

High-Dimensional Tail Index Regression: with An Application to Text Analyses of Viral Posts in Social Media

Yuya Sasaki* Jing Tao† Yulong Wang‡

Abstract

Motivated by the empirical power law of the distributions of credits (e.g., the number of “likes”) of viral posts in social media, we introduce the high-dimensional tail index regression and methods of estimation and inference for its parameters. We propose a regularized estimator, establish its consistency, and derive its convergence rate. To conduct inference, we propose to debias the regularized estimate, and establish the asymptotic normality of the debiased estimator. Simulation studies support our theory. These methods are applied to text analyses of viral posts in X (formerly Twitter) concerning LGBTQ+.

Keywords: high-dimensional data, social media, tail index, text analysis.

1 Introduction

A large literature is devoted to tail features of distributions – see de Haan and Ferreira (2007) and Resnick (2007) for reviews and references. A distribution F is regularly varying with exponent α if its tail is well approximated by a Pareto distribution with shape parameter α . This regularity condition implies that common tail features of interest, such as tail probabilities, extreme quantiles, and tail

* Yuya Sasaki: yuya.sasaki@vanderbilt.edu. Brian and Charlotte Grove Chair and Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Vanderbilt University, VU Station B #351819, 2301 Vanderbilt Place, Nashville, TN 37235-1819.

† Jing Tao: jingtao@uw.edu. Assistant Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, University of Washington, Box 353330, Savery 305, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195-3330.

‡ Yulong Wang: ywang402@maxwell.syr.edu. Associate Professor of Economics, Department of Economics, Syracuse University, 110 Eggers Hall, Syracuse, NY 13244-1020.




Figure 1: The log-log plot for the distribution of “likes” in posts about LGBTQ+ in X. The horizontal axis plots the rank of Y while the vertical axis plots $\log(Y)$.

conditional expectations, can be written in terms of α . Estimates of them are constructed by plugging in estimated values of α . The literature contains numerous suggestions along these lines, a part of which is reviewed in the surveys cited above.

To motivate this framework in contemporary applications, consider the distribution of credits in social media. Figure 1 draws the so-called log-log plot for the distribution of the number Y of “likes” in LGBTQ+ posts in X (formerly Twitter). If the distribution of Y is Pareto with exponent α , then the log-log plot is linear, as in this figure, with its slope indicating $-1/\alpha$. This observation motivates us to use the aforementioned technology for analyses of viral posts on social media.

Now, suppose that the conditional distribution of Y given X has an approximately Pareto tail with shape parameter $\alpha(X)$ depending on X . We are interested in the effect of X on the tail features of Y via $\alpha(X)$. One family of existing methods imposes some parametric structure on $\alpha(X)$. Wang and Tsai (2009) propose a novel tail index regression (TIR) method by modeling $\alpha(X) = \exp(X^\top \theta_0)$ and estimating the pseudo parameter θ_0 . Nicolau, Rodrigues, and Stoykov (2023) extend the TIR method by allowing for weakly dependent data. Li, Leng, and You (2020) consider the semiparametric setup $\alpha(X) = \alpha(X_1, X_2) = \exp(X_1^\top \theta_0 + \eta(X_2))$ for some smooth function η . Combining $\alpha(X) = \exp(X^\top \theta_0)$

with a power transformation of Y , Wang and Li (2013) study the estimation of conditional extreme quantiles of Y given X . Another family of existing methods considers fully nonparametric models and local smoothing (e.g., Gardes and Girard, 2010; Gardes, Guillou, and Schorgen, 2012; Daouia, Gardes, Girard, and Lekina, 2010; Daouia, Gardes, and Girard, 2013).

Common in all of these existing approaches is that X is assumed to be of a fixed and low dimension. In this paper, we aim to relax this restriction by allowing the dimension of X to increase with the sample size and can be much bigger than the sample size. This high-dimensional study is motivated by our empirical question related to Figure 1. Specifically, let Y_i denote the number of “likes” of the i -th post, and let X_i denote a long vector of binary indicators of whether this post contains a list of keywords. Smaller values of $\alpha(X)$ imply that using the words indicated by such X entails more extreme numbers of “likes.” Essentially, we are asking how to write viral posts. Since the number of keywords is potentially very large, a high dimensional setup is necessary to this end.

To address this question, we develop a novel high-dimensional tail index regression (HDTIR) method. Specifically, modifying the TIR method (Wang and Tsai, 2009), we propose an L^1 -regularized maximum likelihood estimator. For inference, we further propose to debias the regularized estimate, and establish its asymptotic normality. Two alternative methods are provided for debiased estimation and inference: one based on sample splitting and the other based on cross-fitting.

To the best of our knowledge, the method proposed in the current paper is the first work to systematically study estimation and inference theory for the high dimensional tail index regression model. This is the key contribution of the current paper. The estimation and inference problem in the high-dimensional tail regression model is related to the extensive literature on high-dimensional generalized linear models (e.g., van de Geer (2008), Negahban, Yu, Wainwright, and Ravikumar (2009), Huang and Zhang (2012), van de Geer, Bühlmann, Ritov, and Dezeure (2014), Zhang and Zhang (2014), Belloni, Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, and Wei (2018), Chernozhukov, Chetverikov, Demirer, Duflo, Hansen, Newey, and Robins (2018), Cai, Guo, and Ma (2023), among many others). However, none of the aforementioned papers focus on tail index regression. Our work also aims to contribute to the vast literature of text analysis. L^1 -regularized estimation has been extensively applied to high-dimensional text regressions (e.g., Taddy, 2013). That said, there is no method tailored to analyzing tail features of distributions of credits, such as the number of “likes” for viral posts in social media.

Our proposal fills this gap in the literature.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the method and its theory. We extend the baseline theory to estimation and inference for conditional quantiles in Section 3. Monte Carlo simulations in Section 4 demonstrate that the proposed HDTIR has excellent small-sample performance. We apply the method to text analyses of viral posts in X in Section 5. Mathematical details are relegated to the appendix.

Throughout the paper, we use the following notation. For a p -dimensional vector $X = (X_1, \dots, X_p)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we use $\|X\|_q = (\sum_{i=1}^p |X_i|^q)^{1/q}$ to denote the vector ℓ_q norm for $1 \leq q < \infty$, and $\|X\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |X_i|$ to denote the vector maximum norm. For a set $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, p\}$, let $X_S = \{X_j : j \in S\}$ and S^c be the complement of S . For a $p \times q$ matrix $A = (a_{i_1 i_2}) \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, we use $\|A\|_1 = \sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^q |a_{i_1 i_2}|$, $\|A\|_2 = \|A\|_F = \{\sum_{i_1=1}^p \sum_{i_2=1}^q (a_{i_1 i_2})^2\}^{1/2}$ and $\|A\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i_1 \leq p, 1 \leq i_2 \leq q} |a_{i_1 i_2}|$ to denote the element-wise ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ , respectively. Let $\|A\|_{\ell_d} = \sup_{X \in \mathbb{R}^q, |X|_d \leq 1} |AX|_d$ denote the matrix operator norm for $1 \leq d \leq \infty$. More specifically, the operator ℓ_1 , ℓ_2 and ℓ_∞ norms are denoted by $\|A\|_{\ell_1} = \max_{1 \leq i_2 \leq q} \sum_{i_1=1}^p |a_{i_1 i_2}|$, $\|A\|_{\ell_2} = \max_{1 \leq i_2 \leq q} \{\sum_{i_1=1}^p (a_{i_1 i_2})^2\}^{1/2}$ and $\|A\|_{\ell_\infty} = \max_{1 \leq i_1 \leq p} \sum_{i_2=1}^q |a_{i_1 i_2}|$, respectively. Let I_p be the $p \times p$ identity matrix. For two positive sequences $\{a_n\}$ and $\{b_n\}$, $a_n \asymp b_n$ means that $\tilde{c}_1 \leq a_n/b_n \leq \tilde{c}_2$ for all n , where \tilde{c}_1 and \tilde{c}_2 are two positive constants. For any random variables X_1, \dots, X_n and functions $h(\cdot)$, let $\mathbb{E}_n\{h(U_i)\} = \sum_{i=1}^n h(U_i)/n$ be the empirical average of $\{h(U_i)\}_{i=1}^n$. Let $\dot{h}(\cdot)$ and $\ddot{h}(\cdot)$ be the first and second order derivatives of a univariate function, and let ∇ denote the operator for gradient or subgradient.

