

# Estimation and inference of high-dimensional partially linear regression models with latent factors

Yanmei Shi<sup>1</sup>, Meiling Hao<sup>2</sup>, Yanlin Tang<sup>3\*</sup> and Xu Guo<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *School of Statistics, Beijing Normal University, Beijing, China*

<sup>2</sup> *School of Statistics, University of International Business and Economics, Beijing, China*

<sup>3</sup> *Key Laboratory of Advanced Theory and Application in Statistics and Data Science–MOE, School of Statistics, East China Normal University, Shanghai, China*

## Abstract

In this paper, we introduce a novel high-dimensional Factor-Adjusted sparse Partially Linear regression Model (FAPLM), to integrate the linear effects of high-dimensional latent factors with the nonparametric effects of low-dimensional covariates. The proposed FAPLM combines the interpretability of linear models, the flexibility of nonparametric models, with the ability to effectively capture the dependencies among high-dimensional covariates. We develop a penalized estimation approach for the model by leveraging B-spline approximations and factor analysis techniques. Theoretical results establish error bounds for the estimators, aligning with the minimax rates of standard Lasso problems. To assess the significance of the linear component, we introduce a factor-adjusted projection debiased procedure and employ the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap method to derive critical values. Theoretical guarantees are provided under regularity conditions. Comprehensive numerical experiments validate the finite-sample performance of the proposed method. Its successful application to a birth weight dataset, the motivating example for this study, highlights both its effectiveness and practical relevance.

*Keywords:* B-spline; Factor-adjusted partially linear regression model; Latent factor; Nonparametric model; Projection debiased procedure

---

\*Corresponding authors: Xu Guo and Yanlin Tang; email-address: xustat12@bnu.edu.cn and yltang@fem.ecnu.edu.cn.

# 1 Introduction

In the era of information explosion, massive datasets have been accumulated across a wide range of scientific disciplines, including genomics, social sciences, and econometrics (Peng et al., 2010; Belloni et al., 2012; Fan et al., 2014; Bühlmann et al., 2014). In this context, we have access to a birth weight dataset, which consists of 24,539 gene expression profiles from peripheral blood samples of 72 pregnant women, along with clinical data such as maternal age, Body Mass Index (BMI), gestational age, parity, blood cotinine levels, and infant birth weights. The study aims to explore the relationship between maternal gene expression and infant birth weight. Preliminary analysis suggests a potential nonlinear association between maternal age and birth weight (Sherwood and Wang, 2016). Additionally, the gene expression profiles exhibit significant correlations, likely stemming from shared biological pathways, co-regulatory mechanisms, and technical factors associated with experimental and preprocessing procedures. Effectively analyzing this dataset requires addressing several key challenges: (1) capturing partially linear relationships between the response variable and covariates, (2) handling high-dimensional data, and (3) accurately modeling dependencies among features. Existing models, however, fall short of fully addressing these requirements. This underscores the pressing need for a novel methodological framework that meets these objectives while providing interpretable and actionable insights. Developing such a model remains both a critical and challenging task.

In this paper, we propose a novel high-dimensional Factor-Adjusted sparse Partially Linear regression Model (FAPLM),

$$Y = \mathbf{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 + g_0(\mathbf{z}) + \varepsilon, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\text{with } \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{B}\mathbf{f} + \mathbf{u}, \quad (1.2)$$

where  $Y$  is a response variable,  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  are  $p$ -dimensional and  $d$ -dimensional predictors,  $\mathbf{f}$  is a  $K$ -dimensional vector of latent factors,  $\mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times K}$  is the corresponding factor loading matrix, and  $\mathbf{u}$  is a  $p$ -dimensional vector of idiosyncratic component which is uncorrelated with  $\mathbf{f}$ . All the three parts  $\mathbf{B}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  are unobserved. The parameter  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$  is a vector of regression parameters, the regression coefficient on  $\mathbf{f}$  is  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 = \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ , and  $g_0(\cdot)$  is an unknown link function. The random error  $\varepsilon$  satisfies that  $\mathbb{E}(\varepsilon) = 0$ ,  $\text{Var}(\varepsilon) = \sigma_\varepsilon^2$ , and it's independent of  $\mathbf{u}$ ,  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$ . In addition, we assume that  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{z}$  are uncorrelated. The proposed model is compelling because it melds the chief advantages of linear regression models, nonparametric models and factor models. Specifically, Model (1.1) integrates a linear structure for  $\mathbf{x}$  with a nonparametric structure for  $\mathbf{z}$ , which strikes a balance between the interpretability of linear regression models and the flexibility of nonparametric models. This paper focuses on scenarios where  $p$  is high-dimensional, including cases where it diverges with  $n$  and  $p \gg n$  (where  $n$  represents the sample size), while  $d$  remains fixed. Without loss of generality, we assume  $d = 1$ . In such cases, the components of the observed  $p$ -dimensional covariate vector  $\mathbf{x}$  are correlated through a set of shared latent factors, effectively addressing the significant dependencies among features in high-dimensional data. In summary, the

FAPLM incorporates all the aforementioned desired features.

The proposed model bridges two important frameworks: factor models and partially linear regression models (PLMs). The factor model (1.2) is a widely used tool for capturing dependencies among features (Bai, 2003; Fan et al., 2013), with extensive research dedicated to its estimation and statistical inference; see e.g., Kneip and Sarda (2011); Fan et al. (2013, 2020, 2021); Guo et al. (2022); Beyhum and Striaukas (2023); Du et al. (2023); Ouyang et al. (2023); Sun et al. (2024); Bing et al. (2024); Fan et al. (2024). However, these studies often rely on specific model assumptions and face challenges in high-dimensional settings or when dealing with semiparametric structures like PLMs. Similarly, extensive research has been conducted on PLMs, particularly in high-dimensional settings. Various methods have been developed to address the parameter estimation problem, as exemplified in studies such as Xie and Huang (2009); Zhu (2017); Lian et al. (2019). Furthermore, significant progress has been made in statistical inference for PLMs, with notable contributions from works such as Zhu et al. (2019); Wang and Cui (2017, 2020); Liu et al. (2020); Zhao et al. (2023). Nevertheless, many of these methods face challenges in consistently recovering the true model or accurately testing regression coefficients when significant correlations exist among the covariates, thereby limiting their effectiveness in such scenarios.

Hence, estimating and inferring the unknown parameters in the FAPLM pose significant challenges, particularly when high-dimensional variables exhibit significant dependence. Addressing these challenges requires the development of novel methodologies. The primary contributions of this work are summarized as follows.

- We propose a general framework for high-dimensional PLMs with latent factors. The primary challenges in Model (1.1) arise from the unknown smooth function  $g_0(\cdot)$  and the unobserved factors  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$ . To address these issues, we employ the B-spline method to approximate the nonparametric component of the FAPLM (Huang et al., 2007; Liang and Li, 2009; Xie and Huang, 2009), and use principal component analysis to estimate the latent factors. It is important to note that estimating  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  introduces additional variability, bringing further complexity to the problem. This approach reformulates the original model into a factor-adjusted linear structure, facilitating more efficient estimation and inference.
- We establish an upper bound for the error of the linear estimator, aligning with the minimax rate for the standard Lasso problem (Raskutti et al., 2011). In the context of high-dimensional FAPLM, we demonstrate that the approximation error of the nonlinear component and the estimation error of the latent factors have a negligible impact on the overall error of the linear component. These findings provide valuable insights into the role of latent factors in mediating the interaction between linear and nonlinear components.
- We develop a test procedure based on the projection strategy to evaluate the significance of the linear component. This task is complicated by the inherent bias of penalized

estimators, as well as the challenges posed by the unknown nonparametric component  $g_0(\cdot)$  and latent factors, which hinder achieving a zero-centered limiting distribution. To overcome these difficulties, we propose a factor-adjusted projection debiased test, where the test statistic is approximated by the maximum of a high-dimensional zero-mean Gaussian vector. Critical values are derived using the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap method. Theoretical validity of the proposed procedure is established under regularity conditions, and its power properties are comprehensively analyzed.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we approximate the nonparametric function with polynomial splines, and thoroughly investigate the estimation of latent factors. In addition, we consider the regularization estimation of  $\beta_0$ . In Section 3, we develop a factor-adjusted projection debiased procedure for testing whether  $\beta_0 = \mathbf{0}$ . Section 4 derives the theoretical properties of the regularized estimator and factor-adjusted projection debiased estimator. We present the findings of our simulation studies in Section 5 and provide an analysis of real data in Section 6 to assess the performance and effectiveness of the proposed approach. Conclusions and discussions are presented in Section 7. Proofs of the main Theorems and related technical Lemmas are attached in the Supplementary Material.

