

Repro Samples Method for High-dimensional Logistic Model

Xiaotian Hou¹, Linjun Zhang¹, Peng Wang², and Min-ge Xie¹

¹Department of Statistics, Rutgers University

²Department of Operations, Business Analytics, and Information Systems,
University of Cincinnati

Abstract

This paper presents a novel method to make statistical inferences for both the model support and regression coefficients in a high-dimensional logistic regression model. Our method is based on the repro samples framework, in which we conduct statistical inference by generating artificial samples mimicking the actual data-generating process. The proposed method has two major advantages. Firstly, for model support, we introduce the first method for constructing model confidence set in a high-dimensional setting and the proposed method only requires a weak signal strength assumption. Secondly, in terms of regression coefficients, we establish confidence sets for any group of linear combinations of regression coefficients. Our simulation results demonstrate that the proposed method produces valid and small model confidence sets and achieves better coverage for regression coefficients than the state-of-the-art debiasing methods. Additionally, we analyze single-cell RNA-seq data on the immune response. Besides identifying genes previously proved as relevant in the literature, our method also discovers a significant gene that has not been studied before, revealing a potential new direction in understanding cellular immune response mechanisms.

1 Introduction

Logistic regression is a widely used method for classification (e.g., [Hosmer Jr et al., 2013](#)). In the high-dimensional setting where the number of variables p exceeds the sample size n , existing inference methods for logistic regression mainly focus on the inference of regression coefficients and their functions, while the uncertainty quantification of model selection remains relatively unexplored. The main challenge is that the model support is discrete, and therefore classical methods for statistical inference such as the central limit theorem cannot be applied. Some recent works have studied the problem of constructing model confident sets ([Ferrari and Yang, 2015](#); [Hansen et al., 2011](#); [Li et al., 2019](#); [Zheng et al.,](#)

2019). However, these methods are either designed for low-dimensional models or require a model selection procedure with a sure screening property (Fan and Song, 2010) to reduce the dimension, which relies on strong signal strength assumptions.

To address this problem, we provide several further developments on the so-called repro samples method and extend the work by Wang et al. (2022) on high-dimensional linear regression models to high-dimensional logistic regression models. Our work differs with Wang et al. (2022) in several aspects. First, unlike linear regression, the response in logistic regression is binary and the information of regression coefficients is highly compressed, making it hard to recover the linear discriminant function in finite-sample as Wang et al. (2022) did. Second, Gaussian noises are assumed in Wang et al. (2022), in which case one can get rid of the nuisance parameters using the corresponding sufficient statistics and construct finite-sample pivot statistics for statistical inference. In logistic models, however, such pivot statistics are no longer available. We thus use asymptotic approximations to characterize the distribution of test statistics and use a profiling method to handle nuisance parameters. To facilitate the asymptotic approximation, we also consider the random design setting instead of the fixed design as studied in Wang et al. (2022).

A key step of our method is to search for a relatively small set of candidate models that include the ground-truth support with high probability, which can be done using an inversion method by noting that the model space is discrete. Then, a likelihood ratio test can be applied to each candidate model to infer the regression coefficients. We use the following intuition to construct a confidence set for the model support – for each candidate model, we generate artificial samples using that model, then compare the summary statistics calculated based on the generated artificial data to that obtained using the observed data; when these two statistics are very different, we reject the current candidate model. We provide rigorous mathematical theories to support our developments.

Our contributions are as follows:

- (1) We propose a novel method to construct the model candidate set that provably contains the true model with high probability as long as the model is identifiable. Here, we only assume that the signal is sufficient to identify the model given the realization of the error term.
- (2) Based on the model candidate set, we further construct a confidence set for the model support with a desired confidence level. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first approach for constructing model confidence sets in the high-dimensional logistic regression setting.
- (3) Besides the model confidence set, we also develop a comprehensive approach that allows for inference on individual regression coefficients, subsets of coefficients, and

even any groups of linear combinations of these coefficients. This general result also enables us to efficiently infer nonlinear transformations of the regression coefficients, such as the case probabilities of a set of new observations. Existing works in the literature only focus on inferring a constrained group of linear combinations of regression coefficients, e.g., see [Shi et al. \(2019\)](#); [Van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#); [Zhang and Cheng \(2017\)](#).

- (4) Existing approaches for high-dimensional inference often depend on either data splitting, feature screening, consistent model or parameter estimations, or sparse inverse Hessian matrix. However, our methods do not rely on these procedures or assumptions. Therefore, the proposed methods require weaker theoretical assumptions and attain the full sample efficiency.

1.1 Related works

The inference problem in high-dimensional generalized linear models has attracted a lot of attention in recent years, almost all of which however focus on the regression coefficients. For instance, [Van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) constructed confidence intervals for $\beta_j, j \in [p]$ based on the debiased estimator by inverting the KKT condition of the ℓ_1 penalized regression problems. [Dezeure et al. \(2015\)](#) proposed the multi sample-splitting approach by repeatedly splitting the data into two parts. For each single splitting, they apply variable selection on one part of the data and apply a low dimensional inference procedure on the other part of the data with the selected variables to produce a p -value. Then they aggregate all the p -values to make the final decision. [Belloni et al. \(2016\)](#) and [Chernozhukov et al. \(2018\)](#) make inferences for single parameters by constructing Neyman-orthogonal estimating equations, so that the proposed estimators are immunized against high-dimensional nuisance parameters and variable selection mistakes. [Ning and Liu \(2017\)](#) tested single parameters by constructing a decorrelated score function to handle the impact of high-dimensional nuisance parameters. [Shi et al. \(2019\)](#) considered the problem of linear hypothesis testing using the partial penalized likelihood where only the high-dimensional parameters not involved in the hypothesis are penalized. [Sur and Candès \(2019\)](#) studied the likelihood ratio test for single parameters under the setting where $\frac{p}{n} \rightarrow \kappa, \kappa < \frac{1}{2}$. [Ma et al. \(2021\)](#) considered the global and multiple testing problem by a two-step standardization procedure. [Cai et al. \(2021\)](#) studied high-dimensional GLM with binary outcomes using the debiased procedure together with a link-specific weighting to ensure the bias of the estimator is dominated by the stochastic error. [Shi et al. \(2021\)](#) generalized the decorrelated score method of [Ning and Liu \(2017\)](#) by recursively conducting model selection and constructing score equations based on the selected variables in an online manner. [Fei and Li \(2021\)](#)

proposed the splitting and smoothing method for inferring single coefficients. The work of [Dezeure et al. \(2015\)](#); [Fei and Li \(2021\)](#); [Shi et al. \(2019, 2021\)](#) require either variable selection methods with sure screening property ([Fan and Song, 2010](#)) or a uniform signal strength condition. The work of [Belloni et al. \(2016\)](#); [Ma et al. \(2021\)](#); [Ning and Liu \(2017\)](#); [Van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) relies on either the sparse inverse Hessian assumption or the sparse precision assumption which can be too stringent in practice. The method in [Cai et al. \(2021\)](#) uses sample splitting which could cause a loss of efficiency for inference. Our method uses generated random noise to approximate the data generating noise, therefore we only require a model selection consistency in the oracle setting, resulting in a much weaker signal strength assumption than the aforementioned methods. Our method requires neither the sparse inverse Hessian, sparse precision matrix assumptions nor data splitting.

It is also of interest to quantify the uncertainty and make inference for the model support, a task that we can do. This inference problem is more difficult than the inference problem for the regression coefficients since the model space is discrete. There are several works to construct a model confidence set, but most of them are in the classical regression settings with $p < n$. For instance, [Hansen et al. \(2011\)](#) constructed the model confidence set by a sequence of equivalence tests and eliminations. Specifically, starting from a set of candidate models, they apply the equivalence tests to all the remaining model pairs in the candidate set, when any test is rejected, they eliminate the worst model from the candidate set. Then they repeat the procedure until all models in the candidate set are tested as equivalent. [Ferrari and Yang \(2015\)](#) constructed the variable selection confidence set for linear regression based on F -testing. Starting from a relatively small full model (that is assumed to be available), they compare each of the sub-models to the full model using F -testing, then collect all the accepted sub-models as the variable selection confidence set. [Zheng et al. \(2019\)](#) extended the linear regression models in [Ferrari and Yang \(2015\)](#) to more general models by comparing the sub-models to the full model using the likelihood ratio test. [Li et al. \(2019\)](#) introduced the model confidence bounds as two nested models such that the true model is between these two models with a certain level of confidence. To achieve this, they construct several Bootstrap samples and apply a model selection procedure to each of them to form a set of selected models. Then they choose the model confidence bounds such that it achieves the pre-specified coverage level on the set of selected models. The work of [Ferrari and Yang \(2015\)](#); [Hansen et al. \(2011\)](#); [Zheng et al. \(2019\)](#) requires either the dimension of the data to be less than the sample size, or a variable screening procedure with sure screening property and thus a uniform signal strength condition. The work of [Li et al. \(2019\)](#) relies on a consistent model selection procedure where uniform signal strength is again necessary. Our proposed method does not have these constraints and it directly applies for high-dimensional models with $p \gg n$.

A very recent work by Wang et al. (2022) uses the repro samples method proposed in Xie and Wang (2022) to address the statistical inference for both regression coefficients and model support in a high-dimensional Gaussian linear regression model with finite sample coverage guarantee. Their artificial-sample-based method mimics the data generating process by sampling from the known noise distribution and generating synthetic response variables using the generated random noises. Noticing that if one knows the noise that generates the observed data, they could calculate all the possible values of the parameters that are able to generate the observed data using the noise, then the uncertainty of identifying the parameters merely comes from the inversion of the data generating process. However the data generating noise is unobservable, the repro samples method then incorporates both the uncertainty of the inversion of the data generating process and the uncertainty of the random noise to construct a confidence set for the parameters. Our developments use the same idea of the repro sample method to develop our inference. However, Wang et al. (2022) focuses on the much easier setting of Gaussian regression models and their development can not be directly applied to high-dimensional logistic regression models.

1.2 Organization

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 includes notations, model setup, and a brief review of the repro samples method. Section 3 is the main section that introduces our methods for constructing the model candidate set, model confidence set, and inference for the regression coefficients. Theoretical properties of the proposed methods are also included. Section 4 provides numerical illustrations of the proposed method, which includes both simulation and real data examples. Section 5 contains further remarks and discussions. The proof of the theoretical results are in Appendix (Section A).

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce notation and the data generative model in Section 2.1 and 2.2, respectively. We also briefly review the general repro samples method in Section 2.3.

2.1 Notation

For any $p \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we denote $[p]$ to be the set $\{1, \dots, p\}$. For a vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and a subset of indexes $\tau \subset [p]$, we denote v_τ to be the sub-vector of v with indexes in τ , denote $\|v\|_k = (\sum_{j \in [p]} |v_j|^k)^{1/k}$ for $k \geq 0$ with $\|v\|_0 = \sum_{j \in [p]} \mathbb{1}\{v_j \neq 0\}$ to be the number of nonzero elements in v and $\|v\|_\infty = \max_{j \in [p]} |v_j|$. We also denote $|\tau| = \sum_{j \in [p]} \mathbb{1}\{j \in \tau\}$

to be the cardinality of τ . For matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$ and $\tau \subset [p]$, we denote $A_{\cdot, \tau}$ to be a submatrix of A consisting of all the columns of A with column indexes in τ and $\|A\|_{\text{op}} = \sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^q, b \in \mathbb{R}^p} a^\top A b$ is the operator norm of A . For a symmetric matrix A , $\lambda_{\min}(A)$ and $\lambda_{\max}(A)$ denote respectively the smallest and largest eigenvalues of A . We use c and C to denote absolute positive constants that may vary from place to place. For two positive sequences a_n and b_n , $a_n \lesssim b_n$ means $a_n \leq C b_n$ for all n and $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ if $b_n \lesssim a_n$ and $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$, and $a_n \ll b_n$ if $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{a_n}{b_n} = 0$ and $a_n \gg b_n$ if $b_n \ll a_n$.

2.2 Model Set-up

In this work, we consider the logistic regression with independent observations $\{(X_i, y_i) : i \in [n]\}$ generated from the following distribution

$$\mathbb{P}(Y = 1 | X) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0 | X) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X^\top \beta_0}}, \quad X \sim \mathbb{P}_X,$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^p, Y \in \{0, 1\}$ and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the linear coefficients in logistic regression with $\|\beta_0\|_0 = s$. We can rewrite this model in the form of a data generating model

$$Y = \mathbb{1}\{X^\top \beta_0 + \epsilon > 0\}, \quad (1)$$

with $X \sim \mathbb{P}_X, \epsilon \sim \text{Logistic}$ is a logistic random variable with cumulative distribution function $\mathbb{P}(\epsilon \leq t) = (1 + e^{-t})^{-1}$. Here we assume β_0 defined in model (1) is unique and this assumption will be satisfied if $\sup_{a \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|a\|_2=1} \mathbb{P}(a^\top X = 0) = 0$. To highlight the observed data and the correspondence between X_i, y_i and ϵ_i , for $i \in [n]$, we use $\{(X_i^{\text{obs}}, y_i^{\text{obs}}, \epsilon_i^{\text{rel}}) : i \in [n]\}$ to denote the oracle data, which consists of the *observed data* and the corresponding *realization* of the data generating noises. Denote $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}} = (X_1^{\text{obs}}, \dots, X_n^{\text{obs}})$, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^\top$, $\mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}} = (y_1^{\text{obs}}, \dots, y_n^{\text{obs}})^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\text{rel}} = (\epsilon_1^{\text{rel}}, \dots, \epsilon_n^{\text{rel}})^\top$. Throughout the paper, we use \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y} and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ to denote the random copy of data and corresponding random noises, respectively. We use $\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\text{rel}}$ when the observed data is treated as given (or realized).

In this model, we have two sets of unknown parameters, one is the support of β_0 denoted by $\tau_0 = \text{supp}(\beta_0) = \{j \in [p] : \beta_{0,j} \neq 0\}$ and the other one is the vector of nonzero coefficients β_{0, τ_0} . We write $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\tau, \beta_\tau)$, $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\tau_0, \beta_{0, \tau_0})$ and denote $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ to be the joint distribution of (X, Y) defined in Equation (1) with parameters equal to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. The log-likelihood function of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is then given by

$$l(\boldsymbol{\theta} | \mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{-(2y_i^{\text{obs}} - 1)X_{i, \tau}^{\text{obs} \top} \beta_\tau}).$$

Most work of statistical inference on high-dimensional logistic models only focuses on the parameters β_0 . In this paper, we are interested in making inferences for both the true model τ_0 and linear coefficients β_0 .

2.3 Repro Samples Method

In this subsection, we briefly review the general repro samples framework for statistical inference proposed by [Xie and Wang \(2022\)](#). This artificial-sample-based method can be applied to construct confidence regions for a variety of parameters that take values in either continuum or discrete sets. Assume we observe n samples $\mathbf{y}^{obs} = \{y_1^{obs}, \dots, y_n^{obs}\}$ from the population $\mathbf{Y} = G(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$, where $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a random vector from a known distribution P_U , $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in \Theta$ is the unknown model parameter and $G : \mathcal{U} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ is a known mapping. The observed data \mathbf{y}^{obs} satisfies $\mathbf{y}^{obs} = G(\mathbf{u}^{rel}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ with $\mathbf{u}^{rel} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a realization of the random vector \mathbf{U} .

The repro samples method makes inference for the parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ by mimicking the model generating process. Intuitively, if we have observed \mathbf{u}^{rel} , then for any parameter $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, we generate an artificial data $\mathbf{y}' = G(\mathbf{u}^{rel}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$. If the artificial data matches the observed samples, i.e., $\mathbf{y}' = \mathbf{y}^{obs}$, then $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is a potential value of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ and, if there is any ambiguity, it comes only from the inversion of $G(\mathbf{u}^{rel}, \cdot)$. However, the data generating noises \mathbf{u}^{rel} is unobserved, we need to incorporate its uncertainty for which we do it by considering a Borel set B_α with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U} \in B_\alpha) \geq \alpha$. For any $\mathbf{u}^* \in B_\alpha$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$, we create an artificial data $\mathbf{y}^* = G(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ called repro sample. We keep $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ as a potential value of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ if $\mathbf{y}^* = \mathbf{y}^{obs}$. All the retained values of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ form a level- α confidence set for $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$. Therefore the total uncertainty of the confidence region comes from both the possible ambiguity of the inversion of $G(\mathbf{u}^{rel}, \cdot)$ and the uncertainty of the unobservability of \mathbf{u}^{rel} . Note that throughout the paper, we use α instead of $1 - \alpha$ to denote the confidence level. For example, $\alpha = .90, .95$, or $.99$.

