# Optimal Network-Guided Covariate Selection for High-Dimensional Data Integration

Tao Shen

Department of Statistics and Data Science, National University of Singapore

and

Wanjie Wang\*

Department of Statistics and Data Science, National University of Singapore

April 8, 2025

#### Abstract

When integrating datasets from different studies, it is common that they have components of different formats. How to combine them organically for improved estimation is important and challenging. This paper investigates this problem in a two-study scenario, where covariates are observed for all subjects, but network data is available in only one study, and response variables are available only in the other.

To leverage the partially observed network information, we propose the Network-Guided Covariate Selection (NGCS) algorithm. It integrates the spectral information from network adjacency matrices with the Higher Criticism Thresholding approach for informative covariates identification. Theoretically, we prove that NGCS achieves the optimal rate in covariate selection, which is the same rate in the supervised learning setting. Furthermore, this optimality is robust to network models and tuning parameters.

This framework extends naturally to clustering and regression tasks, with two proposed algorithms: NG-clu and NG-reg. For clustering, NG-clu accurately clusters data points despite incomplete network information. For regression, NG-reg enhances predictive performance by incorporating latent covariate structures inferred from network data. Empirical studies on synthetic and real-world datasets demonstrate the robustness and superior performance of our algorithms, underscoring their effectiveness in handling heterogeneous data formats.

Keywords: rare and weak signals; network analysis; spectral methods; clustering; regression

<sup>\*</sup>The authors gratefully acknowledge Singapore MOE grant Tier-1-A-8001451-00-00 and NUS Research Scholarship (IRP).

# 1 Introduction

#### **1.1** Background and Motivation

Popular scientific topics often attract several independent studies with different objectives. The datasets collected from these studies may share some common components, while the other components can be in different formats. Methodologies that can combine heterogeneous data types are of high practical value. With such methods, we can either enhance existing estimations by incorporating new data, or leverage datasets from the past to improve the inference accuracy of new studies.

In this paper, we consider a simplified setting where there are two independent studies. We endow subjects in the first study with indices  $i \in [n]$ , and subjects in the second one with indices  $i \in [N]/[n]$ . In both studies, high dimensional covariates of form  $\mathbf{X}_i \in \mathcal{R}^p$ are collected with a common invariant latent structure. Besides these covariates, the first and existing study has also included inter-subjects relation information for its subjects, which is represented through a matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$ . Meanwhile, the second and new study is interested in an additional response variable  $z_i$ , of which the value is collected for the remaining N - n subjects. We are interested in improving the estimation accuracy of the second study by leveraging the first dataset.

In many datasets, only a small subset of covariates contain subtle signal strengths (Donoho and Jin, 2008, 2015). The challenge of identifying these sparse and weak signals among numerous covariates exemplifies the "curse of dimensionality" (Donoho, 2000). This challenge becomes particularly acute when integrating multiple data sources—covariates, networks, and responses—across fields like genomics, neuroscience, and social networks.

Our work addresses this data integration challenge with high-dimensional covariates.

We observe a covariate matrix  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \cdots, \mathbf{x}_N]^\top \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times p}$  where  $p \gg N$ , and a network adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$  (n < N) capturing subject-to-subject connections in the first study. While several works examine settings with both covariates and network structure (e.g., Newman and Clauset (2016); Binkiewicz et al. (2017); Hu and Wang (2024)), our setup is different, as we assume the second dataset does not contain connection information. This reflects common practical constraints where new studies may collect covariate data but omit costly connection measurements. Moreover, observing connections between new test subjects and those from earlier studies is often infeasible. Our goal is to leverage both  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  to construct robust statistical estimates for all N subjects across both studies.

Our problem has two primary objectives. First, we aim to identify covariates related to the latent structure despite their sparsity and weakness, investigating how partial network information  $\boldsymbol{A}$  can aid this recovery. Second, we seek to leverage these identified covariates to enhance downstream applications—specifically clustering and regression—across both studies. The clustering task requires grouping all N subjects into K clusters through a unified approach, though the available data are different in two studies. For regression, we observe an additional response variable  $\boldsymbol{z}$  in the second study and aim to predict responses for subjects in the first study and new subjects with only covariate data.

Before we discuss the integration of A and X, we first review established approaches for high-dimensional data with latent structure. In these works, a fundamental challenge is to overcome the curse of dimensionality  $(p \gg n)$ . Therefore, an influential model and methodological direction has been sparse signal recovery (Joseph and Yu (2016); Fan and Lv (2008); Jin and Wang (2016)).

The sparse signal recovery approach assumes that only a small subset of covariates relates to the underlying latent structure, often with weak signal strengths. Methods differ based on whether auxiliary information (like response variables) is available. Without such information, techniques focus on identifying structure-revealing covariates through modelbased clustering (Raftery and Dean (2006)) or covariate-wise weighting schemes (Friedman and Meulman (2004); Witten and Tibshirani (2010)). When response variables are available, approaches range from penalized regression methods (Tibshirani (1996); Zhang (2010)) to nonparametric techniques (Janitza et al. (2016)). The Higher Criticism (HC) framework (Donoho and Jin (2008, 2009)) utilizes individual *p*-values to recover the signals, which can be adapted to datasets without auxiliary information through distribution assumptions (Jin and Wang (2016); Jin et al. (2017)), as well as with auxiliary information through marginal statistics (Donoho and Jin (2015)). It proves particularly effective and powerful for weak signals.

Network data, represented by adjacency matrix  $A \in \{0,1\}^{n \times n}$ , captures inter-subject connections and appears across diverse scientific domains (Chen and Yuan (2006); Leskovec and Mcauley (2012); Sporns and Betzel (2016)). The modeling of latent structures in networks primarily follows two lines: stochastic blockmodel (SBM) and its variants, and latent position models. Relative methodologies have been developed, focusing on community detection and low-dimensional embedding, with guaranteed consistency for relatively dense networks. In our setting, they face two key limitations: lack of connection information in the second study, and the challenge of model selection (such as determining the number of communities or the dimension of latent space).