**Notations.** Let  $\mathbb{I}(\cdot)$  denote the indicator function. For a vector  $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we denote its  $\ell_q$  norm as  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_q = (\sum_{\ell=1}^m |a_\ell|^q)^{1/q}$ ,  $1 \leq q < \infty$ ,  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq \ell \leq m} |a_\ell|$ , and  $\|\mathbf{a}\|_0 = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \mathbb{I}(a_\ell \neq 0)$ . For any integer  $m$ , we define  $[m] = \{1, \dots, m\}$ . The Orlicz norm of a scalar random variable  $X$  is defined as  $\|X\|_{\psi_2} = \inf \{c > 0 : \mathbb{E} \exp(X^2/c^2) \leq 2\}$ . For a random vector  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ , we define its Orlicz norm as  $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\psi_2} = \sup_{\|\mathbf{c}\|_2=1} \|\mathbf{c}^\top \mathbf{x}\|_{\psi_2}$ . Furthermore, we use  $\mathbf{I}_K$ ,  $\mathbf{1}_K$  and  $\mathbf{0}_K$  to denote the identity matrix in  $\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ , a vector of dimensional  $K$  with all elements being 1 and all elements being 0, respectively. For a matrix  $\mathbf{A} = (A_{jk})$ ,  $\mathbf{a}_i$  represents the  $i$ -th row of  $\mathbf{A}$ , and  $\mathbf{A}_j$  represents the  $j$ -th column of  $\mathbf{A}$ . We define  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\mathbb{F}} = \sqrt{\sum_{jk} A_{jk}^2}$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_{\max} = \max_{j,k} |A_{jk}|$ ,  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_\infty = \max_j \sum_k |A_{jk}|$  and  $\|\mathbf{A}\|_1 = \max_k \sum_j |A_{jk}|$  to be its Frobenius norm, element-wise max-norm, matrix  $\ell_\infty$ -norm and matrix  $\ell_1$ -norm, respectively. Besides, we use  $\lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{A})$  and  $\lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{A})$  to denote the minimal and maximal eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{A}$ , respectively. We use  $|\mathcal{A}|$  to denote the cardinality of a set  $\mathcal{A}$ . For two positive sequences  $\{a_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ ,  $\{b_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ , we write  $a_n = O(b_n)$  if there exists a positive constant  $C$  such that  $a_n \leq C \cdot b_n$ , and we write  $a_n = o(b_n)$  if  $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore, if  $a_n = O(b_n)$  is satisfied, we write  $a_n \lesssim b_n$ . If  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  and  $b_n \lesssim a_n$ , we write it as  $a_n \asymp b_n$  for short. In addition, let  $a_n = O_{\mathbb{P}}(b_n)$  denote  $\Pr(|a_n/b_n| \leq c) \rightarrow 1$  for some constant  $c < \infty$ . Let  $a_n = o_{\mathbb{P}}(b_n)$  denote  $\Pr(|a_n/b_n| > c) \rightarrow 0$  for any constant  $c > 0$ . The parameters  $c, c_0, C, C_1, C_2$  and  $K'$  appearing in this paper are all positive constants.

## 2 Methodology

In this section, we investigate the reformulation of FAPLM and the consistent estimation of latent factors. Based on the transformed model and the estimated factors, we then propose the regularized estimators for the model parameters to ensure accurate inference.

## 2.1 Reformulation of FAPLM

To address the unknown nonparametric component in model (1.1), several methods have been proposed, including B-splines (Sherwood and Wang, 2016), Reproducing Kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS) techniques (Wang et al., 2022), and neural networks (Zhong and Wang, 2024). In this paper, we adopt B-spline method to approximate the nonparametric component  $g_0(\cdot)$  in model (1.1). To proceed, we first introduce the relevant definition.

**Definition 2.1.** (*Hölder Space*). Let  $\mathcal{H}_r$  denote the Hölder space of order  $r$ . Define  $\mathcal{H}_r$  as the collection of all functions  $g : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , whose  $m$ -th order derivative satisfies the Hölder condition of order  $\nu$  with  $r := m + \nu$ , where  $m$  is a positive integer and  $\nu \in (0, 1]$ . Specifically, for any  $g \in \mathcal{H}_r$ , there exists a constant  $c > 0$  such that for any  $0 \leq s, t \leq 1$ ,  $|g^{(m)}(s) - g^{(m)}(t)| \leq c|s - t|^\nu$ .

The order  $r$  reflects the smoothness of functions within the Hölder space and determines the approximation accuracy of the B-spline method for  $g_0(\cdot)$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\pi}_i = \boldsymbol{\Pi}(Z_i) = \{\Pi_1(Z_i), \dots, \Pi_{k_n+h+1}(Z_i)\}^\top$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , be a set of B-spline basis functions of order  $h + 1$  with  $k_n$  quasi-uniform internal knots on  $[0, 1]$ . We assume that the B-spline basis is non-negative and normalized to have  $\sum_{s=1}^{M_n} \Pi_s(Z) = \sqrt{M_n}$ , with  $M_n = k_n + h + 1$ . Then if  $g_0 \in \mathcal{H}_r$  for some  $r \geq 1.5$ ,  $g_0$  can be well approximated by a linear combination of normalized B-spline basis functions. That is, there exists a  $M_n$ -vector  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_0$  such that

$$\sup_{Z \in [0, 1]} |\boldsymbol{\Pi}(Z)^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_0 - g_0(Z)| < CM_n^{-r}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here  $C$  denotes a positive constant that depends solely on the orders of the Hölder space and the spline function space. This result follows from the approximation properties of splines (Huang, 2003; Schumaker, 2007). With the B-spline basis functions, model (1.1) can be approximated by

$$Y \approx \boldsymbol{f}^\top \boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 + \boldsymbol{u}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\Pi}(Z)^\top \boldsymbol{\xi}_0 + \varepsilon, \quad (2.2)$$

with  $\boldsymbol{x} = \boldsymbol{B}\boldsymbol{f} + \boldsymbol{u}$ ,

where  $\boldsymbol{\varphi}_0 = \boldsymbol{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ . This demonstrates that FAPLM has been reformulated into a linear form via the B-spline method. Consequently, we can apply linear model-based estimation and inference methods to analyze the parameters in model (2.2). However, since the latent factors  $\boldsymbol{f}$  and  $\boldsymbol{u}$  are unobserved, they must first be estimated. In the following subsection, we investigate the consistent estimation of these latent factors.

## 2.2 Factor estimation

Throughout this paper, we assume that the data  $\{\boldsymbol{x}_i, Z_i, \boldsymbol{f}_i, \boldsymbol{u}_i, Y_i, \varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$  are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) copies of  $\{\boldsymbol{x}, Z, \boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{u}, Y, \varepsilon\}$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{X} = (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_n)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{F} = (\boldsymbol{f}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{f}_n)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{U} = (\boldsymbol{u}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{u}_n)^\top$ ,  $\boldsymbol{Y} = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)^\top$  and  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} = (\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_n)^\top$ .

In the context of the FAPLM, the latent factor vectors  $\mathbf{f}$  and  $\mathbf{u}$  must be estimated, given that only the predictor vector  $\mathbf{x}$  and the response  $Y$  are directly observed. The constrained least squares estimator of  $(\mathbf{F}, \mathbf{B})$  based on  $\mathbf{X}$  is given by

$$(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}, \widehat{\mathbf{B}}) = \arg \min_{\mathbf{F} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times K}, \mathbf{B} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times K}} \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top\|_{\mathbb{F}}^2 \quad (2.3)$$

subject to  $n^{-1}\mathbf{F}^\top\mathbf{F} = \mathbf{I}_K$  and  $\mathbf{B}^\top\mathbf{B}$  is diagonal.

Elementary manipulation yields that the columns of  $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}/\sqrt{n}$  are the eigenvectors corresponding to the largest  $K$  eigenvalues of the matrix  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{B}} = \mathbf{X}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{F}}(\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1} = n^{-1}\mathbf{X}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{F}}$ . Then the least squares estimator of  $\mathbf{U}$  is given by  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{X} - \widehat{\mathbf{F}}\widehat{\mathbf{B}}^\top = (\mathbf{I}_n - n^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top)\mathbf{X}$  (Fan et al., 2013). Since  $K$  corresponds to the number of spiked eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top$ , it is generally small. Consequently, we treat  $K$  as a fixed constant, as recommended by Fan et al. (2024).

