

A convex formulation of covariate-adjusted Gaussian graphical models via natural parametrization

Ruobin Liu and Guo Yu

Department of Statistics and Applied Probability, University of California, Santa Barbara, Santa Barbara, CA, USA

October 10, 2024

Abstract

Gaussian graphical models (GGMs) are widely used for recovering the conditional independence structure among random variables. Recently, several key advances have been made to exploit an additional set of variables for better estimating the GGMs of the variables of interest. For example, in co-expression quantitative trait locus (eQTL) studies, both the mean expression level of genes as well as their pairwise conditional independence structure may be adjusted by genetic variants local to those genes. Existing methods to estimate covariate-adjusted GGMs either allow only the mean to depend on covariates or suffer from poor scaling assumptions due to the inherent non-convexity of simultaneously estimating the mean and precision matrix. In this paper, we propose a convex formulation that jointly estimates the covariate-adjusted mean and precision matrix by utilizing the natural parametrization of the multivariate Gaussian likelihood. This convexity yields theoretically better performance as the sparsity and dimension of the covariates grow large relative to the number of samples. We verify our theoretical results with numerical simulations and perform a reanalysis of an eQTL study of glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), an aggressive form of brain cancer.

1 Introduction

Graphical models are used to represent the distribution of a random vector $\mathbf{X} = (X_1, \dots, X_p)$ by relating its conditional independence structure to a graph. This correspondence is particularly salient when \mathbf{X} is Gaussian. Letting $\Omega = \Sigma^{-1}$ be the precision matrix of a Gaussian random vector \mathbf{X} , for $i \neq j$, the components X_i and X_j are conditionally independent given $\mathbf{X}_{\{1, \dots, p\} \setminus \{i, j\}}$ if and only if $\Omega_{ij} = 0$ [Lauritzen, 1996]. Models that estimate the conditional independence structure by imposing sparsity on Ω are known as Gaussian graphical models (GGMs).

There has been considerable research on GGMs and their estimation in the high-dimensional setting [Yuan and Lin, 2007, Friedman et al., 2007, Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006]. GGMs find major applications in genomics where the network structure of genes is of interest. Such a setting is typically high-dimensional such that the number of genes exceeds the number of samples [Schäfer and Strimmer, 2005]. Of particular interest in genomics are co-expression quantitative trait locus (eQTL) studies. In these studies, gene expression data are analyzed alongside information about

external genetic markers that are known to confound the expression levels of genes. In order to use GGMs for eQTL studies, one must allow the GGM framework to incorporate covariate information.

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be the vector of responses and $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ the associated vector of covariates. We consider a general model

$$\mathbf{X} | \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{u} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{u}), \boldsymbol{\Omega}^{-1}(\mathbf{u})) \quad (1)$$

and a specification given by

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathbf{u}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{B}_0. \quad (2)$$

Note that in this specification, the error covariance matrix does not depend on covariates. Multivariate regression models specify (2) with the goal to improve estimation of $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ by also estimating \mathbf{B}_0 ; see for example Yuan et al. [2007] and references therein for this well-studied setting. By contrast, the focus of the covariate-adjusted GGM framework is to estimate the sparsity pattern of the precision matrix while accounting for covariate information through \mathbf{B}_0 . Several methods exist in this framework that employ sparse penalization to the negative log-likelihood of (1) [Rothman et al., 2010, Yin and Li, 2011, Cai et al., 2013, Chen et al., 2016, Wang, 2015, Chen et al., 2018]. These models also are termed “conditional Gaussian graphical models” in Yin and Li [2011].

Estimating (1) with (2) is challenging because the negative log-likelihood of (1) is not jointly convex in $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ and \mathbf{B}_0 . Therefore, covariate-adjusted GGM methods use either alternating [Rothman et al., 2010, Yin and Li, 2011, Chen et al., 2018] or two-stage [Cai et al., 2013, Chen et al., 2016] estimation algorithms. Despite these challenges, minimax-optimal error rates in jointly estimating (2) have been established [Chen et al., 2018, Lv et al., 2022].

Although there has been progress in allowing heterogeneous means in GGMs, there is little work on allowing the graph structure of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ to also depend on covariates; indeed the aforementioned methods all assume that \mathbf{B}_0 is fixed across subjects. Yet subject-specific graph structures are plausible in applications such as eQTL analyses. For example, gene C may mediate the co-expression of genes A and B, but only in the presence of a single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) local to gene C. In other words, the expression of genes A and B may be conditionally independent given the rest of the network unless a genetic variant is present near gene C [Fehrmann et al., 2011, Kolberg et al., 2020, Rockman and Kruglyak, 2006]. To capture this additional structure, Zhang and Li [2022] extends (2) to allow both the mean and the network structure of the responses to be adjusted by covariates. Their model specifies (1) by taking

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathbf{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Gamma}\mathbf{u}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Omega}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{B}_0 + \sum_{h=1}^q \mathbf{B}_h u_h \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{B}_h , $h = 0, 1, \dots, q$ are sparse, symmetric matrices. Like previous works in covariate-adjusted GGMs, the joint estimation of the parameters $(\boldsymbol{\Gamma}, \mathbf{B}_0, \mathbf{B}_1, \dots, \mathbf{B}_h)$ in (3) involves a non-jointly-convex objective. Therefore Zhang and Li [2022] use a two-stage estimation procedure like in preceding methods.

In this work, we contribute a jointly convex formulation of (1) such that both the mean and the graph structure may depend on covariates. Like Zhang and Li [2022], our method uses nodewise regression to estimate the covariate-adjusted graph structure [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006]. However, we base our formulation upon a natural parametrization of the multivariate Gaussian likelihood such that each nodewise regression is a convex optimization problem.

1.1 Previous work

Our method is inspired by the penalized likelihood-based method of Zhang and Li [2022]. Bayesian approaches to subject-level precision matrix adjustment have been considered before. In Niu et al. [2024], a Bayesian method is developed where a discrete set of precision matrices $\Omega_1, \dots, \Omega_K$ is determined for a partition of n samples into K sets, with the partition depending on external covariates. However, this approach does not immediately allow for a covariate-adjusted mean, nor is it easy to interpret how each covariate affects the overall graph structure through the Ω_i . Wang et al. [2022] develops a Bayesian approach to solve similar nodewise regression problems as Zhang and Li [2022], utilizing sparsity-inducing priors to estimate the sparse component matrices. Their method also does not allow a covariate-adjusted mean, nor does it identify group structures.

Convex formulations of covariate-adjusted GGMs have been proposed before. Wang [2015] remarks on the non-convex nature of existing covariate-adjusted GGM methods and suggests a convex formulation of (1) with (2). However, their method achieves convexity by relying on an initial estimate of Γ , thereby placing it in the category of two-stage methods. A related line of work is the conditional Gaussian random field, which is also sometimes called the conditional Gaussian graphical model [Sohn and Kim, 2012, Yuan and Zhang, 2014]. This class of methods investigates estimating a sparse \mathbf{B}_0 in (1) and (2) by penalizing a convex negative log-likelihood. This parametrization is made possible by the additional assumption that (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{U}) is jointly Gaussian. In Zhu [2020], the matrix Γ in (2) is written as $\Gamma = \tilde{\Gamma}\Omega$ leading to a negative log-likelihood of \mathbf{X} that is jointly convex in $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and Ω . However, their method does not immediately allow for covariate-adjusted network structures.

Our proposed method differs from these works as it allows both the mean and the precision matrix to depend on external covariates while also offering the advantage of solving a convex optimization problem.

1.2 Outline

We recall the Gaussian graphical regression framework of Zhang and Li [2022] and motivate the natural parametrization in Section 2. In Section 3 we provide the model specification and algorithm to induce a sparse-group structure in the graph. Our theoretical results are discussed in Section 4, namely that the natural parametrization allows for better theoretical scaling of p and q relative to n under the same assumptions as in Zhang and Li [2022]. This is demonstrated through extensive simulations in Section 5. Finally we apply our method to perform a reanalysis of data from glioblastoma microforme (GBM) tissue samples in Section 6.

2 Parametrizations for Covariate-adjusted Graphical Models

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be a random vector of responses and $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ the corresponding covariates. In Zhang and Li [2022], the dependence of \mathbf{X} on \mathbf{U} is given by (1) and (3) so that both the mean and precision matrix are covariate-dependent. Write $\Gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^\top$ and let $\Omega_{jk}(\mathbf{u})$ denote the (j, k) -th element of $\Omega(\mathbf{u})$, keeping in mind its dependence on \mathbf{u} . Then (3) may be estimated via a neighborhood regression method [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006], which amounts to

estimating p separate linear regression models of the form

$$X_j = \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j + \sum_{k \neq j}^p \beta_{jk0} (X_k - \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k) + \sum_{k \neq j}^p \sum_{h=1}^q \beta_{jkh} u_h (X_k - \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k) + \varepsilon_j \quad (4)$$

where $\beta_{jkh} = -[\mathbf{B}_h]_{jk}/\Omega_{jj}$ and $\varepsilon_j \sim N(0, 1/\Omega_{jj})$ for all j, k , and h . This is termed *Gaussian graphical regression* in Zhang and Li [2022].

Note that a least squares criterion based on (4) is not jointly convex owing to the cross term $\beta_{jkh} \times \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_k$. Hence, Zhang and Li [2022] uses a two-stage estimation method. First, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ is estimated for all j via the model

$$X_j = \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j + \xi_j, \quad \mathbb{E} \xi_j = 0, \quad (5)$$

and ℓ_1 penalization is added so that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j$ is sparse. Second, the observed response vectors \mathbf{x}_j are centered using $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j$ and the coefficients β_{jkh} in (4) are estimated with $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}_j$ in place of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ for all $j \in [p]$. As with other two-stage methods, the above procedure incurs an estimation error in the first stage because (5) ignores the dependence on the β_{jkh} terms in (4). Assumptions on the scaling of the ambient dimensions p and q and the sparsity of the coefficient vectors are needed to suppress the model misspecification errors. Next, we will present a formulation of (1) so that the corresponding least squares criterion is convex, obviating the need for a two-stage procedure.

2.1 Convex formulation

Recall the form of the p -dimensional multivariate Gaussian likelihood expressed in terms of the natural parameters $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})$ where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}} = \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} = -\boldsymbol{\Omega}$:

$$L(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} | \mathbf{x}) = \exp \left\{ \tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\top \mathbf{x} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} \mathbf{x} - A(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}}) \right\}.$$

Our formulation is motivated by the fact that the cumulant function A is jointly convex in $(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}})$ and therefore so is $-\log L(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\theta}}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\Theta}} | \mathbf{x})$. Define

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = \text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega} \boldsymbol{\mu} \quad \text{and} \quad \boldsymbol{\Theta} = -\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Omega}, \quad (6)$$

where $\text{diag}(\boldsymbol{\Omega})$ is the $p \times p$ diagonal matrix of $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$. Our model is to incorporate covariates as in (3) to $(\boldsymbol{\theta}, \boldsymbol{\Theta})$ instead of $(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \boldsymbol{\Omega})$, namely

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}(\mathbf{u}) = \boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathbf{u}, \quad \boldsymbol{\Theta}(\mathbf{u}) = \mathbf{B}_0 + \sum_{h=1}^q \mathbf{B}_h u_h. \quad (7)$$

To see that this leads to jointly convex nodewise regression problems, fix $j \in [p]$ and consider the partial regression of component X_j against the covariates \mathbf{U} and the remaining components \mathbf{X}_{-j} in the general setting (1). For a matrix \mathbf{M} and sets of indices \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} , denote by $\mathbf{M}_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$ the sub-matrix of \mathbf{M} consisting of rows indexed by \mathcal{I} and columns indexed by \mathcal{J} . Letting $-j$ indicate all indices excluding j , we have the conditional distribution

$$X_j - \mu_j | \mathbf{X}_{-j}, \mathbf{U} \sim N(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j,-j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{-j,-j}^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_{-j} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{-j}), \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{jj} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{j,-j} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{-j,-j}^{-1} \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{-j,j}), \quad (8)$$

suppressing the dependence of Σ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ on the covariates \mathbf{u} for notational convenience. Defining the error terms $\varepsilon_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2)$ where $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2 = 1/\Omega_{jj}$, by the matrix block inversion formula we may write (8) as the linear model

$$X_j = \mu_j - \Omega_{jj}^{-1} \Omega_{j,-j} (\mathbf{X}_{-j} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_{-j}) + \varepsilon_j = \theta_j + \Theta_{j,-j} \mathbf{X}_{-j} + \varepsilon_j,$$

which is readily seen to be jointly convex in the parameters θ_j and $\Theta_{j,-j}$ as defined in (6). In light of the specification of covariate dependence (7) and with $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^\top$ and $\beta_{jkh} = [\mathbf{B}_h]_{jk}$, the above leads to the nodewise regression model

$$X_j = \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j + \sum_{k \neq j}^p \beta_{jk0} X_k + \sum_{k \neq j}^p \sum_{h=1}^q \beta_{jkh} u_h X_k + \varepsilon_j, \quad \varepsilon_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2) \quad (9)$$

which allows for simultaneous estimation of the parameters $\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j$ and β_{jkh} in a jointly convex setting.

