

Robust and consistent model evaluation criteria in high-dimensional regression

Sumito Kurata^{1*} and Kei Hirose¹

¹ Institute of Mathematics for Industry, Kyushu University, 744 Motoooka, Nishi-ku, 819-0395, Fukuoka, Japan.

Abstract

In the last two decades, sparse regularization methods such as the LASSO have been applied in various fields. Most of the regularization methods have one or more regularization parameters, and to select the value of the regularization parameter is essentially equal to select a model, thus we need to determine the regularization parameter adequately. Regarding the determination of the regularization parameter in the linear regression model, we often apply the information criteria like the AIC and BIC, however, it has been pointed out that these criteria are sensitive to outliers and tend not to perform well in high-dimensional settings. Outliers generally have a negative influence on not only estimation but also model selection, consequently, it is important to employ a selection method that is robust against outliers. In addition, when the number of explanatory variables is quite large, most conventional criteria are prone to select unnecessary explanatory variables. In this paper, we propose model evaluation criteria via the statistical divergence with excellence in robustness in both of parametric estimation and model selection. Furthermore, our proposed criteria simultaneously achieve the selection consistency with the robustness even in high-dimensional settings. We also report the results of some numerical examples to verify that the proposed criteria perform robust and consistent variable selection compared with the conventional selection methods.

*Corresponding author (e-mail: kurata@imi.kyushu-u.ac.jp)

1 Introduction

In the regression analysis, variable selection is essential to understand the cause of a response and background of a phenomenon adequately. Information criteria such as the AIC (Akaike’s information criterion; [1]) and BIC (Bayesian information criterion; [45]) are typical methods of the variable selection, and many studies have modified and extended these criteria (e.g., [19, 33, 34, 47]). For n observations, let us consider the normal linear regression model with P explanatory variables; suppose that the response variables Y_1, \dots, Y_n are drawn from

$$Y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star + \epsilon_i, \quad \epsilon_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{N}(0, \sigma^2) \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad (1)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,P})^\top$ is the explanatory variable vector of i th individual, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star = (\beta_1^\star, \dots, \beta_P^\star)^\top$ is the “true” value of P -dimensional regression coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_P)^\top$, and $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} = (\epsilon_1, \dots, \epsilon_n)^\top$ is the error vector consisting of n independent random variables following the normal distribution with zero mean and variance $\sigma^2 > 0$. Let $\mathbf{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$ be the n -dimensional vector consisting of response variables, $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^\top$ be the $n \times P$ matrix consisting of fixed values of explanatory variables. Under the assumption of normality, the minimization of the residual sum of squares, $\|\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2$, with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ is equivalent to the of the maximization of the likelihood and the minimization of the Kullback-Leibler divergence (KL divergence; [35]), where $\|\cdot\|_2$ means the L^2 -norm. Variable selection methods in the normal linear regression model such as the AIC and BIC generally assumes that every error term (and thus every response variable) is normally distributed, and that the number of explanatory variables is a (not large) constant. However, there unfortunately exist quite a few situations that these assumptions are violated in real data analyses. In this paper, we focus on two critical causes that degrade the performance of variable selection methods; the *outliers* (distinctive, unusual, or mistaken data that are distant from other data) and the *high-dimensional* setting. The main purpose of this paper is to establish the selection method that solves the two challenges simultaneously, i.e., to propose accurate variable selection method with *robustness* against outliers even in the high-dimensional assumptions.

Firstly, it has been pointed out that, analytical methods built upon the KL divergence such as the parametric estimation and statistical test tend to be sensitive against outliers (e.g., [7, 20, 38]). Since providing a clear threshold of the outliers or preventing their occurrence are effectively impossible, it is desirable to conduct robust analysis, regardless of whether there exist outliers in the observation set or not. Especially, in the model selection problem, information criteria that have the log-likelihood as the main term have a tendency to reduce the accuracy when there exist observations that give extremely small values of the probability density function (or probability function) of model’s distribution (see, e.g., [39, 41]). Just as the arithmetic mean is greatly influenced by an extraordinary observation, model evaluation criteria for variable selection without robustness tend to overlook necessary explanatory variables and select unnecessary variables, because of the outliers. To solve this problem, statistical divergence measures with robustness against outliers have been applied; [37] derived an AIC-type criterion built upon the Basu-Harris-Hjort-Jones

(BHHJ) divergence, a representative family of divergence measures with robustness against outliers ([8, 20]), and [36] proposed the BIC-type criteria built upon wide classes of robust divergence measures. Such criteria have a feature to diminish the difference of their values for between populations with and without outliers, in other words, they can maintain the selection results regardless the outliers; this advantage can be expected to apply to the high-dimensional regression problem. We here set the first aim of this paper; (i) to perform robust estimation and variable selection that reduce the negative influence caused by contamination of outliers. For achieving this, to utilize the class of divergence with desirable robustness is absolutely essential.

Secondly, when investigating the asymptotic properties of an estimator and model evaluation criterion, most of methods assume that the sample size n is sufficiently large and the number of candidate explanatory variables P is in constant-order, i.e., $P = O(1)$ with respect to n , however, we sometimes face to situations where P is comparable with or larger than n in real data analyses. In such high-dimensional problems, we often assume the sparsity, that is, the number of necessary explanatory variables (denoted as s throughout this paper) is sufficiently smaller than n and P . In recent years, penalized least squares estimation via L^1 -norm-based penalty terms that works well even when $n < P$ have been developed and applied to wide fields. The *LASSO* (least absolute shrinkage and selection operator; [48]) is a typical regularization method that conducts estimation and variable selection simultaneously, by shrinking the estimates of the regression coefficients corresponding to the unnecessary variables to zero. Most of the regularization methods including the LASSO have one (or more) regularization parameter(s) that control the intensity of the shrinkage for the values of the regression coefficients, and the variable selection problem is generally equivalent to determine the regularization parameter. As we do not know the true subset of explanatory variables in advance, the *oracle property*, the ability to identify the true subset as if it was given, is desirable in variable selection. [15] developed a non-concave penalty function, named *SCAD* (smoothly clipped absolute deviation) penalty, and showed the superiority of the SCAD over the original LASSO in terms of the oracle property. [53] alternatively introduced the *adaptive LASSO*, a generalization of the original LASSO, by assigning different weights to different coefficients, and proved their estimation procedure achieved the oracle property. Noting that, the oracle property provides us with some asymptotic orders of the regularization parameter, yet it does not provide one “optimal value”; generally, any constant multiple of a value achieving the oracle property also achieves the oracle property. Thus, we need an optimal value of the regularization parameter to conduct reliable variable selection, because we do not know the true subset of explanatory variables in advance. Most of commonly used criteria for determining the optimal value of the regularization parameter such as the AIC and BIC have a drawback in addition to non-robustness against outliers; it is lack of the *selection consistency* in high-dimensional settings. The selection consistency, the property that the probability of selecting the “true model” in the candidates tends to one when the sample size n diverges infinity, is an important asymptotic property in model selection. Although the BIC has the selection consistency in the case of fixed dimensionality ($P = O(1)$), it has been pointed out that the original BIC can not keep the selection consistency when $P = P_n$ also goes to infinity (e.g., [12, 13]). Therefore, for detecting the necessary explanatory variables, we set the second

aim; (ii) to establish the selection consistency for model evaluation criteria build upon statistical divergence under the high-dimensional assumptions.

In this paper, we propose the model evaluation criteria that accomplish the above-mentioned two aims (i) and (ii) for determining the regularization parameter of the LASSO-type regularization methods; as per the previous paragraphs, there are previous researches that have achieved one either of the two aims, but we attempt to realize them simultaneously. We introduce the penalized (quasi) likelihood built upon robust divergence measures, and approximate the (quasi) posterior probability based on the divergence, by generalizing the deriving process of the BIC-type criteria. For achieving the aim (ii), it is necessary to approximate the (quasi) posterior probability of each model precisely, considering the relationship among n , P , and s . In addition, to obtain desirable properties of the sparse estimators and to derive accurate criteria from divergence measures, we need to employ appropriate penalty term of the regularization method. We present theorems for achieving the two aims, and provide some specific divergence and penalty term fulfilling the theorems. Our proposed criteria possess a characteristic of reducing the negative influence of outliers by down-weighting for them, and simultaneously, the proposed criteria achieve the selection consistency. The robustness in variable selection and selection consistency hold not only in the case of fixed dimensionality but also in high dimensional settings.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we first review the LASSO and related methods, and statistical divergence with robustness against outliers, then attempt to generalize the idea of the LASSO going along with classes of robust divergence measures. In Section 3, we derive model evaluation criteria by utilizing robust divergence and sparse regularization method, and investigate the two aims. We verify the performance of the proposed method by several numerical simulations and real data analysis in Section 4. We finally conclude this paper in Section 5. The regularity conditions, proofs of theorems, and additional results of numerical experiments are presented in the Appendix.

2 The LASSO-type regularization and its generalization

For the normal linear regression model with sample size n (given in Eq. (1)), we hereafter assume that the number of candidate explanatory variables $P = P_n$ is proportional to $\exp(n^l)$ for some $l \in (0, 1)$. This assumption covers both of the case of $n > P$ (when l is close to 0) and $n < P$ (when l is distant from 0). The relationship $P \simeq \exp(n^l)$ between n and P has been assumed in many studies about the high-dimensional problem (e.g., [6, 13, 14, 29]). In this paper, we discuss the estimation of β and detection of the necessary explanatory variables, and we regard the variance of the error terms σ^2 as a nuisance parameter. We assume that all elements in the true regression coefficient vector β_* are $O(1)$ (constant-order with respect to n), and β_* has s non-zero elements. We suppose that $s = s_n$, corresponding to the number of necessary explanatory variables, diverges to infinity relatively slowly than n and P . This assumption corresponds to the purpose of detecting (relatively) few “truly” necessary variables in numerous candidates; this is often supposed in various fields, for example, the finance, bioinformatics, genetics, and computer science.

We now consider the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, obtained by the following minimizing problem:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^P} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) + n \lambda \|\mathbf{w} \circ \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where $\lambda = \lambda_n$ is a non-negative regularization parameter, $\mathbf{w} = (w_1, \dots, w_P)^\top$ is the P -dimensional weight vector consisting of non-negative elements, $\|\cdot\|_1$ means the L^1 -norm, and \circ indicates the Hadamard product (element-wise product). We assume that, the main term (the first term in Eq. (2)) is composed of non-negative-valued functions ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n , and the functions ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n are convex in Θ_* , an open set containing $\boldsymbol{\beta}_*$. The minimization problem given in Eq. (2) is a generalization of the LASSO ([48]) and the adaptive LASSO ([53]); if $\rho_i(z) = z^2/2$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$, the minimizer of Eq. (2) coincides with the adaptive LASSO estimates. We can see that the (original) LASSO is the special case where the weight vector \mathbf{w} is the P -dimensional unit vector $\mathbf{1}_P = (1, \dots, 1)^\top$. Generally, every value of the element in \mathbf{w} is given preliminarily; in many studies, it depends on an *initial estimator* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\text{ini}} = (\hat{\beta}_1^{\text{ini}}, \dots, \hat{\beta}_P^{\text{ini}})^\top$. As the initial estimator, the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimates, ridge estimates, and (non-adaptive) LASSO-type estimates have been often used (refer also to, e.g., [24, 44, 51]). In this paper, we assume that each weight w_j has the form of $w_j = h(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|)$ for each j and some non-increasing function (we refer to it as *weight function*) $h(\cdot)$ over $(0, +\infty)$.

