

---

# ADATrans: FEATURE-WISE AND SAMPLE-WISE ADAPTIVE TRANSFER LEARNING FOR HIGH-DIMENSIONAL REGRESSION

---

Zelin He \*

Ying Sun †

Jingyuan Liu ‡§

Runze Li\*

**ABSTRACT**

We consider the transfer learning problem in the high dimensional setting, where the feature dimension is larger than the sample size. To learn transferable information, which may vary across features or the source samples, we propose an adaptive transfer learning method that can detect and aggregate the feature-wise (*F-AdaTrans*) or sample-wise (*S-AdaTrans*) transferable structures. We achieve this by employing a novel fused-penalty, coupled with weights that can adapt according to the transferable structure. To choose the weight, we propose a theoretically informed, data-driven procedure, enabling *F-AdaTrans* to selectively fuse the transferable signals with the target while filtering out non-transferable signals, and *S-AdaTrans* to obtain the optimal combination of information transferred from each source sample. The non-asymptotic rates are established, which recover existing near-minimax optimal rates in special cases. The effectiveness of the proposed method is validated using both synthetic and real data.

**Keywords** Transfer Learning · High-dimensional Regression · Feature Selection · Non-asymptotic Theory

**1 Introduction**

Transfer learning is a technique that incorporates knowledge from various source tasks into a target task [Torrey and Shavlik, 2010]. This approach is especially useful in high-dimensional data analysis, such as medical imaging and genetic data analysis, where the number of features is significantly larger than the target sample size. A fundamental challenge in transfer learning, especially under the high-dimensional setting, is addressing the negative transfer issue: If different source samples are equally aggregated into the training procedure, it could lead to a significant deterioration of the estimation accuracy [Li et al., 2022, 2023a,b]. Although several studies have explored the identification of transferable samples, they often pre-select these samples prior to training via some ad-hoc fitting methods [Tian and Feng, 2022, Liu, 2023]. These methods typically result in a binary “all-or-none” decision regarding the transfer of information, which may not be optimal in practice.

In fact, we notice that in high-dimensional setting, the transferable structure often *varies across features* within the same source sample. One such example lies in the analysis of brain functional connectivity patterns [Li et al., 2018], where each source may have a distinct set of non-transferable features due to variations in brain conditions, as depicted in Fig. 1(a). In other applications, the overall source informative level *varies across source samples*, affected by factors such as data quality, reliability, and relevance to the target task. For instance, in genetic-disease association studies, due to patient demographics and measurement methodologies, source-task similarity with the target often varies in a whole-sample manner [Tang and Song, 2016, Wahlsten et al., 2003]. Fig. 1(b) illustrates such a scenario, where the darker orange color in the first source indicates that this source is more relevant to the target task while the second source is less transferable.

The above feature-specific and sample-specific transferable structures inspire us to propose an adaptive transfer learning framework under the high-dimensional setting, to adaptively adjust the information transferred from the sources to the

---

\*Department of Statistics, Pennsylvania State University.

†School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Pennsylvania State University.

‡MOE Key Laboratory of Econometrics, Department of Statistics and Data Science in School of Economics, Wang Yanan Institute for Studies in Economics, and Fujian Key Lab of Statistics, Xiamen University.

§Corresponding Author.




Figure 1: (a) Feature-specific and (b) Sample-specific transferable structure. Target signals are highlighted in blue. The shade of orange depicts amount of transferable information.

target while estimating parameters. Specifically, we present a solution for achieving *feature-* and *sample-wise* adaptive transfer learning, called *AdaTrans*, in high-dimensional linear regression involving  $K$  source tasks. The target model is  $p$ -dimensional with sparsity level  $s$ . The method is based on a novel fused-penalty that extracts the non-transferable signals from the sources and merges the transferable part with the target. We then tailor the method to address the unique challenges of feature-wise and sample-wise adaptation respectively. Our contributions are as follows.

**Feature-wise Adaptive Transfer.** For scenarios where the source samples contain different feature-wise transferable structures, we propose *F-AdaTrans*, which can detect non-transferable features for each source. We achieve this by assigning feature-wise weights to the fused-penalty in the objective function. Under mild conditions, *F-AdaTrans* converges to an “oracle” estimator, which effectively captures the overlap between the target signal set and transferable feature sets within each source.

The convergence rate of the proposed estimator is shown to be of the order  $\kappa_F \sqrt{s \log s / N}$ , where  $N = n_T + Kn_S$  is the full sample size,  $n_T$  and  $n_S$  are respectively the target and source sample size. The factor  $\kappa_F$ , ranging from  $O(1)$  to  $O(\sqrt{N/n_T})$ , quantifies the feature transferability, revealing the enhanced accuracy beyond single-task benchmarks.

**Sample-wise Adaptive Transfer.** For scenarios where the non-transferable signals are dense, we propose *S-AdaTrans* where sample-wise weights  $w$  are given to the penalty term. We prove that the estimator attains a non-asymptotic rate  $O(\kappa_S(w) \cdot s \log p / N + \bar{h}(w) \sqrt{\log p / n_T})$ . The factors  $\kappa_S(w)$  and  $\bar{h}(w)$ , dependent on  $w$ , reveal a tradeoff between the loss of effective sample size and the suppression of negative transfer. The bound recovers near minimax optimal rates in special cases, showing the tightness of our analysis. The result further provides a natural guideline for determining the weights: we show with the optimal weight, *S-AdaTrans* provably improves over the single-task benchmark, achieving robustness against negative transfer.

**Data-driven Weight Selection.** We propose data-driven methods for determining weights for both *F-AdaTrans* and *S-AdaTrans*. For *F-AdaTrans*, we introduce a weighting procedure based on the folded concave penalization [Fan and Li, 2001]. We prove that, when the non-transferable signal is detectable, this method identifies the transferable structure and obtains the oracle estimator with overwhelming probability. For *S-AdaTrans*, we implement a cross-validation-based weight selection procedure, with its effectiveness demonstrated across diverse simulation settings.