Implicit in (6) is that $\Theta_{jj} = -1$ for all $j \in [p]$. This is satisfied in (7) by letting $[\mathbf{B}_0]_{jj} = -1$ and $[\mathbf{B}_h]_{jj} = 0$ for all $h \in [q]$ and $j \in [p]$. By doing so, we assume as in Zhang and Li [2022] that the residual variance $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ is not covariate-dependent, allowing us to write $\Omega_{jj} = \Omega_{jj}(\mathbf{u})$ for $j \in [p]$.

3 Estimation

Suppose we collect n independent observations $\{(\mathbf{x}^{(i)}, \mathbf{u}^{(i)})\}_{i=1}^n$ of responses and covariates that follow the joint distribution in (1) with (6) and (7). Let $\mathbf{U} = [\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{u}^{(n)}]^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ be the matrix of covariates and $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}^{(n)}]^\top$ the matrix of responses with $\mathbf{x}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denoting the j -th column of \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{u}_j \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the j -th column of \mathbf{U} . For $j \in [p]$, let \mathbf{W}_{-j} be the $n \times (p-1)(q+1)$ matrix of interactions of the remaining responses with the covariates. Concretely,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_{-j,0} &= [\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1}, \mathbf{x}_{j+1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p-1)}, \\ \mathbf{W}_{-j,h} &= [\mathbf{x}_1 \odot \mathbf{u}_h, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{j-1} \odot \mathbf{u}_h, \mathbf{x}_{j+1} \odot \mathbf{u}_h, \dots, \mathbf{x}_p \odot \mathbf{u}_h] \text{ for } h \in [q], \\ \mathbf{W}_{-j} &= [\mathbf{W}_{-j,0}, \mathbf{W}_{-j,1}, \dots, \mathbf{W}_{-j,q}] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p-1)(q+1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where \odot denotes the elementwise product of two vectors. By writing

$$\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,h} = (\beta_{j1h}, \dots, \beta_{j,j-1,h}, \beta_{j,j+1,h}, \dots, \beta_{jph})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1} \text{ and } \boldsymbol{\beta}_j = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,0}, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,q})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{(p-1)(q+1)},$$

we can view $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ as $q+1$ blocks of $(p-1)$ -element vectors $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,h}$ for $h = \{0, 1, \dots, q\}$ so that (9) may be written in the block form

$$X_j = \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j + \mathbf{X}_{-j}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,0} + \sum_{h=1}^q (u_h \mathbf{X}_{-j})^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,h} + \varepsilon_j, \quad \varepsilon_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2). \quad (11)$$

Figure 1 relates the blocks $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{j,h}$ to Θ in (7).

The joint convexity of (11) in $(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_j)$ allows for simultaneous estimation of the penalized problem

$$\underset{\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_j}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U} \boldsymbol{\gamma}_j - \mathbf{W}_{-j} \boldsymbol{\beta}_j\|_2^2 + g_j(\boldsymbol{\gamma}_j, \boldsymbol{\beta}_j) \quad (12)$$

where g_j is an arbitrary convex penalty function. Moreover, by the relationship between $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j$ and rows of Θ , sparsity-inducing penalties g_j in (12) will give us sparse estimates of Θ . From (6), we see that Θ has the same sparsity pattern as Ω . Hence we keep the conditional independence interpretation of the sparsity in Θ as in Ω .

$$\Theta = \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{\beta_{j,0}} + u_1 \times \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{\beta_{j,1}} + \dots + u_q \times \underbrace{\hspace{1.5cm}}_{\beta_{j,q}}$$

\mathbf{B}_0

\mathbf{B}_1

\mathbf{B}_q

Figure 1: Decomposition of Θ into components \mathbf{B}_h according to (7). The block $\beta_{j,h}$ corresponds to the effects of covariate u_h on the partial correlations of response X_j while $\beta_{j,0}$ describes the population effect.

3.1 Estimating covariate-adjusted graphs

In the nodewise regression approach to GGMs, a symmetrization step is needed to ensure that the estimate of Ω is symmetric because each regression is fit independently [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006]. In our approach, the nodewise regressions target Θ , which is not necessarily symmetric due to the different scaling factor for each row in (6). To ensure symmetry in the estimate of Ω , we perform a similar symmetrization step after performing all nodewise regressions. First, specify an estimate $\hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ of the error variance in (11). Then for an estimate $\hat{\beta}_j$, set $\tilde{\beta}_j = -\hat{\beta}_j / \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ and define for all $h = 0, 1, \dots, q$ the symmetric matrix

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{jk} = [\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{kj} = \tilde{\beta}_{jkh} \left[|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| < |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}| \right] + \tilde{\beta}_{kjh} \left[|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| > |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}| \right], \quad (13)$$

where the expression $[P]$ is equal to 1 if P is true and 0 otherwise. The mean vector and precision matrix may then be estimated by (6) via

$$\hat{\Omega}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}) = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_0 + \sum_{h=1}^q \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h u_h^{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}) = (\hat{\Omega}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)}))^{-1} \text{diag}(\hat{\Omega}) \hat{\Gamma} \mathbf{u}^{(i)}. \quad (14)$$

The preceding steps are summarized in Algorithm 1 in Section S1.

Equation (13) is the “and-rule” to symmetrize the matrices $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h$ for $h = 0, 1, \dots, q$; $[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{jk}$ is nonzero if both $\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}$ are nonzero. A less conservative estimate would be given by the “or-rule”, namely

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{jk} = [\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{kj} = \tilde{\beta}_{jkh} \left[|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| \geq |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}| \right] + \tilde{\beta}_{kjh} \left[|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| \leq |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}| \right],$$

so that $[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{jk}$ is nonzero if either $\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}$ or $\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}$ is nonzero. We elect to use the more conservative rule and note that both approaches are asymptotically equivalent [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2006] and that the and-rule has been considered before in covariate-adjusted graphical models [Cai et al., 2013, Zhang and Li, 2022].

3.2 Sparsity structure

With the application to eQTL studies in mind, we will focus on a particular sparsity-inducing penalty g_j in (15). We wish to identify elementwise sparsity within a group h , amounting to sparsity in the coefficient vector $\beta_{j,h}$. We may interpret sparse entries in $\beta_{j,h}$ to mean that the covariate u_h affects the conditional independence between X_j and some, but not all other responses X_k .

Meanwhile, we wish to identify groupwise sparsity, where $\beta_{j,h} = \mathbf{0}$ for a group h . This means that u_h has no effect on the conditional independence between X_j and the other responses.

We consider the following convex problem:

$$\underset{\gamma_j, \beta_j}{\text{minimize}} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\gamma_j - \mathbf{W}_{-j}\beta_j\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\gamma_j\|_1 + \lambda \|\beta_j\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\beta_{j,-0}\|_{1,2} \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda \geq 0$ and $\lambda_g \geq 0$ are tuning parameters and $\|\beta_{j,-0}\|_{1,2} = \sum_{h=1}^q \|\beta_{j,h}\|_2$ is the group lasso penalty. Together, the penalty on β_j is the sparse-group lasso penalty developed in Simon et al. [2013]. The group lasso penalty is not applied $\beta_{j,0}$ nor to γ_j .

We considered the following two estimates of $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$,

$$\hat{\sigma}_1^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\gamma}_j - \mathbf{W}_{-j}\hat{\beta}_j\|_2^2}{n - \hat{s}_{\beta_j} - \hat{s}_{\gamma_j}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\sigma}_2^2 = \frac{\|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\gamma}_j - \mathbf{W}_{-j}\hat{\beta}_j\|_2^2}{n - \hat{s}_{\beta_j} - 1},$$

where \hat{s}_{γ_j} and \hat{s}_{β_j} are the number of nonzero elements of $\hat{\gamma}_j$ and $\hat{\beta}_j$. Following the lasso literature [Reid et al., 2016, Yu and Bien, 2019], a straightforward estimate is given by $\hat{\sigma}_1^2$ as the value $\hat{s}_{\beta_j} + \hat{s}_{\gamma_j}$ roughly approximates the degrees of freedom of (15). In our experimentation, we have found $\hat{\sigma}_2^2$ to be slightly more consistent.

3.3 Implementation

We use block coordinate descent to solve (15) where the blocks are given by $\{\gamma_j, \beta_{j,0}, \dots, \beta_{j,q}\}$. Since (15) is convex and separable in these blocks, this approach is guaranteed to converge to the optimal solution [Tseng, 2001]. Our R implementation uses the `sparsegl` package to solve (15) [Liang et al., 2024]. We use k -fold cross-validation to select the tuning parameter pair (λ, λ_g) . To do so, we set a parameter $\lambda_0 > 0$ and mixture parameter $\alpha_s \in [0, 1]$ so that the penalty in (15) may be written as

$$\alpha_s \lambda_0 (\|\gamma_j\|_1 + \|\beta_j\|_1) + (1 - \alpha_s) \lambda_0 \|\beta_{j,-0}\|_{1,2}. \quad (16)$$

Then for each α_s , we run the method on a path of λ_0 .

4 Theoretical Properties

In this section we will analyze the estimation error and support recovery of (15). For two sequences of real numbers a_n and b_n , we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if $a_n = O(b_n)$, i.e. there exists constants $C > 0$ and $N > 0$ so that $a_n < Cb_n$ for all $n \geq N$. If $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$, we write $a_n \asymp b_n$. We write $a_n = o(b_n)$ if $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} a_n/b_n = 0$. With the understanding that j is fixed, we will suppress the subscript j when referring to γ_j, β_j and ε_j for notational convenience.

Let $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta})$ be the solution to (15) and let (γ, β) be the true parameters. Denote by S_γ and S_β the support sets of γ and β respectively. Further let $S_{\beta,g}$ index the active groups of β , that is $S_{\beta,g} = \{h : \beta_{j,h} \neq \mathbf{0}, h \in [q]\}$. Denote by s_γ, s_β and $s_{\beta,g}$ the cardinalities of these sets. For a square matrix \mathbf{M} , denote by $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{M})$ and $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{M})$ its minimum and maximum eigenvalue, respectively.

We require the following assumptions on the model (1) with specification (7).

Assumption 1. The covariates $\{\mathbf{u}^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. mean zero random vectors with covariance matrix satisfying

$$\phi_0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)})) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}^{(i)})) \leq \phi_1$$

for some constants $0 < \phi_0 \leq \phi_1 < \infty$. Furthermore, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that $|\mathbf{u}_j^{(i)}| \leq M$ for all $j \in [q]$ and $i \in [n]$.

Assumption 1 is the same as Assumptions 1 and 5 in Zhang and Li [2022] without requiring a bound on $\|\beta\|_1$. The boundedness of the covariates is not restrictive in the eQTL setting since SNPs are often binary coded.

Denote by $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]$ the $n \times (p(q+1) - 1)$ matrix that is the concatenation of the covariate matrix \mathbf{U} with the interaction matrix \mathbf{W}_{-j} . Define the following Gram matrix of covariates, responses, and interactions:

$$\Sigma_{\mathbf{UW}} = \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]}{n} \right).$$

Our next assumption bounds the eigenvalues of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{UW}}$, which is needed to characterize the joint distribution of $\mathbf{u}^{(i)}$, $\mathbf{x}^{(i)}$, and their interactions.

Assumption 2. We assume there exist positive constants m_0, M_0 such that

$$m_0 \leq \lambda_{\min}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{UW}}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\Sigma_{\mathbf{UW}}) \leq M_0.$$

Elementwise boundedness in Assumption 1 implies that $\mathbf{u}^{(i)}$ is elementwise sub-Gaussian. Our theoretical analysis further requires that our design matrix $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]$ is elementwise sub-Gaussian. Assumption 3 ensures this since each entry of \mathbf{W}_{-j} is the product of a sub-Gaussian and a bounded random variable.

Assumption 3. The marginal distribution of \mathbf{X} is elementwise sub-Gaussian with bounded sub-Gaussian norm.

The following assumption controls how the sparsity of the true parameters may scale with the sample size n .

Assumption 4. Let p and q be the number of responses and covariates, respectively. The true sparsities s_γ and s_β satisfy

1. $(s_\gamma + s_\beta) \sqrt{\log(pq)} = o(\sqrt{n})$,
2. $(s_\gamma + s_\beta) \log(pq) = o(n/\log n)$.

In practice we consider estimates $(\hat{\gamma}, \hat{\beta})$ of varying sparsities and select from this pool of candidate models via cross-validation. Define \hat{s}_γ^{\max} and \hat{s}_β^{\max} to be the maximum sparsity of γ and β out of all candidate models, chosen so that $s_\gamma < \hat{s}_\gamma^{\max}$ and $s_\beta < \hat{s}_\beta^{\max}$. Our first theorem describes the ℓ_2 estimation error of the nodewise solution.