The integration of A and X offers promising solutions to very sparse networks. Most existing works examine how covariates enhance community detection (Newman and Clauset (2016); Binkiewicz et al. (2017); Yan and Sarkar (2021)). In high-dimensional settings, Deshpande et al. (2018) reveals covariates' influence on signal-to-noise ratios. Notably, Abbe et al. (2022) and Hu and Wang (2024) demonstrate that informative covariates enable exact community label recovery even with extremely sparse connections. On the other hand, all these works require  $\boldsymbol{A}$  and  $\boldsymbol{X}$  to be available for all subjects.

Conversely, network information can enhance covariate-based latent structure recovery. In microarray analysis, Li and Li (2008) employs covariate network Laplacian regularization with  $\ell_1$  penalties to enhance biomarker recovery. Wu et al. (2018) introduces a Markov chain approach combining ranking statistics and network structure, later generalized by Wang and Chen (2021) for survival traits. Zhu et al. (2019) considers network autoregression model and identifies limited "portal nodes" among all subjects. All these works assume sparsity on subjects instead of covariates. Gu and Han (2011) and Zhao et al. (2022) address covariate dimension reduction, with reduced interpretability than covariate selection. Further, the latter requires a covariance matrix estimate, challenging for large p.

As a summary, most existing methods consider either the case where network information is fully available for all subjects, or the case where network information is completely unavailable. Our scenario, where network data is partially observed (only for study 1), remains unaddressed. In this work, we develop a novel methodology that directly addresses these limitations. Our approach leverages the shared latent structure between networks and covariates to enhance the recovery of sparse and weak signals in high-dimensional settings, even when network information is only partially observed.

### **1.2** Problem Formulation

We formalize a two-stage problem: first, recover informative covariates using both X and partial network data A; second, leverage these covariates for downstream applications.

We describe the latent information within each subject through K-dimensional latent

factor  $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathcal{R}^K$  ( $K \ll \min\{p, N\}$ ) for each subject *i*, which underlies both network and covariate structures. Given  $\mathbf{y}_i$ 's, we assume  $\mathbf{A}$  and  $\mathbf{X}$  are independent. The relationship between covariates and latent factors is captured through  $E[X_{ij}] = \mathbf{y}_i^\top \mathbf{M}_j$ , where  $\mathbf{M}_j \in$  $\mathcal{R}^k$  represents the effect of latent factors on the *j*-th covariate. Hence,  $\mathbf{M}_j$  captures the relevance of the *j*-th covariate to the latent structure. We define the set of *informative covariates* (signals) as:

$$\mathcal{S} = \{j : \|\boldsymbol{M}_j\| \neq 0\}.$$
(1.1)

Motivated by biological applications, it's assumed that signals are sparse, i.e.  $s = |\mathcal{S}| \ll p$ , and individually weak, i.e.  $\kappa = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} ||\mathbf{M}_j|| \to 0$ . Our goal is to recover  $\mathcal{S}$  in this challenging sparse and weak signals setting.

Previous works on covariate-only analysis (Azizyan et al. (2013); Jin et al. (2017)) show that unsupervised recovery of S requires relatively strong signal-to-noise ratios (SNR):  $\kappa \gtrsim n^{-1/4}$  is a fundamental limit. In contrast, if  $y_i$  is known, the supervised recovery of Srequires a weaker SNR requirement that  $\kappa \gtrsim n^{-1/2}$  (Fan and Lv (2008)). Our setting, with partial network information, represents a "semi-supervised" scenario. A key theoretical question is whether covariate selection in this setting can achieve the favorable sample complexity of supervised learning. The optimal algorithm is of methodological interest.

For downstream applications, we examine both clustering and regression tasks using the estimated covariate set  $\hat{S}$ . In the clustering setting, we aim to label all N subjects into K groups. Traditional community detection methods for networks with covariates will fail, due to unavailable network information in study 2. In this work, we show that  $\hat{S}$  enables effective clustering through a spectral k-means algorithm. The regression task addresses a common scenario where new experiments measure additional responses: we observe a response variable  $z_i$  only for study 2 subjects  $(N - n \ll n)$ . Using  $\hat{S}$ , we construct a linear model that achieves superior prediction performance compared to standard highdimensional regression methods, both for study 1 subjects and new samples with only covariate information.

The semi-supervised nature of our problem, where network data provides "high-quality" information for partial recovery of latent factors, presents unique opportunities. By recovering a generalizable structure through  $\mathcal{S}$ , our approach bridges the gap between subjects with and without network information, enabling improved performance in downstream tasks across both studies.

## **1.3** Methods and Our Contributions

The core challenge in our setting is how to effectively leverage partial network data A to improve covariate selection in X. While one might attempt to first estimate latent factors  $\hat{y}_i$  from A for supervised learning on X, this approach is highly sensitive to model specification and parameter tuning. Our method builds on two key insights. First, covariate selection does not require exact recovery of  $y_i$ ; it only needs information that distinguishes signal from noise. Second, the spectral structure of networks consistently captures this discriminative information across various models (Newman (2013); Zhao et al. (2012); Rubin-Delanchy et al. (2022)).

Building on these insights, we develop a direct approach that measures each covariate's alignment with the network's spectral structure:  $t_j = t_j(\mathbf{A}) = \sum_{i=1}^{\hat{K}} (\boldsymbol{\xi}_i^{\top} \boldsymbol{X}_j)^2$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\hat{K}}$  are the  $\hat{K}$  leading eigenvectors of  $\mathbf{A}$ . The *p*-values can be thus calculated, and covariates with the smallest *p*-values will be selected.

With *p*-values known, the key is to decide the cut-off of the "smallest" *p*-values to estimate  $\hat{S}$ . Donoho and Jin (2008) introduces Higher Criticism Thresholding (HCT),

which is a powerful and efficient method, especially in the presence of sparse and weak signals. Without tuning parameters, it selects the optimal threshold in various tasks, such as detection, regression, and clustering (Donoho and Jin, 2008, 2009, 2015; Jin and Wang, 2016; Jin et al., 2017). We apply HCT to decide  $\hat{S}$  based on these *p*-values, and our theoretical analysis proves its optimality in our setting. The resultant algorithm is called the Network-Guided Covariate Selection (NGCS) algorithm, details in Section 2.

