

Nodewise Loreg: Nodewise L_0 -penalized Regression for High-dimensional Sparse Precision Matrix Estimation

Hai Shu^{1,†}, Ziqi Chen^{2,†,*}, Yingjie Zhang^{2,†}, and Hongtu Zhu^{3,*}

¹Department of Biostatistics, School of Global Public Health, New York University

²School of Statistics, KLATASDS-MOE, East China Normal University

³Departments of Biostatistics, Statistics, Computer Science, and Genetics,
The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

[†]Equal contributions

*Correspondence: zqchen@fem.ecnu.edu.cn, htzhu@email.unc.edu

June 11, 2024

Abstract

We propose Nodewise Loreg, a nodewise L_0 -penalized regression method for estimating high-dimensional sparse precision matrices. We establish its asymptotic properties, including convergence rates, support recovery, and asymptotic normality under high-dimensional sub-Gaussian settings. Notably, the Nodewise Loreg estimator is asymptotically unbiased and normally distributed, eliminating the need for debiasing required by Nodewise Lasso. We also develop a desparsified version of Nodewise Loreg, similar to the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator. The asymptotic variances of the undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator are upper bounded by those of both desparsified Nodewise Loreg and Lasso estimators for Gaussian data, potentially offering more powerful statistical inference. Extensive simulations show that the undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator generally outperforms the two desparsified estimators in asymptotic normal behavior. Moreover, Nodewise Loreg surpasses Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso in most simulations in terms of matrix norm losses, support recovery, and timing performance. Application to a breast cancer gene expression dataset further demonstrates Nodewise Loreg's superiority over the three L_1 -norm based methods.

Keywords: Asymptotic normality, Large precision matrix, L_0 penalty, Nodewise regression, No debiasing.

1 Introduction

The precision matrix, or inverse covariance matrix, is fundamental in multivariate analysis and applications such as linear and quadratic discriminant analysis (Hastie et al., 2009), generalized least squares (Baltagi, 2011), Markowitz portfolio optimization (Cornuéjols et al., 2018), and minimum variance beamforming (Vorobyov, 2013). It is particularly crucial in undirected graphical models, which represent the conditional dependence structure among variables (Lauritzen, 1996). Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_p)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a vector of p random variables with a precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$. In an undirected graphical model, \mathbf{x} is represented as p nodes in a graph, where an undirected edge between x_i and x_j is drawn if they are conditionally dependent given all other variables. This conditional dependence corresponds to a nonzero entry (i, j) in $\mathbf{\Omega}$, when \mathbf{x} is a Gaussian, or more broadly, a nonparanormal random vector (Liu et al., 2009). Undirected graphical models have been widely used in fields such as brain functional connectivity analysis (Ryali et al., 2012), genetic network analysis (Schäfer and Strimmer, 2005), and social network analysis (Farasat et al., 2015), among others (Giudici and Spelta, 2016; Epskamp et al., 2018).

Consider an $n \times p$ data matrix \mathbf{X} , whose rows are n i.i.d. copies of the p -dimensional real-valued random vector \mathbf{x} with a covariance matrix $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}$. It is well known that the sample covariance matrix derived from \mathbf{X} is not a consistent estimator of $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in high-dimensional settings where p grows with n (Bai and Yin, 1993; Bai and Silverstein, 2010), and moreover, it fails to be invertible when $p > n$. Different structural assumptions have been imposed to ensure consistent estimation of high-dimensional precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ (Fan et al., 2016). In this paper, we focus on the sparsity assumption regarding the number of nonzero entries in $\mathbf{\Omega}$.

There is a rich literature on the estimation of high-dimensional sparse precision matrix

Ω . The L_1 -penalized maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) method, known as graphical Lasso (GLasso) (Friedman et al., 2008; Yuan and Lin, 2007; Banerjee et al., 2008; Rothman et al., 2008; Ravikumar et al., 2011; Hsieh et al., 2014), and its variants with different penalties (Lam and Fan, 2009; Marjanovic and Hero, 2015; Van Wieringen and Peeters, 2016; Kuismin et al., 2017; Kovács et al., 2021) have been extensively developed and investigated for their theoretical properties. Methods for estimating Ω column-by-column, which can be implemented with parallel computing, include various nodewise regression approaches (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; Yuan, 2010; Sun and Zhang, 2013; van de Geer et al., 2014; Ren et al., 2015; Wang et al., 2016; Liu and Wang, 2017; Janková and van de Geer, 2017; Klaassen et al., 2023), and constrained L_1 -minimization for inverse matrix estimation (CLIME) (Cai et al., 2011) and its variants (Liu and Luo, 2015; Cai et al., 2016). Notably, Nodewise Lasso (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; van de Geer et al., 2014; Janková and van de Geer, 2017), a nodewise regression method with L_1 penalty, converts the large precision matrix estimation into a high-dimensional sparse linear regression problem, where each node x_j is regressed on the remaining nodes $\{x_i\}_{i \neq j}$ using the Lasso method (Tibshirani, 1996).

High-dimensional sparse linear regression has been extensively studied. The ideal penalty for promoting sparsity penalizes the L_0 norm of the regression coefficient vector, which counts the number of nonzero coefficients. Unfortunately, the L_0 penalty is discontinuous and nonconvex, making the optimization problem NP-hard (Natarajan, 1995; Chen et al., 2014). The popular Lasso method (Tibshirani, 1996) uses the L_1 norm instead, resulting in a convex minimization problem. However, the L_1 penalty tends to overshrink large coefficients, producing biased estimates (Fan and Li, 2001). To reduce this bias, alternatives like the adaptive Lasso (Zou, 2006), SCAD (Fan and Li, 2001), and MCP

(Zhang, 2010) penalties have been proposed as relaxed surrogates of the L_0 penalty. Several algorithms approximate L_0 -penalized linear regression, including GraDes (Garg and Khandekar, 2009), FoBa (Zhang, 2011a), OMP (Zhang, 2011b), MIO (Bertsimas et al., 2016), ABESS (Zhu et al., 2020), and SDAR (Huang et al., 2018). SDAR stands out for its computational efficiency, with complexity $O(np)$ per iteration, and its robust statistical properties such as consistency and sparsistency. Extensive simulations have demonstrated the superior performance of the L_0 penalty over non- L_0 penalties (Johnson et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2018; Dai, 2023).

Another stream of work focuses on “de-biasing” (or “de-sparsifying”) procedures for Lasso-type estimators in high-dimensional linear regression. These procedures yield estimators of regression coefficients that are asymptotically unbiased and normally distributed, enabling statistical inference for high-dimensional linear models (Zhang and Zhang, 2014; van de Geer et al., 2014; Javanmard and Montanari, 2014a,b, 2018; Chernozhukov et al., 2018). Building on these advancements, researchers have developed debiased (desparsified) Nodewise Lasso-type estimators for large precision matrices (Janková and van de Geer, 2017; Chang et al., 2018; Klaassen et al., 2023), which are asymptotically unbiased and enjoy asymptotic normality for inference on matrix parameters. Instead of estimating the regression coefficients, Ren et al. (2015) estimate the noise level using scaled Lasso (Sun and Zhang, 2012), achieving asymptotic normality without debiasing but requiring post-thresholding to provide a sparse estimator of the precision matrix. Inspired by the debiased Lasso (van de Geer et al., 2014), Janková et al. (2015) derive a desparsified GLasso estimator by inverting the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of the GLasso optimization problem, proving the estimator’s asymptotic normality.

We propose Nodewise Loreg, a novel **nodewise** L_0 -penalized **regression** method for

estimating large sparse precision matrices, in contrast to Nodewise Lasso that uses the L_1 penalty (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; van de Geer et al., 2014; Janková and van de Geer, 2017). Utilizing the SDAR algorithm (Huang et al., 2018) for L_0 -penalized regression, we establish comprehensive asymptotic results for Nodewise Loreg, including convergence rates, support recovery, and asymptotic normality in high-dimensional sub-Gaussian settings. Notably, the Nodewise Loreg estimator is asymptotically unbiased and normally distributed, without the need for debiasing. Moreover, its asymptotic normality has entry-wise variances dominated by those of the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator (Janková and van de Geer, 2017) under Gaussian conditions, potentially providing more powerful statistical inference. Additionally, we develop a desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator with the same asymptotic normality as the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator. Extensive simulations demonstrate that the undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator generally outperforms the two desparsified estimators in asymptotic normal behavior. Furthermore, in most simulation settings, Nodewise Loreg surpasses Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso in terms of matrix norm losses, support recovery, and timing performance. While related to linear regression, our method requires a more involved treatment due to its nonlinear nature and the adaptation of SDAR theory from fixed to random design settings.

To the best of our knowledge, our work is the first to theoretically establish the asymptotic properties of the L_0 -penalized nodewise regression estimator. Previous works by Marjanovic and Hero (2015) and Kim et al. (2021) also use the L_0 penalty for large precision matrix estimation, but in different ways. Marjanovic and Hero (2015) propose an L_0 -penalized MLE method, replacing the L_1 penalty in GLasso with the L_0 penalty, and use a cyclic descent algorithm for optimization. However, their analysis is limited to algorithmic convergence and does not address the asymptotic properties of the estimator.

Kim et al. (2021) adopt the innovated scalable efficient estimation framework of Fan and Lv (2016) to estimate $\mathbf{\Omega}$, which is also the covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} := \mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{x}$. They estimate the data matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}\mathbf{X}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times n}$ of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ using L_0 -penalized linear regression via the SDAR algorithm, then use a hard-thresholded sample covariance matrix of $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$ as the estimator of $\mathbf{\Omega}$, but do not provide any asymptotic theory.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 proposes the Nodewise Loreg estimator for high-dimensional sparse precision matrices, following an introduction of the L_0 -penalized linear regression and the SDAR algorithm. Section 3 presents the asymptotic properties of Nodewise Loreg and discusses a desparsified version of the estimator. Section 4 evaluates the performance of Nodewise Loreg against Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso through extensive simulations, and Section 5 analyzes the MDA133 breast cancer gene expression dataset (Hess et al., 2006). Section 6 concludes the paper and suggests possible extensions. Supplementary Materials provide all theoretical proofs, additional simulation results, and the computer code for simulations and real data analysis.

2 Method

2.1 Notation

We now introduce some useful notation. Define $[n] = \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ for any positive integer n . For any matrix $\mathbf{M} = (M_{ij})_{n \times p} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, we denote the spectral norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_2 = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\mathbf{M}^\top \mathbf{M})$, where $\lambda_{\max}(\cdot)$ and $\lambda_{\min}(\cdot)$ are, respectively, the largest and smallest eigenvalues of the input square matrix, the Frobenius norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_F = (\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^p M_{ij}^2)^{1/2}$, the max norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{\max} = \max_{i \in [n], j \in [p]} |M_{ij}|$, the L_1 norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_1 = \max_{j \in [p]} \sum_{i=1}^n |M_{ij}|$, and the L_∞ norm $\|\mathbf{M}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in [n]} \sum_{j=1}^p |M_{ij}|$. The support set of \mathbf{M} is defined by $\text{supp}(\mathbf{M}) = \{(i, j) \in$

$[n] \times [p] : M_{ij} \neq 0\}$. Matrix subsetting is defined as $\mathbf{M}_{AB} = (M_{ij})_{i \in A, j \in B}$, where $A \subseteq [n]$ and $B \subseteq [p]$ are the subsets of row indices and column indices of \mathbf{M} , respectively. Special subsetting symbols $*$, $\setminus k$, and k imply complete, all-but-one, and single index selections for rows or columns. For clarity, we sometimes use a comma to separate A and B in the subscript of \mathbf{M} when subsetting the matrix. For any vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_p)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote the L_0 norm $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 = \sum_{i=1}^p I(v_i \neq 0)$ with $I(\cdot)$ being the indicator function, define $\mathbf{v}_{\setminus j}$ as the vector obtained by excluding v_j from \mathbf{v} , and let \mathbf{v}_S denote the vector consisting of the entries of \mathbf{v} indexed by a given set S . Let $\Phi(\cdot)$ be the cumulative distribution function of the standard Gaussian distribution. Throughout the rest of the paper, by default we assume both $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ in the asymptotic arguments.

2.2 L_0 -penalized linear regression

We consider the high-dimensional linear regression model:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\eta}$$

where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response vector, $\mathbf{Z} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is the design matrix with \sqrt{n} -normalized columns (i.e., $\|\mathbf{Z}_{*j}\|_2 = \sqrt{n}$, $j \in [p]$), $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is the vector of regression coefficients, and $\boldsymbol{\eta} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of random noises. Assume that $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is sparse, that is, the number of its nonzero entries is small relative to n, p . We can then estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ by the solution of the L_0 minimization problem:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2/n \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 \leq s, \quad (1)$$

where $s > 0$ controls the sparsity level. Unfortunately, this optimization is known to be an NP-hard problem (Natarajan, 1995; Chen et al., 2014), making it computationally intractable for large p . To address this challenge, many works have turned to relaxed

surrogates for the L_0 penalty, such as the widely-used Lasso (L_1 -norm) penalty (Tibshirani, 1996), the adaptive Lasso penalty (Zou, 2006), the SCAD penalty (Fan and Li, 2001), and the MCP penalty (Zhang, 2010). Alternatively, several algorithms have been proposed to approximately solve the L_0 -penalized linear regression, including GraDes (Garg and Khandekar, 2009), FoBa (Zhang, 2011a), OMP (Zhang, 2011b), MIO (Bertsimas et al., 2016), ABESS (Zhu et al., 2020), and SDAR (Huang et al., 2018).

We consider the SDAR algorithm (Huang et al., 2018), which is notable for its computational efficiency, with a complexity of $O(np)$ per iteration, and its comprehensive statistical properties, such as consistency in different norms and sparsistency of parameter estimates, when compared to other competing algorithms. The SDAR algorithm is motivated by the necessary KKT conditions for the Lagrangian form of (1). Specifically, the Lagrangian form is

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2/n + 2\lambda\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0. \quad (2)$$

The KKT conditions for the solution of (2) are

$$\begin{cases} \boldsymbol{\beta} = (\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{d})I(|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{d}| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}), \\ \mathbf{d} = \mathbf{Z}^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta})/n. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

It follows from the KKT conditions that

$$\begin{cases} A = \{i \in [p] : |\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\{i\}} + \mathbf{d}_{\{i\}}| \geq \sqrt{2\lambda}\}, \\ \boldsymbol{\beta}_A = (\mathbf{Z}_A^\top \mathbf{Z}_A)^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_A^\top \mathbf{y}, \quad \boldsymbol{\beta}_{A^c} = \mathbf{0}, \\ \mathbf{d}_{A^c} = \mathbf{Z}_{A^c}^\top(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}_A \boldsymbol{\beta}_A)/n, \quad \mathbf{d}_A = \mathbf{0}, \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

where A^c is the complement of set A . The SDAR algorithm finds an approximate sequence of solutions to the KKT conditions in (3) iteratively based on equation (4) until convergence. In particular, instead of tuning the parameter λ , SDAR tunes the size of the active set A ,

denoted by T . Thus, A comprises the indices of the first T largest entries in the vector $|\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{d}|$. Algorithm 1 summarizes the steps of SDAR, where $\text{arg sort}(\cdot, \downarrow)[1 : T]$ yields the set consisting of the indices of the first T largest entries in a given vector.

Algorithm 1. SDAR($\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{Z}, T$) for (2)

Input: \mathbf{y} , \mathbf{Z} , and T .

- 1: Initialize $\boldsymbol{\beta}^0 = \mathbf{0}$,
 - 2: $\mathbf{d}^0 = \mathbf{Z}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}\boldsymbol{\beta}^0)/n$,
 - 3: $A^0 = \text{arg sort}(|\boldsymbol{\beta}^0 + \mathbf{d}^0|, \downarrow)[1 : T]$;
 - 4: **for** $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**
 - 5: $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{A^k}^{k+1} = (\mathbf{Z}_{A^k}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{A^k})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{A^k}^\top \mathbf{y}$,
 - 6: $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(A^k)^c}^{k+1} = \mathbf{0}$,
 - 7: $\mathbf{d}_{(A^k)^c}^{k+1} = \mathbf{Z}_{(A^k)^c}^\top (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{Z}_{A^k} \boldsymbol{\beta}_{A^k}^{k+1})/n$,
 - 8: $\mathbf{d}_{A^k}^{k+1} = \mathbf{0}$,
 - 9: $A^{k+1} = \text{arg sort}(|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{k+1} + \mathbf{d}^{k+1}|, \downarrow)[1 : T]$;
 - 10: **if** $A^{k+1} = A^k$ **then** stop;
 - 11: **end for**
- Output:** $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{k+1}$, $\hat{A} = A^k$, and k .
-

2.3 Nodewise Loreg: nodewise L_0 -penalized regression

Our Nodewise Loreg method modifies the Nodewise Lasso (Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006; van de Geer et al., 2014; Janková and van de Geer, 2017) by replacing the L_1 penalty with the L_0 penalty. We first introduce the nodewise regression. Recall that the rows of data matrix $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ are n i.i.d. copies of the random vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with a precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}$. Following the literature (van de Geer et al., 2014; Janková and van de Geer, 2017), we assume $E(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}$ to concentrate on the precision matrix estimation, avoiding the impact of the mean estimation by centering the data. The projection theorem and the inverse formula for partitioned matrices (Banerjee and Roy, 2014) provide the steps

of the population-level nodewise regression: for each $j \in [p]$, we have

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^* = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} E(x_j - \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j)^2 = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j}, \quad (5)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} = (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j, \setminus j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j})^{-1} \quad (6)$$

$$= (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jj} - 2\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{*\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j} + \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{*\top} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)^{-1} = [E(x_j - \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j)^2]^{-1}, \quad (7)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j, j} = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*. \quad (8)$$

Nodewise Lasso estimates $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ column-by-column using Lasso for the L_1 -penalized least squares based on data matrix \mathbf{X} : for $j \in [p]$,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j\|_2^2/n + 2\lambda_j \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j\|_1,$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_j^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j\|_2^2/n + \lambda_j \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j\|_1,$$

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} = \hat{\sigma}_j^{-2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\setminus j, j} = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j.$$

In contrast to Nodewise Lasso, our proposed Nodewise Loreg uses the standardized design matrix $\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}$ and the L_0 penalty instead of $\mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j}$ and the L_1 penalty in the penalized least squares, which we solve using the SDAR algorithm. Here, $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}^{-1/2}$ with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}} = \text{diag}\{(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{ii})_{i \in [p]}\}$ and $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{ii})_{i \in [p]}$ being the diagonal of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}/n$. Algorithm 2 outlines the estimating procedure for Nodewise Loreg.

For Algorithm 2, we sometimes write $k_j = k_j(T_j)$ and $\hat{A}_j = \hat{A}_j(k_j(T_j)) = \hat{A}_j(T_j)$ to explicitly indicate their dependence on the tuning parameter T_j . To select the optimal value of T_j , we adopt the high-dimensional Bayesian information criterion (HBIC) (Wang et al., 2013; Huang et al., 2018; Zhu et al., 2020). For any active set A_j of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$, the HBIC is defined as

$$\text{HBIC}(A_j) = n \log \mathcal{L}_{A_j} + |A_j| \log(p-1) \log(\log n), \quad (9)$$

Algorithm 2. Nodewise Loreg

Input: \mathbf{X} and $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^p$.

1: $\mathbf{Z} = \mathbf{X}\widehat{\Gamma}^{-1/2}$ with $\widehat{\Gamma} = \text{diag}\{(\widehat{\Sigma}_{ii})_{i \in [p]}\}$ and $\widehat{\Sigma} = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}/n$,

2: **for** $j = 1, \dots, p$ **do**

3: $(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j, \widehat{A}_j, k_j) = \text{SDAR}(\mathbf{X}_{*j}, \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}, T_j)$ from Algorithm 1
for $\min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}_j \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}} \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j\|_2^2/n + 2\lambda_j \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j\|_0$,

4: $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j = \widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1/2} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j$,

5: $\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 = \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j\|_2^2/n$,

6: $\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} = \widehat{\sigma}_j^{-2}$,

7: $\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j, j} = -\widehat{\Omega}_{jj}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j$,

8: **end for**

Output: $\widehat{\Omega}$.

where $\mathcal{L}_{A_j} = \min_{(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)_{A_j^c} = \mathbf{0}} \mathcal{L}_{n,j}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{n,j}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j) = \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}\boldsymbol{\beta}_j\|_2^2/n$. Define the optimal value of T_j as

$$T_j^* = \min_{0 \leq T_j \leq T_{\max,j}} \text{HBIC}(\widehat{A}_j(T_j)), \quad (10)$$

where $T_{\max,j}$ is the largest candidate value of T_j .

Throughout the paper, due to their column-by-column estimating nature, we apply the minimum symmetrization (Cai et al., 2011) to both Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso:

$$\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^S = \widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{\text{US}} I(|\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{\text{US}}| \leq |\widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^{\text{US}}|) + \widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^{\text{US}} I(|\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{\text{US}}| > |\widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^{\text{US}}|),$$

where $\widehat{\Omega}^S$ and $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ are the symmetrized and unsymmetrized estimators of Ω , respectively.

3 Theoretical results

In this section, we study the asymptotic properties of the proposed Nodewise Loreg estimator, including convergence rates, support recovery, and asymptotic normality. We also develop and discuss a desparsified version of the Nodewise Loreg estimator, analogous to the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator in Janková and van de Geer (2017).

For the theoretical analysis, we define $T = \max_{j \in [p]} T_j$ as the maximum tuning param-

eter, $\mathbf{R} = \text{corr}(\mathbf{x})$ as the correlation matrix of \mathbf{x} , $A_j^* = \text{supp}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)$ as the support set of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$ given in (5), $m_j = \min_{i \in A_j^*} |\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij}|$ as the minimum absolute value of the off-diagonal nonzero entries of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ in its j -th column, and $s_j = \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j}\|_0$ as the sparsity of the j -th column of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. We define the following class of precision matrices:

$$\mathcal{G}(s) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p} : \max_{j \in [p]} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j}\|_0 \leq s, \text{ (A1) given below is satisfied} \right\}.$$

We introduce some assumptions frequently used in our theoretical analysis.

(A1) (Bounded spectrum) $\kappa_1^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \leq \kappa_2$ with positive constants κ_1, κ_2 .

(A2) (Sub-Gaussianity) There exists a constant $K > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} E \left[\exp(|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x}|^2 / K^2) \right] \leq 2.$$

(A3) $(s_j - 1) \vee 1 \leq T_j \leq p - 1$ for all $j \in [p]$.

(A4) $\gamma_T < 1 - c_1$ with a constant $c_1 > 0$, $k_j \geq \log_{1-\frac{c_1}{2}} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, where $\gamma_T := [2\theta_{T,T} + (1 + \sqrt{2})\theta_{T,T}^2]c_\kappa^2 + (1 + \sqrt{2})\theta_{T,T}c_\kappa$ with $\theta_{T,T} := \max_{A,B \in S_T: A \cap B = \emptyset} \|\mathbf{R}_{AB}\|_2$, $S_T := \{A \subseteq [p] : |A| \leq T\}$, and $c_\kappa := \kappa_1 \kappa_2$.

(A5) $T\mu < 1/4 - c_2$ with a constant $c_2 > 0$, $\min_{j \in [p]} k_j \geq \log_{\frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, and $T\sqrt{(\log p)/n} = o(1)$, where $\mu := \max_{i \neq j} |\mathbf{R}_{ij}|$.

Assumptions (A1) and (A2) are commonly used in the literature on large precision matrix estimation, such as in Jankova and van de Geer (2017) for Nodewise Lasso. Assumption (A3) requires that the tuning parameter T_j is not smaller than the true support size $|A_j^*| = s_j - 1$, which is satisfied with high probability if T_j is selected optimally using the HBIC (10) (see Lemma 2). Assumptions (A4) and (A5) translate the corresponding

assumptions in Theorems 4(i) and 12(i) of Huang et al. (2018), used to prove the consistency of their fixed design L_0 -penalized linear regression estimation, to the random design setting in our context.

It is important to highlight that although our precision matrix estimation is related to linear regression, the theoretical analysis requires a more involved treatment due to its nonlinear nature and the fact that the SDAR theory developed by Huang et al. (2018) for fixed design linear regression is not directly applicable to the random design used in nodewise regression. Unless specified otherwise, $\widehat{\Omega}$ in this section refers to the Nodewise Loreg estimator obtained from Algorithm 2.

3.1 Convergence rates and support recovery

We present the following theorem for the convergence rates of Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ in various matrix norms.

Theorem 1 (Convergence rates). *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold. For any constant $C > 0$, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that, if (A4) or (A5) holds, then*

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P \left(\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_1 \leq MT \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$$

and

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P \left(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{*j} - \Omega_{*j}\|_2 \leq M \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}),$$

and if (A5) holds, then

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P \left(\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\max} \leq M \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Remark 1. *From Theorem 1, our Nodewise Loreg estimator attains the same order of convergence rates as Nodewise Lasso estimator in the L_1 norm and the max column-*

wise L_2 norm (van de Geer et al., 2014, Theorem 2.4). Convergence rates in the max norm and the scaled Frobenius norm can be obtained by $\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\max} \vee p^{-1/2}\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{*j} - \Omega_{*j}\|_2 = O_P(\sqrt{T(\log p)/n})$. However, our Nodewise Loreg estimator can achieve a faster convergence rate in the max norm, $\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\max} = O_P(\sqrt{\log p/n})$, under assumption (A5). In contrast, this order of the max-norm rate is only shown to be attainable by the desparsified (debiased) Nodewise Lasso estimator, which is not a sparse matrix and needs a post-thresholding that additionally requires $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$ (Janková and van de Geer, 2017, Sections 3.2 and 3.4). The rates in the L_1 norm and the scaled Frobenius norm and the faster max-norm rate of our Nodewise Loreg estimator are faster than the minimax lower bounds, which are of the order $\|\Omega\|_1 T \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, $\|\Omega\|_1 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}$, and $\sqrt{(\log p)/n} \vee T(\log p)/n$, respectively, as shown in Cai et al. (2016, Theorems 4.1 and 6.1) and Ren et al. (2015, Theorem 5). Our faster rates are due to the additional condition (A4) or (A5). These two conditions are translated versions of those in Theorems 4(i) and 12(i) of Huang et al. (2018), which are used to establish the consistency of their fixed design L_0 -penalized linear regression estimation, to the random design setting in our context.

Next, we study the support recovery of Ω by $\widehat{\Omega}$. Before that, we introduce two lemmas regarding the support recovery of $\{A_j^*\}_{j \in [p]}$.

Lemma 1. *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold. For any constant $C > 0$, assume that (A4) holds with $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, or (A5) holds with $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, where M_1 and M_2 are sufficiently large positive constants dependent on C . Then,*

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

If $T_j = s_j - 1$ for all $j \in [p]$, then

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\widehat{A}_j = A_j^*, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Lemma 2 given below shows that the event $\{T_j = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]\}$ is achievable with high probability, when $T_j = T_j^*$, which is selected from the HBIC (10). Denote $T_{\max} = \max_{j \in [p]} T_{\max, j}$, and let $\gamma_{T_{\max}}$ be the γ_T defined in (A4) with T replaced by T_{\max} .

Lemma 2. *Suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold, $\gamma_{T_{\max}} < 1 - c$ with a constant $c > 0$, $T_{\max}(\log p)/n = o(1)$, $s(\log p) \log(\log n)/n = o(1)$, and $k_j(T_j) \geq \log_{1-\frac{\varepsilon}{2}} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ and $0 \leq T_j \leq T_{\max, j} \in [(s_j - 1) \vee 1, p - 1]$ for all $j \in [p]$. For any constant $C > 0$, if $m_j \geq M \sqrt{(T_{\max, j} \vee \log \log n)(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$ with a sufficiently large constant $M > 0$ dependent C , then we have*

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(s)} P(T_j^* = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (11)$$

and $\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(s)} P\left(\widehat{A}_j(k_j(T_j = T_j^*)) = A_j^*, \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$.

Now we present the result of Nodewide Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ on the support recovery of Ω .

Theorem 2 (Support recovery). *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold. For any constant $C > 0$, assume that (A4) holds with $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, or (A5) holds with $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, where M_1 and M_2 are sufficiently large positive constants dependent on C . Then, we have*

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P\left(\text{supp}(\Omega) \subseteq \text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega})\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$$

and $\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P\left(\text{sgn}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}) = \text{sgn}(\Omega_{ij}), \forall (i, j) \in \text{supp}(\Omega)\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. If $T_j = s_j - 1$ for all $j \in [p]$, then we have

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P\left(\text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega}) = \text{supp}(\Omega)\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (12)$$

For the sparsistency of $\widehat{\Omega}$ given in (12) in Theorem 2, the condition $\{T_j = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]\}$ is achievable with high probability if T_j is set to T_j^* selected from the HBIC (10), due to

(11) in Lemma 2. Thus, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 1 (Sparsistency). *Under the conditions of Lemma 2, when $T_j = T_j^*$ for all $j \in [p]$, we have $\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(s)} P(\text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega}) = \text{supp}(\Omega)) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$.*

3.2 Asymptotic normality

We consider the asymptotic normality of Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$. We write

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) = -\sqrt{n}[\Omega_{ii}\Omega_{jj}(\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}^\top + \epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j}^\top)\epsilon_j/n - \Omega_{ij}] + r_{ij} \quad \text{for } i \in [p], \quad (13)$$

$$= -\sqrt{n}[(\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{i*} \widehat{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+} (\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{*j} - \Omega_{ij}] + \tilde{r}_{ij} \quad \text{for } i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, \quad (14)$$

where $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} = [\Omega_{ii}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_i)^\top \Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $\mathbf{e}_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with 1 on the i -th entry and 0 elsewhere, $\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j} = \Omega_{ii}^{-1}\Omega_{ij}\epsilon_j$, $\epsilon_j = \mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j}\alpha_j^*$, and \hat{i} and \hat{j} are the positions of i and j in $\widehat{A}_j^+ = \widehat{A}_j \cup \{j\}$ when its elements are sorted in ascending order. The remainder terms r_{ij} and \tilde{r}_{ij} satisfy $P(r_{ij} = \tilde{r}_{ij}, \forall i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$ and $\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{ij}| = O_P(T(\log p)/\sqrt{n}) = o_P(1)$ under certain conditions (see Lemma 3), and thus are negligible.