In practice, the number of latent factors, denoted  $K$ , is often unknown, and determining  $K$  in a data-driven way is a crucial challenge. Various methods have been proposed in the literature to estimate  $K$  (Bai and Ng, 2002; Lam and Yao, 2012; Ahn and Horenstein, 2013; Fan et al., 2022). In this paper, we adopt the ratio method for numerical studies. Let  $\lambda_k(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top)$  be the  $k$ -th largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top$  and let  $K_{\max}$  be a prescribed upper bound. The number of factors can be consistently estimated (Luo et al., 2009; Lam and Yao, 2012; Ahn and Horenstein, 2013) by

$$\widehat{K} = \arg \max_{k \leq K_{\max}} \frac{\lambda_k(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top)}{\lambda_{k+1}(\mathbf{X}\mathbf{X}^\top)},$$

where  $1 \leq K_{\max} \leq n$  is a prescribed upper bound for  $K$ . In the subsequent theoretical analysis,  $K$  is treated as known. All theoretical results remain valid, with the condition that  $\widehat{K}$  is a consistent estimator of  $K$ .

## 2.3 Regularization estimation

In this subsection, we consider the parameter estimation problem. The regularized estimators of the unknown parameter vectors  $\beta_0$ ,  $\varphi_0$  and  $\xi_0$  in (2.2) are defined as follows,

$$(\widehat{\beta}, \widehat{\varphi}, \widehat{\xi}) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \varphi \in \mathbb{R}^K, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M_n}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \left\| \mathbf{Y} - \widehat{\mathbf{U}}\beta - \widehat{\mathbf{F}}\varphi - \mathbf{\Pi}\xi \right\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1 \right\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where  $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\mathbf{\Pi}(Z_1), \dots, \mathbf{\Pi}(Z_n)\}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times M_n}$ , and  $\lambda > 0$  is a tuning parameter. Recall that  $\widehat{\mathbf{U}} = (\mathbf{I}_n - \widehat{\mathbf{P}})\mathbf{X}$ , where  $\widehat{\mathbf{P}} = n^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top$  is the corresponding projection matrix. Hence,  $\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{0}$ . It is straightforward to verify that the solution of (2.4) is equivalent to

$$(\widehat{\beta}, \widehat{\xi}) = \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{M_n}} \left\{ \frac{1}{2n} \left\| (\mathbf{I}_n - \widehat{\mathbf{P}})(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{\Pi}\xi) - \widehat{\mathbf{U}}\beta \right\|_2^2 + \lambda \|\beta\|_1 \right\}, \quad (2.5)$$

$$\widehat{\varphi} = (\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top\widehat{\mathbf{F}})^{-1}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top(\mathbf{Y} - \widehat{\mathbf{U}}\beta - \mathbf{\Pi}\xi) = \frac{1}{n}\widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top(\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{\Pi}\xi). \quad (2.6)$$

### 3 Inference

In this paper, we are interested in the problem of testing global parameters in model (1.1), that is, the hypothesis testing problem is

$$H_0 : \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \mathbf{0} \text{ versus } H_1 : \boldsymbol{\beta}_0 \neq \mathbf{0}. \quad (3.1)$$

Firstly, we correct the bias of the initial estimator  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  in (2.5). Building on the construction of the debiased estimator  $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , we then develop a max-type test statistic and derive its asymptotic distribution. For statistical inference, we use the bootstrap method to obtain empirical critical values for hypothesis testing.

#### 3.1 Factor-adjusted projection debiased test

In high-dimensional statistical inference, debiased Lasso estimators have been employed for high-dimensional linear models, as developed by Zhang and Zhang (2014); Van de Geer et al. (2014); Javanmard and Montanari (2014). For the linear model  $Y = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ , given an initial Lasso estimator  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ , the debiased Lasso adds a correction term to  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  to remove the bias introduced by regularization. In particular, the correction term takes the form of

$$\frac{1}{n} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_j \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}), \quad (3.2)$$

where  $n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{X}\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})$  is the sample analogue of the population score function  $\mathbb{E}\{\mathbf{x}_i^\top (Y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\}$ ,  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}_j$  denotes the  $j$ -th row of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Gamma}}$ , which is an approximate inverse of  $n^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X}$ , whose population counterpart is  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top)$ .

In our model (1.1), the nuisance nonparametric component  $g_0(\cdot)$  introduces additional bias. Consequently, the standard debiased Lasso cannot fully remove the influence of  $g_0(\cdot)$ , resulting in a limiting distribution that is not centered around zero. A commonly used solution is to project the parametric component onto the nonparametric space. Zhu (2017) utilized the projection method to study the  $\ell_1$ -norm penalized estimator, demonstrating that the estimation error of the nonlinear component has only a second-order effect to the error of the linear component. This finding enables feasible inference based on the debiased estimator and motivates us to apply similar projection strategy in analyzing the linear estimator in FAPLM.

Building on these methods, we propose the Factor-Adjusted Projection Debiased Test (FAPDT). Specifically, we define the projection of  $U_j$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , onto  $Z$  as follows

$$m_{\mathcal{G}_u, j}(Z) = \arg \min_{m \in \mathcal{G}_u} \mathbb{E} \{U_j - m(Z)\}^2. \quad (3.3)$$

Here  $m_{\mathcal{G}_u, j}(Z)$  can be regarded as the projection of conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}(U_j|Z)$  on the function space  $\mathcal{G}_u$ . In this paper, we approximate  $\mathbb{E}(U_j|Z)$  with B-spline method as well, that is,  $\mathcal{G}_u = \{\boldsymbol{\Pi}(Z)^\top \boldsymbol{\xi} : \boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{M_n}\}$ . Similar with the analysis of  $g_0(\cdot)$ , if  $\mathbb{E}(U_j|Z) \in \mathcal{H}_r$  for

some  $r \geq 1.5$ , it can be well approximated by  $m_{\mathcal{G}_{u,j}}(Z)$  with sufficiently large  $M_n$ . Denote  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(Z) = \{m_{\mathcal{G}_{u,1}}(Z), \dots, m_{\mathcal{G}_{u,p}}(Z)\}^\top \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $\mathbf{u}_i^* = \mathbf{u}_i - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}_i|Z_i) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$  and  $\Sigma_u^* = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}^*)$ . Let  $\mathbf{U}^* = (\mathbf{u}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{u}_n^*)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ ,  $\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z}) = \{\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(Z_1), \dots, \mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(Z_n)\}^\top = \Pi(\Pi^\top \Pi)^{-1} \Pi^\top \mathbf{U} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ , and nonparametric surrogates  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}} = \hat{\mathbf{U}} - \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z})$ , with  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z}) = \Pi(\Pi^\top \Pi)^{-1} \Pi^\top \hat{\mathbf{U}} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ .

Let  $\hat{\Theta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$  be an approximation for the inverse of the Gram matrix  $\tilde{\Sigma} = n^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \tilde{\mathbf{U}}$  and  $\Theta = (\Sigma_u^*)^{-1}$ . There are many ways to estimate such a precision matrix. For instance, node-wise regression proposed by Zhang and Zhang (2014) and Van de Geer et al. (2014), as well as the CLIME-type estimator provided in Cai et al. (2011), Javanmard and Montanari (2014) and Avella-Medina et al. (2018). We construct  $\hat{\Theta}$  by employing a similar method proposed by Cai et al. (2011). Concretely,  $\hat{\Theta}$  is the solution to the following constrained optimization problem.