2 High Dimensional Tail Index Regression

2.1 Regularized Estimation

Let $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ be n copies of $\{Y, X\}$, where Y is a real-valued response of interest and X is a p -dimensional random vector of explanatory factors with possibly $p = p_n \rightarrow \infty$ as the sample size n diverges to ∞ . We are interested in modeling the effect of X on the tail feature of the distribution of Y . Without loss of generality, we focus on the right tail and collect observations $Y_i > \omega_n$ for some ω_n . We state the following assumptions.

Assumption 1 (Conditional Pareto Tail). For constant $t \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{Y}{\omega_n} > t \mid Y > \omega_n, X\right) = t^{-\alpha(X)}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\alpha(X) = \exp(X^\top \theta_0)$ and $\theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Assumption 2. X_i is i.i.d. For each j , X_{ij} has a compact support \mathcal{X}_j with $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}_j} f_{X_{ij}}(x) < \bar{f} < \infty$.

Assumption 1 imposes the restriction that the tail of the conditional distribution of Y given X is Pareto with exponent $\alpha(X)$. This condition can be relaxed by multiplying a slowly varying function $\mathcal{L}(t)$ on the right-hand side of (2.1) such that $\mathcal{L}(t) \rightarrow 1$ as $t \rightarrow \infty$ (e.g., Wang and Tsai, 2009). With this said, there are two benefits of imposing (2.1). First, having the exact Pareto distribution substantially simplifies the theory, especially given that we focus on high-dimensional X_j . Second, the empirical strategy remains the same when we select a sufficiently large ω_n so that the higher-order approximation bias from $\mathcal{L}(t)$ becomes asymptotically negligible. This is also commonly implemented in the literature (e.g., Drees (1998b,a)). More discussions about the effect of ω_n can be found in de Haan and Ferreira (2007, Section 3), among others. Assumption 2 assumes that each coordinate of X_i has a compact support. This is coherent with our empirical application, in which X_i is a vector of binary indicators. We can relax the i.i.d. condition at the cost of more sophisticated theory, but we focus on this sampling assumption to explicate our main contribution concerning the high-dimensional setup.

We now introduce our high-dimensional tail index regression (HDTIR) estimator. Let $n_0 := \sum_{i=1}^n I(Y_i \geq \omega_n)$ denote the effective sample size, and rearrange the indices such that $I(Y_i \geq \omega_n) = 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n_0\}$. Define the negative log-likelihood function of Y conditional on $Y \geq \omega_n$ by

$$\ell_{n_0}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \left(\exp(X_i^\top \theta) + 1 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - X_i^\top \theta \right\}.$$

Our regularized HDTIR estimator is given by

$$\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \{ \ell_{n_0}(\theta) + \lambda_{n_0} \|\theta\|_1 \}. \quad (2.2)$$

Let $\Sigma_{\omega_n} = \mathbb{E}[X_i X_i^\top | Y_i > \omega_n]$ and $Z_{ni} = \Sigma_{\omega_n}^{-1/2} X_i$. We denote the sparsity level of the parameter as s_0 . The following Theorem derives the consistency and the convergence rate of this regularized estimator.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold, and suppose that for constants $C_1 > 0$ and $C_2 > 1$ independent of n , p , and ω_n , $\|\theta\|_0 \leq s_0$, $\|\theta\|_2 \leq C_1$, $C_2^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\omega_n}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\omega_n}) \leq C_2$. Let $\lambda_{n_0} = c\sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$ for some constant $c > 0$. If $s_0 \lesssim n_0/(\log p)$, then with probability approaching one,*

$$\|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_1 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0^2(\log p)}{n_0}}, \quad \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left[X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0) \right]^2 \lesssim \frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}.$$

Theorem 1 establishes the rate of convergence for the proposed lasso estimator with mild conditions. The theory extends those earlier work on the generalized linear models with canonical links (e.g., Negahban et al. (2009), Gardes and Girard (2010)) and those focusing on generalized linear models with binary outcome (e.g., van de Geer (2008) and Cai et al. (2023)). However, as is well discussed in the literature, $\hat{\theta}$ cannot be directly applied to construct a confidence interval for θ_0 . In next section, we introduce a debiased estimator for inference.

2.2 Debiased Estimation and Inference

The regularized estimator generally entails non-negligible regularization biases relative to its sampling variations, and cannot be directly used for statistical inference based on its asymptotic distribution. In this light, the current section proposes two approaches to debiased estimation and inference. One approach is based on sample splitting and the other is based on cross-fitting.

Note that the score and Hessian of ℓ_{n_0} evaluated at $\hat{\theta}$ take the forms of

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\hat{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i \quad \text{and} \\ \ddot{\ell}_{n_0}(\hat{\theta}) &= \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) X_i X_i^\top, \end{aligned}$$

respectively.

2.2.1 Sample Splitting

We split the samples so that the initial estimation and bias correction steps are conducted on independent datasets. Without loss of generality, the effective sample of size $2n_0$ is randomly divided into two disjoint subsets $\mathcal{D}_1 = \{(X_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_0}$ and $\mathcal{D}_2 = \{(X_i, y_i)\}_{i=n_0+1}^{2n_0}$. We use \mathcal{D}_2 to obtain $\hat{\theta}$ via (2.2) and use \mathcal{D}_1 for the debiasing step described below.

Using the subsample \mathcal{D}_1 , obtain

$$\hat{u}_j = \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p} u^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right] u \quad (2.3)$$

$$s.t. \quad \left\| \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \right\} X_i X_i^\top u - e_j \right\|_\infty \leq \gamma_{1n_0} \quad \text{and} \quad (2.4)$$

$$\max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |X_i^\top u| \leq \gamma_{2n_0}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^p$ denotes the canonical basis of the Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^p , and γ_{1n_0} and γ_{2n_0} satisfy the conditions stated in Assumption 3 below.

Assumption 3. For some constants $c, c', c'' > 0$, (i) $\lambda_{n_0} = c\sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$, (ii) $\gamma_{1n_0} = c'\sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$ and (iii) $\gamma_{2n_0} = c''\sqrt{\log n_0}$.

For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, the debiased estimator is defined by

$$\tilde{\theta}_j := \hat{\theta}_j - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0 + 1} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{2n_0} \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i,$$

where $\hat{u}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the projection direction constructed by (2.3)–(2.5) using the subsample \mathcal{D}_1 , while $\hat{\theta}$ derives from (2.2) using the subsample \mathcal{D}_2 .

Define the variance estimator by

$$\hat{V}_{1j} := \hat{u}_j^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=n_0+1}^{2n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) X_i X_i^\top \right] \hat{u}_j \quad (2.6)$$

We now establish the asymptotic property for this debiased estimator $\tilde{\theta}_j$.

Theorem 2. Suppose that Assumptions in Theorem 1 and Assumption 3 are satisfied. If $s_0 \ll \frac{\sqrt{n_0}}{\log p \sqrt{\log n_0}}$, then

$$\sqrt{n_0} \hat{V}_{1j}^{-1/2} (\tilde{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j}) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

Following the insight from Cai et al. (2023), with sample splitting, the debiased estimator achieves asymptotic normality without requiring the inverse matrix $\left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right]$ to be weakly sparse, which relaxes a standard assumption in the literature (see, e.g., van de Geer et al. (2014), Javanmard and Montanari (2014) and Zhang and Zhang (2014) for linear regression models).

2.2.2 Cross Fitting

The sample splitting approach introduced in Section 2.2.1 uses only a half of the sample that we exploit. To overcome this deficiency, we now propose a cross-fitting approach.