Theorem 1. Under Assumptions 1-4, with $(\hat{s}_\gamma^{\max} + \hat{s}_\beta^{\max}) \log(pq) = O(\sqrt{n})$, and with

$$\lambda = C \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep)}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} + \frac{s_{\beta,g}}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}) \right)^{1/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_g = \lambda \sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}} \quad (17)$$

we have

$$\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_2^2 + \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n} (s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g})).$$

with probability at least $1 - C_1 \exp\{-C_2(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))\}$ where C, C_1 , and C_2 are positive constants.

The bound on the sparsity of candidate models helps to bound the errors in Theorem 1 and is also assumed in Zhang and Li [2022].

Our second result proves that our method achieves support recovery with high probability under some additional conditions. Denote the (k, ℓ) -th entry of $\Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}$ by $\Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell)$.

Assumption 5. Define $\tau_j = 1 + \sqrt{(s_\gamma + s_\beta)/s_{\beta,g}}$. We assume that there exists a constant $c_0 > 2/m_0$ such that

$$\max_{k \neq \ell} |\Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell)| \leq \frac{1}{c_0(1 + 8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)}.$$

Theorem 2. Suppose Assumptions 1-5 hold. Additionally, suppose $\log p \asymp \log q$ and that

$$n \geq A_1 (s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))$$

for some constant $A_1 > 0$. Then with λ and λ_g defined as in Theorem 1, we have

$$\max\left\{\|\hat{\gamma} - \gamma\|_\infty, \|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_\infty\right\} \leq \frac{3}{m_0} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \left(1 + \frac{6(1 + 4\tau_j)^2}{(1 + 8\tau_j)(c_0 m_0 - 2)}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - C_3 \exp(-C_4 \log p)$ for some positive constants C_3, C_4 .

Theorem 2 implies that our method achieves support recovery with high probability if γ and β satisfy a minimal signal strength condition.

Corollary 1. Define

$$\kappa_0 = \frac{3}{m_0} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \left(1 + \frac{6(1 + 4\tau_j)^2}{(1 + 8\tau_j)(c_0 m_0 - 2)}\right),$$

$$\tilde{S}_\gamma = \{k : |\hat{\gamma}_k| > \kappa_0\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{S}_\beta = \{k : |\hat{\beta}_k| > \kappa_0\}.$$

If it holds that

$$\min\left\{\min_{\ell \in \tilde{S}_\gamma} |\gamma_\ell|, \min_{k \in \tilde{S}_\beta} |\beta_k|\right\} \geq 2\kappa_0,$$

we have that $\mathbb{P}(S_\gamma = \tilde{S}_\gamma \text{ and } S_\beta = \tilde{S}_\beta) \geq 1 - C_3 \exp(-C_4 \log p)$.

Zhang and Li [2022] provides two theorems related to the estimation error of $\hat{\beta}$; an *oracle* rate where the true Γ in (3) is known and a rate where $\hat{\Gamma}$ is estimated via independent regressions in stage 1 of the procedure. It is shown that the oracle rate, given by

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2}{n} (s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g})),$$

can be achieved by the two-stage rate under the assumptions $\log(pq) = O(n^{1/6})$, $s_\beta = o(n^{1/6})$, and $s_\gamma = o(n^{1/3})$. By comparison, Theorem 1 shows that our method achieves the oracle rate under milder assumptions; more explicitly, Assumption 4 is satisfied when $\log(pq) = O(n^{1/3})$ and $s_\gamma + s_\beta = o(n^{1/3})$. The milder scaling assumptions in $\log(pq)$ and s_β in our formulation stems from the fact that (15) is jointly convex in (γ, β) , allowing for their simultaneous estimation. By comparison, a more stringent scaling assumption is needed to control the estimation error of γ_j incurred in stage 1 of Zhang and Li [2022]. These comments apply as well to the support recovery results in Theorem 2.

5 Simulation Study

In this section, we compare our method *Covariate-adjusted Sparse Precision with Natural Estimation* (cspine) with the Gaussian graphical model regression method developed in Zhang and Li [2022] (RegGMM) under extensive simulations. We are interested in the behavior of the two methods under data generated according to both models.

For each simulation setting, we generate a sparse $\Gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$ by independently determining if Γ_{jk} is non-zero with probability 0.3. The non-zero entries are sampled from $N(0, 1)$. Then Γ is scaled by a constant to ensure that the signal-to-noise ratio is approximately 1 for each observation.

We generate the population graph \mathbf{B}_0 using a preferential attachment algorithm [Barabási and Albert, 1999] with power 1. We select $q_e = 5$ out of q covariates to have nonzero effects and generate the covariate-adjusted components \mathbf{B}_h for $h \in [q_e]$ as Erdős-Rényi graphs [Erdős and Rényi, 1959] with edge probability $v_e = 0.01$. This choice of graph structure ensures that the covariate-dependent graphs are more sparse than the population graph; see Clauset et al. [2009] in particular for a discussion of power law graph models in applications. After determining the graph structure, we generate entries in $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ by independently and uniformly sampling from $[-0.5, -0.35] \cup [0.35, 0.5]$ and then dividing each row j by $\sum_h \sum_{k \neq j} |\beta_{jkh}| \times 1.5$ before symmetrizing each $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ by taking the average of β_{jkh} and β_{kjh} . These steps help ensure a diagonally dominant precision matrix, and mirror the data model of Zhang and Li [2022].

We select half of the q covariates to be binary and half to be continuous from $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ and then standardize the continuous covariates across the n observations to have zero mean and unit variance. With Γ and $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ in hand, we generate a precision matrix $\Omega^{(i)} = \mathbf{B}_0 + \sum_{h=1}^q \mathbf{B}_h u_h^{(i)}$. Then we generate a dataset under the original model (3) by setting $\mu^{(i)} = \Gamma \mathbf{u}^{(i)}$ and a second dataset under (7), termed the “natural model”, via $\mu^{(i)} = \Sigma^{(i)} \Gamma \mathbf{u}^{(i)}$. Finally, we sample a vector of responses $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} \sim N_p(\mu^{(i)}, \Sigma^{(i)})$ for $i \in [n]$. In both models, we set $\text{diag}(\Omega^{(i)}) = 1$ so that $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2 = 1$.

For each of the settings $p = 25, q = 50$ and $p = 25, q = 100$, we generate 100 independent data sets of $n = 200$ and $n = 400$ samples and run both RegGMM and cspine on each data set. For a fair comparison, both methods have two tuning parameters selected via 5-fold cross-validation

on a path of 100 λ parameters and 10 mixture parameters. With the notation in (16), this means cross-validating over 100 values of λ_0 and $\alpha_s = 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1$.

We report the mean and standard error of the following metrics after applying (13): TPR, the true positive rate of detected edges across all $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$; TPR_{pop} , the true positive rate of detected edges in the population graph \mathbf{B}_0 ; FPR_{pop} , the false positive rate of detected edges in \mathbf{B}_0 ; TPR_{cov} , the true positive rate of detected edges in covariate graphs \mathbf{B}_h , $h \in [q]$; the nodewise estimation error given by $\beta_{\text{err}} = \sum_{j=1}^p \|\hat{\beta}_j - \beta_j\|_2$; and the average error of the estimated precision matrix given by $\Omega_{\text{err}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\Omega}^{(i)} - \Omega^{(i)}\|_{F,\text{off}}^2/n$, where the norm is taken over off-diagonal entries. The overall false positive rate of detected edges is less than 0.005 in all cases.

In Table 1, we see that `cspine` outperforms `RegGMM` under the natural model setting across all metrics. Table 2 compares the two methods under the setting (3) where `RegGMM` is correctly specified and `cspine` is misspecified. We see that despite the misspecification, `cspine` is competitive with `RegGMM` in edge detection and estimation error due to the convex formulation of the nodewise regressions. Both methods are conservative in their detection of edges in the covariate networks.

n	(p, q)	Method	TPR	TPR_{pop}	FPR_{pop}	TPR_{cov}	β_{err}	Ω_{err}
200	(25, 50)	<code>cspine</code>	0.73 (0.08)	0.89 (0.07)	0.07 (0.02)	0.45 (0.21)	5.66 (0.50)	1.09 (0.15)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.62 (0.09)	0.80 (0.10)	0.16 (0.06)	0.30 (0.18)	7.43 (0.61)	1.82 (0.26)
	(25, 100)	<code>cspine</code>	0.66 (0.10)	0.82 (0.09)	0.05 (0.02)	0.40 (0.24)	5.98 (0.55)	1.22 (0.17)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.55 (0.08)	0.71 (0.08)	0.14 (0.05)	0.28 (0.19)	7.73 (0.56)	1.95 (0.28)
400	(25, 50)	<code>cspine</code>	0.77 (0.10)	0.96 (0.04)	0.09 (0.02)	0.52 (0.24)	4.50 (0.59)	0.66 (0.08)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.67 (0.08)	0.86 (0.07)	0.17 (0.07)	0.41 (0.20)	5.99 (0.55)	1.22 (0.17)
	(25, 100)	<code>cspine</code>	0.72 (0.09)	0.94 (0.05)	0.08 (0.02)	0.44 (0.21)	4.96 (0.60)	0.76 (0.09)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.62 (0.08)	0.85 (0.08)	0.22 (0.07)	0.32 (0.17)	6.80 (0.58)	1.40 (0.20)

Table 1: Mean and standard error of performance metrics over 100 data sets.

n	(p, q)	Method	TPR	TPR_{pop}	FPR_{pop}	TPR_{cov}	β_{err}	Ω_{err}
200	(25, 50)	<code>cspine</code>	0.53 (0.06)	0.77 (0.08)	0.12 (0.02)	0.09 (0.10)	7.70 (0.29)	2.18 (0.24)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.50 (0.07)	0.70 (0.10)	0.14 (0.05)	0.12 (0.11)	8.02 (0.41)	2.20 (0.25)
	(25, 100)	<code>cspine</code>	0.44 (0.07)	0.67 (0.09)	0.09 (0.02)	0.04 (0.06)	7.97 (0.32)	2.43 (0.25)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.39 (0.07)	0.59 (0.12)	0.19 (0.07)	0.05 (0.06)	8.80 (0.45)	2.69 (0.32)
400	(25, 50)	<code>cspine</code>	0.60 (0.05)	0.92 (0.05)	0.18 (0.03)	0.12 (0.10)	6.71 (0.28)	1.54 (0.18)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.59 (0.07)	0.80 (0.10)	0.14 (0.05)	0.28 (0.15)	6.64 (0.42)	1.49 (0.19)
	(25, 100)	<code>cspine</code>	0.55 (0.06)	0.88 (0.07)	0.15 (0.02)	0.12 (0.10)	6.83 (0.26)	1.69 (0.22)
		<code>RegGMM</code>	0.55 (0.07)	0.81 (0.09)	0.22 (0.07)	0.19 (0.14)	7.15 (0.42)	1.69 (0.23)

Table 2: Performance metrics over 100 data sets under specification (3).

Next, we explore the error bound in Theorem 1 through simulations. We fixed $p = 25$, $q = 10$, and $n = 300$. In the first set of simulations, we fixed a collection $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ and generated 300 data sets from Γ matrices of varying sparsities. In the second set of simulations, we fixed a sparse Γ and generated data sets from 300 different collections of $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ with varying sparsity levels. In Figure 2, we plot the error $\gamma_{\text{err}} + \beta_{\text{err}}$ where $\gamma_{\text{err}} = \sum_{j=1}^p \|\hat{\gamma}_j - \gamma_j\|_2$ against the number of non-zero entries in Γ and $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$. The shape of the plot verifies the theoretical results of Section 4, that the ℓ_2 error scales with the square-root of the sparsity levels.




Figure 2: Estimation error of *cspine* over 300 data sets plotted against the number of non-zero entries in (a) Γ and (b) $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$. In both cases, the ℓ_2 estimation error bound increases at a rate that is roughly the square-root of the sparsity level.

6 GBM eQTL Reanalysis

Glioblastoma multiforme (GBM) is the most malignant type of brain cancer and patient prognosis is typically very poor. Although there has been research on the genetic signaling pathways involved in the proliferation of GBM, it remains largely incurable; see Hanif et al. [2017] for a survey. It is important to understand the conditional independence structure of genes involved in GBM in order to discover new drug therapies [Kwiatkowska et al., 2013]. Our estimated graphs describe the conditional independence of co-expressions in a gene network; hence, we refer to estimated networks and effects of SNPs on this network.

We reanalyze a GBM eQTL data set that was reported in Zhang and Li [2022]. The data set contains microarray and SNP profiling data of $n = 401$ GBM patients from the REMBRANDT trial (GSE108476) We use the expression levels of $p = 73$ genes known to belong to the human glioma pathway according to the Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) database [Kanehisa and Goto, 2000]; the genes and pathways are detailed in Table S3. We also consider $q = 118$ SNPs that are local to these 73 genes. The SNPs are binary-coded, with 0 indicating homozygous major alleles at that locus and 1 otherwise. Our data set is slightly different from the one used in Zhang and Li [2022]; we have a larger cohort size (compared to $n = 178$ in Zhang and Li 2022) and do not include age and sex as covariates.