Consider the main term in (13). Define $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} = \Omega_{ii}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_i)^\top \Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}$, $\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j} = \Omega_{ii}^{-1}\Omega_{ij}\epsilon_j$, and $\epsilon_j = x_j - \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top \alpha_j^*$. We let \mathbf{x} be independent of \widehat{A}_j , despite that \widehat{A}_j may change with values of $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, whose rows, however, are i.i.d. copies of \mathbf{x} . The scaled version of the first component, $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}^\top \epsilon_j/n$, is the sample mean of $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} \epsilon_j$ with $E[\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j] = 0$. Rewrite $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} = \Omega_{ii}^{-1} \Omega_{*i}^\top \Sigma_{*\widehat{A}_j} \Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j} = \Omega_{ii}^{-1} E[\Omega_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x} \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top | \widehat{A}_j] \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j} = E[\epsilon_i \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top | \widehat{A}_j] \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j}$ with $\mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j} = \Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}$. Given \widehat{A}_j , it implies that $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}$ is the orthogonal projection of ϵ_i onto $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top)$, which is the subspace spanned by entries of $\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}$ in $(\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}), E)$. Here, $(\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}), E)$ is the \mathcal{L}^2 space of real random variables with expectation as the inner product. Also note that ϵ_j is the orthogonal rejection of x_j from $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top)$. Thus, $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} \perp \epsilon_j$, i.e., $E(\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} \epsilon_{\widehat{A}_j} | \widehat{A}_j) = 0$. The scaled version of the second component, $\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j}^\top \epsilon_j/n$, is the sample

mean of $\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j}\epsilon_j$ with $E[\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j}\epsilon_j] = E[\epsilon_i\epsilon_j] = \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1}\mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1}\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}$, which equals the scaled negative version of the third component, since $\epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j} = E[\epsilon_i\epsilon_j/\text{sd}(\epsilon_j)]\epsilon_j/\text{sd}(\epsilon_j)$ is the orthogonal projection of ϵ_i onto ϵ_j in space $(\mathcal{L}^2(\mathbb{R}), E)$. Hence, the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}$ can be derived using the central limit theorem, assuming \widehat{A}_j is a fixed set given n and p . However, the i.i.d. assumption may not hold for entries of $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}$ in the first scaled component $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}^\top \epsilon_j/n$, as \widehat{A}_j is a random set dependent on data \mathbf{X} .

We consider the asymptotic normality under the assumption that the event $\mathcal{E}_j = \{A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j = \widetilde{A}_j(n, p)\}$ holds with high probability, where $\widetilde{A}_j(n, p)$ is a fixed set given n and p . Lemmas 1 and 2 show that event \mathcal{E}_j is achievable with high probability. One might relax the condition $\widehat{A}_j = \widetilde{A}_j(n, p)$ by treating the entries of $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}$ as exchangeable variables, and then apply the central limit theorem of exchangeable variables (Jiang and Hahn, 2002). This theoretical derivation is more involved and thus is not pursued in this paper. For simplicity, $\widetilde{A}_j(n, p)$ is abbreviated as \widetilde{A}_j by omitting its dependence on n and p . We define $\sigma_{i, \widetilde{A}_j} = \text{sd}(\xi_{i, \widetilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j)$ and $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j} = \text{sd}(\xi_{i, \widehat{A}_j} \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j)$, where $\xi_{i, A} = -\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_A} + \epsilon_{i\|\epsilon_j}) I(i \in A) - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \epsilon_i I(i \notin A)$ and $\epsilon_{i\|\mathbf{x}_A} = \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_i)_A^\top \mathbf{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_A$ with $A \in \{\widetilde{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j\}$.

Lemma 3. *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold, and either (A4) or (A5) is satisfied. For $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$, if $P(A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$, then $P(r_{ij} = \tilde{r}_{ij}, \forall i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$ and $\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{ij}| = O_P(T(\log p)/\sqrt{n})$. Further, if $P(\cap_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{E}_j) \rightarrow 1$, $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$, and $\min_{i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \sigma_{i, \widetilde{A}_j} \geq \omega$ with a constant $\omega > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p], z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| P(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij})/\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j} \leq z) - \Phi(z) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (15)$$

The assumption $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$ and a condition similar to $\min_{i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \sigma_{i, \widetilde{A}_j} \geq \omega$ are also required in the asymptotic normality theorem of the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator in Janková and van de Geer (2017) (see their conditions A2* and A4). From

Lemmas 1 and 2, the condition $P(\cap_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{E}_j) \rightarrow 1$ in Lemma 3 is achievable under certain conditions for minimum magnitudes of nonzero entries $\{m_j\}_{j \in [p]}$ and tuning parameters $\{T_j\}_{j \in [p]}$. Thus, we have the following result.

Theorem 3 (Asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\Omega}$). *Suppose that (A1) and (A2) hold, $\gamma_{T_{\max}} < 1 - c$ with a constant $c > 0$, $T_{\max}(\log p)/n = o(1)$, and $s(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$. For all $j \in [p]$, assume that $k_j(T_j) \geq \log_{1-\frac{c}{2}} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$, $0 \leq T_j \leq T_{\max,j} \in [(s_j - 1) \vee 1, p - 1]$, and $m_j \geq M \sqrt{(T_{\max,j} \vee \log \log n)(\log p)/n}$ with a sufficiently large constant $M > 0$. Let $\widehat{A}_j = \widehat{A}_j(k_j(T_j = T_j^*))$ for all $j \in [p]$ with T_j^* given in (10). Assume that $\min_{i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \sigma_{i,A_j^*} \geq \omega$ with a constant $\omega > 0$. Then, we have*

$$\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(s), i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p], z \in \mathbb{R}} \left| P(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij})/\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j} \leq z) - \Phi(z) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (16)$$

Lemma 3 and Theorem 3 demonstrate that the Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ achieves asymptotic normality without the need for debiasing that is required by the Nodewise Lasso estimator (Janková and van de Geer, 2017). Given the above asymptotic normality and the sparsistency in Section 3.1, we can conclude that the Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}$ is asymptotically unbiased.

We now consider the estimation of the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2$. From (14) and Lemma 3, it holds with high probability that $\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2 = \text{var}((\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{i*} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top (\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{*j} | \widehat{A}_j)$ for $i \in \widehat{A}_j^+$. Thus, we can estimate $\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2$ by

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n [(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{i*} \mathbf{X}_{k,\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k,\widehat{A}_j^+} (\widehat{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{*j}]^2 - \frac{1}{2} (\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^2 + \widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^2) \quad \text{for } i \in \widehat{A}_j^+. \quad (17)$$

Further, if \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution, then with high probability $\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2$ has the closed form $\sigma_{i,\widehat{A}_j}^2 = (\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ii} (\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{jj} + (\Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ij}^2$ for $i \in \widehat{A}_j^+$. Then, we estimate

σ_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2 by

$$\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2 = (\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{A}_j^+ \hat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ii} (\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{A}_j^+ \hat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{jj} + (\hat{\Sigma}_{\hat{A}_j^+ \hat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ij}^2 \quad \text{for } i \in \hat{A}_j^+. \quad (18)$$

The following theorem shows that $\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2$ is a consistent estimator of σ_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2 .

Theorem 4 (Consistency of $\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2$). *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold, either (A4) or (A5) is satisfied, and $P(\cap_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{E}_j) \rightarrow 1$. We have the following results.*

- (i) (Sub-Gaussian cases) *Assume that $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$, and $[\log(p \vee n)]^4/n^{1-c} = o(1)$ with a constant $c > 0$. Let $\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2$ be the estimator defined in (17). Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,*

$$P\left(\max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

- (ii) (Gaussian cases) *Assume that \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution. Let $\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2$ be the estimator defined in (18). Then, we have*

$$\max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\hat{\sigma}_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i,\hat{A}_j}^2| = O_P(\sqrt{T(\log p)/n}).$$

3.3 Discussion on a desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator

We can construct a desparsified version of the Nodewise Loreg estimator in the same form of the desparsified (debiased) Nodewise Lasso estimator given in Janková and van de Geer (2017). Specifically, we have

$$\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \hat{\Omega}_{*i}^\top (\hat{\Sigma} \hat{\Omega}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j) - \Omega_{ij} = -\Omega_{*i}^\top (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Omega_{*j} + \Delta_{ij}/\sqrt{n}. \quad (19)$$

where $\Delta_{ij} = o_P(1)$ under certain conditions (see Theorem 5). Thus, the desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\mathbf{T}} = \hat{\Omega} - \hat{\Omega}^\top (\hat{\Sigma} \hat{\Omega} - \mathbf{I}) = \hat{\Omega} + \hat{\Omega}^\top - \hat{\Omega}^\top \hat{\Sigma} \hat{\Omega}, \quad (20)$$

which employs the same formula as the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator, except for plugging in their respective undesparsified estimators as $\widehat{\Omega}$. The following theorem shows that the desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ enjoys asymptotic normality without requiring the condition $P(\widehat{A}_j = \widetilde{A}_j(n, p), \forall j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$ assumed for its undesparsified counterpart $\widehat{\Omega}$.

Theorem 5 (Asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$). *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold. Assume that (A4) holds with $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, or (A5) holds with $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, where M_1 and M_2 are sufficiently large positive constants. Then uniformly for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$, we have $\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\Delta_{ij}| = O_P(T(\log p)/\sqrt{n})$. Further, if $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$ and $\sigma_{ij} := \text{sd}(\Omega_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \Omega_{*j}) \geq w$ with a constant $w > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1), 1 \leq i, j \leq p, z \in \mathbb{R}} |P(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij})/\sigma_{ij} \leq z) - \Phi(z)| \rightarrow 0.$$

For the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{ij}^2 = \text{var}(\Omega_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \Omega_{*j})$ in Theorem 5, we estimate it by

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (\widehat{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k*}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k*} \widehat{\Omega}_{*j})^2 - \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^2 + \widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^2). \quad (21)$$

If \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution, then we have $\sigma_{ij}^2 = \Omega_{ii}\Omega_{jj} + \Omega_{ij}^2$ and estimate it by

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 = \widehat{\Omega}_{ii}\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} + \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^2 + \widehat{\Omega}_{ji}^2). \quad (22)$$

We establish the following consistency result for $\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2$ with respect to σ_{ij}^2 .

Theorem 6 (Consistency of $\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2$). *Suppose that (A1)-(A3) hold, and either (A4) or (A5) is satisfied. We have the following results.*

- (i) (Sub-Gaussian cases) *Assume that $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$, and $[\log(p \vee n)]^4/n^{1-c} = o(1)$*

with a constant $c > 0$. Let $\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2$ be the estimator defined in (21). Then, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sup_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 - \sigma_{ij}^2| \geq \varepsilon\right) \rightarrow 0.$$

(ii) (Gaussian cases) Assume that \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution. Let $\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2$ be the estimator defined in (22). Then, uniformly for all $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$, we have

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\widehat{\sigma}_{ij}^2 - \sigma_{ij}^2| = O_P(\sqrt{T(\log p)/n}).$$

We observe that the asymptotic variance of desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_{ij}$, $\sigma_{ij}^2 := \text{var}(\Omega_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \Omega_{*j}) = \text{var}(\Omega_{ii} \Omega_{jj} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j)$, is similar to that of undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}$, $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2 := \text{var}(\xi_{i, \widehat{A}_j} \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j) = \text{var}(\Omega_{ii} \Omega_{jj} (\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} + \epsilon_{i \| \epsilon_j}) \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j)$. Thus, we aim to compare these two asymptotic variances. Note that σ_{ij}^2 is also the asymptotic variance of the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator (Janková and van de Geer, 2017).

Theorem 7 (Comparison of asymptotic variances). *Assume that \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution. Given any \widehat{A}_j such that $A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j$, we have $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2 \leq \sigma_{ij}^2$ for $i \in \widehat{A}_j^+$, where equality holds if and only if $(A_i^* \cup \{i\}) \setminus \widehat{A}_j^+ = \emptyset$.*

Remark 2. *From Theorem 7, when \mathbf{x} is Gaussian, $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2$, the asymptotic variance of undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}$, is dominated by σ_{ij}^2 , the asymptotic variance shared by both the desparsified Nodewise Loreg and desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimators $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_{ij}$. This suggests a potential for more powerful statistical inference, such as discovering nonzero Ω_{ij} through hypothesis testing, when $\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}_{ij}$ are very close. It should be noted that Theorem 7 may not hold when \mathbf{x} is non-Gaussian. A counterexample is provided in Supplementary Materials. Nonetheless, in many practical applications, such as genomic data analysis, non-Gaussian data are often transformed to approximate Gaussian distributions (Box and Cox, 1964; Durbin et al., 2002; Feng et al., 2016), potentially retaining the*

advantage when σ_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2 is smaller.

4 Simulation Studies

4.1 Simulation settings

We numerically compare our Nodewise Loreg with Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso.

The following four graph models are considered for the precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$.

- **Band graph:** $\Omega_{ij} = I(|i - j| = 0) + 0.5I(|i - j| = 1) + 0.3I(|i - j| = 2)$. The resulting graph has $2p - 3$ edges.
- **Random graph:** We add an edge between each pair of the p nodes with probability $4/p$ independently. The resulting graph has approximately $2(p - 1)$ edges. Once the graph is obtained, we construct the adjacency matrix \mathbf{A} and generate the precision matrix

$$\mathbf{\Omega} = \mathbf{A} + (|\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})| + 0.1)\mathbf{I}_{p \times p}. \quad (23)$$

- **Hub graph:** The p nodes are evenly partitioned into $p/10$ disjoint groups. Within each group, one node is selected as the hub and we add an edge between the hub and every other node. The resulting graph has $p - p/10$ edges. $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is generated using (23).
- **Cluster graph:** The p nodes are evenly partitioned into $p/10$ disjoint groups. Within each group, we add an edge between each pair of the 10 nodes with probability 0.6 independently. The resulting graph has approximately $2.7p$ edges. $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is generated by (23).

For each graph model, the precision matrix $\mathbf{\Omega}$ is fixed across all replications within the same simulation setting. Similar graph models have been considered in the literature (Liu and Wang, 2017; Wang et al., 2016; Zhao et al., 2012). We generate the data matrix

$\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$, consisting of n rows that are i.i.d. copies of a p -dimensional random vector \mathbf{x} . We consider the following Gaussian and sub-Gaussian cases for \mathbf{x} , also considered in Janková and van de Geer (2017).

- **Gaussian case:** $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1})$.
- **Sub-Gaussian case:** Let \mathbf{u} be a vector consisting of p i.i.d. entries from a continuous uniform distribution on the interval $[-\sqrt{3}, \sqrt{3}]$. Generate $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1/2}\mathbf{u}$.

We mainly consider the four settings of sample size and variable dimension: $(n, p) \in \{(200, 200), (200, 400), (400, 200), (400, 400)\}$. For each simulation setting, we conduct 100 independent replications to calculate evaluation metrics. For figures assessing asymptotic normality, we increase the number of replications to 400 and add cases of $n = 800$ to ensure a clearer comparison of the histogram with the standard Gaussian curve.

We implement our Nodewise Loreg by invoking C++ subroutines through R for the SDAR algorithm. For the implementation of Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso, we utilize the R packages *glmnet* (Friedman et al., 2022), *flare* (Li et al., 2022), and *glasso* (Friedman et al., 2019), which are coded in C++, C, and Fortran, respectively. For our Nodewise Loreg, we select tuning parameters $\{T_j\}_{j=1}^p$ by minimizing the HBIC (9) as described in (10) with the maximum values $\{T_{\max, j}\}_{j=1}^p$ all set to 20. For Nodewise Lasso, tuning parameters $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^p$ are also selected by minimizing the HBIC (9) in which plugging their corresponding estimated active sets. The candidate values for $\{\lambda_j\}_{j=1}^p$ range from 0.02 to 2 with 20 equal logarithmic spaced values. For both CLIME and GLasso, we select the optimal value of their respective tuning parameter λ by minimizing the BIC criterion (Yuan and Lin, 2007):

$$\text{BIC}(\lambda) = -\log |\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\lambda)| + \text{tr}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\lambda)\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}) + \frac{\log n}{n} \sum_{i \leq j} I([\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\lambda)]_{ij}),$$

where $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}(\lambda)$ is the estimated precision matrix using tuning parameter λ , and the candidate

values of λ is the same as those for Nodewise Lasso.

To utilize the asymptotic normality of Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso, we also consider to further threshold their estimates by multiple testing. Denote the null and alternative hypotheses at entry (i, j) by $H_{ij,0}: \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} = 0$ and $H_{ij,1}: \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \neq 0$, respectively. Let $S_L(\mathbf{M})$ denote the support set of the off-diagonal lower triangular part of a square matrix \mathbf{M} . Define $\mathcal{T}(\mathbf{M}_1|Z_0(\mathbf{M}_2), S_L(\mathbf{M}_3))$ as the thresholded version of a symmetric matrix \mathbf{M}_1 via multiple testing for $H_{ij,0}$ against $H_{ij,1}$ at all entries $(i, j) \in S_L(\mathbf{M}_3)$ based on the Z -score of $(\mathbf{M}_2)_{ij}$ under $H_{ij,0}$ as per the asymptotic normality of Nodewise Loreg or Nodewise Lasso, where $(\mathbf{M}_1)_{ij} = (\mathbf{M}_1)_{ji}$ remain unchanged if $(i, j) \in S_L(\mathbf{M}_3)$ with rejected $H_{ij,0}$ or if $i = j$, and all other entries $(i, j) \in [p] \times [p]$ are set to zero. We conduct multiple testing using the false discovery rate (FDR) control method, AdaptZ (Sun and Cai, 2007), which under certain conditions is optimal in minimizing the false nondiscovery rate while controlling FDR. The nominal FDR level is set to 0.05. We consider the four thresholded estimators $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^{\text{US}}), S_L(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S))$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S))$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S))$, and $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$. The asymptotic variances are estimated for the undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator using (17) for sub-Gaussian cases and (18) for Gaussian cases, and for desparsified Nodewise Loreg and desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimators using (21) for sub-Gaussian cases and (22) for Gaussian cases.

4.2 Results on matrix norm losses

We evaluate matrix losses using $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|$ in the L_1 , spectral, Frobenius, and max norms for each method. Results based on 100 replications are summarized in Table 1 and Tables 7 and 8 in the Supplementary Materials.

The undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}^S$ substantially outperforms the un-

desparsified Nodewise Lasso’s $\widehat{\Omega}^S$ across all settings and norms, except for the max norm in Gaussian band graph settings with $n = 200$ and in the sub-Gaussian band graph setting with $(n, p) = (200, 400)$. In these exceptions, undesparsified Nodewise Loreg surpasses when n increases to 400.

The desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ significantly underperforms its undesparsified counterpart $\widehat{\Omega}^S$ in the L_1 , spectral, and Frobenius norms, but shows comparable results in the max norm. Similar trends are observed for Nodewise Lasso, except for improvements in the spectral norm under cluster graph settings and in the max norm. The desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ is not sparse, leading to error accumulation over many zero entries, making it less practical.

Thresholding $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ via multiple testing for Nodewise Loreg is also not recommended, since $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$ and $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$ exhibit significantly inferior performance compared to $\widehat{\Omega}^S$. Thresholding $\widehat{\Omega}^S$ based on the asymptotic normality of $\widehat{\Omega}^{US}$ or $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ also shows no significant improvement in matrix norm losses, as $\widehat{\Omega}^S$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, and $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$ have similarly good results. This is due to their similar performance in support recovery, as shown in the next subsection.

Compared with Nodewise Lasso’s best-performing estimator $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$, Nodewise Loreg’s $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$ shows superior performance in the L_1 , spectral, and Frobenius norms under all band and cluster graph settings, as well as nearly all random and hub graph settings with $n = 400$, achieves better and comparable max norm losses under all graph settings when $n = 400$, and generally has small differences under the other settings. Both estimators generally have significant smaller matrix norm losses than CLIME and GLasso estimators.

Gaussian			L_1 norm	Spectral norm	Frobenius norm	Max norm
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
200		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	1.168(0.192)/ 0.637(0.096)	0.834(0.154)/ 0.453(0.075)	3.299(0.180)/1.832(0.093)	0.511(0.089)/0.269(0.045)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.163(0.193)/0.637(0.097)	0.832(0.154)/0.453(0.075)	3.295(0.179)/1.830(0.092)	0.511(0.089)/0.272(0.045)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.162(0.189)/0.638(0.098)	0.833(0.154)/0.455(0.074)	3.303(0.181)/1.831(0.093)	0.511(0.089)/0.274(0.045)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.633(0.337)/0.804(0.142)	1.100(0.205)/0.559(0.092)	3.979(0.249)/2.097(0.123)	0.514(0.089)/0.277(0.043)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	1.945(0.476)/0.948(0.149)	1.179(0.221)/0.596(0.088)	4.585(0.260)/2.442(0.150)	0.514(0.089)/0.288(0.039)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	16.566(0.992)/10.373(0.407)	3.375(0.139)/2.211(0.088)	15.645(0.250)/10.386(0.129)	0.514(0.089)/0.269(0.042)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	2.010(0.097)/1.332(0.058)	1.522(0.065)/1.052(0.034)	8.248(0.164)/5.772(0.111)	0.497(0.018)/0.338(0.017)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.010(0.097)/1.332(0.058)	1.522(0.065)/1.053(0.034)	8.248(0.164)/5.772(0.111)	0.497(0.018)/0.338(0.017)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.940(0.230)/0.835(0.084)	1.223(0.153)/0.546(0.046)	4.791(0.238)/2.559(0.089)	0.487(0.041)/0.257(0.027)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	1.328(0.145)/0.673(0.084)	0.915(0.093)/0.493(0.051)	3.976(0.184)/2.158(0.092)	0.445(0.044)/0.267(0.031)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	10.455(0.330)/7.770(0.234)	2.207(0.060)/1.598(0.042)	11.123(0.073)/8.324(0.051)	0.445(0.044)/0.250(0.023)
		CLIME	1.988(0.065)/1.454(0.074)	1.666(0.053)/1.156(0.069)	9.986(0.354)/6.609(0.454)	0.534(0.022)/0.382(0.026)
		GLasso	2.157(0.022)/1.928(0.020)	2.021(0.006)/1.768(0.007)	12.801(0.016)/10.958(0.023)	0.614(0.008)/0.524(0.009)
		Band		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	1.384(0.187)/0.707(0.104)	0.972(0.136)/0.508(0.079)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.380(0.183)/0.706(0.104)			0.972(0.136)/0.508(0.079)	5.048(0.208)/2.647(0.089)	0.661(0.122)/0.301(0.039)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.379(0.185)/0.705(0.106)			0.972(0.136)/0.508(0.079)	5.053(0.206)/2.650(0.090)	0.661(0.122)/0.302(0.039)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.101(0.352)/0.919(0.134)			1.358(0.203)/0.639(0.103)	6.258(0.278)/3.081(0.118)	0.663(0.122)/0.304(0.037)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	2.572(0.559)/1.123(0.163)			1.439(0.211)/0.679(0.097)	7.227(0.289)/3.611(0.138)	0.663(0.122)/0.312(0.029)
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	33.504(1.755)/20.077(0.516)			5.585(0.186)/3.516(0.111)	31.403(0.313)/20.751(0.153)	0.663(0.122)/0.298(0.039)
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	2.131(0.024)/1.423(0.061)			1.718(0.047)/1.158(0.031)	13.247(0.191)/9.034(0.106)	0.532(0.022)/0.363(0.018)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.131(0.024)/1.423(0.061)			1.718(0.047)/1.158(0.031)	13.247(0.191)/9.034(0.106)	0.532(0.022)/0.363(0.018)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.150(0.064)/0.944(0.088)			1.549(0.097)/0.628(0.047)	8.771(0.356)/3.948(0.100)	0.532(0.022)/0.290(0.020)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	1.676(0.145)/0.773(0.078)			1.160(0.086)/0.576(0.051)	6.984(0.232)/3.416(0.104)	0.531(0.024)/0.296(0.017)
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	19.481(0.582)/14.731(0.302)			3.471(0.080)/2.417(0.042)	20.929(0.101)/16.087(0.061)	0.531(0.024)/0.280(0.021)
CLIME	1.999(0.055)/1.645(0.060)			1.674(0.021)/1.358(0.021)	14.186(0.091)/11.221(0.080)	0.546(0.015)/0.443(0.015)
GLasso	2.201(0.021)/2.009(0.024)			2.025(0.005)/1.848(0.067)	18.130(0.018)/16.286(0.691)	0.620(0.008)/0.550(0.022)

Table 1: Average (standard deviation) of each matrix norm loss over 100 simulation replications under Gaussian band graph settings. The results for other (sub-)Gaussian graph settings are given in Tables 7 and 8 in Supplementary Materials.

4.3 Results on support recovery

To compare the support recovery performance of estimators on off-diagonal entries of Ω , we adopt the four evaluation metrics, precision, sensitivity, specificity, and Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC). They are defined as follows:

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FP}}, \quad \text{Sensitivity} = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP} + \text{FN}}, \quad \text{Specificity} = \frac{\text{TN}}{\text{FP} + \text{TN}},$$

$$\text{MCC} = \frac{\text{TP} \times \text{TN} - \text{FP} \times \text{FN}}{\sqrt{(\text{TP} + \text{FP})(\text{TP} + \text{FN})(\text{TN} + \text{FP})(\text{TN} + \text{FN})}},$$

where TP is the number of true positives, TN is the number of true negatives, FP is the number of false positives, and FN is the number of false negatives. Table 2 and Tables 9 and 10 in the Supplementary Materials report the support recovery results based on 100 replications. The desparsified estimator $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ for both Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso is

excluded due to its non-sparsity.

The four Nodewise Loreg estimators, $\widehat{\Omega}^S$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, and $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, show similar performance with slight differences. This similarity is due to $\widehat{\Omega}^S$ already having high support recovery, leaving little room for improvement, or because the strong assumption $\max_{j \in [p]} s_j(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$, required by the asymptotic normalities of $\widehat{\Omega}^{US}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ (Theorems 3 and 5), is not ideally met for small n relative to p . The other Nodewise Loreg estimator, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$, which is purely based on the desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$, underperforms the four aforementioned estimators in all settings, except for the cluster graph settings with $n = 200$, where it shows higher MCC and sensitivity as well as lower precision, but is surpassed by the four when n increases to 400. These results suggest that the desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ does not outperform its undesparsified counterpart $\widehat{\Omega}^S$, despite requiring weaker assumptions for asymptotic normality.

The three Nodewise Lasso estimators, $\widehat{\Omega}^S$, $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, and $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$, are inferior to their Nodewise Loreg counterparts, with significantly lower MCC. The other Nodewise Lasso estimator $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$ underperforms the first four Nodewise Loreg estimators by up to 0.152 lower average MCC, except for random graph settings with $n = 200$, where it is still surpassed by or comparable to the four when n increases to 400. The CLIME and GLasso estimators perform worse than the first four Nodewise Loreg estimators, with significantly lower MCC in all settings. Overall, the first four Nodewise Loreg estimators exhibit the best performance in support recovery.

Gaussian		Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC			
Graph	p	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$			
200	Band	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	0.983(0.007)/0.992(0.005)	0.979(0.008)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.980(0.006)/0.996(0.003)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.007)/0.994(0.005)	0.979(0.008)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.981(0.006)/0.997(0.002)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.984(0.006)/ 0.994(0.005)	0.978(0.008)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.981(0.006)/0.997(0.002)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.984(0.006)/ 0.994(0.005)	0.978(0.008)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.981(0.006)/0.997(0.002)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.931(0.015)/0.931(0.010)	0.949(0.012)/0.998(0.002)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.938(0.009)/0.963(0.006)		
		$L_1: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	0.780(0.016)/0.810(0.014)	0.928(0.016)/ 1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.847(0.012)/0.897(0.008)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.782(0.016)/0.811(0.014)	0.928(0.016)/ 1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.848(0.012)/0.898(0.008)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.782(0.016)/0.811(0.014)	0.928(0.016)/ 1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.848(0.012)/0.898(0.008)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.963(0.009)/0.948(0.002)	0.966(0.009)/0.999(0.001)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.964(0.007)/0.973(0.001)		
		CLIME	0.567(0.043)/0.373(0.077)	0.963(0.011)/ 1.000(0.001)	0.985(0.005)/0.964(0.007)	0.732(0.032)/0.598(0.058)		
		GLasso	0.497(0.015)/0.377(0.011)	0.932(0.014)/0.999(0.001)	0.981(0.001)/0.966(0.002)	0.672(0.011)/0.603(0.009)		
		400	Band	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	0.984(0.005)/0.993(0.003)	0.969(0.007)/ 1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.976(0.005)/0.996(0.001)
				$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.994(0.003)	0.969(0.007)/ 1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.977(0.005)/0.997(0.001)
				$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.994(0.003)	0.969(0.007)/ 1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.977(0.005)/0.997(0.001)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.994(0.003)			0.969(0.007)/ 1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.977(0.005)/0.997(0.001)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.930(0.011)/0.936(0.007)			0.930(0.009)/0.997(0.002)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.929(0.007)/0.966(0.003)		
$L_1: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	0.797(0.011)/0.822(0.011)			0.827(0.022)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.810(0.012)/0.905(0.006)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.798(0.011)/0.823(0.011)			0.827(0.022)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.810(0.012)/0.906(0.006)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.798(0.011)/0.823(0.011)			0.827(0.022)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.810(0.012)/0.906(0.006)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	0.957(0.008)/0.948(0.001)			0.945(0.010)/0.998(0.002)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.951(0.008)/0.973(0.001)		
CLIME	0.482(0.007)/0.495(0.009)			0.970(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	0.989(0.000)/0.990(0.000)	0.680(0.006)/0.700(0.006)		
GLasso	0.391(0.010)/0.402(0.119)			0.932(0.010)/0.998(0.002)	0.985(0.001)/0.982(0.009)	0.599(0.008)/0.621(0.098)		

Table 2: Average (standard deviation) of each support-recovery metric over 100 simulation replications under Gaussian band graph settings. The results for other (sub-)Gaussian graph settings are given in Tables 9 and 10 in Supplementary Materials.