Take a K -fold random partition $(I_k)_{k=1}^K$ of the indices $[n_0] = \{1, \dots, n_0\}$ so that the size of each fold I_k is $n_k = n_0/K$. For each $k = 1, \dots, K$, define the set $I_k^c = \{1, \dots, n_0\} \setminus I_k$ of indices for the complement of the fold. In practice, K can be a constant as small as 2.

For each k , we estimate $\widehat{\theta}_k$ via (2.2) by using the subsample of I_k , and estimate $\widehat{u}_{j,k}$ via (2.3)–(2.5) by using the subsample I_k^c .

For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, let

$$\widetilde{\theta}_{j,k} := \widehat{\theta}_{j,k} - \frac{\widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_k\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i,$$

and define the debiased estimator by

$$\widetilde{\theta}_j := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widetilde{\theta}_{j,k}. \quad (2.7)$$

Finally, let the variance estimator be given by

$$\widehat{V}_{2j} := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_k) X_i X_i^\top \right] \widehat{u}_{j,k}.$$

We now establish the asymptotic property for the debiased estimator $\widetilde{\theta}_j$.

Theorem 3. *Suppose that Assumptions in Theorem 1 and Assumption 3 are satisfied. If $s_0 \ll \frac{\sqrt{n_0}}{\log p \sqrt{\log n_0}}$, then*

$$\sqrt{n_0} \widehat{V}_{2j}^{-1/2} \left(\widetilde{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j} \right) \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1) \quad \text{as } n_0 \rightarrow \infty.$$

Based on cross-fitting, Theorem 3 is analogous to Theorem 2. We make use of cross-fitting, which provides an efficient form of data-splitting.

3 Conditional Extreme Quantiles

Our analysis thus far focuses on the pseudo-parameters defining the conditional Pareto exponent, which underlines the tail features of the conditional distribution. We now extend our analysis to conditional extreme quantiles.

For $\tau \in (0, 1)$, let $Q_{Y|X, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)$ denote the conditional τ -quantile of Y_i given X_i and $Y_i > \omega_n$. Assumption 1 implies

$$Q_{Y|X, Y > \omega_n}(\tau) = \omega_n (1 - \tau)^{-\frac{1}{\alpha(X)}} \quad (3.1)$$

with $\alpha(X) = \exp(X^\top \theta_0)$. Plug our regularized estimator (2.2) in (3.1) to construct the estimator

$$\widehat{Q}_{Y|X, Y > \omega_n}(\tau) = \omega_n (1 - \tau)^{-\exp(-X^\top \widehat{\theta})}. \quad (3.2)$$

See, for example, Wang, Li, and He (2012); Wang and Li (2013) for estimators of conditional extreme quantiles under the cases with low- and fixed-dimensional X_i , and the asymptotic distribution theories therein. The following corollary establishes the consistency and convergence rate of this estimator.

Corollary 1. *Suppose that the Assumptions in Theorem 1 are satisfied. Then, as $n_0 \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$\left| \frac{\widehat{Q}_{Y|X, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)}{Q_{Y|X, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)} - 1 \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}}.$$

In addition, the asymptotic normality can be derived analogously to Theorems 2 and 3. For brevity, we focus on the inference theory for the debiased estimator based on the cross-fitting procedure in Section 2.2.2, although the same idea also applies to the debiased estimator based on sample splitting in Section 2.2.1. Define $\tilde{\theta}$ as in $\tilde{\theta} = (\tilde{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_p)^\top$ for $\tilde{\theta}_j$ defined in (2.7). We can replace $\widehat{\theta}$ with $\tilde{\theta}$ to establish the corollary stated below.

Let us introduce the short-handed notation

$$q(x^\top \theta) = \omega_n (1 - \tau)^{-\exp(-x^\top \theta)}$$

for fixed τ . Let $\widehat{u}_k = (\widehat{u}_{1,k}, \dots, \widehat{u}_{p,k})^\top$ be obtained using the subsample in I_k , and estimate \widehat{u}_k via the following procedure by using the subsample I_k^c :

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{u}_k &= \arg \min_{u \in \mathbb{R}^p} u^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right] u \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \left\| \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}) \right\} X_i X_i^\top u - x \right\|_\infty \leq \gamma_{3n_0} \quad \text{and} \\ & \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |X_i^\top u| \leq \gamma_{4n_0}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

where γ_{3n_0} and γ_{4n_0} satisfy the conditions to be stated in Corollary 2 below. Compared to the estimator of \hat{u}_j , the main difference is that we replace e_j with x in the constraint (3.3). Let the variance estimator be given by

$$\hat{V}_3 = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{u}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}_k) X_i X_i^\top \right] \hat{u}.$$

The following corollary establishes the asymptotic normality for the conditional extreme quantile estimator.

Corollary 2. *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 2 are satisfied. For universal constants $c, c' > 0$, suppose that $\gamma_{3n_0} = c\sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$ and $\gamma_{4n_0} = c'\sqrt{\log n_0}$. If $\|x\|_2 \leq C < \infty$. Then,*

$$\sqrt{n_0} \left\{ \dot{q}(x^\top \hat{\theta})^2 x^\top \hat{V}_3 x \right\}^{-1/2} \left\{ q(x^\top \tilde{\theta}) - q(x^\top \theta_0) \right\} \xrightarrow{d} N(0, 1)$$

as $n_0, p \rightarrow \infty$.

Note that the conditional extreme quantile (3.1) is defined conditionally on $Y_i > \omega_n$. Integrating out this condition, (3.1) is equivalent to $Q_{Y|X}(\tilde{\tau}_n)$, where

$$\tilde{\tau}_n = 1 - (1 - \tau)(1 - F_{Y|X}(\omega_n)).$$

By adopting some estimator $\hat{F}_{Y|X}(\omega_n)$, we can estimate $Q_{Y|X}(\tilde{\tau}_n)$ accordingly. For instance, we can adapt the conditional density estimators proposed by Efromovich (2010) and Izbicki and Lee (2016, 2017), all of which allow for a high-dimensional covariate vector X .

4 Simulation Studies

In this section, we use simulated data to numerically evaluate the performance of our proposed method of estimation and inference. Two designs for the p -dimensional parameter vector θ_0 are employed:

1. Sparse Design: $\theta_0 = (1.0, 0.9, 0.8, \dots, 0.2, 0.1, 0.0, 0.0, 0.0, \dots)^\top$, and
2. Exponential Design: $\theta_0 = (1.0, 0.5, 0.5^2, 0.5^3, \dots)^\top$.

A random sample of $(Y_i, X_i^\top)^\top$ is generated as follows. Three designs for the p -dimensional covariate vector X_i are employed:

1. Gaussian Design: $X_i \sim N(0, 0.1^2 \cdot I_p)$,
2. Uniform Design: $X_i \sim \text{Uniform}(-0.1, 0.1)$, and
3. Bernoulli Design: $X_i \sim 0.1 \cdot \text{Bernoulli}(0.1)$,

where I_p denotes the $p \times p$ identity matrix. In turn, generate the exponents by

$$\alpha_i = \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0)$$

and then generate Y_i by

$$Y_i = \Lambda^{-1}(U_i; \alpha_i), \quad U_i \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1),$$

where $\Lambda(\cdot; \alpha)$ denotes the CDF of the Pareto distribution with the unit scale and exponent α .

In each iteration, we draw a random sample $(Y_i, X_i^\top)^\top$ of size $n = 10,000$. Setting the cutoff ω to the 95-th empirical percentile of $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ we have the effective sample size of $n_0 = 500$ from five percent of N . We vary the dimension $p \in \{100, 500, 1000\}$ of the parameter vector θ_0 across sets of simulations. While there are p coordinates in θ_0 , we focus on the first coordinate $\theta_{01} = 1.0$ for evaluating our method of estimation and inference. Throughout, we use $K = 5$ for the number of subsamples in sample splitting. The other tuning parameters are set according to Assumption 3 where $c = 1$, $c' = 1$ and $c'' = 100$. We run 10,000 Monte Carlo iterations for each design.

