plausible is beyond the scope of the current paper. Also, the biological role of the two selected interaction genes in relation to TG response is unclear.

4 Discussion

The need for interaction screening procedures for response profiles as a function of time in high-dimensional longitudinal data motivated this work. We have proposed a conditional screening procedure that screens for both main effects and interactions, without the need for the heredity assumption, and that is able to capture interactions consisting of several terms. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first conditional screening procedure for clustered data. We have shown the sure screening properties of the suggested method. We compared the finite sample performance of the method with the GEE method of Xu et al. [21] through simulations. We saw that the likelihood screening approach is better for capturing the interactions across a range of different signal strengths. The likelihood screening with random slope in time in addition to random intercept also performed significantly better than GEES when it comes to capturing main effects in many set-ups. When focusing on the MMS, LS.slope greatly outperforms both the GEES and LS.likelihood methods. Even though the correlation structure is wrongly specified in the setting of a random intercept data-generating process, it still performs better than the correctly specified LS.intercept. We believe that this is due to the unexplained variation induced by other active interaction terms not included in the present marginal model, which is better captured by a random slope model.

The GEES has the major computational advantage of only evaluating a function once, instead of fitting p separate marginal models, which makes it an interesting alternative. It would be straightforward to modify the GEES approach to screen for interactions if we are interested in single interaction terms, but we have used the method as proposed in Xu et al. [21].

In many situations, a mixed model approach seems a more natural choice than a GEE approach. If we e.g. have missing data, the GEES procedure implicitly assumes that data must be missing completely at random. If the data is missing at random instead, the GEE approach has to be modified in order to incorporate the missing mechanisms, as mentioned by Xu et al. [21], while incorporating this missing data mechanism in mixed models is straightforward. In addition, the mixed model approach is often a favorable approach in studies in which study subjects are measured at different time points, and finally, if the goal is prediction, GEE is not well suited.

An issue that arises for all univariate screening procedures is that covariates that are marginally unrelated but jointly correlated with the response might be missed by the screening procedure. For this reason, Fan

and Lv [4] proposes an iterative version of the screening, in which an initial active set is estimated by variable screening with the original response, while in the subsequent iterations the residuals from the previous model is used as the new response to obtain a new estimated active set, which is then added to the previous set. This iterative approach is straightforward to implement for the proposed procedure and can be expected to have an improved performance, similar to what is seen for SIS and GEES.

How to set the screening threshold is crucial. We argue that it makes most sense to use a liberal threshold, using the screening procedure primarily to reduce the number of variables to a level that is manageable and leave the final variable selection to some regularized regression procedure. Motivated by this, we used a threshold equal to $d = n_e$.

Finally, this work focuses on the linear mixed model. To extend it to generalised linear mixed models would be of interest, but outside the scope of this paper.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to thank Prof. Stine Ulven, Department of Nutrition, University of Oslo, for providing the triglyceride data used in the example.

Data accessibility

The data used in this analysis are from a third party and are not available for distribution.

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The research of AG is partially supported by a research grant (No. SRG2020000072) from the Science & Engineering Research Board (SERB), Government of India, India.