In addition, *AdaTrans* is designed to joint learn the target and all source parameters, rather than pooling the samples all together with a unified parameter vector. Thus, it can automatically account for the covariate-shift issue, which is another typical challenge for high-dimensional transfer learning.

**Related Works.** There are several transfer learning methods for high-dimensional regression problems (e.g. Li et al. [2022], Tian and Feng [2022], Li et al. [2023b], Liu [2023]). Despite the growing interest, none of existing works have considered learning features adaptively from the source. As for the sample adaptive learning, these works usually adopt a discontinuous decision strategy, where a source sample is either included or completely discarded. This fundamentally differs from our sample-adaptive method, where the weights can take continuous values. Consequently, our method includes and continuously interpolates the binary decision options, offering the opportunity to achieving a better performance by exploring a larger search space.

In the low-dimensional setting, there are some existing works focusing on adaptively learning from heterogeneous sources. For instance, sample reweighing technique has been studied in domain adaptation to align the source and

target distributions [Shimodaira, 2000, Cortes et al., 2010, Fang et al., 2020, Zhang et al., 2020, Lu et al., 2022]. When considering multiple sources, generalization error of the model parameter obtained by minimizing empirical risk weighted across the tasks has been derived [Ben-David et al., 2010, Zhang et al., 2012, Konstantinov and Lampert, 2019, Wen et al., 2020]. Then weight can be chosen by minimizing the bound. The problem has also been studied in federated learning [Hanzely et al., 2021]. Therein, adaptive methods choose weights by solving hierarchical optimization problems [Li et al., 2021, Deng et al., 2023]. While non-exhaustively listed, methods fall into the above categories are either purely computational or require estimating the source and target data probability distribution or their discrepancies. Consequently, they are not applicable in the high dimensional setting where feature dimension far exceeds the sample size.

Compared to sample-adaptive methods, the works related to feature-wise adaptive learning is scarce. One line is vertical federated learning [Yang et al., 2019], where the data is partitioned by features. The study therein focus on computation methods rather than the statistical performance.

**Notation.** Bold upper- and lower-case letters denote matrices and vectors, respectively. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ , we denote the  $i$ -th row of  $\mathbf{A}$  as  $\mathbf{A}_i$ , the column-submatrix indexed by a set  $S$  as  $\mathbf{A}_S$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_q$  as the operator norm induced by the  $q$ -norm and  $\Lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\Lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$  as its maximum and minimum eigenvalues, respectively. Set  $[K] := \{1, \dots, K\}$ . We let  $a \vee b := \max\{a, b\}$  and  $a \wedge b := \min\{a, b\}$ . We use  $c, c_0, c_1, \dots$  to denote generic constants independent of  $n, p$  and  $K$ . Let  $a_n = O(b_n)$  and  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  denote  $|a_n/b_n| \leq c$  for some constant  $c$  when  $n$  is large enough;  $a_n = o(b_n)$  or  $b_n \gg a_n$  if  $a_n = O(c_n b_n)$  for some  $c_n \rightarrow 0$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

We consider a high-dimensional transfer learning problem involving one target task and  $K$  source tasks. For the target task, we observe a sample  $(\mathbf{X}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)})$  generated from the linear model

$$\mathbf{y}^{(0)} = \mathbf{X}^{(0)}\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(0)}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{y}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T}$  is the response sample,  $\mathbf{X}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T \times p}$  is the feature matrix,  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is the target parameter of primary interest and  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(0)} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_T}$  is the observation noise. The target parameter is sparse with  $s := \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)}\|_0$  nonzero elements, and the ambient dimension  $p$  is allowed to be larger than  $n_T$ .

In addition to the primary target sample, suppose we have access to  $K$  sets of auxiliary source samples  $\{(\mathbf{X}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})\}_{k=1}^K$ , each generated from

$$\mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \mathbf{X}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)} + \boldsymbol{\delta}^{(k)}) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(k)}, \quad (2)$$

The source parameter differs from that of the target by  $\boldsymbol{\delta}^{(k)} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , which we termed as ‘‘target-source contrast’’ or ‘‘non-transferable signal’’. For simplicity, we assume the source samples share a common size, i.e.,  $n_k = n_S, \forall k \in [K]$ , which is typically larger than  $n_T$ .

Our goal is to estimate the target parameter  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(0)}$  using both target and source samples where only (a) part of source features in each source sample are transferable or (b) part of source samples are transferable, which will be discussed in Section 3 and Section 4, respectively.

This section ends with two standard assumptions on feature matrix  $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$  and observation error  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(k)}$ .

**Assumption 2.1.** For any  $0 \leq k \leq K, 0 \leq i \leq n_k, \mathbf{X}_i^{(k)}$ ’s are independent sub-Gaussian random vectors with mean zero and covariance  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(k)}$ . Furthermore, there exists some constant  $c$  such that  $1/c \leq \min_{0 \leq k \leq K} \Lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(k)}) \leq \max_{0 \leq k \leq K} \Lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{(k)}) \leq c$ .

**Assumption 2.2.** For any  $0 \leq k \leq K, 0 \leq i \leq n_k$ , the  $\epsilon_i^{(k)}$ ’s are independent Gaussian random variables with zero mean and variance  $\sigma_k$  such that  $\max_{0 \leq k \leq K} \sigma_k \leq c$  for some constant  $c$  and  $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{(k)}$  is independent of  $\mathbf{X}^{(k)}$ .

## 3 Feature-wise Adaptive Transfer Learning

In transfer learning, each source task may have its unique transferable structure: some of its features are transferable, whereas others are not. The transferability of the  $j$ th feature in the  $k$ -th source task can be assessed by the magnitude of target-source contrast  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ : If  $\delta_j^{(k)}$  is negligible, indicating the  $j$ th feature has a similar effect between the  $k$ -th source and the target, it is transferable. Conversely, if  $\delta_j^{(k)}$  is non-negligible, the corresponding feature should be treated as non-transferable.