2.1 A generalization of the LASSO via robust statistical divergence

For the LASSO-type regularization, we usually employ the residual sum of squares (RSS) as the main term in Eq. (2). Minimizing of the RSS is equivalent to estimating the regression coefficients based on the KL divergence when the error terms follow the normal distribution, however, it has been pointed that the KL divergence-based methods are not robust against outliers. Therefore, in this paper, we consider applications of statistical divergence measures with robustness to the main term. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let D_i be a divergence measure between the “true” probability distribution of Y_i (in the case of the normal linear regression, it corresponds to $N(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_*, \sigma^2)$, the normal distribution with mean $\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_*$ and variance σ^2) and the distribution of a statistical model (in our case, it corresponds to $N(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}, \sigma^2)$). We here introduce two classes of divergence measures excellent in robustness against outliers, *JHHB divergence family* and *C divergence family*.

For each response variable Y_i , let $g_i(\cdot)$ be the probability (density) function of the true distribution and $f_i(\cdot | \boldsymbol{\beta})$ be the one of the model (in our case, $g_i(\cdot) = f_i(\cdot | \boldsymbol{\beta}_*)$). The JHHB divergence family, proposed by [31], has the following form:

$$D_i^{\text{JHHB}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \frac{1}{\varphi} \left\{ \int f_i(y | \boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha+1} dy \right\}^\varphi - \frac{\alpha+1}{\varphi \alpha} \left\{ \int f_i(y | \boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha g_i(y) dy \right\}^\varphi + \frac{1}{\varphi \alpha} \left\{ \int g_i(y)^{\alpha+1} dy \right\}^\varphi \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad (3)$$

where α and φ are positive tuning parameters associated with this divergence family. When α goes to 0, the JHHB divergence tends to the KL divergence, $D_i^{\text{KL}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \int g_i(y) \log \frac{g_i(y)}{f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})} dy$. This divergence for $\varphi = 1$ is known as the *BHHJ divergence* (also called density power divergence or DPD; proposed by [8]), i.e.,

$$D_i^{\text{BHHJ}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha+1} dy - \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha} \int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha g_i(y) dy + \frac{1}{\alpha} \int g_i(y)^{\alpha+1} dy \quad (i = 1, \dots, n). \quad (4)$$

In addition, when φ goes to 0, it tends to the logarithmic density power divergence (also called the gamma divergence). Noting that, [31] pointed out that this family has exact unbiasedness only when φ is equal to 1 or 0 in parametric estimation.

The C divergence family is another wide class of divergence measures, derived by [50] and [40] independently, that has the following form:

$$D_i^{\text{C}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \int N\left(\frac{g_i(y)}{f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})} - 1\right) f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha+1} dy \quad (i = 1, \dots, n), \quad (5)$$

where α is a positive tuning parameter that controls the robustness as with the one of the JHHB divergence family, and N is a strictly convex function on $[-1, +\infty)$, that is three times continuous differentiable and satisfy $N(0) = 0$, $N'(0) = 0$, and $N''(0) > 0$. The JHHB and C divergence families given in Eqs. (3) and (5) have no inclusion relation, but both of them include the KL divergence and BHHJ divergence; when $N(z) = 1 - \frac{(\alpha+1)(z+1)}{\alpha} + \frac{(z+1)^{\alpha+1}}{\alpha}$, we can see that Eq. (5) coincides with Eq. (3) for $\varphi = 1$.

Based on the above divergence families, we can construct the main term of the LASSO-type regularization (Eq. (2)) as $\sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})$, where ρ_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) is obtained by replacing the (unknown) true distribution with the empirical distribution based on the observations, and by subtracting parts independent of the estimating target $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ from $D_i(\boldsymbol{\beta})$. For example, ρ_i for the BHHJ divergence is calculated as follows:

$$\rho_i^{\text{BHHJ}}(z) = \int f_i(z'|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha+1} dz' - \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha} f_i(z|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \quad (i = 1, \dots, n). \quad (6)$$

In the rest of this paper, we mainly focus on the BHHJ divergence. A cause of the lack of robustness against outlier of the RSS- and KL divergence-based estimation methods is that they treat all observations (residuals) including the outliers equally. If there exist some outliers in the observation set, corresponding residuals will take extremely large values, and non-robust methods will be notably affected by them. An important characteristic of the BHHJ divergence in parametric estimation is the down-weighting based on the value of the probability (density) function of each observation. Outliers that are wildly discrepant with respect to the model's distribution will be given nearly zero weights. The tuning parameter α controls the trade-off between efficiency and robustness in estimation; larger $\alpha > 0$ treats outliers severely (refer to [8, 20]). Many previous studies have reported that analytical methods built upon the BHHJ divergence deliver superior robustness in many problems (refer to, e.g., [22, 23, 38]), and

some studies have shown that the BHHJ divergence contributes not only robust parametric estimation but also in statistical hypothesis tests (e.g., [4, 7]) and model selection (e.g., [3, 36, 41]). In the field of regularization, [6, 24] recently proposed the (adaptive) LASSO-type estimation procedure utilizing the BHHJ divergence and discussed the asymptotic behavior of the estimator. In Section 3, we will propose new criteria for the selection of the regularization parameter in the LASSO-type method, that enable robust variable selection even in high-dimensional settings.

2.2 Asymptotic properties of the adaptive LASSO-type estimators based on divergence measures

In this subsection, we introduce the asymptotic properties of the estimator given in Eq. (2). For the true regression coefficient vector β_* , let define $\mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{(2)}$ as $\{j \mid \beta_j^* \neq 0\}$ and $\{j \mid \beta_j^* = 0\}$, respectively. We can see that, to select an true combination of explanatory variables is equivalent to find out the subset $\mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ composed of the indices of the necessary explanatory variables. Additionally, for any P -dimensional vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_P)^\top$ and for any P -columns matrix $\mathbf{M} = (\mathbf{m}_1, \dots, \mathbf{m}_P)$, we define a s -dimensional vector $\mathbf{v}^{(1)}$ and s -columns matrix $\mathbf{M}^{(1)}$ as $(v_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}}$ and $(\mathbf{m}_j)_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}}$, respectively, and define a $(P-s)$ -dimensional vector $\mathbf{v}^{(2)}$ and $(P-s)$ -columns matrix $\mathbf{M}^{(2)}$ similarly. For sake of simplicity, in this subsection, we suppose that only the first s elements in β_* are non-zero, i.e., $\mathcal{J}^{(1)} = \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $\mathcal{J}^{(2)} = \{s+1, \dots, P\}$.

We here give some notations relative to the functions ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n in Eq. (2). Let $\check{\mathbf{d}}_n$ be a random vector consisting of the first-derivatives of them, $\check{\mathbf{d}}_n = (\rho'_1(\epsilon_1), \dots, \rho'_n(\epsilon_n))^\top$. We assume the expectation vector of $\check{\mathbf{d}}_n$ is zero vector, and denote the covariance matrix of $\check{\mathbf{d}}_n$ by $\mathbf{\Omega}_n$. For example, we can easily confirm that $\mathbf{E}[\rho'_i(\epsilon_i)]$ is equal to zero for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ for the BHHJ divergence-based functions ρ_1, \dots, ρ_n (see also Eq. (6)). Then, let $\mathbf{D}_n = \text{diag}(\mathbf{E}[\rho''_1(\epsilon_1)], \dots, \mathbf{E}[\rho''_n(\epsilon_n)])$ be a $n \times n$ (non-random) diagonal matrix consisting of the expectations of the second-derivatives. In addition, we define a $s \times s$ matrix $\mathbf{V}_n = (\mathbf{X}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{X}^{(1)})^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ and a $n \times s$ matrix $\mathbf{Z}_n = \mathbf{X}^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_n$. Regarding these terms, we give some conditions in order to prove asymptotic properties in Subsection A.1 in the Appendix.

The following proposition is known as the oracle property, and it is a generalization of the result by [24] along wide classes of divergence measures.

Proposition 1. *Under (A-1)–(A-6) in Assumption 1, there exists an optimizer $\hat{\beta} = (\hat{\beta}^{(1)\top}, \hat{\beta}^{(2)\top})^\top$ of Eq. (2) in a neighborhood of β_* that satisfies*

$$\hat{\beta}^{(2)} = \mathbf{0}_{P-s}, \quad \mathbf{U}_n \left(\hat{\beta}^{(1)} - \beta_*^{(1)} + \mathbf{b}_n \right) \xrightarrow{L} \mathbf{N}(\mathbf{0}_s, \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}),$$

with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, where $\mathbf{b}_n = n \lambda \mathbf{V}_n^2 \tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{(1)}$, and $\tilde{\mathbf{w}}^{(1)} = (\tilde{w}_j)_j$ indicates a s -dimensional vector defined as $\tilde{w}_j = w_j \text{sign}(\beta_j^*)$ for each $j \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}$.

The consistency of estimator $\hat{\beta}^{(2)}$ and the asymptotic normality of $\hat{\beta}^{(1)}$ can be proved almost similarly to Theorem 3 in [14] and Theorem 4.3 in [24]. Recently, [24] derived that the original LASSO- and adaptive LASSO-type estimation procedures built upon the BHHJ divergence, and showed the influence

function of the estimator (a measure for assessing the damage caused by a perturbation in data-generating distribution; see also [25, 2]) is bounded for arbitrary outliers when we use the minimum BHHJ divergence estimator (unregularized, or with a sufficiently small regularization parameter) as the initial estimator. Their results can be generalized for the JHHB and C divergence families due to the boundedness of the influence functions based on the divergence families in the case of the normal distribution (refer also to [31, 40]).

3 Model evaluation criteria with robustness and selection consistency in the high-dimensional regression

Proposition 1 in the previous section supports that the estimators based on regularization methods satisfying the assumptions, such as the adaptive LASSO-type regularization methods via statistical divergence, have the desirable asymptotic characteristic of oracle property. Nevertheless, Assumption 1 and Proposition 1 do not give an optimal value the regularization parameter λ , but just provide some asymptotic orders of λ .

To determine a single optimal value (corresponding a combination of explanatory variables) of the regularization parameter, various information criteria other than the original AIC and BIC have been proposed and applied. [46] introduced the regularization information criterion (RIC) for model selection of the penalized likelihood problems in a similar derivation to the AIC. The generalized information criteria (GIC; [34]) that includes the RIC can also be used for regularization parameter selection. [33] generalized the BIC to evaluate models estimated by the maximum penalized likelihood or regularization methods; their criteria is referred as to GBIC. [12, 13, 30] introduced criteria that has the selection consistency when P also grows with n . Moreover, some criteria for regularization parameter selection when employing sparse regularization methods such as the LASSO have been proposed (e.g., [17, 28, 42, 49]). Most of these share a common ground that are built upon the residual sum of squares or log-likelihood, thus we can regard that such criteria are based on the KL divergence. However, determination methods of the regularization parameter based on the KL divergence mentioned above tend to be greatly influenced by an extraordinary observation. We therefore employ robust divergence measures instead of the KL divergence and derive model evaluation criteria probability. In this section, we derive BIC-type model evaluation criteria with robustness against outliers and selection consistency even in the high-dimensional setting, by using the quasi-Bayesian procedure.

Let $\{\mathcal{M}_\iota\}_\iota$ be the set of candidate models, $\nu(\iota)$ be the number of explanatory variables employed in model \mathcal{M}_ι , and $\beta(\iota)$ be the corresponding $\nu(\iota)$ -dimensional regression coefficient vector. We here denote the “true model” and the “true coefficient vector” by $\mathcal{M}_{\iota_\star}$ and $\beta_\star = \beta_\star(\iota_\star)$ (this is a $\nu(\iota_\star) = s$ -dimensional vector), respectively. Since we assume that the number of necessary explanatory variables s is rather smaller than n and P (see also Section 2), we do not need to take models having quite large numbers of explanatory variables into account. Hereafter, we consider to select a model only from the candidate set $\{\mathcal{M}_\iota\}_\iota$ fulfilling $\nu(\iota) \leq S$ for some $S = O(s)$ (obviously, $S \geq s$).