References

- [1] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*, 58(1):267–288, 1996. doi: 10.1111/j.2517-6161.1996.tb02080.x.
- [2] Jianqing Fan and Runze Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *J Am Stat Assoc*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001. doi: 10.1198/016214501753382273.
- [3] Leo Breiman. Better subset regression using the nonnegative garrote. *Technometrics*, 37(4):373–384, 1995. doi: 10.1080/00401706.1995.10484371.
- [4] Jianqing Fan and Jinchi Lv. Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*, 70(5):849–911, 2008. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2008.00674.x.
- [5] Jianqing Fan and Rui Song. Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with NP-dimensionality. *Ann. Stat.*, 38(6):3567 – 3604, 2010. doi: 10.1214/10-AOS798.
- [6] Emre Barut, Jianqing Fan, and Anneleen Verhasselt. Conditional sure independence screening. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 111(515):1266–1277, 2016. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1092974.
- [7] Jian Kang, Hyokyung G Hong, and Yi Li. Partition-based ultrahigh-dimensional variable screening. *Biometrika*, 104(4):785–800, 2017. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asx052.
- [8] Abhik Ghosh and Magne Thoresen. A robust variable screening procedure for ultra-high dimensional data. *Stat Methods Med Res*, 30(8):1816–1832, 2021. doi: 10.1177/09622802211017299.
- [9] Yeqing Zhou and Liping Zhu. Model-free feature screening for ultrahigh dimensional data through a modified Blum-Kiefer-Rosenblatt correlation. *Stat. Sin.*, 28(3):1351–1370, 2018. doi: 10.5705/ss.202016.0264.
- [10] Runze Li, Wei Zhong, and Liping Zhu. Feature screening via distance correlation learning. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 107(499):1129–1139, 2012. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2012.695654.
- [11] Xiaofeng Shao and Jingsi Zhang. Martingale difference correlation and its use in high-dimensional variable screening. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 109(507):1302–1318, 2014. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2014.887012.
- [12] Xiangyu Wang and Chenlei Leng. High dimensional ordinary least squares projection for screening variables. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*, 78(3):589–611, 2016. doi: 10.1111/rssb.12127.

- [13] Debmalya Nandy, Francesca Chiaromonte, and Runze Li. Covariate information number for feature screening in ultrahigh-dimensional supervised problems. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 117(539):1516–1529, 2022. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2020.1864380.
- [14] Jürg Schelldorfer, Peter Bühlmann, and Sara van de Geer. Estimation for high-dimensional linear mixed-effects models using ℓ_1 -penalization. *Scand. J. Stat.*, 38(2):197–214, 2011. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9469.2011.00740.x.
- [15] Abhik Ghosh and Magne Thoresen. Non-concave penalization in linear mixed-effect models and regularized selection of fixed effects. *Adv Stat Anal*, 102:179–210, 2018. doi: 10.1007/s10182-017-0298-z.
- [16] Ning Hao and Hao Helen Zhang. Interaction screening for ultrahigh-dimensional data. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 109(507):1285–1301, 2014. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2014.881741.
- [17] Peter Hall and Jing-Hao Xue. On selecting interacting features from high-dimensional data. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 71:694–708, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.csda.2012.10.010.
- [18] Ning Hao, Yang Feng, and Hao Helen Zhang. Model selection for high-dimensional quadratic regression via regularization. *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 113(522):615–625, 2018.
- [19] Bo Jiang and Jun S. Liu. Variable selection for general index models via sliced inverse regression. *Ann. Stat.*, 42(5):1751–1786, 2014. doi: 10.1214/14-AOS1233.
- [20] Min Zhou, Mingwei Dai, Yuan Yao, Jin Liu, Can Yang, and Heng Peng. Bolt-ssi: A statistical approach to screening interaction effects for ultra-high dimensional data. *Stat. Sin.*, 2023. doi: 10.5705/ss.202020.0498.
- [21] Peirong Xu, Lixing Zhu, and Yi Li. Ultrahigh dimensional time course feature selection. *Biometrics*, 70(2):356–365, 2014. doi: 10.1111/biom.12137.
- [22] Andrea Bratsberg, Magne Thoresen, and Abhik Ghosh. Exponential consistency of M-estimators in generalized linear mixed models. 2023. doi: 10.48550/arXiv.2207.12480.
- [23] Patrik Hansson, Kirsten B Holven, Linn K L Øyri, Hilde K Brekke, Anne S Biong, Gyrd O Gjevestad, Ghulam S Raza, Karl-Heinz Herzig, Magne Thoresen, and Stine M Ulven. Meals with Similar Fat Content from Different Dairy Products Induce Different Postprandial Triglyceride Responses in Healthy Adults: A Randomized Controlled Cross-Over Trial. *J. Nutr.*, 149(3):422–431, 2019. doi: 10.1093/jn/nxy291.