Let  $S_0 = \{j : \beta_j^{(0)} \neq 0\}$ , depicting the sparsity structure of the primary parameter  $\beta^{(0)}$ . For  $k \in [K]$ , define  $S_k = \{j : \delta_j^{(k)} \neq 0\}$ ; then the features in the  $k$ -th source can be divided into two sets - the transferable set  $S_k^c = \{j : \delta_j^{(k)} = 0\}$ , with zero source-target contrasts, and the non-transferable set  $S_k$  with non-negligible contrasts. Note that we assume zero contrasts for the transferable sets for technical simplicity, and they can be relaxed to sufficiently small contrasts in practice.

Next we introduce a feature-wise adaptive transfer learning framework that auto-detects transferable features in each source, by assigning different penalty strengths based on the non-transferable signal  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ 's. Setting  $\delta^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ , consider the problem

$$\min_{\beta^{(0)}, \delta^{(1)}, \dots, \delta^{(K)}} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^K \|\mathbf{y}^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}^{(k)}(\beta^{(0)} + \delta^{(k)})\|_2^2 + \lambda_0 \sum_{j=1}^p w_j^{(0)} |\beta_j^{(0)}| + \lambda_1 \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^p w_j^{(k)} |\delta_j^{(k)}| \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $N = Kn_S + n_T$  is the total sample size,  $\lambda_0$  and  $\lambda_1$  are tuning parameters and  $w_j^{(k)}$ 's are the weights assigned for different non-transferable signals. The first term of (3) measures the overall fit of the models with parameters  $\{\beta^{(0)} + \delta^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^K$ , and the second term imposes a penalty to achieve sparsity of  $\beta^{(0)}$ . The third term of (3) is a fused-penalty with weights that adaptively shrinks  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ 's: Ideally, it applies stronger penalties to transferable features with negligible  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ , shrinks them to zero, so that the information from the  $j$ th feature of the  $k$ -th source is successfully transferred to help estimate  $\beta^{(0)}$ ; meanwhile, it does not impose excessive penalties to non-transferable features with relatively large  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ 's, to prevent introducing bias. Problem (3) can be written as a standard Lasso regression problem and can be efficiently solved.

We remark that the definition of transferable/informative features inverts the usual logic of penalized regression. Recall that in the penalized regression, non-informative features are penalized to zero while informative features are preserved in the model. However, for the penalties imposed on source-target contrasts  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ 's, "shrinking to zero" indeed represents a transferable feature that is "informative" to the model, while  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ 's that are not penalized to zero correspond to "non-informative" and non-transferable features.

### 3.1 Weight Choice with Known Transferable Structure

A natural question in feature-wise adaptive transfer learning is how to determine the weights  $w_j^{(k)}$ 's. To answer this, we first consider a ideal scenario where the sparsity and transferable structure are known. In this setting, we can define "oracle estimators"  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{ora}}^{(0)}, \hat{\delta}_{\text{ora}}^{(1)}, \dots, \hat{\delta}_{\text{ora}}^{(K)}$  via

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\beta^{(0)}, \{\delta^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^K} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^K \|\mathbf{y}^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}^{(k)}(\beta^{(0)} + \delta^{(k)})\|_2^2 \\ \text{s.t.} & \beta_{S_0^c}^{(0)} = 0, \delta_{S_k^c}^{(k)} = 0, \forall k \in [K]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Based on the above definition, the optimal weights in this oracle scenario should be chosen such that solving problem (3) would yield the oracle estimator in (4). The choice of such oracle weight is provided in the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Given Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, and provided that  $n_S \gtrsim \log p$ , if choose  $w_j^{(k)} = \mathbf{1}_{\{j \in S_k^c\}}$ ,  $\lambda_0 \gtrsim \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{N}}$  and  $\lambda_1 \gtrsim \frac{n_S}{N} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_S}}$ , then with probability larger than  $1 - \exp(-c_1 \log p)$ , the solution of problem (3) satisfies (4).*

Theorem 3.1 states that if we choose the weight such that only the transferable set of features are penalized, then with a sufficiently strong penalty, solving the problem (3) could yield an oracle estimator that fully utilizes the transferable structure. To better understand the oracle estimator, we denote  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0} = ((\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(0)})^\top, (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(1)})^\top, \dots, (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(K)})^\top)^\top$ , where  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(k)} = (\mathbf{I} - \mathbf{H}_{S_k}^{(k)})\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{H}_{S_k}^{(k)} := \mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}[(\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)})^\top \mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}]^{-1}(\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)})^\top$  represents the projection matrix onto the column space of  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}$ . Next, we provide the explicit form of the oracle estimator of  $\beta^{(0)}$ .

**Proposition 3.2.** *If  $|S_0| < n_T$  and  $\max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |S_k| < n_S$ , the solution to problem (4) satisfies*

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{ora}, S_0}^{(0)} = [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}]^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^\top \mathbf{y} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\beta}_{\text{ora}, S_0^c}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}, \quad (5)$$

Note that  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(k)}$  is the projection of  $\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$ , our feature matrix of interest, onto the *null space* of  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}$ , the non-transferable feature matrix. The projection essentially filters out the non-transferable components, and the ‘‘overlap’’ between  $\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$  and  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}$  represents the transferable proportion of the  $k$ -th source: if the non-transferable feature matrix  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}$  is orthogonal to the target feature matrix  $\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$ ,  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(k)} = \mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$ ; in this case, the  $k$ -th source sample is fully transferable. On the other hand, if  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)}$  is linearly related to  $\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$ , as would be the case when  $S_0 \subset S_k$ , then  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^{(k)} = 0$ , indicating that the entire  $k$ -th source is non-transferable. Thus,  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$  is indeed the collection of the ‘‘transferable part’’ of each source sample, along with the full target sample.

In the following proposition, we study the estimation error of the oracle estimator.