Now, we regard the following function as the *quasi-likelihood* under model \mathcal{M}_ι :

$$M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = - \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i (Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i(\iota)^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) , \quad (7)$$

where $\mathbf{x}_i(\iota)$ is the $\nu(\iota)$ -dimensional explanatory variable vector for i th ($i = 1, \dots, n$) observation corresponding to model \mathcal{M}_ι . By (A-1) in Assumption 1, $M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))$ is three times differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)$. We here define a $\nu(\iota) \times \nu(\iota)$ matrix, $\mathbf{H}_{M_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = -\frac{\partial^2 M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota) \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)^\top}$. Let π_ι be the prior density of $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)$ under model \mathcal{M}_ι , that is proper and twice continuously differentiable, and define the estimator as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota) = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)} R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) , \quad R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) + \log \pi_\iota(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) .$$

In the normal linear regression models, the maximizer coincides with the adaptive LASSO-type estimator in Eq. (2) when we use the Laplace distribution (double exponential distribution) whose density function is

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_\iota(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) &= \prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} \frac{n \lambda w_j}{2} \exp(-n \lambda w_j |\beta_j|) \\ &= \left(\frac{n \lambda}{2}\right)^{\nu(\iota)} \left(\prod_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} w_j\right) \exp\left(-n \lambda \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} w_j |\beta_j|\right) \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

as the prior distribution, where $\mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}$ is the subset of $\{1, \dots, P\}$ consisting of the indices corresponding to explanatory variables employed in model \mathcal{M}_ι . Then, for a model \mathcal{M}_ι with prior probability $p(\iota)$, we define the quasi-marginal distribution and quasi-posterior probability with respect to the model \mathcal{M}_ι (refer also to [22]), as follows:

$$m_\iota(\mathbf{Y}) = \int \exp\{M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))\} \pi_\iota(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) d\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota) , \quad p(\iota | \mathbf{Y}) = \frac{m_\iota(\mathbf{Y}) p(\iota)}{\sum_{\iota'} m_{\iota'}(\mathbf{Y}) p(\iota')} .$$

The BIC-type criteria can be regarded as the approximations of (-2) times of the logarithm of the numerator of the quasi-posterior probability $p(\iota | \mathbf{Y})$, i.e., $-2 \log m_\iota(\mathbf{Y}) - 2 \log p(\iota)$. When using the log-likelihood as M_n (Eq. (7)) and supposing that the prior probability $p(\iota)$ is uniform on the candidate set, we have the original BIC ([45]). Moreover, we also obtain the *DBBC* (divergence-based Bayesian criterion; [36]) when using M_n based on statistical divergence such as the BHHJ and JHHB divergence families. The definition of the DBBC-type criterion including the BIC is given as $-2 M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \nu(\iota) \log n$.

It is known that the original BIC and some related criteria like the DBBC have the selection consistency in the case of fixed dimensionality, i.e., $P = O(1)$ (e.g., [10, 43]), yet, the selection consistency can not be guaranteed in high dimensional settings (i.e., P also grows with n). [12] proposed the extended BIC (EBIC) that keep the selection consistency even if P diverges to infinity, by introducing another prior probability of each model \mathcal{M}_ι (denoted as $p(\iota)$). The EBIC and its related criteria (e.g., [13, 30]) overcame the important drawback of the BIC, selection consistency in high-dimensional settings, nevertheless, such

criteria still suffer from another weak point, non-robustness against outliers, because they are based on the log-likelihood and thus the KL divergence. Thus, we further extend the EBIC via robust divergence measures, going along with the idea of [12, 13]. Suppose that the candidate set is partitioned into $\bigsqcup_{j=1}^P \mathcal{M}_{(j)}$, where $\mathcal{M}_{(j)} = \{\mathcal{M}_\iota | \nu(\iota) = j\}$ for each $j = 1, \dots, P$, i.e., every candidate model in the set $\mathcal{M}_{(j)}$ has j necessary explanatory variables. Assume that the conditional probability $p(\iota | \mathcal{M}_{(j)})$ is equal to the reciprocal of the cardinality of $\mathcal{M}_{(j)}$, and assign the prior probability $p(\mathcal{M}_{(j)})$ proportional to $(\#\mathcal{M}_{(j)})^\gamma$ for some constant $\gamma \in (0, 1)$. These imply that the prior probability $p(\iota)$ is proportional to $(\#\mathcal{M}_{(\nu(\iota))})^{-(1-\gamma)}$ ([12]). In the case of the normal linear regression model, $\#\mathcal{M}_{(j)} = 1/\binom{P}{j}$ for each j , and $p(\iota)$ is approximately proportional to $P^{-(1-\gamma)\nu(\iota)}$ for sufficiently large P . Thus, by applying the Laplace approximation (e.g., [32]), we obtain the following approximation of $\log m_\iota(\mathbf{Y}) + \log p(\iota)$:

$$M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \log \pi_\iota(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \frac{\nu(\iota)}{2} \{\log(2\pi) - \log n\} - \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))| - (1-\gamma)\nu(\iota) \log P, \quad (9)$$

in a similar ways as [12, 30, 36], where $\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota) \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)^\top}$. As every element in $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)$ is non-zero under model \mathcal{M}_ι , $R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))$ is three times differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)$ (see also Assumption 1). By ignoring small-order terms in Eq. (9) and multiplying by (-2) , we obtain the more-extended criteria of the EBIC, as follows:

$$-2 M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \nu(\iota) \log n + 2(1-\gamma)\nu(\iota) \log P. \quad (10)$$

We refer to the criterion in Eq. (10) built upon statistical divergence excepting the KL divergence, such as the BHHJ divergence, as *E-DBBC* (extended DBBC).

Noting that, although the remaining terms in Eq. (9) are small-order with respect to n , the prior density π_ι and $\frac{\nu(\iota)}{2} \log(2\pi)$ depend on $\nu(\iota)$, and the size of the matrix $\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))$ is $\nu(\iota) \times \nu(\iota)$. Since we consider models $\{\mathcal{M}_\iota\}_\iota$ with $\nu(\iota) \leq S$ and $S = O(s)$ diverges to infinity, the $\nu(\iota)$ can diverge to infinity as n goes to infinity. Therefore, we further propose another model evaluation criterion, without ignoring such terms, as follows:

$$-2 R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \nu(\iota) \log n - \nu(\iota) \log(2\pi) + \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))| + 2(1-\gamma)\nu(\iota) \log P, \quad (11)$$

This criterion can be regarded as a generalization of a hybrid criterion of the EBIC and the GBIC ([33]) along wide classes of divergence, thus we refer to the criterion in Eq. (11) based on the KL divergence as *GEBIC*, and we name the criterion based on other divergence *GE-DBBC* (generalized E-DBBC). As with the BIC, we choose a model (equivalent to determine a regularization parameter) whose value of Eq. (11) is minimum in the candidate models. The characteristics of criteria, E-DBBC and GE-DBBC, can considerably depend on which term (divergence) we employ as the quasi-likelihood. For example, when we utilize a robust divergence like the BHHJ divergence, the criteria is expected to perform robustness in selection of the regularization parameter.

3.1 Robustness of the criteria based on statistical divergence

In this subsection, we assess the robustness in variable selection against outliers of the three types of model evaluation criteria, DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC, for some statistical divergence families, to achieve the aim (i) in Section 1. For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let G_i be the “true” data-generating distribution with probability (density) function g_i , and let Ξ_i be another distribution, that is the source of outliers, with probability (density) function ξ_i . Then, we define a mixture distribution $\Psi_i = (1 - r)G_i + r\Xi_i$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), for a (small) contamination rate $r > 0$. [36] introduced a measure of the sensitivity of a model evaluation criterion from the viewpoint of the difference of values of the criterion between the populations without outliers ($\mathbf{G} = (G_1, \dots, G_n)$) and the contaminated populations by outlier-generation distributions ($\mathbf{\Psi} = (\Psi_1, \dots, \Psi_n)$). Let $\mathcal{C}(\mathbf{G})$ be the value of a model evaluation criterion when the data generation distribution is \mathbf{G} . We can interpret that a criterion is sensitive against contamination of the data-generation distribution if (the absolute value of) the difference $\mathcal{I}(\mathbf{G}, \mathbf{\Xi}, r) = \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{\Psi}) - \mathcal{C}(\mathbf{G})$ will be unboundedly large depending on the outliers. By contrast, we can regard a criterion as robust if \mathcal{I} will be bounded for any outlier-generating distributions $\mathbf{\Xi} = (\Xi_1, \dots, \Xi_n)$. To evaluate \mathcal{I} , we apply the second-order Taylor expansion around $r = 0$. We here provide a theorem on the boundedness of the second-order approximation term.

Theorem 1. *Under (A-1)–(A-6) in Assumption 1, the DBBC, E-DBBC, GE-DBBC built upon the BHHJ divergence with $\alpha > 0$ and JHHB divergence with $\alpha > 0$ and $\varphi > 0$ satisfy that the second-order approximation term of \mathcal{I} is bounded for arbitrary $\mathbf{\Xi}$. For the criteria built upon the C divergence, the boundedness holds if we further assume $\alpha \geq 1$ and $\int \xi_i(y)^2 dy < +\infty$ for each $i = 1, \dots, n$.*

Theorem 1 describes the robustness in model selection based on the BHHJ, JHHB, and C divergence families. Note that, the condition “ $\alpha \geq 1$ ” assigned for most of the divergence in C family (excepting the BHHJ divergence) is not desirable from the viewpoint of efficiency of the estimator, because using larger α in the C divergence family increases the asymptotic variance of the estimator (refer also to, e.g., [8, 40]). Additionally, in continuous populations, we need to replace the true distribution with some kind of estimated distribution such as kernel density when using the C divergence (see also [36, 40]), whereas the BHHJ divergence does not require such procedure. Furthermore, the KL divergence and the JHHB divergence with $\varphi = 0$ do not have the above-mentioned robustness ([36]), and the JHHB divergence with $\varphi > 0$ and $\varphi \neq 1$ does not have exact unbiasedness in estimation ([31]). In light of the above, Theorem 1 shows the superiority of the BHHJ divergence in the JHHB and C divergence families regarding to the robust selection of the regularization parameter and explanatory variables. We will prove this theorem in Section B in the Appendix; this theorem can be proved going along with the proofs of Theorems 1–3 in [36]. Remark that, Theorem 1 does not restrict the asymptotic behavior (divergence speed) of the number of candidate explanatory variables (P) and the necessary variables (s), therefore, this theorem guarantees the robustness of the three types of criteria, DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC in not only the case of fixed dimensionality but also high-dimensional settings.

3.2 Model selection consistency of the criteria based on statistical divergence in the high-dimensional regression

The selection consistency is a meaningful property for the purpose of detecting necessary variables in the various candidates, and it can be compatible with robustness against outliers. Selecting a too large value of the regularization parameter brings an under-specified model that misses some of necessary explanatory variables, and a too small value makes an over-specified model that employs even unnecessary variables. In the case of fixed dimensionality, [39, 36] proposed robust model evaluation criteria with selection consistency based on divergence measures. In this subsection, we provide a theorem supporting the selection consistency of the proposed criteria even in the high-dimensional setting, to achieve the aim (ii) in Section 1. Regarding this, we give some conditions in order to prove asymptotic properties in Subsection A.2 in the Appendix.