4.4 Results on asymptotic normality

We evaluate the asymptotic normality of Nodewise Loreg in comparison to Nodewise Lasso.

We consider the unsymmetrized Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}^{US}$ and the desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ respectively from Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso. Denote $S_{\Omega} = \text{supp}(\Omega)$, $S_{\Omega}^c = [p] \times [p] \setminus S_{\Omega}$, and $\widehat{S}_{\Omega} = \bigcap_{m=1}^M \text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega}_{L_0}^{US,(m)})$, where $\widehat{\Omega}_{L_0}^{US,(m)}$ is the unsymmetrized estimate of Ω from Nodewise Loreg based on the data from the m -th replication. We consider four evaluation metrics computed for each single entry in a given set. The average and standard deviation of each evaluation metric are calculated over all entries in \widehat{S}_{Ω} for all the three estimators, and in S_{Ω} and in S_{Ω}^c only for the two desparsified estimators which are applicable there. For entry (i, j) , the four evaluation metrics are defined as follows, where $\widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)}$ and $\widehat{\Omega}^{(m)}$ denote the estimates of the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{\Omega_{ij}}$ (either $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}$ or σ_{ij} as per method) and the precision matrix Ω , respectively, obtained from the m -th replication.

- Average length of estimated $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence intervals:

$$\text{AvgLength}_{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)} / \sqrt{n},$$

which estimates the length of the corresponding true confidence interval

$$\text{TrueLength}_{(i,j)} = 2\Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \sigma_{\Omega_{ij}} / \sqrt{n}.$$

- Coverage rate of estimated $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ confidence intervals:

$$\text{CovRate}_{(i,j)} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M I\left(\Omega_{ij} \in \left[\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)} / \sqrt{n}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} + \Phi^{-1}(1 - \alpha/2) \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)} / \sqrt{n} \right] \right).$$

- Absolute average Z -score:

$$\text{AbsAvgZ}_{(i,j)} = \left| \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \sqrt{n} (\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)} \right|.$$

- Standard deviation of Z -scores:

$$\text{SDZ}_{(i,j)} = \text{sd} \left(\left(\sqrt{n} (\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)} \right)_{m=1}^M \right).$$

Table 3 and Tables 11–15 in the Supplementary Materials present the results on asymptotic normality using the four evaluation metrics, based on $M = 100$ replications and $\alpha = 0.05$ for constructing confidence intervals.

Specifically, Table 3 and Table 13 show the results on \widehat{S}_{Ω} under Gaussian and sub-Gaussian settings, respectively. We observe that the true length of the 95% confidence interval, $\text{TrueLength}_{(i,j)}$, for the unsymmetrized Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ is, on average, smaller on \widehat{S}_{Ω} than for the desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ of both Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso. This result is consistent with Theorem 7 for multivariate Gaussian distri-

butions, though the theorem does not universally apply to sub-Gaussian scenarios.

The average length of estimated confidence intervals, $\text{AvgLength}_{(i,j)}$, from both Node-wise Loreg estimators $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ more accurately approximates the true length, $\text{TrueLength}_{(i,j)}$, across \widehat{S}_{Ω} compared to the Nodewise Lasso estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$. This indicates that our Nodewise Loreg estimators for asymptotic variances σ_{i,\widehat{A}_j} and σ_{ij} are generally closer to their true values on \widehat{S}_{Ω} than the Nodewise Lasso estimator for σ_{ij} .

The unsymmetrized Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ outperforms the other two estimators in the coverage rate of estimated 95% confidence intervals, $\text{CovRate}_{(i,j)}$, on \widehat{S}_{Ω} , aligning more closely with the nominal value of 0.95. The desparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ ranks second, while the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ significantly underperforms, particularly in cluster graph settings, trailing by over 0.4 on average compared to

Gaussian Graph	p	Method	$\text{TrueLength}_{(i,j) \in \widehat{S}_{\Omega}}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	$\text{AvgLength}_{(i,j) \in \widehat{S}_{\Omega}}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	$\text{CovRate}_{(i,j) \in \widehat{S}_{\Omega}}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	$\text{AbsAvgZ}_{(i,j) \in \widehat{S}_{\Omega}}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	$\text{SDZ}_{(i,j) \in \widehat{S}_{\Omega}}$ $n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.322(0.048)/0.209(0.038)	0.347(0.054)/0.214(0.039)	0.904(0.032)/0.942(0.023)	0.445(0.158)/0.204(0.116)	1.088(0.094)/ 1.010(0.071)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.336(0.039)/0.225(0.027)	0.362(0.043)/0.232(0.028)	0.883(0.033)/0.938(0.024)	0.631(0.103)/0.283(0.111)	1.075(0.085) /1.012(0.073)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.336(0.039)/0.225(0.027)	0.257(0.039)/0.190(0.026)	0.627(0.097)/0.846(0.088)	1.536(0.378)/0.673(0.407)	1.497(0.160)/1.144(0.117)
	400	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.322(0.047)/0.209(0.038)	0.351(0.054)/0.215(0.040)	0.884(0.036)/0.938(0.024)	0.505(0.180)/0.230(0.123)	1.139(0.098)/ 1.024(0.073)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.337(0.039)/0.225(0.027)	0.367(0.043)/0.233(0.028)	0.851(0.038)/0.930(0.025)	0.754(0.127)/0.325(0.115)	1.130(0.089) /1.031(0.074)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.337(0.039)/0.225(0.027)	0.241(0.038)/0.184(0.026)	0.443(0.107)/0.787(0.129)	2.344(0.459)/0.916(0.506)	1.777(0.226)/1.196(0.132)
Random	200	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.583(0.258)/0.375(0.174)	0.652(0.308)/ 0.387(0.183)	0.898(0.033)/0.938(0.025)	0.372(0.133)/0.216(0.126)	1.139(0.094) /1.026(0.078)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.624(0.296)/0.433(0.197)	0.659(0.322) /0.446(0.205)	0.898(0.033) /0.935(0.025)	0.375(0.138)/0.259(0.114)	1.140(0.094)/ 1.026(0.074)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.624(0.296)/0.433(0.197)	0.516(0.208)/0.377(0.153)	0.616(0.169)/0.890(0.089)	1.628(0.686)/0.528(0.391)	1.531(0.350)/1.059(0.151)
	400	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.585(0.200)/0.371(0.138)	0.667(0.251)/ 0.384(0.146)	0.874(0.038)/0.936(0.026)	0.402(0.137)/0.231(0.129)	1.212(0.110)/ 1.032(0.076)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.639(0.240)/0.441(0.145)	0.678(0.261) /0.455(0.152)	0.874(0.038) /0.932(0.025)	0.406(0.140)/0.279(0.117)	1.211(0.111) /1.038(0.074)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.639(0.240)/0.441(0.145)	0.509(0.153)/0.375(0.107)	0.534(0.197)/0.865(0.123)	2.039(0.875)/0.668(0.484)	1.609(0.415)/1.053(0.176)
Hub	200	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	1.328(1.092)/1.030(0.707)	1.406(1.212)/1.056(0.736)	0.932(0.027)/0.945(0.022)	0.270(0.137)/0.160(0.108)	1.040(0.078)/1.008(0.075)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.726(1.063)/1.245(0.662)	1.829(1.161)/1.276(0.688)	0.919(0.028)/0.941(0.023)	0.356(0.131)/0.206(0.113)	1.060(0.080)/1.012(0.076)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.726(1.063)/1.245(0.662)	1.333(0.692)/1.020(0.476)	0.891(0.086)/0.920(0.063)	0.398(0.395)/0.267(0.297)	1.124(0.156)/1.050(0.115)
	400	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	1.297(1.107)/1.028(0.708)	1.379(1.246)/1.056(0.739)	0.924(0.031)/0.942(0.024)	0.309(0.144)/0.175(0.106)	1.053(0.079)/1.019(0.077)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.717(1.090)/1.244(0.664)	1.831(1.202)/1.277(0.691)	0.907(0.033)/0.936(0.025)	0.408(0.144)/0.226(0.112)	1.082(0.084)/1.031(0.077)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.717(1.090)/1.244(0.664)	1.289(0.675)/1.000(0.461)	0.863(0.114)/0.909(0.079)	0.510(0.517)/0.315(0.371)	1.147(0.168)/1.066(0.127)
Cluster	200	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.739(0.355)/0.401(0.170)	0.831(0.396)/ 0.413(0.176)	0.849(0.055)/0.941(0.024)	0.473(0.180)/0.191(0.132)	1.261(0.207)/1.016(0.070)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.789(0.373)/0.426(0.175)	0.847(0.413) /0.441(0.183)	0.847(0.053)/0.936(0.025)	0.498(0.174)/0.265(0.123)	1.261(0.207) /1.020(0.070)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.789(0.373)/0.426(0.175)	0.586(0.281)/0.338(0.138)	0.352(0.279)/0.537(0.280)	2.908(1.411)/1.967(1.251)	1.631(0.312)/1.306(0.223)
	400	$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.600(0.246)/0.359(0.147)	0.695(0.283)/ 0.371(0.154)	0.809(0.072)/0.938(0.026)	0.391(0.248)/0.217(0.146)	1.431(0.233)/1.021(0.076)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.662(0.257)/0.381(0.151)	0.697(0.289) /0.395(0.158)	0.809(0.072) /0.932(0.027)	0.392(0.249)/0.294(0.126)	1.431(0.234)/1.029(0.077)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.662(0.257)/0.381(0.151)	0.485(0.183)/0.301(0.118)	0.228(0.200)/0.527(0.297)	3.513(1.144)/1.997(1.308)	1.654(0.288)/1.280(0.232)

Table 3: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in \widehat{S}_{Ω} under Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications. The results for other (sub-)Gaussian settings on \widehat{S}_{Ω} , S_{Ω} and S_{Ω}^c are given in Tables 11–15 in Supplementary Materials.

$\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$.

Regarding the Z -score, the unsymmetrized Nodewise Loreg estimator $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ performs the best in all settings in terms of the absolute average Z -score $\text{AbsAvg}Z_{(i,j)}$ being closer to zero on \widehat{S}_{Ω} , leading by a large margin in most settings compared to Nodewise Loreg’s desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ and even more significantly against Nodewise Lasso’s $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ in all settings. This result suggests that debiasing Nodewise Loreg’s $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ may be unnecessary. Additionally, with the standard deviation of Z -scores, $\text{SD}Z_{(i,j)}$, being closest to one or nearly the best, the Z -score of Nodewise Loreg’s $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ more closely follows the standard Gaussian distribution.

Comparative analysis of Nodewise Loreg’s desparsified estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ and Nodewise Lasso’s $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ based on the results on S_{Ω} and S_{Ω}^c given in Tables 11, 12, 14, and 15 shows the former’s superior performance in most settings.

To visualize the performance of the three estimators on asymptotic normality, we present histograms of their Z -score values $(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij})/\widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^M$ from $M = 400$ replications in Figure 1 and Figures 4–11 in the Supplementary Materials, superimposed with the density curve of the standard Gaussian distribution.

All three methods show Z -score histograms approaching the standard Gaussian curve as n increases. The Nodewise Loreg estimators $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ exhibit similar performance, again suggesting that debiasing $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$ may not be necessary. Moreover, they outperform the Nodewise Lasso estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$ in demonstrating asymptotic normality. Particularly, the two Nodewise Loreg estimators have Z -score histograms well approximated by the standard Gaussian curve in most examples when $n \leq p$, though the theorems for their asymptotic normality (Theorems 3 and 5) require the strong assumption $\max_{j \in [p]} s_j(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$ as in Nodewise Lasso’s (Janková and van de Geer, 2017, Theorem 1). In contrast, the

Nodewise Lasso estimator $\hat{\mathbf{T}}$ often fails to fit the curve well, even when $n = 800$, especially under the cluster graph settings.




Figure 1: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij})/\hat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under Gaussian band graph settings. The results for more matrix entries and other (sub-)Gaussian graph settings are given in Figures 4–11 in Supplementary Materials.

4.5 Timing performance

We execute the Nodewise Loreg, Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso using our institution’s High Performance Computing cluster. Each simulation replication is allocated with 2GB memory on an Intel Xeon Platinum 8268 CPU core operating at 2.90GHz. We only compute the runtime of the respective estimator $\hat{\Omega}^S$ for Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso, without considering the optional post-thresholding using multiple testing, which varies in time depending on the selected FDR control method. Table 4 summarizes the average and standard deviation of the runtime over the 100 replications under each simulation setting for each method. Notably, our Nodewise Loreg outperforms the other methods in 13 of the 32 settings, achieving significantly shorter runtime than Nodewise Lasso with a reduction of up to 45% in average runtime for all settings, except the two hub graph settings with $(p, n) = (400, 400)$. CLIME exhibits the longest runtime in every setting, with its average runtime more than 100 times that of Nodewise Loreg in 22 settings. While GLasso records the shortest runtime in 19 settings, 16 of which have $n = 400$, it requires up to 54% longer average runtime in the corresponding 16 settings with $n = 200$, where GLasso is slower than Nodewise Loreg in 13 settings. This counterintuitive phenomenon of increased runtime for smaller n is also observed for CLIME when $p = 200$. This occurs because GLasso and CLIME only require the sample covariance matrix as input data, without the need for the sample size n . Such significant variability in runtime across settings with the same p but different n highlights the unstable timing performance of GLasso. As expected, the runtime increases as either n or p increases for Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso. Moreover, the column-by-column estimating nature of Nodewise Loreg, Nodewise Lasso, and CLIME allows for acceleration using parallel computing on multiple CPU cores, an advantage that GLasso lacks.

Graph Setting	Method	Gaussian: $p = 200$ $n = 200/n = 400$	Gaussian: $p = 400$ $n = 200/n = 400$	Sub-Gaussian: $p = 200$ $n = 200/n = 400$	Sub-Gaussian: $p = 400$ $n = 200/n = 400$
Band	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	5.335(0.219) /9.111(0.246)	22.434(0.822) /41.196(2.315)	5.297(0.197) /9.209(0.270)	22.472(0.785) /40.648(2.203)
	$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	9.513(0.630)/12.27(0.323)	38.927(2.095)/55.500(2.060)	9.719(0.763)/12.36(0.457)	39.496(2.198)/54.575(2.175)
	CLIME	578.0(3.380)/182.9(1.213)	2687.4(53.87)/4997.6(184.8)	577.7(3.325)/182.6(1.423)	2641.8(75.47)/4975.7(174.9)
	GLasso	5.791(0.226)/ 4.519(0.046)	56.328(2.206)/ 36.860(1.184)	5.753(0.220)/ 4.529(0.062)	57.388(2.136)/ 37.239(1.407)
Random	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	5.241(0.230) /8.975(0.328)	22.351(0.865) /40.906(1.739)	5.113(0.197) /8.775(0.289)	22.107(0.839) /40.901(1.854)
	$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	9.007(0.437)/11.72(0.614)	33.733(0.597)/49.489(2.340)	9.208(0.475)/11.85(0.622)	33.752(0.718)/49.643(2.800)
	CLIME	571.9(19.42)/180.5(5.070)	2618.6(69.71)/5080.0(53.11)	572.5(17.44)/180.6(4.681)	2617.3(81.80)/5040.2(85.89)
	GLasso	5.543(0.366)/ 3.812(0.215)	48.725(3.261)/ 34.274(1.565)	5.663(0.352)/ 3.816(0.192)	48.929(3.222)/ 34.207(1.512)
Hub	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	5.932(0.178)/10.73(0.261)	24.319(0.616) /44.034(2.488)	5.826(0.169) /10.53(0.282)	23.947(0.652) /43.753(2.029)
	$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	8.374(0.392)/11.12(0.503)	28.248(2.020)/40.368(3.410)	8.580(0.421)/11.10(0.528)	28.416(2.025)/40.291(3.620)
	CLIME	560.2(14.25)/196.3(7.235)	2665.2(67.20)/4806.5(37.98)	559.4(14.29)/196.0(6.804)	2660.3(71.48)/4793.6(39.04)
	GLasso	5.854(0.299) / 4.610(0.195)	49.782(2.863)/ 36.676(1.709)	6.008(0.294)/ 4.574(0.204)	49.762(2.706)/ 36.840(1.863)
Cluster	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	5.148(0.169)/8.992(0.210)	21.933(0.958) /38.489(2.411)	5.061(0.164)/8.849(0.207)	21.639(0.936) /38.647(2.232)
	$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	8.910(0.212)/11.73(0.679)	33.537(2.272)/51.223(9.438)	9.030(0.247)/11.86(0.729)	33.515(2.394)/51.020(9.905)
	CLIME	566.1(5.136)/181.3(5.235)	2453.5(23.43)/4719.1(211.9)	556.5(4.938)/181.0(5.203)	2451.9(22.73)/4543.9(262.2)
	GLasso	4.538(0.249) / 3.423(0.129)	34.968(1.797)/ 24.114(1.060)	4.654(0.244) / 3.421(0.108)	34.765(1.856)/ 24.347(1.259)

Table 4: Average (standard deviation) of runtime in seconds over 100 simulation replications.

5 Analysis of MDA133 breast cancer gene expression

We compare the performance of Nodewise Loreg, Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso on precision matrix estimation using the MDA133 breast cancer gene expression dataset (Hess et al., 2006) obtained from MD Anderson Cancer Center (<https://bioinformatics.mdanderson.org/public-datasets>). This dataset contains the dChip normalized model based expression index (MBEI) values at 22,283 Affymetrix gene probesets for 133 breast cancer patients treated with neoadjuvant chemotherapy, including 34 patients with pathologic complete response (pCR) and 99 patients with non-pCR. pCR is a strong surrogate marker for improved disease-free survival and overall survival (Spring et al., 2020), which is defined as no residual invasive cancer in the breast or lymph nodes, or residual in situ carcinoma without invasive component. Based on the estimated precision matrix from the gene expression data, we apply linear discriminant analysis (LDA; Hastie et al., 2009) to predict patients' pCR status, and also explore the direct connectivity between gene probesets.

We transform the MBEI data using $\log_2(\text{MBEI}+1)$, making the \log_2 -transformed MBEI approximately Gaussian for each gene probeset. We focus on the 300 most significantly differentially expressed gene probesets selected by the limma moderated t -test (Ritchie et al., 2015). We apply a stratified sampling approach to randomly divide the dataset into training and testing sets, with sizes $n_{\text{train}} = 112$ and $n_{\text{test}} = 21$, respectively, where the testing set includes 5 pCR subjects and 16 non-pCR subjects (approximately 1/6 of the subjects in each class). This data splitting strategy is randomly repeated 100 times to train and test the LDA.

The LDA assumes that the \log_2 -transformed MBEI data of the $p = 300$ selected gene probesets follows a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1})$ with the same precision matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ but different means $\boldsymbol{\mu}_k$, where $k = 1$ for the pCR class and $k = 0$ for the non-pCR class. The LDA scores are defined as:

$$\delta_k(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k - \frac{1}{2} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k + \log \widehat{\pi}_k, \quad k = 0, 1,$$

where \mathbf{x} is the data of a given testing subject, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$ is the precision matrix estimated from the sample mean-centered training data, $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_k$ is the within-class average vector in the training set, and $\widehat{\pi}_k$ is the proportion of class- k subjects in the training set. A testing subject is classified as pCR if $\delta_1(\mathbf{x}) > \delta_0(\mathbf{x})$, and otherwise is classified as non-pCR. We select the tuning parameters for each method as in our simulations, except for Nodewise Loreg, for which $T_{\max, j} = \lfloor n / (\log(p) \log(\log n)) \rfloor$, $j \in [p]$, as suggested in Zhu et al. (2020). The nominal FDR level is set to 0.05 for all thresholding estimators of Nodewise Loreg and Nodewise Lasso.

Table 5 reports the the classification performance of each precision matrix estimator in evaluation metrics including precision, sensitivity, specificity, MCC, and sparsity, which denotes the number of edges in the resulting graph. We observe that the Nodewise Loreg

estimators $\hat{\Omega}^S$, $\mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$, and $\mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$ perform similarly and outperform the other estimators, with the highest values in precision, sensitivity, and MCC, nearly the highest specificity, and the smallest values in sparsity.

We analyze the direct connectivity among the 300 differentially expressed gene probesets

Method	Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC	Sparsity: # edges
$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.637(0.158)	0.838(0.155)	0.829(0.106)	0.622(0.164)	285.440(10.372)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.637(0.158)	0.838(0.155)	0.829(0.106)	0.622(0.164)	284.440(10.372)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.637(0.158)	0.838(0.155)	0.829(0.106)	0.622(0.164)	284.440(10.372)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.130(0.085)	0.310(0.212)	0.357(0.143)	-0.294(0.225)	284.440(10.372)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.210(0.158)	0.394(0.250)	0.486(0.197)	-0.106(0.329)	428.410(25.700)
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.069(0.053)	0.206(0.167)	0.181(0.116)	-0.576(0.165)	44850.00(0.000)
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.611(0.156)	0.826(0.172)	0.813(0.108)	0.592(0.180)	288.220(15.005)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.612(0.156)	0.826(0.172)	0.814(0.108)	0.593(0.180)	293.200(15.460)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.114(0.063)	0.330(0.198)	0.233(0.119)	-0.409(0.203)	293.200(15.460)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.051(0.049)	0.148(0.144)	0.186(0.110)	-0.614(0.158)	4981.65(565.00)
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.051(0.049)	0.148(0.144)	0.187(0.106)	-0.613(0.153)	44850.00(0.000)
CLIME	0.608(0.141)	0.828(0.153)	0.811(0.107)	0.591(0.152)	616.590(41.211)
GLasso	0.627(0.167)	0.686(0.187)	0.855(0.091)	0.531(0.176)	3862.01(353.98)

Table 5: Average (standard deviation) of each pCR classification metric over 100 replications.




Figure 2: Venn diagrams for direct connections of gene probesets identified by Nodewise Loret ($L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$), Nodewise Lasso ($L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$), CLIME, and GLasso.

using the estimated partial correlation matrices derived from the four precision matrix estimation methods based on the entire dataset. The partial correlation between x_i and x_j given $\{x_k\}_{k \notin \{i,j\}}$ is equal to $-\Omega_{ij}/\sqrt{\Omega_{ii}\Omega_{jj}}$ (Cramér, 1946). A zero partial correlation indicates conditional independence if \mathbf{x} is Gaussian or nonparanormal (Liu et al., 2009).

We focus on $\mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$ for Nodewise Loreg and $\mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$ for Nodewise Lasso due to their superior performance in pCR classification. We detect 321, 350, 586, and 4032 direct connections of gene probesets using Nodewise Loreg, Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso, respectively (Figure 2).

Nodewise Loreg uniquely identifies 78 direct connections not found by the other methods, while 4095 direct connections are identified by at least one other method but not by




Figure 3: Network graphs of gene probesets identified by Nodewise Loreg ($L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$), Nodewise Lasso ($L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S|Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$), CLIME, and GLasso.

Nodewise Loreg, with 3583 unique to GLasso. Of these 4095 connections, only 14 have an absolute partial correlation estimate larger than 0.1 by at least two other methods, and only one of these is detected by another Nodewise Loreg estimator $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$. Among the 78 unique connections identified by Nodewise Loreg, 49 are also found by another Nodewise Lasso estimator $\mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}|Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$, and only 5, which are in the remaining 29, have an absolute partial correlation estimate no larger than 0.1.

Figure 3 shows network graphs of the 300 gene probesets based on estimated absolute partial correlations from each method. We observe that 60.6%, 82.6%, and 93.9% of the direct connections (i.e., edges) detected by Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso, respectively, are weak (estimated absolute partial correlations ≤ 0.1), while only 8 direct connections found by Nodewise Loreg are weak. For networks thresholded at 0.1, the majority of Nodewise Lasso and CLIME’s structures (89.9% and 85.3% of edges) are subsumed within the network identified by Nodewise Loreg, which significantly differs from GLasso’s network, covering only 56.9% of its edges. Given GLasso’s poor performance in simulations, we focus on Nodewise Loreg’s network. The unthresholded network from Nodewise Loreg contains 33 isolates, 9 dyads, 3 triads, and 1 pentad, with the remaining 235 gene probesets forming a connected subnetwork with several small clusters and no hubs, as the maximum node degree is 9.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we propose Nodewise Loreg, a nodewise L_0 -penalized regression method for estimating high-dimensional sparse precision matrix. We establish its asymptotic results, including convergence rates in various matrix norms, support recovery, and asymptotic normality, under high-dimensional sub-Gaussian settings. In particular, under certain condi-

tions, we prove that the Nodewise Loreg estimator is asymptotically unbiased and normally distributed without the need for debiasing. A desparsified version of the Nodewise Loreg estimator is also developed in parallel to the desparsified Nodewise Lasso estimator. The asymptotic variances of undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator are entrywise dominated by those of the two desparsified estimators for Gaussian data, potentially providing more powerful statistical inference when the data is Gaussian or can be transformed to be nearly Gaussian. Our extensive simulations demonstrate that the undesparsified Nodewise Loreg estimator generally surpasses the two desparsified estimators in exhibiting asymptotic normal behavior. Moreover, the proposed Nodewise Loreg method outperforms Nodewise Lasso, CLIME, and GLasso in most simulation settings in terms of matrix norm losses, support recovery, and timing performance. The analysis of MDA133 breast cancer gene expression dataset shows that our Nodewise Loreg performs better in the pCR classification and detects a higher quality partial correlation network of gene probesets than the three L_1 -norm based methods.

There are many possible future extensions of our research. The first is to extend the entrywise asymptotic normality of the Nodewise Loreg estimator to the asymptotic normality of a subset of its matrix entries. The subset-based asymptotic normality has been recently studied by Chang et al. (2018) and Klaassen et al. (2023) for Nodewise Lasso-type estimators, which enables simultaneous inference via joint hypothesis testing without multiple testing correction. Another direction is to extend our theory from i.i.d. data to time series data. In many applications, such as brain functional connectivity analysis using functional MRI (Ryali et al., 2012), data are not a i.i.d. random sample but are temporally dependent observations. Chen et al. (2013, 2016), Shu and Nan (2019), and Zhang et al. (2021) show that large precision matrix estimators like GLasso and CLIME are still

applicable to high-dimensional time series data, even with strong temporal dependence, and provide convergence rates depending on the strength of temporal dependence. These interesting and challenging studies are worth further investigation.

Supplementary Materials

7 Theoretical proofs

Lemma 4. Define $\epsilon_j = x_j - \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j = \mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$, and $\sigma_j^2 = \text{var}(\epsilon_j)$. If Assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold and $(\log p)/n = o(1)$, then

$$P \left(\max_{j \in [p]} \left| \|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2^2/n - \sigma_j^2 \right| > M \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \right) = O(p^{-C})$$

for any given constant $C > 0$ and some constant $M > 0$ dependent on C .

Proof of Lemma 4. In the rest of the paper, for simplicity, we choose a constant $\kappa > 1$ such that $\kappa^{-1} \leq \kappa_1^{-1} \leq \kappa_2 \leq \kappa$. We first prove ϵ_j is a sub-Gaussian variable. Define $\mathbf{v}_j = (1, -\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{*\top})^\top$. Recall that $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^* = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j}$. By the second inequality in Lemma 1 of Lam and Fan (2009),

$$\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*\|_2 = \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1/2}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j}\|_2 = \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}) (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j})^{1/2}.$$

By Cauchy's interlace theorem (Hwang, 2004) and Assumption (A1),

$$\lambda_{\min}^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}) \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \lambda_{\max}^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \leq \kappa^{1/2}.$$

From (6), we have

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j, \setminus j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jj} - 1/\max_{j \in [p]} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) - 1/\lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \leq \kappa - \kappa^{-1}.$$

From the above, we obtain

$$\|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*\|_2 \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j})(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j, \setminus j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\setminus j, j})^{1/2} \leq \kappa^{1/2}(\kappa - \kappa^{-1})^{1/2} = (\kappa^2 - 1)^{1/2} \quad (24)$$

Hence, $\|\mathbf{v}_j\|_2^2 = \|(1, -\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^{*\top})^\top\|_2^2 = 1 + \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*\|_2^2 \leq 1 + (\kappa^2 - 1) = \kappa^2$. Then from Assumption (A2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\exp(\epsilon_j^2 / (\kappa K)^2) \right] &= E \left[\exp(|\mathbf{v}_j^\top(x_j, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top)|^2 / (\kappa K)^2) \right] = E \left[\exp(|\kappa^{-1} \mathbf{v}_j^\top(x_j, \mathbf{x}_{\setminus j}^\top)|^2 / K^2) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} E \left[\exp(|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x}|^2 / K^2) \right] \leq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Therefore, ϵ_j is a sub-Gaussian random variable (Vershynin, 2018, Definition 2.5.6) with a parameter κK for all $j \in [p]$.