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Theta} &= \arg \min_{\Theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}} \|\Theta\|_1 \\ \text{s.t. } &\|\Theta \tilde{\Sigma} - \mathbf{I}_p\|_{\max} \leq \delta_n, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\delta_n$  is a predetermined tuning parameter. In general,  $\hat{\Theta}$  is not symmetric since there is no symmetry constraint on (3.4). Symmetry can be enforced through additional operations. Denote  $\hat{\Theta} = (\hat{\Gamma}_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$ . Write  $\hat{\Theta}^{\text{sym}} = (\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^{\text{sym}})_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$ , where  $\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^{\text{sym}}$  is defined as

$$\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}^{\text{sym}} = \hat{\Gamma}_{ij} \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}| \leq |\hat{\Gamma}_{ji}|) + \hat{\Gamma}_{ji} \mathbb{I}(|\hat{\Gamma}_{ij}| > |\hat{\Gamma}_{ji}|).$$

Apparently,  $\hat{\Theta}^{\text{sym}}$  is a symmetric matrix. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\hat{\Theta}$  is symmetric in the rest of the paper. Given  $\hat{\Theta}$  and  $\tilde{\mathbf{U}}$ , the Factor-adjusted projection debiased estimator of  $\beta_0$  is then defined as

$$\tilde{\beta} = \hat{\beta} + \frac{1}{n} \hat{\Theta} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}^\top \left( \mathbf{Y} - \hat{\mathbf{U}} \hat{\beta} - \hat{\mathbf{F}} \tilde{\varphi} - \Pi \hat{\xi} \right), \quad (3.5)$$

with  $\hat{\beta}$  and  $\hat{\xi}$  defined in (2.5), and  $\tilde{\varphi} = n^{-1} \hat{\mathbf{F}}^\top (\mathbf{Y} - \Pi \hat{\xi})$ .

In this paper, we consider the max-type statistic  $\sqrt{n} \|\tilde{\beta} - \beta_0\|_\infty$ . To determine its asymptotic distribution, we define  $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_p)^\top$  as a mean-zero Gaussian random vector with the same covariance matrix as  $n^{-1/2} \Theta \mathbf{U}^{*\top} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ , that is,

$$\text{Cov}(\mathbf{V}) = \text{Cov} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \Theta \mathbf{U}^{*\top} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \right) = \sigma_\varepsilon^2 \Theta. \quad (3.6)$$

Here  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$  is the variance of  $\varepsilon$ .

## 3.2 Gaussian multiplier bootstrap

Since  $\sigma_\varepsilon$  and  $\Theta$  are unknown, obtaining the critical value  $c_{1-\alpha}$  directly poses a challenge. Fan et al. (2024) suggests using the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap to derive it. We provide an overview of the procedural steps.

1. Generate i.i.d random variables  $v_1, \dots, v_n \sim N(0, 1)$  independent of the observed dataset  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_n, Y_1, \dots, Y_n\}$ , and compute

$$\widehat{L} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|\widehat{\Theta} \widetilde{U}^\top \mathbf{v}\|_\infty, \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\widetilde{U} = \widehat{U} - \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z})$ , with  $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z}) = \mathbf{\Pi}(\mathbf{\Pi}^\top \mathbf{\Pi})^{-1} \mathbf{\Pi}^\top \widehat{U}$ , and  $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_n)^\top$ .

2. Independently repeat the initial step  $B$  times to obtain  $\widehat{L}_1, \dots, \widehat{L}_B$ . Estimate the critical value  $c_{1-\alpha}$  via the  $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of the empirical distribution of the bootstrap statistics:

$$\widehat{c}_{1-\alpha} = \inf \left\{ t \geq 0 : H_B(t) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \mathbb{I}(\widehat{L}_b \leq t) \geq 1 - \alpha \right\}. \quad (3.8)$$

Our test statistic for  $H_0$  is given by

$$T_n = \frac{\sqrt{n} \|\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_\infty}{\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon}, \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  is defined in (3.5), and  $\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2$  is defined as

$$\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{\mathbf{u}}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}_i^\top \widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} - \boldsymbol{\pi}_i^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}})^2, \quad (3.10)$$

with  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  being defined in (2.5), and  $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{\varphi}} = n^{-1} \widehat{\mathbf{F}}^\top (\mathbf{Y} - \mathbf{\Pi} \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}})$ . We reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$  if and only if  $T_n \geq \widehat{c}_{1-\alpha}$ .

## 4 Theoretical results

In this section, we present the theoretical properties of the proposed estimation and inference procedures. To set the stage for the main results, we begin by outlining the necessary assumptions. Firstly, we introduce the identifiability conditions similar to those in [Fan et al. \(2013\)](#).

**Assumption 1.** *Assume that  $\text{Cov}(\mathbf{f}_t) = \mathbf{I}_K$ ,  $t = 1, \dots, n$ , and  $\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B}$  is diagonal.*

More specifically, let  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} = \text{diag}(\widehat{\lambda}_1, \dots, \widehat{\lambda}_K)$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} = (\widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_1, \dots, \widehat{\boldsymbol{\eta}}_K)$  be initial pilot estimators of the covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  of  $\mathbf{x}$ , the matrix consisting of its leading  $K$  eigenvalues  $\boldsymbol{\Lambda} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_K)$ , and the matrix consisting of their corresponding leading  $K$  orthonormalized eigenvectors  $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_K)$ , respectively. We adopt the regularity assumptions in [Fan et al. \(2024, 2013\)](#); [Bai \(2003\)](#) and other literature on high-dimensional factor analysis.

**Assumption 2.** *We make the following assumptions.*

(i) There exists some positive constant  $c_0 < \infty$  such that  $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\psi_2} \leq c_0$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\psi_2} \leq c_0$ . In addition,  $\mathbb{E}(U_{ij}) = \mathbb{E}(F_{ik}) = 0$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K$ .

(ii) There exists a constant  $\tau > 1$  such that  $p/\tau \leq \lambda_{\min}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B}) \leq \lambda_{\max}(\mathbf{B}^\top \mathbf{B}) \leq p\tau$ .

(iii) Let  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u})$ ,  $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u\|_2$  is bounded. In addition, there exists a constant  $\Upsilon > 0$  such that  $\|\mathbf{B}\|_{\max} \leq \Upsilon$  and

$$\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{u}^\top \mathbf{u} - \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u)|^4 \leq \Upsilon p^2.$$

(iv) There exists a positive constant  $\kappa < 1$  such that  $\kappa \leq \lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u)$ ,  $\|\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u\|_1 \leq 1/\kappa$  and  $\min_{1 \leq k, l \leq p} \text{Var}(U_{ik}U_{il}) \geq \kappa$ .

**Assumption 3.** (Initial pilot estimators). Assume that  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}}$ ,  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}$  and  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}}$  satisfy  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Sigma}} - \boldsymbol{\Sigma}\|_{\max} = O_{\mathbb{P}}\{\sqrt{(\log p)/n}\}$ ,  $\|(\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}} - \boldsymbol{\Lambda})\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Lambda}}^{-1}\|_{\max} = O_{\mathbb{P}}\{\sqrt{(\log p)/n}\}$ , and  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\Omega}} - \boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_{\max} = O_{\mathbb{P}}\{\sqrt{(\log p)/(np)}\}$ .

**Remark 1.** Assumption 3 is adopted from Bayle and Fan (2022) and is applicable in numerous scenarios, including the sample covariance matrix under sub-Gaussian distributions (Fan et al., 2013). Furthermore, estimators such as the marginal and spatial Kendall's tau (Fan et al., 2018) and the elementwise adaptive Huber estimator (Fan et al., 2019) are consistent with this assumption.

We summarize the theoretical results related to consistent factor estimation in Lemma B.1 in Supplementary Material, which directly follows from Proposition 2.1 in Fan et al. (2024) and Lemma 3.1 in Bayle and Fan (2022).

## 4.1 Estimation error

In the following, we investigate the error bounds of the estimators in (2.5) and analyze how factor estimation and nonparametric approximation affect parameter estimation. Recall that  $\mathbf{U}^* = \mathbf{U} - \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{U}|\mathbf{Z})$ ,  $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}} = \widehat{\mathbf{U}} - \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{G}_u}(\mathbf{Z})$ , and  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u^* = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{u}^*)$ . To investigate the consistency property of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ , we need to make the following technical conditions.

**Assumption 4.** We make the following assumptions.

(i) There exist positive constants  $c_1, c_u < \infty$ , such that  $\|\varepsilon\|_{\psi_2} \leq c_1$  and  $\|\mathbf{u}^*\|_{\psi_2} \leq c_u$ .

(ii) The covariance matrix  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \text{Cov}(\mathbf{x}) > 0$ , and  $\lambda_{\min}(\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_u^*)$  is bounded away from zero.

(iii) There exists some constant  $r \geq 1.5$ , such that  $g_0 \in \mathcal{H}_r$ , and each component of  $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{u}|\mathbf{Z})$  belongs to  $\mathcal{H}_r$ .