Table 1 summarizes the simulation results. The sets of results vary with the effective sample size n_0 , the dimension p of the parameter vector θ , the design for the parameter vector θ , and the design for the covariate vector X . For each row, displayed are the bias (Bias) of the debiased estimator $\tilde{\theta}_1$, standard deviations (SD), root mean square errors (RMSE), and the coverage frequencies by the 95% confidence interval (95%).

For each set, the bias is much smaller than the standard deviations and hence the 95% confidence interval delivers accurate coverage frequencies. We ran many other sets of simulations with different values of n_0 and p as well as parameter designs and data generating designs, and confirm that the simulation results turned out to be similar in qualitative patterns to those presented here. The additional results are omitted from the paper to avoid repetitive exposition.

n_0	p	θ	X	Λ	Bias	SD	RMSE	95%
500	100	Sparse	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.02	0.53	0.53	0.93
500	100	Exponential	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.01	0.48	0.48	0.94
500	500	Sparse	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.03	0.52	0.52	0.93
500	500	Exponential	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.01	0.47	0.47	0.95
500	1000	Sparse	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.04	0.52	0.52	0.93
500	1000	Exponential	Gaussian	Pareto	-0.03	0.47	0.47	0.95
500	100	Sparse	Uniform	Pareto	0.00	0.82	0.82	0.95
500	100	Exponential	Uniform	Pareto	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.95
500	500	Sparse	Uniform	Pareto	0.00	0.82	0.82	0.94
500	500	Exponential	Uniform	Pareto	-0.01	0.79	0.79	0.95
500	1000	Sparse	Uniform	Pareto	0.00	0.82	0.82	0.94
500	1000	Exponential	Uniform	Pareto	0.00	0.79	0.79	0.95
500	100	Sparse	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.23	0.71	0.74	0.96
500	100	Exponential	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.09	0.82	0.83	0.96
500	500	Sparse	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.24	0.71	0.75	0.96
500	500	Exponential	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.10	0.81	0.82	0.96
500	1000	Sparse	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.24	0.72	0.76	0.96
500	1000	Exponential	Bernoulli	Pareto	-0.09	0.83	0.83	0.96

Table 1: Simulation results. The sets of results vary with the dimension p of the parameter vector θ_0 , the design for the parameter vector θ_0 , and the design for the covariate vector X . For each row, displayed are the bias (Bias), standard deviations (SD), root mean square errors (RMSE), and the coverage frequencies by the 95% confidence interval (95%).

5 Application: Text Analysis of Viral Posts about LGBTQ+

In this section, we apply our proposed method to text analyses of LGBTQ+-related posts on X (formerly Twitter). The objective is to make an inference about the impacts of words on attracting “likes” on posts. We use a sample of tweets scraped from Twitter using the keyword ‘LGBT’ from August 21 to August 26 in 2022.¹

A unit of observation is a post. There are $n = 32,456$ posts in total in our sample. The data record the number Y_i of likes that the i -th post has attracted. As we shall see below, Y_i has a heavy-tailed

¹The data set is publicly available at <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/vencerlanz09/lgbt-tweets>.




Figure 2: The log-log plot for the distribution of “likes” in LGBTQ+-related posts. The horizontal axis plots the rank of $\log(Y)$ while the vertical axis plots $\log(Y)$.

distribution with most of the posts attracting small numbers of likes while a few viral posts attracting huge numbers of likes. We construct a word bank comprising 936,556 unique words that are used in any of the $n = 32,456$ posts in our sample. The j -th coordinate X_{ij} of the covariate vector X_i takes the value of 1 if the j -th word in the word bank is used in the i -th post and 0 otherwise. Out of the 936,556 unique words, we only include the 500 most frequently used words to construct the binary indicators in X_i . In other words, the dimension p of X_i is 500. This list excludes articles, be verbs, and prepositions.

Figure 2 shows the log-log plot of the empirical distribution $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$ of the positive number of likes. We focus on those posts with positive numbers of likes as the log of zero is undefined. The horizontal axis plots the rank of Y while the vertical axis plots $\log(Y)$. The approximate linearity of this log-log plot implies that the distribution of Y can be characterized by the power law. In other words, Y follows the Pareto distribution.

Table 2 shows the top 30 most frequent words used in LGBTQ+ posts. Displayed next to each word are the total number of times it appeared (Count) and the total number of posts in which it

Word	Count	Tweets	Word	Count	Tweets	Word	Count	Tweets			
1	lgbt	23734	8133	11	#lgbt	4989	1280	21	it's	3194	1842
2	and	18706	12357	12	this	4956	3532	22	lgbt+	3165	578
3	i	10162	1559	13	community	4189	3640	23	their	3127	2641
4	that	9022	6931	14	have	4186	3605	24	my	2747	2003
5	you	8965	5374	15	just	3563	2900	25	don't	2690	2195
6	people	7117	5495	16	or	3555	2903	26	what	2662	1840
7	it	7015	5025	17	so	3517	2534	27	he	2631	1548
8	not	5987	4650	18	if	3346	2207	28	your	2608	2068
9	they	5695	3705	19	all	3231	2624	29	gay	2559	1833
10	but	5012	3770	20	who	3227	2723	30	do	2559	2072

Table 2: The top 30 most frequent words used in LGBTQ+ posts. Displayed next to each word are the total number of times it appeared (Count) and the total number of posts in which it appeared (Tweets). All the characters are unified to lower-case letters so that the counting is not case sensitive.

appeared (Tweets). The last number corresponds to $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{ij}$. All the characters are unified into lower-case letters so that the counting is not case-sensitive. Observe that the most frequent word ‘lgbt’ is distinguished from the eleventh most frequent word ‘#lgbt.’ While the former is a plain word, the latter is known as a hashtag and plays the role of linking the posts with all the posts containing the same hashtag.

We apply our proposed method of estimation and inference to analyze the effects of using these and other words on the tail shape of the distribution of likes. As in the simulation studies, we set ω_n to the 95th percentile of the empirical distribution of $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$, resulting in the effective sample size of $n_0 = 1623$. The rules for the tuning parameters remain the same as those used in our simulation studies.

Table 3 lists the estimates, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals, and the t statistics for θ_j for the top 30 most frequent words. These words are listed in the same order as in Table 2. Note that the most frequent word ‘lgbt’ has a significantly negative coefficient while the eleventh most frequent word ‘#lgbt’ has a significantly positive coefficient. Recall that smaller values of the Pareto exponent lead to more extreme values of Y_i . Thus, this observation implies that the use of the plain word ‘lgbt’ contributes to attracting extremely large numbers of likes, while the use of the hashtag ‘#lgbt’ can

j	Word	$\tilde{\theta}_j$	SE	95% CI	t	j	Word	$\tilde{\theta}_j$	SE	95% CI	t
1	lgbt	-0.14	0.06	[-0.26 -0.03]	-2.40	16	or	0.00	0.09	[-0.17 0.18]	0.04
2	and	-0.01	0.05	[-0.11 0.10]	-0.16	17	so	0.10	0.10	[-0.09 0.29]	1.02
3	i	0.07	0.12	[-0.17 0.31]	0.58	18	if	-0.08	0.11	[-0.30 0.14]	-0.73
4	that	0.04	0.06	[-0.08 0.16]	0.70	19	all	0.17	0.09	[0.00 0.35]	1.96
5	you	0.10	0.07	[-0.03 0.24]	1.49	20	who	0.10	0.08	[-0.05 0.25]	1.26
6	people	0.07	0.07	[-0.06 0.20]	1.04	21	it's	0.22	0.10	[0.02 0.42]	2.14
7	it	0.06	0.07	[-0.08 0.21]	0.89	22	lgbt+	0.03	0.17	[-0.31 0.37]	0.18
8	not	0.01	0.08	[-0.14 0.16]	0.10	23	their	0.06	0.09	[-0.12 0.24]	0.68
9	they	0.16	0.07	[0.02 0.30]	2.26	24	my	0.17	0.10	[-0.02 0.37]	1.75
10	but	0.02	0.08	[-0.14 0.18]	0.25	25	don't	0.14	0.10	[-0.05 0.34]	1.43
11	#lgbt	0.41	0.15	[0.11 0.71]	2.69	26	what	0.09	0.11	[-0.13 0.31]	0.81
12	this	0.13	0.07	[-0.01 0.28]	1.82	27	he	0.04	0.09	[-0.15 0.22]	0.41
13	community	-0.03	0.08	[-0.19 0.13]	-0.38	28	your	0.07	0.10	[-0.13 0.27]	0.71
14	have	0.12	0.08	[-0.03 0.27]	1.60	29	gay	0.08	0.10	[-0.11 0.27]	0.82
15	just	-0.04	0.09	[-0.22 0.15]	-0.41	30	do	0.11	0.10	[-0.09 0.32]	1.09