**Proposition 3.3.** *Under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, if  $|S_0| < n_T$ ,  $\max_{1 \leq k \leq K} |S_k| < n_S$  and  $N \geq \log p$ , the error of  $\hat{\beta}_{\text{ora}}^{(0)}$  satisfies the  $\ell_2$  bound*

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{\text{ora}}^{(0)} - \beta^{(0)}\|_2 \lesssim \kappa_F \left\| \left( \frac{\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^\top \mathbf{X}_{S_0}}{N} \right)^{-1} \right\|_\infty \sqrt{\frac{s \log s}{N}}, \quad (6)$$

with probability larger than  $1 - \exp(-c_1 \log p)$ , where  $\mathbf{X}_{S_0}$  is column-submatrix indexed by  $S_0$  of the full-sample design matrix  $\mathbf{X}$ , and

$$\kappa_F := \frac{\left\| [\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}]^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{S_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \right\|_\infty}{\left\| [\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^\top \mathbf{X}_{S_0}]^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{S_0}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \right\|_\infty}. \quad (7)$$

The term  $(s \log s / N)^{1/2}$  in (6) is nearly optimal for estimating  $\beta^{(0)}$  using the full samples of size  $N$  - it reveals the benefit of transferring the source information when estimating  $\beta^{(0)}$ .  $(\mathbf{X}_{S_0}^\top \mathbf{X}_{S_0} / N)^{-1}$  is a full-sample estimate of the precision matrix  $\Sigma_{S_0}^{-1}$  and has a bounded  $\ell_\infty$  norm. The term  $\kappa_F$  in (7) measures the transferability of source datasets. If all source datasets are transferable in the sense that  $\mathbf{X}_{S_k}^{(k)} \perp \mathbf{X}_{S_0}^{(k)}$  for all  $k \in [K]$ , then  $\kappa_F = 1$ . In this ideal case, we can utilize all information from size- $N$  full sample when estimating  $\beta^{(0)}$ . Otherwise, if all source tasks are completely non-transferable in the sense that  $S_0 \subset S_k$  for all  $k \in [K]$ , we have  $\kappa_F \asymp \sqrt{N/n_T}$ . In this case, the estimation rate becomes  $\sqrt{s \log s / n_T}$ , which is actually the single-task benchmark up to a logarithm order. Between these two extremes, each source contains both transferable and non-transferable features, hence  $\kappa_F$  reflects the proportion of transferable information among the full sample.

### 3.2 Weight Choice with Unknown Transferable Structure

We now introduce a data-driven approach to determine the weights in (3) when the non-transferable signals  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ s are unknown, which is often the case in practice. Recall that a larger penalty should be imposed on negligible  $\delta_j^{(k)}$  and a smaller penalty on non-negligible  $\delta_j^{(k)}$ . A suitable candidate for this purpose is the family of folded-concave penalties, denoted by  $\mathcal{R}_\lambda(t)$ , including SCAD [Fan and Li, 2001], MCP [Zhang, 2010], etc. See a formal definition of a folded-concave penalty in Appendix C.1. Furthermore, inspired by the local linear approximation (LLA) algorithm [Zou and Li, 2008, Fan et al., 2014], we consider the first-order Taylor approximation of the folded-concave penalties on some initial estimators:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_\lambda(\beta_j^{(0)}) &\approx \mathcal{R}'_\lambda(\beta_{\text{init},j}^{(0)})(\beta^{(0)} - \beta_{\text{init},j}^{(0)}), \\ \mathcal{R}_\lambda(\delta_j^{(k)}) &\approx \mathcal{R}'_\lambda(\delta_{\text{init},j}^{(k)})(\delta^{(k)} - \delta_{\text{init},j}^{(k)}), \quad k \in [K], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mathcal{R}'_\lambda(t)$  is the first-order derivative of  $\mathcal{R}_\lambda(t)$ . Based on this, we set the weights in (3) as  $\lambda_0 w_j^{(0)} = \mathcal{R}'_{\lambda_0}(\beta_{\text{init},j}^{(0)})$  and  $\lambda_1 w_j^{(k)} = \mathcal{R}'_{\lambda_1}(\delta_{\text{init},j}^{(k)})$ . Fig. 2 depicts the SCAD penalty function along with its derivative, which demonstrates a stronger penalty to small entries to promote sparse solutions, and a constant penalty to large entries to avoid bias.

In the next theorem, we show that with an appropriate choice of initial estimator and tuning parameters, solving the problem (3) with the proposed weight yields the oracle estimator in (4), or equivalently, Proposition 3.2. To begin with, we consider the parameter space

$$\Theta_1 = \left\{ \|\delta_{S_k}^{(k)}\|_{\min} \geq h_k^\wedge, \|\delta_{S_k^c}^{(k)}\|_{\max} = 0, k \in [K], \|\beta_{S_0}^{(0)}\|_{\min} \geq h_0^\wedge, \|\beta_{S_0^c}^{(0)}\|_{\max} = 0 \right\}, \quad (8)$$




Figure 2: Penalty Functions. SCAD (blue) and Lasso (green) shown on the left; the absolute value of their first-order derivatives are on the right.

where  $h_k^\wedge$ 's and  $h_0^\wedge$  are minimum signals, which are crucial for identifying the transferable and sparsity structure using the limited samples. In cases where this minimum signal assumption is too restrictive, one may consider the alternatives discussed in Section 4.

**Theorem 3.4.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.2, consider initial estimators satisfying for all  $k \in [K]$ ,*

$$\left\| \hat{\beta}_{init}^{(0)} - \beta^{(0)} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{a_2}{2} \lambda_0, \quad \left\| \hat{\delta}_{init}^{(k)} - \delta^{(k)} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{a_2}{2} \lambda_1. \quad (9)$$

Further assume  $n_S \gtrsim \log p$ ,  $h_k^\wedge \geq \frac{3a}{2} \lambda_1 \gtrsim n_S/N \sqrt{\log p/n_S}$ ,  $k \in [K]$  and  $h_0^\wedge \geq \frac{3a}{2} \lambda_0 \gtrsim \sqrt{\log p/N}$ , where  $a > a_2 \geq 0$  and  $a_1 \geq 0$  are constants specified in Appendix C.1. If we choose  $w_j^{(0)} = (\lambda_0)^{-1} \mathcal{R}'_{\lambda_0}(\beta_{init,j}^{(0)})$  and  $w_j^{(k)} = (\lambda_1)^{-1} \mathcal{R}'_{\lambda_1}(\delta_{init,j}^{(k)})$ , then with probability larger than  $1 - \exp(-c_1 \log p)$ , the solution of problem (3) satisfies (4).