(iv) The variable  $Z$  is bounded as  $\sup |Z| < \infty$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that  $Z \in [0, 1]$ .

Assumption 4 is mild and commonly adopted in high-dimensional analysis. Specifically, condition (i) imposes the sub-Gaussian assumption on  $\varepsilon$ , consistent with Fan et al. (2024). Condition (ii) requires the covariance matrix of  $\mathbf{x}$  to be positive definite and places a lower bound on the minimum eigenvalue of  $\Sigma_u^*$ , both of which are standard requirements in high-dimensional literature (Li and Li, 2022; Ouyang et al., 2023; Fan et al., 2024). Condition (iii) is a standard assumption on the smoothness of the function for the B-spline method (Xue and Yang, 2006; Sherwood and Wang, 2016). Finally, condition (iv) assumes that the variable  $Z$  takes values within a compact interval  $[0, 1]$ , as also assumed in Xie and Huang (2009); Lian et al. (2019).

We next analyze the estimation consistency of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ . Denote  $\mathcal{S}^* = \{j \in [p] : \beta_j \neq 0\}$ ,  $s = |\mathcal{S}^*|$  is its cardinality, and  $\mathcal{S}^{*C} = [p]/\mathcal{S}^*$ .

**Theorem 4.1.** *Suppose that the true parameter  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$  satisfies that  $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_\infty \leq C$  and  $s = o\{\sqrt{n}/(\log p) + \sqrt{n}/(M_n \log p)\}$ . Additionally, we assume that  $(\log p)^{12} = O(n)$ . By taking  $\lambda = O\{\sqrt{(\log p)/n}\}$  and  $M_n \approx n^{1/(2r+1)}$ , under Assumptions 1-4, the  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$  defined in (2.5) satisfies that*

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_2 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\lambda\sqrt{s}), \quad \text{and} \quad \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_1 = O_{\mathbb{P}}(\lambda s).$$

**Remark 2.** Theorem 4.1 establishes the  $\ell_1$ - and  $\ell_2$ -norm error bounds for our estimator  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ . The order  $\sqrt{s(\log p)/n}$  agrees with the minimax rate of the standard Lasso problem (Raskutti et al., 2011). From the proof of Theorem 4.1, it is evident that the contribution of the nonlinear approximation error and the latent factor estimation error to the linear component's estimation error is

$$\sqrt{s}M_n^{-2r}(\log p)(\log n) + \frac{\sqrt{s}(\log p)^{3/2}(\log n)^2}{n} + M_n^{-2r}\sqrt{sM_n(\log p)},$$

which is trivial compared to  $\sqrt{s(\log p)/n}$  under the conditions outlined in Theorem 4.1.

Using the estimated parameter  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  from (2.5), an estimator of the nonparametric function  $g_0(Z)$  can be constructed as  $\widehat{g}(Z) = \boldsymbol{\pi}(Z)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$ . The error bound for this estimator is given by the following Proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** *(Error bound of nonlinear part). Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 4.1 hold. The estimator  $\widehat{g}(Z) = \boldsymbol{\pi}(Z)^\top \widehat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$  satisfies that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{g}(Z_i) - g_0(Z_i)\}^2 = O_{\mathbb{P}} \left\{ M_n^{-2r} + \frac{(\log p)(\log n)^2}{n} + s^2 \frac{(\log p)^2}{n} \right\}.$$

Proposition 4.1 provides the error bound for the nonlinear estimator. This result demonstrates that the estimation error of the latent factors does not affect the order of the nonlinear component's estimation error, provided that  $(\log p)^3 \ll M_n$ .

## 4.2 Asymptotic properties of factor-adjusted projection debiased estimator

To establish an accuracy bound for  $\widehat{\Theta}$  as an approximation of the inverse of the pseudo Hessian matrix  $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ , we first introduce a necessary assumption regarding the sparsity of  $\Theta$ .

**Assumption 5.** *There exists some positive constant  $M_\Sigma$ , such that  $\|\Theta\|_\infty \leq M_\Sigma$ . Moreover,  $\Theta = (\Gamma_1, \dots, \Gamma_p)^\top = (\Gamma_{ij})_{1 \leq i, j \leq p}$  is row-wise sparse, i.e.,  $\max_{i \in [p]} \sum_{j=1}^p |\Gamma_{ij}|^q \leq c_{n,p}$ , for some  $0 \leq q < 1$ , where  $c_{n,p}$  is positive and bounded away from zero and allowed to increase as  $n$  and  $p$  grow.*

Assumption 5 requires that  $\Theta$  is sparse with respect to both its  $\ell_\infty$ -norm and its matrix row space. Similar assumptions regarding precision matrix estimation and more general inverse Hessian matrix estimation have been discussed by Van de Geer et al. (2014), Cai et al. (2016), and Ning and Liu (2017). The estimation error bounds for  $\widehat{\Theta}$  and the upper bound of  $\|\widehat{\Theta} - \Theta\|_\infty$  are provided in Proposition B.1 and Lemma B.9 in the Supplementary Material. These results are essential for establishing the theoretical foundations. In the following, we give the Gaussian approximation result for the test statistic.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 4.1 and Assumption 5 are satisfied. Additionally, we assume that  $s = o[\sqrt{n}/(\log p)^2 + \sqrt{n}/\{M_n(\log p)^3\}]$  and  $(\log p)^{(12-4q)/(3-3q)} = o(n)$ , with  $0 \leq q < 1$  being the constant in Assumption 5. Then, under the null hypothesis, we have*

$$\sup_{x>0} \left| \Pr \left( \sqrt{n} \|\widetilde{\beta} - \beta_0\|_\infty \leq x \right) - \Pr \left( \|\mathbf{V}\|_\infty \leq x \right) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (4.1)$$

Theorem 4.2 indicates that our test statistic can be approximated by the maximum of a high-dimensional mean-zero Gaussian vector under mild conditions. Based on this, we can reject the null hypothesis  $H_0$  at the significant level  $\alpha$  if and only if  $\sqrt{n} \|\widetilde{\beta} - \beta_0\|_\infty > c_{1-\alpha}$ , where  $c_{1-\alpha}$  is the  $(1-\alpha)$ -th quantile of the distribution of  $\|\mathbf{V}\|_\infty$ .

We next demonstrate that the estimator  $\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2$ , defined in (3.10), is consistent to the true variance  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$ .

**Proposition 4.2.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 4.1 hold and  $s = o(n^{1/4}/\sqrt{\log p})$ . Then, under the null hypothesis, we have*

$$\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2 - \sigma_\varepsilon^2 = o_{\mathbb{P}} \left( \frac{1}{\log p} \right).$$

**Remark 3.** Proposition 4.2 establishes the consistency of the variance estimator  $\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon^2$ . Actually, the estimator of  $\sigma_\varepsilon^2$  in high-dimensional linear regression has been extensively studied in the literature. For instance, Fan et al. (2012) proposed the refitted cross-validation method to develop a consistent estimation that quantifies the uncertainty of  $\widehat{\sigma}_\varepsilon$  in ultra-high-dimensional settings. Moreover, Sun and Zhang (2012) introduced the scaled-Lasso method, while Yu and Bien (2019) developed the organic Lasso method for estimating  $\sigma_\varepsilon$ .

We give the theoretical results related to the validity of the bootstrap procedure in the following Theorem.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 4.2 and Proposition 4.2 hold. Then, under the null hypothesis, we have*

$$\sup_{x>0} \left| \Pr \left( \frac{\sqrt{n} \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}_0\|_\infty}{\hat{\sigma}_\varepsilon} \leq x \right) - \Pr^*(\hat{L} \leq x) \right| \rightarrow 0,$$

where  $\Pr^*(\cdot) = \Pr(\cdot | \mathcal{D})$  denotes the conditional probability.

Theorem 4.3 establishes the validity of the proposed bootstrap procedure, based on the Gaussian approximation theory outlined in Theorem 4.2. Building on this foundation, we can define our decision rule as follows

$$\psi_{\infty, \alpha} = \mathbb{I}(T_n > \hat{c}_{1-\alpha}).$$

The null hypothesis  $H_0$  is rejected if and only if  $\psi_{\infty, \alpha} = 1$ .