We ran *cspine* on the data set using 5-fold cross-validation over $\alpha_s = 0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1$, and 100 values of λ_0 . Our method identified 56 SNPs that potentially modify expressions in the network. However, many of the identified edges in these networks have small weights. Since cross-validation tends to select dense models, we focus on interpreting those entries of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h\}$ above 0.005 in magnitude. With this threshold, 10 SNPs are estimated to have effects on the network; see Table S4.

We also ran RegGMM on the data set for comparison, using 5-fold cross-validation for a path of 100 λ parameters and 10 mixture parameters. RegGMM identified 16 SNPs with nonzero effects on

the network. However, similarly to *cspine*, many of the estimated edges have very small weights. We choose to threshold these edges as well.

Figure 3 shows the estimated population (covariate-independent) network from *cspine* and RegGMM. It can be seen that many estimated edges overlap and that *cspine* estimates a somewhat denser network. For example, SHC4 and CALML4 are highly connected nodes in both population networks.





Figure 3: Population network from GBM eQTL data estimated by *cspine* (left) and RegGMM (right). The graph structure is determined by the estimates of \mathbf{B}_0 in (3) and (7). Solid blue lines and dashed red lines indicate positive and negative edge weights, respectively.

Four SNPs are identified by RegGMM to affect the network of co-expressions. Out of the four, *rs1267622* is also identified by *cspine* to have a nonzero effect. It is interesting to look at the estimated effect of *rs1267622*, a variant of the BRAF gene, by the two methods, shown in Figure 4. The results from both methods suggest that this SNP may modify the co-expressions of PDGFRA and PDGFB as well as PDGFRA and SOS2. This is plausible since all three of these genes lie in the Ras-Raf-MEK-ERK pathway along with BRAF (Table S3). There is evidence that variants on this pathway are associated with the proliferation of certain cancers [Gonzalez-Hormazabal et al., 2019]. Beyond this, the two methods differ; *cspine* estimates this variant to modify the co-expressions of GADD45A and GADD45B while RegGMM suggests that the co-expressions of PDGFRA and CAMK1 are modified.

We now focus on the connections between four genes in particular, namely PIK3CA, CALML5, E2F1, and E2F3. PIK3CA is one of the most highly mutated oncogenes in a variety of cancers and resides in the PI3K/Akt/mTOR signaling pathway [Samuels and Velculescu, 2004]. CALML5 is a calcium-binding protein that is part of the calcium (Ca^{+2}) signaling pathway, which is known to have diverse roles in explaining GBM biology and is a topic of active research [Azab et al., 2020, Cheng et al., 2021]. E2F1 and E2F3 are oncogenic transcription factors. The over-expression of

Effect of variant rs1267622 - cspline



Effect of variant rs1267622 - RegGMM




Figure 4: Estimated covariate networks for the SNP rs1267622, a variant local to the BRAF gene. The graph structure corresponds to the sparsity pattern of the matrix \mathbf{B}_h corresponding to this SNP in (3) and (7). Solid blue lines and dashed red lines indicate positive and negative effects of this SNP on the partial correlation of co-expressions. An effect on the co-expression of GADD45A and GADD45B is detected by cspline while RegGMM detects an effect between PDGFRA and SOS2. The remaining two edges, between PDGFRA and PDGFBA and PDGFRA and SOS2, are detected by both methods.

E2F3 is known to be vital in the development of various types of cancers including GBM [Zhang et al., 2019, Wu et al., 2021, Feng et al., 2018].

The estimated connections among these four genes in the population network are shown in Figure 5. While RegGMM and *cspine* detect mostly the same edges in the population, only *cspine* finds that these co-expressions are modified by the presence of SNPs. These effects are summarized in Figure 5 (*right*). For instance, it is estimated that a variant local to the CALML4 gene may mediate the induction of the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway by expressions in E2F1. PIK3CA and E2F1 are part of interconnected signaling pathways implicated in cancer progression; E2F1 is involved in regulating the expression of PIK3CA and downstream signaling components [Ladu et al., 2008]. Hence, this discovery may give a clue for the role of CALML4 on regulating this pathway.




Figure 5: Estimated population network from *cspine* (*left*) and RegGMM (*middle*) highlighting four select genes. An edge indicates the partial correlation between the expressions of two genes conditional on the rest of the network (not shown). *Right*: the estimated effect of SNPs on co-expressions among the selected genes according to *cspine*. The gene to which the SNP is local is given in parentheses. Solid blue lines and dashed red lines indicate positive and negative edges, respectively. RegGMM did not detected any effects of SNPs on these co-expressions.

7 Discussion

In this work, we contributed to the covariate-adjusted Gaussian graphical model literature by developing a framework allowing for jointly convex optimization of the mean and precision matrix. Our theoretical work implies that the convex formulation allows for more relaxed scaling assumptions in the sparsities of β_j in relation to the sample size n and this is confirmed by our simulation results. Our method relies on tuning the pair (α_s, λ_0) over a grid as described in 3.3, which may be too computationally intensive for large datasets. If the practitioner has preconceptions about how many covariates are relevant in explaining the network structure of the responses, he may fix α_s to specify a desired group sparsity level. Alternatively, adapting tuning-free methods such as the square-root lasso [Belloni et al., 2011] to our method would be an important contribution for large datasets. A direction for theoretical work would be to establish the minimax rate of (15). Although our estimator achieves the same rate as in Zhang and Li [2022],

the optimality of this rate has yet to be established. Our R package `cspine` is available on GitHub¹.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Emma Zhang for generously making the RegGMM software and GBM eQTL data set available to us.

Use was made of computational facilities purchased with funds from the National Science Foundation (CNS-1725797) and administered by the Center for Scientific Computing (CSC). The CSC is supported by the California NanoSystems Institute and the Materials Research Science and Engineering Center (MRSEC; NSF DMR 2308708) at UC Santa Barbara.

References

- Steffen L. Lauritzen. *Graphical Models*. Oxford University Press, 1996. ISBN 0-19-852219-3.
- Ming Yuan and Yi Lin. Model selection and estimation in the gaussian graphical model. *Biometrika*, 94(1):19–35, 2007. ISSN 00063444, 14643510. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20441351>.
- Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441, 12 2007. ISSN 1465-4644. doi: 10.1093/biostatistics/kxm045. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/biostatistics/kxm045>.
- Nicolai Meinshausen and Peter Bühlmann. High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the Lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(3):1436 – 1462, 2006. doi: 10.1214/009053606000000281. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/009053606000000281>.
- Juliane Schäfer and Korbinian Strimmer. A shrinkage approach to large-scale covariance matrix estimation and implications for functional genomics. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 4(1), 2005. doi: doi:10.2202/1544-6115.1175. URL <https://doi.org/10.2202/1544-6115.1175>.
- Ming Yuan, Ali Ekici, Zhaosong Lu, and Renato Monteiro. Dimension reduction and coefficient estimation in multivariate linear regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69(3):329–346, 2007. ISSN 13697412, 14679868.
- Adam J. Rothman, Elizaveta Levina, and Ji Zhu. Sparse multivariate regression with covariance estimation. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 19(4):947–962, 2010. ISSN 10618600. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25765382>.
- Jianxin Yin and Hongzhe Li. A sparse conditional gaussian graphical model for analysis of genetical genomics data. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5(4):2630–2650, 2011. ISSN 19326157, 19417330. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23069344>.

¹<https://github.com/roobnloo/cspine>

- T. Tony Cai, Hongzhe Li, Weidong Liu, and Jichun Xie. Covariate-adjusted precision matrix estimation with an application in genetical genomics. *Biometrika*, 100(1):139–156, 2013. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43304542>.
- Mengjie Chen, Zhao Ren, Hongyu Zhao, and Harrison Zhou. Asymptotically normal and efficient estimation of covariate-adjusted gaussian graphical model. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(513):394–406, 2016. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2015.1010039.
- Junhui Wang. Joint Estimation of Sparse Multivariate Regression and Conditional Graphical Models. *Statistica Sinica*, 25(3):831–851, 2015. ISSN 1017-0405. Publisher: Institute of Statistical Science, Academia Sinica.
- Jinghui Chen, Pan Xu, Lingxiao Wang, Jian Ma, and Quanquan Gu. Covariate adjusted precision matrix estimation via nonconvex optimization. In Jennifer Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 922–931. PMLR, July 2018.
- Xiao Lv, Wei Cui, and Yulong Liu. A sharp analysis of covariate adjusted precision matrix estimation via alternating projected gradient descent. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 29:877–881, 2022. doi: 10.1109/LSP.2022.3159402.
- Rudolf S. N. Fehrmann, Ritsert C. Jansen, Jan H. Veldink, Harm-Jan Westra, Danny Arends, Marc Jan Bonder, Jingyuan Fu, Patrick Deelen, Harry J. M. Groen, Asia Smolonska, Rinse K. Weersma, Robert M. W. Hofstra, Wim A. Buurman, Sander Rensen, Marcel G. M. Wolfs, Mathieu Platteel, Alexandra Zhernakova, Clara C. Elbers, Eleanora M. Festen, Gosia Trynka, Marten H. Hofker, Christiaan G. J. Saris, Roel A. Ophoff, Leonard H. van den Berg, David A. van Heel, Cisca Wijmenga, Gerard J. te Meerman, and Lude Franke. Trans-eqtls reveal that independent genetic variants associated with a complex phenotype converge on intermediate genes, with a major role for the hla. *PLoS Genetics*, 7(8):e1002197, August 2011. ISSN 1553-7404. doi: 10.1371/journal.pgen.1002197. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002197>.
- Liis Kolberg, Nurlan Kerimov, Hedi Peterson, and Kaur Alasoo. Co-expression analysis reveals interpretable gene modules controlled by trans-acting genetic variants. *eLife*, 9, September 2020. ISSN 2050-084X. doi: 10.7554/elife.58705. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.7554/eLife.58705>.
- Matthew Rockman and Leonid Kruglyak. Genetics of global gene expression. *Nature reviews. Genetics*, 7:862–72, 12 2006. doi: 10.1038/nrg1964.
- Jingfei Zhang and Yi Li. High-dimensional gaussian graphical regression models with covariates. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0(0):1–13, 2022. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2022.2034632. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2022.2034632>.
- Yabo Niu, Yang Ni, Debdeep Pati, and Bani K. Mallick. Covariate-Assisted Bayesian Graph Learning for Heterogeneous Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(547): 1985–1999, July 2024. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2023.2233744. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2023.2233744>.

- Zeya Wang, Veerabhadran Baladandayuthapani, Ahmed O. Kaseb, Hesham M. Amin, Manal M. Hassan, Wenyi Wang, and Jeffrey S. Morris. Bayesian Edge Regression in Undirected Graphical Models to Characterize Interpatient Heterogeneity in Cancer. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(538):533–546, April 2022. ISSN 0162-1459. doi: 10.1080/01621459.2021.2000866. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2021.2000866>. Publisher: ASA Website _eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2021.2000866>.
- Kyung-Ah Sohn and Seyoung Kim. Joint Estimation of Structured Sparsity and Output Structure in Multiple-Output Regression via Inverse-Covariance Regularization. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1081–1089. PMLR, March 2012. ISSN: 1938-7228.
- Xiao-Tong Yuan and Tong Zhang. Partial Gaussian Graphical Model Estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(3):1673–1687, March 2014. ISSN 1557-9654. doi: 10.1109/TIT.2013.2296784. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Theory.
- Yunzhang Zhu. A convex optimization formulation for multivariate regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 17652–17661. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/hash/ccd2d123f4ec4d777fc6ef757d0fb642-Abstract.html.
- Noah Simon, Jerome Friedman, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. A sparse-group lasso. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 22(2):231–245, 2013. doi: 10.1080/10618600.2012.681250. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/10618600.2012.681250>.
- Stephen Reid, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. A study of error variance estimation in lasso regression. *Statistica Sinica*, 26(1):35–67, 2016. ISSN 10170405, 19968507.
- Guo Yu and Jacob Bien. Estimating the error variance in a high-dimensional linear model. *Biometrika*, 106(3):533–546, May 2019. ISSN 1464-3510. doi: 10.1093/biomet/asz017.
- P. Tseng. Convergence of a block coordinate descent method for nondifferentiable minimization. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 109(3):475–494, June 2001. ISSN 1573-2878. doi: 10.1023/a:1017501703105.
- Xiaoxuan Liang, Aaron Cohen, Anibal Sólón Heinsfeld, Franco Pestilli, and Daniel J. McDonald. **sparsegl**: An R Package for Estimating Sparse Group Lasso. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 110(6), 2024. ISSN 1548-7660. doi: 10.18637/jss.v110.i06. URL <https://www.jstatsoft.org/v110/i06/>.
- Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999. doi: 10.1126/science.286.5439.509. URL <https://www.science.org/doi/abs/10.1126/science.286.5439.509>.
- P. Erdős and A. Rényi. On random graphs. i. *Publicationes Mathematicae Debrecen*, 6(3–4):290–297, 1959. ISSN 0033-3883. doi: 10.5486/pmd.1959.6.3-4.12.