- [24] Rajen D. Shah, Richard J. Samworth, and R. J. Samworth. Variable selection with error control: another look at stability selection. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*, 75(1):55–80, 2013. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9868.2011.01034.x.

A Regularity conditions for sure screening properties

We consider the following conditions for every $k = 1, \dots, p$ while proving the sure screening property for the proposed screening procedure based on likelihood value.

A.1 Suppose that there exists a suitable constant $Z > 0$ such that $(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k)$ is an interior point of the compact and convex set $\mathcal{Z} = \{(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) : |\beta_{0k} - \bar{\beta}_{0k}| + \|\boldsymbol{\zeta}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\tau}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k\|_1 < Z\}$.

A.2 There exists a positive constant C_0 such that $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{Z}_{-k}\|^2 \leq mC_0$ and $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{Z}_k\|^2 \leq mC_0$.

A.3 The variance-covariance matrix $\mathbf{V}(\boldsymbol{\eta})$ is positive definite at $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k$. and the matrix $[\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}]$ is of full column rank. Additionally, $\|I_k\|$ is bounded from above, where I_k is the semi-marginal Fisher information matrix, given by

$$I_k = \mathbb{E} \left[[\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}]^T \mathbf{V}^{-1}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}) [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}] \right].$$

A.4 There exist positive constants s_0, s_1 such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp \left[(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} + s_0)^2 / 2 - (\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2 / 2 \right] \right\} \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left\{ \exp \left[(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} - s_0)^2 / 2 - (\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2 / 2 \right] \right\} \right] \leq s_1, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathbf{x}_j^T and \mathbf{q}_j^T are the j th row of \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Q} , respectively.

A.5 There exist positive constants r_0, r_1, α (independent of k) such that, for a sufficiently large t , we have

$$\Pr(\|\mathbf{Z}_k\|_1 > t) \leq \frac{1}{2}(r_1 - s_1) \exp(-r_0 t^\alpha), \quad \Pr(\|\mathbf{Z}_{-k}\|_1 > t) \leq \frac{1}{2}(r_1 - s_1) \exp(-r_0 t^\alpha),$$

where s_1 is the same constant from Condition A.4.

A.6 For a given $(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \in \mathcal{Z}$, the function $l(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k, \boldsymbol{\eta} | \mathbf{y})$ satisfies the Lipschitz condition with a positive constant k_n at $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k$. That is, for any $(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k), (\beta'_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}'_k) \in \mathcal{Z}$ and all $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) \in \Lambda_n := \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) : \|\mathbf{X}\|_1 \leq K_n, \|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \leq K_n^*\}$ for sufficiently large positive constants K_n and K_n^* , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |l(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y}) - l(\beta'_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}'_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}'_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y})| \\ & \leq k_n \left| m(\beta_{0k} - \beta'_{0k}) + \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{Z}_k (\boldsymbol{\zeta}_k - \boldsymbol{\zeta}'_k) + \mathbf{1}_m^T \mathbf{Z}_{-k} (\boldsymbol{\tau}_k - \boldsymbol{\tau}'_k) \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

A.7 There exists an $\epsilon_1 > 0$ (independent of k) such that, for the constant K_n in Condition A.6, we have

$$\sup_{\substack{\{\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k\} \in \mathcal{Z}, \\ \|\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k^T, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k^T\|^T - \|\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k^T\|^T \leq \epsilon_1}} \left| \mathbb{E}[(\boldsymbol{\theta}^T \mathbb{Z}_k \mathbf{V}^{-1}(\bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k) \mathbb{Z}_k \boldsymbol{\theta}) I(\|\mathbb{Z}_k\|_1 > K_n)] \right| \leq o(m/n),$$

where $\mathbb{Z}_k := [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}]$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} := [\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k^T, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k^T]^T$.