Table 3: Estimates, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals, and the t statistics for θ_j for the top 30 most frequent words. These words are listed in the same order as in Table 2.

have adverse effects. Most of the other words displayed in Table 3 are statistically insignificant – exceptions are ‘they’ and ‘it’s’ whose coefficients are positive implying their adverse effects.

We next collect the 10 most effective words and the 10 least effective words from the list of $p = 500$ words. Table 4 lists the estimates, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals, and the t statistics for θ_j for the least and most effective words. These words are sorted in descending order in terms of the absolute value of the estimate $\tilde{\theta}_j$. Once again, we continue to observe that the plain word ‘lgbt’ is the only significantly effective word. On the other hand, hashtags including this sole effective keyword ‘lgbt’ such as ‘#lgbtqia’ and ‘#lgbtq’ tend to have negative contributions to attracting ‘likes.’

Appendix

Section A presents the proofs of main theorems. Section B presents some technical lemmas. Section C presents the proofs of the corollaries.

10 Most Effective Words					10 Least Effective Words				
Word	$\tilde{\theta}_j$	SE	95% CI	t	Word	$\tilde{\theta}_j$	SE	95% CI	t
lgbt	-0.14	0.06	[-0.26 -0.03]	-2.40	lgb	4.04	0.80	[2.48 5.61]	5.06
if	-0.08	0.11	[-0.30 0.14]	-0.73	ukraine	3.68	0.67	[2.36 5.00]	5.46
me	-0.07	0.11	[-0.28 0.14]	-0.67	377a	3.30	0.70	[1.92 4.68]	4.69
make	-0.07	0.14	[-0.33 0.20]	-0.49	#lgbtqia	3.01	0.69	[1.67 4.36]	4.39
just	-0.04	0.09	[-0.22 0.15]	-0.41	#pride	2.74	0.64	[1.48 3.99]	4.27
community	-0.03	0.08	[-0.19 0.13]	-0.38	let's	2.62	0.73	[1.18 4.06]	3.57
and	-0.01	0.05	[-0.11 0.10]	-0.16	#lgbtq	2.60	0.54	[1.53 3.66]	4.79
also	0.00	0.14	[-0.28 0.27]	-0.01	american	2.42	0.54	[1.36 3.49]	4.46
has	0.00	0.10	[-0.19 0.19]	-0.01	magic	2.41	0.55	[1.34 3.49]	4.41
or	0.00	0.09	[-0.17 0.18]	0.04	x	2.33	0.45	[1.44 3.21]	5.16

Table 4: Estimates, standard errors, 95% confidence intervals, and the t statistics for θ_j for the top 30 most effective words to attract likes. These words are sorted in descending order in terms of the estimate $\tilde{\theta}_j$.

A Proofs for the Main Theorems

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof of Theorem 1. We define three events below. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_1 &= \left\{ \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n}} \right\}, \\ \mathcal{E}_2 &= \left\{ \|\hat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_1 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0^2(\log p)}{n_0}} \right\}, \text{ and} \\ \mathcal{E}_3 &= \left\{ \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} [X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)]^2 \lesssim \frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We will show that $\mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3$ holds with probability approaching one.

We first verify conditions in Proposition 1 below. In our model,

$$\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i,$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}\|\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0)\|_\infty &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_{ij} \right| \\ &= \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \left| \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} Z_{n_0,i,j} \right|\end{aligned}$$

with $Z_{n_0,i,j}$ defined in Lemma 1 below. From Lemma 3 below,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_{ij} | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = 0.$$

Moreover, Lemma 1 implies that $Z_{n_0,i,j}$ is sub-exponential. By the Bernstein's inequality for sub-exponential random variables (e.g., Vershynin, 2018, Theorem 2.8.1),

$$\Pr \left(\|\dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0)\|_\infty \geq C \sqrt{\frac{(\log p)}{n_0}} \right) \leq p^{-c}$$

for some $c, C \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Let $z^* = \|\dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0)\|_\infty$ and $\lambda_{n_0} \asymp \sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$. Proposition 1 implies that

$$\|\dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0)\|_\infty \leq \lambda_{n_0}$$

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

Furthermore, because

$$\ddot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0) = \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) X_i X_i^\top$$

for $0 < \eta < 1$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\langle b, \dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0 + b) - \dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0) \right\rangle &= \int_0^1 \left\langle b, \ddot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0 + tb) \right\rangle dt \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top (\theta_0 + tb)\right) (b^\top X_i)^2 dt.\end{aligned}$$

Let $\psi(b) = \psi_0(b) = \|b\|_2$. For $F(\zeta, S; \psi, \psi_0)$ defined in Proposition 1, for some constant $M > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}F(\zeta, S; \psi, \psi_0) &= \inf_{b \in \mathcal{C}(\zeta, S), \psi_0(b) \leq 1} \frac{\left\langle b, \dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0 + b) - \dot{\ell}_{n_0}(\theta_0) \right\rangle \exp(-\psi_0(b)^2 - \psi_0(b))}{\|b_S\|_1 \|b\|_2} \\ &= \inf_{b \in \mathcal{C}(\zeta, S), \|b\|_2 = 1} \frac{\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \int_0^1 \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top (\theta_0 + tb)\right) dt (b^\top X_i)^2 \exp(-\|b\|_2^2 - \|b\|_2)}{\|b_S\|_1 \|b\|} \\ &\geq M \inf_{b \in \mathcal{C}(\zeta, S), \|b\|_2 = 1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \frac{\int_0^1 \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top (\theta_0 + tb)\right) dt (b^\top X_i)^2}{\|b_S\|_1 \|b\|_2} \\ &\geq M s_0^{-1/2} \inf_{b \in \mathcal{C}(\zeta, S), \|b\|_2 = 1} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \min \left\{ |b^\top X_i|, (b^\top X_i)^2 \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

Then, following the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 3 in Cai et al. (2023), we have $F(\zeta, S; \psi, \psi_0) \lesssim s_0^{1/2}$.

Thus, Proposition 1 implies that \mathcal{E}_1 holds with probability approaching one. Furthermore, since all the conditions in Proposition 1 are satisfied, Lemma 7 in Cai et al. (2023) implies that

$$\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_1 \leq (1 + \varsigma) \|(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0)_S\|_1 \leq (1 + \zeta) \sqrt{s_0} \|(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0)_S\|_2 \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}}$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-c}$ and \mathcal{E}_2 holds with probability approaching one.

Finally, with Assumption 2,

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\| X(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \right\|_2 = \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0)^\top X^\top X (\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \lesssim \|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}$$

with probability at least $1 - p^{-c}$ and \mathcal{E}_3 holds with probability approaching one. The conclusion follows. \square

Below, we cite the auxiliary proposition from the existing literature, which we use to prove our first main theorem.