- Aaron Clauset, Cosma Rohilla Shalizi, and M. E. J. Newman. Power-law distributions in empirical data. *SIAM Review*, 51(4):661–703, 2009. ISSN 00361445, 10957200. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25662336>.
- Farina Hanif, Kanza Muzaffar, kakhkashan Perveen, Saima Malhi, and Shabana Simjee. Glioblastoma multiforme: A review of its epidemiology and pathogenesis through clinical presentation and treatment. *Asian Pacific Journal of Cancer Prevention*, 18(1), January 2017. doi: 10.22034/APJCP.2017.18.1.3. URL <https://doi.org/10.22034/APJCP.2017.18.1.3>.
- Aneta Kwiatkowska, Mohan Nandhu, Prajna Behera, E. Chiocca, and Mariano Viapiano. Strategies in gene therapy for glioblastoma. *Cancers*, 5(4):1271–1305, October 2013. ISSN 2072-6694. doi: 10.3390/cancers5041271. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/cancers5041271>.
- Minoru Kanehisa and Susumu Goto. KEGG: Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes. *Nucleic Acids Research*, 28(1):27–30, 01 2000. ISSN 0305-1048. doi: 10.1093/nar/28.1.27.
- Patricio Gonzalez-Hormazabal, Maher Musleh, Marco Bustamante, Juan Stambuk, Raul Pisano, Hector Valladares, Enrique Lanzarini, Hector Chiong, Jorge Rojas, Jose Suazo, V. Gonzalo Castro, Lilian Jara, and Zoltan Berger. Polymorphisms in ras/raf/mek/erk pathway are associated with gastric cancer. *Genes*, 10(1), 2019. ISSN 2073-4425. doi: 10.3390/genes10010020. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4425/10/1/20>.
- Yardena Samuels and Victor E. Velculescu. Oncogenic mutations of pik3ca in human cancers. *Cell Cycle*, 3(10):1221–1224, October 2004. ISSN 1551-4005. doi: 10.4161/cc.3.10.1164. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/cc.3.10.1164>.
- Mohammed A Azab, Abdulraheem Alomari, and Ahmed Y Azzam. Featuring how calcium channels and calmodulin affect glioblastoma behavior. a review article. *Cancer Treatment and Research Communications*, 25:100255, 2020. ISSN 2468-2942. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ctarc.2020.100255>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2468294220300903>.
- Quan Cheng, Anliu Tang, Zeyu Wang, Ning Fang, Zhuojing Zhang, Liyang Zhang, Chuntao Li, and Yu Zeng. Cald1 modulates gliomas progression via facilitating tumor angiogenesis. *Cancers*, 13(11), 2021. ISSN 2072-6694. doi: 10.3390/cancers13112705. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/13/11/2705>.
- Guoxin Zhang, Zhen Dong, Briana C. Prager, Leo J.K. Kim, Qiulian Wu, Ryan C. Gimple, Xiuxing Wang, Shideng Bao, Petra Hamerlik, and Jeremy N. Rich. Chromatin remodeler hells maintains glioma stem cells through e2f3 and myc. *JCI Insight*, 4(7), 4 2019. doi: 10.1172/jci.insight.126140. URL <https://insight.jci.org/articles/view/126140>.
- Lei Wu, Jinfan Li, Yiyang Xu, Xiaoli Lou, Maomin Sun, and Shouli Wang. Expression and prognostic value of e2f3 transcription factor in non-small cell lung cancer. *Oncology letters*, 21:411, 05 2021. doi: 10.3892/ol.2021.12672.
- Zhicai Feng, Cheng Peng, Daojiang Li, Danhua Zhang, Xu Li, Fengran Cui, Yanhong Chen, and Quanyong He. E2f3 promotes cancer growth and is overexpressed through copy number variation in human melanoma. *OncoTargets and therapy*, pages 5303–5313, 2018.

- Sara Ladu, Diego F. Calvisi, Elizabeth A. Conner, Miriam Farina, Valentina M. Factor, and Snorri S. Thorgeirsson. E2f1 inhibits c-myc-driven apoptosis via pik3ca/akt/mtor and cox-2 in a mouse model of human liver cancer. *Gastroenterology*, 135(4):1322–1332, 2008. ISSN 0016-5085. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1053/j.gastro.2008.07.012>.
- A. Belloni, V. Chernozhukov, and L. Wang. Square-root lasso: pivotal recovery of sparse signals via conic programming. *Biometrika*, 98(4):791–806, November 2011. ISSN 1464-3510. doi: [10.1093/biomet/asr043](https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asr043). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asr043>.
- Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. Comprehensive genomic characterization defines human glioblastoma genes and core pathways. *Nature*, 455(7216):1061–1068, September 2008. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: [10.1038/nature07385](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature07385). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/nature07385>.
- Cameron W. Brennan, Roel G.W. Verhaak, Aaron McKenna, Benito Campos, Houtan Noushmehr, Sofie R. Salama, Siyuan Zheng, Debyani Chakravarty, J. Zachary Sanborn, Samuel H. Berman, Rameen Beroukhim, Brady Bernard, Chang-Jiun Wu, Giannicola Genovese, Ilya Shmulevich, Jill Barnholtz-Sloan, Lihua Zou, Rahulshimham Vegesna, Sachet A. Shukla, Giovanni Ciriello, W.K. Yung, and Zhang. The somatic genomic landscape of glioblastoma. *Cell*, 155(2):462–477, October 2013. ISSN 0092-8674. doi: [10.1016/j.cell.2013.09.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.09.034). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2013.09.034>.
- Ahmed Maklad, Anjana Sharma, and Iman Azimi. Calcium signaling in brain cancers: Roles and therapeutic targeting. *Cancers*, 11(2):145, January 2019. ISSN 2072-6694. doi: [10.3390/cancers11020145](https://doi.org/10.3390/cancers11020145). URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/cancers11020145>.
- Pierre C. Bellec, Arnak S. Dalalyan, Edwin Grappin, and Quentin Paris. On the prediction loss of the lasso in the partially labeled setting. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 12(2):3443 – 3472, 2018. doi: [10.1214/18-EJS1457](https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJS1457). URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/18-EJS1457>.
- Franklin A. Graybill and George Marsaglia. Idempotent matrices and quadratic forms in the general linear hypothesis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 28(3):678–686, 1957. ISSN 00034851. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2237227>.
- B. Laurent and P. Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1302–1338, 2000. ISSN 00905364. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2674095>.
- Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices, 2011.
- Arun Kuchibhotla and Abhishek Chakraborty. Moving beyond sub-gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression. *Information and Inference A Journal of the IMA*, 11:1389–1456, 06 2022. doi: [10.1093/imaia/iaac012](https://doi.org/10.1093/imaia/iaac012).
- Po-Ling Loh and Martin J. Wainwright. High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with nonconvexity. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1637 – 1664, 2012. doi: [10.1214/12-AOS1018](https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1018). URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1018>.

Supplemental Materials

A convex formulation of covariate-adjusted Gaussian graphical models via natural parametrization

S1 Algorithm outline

Algorithm 1: Covariate-adjusted Sparse Precision with Natural Estimation (cspine)

Input : $\mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ matrix of covariates.
 $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ matrix of responses.
 $g_j: \mathbb{R}^q \times \mathbb{R}^{(p-1)(q+1)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ convex penalty functions for $j \in [p]$.
 $H(\hat{\gamma}_j, \hat{\beta}_j)$ a function to estimate the error variance $\sigma_{\varepsilon_j}^2$.

Output : $\hat{\Gamma} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$, and $\hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ for $j \in [p]$.

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

 Define \mathbf{W}_{-j} as in (10) and solve

$$(\hat{\gamma}_j, \hat{\beta}_j) = \arg \min_{\gamma_j, \beta_j} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\gamma_j - \mathbf{W}_{-j}\beta_j\|_2^2 + g_j(\gamma_j, \beta_j).$$

 Set $\hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}^2 = H(\hat{\gamma}_j, \hat{\beta}_j)$ and $\tilde{\beta}_{jkh} = -\hat{\beta}_{jkh} / \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_j}^2$ for $k \neq j, h = 0, 1, \dots, q$.

end

Set $\hat{\Gamma} = [\hat{\gamma}_1, \dots, \hat{\gamma}_p]^\top$.

Initialize $\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_0 = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1 = \dots = \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q = \mathbf{0}$.

for $h = 0, 1, \dots, q$ **do**

 Apply the and-rule:

$$[\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{jk} = [\tilde{\mathbf{B}}_h]_{kj} = \tilde{\beta}_{jkh} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| < |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}|\}} + \tilde{\beta}_{kjh} \mathbf{1}_{\{|\tilde{\beta}_{jkh}| > |\tilde{\beta}_{kjh}|\}}, \quad j \neq k$$

end

return $\hat{\Gamma}, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{B}}_q, \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_1}^2, \dots, \hat{\sigma}_{\varepsilon_p}^2$.

S2 Additional Simulation Results

In addition to the metrics reported in Table 1, we report here the support recovery metrics for the estimated precision matrix and the estimation error of the mean given by $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\text{err}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i - \boldsymbol{\mu}_i\|_2^2 / n$ where $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_i$ is computed from (14). The results are shown in Table S1 for data generated under the natural model (7) and in Table S2 for data generated under the original model (3). We see that cspine underperforms in mean prediction error in both data models. This is a reasonable finding since our method does not focus on estimating the mean. Instead, our method targets the precision matrix and its components $\{\mathbf{B}_h\}$ while incorporating the covariate effects on the mean.

n	(p, q)	Method	Ω_{TPR}	Ω_{FPR}	Ω_{err}	μ_{err}
200	(25, 50)	cspine	0.84 (0.06)	0.10 (0.03)	1.09 (0.15)	10.14 (1.49)
		RegGMM	0.74 (0.08)	0.18 (0.06)	1.82 (0.26)	8.28 (1.13)
	(25, 100)	cspine	0.79 (0.07)	0.08 (0.02)	1.22 (0.17)	11.94 (1.12)
		RegGMM	0.68 (0.07)	0.17 (0.04)	1.95 (0.28)	10.11 (1.01)
400	(25, 50)	cspine	0.93 (0.04)	0.12 (0.03)	0.66 (0.08)	5.80 (1.05)
		RegGMM	0.83 (0.06)	0.20 (0.07)	1.22 (0.17)	4.96 (0.72)
	(25, 100)	cspine	0.89 (0.04)	0.11 (0.03)	0.76 (0.09)	7.98 (1.05)
		RegGMM	0.79 (0.06)	0.24 (0.07)	1.40 (0.20)	6.76 (0.91)

Table S1: Additional metrics under the natural model setting (7).

n	(p, q)	Method	Ω_{TPR}	Ω_{FPR}	Ω_{err}	μ_{err}
200	(25, 50)	cspine	0.69 (0.07)	0.14 (0.03)	2.18 (0.24)	6.20 (0.67)
		RegGMM	0.65 (0.09)	0.16 (0.05)	2.20 (0.25)	5.89 (0.66)
	(25, 100)	cspine	0.54 (0.07)	0.12 (0.02)	2.43 (0.25)	9.95 (1.16)
		RegGMM	0.51 (0.09)	0.21 (0.06)	2.69 (0.32)	9.58 (1.12)
400	(25, 50)	cspine	0.79 (0.06)	0.20 (0.03)	1.54 (0.18)	3.34 (0.36)
		RegGMM	0.75 (0.07)	0.16 (0.05)	1.49 (0.19)	3.07 (0.31)
	(25, 100)	cspine	0.73 (0.06)	0.16 (0.03)	1.69 (0.22)	5.83 (0.63)
		RegGMM	0.74 (0.07)	0.24 (0.07)	1.69 (0.23)	5.58 (0.54)

Table S2: Additional metrics under specification (3).

S3 Additional Results from GBM eQTL Analysis

Table S3 displays the genes belonging to known signaling pathways associated with GBM. The table is copied from Zhang and Li [2022]. Table S4 lists the SNPs that are detected by cspine to affect network co-expression.

name	genes	references
PI3K/Akt/mTOR signaling pathway	PIK3CA, PIK3CB, PIK3CD, PIK3R3, PTEN, AKT1, AKT2, AKT3, MTOR, IGF1, PRKCA	Network [2008]
Ras-Raf-MEK-ERK signaling pathway	EGF, EGFR, GRB2, SOS1, SOS2, IGF1, SHC1, SHC2, SHC3, SHC4, MAPK1, MAPK3, MAP2K1, MAP2K2, HRAS, KRAS, NRAS, RAF1, ARAF, BRAF, PRKCA	Brennan et al. [2013]
calcium (Ca+2) signaling pathway	CALM1, CALML3, CALML4, CALML5, CALML6, CAMK1, CAMK4, CAMK1D, CAMK1G, CAMK2A, CAMK2B, CAMK2D, CAMK2G, PRKCA	Maklad et al. [2019]
p53 signaling pathway	TP53, MDM2, DDB2, PTEN, IGF1, CDK4, CDK6, CDKN1A, CDKN2A	Network [2008]

Table S3: Gene signaling pathways related to GBM.