Our theoretical analysis in Section 3 reveals several remarkable properties of NGCS. First, under general network models, we establish conditions for consistent recovery of S. Under both degree-corrected SBM in Karrer and Newman (2011) and random dot product graphs in Athreya et al. (2017), we demonstrate that regular conditions are sufficient. The most surprising result is that NGCS achieves rate-optimal performance even when  $\hat{K} > K$ , demonstrating strong robustness to model misspecification; details in Section 3.3. This theoretical guarantee validates our intuition about the advantages of working directly with network spectral structure.

The selected covariates  $\hat{S}$  provide a foundation for effective downstream analysis across both studies. We develop two specific applications: NG-clu algorithm in Table 2 for clustering on all N subjects, and NG-reg in Table 3 for response prediction. In the regression setting, our method achieves prediction accuracy that scales with the total sample size N rather than just the subset with responses (N-n), demonstrating the value of incorporating network information.

A distinctive feature of our framework is its ability to bridge heterogeneous data formats—an increasingly common challenge in modern applications where different studies may collect different types of measurements. Unlike previous approaches that typically assume uniform data structure, our method effectively transfers information from networkaugmented data to covariate-only settings through interpretable steps. This flexibility, combined with our theoretical guarantees and empirical success, opens new possibilities for complex data analysis. Other than the listed clustering and regression applications in this work, the underlying principles can be extended to many other downstream tasks in high-dimensional and network data analysis.

#### **1.4** Organization of the Paper and Notations

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents our methodology, beginning with a review of relevant techniques for high-dimensional covariate analysis in Section 2.1, followed by our NGCS algorithm in Section 2.2 and downstream algorithms in Section 2.3. Section 3 provides theoretical analysis, establishing consistency of NGCS in Section 3.2 and deriving statistical lower bounds in Section 3.3. We then analyze two specific network models: degree-corrected SBM in Section 3.4 and random dot product graphs in Section 3.5. Sections 4 and 5 present numerical results on simulated and real data, respectively. Technical proofs and additional numerical results are in the supplementary materials.

Throughout this paper, we discuss the adjacency matrix  $A \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$  and covariate matrix  $\tilde{X} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times p}$  on the first *n* subjects. Let  $y_i \in \mathcal{R}^K$  be the latent factor of each subject. We always use lower case for subject-wise vectors, such as  $x_i$  and  $y_i$ , and upper case for covariate-wise vectors, such as  $X_j$  and  $M_j$ .

For a vector  $\boldsymbol{a}$ ,  $\|\boldsymbol{a}\|$  gives the  $\ell_2$  norm of  $\boldsymbol{a}$  and  $\|\boldsymbol{a}\|_{\infty} = \max_i \|a_i\|$  gives the  $\ell_{\infty}$  norm. Let  $\boldsymbol{A}$  be a matrix,  $\lambda_k(\boldsymbol{A})$  denotes the k-th largest singular value of  $\boldsymbol{A}$ , and  $\|\boldsymbol{A}\| = \lambda_1(\boldsymbol{A})$ . For two series  $a_n$  and  $b_n$ , we say  $a_n \asymp b_n$  if there is a constant C, such that  $a_n \leq Cb_n$ and  $b_n \leq Ca_n$  when n is large enough. We say  $a_n \lesssim b_n$  if  $\overline{\lim}_{n\to\infty} a_n/b_n \leq 1$ , and  $a_n \gtrsim b_n$ similarly. Finally, we use the notation  $[N] := \{1, \ldots, N\}$  for any integer N.

## 2 Methodology: Network-Guided Covariate Selection

## 2.1 Network-Guided Screening Statistics

Consider the network  $\boldsymbol{A} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times n}$  and the covariate matrix  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times p}$  from the first study. Let  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}} = (\boldsymbol{y}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{y}_n)^{\top}$  be the latent information matrix. Suppose the relationship between  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  can be captured by a linear dependence  $\mathbb{E}[\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_j|\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}] = \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}\boldsymbol{M}_j, j \in [p]$ . Our goal is to recover the set of informative covariates  $\boldsymbol{S} = \{j : \|\boldsymbol{M}_j\| \neq 0\}$  in (1.1).

Given the high-dimensional setting where n and p can increase to infinity in an arbitrary fashion, computation efficiency is a crucial concern. Among various approaches, covariate selection based on marginal p-values offers an intuitive and computationally efficient solution (Fan and Lv, 2008; Jin and Wang, 2016). The basic framework proceeds as follows: for each covariate  $j \in [p]$ , we construct a test statistic  $t_j$  based on  $\tilde{X}_j$  and compute its corresponding p-value  $\pi_j$ , which quantifies the derivation of this covariate from the null distribution. The set of selected covariates is then:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}} = \{ 1 \le j \le p : \pi_j \le T_{thre} \}, \tag{2.2}$$

where  $T_{thre}$  is determined through the Higher Criticism (HC) procedure, known for its optimality and data-driven nature (Donoho and Jin, 2008, 2015).

The key underpinning this procedure is to construct an effective test statistic that leverages network structure. Suppose  $\tilde{Y}$  is known, the most powerful test is to project each covariate to the eigenspace of  $\tilde{Y}$ . Specifically, let  $\Xi(\tilde{Y}) = [\xi_1, \dots, \xi_K]$  contain the left singular vectors of  $\tilde{Y}$  corresponding to its K largest singular values. The oracle test statistic is  $t_j^o = \|\Xi(\tilde{Y})^\top \tilde{X}_j\|^2$ . If covariate j has no information but Gaussian noise,  $t_j^o \sim \chi_K^2$ , while for informative covariates,  $\mathbb{E}[t_j^o|\tilde{Y}] \gtrsim n \|M_j\|^2$  when  $\tilde{Y}$  is non-degenerate.