From Theorem 1.1 in Rudelson and Vershynin (2013), for any given constant $C > 0$, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$P \left(\max_{j \in [p]} \left| \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2^2}{n} - \sigma_j^2 \right| > M \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \right) \leq \sum_{j=1}^p P \left(\left| \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2^2}{n} - \sigma_j^2 \right| > M \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \right) = O(p^{-C}). \quad (26)$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. We first consider the proof under Assumption (A4).

We will use Theorem 4 (i) in Huang et al. (2018) to obtain the bound of $\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* := \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*$. Before using the theorem, we need to verify whether their Assumptions (A1) and (A2) hold in our case. Due to our Assumption (A3), their (A1) holds for all $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^p$. Next, we check their (A2). We have that

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq |A|, A \in \mathcal{S}_{2T}} |\lambda_\ell(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}) - \lambda_\ell(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA})| &\leq \max_{A \in \mathcal{S}_{2T}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA}\|_2 \leq \max_{A \subseteq [p], |A|=2T} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA}\|_2 \\ &\leq \check{M}_0 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for any given constant $C > 0$ and some constant $\check{M}_0 >$

0 dependent on C , where the first inequality follows from Weyl's inequality, the second inequality follows from Cauchy's interlace theorem, and the last inequality is obtained by using Assumption (A2), $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, Remark 5.40 in Vershynin (2012) (in which let $t = \sqrt{(\log p^{2T+C})/c}$), and the same proof technique used in (26) (at most p^{2T} terms in the summation). From Cauchy's interlace theorem and Assumption (A1), for any $A \subseteq [p]$,

$$\kappa^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{AA}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}_{AA}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \leq \kappa. \quad (28)$$

By (27), (28), and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have

$$P\left((2\kappa)^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \leq 2\kappa, \forall A \in S_{2T}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (29)$$

Then, it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that

$$\begin{aligned} (2\kappa)^{-1} &\leq \min_{A \in S_{2T}} \lambda_{\min}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \leq \min_{i \in A, A \in S_{2T}} \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii} \\ &= \min_{i \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii} \leq \max_{i \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii} \\ &= \max_{i \in A, A \in S_{2T}} \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii} \leq \max_{A \in S_{2T}} \lambda_{\max}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \leq 2\kappa. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

From (30), $P(\min_{i \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii} \geq (2\kappa)^{-1} > 0) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$, which implies

$$P(\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}}_{ii}^{-1} \text{ exists}, \forall i \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (31)$$

From Assumption (A1), we have

$$\kappa_2^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \leq \min_{i \in [p]} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{ii} \leq \max_{i \in [p]} \mathbf{\Sigma}_{ii} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{\Sigma}) \leq \kappa_1. \quad (32)$$

From the sub-Gaussian concentration inequality in (29) of Cai et al. (2011), Assumption (A2), and $(\log p)/n = o(1)$,

$$\|\widehat{\mathbf{\Sigma}} - \mathbf{\Sigma}\|_{\max} \leq \tilde{M}_0 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \quad (33)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $\tilde{M}_0 > 0$ dependent on C . By the mean value theorem, (30), (32), and (33), we have

$$\max_{i \in [p]} |\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{-1/2} - \Sigma_{ii}^{-1/2}| \leq \frac{1}{2} \max_{i \in [p]} \{\hat{\Sigma}_{ii}^{-3/2}, \Sigma_{ii}^{-3/2}\} \max_{i \in [p]} |\hat{\Sigma}_{ii} - \Sigma_{ii}| \leq \tilde{M}_1 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \quad (34)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $\tilde{M}_1 > 0$ dependent on C . By Weyl's inequality, (27), (28), (30), (32), and (34), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq |A|, A \in S_{2T}} |\lambda_\ell(\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*A}/n) - \lambda_\ell(\mathbf{R}_{AA})| \\ & \leq \max_{A \in S_{2T}} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*A}/n - \mathbf{R}_{AA}\|_2 \\ & = \max_{A \in S_{2T}} \|\hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} \hat{\Sigma}_{AA} \hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} - \Gamma_{AA}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{AA} \Gamma_{AA}^{-1/2}\|_2 \\ & \leq \max_{A \in S_{2T}} \left\{ \|\hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} (\hat{\Sigma}_{AA} - \Sigma_{AA}) \hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2}\|_2 + \|\hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} \Sigma_{AA} (\hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} - \Gamma_{AA}^{-1/2})\|_2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \|(\hat{\Gamma}_{AA}^{-1/2} - \Gamma_{AA}^{-1/2}) \Sigma_{AA} \Gamma_{AA}^{-1/2}\|_2 \right\} \\ & \leq \tilde{M}_1 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $\tilde{M}_1 > 0$ dependent on C , where $\mathbf{R} := \text{corr}(\mathbf{x})$. Since $\lambda_{\max}(\Sigma) \Gamma^{-1} \succeq \mathbf{R} = \Gamma^{-1/2} \Sigma \Gamma^{-1/2} \succeq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) \Gamma^{-1}$, where $\mathbf{M}_1 \succeq \mathbf{M}_2$ denotes that $\mathbf{M}_1 - \mathbf{M}_2$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, then together with (32) we obtain

$$(\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma) (\max_{i \in [p]} \Sigma_{ii})^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma) (\min_{i \in [p]} \Sigma_{ii})^{-1} \leq \kappa_1 \kappa_2. \quad (36)$$

By Cauchy's interlace theorem, $(\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{R}_{AA}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R}_{AA}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{R}) \leq \kappa_1 \kappa_2$ for any $A \subseteq [p]$. Combining it with (35) and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$ yields

$$P(\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{R}}}) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad \text{where} \quad (37)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_{\hat{\mathbf{R}}} := \{\tilde{c}_\kappa^{-1} \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*A}/n) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*A}/n) \leq \tilde{c}_\kappa, \forall A \in S_{2T}\}$$

with $\tilde{c}_\kappa = c_\kappa + o(1) > c_\kappa := \kappa_1 \kappa_2$. Hence, Assumption (A2) in Huang et al. (2018) holds for all $\{T_i\}_{i=1}^p$ with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. Recall from Algorithms 1 and 2 that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j = \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{k_j+1}$ and $\widehat{A}_j = A_j^{k_j}$. Then by Theorem 4 (i) in Huang et al. (2018), on the event $\mathcal{E}_{\widehat{\mathbf{R}}}$, for any $\tilde{\theta}_{T,T} \geq \max_{A,B \in S_T: A \cap B = \emptyset} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*B}/n\|_2$, we have that, for all $j \in [p]$,

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{k_j+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 \leq \tilde{b}_1 \tilde{\gamma}_T^{k_j} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 + \tilde{b}_2 h_2(T_j), \quad (38)$$

$$\|(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_2 \leq \tilde{\gamma}_T^{k_j} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_T}{(1 - \tilde{\gamma}_T) \tilde{\theta}_{T,T}} h_2(T_j), \quad (39)$$

when $\tilde{\gamma}_T := [2\tilde{\theta}_{T,T} + (1 + \sqrt{2})\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}^2]\tilde{c}_\kappa^2 + (1 + \sqrt{2})\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}\tilde{c}_\kappa < 1$, where $\tilde{b}_1 := 1 + \tilde{\theta}_{T,T}\tilde{c}_\kappa$, $\tilde{b}_2 := \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_T \tilde{b}_1}{(1 - \tilde{\gamma}_T)\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}} + \tilde{c}_\kappa$, and $h_2(T_j) := \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T_j} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2/n$.

We now consider the bounds for $\max_{j \in [p]} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2$ and $h_2(T)$. By (30) and (24), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 &= \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*\|_2 \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{1/2}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*\|_2 \\ &\leq \max_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{jj}^{1/2} (\kappa^2 - 1)^{1/2} \leq (2\kappa)^{1/2} (\kappa^2 - 1)^{1/2} = (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. By the sub-Gaussianity of $\{x_j, \epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^p$ given in Assumption (A2) and inequality (25), $\text{cov}(x_i, \epsilon_j) = 0$ for $i \neq j$, the sub-Gaussian concentration inequality in (29) of Cai et al. (2011), and $(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have

$$P \left(\max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T_j} \|\mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2/n \leq \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{T_j (\log p)/n}, \forall j \in [p] \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (41)$$

for some constant $\tilde{M}_2 > 0$ dependent on C . By $\|\mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2 = \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{AA}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2 \geq \min_{i \in [p]} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{ii}^{1/2} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2$, (30) and (41), we have

$$P \left(h_2(T_j) := \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T_j} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2/n \leq \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa T_j (\log p)/n}, \forall j \in [p] \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (42)$$

Due to (37), (38), (40) and (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^{k_j+1} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 \leq \tilde{b}_1 \tilde{\gamma}_T^{k_j} (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \tilde{b}_2 \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa T_j(\log p)/n}\right. \\
\left. \leq [\tilde{b}_1 (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \tilde{b}_2 \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa}] \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \quad \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})
\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

when $0 < \tilde{\gamma}_T < 1$ and $k_j \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_T} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$. Note that $\tilde{\gamma}_T > 0$ when $\tilde{\theta}_{T,T} > 0$.

From (35), with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{A,B \in S_T: A \cap B = \emptyset} \left| \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*B}/n\|_2 - \|\mathbf{R}_{AB}\|_2 \right| &\leq \max_{A,B \in S_T: A \cap B = \emptyset} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*B}/n - \mathbf{R}_{AB}\|_2 \\
&\leq \max_{A \in S_{2T}} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*A}/n - \mathbf{R}_{AA}\|_2 \leq \tilde{M}_1 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}.
\end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Thus, $P(\tilde{\theta}_{T,T} \leq \theta_{T,T} + \tilde{M}_1 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some $\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}$ satisfying $0 < \tilde{\theta}_{T,T} \geq \max_{A,B \in S_T: A \cap B = \emptyset} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*B}/n\|_2$. Since $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have $P(\tilde{\theta}_{T,T} \leq \theta_{T,T} + o(1)) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. Combining it with $\theta_{T,T} \leq \|\mathbf{R}\|_2 \leq \kappa_1 \kappa_2$ (from (36)) and $\tilde{c}_\kappa = c_\kappa + o(1) = \kappa_1 \kappa_2 + o(1)$ yields $P(\tilde{\gamma}_T \leq \gamma_T + o(1)) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. Then by $\gamma_T < 1 - c_1$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have the following results: $\tilde{\gamma}_T \leq \gamma_T + c_1/2 < 1 - c_1/2$, both \tilde{b}_1 and \tilde{b}_2 are upper bounded by a constant, and $\log_{1-c_1/2} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n} \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_T} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$. Thus, if $k_j \geq \log_{1-c_1/2} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, then by (43) we have

$$P\left(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 \leq M_3 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \tag{45}$$

for some constant $M_3 > 0$ dependent on C .

Note that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_1 \leq \max_{j \in [p]} |\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}| + \max_{j \in [p]} \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\setminus j, j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j, j}\|_1. \tag{46}$$

We first consider the first term on the right-hand side (RHS) of (46). For all $j \in [p]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 - \sigma_j^2 &= \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j\|_2^2/n - \sigma_j^2 = \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j) + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2^2/n - \sigma_j^2 \\ &= (\|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2^2/n - \sigma_j^2) + \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)\|_2^2/n + 2(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j/n.\end{aligned}\quad (47)$$

The bound for the first term on the RHS of (47) is given in Lemma 4. For the second term, by (37) and (45), with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)\|_2^2/n &= \max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*S_j}[(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)_{S_j} - (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)_{S_j}]\|_2^2/n \\ &\leq \max_{j \in [p]} n^{-1} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*S_j}\|_2^2 \|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)_{S_j} - (\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)_{S_j}\|_2^2 = \max_{j \in [p]} \|n^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{*S_j}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*S_j}\|_2 \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2^2 \\ &\leq 2c_\kappa M_3^2 T(\log p)/n\end{aligned}\quad (48)$$

where $S_j = A_j^* \cup \widehat{A}_j$. Now consider the third term on the RHS of (47). Similar to (41) and (42), we can obtain

$$P\left(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_\infty/n \leq M_4 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})\quad (49)$$

and

$$P\left(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_\infty/n \leq M_4 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C})\quad (50)$$

for some constant $M_4 > 0$ dependent on C . From (45) and (50), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{j \in [p]} 2|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j|/n &\leq 2(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_1) \max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_\infty/n \\ &\leq 2(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 \sqrt{T_j + s_j - 1}) \max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*\setminus j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_\infty/n \\ &\leq M_5 T(\log p)/n\end{aligned}\quad (51)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $M_5 > 0$ dependent on C . Combining (47),

Lemma 4, (48), and (51) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_j^2 - \sigma_j^2| &\leq M \sqrt{(\log p)/n} + 2c_\kappa M_3^2 T(\log p)/n + M_5 T(\log p)/n \\ &\leq M_6 [\sqrt{(\log p)/n} + T(\log p)/n] \end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $M_6 > 0$ dependent on C . From the above inequality, $\sigma_j^2 = \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1}$, Assumption (A1) and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have

$$P((2\kappa)^{-1} \leq \min_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\sigma}_j \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\sigma}_j \leq 2\kappa) = 1 - O(p^{-C}),$$

which implies

$$P(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} := \widehat{\sigma}_j^{-2} \text{ exists, } \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (52)$$

and

$$P((2\kappa)^{-1} \leq \min_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} \leq 2\kappa) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (53)$$

Hence, we have

$$\max_{j \in [p]} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}| \leq (\max_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj}) (\max_{j \in [p]} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}) \max_{j \in [p]} |\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj}^{-1} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1}| \leq 2\kappa^2 M_6 [\sqrt{(\log p)/n} + T(\log p)/n] \quad (54)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$.

Next, we consider the bound for the second term on the RHS of (46). For any $j \in [p]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j} - \Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_1 \\
&= \left\| -\widehat{\Omega}_{jj}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\widehat{\beta}_j + \Omega_{jj}\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\beta_j^* \right\|_1 = \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}(\widehat{\Omega}_{jj}\widehat{\beta}_j - \Omega_{jj}\beta_j^*)\|_1 \\
&\leq \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\|_1 \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} \|\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*\|_1 + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}| \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\beta_j^*\|_1 \\
&\leq (\max_{k \in [p]} \widehat{\Sigma}_{kk}^{-1/2}) \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} \|\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*\|_1 + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}| \|\Omega_{\setminus j,j} \Omega_{jj}^{-1}\|_1 \tag{55} \\
&\leq (\min_{k \in [p]} \widehat{\Sigma}_{kk})^{-1/2} \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} \|\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*\|_2 \sqrt{T_j + s_j - 1} + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}| \|\Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_1 (\min_{k \in [p]} \Omega_{kk})^{-1} \\
&\leq (\min_{k \in [p]} \widehat{\Sigma}_{kk})^{-1/2} \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} \|\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*\|_2 \sqrt{2T} + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}| (\|\Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_2 \sqrt{T}) (\min_{k \in [p]} \Omega_{kk})^{-1}.
\end{aligned}$$

Together with (30), (53), (45), (54), $\|\Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_2 \leq \|\Omega\|_2 \leq \kappa$, $\min_k \Omega_{kk} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\Omega) \geq 1/\kappa$, and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have

$$P(\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j} - \Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_1 \leq M_7 T \sqrt{(\log p)/n}) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \tag{56}$$

for some constant $M_7 > 0$ dependent on C .

Combining (46), (54), (56) and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$ yields

$$P\left(\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_1 \leq M_8 T \sqrt{(\log p)/n}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \tag{57}$$

with some constant $M_8 > 0$ dependent on C .

Similar to (55), from (53), (30), (45), (54), (40), and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\|\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j} - \Omega_{\setminus j,j}\|_2 \leq \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\|_2 \|\widehat{\beta}_j - \beta_j^*\|_2 + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}| \|\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,\setminus j}^{-1/2}\|_2 \|\beta_j^*\|_2 \right. \\
\left. \leq \tilde{M}_8 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \quad \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \tag{58}
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $\tilde{M}_8 > 0$ dependent on C . Due to (58), (54), $\|\widehat{\Omega}_{*j} - \Omega_{*j}\|_2^2 = \|\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j} -$

$\Omega_{\setminus j,j} \|_2^2 + |\widehat{\Omega}_{jj} - \Omega_{jj}|^2$, and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$, it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that

$$\max\{\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_{\max}, p^{-1/2}\|\widehat{\Omega} - \Omega\|_F\} \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Omega}_{*j} - \Omega_{*j}\|_2 \leq \sqrt{(\tilde{M}_8^2 + 4\kappa^4 M_6^2)T(\log p)/n}. \quad (59)$$

Next, we consider the error bounds of $\widehat{\Omega}$ under Assumption (A5).

By Theorem 12 (i) in Huang et al. (2018), for any $\tilde{\mu} \geq \max_{i \neq j} |\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij}|$ with $\widehat{\mathbf{R}} := \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}/n$, when $T\tilde{\mu} \leq 1/4$, we have that, for all $j \in [p]$,

$$\|\beta_j^{k_j+1} - \beta_j^*\|_\infty \leq \frac{4}{3} \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}^{k_j} \|\beta_j^*\|_\infty + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} + 1 \right) h_\infty(T), \quad (60)$$

$$\|\beta_j^*|_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_\infty \leq \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}^{k_j} \|\beta_j^*\|_\infty + \frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} h_\infty(T), \quad (61)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} := (1+2T\tilde{\mu})T\tilde{\mu}/[1-(T-1)\tilde{\mu}] + 2T\tilde{\mu} < 1$ and $h_\infty(T) := \max_{j \in [p], A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T} \|\mathbf{Z}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_\infty/n$.

By (60), $\|\beta_j^*\|_\infty \leq \|\beta_j^*\|_2$, (40) and (50), we have that, when $T\tilde{\mu} \leq 1/4$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} \|\beta_j^{k_j+1} - \beta_j^*\|_\infty &\leq \frac{4}{3} (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} \max_{j \in [p]} \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}^{k_j} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} + 1 \right) M_4 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \\ &\leq \left[\frac{4}{3} (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{4}{3} \left(\frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} + 1 \right) M_4 \right] \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

if $0 < \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} < 1$ and $\min_{j \in [p]} k_j \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$. Note that $\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} > 0$ when $\tilde{\mu} > 0$. From (32) and (33),

$$\|\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1/2}(\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma)\mathbf{\Gamma}^{-1/2}\|_{\max} \leq \left(\min_{i \in [p]} \Sigma_{ii} \right)^{-1} \|\widehat{\Sigma} - \Sigma\|_{\max} \leq \kappa_2 \tilde{M}_0 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. Using the above inequality and following the proof of (S.15) in the supplement of Shu and Nan (2019) yields

$$P \left(\|\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}/n - \mathbf{R}\|_{\max} \leq 4\kappa_2 \tilde{M}_0 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (63)$$

Thus, we have $P(\tilde{\mu} \leq \mu + 4\kappa_2 \tilde{M}_0 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some $\tilde{\mu}$ satisfying $0 < \tilde{\mu} \geq$

$\max_{i \neq j} |\widehat{\mathbf{R}}_{ij}|$. Then by $T\mu < 1/4 - c_2$ and $T\sqrt{(\log p)/n} = o(1)$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have the following results: $T\tilde{\mu} \leq T\mu + 4\kappa_2\tilde{M}_0T\sqrt{(\log p)/n} \leq T\mu + c_2/2 < 1/4 - c_2/2$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} < [1 + 2(1/4 - c_2/2)](1/4 - c_2/2) / [1 - (1/4 - c_2/2)] + 2(1/4 - c_2/2) = (3 - 6c_2)/(3 + 2c_2) < 1$, and $\log \frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2} \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$. Thus, if $\min_{j \in [p]} k_j \geq \log \frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, then by (62) we obtain

$$\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_\infty \leq M_9 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \quad (64)$$

and

$$\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2T} \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_\infty \leq M_9 \sqrt{2T(\log p)/n} \quad (65)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $M_9 > 0$ dependent on C .

Using (65) instead of (45), we can still obtain all the results given in the part from (46) to (59), including (57) and (59). But we can refine the error bound in the max norm using (64). Specifically, note that

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_{\max} \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\setminus j,j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}\|_\infty + \max_{j \in [p]} |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}|. \quad (66)$$

Similar to (55) and (56), by (64), (54) and $T\sqrt{(\log p)/n} = o(1)$, the first term on the RHS of (66)

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\setminus j,j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}\|_\infty \\ & \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \left\{ \max_{k \in [p]} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{kk}^{-1/2}) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j - \boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*\|_\infty + |\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}| \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}\|_\infty \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \right\} \\ & \leq (2\kappa)^{3/2} M_9 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} + 2\kappa^4 M_6 [\sqrt{(\log p)/n} + T(\log p)/n] \\ & \leq [(2\kappa)^{3/2} + 4\kappa^4 M_6] \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \end{aligned} \quad (67)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. Combining (66), (67) and (54) gives

$$P \left(\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_{\max} \leq [(2\kappa)^{3/2} + 8\kappa^4 M_6] \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (68)$$

It is easily seen from the proof that the above results hold uniformly for $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$.

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 2 and Lemma 1. We first consider the diagonal entries of $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}$. By Assumption (A1), we have $\min_{j \in [p]} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \geq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \geq \kappa_1^{-1} > 0$. Recall from the proof of Theorem 1 that (53) holds under (A4) or (A5). Thus, $P(\min_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} \geq (2\kappa)^{-1} > 0) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$.

Now consider the off-diagonal entries of $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}$. Under Assumption (A4), from (58) we have

$$P\left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\setminus j,j} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}\|_{\max} \leq \tilde{M}_8 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \quad \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Thus, when $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$ with a constant $M_1 > \tilde{M}_8$, it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that $|\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}| > 0$ and $\text{sgn}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}) = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij})$ for $i \neq j$ and $(i, j) \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{\Omega})$. Similarly, under Assumption (A5) with $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$ for some constant $M_2 > 0$, by using (68) and letting $M_2 > (2\kappa)^{3/2} + 8\kappa^4 M_6$, we obtain the same result for support and sign recovery.

Note that the above results hold uniformly for $\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$. Thus, under Assumption (A4) with $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$ and $M_1 > \tilde{M}_8$, or under Assumption (A5) with $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$ and $M_2 > (2\kappa)^{3/2} + 8\kappa^4 M_6$, we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{supp}(\mathbf{\Omega}) \subseteq \text{supp}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}})) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (69)$$

and

$$\inf_{\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{sgn}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}) = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}), \forall (i, j) \in \text{supp}(\mathbf{\Omega})) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Recall that $\mathbf{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j} = -\mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\alpha}_j^* = -\mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1/2} \mathbf{\beta}_j^*$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{\setminus j,j} = -\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{\alpha}}_j = -\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{-1/2} \widehat{\mathbf{\beta}}_j$.

From (31) and $\min_{j \in [p]} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \geq \kappa_1^{-1} > 0$, we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{supp}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}) = A_j^* := \text{supp}(\mathbf{\alpha}_j^*) = \text{supp}(\mathbf{\beta}_j^*), \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (70)$$

It follows from (31), (52) and (53) that

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega}_{\setminus j,j}) = \text{supp}(\widehat{\beta}_j) \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (71)$$

Combining (69), (70) and (71) yields

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Next, we consider the second part of the theorem and that of the lemma.

We first give the proof under Assumption (A4). Combining (37), (39), (40) and (42), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\|(\beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_2 \leq \tilde{\gamma}_T^{k_j} (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_T}{(1 - \tilde{\gamma}_T)\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}} \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa T_j(\log p)/n}\right. \\ \left. \leq [(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{\tilde{\gamma}_T}{(1 - \tilde{\gamma}_T)\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}} \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa}] \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \end{aligned}$$

when $0 < \tilde{\gamma}_T < 1$ and $k_j \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_T} \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}$. By the argument below (44), when $\gamma_T < 1 - c_1$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have the following results: $\tilde{\gamma}_T < 1 - c_1/2$, $\frac{\tilde{\gamma}_T}{(1 - \tilde{\gamma}_T)\tilde{\theta}_{T,T}} \leq M_0$ for some constant $M_0 > 0$, and $\log_{1-c_1/2} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n} \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_T} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$. Thus, when $k_j \geq \log_{1-c_1/2} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have

$$P(\|(\beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_2 \leq [(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + M_0 \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa}] \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Combining it with (31), (30) and $\|\Omega\|_{\max} \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Omega) \leq \kappa$ yields that the event

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \left\| (\Omega_{\setminus j,j})_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}} \right\|_2 = \left\| -\Omega_{jj}(\alpha_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}} \right\|_2 = \left\| -\Omega_{jj}(\widehat{\Gamma}_{\setminus j,j}^{-1/2} \beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}} \right\|_2 \right. \\ \leq \Omega_{jj} (\min_{j \in [p]} \widehat{\Sigma}_{ii})^{-1/2} \|(\beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_2 \\ \leq \kappa (2\kappa)^{1/2} [(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + M_0 \tilde{M}_2 \sqrt{2\kappa}] \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n} \\ \left. < M_1 \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n} \leq m_j, \forall j \in [p] \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$, where we let the constant $M_1 > \kappa(2\kappa)^{1/2}[(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + M_0\tilde{M}_2\sqrt{2\kappa}]$. Thus, when $|A_j^{k_j}| = s_j - 1$ for all $j \in [p]$,

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\hat{A}_j := A_j^{k_j} = A_j^*, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (73)$$

From (69), (70), (71), and (73) (note that the last three results hold uniformly for $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$), when $m_j \geq M_1\sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$ for all $j \in [p]$ with $M_1 > \max\{\tilde{M}_8, \kappa(2\kappa)^{1/2}[(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + M_0\tilde{M}_2\sqrt{2\kappa}]\}$, we have

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{supp}(\Omega) = \text{supp}(\hat{\Omega})) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

Now we give the proof under Assumption (A5). By (61), $\|\beta_j^*\|_\infty \leq \|\beta_j^*\|_2$, (40) and (50), when $T\tilde{\mu} \leq 1/4$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} \|(\beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_\infty &\leq (2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} \max_{j \in [p]} \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}^{k_j} + \frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} M_4 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \\ &\leq [(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{4}{1 - \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} M_4] \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \end{aligned}$$

if $0 < \tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} < 1$ and $\min_{j \in [p]} k_j \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$. By the argument below (63), when $T\mu < 1/4 - c_2$, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have the following results: $T\tilde{\mu} < 1/4 - c_2/2$, $\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu} < (3 - 6c_2)/(3 + 2c_2) < 1$, and $\log_{\frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \geq \log_{\tilde{\gamma}_{T,\mu}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$. Thus, when $\min_{j \in [p]} k_j \geq \log_{\frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} \sqrt{(\log p)/n}$, similar to (72), with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} \|(\Omega_{\setminus j,j})_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_\infty &\leq \max_{j \in [p]} |\Omega_{jj}| (\min_{j \in [p]} \hat{\Sigma}_{ii})^{-1/2} \max_{j \in [p]} \|(\beta_j^*)_{A_j^* \setminus A_j^{k_j}}\|_\infty \\ &\leq \kappa(2\kappa)^{1/2} [(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{4}{1 - \frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} M_4] \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \\ &< M_2 \sqrt{(\log p)/n} \leq \min_{j \in [p]} m_j \end{aligned}$$

where we let the constant $M_2 > \kappa(2\kappa)^{1/2}[(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{4}{1 - \frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} M_4]$. Thus, when $|A_j^{k_j}| =$

$s_j - 1$ for all $j \in [p]$, we have

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\widehat{A}_j := A_j^{k_j} = A_j^*, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (74)$$

From (69), (70), (71) and (74) (note that the last three results hold uniformly for $\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$), when $\min_{j \in [p]} m_j \geq M_2[\sqrt{(\log p)/n} + s(\log p)/n]$ with $M_2 > \max\{(2\kappa)^{3/2} + 8\kappa^4 M_6, \kappa(2\kappa)^{1/2}[(2\kappa^3 - 2\kappa)^{1/2} + \frac{4}{1 - \frac{3-6c_2}{3+2c_2}} M_4]\}$, we have

$$\inf_{\Omega \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(\text{supp}(\Omega) = \text{supp}(\widehat{\Omega})) = 1 - O(p^{-C}).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Lemma 2. The proof follows the proof of Theorem 4 given in the appendix of Zhu et al. (2020) with some modifications. Note that the inequality $P(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^s \supseteq \mathcal{A}^*) \geq 1 - O(p^{-\alpha})$ below their (13) can be obtained by our Lemma 1 when $T_j \geq \max(s_j - 1, 1)$, $\gamma_{T_{\max}} < 1 - c_1$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$, $k_j \geq \log_{1 - \frac{c_1}{2}} \sqrt{T_j(\log p)/n}$, $T_{\max}(\log p)/n = o(1)$ and $m_j \geq M_1 \sqrt{T_{\max, j}(\log p)/n}$. We revise their (16) to be $\mathcal{L}_{\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^s} \geq \kappa_2^{-1}/4$, which is obtained by our Lemma 4, (48) and $\sigma_j^2 = \Omega_{jj}^{-1} \geq \kappa_2^{-1}$. Note that σ^2 in their (17) and the inequality below their (19) should be corrected to $\epsilon^\top \epsilon/n$, $\|\epsilon^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{A}^*} \epsilon\|_2^2$ in the inequality below their (17) and also in their (18) should be corrected to $\|\epsilon^\top \mathbf{H}_{\mathcal{A}^*} \epsilon\|_2$, and $(c_-(s), c_+(s), \theta_{s,s}^2)$ in the proof from their (17) to the inequality below their (19) should be corrected to $(c_-(s^*), c_+(s^*), \theta_{s^*, s^*}^2)$. From the argument below (44), $P(\tilde{\gamma}_{T_{\max}} < 1, \tilde{\theta}_{T_{\max}, T_{\max}} < 2\kappa_1 \kappa_2) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. Let their $c_-(s^*) = 1/c_+(s^*)$ and let it equal our \tilde{c}_κ^{-1} which falls in $[(2\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-1}, (\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-1}]$ with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$, and let their θ_{s^*, s^*} be our $\tilde{\theta}_{s^*, s^*}$. Then, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have their $(1 + \sqrt{2})\theta_{s^*, s^*}^2/c_-^2(s^*) \leq$ our $\tilde{\gamma}_{T_{\max}} < 1$. Thus, it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that $(\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-2} \geq c_-^2(s^*) \geq c_-^2(s^*) - \theta_{s^*, s^*}^2 \geq [1 - 1/(1 + \sqrt{2})]c_-^2(s^*) \geq [1 - 1/(1 + \sqrt{2})](2\kappa_1 \kappa_2)^{-2}$. Thus, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$,

we have that their $K_{s,3}, K_{s,4}$ and $K_{s,5}$ with $s = s^*$ are upper and lower bounded by constants. Thus, we need their $b^* = M_b \max\{s^*(\log p)/n, (\log p) \log(\log n)/n\}$ for a sufficiently large constant $M_b > 0$, and $s^*(\log p) \log(\log n)/n = o(1)$ to obtain the last upper bound in their (18) and the last inequality in the proof of their Theorem 4. Translating these conditions into our context, we need $\min_{i \in A_j^*} |(\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^*)_{\{i\}}| = \min_{i \in A_j^*} |(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\setminus j, \setminus j}^{1/2} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j, j})_{\{i\}}| \geq [M_b \max\{s_j(\log p)/n, (\log p) \log(\log n)/n\}]^{1/2}$ with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$, which is satisfied when $m_j := \min_{i \in A_j^*} |(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{\setminus j, j})_{\{i\}}| \geq (2\kappa)^{1/2} \kappa [M_b \max\{s_j(\log p)/n, (\log p) \log(\log n)/n\}]^{1/2}$, and we also need $s_j(\log p) \log(\log n)/n = o(1)$. The two conditions are assumed in the lemma. Consequently, we have $P(T_j^* = s_j - 1) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$ for any given constant $C > 0$, and thus $P(T_j^* = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C+1})$, where we can further let $C > 1$. Then from Lemma 1, we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. Combining (11) in Lemma 2 and (12) in Theorem 2, we obtain the corollary. \square

We now provide the proof of Theorem 5, followed by the proof of Lemma 3.