A.8 There exists a positive constant \tilde{K} (independent of k) such that, for all $(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k) \in \mathcal{Z}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} [l(\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y}) - l(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y})] \geq \tilde{K} \left\| [\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k^T, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k^T]^T - [\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k^T]^T \right\|^2.$$

A.9 Suppose that there exist constants r_2 and r_3 such that $\Pr(\Omega_n^c) \leq r_2 \exp(-r_3 n)$, where $\Omega_n = \{(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{X}) :$

$$\mathbb{P}_n l(\hat{\beta}_{0k}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y}) \leq \mathbb{P}_n l(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k, \bar{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_k | \mathbf{y})\}.$$

A.10 For each k , let $\mathbf{S}_k = \mathbb{P}_n [[1, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}]^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} [1, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}]]$. Then, there exists some positive constants c_7 and c_8 (independent of k) and some $0 < \kappa < 1/2$, such that

$$\Pr(\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{S}_k) > c_7) = 1 - \mathcal{O}\{\exp(-c_8 n^{1-\kappa})\}.$$

Conditions A.1-A.8 (except A.2) are equivalent to Condition 2 in [6] for multivariate response variables, which hold for most common practical cases. Condition A.2 ensures that the sum of the variances of the covariates is finite, whereas in [6] the assumption was made that the marginal variances were equal to one. Conditions A.9 and A.10 are related to the data-generating process. Condition A.9 is required for the sure screening property to hold with an unknown variance parameter $\boldsymbol{\eta}$. Condition A.10 ensures that the matrix \mathbf{S}_k is positive definite with exponentially high probability, by letting its minimum eigenvalue be bounded away from zero with probability converging to one at an exponential rate.

B Appendix

B.1 Proof of Theorem 1

From (8), we have that $E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) = \bar{\beta}^M \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M$ and $E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) = \bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k$.

\Leftarrow :

If $E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) = E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k})$ then $\bar{\beta}^M \mathbf{1} + \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M \mathbf{z}_{-k} = \bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k$ which implies $\mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k = 0$.

By A.3, this is true if and only if $\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k = \mathbf{0}$. Because we assume the solution to (6) is unique, then $\bar{\beta}_0^M = \bar{\beta}_{0k}$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M = \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k$, which means $L_k^R = 0$.

\Rightarrow :

If $L_k^R = 0$, then from Condition A.8, $\left\| \left[\bar{\beta}_0^M - \bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{L}k}^T, (\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M - \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k)^T \right]^T \right\|^2 = 0$, which means that $[\bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \bar{\beta}_{\mathcal{L}k}^T]^T = \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k = [0, \mathbf{0}]^T$. By the definition of the conditional linear expectation, $(\bar{\beta}_0^M, 0, \mathbf{0}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M)$ is a solution to

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_0^M \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right]. \quad (15)$$

Similarly, $(\bar{\beta}_{0k}, 0, \mathbf{0}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k)$ is a solution to (6). But, note that (6) is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right], \text{ and} \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k = [0, \mathbf{0}]^T$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

implying that a solution to (15) is also a solution to (6). Since we assume that this solution is unique, we must have that $\bar{\beta}_0^M = \bar{\beta}_{0k}$, $\bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M = \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k$, i.e. $E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) = E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k})$. \square

B.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Let $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_k = \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} & \mathbf{Z}_k \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} & \mathbf{Z}_k \end{bmatrix} \right]$. We can then partition $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_k$ as follows:

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_k = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix} \right] & \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k \right] \\ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix} \right] & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_k \right] \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11} & \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12} \\ \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{21} & \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

From the score equations (6) and (15),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\bar{\beta}^M \mathbf{1} + \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \mathbf{y} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Let $\check{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k = \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}^M$ and $\check{\beta}_{0k} = \bar{\beta}_{0k} - \bar{\beta}^M$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} (\check{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \check{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k) \right] = 0$$

Solving this for $(\check{\beta}_{0k}, \check{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k)$ gives

$$[\check{\beta}_{0k}, \check{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k^T]^T = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12} \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k.$$

Now, we have that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \{E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) - E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k})\}] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \{\check{\beta}_{0k} \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \check{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k + \mathbf{Z}_k \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\}] \quad (18)$$

$$= \{\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12}\} \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k. \quad (19)$$