More generally, we consider a Borel set $B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ with $\mathbb{P}(T(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})) \geq \alpha$. Then define the confidence region of $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0$ as

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \exists \mathbf{u}^* \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{y}^{obs} = G(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}), T(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})\}.$$

It follows

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in \Gamma_\alpha^{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{Y})) \geq \mathbb{P}(T(\mathbf{U}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \in B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}_0)) \geq \alpha.$$

Here $T : \mathcal{U} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ is called the nuclear mapping. Clearly, there might be multiple choices of T that all lead to valid confidence regions. One choice is $T(\mathbf{u}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \mathbf{u}$ for any $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \Theta$ and $B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = D_\alpha$ is a level- α Borel set of P_U with $\mathbb{P}(\mathbf{U} \in D_\alpha) \geq \alpha$. However, this naive nuclear statistic could lead to an oversized confidence region. Therefore T is similar to a test statistic under the hypothesis testing framework and should be designed properly, see [Xie and Wang \(2022\)](#) for more details. Note that if T depends on \mathbf{u}^* through $G(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})$, i.e., $T(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \tilde{T}(G(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \boldsymbol{\theta})$ for some \tilde{T} , then $\Gamma_\alpha^{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}$ can be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_\alpha^{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs}) &= \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \exists \mathbf{u}^* \text{ s.t. } \mathbf{y}^{obs} = G(\mathbf{u}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}), \tilde{T}(\mathbf{y}^{obs}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} \\ &\subseteq \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{y}^{obs}, \boldsymbol{\theta}) \in B_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\theta})\} = \tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha^{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs}). \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

Specifically, if \tilde{T} is a test statistic under the Neyman-Pearson framework, by the property of test duality, $\tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha^{\theta_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs})$ is a level- α confidence set and the confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{\theta_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs})$ constructed by repro samples method becomes a subset of $\tilde{\Gamma}_\alpha^{\theta_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs})$.

In cases when nuisance parameters are present, [Xie and Wang \(2022\)](#) proposes a nuclear mapping function to make inferences for the parameters of interest. However, this approach encounters specific challenges when applied to high-dimensional logistic regression models. First, when making inference for τ_0 , the regression coefficients β_0 are unknown nuisance parameters. Since it is infeasible to sample from the conditional distribution given the sufficient statistics, we would need to tackle the computational challenge by designing a nuclear mapping that can profile out all possible values of β_0 . On the other hand, when making inferences for the regression coefficients, we would need to profile out τ_0 , this would require a viable model candidate set. Unlike the linear model setting in [Wang et al. \(2022\)](#), in the logistic regression framework, multiple values of θ may satisfy (1) given \mathbf{y}^{obs} and ϵ^{rel} . This aspect significantly complicates the task of establishing a candidate set, both from computational and theoretical standpoints. See [Section 3](#) for a detailed explanation of the strategies to address the above challenges.

3 Method and Theory

This section presents the methods and theoretical results for statistical inference in high-dimensional logistic regression models. Specifically, in [Section 3.1](#), we construct the model candidate set to reduce the computation cost, by selecting a subset of the model space for inference. In [Section 3.2](#), we prune the model candidate set to get a model confidence set. During both of these subsections, the parameter of interest is τ_0 , while β_0 is a nuisance parameter. Subsequently, in [Section 3.3](#), we delve into techniques for inferring q linear combinations of β_0 , denoted as $A\beta_0$, utilizing any predetermined constant matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$ where $1 \leq q \leq p$.

3.1 Model candidate set

As mentioned in [Section 2.3](#), we need a Borel set $B_\alpha(\theta)$ for $\theta = (\tau, \beta_\tau)$ to incorporate the uncertainty of ϵ^{rel} . We will see in later sections that if we fix a model τ , the set $B_\alpha(\theta)$ can be easily constructed for any β_τ . However, we still need to search over all model τ 's, which can be computationally expensive. Therefore we introduce the notion of model candidate set to constrain the potential values of τ_0 to only a small set of models without loss of much confidence and propose an efficient procedure for constructing such a candidate set.

To demonstrate our construction of the model candidate set, we start from the oracle

scenario when ϵ^{rel} is known. With this oracle data, we show that τ_0 can be identified under a weak signal strength assumption. However, the noise ϵ^{rel} is not observable in practice, so we randomly generate d noises $\{\epsilon^{*(j)} : j \in [d]\}$ to approximate ϵ^{rel} . For each $\epsilon^{*(j)}$, we construct an estimator $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)})$ of τ_0 , then we collect these d estimators to form the model candidate set $\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}) : j \in [d]\}$.

Since the estimators $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)})$ are constructed using empirical risk minimization, we define the following notations at first. Given any noises $\tilde{\epsilon} = \{\tilde{\epsilon}_i : i \in [n]\}$, if we apply the following function $(X, \tilde{\epsilon}) \mapsto \mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau}^{\top} \beta_{\tau} + \sigma \tilde{\epsilon} > 0\}$ to $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \tilde{\epsilon})$ to predict \mathbf{y}^{obs} , we denote the empirical prediction error as

$$\begin{aligned} L_n(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tilde{\epsilon}) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{y_i^{obs} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau}^{obs\top} \beta_{\tau} + \sigma \tilde{\epsilon}_i > 0\}\} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}\{\mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau_0}^{obs\top} \beta_{0,\tau_0} + \epsilon_i^{rel} > 0\} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau}^{obs\top} \beta_{\tau} + \sigma \tilde{\epsilon}_i > 0\}\}. \end{aligned}$$

In this work, we will choose $\tilde{\epsilon}$ to be either ϵ^{rel} or an artificially generated ϵ^* that is independent of the oracle data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{rel})$. Now we define the expected prediction error using these two choices of $\tilde{\epsilon}$ respectively. For a random copy $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon)$ of the oracle data, if we choose $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon$, the expected prediction error is denoted as

$$L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma) = \mathbb{E}L_n(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_0}^{\top} \beta_{0,\tau_0} + \epsilon > 0\} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau}^{\top} \beta_{\tau} + \sigma \epsilon > 0\}),$$

where the expectation \mathbb{E} is over the randomness of \mathbf{X} , ϵ and \mathbf{y} (or equivalently \mathbf{X} and ϵ). When we set $\tilde{\epsilon} = \epsilon^*$ which is independent of $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon)$, we denote the expected prediction error as

$$L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma) = \mathbb{E}L_n(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon^*) = \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_0}^{\top} \beta_{0,\tau_0} + \epsilon > 0\} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau}^{\top} \beta_{\tau} + \sigma \epsilon^* > 0\}).$$

Here the expectation \mathbb{E} above is over the randomness of \mathbf{X} , \mathbf{y} and ϵ^* (or \mathbf{X} , ϵ and ϵ^*).

3.1.1 Signal strength condition and recovery under oracle setting

As outlined in Section 3.1. Our intuition for constructing the model candidate set contains two stages. At first, we show τ_0 can be recovered given ϵ^{rel} . Then we generate independent copies of ϵ to approximate ϵ^{rel} . This subsection considers the first stage, investigating the sufficient condition for recovering τ_0 given the knowledge of ϵ^{rel} . Then we will show in Section 3.1.2 that under this sufficient condition, the recovery of τ_0 still holds providing ϵ^{rel} aligns with some of the generated synthetic noises.

Note that $L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma)$ attains its minimum value 0 at $(\tau_0, \beta_{0,\tau_0}, 1)$. Therefore, supposing ϵ^{rel} is known, we could estimate τ_0 by minimizing $L_n(\tau, \beta_{\tau}, \sigma | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{rel})$. However,

when β_{0,τ_0} has weak signals, excluding those weak signals from τ_0 may not increase L_{θ_0} substantially. Consequently, the minimizer of L_n may differ from τ_0 , making it hard to identify the true model using the oracle data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{rel})$. Therefore, to identify the true model τ_0 , we need the following assumption on the signal strength to separate τ_0 from all other wrong models using data.

Assumption 1. For all $\tau \subset [p]$ with $|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0$,

$$\inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) \gtrsim \min \left\{ |\tau_0 \setminus \tau| \frac{\log p}{n} + (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log \frac{n}{|\tau|+1}}{n}, (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log p}{n} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Note that when ϵ^{rel} is known, the prediction error under the true parameter is 0, $L_{\theta_0}(\tau_0, \beta_{0,\tau_0}, 1) = 0$. Then Assumption 1 links model selection to prediction in the sense that at the population level, any wrong model $|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0$ has a positive prediction error gap from the true model. As we will show in Remark 1 and 2 later, this assumption is weaker than other commonly used signal strength conditions in the literature.

Under Assumption 1, all the wrong models have a relatively large prediction error while the true model τ_0 has a prediction error equal to 0, therefore if we solve the constrained empirical risk minimization problem

$$\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{rel}) = \arg \min_{|\tau| \leq s} \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{rel}), \quad (4)$$

$\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{rel})$ is likely to equal to τ_0 . Formally, we have the following Lemma 1 which states that as long as Assumption 1 is satisfied, we can identify τ_0 using $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{rel})$ in probability. A proof is given in the Appendix. In Lemma 1, we denote $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon) = \arg \min_{|\tau| \leq s} \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon)$ to be a random copy of $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{rel})$.

Lemma 1. For $\hat{\tau}$ defined in Equation (4), denote

$$\tilde{c}_{\min} = \min_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - \frac{2|\tau|+2}{n} \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}}{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|},$$

$$c_{\min} = \min_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - \frac{2|\tau|+2}{n} \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}}{|\tau| \vee 1},$$

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau}(\epsilon) \neq \tau_0) \lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + 2\log_2 p} \wedge 2^{-\frac{1}{2}nc_{\min} + \log_2 p}.$$

Here the probability is taken with respect to $(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon)$. Furthermore, if Assumption 1 holds,

$$\mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau}(\epsilon) \neq \tau_0) \lesssim 2^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}} \wedge 2^{-cnc_{\min}}.$$

Remark 1. Assumption 1 can be shown to be weaker than the C_{\min} condition in Shen et al. (2012). Note that the C_{\min} condition requires

$$\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{[H(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau, \beta_\tau)})]^2}{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|} \gtrsim \frac{\log p}{n},$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{(\tau, \beta_\tau)}$ is the joint distribution of (X, Y) with $X \sim \mathbb{P}_X$, $\epsilon \sim \text{Logistic}$ and $Y = \mathbb{1}\{X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau + \epsilon > 0\}$, $H(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$ is the Hellinger distance between $\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2$. However as we will show in Lemma 2 of Section A, when $\sigma > 0$,

$$L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) = \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau, \frac{\beta_\tau}{\sigma})}),$$

where $\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) = \sup_A |\mathbb{P}_1(A) - \mathbb{P}_2(A)|$ is the total variation distance between $\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2$. If for any $\tau \subset [p]$ with $|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0$, the minimizer (β_τ, σ) of Equation (3) satisfies $\sigma > 0$, and if we further assume $s \log \frac{n}{s} \lesssim \log p$, then a sufficient condition for Assumption 1 is

$$\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau, \beta_\tau)})}{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|} \gtrsim \frac{\log p}{n}.$$

Since $\{H(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)\}^2 \lesssim \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2) \lesssim H(\mathbb{P}_1, \mathbb{P}_2)$, Assumption 1 is weaker than the C_{\min} condition in Shen et al. (2012).

Remark 2. Assumption 1 is also weaker than the commonly used β -min condition (Bunea, 2008; Zhang, 2010; Zhao and Yu, 2006). Denote $\beta_{\min} = \min_{j \in \tau_0} |\beta_{0,j}|$, then the β -min condition assumes

$$\beta_{\min} \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

As we will show in Lemma 3 of Section A, suppose X is sub-Gaussian with $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim 1$, $\|\beta_0\|_2 \lesssim 1$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}XX^\top) \gtrsim 1$, then

$$\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau, \beta_\tau)})}{\sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|}} \gtrsim \beta_{\min}.$$

Therefore another sufficient condition for Assumption 1 is $\beta_{\min} \gtrsim \frac{\sqrt{s \log p}}{n} + \frac{s \log \frac{n}{s}}{n}$. When $\frac{s \log p}{n} + \frac{s^2 \log^2 \frac{n}{s}}{n \log p} \lesssim 1$, we have Assumption 1 is weaker than the β -min condition.

3.1.2 Candidate set construction in the practical setting

In practice, although the oracle noise ϵ^{rel} is unobservable, we can generate a vector ϵ^* independently from logistic distribution and calculate $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^*)$ as

$$\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^*) = \arg \min_{|\tau| \leq k} \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^*).$$

We expect that as long as ϵ^* and ϵ^{rel} are close enough, we would have $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^*) = \hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{rel})$. Therefore, we generate d i.i.d. random noises $\{\epsilon^{*(j)} : j \in [d]\}$ and calculate their corresponding $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)})$. Then we collect all the estimated models into the model candidate set \mathcal{C} as

$$\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}) : \epsilon_i^{*(j)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Logistic}, i \in [n], j \in [d]\}.$$

We summarize the above procedure in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Model Candidate Set

- 1: **Input:** Observed data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$, the number of repro samples d .
 - 2: **Output:** Model candidate set \mathcal{C} .
 - 3: Generate d copies of logistic random noises $\{\epsilon^{*(j)} : \epsilon_i^{*(j)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Logistic}, i \in [n], j \in [d]\}$.
 - 4: Compute $\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}) = \arg \min_{|\tau| \leq k} \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \epsilon^{*(j)})$, for $j \in [d]$ and some k .
 - 5: Construct $\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}) : j \in [d]\}$.
-

Remark 3 (Practical implementation of Algorithm 1). *Step 2 in Algorithm 1 involves optimization for 0-1 loss function with ℓ_0 constraint which can be hard to calculate. In practice, we use the hinge loss or logistic loss as surrogates for the 0-1 loss, then replace the ℓ_0 constraint by the adaptive LASSO penalty and apply the extended BIC (Chen and Chen, 2008) to choose the tuning parameter for the penalty.*

In the following theorem, we show that as long as the number of Monte Carlo copies, d , is large enough, there will be at least one $\epsilon^{*(j)}$ that is closed to ϵ^{rel} , then the model candidate set \mathcal{C} contains the true model τ_0 with high probability. A proof is given in the Appendix.

Theorem 1. *Using the same notation as in Lemma 1, if we further denote $F_\epsilon(z) = (1 + e^{-z})^{-1}$ to be the CDF of logistic distribution, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + 2\log_2 p} \wedge 2^{-\frac{1}{2}nc_{\min} + \log_2 p} + (1 - \{\mathbb{E}|F_\epsilon(\epsilon) - F_\epsilon(-X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0})|\}^n)^d.$$

If Assumption 1 holds, for any fixed n , when d is large enough such that

$$(1 - \{\mathbb{E}|F_\epsilon(\epsilon) - F_\epsilon(-X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0})|\}^n)^d \lesssim 2^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}} \wedge 2^{-cnc_{\min}},$$

we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \lesssim 2^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}} \wedge 2^{-cnc_{\min}}.$$

Theorem 1 ensures the inclusion of τ_0 in \mathcal{C} as long as Assumption 1 is satisfied and d is large enough.

Next, we demonstrate that under a stronger signal strength condition, the requirement for the number of repro samples, d , can be relaxed.

Assumption 2. For all τ with $|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0$,

$$\min_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau_0, \beta_{0, \tau_0}, 0) \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{|\tau| \vee 1}{n}} + \sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau| \wedge (|\tau| \vee 1)} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

Since ϵ^* is independent of (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) , we know that $(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) = (\tau_0, \beta_{0, \tau_0}, 0)$ minimizes the expected prediction error $L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma)$. Thus Assumption 2 assumes that all the wrong models $\tau \neq \tau_0$ with $|\tau| \leq s$ have a positive error gap from the true model. Compared to Assumption 1, the signal strength in Assumption 2 scales with $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ instead of $\frac{1}{n}$ as in Assumption 1.

As we will show in the following theorem, if the stronger signal strength Assumption 2 holds, then similar to the model selection consistency (Bunea, 2008; Zhang, 2010; Zhao and Yu, 2006), the model candidate set contains the true model support with high probability for any $d \geq 1$. A proof is provided in the Appendix.

Theorem 2. Denote

$$\tilde{c}_{\min}^* = \left(\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau_0, \beta_{0, \tau_0}, 0) - c\sqrt{\frac{|\tau|+1}{n}}}{\sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|}} \right)^2,$$

$$c_{\min}^* = \left(\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - L_{\theta_0}^*(\tau_0, \beta_{0, \tau_0}, 0) - c\sqrt{\frac{|\tau|+1}{n}}}{\sqrt{|\tau| \vee 1}} \right)^2.$$

For any n and d , the model candidate set satisfies,

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \lesssim e^{-\frac{n}{8}\tilde{c}_{\min}^* + 2\log p} \wedge e^{-\frac{n}{8}nc_{\min}^* + \log p}.$$

If Assumption 2 holds, then

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \lesssim e^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}^*} \wedge e^{-cnc_{\min}^*}.$$

Remark 4. (1) Besides the coverage for τ_0 , we can also guarantee the consistency of \mathcal{C} . Specifically, under Assumption 2, using the same notation as in Theorem 2, if we set d such that $\log d \lesssim \log p$, then with high probability, we have \mathcal{C} contains only τ_0 ,

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C} \neq \{\tau_0\}) \lesssim e^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}^*} \wedge e^{-cnc_{\min}^*}.$$

Note that to conduct inference for τ_0 and β_0 , it is only necessary that $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{C}$, but $\mathcal{C} = \{\tau_0\}$ is not required. Therefore, we can set d as large as necessary.