Proof of Theorem 5. From (37), $P((\mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j})^{-1} \text{ exists}, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. By (7) in Huang et al. (2018), we have $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} = (\mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*j}$. From the above two equations, (31), and (52), it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\hat{A}_j, j} = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} \tag{75}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{-1/2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} = -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{-1/2} (\mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j})^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*j} \\ &= -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{-1/2} [\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{-1/2} (\hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{1/2} \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j} \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{1/2}) \hat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_{\hat{A}_j, \hat{A}_j}^{-1/2}]^{-1} \mathbf{Z}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*j} \\ &= -\hat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} (\mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*j}, \quad \forall j \in [p]. \end{aligned} \tag{76}$$

From (75) and (76),

$$P\left(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j|_{\widehat{A}_j} = \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j}, \forall j \in [p]\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (77)$$

Then, with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}^{-1} &= \widehat{\sigma}_j^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\setminus j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j\|_2^2 = \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}_{*j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*j} - \frac{2}{n} \mathbf{X}_{*j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j} + \frac{1}{n} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j} \\ &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{jj} - 2\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{j, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} \\ &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{jj} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{j, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j}, \quad \forall j \in [p]. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

Multiplying both sides of the above equation by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}$ and then using (76) yields

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{jj} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{j, \widehat{A}_j} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}) \\ &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{jj} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{j, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j}. \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

On the other hand, left multiplying both sides of (76) by $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j}$ gives

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} = -\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j},$$

where $\widehat{A}_j^+ := \widehat{A}_j \cup \{j\}$ and $(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c := [p] \setminus \widehat{A}_j^+$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} &= -\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \\ &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, j} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c, \widehat{A}_j} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j}) \\ &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}]. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above equation, (79) and (76) obtains

$$P(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} = \mathbf{e}_j + \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j, \quad \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}), \quad (80)$$

where $\mathbf{e}_j \in \mathbb{R}^p$ has 1 on the j -th entry and 0 elsewhere, and $\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j = \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{0}_{1 \times \widehat{A}_j^+}, \{n^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}]\}^\top)^\top$ with a permutation matrix \mathbf{P} .

From (80) and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j} = \mathbf{e}_j$, it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that, for all $i, j \in [p]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{ij} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} &= \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{ij} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i}^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j) - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \\ &= -\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}) \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j} - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i} - \mathbf{e}_i) - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j). \end{aligned} \quad (81)$$

First, consider the bound of the third term on the RHS of (81). From (80), with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j)| &\leq \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}\|_2 \|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j)_{\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup A_i^*}\|_2 \\ &= \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}\|_2 \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \|(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup A_i^*}\|_2, \quad \forall i, j \in [p]. \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

Due to the first part of Lemma 1, i.e.,

$$\inf_{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)} P(A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C}), \quad (83)$$

it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that, for all $i, j \in [p]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup A_i^*}\|_2 &= \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap (\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup A_i^*), *} [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}]\|_2 \\ &= \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *} [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}]\|_2 \\ &\leq \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *} [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j}]\|_2 \\ &\quad + \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j} [(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j} - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}]\|_2 \\ &\leq \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2 + \|n^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}\|_2 \|(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j} - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Similar to (41),

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \|n^{-1}(\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2 \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T+1} \|n^{-1}(\mathbf{X}^\top)_{A*}\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j\|_2\right. \\
\left. \leq M_{22}\sqrt{T(\log p)/n}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (85)
\end{aligned}$$

for some constant $M_{22} > 0$ dependent on C . By (29) (which holds with S_{2T} replaced by S_{2T+1}),

$$\begin{aligned}
P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \|n^{-1}(\mathbf{X}^\top)_{(\widehat{A}_j^+)^c \cap \widehat{A}_i^+, *}\mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}\|_2 \leq \max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup \widehat{A}_j, \widehat{A}_i^+ \cup \widehat{A}_j}\|_2\right. \\
\left. \leq \max_{A \in S_{2T+1}} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}\|_2 \leq 2\kappa\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (86)
\end{aligned}$$

From (76) and (83), it holds with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ that, for all $j \in [p]$,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j} &= -\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}^{-1}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{\widehat{A}_j, j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j} \\
&= (\mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j}] = (\mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j \\
&= \underbrace{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top}_{\mathbf{r}_{1j}} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n + \underbrace{(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1})}_{\mathbf{r}_{1j}} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n. \quad (87)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\mathbf{r}_{1j}\|_2 &= \left\| (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1}) \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 = \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}) \right\|_2 \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 \\
&\leq \max_{j \in [p]} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \right\|_2 \left\| \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2. \quad (88)
\end{aligned}$$

From (28) and (27),

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{j \in [p]} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}, |A| \leq T} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}) \right\|_2 &\leq (\max_{A \in S_T} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1}\|_2) (\max_{A \in S_T} \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{AA} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{AA}\|_2) \\
&\leq \kappa \check{M}_0 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \quad (89)
\end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. For the second component on the RHS of (88), by (29) and

an inequality similar to (41),

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{j \in [p]} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}: |A| \leq T} \left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 &\leq \max_{j \in [p]} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}: |A| \leq T} \left\| \widehat{\Sigma}_{AA}^{-1} \right\|_2 \left\| \mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \tilde{M}_4 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $\tilde{M}_4 > 0$ dependent on C . Plugging (89) and (90) into (88) yields

$$\max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{r}_{1j}\|_\infty \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\mathbf{r}_{1j}\|_2 \leq \kappa \tilde{M}_0 \tilde{M}_4 T(\log p)/n \quad (91)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. Similar to (90), the first term on the RHS of (87)

$$\max_{j \in [p]} \left\| \Sigma_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \max_{A \subseteq [p] \setminus \{j\}: |A| \leq T} \left\| \Sigma_{AA}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*A}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \right\|_2 \leq \tilde{M}_4 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$. By the above inequality, (91), (87), and $T(\log p)/n = o(1)$,

$$P \left(\max_{j \in [p]} \|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j}\|_2 \leq M_\alpha \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (92)$$

for some constant $M_\alpha > 0$ dependent on C . Combining (84), (85), (86) and (92) yields

$$P \left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} \|(\widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_i^+ \cup A_i^*}\|_2 \leq (M_{22} + 2\kappa M_\alpha) \sqrt{T(\log p)/n} \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}). \quad (93)$$

Plugging (59), (53) and (93) into (82) yields

$$P \left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i})^\top (\widehat{\Sigma} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \mathbf{e}_j)| \leq M_{31} T(\log p)/n \right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (94)$$

for some constant $M_{31} > 0$ dependent on C .

For the second term on the RHS of (81), by (57), Lemma 10 in the supplement of Janková and van de Geer (2017), $\max_{i \in [p]} \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_2 \leq \kappa$, and $(\log p)/n = o(1)$, we

have

$$\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j})^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i} - \mathbf{e}_i)| \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j}\|_1 \max_{i \in [p]} \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i} - \mathbf{e}_i\|_{\max} \leq \check{M}_2 T(\log p)/n \quad (95)$$

with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ for some constant $\check{M}_2 > 0$ dependent on C .

It follows from (81), (95) and (94) that $\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |\Delta_{ij}| = O_P(T(\log p)/\sqrt{n})$ holds uniformly for $\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(T+1)$.

Using (81), (95) and (94), and following the proof of Theorem 1 in Jankova and van de Geer (2017) yields the asymptotic normality. \square

Proof of Lemma 3. Note that

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i}^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j + \underbrace{(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{*i}^\top - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top) \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j + \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}) \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j}_{r_{2ij}}. \quad (96)$$

We first assume that $A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j$ for all $j \in [p]$.

Using (80) and (94) for the first term in r_{2ij} , and using $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_2 \leq \kappa$, (54) and (93) for the second term in r_{2ij} , we have

$$P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{2ij}| \leq M_{23} T(\log p)/n\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (97)$$

for some constant $M_{23} > 0$ dependent on C .

Consider the first term on the RHS of (96). From (77), $P(\mathbf{X}_{*, \widehat{A}_j}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}] = \mathbf{0}, \forall j \in [p]) = 1 - O(p^{-C})$. From this equation, (77) and (78), with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$ we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \widehat{\mathbf{d}}_j = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j}] - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ji}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{jj}^{-1}, \quad \forall i, j \in [p]. \quad (98)$$

The first term on the RHS of (98)

$$\begin{aligned}
& \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j}] \\
&= \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top [\mathbf{X}_{*j} - \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\hat{A}_j}] - \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j} [(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\hat{A}_j}] \\
&= \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} \Sigma_{*\hat{A}_j} [(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\hat{A}_j}] \\
&\quad + \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} (\Sigma_{*\hat{A}_j} - n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}) [(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\hat{A}_j}] \\
&= \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \Omega_{jj} \Omega_{*i}^\top \Sigma_{*\hat{A}_j} \Sigma_{\hat{A}_j \hat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n \\
&\quad - \underbrace{\Omega_{jj} (\mathbf{e}_i)_{\hat{A}_j}^\top \mathbf{r}_{1j} + \Omega_{jj} [(\mathbf{e}_i)_{\hat{A}_j}^\top - n^{-1} \Omega_{ii} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i^\top \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}]}_{r_{3ij}} [(\hat{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}_j)_{\hat{A}_j} - (\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\hat{A}_j}] \tag{99}
\end{aligned}$$

holds for all $i, j \in [p]$ with probability $1 - O(p^{-C})$, where the last equality follows from (87) and (8). Using (91) for the first term in r_{3ij} , and using a concentration inequality similar to (41) together with (92) for the second term in r_{3ij} , we have

$$P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{3ij}| \leq M_{34} T(\log p)/n\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \tag{100}$$

for some constant $M_{34} > 0$ dependent on C .

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\Omega_{*i}^\top (\hat{\Sigma} - \Sigma) \Omega_{*j} + \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \Omega_{ji}^\top \Omega_{jj} \hat{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \\
&= -\Omega_{*i}^\top n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \Omega_{*j} + \Omega_{*i}^\top \Omega_{jj} n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j + \Omega_{ji}^\top - \Omega_{ji}^\top \Omega_{jj} \hat{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \\
&= -\Omega_{jj} \Omega_{*i}^\top n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j - \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j) - \Omega_{ij} \Omega_{jj} (\hat{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} - \Omega_{jj}^{-1}) \\
&= -\Omega_{ij} \Omega_{jj} (\hat{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} - \Omega_{jj}^{-1}) \tag{101}
\end{aligned}$$

By (81), (95), (94), (96), (97), (98), (99), (100), (101), (47), (48) and (51), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) &= -\sqrt{n} \Omega_{jj} \Omega_{*i}^\top [\Sigma_{*\hat{A}_j} \Sigma_{\hat{A}_j \hat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\hat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n] - \sqrt{n} \Omega_{jj} \Omega_{ij} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n - \Omega_{jj}^{-1}) + r_{ij} \\
&= -\sqrt{n} [\Omega_{jj} \Omega_{ii} (\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i|\mathbf{x}_{\hat{A}_j}}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i|\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j / n) - \Omega_{ij}] + r_{ij},
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{ij}| \leq M_r T(\log p)/\sqrt{n}\right) = 1 - O(p^{-C}) \quad (102)$$

for some constant $M_r > 0$ dependent on C , $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} := [\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_i)_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j}^\top]^\top$ consists of the n observations of

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} &:= E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top | \widehat{A}_j] \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} E[\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x} \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top | \widehat{A}_j] \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top E[\mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top | \widehat{A}_j] \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{*\widehat{A}_j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j} \quad \text{with} \quad \mathbf{b}_{\widehat{A}_j} := \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j \widehat{A}_j}^{-1/2} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}, \end{aligned}$$

and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\epsilon_j} := \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j$ consists of the n observations of

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\epsilon_j} &:= E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \epsilon_j / \text{sd}(\epsilon_j)] \epsilon_j / \text{sd}(\epsilon_j) = E[\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i \epsilon_j] \epsilon_j \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} = E[\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{i*} \mathbf{x} \mathbf{x}^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1}] \epsilon_j \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \\ &= \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{i*} \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{*j} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \epsilon_j \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j. \end{aligned}$$

We now connect (13) and (14) under the condition that $A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j$ for all $j \in [p]$. We note that $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\epsilon_j} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$, where $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} = [\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_i)_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top]^\top$. To show this equation, first, like $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}}$, we see that $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} := \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_i)_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}$ is the orthogonal projection of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ onto $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top)$; besides, $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\epsilon_j}$ is the orthogonal projection of $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_i$ onto $\text{span}((\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top, \epsilon_j))$ due to $\epsilon_j \perp \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top)$; then by $x_j = \mathbf{x}_{A_j^*}^\top(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{A_j^*} + \epsilon_j = \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j} + \epsilon_j$, we have $\text{span}((\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top, \epsilon_j)) = \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top)$, and thus $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}} + \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\epsilon_j} = \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_{i\|\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}$. On the other hand, since the orthogonal projection of x_j onto $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top)$ is $\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^* = \mathbf{x}_{A_j^*}^\top(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{A_j^*} \in \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{A_j^*}^\top) \subseteq \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top)$, then the orthogonal projection of x_j onto $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top)$ is also $\mathbf{x}_{A_j^*}^\top(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{A_j^*} = \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j}^\top(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j}$. Applying (5)-(8) to $\{x_\ell\}_{\ell \in \widehat{A}_j^+}$ yields $(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{\widehat{A}_j, \widehat{j}} = -(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{\widehat{j} \widehat{j}}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_j^*)_{\widehat{A}_j}$ and $(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{\widehat{j} \widehat{j}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}$. It follows that $\epsilon_j = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1}(\mathbf{e}_j)_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}$. Then from (13), we have

$$\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}_{ij} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij}) = -\sqrt{n}[(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{i*} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+} (\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\widehat{A}_j^+ \widehat{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{*j} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij}] + r_{ij} \quad \text{for } i \in \widehat{A}_j^+.$$

Comparing the above equation with (14), we obtain

$$r_{ij} = \tilde{r}_{ij} \text{ for all } i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]. \quad (103)$$

Recall that (103) and (102) are obtained by assuming $A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j$ for all $j \in [p]$. If $P(A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j, \forall j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$, then

$$P(r_{ij} = \tilde{r}_{ij}, \forall i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$$

and

$$P\left(\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{ij}| \leq M_r T(\log p) / \sqrt{n}\right) \rightarrow 1. \quad (104)$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} &:= -\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}} + \epsilon_{i \| \epsilon_j}) I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j) \\ &= [-\mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\mathbf{e}_i)_{\tilde{A}_j}^\top \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{\tilde{A}_j} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j] I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^\top &:= -\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}}^\top + \epsilon_{i \| \epsilon_j}^\top) I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i^\top I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j) \\ &= [-\mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\mathbf{e}_i)_{\tilde{A}_j}^\top \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{*\tilde{A}_j}^\top - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j^\top] I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) - \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i^\top I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Since \tilde{A}_j is a fixed set given n and p , we have $E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j] = -\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}$ due to $\epsilon_j \perp \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}^\top) \ni \epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}}$ and $E[\epsilon_{i \| \epsilon_j} \epsilon_j] = E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_j] = \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}$. By the Lyapunov inequality, Minkowski inequality, Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, and $\|\mathbf{\Omega}\|_{\max} \leq \|\mathbf{\Omega}\|_2 \leq \kappa$, we have that, for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$,

$$\begin{aligned} E[|\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j + \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}|^3] &\leq \{E[|\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j + \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}|^4]\}^{\frac{3}{4}} \leq (\{E[(\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j)^4]\}^{\frac{1}{4}} + |\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}|)^3 \\ &\leq (\{E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^8] E[\epsilon_j^8]\}^{\frac{1}{8}} + \kappa)^3. \end{aligned} \quad (105)$$

Define $\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1} \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}$, $\mathbf{Y}_{*\tilde{A}_j} = \mathbf{X}_{*\tilde{A}_j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1}$, and $\mathbf{v}_{ij} = \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1} (\mathbf{e}_i)_{\tilde{A}_j}$. If $i \in \tilde{A}_j$, then let $i_{\tilde{A}_j}$ denote the position of i in the set \tilde{A}_j when its elements are sorted in ascending order. From Cauchy's interlace theorem and Assumption (A1), $\|\mathbf{v}_{ij}\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}^{-1}\|_2 \|(\mathbf{e}_i)_{\tilde{A}_j}\|_2 \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j \tilde{A}_j}) \leq \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}) = \lambda_{\max}(\boldsymbol{\Omega}) \leq \kappa$. Then by Assumption (A2),

$$\begin{aligned} E \left[\exp\{(\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j})_{\{i_{\tilde{A}_j}\}}^2 / (\kappa K)^2\} \right] &= E \left[\exp(|\mathbf{v}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}|^2 / (\kappa K)^2) \right] = E \left[\exp(|\kappa^{-1} \mathbf{v}_{ij}^\top \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j}|^2 / K^2) \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p: \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} E \left[\exp(|\mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{x}|^2 / K^2) \right] \leq 2. \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

Thus, $(\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j})_{\{i_{\tilde{A}_j}\}}$ is a sub-Gaussian random variable (Vershynin, 2018, Definition 2.5.6) with a parameter κK for $i \in \tilde{A}_j$ and $j \in [p]$. From (25), ϵ_j is a sub-Gaussian random variable with a parameter κK for $j \in [p]$. By the bounds of sub-Gaussian moments (Vershynin, 2018, Proposition 2.5.2), we have

$$\max\{E[\epsilon_j^8], E[(\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j})_{\{i_{\tilde{A}_j}\}}^8]\} \leq C_{ey}^8$$

with a constant $C_{ey} > 0$ for $i \in \tilde{A}_j$ and $j \in [p]$. By $\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} = [-\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}(\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j})_{\{i_{\tilde{A}_j}\}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j] I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) - \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j)$, the Minkowski inequality, and $\|\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_{\max} \leq \kappa$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^8] &\leq (\{E[(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}(\mathbf{y}_{\tilde{A}_j})_{\{i_{\tilde{A}_j}\}})^8]\}^{\frac{1}{8}} + \{E[(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \epsilon_j)^8]\}^{\frac{1}{8}})^8 I(i \in \tilde{A}_j) + E[(\boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii} \epsilon_i)^8] I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j) \\ &\leq (\kappa C_{ey} + \kappa^2 C_{ey})^8 \end{aligned}$$

for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$. Then by (105), for $1 \leq i, j \leq p$,

$$E[|\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j + \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij}|^3] \leq (\{E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^8] E[\epsilon_j^8]\}^{\frac{1}{8}} + \kappa)^3 \leq (\kappa C_{ey}^2 + \kappa^2 C_{ey}^2 + \kappa)^3.$$

By the above inequality, $\min_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \geq \omega$, and Berry-Esseen theorem (Theo-

rem 3.4.17 in Durrett (2019)), we have that, for any $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left| P(\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j/n - E[\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j])/\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \leq z) - \Phi(z) \right| \\ & \leq 3(\kappa C_{ey}^2 + \kappa^2 C_{ey}^2 + \kappa)^3/(\omega^3 \sqrt{n}) =: M_{13}/\sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Let Z be a standard Gaussian random variable, define the event $\mathcal{E}_r = \{\max_{1 \leq i, j \leq p} |r_{ij}| \leq M_r T(\log p)/\sqrt{n}\}$, and denote its complement by \mathcal{E}_r^c . From $P(\cap_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{E}_j) \rightarrow 1$, the above in-

equality, (104), and $T(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1)$, we have that, uniformly for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left| P(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij})/\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j} \leq z) - \Phi(z) \right| \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left| P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) - r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}}\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left(\left| P\left(\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) - r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_j\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + P\left(\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) - r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c\right) \right) \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left| P\left(\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij} - \Omega_{ij}) - r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_j\right) - \Phi(z) \right| + o(1) \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left(\left| P\left(\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j/n - E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j])}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_j\right) - P\left(\left\{Z \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\}\right) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left| P\left(\left\{Z \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\}\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \right) + o(1) \\
& \leq \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left(\left| P\left(\frac{\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j/n - E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j])}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right) - P\left(Z \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right) \right| \right. \\
& \quad \left. + P\left(\left\{\frac{\sqrt{n}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^\top \boldsymbol{\epsilon}_j/n - E[\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j])}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq z - \frac{r_{ij}}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_j^c\right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + P\left(z - \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right) \right) + o(1) \\
& \leq M_{13}/\sqrt{n} + o(1) + \max_{i \in \hat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} \left(P\left(\left\{z - \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_r\right) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + P\left(\left\{z - \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{|r_{ij}|}{\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_r^c\right) \right) \\
& = M_{13}/\sqrt{n} + o(1) + P\left(z - \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}}\right) \\
& = o(1). \tag{107}
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 3. From Lemma 2, we have $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(s)} P(T_j^* = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$ and $\inf_{\boldsymbol{\Omega} \in \mathcal{G}(s)} P(\hat{A}_j = A_j^*, \forall j \in [p]) \rightarrow 1$. Define event $\mathcal{E}_T = \{T_j^* = s_j - 1, \forall j \in [p]\}$. Then

following the proof of Lemma 3 and plugging

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(z - \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}}\right) \\
&= P\left(\left\{z - \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_T\right) \\
&\quad + P\left(\left\{z - \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{M_r T \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}}\right\} \cap \mathcal{E}_T^c\right) \\
&\leq P\left(z - \frac{M_r s \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}} \leq Z \leq z + \frac{M_r s \log p}{\omega \sqrt{n}}\right) + P(\mathcal{E}_T^c) \\
&= o(1) \quad (\text{due to } s(\log p)/\sqrt{n} = o(1) \text{ and } P(\mathcal{E}_T^c) = o(1))
\end{aligned}$$

into the second to last line of (107), we complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 4. First, we prove Part (i) of the theorem.

When $A_j^* \subseteq \tilde{A}_j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 &:= \text{var}(\xi_{i, \tilde{A}_j} \epsilon_j) \\
&= \text{var} \left[\left(\Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} \right)_{\tilde{i}^*} \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j^+} \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j^+}^\top \left(\Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} \right)_{*\tilde{j}} I(i \in \tilde{A}_j^+) + \mathbf{\Omega}_{*i}^\top \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j^+} \mathbf{x}_{\tilde{A}_j^+}^\top \mathbf{\Omega}_{*j} I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j^+) \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{A}_j^+ := \tilde{A}_j \cup \{j\}$, and \tilde{i} and \tilde{j} are the positions of i and j in \tilde{A}_j^+ when its elements are sorted in ascending order. Define

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left[\left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} \right)_{\tilde{i}^*} \mathbf{X}_{k, \tilde{A}_j^+}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k, \tilde{A}_j^+} \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} \right)_{*\tilde{j}} I(i \in \tilde{A}_j^+) + \hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{*i}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k, \tilde{A}_j^+}^\top \mathbf{X}_{k, \tilde{A}_j^+} \hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{*j} I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j^+) \right]^2 \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} (\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}^2 + \hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ji}^2).
\end{aligned}$$

From (27), (28) and (29), with probability $1 - O(p^C)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{j \in [p]} \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} - \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1}\|_2 &\leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1}\|_2 \|\hat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+} - \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}\|_2 \|\Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1}\|_2 \\
&\leq 2\kappa^2 \check{M}_0 \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}
\end{aligned} \tag{108}$$

and

$$\max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} - \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1}\|_1 \leq \max_{j \in [p]} \|\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1} - \Sigma_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1}\|_2 \sqrt{T+1} \leq 2^{3/2} \kappa^2 \check{M}_0 T \sqrt{(\log p)/n}. \quad (109)$$

Following the proof of Lemma 3 in Supplementary Material of Janková and van de Geer (2017), but using (108), (109), (57), (59), (28), and (33) instead of their counterparts, we obtain that, for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$P(\max_{i, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon) = o(1) \text{ if } A_j^* \subseteq \tilde{A}_j.$$

Define $\mathcal{E}_A = \cap_{j \in [p]} \mathcal{E}_j$ and denote its complement by \mathcal{E}_A^c . Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon) \\ & \leq P(\{\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon\} \cap \mathcal{E}_A) + P(\{\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \hat{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon\} \cap \mathcal{E}_A^c) \\ & = P(\{\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon\} \cap \mathcal{E}_A) + o(1) \\ & \leq P(\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2| \geq \varepsilon) + o(1) \\ & = o(1). \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Now, we prove Part (ii) of the theorem. Re-define

$$\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 = [(\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ii} (\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{jj} + (\widehat{\Sigma}_{\tilde{A}_j^+ \tilde{A}_j^+}^{-1})_{ij}^2] I(i \in \tilde{A}_j^+) + (\widehat{\Omega}_{ii} \widehat{\Omega}_{jj} + \widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^2) I(i \notin \tilde{A}_j^+).$$

Following the proof of Lemma 2 in Supplementary Material of Janková and van de Geer (2017), but using (108), (59), and (28) instead of their counterparts, we obtain that

$$P(\max_{i \in \tilde{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \tilde{A}_j}^2| \geq M \sqrt{T(\log p)/n}) = O(p^{-C}) \text{ if } A_j^* \subseteq \tilde{A}_j.$$

for some constant $M > 0$ dependent on C . Then using the same proof technique for (110)

yields

$$\max_{i \in \widehat{A}_j^+, j \in [p]} |\widehat{\sigma}_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2 - \sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2| = O_P(\sqrt{T(\log p)/n}).$$

The proof is complete. \square

Proof of Theorem 6. Following the proof of Lemma 3 in Supplementary Material of Janková and van de Geer (2017), but using (57), (59), (A1) and (33) instead of their counterparts, we can obtain the result in Part (i) of the theorem. On the other hand, following the proof of Lemma 2 in Supplementary Material of Janková and van de Geer (2017), but using (59) and (A1) instead of their counterparts, we can obtain the result in Part (ii) of the theorem. \square

Proof of Theorem 7. For $i \in \widehat{A}_j^+$, we have

$$\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2 = \text{var}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} (\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j} + \epsilon_{i \| \epsilon_j}) \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j) = \text{var}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j) = \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii}^2 \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^2 E[\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}^2$$

$$\text{and } \sigma_{ij}^2 = \text{var}(\mathbf{\Omega}_{ii} \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj} \epsilon_i \epsilon_j) = \mathbf{\Omega}_{ii}^2 \mathbf{\Omega}_{jj}^2 E[\epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2] - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}^2.$$

If $i = j$, then $\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} = \epsilon_i$, and thus $\sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}^2 = \sigma_{ij}^2$.

If $i \in \widehat{A}_j$, we only need to compare $E[\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j]$ and $E[\epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2]$. Define $\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$, which is the orthogonal rejection of ϵ_i from $\text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top)$ when \widehat{A}_j is given. Thus, $\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \perp \epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$. Since $\epsilon_j \in \text{span}(\mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}^\top)$ due to $A_j^* \subseteq \widehat{A}_j$, we have $\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \perp \epsilon_j$. Thus, given \widehat{A}_j , $\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$ is independent of $(\epsilon_{i \| \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}, \epsilon_j)$ when \mathbf{x} follows a p -variate Gaussian distribution.

Then, when \widehat{A}_j is given, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E[\epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2] &= E[\epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] = E[(\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} + \epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}})^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] \\
&= E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] + E[\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] + 2E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] \\
&= E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] + E[\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] + 2E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] E[\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} | \widehat{A}_j] \\
&= E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] + E[\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j] \\
&\geq E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j],
\end{aligned}$$

where equality holds if and only if $P(\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} = \epsilon_i - \epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} = 0 | \widehat{A}_j) = 1$, i.e., $(A_i^* \cup \{i\}) \setminus \widehat{A}_j^+ = \emptyset$.