We may note that $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{21} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12}$ is the Schur complement of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22}$ in $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_k$ and is positive semi-definite, because $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22}$ is positive definite. From the first part of Condition (10), $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22}\| \leq M$ for a positive constant M . Hence,

$$0 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{21} (\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{11})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{12}\| \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{22}\| \leq M.$$

Finally, by the second part of Condition (10), we have

$$\|\bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\| \geq M^{-1} \left\| \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}_k^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \{E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}) - E_L(\mathbf{y} | \mathbf{Z}_{-k})\}] \right\| \geq c_2 m^{1/2} n^{-\kappa}, \quad (20)$$

where $c_2 = c_0/M$ for $k \in \mathcal{B}$. From Condition A.8, there then exists a constant c_1 such that

$$|L_k^R| \geq c_1 m n^{-2\kappa}$$

for $k \in \mathcal{B}$. This completes the proof. \square

B.3 Proof of Theorem 3

In order to establish Theorem 3, we need to first consider some lemmas. The first lemma shows a uniform tail bound for the MLEs, whereas the second one gives the tail probability bound for the response vector; both requires appropriate conditions on the distributions of the covariates as specified in the respective lemmas.

Lemma 1: *For any $k = 1, \dots, p$, if Conditions A.1-A.9 hold true, then for any $t > 0$ and large enough n ,*

we have that

$$\Pr\left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\| \geq c_5 m^{1/2} n^{-\kappa}\right) \leq \exp(-c_6 n^{1-2\kappa}/(k_n K_n)^2) + r_2 \exp(-r_3 n) + n \Pr(\Lambda_n^c), \quad (21)$$

for some positive constants c_5 and c_6 .

Proof: Fix any $k = 1, \dots, p$. Note that, under our general uniform formulations, $(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{Z}_{ik}, \mathbf{Z}_{-ik})_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are the i.i.d. realizations of the random variables $(\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k})$; put $\mathbb{Z}_k = [\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}] \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times p_m}$, where $p_m = 2m$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} = [\beta_{0k}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_k^T, \boldsymbol{\tau}_k^T]^T$. Then, Assumptions A.1–A.6 in Theorem 1 in [22] hold for each semi-marginal model where the loss function is the log-likelihood with only covariates \mathbb{Z}_k included. Therefore, the result follows for regression coefficients $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ by an application of Theorem 1 of [22] with $1 + t = \tilde{K} n^{1/2 - \kappa} / 16 C^{1/2} k_n$. Thus, the results follow from the fact that $\Pr\left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k - \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\| \geq u\right) \leq \Pr\left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} - \bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\| \geq u\right)$ for any positive u , where $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = [\widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k^T, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k^T]^T$ and $\bar{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = [\bar{\beta}_{0k}, \bar{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k^T, \bar{\boldsymbol{\tau}}_k^T]^T$. \square

Lemma 2: *If Condition A.4 holds, then we have*

$$\Pr(\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \geq m_0 t^\alpha / s_0) \leq s_1 \exp(-m_0 t^\alpha), \quad \text{for any } t > 0.$$

Proof: Let $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, \dots, y_m]^T$. By the exponential Chebyshev's inequality, as in the proof of Lemma 1 of [5], we can show that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(|y_j| \geq u) &\leq \exp(-s_0 u) \mathbb{E}[\exp(s_0 y_j) + \exp(-s_0 y_j)] \\ &= \exp(-s_0 u) \mathbb{E}\{\mathbb{E}[\exp(s_0 y_j) | \mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b}] + \mathbb{E}[\exp(-s_0 y_j) | \mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b}]\} \\ &\leq \exp(-s_0 u) \left[\mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left[\frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} + s_0)^2}{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2}{2}\right] \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left[\frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} - s_0)^2}{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2}{2}\right] \right\} \right], \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Therefore, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty \geq u) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^m \Pr(|y_j| \geq u) \\ &\leq \exp(-s_0 u) \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left[\frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} + s_0)^2}{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2}{2}\right] \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}\left\{ \exp\left[\frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b} - s_0)^2}{2} - \frac{(\mathbf{x}_j^T \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{q}_j^T \mathbf{b})^2}{2}\right] \right\} \right] \\ &\leq s_1 \exp(-s_0 u), \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Condition A.4. Then, the desired result is obtained by letting $u = m_0 t^\alpha / s_0$.
 \square