This insight motivates us to consider screening statistics from a projection. For any

matrix  $\boldsymbol{U} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times \hat{K}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{U}^{\top} \boldsymbol{U} = \boldsymbol{I}$ , define  $t_j(\boldsymbol{U}) = \|\boldsymbol{U}^{\top} \tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_j\|^2$ . For informative covariates, there is  $\mathbb{E}[t_j(\boldsymbol{U})|\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}] = \|\boldsymbol{U}^{\top} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}} \boldsymbol{M}_j\|^2 + \hat{K}$ . Hence,  $t_j(\boldsymbol{U})$  will be effective when  $\boldsymbol{U}^{\top} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  is non-degenerate. For the oracle case  $t_j^o = t_j(\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}})), \, \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}})^{\top} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  is non-degenerate and  $t_j^o$  is effective. In practice,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  is unknown, we seek a good projection  $\boldsymbol{U}$  using network data.

We propose using spectral information of  $\boldsymbol{A}$  as the choice of  $\boldsymbol{U}$ . The basic idea can be easily demonstrated under the random dot product graph (RDPG) model (Athreya et al., 2017; Lyzinski et al., 2014), where  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{A}] = \boldsymbol{P}_Y - \operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{P}_Y)$  and  $\boldsymbol{P}_Y = \rho_n \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}^\top$ with an intensity parameter  $\rho_n$ . The relationship between  $\boldsymbol{A}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  suggests the leading eigenvectors of  $\boldsymbol{A}$  will provide a proper projection. Let  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A};K)$  contain the eigenvectors corresponding to the K largest eigenvalues (in magnitude) of  $\boldsymbol{A}$ . Under mild conditions,  $\|\boldsymbol{A} - \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{A}]\| + \|\operatorname{diag}(\boldsymbol{P}_Y)\| \ll \|\boldsymbol{P}_Y\|$  with high probability, and the Davis-Kahan theorem ensures  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A};K)$  is close to  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}})$  up to a rotation. This leads to our proposed test statistic:

$$t_j(\boldsymbol{A};K) = t_j(\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A};K)) = \|\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A};K)^\top \boldsymbol{X}_j\|^2.$$

This statistic is effective under other network models. For the degree-corrected SBM (Karrer and Newman, 2011),  $\boldsymbol{U} = \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A}; K)$  is not an estimation of  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}})$ , but it still satisfies the condition that  $\boldsymbol{U}^{\top}\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  is non-degenerate when  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  is non-degenerate, so the statistic  $t_j(\boldsymbol{A}; K)$ still works. It's not surprising, since  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A}; K)$  is powerful in recovering the community structure (Zhao et al., 2012; Jin, 2015; Hu and Wang, 2024). Therefore,  $t_j(\boldsymbol{A}; K)$  is an effective and robust test statistic.

The choice of U can be modified to adapt specific network properties. For networks with degree heterogeneity, where node degrees can vary substantially, we extend our approach using the normalized Laplacian matrix. Define the diagonal matrix D with *i*-th diagonal entry being  $d(i) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} A_{ij}$ . The normalized Laplacian defined as  $L = D^{-1/2}AD^{-1/2}$ . The spectral matrix of L is denoted as  $\Xi(L; K) = [\xi_1(L), \dots, \xi_K(L)]$ , and the statistic is  $t_j(\boldsymbol{L}; K) = \|\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{L}; K)^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_j\|^2$ .  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{L}; K)$  is also related to the modularity maximization approach and normalized-cut graph partitioning; see Newman (2013). This work further discusses the theoretical properties of  $t_j(\boldsymbol{L}; K)$ . This idea can be further extended to the regularized Laplacian approach (Joseph and Yu, 2016). We leave it to interested readers.

The robustness of screening statistics  $t_j(\cdot; \hat{K})$  can further be found in the choice of  $\hat{K}$ . While we use  $\hat{K} = K$  to illustrate the intuition of  $t_j(\cdot; \hat{K})$ , a slightly inflating  $\hat{K} \geq K$ still guarantees an exact recovery of S; see Section 3. This robustness to overestimation is particularly valuable in practice, where the exact latent dimension is often unknown but can be reasonably bounded based on domain knowledge. The robustness of our approach to network model specification and choice of  $\hat{K}$  comes from its nature, that it focuses on finding an appropriate projection U that aligns with the latent structure, rather than recovering  $\tilde{Y}$  or  $\Xi(\tilde{Y})$  exactly.

## 2.2 Algorithm: Network-Guided Covariate Selection

Building on the insights from Section 2.1, we propose the Network-Guided Covariate Selection (NGCS) algorithm that leverages spectral information from the network to identify informative covariates S. The algorithm takes as input an adjacency matrix A, a covariate matrix  $\tilde{X}$ , and a dimension parameter  $\hat{K} \geq K$ .

The procedure consists of three main steps. First, extract the  $\hat{K}$  leading eigenvectors  $\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_k\}_{k=1}^{\hat{K}}$  from either the adjacency matrix  $\boldsymbol{A}$  or the normalized Laplacian matrix  $\boldsymbol{L} = \boldsymbol{D}^{-1/2} \boldsymbol{A} \boldsymbol{D}^{-1/2}$ . Next, for each covariate j, compute the test statistic:

$$t_j = \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{K}} (\boldsymbol{\xi}_k^{\top} \tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}_j)^2$$
(2.3)

Under the linear covariate and Gaussian noise assumption,  $t_j$  follows a  $\chi^2_{\hat{K}}$  distribution for noise covariates and a non-central chi-square distribution for informative covariates. This

allows us to compute *p*-values  $\pi_j = P(t_j < \chi^2_{\hat{K}})$ . Last, apply the HC procedure to these *p*-values to determine an optimal threshold  $T_{thre}$ , yielding the selected covariate set:

$$\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{ j : \pi_j < T_{thre} \}$$

The complete algorithm is detailed in Table 1.

In the procedure, the only tuning parameter is  $\hat{K}$ . To achieve rate-optimal recovery results,  $\hat{K}$  must be an overestimate of K with inflation at O(1). It is not a strict requirement in real applications with domain knowledge. On the other hand, in the case that not any information about K is available, an underestimate  $\hat{K} < K$  still has power in covariate selection. The choice of  $\hat{K}$  is very flexible.