Proposition 1 (Huang and Zhang, 2012 and Cai et al., 2023). *Let $\widehat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta} \{\ell_n(\theta) + \lambda \|\theta\|_1\}$ be the Lasso estimator for some generalized linear model with true regression coefficient θ_0 , where the normalized negative log-likelihood $\ell(\theta)$ is a convex function. Let*

$$F(\varsigma, S; \psi, \psi_0) = \inf_{b \in \mathcal{C}(\varsigma, S), \psi_0(b) \leq 1} \frac{b^\top \left(\dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0 + b) - \dot{\ell}_n(\theta_0) \right) e^{-\psi_0^2(b) - \psi_0(b)}}{\|b_S\|_1 \psi(b)},$$

where $S = \{j : \theta_{0j} \neq 0\}$, ψ and ψ_0 are semi-norms, $M_2 > 0$ is a constant, and

$$\mathcal{C}(\varsigma, S) = \{b \in \mathbb{R}^p : \|b_{S^c}\|_1 \leq \varsigma \|b_S\|_1 \neq 0\}.$$

Define

$$\Omega = \left\{ \frac{\lambda + z^*}{(\lambda - z^*)_+} \leq \xi, \frac{\lambda + z^*}{F(\varsigma, S; \psi, \psi_0)} \leq \eta e^{-\eta^2 - \eta} \right\}$$

for some $\eta \leq 1/2$ and $z^* = \|\ell'(\theta_0)\|_\infty \leq \lambda$. Then, in the event Ω , we have $\psi(\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0) \leq \frac{(\lambda + z^*)e^{\eta^2 + \eta}}{F(\varsigma, S; \psi, \psi_0)}$.

A.2 Proof of Theorem 2

Proof of Theorem 2. Applying Taylor expansion yields that for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j} &= \hat{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j} - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \right\} X_i \\
&= \hat{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j} - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \right\} X_i \\
&\quad - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) X_i \exp \left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} + t X_i^\top \left(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta} \right) \right) \cdot \left[X_i^\top \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \right) \right]^2 \\
&= - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \right\} X_i \\
&\quad - \left(\frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top - e_j \right) \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{\hat{u}_j^\top}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) X_i \exp \left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} + t X_i^\top \left(\theta_0 - \hat{\theta} \right) \right) \cdot \left[X_i^\top \left(\hat{\theta} - \theta_0 \right) \right]^2
\end{aligned}$$

for some $0 < t < 1$.

Let

$$\hat{\alpha}_j = \hat{u}_j^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} \right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right] \hat{u}_j$$

and

$$\alpha_j = \hat{u}_j^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right] \hat{u}_j.$$

Let $Z_i := \alpha_j^{-1/2} \hat{u}_j^\top \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \right\} X_i$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E} \left[X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log \left(Y_i / \omega_n \right) - 1 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i (1 - 1) \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] = 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, conditional on the subsample \mathcal{D}_2 defined at the beginning of Section 2.2.1, $Y_i > \omega_n$ and $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^{n_0}, \{Z_i\}_{i=1}^{n_0}$ are independent random variables with $\mathbb{E}[Z_i | X_i, \mathcal{D}_2, Y_i > \omega_n] = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_0} \text{var}(Z_i | X_i, \mathcal{D}_2, Y_i > \omega_n) = n_0$. The rest of the argument is similar to the proof of Theorem 3 and is omitted. \square

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof of Theorem 3. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \tilde{\theta}_j - \theta_{0j} \\
&= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K (\tilde{\theta}_{j,k} - \theta_{0j}) \\
&= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left\{ \hat{\theta}_{j,k} - \theta_{0j} - \frac{\hat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left[\exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}_k) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right] X_i \right\} \\
&= -\frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{\hat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left[\exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right] X_i \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\left(\frac{\hat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) X_i X_i^\top - e_j \right) (\hat{\theta}_k - \theta_0) \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\frac{\hat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) X_i \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} + t X_i^\top (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_k)) \cdot [X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)]^2 \right] \\
&:= I_1 + I_2 + I_3
\end{aligned}$$

for some $t \in (0, 1)$.

We first show that $\sqrt{n_0}I_2 = o_p(1)$ and $\sqrt{n_0}I_3 = o_p(1)$. For the second term I_2 , note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n_0}I_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}} \sum_{k=1}^K \left[\left(\frac{\hat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) X_i X_i^\top - e_j \right) \right] \right\|_\infty \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \|\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_k\|_1 \\
&= O_p\left(\frac{s_0(\log p)}{\sqrt{n_0}}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Lemma 2, so we have $\sqrt{n_0}I_2 = o_p(1)$ from the condition in the theorem.

We next show that the term $\sqrt{n_0}I_3$ is $o_p(1)$. Let

$$\Delta_i = \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta} + t X_i^\top (\theta_0 - \hat{\theta}_k)\right) \cdot [X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)]^2.$$

By Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top}{\sqrt{n_0}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} X_i \Delta_i \right| &\leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_k} \left| \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top X_i \right| \cdot \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \Delta_i \right| \\ &\lesssim \frac{\gamma_{2n_0}}{\sqrt{n_0}} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \left[X_i^\top (\widehat{\theta}_k - \theta_0) \right]^2 \lesssim_p \frac{\gamma_{2n_0} s_0 \log p}{\sqrt{n_0}} \\ &= O_p \left(\frac{s_0 (\log p) \sqrt{\log n_0}}{\sqrt{n_0}} \right) = o_p(1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the constraint (2.5) and Assumption 1, the third inequality follows from Theorem 1, the first equality follows because of Assumption 3(iii) and the second equality follows from the condition in the theorem. Hence, $\sqrt{n_0} I_3 = o_p(1)$.

Next, we derive the asymptotic normality result for the I_1 term. Let

$$\widehat{\alpha}_j = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \widehat{\theta}_k) X_i X_i^\top \right] \widehat{u}_{j,k}$$

and

$$\alpha_j := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top \left[\frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) X_i X_i^\top \right] \widehat{u}_{j,k}.$$

Let

$$\Psi_{i,k} := \alpha_j^{-1/2} \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i.$$

For $W_i = (X_i, Y_i > \omega_n)$, conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}$, $\widehat{u}_{j,k}$ is non-stochastic and $\{\Psi_{i,k}\}_{i \in I_k}$ are independent random variables with $\mathbb{E}[\Psi_{i,k} | \{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}] = 0$ and $\sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \text{var}(\Psi_{i,k} | \{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}) = n_k$.

We next check Lindeberg's condition: for any constant $\delta > 0$,

$$\lim_{n_0 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n_0} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i \in I_k} \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi_{i,k}^2 \mathbf{1}\{|\Psi_{i,k}|/\sqrt{n_k} \geq \delta\} | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = 0. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note that by Assumption 1 and Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |Z_{i,k}| &= \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} \left| \alpha_j^{-1/2} \widehat{u}_{j,k}^\top \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i \right| \\ &\lesssim \max_{1 \leq k \leq K} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |X_i^\top \widehat{u}_{j,k}| \lesssim \gamma_{2n} \lesssim \sqrt{n_0} \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from Assumptions 1 and 2 and the second inequality follows from Assumption 3 ($\gamma_{2n_0} = c'' \sqrt{(\log n_0)}$). Thus, we have the CLT.

Finally, note that for any θ that satisfies the conditions in this theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \theta) - \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \right\} X_i X_i^\top \right| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left| \exp(X_i^\top \theta) - \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \right| \|X_i\|_2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) |X_i^\top (\theta - \theta_0)| \exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \|X_i\|_2 \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\alpha(X_i)}{\alpha(X_i) - 1} \|X_i\|_2^2 \sup_x \alpha(x) \|\theta - \theta_0\|_2 \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is due to the i.i.d. sampling, the second is by mean value theorem for some middle value $\hat{\theta}$, and the third inequality is by the Pareto tail (Assumption 1) and $\exp(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}) \leq \sup_x \alpha(x)$. Then Assumption 1 and Theorem 1 implies that $\hat{\alpha}_j \rightarrow \alpha_j$ conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}$, and thus the variance estimator $\hat{V}_{2j} \xrightarrow{P} V_{2j}$. The desired conclusion follows. \square

B Useful Lemmas

Lemma 1. *Suppose that Assumptions 1-2 hold. Define*

$$Z_{n_0, i, j} = [\alpha(X_i) \log(Y_i/w_n) - 1] X_{ij}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(|Z_{n_0, i, j}| > u) \leq C \exp(-u)$$

for some finite positive constant C .