Finally, we consider the power performance. To demonstrate the validity of the test, we consider the following local alternative hypotheses family for  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ .

$$\mathcal{B}(C) = \left\{ \boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p : \max_{j \in [p]} |\beta_j| \geq \sqrt{C \frac{\log p}{n}} \right\}, \quad (4.2)$$

where  $C$  is a positive constant. Next, we present the power property of the test statistic  $T_n$  under the alternative hypothesis  $H_1$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *Suppose that the conditions in Theorem 4.3 are hold. For the test statistic  $T_n$  defined in (3.9), we have*

$$\lim_{(n,p) \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathcal{B}(C)} \Pr(T_n \geq \hat{c}_{1-\alpha}) = 1, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $\mathcal{B}(C)$  is the local alternative hypotheses family defined in (4.2).

Theorem 4.4 demonstrates that our testing procedure maintains high power even when only a single component of the parameter  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  exceeds the order of  $\sqrt{C(\log p)/n}$ . This result highlights the effectiveness of our method under sparse alternative hypotheses, making it powerful in such scenarios. Moreover, this separation rate aligns with the minimax optimal rate for detecting local alternative hypotheses, as established in prior works by [Verzelen \(2012\)](#), [Cai et al. \(2014\)](#), [Zhang and Cheng \(2017\)](#) and [Ma et al. \(2021\)](#).

## 5 Simulations

In this section, we conduct simulation studies to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed method.

## 5.1 Estimation performance

Throughout the simulation study, we generate data based on the following model:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Y} &= \mathbf{U}\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{F}\boldsymbol{\phi}_0 + g_0(\mathbf{Z}) + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \\ \text{with } \mathbf{X} &= \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top + \mathbf{U}. \end{aligned}$$

Here  $\boldsymbol{\phi}_0 = \mathbf{B}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_0$ . To illustrate the accuracy of our estimation, we set the number of latent factors to  $K = 2$ , and the dimension of  $\mathbf{x}$  to either  $p = 200$  or  $500$ . The first  $s = 5$  entries of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0$  are set to 2, while the remaining  $p - s$  entries are set to 0. Throughout this subsection, we generate each entry of  $\mathbf{F}$  and  $\mathbf{U}$  from the standard Gaussian distribution  $N(0, 1)$ , and each entry of  $\mathbf{B}$  is randomly drawn from the uniform distribution  $\text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ . The error term  $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$  is generated from the Gaussian distribution  $N(0, 0.25)$ . In addition, we consider the following two forms of  $g_0(Z_i), i = 1, \dots, n$ .

$$\text{Model 1 : } g_0(Z_i) = Z_i; \tag{5.1}$$

$$\text{Model 2 : } g_0(Z_i) = \sin(2\pi Z_i). \tag{5.2}$$

The variable  $Z$  is generated from the uniform distribution  $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$ . Note that Model (5.1) corresponds to a linear model, while Model (5.2) corresponds to a nonlinear model. Under each setting, we generate  $n = 200$  i.i.d. observations, and replicate 500 times. Following the recommendation of [Lian et al. \(2019\)](#), we use cubic splines (of order 4) to approximate the nonparametric function  $g_0(\cdot)$  and set the number of internal nodes to  $n^{1/9}$ , which is the theoretical optimal order.

To emphasize the importance of incorporating latent factors and partially linear structures in modeling the relationships between response variables and covariates, we compare our method (denoted as ‘‘FAPLM’’) with two existing approaches. The first is the method of [Lian et al. \(2019\)](#) (denoted as ‘‘PLM’’), which uses B-spline method to approximate the nonparametric function and then applies the standard Lasso method with partial penalties for parameter estimation, but without accounting for latent factor effects. The second method is that of [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#), referred to as ‘‘FALM’’, which estimates parameters under the assumption of linear relationships between predictors and the response  $Y$ . This approach integrates  $\mathbf{x}$  and  $Z$ , while simultaneously considering their factor decomposition. We measure the prediction accuracy by using the following indicators.

- $\ell_1$ -norm error:  $\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1$ .
- Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE):  $n^{-1/2}[\sum_{i=1}^n \{\widehat{g}(Z_i) - g_0(Z_i)\}^2]^{1/2}$ .

Table 1 presents the estimation results for FAPLM, PLM, and FALM under the linear model corresponding to the link function (5.1). The results show that, for both  $p = 200$  and  $p = 500$ , FALM outperforms the other methods in terms of both  $\ell_1$ -norm error and RMSE, indicating that FALM provides the most accurate estimation. This is because the model in these settings corresponds to the true model of [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#). In contrast, our method still

relies on B-splines to estimate the nonparametric part, which may introduce approximation errors. However, compared to PLM, our method demonstrates superior performance in both  $\ell_1$ -norm error and RMSE, highlighting the advantage of incorporating factor analysis into partially linear models for more precise estimation. Table 2 presents the estimation results for FAPLM, PLM, and FALM under the nonlinear model corresponding to the link function (5.2), with results differing significantly from those in the linear case. For both  $p = 200$  and  $p = 500$ , our method achieves the best performance in terms of  $\ell_1$ -norm error and RMSE, while FALM performs the worst. This is because, for the nonlinear form of the nonparametric function, the method of Fan et al. (2024) incorrectly assumes linearity and applies factor analysis and parameter estimation based on this assumption, leading to substantial errors. In contrast, our method uses B-splines to approximate the nonparametric functions, resulting in a smaller approximation error and more accurate estimation. Furthermore, compared to PLM, our method benefits from the factor model’s ability to more effectively capture feature dependencies, resulting in improved estimation performance.

Table 1: Empirical average of all indicators in linear model (5.1) based on 500 replications. The “FAPLM”, “PLM” and “FALM” represent the estimation results under FAPLM in this paper and PLM without incorporating the factor effect in Lian et al. (2019), and linear regression model accounting for latent factor effects in Fan et al. (2024), respectively.

Method	$p$	FAPLM	PLM	FALM
$\ell_1$ -norm error	200	0.675	0.724	0.566
RMSE		0.085	0.096	0.073
$\ell_1$ -norm error	500	0.796	0.860	0.630
RMSE		0.087	0.099	0.076

Table 2: Empirical average of all indicators in nonlinear model (5.2) based on 500 replications. The “FAPLM”, “PLM” and “FALM” represent the estimation results under FAPLM in this paper and PLM without incorporating the factor effect in Lian et al. (2019), and linear regression model accounting for latent factor effects in Fan et al. (2024), respectively.

Method	$p$	FAPLM	PLM	FALM
$\ell_1$ -norm error	200	0.636	0.903	0.912
RMSE		0.096	0.117	0.660
$\ell_1$ -norm error	500	0.772	0.899	1.015
RMSE		0.096	0.113	0.659

## 5.2 Factor-adjusted projection debiased Lasso inference

In this subsection, we set  $K = 2$ ,  $p = 200$  or  $500$ . Here the entries of  $\mathbf{B}$  are generated from the uniform distribution  $\text{Unif}(-1, 1)$ , every row of  $\mathbf{F}$  follows from  $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_K)$ , and every row of  $\mathbf{U}$  follows from  $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_p)$ . We set  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{F}\mathbf{B}^\top + \mathbf{U}$ . The distributions of the variable  $Z$  and the error term  $\varepsilon$ , and the forms of  $g_0(\cdot)$  are the same as those in Section 5.1. We specify the parameter vector  $\boldsymbol{\beta}_0 = \omega * (\mathbf{1}_5, \mathbf{0}_{p-5})^\top$ ,  $\omega \geq 0$ . When  $\omega = 0$ , it indicates that the null hypothesis holds, and the simulation results correspond to the empirical size. Otherwise, they correspond to the empirical power.

To illustrate the importance of accounting for latent factors and leveraging PLM to capture the partially linear structure between the response variable and covariates, we compare our method with the testing approaches of [Zhu et al. \(2019\)](#) (denoted as ‘‘PDT’’) and [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#) (denoted as ‘‘FabT’’). While PDT employs projection and debiased techniques within PLMs to test parameters, it overlooks latent factors. In contrast, FabT incorporates latent factors but assumes a fully linear structure between the response and covariates. The results for dimensions  $p = 200$  and  $p = 500$  are presented in Figures 1 and 2, respectively. The label ‘‘FAPDT’’ corresponds to the method proposed in this paper. When  $p = 200$ , for both Models (5.1) and (5.2), when  $\omega = 0$ , all three tests exhibit size performance close to the nominal significance level of 0.05. As  $\omega$  increases, the power curves of FAPDT and FabT for the linear model show similar convergence rates. However, for the nonlinear model, the power curve of FAPDT increases at a faster rate than that of FabT. This highlights the advantage of using a PLM to more effectively capture the partially linear structure between the response and covariates. In addition, for both Models (5.1) and (5.2), the power convergence rates of FAPDT and FabT consistently outperform those of PDT. This underscores the critical role of considering latent factors to enhance model performance. As the parameter dimension increases to  $p = 500$ , the patterns remain consistent, further reinforcing the effectiveness of FAPDT and the importance of accounting for latent factors.