Theorem 3.4 suggests that under certain conditions, solving the problem (3) yields the oracle estimator. The minimum signal strength condition on  $h_k^\wedge$  requires that the contrast  $\delta^{(k)}$  within the transferable set  $S_k^c$  and the non-transferable set  $S_k$  are separable. Condition (9) requires that the underlying problem is localizable. That is, it should be possible to identify an initial estimator that is accurate enough to differentiate the separated  $\delta^{(k)}$ 's. Proposition C.1 in Appendix C provides a concrete example of such an initial estimator.

In sum, Theorem 3.4 indicates that under certain conditions, the folded concave penalization-based transfer learning procedure can fully utilize the sparse nature of  $\beta^{(0)}$  and the transferable structure of source tasks for estimating  $\beta^{(0)}$ .

## 4 Sample-wise Adaptive Transfer Learning

The success of the feature-wise adaptive transfer learning relies on the assumption that the target signal is sufficiently strong and the source-target contrast possesses a transferable structure, i.e.,  $\delta^{(k)}$  is a sparse vector with  $h_k^\wedge$  sufficiently large. In applications where the source samples' quality is low or unreliable, the source parameter can deviate from that of the target significantly, yielding dense source-target contrasts. In this setting, theoretical guarantees of the feature adaptive method (3) no longer hold due to the hardness of identifying the transferable elements of the sources. To address the problem and limit the impact of less informative sources, we introduce a sample-wise adaptive transfer learning method that automatically weights the source samples according to their informative level.

Let  $w = [w_0, \dots, w_K]$  with  $w_k \geq 0$  being the weight assigned to the  $k$ -th source, and recall that  $n_k = n_S$  for  $k \in [K]$  and  $n_k = n_T$  for  $k = 0$ . We propose to estimate the target parameter  $\hat{\beta}^{(0)}$  by solving:

$$\min_{\beta^{(0)}, \{\delta^{(k)}\}_{k=1}^K} \left\{ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^K w_k \|\mathbf{y}^{(k)} - \mathbf{X}^{(k)}(\beta^{(0)} + \delta^{(k)})\|_2^2 + \lambda_0 \sqrt{\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{n_k}{N} w_k^2} \|\beta^{(0)}\|_1 + \lambda_1 \sum_{k=1}^K w_k \|\delta^{(k)}\|_1 \right\}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \frac{1}{n_T} \|(\mathbf{X}^{(0)})^\top (\mathbf{y}^{(0)} - \mathbf{X}^{(0)} \beta^{(0)})\|_\infty \leq \lambda_T, \quad (10b)$$

where  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\lambda_1$  and  $\lambda_T$  are nonnegative tuning parameters.

Problem (10) is designed based on the same fused-penalty as (3). However, two key differences are made to achieve sample-wise adaptive transfer. First, unlike in problem (3) where different weights are applied element-wise to  $\beta^{(0)}$  and  $\delta^{(k)}$ , a single scalar  $w_k$  is assigned to both the loss term and parameters associated to the  $k$ -th source, adjusting its importance in estimating the target parameter. Second, we introduce constraint (10b) to identify  $\beta^{(0)}$ : The left hand side of (10b) corresponds to the gradient of target loss function and is equal to zero at the ground truth  $\beta^{(0)}$  in the noiseless case  $\epsilon_i^{(0)} = 0$ ; the slackness  $\lambda_T$  is introduced to account for the presence of noise. Intuitively, constraint (10b) narrows down the search space for  $\beta^{(0)}$  using primary target data, and the objective function (10a) proceeds to use the full sample, improving the estimation accuracy.

We note that the solution of problem (10) is invariant under positive scaling of the  $w_k$ 's. To remove such ambiguity, we restrict the weights to satisfy the normalization constraint

$$\sum_{k=0}^K \frac{n_k}{N} w_k = 1, \quad w_k \geq 0, \quad k = 0, \dots, K. \quad (11)$$

To better understand the formulation (10), we examine two cases. If we set the target weight  $w_0 = N/n_T$  and the source weight  $w_k = 0$  for all  $k \in [K]$ , problem (10) reduces to a single-task lasso regression problem where only the target data is used to estimate  $\beta^{(0)}$ . In this case, there is no information transfer from the source samples and should be chosen when the  $\delta^{(k)}$ 's are large. On the other hand, if we set all  $w_k = 1$  for all  $k = 0, \dots, K$ , then equal importance is assigned to all samples in estimating  $\beta^{(0)}$ . Such weight assignment is ideal if all the  $\delta^{(k)}$ 's are zero. By adjusting the  $w_k$ 's, we interpolate the two extremes and aim to achieve the optimal balance between the source and target samples.

#### 4.1 Weight Choice with Known Informative Level

We first discuss the choice of  $w_k$  with a known informative level, characterized by the following parameter space:

$$\Theta_2 := \left\{ \beta : \|\beta^{(0)}\|_0 \leq s, \|\delta^{(k)}\|_1 \leq h_k, k \in [K] \right\}. \quad (12)$$

The target parameter  $\beta^{(0)}$  is still assumed to be  $s$ -sparse. However, the informative level of the  $k$ -th source is quantified by the  $\ell_1$  norm of the whole source-target contrast  $\delta^{(k)}$ , allowing for dense  $\delta^{(k)}$ 's with small elements. A larger  $h_k$  indicates that the  $k$ -th source is less similar to the target.

The following result establishes the estimation error of  $\hat{\beta}^{(0)}$  assuming both  $s$  and  $h_k$ 's are known.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Under Assumption 2.1 and 2.2, assume  $n_S > n_T$ ,  $\frac{s \log p}{n_T} + K \bar{h}(w) \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_T}} = o(1)$  and  $w_k = 0$  or  $w_k \geq \underline{w}$  for some small constant  $\underline{w} > 0$ . If we choose*

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_0 &= c_0 \left[ \left( \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{n_k}{N} w_k^2 \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left( \frac{\bar{h}(w)^2 \log p}{s^2 n_T} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} + \left( \frac{\log p}{N} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right], \\ \lambda_1 &= c_0 \frac{n_S}{N} \left( \frac{\log p}{n_T} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \text{and } \lambda_T = c_1 \left( \frac{\log p}{n_T} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

for some appropriate constants  $c_0$  and  $c_1$ , then the solution of (10) satisfies

$$\|\hat{\beta}^{(0)} - \beta^{(0)}\|_2^2 \lesssim \kappa_S(w) \frac{s \log p}{N} + c_{\Sigma} \bar{h}(w) \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_T}}, \quad (13)$$

with probability larger than  $1 - \exp(-c_2 \log p)$ , where

$$\kappa_S(w) := \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{n_k w_k^2}{N}, \quad \bar{h}(w) := \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k w_k}{N} h_k, \quad (14)$$

and  $c_{\Sigma}$  is a universal constant.