Theorem 2. *Under all conditions in Assumption 1 and Assumption 2, and supposing $S = o(n^{\min\{1/2, (1-l)/2\}})$, the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC have the selection consistency, i.e., for any under- and over-specified model \mathcal{M}_l with $\nu(l) \leq S$, the probabilities $\mathbf{P}\{\text{E-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_l) - \text{E-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_{l_*}) > 0\}$ and $\mathbf{P}\{\text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_l) - \text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_{l_*}) > 0\}$ converge to one as n goes to $+\infty$.*

Theorem 2 guarantees the selection consistency of the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC in the high-dimensional setting, but does not support that of the DBBC. Actually, DBBC-type criteria including the BIC tend to select over-specified models probabilistically in the high-dimensional setting, even if there is a sufficiently large sample size. The proof will be provided in Section B in the Appendix.

3.3 On the form of the weight function and the asymptotic order of the regularization parameter

When analyzing data by the adaptive LASSO, the choice of the weights $w_j = h(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|)$ ($j = 1, \dots, P$) is pivotal as well as the determination of the regularization parameter. As the weight function $h(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|)$, reciprocal function $1/|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|$ or its exponentiation have been often used (e.g., [11, 29, 53]). Moreover, the first-derivative of the SCAD penalty ([15]),

$$\tau(|\beta|) = \begin{cases} 1 & (|\beta| \leq \lambda) \\ \frac{a\lambda - |\beta|}{(a-1)\lambda} & (\lambda \leq |\beta| \leq a\lambda) \\ 0 & (a\lambda \leq |\beta|) \end{cases}, \quad (12)$$

is also utilized as the weight function (e.g., [14, 24]), where $a > 2$ is a some constant ($a = 3.7$ is commonly used). Since every element in $\beta_\star^{(1)}$ is non-zero and $\beta_\star^{(2)} = \mathbf{0}_{P-s}$, we can expect that the values of $\tau(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|)$ will be equal or close to 0 for any $j \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}$ and will be equal or close to 1 for $j \in \mathcal{J}^{(2)}$. This SCAD-based weight function is desirable from the viewpoint of the oracle property (see also [14, 24]), nevertheless, there is a problem when we apply it to the model evaluation criteria. The density function of prior distribution, π_l (Laplace distribution), will be equal to 0 if $w_j = 0$ holds for any one of $j =$

$1, \dots, P$. In such a case, we can not obtain $\log \pi_\iota$, and thus we can not derive the GE-DBBC defined in Eq. (11). Therefore, we here employ another weight function, as follows:

$$w_j = h(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|) = q_n + \tau(|\hat{\beta}_j^{\text{ini}}|) \quad (j = 1, \dots, P), \quad (13)$$

where q_n is some positive value fulfilling $q_n \rightarrow 0$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Clearly, this weight function can be regarded as a generalization of the SCAD. The SCAD penalty behaves like the L^1 -penalty in a neighborhood of the origin, has the form of a quadratic function for values slightly away from the origin, and takes a constant value (i.e., behaves like the L^0 -penalty) for values further away from the origin (see also [15, 16]). We can see that, the adaptive LASSO via the weight function defined in Eq. (13) is equivalent to the first-order approximation of the penalty function that behaves like the L^1 -penalty in a neighborhood of the origin, has the form of a quadratic function for values slightly away from the origin, and behaves like the small-slope L^1 -penalty for values further away from the origin (see Fig. 1).




Figure 1: The weight function and corresponding penalty function for $q_n = 0$ (grey dotted line; corresponding the SCAD penalty), 0.05 (red dashed line), 0.20 (blue solid line), with $\lambda = 0.5$ and $a = 3.7$. Vertical lines indicate $\beta = \pm \lambda$ and $\pm a \lambda$, the change points of the penalty (see also Eqs. (12) and (13)).

For achieving the two main aims of this paper, (i) and (ii) simultaneously, the convergence speed of q_n in Eq. (13) will be restricted. We now provide the sufficient conditions for fulfilling Assumptions 1 and 2, when employing h defined in Eq. (13) as the weight function.

Corollary 1. *Suppose (A-1)–(A-3) in Assumption 1 and (C-1)–(C-3) in Assumption 2. Then, in the case of the normal linear regression model, the regularization method employing the weight function in Eq. (13) with $q_n \leq \frac{a_4}{\sqrt{s \log P}}$ for a positive constant a_4 (given in Assumption 1) and the model selection via the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC based on the BHHJ divergence achieve the same properties as those described in Proposition 1, Theorem 1, and Theorem 2.*

Corollary 1 shows that the functional form of Eq. (13) is one of desirable weights that achieve the oracle property and enable us to derive model evaluation criteria naturally. Remark that, asymptotic properties such as the oracle property does not hold if we employ too large q_n ($\neq 0$). As the value of q_n , we can use some sufficiently small positive value in practice, for example, $q_n =$

n^{-2} . We can see that, assumptions about the regularization parameter $\lambda = \lambda_n$ when it has the order $\lambda = O(\sqrt{\frac{s \log P}{n}})$ (see also [24]). However, since the oracle property holds for any values of λ that are proportional to $\sqrt{\frac{s \log P}{n}}$, we need to determine a single value in order to obtain the optimal combination of the explanatory variables, as previously stated in this paper.

3.4 On the differences among three types of criteria

We here discuss the difference of the three types of criteria, the DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC. Although both of the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC have the selection consistency as mentioned in Theorem 2, their additional terms are different to no small extent. In this subsection, we denote the value of a criterion with respect to model \mathcal{M}_ι by

$$\text{Criterion}(\mathcal{M}_\iota) = -2 M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + A_n^{\text{Criterion}},$$

and refer to $A_n^{\text{Criterion}}$ as the additional term of the criterion. We can see that the additional terms corresponding to the DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC, are

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{\text{DBBC}} &= \nu(\iota) \log n, \\ A_n^{\text{E-DBBC}} &= \nu(\iota) \log n + 2(1 - \gamma) \nu(\iota) \log P, \\ A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}} &= -2 \log \pi_\iota(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) + \nu(\iota) \log n - \nu(\iota) \log(2\pi) \\ &\quad + \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))| + 2(1 - \gamma) \nu(\iota) \log P, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

respectively, where π_ι is the probability density function of the prior distribution (in our case, it corresponds to the Laplace distribution; see also Eq. (8)).

Now, we show the asymptotic behavior of each term in Eq. (14). We can see that $A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}}$ can be reduced as follows (see also Eq. (8)):

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}} &= 2n\lambda \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} w_j \left| \hat{\beta}_j(\iota) \right| - 2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} \log w_j + \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))| \\ &\quad + \nu(\iota) \left\{ -2 \log \frac{n\lambda}{2} + \log n - \log(2\pi) + 2(1 - \gamma) \log P \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

If we employ the function given in Eq. (13) as the weight w_j and assume $q_n = n^{-\zeta}$ ($\zeta > 3/2$), the first term in Eq. (15) will go to 0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$ for sufficiently large n , because every true value of the regression coefficient is in constant-order (or equal to 0), moreover, we can confirm that $-2 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} \log w_j$ is asymptotically equivalent to $2\nu(\iota) \zeta \log n$. Therefore, we can reduce $A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}}$ as

$$\nu(\iota) \{-2 \log \lambda + (2\zeta - 1) \log n + 2(1 - \gamma) \log P\} + \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))| + o_P(1). \quad (16)$$

Additionally, by (C-4) in Assumption 2, $\log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota))|$ is asymptotically proportional to (or less than) $\nu(\iota)$. If we further specify that the regularization parameter $\lambda = \lambda_n$ is asymptotically proportional to $\sqrt{\frac{\nu(\iota) \log P}{n}}$ (see also Subsection 3.3), then Eq. (16) will be evaluated as

$$\nu(\iota) \{(2\zeta - 1) \log n + 2(1 - \gamma) \log P - \log \nu(\iota) + O_P(1)\} + o_P(1), \quad (17)$$

since $\log \log P = l \log n$ ($l \in (0, 1)$). From the form of Eqs. (16) and (17),

$$A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}} > A_n^{\text{DBBC}}, \quad A_n^{\text{GE-DBBC}} > A_n^{\text{E-DBBC}}$$

hold for sufficiently large n . From these, we can see that more accurate approximation for the (quasi) posterior probability leads more severe evaluation for the over-specified models. In other words, the GE-DBBC tends not to select the over-specified models relatively to the DBBC and E-DBBC when the sample size n is large.

4 Numerical examples

In the previous section, we showed that three types of the model evaluation criteria, the DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC, achieve the robustness in model selection when we employ appropriate divergence measures, and that the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC also have the selection consistency even in the high-dimensional setting under some regularity conditions. In this section, we introduce some numerical examples to verify the properties of the proposed criteria. Considering the superiority in robustness described in Theorem 1, we employed the BHHJ divergence (Eq. (4)) to derive the model evaluation criteria. As the weights of the adaptive LASSO, we utilized the function defined in Eq. (13) with $q_n = n^{-2}$. Throughout this section, we use the criterion that has the additional term given in Eq. (16) omitting the part of $o_P(1)$, as the GE-DBBC.

4.1 Simulations

We conducted simulation studies to verify the robustness against outliers and the selection consistency. We generated the explanatory variables $\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n$ independently from the normal distribution $N(\mathbf{0}_P, \mathbf{I}_{P \times P})$; the value of the design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n)^\top$ was fixed through the simulations. We defined the true value of the regression coefficient $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ as $(\mathbf{1}_5^\top, \mathbf{0}_{P-5}^\top)^\top$, i.e., $s = 5$, and we generated n centered response variables according to the normal linear regression model (Eq. (1)) with $\sigma^2 = 1$. We set four pairs of the sample sizes n and the number of candidate explanatory variables P , $(n, P) = (5000, 20)$, $(5000, 200)$, $(500, 200)$, and $(200, 1000)$. Then, to measure the selection robustness, we replaced values of Y 's with ten times of their original values with probability r . As the value of r , we used 0 (non-contaminated setting), 0.01, 0.05, and 0.10. For comparison, we also conducted variable selection via the BIC and EBIC using the original LASSO (uniform weight); we refer as them to ‘‘unif-BIC’’ and ‘‘unif-EBIC’’, respectively.

Fig. 2 illustrates the accuracy rates of 100 trials of the unif-BIC, unif-EBIC and three types of criteria (DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC) for some values of α ($\alpha = 0, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$, and 1). Additionally, Tables 5–8 in the Appendix (Section C) show the detailed selection rates of the under-specified models, true model, and over-specified models for each (n, P) . From the figure and tables, all criteria performed well in the non-contaminated setting ($r = 0$) with $(n, P) = (5000, 20)$, however, in other settings, the accuracy greatly varies depending on the type of criterion and the tuning parameter α . We can see that the unif-BIC and unif-EBIC did not performed well when P was not small or there existed some outliers in the data. As the unif-BIC and unif-EBIC are

based on the KL divergence, they do not have the robustness in estimation and model selection. Additionally, the LASSO-type estimator employing uniform weight does not fulfill (A-4) and (A-5) in Assumption 1, hence Theorem 2 does not hold for the unif-BIC and unif-EBIC (in the first place, the uniform weight does not achieve the oracle property; see also, e.g., [15, 53]). Thus, we cannot support that these two criteria have either the robustness in model selection or selection consistency in high-dimensional settings.




Figure 2: The accuracy rates (%) of the DBBC (green line graphs with square symbols), E-DBBC (orange / triangle symbols), and GE-DBBC (purple / circle symbols) with $\alpha = 0, 0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75$, and 1 , for each sample size n , the number of candidate explanatory variables P , and contamination rate r . Dashed horizontal line indicates the accuracy rates of the unif-BIC (green) and (orange).