Table 1: Network-Guided Covariate Selection Algorithm

	Input: adjacency matrix $\boldsymbol{A}$ , covariate matrix $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$ , tuning parameter $\hat{K}$ .
Step 1 (PCA)	Calculate the top $\hat{K}$ eigenvectors of $\boldsymbol{A}$ (or $\boldsymbol{L}$ ), denoted as $\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \cdots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\hat{K}}$ .
Step 2 (Tests)	Calculate the Network-Guided statistic: $t_j = \sum_{k=1}^{\hat{K}} (\xi_k^{\top} \tilde{X}_j)^2$ .
	Find <i>p</i> -values for covariate <i>j</i> : $\pi_j = P(\chi_{\hat{K}}^2 > t_j)$ .
Step 3 (HC)	Order the <i>p</i> -values so that $\pi_{(1)} \leq \pi_{(2)} \leq \cdots \leq \pi_{(p)}$ .
	Calculate HC score: $HC(j) = \sqrt{p} \frac{j/p - \pi_{(j)}}{\sqrt{\pi_{(j)}(1 - \pi_{(j)})}}.$
	Define the threshold $T_{thre} = \pi_{(\hat{s})}$ , where $\hat{s} = \arg \max_{1 \le j \le p/2} HC(j)$ .
Output	Recovered set $\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \{j : \pi_j < T_{thre}\}.$

**Remark.** In the PCA step, the matrix of concern can be A or L. For both cases, the consistency in covariate selection is theoretically justified in Section 3, with numerical support in Sections 4–5. In practice, we suggest using L when the network data has severe heterogeneity among node degrees.

## 2.3 Applications: Network-Guided Clustering and Regression

Recall our two-study setting where the first study provides network data  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$  and covariates  $\tilde{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  for *n* subjects, while the second study contains only covariates for the remaining N - n subjects. By the NGCS algorithm in Section 2.2, we find  $\hat{S}$  based on A and  $\tilde{X}$ . A natural question arises: how can we leverage this information for data points in study 2 without network data? To address this challenge, we develop network-guided approaches for two fundamental statistical tasks: clustering and regression.

Our framework effectively transfers network-encoded latent structure information to X through a two-step approach. First, we apply NGCS to identify informative covariates  $\hat{S}$  using network-informed data  $(A, \tilde{X})$  from study 1. Second, we perform dimension reduction on selected covariates  $X^{\hat{S}}$  via singular value decomposition (SVD), further reducing noise while maintaining the structural information. The largest singular values and corresponding singular vectors are then used for downstream applications. It effectively reduces the curse of dimensionality.

**Clustering**. Let's first consider the clustering problem, where our goal is to recover the latent class label  $\ell(i) \in [K]$  for all N data points, with a known K representing the number of classes.

We apply the two-step approach to recover  $\ell$ . By A and  $\tilde{X}$ , we obtain  $\hat{S}$  through NGCS, and then construct the  $N \times |\hat{S}|$  post-selection matrix  $X^{\hat{S}}$  on all data points. Denote the SVD as  $X^{\hat{S}} = U\Lambda V^{\top}$ . Let  $\Lambda \in \mathcal{R}^{\hat{K} \times \hat{K}}$  be the diagonal matrix consisting of the largest  $\hat{K}$  singular values and  $U_{\hat{K}} \in \mathcal{R}^{N \times \hat{K}}$  consisting of the corresponding left singular vectors. Project the data onto the  $\hat{K}$ -dimensional spectral space  $U_{\hat{K}}\Lambda_{\hat{K}}$  and then apply k-means algorithm on the weighted projection  $U_{\hat{K}}\Lambda_{\hat{K}}$ , treating each row as a data point. It gives the clustering result  $\ell$  on N data points. The detailed algorithm is in Table 2. While the number of clusters is K, it is reasonable to assume the latent factor lies in K-dimensional space and set  $\hat{K} = K$  in this algorithm. However, it might be an overly optimistic assumption. We allow the choice of  $\hat{K}$  in NGCS and SVD to be different from K in k-means. The inclusion of singular values  $\Lambda_{\hat{K}}$  is crucial, which provides a "weight" on the importance of singular vectors and guarantees clustering consistency when  $\hat{K} \ge K$ ; see Theorem 3.4. This novel property makes our method notably robust to overestimation of the number of clusters, a common challenge in practical applications.

Table 2: Network-Guided Clustering (NG-Clu) Algorithm

	Input: $\boldsymbol{A},  \tilde{\boldsymbol{X}},  \boldsymbol{X}$ , number of classes $K$ , tuning parameter $\hat{K}$ .
Step 1.	Covariate Selection: Apply NGCS Algorithm 1 to get $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ .
	Let $\boldsymbol{X}^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ be the sub-matrix of $\boldsymbol{X}$ restricted on columns in $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ only.
Step 2.	SVD: Let $\mathbf{\Lambda}_{\hat{K}}$ be the diagonal matrix consisting of the largest $\hat{K}$ singular
	values of $m{X}^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ and $m{U}_{\hat{K}}$ contain the corresponding left singular vectors.
Step 3.	Clustering: Apply k-means to $oldsymbol{U}_{\hat{K}} oldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\hat{K}}$ with each row being a data point.
Output.	Return the estimated label $\hat{\ell}$ .

**Regression.** For the regression problem, we observe response variable  $z_i$  for the N - n data points in study 2. Our goal is to predict  $z_i$  for  $i \in [n]$  and new covariate data point  $\boldsymbol{x}_{new}$ . Consider a linear model:

$$z_i = \boldsymbol{\beta}^{\top} \boldsymbol{y}_i + \delta_i, \qquad \delta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\delta}^2), \quad i \in [N]/[n],$$

where  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  represents the latent factor of *i*-th data point. The classical prediction procedure faces two challenges. First, the latent factors  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  are not available. Even in an overly optimistic case that  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  can be recovered by the network  $\boldsymbol{A}$  for  $i \in [n]$ , the model cannot be fitted, since the available responses  $z_i$  are not for  $i \in [n]$ . Second, the latent factor  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  is unavailable for new covariate data  $\boldsymbol{x}_{new}$ .