(2) Combining Theorem 1 and 2, it becomes evident that the model candidate set \mathcal{C} is adaptive to the signal strength. Under the weak signal strength Assumption 1, as we discussed in Remark 1 and 2, none of the existing work can be guaranteed to find τ_0 ,

but our approach assures $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ as long as d is large enough. Furthermore, if the stronger signal strength Assumption 2 is satisfied, then d doesn't need to be large at all, since $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{C}$ holds for any $d \geq 1$. Moreover, under Assumption 2, if d is not too large such that $\log d \lesssim \log p$, it is ensured that $\mathcal{C} = \{\tau_0\}$.

3.2 Inference for τ_0

If we are interested in the inference for the true model τ_0 , then β_{0,τ_0} is a nuisance parameter. As we discussed in Section 2.3 Equation (2), if the nuclear statistic has the form $T(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \epsilon^*, \theta) = \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta)$ where \mathbf{Y}^* is generated by $\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \epsilon^*$ and θ , then it suffices to check whether $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \theta)$ is in $B_\alpha(\theta)$. In order to deal with the nuisance parameter, we consider the following form of confidence set for τ_0 ,

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\tau : \exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|} \text{ s.t. } \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)) \in B_\alpha((\tau, \beta_\tau))\},$$

with $B_\alpha(\theta)$ satisfies $\mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta) \in B_\alpha(\theta)) \geq \alpha$.

If $1 - \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta)$ is a p -value, then we can take $B_\alpha(\theta) = (-\infty, \alpha)$ and rewrite $\Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ as

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\tau : \min_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)) < \alpha\}. \quad (5)$$

Here, we refer to $\min_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, (\tau, \beta_\tau))$ as a *profile nuclear statistic*.

Specifically, we construct the nuclear statistic \tilde{T} and the model confidence sets as follows. For any given $\theta = (\tau, \beta_\tau)$ and $\mathbf{Y}^* \in \{0, 1\}^n$ generated by $Y_i^* = \mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau}^{obs\top} \beta_\tau + \epsilon_i^* > 0\}$ with $\epsilon_i^* \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Logistic}$, we solve

$$\tilde{\beta}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{-(2Y_i^* - 1)X_i^{obs\top} \beta}) + \lambda \|\beta\|_1, \quad (6)$$

$$\tilde{\lambda}(\tau, \beta_\tau) = \arg \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \|\tilde{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0, \quad \text{s.t. } \|\tilde{\beta}(\lambda)\|_0 \leq |\tau|,$$

$$\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta) = \text{supp}(\tilde{\beta}(\tilde{\lambda}(\theta))).$$

The model selector $\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta)$ is the largest model with cardinality at most $|\tau|$ in the solution path of Problem (6) using the synthetic data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*)$. Denote

$$P_\theta(\tau^*) = \mathbb{P}_{\epsilon^*|\theta}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta) = \tau^*),$$

where $\mathbb{P}_{\epsilon^*|\theta}$ counts the randomness of \mathbf{Y}^* given \mathbf{X}^{obs} . Then we consider the nuclear statistic

$$T(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \epsilon, \theta) = \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \theta) = \mathbb{P}_{\epsilon^*|\theta}(P_\theta(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \theta)) > P_\theta(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \theta)))$$

which is the probability that $\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ appears less often than the synthetic model selector $\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ in $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\cdot)$. Since $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ is also the survival function of random variable $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^*, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$ evaluated at $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))$, when $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \mathbf{y} = \mathbb{1}(\mathbf{X}^{obs} \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\epsilon} > 0)$, we know that $1 - \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)$ is a p-value with

$$\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}(\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) < \alpha) \geq \alpha.$$

Here $\mathbb{P}_{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ counts the randomness of \mathbf{y} given \mathbf{X}^{obs} . Since τ_0 belongs to \mathcal{C} with high probability as guaranteed by Theorem 1 and 2, we constrain the model confidence set to be a subset of \mathcal{C} . Then according to Equation (5), we define the confidence set for τ_0 as

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) &= \{\tau : \exists \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|} \text{ s.t. } \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau})) < \alpha, \tau \in \mathcal{C}\} \\ &= \{\tau : \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau})) < \alpha, \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Since we don't have an explicit expression for $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tau)$, we apply the Monte Carlo method to approximate it. More specifically, we generate $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)} : j \in [m]\}$ with $\epsilon_i^{*(j)}$ i.i.d. Logistic for $i \in [n], j \in [m]$, then generate $\{\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)} : j \in [m]\}$ by $Y_i^{*(j)} = \mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau}^{obs} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau} + \epsilon_i^{*(j)} > 0\}$. For each $\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)}$, we calculate the corresponding $\tilde{\tau}^{(j)} \triangleq \tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{Y}^{*(j)}, \boldsymbol{\theta})$ and estimate $P_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tau^*)$ by $\hat{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}(\tau^*) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{\tau}^{(j)} = \tau^*\}$. Denote the estimated profile nuclear statistic as

$$\hat{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \tau) = \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau} \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{|\{j \in [m] : \hat{P}_{\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau}}(\tilde{\tau}^{(j)}) > \hat{P}_{\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{\tau}}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\theta}))\}|}{m},$$

then the final confidence set for τ_0 becomes

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\tau : \hat{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau) < \alpha, \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We summarize the procedure in Algorithm 2.

Now we formalize the intuition stated above as the following theorem, which guarantees the validity of $\hat{\Gamma}_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{y}^{obs})$. A proof is given in the Appendix.

Theorem 3. (1) If Assumption 1 holds, d is large enough as required in Theorem 1 and n is any fixed number, for $c_{\min}, \tilde{c}_{\min}$ defined in Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - \sqrt{\frac{(\frac{ep}{s})^s}{4m}} - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8m}} - ce^{-cnc_{\min}} \wedge ce^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}}.$$

(2) If Assumption 2 holds, n and d are any fixed numbers, for $c_{\min}^*, \tilde{c}_{\min}^*$ defined in Theorem 2, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \in \hat{\Gamma}_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - \sqrt{\frac{(\frac{ep}{s})^s}{4m}} - \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8m}} - ce^{-cnc_{\min}^*} \wedge ce^{-cn\tilde{c}_{\min}^*}.$$

Algorithm 2 Model Confidence Set

- 1: **Input:** Observed data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$, model candidate set \mathcal{C} , the number of Monte Carlo samples m .
- 2: **Output:** Model confidence set $\hat{\Gamma}_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$.
- 3: **for** $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
- 4: Generate m copies of logistic random noises $\{\epsilon^{*(j)} : \epsilon_i^{*(j)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Logistic}, i \in [n], j \in [m]\}$.
- 5: For some β_τ to be optimized later, compute $\{\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)} : j \in [m]\}$ with $Y_i^{*(j)} = \mathbb{1}\{X_{i,\tau}^{obs\top} \beta_\tau + \epsilon_i^{*(j)} > 0\}$.
- 6: For each $\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)}, j \in [m]$, calculate

$$\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{-(2Y_i^{*(j)} - 1)X_i^{obs\top} \beta}) + \lambda \|\beta\|_1,$$

$$\tilde{\tau}^{(j)} = \text{supp}(\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}(\tilde{\lambda}^{(j)}(\tau, \beta_\tau))), \quad \tilde{\lambda}^{(j)}(\tau, \beta_\tau) = \arg \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\| \tilde{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda) \right\|_0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \left\| \tilde{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda) \right\|_0 \leq |\tau|,$$

and

$$\tilde{\beta}(\lambda) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(1 + e^{-(2y_i^{obs} - 1)X_i^{obs\top} \beta}) + \lambda \|\beta\|_1,$$

$$\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)) = \text{supp}(\tilde{\beta}(\tilde{\lambda}(\tau, \beta_\tau))), \quad \tilde{\lambda}(\tau, \beta_\tau) = \arg \max_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\| \tilde{\beta}(\lambda) \right\|_0 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \left\| \tilde{\beta}(\lambda) \right\|_0 \leq |\tau|.$$

- 7: Calculate

$$\hat{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau) = \min_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{\left| \{j \in [m] : \hat{P}_{\tau, \beta_\tau}(\tilde{\tau}^{(j)}) > \hat{P}_{\tau, \beta_\tau}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)))\} \right|}{m},$$

with $\hat{P}_{\tau, \beta_\tau}(\tau^*) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{\tau}^{(j)} = \tau^*\}$.

- 8: **end for**
- 9: Construct the model confidence set as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\tau : \hat{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau) < \alpha, \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Remark 5 (Practical implementation of Algorithm 2). *Step 4 in Algorithm 2 involves the optimization for indicator functions which could be computationally challenging. This optimization with respect to β_τ ensures that under the true model τ_0 , the statistic $\hat{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau_0)$ is more conservative than $\frac{|\{j \in [m] : \hat{P}_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}(\hat{\tau}^{(j)}) > \hat{P}_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}(\hat{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0)))\}|}{m}$ which is the oracle statistic when using β_0, τ_0 to generate \mathbf{Y}^* . In practice, for any $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$, MLE of β_τ can also be employed to generate $\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)}$ since it is a consistent estimator in the low dimensional setting given τ_0 . And our numerical results confirm that MLE indeed yields confidence sets with guaranteed coverages and reasonable sizes.*

3.3 Inference for $A\beta_0$

In this section, we construct confidence sets for linear combinations of coefficients $A\beta_0$ for any $A \in \mathbb{R}^{q \times p}$, $q \geq 1$. Without loss of generality, we assume $\text{rank}(A) = q \leq p$. Here, our target is $A\beta_0$, and we treat τ_0 and the remaining $p - q$ parameters as the nuisance parameters. In the following, we first provide a brief overview of the intuition for inferring $A\beta_0$. Then, we elaborate on this intuition with more details.

Recall that A_τ is a submatrix of A consisting of all the columns with column indexes in τ , so we have $A\beta_0 = A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0}$. Then we can quantify the uncertainty of estimating $A\beta_0$ by considering two components: the uncertainty of estimating the model parameters $A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0}$ given the true nuisance parameters and the impact of not knowing the nuisance parameters. At first, when the true model τ_0 is known, we consider the low-dimensional data $\{(X_{i, \tau_0}^{obs}, y_i^{obs}) : i \in [n]\}$ with covariates $\mathbf{X}_{\tau_0}^{obs}$ constrained on τ_0 and construct a confidence set for $A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0}$ by employing likelihood ratio tests on $A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0}$. To address the impact of unknown nuisance parameters, we consider each $\hat{\tau} \in \mathcal{C}$ as a possible true model and apply a likelihood ratio test using data $\{(X_{i, \hat{\tau}}^{obs}, y_i^{obs}) : i \in [n]\}$, resulting in a set for $A_{\hat{\tau}}\beta_{0, \hat{\tau}}$, which we refer to as *representative set*. If $\hat{\tau} = \tau_0$, this resulting set is a level- α confidence set for $A_{\tau_0}\beta_0$. However, when $\hat{\tau} \neq \tau_0$, the confidence statement for the resulting set does not hold, thus we refer it here as a representative set. By combining these representative sets, we obtain a valid confidence set for $A\beta_0$. Following the intuition described above, we elaborate on this intuition with more details as follows.

Let us first consider the case where τ_0 is known and derive the test statistic for $A\beta_0$ by considering the working hypothesis test $H_0 : A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0} = t, \beta_{0, \tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}$ versus $H_1 : A_{\tau_0}\beta_{0, \tau_0} \neq t, \beta_{0, \tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}$ for any $t \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Without loss of generality, we assume $A\beta_0 = t$ and τ_0 are compatible, i.e., $\{b \in \mathbb{R}^s : A_{\tau_0}b = t\} \neq \emptyset$, otherwise we reject $A\beta_0 = t$. Then we denote $\text{rank}(A_\tau) = r(\tau)$, so $r(\tau) \leq q \wedge |\tau|$. We also denote the MLE of β_{0, τ_0} under $H_0, H_0 \cup H_1$ given $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to be \hat{b}_0 and \hat{b}_1 , respectively. Then the likelihood ratio test statistic is

defined as

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau_0, t)) = -2(l(\tau_0, \hat{b}_0 | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) - l(\tau_0, \hat{b}_1 | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})).$$

Due to the chi-squared approximation of the likelihood ratio test statistic in moderate dimension, if we let $B_\alpha(\tau_0) = [0, F_{\chi_r^2(\tau_0)}^{-1}(\alpha)]$ with $F_{\chi_r^2}^{-1}(\alpha)$ to be the α -quantile of χ_r^2 , then

$$\mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, (\tau_0, A\beta_0)) \in B_\alpha(\tau_0)) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

Therefore we collect all the values of $A\beta_0$ that are accepted by the test to get a confidence set for $A\beta_0$.

Secondly, to deal with the impact of unknown τ_0 , we apply the previous procedure to each candidate model pretending it is the true model, then we combine all the sets together to get a level- α confidence set of $A\beta_0$:

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{t : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, t)) < F_{\chi_r^2(\tau)}^{-1}(\alpha), \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

We summarize the above procedure in Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 Confidence set for $A\beta_0$

- 1: **Input:** Observed data $(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$, model candidate set \mathcal{C} .
- 2: **Output:** Confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ for $A\beta_0$.
- 3: **for** $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$ **do**
- 4: Fix any null parameter space $\Theta_0 = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : A\beta = t, \beta_{\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}\}$ and the full parameter space $\Theta = \{b \in \mathbb{R}^s : \beta_{\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}\}$, calculate the MLE under Θ_0 and Θ as $\hat{\beta}_\tau^{mle_0}$ and $\hat{\beta}_\tau^{mle}$, respectively.
- 5: Calculate

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, t)) = -2(l(\tau, \hat{\beta}_\tau^{mle_0} | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) - l(\tau, \hat{\beta}_\tau^{mle} | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})).$$
- 6: **end for**
- 7: For $r = \text{rank}(A_\tau)$, construct

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{t : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, t)) \leq F_{\chi_r^2}^{-1}(\alpha), \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

It is worth noting that once we get the confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ for $A\beta_0$, it is straightforward to transfer $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ into the confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ for a nonlinear transformation h of $A\beta_0$, by applying h to each element in $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$,

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{h(t) : t \in \Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})\}.$$

In the following, we provide the theoretical guarantee of Algorithm 3 to show the valid coverage of $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ and $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$. We first introduce an assumption.

Assumption 3. Denote $H = n\mathbb{E}\frac{e^{YX^\top\beta_0}}{(1+e^{YX^\top\beta_0})^2}X_{\tau_0}X_{\tau_0}^\top$ to be the negative expected Hessian of likelihood $l(\tau_0, \cdot | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$, we assume

$$\lambda_{\min}(H) \asymp \lambda_{\max}(H) \asymp n.$$

Assumption 3 is on the Hessian matrix under the true model τ_0 , rather than the Hessian matrix with respect to the full coefficient vector β_0 . Therefore, it is weaker than other commonly imposed conditions on the Hessian matrix (Cai et al., 2021; Fei and Li, 2021; Van de Geer et al., 2014).

Theorem 4 below states that $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ and $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ are level- α confidence sets of $A\beta_0$ and $h(A\beta_0)$, respectively. A proof can be found in the Appendix.

Theorem 4. If Assumption 3 holds, $\|X_{\tau_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi$, $n \gtrsim (s \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $n \gg \frac{s^3}{\sqrt{r(\tau_0)}}$, when one of the following conditions holds

(1) $d \rightarrow \infty$ at first, then $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 1,

(2) fix any d , $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 2,

then the confidence sets $\Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ and $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ are asymptotically valid

$$\mathbb{P}(A\beta_0 \in \Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1), \quad \mathbb{P}(h(A\beta_0) \in \Gamma_\alpha^{h(A\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1).$$

Shi et al. (2019) also studied the problem of testing $A\beta_0$ but with the assumption that A has only m non-zero columns. This implies only m elements $\beta_{0,M}$ of β_0 are involved in $A\beta_0$, for some $M \subset [p]$ with $|M| = m$. They developed asymptotically valid tests using partial penalized Wald, score and likelihood ratio statistics, respectively. However, the validity of their proposed tests relies on two conditions. On the one hand, they suppose $m \ll n^{\frac{1}{3}}$, which restricts the number of coefficients in the test and excludes many important cases such as $A\beta_0 = \beta_0$. On the other hand, their approach requires a signal strength condition on the coefficients β_{0,M^c} that are not involved in the hypothesis, which can be more stringent than the β -min condition in cases like testing a single large coefficient.

Marginal inference for single coefficients $\beta_{0,j}$ and joint inference for the whole vector β_0 are usually of particular interest. Additionally, simultaneous inference for the case probabilities of a set of new observations plays an important role in many cases, such as electronic health record data analysis (Guo et al., 2021). Equipped with the general result in Theorem 4, we can address these special cases by setting $A = e_j^\top$, $A = I_p$, and $A = \mathbf{X}_{\text{new}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{new}} \times p}$, respectively.