The comparison among α of the three types of criteria (DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC) reflects the effects of robustness of the BHHJ divergence. In the non-contaminated settings, every criterion performed well, yet we can see that criteria with small α failed to select the true model in contaminated settings. Particularly, most criteria with $\alpha = 0$ (based on the KL divergence) and $\alpha = 0.001$ selected over-specified models at a high rate in heavily contaminated settings (see the columns of “ $r = 0.05$ ” and “ $r = 0.1$ ” in Tables 5–8). By contrast, we can confirm that the criteria with moderately large $\alpha > 0$ performed well regardless of whether there existed outliers in the observations or not. This results were consistent with Theorem 1 describing that the model evaluation criteria based on appropriate divergence measures including the BHHJ divergence are robust against the contamination of outliers. For $(n, P) = (200, 1000)$, criteria

with $\alpha > 0.5$ did not perform well in comparison with the cases for large n . In fact, larger α of the C divergence family (including the BHHJ divergence) increases the asymptotic variance of the estimator ([8, 40, 50]), hence an excessively large α is not desirable from the viewpoint of parametric estimation. In previous studies, estimation and model selection with too large α also tend to be unstable due to the lack of efficiency, especially when the sample size is not sufficiently large (e.g., [8, 20, 36]). On detailed discussion about the optimal value or range of the tuning parameter, refer also to, e.g., [5, 21, 52].

Results for $(n, P) = (200, 1000)$ suggests that the DBBC (including the BIC) has a drawback that can not cope well with the case where the number of candidate explanatory variables is large and the sample size is not sufficiently large. These results agreed with Theorem 2 and the description in Subsection 3.4. The DBBC has asymptotically smaller additional term than the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC (Eqs. (14) and (16)), and thus selection via the DBBC tends fail to remove some unnecessary variables in high-dimensional settings. The E-DBBC and GE-DBBC recorded similar results, yet the GE-DBBC performed better in most of contaminated settings. In particular, the GE-DBBC tended to prevent to select over-specified models relatively to the DBBC and E-DBBC, for heavily contaminated cases. We can consider that more precise approximation for the quasi-posterior probability and the asymptotically large additional term of the GE-DBBC brought the difference of the results.

4.2 Real data analysis

In this subsection, we show an application of the proposed model evaluation criteria for the variable selection problem using the Boston housing data set. The dataset consists of $n = 506$ observations and 14 variables (on the detail of this dataset, see [26]). We employed the median value of owner-occupied homes as the response variable (centered), and other variables (standardized) and their interaction terms as explanatory variables; we conducted variable selection to detect the set necessary explanatory variables from the $P = 91$ candidates. We randomly split the dataset into a training data and test data at a ratio of 4:1 (the sample size of the training data was 405). As the value of the σ^2 (variance of the error terms) for every method, we used the square of the adjusted standard deviation of the residuals with respect to the LASSO estimates, to ensure fairness among the selection methods. Fig. 3(a) is the histogram of the residuals for the OLS estimates when employing all P explanatory variables. We can see that the residuals roughly distributed symmetrically and suspect that there can exist some outliers in the observations.

Next, in order to verify the robustness in selection, we randomly replaced k values of the response variables of the training data with m times of its original value. Fig. 3(b) shows the examples of histogram of the residuals for the OLS estimates (using all explanatory variables), for contaminated data when $(k, m) = (1, 10)$. We can see more outlying residuals that exert negative influence on estimation and variable selection, in comparison with the raw data. We can consider that outliers distorted the (non-robust) OLS estimation, and brought the extremely large residuals. In this experiment, we employed $\alpha = 0.1$ as the value of the tuning parameter of the BHHJ divergence, taking the stable performance in the simulation into account (Subsection 4.1). To measure the robustness of each model criterion against the contamination of outliers, we define ‘‘CR’’, the

concordance rate with the selected result of the raw data. If a criterion selects similar explanatory variables for both of the raw and contaminated data, the value of CR will be close to 1 (see Table 1).




Figure 3: Histograms of the residuals for the OLS estimates using all explanatory variables, for (a) raw data and (b) contaminated training data.

Table 1: The concordance rate (CR) is calculated as $(A + D) / (A + B + C + D)$.

		Contaminated data	
		Necessary	Unnecessary
Raw data	Necessary	A	C
	Unnecessary	B	D

Tables 2, 3, and 4 illustrate the summaries of results (the RMSE of the residuals of test data, the number of the selected explanatory variables, and the CR) of 100 trials of the three types of criteria (DBBC, E-DBBC, and GE-DBBC) utilizing the BHHJ divergence with $\alpha = 0$ and 0.1, for $(k, m) = (1, 10)$, $(5, 10)$, and $(1, 20)$, respectively. For the raw data, the DBBC with $\alpha = 0$ (corresponding to BIC) and E-DBBC with $\alpha = 0$ (EBIC), and E-DBBC with $\alpha = 0.1$ and GE-DBBC with $\alpha = 0.1$ selected the same combinations of explanatory variables, respectively. Regarding the average, the RMSEs of the residuals of test data for $\alpha = 0.1$ were not much different from for $\alpha = 0$, but the standard deviations for $\alpha = 0.1$ were remarkably smaller than for $\alpha = 0$ when there existed multiple outliers (Table 3) and there existed a more extreme outlier (Table 4). We can consider that, non-robust criteria tended to have extremely large residuals due to outliers (see also histograms in Fig. 3), as a result, the variances of the RMSE became large. Moreover, we can see that the values of CR of the criteria for $\alpha = 0$ were smaller than those of the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC for $\alpha = 0.1$; these reflect that non-robust criteria treated outliers equally with other observations, and thus they failed to perform consistent variable selection robustly. For both of raw data and contaminated data, the DBBC generally selected more candidate variables than the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC. This trend was similar to the previous simulations (see Subsection 4.1), and agrees with the theoretical descriptions in this paper (Theorem 2 and Subsection 3.4). Although the DBBC recorded smaller RMSE than the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC, there is suspicion that the DBBC selected not only truly necessary variables but also some unnecessary ones. High averages and small standard deviations of the CR for the E-DBBC and GE-DBBC with $\alpha = 0.1$ show the robust and stable

variable selection of the proposed method.

Table 2: Averages (Ave) and standard deviations (SD) of the root mean squared error of the residuals of the test data (RMSE), the number of the selected explanatory variables (ν), and the concordance rate (CR), for the contaminated data with $(k, m) = (1, 10)$. The column of “Raw” shows the results for the raw data.

Criterion (α)	RMSE		ν			CR	
	Ave	(SD)	Raw	Ave	(SD)	Ave	(SD)
DBBC (0)	4.67	(1.50)	50	40.57	(10.61)	0.76	(0.10)
E-DBBC (0)	4.75	(1.35)	50	31.04	(8.28)	0.71	(0.09)
GE-DBBC (0)	4.92	(1.26)	38	23.98	(6.91)	0.78	(0.07)
DBBC (0.1)	4.48	(0.85)	45	29.90	(9.98)	0.78	(0.08)
E-DBBC (0.1)	4.89	(0.99)	18	19.71	(7.00)	0.91	(0.05)
GE-DBBC (0.1)	5.34	(1.16)	18	15.24	(5.48)	0.92	(0.03)

Table 3: Results for $(k, m) = (5, 10)$.

Criterion (α)	RMSE		ν			CR	
	Ave	(SD)	Raw	Ave	(SD)	Ave	(SD)
DBBC (0)	7.05	(3.71)	50	26.52	(8.70)	0.60	(0.06)
E-DBBC (0)	7.05	(2.93)	50	17.93	(9.85)	0.57	(0.06)
GE-DBBC (0)	7.13	(2.69)	38	12.17	(8.16)	0.66	(0.05)
DBBC (0.1)	5.47	(1.27)	45	15.36	(7.05)	0.66	(0.06)
E-DBBC (0.1)	6.51	(1.49)	18	9.58	(6.39)	0.88	(0.06)
GE-DBBC (0.1)	7.06	(1.42)	18	6.97	(4.81)	0.86	(0.04)

Table 4: Results for $(k, m) = (1, 20)$.

Criterion (α)	RMSE		ν			CR	
	Ave	(SD)	Raw	Ave	(SD)	Ave	(SD)
DBBC (0)	5.80	(3.26)	50	34.11	(12.30)	0.69	(0.12)
E-DBBC (0)	5.86	(2.65)	50	24.50	(11.58)	0.64	(0.10)
GE-DBBC (0)	6.13	(2.54)	38	18.19	(9.76)	0.73	(0.09)
DBBC (0.1)	5.08	(1.36)	45	22.90	(11.90)	0.72	(0.11)
E-DBBC (0.1)	5.64	(1.56)	18	15.55	(8.84)	0.90	(0.05)
GE-DBBC (0.1)	6.27	(1.74)	18	11.06	(6.56)	0.90	(0.05)

5 Discussion

In this paper, we developed model evaluation criteria that achieve the robustness in model selection and selection consistency simultaneously for the high-dimensional linear regression model based on statistical divergence measures. Robust divergence families such as the BHHJ divergence reduce damage from outliers, and precise approximation for the quasi-posterior probability built upon the divergence derives criteria that hold the selection consistency even when the number of candidate explanatory variables are quite large. The adaptive LASSO-type regularization employing appropriate penalty term introduced in this paper leads the above-mentioned desirable characteristics without losing asymptotic properties such as the oracle property in estimation of regression coefficients. We also conducted various numerical examples to confirm the performance of our proposed criteria. Proposed methods recorded high accuracy in comparison with non-robust criteria and methods without selection consistency, and the results agreed with the theorems proved in this paper.

Noting that, there are various regularization methods, for example, the elastic net (e.g., [54]), L^q -penalty like the Bridge (e.g., [18]), and L^0 -penalty (e.g., [9, 27]), other than the (adaptive) LASSO that we investigated thought this paper. The study of robustify of such regularization methods will be productive, and comparing investigation of their properties will contribute higher accuracy of the variable selection for the high-dimensional regression. Moreover, although we discussed asymptotic behavior and robustness against outliers only for the normal linear regression model, our approach has a potential to apply to wide classes of models like the generalized linear model and functional data analysis. Additionally, theoretical and numerical results support the robustness of our proposed criteria against general contamination by outliers, yet we can expect more precise evaluation of robustness of the proposed criteria, such as exact distribution of estimators and criteria for contaminated populations, if we assume some specific contamination. These topics will be interesting and important subjects for future study.

A On the regularity conditions

A.1 Conditions for proving the oracle property of the estimator and deriving the model evaluation criteria

We first introduce conditions on the optimization function of the estimation (Eq. (2) in Section 2) and its associated terms, the regularization parameters, the explanatory variables, and the weights, to show the asymptotic properties of the (adaptive) LASSO-type estimators; some of the conditions are related to the ones in [14].

Assumption 1. *We assume the following conditions:*

(A-1) *For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, the probability (density) function f_i and the function ρ_i are Lipschitz continuous, and the ρ_i is three times continuously differentiable with respect to any $\beta_j \neq 0$ ($j = 1, \dots, P$).*

(A-2) *With the regularization parameter $\lambda = \lambda_n$, $\lambda > 2\sqrt{\frac{(a_1+1)\log P}{n}}$ holds for*

some positive constant a_1 , and $s^2(\log n)^{\frac{5}{2}}n^{-\frac{3}{2}}\lambda^{-2}$ goes to 0 as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

(A-3) The maximum of absolute value in the design matrix $\mathbf{X} = (x_{i,j})_{i,j}$ is in constant-order $O(1)$. Moreover, the $s \times s$ matrix $\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^{(1)\top}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{X}^{(1)}$ is positive definite, and all eigenvalues of this matrix are bounded below and above by some positive constants. Additionally, $\|\frac{1}{n}\mathbf{X}^{(2)\top}\mathbf{D}_n\mathbf{X}^{(1)}\|_{2,\infty} < a_2\lambda\sqrt{\frac{n}{s\log n}}\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{(2)}}|w_j|$ holds for sufficiently large n and a positive constant a_2 , where $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{2,\infty}$ for a $p \times q$ matrix \mathbf{M} is defined as $\|\mathbf{M}\|_{2,\infty} = \sup_{\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^q \setminus \{0\}} \frac{\|\mathbf{M}\mathbf{m}\|_\infty}{\|\mathbf{m}\|_2}$ (p and q are any positive integers).