SNP	co-expressed genes
rs1267622	(PDGFRA, PDGFB), (PDGRFA, SOS2), (GADD45A, GADD45B)
rs10519201	(E2F3, PIK3CA), (E2F3, BAX)
rs10488141	(SOS2, E2F1), (SOS2, GADD45B)
rs2076655	(E2F1, CALML5)
rs10509346	(E2F3, CALML5)
rs10518759	(E2F1, PIK3CA)
rs10512510	(E2F3, BRAF)
rs9303504	(E2F1, CALML5)
rs4834352	(E2F1, E2F3)
rs2075109	(PIK3CA, CALML5)

Table S4: Estimated SNP effects on gene co-expressions according to cspine.

S4 Proofs

Our proof strategies for Theorems 1 and 2 follow that of Zhang and Li [2022], with modifications made to accommodate our concatenated design matrix $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]$. First we state a few lemmas.

Lemma 1 (Bellec et al. [2018] Lemma 1). *Let $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be any convex function and let*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \in \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \{ \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + g(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \}$$

where $\mathbf{H} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then for all $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_2^2 + g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{H}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta})\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{H}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + g(\boldsymbol{\beta}).$$

Lemma 2 (Graybill and Marsaglia [1957] Theorem F). *Let $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N_p(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_p)$ and let A be a $p \times p$ idempotent matrix with rank $r \leq p$. Then $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^\top A \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} / \sigma^2 \sim \chi_r^2$.*

Lemma 3 (Laurent and Massart [2000] Lemma 1). *Suppose that $U \sim \chi_r^2$. For any $x > 0$ it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}(U - r \geq 2\sqrt{rx} + 2x) \leq e^{-x}.$$

Lemma 4 (Vershynin [2011] Proposition 5.16). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent, mean zero sub-exponential random variables. Let $v_1 = \max_i \|X_i\|_{\psi_1}$ where $\|\cdot\|_{\psi_1}$ is the sub-exponential norm. Then there exists a constant c such that for any $t > 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right| \geq t\right) \leq 2 \exp\left\{-c \min\left(\frac{t^2}{v_1^2 n}, \frac{t}{v_1}\right)\right\}.$$

Lemma 5 comes from Theorem 4.1 in Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty [2022] applied to marginally sub-Gaussian random vectors.

Lemma 5 (Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty [2022] Theorem 4.1). *Let $\mathbf{Z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{Z}_n$ be independent random vectors in \mathbb{R}^p . Assume each element of \mathbf{Z}_i is sub-Gaussian with bounded sub-Gaussian norm for all $i \in [n]$. Let $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}/n$ and $\Sigma_{\mathbf{Z}} = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{Z}^\top \mathbf{Z}/n]$. Define*

$$\Upsilon_n = \max_{j,k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}(Z_{ij} Z_{ik}).$$

Then we have

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} \left| \mathbf{v}^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{Z}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{Z}}) \mathbf{v} \right| \lesssim k \sqrt{\frac{\Upsilon_n \log p}{n}} + \frac{k \log n \log p}{n}$$

with probability at least $1 - O(1/p)$.

We may apply Lemma 5 because by Assumption 3, $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]$ is elementwise sub-Gaussian, each entry being the product of a sub-Gaussian and a bounded random variable. Furthermore, we have by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality that

$$\max_{\ell, k} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Var}([\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]_{i\ell} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]_{ik}) \leq \max_{\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_3, \ell_4} \mathbb{E}\left(X_{\ell_1}^{(1)2} X_{\ell_2}^{(1)2} U_{\ell_3}^{(1)2} U_{\ell_4}^{(1)2}\right) = O(1)$$

since the entries of $\mathbf{X}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{U}^{(1)}$ have bounded moments. Thus $\Upsilon_n = O(1)$ in our setting.

Lemma 6 (Loh and Wainwright [2012] Lemma 12). *Let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ be a symmetric matrix such that $|\mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{v}| \leq \delta_1$ for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = 1$ and $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq 2s$. It holds for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ that*

$$|\mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{v}| \leq 27\delta_1 \left(\|\mathbf{v}\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{s} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 \right).$$

Define the matrices:

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} = \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}], \quad \Sigma_{\mathbf{UW}} = \mathbb{E}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}).$$

Lemma 7. For a set of indices $S \subset [p(q+1) - 1]$, denote by $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]_S$ the submatrix of $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]$ with columns indexed by S . Let $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ denote the matrix operator norm. Under Assumptions 1-4, there exist constants M_{uw} and C_0 such that with probability at least $1 - C_0 \exp(-\log(pq))$ we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \|[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}_{-j}]_S\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq M_{uw}$$

for all S satisfying $|S| \leq \hat{s}_\gamma^{\max} + \hat{s}_\beta^{\max}$, provided that $(\hat{s}_\gamma^{\max} + \hat{s}_\beta^{\max}) \log(pq) = O(\sqrt{n})$, as assumed in Theorem 1.

Proof. Letting $k = |S|$, it suffices to show that $\sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} \mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{v}$ is bounded. We may write

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} \mathbf{v}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{v} = \sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} \left\{ \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \right) \mathbf{v} + \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \mathbf{v} \right\}.$$

By Assumption 2, the second term is bounded. For the first term, by Lemma 5 we have

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq k, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 \leq 1} \left\{ \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} - \Sigma_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \right) \mathbf{v} \right\} \lesssim \left(\frac{k^2 \log(pq)}{n} \right)^{1/2} + \frac{k \log(pq)}{n / \log n}$$

with probability at least $1 - C_0 \exp(-\log(pq))$ and we see that the right-hand side is bounded by Assumption 4. \square

S4.1 Proof of Theorem 1

For ease of notation, we will drop the dependence of $\gamma_j, \beta_j, \varepsilon_j$ and \mathbf{W}_{-j} on j . Let $S_\beta, S_\gamma, \hat{S}_\beta, \hat{S}_\gamma$ be the support sets of $\beta, \gamma, \hat{\beta}, \hat{\gamma}$, respectively. Let $S_{\beta,g} = \{h \in [q] : \beta_h \neq \mathbf{0}\}$ index the blocks β_h of β that are not identically zero and let $\hat{S}_{\beta,g}$ be the corresponding block indices for $\hat{\beta}$. For any vector \mathbf{v} and set of block indices S , let $\mathbf{v}_{(S)}$ denote the sub-vector containing blocks in S . Let $s_\beta, s_\gamma, s_{\beta,g}, \hat{s}_\beta, \hat{s}_\gamma, \hat{s}_{\beta,g}$ be the number of elements in $S_\beta, S_\gamma, S_{\beta,g}, \hat{S}_\beta, \hat{S}_\gamma, \hat{S}_{\beta,g}$, respectively. Our proof occurs in three steps.

Step 1

In this step we bound the error $\|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2/n$ by the stochastic term $\langle \varepsilon, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle/n$, which is then bounded by a projection of ε onto the columns of $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]$.

Since our penalty function

$$g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}$$

is convex, by Lemma 1 we have

$$\frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_2^2 + g(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + g(\boldsymbol{\gamma}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$$

where $\boldsymbol{\nu} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Delta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}$. Since $\varepsilon = \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\beta}$ we may write

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_2^2 &= \frac{1}{2n} \|\varepsilon - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2n} \|\varepsilon\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \langle \varepsilon, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into the previous expression and substituting the penalty expression then yields

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that $\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1$, $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1$, and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_\beta}\|_1$. Hence we can express the above as

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \underbrace{\lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1}_{\lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1} + \lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \underbrace{\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_\beta}\|_1}_{\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1} + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{S_\beta}\|_1) + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \end{aligned}$$

using the triangle inequality for the ℓ_1 norm. The same development holds for $\lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1$. Finally, notice that

$$\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g}^c)}\|_{1,2} = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(S_{\beta,g}^c)}\|_{1,2}, \quad \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} = \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2} + \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(S_{\beta,g}^c)}\|_{1,2}, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} = \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2}.$$

Hence the previous development holds for the $\lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2}$ term by the triangle inequality of $\|\cdot\|_{1,2}$. All in all we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma^c}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g}^c)}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{n} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2}. \end{aligned} \tag{S1}$$

Now let \mathcal{I} and \mathcal{J} be arbitrary index sets of the columns of \mathbf{U} and \mathbf{W} respectively. Denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}$ the orthogonal projection onto the columns of $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]$ indexed by $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J})$. Let $\mathcal{I}_0 = S_\gamma \cup \hat{S}_\gamma$ and $\mathcal{J}_0 = S_\beta \cup \hat{S}_\beta$ denote the unions of the true and estimated support sets of $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. We seek to bound the stochastic term

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle & = \langle \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}), \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} \rangle \\ & \leq \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2 \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2a_1} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{a_1}{2} \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \tag{S2}$$

The last inequality follows from the fact that $2xy \leq ax^2 + y^2/a$ holds for any constant $a > 0$ and real numbers x and y .

Following Zhang and Li [2022], we first bound the term $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2$ with a counting argument. For fixed $s'_\gamma, s'_\beta,$ and $s'_{\beta,g}$, we will bound the cardinality of the set

$$\mathcal{H}(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}) = \{(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}) \subset [q] \times [(p-1)(q+1)] : |\mathcal{I}| = s'_\gamma, |\mathcal{J}| = s'_\beta, |g(\mathcal{J})| = s'_{\beta,g}\}$$

where $g(\mathcal{J})$ is the number of nonzero groups of $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{J}}$. For ease of notation, we will write \mathcal{H} while keeping in mind its dependence on $s'_\gamma, s'_\beta,$ and $s'_{\beta,g}$. We will show that

$$\log|\mathcal{H}| \leq s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep)$$

by considering the two cases $s'_\beta = s'_{\beta,g}$ and $s'_\beta > s'_{\beta,g}$ separately. These are the only cases since we cannot have more nonzero groups than nonzero elements.

1. $s'_\beta = s'_{\beta,g}$: In this case, we have $|\mathcal{H}| \leq \binom{q}{s'_\gamma} \binom{q}{s'_{\beta,g}} (p-1)^{s'_\beta}$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} \log|\mathcal{H}| &\leq \log \binom{q}{s'_\gamma} + \log \binom{q}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(p-1) \\ &\leq s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep) \end{aligned}$$

where we use $\log \binom{n}{k} \leq k \log(en/k)$ which follows from Stirling's approximation.

2. $s'_\beta > s'_{\beta,g}$: In this case, the cardinality is bounded by

$$|\mathcal{H}| \leq \binom{q}{s'_\gamma} \binom{q}{s'_{\beta,g}} \binom{(p-1)(s'_{\beta,g}+1)}{s'_\beta}.$$

Since by Stirling's approximation

$$\log \binom{(p-1)(s'_{\beta,g}+1)}{s'_\beta} \leq s'_\beta \log \frac{e(p-1)(s'_{\beta,g}+1)}{s'_\beta} \leq s'_\beta \log(ep),$$

we have

$$\log|\mathcal{H}| \leq s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep)$$

as desired.

Define k_0 to be the exponential of the right hand side of the above inequality, so that $|\mathcal{H}| \leq k_0$. For any $(\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}) \in \mathcal{H}$, since $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$ is idempotent, Lemma 2 implies

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 / \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \sim \chi_d^2$$

where $d \leq |\mathcal{I}| + |\mathcal{J}| = s'_\gamma + s'_\beta$ is the rank of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}$. By Lemma 3 we have for arbitrary $t' > 0$ that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}, \mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_\varepsilon^2(2\sqrt{dt'} + d + 2t')\right) \leq e^{-t'}.$$

Since $2\sqrt{dt'} \leq d + t'$ and $d \leq s'_\gamma + s'_\beta \leq \log k_0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}(\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_\varepsilon^2(2 \log k_0 + 3t')) \leq e^{-t'}.$$

Taking the supremum over \mathcal{H} and applying the union bound yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}) \in \mathcal{H}} \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \geq \sigma_\varepsilon^2(2 \log k_0 + 3t')\right) \leq |\mathcal{H}|e^{-t'}.$$

Now set $t' = t/3 + \log k_0$ for $t > 0$. Then $|\mathcal{H}|e^{-t'} = |\mathcal{H}|/k_0 \cdot e^{-t/3} \leq e^{-t/3}$ since $|\mathcal{H}| \leq k_0$. Substituting these expressions into the previous bound (and recalling that we have fixed s'_γ , s'_β , and $s'_{\beta,g}$) yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}) \in \mathcal{H}(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g})} \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \geq 5\sigma_\varepsilon^2 \left[s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep) \right] + \sigma_\varepsilon^2 t\right) \leq e^{-t/3}, \quad (\text{S3})$$

recalling that

$$\log k_0 = s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep).$$

This gives a concentration bound of $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2$ over all possible subsets \mathcal{I} of columns of \mathbf{U} and \mathcal{J} of columns of \mathbf{W} satisfying $|\mathcal{I}| = s'_\gamma$, $|\mathcal{J}| = s'_\beta$, and $|g(\mathcal{J})| = s'_{\beta,g}$. Recalling that \mathcal{I}_0 and \mathcal{J}_0 are the support sets of $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ and $\boldsymbol{\Delta}$, we can now bound $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2$. Define

$$r(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}) = \left(\sup_{(\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}) \in \mathcal{H}(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g})} \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I},\mathcal{J}}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 - 5\sigma_\varepsilon^2 \left\{ s'_\gamma \log \frac{eq}{s'_\gamma} + s'_{\beta,g} \log \frac{eq}{s'_{\beta,g}} + s'_\beta \log(ep) \right\} \right)_+$$

and

$$r = \sup_{s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}} r(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}).$$

It is clear that

$$|\mathcal{I}_0| \leq s_\gamma + \hat{s}_\gamma, \quad |\mathcal{J}_0| \leq s_\beta + \hat{s}_\beta, \quad \text{and} \quad |g(\mathcal{J}_0)| \leq s_{\beta,g} + \hat{s}_{\beta,g}.$$

Thus we have

$$\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \leq 5\sigma_\varepsilon^2 \left\{ (s_\gamma + \hat{s}_\gamma) \log \frac{eq}{s_\gamma} + (s_\beta + \hat{s}_\beta) \log(ep) + (s_{\beta,g} + \hat{s}_{\beta,g}) \log \frac{eq}{s_{\beta,g}} \right\} + r. \quad (\text{S4})$$

We also have the following concentration inequality on r for $t > 0$, which comes from the definition of $r(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g})$ along with (S3):

$$\mathbb{P}(r \geq t\sigma_\varepsilon^2) \leq \sum_{s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}} \mathbb{P}(r(s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}) \geq t\sigma_\varepsilon^2) \leq \sum_{s'_\gamma, s'_\beta, s'_{\beta,g}} e^{-t/3} \leq q^3 p c_1 e^{-t/3},$$

where $c_1 > 0$ is a constant and the sum is taken over $s'_\gamma \in [q]$, $s'_\beta \in [(p-1)(q+1)]$, $s'_{\beta,g} \in [q]$.