3.3.1 Inference for $\beta_{0,j}$

Following the general framework described in Section 3.3 with $A = e_j^\top$, to construct a confidence set for $\beta_{0,j}$, we apply the likelihood ratio test to $\beta_{0,j}$ under each candidate model. Concretely, given any candidate model $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$, we test the working hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_{0,j} = \beta_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$ versus $H_1 : \beta_{0,j} \neq \beta_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$. Without loss of generality, we assume $j \in \tau$, otherwise, if $j \notin \tau$ and $\beta_j = 0$, we accept H_0 and if $j \notin \tau$, $\beta_j \neq 0$, we reject H_0 . Denote the MLEs of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau}$ under H_0 and $H_0 \cup H_1$ to be \hat{b}_0 and \hat{b}_1 , respectively. Then the likelihood ratio test statistic is

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_j)) = -2(l(\tau, \hat{b}_0 | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) - l(\tau, \hat{b}_1 | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})).$$

Finally, we combine the likelihood ratio test statistics corresponding to each candidate model and define the level- α confidence set for $\beta_{0,j}$ as

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\beta_j : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_j)) < F_{\chi_1^2}^{-1}(\alpha), \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Following Theorem 4, we can show $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ is a valid asymptotic level- α confidence set for $\beta_{0,j}$.

Corollary 1. *If Assumption 3 holds, $\|X_{\tau_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi$, $n \gtrsim (s \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $n \gg s^3$, for any $j \in [p]$, when one of the following conditions holds*

- (1) $d \rightarrow \infty$ at first, then $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 1,
- (2) fix any d , $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 2,

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\beta_{0,j} \in \Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1).$$

The debiasing methods for high-dimensional logistic regression models (Cai et al., 2021; Van de Geer et al., 2014) have been proposed for inferring single coefficients. These methods require a constant lower bound for the smallest eigenvalue, of either the Hessian matrix with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ or the covariance matrix $\mathbb{E}XX^\top$. Such assumptions can be violated if, for instance, two non-informative covariates are identical. However, since Assumption 3 only involves X_{τ_0} , our results remain valid in such cases.

The confidence sets generated by debiasing methods are intervals for any $\beta_{0,j}$, regardless of whether $\beta_{0,j}$ is zero. In contrast, the confidence sets produced by our method are unions of intervals. Specifically, if a candidate model contains the index j , the confidence set for $\beta_{0,j}$ will encompass the interval derived under that candidate model. If no candidate model includes j , then we are confident that $\beta_{0,j} = 0$ and the confidence set for $\beta_{0,j}$ reduces to a singleton $\{0\}$. Therefore our method is more flexible and can adapt to the uncertainties of model selection.

Remark 6. The inclusion of τ_0 in \mathcal{C} is derived under the signal strength condition in Assumption 1, when this condition is violated, the model candidate set may not contain the true support, thus the proposed inference method fails. However, if we divide the set of models $\{\tau \subset [p] : |\tau| \leq s\}$ into two parts $\mathcal{T}_1, \mathcal{T}_2$ with $\tau_0 \in \mathcal{T}_2$,

$$\inf_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_1, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) \gtrsim \min \left\{ |\tau_0 \setminus \tau| \frac{\log p}{n} + (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log \frac{n}{|\tau|+1}}{n}, (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log p}{n} \right\},$$

$$\max_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_2} \inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) \lesssim \min \left\{ |\tau_0 \setminus \tau| \frac{\log p}{n} + (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log \frac{n}{|\tau|+1}}{n}, (|\tau| + 1) \frac{\log p}{n} \right\},$$

here \mathcal{T}_1 contains all the models that have bad prediction performance, while \mathcal{T}_2 consists of all models that are close to the true model in terms of prediction. Then using the same argument as Lemma 1 and Theorem 1, we are sure that the model candidate set \mathcal{C} contains at least one model in \mathcal{T}_2 which is close to τ_0 . Therefore, to make inference for $\beta_{0,j}$, we apply the following heuristic: for any $\hat{\tau} \in \mathcal{C}$, instead of using the low-dimensional model $\hat{\tau}$ based on $\{(X_{i,\hat{\tau}}^{obs}, y_i^{obs}) : i \in [n]\}$, we consider an augmented model $\hat{\tau} \cup \{j\}$ and use the data $\{(X_{i,\hat{\tau} \cup \{j\}}^{obs}, y_i^{obs}) : i \in [n]\}$, then apply the approach above to test β_j .

The intuition is that for $j \in \tau_0$, if $|\beta_{0,j}|$ is large, then $\hat{\tau}$ is likely to contain j , so the model augmentation is not harmful, however, if $|\beta_{0,j}|$ is small, then \mathcal{C} could omit j . In this case $\hat{\tau} \cup \{j\}$ may result in better coverage than $\hat{\tau}$ since the former includes more informative covariates. However, for $j \notin \tau_0$, since $j \in \hat{\tau} \cup \{j\}$, using the augmented model, our decision on β_j is always reached using likelihood ratio test, therefore the confidence set of $\beta_{0,j}$ always has positive size. While using original $\hat{\tau}$ may leads to a confidence set $\{0\}$, since if $j \notin \hat{\tau}$ for $\forall \hat{\tau} \in \mathcal{C}$, the original procedure concludes that $\beta_{0,j} = 0$. Therefore although the augmented models may lead to better coverage, it could also result in a wider confidence set for the coefficients of non-informative covariates.

3.3.2 Inference for β_0

Following the general framework in Section 3.3 with $A = I_p$, to construct a confidence set for β_0 , we apply the likelihood ratio test to β_0 under each candidate model. Particularly, for each candidate model $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$, we consider the working hypothesis $H_0 : \beta_{0,\tau} = \beta_\tau, \beta_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$ versus $H_1 : \beta_{0,\tau} \neq \beta_\tau, \beta_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$. We calculate the MLE of $\beta_{0,\tau}$ as \hat{b}_1 , then the likelihood ratio test statistic for β_τ is

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)) = -2(l(\tau, \beta_\tau | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) - l(\tau, \hat{b}_1 | \mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})).$$

Given the likelihood ratio test statistics corresponding to each candidate model, the final level- α confidence set for β_0 is

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}) = \{\beta : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, (\tau, \beta_\tau)) < F_{\chi_s^2}^{-1}(\alpha), \beta_{\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}, \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

Similarly, we have the following corollary stating that $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ has asymptotic coverage α .

Corollary 2. *If Assumption 3 holds, $\|X_{\tau_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi$, $n \gtrsim (s \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $n \gg s^{5/2}$, when one of the following conditions holds*

- (1) $d \rightarrow \infty$ at first, then $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 1,
- (2) fix any d , $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 2,

then

$$\mathbb{P}(\beta_0 \in \Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1).$$

Zhang and Cheng (2017) also studied the simultaneous inference for β_0 based on the debiasing method (Van de Geer et al., 2014). Their approach produces an asymptotically valid test for β_0 , provided the smallest eigenvalue of the Hessian matrix of the log-likelihood with respect to β_0 exceeds a positive constant. However, this assumption fails to hold if there is collinearity among the non-informative covariates. In contrast, our method remains valid in such cases. Moreover, instead of being a full-dimensional ellipsoid, our constructed confidence set is a union of low-dimensional ellipsoids with many coefficients to be exactly zero. Therefore, our method can adapt to the uncertainty of model selection.

3.3.3 Simultaneous inference for case probabilities

Logistic regression has been widely applied to detect infectious diseases based on information of patients (Chadwick et al., 2006; Ravi et al., 2019). Statistical inference for patients' case probabilities is critical for identifying those at risk, enabling early intervention. However, individual-level inference lacks the capacity for group-wise error control and, therefore fails to control disease transmission due to interconnected infection dynamics. Consequently, there is an imperative need for simultaneous inference methods for case probabilities of a group of patients.

Given the fixed covariates $\{X_{\text{new},i} \in \mathbb{R}^p : i \in [n_{\text{new}}]\}$ of an arbitrary group of new patients, we assume the unknown infection statuses $\{Y_{\text{new},i} \in \{0, 1\} : i \in [n]\}$ share the same conditional distribution with the training data, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_{\text{new},i} = 1 | X_{\text{new},i}) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_{\text{new},i}^\top \beta_0}} = h(X_{\text{new},i}^\top \beta_0).$$

Then the case probabilities $\{h(X_{\text{new},i}^\top \beta_0) : i \in [n_{\text{new}}]\}$ measure the confidence for labeling each new patient as infected. Denote $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}} = (X_{\text{new},1}, \dots, X_{\text{new},n_{\text{new}}})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{new}} \times p}$, $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \beta_0) = (h(X_{\text{new},1}^\top \beta_0), \dots, h(X_{\text{new},n_{\text{new}}}^\top \beta_0))^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{new}}}$. To quantify the uncertainty

of predicting $Y_{\text{new},i}$'s, we aim to conduct statistical inference for all the case probabilities $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ of these n_{new} new patients simultaneously. To this end, we construct a confidence set for the vector $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ and the matrix A in Section 3.3 equals $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top$. Then it suffices to form a confidence set for $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$.

Following the strategy described in Section 3.3 with $A = \mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top$, to construct a confidence set for $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$, we apply the likelihood ratio test to $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ under each candidate model. Specifically, for any candidate model $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$, we consider the working hypotheses $H_0 : \mathbf{X}_{\text{new},\tau} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau} = t, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$ versus $H_1 : \mathbf{X}_{\text{new},\tau} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau} \neq t, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau^c} = \mathbf{0}$, with $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new},\tau}$ to be a submatrix consisting of the columns of \mathbf{X}_{new} with indexes in τ . Without loss of generality, we assume the existence of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ such that $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new},\tau} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau = t$, otherwise we reject H_0 . We denote $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new},\tau}) = r(\tau)$ and let the MLE of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau}$ under H_0 and $H_0 \cup H_1$ to be \hat{b}_0 and \hat{b}_1 , respectively. Then the likelihood ratio test statistic is

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}, (\tau, t)) = -2(l(\tau, \hat{b}_0 | \mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}) - l(\tau, \hat{b}_1 | \mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}})).$$

Given the likelihood ratio test statistics corresponding to each candidate model, we define the final confidence set for $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)$ to be

$$\Gamma_\alpha^{h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}) = \{h(t) : \tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}}, (\tau, t)) < F_{\chi_{r(\tau)}^2}^{-1}(\alpha), \tau \in \mathcal{C}\}.$$

According to Theorem 4, we know $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}})$ is asymptotically valid.

Corollary 3. *If Assumption 3 holds, $\|X_{\tau_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi$, $n \gtrsim (s \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}$ and $n \gg \frac{s^3}{\sqrt{r(\tau_0)}}$, when one of the following conditions holds*

- (1) $d \rightarrow \infty$ at first, then $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 1,
- (2) fix any d , $n \rightarrow \infty$, and n, p, s satisfy Assumption 2,

then the confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{\text{obs}}, \mathbf{y}^{\text{obs}})$ is asymptotically valid

$$\mathbb{P}(h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \in \Gamma_\alpha^{h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1).$$

In comparison, Guo et al. (2021) pioneered the study of statistical inference for case probabilities in high-dimensional logistic regression models. However, their method can only be applied to one observation, in contrast, our method enables simultaneous inference for the case probabilities of an arbitrary set of new observations.

4 Numerical Results

In this section, we illustrate the performance of the proposed methods using both synthetic data and real data.

4.1 Synthetic Data

In this subsection, we demonstrate the performance of the proposed methods based on synthetic data. Throughout this subsection, for any sample size n , model dimension p , sparsity s , number of repro samples d and the regression coefficients β_0 to be specified later, we generate n i.i.d. copies $\{X_i : i \in [n]\}$ of $X \in \mathbb{R}^p$ from normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ with mean vector $\mathbf{0}$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ satisfying $\Sigma_{ij} = 0.2^{|i-j|}$. We set $\tau_0 = [s]$, then generate $\{Y_i : i \in [n]\}$ from the logistic regression model with

$$\mathbb{P}(Y_i = 1|X_i) = 1 - \mathbb{P}(Y_i = 0|X_i) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_i^\top \beta_{0, \tau_0}}}.$$

Specifically, we consider the following four choices of $(n, p, s, d, \beta_{0, \tau_0})$.

$$(M1) \quad n = 400, p = 1000, s = 4, d = 4000, \beta_{0, \tau_0} = (5, 4, 3, 2)^\top.$$

$$(M2) \quad n = 500, p = 1000, s = 4, d = 2000, \beta_{0, \tau_0} = (5, 4, 3, 2)^\top.$$

$$(M3) \quad n = 700, p = 1000, s = 4, d = 10000, \beta_{0, \tau_0} = (5, 4, 3, 1)^\top.$$

$$(M4) \quad n = 900, p = 1000, s = 4, d = 10000, \beta_{0, \tau_0} = (5, 4, 3, 1)^\top.$$

The Model (M1) has strong signals and a relatively small sample size while Model (M3) has weaker signal strength but a relatively larger sample size. Then we consider Model (M2) and (M4) to investigate the influence of sample size by increasing the sample sizes of Model (M1) and (M3), respectively. In the following subsections, we choose the confidence level α to be 0.95 and report the performance of the proposed methods for each model, all the results are calculated based on 100 replications.

4.1.1 Model candidate set

In this section, we study the coverage of our proposed model candidate set for the unknown true model τ_0 . When applying Algorithm 1 for the model candidate set, we replace the ℓ_0 constrained empirical 0-1 risk minimization problem in Step 2 by the following computationally efficient surrogate

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda_j), \hat{\sigma}^{(j)}(\lambda_j)) &= \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^n L((2y_i^{obs} - 1)(X_i^{obs \top} \beta + \sigma \epsilon_i^{*(j)})) + \lambda_j \frac{\|\beta\|_1}{\|\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}\|_1}, \\ \hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}, \lambda_j) &= \text{supp}\{\hat{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda_j)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we take L to be either the logistic loss L_l or hinge loss L_h defined as

$$L_l(t) = \log(1 + e^{-t}), \quad L_h(t) = \max\{0, 1 - t\},$$

and we choose $\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}$ as the solution of

$$(\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}(\tilde{\lambda}_j), \tilde{\sigma}^{(j)}(\tilde{\lambda}_j)) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^n L((2y_i^{obs} - 1)(X_i^{obs\top} \beta + \sigma \epsilon_i^{*(j)})) + \tilde{\lambda}_j \|\beta\|_2,$$

for $\tilde{\lambda}_j$ chosen by 3-fold cross validation. The tuning parameter λ_j is selected using the extended BIC (Chen and Chen, 2008)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{EBIC}_{j,\xi}(\lambda) = & -2 \sum_{i=1}^n L((2y_i^{obs} - 1)(X_i^{obs\top} \hat{\beta}^{(j)}(\lambda) + \hat{\sigma}^{(j)}(\lambda) \epsilon_i^{*(j)})) \\ & + \left| \hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}, \lambda) \right| \log n + 2\xi \log \left(\binom{p}{|\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}, \lambda)|} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here we choose $\lambda_j(\xi)$ to maximize $\text{EBIC}_{j,\xi}(\lambda)$ for each $\xi \in [0, 1]$. Therefore for each $\epsilon^{*(j)}$, we collect all models $\{\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}, \lambda_j(\xi)) : \xi \in [0, 1]\}$. Then the final model candidate set becomes

$$\{\hat{\tau}(\epsilon^{*(j)}, \lambda_j(\xi)) : j \in [d], \xi \in [0, 1]\}.$$

For the logistic loss L_l and hinge loss L_h , we calculate the model candidate sets with 100 replications and report the averaged coverage of τ_0 and the averaged cardinality of the candidate sets with standard deviations in the parentheses in Table 1. From Table 1, we see the proposed method performs well for all four models with high coverage and small cardinality. These results are in line with our theoretical results in Section 3.1. If the signal is strong enough such that Assumption 1 or Assumption 2 are satisfied, then the candidate set is guaranteed to contain the true model. Comparing (M1) with (M2) and (M3) with (M4), we find the coverages increase as sample sizes increase, this coincides with Theorems 1 and 2 in that the probability of missing τ_0 is decreasing in n . It is not surprising that the cardinalities decrease when n increases, since as stated in Theorem 2, when n increases, the stronger signal strength Assumption 2 becomes weaker, and if this stronger assumption is satisfied, the candidate set are likely to be smaller or even to be precisely $\{\tau_0\}$. Comparing (M1) (M2) with (M3) (M4), we see when β_{0,τ_0} changes from $(5, 4, 3, 2)^\top$ to $(5, 4, 3, 1)$ and n increases from $(400, 500)$ to $(700, 900)$, the coverage in (M3) (M4) are comparable to that in (M1) (M2). This demonstrates that if the signals become weaker, the quantities c_{\min} and \tilde{c}_{\min} in Theorems 1 and 2 become smaller, therefore the performance will be worse. Then more samples are required to make $nc_{\min}, n\tilde{c}_{\min}$ still comparable in these two settings, which leads to comparable coverages.