Term  $\bar{h}(w)$  is the weighted non-transferable level and  $c_{\Sigma}$  is a universal constant depending on the largest and smallest eigenvalues of  $\{\Sigma^{(k)}\}_{k=0}^K$ . To interpret  $\kappa_S(w)$ , we notice that under the normalization constraint (11), by solving the KKT system we can conclude  $\kappa_S(w)$  attains minimum value 1 with the corresponding  $w_k = 1$  for  $k = 0, \dots, K$ . In

such a case, the first term is  $s \log p/N$  and corresponds to a near minimax optimal rate using  $N$  target samples [Raskutti et al., 2011]. Therefore, in the same way as  $\kappa_F$  defined in (7),  $\kappa_S(w)$  can be viewed as a metric quantifying the transferability of the source datasets.

To further understand the result, we revisit the two extreme cases previously discussed. Under the weight choice  $w_0 = N/n_T$  and  $w_k = 0$  for all  $k \in [K]$ , problem (10) reduces to the single-task lasso regression problem and (13) correspondingly degenerates to the near minimax optimal bound  $s \log p/n_T$ . When setting  $w_k = 1$ , on the other hand, (13) becomes  $s \log p/N + \tilde{h} \sqrt{\log p/n_T}$  with  $\tilde{h} := \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K h_k$  being the average of all  $h_k$ s. In this case, the first term of (13) achieves its minimum, at the cost of introducing a nonzero second term accounting for the negative impact of non-transferable source-target contrasts  $\delta^{(k)}$ . Such a rate is again near minimax optimal for multi-source sparse regression problems under small  $\tilde{h}$  [Li et al., 2022].

With a flexible choice of the weights  $w_k$ 's, the upper bound (13) represents a middle ground between the two extremes. As  $\kappa_S(w) \geq 1$ , the first term,  $\kappa_S(w)s \log p/N$ , reflects a loss in the effective sample size when the source samples are not fully utilized. The second term,  $\tilde{h}(w) \sqrt{\log p/n_T}$ , also depending on the weight  $w_k$ , shows the potential reduction of negative transfer if  $h_k$  is large but the corresponding source sample is down-weighted. Consequently, the weights should be carefully chosen to balance the tradeoff between these two terms to achieve the optimal estimation rate.

To gain theoretical insights, we consider the simple case with  $K = 1$ , and investigate the impact of the sample size  $n_S$ ,  $n_T$ , and the informative level  $h_k$  on the optimal weights.

**Corollary 4.2.** *Suppose  $K = 1$ , the weight under condition (11) that minimizes the estimation error bound (13) is  $w_0 = (N/n_S)w'_0$  and  $w_1 = (N/n_T)w'_1$ , with*

$$w'_1 = \max \left\{ \frac{s \log p - \frac{c_S}{2} \sqrt{n_T} \cdot h_1 \sqrt{\log p}}{s \log p + \frac{n_T}{n_S} \cdot s \log p}, 0 \right\},$$

and  $w'_0 = 1 - w'_1$ .

Corollary 4.2 reveals the following facts. When  $h_1 = 0$ , we have  $w_0 = w_1 = 1$ , corroborating the fact that source and target samples should be equally weighted when sharing the same ground truth parameter. As  $h_1$  increases, the weight  $w_1$  assigned to the source sample decreases, indicating we should down-weight the source when it becomes less informative. Considering the impact of the sample size, we see that the normalized weight  $w'_1$  decreases either when  $n_S$  decreases or  $n_T$  increases. The implication is intuitive, showing that under these two cases, the target becomes relatively more reliable and more weights should be allocated.

We finish by discussing the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. The condition  $s \log p/n_T = o(1)$  shows that the dimension  $p$  can grow up to an exponential order with respect to the target sample size. Such a sample-dimension dependency is standard in the high-dimensional setting. The requirement that  $K\tilde{h}(w) \sqrt{\log p/n_T}$  is bounded can be fulfilled if either  $\tilde{h}(w)$  diminishes or  $n_T$  grows with the task number  $K$ . The lowerbound on  $w_k$  prevents the weights to be  $o(1)$  as  $p$  grows. In practice it can be set as a small numerical constant. These two requirements are technical conditions imposed to deal with the higher order terms arise due to the non-strong convexity and smoothness of the empirical loss, *challenges unique to the high dimensional setting* (cf. Lemma A.5 and Sec.4.1). Notably, our bound does not depend on the whole covariance matrices  $\Sigma^{(k)}$ 's but only their eigenvalue bounds, demonstrating the robustness of our method to covariate shifts. At the technical level, the proof of the theorem involves a non-asymptotic analysis of the coupled structure of  $\beta^{(0)}$  and  $\delta^{(k)}$  in problem (10), together with a fine treatment of both the non-strong convexity and smoothness, which may be of independent interest.