## 6 Real data analysis

In this section, we apply the proposed methods to analyze the birth weight data ([Votavova et al., 2011](#)), which includes blood samples and gene expression profiles collected from 72 pregnant women. Along with infant birth weights, maternal characteristics such as age, BMI, gestational age, parity, and blood cotinine levels are recorded. Low birth weight is strongly associated with increased risks of morbidity and mortality in newborns ([McIntire et al., 1999](#)) and is further linked to a higher likelihood of developing chronic conditions later in life, such as obesity and type II diabetes ([Ishida et al., 2012](#)). Fetal growth, which is largely determined by the nutrients delivered through the placenta, is influenced by both environmental factors and gene expression ([Ishida et al., 2012](#)). Building on these findings, it is crucial to investigate the relationship between maternal gene expression and low birth weight. To effectively capture the partially linear structure between the response variable and




Figure 1: Power curves of linear model (5.1) (the left panel) and nonlinear model (5.2) (the right panel) with  $p = 200$  and  $\beta_0 = \omega * (\mathbf{1}_5, \mathbf{0}_{p-5})^\top$ . The “FAPDT”, “PDT” and “FabT” signify the results derived from the method in this paper and the approach in Zhu et al. (2019) and Fan et al. (2024), respectively.




Figure 2: Power curves of linear model (5.1) (the left panel) and nonlinear model (5.2) (the right panel) with  $p = 500$  and  $\beta_0 = \omega * (\mathbf{1}_5, \mathbf{0}_{p-5})^\top$ . The “FAPDT”, “PDT” and “FabT” signify the results derived from the method in this paper and the approach in Zhu et al. (2019) and Fan et al. (2024), respectively.

covariates, while accounting for the significant correlations among gene expression profiles discussed in Section 1, we employ the FAPLM for robust estimation and inference.

After excluding incomplete cases, a total of 65 individuals are retained, each with expression data for 24,539 genetic loci. For initial screening, we adopt the Pearson correlation coefficient proposed by Pearson (1895) to assess the association between the response variable and each genetic locus. The top 200 loci are selected and treated as linear covariates. Additionally, parity, maternal BMI, gestational age, and blood cotinine levels are also included as linear covariates. Considering the potential nonlinear relationship between maternal age and birth weight, maternal age is incorporated into the model as a nonlinear component.

Firstly, we assess the estimation performance of the FAPLM proposed in this paper, alongside the PLM from Lian et al. (2019), and the FALM from Fan et al. (2024). The evaluation is based on 200 random partitions of the dataset, with 50 subjects randomly selected as the training set and the remaining 15 as the test set. Using the model trained on each partition, we predict the response variables in the test set. Table 3 reports the average values of the following indicators to evaluate the estimation accuracy and predictive performance.

- RMSE:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_{\text{test}}}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} (\hat{Y}_i - Y_i^*)^2 \right\}^{1/2}.$$

Here  $n_{\text{test}} = 15$ ,  $Y_i^*$  represents the actual response of the  $i$ -th observation in the test set, while  $\hat{Y}_i$  denotes its corresponding predicted value.

- Out-of-sample  $R^2$ :

$$R^2 = 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} (\hat{Y}_i - Y_i^*)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} (\bar{Y}_i - Y_i^*)^2},$$

where  $\bar{Y}_i = n_{\text{test}}^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} Y_i^*$ .

The results in Table 3 show that FAPLM outperforms both PLM and FALM. When covariates exhibit significant correlations, applying PLM directly yields inaccurate estimators of parameters and suboptimal predictive performance, indicating its inability to capture the underlying data structure effectively. Additionally, FAPLM demonstrates superior predictive accuracy compared to FALM, highlighting the necessity of incorporating a partially linear structure to account for nonparametric effects.

Table 3: Prediction results of different methods based on 200 random partitions. The “FAPLM”, “PLM” and “FALM” represent the prediction results under FAPLM in this paper and PLM without incorporating the factor effect in Lian et al. (2019), and linear regression model accounting for latent factor effects in Fan et al. (2024), respectively.

	FAPLM	PLM	FALM
RMSE	280.94	341.72	288.68
$R^2$	0.75	0.56	0.68

We next illustrate the estimated function  $\hat{g}(Z)$  using the FAPDT method proposed in this paper and the PDT method from Zhu et al. (2019). The effect of mother’s age on infant birth weight is nonmonotone: the effect is first decreasing (up to age 25), then increasing (to about age 29), then decreasing (to about age 34), then increasing (to about age 38), and decreasing again. Furthermore, the nonlinear effects estimated by the two methods differ significantly. Specifically, the effect estimated using the FAPDT method varies markedly with maternal age, aligning more closely with real-world observations, while the effect estimated by the PDT method appears smoother and less variable.




Figure 3: The estimated nonlinear effect  $\hat{g}(Z)$  of mother’s age using two testing methods. The “FAPDT” and “PDT” signify the results derived from the method in this paper and the approach in Zhu et al. (2019), respectively.

Finally, we utilize the proposed FAPDT, along with the PDT from Zhu et al. (2019) and the FabT from Fan et al. (2024), to assess the significance of the linear components. Critical

values are obtained through 2000 bootstrap replications. For FabT, 10-fold cross-validation is employed to determine the tuning parameters, and iterated sure independent screening is used to estimate error variance. Table 4 reports the  $p$ -values for these tests. At a significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected for all three methods, indicating that the linear components of the selected gene expression and corresponding clinical variables significantly influence infant birth weight.

Table 4:  $p$ -values for FAPDT, PDT, and FabT: Results correspond to the method proposed in this paper and the approaches from [Zhu et al. \(2019\)](#) and [Fan et al. \(2024\)](#).

Test	FAPDT	PDT	FabT
$p$ -value	0.027	0.016	0.046

## 7 Conclusions and discussions

Motivated by the challenges presented in the birth weight data, this paper introduces FAPLM to address the partially linear dependence between the response variable and covariates, as well as the significant correlations among high-dimensional covariates. To achieve effective estimation and inference, we first employ the B-spline method to handle the nonparametric component and use the factor model to capture the dependency structure among features. For parameter estimation, we apply the  $\ell_1$ -norm penalty and establish both  $\ell_1$ - and  $\ell_2$ -norm error bounds, which agree with the minimax rate of the standard Lasso problems. Additionally, we develop a factor-adjusted projection debiased test to assess the significance of the linear component. To determine the critical value of the proposed test statistic FAPDT, we introduce the Gaussian multiplier bootstrap procedure. The theoretical validity of our methods is established under regularity conditions. Numerical results demonstrate the finite sample performance of our proposed methodologies.

There are several promising directions for future research. First, our current work assume that the dimension of the nonparametric component is fixed. Exploring methods to handle PLMs with high-dimensional linear and nonparametric components would be an intriguing avenue. Second, our framework relies on the sub-Gaussian assumption for the error term. Developing inference techniques for high-dimensional PLMs with heavy-tailed errors is both crucial and of significant interest. We plan to address this challenging problem in the near future.

## References

- Ahn, S. C. and Horenstein, A. R. (2013). Eigenvalue ratio test for the number of factors. *Econometrica*, 81(3):1203–1227.