(A-4) For the initial estimator $\hat{\beta}^{\text{ini}}$ and a positive constant a_3 , $\|\hat{\beta}^{\text{ini}(1)} - \beta_\star^{(1)}\| \leq a_3\sqrt{\frac{s\log P}{n}}$ holds with probability tending to one as $n \rightarrow +\infty$.

(A-5) With the weight vector $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}^{(1)\top}, \mathbf{w}^{(2)\top})^\top$, $\lambda\|\mathbf{w}^{(1)}\|_2 \leq a_4\sqrt{\frac{s}{n}}$ holds for a positive constant a_4 and for sufficiently large n , and there exists a positive constant a_5 such that $w_j > a_5$ for any $j \in \mathcal{J}^{(2)}$. Moreover, the weight function h is non-increasing and Lipschitz continuous over $(0, +\infty)$, $h(a_3\sqrt{\frac{s\log P}{n}}) > \frac{h(0+)}{2}$ holds for sufficiently large n , and $h'(z) = o(s^{-1}\lambda^{-1}n^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\log P)^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ holds for any $z > \frac{1}{2}\min_{j \in \mathcal{J}^{(1)}}|\beta_j^\star|$.

(A-6) The $s \times s$ matrix $\mathbf{Z}_n^\top\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n\mathbf{Z}_n$ is positive definite, and all eigenvalues of the matrices \mathbf{V}_n and $\mathbf{Z}_n^\top\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n\mathbf{Z}_n$ are bounded below and above by some positive constants.

(A-7) Let $\mathbf{U}_n = (\mathbf{Z}_n^\top\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n\mathbf{Z}_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{V}_n^{-1}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_n = \mathbf{E}\left[-\frac{\partial^2\sum_{i=1}^n\rho_i(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top\beta_\star)}{\partial\beta^{(1)}\partial\beta^{(1)\top}}\right]$, then the value of the trace of $\mathbf{Q}_n\mathbf{U}_n^{-1}(\mathbf{U}_n^\top)^{-1}$ is in between $O(1)$ and $O(s)$.

In the normal linear regression models, we can confirm that (A-1) holds for the BHHJ divergence and most divergence measures in the JHHB and the C families. (A-2) is the condition restricting the asymptotic order of the regularization parameter λ . The optimal order has also been discussed in many studies (e.g., [14, 24, 53]). (A-3) is the condition regarding the explanatory variables, that controls the correlation between the necessary and unnecessary variables. We can see that, the third condition in (A-3) immediately holds if the necessary and unnecessary explanatory variables are uncorrelated, i.e., $\mathbf{X}^{(2)\top}\mathbf{X}^{(1)} = \mathbf{O}_{(P-s) \times s}$ (see also [14]). (A-4) specifies the asymptotic behavior of the initial estimator $\hat{\beta}^{\text{ini}}$. The LASSO-type estimator (solution of Eq. (2)) employing the BHHJ divergence and the uniform weight ($h(z) = 1$ for any $z > 0$) is an estimator satisfying this condition (see also [24]). (A-5) provides the asymptotic order of the weight function, and it supposes that the weights imposing on the necessary explanatory variables are asymptotically smaller than on the unnecessary ones. (A-6) is related to the condition in [24], that is needed to obtain the asymptotic variance of the estimator. (A-7) is required to prove properties about the selection of the regularization parameter λ . We will provide a simple example when using the BHHJ divergence, in Subsection A.3.

A.2 Conditions for establishing the selection consistency

We next introduce conditions on the models and their associated terms, to prove the selection consistency (Theorem 2).

Assumption 2. We assume the following conditions:

(C-1) For any model \mathcal{M}_ι with $\nu(\iota) \leq S$, every eigenvalue of the $\nu(\iota) \times \nu(\iota)$ matrix $\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{H}_{M_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota))$ is positive and in constant-order $O(1)$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)$ is a $\nu(\iota)$ -dimensional vector defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota) = (\beta_j^* \mid j \text{ th explanatory variable is employed in model } \mathcal{M}_\iota)$$

if \mathcal{M}_ι is an under-specified model, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota) = (\beta_j)_j$ with

$$\beta_j = \begin{cases} \beta_j^* & (j \text{ th explanatory variable is in the true model } \mathcal{M}_{\iota_*}) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases}$$

for each j if \mathcal{M}_ι is an over-specified model ($j = 1, \dots, \nu(\iota)$).

(C-2) For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $(1 - \epsilon) \mathbf{H}_{M_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) \leq \mathbf{H}_{M_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) \leq (1 + \epsilon) \mathbf{H}_{M_n}(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota))$ for any model \mathcal{M}_ι with $\nu(\iota) \leq S$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota) - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)\|_2 \leq \delta$, when n is sufficiently large.

(C-3) There exists a constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that, for all $\delta \in (0, \epsilon)$,

$$\boldsymbol{\beta} \notin \mathcal{B}_\delta(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota_* : \iota_F)) \Rightarrow \limsup_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) - R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota_* : \iota_F)) \right\} < 0$$

holds, where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota : \iota_F) = (\hat{\beta}_j(\iota : \iota_F))_j$ for a model \mathcal{M}_ι is defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_j(\iota : \iota_F) = \begin{cases} \hat{\beta}_j^F & (j \text{ th explanatory variable is in model } \mathcal{M}_\iota) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases},$$

for each j , $(\hat{\beta}_1^F, \dots, \hat{\beta}_P^F)^\top$ is the estimator in the full model employing all of the P explanatory variables, and $\mathcal{B}_\delta(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ indicates an open ball with center $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and radius δ .

(C-4) Every element in the $\nu(\iota) \times \nu(\iota)$ matrix $\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))$ is bounded below and above by some positive constants in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)$ for any model \mathcal{M}_ι . Moreover, there exist two positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that, $c_1 \leq |\log |\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))|| \leq c_2 \nu(\iota)$ holds in the neighborhood.

(C-1) and (C-2) are expansions of the conditions given by [13], that specify the behavior of the regression coefficients in the neighborhood of the true value. (C-3) is a sufficient condition for the assumptions described in [32] for conducting the Laplace approximation and establishing the selection consistency; it implies that the estimators based on under-specified models can not achieve asymptotically equivalent values of R_n to the estimator based on the true model. (C-4) is the condition to restrict the asymptotic behavior of \mathbf{T}_n , that generally holds in the normal linear regression models when each value of explanatory variable is in constant-order.

A.3 An example for the case of the BHHJ divergence

In this subsection, we give an example, in the case where $\frac{1}{n} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}$ is equal to the identity matrix $\mathbf{I}_{P \times P}$ and every value in the design matrix \mathbf{X} is in $O(1)$. We utilize the BHHJ divergence for the quasi-likelihood, and confirm the conditions

(A-6) and (A-7) in Assumption 1 in this case. As the distribution of $\epsilon_i = Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$) under the model employing $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ as the regression coefficient vector is the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2)$, the function ρ_i for each $i = 1, \dots, n$ and its derivatives are calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_i(\epsilon_i) &= (2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha} \left\{ (\alpha + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} - \frac{\alpha + 1}{\alpha} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha \epsilon_i^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \right\}, \\ \rho_i'(\epsilon_i) &= (\alpha + 1) (2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha-2} \epsilon_i \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha \epsilon_i^2}{2\sigma^2}\right), \\ \rho_i''(\epsilon_i) &= (\alpha + 1) (2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha-2} \left(1 - \frac{\alpha \epsilon_i^2}{\sigma^2}\right) \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha \epsilon_i^2}{2\sigma^2}\right).\end{aligned}$$

for $\alpha > 0$. We obtain the matrix $\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n$, the covariance matrix of $(\rho_1'(\epsilon_1), \dots, \rho_n'(\epsilon_n))^\top$, and the diagonal matrix $\mathbf{D}_n = \text{diag}(\mathbf{E}[\rho_1''(\epsilon_1)], \dots, \mathbf{E}[\rho_n''(\epsilon_n)])$ as

$$\begin{aligned}\boldsymbol{\Omega}_n &= (\alpha + 1)^2 (2\alpha + 1)^{-\frac{3}{2}} (2\pi)^{-\alpha} \sigma^{-2\alpha-2} \mathbf{I}_{n \times n}, \\ \mathbf{D}_n &= (\alpha + 1)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha-2} \mathbf{I}_{n \times n},\end{aligned}$$

respectively. Clearly, elements in these matrices have values in constant-order with respect to n . As $\mathbf{X}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{X}^{(1)} = n \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}$, we can confirm that $\mathbf{V}_n = (\mathbf{X}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{D}_n \mathbf{X}^{(1)})^{-\frac{1}{2}} = c n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}$ holds for a positive constant $c = O(1)$. Hereafter, we denote terms in constant-order by c (this does not always indicate the same value). Thus, $\mathbf{Z}_n = \mathbf{X}^{(1)} \mathbf{V}_n = c n^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{X}^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{Z}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{Z}_n = c \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}$, and $\mathbf{U}_n = (\mathbf{Z}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{Z}_n)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{V}_n^{-1} = c n^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}$. We can see that $\mathbf{Z}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{Z}_n$ is clearly positive definite and the eigenvalues \mathbf{V}_n and $\mathbf{Z}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\Omega}_n \mathbf{Z}_n$ are $O(1)$ due to $\max_{i,j} |x_{i,j}| = O(1)$, hence the condition (A-6) holds.

Then, we confirm (A-7). We can calculate the matrices \mathbf{Q}_n and $\mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{U}_n^\top)^{-1}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)\top}} &= \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i''(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{x}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(1)\top}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_n &= \mathbf{E} \left[-\frac{\partial^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \rho_i(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_*)}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)\top}} \right] = -\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{E} [\rho_i''(\epsilon_i)] \mathbf{x}_i^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_i^{(1)\top} = -c n \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}, \\ \mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{U}_n^\top)^{-1} &= -c \mathbf{I}_{s \times s}.\end{aligned}$$

Since the value of $\text{tr}\{\mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{U}_n^\top)^{-1}\}$ is proportional to s , the condition (A-7) holds.

B Proofs of theorems

Proof of Theorem 1. For proving this theorem, we use the following lemma provided by [36].

Lemma 1. *For each $i = 1, \dots, n$, let $f_i(\cdot | \boldsymbol{\beta})$, $g_i(\cdot)$, and $\xi_i(\cdot)$ be the probability (density) functions of the model distribution, the true distribution, and the outlier-generating distribution, respectively. When assuming the following conditions (R-1) and (R-2), the second-order approximation term of the difference of the value of M_n (defined in Eq. (7)) built upon any divergence of the*

C divergence family with $\alpha \geq 1$ between the case where the data-generating distribution is (non-contaminated) \mathbf{G} and the case where that is (contaminated) Ψ is bounded for arbitrary outlier-generating distribution Ξ . Moreover, for the BHHJ divergence family with $\alpha > 0$ and JHHB divergence family with $\alpha > 0$ and $\varphi > 0$, the boundedness holds under only (R-1).

(R-1) For all i , $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \xi_i(y) dy$ and $\int \left\| \frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\| f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \xi_i(y) dy$ are finite for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_\star$.

(R-2) For all i , $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} \xi_i(y)^2 dy$, $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} g_i(y) \xi_i(y) dy$, and $\int \left\| \frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\| f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} g_i(y) \xi_i(y) dy$ are finite for any $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \Theta_\star$.