4.1.2 Inference for τ_0

In this subsection, we study the performance of the model confidence set proposed in Section 3.2. When applying Algorithm 2, in Step 4, for each $\tau \in \mathcal{C}$, we need to solve an

Models	Losses			
	Hinge		Logistic	
	Coverage	Cardinality	Coverage	Cardinality
M1	1.00(0.00)	6.99(3.37)	0.98(0.14)	7.81(4.99)
M2	1.00(0.00)	5.14(2.12)	0.99(0.10)	4.91(3.12)
M3	0.98(0.14)	5.54(2.45)	0.97(0.17)	3.95(2.07)
M4	0.97(0.17)	4.11(2.05)	0.99(0.10)	2.48(1.51)

Table 1: Comparison of performance of the model candidate sets. Here “Coverage” means the probability for the model candidate set \mathcal{C} to contain τ_0 , and “Cardinality” indicates the number of models in \mathcal{C} .

Models	Losses	β_τ			
		Profile		MLE	
		Coverage	Cardinality	Coverage	Cardinality
M1	Hinge	1.00(0.00)	4.88(2.68)	1.00(0.00)	4.02(2.34)
	Logistic	0.98(0.14)	5.19(3.05)	0.98(0.14)	4.30(2.37)
M2	Hinge	1.00(0.00)	3.57(1.88)	1.00(0.00)	3.02(1.58)
	Logistic	0.99(0.10)	3.79(2.28)	0.99(0.10)	3.10(1.82)
M3	Hinge	0.98(0.14)	3.78(1.61)	0.98(0.14)	3.21(1.45)
	Logistic	0.97(0.17)	3.05(1.69)	0.97(0.17)	2.62(1.47)
M4	Hinge	0.97(0.17)	2.80(1.52)	0.97(0.17)	2.53(1.40)
	Logistic	0.99(0.10)	1.94(1.11)	0.99(0.10)	1.82(0.98)

Table 2: Comparison of performance of the model confidence sets. Here “Coverage” means the probability for the model confidence set $\Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to contain τ_0 , and “Cardinality” indicates the number of models in $\Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$.

optimization problem for a discrete function which can be hard. In practice, we use the MLE of β_τ to generate $\mathbf{Y}^{*(j)}$. We also report the results when the profile method in Step 4 is solved by the `optim` function in **R** using the method in [Nelder and Mead \(1965\)](#). Here we choose the number m of Monte Carlo samples to be 100 for all settings. The coverages and cardinalities of the model confidence sets are reported in Table 2 where we deal with the nuisance parameter $\beta_{0,\tau}$ using both the MLE and profile method. From Table 2, we find the model confidence sets are smaller than the model candidate sets in all settings while the coverages of the model confidence sets are the same as the model candidate sets. Due to the discreteness of the nuclear statistic, the model confidence sets are conservative, however, they are still able to reject some models in the model candidate sets and produce smaller sets of models.

4.1.3 Inference for $\beta_{0,j}$

In this subsection, we study the performance of the confidence sets for individual coefficients $\beta_{0,j}$ for $j \in [p]$. We also compare our method with the Debiased Lasso method in [Van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) implemented using the `lasso.proj` function in `hdi` package and also the oracle likelihood ratio test assuming τ_0 were known. For Model (M1)-(M4), for each replication, we calculate the coverage and size of confidence sets for each $\beta_{0,j}, j \in [p]$, then we average the performance over $j \in \tau_0$ and $j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$, respectively. Note that the proposed confidence sets for $\beta_{0,j}$ is a union of intervals, so we report the Lebesgue measure of the confidence sets. Then the final results reported in [Table 3](#) contain the averaged coverages and sizes of confidence sets over 100 replications with standard deviations in the parentheses. As we discussed in [Section 4.1.1](#), we consider two losses, logistic loss and hinge loss, for Step 2 in [Algorithm 1](#). Hereafter, we use the abbreviations “Repro-Logistic” and “Repro-Hinge” to denote the repro samples method with logistic loss and hinge loss, respectively. We also use “Debias” to denote the Debiased Lasso method and use “Oracle” to denote the oracle likelihood ratio test with the knowledge of τ_0 . From [Table 3](#), we see that for $j \in \tau_0$, the proposed methods Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic have the desired coverage of 0.95 for all four models, while the Oracle method undercovers in (M1) and the Debiased method couldn’t cover the nonzero coefficients in all the settings. In terms of size, the confidence sets produced by Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic are wider than that of the Oracle method in Model (M1) (M2). The reasons are two folded, on the one hand, the model candidate sets in these two models are relatively large, therefore the confidence sets of $\beta_{0,j}, j \in \tau_0$ contain intervals calculated using likelihood ratio test under some wrong models; on the other hand, due to the smaller sample size (400, 500), the likelihood ratio tests are not accurate in finite sample, therefore the intervals under wrong models are also wide and unstable, resulting in a large set after taking the union. The sizes of confidence sets created by Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic are comparable to that of the Oracle methods in Model (M3) (M4), because the model candidate sets are smaller, and due to the larger sample size (700, 900), the likelihood ratio tests are more accurate, so the intervals calculated under supermodels of τ_0 are likely to be close to the interval under τ_0 . The sizes of the intervals calculated by the Debiased Lasso method are even shorter than that of the Oracle method, so are likely to be undercover. For the zero coefficients with $j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$, Repro-Hinge, Repro-Logistic and Debiased Lasso all have coverage rates approaching 1, but the sizes corresponding to Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic are shorter than the sizes correspond to Debiased Lasso, the reason is Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic also make use of the uncertainty of the selected models. When no models in the candidate set contain $\beta_{0,j}$, we estimate $\beta_{0,j}$ by 0 with confidence 1.

Model	Method	$\beta_{0,j}, j \in \tau_0$		$\beta_{0,j}, j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$	
		Coverage	Length	Coverage	Length
M1	Repro-Hinge	0.94(0.19)	3.20(1.23)	1.00(0.00)	0.01(0.00)
	Repro-Logistic	0.94(0.19)	3.42(1.40)	1.00(0.00)	0.01(0.00)
	Debias	0.09(0.22)	0.98(0.19)	1.00(0.00)	0.82(0.15)
	Oracle	0.90(0.23)	2.23(0.50)		
M2	Repro-Hinge	0.94(0.18)	2.55(0.72)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Repro-Logistic	0.94(0.19)	2.69(1.06)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Debias	0.13(0.27)	0.89(0.18)	1.00(0.00)	0.74(0.14)
	Oracle	0.93(0.20)	1.98(0.34)		
M3	Repro-Hinge	0.97(0.11)	1.95(0.43)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Repro-Logistic	0.96(0.12)	1.86(0.38)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Debias	0.15(0.24)	0.73(0.10)	1.00(0.00)	0.59(0.08)
	Oracle	0.94(0.14)	1.53(0.21)		
M4	Repro-Hinge	0.96(0.14)	1.52(0.24)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Repro-Logistic	0.96(0.12)	1.43(0.21)	1.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
	Debias	0.15(0.25)	0.64(0.07)	0.99(0.00)	0.51(0.05)
	Oracle	0.94(0.17)	1.30(0.16)		

Table 3: Comparison of performance of the confidence sets of $\beta_{0,j}$. Here ‘‘Coverage’’ means the probability for $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to contain $\beta_{0,j}$, and ‘‘Length’’ means the Lebesgue measure of $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$. The third and fourth columns correspond to $j \in \tau_0$, and the last two columns correspond to $j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$.

4.1.4 Inference for β_0

We also study the performance of the proposed method for simultaneous inference for the vector parameter β_0 . Since it is hard to calculate the Lebesgue measure of the confidence sets, we report only the coverage rates of Repro-Hinge, Repro-Logistic, and the Oracle method with known τ_0 in Table 4. From Table 4, we can see the Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic have similar performance to that of the Oracle method, and the coverage rates are all close to the desired 0.95.

4.1.5 Simultaneous inference for case probabilities

To evaluate the empirical performance of our proposed method for simultaneous inference for case probabilities, we construct \mathbf{X}_{new} as follows. For (M1)-(M4), the number of new observations is consistently set to $n_{new} = 2$ or 2000. Then for each of the four models, we generate $X_{new,i} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ to be i.i.d. random vectors from normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_{new})$ with

Models	Coverage		
	Repro-Hinge	Repro-Logistic	Oracle
M1	0.98(0.14)	0.96(0.20)	0.98(0.14)
M2	0.93(0.26)	0.92(0.27)	0.93(0.26)
M3	0.93(0.26)	0.91(0.29)	0.94(0.24)
M4	0.92(0.27)	0.94(0.24)	0.95(0.22)

Table 4: Comparison of performance of the confidence sets of β_0 . Here “Coverage” means the probability for $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to contain β_0 .

n_{new}	Models	Coverage		
		Repro-Hinge	Repro-Logistic	Oracle
2	M1	0.97(0.17)	0.97(0.17)	0.93(0.26)
	M2	0.96(0.20)	0.97(0.17)	0.93(0.26)
	M3	0.95(0.22)	0.94(0.24)	0.95(0.22)
	M4	0.94(0.24)	0.94(0.24)	0.92(0.27)
2000	M1	0.98(0.14)	0.96(0.20)	0.98(0.14)
	M2	0.93(0.26)	0.92(0.27)	0.93(0.26)
	M3	0.93(0.26)	0.91(0.29)	0.94(0.24)
	M4	0.92(0.27)	0.94(0.24)	0.95(0.22)

Table 5: Comparison of performance of the confidence sets of $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}\beta_0)$. Here “Coverage” means the probability for $\Gamma_\alpha^{h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}\beta_0)}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to contain $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}\beta_0)$.

the covariance matrix Σ_{new} satisfying $\Sigma_{\text{new},ij} = 0.3^{|i-j|}$. Since it is hard to measure the volume of the confidence sets, we instead report the coverage rates of Repro-Hinge, Repro-Logistic, and the Oracle method with known τ_0 in Table 5. The results in Table 5 reveal that both Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic have performance comparable to the Oracle method, with coverage rates close to the nominal value of 0.95. Notably, when $n_{\text{new}} = 2000 > p$, it is typical that $\text{rank}(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}) = p$. Therefore testing $\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}\beta_0$ is equivalent to testing β_0 . And the coverages for $h(\mathbf{X}_{\text{new}}\beta_0)$, as listed in Table 5 are indeed the same as the coverages for β_0 in Table 4.

4.1.6 Inference for $\beta_{0,j}$ with weak signals

In this subsection, we consider such a difficult setting with several weak signals and a small sample size:

$$(M5) \quad n = 300, p = 500, s = 6, d = 10000, \beta_{0,\tau_0} = (5, 4, 3, 1, 0.5, 0.2)^\top.$$

Under this setting, the signal strength Assumption 1 or 2 may be violated, and then the model candidate set is no longer guaranteed to contain the true model. This is evidenced in our simulation results, where the candidate sets obtained using either Repro-Logistic or Repro-Hinge fail to contain the true model and both have coverage rates equal to 0. However, we can still get desirable results for the single coefficient $\beta_{0,j}$ using the augmented method proposed in Section 3.3.1 Remark 6.

To make inference for $\beta_{0,j}$ with weak signals, we study the performance of the heuristic methods augmented Repro-Hinge and augmented Repro-Logistic proposed in Section 3.3.1 Remark 6 under Model (M5). In Table 6, we compare augmented Repro-Hinge and augmented Repro-Logistic with the Debiased Lasso method and the oracle likelihood ratio test with known τ_0 . The confidence intervals of the Oracle method for $\beta_{0,j}, j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$ are calculated by performing the likelihood ratio test under the model $\tau_0 \cup \{j\}$. In Table 6, we divide the coefficients into three groups, the first group is $j \in [3]$ which corresponds to the coefficients with large value $(5, 4, 3)^\top$, the second group is $j \in \tau_0 \setminus [3]$ corresponding to small nonzero coefficients $(1, 0.5, 0.2)^\top$, and the last group $j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$ contains all the zero coefficients. From Table 6, we find Repro-Hinge, and Repro-Logistic have the same performance with their augmented version augmented Repro-Hinge, and augmented Repro-Logistic when $j \in [3]$. Compared to the Oracle method, they have much better coverage and slightly larger sizes. This is due to the weak signals and small sample size. The model candidate set is large in (M5), therefore the confidence intervals produced by the repro samples method contain the intervals of the likelihood ratio test under the wrong models. Due to the small sample size, the chi-squared approximation of the likelihood ratio test is not accurate, so the intervals corresponding to the wrong models are wide and unstable, resulting in a large confidence set after taking the union. The small sample size is also the reason for the Oracle method to be undercover. The Debiased Lasso method still creates confidence intervals with too short lengths and, therefore is likely to be undercover. For the weak signals with $j \in \tau_0 \setminus [3]$, the performances of Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic are poor since the model candidate set fails to identify these weak signals, however, the augmented Repro-Hinge and augmented Repro-Logistic methods have the desired coverages and the sizes are comparable to that of the Oracle method. The reason is when testing $\beta_{0,j}$, we artificially include j into each candidate model, although the candidate models may still miss some other small nonzero coefficients, they do not have much influence on the data, therefore augmented Repro-Hinge and augmented Repro-Logistic are still able to cover $\beta_{0,j}$. For the zero coefficients with $j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$, Repro-Hinge, Repro-Logistic, and Debiased Lasso all have coverage 1 while the sizes corresponding to Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic are nearly 0. The performances of augmented Repro-Hinge and augmented Repro-Logistic are more similar to that of the Oracle method. They all have coverages approaching 0.95 and

Coefficients		Methods					
		Repro-Hinge		Repro-Logistic		Debias	Oracle
		Non-augmented	Augmented	Non-augmented	Augmented		
$j \in [3]$	Coverage	0.98(0.14)	0.98(0.14)	0.98(0.13)	0.98(0.13)	0.11(0.32)	0.89(0.32)
	Length	4.43(2.27)	4.43(2.27)	5.21(3.06)	5.21(3.06)	1.11(0.27)	3.14(1.27)
$j \in \tau_0 \setminus [3]$	Coverage	0.30(0.46)	0.96(0.20)	0.34(0.48)	0.95(0.22)	0.72(0.45)	0.93(0.26)
	Length	0.61(1.00)	1.71(0.61)	0.83(1.26)	1.99(1.13)	0.89(0.20)	1.30(0.27)
$j \in [p] \setminus \tau_0$	Coverage	1.00(0.00)	0.98(0.01)	1.00(0.00)	0.98(0.10)	1.00(0.00)	0.94(0.01)
	Length	0.01(0.01)	1.54(0.40)	0.02(0.03)	1.79(1.03)	0.88(0.20)	1.17(0.15)

Table 6: Comparison of performance of the confidence sets of $\beta_{0,j}$ under model (M5). We consider the following 6 methods: Repro-Hinge, augmented Repro-Hinge, Repro-Logistic, augmented Repro-Logistic, Debaised Lasso, and the Oracle method with τ_0 to be known. We use the terms non-augmented Repro-Hinge, and non-augmented Repro-Logistic to distinguish Repro-Hinge and Repro-Logistic, respectively, from their augmented counterparts. Here ‘‘Coverage’’ means the probability for $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$ to contain $\beta_{0,j}$, and ‘‘Length’’ means the Lebesgue measure of $\Gamma_\alpha^{\beta_{0,j}}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs})$.

comparable sizes.

4.2 Real Data

In this section, we consider a high-dimensional real data analysis. Note that most existing methods focus on statistical inference for single coefficients, but our method can also quantify the uncertainty of model selection. As will be demonstrated, the Debaised Lasso method identifies only one variable as significant. In contrast, our model confidence sets find several variables that have been shown as important by many existing studies.

Specifically, we apply the proposed repro samples method to the single-cell RNA-seq data from [Shalek et al. \(2014\)](#). This data comprises gene expression profiles for 27723 genes across 1861 primary mouse bone-marrow-derived dendritic cells spanning several experimental conditions. Specifically, we focus on a subset of the data consisting of 96 cells stimulated by the pathogenic component PIC (viral-like double-stranded RNA) and 96 control cells without stimulation, with gene expressions measured six hours after stimulation. In our study, we label each cell with 0 and 1 to indicate ‘‘unstimulated’’ and ‘‘stimulated’’ statues, respectively. Our goal is to investigate the association between gene expressions and stimulation status. Similar to [Cai et al. \(2021\)](#), we filter out genes that are not expressed in more than 80% of the cells and discard the bottom 90% genes with the lowest variances. Subsequently, we log-transform and normalize the gene expressions to have mean 0 and unit variance.

Using the same parameter tuning strategy as detailed in Section 4.1, *Repro-Hinge* and *Repro-Logistic* identify 7 and 12 models, respectively, in both the model candidate and model confidence sets. We list all models within the model confidence sets in Table 7. Most of the identified genes have been previously associated with immune systems. *RSAD2* is involved in antiviral innate immune responses, and is also a powerful stimulator of adaptive immune response mediated via mDCs (Jang et al., 2018). *IFIT1* inhibits viral replication by binding viral RNA that carries PPP-RNA (Pichlmair et al., 2011). *IFT80* is known to be an essential component for the development and maintenance of motile and sensory cilia (Wang et al., 2018), while ciliary machinery is repurposed by T cell to focus the signaling protein *LCK* at immune synapse (Stephen et al., 2018). *BC044745* has been identified as significant in *MRepro-Logistic/MpJ* mouse, which exhibits distinct gene expression patterns involved in immune response (Podolak-Popinigis et al., 2015). *ACTB* has shown associations with immune cell infiltration, immune checkpoints, and other immune modulators in most cancers (Gu et al., 2021). *HMG2* has been validated to play an important role in the innate immune system during pregnancy and development in mice (Deng et al., 2012). Finally, *IFI47*, also known as *IRG47*, has been proven to be vital for immune defense against protozoan and bacterial infections (Collazo et al., 2001).