The proof is complete. \square

A counterexample to Theorem 7 when \mathbf{x} is non-Gaussian. Given \widehat{A}_j , denote $X = \epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$, $Y = \epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}$, and $Z = \epsilon_j$. Consider $i \in A_j^*$. We have $E[(X+Y)Z] = E[\epsilon_i \epsilon_j] = \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ii}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{jj}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}_{ij} \neq 0$. Then by $E[YZ] = E[\epsilon_{i \perp \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} \epsilon_j | \widehat{A}_j] = 0$ (from the proof of Theorem 7), we obtain $E[XZ] \neq 0$. On the other hand, $E[(X+Y)^2] = \text{var}(\epsilon_i) \geq E[X^2] = \text{var}(\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}} | \widehat{A}_j)$. From the proof of Theorem 7, $\sigma_{ij} < \sigma_{i, \widehat{A}_j}$ is equivalent to $E[\epsilon_i^2 \epsilon_j^2] < E[\epsilon_{i \parallel \mathbf{x}_{\widehat{A}_j^+}}^2 \epsilon_j^2 | \widehat{A}_j]$ when $i \in \widehat{A}_j \supseteq A_j^*$. Thus, we only need to find a counterexample such that $E[(X+Y)^2 Z^2] < E[X^2 Z^2]$, $E[(X+Y)^2] \geq E[X^2]$, $E[XZ] \neq 0$, $E[XY] = 0$, $E[YZ] = 0$, and $E[X] = E[Y] = E[Z] = 0$. Table 6 gives the joint probability distribution of (X, Y, Z) for the counterexample. \square

8 Additional simulation results

X	Y	Z	$P(X, Y, Z)$
1	1	1	1/96
-1	1	1	1/8
-1	-1	1	1/8
-1	1	-1	1/8
1	1	-1	1/96
1	-1	-1	3/16
1	-1	1	1/16
1	1	0	11/48
-1	-1	0	1/8

Table 6: The joint probability of (X, Y, Z) for the counterexample.

Gaussian			L_1 norm	Spectral norm	Frobenius norm	Max norm
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
200		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	4.122(0.920)/2.065(0.491)	2.204(0.518)/ 1.158(0.282)	7.468(0.341)/3.563(0.244)	1.423(0.526)/0.810(0.248)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.126(0.912)/ 2.056(0.492)	2.228(0.502)/1.159(0.278)	7.489(0.341)/ 3.560(0.251)	1.434(0.518)/0.812(0.249)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.226(0.956)/2.111(0.503)	2.258(0.528)/1.184(0.285)	7.520(0.350)/3.616(0.249)	1.433(0.519)/0.834(0.253)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	5.835(1.493)/2.843(0.751)	2.835(0.683)/1.455(0.370)	8.636(0.429)/4.189(0.302)	1.458(0.507)/0.859(0.249)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.434(1.279)/3.330(0.884)	3.351(0.536)/1.691(0.377)	10.156(0.360)/5.045(0.369)	1.532(0.447)/1.009(0.234)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	40.199(3.800)/26.287(1.908)	5.358(0.552)/3.483(0.216)	24.011(0.389)/16.257(0.192)	1.449(0.513)/0.816(0.248)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	6.627(0.761)/4.814(0.593)	3.245(0.312)/2.438(0.283)	10.221(0.281)/7.101(0.238)	1.901(0.284)/1.427(0.289)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.614(0.762)/4.810(0.594)	3.241(0.314)/2.436(0.283)	10.221(0.282)/7.101(0.238)	1.901(0.284)/1.427(0.289)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.055(0.774)/2.483(0.414)	2.047(0.277)/1.260(0.188)	8.578(0.301)/4.207(0.204)	1.168(0.253)/0.773(0.208)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	3.601(0.807) /2.081(0.357)	1.991(0.345) /1.161(0.213)	7.053(0.277) /3.666(0.181)	1.202(0.235)/0.793(0.221)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	26.533(1.567)/19.727(0.978)	5.658(0.343)/2.948(0.141)	18.501(0.152)/13.569(0.093)	1.166(0.253) / 0.771(0.210)
		CLIME	9.376(0.328)/8.148(0.552)	5.226(0.182)/4.601(0.323)	12.876(0.138)/10.376(0.662)	3.212(0.184)/2.908(0.258)
		GLasso	11.422(0.199)/10.116(0.395)	6.615(0.057)/5.799(0.198)	15.052(0.061)/12.399(0.566)	4.458(0.054)/3.875(0.141)
		400		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	4.006(0.721)/ 1.850(0.303)	2.233(0.519)/ 1.061(0.201)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.013(0.750)/ 1.850(0.303)			2.235(0.527)/ 1.061(0.201)	11.429(0.293)/ 5.297(0.212)	1.681(0.605)/0.794(0.211)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.069(0.759)/1.867(0.313)			2.261(0.523)/1.078(0.207)	11.449(0.295)/5.336(0.213)	1.682(0.604)/0.796(0.210)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.115(1.545)/2.695(0.630)			2.957(0.741)/1.383(0.295)	13.298(0.438)/6.223(0.245)	1.685(0.602)/0.797(0.208)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	8.344(2.237)/3.547(0.822)			3.510(0.776)/1.752(0.321)	15.884(0.408)/8.062(0.282)	1.689(0.597)/0.962(0.174)
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	77.940(7.565)/51.088(3.032)			8.335(0.253)/5.417(0.159)	49.063(0.539)/33.208(0.213)	1.685(0.602)/ 0.788(0.209)
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	6.032(0.618)/4.716(0.657)			3.136(0.267)/2.405(0.274)	15.533(0.256)/10.724(0.187)	1.924(0.333)/1.551(0.288)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.030(0.619)/4.714(0.659)			3.135(0.267)/2.405(0.274)	15.533(0.256)/10.724(0.187)	1.924(0.333)/1.551(0.288)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.146(0.495)/2.227(0.369)			2.117(0.175)/1.192(0.168)	12.978(0.291)/6.149(0.173)	1.299(0.221)/0.838(0.197)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	3.285(0.476) /1.962(0.312)			1.892(0.197) /1.109(0.169)	10.646(0.218) /5.395(0.144)	1.299(0.220) /0.843(0.193)
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	49.256(2.707)/36.725(1.501)			9.793(0.537)/5.138(0.215)	36.186(0.211)/26.948(0.113)	1.299(0.221)/0.838(0.197)
CLIME	8.933(0.560)/7.561(0.427)			4.417(0.229)/3.722(0.181)	17.716(0.157)/14.240(0.130)	2.838(0.304)/2.500(0.189)
GLasso	11.886(0.206)/10.517(0.221)			6.089(0.042)/5.309(0.062)	22.535(0.059)/18.151(0.064)	4.605(0.037)/4.014(0.048)
200				$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	8.163(1.466)/ 4.694(0.728)	5.610(1.441)/ 3.062(0.639)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	8.220(1.441)/4.755(0.765)	5.622(1.432)/3.086(0.632)	13.967(1.663)/8.040(0.760)	5.300(1.559)/2.892(0.678)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	8.207(1.454)/4.743(0.751)	5.619(1.435)/3.077(0.630)	13.926(1.663)/8.015(0.755)	5.300(1.559)/2.892(0.678)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	13.156(3.072)/7.068(1.377)	6.768(1.657)/3.678(0.756)	16.843(1.953)/9.565(0.963)	5.300(1.559)/2.892(0.678)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	15.199(3.624)/7.561(1.653)	7.329(1.693)/3.879(0.849)	20.413(1.882)/10.204(0.987)	5.355(1.523)/2.932(0.664)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	109.767(7.634)/71.205(3.404)	15.874(1.029)/10.584(0.594)	60.506(1.336)/40.953(0.730)	5.394(1.474)/2.989(0.607)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	16.115(0.857)/12.576(0.767)	8.227(0.447)/6.409(0.391)	28.589(1.061)/22.625(0.822)	6.942(0.413)/5.398(0.344)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	16.115(0.857)/12.576(0.767)	8.227(0.447)/6.409(0.391)	28.590(1.061)/22.625(0.822)	6.942(0.413)/5.398(0.344)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.198(0.907) /5.138(0.687)	4.521(0.602) /3.118(0.439)	13.359(0.868)/9.220(0.544)	4.195(0.593) / 2.828(0.428)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.434(0.928)/5.148(0.690)	4.579(0.595)/3.108(0.437)	13.164(0.948) /8.848(0.548)	4.195(0.593) / 2.828(0.428)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	56.881(2.376)/44.929(1.985)	9.794(0.439)/7.514(0.354)	38.334(0.357)/29.411(0.273)	4.195(0.593) / 2.828(0.428)
		CLIME	24.208(0.375)/23.184(0.498)	12.640(0.203)/12.117(0.257)	55.652(0.839)/51.108(1.703)	10.909(0.184)/10.480(0.227)
		GLasso	27.814(0.093)/24.878(0.303)	14.660(0.045)/13.112(0.161)	66.004(0.075)/58.411(0.807)	12.662(0.039)/11.323(0.139)
		400		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	9.489(1.418)/ 5.314(0.819)	6.949(1.427)/3.631(0.734)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	9.502(1.408)/5.352(0.846)			6.949(1.427)/3.643(0.734)	21.027(1.610)/11.619(0.779)	6.739(1.487)/3.483(0.760)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	9.490(1.417)/5.345(0.850)			6.949(1.427)/3.643(0.734)	20.978(1.617)/11.615(0.764)	6.739(1.487)/3.483(0.760)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	15.953(3.145)/8.294(1.622)			8.350(1.628)/4.326(0.847)	25.528(1.963)/13.924(0.971)	6.739(1.487)/3.483(0.760)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	18.040(3.267)/8.700(1.633)			8.811(1.564)/4.454(0.856)	31.865(1.655)/15.001(1.030)	6.739(1.487)/3.497(0.748)
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	222.212(11.367)/140.691(5.345)			25.751(1.038)/16.530(0.663)	120.825(1.622)/81.511(0.757)	6.745(1.478)/3.519(0.725)
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	17.025(0.767)/13.991(0.635)			8.669(0.406)/7.124(0.338)	43.539(1.104)/34.396(0.918)	7.319(0.364)/6.028(0.307)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	17.025(0.767)/13.991(0.635)			8.670(0.406)/7.124(0.338)	43.540(1.103)/34.396(0.918)	7.319(0.364)/6.028(0.307)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.798(0.793) /5.844(0.667)			4.984(0.478) /3.630(0.411)	20.099(0.925)/13.921(0.687)	4.669(0.464) / 3.368(0.400)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	8.155(0.866)/5.849(0.666)			5.092(0.473)/ 3.619(0.408)	19.973(0.965) /13.425(0.693)	4.669(0.464) / 3.368(0.400)
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	106.962(3.980)/85.024(2.843)			14.591(0.422)/10.946(0.352)	72.631(0.429)/56.511(0.336)	4.669(0.464) / 3.368(0.400)
CLIME	23.561(0.617)/20.441(0.352)			12.144(0.378)/10.622(0.189)	71.596(2.514)/65.243(0.863)	10.354(0.370)/9.145(0.170)
GLasso	29.043(0.051)/26.410(0.082)			15.296(0.023)/13.915(0.040)	98.003(0.056)/88.160(0.077)	13.211(0.021)/12.016(0.035)

Table 7: Average (standard deviation) of each matrix norm loss over 100 simulation replications under Gaussian random, hub, and cluster graph settings.

Gaussian			L_1 norm	Spectral norm	Frobenius norm	Max norm
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
200		$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	6.040(1.529)/2.424(0.565)	3.422(0.748)/1.510(0.366)	11.470(0.601)/4.438(0.273)	1.737(0.514)/0.930(0.301)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	6.007(1.512)/2.385(0.547)	3.398(0.760)/1.492(0.366)	11.463(0.602)/4.417(0.273)	1.740(0.512)/ 0.929(0.303)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	5.987(1.523)/2.383(0.546)	3.406(0.742)/1.493(0.366)	11.460(0.597)/4.417(0.272)	1.740(0.514)/ 0.929(0.303)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	6.689(1.562)/2.803(0.782)	3.785(0.882)/1.752(0.486)	12.602(0.603)/4.954(0.327)	1.761(0.531)/0.946(0.299)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	6.308(1.655)/3.158(0.784)	3.621(0.961)/1.850(0.477)	11.711(0.645)/5.638(0.347)	1.872(0.524)/0.959(0.293)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	49.675(4.593)/33.122(2.186)	7.023(0.846)/4.662(0.335)	30.694(0.570)/20.440(0.264)	1.720(0.562)/0.956(0.286)
		$L_1: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	9.270(0.462)/8.406(0.414)	7.091(0.326)/6.479(0.223)	19.370(0.214)/16.248(0.218)	2.177(0.393)/1.748(0.317)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	9.270(0.462)/8.406(0.414)	7.089(0.326)/6.478(0.224)	19.370(0.214)/16.248(0.218)	2.177(0.393)/1.748(0.317)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	7.614(0.800)/6.247(0.614)	5.038(0.452)/4.351(0.331)	16.978(0.270)/12.073(0.289)	1.504(0.175)/1.390(0.066)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.227(0.686)/4.840(0.561)	4.885(0.472)/3.335(0.331)	15.224(0.329)/8.963(0.297)	1.529(0.188)/1.206(0.157)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	30.187(1.780)/23.595(1.200)	5.124(0.364)/4.069(0.260)	22.426(0.184)/16.859(0.137)	1.460(0.213)/1.120(0.190)
		CLIME	11.500(0.591)/9.465(0.506)	9.286(0.416)/7.754(0.222)	22.086(0.978)/17.435(0.185)	4.415(0.321)/3.286(0.457)
		GLasso	14.661(0.090)/13.463(0.139)	10.845(0.043)/10.035(0.062)	24.755(0.058)/22.054(0.057)	6.361(0.042)/5.652(0.060)
	400		$L_0: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	6.354(1.421)/3.055(0.838)	3.665(0.760)/1.779(0.482)	16.268(0.432)/6.006(0.457)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	6.314(1.407)/ 3.004(0.835)	3.679(0.773)/ 1.760(0.488)	16.280(0.435)/ 5.988(0.456)	2.042(0.688)/1.040(0.349)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	6.299(1.397)/3.011(0.830)	3.652(0.749)/1.763(0.486)	16.265(0.429)/5.991(0.455)	2.037(0.692)/1.043(0.348)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	7.371(1.906)/3.266(0.959)	4.215(1.067)/1.987(0.582)	17.759(0.483)/6.586(0.474)	2.050(0.690)/1.052(0.344)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	8.049(2.784)/3.293(0.973)	4.297(1.168)/1.968(0.589)	16.746(0.608)/7.134(0.412)	2.090(0.650)/1.056(0.385)
		$L_0: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	91.600(7.670)/60.226(3.023)	9.008(0.696)/6.046(0.319)	51.123(0.622)/34.852(0.272)	1.984(0.739)/ 1.017(0.342)
		$L_1: \widehat{\Omega}^S$	9.602(0.761)/8.557(0.605)	7.149(0.305)/6.405(0.311)	23.099(0.165)/19.833(0.195)	2.493(0.385)/1.897(0.247)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	9.581(0.765)/8.546(0.610)	7.131(0.303)/6.397(0.314)	23.099(0.165)/19.833(0.195)	2.493(0.385)/1.897(0.247)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\Omega}^S))$	7.633(0.955)/6.201(0.752)	5.103(0.500)/4.307(0.426)	21.406(0.226)/16.209(0.317)	1.715(0.328)/1.318(0.147)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\widehat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\widehat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.436(1.162)/4.847(0.934)	4.922(0.632)/3.171(0.480)	19.317(0.286)/12.555(0.300)	1.801(0.273)/1.288(0.235)
		$L_1: \widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	53.387(2.283)/41.789(1.695)	6.538(0.234)/4.808(0.291)	36.319(0.160)/27.675(0.120)	1.680(0.360)/1.202(0.239)
		CLIME	11.546(0.325)/10.151(0.379)	8.903(0.168)/7.910(0.173)	24.787(0.119)/21.980(0.116)	4.008(0.156)/3.171(0.152)
		GLasso	14.218(0.075)/13.384(0.106)	11.021(0.030)/10.316(0.044)	28.677(0.040)/25.575(0.043)	5.839(0.034)/5.233(0.043)

Table 7 (continued)

Sub-Gaussian			L_1 norm	Spectral norm	Frobenius norm	Max norm
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	1.102(0.204)/0.575(0.091)	0.776(0.139)/ 0.408(0.075)	3.063(0.166)/1.670(0.087)	0.452(0.091)/ 0.219(0.039)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.095(0.206)/0.575(0.089)	0.775(0.138)/0.409(0.074)	3.057(0.165)/1.664(0.088)	0.452(0.091)/0.222(0.042)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.100(0.198)/0.578(0.089)	0.776(0.138)/0.411(0.074)	3.064(0.164)/1.669(0.090)	0.452(0.091)/0.230(0.047)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.578(0.325)/0.754(0.119)	1.056(0.190)/0.524(0.087)	3.777(0.221)/1.969(0.121)	0.461(0.088)/0.244(0.040)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	1.928(0.390)/0.941(0.193)	1.133(0.188)/0.570(0.088)	4.421(0.246)/2.339(0.140)	0.462(0.087)/0.268(0.038)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	16.316(0.827)/10.235(0.375)	3.340(0.159)/2.220(0.099)	15.511(0.236)/10.358(0.113)	0.462(0.087)/0.237(0.027)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	2.014(0.084)/1.302(0.065)	1.517(0.063)/1.038(0.038)	8.242(0.169)/5.719(0.100)	0.494(0.017)/0.335(0.020)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.014(0.084)/1.302(0.065)	1.517(0.063)/1.038(0.038)	8.242(0.169)/5.719(0.100)	0.494(0.017)/0.335(0.020)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.948(0.213)/0.823(0.090)	1.214(0.140)/0.523(0.045)	4.727(0.245)/2.471(0.085)	0.484(0.045)/0.226(0.028)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	1.415(0.164)/0.749(0.102)	0.926(0.106)/0.491(0.053)	4.070(0.186)/2.263(0.090)	0.434(0.046)/0.228(0.029)
	$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	10.214(0.344)/7.670(0.158)	2.209(0.061)/1.605(0.055)	11.046(0.074)/8.291(0.047)	0.433(0.045)/0.220(0.017)	
	CLIME	1.959(0.058)/1.413(0.066)	1.667(0.028)/1.137(0.063)	10.032(0.075)/6.528(0.398)	0.498(0.014)/0.344(0.021)	
	GLasso	2.148(0.022)/1.920(0.021)	2.020(0.013)/1.767(0.007)	12.793(0.090)/10.954(0.020)	0.591(0.007)/0.503(0.006)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	1.237(0.176)/0.614(0.077)	0.886(0.123)/0.442(0.061)	4.690(0.208)/2.371(0.092)	0.614(0.113)/0.252(0.042)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.235(0.175)/0.612(0.078)	0.885(0.123)/0.442(0.061)	4.686(0.210)/2.366(0.092)	0.614(0.113)/0.254(0.043)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	1.236(0.176)/ 0.612(0.078)	0.885(0.123)/0.442(0.060)	4.689(0.205)/2.370(0.094)	0.614(0.113)/0.261(0.043)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	2.003(0.343)/0.828(0.116)	1.304(0.196)/0.578(0.076)	5.953(0.282)/2.816(0.123)	0.618(0.111)/0.271(0.035)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	2.588(0.615)/1.022(0.148)	1.409(0.221)/0.621(0.078)	6.984(0.308)/3.390(0.139)	0.617(0.112)/0.296(0.019)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	33.091(1.999)/19.671(0.451)	5.534(0.153)/3.520(0.110)	31.192(0.283)/20.681(0.135)	0.617(0.112)/0.260(0.026)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	2.111(0.017)/1.406(0.060)	1.721(0.046)/1.145(0.029)	13.230(0.178)/9.031(0.103)	0.513(0.013)/0.363(0.016)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		2.111(0.017)/1.406(0.060)	1.721(0.046)/1.145(0.029)	13.230(0.178)/9.031(0.103)	0.513(0.013)/0.363(0.016)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		2.129(0.054)/0.922(0.076)	1.549(0.092)/0.603(0.047)	8.721(0.330)/3.846(0.095)	0.513(0.013)/0.269(0.032)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$		1.714(0.123)/0.866(0.098)	1.188(0.099)/0.571(0.052)	7.097(0.216)/3.582(0.105)	0.511(0.015)/0.269(0.032)	
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	18.855(0.466)/14.431(0.258)	3.450(0.076)/2.420(0.044)	20.824(0.076)/16.027(0.055)	0.510(0.016)/ 0.244(0.019)		
CLIME	1.954(0.050)/1.605(0.047)	1.661(0.020)/1.349(0.019)	14.156(0.073)/11.222(0.084)	0.498(0.013)/0.407(0.011)		
GLasso	2.186(0.021)/2.005(0.026)	2.025(0.005)/1.868(0.061)	18.131(0.015)/16.494(0.630)	0.595(0.005)/0.535(0.019)		
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	3.885(0.773)/1.804(0.406)	2.024(0.376)/1.004(0.231)	7.152(0.284)/3.229(0.199)	1.224(0.358)/ 0.695(0.188)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	3.892(0.748)/ 1.798(0.392)	2.026(0.356)/ 1.004(0.226)	7.161(0.276)/ 3.223(0.198)	1.227(0.357)/0.700(0.188)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	3.934(0.782)/1.849(0.460)	2.071(0.372)/1.040(0.271)	7.207(0.270)/3.290(0.219)	1.252(0.345)/0.744(0.220)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	5.481(1.295)/2.500(0.695)	2.627(0.590)/1.288(0.343)	8.313(0.343)/3.863(0.247)	1.286(0.338)/0.760(0.222)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.010(1.385)/3.011(0.759)	3.163(0.536)/1.560(0.345)	9.821(0.349)/4.755(0.318)	1.381(0.263)/0.966(0.223)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	39.650(3.332)/26.062(1.562)	5.244(0.454)/3.491(0.194)	23.772(0.361)/16.156(0.174)	1.249(0.357)/0.700(0.187)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	6.648(0.779)/4.894(0.540)	3.289(0.325)/2.448(0.241)	10.199(0.275)/7.048(0.208)	1.924(0.303)/1.444(0.229)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.642(0.778)/4.888(0.540)	3.286(0.324)/2.445(0.241)	10.199(0.275)/7.047(0.208)	1.924(0.303)/1.444(0.229)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	4.070(0.742)/2.436(0.430)	2.045(0.288)/1.220(0.150)	8.459(0.314)/4.009(0.162)	1.174(0.270)/0.713(0.175)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	3.389(0.654)/2.107(0.396)	1.882(0.270)/1.124(0.154)	6.819(0.250)/3.630(0.151)	1.192(0.254)/0.714(0.180)
	$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	26.637(1.349)/19.632(0.824)	5.653(0.334)/2.942(0.123)	18.357(0.142)/13.487(0.088)	1.172(0.272)/0.712(0.177)	
	CLIME	9.406(0.356)/8.217(0.540)	5.262(0.158)/4.658(0.306)	12.874(0.125)/10.427(0.614)	3.242(0.140)/2.935(0.230)	
	GLasso	11.488(0.192)/10.074(0.291)	6.631(0.051)/5.763(0.144)	15.057(0.055)/12.255(0.400)	4.467(0.037)/3.847(0.099)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	3.794(0.773)/ 1.759(0.347)	2.038(0.450)/ 0.978(0.184)	10.978(0.288)/4.944(0.204)	1.409(0.462)/ 0.703(0.174)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	3.805(0.781)/1.761(0.348)	2.041(0.454)/0.979(0.184)	10.982(0.288)/ 4.940(0.202)	1.409(0.462)/0.704(0.173)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	3.815(0.779)/1.799(0.384)	2.053(0.457)/1.007(0.212)	11.004(0.285)/4.991(0.205)	1.409(0.462)/0.724(0.167)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	5.764(1.390)/2.640(0.625)	2.746(0.654)/1.308(0.281)	12.892(0.417)/5.932(0.246)	1.427(0.451)/0.734(0.162)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.943(1.614)/3.365(0.615)	3.293(0.606)/1.660(0.261)	15.442(0.413)/7.761(0.279)	1.447(0.434)/0.918(0.132)
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	76.403(6.038)/51.051(3.042)	8.282(0.262)/5.404(0.159)	48.701(0.475)/33.094(0.195)	1.431(0.448)/0.717(0.170)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	6.226(0.659)/4.662(0.556)	3.194(0.284)/2.375(0.237)	15.518(0.236)/10.641(0.156)	1.999(0.312)/1.519(0.249)
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		6.224(0.661)/4.661(0.556)	3.194(0.284)/2.375(0.237)	15.518(0.236)/10.641(0.156)	1.999(0.312)/1.519(0.249)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		4.207(0.490)/2.112(0.291)	2.137(0.195)/1.149(0.136)	12.844(0.322)/5.910(0.168)	1.262(0.223)/0.746(0.176)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$		3.233(0.429)/2.051(0.310)	1.828(0.189)/1.101(0.141)	10.423(0.253)/5.475(0.149)	1.264(0.221)/0.747(0.176)	
$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	49.235(2.398)/36.838(1.491)	9.882(0.522)/5.131(0.216)	35.930(0.164)/26.834(0.097)	1.262(0.223)/0.746(0.176)		
CLIME	8.988(0.483)/7.594(0.388)	4.421(0.212)/3.731(0.150)	17.683(0.111)/14.202(0.109)	2.819(0.273)/2.504(0.158)		
GLasso	11.919(0.195)/10.547(0.208)	6.094(0.041)/5.314(0.051)	22.531(0.052)/18.141(0.047)	4.608(0.034)/4.017(0.038)		

Table 8: Average (standard deviation) of each matrix norm loss over 100 simulation replications under sub-Gaussian graph settings.