While we cannot directly observe  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  for new points, the relationship between covariates and latent factors enables effective prediction. Recall the linear assumption on the covariates  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}_i|\boldsymbol{y}_i] = \boldsymbol{M}^{\top}\boldsymbol{y}_i$ . This formulation allows us to re-express the response variable as  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{z}_i|\boldsymbol{y}_i] = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\top}\boldsymbol{M}^{\top}\boldsymbol{y}_i = \boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\top}\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{x}_i|\boldsymbol{y}_i]$ , with  $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$  satisfying the constraint  $\boldsymbol{M}\boldsymbol{\gamma} = \boldsymbol{\beta}$ . It provides the possibility of using  $\boldsymbol{x}_i$  to estimate  $z_i$ , and a critical insight: covariates not in  $\boldsymbol{\mathcal{S}}$  contribute negligible information to the response prediction.

Now we propose the algorithm. Let  $\tilde{X}_{(2)} = (x_{n+1}, \cdots, x_N)^{\top}$  denote the covariate matrix of data points in study 2. Let  $z = (z_{n+1}, \cdots, z_N)^{\top}$ . For any vector v, we use the superscript  $v^{\hat{S}}$  to denote the sub-vector restricted on  $\hat{S}$ . Following our general framework, we first apply NGCS on A and  $\tilde{X}$  to obtain  $\hat{S}$  and then perform SVD on the post-selection matrix  $\tilde{X}_{(2)}^{\hat{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{(N-n) \times |\hat{S}|}$ . The regression coefficients are then estimated through a spectral projection approach:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \boldsymbol{V}_{\hat{K}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\hat{K}} \boldsymbol{U}_{\hat{K}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{z}.$$
(2.4)

For  $\boldsymbol{x}_{new}$ , we predict its response using  $\hat{z}_{new} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{x}_{new}^{\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}}$ .

This approach addresses several challenges in the two-study setting: it handles missing network information for new data, manages high-dimensionality through informed covariate selection and spectral projection, and remains effective even when the observed responses are very few, i.e.  $N - n \ll p$ . Details are in Table 3. Relevant theoretical results can be found in Theorem 3.6.

Table 3: Network-Guided Regression (NG-reg) Algorithm

	Input: $\boldsymbol{A}, \boldsymbol{X},  \boldsymbol{X}_{(2)}, \boldsymbol{z}$ , tuning parameter $K$ , new sample $\boldsymbol{x}_{new}$						
Step 1.	Covariate Selection: Apply NGCS Algorithm 1 on $(\boldsymbol{A}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{X}})$ to get $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ .						
	Let $\tilde{X}_{(2)}^{\hat{S}}$ be the sub-matrix of $\tilde{X}_{(2)}$ restricted on columns in $\hat{S}$ only.						
Step 2.	SVD: Let $\Lambda_{\hat{K}}$ consist of the largest $\hat{K}$ singular values of $\tilde{X}_{(2)}^{\hat{S}}$ . Let $U_{\hat{K}}$ and						
	$\boldsymbol{V}_{\hat{K}}$ contain the corresponding left and right singular vectors, respectively.						
Step 3.	Regression: Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}} = \boldsymbol{V}_{\hat{K}} \boldsymbol{\Lambda}_{\hat{K}} \boldsymbol{U}_{\hat{K}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{z}.$						
Output:	Return the estimate $\hat{z}_{new} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{x}_{new}^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}}$ .						

# 3 Theoretical Guarantee

#### 3.1 Rare and Weak Signal Model

To establish theoretical guarantees, we first present our model assumptions. We focus on the relationship between A and  $\tilde{X}$  in study 1, while network-specific assumptions for downstream applications are deferred to later sections. In the following discussions, when study 2 is not involved, we use X and Y instead of  $\tilde{X}$  and  $\tilde{Y}$  for notation simplicity.

Assumption 1. The adjacency matrix A and covariate matrix X are conditionally independent given the latent vectors  $y_i$  for  $i \in [n]$ .

Assumption 2. Conditional on  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ , there is  $\boldsymbol{M}_j \in \mathcal{R}^K$ , so that the covariates follow  $X_{ij}|\boldsymbol{y}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{M}_j, 1), i \in [n], j \in [p]$ . Denote  $\boldsymbol{M} = [\boldsymbol{M}_1, \boldsymbol{M}_2, \cdots, \boldsymbol{M}_p] \in \mathcal{R}^{K \times p}$  as the covariate loading matrix.

Recall  $S = \{j : ||M_j|| \neq 0\}$  as the set of informative covariates. We define the signal strength parameter and sparsity parameter as:

$$\kappa = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \|\boldsymbol{M}_j\|, \qquad \epsilon = |\mathcal{S}|/p.$$
(3.5)

Here,  $\kappa$  measures the signal strength among informative covariates, while  $\epsilon$  represents the proportion of informative covariates. From an information-theoretic perspective, the most challenging regime occurs when both the signal-to-noise ratio  $\kappa$  and the proportion  $\epsilon$  are small, which is known as the "rare and weak signal model" in the literature (Donoho and Jin, 2008, 2009, 2015; Jin et al., 2017).

#### **Assumption 3.** When $p \to \infty$ , both parameters vanish, i.e. $\kappa \to 0$ and $\epsilon \to 0$ .

Our theoretical analysis proceeds in several steps. First, we establish consistency guarantees for our covariate selection approach based on any projected statistics  $t_j(U)$ . The NGCS algorithm serves as a special case where U is achieved from the network A. When the network information satisfies a certain condition, NGCS recovers S. This condition is then verified for two fundamental network models: the Degree-Corrected SBM (DCSBM) and the RDPG model. We also establish the statistical lower bound of  $\kappa$  to recover S, which meets the upper bound by NGCS up to a constant. It demonstrates the rate-optimality of our NGCS approach.