Regarding confidence sets for individual genes, we compare the proposed *Repro-Hinge* and *Repro-Logistic* methods with the debiased approach. *Repro-Hinge* identifies *RSAD2* and *AK217941* as significant, while both *Repro-Logistic* and *Debiased Lasso* only identify *RSAD2* as significant. While *RSAD2* plays an important role in antiviral innate immune responses, *AK217941*, though not studied in the literature, deserves further attention as it has been identified in both model confidence sets and single coefficient confidence sets.

5 Conclusions and Discussions

In this article, we develop a novel method for statistical inference for both the model support and regression coefficients in high-dimensional logistic regression models based on the repro samples method. For model support, we provide the first effective approach for constructing model confidence sets, assuming only a weak signal strength condition. For the regression coefficients, we develop a comprehensive approach for inference for any group of linear combinations of coefficients without relying on data splitting, sure screening, or sparse Hessian matrix assumptions. Our simulation results demonstrate that the proposed method produces valid and small model confidence sets and achieves better coverage for regression coefficients than the debiasing methods. It is worth noting that under the proposed framework, the logistic distribution of the random noise ϵ is not crucial, so our method could be extended to other generalized linear models with binary outcomes.

Genes	Methods																	
	Repro-Hinge							Repro-Logistic										
RSAD2	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
AK217941	●	●	●	●	●	●	●	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
IFIT1					●	●		○	○		○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
IFT80								○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	
BC044745			●	●	●	●	●			○			○				○	
ACTB		●	●			●	●										○	○
HMG2							●						○	○				
IFI47												○						
ZFP488																	○	

Table 7: All the models in the model confidence sets. Each row stands for a gene while each column corresponds to a model. The circle in the i -th row and j -th column indicates that the i -th gene appears in the j -th model.

To ensure the coverage of model candidate sets, we introduce a signal strength condition. However, as discussed in Remark 6, in the presence of weak signals, the constructed model candidate sets can only be guaranteed to contain at least one model with distribution close to the true data generating distribution. An interesting direction for future exploration would be to devise a method for constructing model candidate sets that contain the true model without relying on any signal strength condition.

References

Alexandre Belloni, Victor Chernozhukov, and Ying Wei. Post-selection inference for generalized linear models with many controls. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 34(4):606–619, 2016.

Daniel Berend and Aryeh Kontorovich. On the convergence of the empirical distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1205.6711*, 2012.

Florentina Bunea. Honest variable selection in linear and logistic regression models via ℓ_1 and $\ell_1 + \ell_2$ penalization. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2:1153–1194, 2008.

T Tony Cai, Zijian Guo, and Rong Ma. Statistical inference for high-dimensional generalized linear models with binary outcomes. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–14, 2021.

- David Chadwick, Barbara Arch, Annelies Wilder-Smith, and Nicholas Paton. Distinguishing dengue fever from other infections on the basis of simple clinical and laboratory features: application of logistic regression analysis. *Journal of Clinical Virology*, 35(2): 147–153, 2006.
- Jiahua Chen and Zehua Chen. Extended bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces. *Biometrika*, 95(3):759–771, 2008.
- Victor Chernozhukov, Denis Chetverikov, Mert Demirer, Esther Duflo, Christian Hansen, Whitney Newey, and James Robins. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters: Double/debiased machine learning. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1), 2018.
- Carmen M Collazo, George S Yap, Gregory D Sempowski, Kimberly C Lusby, Lino Tessarollo, George F Vande Woude, Alan Sher, and Gregory A Taylor. Inactivation of *irg-47* and *irg-47* reveals a family of interferon γ -inducible genes with essential, pathogen-specific roles in resistance to infection. *The Journal of Experimental Medicine*, 194(2): 181–188, 2001.
- Lu-Xia Deng, Gui-Xia Wu, Yue Cao, Bo Fan, Xiang Gao, Xiao-Hai Tang, and Ning Huang. The chromosomal protein *hmg2* mediates the *lps*-induced expression of β -defensins in mice. *Inflammation*, 35(2):456–473, 2012.
- Ruben Dezeure, Peter Bühlmann, Lukas Meier, and Nicolai Meinshausen. High-dimensional inference: confidence intervals, p-values and r-software hdi. *Statistical Science*, pages 533–558, 2015.
- Jianqing Fan and Rui Song. Sure independence screening in generalized linear models with np-dimensionality. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(6):3567–3604, 2010.
- Jianqing Fan, Weichen Wang, and Ziwei Zhu. A shrinkage principle for heavy-tailed data: High-dimensional robust low-rank matrix recovery. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(3):1239, 2021.
- Zhe Fei and Yi Li. Estimation and inference for high dimensional generalized linear models: A splitting and smoothing approach. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22:58–1, 2021.
- Davide Ferrari and Yuhong Yang. Confidence sets for model selection by f-testing. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1637–1658, 2015.

- Yuxi Gu, Shouyi Tang, Zhen Wang, Luyao Cai, Haosen Lian, Yingqiang Shen, and Yu Zhou. A pan-cancer analysis of the prognostic and immunological role of β -actin (actb) in human cancers. *Bioengineered*, 12(1):6166–6185, 2021.
- Zijian Guo, Prabrisha Rakshit, Daniel S Herman, and Jinbo Chen. Inference for the case probability in high-dimensional logistic regression. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):11480–11533, 2021.
- Peter R Hansen, Asger Lunde, and James M Nason. The model confidence set. *Econometrica*, 79(2):453–497, 2011.
- Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. In *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding*, pages 409–426. Springer, 1994.
- David W Hosmer Jr, Stanley Lemeshow, and Rodney X Sturdivant. *Applied logistic regression*, volume 398. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Ji-Su Jang, Jun-Ho Lee, Nam-Chul Jung, So-Yeon Choi, Soo-Yeoun Park, Ji-Young Yoo, Jie-Young Song, Han Geuk Seo, Hyun Soo Lee, and Dae-Seog Lim. Rsad2 is necessary for mouse dendritic cell maturation via the irf7-mediated signaling pathway. *Cell Death & Disease*, 9(8):823, 2018.
- Chi Jin, Praneeth Netrapalli, Rong Ge, Sham M Kakade, and Michael I Jordan. A short note on concentration inequalities for random vectors with subgaussian norm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1902.03736*, 2019.
- Arun Kumar Kuchibhotla and Abhishek Chakraborty. Moving beyond sub-gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11(4):1389–1456, 2022.
- Yang Li, Yuetian Luo, Davide Ferrari, Xiaonan Hu, and Yichen Qin. Model confidence bounds for variable selection. *Biometrics*, 75(2):392–403, 2019.
- Rong Ma, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. Global and simultaneous hypothesis testing for high-dimensional logistic regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):984–998, 2021.
- John A Nelder and Roger Mead. A simplex method for function minimization. *The Computer Journal*, 7(4):308–313, 1965.
- Yang Ning and Han Liu. A general theory of hypothesis tests and confidence regions for sparse high dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(1):158–195, 2017.

- Andreas Pichlmair, Caroline Lassnig, Carol-Ann Eberle, Maria W Górna, Christoph L Baumann, Thomas R Burkard, Tilmann Bürckstümmer, Adrijana Stefanovic, Sigurd Krieger, Keiryn L Bennett, et al. Ifit1 is an antiviral protein that recognizes 5'-triphosphate rna. *Nature Immunology*, 12(7):624–630, 2011.
- Justyna Podolak-Popinigis, Bartosz Górniewicz, Anna Ronowicz, and Paweł Sachadyn. Transcriptome profiling reveals distinctive traits of retinol metabolism and neonatal parallels in the mrl/mpj mouse. *BMC Genomics*, 16(1):1–17, 2015.
- Anirudhh Ravi, Varun Gopal, J Preetha Roselyn, D Devaraj, Pranav Chandran, and R Sai Madhura. Detection of infectious disease using non-invasive logistic regression technique. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Intelligent Techniques in Control, Optimization and Signal Processing (INCOS)*, pages 1–5. IEEE, 2019.
- Alex K Shalek, Rahul Satija, Joe Shuga, John J Trombetta, Dave Gennert, Diana Lu, Peilin Chen, Rona S Gertner, Jellert T Gaublomme, Nir Yosef, et al. Single-cell rna-seq reveals dynamic paracrine control of cellular variation. *Nature*, 510(7505):363–369, 2014.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- Xiaotong Shen, Wei Pan, and Yunzhang Zhu. Likelihood-based selection and sharp parameter estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(497):223–232, 2012.
- Chengchun Shi, Rui Song, Zhao Chen, and Runze Li. Linear hypothesis testing for high dimensional generalized linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2671, 2019.
- Chengchun Shi, Rui Song, Wenbin Lu, and Runze Li. Statistical inference for high-dimensional models via recursive online-score estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(535):1307–1318, 2021.
- Louise A Stephen, Yasmin ElMaghloob, Michael J McIlwraith, Tamas Yelland, Patricia Castro Sanchez, Pedro Roda-Navarro, and Shehab Ismail. The ciliary machinery is repurposed for t cell immune synapse trafficking of lck. *Developmental Cell*, 47(1):122–132, 2018.
- Pragya Sur and Emmanuel J Candès. A modern maximum-likelihood theory for high-dimensional logistic regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(29):14516–14525, 2019.

- Sara Van de Geer, Peter Bühlmann, Ya'acov Ritov, and Ruben Dezeure. On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202, 2014.
- Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press, 2019.
- Miaoyan Wang, Khanh Dao Duc, Jonathan Fischer, and Yun S Song. Operator norm inequalities between tensor unfoldings on the partition lattice. *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, 520:44–66, 2017.
- Peng Wang, Min-ge Xie, and Linjun Zhang. Finite-and large-sample inference for model and coefficients in high-dimensional linear regression with repro samples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.09299*, 2022.
- Rui Wang, Xiaoyan Deng, Chengfu Yuan, Hongmei Xin, Geli Liu, Yong Zhu, Xue Jiang, and Changdong Wang. Ift80 improves invasion ability in gastric cancer cell line via ift80/p75ngfr/mmp9 signaling. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, 19(11):3616, 2018.
- Min-ge Xie and Peng Wang. Repro samples method for finite-and large-sample inferences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.06421 (new version: arXiv:2402.15004)*, 2022.
- Cun-Hui Zhang. Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of statistics*, 38(2):894–942, 2010.
- Xianyang Zhang and Guang Cheng. Simultaneous inference for high-dimensional linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(518):757–768, 2017.
- Peng Zhao and Bin Yu. On model selection consistency of lasso. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:2541–2563, 2006.
- Chao Zheng, Davide Ferrari, and Yuhong Yang. Model selection confidence sets by likelihood ratio testing. *Statistica Sinica*, 29(2):827–851, 2019.
- Mayya Zhilova. New edgeworth-type expansions with finite sample guarantees. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(5):2545–2561, 2022.

A Proofs

This section includes all the proofs of the theoretical results in previous sections.

A.1 Connection to β_{\min}

Lemma 2. For any $\tau_1, \tau_2 \subset [p], \beta_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau_1|}, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau_2|}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_1}^\top \beta_1 + \epsilon > 0\} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_2}^\top \beta_2 + \epsilon > 0\}) = \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{X,Y|\tau_1,\beta_1}, \mathbb{P}_{X,Y|\tau_2,\beta_2}).$$

Proof. Denote F_ϵ to be the CDF of ϵ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_1}^\top \beta_1 + \epsilon > 0\} \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_{\tau_2}^\top \beta_2 + \epsilon > 0\}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}(-X_{\tau_1}^\top \beta_1 < \epsilon \leq -X_{\tau_2}^\top \beta_2 | X) + \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}(-X_{\tau_2}^\top \beta_2 < \epsilon \leq -X_{\tau_1}^\top \beta_1 | X) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| F_\epsilon(-X_{\tau_1}^\top \beta_1) - F_\epsilon(-X_{\tau_2}^\top \beta_2) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \mathbb{P}_{Y|X,(\tau_1,\beta_1)}(Y = 1 | X) - \mathbb{P}_{Y|X,(\tau_2,\beta_2)}(Y = 1 | X) \right| \\ &= \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{(\tau_1,\beta_1)}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau_2,\beta_2)}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 3. Denote $\beta_{\min} = \min_{j \in \tau_0} |\beta_{0,j}|$. Assume $\|X\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi$, $\|\beta_0\|_2 \leq B$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbb{E}XX^\top) \geq C$ with ξ, B and C are positive constants, then

$$\inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \frac{\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau,\beta_\tau)})}{\sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|}} \gtrsim \beta_{\min}.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_{\theta_0}, \mathbb{P}_{(\tau,\beta_\tau)}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau}} \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left| \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}}} - \frac{1}{1 + e^{-X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau}} \right| \{ \mathbb{1}\{|X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau| \leq 2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|\} + \mathbb{1}\{|X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau| > 2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|\} \} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E} |X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau| \frac{e^{-2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|}}{(1 + e^{-2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|})^2} \mathbb{1}\{|X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau| \leq 2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|\} \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} |X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}| \frac{e^{-2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|}}{(1 + e^{-2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|})^2} \mathbb{1}\{|X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau| > 2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|\} \\ &\geq \frac{(\mathbb{E} \min\{|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau|, |X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|\})^{1/2})^2}{\mathbb{E}(1 + e^{-2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|})^2 e^{2|X_{\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0}|}} \\ &\geq \beta_{\min} \inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \left(\mathbb{E} \min \left\{ \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau \right|, \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right| \right\}^{1/2} \right)^2 e^{-c\|\beta_0\|_2^2 \xi^2 / 4}. \end{aligned}$$

For $\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s$, there exists $b \in \mathbb{R}^p, \|b\|_0 \leq 2s$ such that $X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau = X^\top b$. For any $j \in \tau_0 \setminus \tau$, we have $|b_j| = \frac{|\beta_{0,j}|}{\beta_{\min}} \geq 1$, therefore $\|b\|_2 \geq \sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|}$. Similarly $\left\| \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right\|_2 \geq \sqrt{s}$.

Note that

$$\sup_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq 2s, \|\beta\|_1 = 1} \mathbb{P}\left(|X^\top \beta| \leq \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2}\right) \leq \sup_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq 2s, \|\beta\|_1 = 1} \frac{C^2}{4\beta^\top \mathbb{E} X X^\top \beta} \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \mathbb{E} \min \left\{ \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau \right|, \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right| \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \geq \inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \mathbb{E} \min \left\{ \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau \right|, \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right| \right\}^{1/2} \\ & \quad \cdot \mathbb{1} \left\{ \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau \right| > \sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2}, \left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right| > \sqrt{s} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2} \right\} \\ & \geq \frac{C^{1/4}}{\sqrt{2}} |\tau_0 \setminus \tau|^{1/4} \inf_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \neq \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}} \left(1 - \mathbb{P} \left(\left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} - X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau \right| \leq \sqrt{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2} \right) \right. \\ & \quad \left. - \mathbb{P} \left(\left| X_{\tau_0}^\top \frac{\beta_{0,\tau_0}}{\beta_{\min}} \right| \leq \sqrt{s} \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2} \right) \right) \\ & \geq \frac{C^{1/4}}{\sqrt{2}} |\tau_0 \setminus \tau|^{1/4} \left(1 - 2 \sup_{\|\beta\|_0 \leq 2s, \|\beta\|_2 = 1} \mathbb{P}(|X^\top \beta| \leq \frac{\sqrt{C}}{2}) \right) \\ & \geq \frac{C^{1/4}}{2\sqrt{2}} |\tau_0 \setminus \tau|^{1/4}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining terms completes the proof. \square

A.2 Proofs in Section 3.1

The following lemma follows from the Fundamental Theorem of Learning Theory (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David 2014)

Lemma 4. *For any $\tau \subset [p]$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}(\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) \geq \eta) \\ & \leq (1 - e^{-\frac{n\eta}{8}})^{-1} \left\{ 2^{|\tau|+1} \vee \left(\frac{2en}{|\tau|+1} \right)^{|\tau|+1} \right\} 2^{-\frac{n\eta}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Lemma 4. Suppose we have another sample $\tilde{S} = \{(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{\epsilon}_i, \tilde{Y}_i) : i \in [n]\}$ that is i.i.d. with $S = \{(X_i^{obs}, \epsilon_i^{rel}, y_i^{obs}) : i \in [n]\}$. Denote

$$A = \{\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) \geq \eta\},$$

$$B = \{\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2}\}.$$

Conditioning on event A , we denote $\hat{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}$, $\hat{\sigma} \geq 0$ to be the coefficients satisfy A . Given S and A , $\mathbb{1}\{\tilde{Y} \neq \mathbb{1}\{\tilde{X}_\tau^\top \hat{\beta}_\tau + \hat{\sigma} \tilde{\epsilon} > 0\}\}$ is a Bernoulli random variable with parameter $\rho = L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \hat{\beta}_\tau, \hat{\sigma}) \geq \eta$, using Chernoff bound in multiplicative form (Hoeffding, 1994), we have

$$\mathbb{P}(B^c|A) \leq \mathbb{P}(L_n(\tau, \hat{\beta}_\tau, \hat{\sigma}|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \leq \frac{1}{2}L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \hat{\beta}_\tau, \sigma)|A) \leq \mathbb{E}e^{-\frac{n\rho}{8}} \leq e^{-\frac{n\eta}{8}}.$$