Proof. On the event that $\{X_{ij} = 0\}$, $Z_{n_0, i, j} = 0$ and hence the lemma follows trivially. Now consider the event $\{X_{ij} \neq 0\}$. For any $u > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{P}(|Z_{n_0, i, j}| > u) \\
& = \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{P}(|Z_{n_0, i, j}| > u | X_i)] \\
& = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\alpha(X_i) \log(Y_i/w_n) > 1 + \frac{u}{|X_{ij}|} \middle| X_i \right) \right] \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P} \left(\alpha(X_i) \log(Y_i/w_n) < 1 - \frac{u}{|X_{ij}|} \middle| X_i \right) \right] \\
& = P_1(u) + P_2(u).
\end{aligned}$$

For $P_1(u)$, Assumption 1 implies that for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^{\dim\{X\}}$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\alpha(x) \log(Y/w_n) > \left(1 + \frac{u}{|x_j|}\right) \middle| X = x\right) = e^{-(1+u/|x_j|)},$$

where x_j denote the j th component of the vector x . Given that $|X_{ij}|$ has a bounded support from Assumption 2, we proceed with $|X_{ij}| \leq 1$ without loss of generality. Let C denote a generic constant, whose value could change line-by-line. It follow that

$$\begin{aligned} P_1(u) &= \int_0^1 e^{-(1+u/x)} f_{|X_{ij}|}(x) dx \\ &\leq C \int_0^1 e^{-(1+u/x)} dx \\ &\leq C e^{-u}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from $f_{X_{ij}} < \bar{f}$ (Assumption 2), and the second inequality is by direct calculation.

For $P_2(u)$, the assumptions that $\|\theta\|_2 < C$ (the parameter space) and $X_{i,j}$ has a compact support for all j (Assumption 2) imply that $|\sup_x \alpha(x)| < \bar{\alpha} < \infty$ for some $\bar{\alpha}$. Therefore, we have that $\alpha(X_i) (\log(Y_i/w_n) - 1) \geq -\alpha(X_i) \geq -\bar{\alpha}$ given $\sup_x \alpha(x) \leq \bar{\alpha}$ from Assumption 1. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} P_2(u) &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[1 - \left(-\alpha(X_i) < 1 - \frac{u}{|X_{ij}|}\right)\right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(|X_{ij}| > \frac{u}{1 + \bar{\alpha}}\right) \\ &\leq C e^{-u}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Assumption 1 that X_{ij} has a compact support and $f_{X_{ij}} < \bar{f} < \infty$. The proof is complete by combining $P_1(u)$ and $P_2(u)$. Note that the both bounds hold uniformly over n_0 . \square

Lemma 2. *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 2 hold. With probability at least $1 - p^{-c} - n_0^{-c}$, there exists \hat{u}_j such that for each $j = 1, \dots, p$ and $k = 1, \dots, K$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{u}_{j,k}^\top \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top - e_j \right\|_\infty &\leq \gamma_{1n_0} \\ \max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |X_i^\top \hat{u}_{j,k}| &\leq \gamma_{2n_0}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To show that \hat{u}_j exists with high probability, we verify that conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}$,

(i) the matrix

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{\omega_n} := \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top | Y_i > \omega_n \right]$$

is invertible;

(ii) the j -th column $\tilde{u}_{j,k}$ of $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\omega_n}^{-1}$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, is feasible for the constraint in (2.3) with high probability.

To verify (i), we first show that for any unit vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and some constant $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \right\} (a^\top X_i)^2 | Y_i > \omega_n] > \epsilon$$

uniformly over $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Because $0 < c_0 \leq \mathbb{E}[(a^\top X_i)^2]$ by Assumption 2, and

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(a^\top X_i)^2 - (a^\top X_i)^2 \mathbf{1} \left\{ |a^\top X_i| < T \right\} \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[(a^\top X_i)^4]} \sqrt{\Pr(|a^\top X_i| > T)} \leq c \exp(-c'T^2)$$

for positive constants c, c' , if we choose T sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[(a^\top X_i)^2 - (a^\top X_i)^2 \mathbf{1} \left\{ |a^\top X_i| < T \right\} \right] \gtrsim c_0/3.$$

Thus, if we choose $\epsilon \lesssim c_0/9$, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0) \right\} (a^\top X_i)^2 | Y_i > \omega_n] \gtrsim c_0/3$ and

$$a^\top \Sigma_{\omega_n} a > 0 \tag{B.1}$$

for any unit vector $a \in \mathbb{R}^p$.

Furthermore, by Assumption 1, with probability at least $1 - p^{-c}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) - \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \right\} (a^\top X_i)^2 | Y_i > \omega_n \right] \right| \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) (a^\top X_i)^2 |X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)| \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) | Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\alpha(X_i)}{\alpha(X_i) - 1} (a^\top X_i)^2 |X_i^\top (\hat{\theta} - \theta_0)| \sup_x \alpha(x) \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}^2}{\alpha - 1} \bar{X} \frac{s_0 \log p}{n_0}, \end{aligned} \tag{B.2}$$

where the first inequality follows from the mean value theorem, the second is by the Pareto tail assumption (Assumption 1) and that $\exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \leq \sup_x (x^\top \theta)$ (the definition of our parameter space

$\Omega(s_0)$), and the third inequality is by Assumption 2 and Theorem 1, where $\bar{\mathcal{X}}$ denotes the upper bound of the support of X_{ij} for all component j , which is finite. Therefore, (B.1) and (B.2) imply that $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\omega_n}$ is invertible.

To verify (ii), note that conditional on $\{W_i\}_{i \in I_k^c}$, $\hat{u}_{j,k}$ is non-stochastic. Therefore, with the feasible solution $\tilde{\Sigma}_{\omega_n}^{-1}$ for (2.3), the terms $\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}\right) \right\} \tilde{u}_{j,k}^\top X_i X_i^\top e_j, i = 1, \dots, n$ are independent subexponential random variables because of Assumption 1 and Lemma 1. Then,

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \tilde{u}_{j,k}^\top \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \hat{\theta}_k\right) \right\} X_i X_i^\top - e_j \right\|_\infty \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{(\log p)}{n_0}} \lesssim \gamma_{1n_0}$$

for $\gamma_{1n_0} \asymp \sqrt{(\log p)/n_0}$ with probability at least $1 - p^{-c}$.

Moreover, since $\mathbb{E}[(a^\top X)^2] \geq c_0 > 0$ due to Assumption 2, with probability at least $1 - n_0^{-c}$, $\max_{1 \leq i \leq n_0} |X_i^\top \tilde{u}_{j,k}| \leq \lambda_{2n_0}$, which proves (ii). Thus, the conclusion follows from (i) and (ii). \square

Lemma 3. *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 1 hold. Then,*

$$(i) \quad \mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) | X_i, Y_i > \omega_n] = \frac{1}{\exp(X_i^\top \theta_0)}, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$(ii) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = 0, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$(iii) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\}^2 | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top | Y_i > \omega_n \right], \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$(iv) \quad \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = \Sigma_{\omega_n}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

Proof. Part (i) follows because, conditional on X_i and ω_n , the random variable $\log(Y_i/\omega_n)$ is exponentially distributed with shape parameter $\alpha(X_i) = \exp(X_i^\top \theta_0)$.