We then demonstrate the performance of our two-step approaches in downstream applications. For the clustering task under DCSBM and the regression task under RDPG, we establish explicit error bounds of NG-clu and NG-reg algorithms. While we present these results under specific model combinations, we want to point out our theoretical framework is flexible: the analyses can be readily extended to clustering under RDPG and regression under DCSBM using similar techniques.

## 3.2 Consistency of Covariate Selection

In the NGCS algorithm, we propose a test statistic  $t_j(U)$  based on an arbitrary projection U. With network A, we substitute U to be the  $\Xi(A; \hat{K})$  or  $\Xi(L; \hat{K})$ . Here, we first derive

the consistency for a general projection U, and then apply it to  $U = \Xi(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K})$  or  $\Xi(\mathbf{L}; \hat{K})$ .

For a general U, define the aggregated signal strength to be

$$\tau(\boldsymbol{U}) = \tau(\boldsymbol{U}; \boldsymbol{M}, \boldsymbol{Y}) = \min_{j \in \mathcal{S}} \|\boldsymbol{U}^{\top} \boldsymbol{Y} \boldsymbol{M}_{j}\|.$$
(3.6)

Given the latent factors  $\boldsymbol{Y}, \tau(\boldsymbol{U})$  measures the signal strength of  $t_j(\boldsymbol{U})$ .

Below, Theorem 3.1 establishes the condition on  $\tau(U)$  for a clear division of S and  $S^c$  based on *p*-values. Moreover, the HC procedure will choose the correct threshold with a high probability.

**Theorem 3.1.** Suppose Assumptions 1–3 hold and  $\epsilon = \epsilon_p = p^{-\beta}$  for a constant  $0 < \beta < 1$ . Let  $\pi_i$  be the p-value of i-th covariate based on  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{R}^{n \times \hat{K}}$ , where  $\mathbf{U}^{\top}\mathbf{U} = \mathbf{I}$ . Suppose the aggregated signal strength  $\tau(\mathbf{U})^2 \ge \max\{16 - 16\beta, 14\} \log p$ , then there is a threshold  $p_0$  so that if  $p > p_0$ , with probability at least 1 - O(1/p),

$$\max_{i\in\mathcal{S}}\pi_i < \min_{i\in\mathcal{S}^c}\pi_i.$$

Further, let  $\hat{S}$  be the set of selected covariates by HCT in Algorithm 1. There is a constant C > 0, so that with probability at least 1 - O(1/p),  $S \subset \hat{S}$  and  $|\hat{S} \setminus S| \le C \log^2 p \ll |S|$ .

Theorem 3.1 guarantees that the HC procedure on  $t_j(U)$  will almost exactly recover S, assuming that the aggregated signal strength  $\tau(U) \ge c \log p$ . The constant c depends on the sparsity level of informative covariates. An efficient projection matrix U is essential in the recovery of S. With network A, we proposed  $U = \Xi(A; \hat{K})$  or  $U = \Xi(L; \hat{K})$ , where  $\Xi$  is the matrix containing the  $\hat{K}$  leading eigenvectors of A or L. With such a projection matrix  $\Xi$ , we have Corollary 3.1 on the selection consistency.

**Corollary 3.1.** Suppose the same assumptions in Theorem 3.1 hold. Let  $\hat{S}$  be the set of selected covariates by Algorithm 1, where  $\Xi(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K})$  or  $\Xi(\mathbf{L}; \hat{K})$  is used. If the aggregated

signal strength  $\tau(\Xi)^2 \ge \max\{16 - 16\beta, 14\} \log p$ , then there is a constant C > 0, so that with probability at least 1 - O(1/p),  $\mathcal{S} \subset \hat{\mathcal{S}}$  and  $|\hat{\mathcal{S}} \setminus \mathcal{S}| \le C \log^2 p \ll |\mathcal{S}|$ .

Corollary 3.1 gives the requirement for network  $\mathbf{A}$  under general case. To better understand this requirement, we discuss it under the DCSBM setup in Section 3.4 and the RDPG setup in Section 3.5. Under regular conditions, we verify that the aggregated signal strength  $\tau(\mathbf{\Xi}) \simeq \sqrt{n\kappa}$ , where  $\kappa$  in (3.5) is the minimum individual signal strength among  $\mathcal{S}$ . Therefore, we find that  $\mathcal{S}$  can be exactly recovered with a high probability, if  $\kappa \ge c_{\beta}\sqrt{\log p/n}$  for some constant  $c_{\beta}$ .

### 3.3 Statistical Lower Bound

We investigate the statistical lower bound for the covariate selection problem when both A and X are available. Consider a simplified model on X, where  $M_j$  is nonzero with probability  $\epsilon$  and independent of each other. In other words,

$$I\{\|\boldsymbol{M}_{j}\| \neq 0\} \sim Bernoulli(\epsilon) \qquad j \in [p].$$

$$(3.7)$$

We are interested in the recovery of  $S = \{j : ||M_j|| \neq 0\}.$ 

**Theorem 3.2.** Suppose Assumptions 1–3 and (3.7) hold. For any constants  $0 < q_1, q_2 < 1$ , suppose the individual signal strength follows  $\max_{j \in S} \|\mathbf{M}_j\| \leq \sqrt{-2\log(q_1/\epsilon + q_2)}/\sqrt{n}$ . Then any statistical estimator  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$  of S fails to control two types of error simultaneously. In other words, the following inequality cannot hold for any  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{A})$ :

$$P(j \in \hat{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{A}) | j \notin \mathcal{S}) \le q_1, \quad P(j \notin \hat{\mathcal{S}}(\boldsymbol{X}, \boldsymbol{A}) | j \in \mathcal{S}) \le q_2.$$
 (3.8)

In particular, suppose  $\epsilon = p^{-\beta}$  and let  $q_1 = p^{-1}$  and  $q_2 = 0$ , then no statistical method can exactly recover S with a high probability if  $\max_{j \in S} \|\mathbf{M}_j\| \leq \sqrt{2(1-\beta)\log p/n}$ .