## 4.2 Weight Choice with Unknown Informative Level

Obtaining optimal weights by minimizing the error bound in (13) requires knowing the sparsity level  $s$  of  $\beta^{(0)}$ , the informative level  $h_k$ , and the universal constant  $c$ . In this section, we provide a data-driven approach to compute the weights by solving the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\{w'_k\}_{k=0}^K} & \left\{ \sum_{k=0}^K \frac{\|\hat{\beta}_{\text{init}}^{(0)}\|_0 \log p}{n_S} (w'_k)^2 + \lambda_W \sum_{k=1}^K \|\hat{\delta}_{\text{init}}^{(k)}\|_1 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n_T}} w'_k \right\} \\ \text{s.t.} & \sum_{k=0}^K w'_k = 1 \text{ and } w'_k \geq 0, k = 0, 1, \dots, K. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In (15), we estimate  $s$  and  $h_k$  respectively by  $\|\hat{\beta}_{\text{init}}^{(0)}\|_0$  and  $\|\hat{\delta}_{\text{init}}^{(k)}\|_1$  using some initial estimators, such as the Lasso estimator described in Corollary C.1. The unknown constant  $c_1$  is handled as a hyperparameter  $\lambda_W$ , whose optimal choice is found through cross-validation on the target dataset. The optimization problem (15) is convex and can be solved efficiently. With the weight computed by (15), we can then proceed to solve problem (10) to obtain an estimator for  $\beta^{(0)}$ . Note that although problem (10) involves three hyperparameters, namely  $\lambda_0$ ,  $\lambda_1$ , and  $\lambda_T$ , their relative magnitudes are fixed and thus can be jointly tuned.

## 5 Empirical Experiments

We evaluate the empirical performance of our proposed methods, *F-AdaTrans* and *S-AdaTrans*, and compare with existing high-dimensional transfer learning method *TransGLM* [Tian and Feng, 2022]. Specifically, the following methods are implemented:

- *Ora-Est* : Oracle estimator with known transferable structure and *Ora-F-AdaTrans* : F-AdaTrans with known transferable structure (Section 3.1); *F-AdaTrans*: F-AdaTrans with data-driven weights selection (Section 3.2);
- *Ora-S-AdaTrans*: S-AdaTrans with known source informative level (Section 4.1); *S-AdaTrans*: S-AdaTrans with data-driven weights selection (Section 4.2);
- *TransGLM* [Tian and Feng, 2022]: a transfer learning algorithm with transferable source detection, each source is either included or discarded based on some decision rule;
- *Lasso (baseline)*: LASSO regression on the target task.

Each simulation setting is replicated with 100 independent trials, and we report the average estimation error of the target parameter, i.e.,  $\|\hat{\beta}^{(0)} - \beta^{(0)}\|_2^2$ . Implementation details can be found in Appendix D.1.

**Problem settings.** We consider a high-dimensional linear regression problem with dimension  $p = 500$  and sparsity level  $s = 8$ . The target coefficient is set as  $\beta_j^{(0)} = 0.3$  for  $1 \leq j \leq s$  and  $\beta_j^{(0)} = 0$  otherwise. The target sample is generated according to (1) with  $n_T = 50$  and the source samples are generated according to (2). We set  $n_S = 250$  and  $K = 2$  if not otherwise specified. We consider the following two parameter configurations of  $\delta^{(k)}$ .

*Setting 1: feature-wise adaptive transfer.* We generate two types of source samples with non-overlapping transferable features as depicted in Fig. 1(a). For  $k \in [K]$ , if  $k$  is odd the non-transferable  $\delta^{(k)}$  is nonzero for the first  $s/2$  elements; otherwise it has nonzero elements ranging from  $s/2 + 1$  to  $s_k$ . The strength of  $\delta^{(k)}$  is controlled by a parameter  $h^\wedge$ . We set  $h^\wedge = 0.6$  and  $s_k = 25$  if not otherwise specified.

*Setting 2: sample-wise adaptive transfer.* We generate the two types of sources corrupted by weak dense non-transferable signals, as depicted in Fig. 1(b). The non-transferable signal  $\delta^{(k)}$  is nonzero for the first  $s_k$  elements for all  $k \in [K]$ . For odd  $k$  the strength of  $\delta^{(k)}$  is controlled by  $h^\wedge/10$ , and for even  $k$  it is controlled by  $h^\wedge$ . We set  $h^\wedge = 0.024$  and  $s_k = 450$  if not otherwise specified.

The detailed description of the problem setting is left to Appendix D.2. We investigate the impact of four key factors on the performance of *F-AdaTrans* in Setting 1 and that of *S-AdaTrans* in Setting 2, namely, the (i) non-transferable signal strength  $h^\wedge$ , (ii) number of non-transferable features  $s_k$ , (iii) number of source tasks  $K$ , and (iv) source sample size  $n_S$ , reported respectively in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4. For details on the comparative performance of *F-AdaTrans* and *S-AdaTrans*, please see Appendix D.4.

**F-AdaTrans (Setting 1).** Fig. 3(i) illustrates as the strength of non-transferable signals  $h^\wedge$  increases, the estimation error of *F-AdaTrans* slightly increases then decreases. This trend demonstrates the method’s increased capability to identify the transferable structure with increasing signal strength. Once some non-transferable features are pinpointed, they are subsequently filtered out, and thereby preventing further negative transfer. This finding is further supported by Fig.7 in Appendix D.4, showing the detection accuracy of the non-transferable features increases as  $h^\wedge$  increases. In contrast, the *TransGLM* method shows a rapidly increasing error, due to the fact that it can only either include or completely discard a source sample, but fails to transfer useful features.

Fig. 3(ii) shows as  $s_k$  increases, *TransGLM* has an error close to *Lasso (baseline)*, primarily because the source samples are excluded in the estimation. The error of *F-AdaTrans* increases since the initial estimator gets worse as the cardinality of  $\delta^{(k)}$  grows, making it harder to identify the transferable structure in the source. However, it still achieves a better performance than the benchmark methods due to the partial inclusion of transferable features.




Figure 3: The average estimation error under feature-wise adaptive transfer setting (Setting 1)




Figure 4: The average estimation error under sample-wise adaptive transfer setting (Setting 2)

Fig. 3(iii) and (iv) shows as the total number of source samples increases, either in the form of an increasing task number  $K$  or the samples  $n_S$  per task,  $F\text{-AdaTrans}$  achieves a smaller estimation error. We can also observe that  $F\text{-AdaTrans}$  has a favourable scalability with respect to  $K$ .