The proof of this lemma is provided in the supplemental material in [36]. Incidentally, although “ $\alpha > 1$ ” is required for establishing the selection robustness of the *C* divergence-based criteria in general cases ([36]), we can also prove for $\alpha = 1$ in the case of the normal linear regression models. Lemma 1 supports the boundedness of second-order approximation term of the main term of the GE-DBBC against outliers. As the prior density in our setting and every term excepting the main term in the DBBC and E-DBBC (Eq. (10)) do not depend on the observation \mathbf{Y} , we can also confirm the boundedness of the values of the DBBC and E-DBBC. Hence, to prove the boundedness of the GE-DBBC (Eq. (11)), we need to verify (R-1) and (R-2) and to check the behavior of $\log |\mathbf{T}_n|$ against outliers. In this proof, we omit the notation “ (ι) ” in “ $\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)$ ” for the sake of simplicity.

In our setting, the probability density functions of i th response variable in the model and true distributions are $f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (2\pi\sigma^2)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp\{-\frac{(y-\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{2\sigma^2}\}$ and $g_i(y) = f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)$, respectively. As the density f_i is bounded with respect to y , $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \xi_i(y) dy$ in (R-1) is clearly finite for any outlier-generating distribution Ξ_i . The finiteness of $\int \left\| \frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\| f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \xi_i(y) dy$ also holds since $\frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} = \sigma^{-2} (y - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbf{x}_i$ and $m^2 \exp(-\alpha m^2) \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \pm\infty$ for any $\alpha > 0$. Thus we proved (R-1).

Next, under assuming $\int \xi_i(y)^2 dy < +\infty$, we can confirm the finiteness of $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} \xi_i(y)^2 dy$ for $\alpha \geq 1$. Since $f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} g_i(y) \propto \exp\{-\frac{(\alpha-1)(y-\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{2\sigma^2}\} \exp\{-\frac{(y-\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)^2}{2\sigma^2}\}$, $\int f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} g_i(y) \xi_i(y) dy$ is finite for any $\alpha \geq 1$. The finiteness of $\int \left\| \frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\| f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^{\alpha-1} g_i(y) \xi_i(y) dy$ for $\alpha \geq 1$ can be confirmed as with of $\int \left\| \frac{\partial \log f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}} \right\| f_i(y|\boldsymbol{\beta})^\alpha \xi_i(y) dy$. Remark that, if $\alpha < 1$, we can not support the finiteness of terms in (R-2).

We finally consider the matrix $\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = -\frac{1}{n} \frac{\partial^2 R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top}$. In the setting of the normal linear regression model, when using the BHHJ divergence, the part depending on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ of $R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = M_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + \log \pi_\iota(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is calculated as

$$-\sum_{i=1}^n (2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha} \frac{\alpha+1}{\alpha} \exp\left\{-\frac{\alpha(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{2\sigma^2}\right\} + n\lambda \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}(\iota)^{(1)}} w_j |\beta_j|.$$

Thus, by using $\frac{\partial |\beta_j|}{\partial \beta_j} = \text{sign}(\beta_j)$ and $\frac{\partial^2 |\beta_j|}{\partial \beta_j^2} = 0$ for any $\beta_j \neq 0$, we obtain the

$\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \frac{(\alpha + 1)(2\pi)^{-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sigma^{-\alpha-2}}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ 1 - \frac{\alpha(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{\sigma^2} \right\} \\ &\quad \times \exp \left\{ -\frac{\alpha(Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})^2}{\sigma^2} \right\} \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top. \end{aligned}$$

As the terms in the sum in the right-hand side of this equation are bounded for variation of the value of Y_i , the boundedness of $\log |\mathbf{T}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})|$ around $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ holds due to (C-4) in Assumption 2. When using other divergence in the JHHB and C families, we can confirm that in a similar way. We complete the proof. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Assume that \mathcal{M}_l is a model employing $\nu(l) (\leq S)$ explanatory variables and it is not coincide with the true model \mathcal{M}_{l_\star} . We will show the probability of the event $\{\text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_l) - \text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_{l_\star}) \leq 0\}$, that is equal to $\{B_1 - B_2 \geq 0\}$, tend to zero when n goes to infinity, where

$$\begin{aligned} B_1 &= R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l)) - R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star)) \\ &= \left\{ M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l)) + \log \pi_l(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l)) \right\} - \left\{ M_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star)) + \log \pi_{l_\star}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star)) \right\}, \\ B_2 &= \{\nu(l) - \nu(l_\star)\} \left\{ \frac{\log n - \log(2\pi)}{2} + (1 - \gamma) \log P \right\} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l))| - \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star))| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

[The case where \mathcal{M}_l is an under-specified model] As the model \mathcal{M}_l does not include the true model \mathcal{M}_{l_\star} , the (L^2) -norm $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l : l_F) - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star : l_F)\|_2$ is in $O_P(1)$ or more (at most $O_P(\sqrt{S})$), because every element in the true coefficient vector is in $O(1)$. Thus, B_1 takes a negative value almost surely and $B_1 = O_P(n)$ when n is sufficiently large, by (C-3) in Assumption 2. In addition, (C-4) in Assumption 2 supports $\log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l))| - \log |\mathbf{T}_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(l_\star))|$ in B_2 is in between $O_P(1)$ and $O_P(S)$. For this reason, if $\nu(l) = \nu(l_\star)$, $\mathbf{P}\{B_1 - B_2 \geq 0\}$ obviously goes to zero as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Then, if $\nu(l) < \nu(l_\star)$, the difference $\nu(l) - \nu(l_\star)$ must be in the range $[-S, -1]$, thus $B_1 \leq -e_1 n$ and $-B_2 \leq e_2 S \log P = e_2 S n^l$ hold for sufficiently large n , $l \in (0, 1)$, and some positive constants e_1, e_2 . Therefore, since $S = o(n^{\min\{l/2, (1-l)/2\}})$, $\mathbf{P}\{B_1 - B_2 \geq 0\}$ tends to zero as $n \rightarrow +\infty$. Moreover, if $\nu(l) > \nu(l_\star)$, as B_2 takes positive value almost surely for sufficiently large n , $\mathbf{P}\{B_1 - B_2 \geq 0\} \rightarrow 0$ ($n \rightarrow +\infty$) clearly holds. Hence, the probability of $\{\text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_l) - \text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_{l_\star}) \leq 0\}$ tends to zero for any under-specified model \mathcal{M}_l with $\nu(l) \leq S$.

[The case where \mathcal{M}_l is an over-specified model] We define the $s = \nu(l_\star)$ -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}(l)^{(1)}$ for the $\nu(l)$ -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}(l)$. As an over-specified model includes the true model \mathcal{M}_{l_\star} , we can see that $\nu(l) > \nu(l_\star)$ holds necessarily and both of B_1 and B_2 take positive values almost surely for sufficiently large n . Remark that, as every element in $\boldsymbol{\beta}(l)^{(1)}$ is non-zero around $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star(l_\star)$, $R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(l))$ is three times differentiable with respect to $\boldsymbol{\beta}(l)$ in a neighborhood of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ (see also (A-1) in Assumption 1). By the Taylor expansion,

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) &= \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)^{(1)} \right\}^\top \check{\mathbf{q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)^{(1)} \right\}^\top \check{\mathbf{Q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) \left\{ \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)^{(1)} \right\} \\
&\quad + O_P \left(\left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)^{(1)} \right\|_2^3 \right), \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

for sufficiently large n , where the $\nu(\iota)$ -dimensional vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)$ was defined in Assumption 2, and $\check{\mathbf{q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = \frac{\partial R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)^{(1)}}$ and $\check{\mathbf{Q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)) = \frac{\partial^2 R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota))}{\partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)^{(1)} \partial \boldsymbol{\beta}(\iota)^{(1)\top}}$. By ignoring the remainder term in Eq. (18), and using the completing the square and the Slutsky's theorem, we have

$$R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) \simeq \frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{Q}_n^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n)^\top \mathbf{Q}_n (\mathbf{z} + \mathbf{Q}_n^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n) - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{q}_n^\top \mathbf{Q}_n^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n,$$

where $\mathbf{z} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)^{(1)} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)^{(1)}$, $\mathbf{q}_n = \mathbf{E}[\check{\mathbf{q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota))]$, and $\mathbf{Q}_n = \mathbf{E}[\check{\mathbf{Q}}_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota))]$. By Proposition 1, we can give an upper bound of the absolute value for sufficiently large n , as follows:

$$\left| R_n(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}(\iota)) - R_n(\boldsymbol{\beta}_*(\iota)) \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \text{tr} \left\{ \mathbf{Q}_n \mathbf{U}_n^{-1} (\mathbf{U}_n^\top)^{-1} \right\} \right| + \mathbf{q}_n^\top \mathbf{Q}_n^{-1} \mathbf{q}_n,$$

By (A-7) in Assumption 1, the right-hand side of this equation is at most $O(S)$ for sufficiently large n , and thus, $B_1 \leq e_3 S$ holds for some positive constant e_3 . On the other hand, as the difference $\nu(\iota) - \nu(\iota_*)$ is in the range $[1, S]$, the order of B_2 is in between $O(\log P) = O(n^l)$ and $O(S n^l)$, and thus $-B_2 \leq e_4 n^l$ holds for some positive constant e_4 . Since $S = o(n^{\min\{l/2, (1-l)/2\}})$, we can confirm that $B_1 - B_2$ takes a negative value almost surely for sufficient large n , and hence the probability of $\{\text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_\iota) - \text{GE-DBBC}(\mathcal{M}_{\iota_*}) \leq 0\}$ tends to zero for any over-specified model \mathcal{M}_ι with $\nu(\iota) \leq S$. We complete the proof. \square

C Details of the numerical simulations

Table 5: Selection rates (%) of criteria for different contamination rates ($r = 0, 0.01, 0.05, \text{ and } 0.1$) with $n = 5000$ and $P = 20$. “UM”, “TM”, and “OM” indicate the selection rates of the under-specified, true, and over-specified models, respectively.

Criterion (α)	$r = 0$			$r = 0.01$			$r = 0.05$			$r = 0.1$		
	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM
Unif-BIC	0	95	5	0	5	95	0	0	100	0	0	100
Unif-EBIC	0	99	1	0	8	92	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	96	4	0	38	62	0	24	76
E-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	98	2	0	49	51	0	35	65
GE-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	99	1	0	82	18
DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	69	31	0	52	48
E-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	87	13	0	62	38
GE-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0

Table 6: Results for $n = 5000$ and $P = 200$.

Criterion (α)	$r = 0$			$r = 0.01$			$r = 0.05$			$r = 0.1$		
	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM
Unif-BIC	0	45	55	0	1	99	0	0	100	0	0	100
Unif-EBIC	0	91	9	0	8	92	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	80	20	0	18	82	0	14	86
E-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	94	6	0	39	61	0	19	81
GE-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	98	2	0	47	53
DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	57	43	0	21	79
E-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	79	21	0	31	69
GE-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	94	6
DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0

Table 7: Results for $n = 500$ and $P = 200$.

Criterion (α)	$r = 0$			$r = 0.01$			$r = 0.05$			$r = 0.1$		
	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM
Unif-BIC	0	36	64	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100
Unif-EBIC	0	69	31	0	2	98	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	36	64	0	0	100	0	0	100
E-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	52	48	0	0	100	0	0	100
GE-DBBC (0)	0	100	0	0	60	40	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	92	8	0	0	100	0	0	100
E-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	97	3	0	4	96	0	0	100
GE-DBBC (0.001)	0	100	0	0	99	1	0	12	88	0	0	100
DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	98	2	0	78	22
E-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	92	8
GE-DBBC (0.01)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	99	1
DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.25)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (0.5)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	1	99	0
GE-DBBC (0.75)	0	100	0	0	100	0	0	100	0	1	99	0
DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	1	99	0	0	100	0
E-DBBC (1)	0	100	0	0	100	0	1	99	0	0	100	0
GE-DBBC (1)	2	98	0	1	99	0	4	96	0	7	93	0

Table 8: Results for $n = 200$ and $P = 1000$.