Sub-Gaussian			L_1 norm	Spectral norm	Frobenius norm	Max norm		
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$		
200		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	7.008(1.160)/ 4.063(0.533)	4.804(1.158)/ 2.619(0.549)	12.094(1.272)/6.906(0.559)	4.499(1.269)/2.442(0.612)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.084(1.169)/4.174(0.622)	4.844(1.148)/2.682(0.557)	12.306(1.246)/7.031(0.594)	4.499(1.269)/2.464(0.591)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.045(1.182)/4.156(0.594)	4.827(1.157)/2.672(0.552)	12.261(1.263)/7.013(0.588)	4.499(1.269)/2.461(0.595)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	11.775(2.445)/6.456(1.178)	5.964(1.354)/3.277(0.663)	15.344(1.548)/8.809(0.738)	4.501(1.266)/2.461(0.595)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	13.481(2.965)/6.925(1.418)	6.459(1.386)/3.451(0.687)	18.278(1.486)/9.500(0.777)	4.509(1.270)/2.508(0.598)		
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	107.968(6.698)/70.427(3.220)	15.730(0.957)/10.386(0.549)	59.902(1.203)/40.680(0.596)	4.609(1.158)/2.693(0.446)		
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	15.553(0.734)/12.086(0.699)	7.874(0.385)/6.123(0.362)	28.458(0.906)/22.450(0.710)	6.595(0.346)/5.122(0.328)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	15.553(0.734)/12.086(0.699)	7.874(0.385)/6.123(0.362)	28.458(0.906)/22.450(0.710)	6.595(0.346)/5.122(0.328)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.426(0.658)/4.574(0.498)	3.965(0.445)/2.701(0.353)	12.302(0.701)/8.435(0.481)	3.638(0.485)/2.422(0.366)		
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	6.714(0.766)/4.867(0.574)	4.012(0.475)/2.793(0.383)	12.277(0.690)/8.460(0.469)	3.638(0.485)/2.422(0.366)		
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	55.921(2.131)/44.423(1.508)	9.723(0.468)/7.334(0.340)	37.816(0.332)/29.072(0.278)	3.638(0.485)/2.422(0.366)		
		CLIME	24.222(0.381)/22.891(0.635)	12.633(0.207)/11.945(0.342)	55.783(1.005)/51.042(1.988)	10.888(0.187)/10.312(0.309)		
		GLasso	27.796(0.074)/24.780(0.244)	14.632(0.033)/13.049(0.128)	66.006(0.062)/58.306(0.586)	12.624(0.024)/11.258(0.108)		
		Hub		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	8.299(1.246)/ 4.417(0.568)	6.108(1.164)/ 2.984(0.574)	18.342(1.244)/9.866(0.635)	5.905(1.211)/ 2.852(0.606)
				$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	8.341(1.241)/4.488(0.582)	6.115(1.162)/3.010(0.571)	18.500(1.237)/9.939(0.654)	5.905(1.211)/ 2.852(0.606)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	8.331(1.237)/4.482(0.588)			6.121(1.160)/3.006(0.575)	18.447(1.240)/9.934(0.651)	5.905(1.211)/ 2.852(0.606)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	14.651(2.540)/7.252(1.257)			7.509(1.364)/3.700(0.673)	23.191(1.496)/12.493(0.829)	5.905(1.211)/ 2.852(0.606)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	16.890(3.308)/7.722(1.337)			8.005(1.437)/3.914(0.735)	28.425(1.487)/13.626(0.877)	5.913(1.199)/2.938(0.599)		
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	214.660(9.951)/138.357(4.979)			25.503(1.219)/16.544(0.616)	119.779(1.182)/81.206(0.692)	5.924(1.185)/3.072(0.492)		
400				$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	16.393(0.561)/13.506(0.608)	8.295(0.284)/6.845(0.308)	43.368(0.773)/34.047(0.682)	6.961(0.250)/5.762(0.278)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	16.393(0.561)/13.506(0.608)	8.295(0.284)/6.845(0.308)	43.368(0.773)/34.046(0.682)	6.961(0.250)/5.762(0.278)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.771(0.521)/5.015(0.456)	4.389(0.339)/3.174(0.331)	18.799(0.693)/12.727(0.511)	4.132(0.335)/2.953(0.345)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.092(0.543)/5.316(0.500)	4.477(0.365)/3.248(0.335)	18.783(0.707)/12.764(0.489)	4.132(0.335)/2.953(0.345)
				$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	104.489(3.138)/84.004(2.198)	14.360(0.490)/10.882(0.344)	71.971(0.395)/56.163(0.268)	4.132(0.335)/2.953(0.345)
				CLIME	23.352(0.725)/20.300(0.295)	11.956(0.431)/10.530(0.163)	72.420(3.204)/65.251(0.935)	10.133(0.415)/9.060(0.150)
GLasso	29.019(0.055)/26.382(0.157)			15.272(0.020)/13.888(0.079)	98.006(0.040)/88.202(0.535)	13.180(0.015)/11.983(0.068)		
200				$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	5.588(1.283)/2.242(0.480)	3.180(0.707)/1.388(0.312)	10.998(0.560)/4.111(0.297)	1.655(0.583)/0.785(0.228)
				$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	5.571(1.288)/ 2.189(0.461)	3.159(0.713)/1.367(0.307)	10.986(0.562)/4.085(0.297)	1.655(0.583)/ 0.783(0.230)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	5.567(1.285)/2.195(0.464)	3.163(0.708)/1.367(0.307)	10.990(0.572)/4.089(0.299)	1.665(0.586)/0.784(0.229)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.356(1.655)/2.621(0.632)	3.672(0.951)/1.664(0.428)	12.179(0.650)/4.663(0.367)	1.693(0.578)/0.805(0.225)		
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	6.349(2.401)/2.984(0.734)	3.571(1.076)/1.744(0.444)	11.348(0.795)/5.407(0.393)	1.778(0.574)/0.831(0.247)		
		$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	49.698(5.426)/33.005(2.356)	7.028(0.921)/4.663(0.341)	30.437(0.603)/20.366(0.271)	1.629(0.619)/0.827(0.201)		
		400		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	9.192(0.448)/8.339(0.382)	7.151(0.291)/6.475(0.229)	19.420(0.167)/16.188(0.174)	2.247(0.380)/1.671(0.264)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	9.190(0.449)/8.339(0.382)	7.148(0.293)/6.475(0.229)	19.419(0.167)/16.188(0.174)	2.247(0.380)/1.671(0.264)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.485(0.689)/6.118(0.624)	5.008(0.411)/4.289(0.332)	16.927(0.247)/11.955(0.280)	1.444(0.100)/1.377(0.009)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	6.913(0.696)/4.753(0.602)	4.626(0.459)/3.273(0.345)	14.966(0.289)/8.918(0.273)	1.447(0.150)/1.103(0.120)
				$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	29.838(1.684)/23.494(1.173)	5.170(0.335)/4.082(0.297)	22.287(0.142)/16.784(0.133)	1.362(0.164)/1.025(0.108)
				CLIME	11.586(0.637)/9.469(0.480)	9.311(0.417)/7.758(0.215)	22.028(1.050)/17.422(0.172)	4.425(0.322)/3.266(0.390)
		GLasso	14.686(0.090)/13.460(0.126)	10.860(0.037)/10.040(0.050)	24.776(0.044)/22.054(0.049)	6.367(0.035)/5.643(0.048)		
		Cluster		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	6.213(1.597)/2.785(0.620)	3.546(0.694)/1.573(0.325)	15.993(0.431)/5.571(0.376)	1.810(0.423)/0.901(0.214)
				$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.157(1.526)/2.738(0.606)	3.537(0.687)/1.554(0.331)	15.997(0.435)/ 5.553(0.376)	1.824(0.416)/0.900(0.217)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	6.159(1.548)/ 2.732(0.600)			3.534(0.689)/1.556(0.328)	15.987(0.431)/5.556(0.372)	1.816(0.420)/0.901(0.216)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.200(1.431)/2.965(0.594)			4.034(0.677)/1.778(0.404)	17.448(0.409)/6.157(0.355)	1.843(0.399)/0.924(0.212)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.623(1.702)/3.079(0.695)			4.003(0.723)/1.787(0.426)	16.451(0.523)/6.785(0.280)	1.916(0.334)/0.919(0.295)		
$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	89.667(5.990)/59.694(2.355)			8.819(0.351)/6.030(0.293)	50.745(0.615)/34.714(0.195)	1.732(0.486)/ 0.864(0.213)		
400				$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	9.658(0.675)/8.462(0.504)	7.255(0.330)/6.392(0.267)	23.129(0.145)/19.803(0.151)	2.391(0.267)/1.828(0.166)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	9.641(0.688)/8.457(0.506)	7.242(0.335)/6.385(0.267)	23.129(0.145)/19.802(0.151)	2.391(0.267)/1.828(0.166)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	7.702(0.885)/6.165(0.657)	5.224(0.537)/4.297(0.359)	21.408(0.230)/16.116(0.255)	1.587(0.203)/1.247(0.091)
				$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} _{Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}})}, S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	7.303(1.200)/4.814(0.789)	4.781(0.674)/3.144(0.421)	19.258(0.290)/12.492(0.288)	1.639(0.198)/1.148(0.164)
				$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	53.208(1.998)/41.619(1.275)	6.572(0.268)/4.825(0.273)	36.141(0.176)/27.575(0.120)	1.561(0.217)/1.109(0.140)
				CLIME	11.547(0.337)/10.078(0.300)	8.951(0.167)/7.911(0.157)	24.785(0.091)/21.955(0.097)	3.988(0.122)/3.156(0.127)
GLasso	14.235(0.071)/13.392(0.098)			11.033(0.031)/10.313(0.039)	28.693(0.030)/25.576(0.034)	5.839(0.024)/5.238(0.032)		

Table 8 (continued)

Gaussian			Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC	
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.935(0.014)/0.977(0.008)	0.707(0.023)/0.966(0.010)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.810(0.015)/0.971(0.007)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.937(0.014)/ 0.979(0.009)	0.705(0.023)/0.965(0.010)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.810(0.016)/ 0.972(0.007)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.935(0.014)/0.977(0.008)	0.704(0.024)/0.964(0.010)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.809(0.016)/0.970(0.007)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.935(0.014)/0.977(0.008)	0.704(0.024)/0.964(0.010)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.809(0.016)/0.970(0.007)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.911(0.020)/0.940(0.013)	0.550(0.026)/0.925(0.013)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.703(0.018)/0.931(0.011)	
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.925(0.017)/0.924(0.014)	0.495(0.036)/0.947(0.014)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.672(0.027)/0.934(0.009)	
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.930(0.017)/0.926(0.014)	0.495(0.037)/0.947(0.014)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.674(0.027)/0.935(0.009)	
	$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.930(0.017)/0.926(0.014)	0.495(0.037)/0.947(0.014)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.674(0.027)/0.935(0.009)		
	$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.955(0.012)/0.960(0.007)	0.793(0.021)/0.981(0.007)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.868(0.013)/0.969(0.005)		
	CLIME	0.633(0.017)/0.626(0.121)	0.914(0.014)/ 0.995(0.004)	0.989(0.001)/0.987(0.009)	0.755(0.014)/0.780(0.084)		
	GLasso	0.398(0.017)/0.333(0.058)	0.928(0.013)/0.995(0.004)	0.972(0.002)/0.959(0.008)	0.597(0.014)/0.562(0.048)		
	Hub	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.943(0.010)/0.982(0.005)	0.659(0.012)/0.952(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.787(0.010)/0.967(0.005)
			$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.943(0.010)/ 0.983(0.005)	0.658(0.012)/0.952(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.786(0.010)/0.967(0.005)
			$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.943(0.010)/0.982(0.005)	0.658(0.012)/0.951(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.786(0.010)/0.966(0.005)
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$			0.943(0.010)/0.982(0.005)	0.658(0.012)/0.951(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.786(0.010)/0.966(0.005)	
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$			0.890(0.019)/0.943(0.008)	0.473(0.019)/0.882(0.011)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.646(0.014)/0.911(0.007)	
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$			0.949(0.011)/0.947(0.008)	0.484(0.024)/0.936(0.010)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.676(0.017)/0.941(0.006)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$			0.952(0.011)/0.948(0.008)	0.484(0.024)/0.936(0.010)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.677(0.017)/0.941(0.006)	
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		0.952(0.011)/0.948(0.008)	0.484(0.024)/0.936(0.010)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.677(0.017)/0.941(0.006)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$		0.956(0.010)/0.964(0.005)	0.788(0.015)/0.979(0.005)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.867(0.009)/0.971(0.004)		
CLIME		0.517(0.012)/0.589(0.011)	0.928(0.009)/0.997(0.002)	0.991(0.000)/0.993(0.000)	0.689(0.009)/0.763(0.007)		
GLasso		0.510(0.025)/0.373(0.011)	0.861(0.014)/0.996(0.002)	0.991(0.001)/0.983(0.001)	0.658(0.016)/0.604(0.009)		
Hub		200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.985(0.009)/0.991(0.007)	0.987(0.009)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.007)/0.995(0.004)
			$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.986(0.009)/0.994(0.006)	0.982(0.009)/0.998(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.984(0.007)/0.996(0.003)
			$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.987(0.008)/0.995(0.006)	0.983(0.009)/0.999(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.007)/ 0.997(0.003)
	$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		0.987(0.008)/0.995(0.006)	0.983(0.009)/0.999(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.007)/ 0.997(0.003)	
	$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$		0.944(0.018)/0.930(0.011)	0.906(0.021)/0.998(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.924(0.016)/0.963(0.006)	
	$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$		0.799(0.022)/0.813(0.025)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.893(0.012)/0.901(0.014)	
	$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		0.802(0.022)/0.817(0.025)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.894(0.013)/0.903(0.014)	
	$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.802(0.022)/0.817(0.025)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.894(0.013)/0.903(0.014)		
	$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.950(0.006)/0.945(0.003)	0.992(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.970(0.005)/0.972(0.002)		
	CLIME	0.183(0.019)/0.174(0.007)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.959(0.004)/0.956(0.003)	0.418(0.021)/0.407(0.009)		
	GLasso	0.115(0.003)/0.099(0.007)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.930(0.002)/0.917(0.005)	0.327(0.004)/0.302(0.010)		
	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.989(0.006)/0.994(0.004)	0.982(0.007)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.005)/0.997(0.002)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.989(0.006)/ 0.996(0.004)	0.979(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.984(0.005)/0.997(0.002)	
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.990(0.005)/0.996(0.004)	0.980(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.005)/ 0.998(0.002)	
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		0.990(0.005)/0.996(0.004)	0.980(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.005)/ 0.998(0.002)		
$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$		0.947(0.013)/0.935(0.008)	0.869(0.016)/0.997(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.907(0.010)/0.965(0.004)		
$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$		0.833(0.015)/0.832(0.014)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.912(0.009)/0.911(0.008)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$		0.834(0.015)/0.834(0.014)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.913(0.008)/0.913(0.008)		
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.834(0.015)/0.834(0.014)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.913(0.008)/0.913(0.008)			
$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.949(0.003)/0.944(0.001)	0.991(0.004)/ 1.000(0.000)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.969(0.003)/0.972(0.001)			
CLIME	0.242(0.034)/0.131(0.002)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.002)/0.970(0.001)	0.487(0.033)/0.356(0.003)			
GLasso	0.114(0.002)/0.094(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.965(0.001)/0.956(0.001)	0.332(0.003)/0.300(0.002)			

Table 9: Average (standard deviation) of each support-recovery metric over 100 simulation replications under Gaussian random, hub, and cluster graph settings.

Gaussian			Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
200		$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.960(0.010)/0.989(0.004)	0.775(0.028)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.859(0.018)/0.993(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.010)/0.991(0.004)	0.775(0.028)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.860(0.018)/ 0.994(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.010)/0.991(0.004)	0.775(0.028)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.860(0.018)/ 0.994(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.010)/0.991(0.004)	0.775(0.028)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.860(0.018)/ 0.994(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.921(0.011)/0.933(0.007)	0.885(0.019)/0.998(0.002)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.900(0.012)/0.964(0.004)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.801(0.017)/0.813(0.012)	0.360(0.019)/0.722(0.020)	0.997(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.529(0.017)/0.760(0.012)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.804(0.018)/0.814(0.012)	0.360(0.019)/0.722(0.020)	0.998(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.530(0.017)/0.760(0.012)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.804(0.018)/0.814(0.012)	0.360(0.019)/0.722(0.020)	0.998(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.530(0.017)/0.760(0.012)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.919(0.017)/0.949(0.009)	0.560(0.018)/0.929(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.711(0.016)/0.937(0.007)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.919(0.017)/0.949(0.009)	0.560(0.018)/0.929(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.711(0.016)/0.937(0.007)
		CLIME	0.581(0.080)/0.464(0.009)	0.689(0.062)/0.960(0.007)	0.985(0.008)/0.969(0.001)	0.617(0.027)/0.656(0.008)
		GLasso	0.500(0.016)/0.420(0.011)	0.662(0.012)/0.846(0.008)	0.981(0.001)/0.967(0.002)	0.562(0.011)/0.581(0.009)
400	Cluster	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.938(0.009)/0.988(0.003)	0.591(0.018)/0.984(0.008)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.742(0.014)/0.985(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.939(0.009)/0.989(0.003)	0.591(0.018)/0.984(0.008)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.742(0.014)/ 0.986(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.939(0.009)/0.989(0.003)	0.591(0.018)/0.983(0.008)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.742(0.014)/0.986(0.005)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.939(0.009)/0.989(0.003)	0.591(0.018)/0.983(0.008)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.742(0.014)/0.986(0.005)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.900(0.011)/0.937(0.006)	0.736(0.021)/0.991(0.004)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.812(0.013)/0.963(0.003)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.830(0.019)/0.840(0.010)	0.211(0.012)/0.562(0.021)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.415(0.014)/0.683(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.833(0.019)/0.841(0.010)	0.211(0.012)/0.562(0.021)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.416(0.014)/0.684(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.833(0.019)/0.841(0.010)	0.211(0.012)/0.562(0.021)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.416(0.014)/0.684(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.896(0.015)/0.942(0.008)	0.443(0.013)/0.829(0.011)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.627(0.012)/0.882(0.008)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.896(0.015)/0.942(0.008)	0.443(0.013)/0.829(0.011)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.627(0.012)/0.882(0.008)
		CLIME	0.494(0.010)/0.604(0.009)	0.643(0.010)/0.865(0.008)	0.991(0.000)/0.992(0.000)	0.557(0.009)/0.718(0.007)
		GLasso	0.636(0.013)/0.539(0.010)	0.522(0.011)/0.776(0.007)	0.996(0.000)/0.991(0.000)	0.571(0.008)/0.641(0.007)

Table 9 (continued)

Sub-Gaussian		Precision		Sensitivity		Specificity		MCC	
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.981(0.007)/0.992(0.005)	0.979(0.007)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.979(0.006)/0.996(0.002)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.983(0.007)/0.994(0.004)	0.978(0.007)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.980(0.006)/0.997(0.002)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.982(0.006)/ 0.994(0.004)	0.978(0.008)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.980(0.006)/0.997(0.002)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.982(0.006)/ 0.994(0.004)	0.978(0.008)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.980(0.006)/0.997(0.002)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.926(0.014)/0.931(0.009)	0.950(0.011)/0.998(0.002)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.937(0.009)/0.963(0.005)			
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.780(0.017)/0.809(0.016)	0.928(0.017)/1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.001)/0.995(0.000)	0.848(0.012)/0.897(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.782(0.017)/0.811(0.016)	0.928(0.017)/1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.001)/0.995(0.000)	0.848(0.012)/0.898(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.782(0.017)/0.811(0.016)	0.928(0.017)/1.000(0.001)	0.995(0.001)/0.995(0.000)	0.848(0.012)/0.898(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.920(0.013)/0.929(0.007)	0.969(0.009)/1.000(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.943(0.010)/0.963(0.004)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.570(0.012)/0.364(0.061)	0.966(0.009)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.001)/0.963(0.006)	0.736(0.009)/0.591(0.046)			
		GLIME	0.495(0.023)/0.377(0.009)	0.936(0.015)/0.999(0.001)	0.980(0.003)/0.966(0.001)	0.673(0.018)/0.603(0.008)			
		GLasso	0.495(0.023)/0.377(0.009)	0.936(0.015)/0.999(0.001)	0.980(0.003)/0.966(0.001)	0.673(0.018)/0.603(0.008)			
Band	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.984(0.005)/0.994(0.003)	0.971(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.977(0.004)/ 0.997(0.001)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.995(0.003)	0.971(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.978(0.004)/0.997(0.001)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.995(0.003)	0.971(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.978(0.004)/0.997(0.001)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.005)/0.995(0.003)	0.971(0.006)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.978(0.004)/0.997(0.001)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.924(0.010)/0.935(0.006)	0.936(0.009)/0.998(0.002)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.929(0.007)/0.966(0.004)			
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.796(0.012)/0.822(0.010)	0.828(0.021)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.809(0.012)/0.905(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.797(0.012)/0.823(0.010)	0.828(0.021)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.810(0.012)/0.906(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.797(0.012)/0.823(0.010)	0.828(0.021)/0.999(0.001)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.810(0.012)/0.906(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.912(0.011)/0.932(0.006)	0.946(0.009)/0.999(0.001)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.928(0.008)/0.964(0.003)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.475(0.007)/0.491(0.007)	0.973(0.005)/1.000(0.000)	0.989(0.000)/0.990(0.000)	0.676(0.006)/0.697(0.005)			
		CLIME	0.475(0.007)/0.491(0.007)	0.973(0.005)/1.000(0.000)	0.989(0.000)/0.990(0.000)	0.676(0.006)/0.697(0.005)			
		GLasso	0.394(0.008)/0.440(0.111)	0.937(0.010)/0.998(0.002)	0.985(0.001)/0.985(0.008)	0.602(0.007)/0.652(0.091)			
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.934(0.013)/0.975(0.008)	0.706(0.023)/0.970(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.809(0.016)/0.972(0.006)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.936(0.013)/0.977(0.008)	0.705(0.022)/0.969(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.810(0.015)/ 0.973(0.006)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.935(0.013)/0.975(0.008)	0.704(0.023)/0.968(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.808(0.015)/0.971(0.006)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.935(0.013)/0.975(0.008)	0.704(0.023)/0.968(0.009)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.808(0.015)/0.971(0.006)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.890(0.023)/0.935(0.013)	0.579(0.026)/0.933(0.013)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.713(0.019)/0.932(0.010)			
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.924(0.018)/0.922(0.015)	0.496(0.042)/0.949(0.012)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.672(0.029)/0.934(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.929(0.018)/0.925(0.015)	0.496(0.042)/0.949(0.012)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.674(0.029)/0.936(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.929(0.018)/0.925(0.015)	0.496(0.042)/0.949(0.012)	0.999(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.674(0.029)/0.936(0.009)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.929(0.014)/0.930(0.011)	0.804(0.022)/0.985(0.006)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.861(0.015)/0.956(0.007)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.620(0.017)/0.634(0.112)	0.917(0.014)/0.996(0.004)	0.989(0.001)/0.987(0.008)	0.748(0.014)/0.786(0.079)			
		CLIME	0.620(0.017)/0.634(0.112)	0.917(0.014)/0.996(0.004)	0.989(0.001)/0.987(0.008)	0.748(0.014)/0.786(0.079)			
		GLasso	0.397(0.016)/0.318(0.043)	0.928(0.013)/0.997(0.003)	0.972(0.002)/0.957(0.006)	0.596(0.013)/0.549(0.036)			
Random	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.943(0.010)/0.981(0.005)	0.663(0.015)/0.952(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.789(0.011)/0.966(0.005)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.944(0.010)/ 0.982(0.005)	0.662(0.015)/0.952(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.789(0.011)/ 0.966(0.004)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.943(0.010)/0.981(0.005)	0.662(0.015)/0.951(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.788(0.011)/0.965(0.005)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.943(0.010)/0.981(0.005)	0.662(0.015)/0.951(0.008)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.788(0.011)/0.965(0.005)			
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.864(0.020)/0.936(0.009)	0.511(0.018)/0.890(0.010)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.662(0.014)/0.912(0.007)			
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.949(0.010)/0.947(0.007)	0.487(0.025)/0.936(0.011)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.678(0.018)/0.941(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.951(0.010)/0.948(0.007)	0.487(0.025)/0.936(0.011)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.678(0.018)/0.942(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.951(0.010)/0.948(0.007)	0.487(0.025)/0.936(0.011)	1.000(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.678(0.018)/0.942(0.006)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.924(0.012)/0.934(0.008)	0.802(0.016)/0.983(0.005)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.859(0.010)/0.957(0.005)			
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.505(0.013)/0.581(0.010)	0.935(0.009)/0.997(0.002)	0.990(0.000)/0.993(0.000)	0.683(0.010)/0.758(0.007)			
		CLIME	0.505(0.013)/0.581(0.010)	0.935(0.009)/0.997(0.002)	0.990(0.000)/0.993(0.000)	0.683(0.010)/0.758(0.007)			
		GLasso	0.509(0.025)/0.373(0.010)	0.869(0.014)/0.996(0.002)	0.991(0.001)/0.983(0.001)	0.661(0.017)/0.604(0.008)			

Table 10: Average (standard deviation) of each support-recovery metric over 100 simulation replications under sub-Gaussian settings.

Sub-Gaussian			Precision	Sensitivity	Specificity	MCC
Graph	p	Method	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$	$n = 200/n = 400$
Hub	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.984(0.008)/0.991(0.007)	0.988(0.008)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.006)/0.995(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.985(0.008)/ 0.995(0.006)	0.983(0.008)/0.998(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.984(0.006)/ 0.997(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.986(0.008)/0.995(0.006)	0.984(0.008)/0.999(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.006)/ 0.997(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.986(0.008)/0.995(0.006)	0.984(0.008)/0.999(0.003)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.006)/ 0.997(0.003)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.933(0.016)/0.925(0.012)	0.931(0.016)/0.999(0.002)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.931(0.012)/0.961(0.006)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.801(0.024)/0.817(0.020)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.894(0.013)/0.903(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.805(0.024)/0.820(0.020)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.896(0.014)/0.905(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.805(0.024)/0.820(0.020)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.998(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.896(0.014)/0.905(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.895(0.016)/0.914(0.012)	0.999(0.002)/ 1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.945(0.009)/0.956(0.007)
		CLIME	0.183(0.025)/0.174(0.009)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.958(0.006)/0.957(0.002)	0.417(0.029)/0.408(0.010)
	GLasso	0.115(0.002)/0.098(0.005)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.929(0.001)/0.916(0.004)	0.326(0.003)/0.300(0.008)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.989(0.005)/0.994(0.004)	0.983(0.007)/1.000(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.004)/0.997(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.989(0.005)/ 0.996(0.004)	0.981(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.985(0.005)/ 0.998(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.990(0.005)/0.996(0.004)	0.981(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.004)/0.998(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.990(0.005)/0.996(0.004)	0.981(0.007)/0.999(0.001)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.004)/0.998(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.940(0.013)/0.932(0.007)	0.903(0.015)/0.998(0.002)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.921(0.010)/0.964(0.004)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.837(0.015)/0.835(0.015)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.914(0.008)/0.913(0.008)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.839(0.015)/0.837(0.015)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.915(0.008)/0.915(0.008)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.839(0.015)/0.837(0.015)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.915(0.008)/0.915(0.008)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.908(0.012)/0.920(0.008)	1.000(0.001)/ 1.000(0.000)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.953(0.006)/0.959(0.004)
CLIME		0.251(0.044)/0.131(0.009)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.986(0.003)/0.970(0.002)	0.495(0.042)/0.356(0.012)	
GLasso	0.114(0.002)/0.094(0.004)	1.000(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.965(0.001)/0.956(0.002)	0.332(0.003)/0.300(0.007)		
Cluster	200	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.961(0.009)/0.989(0.004)	0.779(0.024)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.861(0.016)/0.993(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.009)/0.991(0.004)	0.778(0.024)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.862(0.016)/ 0.994(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.009)/0.991(0.004)	0.778(0.024)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.862(0.016)/ 0.994(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.962(0.009)/0.991(0.004)	0.778(0.024)/0.998(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.862(0.016)/ 0.994(0.002)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.910(0.014)/0.930(0.009)	0.894(0.018)/0.998(0.002)	0.997(0.000)/0.998(0.000)	0.899(0.013)/0.962(0.005)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.803(0.016)/0.811(0.012)	0.359(0.018)/0.725(0.021)	0.998(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.529(0.016)/0.760(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.806(0.016)/0.812(0.012)	0.359(0.019)/0.725(0.021)	0.998(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.530(0.016)/0.761(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.806(0.016)/0.812(0.012)	0.359(0.019)/0.725(0.021)	0.998(0.000)/0.995(0.000)	0.530(0.016)/0.761(0.013)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.882(0.016)/0.911(0.010)	0.582(0.016)/0.936(0.011)	0.998(0.000)/0.997(0.000)	0.710(0.014)/0.921(0.009)
		CLIME	0.566(0.086)/0.461(0.008)	0.696(0.065)/0.961(0.007)	0.983(0.009)/0.968(0.001)	0.611(0.030)/0.654(0.007)
	GLasso	0.498(0.015)/0.420(0.011)	0.664(0.012)/0.848(0.009)	0.981(0.001)/0.967(0.002)	0.561(0.011)/0.582(0.009)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.937(0.009)/0.987(0.004)	0.590(0.018)/0.985(0.006)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.741(0.013)/ 0.986(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\Omega}^{US}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.938(0.009)/0.988(0.004)	0.590(0.018)/0.984(0.006)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.741(0.013)/ 0.986(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.938(0.009)/0.988(0.004)	0.590(0.018)/0.984(0.006)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.741(0.013)/ 0.986(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.938(0.009)/0.988(0.004)	0.590(0.018)/0.984(0.006)	0.999(0.000)/1.000(0.000)	0.741(0.013)/ 0.986(0.004)
		$L_0: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.880(0.013)/0.934(0.006)	0.749(0.020)/0.992(0.003)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.809(0.013)/0.962(0.004)
		$L_1: \hat{\Omega}^S$	0.827(0.017)/0.840(0.011)	0.210(0.012)/0.563(0.018)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.413(0.013)/0.684(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\Omega}^S Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.830(0.017)/0.841(0.011)	0.210(0.012)/0.563(0.018)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.414(0.013)/0.685(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\Omega}^S))$	0.830(0.017)/0.841(0.011)	0.210(0.012)/0.563(0.018)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.414(0.013)/0.685(0.011)
		$L_1: \mathcal{T}(\hat{\mathbf{T}} Z_0(\hat{\mathbf{T}}), S_L(\hat{\mathbf{T}}))$	0.878(0.017)/0.911(0.010)	0.439(0.012)/0.837(0.012)	0.999(0.000)/0.999(0.000)	0.618(0.012)/0.872(0.009)
CLIME		0.484(0.009)/0.598(0.010)	0.648(0.010)/0.865(0.009)	0.991(0.000)/0.992(0.000)	0.553(0.008)/0.715(0.008)	
GLasso	0.642(0.012)/0.539(0.011)	0.525(0.011)/0.777(0.008)	0.996(0.000)/0.991(0.000)	0.576(0.009)/0.641(0.007)		

Table 10 (continued)

Gaussian Graph		p	Method	TrueLength $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AvgLength $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	CovRate $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AbsAvgZ $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	SDZ $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega}$ $n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.318(0.038)/0.225(0.027)	0.343(0.042)/0.232(0.028)	0.890(0.032)/0.938(0.024)	0.552(0.144)/0.282(0.112)	1.080(0.083)/1.012(0.073)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.318(0.038)/0.225(0.027)	0.244(0.035)/0.189(0.026)	0.714(0.137)/0.847(0.088)	1.193(0.537)/0.670(0.407)	1.376(0.206)/1.144(0.117)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.318(0.038)/0.225(0.027)	0.346(0.042)/0.232(0.028)	0.864(0.040)/0.930(0.025)	0.658(0.172)/0.324(0.115)	1.131(0.092)/1.032(0.074)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.318(0.038)/0.225(0.027)	0.229(0.033)/0.184(0.025)	0.565(0.176)/0.788(0.129)	1.827(0.743)/0.908(0.506)	1.582(0.305)/1.195(0.131)	
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.522(0.224)/0.369(0.158)	0.551(0.243)/0.380(0.165)	0.892(0.034)/0.934(0.025)	0.350(0.142)/0.214(0.111)	1.171(0.091)/1.038(0.075)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.522(0.224)/0.369(0.158)	0.418(0.164)/0.323(0.125)	0.868(0.155)/0.920(0.069)	0.517(0.684)/0.349(0.327)	1.135(0.268)/1.022(0.119)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.537(0.177)/0.380(0.125)	0.569(0.192)/0.392(0.130)	0.873(0.036)/0.932(0.024)	0.403(0.169)/0.237(0.115)	1.221(0.093)/1.047(0.073)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.537(0.177)/0.380(0.125)	0.413(0.121)/0.324(0.094)	0.856(0.188)/0.910(0.094)	0.615(0.841)/0.422(0.408)	1.131(0.312)/1.012(0.135)	
Hub	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	1.760(0.936)/1.245(0.662)	1.866(1.022)/1.276(0.688)	0.916(0.028)/0.941(0.023)	0.358(0.125)/ 0.206(0.113)	1.068(0.081)/1.012(0.076)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	1.760(0.936)/1.245(0.662)	1.354(0.609)/1.020(0.475)	0.902(0.079)/0.920(0.063)	0.326(0.372)/0.267(0.297)	1.104(0.147)/1.050(0.115)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	1.760(0.936)/1.245(0.662)	1.877(1.031)/1.278(0.689)	0.903(0.033)/0.936(0.025)	0.416(0.136)/ 0.225(0.112)	1.094(0.085)/1.031(0.077)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	1.760(0.936)/1.245(0.662)	1.313(0.579)/1.000(0.459)	0.884(0.104)/0.910(0.078)	0.395(0.483)/0.313(0.370)	1.118(0.156)/1.066(0.127)	
Cluster	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.597(0.238)/0.422(0.168)	0.635(0.264)/0.436(0.175)	0.849(0.052)/0.936(0.025)	0.405(0.171)/0.258(0.122)	1.284(0.184)/ 1.024(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.597(0.238)/0.422(0.168)	0.423(0.179)/0.333(0.132)	0.374(0.297)/0.522(0.282)	2.553(1.316)/2.031(1.268)	1.251(0.250)/1.310(0.217)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.513(0.181)/0.363(0.128)	0.533(0.203)/0.376(0.134)	0.789(0.083)/0.930(0.027)	0.367(0.247)/0.274(0.121)	1.469(0.225)/ 1.044(0.080)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.513(0.181)/0.363(0.128)	0.360(0.131)/0.282(0.101)	0.358(0.298)/0.452(0.308)	2.564(1.322)/2.328(1.404)	1.178(0.258)/1.263(0.204)	

Table 11: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in S_Ω under Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications.