**Sample-AdaTrans (Setting 2).** Fig. 4(i) shows  $S\text{-AdaTrans}$  is robust to increasing  $h^\wedge$ . It is interesting to observe that  $\text{TransGLM}$  in this case shows significant instability in the estimation error. This is because for small  $h^\wedge$ ,  $\text{TransGLM}$  includes both sources to estimate  $\beta^{(0)}$  for most of the trails. This leads to an error even larger than  $\text{Lasso}$  (baseline) due to negative transfer. The error then decreases for large  $h^\wedge$ , since in some replications the non-informative source is detected and excluded.  $S\text{-AdaTrans}$ , on the other hand, is able to adjust the importance of the source samples by assigning continuous values of weights, and thus more stable with respect to the change of source informative level. See Fig.8 in Appendix D.4 for the numerical evidence. Similar behavior of the methods also appear in Fig. 4(ii) as  $s_k$  increases, as both two cases essentially imply an increase in  $h_k$  [cf. (12)].

For cases (iii) and (iv), we observe the error of  $S\text{-AdaTrans}$  decreases. Further, it gets closer to  $\text{Ora-}S\text{-AdaTrans}$  with known source informative level since the initial estimators become more accurate.

In addition to the synthetic data study, we also apply  $F\text{-AdaTrans}$  and  $S\text{-AdaTrans}$  to analyzing the impact of the high-dimensional financial metrics on the stock recovery ability of S&P 500 companies after the COVID-19 pandemic. The results are provided in Appendix D.3.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduce an adaptive transfer learning method  $\text{AdaTrans}$  enabling feature- and sample-specific transfer in high-dimensional regression. If the transferable information is known, we derive the optimal weights and the rate of these oracle estimators. When the transferable information is unknown, we further develop data-driven methods to compute the weights. We show both theoretically and empirically that by adaptively choosing the transferable information,  $\text{AdaTrans}$  outperforms existing methods.

## References

- Shai Ben-David, John Blitzer, Koby Crammer, Alex Kulesza, Fernando Pereira, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan. A theory of learning from different domains. *Machine learning*, 79:151–175, 2010.
- Corinna Cortes, Yishay Mansour, and Mehryar Mohri. Learning bounds for importance weighting. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 23, 2010.
- Yuyang Deng, Mohammad Mahdi Kamani, Pouria Mahdavinia, and Mehrdad Mahdavi. Distributed personalized empirical risk minimization. In *International Workshop on Federated Learning for Distributed Data Mining*, 2023.
- Jianqing Fan and Runze Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, pages 1348–1360, 2001.
- Jianqing Fan, Lingzhou Xue, and Hui Zou. Strong oracle optimality of folded concave penalized estimation. *Annals of statistics*, 42(3):819, 2014.
- Tongtong Fang, Nan Lu, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. Rethinking importance weighting for deep learning under distribution shift. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:11996–12007, 2020.
- Filip Hanzely, Boxin Zhao, and Mladen Kolar. Personalized federated learning: A unified framework and universal optimization techniques. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2102.09743*, 2021.
- Nikola Konstantinov and Christoph Lampert. Robust learning from untrusted sources. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 3488–3498. PMLR, 2019.
- Hailong Li, Nehal A Parikh, and Lili He. A novel transfer learning approach to enhance deep neural network classification of brain functional connectomes. *Frontiers in neuroscience*, 12:491, 2018.
- Sai Li, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. Transfer learning for high-dimensional linear regression: Prediction, estimation and minimax optimality. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(1):149–173, 2022.
- Sai Li, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. Transfer learning in large-scale gaussian graphical models with false discovery rate control. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 118(543):2171–2183, 2023a.
- Sai Li, Linjun Zhang, T Tony Cai, and Hongzhe Li. Estimation and inference for high-dimensional generalized linear models with knowledge transfer. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–12, 2023b.

- Tian Li, Shengyuan Hu, Ahmad Beirami, and Virginia Smith. Ditto: Fair and robust federated learning through personalization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6357–6368. PMLR, 2021.
- Shuo Shuo Liu. Unified transfer learning models for high-dimensional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.00238*, 2023.
- Nan Lu, Tianyi Zhang, Tongtong Fang, Takeshi Teshima, and Masashi Sugiyama. Rethinking importance weighting for transfer learning. In *Federated and Transfer Learning*, pages 185–231. Springer, 2022.
- Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over  $\ell_q$ -balls. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57(10):6976–6994, 2011.
- Hidetoshi Shimodaira. Improving predictive inference under covariate shift by weighting the log-likelihood function. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 90(2):227–244, 2000.
- Lu Tang and Peter XK Song. Fused lasso approach in regression coefficients clustering: learning parameter heterogeneity in data integration. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):3915–3937, 2016.
- Ye Tian and Yang Feng. Transfer learning under high-dimensional generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, pages 1–14, 2022.
- Lisa Torrey and Jude Shavlik. Transfer learning. In *Handbook of research on machine learning applications and trends: algorithms, methods, and techniques*, pages 242–264. IGI global, 2010.
- Douglas Wahlsten, Pamela Metten, Tamara J Phillips, Stephen L Boehm, Sue Burkhart-Kasch, Janet Dorow, Sharon Doerksen, Chris Downing, Jennifer Fogarty, Kristina Rodd-Henricks, et al. Different data from different labs: lessons from studies of gene–environment interaction. *Journal of neurobiology*, 54(1):283–311, 2003.
- Junfeng Wen, Russell Greiner, and Dale Schuurmans. Domain aggregation networks for multi-source domain adaptation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 10214–10224. PMLR, 2020.
- Qiang Yang, Yang Liu, Tianjian Chen, and Yongxin Tong. Federated machine learning: Concept and applications. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)*, 10(2):1–19, 2019.
- Chao Zhang, Lei Zhang, and Jieping Ye. Generalization bounds for domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 25, 2012.
- Cun-Hui Zhang. Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(2): 894–942, 2010.
- Tianyi Zhang, Ikko Yamane, Nan Lu, and Masashi Sugiyama. A one-step approach to covariate shift adaptation. In *Asian Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 65–80. PMLR, 2020.
- Hui Zou and Runze Li. One-step sparse estimates in nonconcave penalized likelihood models. *Annals of statistics*, 36(4):1509, 2008.