- Avella-Medina, M., Battey, H. S., Fan, J., and Li, Q. (2018). Robust estimation of high-dimensional covariance and precision matrices. *Biometrika*, 105(2):271–284.
- Bai, J. (2003). Inferential theory for factor models of large dimensions. *Econometrica*, 71(1):135–171.
- Bai, J. and Ng, S. (2002). Determining the number of factors in approximate factor models. *Econometrica*, 70(1):191–221.
- Bayle, P. and Fan, J. (2022). Factor-augmented regularized model for hazard regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.01067*.
- Belloni, A., Chen, D., Chernozhukov, V., and Hansen, C. (2012). Sparse models and methods for optimal instruments with an application to eminent domain. *Econometrica*, 80(6):2369–2429.
- Beyhum, J. and Striaukas, J. (2023). Tuning-free testing of factor regression against factor-augmented sparse alternatives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.13364*.
- Bing, X., Cheng, W., Feng, H., and Ning, Y. (2024). Inference in high-dimensional multivariate response regression with hidden variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(547):2066–2077.
- Bühlmann, P., Kalisch, M., and Meier, L. (2014). High-dimensional statistics with a view toward applications in biology. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 1(1):255–278.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Luo, X. (2011). A constrained  $\ell_1$  minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(494):594–607.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Xia, Y. (2014). Two-sample test of high dimensional means under dependence. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(2):349–372.
- Cai, T., Liu, W., and Zhou, H. H. (2016). Estimating sparse precision matrix: Optimal rates of convergence and adaptive estimation. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):455–488.
- Du, J.-H., Wasserman, L., and Roeder, K. (2023). Simultaneous inference for generalized linear models with unmeasured confounders. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.07261*.
- Fan, J., Guo, J., and Zheng, S. (2022). Estimating number of factors by adjusted eigenvalues thresholding. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(538):852–861.
- Fan, J., Guo, S., and Hao, N. (2012). Variance estimation using refitted cross-validation in ultrahigh dimensional regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 74(1):37–65.

- Fan, J., Han, F., and Liu, H. (2014). Challenges of big data analysis. *National Science Review*, 1(2):293–314.
- Fan, J., Ke, Y., and Liao, Y. (2021). Augmented factor models with applications to validating market risk factors and forecasting bond risk premia. *Journal of Econometrics*, 222(1):269–294.
- Fan, J., Ke, Y., and Wang, K. (2020). Factor-adjusted regularized model selection. *Journal of Econometrics*, 216(1):71–85.
- Fan, J., Liao, Y., and Mincheva, M. (2013). Large covariance estimation by thresholding principal orthogonal complements. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 75(4):603–680.
- Fan, J., Liu, H., and Wang, W. (2018). Large covariance estimation through elliptical factor models. *Annals of Statistics*, 46(4):1383.
- Fan, J., Lou, Z., and Yu, M. (2024). Are latent factor regression and sparse regression adequate? *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(546):1076–1088.
- Fan, J., Wang, W., and Zhong, Y. (2019). Robust covariance estimation for approximate factor models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 208(1):5–22.
- Guo, Z., Čevd, D., and Bühlmann, P. (2022). Doubly debiased lasso: High-dimensional inference under hidden confounding. *Annals of Statistics*, 50(3):1320.
- Huang, J. Z. (2003). Local asymptotics for polynomial spline regression. *Annals of Statistics*, 31(5):1600–1635.
- Huang, J. Z., Zhang, L., and Zhou, L. (2007). Efficient estimation in marginal partially linear models for longitudinal/clustered data using splines. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 34(3):451–477.
- Ishida, M., Monk, D., Duncan, A. J., Abu-Amero, S., Chong, J., Ring, S. M., Pembrey, M. E., Hindmarsh, P. C., Whittaker, J. C., Stanier, P., et al. (2012). Maternal inheritance of a promoter variant in the imprinted *phlda2* gene significantly increases birth weight. *The American Journal of Human Genetics*, 90(4):715–719.
- Javanmard, A. and Montanari, A. (2014). Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):2869–2909.
- Kneip, A. and Sarda, P. (2011). Factor models and variable selection in high-dimensional regression analysis. *Annals of Statistics*, 39:2410–2447.
- Lam, C. and Yao, Q. (2012). Factor modeling for high-dimensional time series: inference for the number of factors. *Annals of Statistics*, 40(2):694–726.

- Li, Q. and Li, L. (2022). Integrative factor regression and its inference for multimodal data analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(540):2207–2221.
- Lian, H., Zhao, K., and Lv, S. (2019). Projected spline estimation of the nonparametric function in high-dimensional partially linear models for massive data. *Annals of Statistics*, 47(5):2922–2949.
- Liang, H. and Li, R. (2009). Variable selection for partially linear models with measurement errors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 104(485):234–248.
- Liu, Y., Zhang, S., Ma, S., and Zhang, Q. (2020). Tests for regression coefficients in high dimensional partially linear models. *Statistics & Probability Letters*, 163:108772.
- Luo, R., Wang, H., and Tsai, C.-L. (2009). Contour projected dimension reduction. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:3743–3778.
- Ma, R., Cai, T., and Li, H. (2021). Global and simultaneous hypothesis testing for high-dimensional logistic regression models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):984–998.
- McIntire, D. D., Bloom, S. L., Casey, B. M., and Leveno, K. J. (1999). Birth weight in relation to morbidity and mortality among newborn infants. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 340(16):1234–1238.
- Ning, Y. and Liu, H. (2017). A general theory of hypothesis tests and confidence regions for sparse high dimensional models. *Annals of Statistics*, 45(1):158–195.
- Ouyang, J., Tan, K. M., and Xu, G. (2023). High-dimensional inference for generalized linear models with hidden confounding. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(296):1–61.
- Pearson, K. (1895). Note on regression and inheritance in the case of two parents. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London*, 58:240–242.
- Peng, J., Zhu, J., Bergamaschi, A., Han, W., Noh, D.-Y., Pollack, J. R., and Wang, P. (2010). Regularized multivariate regression for identifying master predictors with application to integrative genomics study of breast cancer. *Annals of Applied Statistics*, 4(1):53.
- Raskutti, G., Wainwright, M. J., and Yu, B. (2011). Minimax rates of estimation for high-dimensional linear regression over  $\ell_q$ -balls. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 57(10):6976–6994.
- Schumaker, L. (2007). *Spline Functions: Basic Theory*. Cambridge university press.
- Sherwood, B. and Wang, L. (2016). Partially linear additive quantile regression in ultra-high dimension. *Annals of Statistics*, 44(1):288–317.

- Sun, T. and Zhang, C.-H. (2012). Scaled sparse linear regression. *Biometrika*, 99(4):879–898.
- Sun, Y., Ma, L., and Xia, Y. (2024). A decorrelating and debiasing approach to simultaneous inference for high-dimensional confounded models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 119(548):2857–2868.
- Van de Geer, S., Bühlmann, P., Ritov, Y., and Dezeure, R. (2014). On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models. *Annals of Statistics*, 42(3):1166–1202.
- Verzelen, N. (2012). Minimax risks for sparse regressions: Ultra-high dimensional phenomena. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 6:38–90.
- Votavova, H., Merkerova, M. D., Fejglova, K., Vasikova, A., Krejcek, Z., Pastorkova, A., Tabashidze, N., Topinka, J., Veleminsky Jr, M., Sram, R., et al. (2011). Transcriptome alterations in maternal and fetal cells induced by tobacco smoke. *Placenta*, 32(10):763–770.
- Wang, S. and Cui, H. (2017). Generalized f-test for high dimensional regression coefficients of partially linear models. *Journal of Systems Science and Complexity*, 30(5):1206–1226.
- Wang, S. and Cui, H. (2020). Test for high dimensional regression coefficients of partially linear models. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods*, 49(17):4091–4116.
- Wang, Y., Zhou, Y., Li, R., and Lian, H. (2022). Sparse high-dimensional semi-nonparametric quantile regression in a reproducing kernel hilbert space. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 168:107388.
- Xie, H. and Huang, J. (2009). Scad-penalized regression in high-dimensional partially linear models. *Annals of Statistics*, 37:673–696.
- Xue, L. and Yang, L. (2006). Additive coefficient modeling via polynomial spline. *Statistica Sinica*, 16:1423–1446.
- Yu, G. and Bien, J. (2019). Estimating the error variance in a high-dimensional linear model. *Biometrika*, 106(3):533–546.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, S. S. (2014). Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76(1):217–242.
- Zhang, X. and Cheng, G. (2017). Simultaneous inference for high-dimensional linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(518):757–768.
- Zhao, F., Lin, N., and Zhang, B. (2023). A new test for high-dimensional regression coefficients in partially linear models. *Canadian Journal of Statistics*, 51(1):5–18.

- Zhong, Q. and Wang, J.-L. (2024). Neural networks for partially linear quantile regression. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics*, 42(2):603–614.
- Zhu, Y. (2017). Nonasymptotic analysis of semiparametric regression models with high-dimensional parametric coefficients. *Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):2274–2298.
- Zhu, Y., Yu, Z., and Cheng, G. (2019). High dimensional inference in partially linear models. *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, 89:2760–2769.