Criterion (α)	$r = 0$			$r = 0.01$			$r = 0.05$			$r = 0.1$		
	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM	UM	TM	OM
Unif-BIC	0	4	96	0	1	99	0	0	100	0	0	100
Unif-EBIC	5	31	64	0	6	94	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0)	0	94	6	0	14	86	0	0	100	0	0	100
E-DBBC (0)	0	99	1	0	27	73	0	0	100	0	0	100
GE-DBBC (0)	0	98	2	0	21	79	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0.001)	0	94	6	0	18	82	0	0	100	0	0	100
E-DBBC (0.001)	0	99	1	0	42	58	0	0	100	0	0	100
GE-DBBC (0.001)	0	98	2	0	25	75	0	0	100	0	0	100
DBBC (0.01)	0	92	8	0	84	16	0	39	61	0	12	88
E-DBBC (0.01)	2	96	2	0	99	1	0	70	30	1	46	53
GE-DBBC (0.01)	0	98	2	0	98	2	0	70	30	0	42	58
DBBC (0.1)	0	87	13	0	86	14	0	85	15	0	85	15
E-DBBC (0.1)	0	98	2	0	99	1	0	98	2	0	98	2
GE-DBBC (0.1)	0	97	3	0	99	1	0	98	2	0	96	4
DBBC (0.25)	0	81	19	0	84	16	0	81	19	0	82	18
E-DBBC (0.25)	1	97	2	1	97	2	5	94	1	0	97	3
GE-DBBC (0.25)	0	98	2	0	98	2	0	99	1	0	96	4
DBBC (0.5)	3	90	7	4	80	16	3	85	12	2	85	13
E-DBBC (0.5)	16	84	0	18	82	0	18	81	1	20	78	2
GE-DBBC (0.5)	2	97	1	2	97	1	2	97	1	3	92	5
DBBC (0.75)	9	89	2	10	83	7	11	76	13	14	78	8
E-DBBC (0.75)	39	61	0	52	48	0	45	55	0	43	55	2
GE-DBBC (0.75)	11	89	0	17	82	1	16	82	2	27	72	1
DBBC (1)	24	76	0	27	70	3	29	67	4	33	62	5
E-DBBC (1)	60	40	0	56	44	0	59	40	1	66	33	1
GE-DBBC (1)	42	58	0	40	59	1	49	50	1	58	41	1

Funding

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers JP20K19753, JP23K11007, JP23K01333, JP23H04474, JP23H00466, JP22H01139, and JST Mirai Program Grant Number JPMJMI18A2, Japan.

References

- [1] Hirotugu Akaike. A new look at the statistical model identification. *IEEE transactions on automatic control*, 19(6):716–723, 1974.
- [2] Marco Avella-Medina. Influence functions for penalized M-estimators. *Bernoulli*, 23(4B):3178–3196, 2017.
- [3] G Avlogiaris, AC Micheas, and K Zografos. A criterion for local model selection. *Sankhya A*, 81:406–444, 2019.
- [4] Narayanaswamy Balakrishnan, Elena Castilla, Nirian Martín, and Leandro Pardo. Robust inference for one-shot device testing data under Weibull lifetime model. *IEEE transactions on Reliability*, 69(3):937–953, 2019.
- [5] Sancharee Basak, Ayanendranath Basu, and MC Jones. On the ‘optimal’ density power divergence tuning parameter. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 48(3):536–556, 2021.
- [6] Ayanendranath Basu, Abhik Ghosh, María Jaenada, and Leandro Pardo. Robust adaptive Lasso in high-dimensional logistic regression with an application to genomic classification of cancer patients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.03028*, 2021.
- [7] Ayanendranath Basu, Abhik Ghosh, Abhijit Mandal, Nirian Martín, and Leandro Pardo. A Wald-type test statistic for testing linear hypothesis in logistic regression models based on minimum density power divergence estimator. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 11(2):2741–2772, 2017.
- [8] Ayanendranath Basu, Ian R Harris, Nils L Hjort, and MC Jones. Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, 85(3):549–559, 1998.
- [9] Dimitris Bertsimas, Angela King, and Rahul Mazumder. Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):813–852, 2016.
- [10] Hamparsum Bozdogan. Model selection and Akaike’s information criterion (AIC): The general theory and its analytical extensions. *Psychometrika*, 52(3):345–370, 1987.
- [11] Arindam Chatterjee and Soumendra N Lahiri. Rates of convergence of the adaptive LASSO estimators to the oracle distribution and higher order refinements by the bootstrap. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(3):1232–1259, 2013.
- [12] Jiahua Chen and Zehua Chen. Extended bayesian information criteria for model selection with large model spaces. *Biometrika*, 95(3):759–771, 2008.

- [13] Jiahua Chen and Zehua Chen. Extended BIC for small- n -large- P sparse GLM. *Statistica Sinica*, 22(2):555–574, 2012.
- [14] Jianqing Fan, Yingying Fan, and Emre Barut. Adaptive robust variable selection. *Annals of statistics*, 42(1):324, 2014.
- [15] Jianqing Fan and Runze Li. Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 96(456):1348–1360, 2001.
- [16] Jianqing Fan, Runze Li, Cun-Hui Zhang, and Hui Zou. *Statistical foundations of data science*. CRC press, Boca Raton, USA, 2020.
- [17] Yingying Fan and Cheng Yong Tang. Tuning parameter selection in high dimensional penalized likelihood. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 75(3):531–552, 2013.
- [18] Ildiko E Frank and Jerome H Friedman. A statistical view of some chemometrics regression tools. *Technometrics*, 35(2):109–135, 1993.
- [19] Yasunori Fujikoshi and Kenichi Satoh. Modified AIC and Cp in multivariate linear regression. *Biometrika*, 84(3):707–716, 1997.
- [20] Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu. Robust estimation for independent non-homogeneous observations using density power divergence with applications to linear regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7(1):2420–2456, 2013.
- [21] Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu. Robust estimation for non-homogeneous data and the selection of the optimal tuning parameter: The density power divergence approach. *Journal of Applied Statistics*, 42(9):2056–2072, 2015.
- [22] Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu. Robust Bayes estimation using the density power divergence. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 68(2):413–437, 2016.
- [23] Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu. Robust estimation in generalized linear models: The density power divergence approach. *Test*, 25(2):269–290, 2016.
- [24] Abhik Ghosh, María Jaenada, and Leandro Pardo. Robust adaptive variable selection in ultra-high dimensional linear regression models. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 94(3):571–603, 2024.
- [25] Frank R Hampel, Elvezio M Ronchetti, Peter J Rousseeuw, and Werner A Stahel. *Robust statistics: The approach based on influence functions*. John Wiley & Sons, New York, USA, 1986.
- [26] David Harrison Jr and Daniel L Rubinfeld. Hedonic housing prices and the demand for clean air. *Journal of environmental economics and management*, 5(1):81–102, 1978.

- [27] Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Ryan Tibshirani. Best subset, forward stepwise or lasso? Analysis and recommendations based on extensive comparisons. *Statistical Science*, 35(4):579–592, 2020.
- [28] Kei Hirose and Sadanori Konishi. Variable selection via the weighted group lasso for factor analysis models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 40(2):345–361, 2012.
- [29] Jian Huang, Shuangge Ma, and Cun-Hui Zhang. Adaptive Lasso for sparse high-dimensional regression models. *Statistica Sinica*, 18(4):1603–1618, 2008.
- [30] Francis KC Hui, David I Warton, and Scott D Foster. Tuning parameter selection for the adaptive lasso using ERIC. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(509):262–269, 2015.
- [31] MC Jones, Nils Lid Hjort, Ian R Harris, and Ayanendranath Basu. A comparison of related density-based minimum divergence estimators. *Biometrika*, 88(3):865–873, 2001.
- [32] Robert E Kass, Luke Tierney, and Joseph B Kadane. The validity of posterior expansions based on Laplace’s method. In S Geisser, JS Hodges, SJ Press, and A Zellner, editors, *Bayesian and likelihood methods in statistics and econometrics: Essays in honor of George A. Barnard*, pages 473–487. North Holland, Amsterdam, Nederland, 1990.
- [33] Sadanori Konishi, Tomohiro Ando, and Seiya Imoto. Bayesian information criteria and smoothing parameter selection in radial basis function networks. *Biometrika*, 91(1):27–43, 2004.
- [34] Sadanori Konishi and Genshiro Kitagawa. Generalised information criteria in model selection. *Biometrika*, 83(4):875–890, 1996.
- [35] Solomon Kullback and Richard A Leibler. On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(1):79–86, 1951.
- [36] Sumito Kurata. On robustness of model selection criteria based on divergence measures: Generalizations of BHHJ divergence-based method and comparison. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 53(10):3499–3516, 2024.
- [37] Sumito Kurata and Etsuo Hamada. A robust generalization and asymptotic properties of the model selection criterion family. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 47(3):532–547, 2018.
- [38] Sumito Kurata and Etsuo Hamada. A discrete probabilistic model for analyzing pairwise comparison matrices. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 48(15):3801–3815, 2019.
- [39] Sumito Kurata and Etsuo Hamada. On the consistency and the robustness in model selection criteria. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 49(21):5175–5195, 2020.

- [40] Avijit Maji, Abhik Ghosh, Ayanendranath Basu, and Leandro Pardo. Robust statistical inference based on the C-divergence family. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 71(5):1289–1322, 2019.
- [41] Panagiotis Mantalos, Kyriacos Mattheou, and Alex Karagrigoriou. An improved divergence information criterion for the determination of the order of an AR process. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 39(5):865–879, 2010.
- [42] Yoshiyuki Ninomiya and Shuichi Kawano. AIC for the Lasso in generalized linear models. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 10(2):2537–2560, 2016.
- [43] Ryuei Nishii. Asymptotic properties of criteria for selection of variables in multiple regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 12(2):758–765, 1984.
- [44] Ulrike Schneider and Martin Wagner. Catching growth determinants with the adaptive lasso. *German Economic Review*, 13(1):71–85, 2012.
- [45] Gideon Schwarz. Estimating the dimension of a model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 6(2):461–464, 1978.
- [46] Ritei Shibata. Statistical aspects of model selection. In Jan C Willems, editor, *From data to model*, pages 215–240. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Germany, 1989.
- [47] Nariaki Sugiura. Further analysis of the data by Akaike’s information criterion and the finite corrections. *Communications in Statistics-theory and Methods*, 7(1):13–26, 1978.
- [48] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
- [49] Yuta Umezu, Yusuke Shimizu, Hiroki Masuda, and Yoshiyuki Ninomiya. AIC for the non-concave penalized likelihood method. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 71(2):247–274, 2019.
- [50] Filia Vonta, Kyriacos Mattheou, and Alex Karagrigoriou. On properties of the (Φ, a) -power divergence family with applications in goodness of fit tests. *Methodology and Computing in Applied Probability*, 14(2):335–356, 2012.
- [51] Jens Wager and Holger Dette. Bridge estimators and the adaptive lasso under heteroscedasticity. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 21:109–126, 2012.
- [52] Jane Warwick and MC Jones. Choosing a robustness tuning parameter. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation*, 75(7):581–588, 2005.
- [53] Hui Zou. The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(476):1418–1429, 2006.
- [54] Hui Zou and Trevor Hastie. Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 67(2):301–320, 2005.