Then

$$\mathbb{P}(B) \geq \mathbb{P}(B|A)\mathbb{P}(A) \geq (1 - e^{-\frac{n\eta}{8}})\mathbb{P}(A).$$

Now conditioning on $S \cup \tilde{S}$, we construct T and \tilde{T} by randomly partitioning $S \cup \tilde{S}$ into two sets with equal sizes. We also denote

$$L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|T) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(X, \epsilon, Y) \in T} \mathbb{1}\{Y \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau + \sigma \epsilon > 0\}\},$$

$$L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\tilde{T}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{(X, \epsilon, Y) \in \tilde{T}} \mathbb{1}\{Y \neq \mathbb{1}\{X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau + \sigma \epsilon > 0\}\},$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(B) &= \mathbb{E}_{S \cup \tilde{S}} \mathbb{P}(\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}, \tilde{\mathbf{Y}}, \tilde{\epsilon}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2} | S \cup \tilde{S}) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{S \cup \tilde{S}} \mathbb{P}(\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|T) = 0, L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\tilde{T}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2} | S \cup \tilde{S}). \end{aligned}$$

Conditioning on $S \cup \tilde{S}$, instead of considering β_τ directly, we study the evaluation of the classifiers $\mathbb{1}\{X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau + \sigma \epsilon > 0\}$ on samples in $S \cup \tilde{S}$, then by Sauer's Lemma (Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014), the total number of labellings of $\mathbb{1}\{X_\tau^\top \beta_\tau + \sigma \epsilon > 0\}, \forall \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0$ on $S \cup \tilde{S}$ is less than $2^{|\tau|+1} \vee \left(\frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}\right)^{|\tau|+1}$

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|T) = 0, L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\tilde{T}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2} | S \cup \tilde{S}) \\ &\leq \left\{ 2^{|\tau|+1} \vee \left(\frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}\right)^{|\tau|+1} \right\} \sup_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|T) = 0, L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma|\tilde{T}) \geq \frac{\eta}{2} | S \cup \tilde{S}) \\ &\leq \left\{ 2^{|\tau|+1} \vee \left(\frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}\right)^{|\tau|+1} \right\} 2^{-\frac{n\eta}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where to derive the last inequality, we assume the total number of errors of β_τ on $S \cup \tilde{S}$ to be $m \in [\frac{n\eta}{2}, n]$, then the probability that all the m wrong samples are in \tilde{T} is $\binom{n}{m} / \binom{2n}{m} \leq 2^{-m} \leq 2^{-\frac{n\eta}{2}}$.

In conclusion, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(A) \leq (1 - e^{-\frac{n\eta}{8}})^{-1} \left\{ 2^{|\tau|+1} \vee \left(\frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}\right)^{|\tau|+1} \right\} 2^{-\frac{n\eta}{2}}.$$

□

Proof of Lemma 1. Since τ_0 is one of the minimizers of problem (4), we know the minimum is 0. Denote

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{c}_{\min} &= \min_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \not\supset \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - \frac{2|\tau|+2}{n} \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}}{|\tau_0 \setminus \tau|}, \\ c_{\min} &= \min_{|\tau| \leq s, \tau \not\supset \tau_0, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} \frac{L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) - \frac{2|\tau|+2}{n} \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}}{|\tau| \vee 1},\end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}& \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{\tau \not\supset \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^p, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0\right) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(\exists \tau \not\supset \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, \\ & \quad L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) \geq \inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma)) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tau \not\supset \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s} \mathbb{P}(\exists \beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0 \text{ s.t. } L_n(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \epsilon) = 0, \\ & \quad L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) \geq \inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma)) \\ &\triangleq T.\end{aligned}$$

On the one hand, noting that $\sum_{l=0}^r \binom{p-s}{l} \leq \left(\frac{e(p-s)}{r}\right)^r$, $\binom{s}{r} \leq s^r$, $s(p-s) \leq \frac{p^2}{4}$, if we divide $|\tau|$ into $j = |\tau_0 \cap \tau|$ and $l = |\tau \setminus \tau_0|$, then applying Lemma 4 gives

$$\begin{aligned}T &\lesssim \sum_{\tau \not\supset \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n \inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) + (|\tau|+1) \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}} \\ &\leq \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \sum_{l=0}^{s-j} \binom{s}{j} \binom{p-s}{l} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n(s-j)\tilde{c}_{\min}} \\ &\leq \sum_{r=1}^{r=s-j} s^r 2^{-\frac{1}{2}nr\tilde{c}_{\min}} \sum_{l=0}^r \binom{p-s}{l} \\ &\leq \sum_{r=1}^s 2^{-r(\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} - \log_2(es(p-s)))} \\ &\leq \frac{2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + \log_2(es(p-s))}}{1 - 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + \log_2(es(p-s))}} \\ &\leq 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + \log_2(es(p-s)) + 1} \\ &\lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + 2\log_2 p}.\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, similarly we denote $j = |\tau|$, then

$$T \lesssim \sum_{\tau \not\supset \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n \inf_{\beta_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\theta_0}(\tau, \beta_\tau, \sigma) + (|\tau|+1) \log_2 \frac{2en}{|\tau|+1}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^s \binom{p}{j} 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n(j \vee 1)c_{\min}} \\
&\leq \sum_{j=0}^s 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n(j \vee 1)c_{\min} + j \log_2 p} \\
&\lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}nc_{\min} + \log_2 p}.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1. If we denote

$$A = \{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* : -X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0} < \epsilon_i^* \leq \epsilon_i \text{ or } \epsilon_i \leq \epsilon_i^* \leq -X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}\},$$

then we have the following decomposition

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \leq \mathbb{P}(\{\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}\} \cap (\cup_{j \in [d]} \{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)} \in A\})) + \mathbb{P}(\cap_{j \in [d]} \{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)} \notin A\}) = T_1 + T_2.$$

Note that for any $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* \in A$, we have

$$y_i = \mathbb{1}(X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0} + \epsilon_i^* > 0), \quad \epsilon_i^* - \epsilon_i \begin{cases} \leq 0 & \text{if } y_i = 1, \\ \geq 0 & \text{if } y_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

Then for all $\tau \subset [p], \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{1}(y_i \neq \mathbb{1}(X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i^* > 0)) \\
&= \mathbb{1}(y_i = 1, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i^* \leq 0) + \mathbb{1}(y_i = 0, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i^* > 0) \\
&= \mathbb{1}(y_i = 1, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i + \sigma(\epsilon_i^* - \epsilon_i) \leq 0) + \mathbb{1}(y_i = 0, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i + \sigma(\epsilon_i^* - \epsilon_i) > 0) \\
&\geq \mathbb{1}(y_i = 1, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i \leq 0) + \mathbb{1}(y_i = 0, X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i > 0) \\
&= \mathbb{1}(y_i \neq \mathbb{1}(X_{i,\tau}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau + \sigma \epsilon_i > 0)),
\end{aligned}$$

then we can control term T_1 as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 &\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* \in A \text{ s.t. } \tau_0 \neq \arg \min_{|\tau| \leq s} \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*)) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\exists \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* \in A \text{ s.t. } \inf_{\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \leq L_n(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 1 | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*)) \\
&= \mathbb{P}(\exists \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* \in A \text{ s.t. } \inf_{\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) = 0) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}(\inf_{\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}) = 0) \\
&\lesssim 2^{-\frac{1}{2}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + 2\log_2 p} \wedge 2^{-\frac{1}{2}nc_{\min} + \log_2 p},
\end{aligned}$$

where we have used Lemma 1 in the last inequality.

For term T_2 , denote $F_\epsilon(z) = (1 + e^{-z})^{-1}$ to be the CDF of logistic distribution, then

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 &= (1 - \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^* \in A))^d \\ &= (1 - \{\mathbb{P}(-X_{\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0} < \epsilon^* \leq \epsilon \text{ or } \epsilon \leq \epsilon^* \leq -X_{\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0})\}^n)^d \\ &= (1 - \{\mathbb{E}|F_\epsilon(\epsilon) - F_\epsilon(-X_{\tau_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0})|\}^n)^d, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last equation, we have used the fact that ϵ^* is independent of Y, X . Combining terms completes the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. For any $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*$ independent of the observed data, by Theorem 4.10 and Example 5.24 in [Wainwright \(2019\)](#), given any $\tau \subset [p]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^\tau, \sigma \geq 0} |L_n - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}|(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \vee |L_n - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}|(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 0 | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*)\right) \\ &\quad \geq c\sqrt{\frac{|\tau| + 1}{n}} + \delta) \\ &\leq e^{-\frac{n\delta^2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then we can control the probability of false model selection as

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \neq \tau_0) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_n(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \leq L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, n}(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 0 | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*)\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tau \neq \tau_0, |\tau| \leq s} \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 0 | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*)\right) \\ &\quad \leq 2 \sup_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} |L_n - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}|(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \vee |L_n - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}|(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 0 | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \\ &\leq \sum_{\tau \neq \tau_0, \sigma \geq 0} e^{-\frac{n}{8} \left\{ \inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau \in \mathbb{R}^{|\tau|}, \sigma \geq 0} L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\tau, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\tau, \sigma | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) - L_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0}(\tau_0, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{0,\tau_0}, 0 | \mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) - c\sqrt{\frac{|\tau| + 1}{n}} \right\}^2} \\ &= T. \end{aligned}$$

Similar with the proof of Lemma 1, on the one hand, if we denote $j = |\tau_0 \cap \tau|, l = |\tau \setminus \tau_0|$, then

$$T \leq \sum_{j=0}^{s-1} \sum_{l=0}^{s-j} \binom{s}{j} \binom{p-s}{l} e^{-\frac{n}{8}(s-j)\tilde{c}_{\min}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8}n\tilde{c}_{\min} + 2\log p}.$$

On the other hand, if we denote $j = |\tau|$, then

$$T \leq \sum_{j=0}^s \binom{p}{j} e^{-\frac{1}{8}n(j \vee 1)c_{\min}} \lesssim e^{-\frac{1}{8}nc_{\min} + \log p}.$$

Suppose $\mathcal{C} = \{\hat{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)}) : \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^{*(j)} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \text{Logistic}, i \in [n], j \in [d]\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^*) \neq \tau_0) \lesssim e^{-\frac{n}{8}\tilde{c}_{\min}+2\log p} \wedge e^{-\frac{n}{8}nc_{\min}+\log p}, \\ \mathbb{P}(\mathcal{C} \neq \{\tau_0\}) &\leq \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}(\hat{\tau}(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)}) \neq \tau_0) \lesssim e^{-\frac{n}{8}\tilde{c}_{\min}+2\log p+\log d} \wedge e^{-\frac{n}{8}c_{\min}+\log p+\log d}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

To prove Theorem 3, we need the following lemma from [Berend and Kontorovich \(2012\)](#).

Lemma 5 (Theorem 2 in [Berend and Kontorovich \(2012\)](#)). *For every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, distribution \mathbb{P} with support on k elements and its empirical version $\hat{\mathbb{P}}$ based on m samples, we have*

$$\mathbb{P}(\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) > \delta) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{m}{2}\left(2\delta - \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}}\right)^2\right), \quad 2\delta \geq \sqrt{\frac{k}{m}}.$$

Proof of Theorem 3.

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \Gamma_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \Gamma_{\alpha}^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}), \tau_0 \in \mathcal{C}) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}(\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}, \tau_0) \geq \alpha) + \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \\ &= T_1 + T_2. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\mathbb{P}_{\tau}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}$ to be the probabilities with respect to τ with distribution $P_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}, \hat{P}_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}$, respectively. And for simplicity, we also compress $P_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}, \hat{P}_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}$ as P, \hat{P} , respectively. Then the nuclear statistic $\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau_0)$ can be expressed as

$$\tilde{T}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau_0) = \hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau_0))).$$

Note that P only counts the randomness of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{rel}$ conditional on \mathbf{X} , therefore it is still random. Since $\tilde{\tau}(\mathbf{X}^{obs}, \mathbf{y}^{obs}, \tau_0)$ is a realization from $P_{\tau_0, \beta_0, \tau_0}$, then we can rewrite T_1 as

$$T_1 = \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \geq \alpha),$$

where \mathbb{E} includes the randomness of both the Monte Carlo samples $\{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{*(j)} : j \in [m]\}$ and the covariates \mathbf{X} . By the property of CDF, we know

$$\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \geq \alpha) = \hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) \leq \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \leq 1 - \alpha) \leq 1 - \alpha \quad \text{a.s..}$$

Then

$$T_1 = \mathbb{E}\mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \geq \alpha) - \mathbb{E}\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \geq \alpha) + \mathbb{E}\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tilde{\tau}}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}_{\tau}(\hat{P}(\tau) > \hat{P}(\tilde{\tau})) \geq \alpha)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_\tau, \hat{\mathbb{P}}_\tau) + 1 - \alpha.$$

By construction, P and \hat{P} have supports on at most $\sum_{j=0}^s \binom{p}{j} \leq \left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s$ elements, then we can control the expected total variation term using Lemma 5 as

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \mathbb{1} \left\{ \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \leq \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} \right\} + \mathbb{E} \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) \mathbb{1} \left\{ \text{TV}(\mathbb{P}, \hat{\mathbb{P}}) > \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} \right\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} + \int_{\sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}}}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}(\text{TV}(\mathbb{P}_\tau, \hat{\mathbb{P}}_\tau) > t) dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} + \int_{\sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}}}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{m}{2} \left(2t - \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{m}}\right)^2} dt \\ &= \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8m}}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \Gamma_\alpha^{\tau_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \leq 1 - \alpha + \sqrt{\frac{\left(\frac{ep}{s}\right)^s}{4m}} + \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{8m}} + \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}).$$

Together with Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, we conclude the proof. \square

A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Lemma 6. For any fixed $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times s}$ with $BB^\top = I_{d_1}$, denote $\mathcal{B}_{d_1} = \{a \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1} : \|a\|_2 = 1\}$ to be the unit sphere in \mathbb{R}^{d_1} , then

$$\sup_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| a^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} b^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} c^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} \right| = O_P(n + \sqrt{nd_1} + (d_1 \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}).$$

Proof of Lemma 6. Note that for any $a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}$, we have

$$\left\| a^\top B X_{\tau_0} b^\top B X_{\tau_0} c^\top B X_{\tau_0} \right\|_{\psi_{2/3}} \leq \xi^3,$$

$$\left\| \left(a^\top B X_{\tau_0} b^\top B X_{\tau_0} c^\top B X_{\tau_0} \right)^2 \right\|_{\psi_{1/3}} \leq \xi^6.$$

Denote $\mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ to be the $\frac{1}{4}$ -net of \mathcal{B}_{d_1} , then $\log |\mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}| \lesssim d_1$. For any $a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}$, there exist $\tilde{a}, \tilde{b}, \tilde{c} \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ such that $\|a - \tilde{a}\|_2, \|b - \tilde{b}\|_2, \|c - \tilde{c}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} b^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} c^\top B X_{i, \tau_0}| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^n |\tilde{a}^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} \tilde{b}^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} \tilde{c}^\top B X_{i, \tau_0}| + \frac{61}{64} \sup_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} b^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} c^\top B X_{i, \tau_0}|. \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum over $a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}$, we get

$$\sup_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| \leq \frac{64}{3} \max_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}|.$$

By Theorem 3.4 in [Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty \(2022\)](#), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| - \mathbb{E} |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| \right\} \\ &= O_P(\sqrt{nd_1} + (\log n)^{\frac{3}{2}} d_1^{\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1}} \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| \\ & \leq \frac{64}{3} \max_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}} \sum_{i=1}^n |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| \\ & \leq \frac{64}{3} \max_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}} n \mathbb{E} |a^\top BX_{\tau_0} b^\top BX_{\tau_0} c^\top BX_{\tau_0}| \\ & \quad + \max_{a, b, c \in \mathcal{N}_{\frac{1}{4}}} \frac{64}{3} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| - \mathbb{E} |a^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} b^\top BX_{i, \tau_0} c^\top BX_{i, \tau_0}| \right\} \\ &= O_P(n + \sqrt{nd_1} + (d_1 \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7. For $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times s}$, $d_1 \in [s]$ with $BB^\top = I_{d_1}$, denote

$$\hat{H}_{\tau_0} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0}}{(1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0})^2} BX_{i, \tau_0} X_{i, \tau_0}^\top B^\top,$$

then with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-cd_1}$,

$$\left\| \hat{H}_{\tau_0} - \mathbb{E} \hat{H}_{\tau_0} \right\|_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sqrt{(c+1)d_1 n} + (c+1)d_1.$$

Proof of Lemma 7. Take \mathcal{N}_{d_1} to be the $\frac{1}{4}$ -nets of the unit ball \mathcal{B}_{d_1} in \mathbb{R}^{d_1} . As in [Fan et al. \(2021\)](#), if we denote

$$\Phi(A) = \max_{(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}_{d_1} \times \mathcal{N}_{d_1}} u^\top A v,$$

we have

$$\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{16}{7} \Phi(A).$$

To see this, for any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{B}_{d_1} \times \mathcal{B}_{d_1}$, there exist $(u_1, v_1) \in \mathcal{N}_{d_1} \times \mathcal{N}_{d_1}$ such that $\|u - u_1\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}, \|v - v_1\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{4}$,

$$\begin{aligned} u^\top Av &= u_1^\top Av_1 + (u - u_1)^\top Av_1 + u_1^\top A(v - v_1) + (u - u_1)^\top A(v - v_1) \\ &\leq \Phi(A) + \left(\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{16}\right) \|A\|_{\text{op}}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking supremum on both sides yields the result.