Then for a sufficiently large constant \tilde{M} and some $c_2 > 0$, by letting

$$t = \tilde{M}(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{ r \geq \tilde{M}\sigma_\varepsilon^2 (s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g})) \right\} \\ & \leq c_1 \exp\{-c_2 (s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S5})$$

Step 2

We now use the KKT optimality conditions to bound $\|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2$ in terms of $\|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2$. This takes care of the stochastic term after plugging back into (S1) and (S2). To ease the notation when describing the conditions, define the vectors

$$\mathbf{r}_\gamma = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{U}^\top(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{r}_\beta = \frac{1}{n}\mathbf{W}^\top(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h$ be the h -th block of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. By the KKT conditions, we know that an optimizer $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ of (15) must satisfy

$$(\mathbf{r}_\gamma)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}(\hat{\gamma}_\ell) \quad \text{for } \hat{\gamma}_\ell \neq 0 \quad (\text{S6})$$

$$(\mathbf{r}_\beta)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)_\ell) \quad \text{for } (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)_\ell \neq 0 \quad (\text{S7})$$

$$(\mathbf{r}_\beta)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell) + \lambda_g \frac{(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h\|_2} \quad \text{for } (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell \neq 0, h \in [q]. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Squaring both sides of (S6) and summing over ℓ gives

$$\lambda^2 \hat{s}_\gamma = \frac{1}{n^2} \|\mathbf{U}_{\hat{S}_\gamma}^\top(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_2^2$$

and doing the same for (S7) and (S8) gives

$$\lambda^2 \hat{s}_\beta + \lambda_g^2 \hat{s}_{\beta,g} \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \|\mathbf{W}_{\hat{S}_\beta}^\top(\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_2^2$$

since in (S8) the cross term $\operatorname{sign}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j,h})_\ell) \times (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{j,h})_\ell$ is nonnegative. We have shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 \hat{s}_\gamma + \lambda^2 \hat{s}_\beta + \lambda_g^2 \hat{s}_{\beta,g} &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left\| [\mathbf{U}_{\hat{S}_\gamma}, \mathbf{W}_{\hat{S}_\beta}]^\top (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\|_2^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \left\| [\mathbf{U}_{\hat{S}_\gamma}, \mathbf{W}_{\hat{S}_\beta}]^\top (\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}) \right\|_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S9})$$

Using that $\|\mathbf{a} - \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 \leq 2\|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + 2\|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2$ for any vectors \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{b} along with Lemma 7, we have with probability at least $1 - C_0 \exp(-\log(pq))$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda^2 \hat{s}_\gamma + \lambda^2 \hat{s}_\beta + \lambda_g^2 \hat{s}_{\beta,g} &\leq \frac{2}{n^2} \left\| [\mathbf{U}_{\hat{S}_\gamma}, \mathbf{W}_{\hat{S}_\beta}]^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \right\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{n^2} \left\| [\mathbf{U}_{\hat{S}_\gamma}, \mathbf{W}_{\hat{S}_\beta}]^\top (\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}) \right\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2}{n} M_{uw} \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 + \frac{2}{n} M_{uw} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S10})$$

where the last inequality uses that $\hat{S}_\gamma \subset \mathcal{I}_0$ and $\hat{S}_\beta \subset \mathcal{J}_0$.

Now let

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda &= C \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep)}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} + \frac{s_{\beta,g}}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}) \right)^{1/2}, \\ \lambda_g &= C \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon}{\sqrt{n}} \left(\frac{s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep)}{s_{\beta,g}} + \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}) \right)^{1/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C = \sqrt{5M_{uv}a_2}$ for some $a_2 > 2$. Combining (S10) and (S4) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{2}{a_2}\right) \|\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{I}_0, \mathcal{J}_0}(\boldsymbol{\varepsilon})\|_2^2 \\ & \leq 5\sigma_\varepsilon^2(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g})) + \frac{2}{a_2} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + r \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S11})$$

It is then straightforward to multiply both sides by $a_1a_2/(2(a_2 - 2))$ and plug into (S1) and (S2) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\varepsilon^c}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_{\beta,g}^c}\|_{1,2} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{2a_1} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{5a_1a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} \cdot E_j + \frac{a_1}{a_2 - 2} \cdot \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \\ & \quad + \frac{a_1a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} \cdot \frac{r}{n} + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_{\beta,g}}\|_{1,2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S12})$$

where $E_j = (\sigma_\varepsilon^2/n) \cdot (s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))$.

We also have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1}{\sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_{\beta,g}}\|_{1,2}}{\sqrt{s_{\beta,g}}} & \leq \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_{\beta,g}}\|_2 \\ & \leq 2 \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \leq 2m_0^{-1/2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Assumption 2. With our chosen values of λ and λ_g , we have after multiplying through by $C\sqrt{E_j}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_{\beta,g}}\|_{1,2} & \leq 2Cm_0^{-1/2} \sqrt{E_j} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2 \\ & \leq a_3 \frac{C^2}{m_0} E_j + \frac{1}{a_3} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

for any $a_3 > 0$. Plugging this into (S12) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2a_1} - \frac{a_1}{a_2 - 2}\right) \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{5a_1a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} + a_3 \frac{C^2}{m_0}\right) E_j + \frac{1}{a_3} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 + \frac{a_1a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} \cdot \frac{r}{n}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S13})$$

Step 3

We now bound the difference between $\|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2/n$ and $\left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2$. Let $L > 0$ be an arbitrarily large constant. By Assumption 4 and Lemma 5, we have with probability at least $1 - C' \exp(-\log(pq))$ that

$$\sup_{\|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq 2(s_\gamma + s_\beta), \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = 1} \left| \mathbf{v}^\top \left(\frac{[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]}{n} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} \right) \mathbf{v} \right| \leq \frac{1}{27L}$$

for sufficiently large n . By Lemma 6, it holds with probability at least $1 - C' \exp(-\log(pq))$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| (\boldsymbol{\nu}^\top, \boldsymbol{\Delta}^\top) \left(\frac{[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]}{n} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{L} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S14})$$

for sufficiently large n . Plugging this into (S13) gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2a_1} - \frac{a_1}{a_2 - 2} - \frac{1}{a_3} \right) \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \\ & \leq \left(\frac{5a_1 a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} + a_3 \frac{C^2}{m_0} \right) E_j + \frac{a_1 a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} \cdot \frac{r}{n} \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2a_1} - \frac{a_1}{a_2 - 2} \right) \left(\left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 - \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \right) \\ & \leq \left(\frac{5a_1 a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} + a_3 \frac{C^2}{m_0} \right) E_j + \frac{a_1 a_2}{2(a_2 - 2)} \cdot \frac{r}{n} \\ & \quad + \left(1 - \frac{1}{2a_1} - \frac{a_1}{a_2 - 2} \right) \cdot \frac{1}{L} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Recalling that the above holds for any $a_1 > 0$, $a_2 > 2$, and $a_3 > 0$, choose $a_1 = 2$, $a_2 = 6$, and $a_3 = 6$ to get

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \lesssim E_j + \frac{1}{L} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \right) + \frac{r}{n}.$$

By the concentration bound on r in (S5), we in fact have

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}^{1/2} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \lesssim E_j + \frac{1}{L} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \right) \quad (\text{S15})$$

with probability at least $1 - c_1 \exp\{-c_2(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))\}$. Then by Assumption 2 we have with the same high probability

$$\frac{m_0}{2} (\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2) \lesssim E_j + \frac{1}{L} \left(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \right). \quad (\text{S16})$$

Next, taking $a_1 = 2 - \sqrt{2}$, $a_2 = 6$ in (S12) cancels out the $\|\mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2/n$ terms. Appealing again to (S5) yields

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma^c}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1}{\sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g}^c)}\|_{1,2}}{\sqrt{s_{\beta,g}}} \leq \sqrt{E_j} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1}{\sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2}}{\sqrt{s_{\beta,g}}}.$$

with probability at least $1 - c_1 \exp\{-c_2(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta,g} \log(eq/s_{\beta,g}))\}$.

Adding $(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1)/\sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}$ to both sides and using

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_\beta, g)}\|_{1,2} \leq \sqrt{s_{\beta, g}}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2$$

yields

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1}{\sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}} \leq \sqrt{E_j} + 2\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2 + 3\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2$$

and after squaring both sides we have

$$\frac{\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1^2}{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \leq k_0 E_j + k_1 \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + k_2 \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \quad (\text{S17})$$

for some absolute constants $k_0, k_1, k_2 > 0$. Plugging (S17) into the right-hand side of (S16) yields

$$\frac{m_0}{2}(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2) \lesssim \left(1 + \frac{k_0}{L}\right)E_j + \frac{k_1 + 1}{L}\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \frac{k_2 + 1}{L}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2$$

Finally, plugging in the expression for E_j and recalling that L is arbitrarily large yields

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_2^2 \lesssim \frac{\sigma_\varepsilon^2}{n}(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta, g} \log(eq/s_{\beta, g}))$$

with probability at least $1 - C_1 \exp\{-C_2(s_\gamma \log(eq/s_\gamma) + s_\beta \log(ep) + s_{\beta, g} \log(eq/s_{\beta, g}))\}$ for some positive constants C_1, C_2 as desired. \square

S4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

The proof of Theorem 2 occurs in three steps.