Proof of Theorem 3:

The idea is to bound \widehat{L}_k^R from below to show the strength of the signals. By Taylor expansion, we have that

$$2\widehat{L}_k^R = \left[\widehat{\beta}_0^M - \widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}^T, (\widehat{\tau}^M - \widehat{\tau}_k)^T \right] \mathbf{L}_k'' \left[\widehat{\beta}_0^M - \widehat{\beta}_{0k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}^T, (\widehat{\tau}^M - \widehat{\tau}_k)^T \right]^T \geq \lambda_{k, \min} \|\widehat{\zeta}_k\|^2$$

where $\widehat{\zeta}_k = [\widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{M}k}, \widehat{\beta}_{\mathcal{I}k}^T]^T$ and $\lambda_{k, \min}$ is the minimum eigenvalue of

$$\mathbf{L}_k'' := \mathbb{P}_n \left[\begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_k & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix}^T \mathbf{V}^{-1} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \mathbf{Z}_k & \mathbf{Z}_{-k} \end{bmatrix} \right],$$

which by Condition A.10 is bounded according to

$$\Pr(\lambda_{k, \min} > c_7) = 1 - \mathcal{O}\{\exp(-c_8 n^{1-\kappa})\}. \quad (23)$$

Now, we bound $\|\widehat{\zeta}_k\|$. By (20),

$$\min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \|\bar{\zeta}_k\| \geq c_2 m^{1/2} n^{-\kappa}.$$

By applying Lemma 1 over all $k \in \mathcal{B}$ and the union bound of probability, we have

$$\Pr\left(\max_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \|\widehat{\zeta}_k - \bar{\zeta}_k\| \leq c_2 m^{1/2} n^{-\kappa} / 2\right) \geq 1 - s \exp(c_4 n^{1-2\kappa} (k_n K_n)^{-2}) - sn \Pr(\Lambda_n^c), \quad (24)$$

for some constant c_4 . Further, by Lemma 2, we have

$$\Pr(\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty > t) \leq s_1 \exp(-s_0 t).$$

Thus, using this tail probability bound and Condition A.5, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr(\Lambda_n^c) &\leq \Pr(\|\mathbf{I}, \mathbf{Z}_k, \mathbf{Z}_{-k}\|_\infty > K_n) + \Pr(\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty > r_0 K_n^\alpha / s_0) \\
&\leq \Pr(\|\mathbf{Z}_k\|_\infty > K_n) + \Pr(\|\mathbf{Z}_{-k}\|_\infty > K_n) + \Pr(\|\mathbf{y}\|_\infty > r_0 K_n^\alpha / s_0) \\
&\leq r_1 \exp(-r_0 K_n^\alpha),
\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

where $K_n \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Hence,

$$\Pr\left(\min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\zeta}}_k\| \geq c_2 m^{1/2} n^{-\kappa} / 2\right) = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(s \exp(c_4 n^{1-2\kappa} (k_n K_n)^{-2}) + snr_1 \exp(-r_0 K_n^\alpha)\right).$$

Combining the bound above with (23) gives

$$\Pr\left(\min_{k \in \mathcal{B}} \widehat{L}_k^R \geq c_7 c_2^2 m n^{-2\kappa} / 8\right) = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(s \exp(c_4 n^{1-2\kappa} (k_n K_n)^{-2}) + snr_1 \exp(-r_0 K_n^\alpha)\right).$$

Hence, by setting $\nu_n = c_3 m n^{-2\kappa}$ for $c_3 < c_7 c_2^2 / 8$ we have that $\mathcal{B} \subset \widehat{\mathcal{B}}$ with the probability tending to one exponentially fast. This completes the proof. \square