Gaussian Graph		p	Method	TrueLength $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AvgLength $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	CovRate $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AbsAvgZ $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	SDZ $_{(i,j) \in S_\Omega^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.298(0.002)/0.202(0.001)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.060)/0.080(0.061)	1.004(0.072)/0.998(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.221(0.002)/0.170(0.001)	0.962(0.033)/0.963(0.023)	0.097(0.160)/0.090(0.119)	0.926(0.066)/0.930(0.066)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.301(0.003)/0.202(0.001)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.003(0.071)/0.998(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.208(0.002)/0.166(0.001)	0.962(0.035)/0.964(0.023)	0.090(0.147)/0.084(0.108)	0.933(0.066)/0.929(0.066)	
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.418(0.107)/0.295(0.076)	0.439(0.115)/0.303(0.079)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.004(0.073)/0.999(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.418(0.107)/0.295(0.076)	0.349(0.076)/0.267(0.059)	0.952(0.026)/0.958(0.021)	0.196(0.190)/0.136(0.121)	0.954(0.075)/0.948(0.072)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.432(0.100)/0.306(0.070)	0.456(0.107)/0.314(0.074)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.081(0.060)/0.080(0.060)	1.003(0.073)/0.998(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.432(0.100)/0.306(0.070)	0.348(0.063)/0.270(0.052)	0.953(0.027)/0.959(0.021)	0.198(0.196)/0.138(0.126)	0.951(0.076)/0.942(0.072)	
Hub	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.950(0.523)/0.672(0.369)	0.994(0.564)/0.684(0.382)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.060)/0.080(0.060)	1.000(0.071)/0.998(0.070)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.950(0.523)/0.672(0.369)	0.780(0.356)/0.580(0.275)	0.973(0.023)/0.969(0.021)	0.094(0.138)/0.090(0.108)	0.870(0.075)/0.895(0.072)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.954(0.527)/0.674(0.372)	1.004(0.573)/0.688(0.386)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.060)/0.080(0.060)	0.999(0.071)/0.997(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.954(0.527)/0.674(0.372)	0.765(0.343)/0.574(0.269)	0.975(0.021)/0.971(0.020)	0.083(0.118)/0.082(0.094)	0.863(0.077)/0.889(0.074)	
Cluster	200	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.525(0.127)/0.371(0.090)	0.559(0.140)/0.383(0.093)	0.948(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.081(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.007(0.073)/0.999(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.525(0.127)/0.371(0.090)	0.388(0.096)/0.304(0.072)	0.958(0.052)/0.961(0.039)	0.098(0.215)/0.091(0.167)	0.943(0.073)/0.935(0.070)	
	400	$L_0: \hat{T}$	0.454(0.089)/0.321(0.063)	0.474(0.099)/0.332(0.066)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.005(0.074)/0.998(0.071)	
		$L_1: \hat{T}$	0.454(0.089)/0.321(0.063)	0.332(0.064)/0.259(0.050)	0.954(0.044)/0.958(0.036)	0.090(0.174)/0.086(0.146)	0.966(0.073)/0.952(0.071)	

Table 12: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in S_Ω^c under Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications.

Sub-Gaussian		TrueLength _{(i,j)∈S_n}	AvgLength _{(i,j)∈S_n}	CovRate _{(i,j)∈S_n}	AbsAvgZ _{(i,j)∈S_n}	SDZ _{(i,j)∈S_n}	
Graph	p	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	
Band	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.280(0.013)/0.188(0.016)	0.306(0.021)/0.194(0.018)	0.895(0.037)/0.937(0.025)	0.479(0.204)/0.230(0.142)	1.101(0.094)/1.025(0.073)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.295(0.003)/0.205(0.004)	0.318(0.011)/0.211(0.006)	0.861(0.036)/0.927(0.026)	0.698(0.122)/0.324(0.126)	1.116(0.088)/1.037(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.295(0.003)/0.205(0.004)	0.190(0.010)/0.150(0.008)	0.497(0.180)/0.756(0.184)	2.138(1.006)/0.914(0.784)	1.793(0.427)/1.367(0.278)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.281(0.011)/0.188(0.016)	0.311(0.021)/0.194(0.018)	0.871(0.043)/0.936(0.026)	0.558(0.229)/0.244(0.143)	1.156(0.097)/1.024(0.072)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.295(0.002)/0.205(0.004)	0.322(0.013)/0.212(0.006)	0.823(0.038)/0.925(0.027)	0.845(0.128)/0.353(0.123)	1.186(0.094)/1.037(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.295(0.002)/0.205(0.004)	0.181(0.009)/0.145(0.008)	0.328(0.164)/0.690(0.223)	3.139(1.292)/1.289(1.025)	2.015(0.494)/1.419(0.327)
Random	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.411(0.204)/0.307(0.134)	0.487(0.251)/0.319(0.142)	0.871(0.037)/0.935(0.028)	0.438(0.140)/0.250(0.161)	1.211(0.115)/1.026(0.078)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.441(0.241)/0.366(0.180)	0.498(0.275)/0.379(0.187)	0.870(0.037)/0.931(0.027)	0.443(0.145)/0.296(0.139)	1.211(0.115)/1.028(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.441(0.241)/0.366(0.180)	0.309(0.084)/0.276(0.104)	0.420(0.219)/0.796(0.186)	2.647(1.140)/0.833(0.766)	1.984(0.669)/1.257(0.353)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.416(0.161)/0.305(0.098)	0.506(0.211)/0.319(0.106)	0.844(0.038)/0.928(0.030)	0.493(0.160)/0.279(0.164)	1.286(0.119)/1.046(0.074)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.453(0.199)/0.376(0.137)	0.520(0.231)/0.391(0.142)	0.843(0.037)/0.922(0.029)	0.496(0.162)/0.329(0.142)	1.287(0.118)/1.056(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.453(0.199)/0.376(0.137)	0.307(0.061)/0.273(0.074)	0.334(0.237)/0.750(0.236)	3.300(1.508)/1.094(0.998)	2.034(0.712)/1.290(0.395)
Hub	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	1.059(0.820)/0.872(0.556)	1.132(0.964)/0.900(0.597)	0.920(0.032)/0.940(0.024)	0.297(0.177)/0.182(0.127)	1.078(0.087)/1.023(0.074)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.475(0.844)/1.096(0.530)	1.573(0.961)/1.127(0.563)	0.907(0.033)/0.933(0.026)	0.406(0.157)/0.248(0.126)	1.088(0.081)/1.037(0.079)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.475(0.844)/1.096(0.530)	0.758(0.286)/0.668(0.223)	0.718(0.167)/0.802(0.149)	0.991(1.469)/0.809(2.051)	1.989(2.081)/1.894(2.949)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	1.028(0.821)/0.870(0.557)	1.108(0.983)/0.899(0.597)	0.912(0.035)/0.938(0.025)	0.347(0.181)/0.193(0.131)	1.087(0.080)/1.027(0.075)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.462(0.858)/1.095(0.531)	1.571(0.990)/1.126(0.563)	0.895(0.037)/0.931(0.026)	0.461(0.162)/0.258(0.130)	1.109(0.082)/1.042(0.075)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.462(0.858)/1.095(0.531)	0.709(0.273)/0.639(0.216)	0.680(0.198)/0.782(0.169)	1.304(2.770)/1.003(2.700)	2.233(3.526)/1.930(3.017)
Cluster	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.548(0.280)/0.368(0.139)	0.651(0.324)/0.381(0.146)	0.816(0.080)/0.938(0.026)	0.557(0.231)/0.221(0.166)	1.355(0.315)/1.022(0.075)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.585(0.298)/0.395(0.150)	0.661(0.340)/0.409(0.157)	0.813(0.076)/0.930(0.027)	0.575(0.222)/0.307(0.146)	1.359(0.311)/1.030(0.077)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.585(0.298)/0.395(0.150)	0.343(0.122)/0.281(0.088)	0.176(0.242)/0.477(0.281)	4.922(2.070)/2.299(1.569)	2.237(0.966)/1.468(0.391)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\Omega}^{\text{US}}$	0.435(0.201)/0.320(0.118)	0.543(0.239)/0.332(0.124)	0.747(0.089)/0.935(0.031)	0.477(0.324)/0.248(0.184)	1.637(0.349)/1.026(0.083)
		L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.480(0.213)/0.342(0.128)	0.546(0.249)/0.355(0.135)	0.747(0.089)/0.927(0.030)	0.479(0.324)/0.333(0.151)	1.637(0.350)/1.036(0.082)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.480(0.213)/0.342(0.128)	0.303(0.072)/0.246(0.072)	0.090(0.148)/0.459(0.317)	5.426(1.602)/2.526(1.921)	2.034(0.460)/1.422(0.403)

Table 13: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in \widehat{S}_Ω under sub-Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications.

Sub-Gaussian		TrueLength _{(i,j)∈S_n}	AvgLength _{(i,j)∈S_n}	CovRate _{(i,j)∈S_n}	AbsAvgZ _{(i,j)∈S_n}	SDZ _{(i,j)∈S_n}	
Graph	p	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	n = 200/n = 400	
Band	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.290(0.006)/0.205(0.004)	0.312(0.012)/0.211(0.006)	0.873(0.038)/0.927(0.026)	0.605(0.169)/0.323(0.125)	1.119(0.089)/1.037(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.290(0.006)/0.205(0.004)	0.195(0.011)/0.150(0.008)	0.622(0.218)/0.757(0.184)	1.585(1.079)/0.909(0.783)	1.589(0.434)/1.365(0.277)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.290(0.006)/0.205(0.004)	0.315(0.013)/0.212(0.006)	0.841(0.044)/0.925(0.027)	0.731(0.190)/0.351(0.123)	1.180(0.092)/1.038(0.073)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.290(0.006)/0.205(0.004)	0.187(0.010)/0.145(0.008)	0.488(0.240)/0.693(0.223)	2.321(1.439)/1.277(1.023)	1.737(0.522)/1.415(0.326)
Random	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.477(0.200)/0.337(0.142)	0.505(0.217)/0.347(0.147)	0.883(0.035)/0.933(0.026)	0.369(0.153)/0.232(0.134)	1.195(0.095)/1.037(0.076)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.477(0.200)/0.337(0.142)	0.352(0.095)/0.266(0.082)	0.812(0.230)/0.867(0.146)	0.747(1.135)/0.508(0.621)	1.274(0.486)/1.144(0.272)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.493(0.157)/0.349(0.111)	0.525(0.171)/0.360(0.116)	0.860(0.039)/0.925(0.027)	0.448(0.176)/0.264(0.138)	1.253(0.099)/1.061(0.075)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.493(0.157)/0.349(0.111)	0.350(0.066)/0.266(0.059)	0.800(0.262)/0.848(0.184)	0.897(1.409)/0.636(0.804)	1.259(0.512)/1.153(0.300)
Hub	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.551(0.750)/1.097(0.530)	1.647(0.849)/1.127(0.562)	0.905(0.032)/0.933(0.026)	0.405(0.147)/0.248(0.126)	1.097(0.082)/1.037(0.080)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.551(0.750)/1.097(0.530)	0.821(0.273)/0.668(0.223)	0.750(0.158)/0.802(0.149)	0.786(1.336)/0.808(2.049)	1.840(1.837)/1.893(2.947)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.551(0.749)/1.097(0.530)	1.657(0.860)/1.127(0.562)	0.892(0.037)/0.931(0.027)	0.464(0.150)/0.257(0.130)	1.119(0.085)/1.043(0.075)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	1.551(0.749)/1.097(0.530)	0.779(0.261)/0.640(0.215)	0.724(0.185)/0.782(0.168)	0.988(2.428)/0.996(2.691)	2.004(3.042)/1.926(3.006)
Cluster	200	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.555(0.205)/0.392(0.145)	0.589(0.231)/0.406(0.152)	0.837(0.060)/0.930(0.026)	0.445(0.186)/0.302(0.144)	1.313(0.209)/1.035(0.078)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.555(0.205)/0.392(0.145)	0.360(0.102)/0.280(0.085)	0.325(0.292)/0.464(0.281)	2.955(1.722)/2.354(1.566)	1.361(0.574)/1.463(0.375)
	400	L ₀ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.476(0.154)/0.337(0.109)	0.494(0.173)/0.349(0.114)	0.770(0.087)/0.926(0.029)	0.392(0.255)/0.298(0.142)	1.532(0.260)/1.050(0.082)
		L ₁ : $\widehat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.476(0.154)/0.337(0.109)	0.321(0.072)/0.244(0.062)	0.331(0.308)/0.404(0.311)	2.896(1.745)/2.675(1.749)	1.230(0.412)/1.353(0.339)

Table 14: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in S_Ω under sub-Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications.

Sub-Gaussian Graph	p	Method	TrueLength $_{(i,j) \in S_{\Omega}^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AvgLength $_{(i,j) \in S_{\Omega}^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	CovRate $_{(i,j) \in S_{\Omega}^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	AbsAvgZ $_{(i,j) \in S_{\Omega}^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$	SDZ $_{(i,j) \in S_{\Omega}^c}$ $n = 200/n = 400$
Band	200	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.297(0.002)/0.201(0.001)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.081(0.061)/0.081(0.061)	1.005(0.072)/1.000(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.205(0.002)/0.159(0.001)	0.948(0.037)/0.949(0.026)	0.105(0.171)/0.096(0.126)	0.994(0.071)/0.995(0.070)
	400	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.300(0.003)/0.202(0.001)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.060)/0.080(0.060)	1.002(0.072)/0.999(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.277(0.000)/0.196(0.000)	0.194(0.002)/0.154(0.001)	0.948(0.038)/0.949(0.027)	0.096(0.156)/0.090(0.116)	0.995(0.070)/0.996(0.070)
Random	200	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.418(0.107)/0.295(0.076)	0.436(0.114)/0.302(0.079)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.006(0.074)/1.000(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.418(0.107)/0.295(0.076)	0.331(0.058)/0.252(0.048)	0.943(0.029)/0.948(0.023)	0.206(0.204)/0.143(0.130)	0.993(0.071)/0.995(0.071)
	400	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.432(0.100)/0.306(0.070)	0.454(0.107)/0.313(0.073)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.004(0.073)/0.999(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.432(0.100)/0.306(0.070)	0.329(0.046)/0.254(0.041)	0.942(0.030)/0.947(0.023)	0.209(0.210)/0.145(0.136)	0.993(0.070)/0.995(0.071)
Hub	200	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.950(0.523)/0.671(0.370)	0.989(0.564)/0.683(0.383)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.060)/0.080(0.060)	1.000(0.071)/0.998(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.950(0.523)/0.671(0.370)	0.662(0.239)/0.510(0.204)	0.947(0.028)/0.948(0.025)	0.107(0.153)/0.099(0.118)	0.998(0.071)/0.998(0.071)
	400	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.954(0.527)/0.674(0.372)	0.999(0.572)/0.687(0.386)	0.950(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.080(0.061)/0.080(0.060)	1.000(0.071)/0.998(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.954(0.527)/0.674(0.372)	0.643(0.223)/0.501(0.195)	0.949(0.026)/0.949(0.024)	0.096(0.132)/0.091(0.103)	0.997(0.070)/0.998(0.071)
Cluster	200	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.525(0.127)/0.371(0.090)	0.556(0.140)/0.383(0.093)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.081(0.061)/0.081(0.061)	1.009(0.074)/1.000(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.525(0.127)/0.371(0.090)	0.361(0.074)/0.284(0.060)	0.946(0.054)/0.947(0.042)	0.105(0.227)/0.098(0.178)	0.997(0.073)/0.997(0.073)
	400	$L_0: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.454(0.089)/0.321(0.063)	0.472(0.097)/0.331(0.066)	0.949(0.022)/0.950(0.022)	0.081(0.062)/0.080(0.060)	1.006(0.075)/0.999(0.071)
		$L_1: \hat{\mathbf{T}}$	0.454(0.089)/0.321(0.063)	0.318(0.050)/0.246(0.041)	0.948(0.045)/0.948(0.038)	0.093(0.178)/0.090(0.154)	0.997(0.071)/0.997(0.071)

Table 15: Average (standard deviation) of each asymptotic-normality metric over all entries in S_{Ω}^c under sub-Gaussian settings based on 100 simulation replications.




Figure 4: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij})/\widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under Gaussian band graph settings.




Figure 5: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \hat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under Gaussian random graph settings.




Figure 6: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under Gaussian hub graph settings.




Figure 7: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \hat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under Gaussian cluster graph settings.




Figure 8: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \hat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{400}^{400}$ under sub-Gaussian band graph settings.




Figure 9: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\Omega}_{ij}^{(m)} - \Omega_{ij}) / \widehat{\sigma}_{\Omega_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under sub-Gaussian random graph settings.




Figure 10: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\hat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}^{(m)} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}) / \hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under sub-Gaussian hub graph settings.




Figure 11: Histograms of $(\sqrt{n}(\widehat{\mathbf{\Omega}}_{ij}^{(m)} - \mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}) / \widehat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{\Omega}_{ij}}^{(m)})_{m=1}^{400}$ under sub-Gaussian cluster graph settings.

References

- Bai, Z. and Silverstein, J. W. (2010), *Spectral Analysis of Large Dimensional Random Matrices*, Springer, New York, 2nd ed.
- Bai, Z. D. and Yin, Y. Q. (1993), “Limit of the smallest eigenvalue of a large-dimensional sample covariance matrix,” *The Annals of Probability*, 21, 1275–1294.
- Baltagi, B. H. (2011), *Econometrics*, Springer, Heidelberg, 5th ed.
- Banerjee, O., El Ghaoui, L., and d’Aspremont, A. (2008), “Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation for multivariate Gaussian or binary data,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9, 485–516.
- Banerjee, S. and Roy, A. (2014), *Linear Algebra and Matrix Analysis for Statistics*, CRC Press.
- Bertsimas, D., King, A., and Mazumder, R. (2016), “Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 44, 813–852.
- Box, G. E. and Cox, D. R. (1964), “An analysis of transformations,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 26, 211–243.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Luo, X. (2011), “A constrained ℓ_1 minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 594–607.
- Cai, T. T., Liu, W., and Zhou, H. H. (2016), “Estimating sparse precision matrix: optimal rates of convergence and adaptive estimation,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 44, 455–488.

- Chang, J., Qiu, Y., Yao, Q., and Zou, T. (2018), “Confidence regions for entries of a large precision matrix,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 206, 57–82.
- Chen, X., Ge, D., Wang, Z., and Ye, Y. (2014), “Complexity of unconstrained L_2 - L_p minimization,” *Mathematical Programming*, 143, 371–383.
- Chen, X., Xu, M., and Wu, W. B. (2013), “Covariance and precision matrix estimation for high-dimensional time series,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 2994 – 3021.
- (2016), “Regularized estimation of linear functionals of precision matrices for high-dimensional time series,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 64, 6459–6470.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018), “Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 21, C1–C68.
- Cornuéjols, G., Peña, J., and Tütüncü, R. (2018), *Optimization Methods in Finance*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2nd ed.
- Cramér, H. (1946), *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Dai, S. (2023), “Variable selection in convex quantile regression: L_1 -norm or L_0 -norm regularization?” *European Journal of Operational Research*, 305, 338–355.
- Durbin, B., Hardin, J., Hawkins, D., and Rocke, D. (2002), “A variance-stabilizing transformation for gene-expression microarray data,” *Bioinformatics*, 18, S105–S110.
- Durrett, R. (2019), *Probability—Theory and Examples*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 5th ed.

- Epskamp, S., Waldorp, L. J., Mottus, R., and Borsboom, D. (2018), “The Gaussian graphical model in cross-sectional and time-series data,” *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 53, 453–480.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), “Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96, 1348–1360.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Liu, H. (2016), “An overview of the estimation of large covariance and precision matrices,” *The Econometrics Journal*, 19, C1–C32.
- Fan, Y. and Lv, J. (2016), “Innovated scalable efficient estimation in ultra-large Gaussian graphical models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 44, 2098–2126.
- Farasat, A., Nikolaev, A., Srihari, S. N., and Blair, R. H. (2015), “Probabilistic graphical models in modern social network analysis,” *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 5, 1–18.
- Feng, Q., Hannig, J., and Marron, J. (2016), “A note on automatic data transformation,” *Stat*, 5, 82–87.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., and Tibshirani, R. (2008), “Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso,” *Biostatistics*, 9, 432–441.
- (2019), *glasso: Graphical Lasso: Estimation of Gaussian Graphical Models*, R package version 1.11.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Narasimhan, B., Tay, K., Simon, N., Qian, J., and Yang, J. (2022), *glmnet: Lasso and Elastic-Net Regularized Generalized Linear Models*, R package version 4.1-4.
- Garg, R. and Khandekar, R. (2009), “Gradient descent with sparsification: an iterative

- algorithm for sparse recovery with restricted isometry property,” in *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 337–344.
- Giudici, P. and Spelta, A. (2016), “Graphical network models for international financial flows,” *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 34, 128–138.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., and Friedman, J. (2009), *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, Springer, New York, 2nd ed.
- Hess, K. R., Anderson, K., Symmans, W. F., Valero, V., Ibrahim, N., Mejia, J. A., Booser, D., Theriault, R. L., Buzdar, A. U., Dempsey, P. J., et al. (2006), “Pharmacogenomic predictor of sensitivity to preoperative chemotherapy with paclitaxel and fluorouracil, doxorubicin, and cyclophosphamide in breast cancer,” *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, 24, 4236–4244.
- Hsieh, C.-J., Sustik, M. A., Dhillon, I. S., and Ravikumar, P. (2014), “QUIC: quadratic approximation for sparse inverse covariance estimation,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2911–2947.
- Huang, J., Jiao, Y., Liu, Y., and Lu, X. (2018), “A constructive approach to L_0 penalized regression,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19, 403–439.
- Hwang, S.-G. (2004), “Cauchy’s interlace theorem for eigenvalues of Hermitian matrices,” *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 111, 157–159.
- Janková, J. and van de Geer, S. (2017), “Honest confidence regions and optimality in high-dimensional precision matrix estimation,” *Test*, 26, 143–162.
- Janková, J., Van De Geer, S., et al. (2015), “Confidence intervals for high-dimensional inverse covariance estimation,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 9, 1205–1229.

- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014a), “Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2869–2909.
- (2014b), “Hypothesis testing in high-dimensional regression under the gaussian random design model: Asymptotic theory,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60, 6522–6554.
- (2018), “Debiasing the lasso: Optimal sample size for Gaussian designs,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 46, 2593 – 2622.
- Jiang, X. and Hahn, M. G. (2002), “Empirical central limit theorems for exchangeable random variables,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 59, 75–81.
- Johnson, K. D., Lin, D., Ungar, L. H., Foster, D. P., and Stine, R. A. (2015), “A risk ratio comparison of l_0 and l_1 penalized regression,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1510.06319*.
- Kim, J., Zhu, H., Wang, X., and Do, K.-A. (2021), “Scalable network estimation with L_0 penalty,” *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining*, 14, 18–30.
- Klaassen, S., Kueck, J., Spindler, M., and Chernozhukov, V. (2023), “Uniform inference in high-dimensional Gaussian graphical models,” *Biometrika*, 110, 51–68.
- Kovács, S., Ruckstuhl, T., Obrist, H., and Bühlmann, P. (2021), “Graphical elastic net and target matrices: Fast algorithms and software for sparse precision matrix estimation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2101.02148*.
- Kuismin, M., Kemppainen, J., and Sillanpää, M. (2017), “Precision matrix estimation with ROPE,” *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 26, 682–694.
- Lam, C. and Fan, J. (2009), “Sparsistency and rates of convergence in large covariance matrix estimation,” *Annals of statistics*, 37, 4254.

- Lauritzen, S. L. (1996), *Graphical Models*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Li, X., Zhao, T., Wang, L., Yuan, X., and Liu, H. (2022), *flare: Family of Lasso Regression*, R package version 1.7.0.1.
- Liu, H., Lafferty, J., and Wasserman, L. (2009), “The nonparanormal: semiparametric estimation of high dimensional undirected graphs,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10, 2295–2328.
- Liu, H. and Wang, L. (2017), “TIGER: a tuning-insensitive approach for optimally estimating Gaussian graphical models,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11, 241–294.
- Liu, W. and Luo, X. (2015), “Fast and adaptive sparse precision matrix estimation in high dimensions,” *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 135, 153–162.
- Marjanovic, G. and Hero, A. O. (2015), “ l_0 sparse inverse covariance estimation,” *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 63, 3218–3231.
- Meinshausen, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006), “High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 34, 1436–1462.
- Natarajan, B. K. (1995), “Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems,” *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 24, 227–234.
- Ravikumar, P., Wainwright, M. J., Raskutti, G., and Yu, B. (2011), “High-dimensional covariance estimation by minimizing ℓ_1 -penalized log-determinant divergence,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 5, 935–980.
- Ren, Z., Sun, T., Zhang, C.-H., and Zhou, H. H. (2015), “Asymptotic normality and optimality in estimation of large Gaussian graphical models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 43, 991–1026.

- Ritchie, M. E., Phipson, B., Wu, D., Hu, Y., Law, C. W., Shi, W., and Smyth, G. K. (2015), “limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies,” *Nucleic Acids Research*, 43, e47–e47.
- Rothman, A. J., Bickel, P. J., Levina, E., and Zhu, J. (2008), “Sparse permutation invariant covariance estimation,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 2, 494–515.
- Rudelson, M. and Vershynin, R. (2013), “Hanson-Wright inequality and sub-Gaussian concentration,” *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 18, no. 82, 9.
- Ryali, S., Chen, T., Supekar, K., and Menon, V. (2012), “Estimation of functional connectivity in fMRI data using stability selection-based sparse partial correlation with elastic net penalty,” *NeuroImage*, 59, 3852–3861.
- Schäfer, J. and Strimmer, K. (2005), “A shrinkage approach to large-scale covariance matrix estimation and implications for functional genomics,” *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 4, 1–30.
- Shu, H. and Nan, B. (2019), “Estimation of large covariance and precision matrices from temporally dependent observations,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 47, 1321–1350.
- Spring, L. M., Fell, G., Arfe, A., Sharma, C., Greenup, R., Reynolds, K. L., Smith, B. L., Alexander, B., Moy, B., Isakoff, S. J., et al. (2020), “Pathologic complete response after neoadjuvant chemotherapy and impact on breast cancer recurrence and survival: a comprehensive meta-analysis,” *Clinical Cancer Research*, 26, 2838–2848.
- Sun, T. and Zhang, C.-H. (2012), “Scaled sparse linear regression,” *Biometrika*, 99, 879–898.

- (2013), “Sparse matrix inversion with scaled lasso,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 14, 3385–3418.
- Sun, W. and Cai, T. T. (2007), “Oracle and adaptive compound decision rules for false discovery rate control,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 102, 901–912.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), “Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58, 267–288.
- van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y., and Dezeure, R. (2014), “On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 42, 1166–1202.
- Van Wieringen, W. N. and Peeters, C. F. (2016), “Ridge estimation of inverse covariance matrices from high-dimensional data,” *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 103, 284–303.
- Vershynin, R. (2012), “Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices,” in *Compressed sensing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 210–268.
- (2018), *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Vorobyov, S. (2013), “Principles of minimum variance robust adaptive beamforming design,” *Signal Processing*, 93, 3264–3277.
- Wang, L., Kim, Y., and Li, R. (2013), “Calibrating nonconvex penalized regression in ultra-high dimension,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 41, 2505–2536.
- Wang, L., Ren, X., and Gu, Q. (2016), “Precision Matrix Estimation in High Dimensional

- Gaussian Graphical Models with Faster Rates,” in *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 177–185.
- Yuan, M. (2010), “High dimensional inverse covariance matrix estimation via linear programming,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 2261–2286.
- Yuan, M. and Lin, Y. (2007), “Model selection and estimation in the Gaussian graphical model,” *Biometrika*, 94, 19–35.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010), “Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 38, 894–942.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014), “Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76, 217–242.
- Zhang, Q., Park, C., and Chung, J. (2021), “Minimax estimation of covariance and precision matrices for high-dimensional time series with long-memory,” *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 177, 109177.
- Zhang, T. (2011a), “Adaptive forward-backward greedy algorithm for learning sparse representations,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57, 4689–4708.
- (2011b), “Sparse recovery with orthogonal matching pursuit under RIP,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 57, 6215–6221.
- Zhao, T., Liu, H., Roeder, K., Lafferty, J., and Wasserman, L. (2012), “The huge package for high-dimensional undirected graph estimation in R,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13, 1059–1062.

Zhu, J., Wen, C., Zhu, J., Zhang, H., and Wang, X. (2020), “A polynomial algorithm for best-subset selection problem,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117, 33117–33123.

Zou, H. (2006), “The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 1418–1429.