Part (ii): It follows because

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i | X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] | Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i \exp\left(X_i^\top \theta_0\right) \mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 | X_i, Y_i > \omega_n] | Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i (1 - 1) | Y_i > \omega_n \right] = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Part (iii): This is because

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\}^2 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \right)^2 - 2 \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) + 1 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) \right)^2 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right)^2 \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \right)^2 \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right)^2 \left(\mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n]^2 + \text{Var}(\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n) \right) \\ &= \left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right)^2 \times \left(\frac{1}{\left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right)^2} + \frac{1}{\left(\exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \right)^2} \right) = 2. \end{aligned}$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\}^2 \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top (2 - 2 + 1) \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Part (iv): It follows because

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \mathbb{E}[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \mid X_i, Y_i > \omega_n] \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[X_i X_i^\top \frac{\exp(X_i^\top \theta_0)}{\exp(X_i^\top \theta_0)} \mid Y_i > \omega_n \right] = \Sigma_{\omega_n}. \end{aligned}$$

This completes proofs of all the four parts of the lemma. \square

C Proofs of Corollaries

C.1 Proof of Corollary 1

Proof of Corollary 1. Theorem 1 and the continuous mapping theorem imply that for any x satisfying that $\|x\|_2 < \infty$,

$$\left| \exp(-x^\top \hat{\theta}) - \exp(-x^\top \theta_0) \right| \lesssim \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}}. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Consider the following argument. Conditional on $X = x$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \frac{\widehat{Q}_{Y|X=x, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)}{Q_{Y|X=x, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)} - 1 \right| \\
& \stackrel{(1)}{=} \left| (1 - \tau)^{-\exp(-x^\top \widehat{\theta}) + \exp(-x^\top \theta_0)} - 1 \right| \\
& \stackrel{(2)}{\leq} (1 - \tau)^{-\epsilon} |\log(1 - \tau)| \left| \exp(-x^\top \widehat{\theta}) - \exp(-x^\top \theta_0) \right| \\
& \stackrel{(3)}{\lesssim} \sqrt{\frac{s_0(\log p)}{n_0}},
\end{aligned}$$

where (1) is by the definition of $\widehat{Q}_{Y|X=x, Y > \omega_n}(\tau)$ and Assumption 1; (2) is by the mean value expansion with ϵ between $x^\top \widehat{\theta}$ and $x^\top \theta_0$; and (3) is by (C.1) and the fact that $\tau \in (0, 1)$. \square

C.2 Proof of Corollary 2

Proof of Corollary 2. Let

$$V = \mathbb{E} \left[\log(Y_i/\omega_n) \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) X_i X_i^\top \right].$$

Following the proof of Theorems 3, it can be similarly shown that

$$\sqrt{n} x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) = \sqrt{n} \widehat{u}^\top \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i + o_p(1) \quad (\text{C.2})$$

and $x^\top (\widehat{V}_3 - V_3) x \rightarrow 0$ as $n_0, p \rightarrow \infty$. Since $\|x\|_2 < C$, $\widehat{u}^\top \left\{ \exp \left(X_i^\top \theta_0 \right) \log(Y_i/\omega_n) - 1 \right\} X_i$ are sub-Gaussian, which implies that $\sqrt{n} x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) (x^\top V x)^{-1/2} \rightarrow N(0, 1)$ in distribution as $n_0, p \rightarrow \infty$.

For the extreme quantile parameter $q(x^\top \theta_0)$, by Taylor expansion, we have

$$q(x^\top \widetilde{\theta}) = q(x^\top \theta_0) + \dot{q}(x^\top \theta_0) x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) + \ddot{q}(x^\top \theta_*) \left\{ x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) \right\}^2 / 2$$

where θ_* is between θ_0 and the debiased estimator $\widetilde{\theta}$. Since $x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) = O_p(n^{-1/2})$ from (C.2), we have

$$\sqrt{n} \left\{ q(x^\top \widetilde{\theta}) - q(x^\top \theta_0) \right\} = \sqrt{n} \dot{q}(x^\top \theta_0) x^\top (\widetilde{\theta} - \theta_0) + o_p(1).$$

Note that Theorem 1 implies that $\dot{q}(x^\top \widehat{\theta}) \xrightarrow{p} \dot{q}(x^\top \theta_0)$ due to $\|\widehat{\theta} - \theta_0\|_1 \xrightarrow{p} 0$. Hence, $\dot{q}(x^\top \widehat{\theta})^2 x^\top \widehat{V}_3 x \xrightarrow{p} \dot{q}(x^\top \theta_0)^2 x^\top V x$. The asymptotic normality in Corollary 2 follows. \square

References

- BELLONI, A., V. CHERNOZHUKOV, D. CHETVERIKOV, AND Y. WEI (2018): “Uniformly valid post-regularization confidence regions for many functional parameters in z-estimation framework,” *Annals of statistics*, 46, 3643.
- CAI, T. T., Z. GUO, AND R. MA (2023): “Statistical inference for high-dimensional generalized linear models with binary outcomes,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118, 1319–1332.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., D. CHETVERIKOV, M. DEMIRER, E. DUFLO, C. HANSEN, W. NEWEY, AND J. ROBINS (2018): “Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters,” *Econometrics Journal*, 21, 1–68.
- DAOUIA, A., L. GARDES, AND S. GIRARD (2013): “On kernel smoothing for extremal quantile regression,” *Bernoulli*, 19, 2557–2589.
- DAOUIA, A., L. GARDES, S. GIRARD, AND A. LEKINA (2010): “Kernel estimators of extreme level curves,” *Test*, 20, 311–333.
- DE HAAN, L. AND A. FERREIRA (2007): *Extreme Value Theory: An Introduction*, Springer Science and Business Media, New York.
- DREES, H. (1998a): “A general class of estimators of the extreme value index,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 66, 95–112.
- (1998b): “On smooth statistical tail functionals,” *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 25, 187–210.
- EFROMOVICH, S. (2010): “Dimension reduction and adaptation in conditional density estimation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105, 761–774.
- GARDES, L. AND S. GIRARD (2010): “Conditional extremes from heavy-tailed distributions: An application to the estimation of extreme rain fall return levels,” *Extremes*, 13, 177–204.

- GARDES, L., A. GUILLOU, AND A. SCHORGEN (2012): “Estimating the conditional tail index by integrating a kernel conditional quantile estimator,” *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 142, 1586–1598.
- HUANG, J. AND C.-H. ZHANG (2012): “Estimation and selection via absolute penalized convex minimization and its multistage adaptive applications,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13, 1839–1864.
- IZBICKI, R. AND A. B. LEE (2016): “Nonparametric conditional density estimation in a high-dimensional regression setting,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 25.
- (2017): “Converting high-dimensional regression to high-dimensional conditional density estimation,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11, 2800–2831.
- JAVANMARD, A. AND A. MONTANARI (2014): “Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2869–2909.
- LI, R., C. LENG, AND J. YOU (2020): “Semiparametric Tail Index Regression,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 40, 82–95.
- NEGAHBAN, S., B. YU, M. J. WAINWRIGHT, AND P. RAVIKUMAR (2009): “A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of m -estimators with decomposable regularizers,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 22.
- NICOLAU, J., P. M. RODRIGUES, AND M. Z. STOYKOV (2023): “Tail index estimation in the presence of covariates: Stock returns’ tail risk dynamics,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 235, 2266–2284.
- RESNICK, S. (2007): *Heavy-tail phenomena: probabilistic and statistical modeling*, Springer Science & Business Media.
- TADDY, M. (2013): “Multinomial inverse regression for text analysis,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 755–770.
- VAN DE GEER, S., P. BÜHLMANN, Y. RITOV, AND R. DEZEURE (2014): “On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models,” *Annals of Statistics*, 42, 1166 – 1202.

- VAN DE GEER, S. A. (2008): “High-dimensional generalized linear models and the lasso,” *Annals of Statistics*, 36, 614.
- VERSHYNIN, R. (2018): *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, vol. 47, Cambridge university press.
- WANG, H. AND C.-L. TSAI (2009): “Tail index regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104, 1233–1240.
- WANG, H. J. AND D. LI (2013): “Estimation of Extreme Conditional Quantiles Through Power Transformation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 108, 1062–1074.
- WANG, H. J., D. LI, AND X. HE (2012): “Estimation of High Conditional Quantiles for Heavy-Tailed Distributions,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107, 1453–1464.
- ZHANG, C.-H. AND S. S. ZHANG (2014): “Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 217–242.