Step 1

Recall that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} = [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]/n$. We wish to show that with high probability

$$\left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{3}{2}(\lambda + \lambda_g). \quad (\text{S18})$$

To ease the notation for this step, define the vectors

$$\mathbf{r}_\gamma = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{U}^\top (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad \mathbf{r}_\beta = \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{W}^\top (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$$

Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h$ indicate the h -th block of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. By the KKT conditions, we know that an optimizer $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ of (15) must satisfy

$$\begin{cases} (\mathbf{r}_\gamma)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}(\hat{\gamma}_\ell) & \hat{\gamma}_\ell \neq 0 \\ |(\mathbf{r}_\gamma)_\ell| \leq \lambda & \hat{\gamma}_\ell = 0 \\ (\mathbf{r}_\beta)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)_\ell) & (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)_\ell \neq 0 \\ (\mathbf{r}_\beta)_\ell = \lambda \operatorname{sign}((\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell) + \lambda_g \frac{(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell}{\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h\|_2} & (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell \neq 0, h \in [q] \\ |(\mathbf{r}_\beta)_\ell| \leq \lambda + \lambda_g & (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_h)_\ell = 0, h \in [q] \end{cases}$$

so we have for all $\ell \in [p(q+1) - 1]$

$$\left| \left([\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) / n \right)_\ell \right| \leq \lambda + \lambda_g.$$

Recalling that

$$\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\gamma} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\beta} = \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} - \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta},$$

it follows by the triangle inequality that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty - \left\| \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \right\|_\infty &\leq \left\| \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} - \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}] \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_\infty \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\|_\infty \\ &\leq \lambda + \lambda_g. \end{aligned}$$

Thus to show (S18) it suffices to show that with high probability

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \right\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda + \lambda_g}{2}. \quad (\text{S19})$$

To see this, let M_Σ denote the bound on the sub-Gaussian norm of elements of \mathbf{X} as assumed in Assumption 3. Recall that each element of \mathbf{U} is bounded by a constant M by Assumption 1. Then the products of random variables U_ℓ and X_ℓ with the random noise $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ are sub-exponential with norm satisfying

$$\begin{aligned} \max_\ell \|U_\ell \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\psi_1} &\leq \max_\ell \|U_\ell\|_{\psi_2} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\psi_2} \leq M\sigma_\varepsilon \\ \max_\ell \|X_\ell \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\psi_1} &\leq \max_\ell \|U_\ell\|_{\psi_2} \max_\ell \|X_\ell\|_{\psi_2} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_{\psi_2} \leq MM_\Sigma\sigma_\varepsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Define the vector $\mathbf{v} = [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} / n$, where each element v_i is a sum of sub-exponential functions with bounded norm. By Lemma 4 we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ |v_i| > \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda_g) \right\} \leq 2 \exp \left(-c \min \left(\frac{n(\lambda + \lambda_g)^2}{4M^2M_\Sigma^2\sigma_\varepsilon^2}, \frac{n(\lambda + \lambda_g)}{2MM_\Sigma\sigma_\varepsilon} \right) \right).$$

where $c > 0$ is a constant coming from Lemma 4. Since by (17)

$$\lambda + \lambda_g \geq C\sigma_\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \iff \frac{(\lambda + \lambda_g)^2 n}{C^2 \sigma_\varepsilon^2} \geq \log p,$$

we have

$$\frac{(\lambda + \lambda_g)^2 n}{C^2 \sigma_\varepsilon^2} \cdot C_0'' \geq C_0'' \log p$$

where $C_0'' = C^2 / (4M^2M_\Sigma^2)$. Similarly, the inequality

$$\frac{(\lambda + \lambda_g)n}{C\sigma_\varepsilon} \geq \sqrt{n \log p}$$

implies

$$\frac{(\lambda + \lambda_g)n}{C\sigma_\varepsilon} \cdot \sqrt{C_0''} \geq \sqrt{C_0''} \cdot \sqrt{n \log p} \geq \tilde{A}^{-1/2} \sqrt{C_0''} \log p$$

provided that $\log p \leq \tilde{A}n$ for some constant $\tilde{A} > 0$, which we assumed in the hypothesis of Theorem 2. The above shows that we can pick either argument of the minimum in Lemma 4 to develop and hence

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{|v_i| > \frac{1}{2}(\lambda + \lambda_g)\right\} \leq 2 \exp(-C_0' \log p).$$

for some constant C_0' that increases with C , recalling that C comes from (17). Then by the union bound we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}\|^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_\infty \geq \frac{\lambda + \lambda_g}{2}\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_i |v_i| \geq \frac{\lambda + \lambda_g}{2}\right) \\ &\leq (p(q+1)) \cdot 2 \exp(-C_0' \log p) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-C_0' \log p + \log p + \log(q+1)) \\ &\leq 2 \exp(-c_3 \log p) \end{aligned}$$

for some $c_3 > 0$. In the last step we used $\log p \asymp \log q$. This shows (S19) holds with high probability.

Next we will show the cone condition

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma^c}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 \leq 4\tau_j (\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1) \quad (\text{S20})$$

holds with high probability, where $\tau_j = 1 + \sqrt{(s_\gamma + s_\beta)/s_{\beta,g}}$ as defined in Assumption 5. Since $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$ is optimal, we have that

$$\frac{1}{2n} \|\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{U}\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} - \mathbf{W}\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \leq \frac{1}{2n} \|\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}_j\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}.$$

Rearranging the above leads to

$$\lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \lambda \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \leq \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} + \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle. \quad (\text{S21})$$

By the same argument leading to (S19), the events

$$\mathcal{A}_1 = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A}_2 = \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{W}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_\infty \leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \right\}$$

hold with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-c_4 \log p)$ and $1 - 2 \exp(-c_5 \log p)$ respectively for some constants $c_4 > 0$ and $c_5 > 0$.

Conditional on \mathcal{A}_1 and \mathcal{A}_2 , we have by Hölder's inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu} + \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle &= \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\nu}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle + \frac{1}{n} \langle \mathbf{W}\boldsymbol{\Delta}, \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{U}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \frac{1}{n} \|\mathbf{W}^\top \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}\|_\infty \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \end{aligned}$$

so that (S21) becomes

$$\lambda\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \lambda\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + \lambda_g\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \leq \lambda\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + \lambda\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + \lambda_g\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1.$$

Since $\lambda_g/\lambda = \sqrt{(s_\gamma + s_\beta)/s_{\beta,g}}$, we have

$$2\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + 2\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}}\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} \leq 2\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 + 2\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 + 2\sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}}\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} + \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1.$$

Now subtract by the left-hand side and add $\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1$, and $\sqrt{(s_\gamma + s_\beta)/s_{\beta,g}}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}$ to find

$$\begin{aligned} \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 + \sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} &\leq 2(\|\boldsymbol{\gamma}\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1) \\ &\quad + 2\left(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1\right) \\ &\quad + 2\sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}}\left(\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{-0}\|_{1,2} - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{-0}\|_{1,2} + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{-0}\|_{1,2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

Then using the triangle inequality and the fact that the terms in parentheses vanish outside of the respective support sets S_γ , S_β , and $S_{\beta,g}$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}\|_1 \leq 4\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + 4\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1 + 4\sqrt{\frac{s_\gamma + s_\beta}{s_{\beta,g}}}\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2}.$$

Since $\|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{(S_{\beta,g})}\|_{1,2} \leq \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1$, the above yields

$$\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma^c}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 \leq 4\tau_j(\|\boldsymbol{\nu}_{S_\gamma}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\Delta}_{S_\beta}\|_1)$$

as desired, recalling again that $\tau_j = 1 + \sqrt{(s_\gamma + s_\beta)/s_{\beta,g}}$ as defined in Assumption 5

Step 2

In this step, we bound the diagonal difference $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)|$. Notice that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)$ is a sum of sub-exponential random variables with sub-exponential norm bounded by $M^2M_\Sigma^2$, where M is from Assumption 1 and M_Σ from Assumption 3. We have by Lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)| > \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)\right) &\leq 2\exp\left(-cn \min\left(\frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)^2}{4M^2M_\Sigma^2}, \frac{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)}{2MM_\Sigma}\right)\right) \\ &\leq 2\exp\left(-cn \min\left(\frac{m_0^2}{4M^2M_\Sigma^2}, \frac{m_0}{2MM_\Sigma}\right)\right) \\ &\leq 2\exp(-c_6n) \end{aligned}$$

where we used $m_0 \leq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)$ by Assumption 2. Since

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)| \leq \frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell)$$

implies

$$\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell) \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell) \leq 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell)$$

which by Assumption 2 implies

$$\frac{m_0}{2} \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell) \leq 2M_0,$$

it follows from the above concentration bound that

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{m_0}{2} \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell) \leq 2M_0\right) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-c_6 n). \quad (\text{S22})$$

Next we bound the off-diagonal terms. Again by Lemma 4

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left(|\hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, k) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, k)| \geq 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, k)\right) \\ & \leq 2\exp\left(-cn \min\left(\frac{4\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, k)^2}{M^2 M_\Sigma^2}, \frac{2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, k)}{M M_\Sigma}\right)\right) \\ & \leq 2\exp\left(-cn \min\left(\frac{4M_0^2}{M^2 M_\Sigma^2}, \frac{4M_0}{M M_\Sigma}\right)\right) \\ & \leq 2\exp(-c_7 n). \end{aligned}$$

By Assumption 5, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq 2\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \\ & \implies -\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq 3\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \\ & \implies -\frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)} \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq \frac{3}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)} \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the above concentration bound yields

$$\mathbb{P}\left(-\frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)} \leq \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq \frac{3}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)}\right) \geq 1 - 2\exp(-c_7 n). \quad (\text{S23})$$

Step 3

Define the index set $\tilde{S} = S_\gamma \cup \{q+i \mid i \in S_\beta\}$. The set $\{q+i \mid i \in S_\beta\}$ indexes the columns of the submatrix \mathbf{W} of the matrix $[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]$ corresponding to the support set of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$. With slight abuse of notation, for a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{p(q+1)-1}$ let $\mathbf{v}_{\tilde{S}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p(q+1)-1}$ be the vector that equals \mathbf{v} on the set \tilde{S} and is zero on \tilde{S}^c , so that it has $s_\gamma + s_\beta$ nonzero elements. Define $\mathbf{v}_{\tilde{S}^c}$ analogously.

We will show that conditional on $\mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{A}_2$, and the bounds

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{m_0}{2} \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(\ell, \ell) \leq 2M_0, \\ & -\frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)} \leq \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}}(k, \ell) \leq \frac{3}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta + s_\gamma)}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

we have

$$\inf_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathcal{V}} \frac{\|[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]\mathbf{v}\|_2}{\sqrt{n}\|\mathbf{v}_{\tilde{S}}\|_2} \geq \sqrt{\frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0}} > 0.$$

where $\mathcal{V} = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{p(q+1)-1} \mid \|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}^c}\|_1 \leq 4\tau_j \|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1\}$

First we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2}{n\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} &= \frac{\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}^\top \text{diag}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}})\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} + \frac{\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}^\top (\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} - \text{diag}(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}))\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Then by $\|\mathbf{a} + \mathbf{b}\|_2^2 = \|\mathbf{a}\|_2^2 + 2\mathbf{a}^\top \mathbf{b} + \|\mathbf{b}\|_2^2$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\|[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]\mathbf{v}\|_2^2}{n\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} &\geq \frac{\|[\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}]\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2}{n\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} + 2\frac{\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}^\top \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}^c}}{n\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} - \frac{2}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1 \|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}^c}\|_1}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} - \frac{8\tau_j}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1+8\tau_j}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} \frac{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_1^2}{\|\mathbf{v}_{\hat{S}}\|_2^2} \\ &\geq \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\beta+s_\gamma)} = \frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0} > 0. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used that $c_0 > 2/m_0$ in Assumption 5. We have shown that

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\| [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}] \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 \geq \left(\frac{m_0}{2} - \frac{1}{c_0} \right) \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\hat{S}}^2 \quad (\text{S25})$$

Final step

It is true that for $\ell \in [p(q+1)-1]$ we have

$$\left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right)_\ell = \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_\ell + \sum_{k \neq \ell} \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(k, \ell) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_k.$$

Then by (S24) and the triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_\ell - \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right)_\ell \right| &\leq \left| \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(\ell, \ell) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_\ell - \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right)_\ell \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{k \neq \ell} \hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}}(k, \ell) \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_k \right| \\ &\leq \frac{3}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\gamma+s_\beta)} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \left| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_k \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging terms and applying (S24) yields

$$\frac{m_0}{2} \left| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix}_\ell \right| \leq \left| \left(\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{UW}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right)_\ell \right| + \frac{3}{c_0(1+8\tau_j)(s_\gamma+s_\beta)} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1.$$

Since this holds for all $\ell \in [p(q+1) - 1]$, we have shown that

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} \leq \frac{2}{m_0} \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} + \frac{6}{c_0 m_0 (1 + 8\tau_j)(s_\gamma + s_\beta)} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1. \quad (\text{S26})$$

Combining (S18) and (S20) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \left\| [\mathbf{U}, \mathbf{W}] \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_2^2 &\leq \left\| \hat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}_{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{W}} \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \cdot (1 + 4\tau_j) \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_1 \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \cdot (1 + 4\tau_j) \sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_2 \end{aligned}$$

and combining this with (S25) gives us

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_2^2 \leq \frac{3}{2} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \cdot (1 + 4\tau_j) \left(\frac{2c_0}{c_0 m_0 - 2} \right) \sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_2$$

and therefore

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_2 \leq 3(\lambda + \lambda_g)(1 + 4\tau_j) \left(\frac{c_0}{c_0 m_0 - 2} \right) \sqrt{s_\gamma + s_\beta}.$$

On the other hand, by (S20) we have

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \leq (1 + 4\tau_j) \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_1 \leq (1 + 4\tau_j) \sqrt{s_\beta + s_\gamma} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\tilde{s}} \Big|_2$$

so combining this with the above yields

$$\left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_1 \leq 3(\lambda + \lambda_g)(1 + 4\tau_j)^2 \left(\frac{c_0}{c_0 m_0 - 2} \right) (s_\gamma + s_\beta)$$

Finally, plugging this into (S26) and with (S18) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \begin{pmatrix} \boldsymbol{\nu} \\ \boldsymbol{\Delta} \end{pmatrix} \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \frac{3}{m_0} (\lambda + \lambda_g) + \frac{18(\lambda + \lambda_g)(1 + 4\tau_j)^2}{c_0 m_0 (1 + 8\tau_j)} \left(\frac{c_0}{c_0 m_0 - 2} \right) \\ &= \frac{3}{m_0} (\lambda + \lambda_g) \left(1 + \frac{6(1 + 4\tau_j)^2}{(1 + 8\tau_j)(c_0 m_0 - 2)} \right) \end{aligned}$$

as desired. \square