Fix any $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}_{d_1} \times \mathcal{N}_{d_1}$ and denote $G_i = \frac{e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0}}{(1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0})^2} u^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} X_{i, \tau_0}^\top B^\top v$, then

$$\|G_i\|_{\psi_1} \leq \left\| u^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} \right\|_{\psi_2} \left\| v^\top B X_{i, \tau_0} \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi^2.$$

By Bernstein's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{H}_{\tau_0} - \mathbb{E}\hat{H}_{\tau_0}| \gtrsim (\sqrt{nt} + t)\xi^2\right) \leq 2e^{-t}.$$

Applying union bound over $(u, v) \in \mathcal{N}_{d_1} \times \mathcal{N}_{d_1}$ and take $t = d_1(2\log 8 + c)$, we have with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-cd_1}$,

$$\left\| \hat{H}_{\tau_0} - \mathbb{E}\hat{H}_{\tau_0} \right\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{16}{7} \Phi(\hat{H}_{\tau_0} - \mathbb{E}\hat{H}_{\tau_0}) \lesssim \sqrt{(c+1)d_1 n} + (c+1)d_1.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4. Given the true model τ_0 , without loss of generality, we assume $A_{\cdot\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}$, $A_{\cdot\tau_0} A_{\cdot\tau_0}^\top = I_r$ with $r = r(\tau_0)$. Denote $\tilde{A} = A_{\cdot\tau_0}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{(s-r) \times s}$ satisfies (\tilde{A}^\top, B^\top) to be an orthogonal matrix. Then the null parameter space is

$$\Theta_0 = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : A\beta = t, \beta_{\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}\} = \{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p : \beta_{\tau_0} = \tilde{A}^\top t + B^\top v, \beta_{\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}\}.$$

For $\beta \in \Theta_0$ with $\beta_{\tau_0} = \tilde{A}^\top t + B^\top v, \beta_{\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_v l(\beta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i B X_{i, \tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta}}, \\ \nabla_{vv}^2 l(\beta) &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta}}{(1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta})^2} B X_{i, \tau_0} X_{i, \tau_0}^\top B^\top. \end{aligned}$$

For the MLE $\hat{b}_0 \in \Theta_0$ under null with $\hat{b}_{0, \tau_0} = \tilde{A}^\top t + B^\top \hat{v}$, we have

$$\nabla_v l(\hat{b}_0) = 0.$$

Suppose $\beta_{0, \tau_0} = \tilde{A}^\top t + B^\top v_0$, to control the error of \hat{v} for v_0 , note that if $l(\beta_0) > l(\beta)$ for all $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_c = \{\beta : \beta_{\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}, \beta_{\tau_0} = \beta_{0, \tau_0} + B^\top \Delta v, \|\Delta v\|_2 = c\sqrt{\frac{s-r}{n}}\}$, by the concavity of l , we have $\|\hat{v} - v_0\|_2 \leq c\sqrt{\frac{s-r}{n}}$. For $\beta \in \mathcal{B}_c$, there exists $\tilde{\beta}$ between β and β_0 , such that

$$l(\beta) - l(\beta_0)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \nabla_v^\top l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \Delta_v + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_v^\top \nabla_{vv}^2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \Delta_v \\
&\leq \|\nabla_v l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_2 c \sqrt{\frac{s-r}{n}} - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\min}(-\nabla_{vv}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) c^2 \frac{s-r}{n} + \frac{1}{2} \Delta_v^\top (\nabla_{vv}^2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \nabla_{vv}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) \Delta_v \\
&= T_1 + T_2 + T_3.
\end{aligned}$$

For T_1 , since

$$\left\| \frac{y_i B X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0}} \right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \|B X_{i,\tau_0}\|_{\psi_2} \leq \xi, \quad \mathbb{E} \nabla_v l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) = 0,$$

it follows from sub-Gaussian concentration inequality that

$$\|\nabla_v l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sqrt{n}.$$

Then, by Lemma 1 in [Jin et al. \(2019\)](#), we know with high probability

$$T_1 \lesssim c(s-r).$$

By Lemma 7, we can control T_2 as follows with high probability

$$|T_2| \gtrsim c^2(s-r).$$

Denote $g(z) = \frac{e^z}{(1+e^z)^2}$, we have $|g'(z)| \leq \frac{1}{4}$. By Lemma 1 in [Jin et al. \(2019\)](#),

$$\begin{aligned}
\| \|B X_{i,\tau_0}\|_2 \|_{\psi_2} &\leq \| \|B X_{i,\tau_0} - \mathbb{E} B X_{i,\tau_0}\|_2 \|_{\psi_2} + \| \| \mathbb{E} B X_{i,\tau_0} \|_2 \|_{\psi_2} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{s-r}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $(s \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}} \lesssim n$, by Lemma 6, we have that with high probability

$$\begin{aligned}
T_3 &= \frac{1}{2} \Delta_v^\top (\nabla_{vv}^2(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - \nabla_{vv}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) \Delta_v \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} (g(y_i X_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) - g(y_i X_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0)) (X_{i,\tau_0}^\top B^\top \Delta_v)^2 \\
&\leq \frac{1}{8} \sum_{i=1}^{n_0} |X_{i,\tau_0}^\top B^\top \Delta_v|^3 \\
&\lesssim (n + \sqrt{n(s-r)} + ((s-r) \log n)^{\frac{3}{2}}) \|\Delta_v\|_2^3 \\
&\lesssim c^3 \sqrt{\frac{(s-r)^3}{n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then

$$l(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0) \lesssim c(s-r) - c^2(s-r) + c^3 \sqrt{\frac{(s-r)^3}{n}}.$$

Since $n \gg s-r$, by choosing $c \asymp 1$ large enough, with high probability, it happens

$$l(\boldsymbol{\beta}) < l(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0),$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned}\|\hat{v} - v_0\|_2 &= O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s-r}{n}}\right), \\ \|\hat{b}_0 - \beta_0\|_2 &= \|B^\top(\hat{v} - v_0)\|_2 = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s-r}{n}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Note that for $\beta \in \Theta_0$,

$$\begin{aligned}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i \tilde{A}^\top \tilde{A} X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta}} + \frac{y_i B^\top B X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta}}, \\ \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta) &= - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta}}{(1 + e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta})^2} X_{i,\tau_0} X_{i,\tau_0}^\top.\end{aligned}$$

If we denote $u = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{y_i \tilde{A} X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \hat{b}_0}}$, then

$$\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\hat{b}_0) = \tilde{A}^\top u.$$

By Taylor expansion,

$$\tilde{A}^\top u = \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\hat{b}_0) = \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta_0) + \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta_0) (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) + R \quad (7)$$

with

$$R_j = (\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}) - \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta_0))_j \cdot (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0})$$

for some $\tilde{\beta}^{(j)}$ between \hat{b}_0 and β_0 , $j \in [s]$. Then for some $t_i^{(j)}$ between $y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(j)}$ and $y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta_0$, $i \in [n], j \in [s]$, by Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned}\|R\|_\infty &= \max_{j \in [s]} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (g(y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(j)}) - g(y_i X_{i,\tau_0}^\top \beta_{0,\tau_0})) X_{i,\tau_0,j} X_{i,\tau_0}^\top (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) \right| \\ &= \max_{j \in [s]} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| g'(t_i^{(j)}) X_{i,\tau_0,j} (\tilde{\beta}^{(j)} - \beta_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{4} \max_{j \in [s]} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| X_{i,\tau_0,j} (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} \right| \\ &= O_P(s-r),\end{aligned}$$

therefore

$$\|R\|_2 \leq \sqrt{s} \|R\|_\infty = O_P(\sqrt{s}(s-r)).$$

Denote $H = -\mathbb{E} \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta_0)$, $\hat{H} = -\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0} \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta_0)$, by the same argument with Lemma 7, we know

$$\|H\|_{\text{op}} \asymp n, \quad \left\| \hat{H} - H \right\|_{\text{op}} = O_P(\sqrt{sn}).$$

Then by Equation (7),

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) \\
&= \sqrt{n}H^{-1}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) - \sqrt{n}H^{-1}\tilde{A}^\top u + \sqrt{n}H^{-1}(\hat{H} - H)(\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) + \sqrt{n}H^{-1}R \quad (8) \\
&= \sqrt{n}H^{-1}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) - \sqrt{n}H^{-1}\tilde{A}^\top u + \tilde{R},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\|\tilde{R}\|_2 = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}}(s-r)\right).$$

Multiplying both sides of Equation (8) from the left by \tilde{A} , since $\tilde{A}\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} = t = \tilde{A}\beta_{0,\tau_0}$, we get

$$u = (\tilde{A}H^{-1}\tilde{A}^\top)^{-1}\tilde{A}H^{-1}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\tilde{A}H^{-1}\tilde{A}^\top)^{-1}\tilde{A}\tilde{R}.$$

Plugging back to Equation (8), if we denote

$$P = H^{-1/2}\tilde{A}^\top(\tilde{A}H^{-1}\tilde{A}^\top)^{-1}\tilde{A}H^{-1/2}, \quad Q = I_s - P,$$

we get

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_{0,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) = \sqrt{n}H^{-1/2}QH^{-1/2}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) + H^{-1/2}QH^{1/2}\tilde{R}.$$

Similarly, if we denote \hat{b}_1 as the MLE in $\Theta = \{\beta : \beta_{\tau_0^c} = \mathbf{0}\}$, then

$$\|\hat{b}_1 - \beta_0\|_2 = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}}\right), \quad \sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \beta_{0,\tau_0}) = \sqrt{n}H^{-1}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) + \hat{R},$$

with

$$\|\hat{R}\|_2 = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{s^3}{n}}\right).$$

Therefore

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}) = \sqrt{n}H^{-1/2}PH^{-1/2}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0) + \hat{R} - H^{-1/2}QH^{1/2}\tilde{R},$$

if we denote the SVD of $P = UU^\top$ with $U^\top U = I_r$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_0\|_2 &\leq \left\|H^{-1/2}PH^{-1/2}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0)\right\|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\|\hat{R}\|_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left\|H^{-1/2}QH^{1/2}\tilde{R}\right\|_2 \\
&= O_P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\left\|U^\top H^{-1/2}\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}l(\beta_0)\right\|_2 + \frac{\sqrt{s^3}}{n} + \frac{(s-r)\sqrt{s}}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\left\|\frac{y_i U^\top H^{-1/2} X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0}}\right\|_{\psi_2} \leq \left\|H^{-1/2}\right\|_{\text{op}} \xi \lesssim \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}},$$

we know from sub-Gaussian concentration inequality that

$$\left\| U^\top H^{-1/2} \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta_0) \right\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim 1,$$

then Lemma 1 in [Jin et al. \(2019\)](#) implies

$$\left\| U^\top H^{-1/2} \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta_0) \right\|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{r}).$$

So

$$\left\| \hat{b}_1 - \hat{b}_0 \right\|_2 = O_P\left(\sqrt{\frac{r}{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{s^3}}{n}\right).$$

Then for some $\tilde{\beta}$ between \hat{b}_0 and \hat{b}_1 , we can control the log-likelihood ratio test statistic as

$$\begin{aligned} & -2(l(\hat{b}_0) - l(\hat{b}_1)) \\ &= -(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\tilde{\beta})(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}) \\ &= (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top H(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}) - (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top (H + \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\tilde{\beta}))(\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}) \\ &= \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}}^\top l(\beta_0) H^{-1/2} P H^{-1/2} \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta_0) + \tilde{R}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{R} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} (\hat{R} - H^{-1/2} Q H^{-1/2} \tilde{R}) H^{1/2} P H^{-1/2} \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}} l(\beta_0) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n} (\hat{R} - H^{-1/2} Q H^{-1/2} \tilde{R})^\top H (\hat{R} - H^{-1/2} Q H^{-1/2} \tilde{R}) \\ &\quad - (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top (H + \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\tilde{\beta})) (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}). \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 6, we can find t_i between $y_i X_i^\top \beta_0$ and $y_i X_i^\top \tilde{\beta}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top (\nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\beta_0) - \nabla_{\beta_{\tau_0}, \beta_{\tau_0}}^2 l(\tilde{\beta})) (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0}) \right| \\ & \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \left| g'(t_i) (\beta_{0,\tau_0} - \tilde{\beta}_{\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| (\beta_{0,\tau_0} - \tilde{\beta}_{\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} (\hat{b}_{1,\tau_0} - \hat{b}_{0,\tau_0})^\top X_{i,\tau_0} \right| \\ & = O_P\left(\frac{r\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{s^{7/2}}{n^{3/2}}\right), \end{aligned}$$

then if $n \gg \frac{s^3}{r^{1/2}}$, we have

$$\left| \tilde{R} \right| = o_P(\sqrt{r}).$$

Denote $Z_i = \frac{\sqrt{n} y_i U H^{-1/2} X_{i,\tau_0}}{1 + e^{y_i X_i^\top \beta_0}}$, we have $\text{Var}(Z_i) = I_r$, $\|Z_i\|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \xi$, therefore for any $j_1, j_2, j_3, j_4 \in [r]$,

$$\mathbb{E} |Z_{i,j_1} Z_{i,j_2} Z_{i,j_3} Z_{i,j_4}| < \infty.$$

Denote $G \sim N(0, I_r)$, $Z_i^{\otimes 3} = Z_i \otimes Z_i \otimes Z_i$ to be a tensor in $\mathbb{R}^{r^{\otimes 3}}$, by Corollary 4.10 in Wang et al. (2017),

$$\|\mathbb{E}Z_i^{\otimes 3}\|_{\text{F}} \leq r \|\mathbb{E}Z_i^{\otimes 3}\|_{\text{sp}} = r \sup_{a,b,c \in \mathcal{B}_s} \mathbb{E}a^\top Z_i b^\top Z_i c^\top Z_i \lesssim r.$$

By Lemma 1 in Jin et al. (2019), we know $\| \|Z_i\|_2 \|_{\psi_2} \lesssim \sqrt{r}$, then

$$\mathbb{E} \|Z_i\|_2^4 \lesssim r^2.$$

Then Corollary 1 in Zhilova (2022) implies

$$\sup_{c \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 \leq c \right) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq c) \right| \lesssim \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Now we can approximate the likelihood ratio test statistic as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(-2(l(\hat{b}_0) - l(\hat{b}_1)) \leq c\sqrt{r}) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq c\sqrt{r}) \\ &= \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 + \tilde{R} \leq c\sqrt{r} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq c\sqrt{r}) \\ &\leq \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{R} \leq -\delta\sqrt{r}) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r}) + \mathbb{P}(c\sqrt{r} < \|G\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r}) \\ &\leq \sup_{c \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r}) \right| \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{R} \leq -\delta\sqrt{r}) + \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(c\sqrt{r} < \|G\|_2^2 \leq (c + \delta)\sqrt{r}) \\ &\rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last step follows from Lemma S.7 in Shi et al. (2019) by letting n go to infinity then δ go to 0 from the right. Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 \leq c\sqrt{r}) - \mathbb{P}(-2(l(\hat{b}_0) - l(\hat{b}_1)) \leq c\sqrt{r}) \\ &= \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 + \tilde{R} > c\sqrt{r} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 > c\sqrt{r}) \\ &\leq \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 > (c - \delta)\sqrt{r} \right) + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{R} > \delta\sqrt{r}) \\ &\quad - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 > (c - \delta)\sqrt{r}) + \mathbb{P}((c - \delta)\sqrt{r} < \|G\|_2^2 \leq c\sqrt{r}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{c \geq 0} \left| \mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_2^2 > (c - \delta)\sqrt{r} \right) - \mathbb{P}(\|G\|_2^2 > (c - \delta)\sqrt{r}) \right| \\
&\quad + \mathbb{P}(\tilde{R} > \delta\sqrt{r}) + \sup_{c \geq 0} \mathbb{P}((c - \delta)\sqrt{r} < \|G\|_2^2 \leq c\sqrt{r}) \\
&\rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Now the confidence set satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}(A\beta_0 \in \Gamma_\alpha^{A\beta_0}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})) \geq \alpha - o(1) - \mathbb{P}(\tau_0 \notin \mathcal{C}) \rightarrow \alpha.$$

□