According to Theorem 3.2, with network information  $\boldsymbol{A}$ , to achieve an exact recovery of  $\mathcal{S}$ , the signal strength in  $\boldsymbol{X}$  must satisfy that  $\max_{j\in\mathcal{S}} \|\boldsymbol{M}_j\| \geq \sqrt{2(1-\beta)\log p/n}$ . It is the first result about the lower bound in recovering  $\mathcal{S}$  with information from both  $\boldsymbol{A}$  and  $\boldsymbol{X}$ . It suggests that the lower bound matches the supervised learning case because of the additional information in  $\boldsymbol{A}$ . Combining it with Corollary 3.1, where our NGCS algorithm can exactly recover  $\mathcal{S}$  when  $\kappa \geq c_\beta \sqrt{\log p/n}$ , it can be found that the NGCS algorithm is rate-optimal.

#### 3.4 Clustering Consistency under Degree-Corrected SBM

Under the DCSBM (Karrer and Newman, 2011; Bickel and Chen, 2009; Zhao et al., 2012), we discuss the covariate selection consistency based on  $\kappa$ , and the clustering error rate. Let  $\boldsymbol{A}$  and  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{X}}$  be the network and covariate for the *n* data points in study 1. Let  $\boldsymbol{X}$  and  $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ denote the covariate matrix and the label vector for all *N* data points, where  $\ell(i) \in [K]$ . Similarly,  $\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}$  and  $\boldsymbol{Y}$  denote the latent factor matrix for the *n* data points in study 1 and all *N* data points, respectively. With a known *K*, our goal is to recover  $\boldsymbol{\ell}$ .

Under the clustering setup, we assume the latent factor  $\boldsymbol{y}_i \in \mathcal{R}^K$  is decided by  $\ell(i)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  has 1 on  $\ell(i)$ -th element and 0 otherwise. Therefore, Assumption 2 is updated as

Assumption 4. Let  $M \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times p}$  be the covariate loading matrix and  $\mu_k$  be the k-th row of M, then the covariates follow  $\boldsymbol{x}_i | [\ell(i) = k] \sim \mathcal{N}(\boldsymbol{\mu}_k, \boldsymbol{I}), \quad i \in [N], j \in [p].$ 

The network  $\boldsymbol{A}$  is generated under the DCSBM, which is a popular model in the community detection problem; see Bickel and Chen (2009); Zhao et al. (2012); Jin (2015). Under DCSBM, the network edges are independent, where  $\boldsymbol{A}_{ij}|[\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_j] \sim Bernoulli(\theta_i \theta_j \boldsymbol{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{y}_j)$ . Here,  $\theta_i$  evaluates the degree heterogeneity of node i and  $\boldsymbol{B} \in \mathcal{R}^{K \times K}$  contains the community by community connection parameters. We further make the following assumptions on **B** and  $\theta_i$  for  $i \in [n]$ . These assumptions are regular in community detection.

**Assumption 5.** Suppose the network  $\boldsymbol{A}$  follows DCSBM with parameters  $\{\theta_i\}_{i \in [n]}$  and  $\boldsymbol{B}$ . Further, assume the following conditions hold.

- 1. **B** is a constant matrix with a rank of K. Hence, there is a constant  $c_B > 0$  so that  $\lambda_K(\mathbf{B}) \ge c_B$  and the row maximum  $\max_{k \in [K]} B_{jk} \ge c_B$  for any  $j \in [K]$ .
- 2. Let  $\theta_0 = \max_i \theta_i$ , which depends on n. When  $n \to \infty$ , there is constant  $c_{\theta} > 0$  so that  $\theta_0/c_{\theta} \le \theta_i \le \theta_0$  for all  $i \in [n]$  and  $n\theta_0^2 \ge c_{\theta} \log n$ .
- 3. There is a constant  $\rho > 0$  so that  $\sum_{i \in [n]} I\{\ell(i) = k\}/n \ge \rho$  for any  $k \in [K]$ .

We first examine the consistency in  $\hat{S}$  by our NGCS algorithm. By Corollary 3.1, the consistency of  $\hat{S}$  can be guaranteed when  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) \gtrsim \sqrt{c_{\beta} \log p}$ , where  $\Xi_{\hat{K}} = \Xi(\boldsymbol{A}; \hat{K})$  or  $\Xi_{\hat{K}} = \Xi(\boldsymbol{L}; \hat{K})$ . Theorem 3.3 connects  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}})$  to the individual signal strength parameter  $\kappa$  under the DCSBM model.

**Theorem 3.3.** Suppose network  $\mathbf{A}$  is generated from DCSBM where Assumption 5 holds. Let  $\tau(\mathbf{\Xi}_{\hat{K}}) = \tau(\mathbf{\Xi}(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K}))$  defined in (3.6), where  $\mathbf{\Xi}(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K})$  contains the top  $\hat{K} \geq K$  leading eigenvectors of the adjacency matrix  $\mathbf{A}$ . Then there is a constant  $c_D = c_D(c_{\theta}, c_B, \rho, K)$ , so that with probability 1 - O(1/n),  $\tau(\mathbf{\Xi}_{\hat{K}})^2 \geq nc_D\kappa^2$ . Further, the same result holds when  $\mathbf{\Xi}_{\hat{K}} = \mathbf{\Xi}(\mathbf{L}; \hat{K})$ , where  $\mathbf{L}$  is the normalized Laplacian matrix.

Combining with Corollary 3.1, Theorem 3.3 guarantees an exact recovery of S by our NGCS Algorithm when  $\kappa \gtrsim \sqrt{\log p/n}$ . It meets the lower bound in Theorem 3.2 up to a constant. Further, it doesn't require  $\hat{K}$  to be the exact dimension K.

We then apply the NG-clu algorithm to  $X^{(\hat{S})}$ , which has much less noise than X. To guarantee the clustering consistency, we need some assumptions on M. Let s = |S| and

 $\hat{s} = |\hat{S}|$ . Recall that  $M_j$  denotes the *j*-th column and  $\mu_k$  denotes the *k*-th row of M, and the individual signal strength parameter  $\kappa = \min_{j \in S} ||M_j||$ . Naturally, it's reasonable to assume  $||\mu_k|| \gtrsim \sqrt{s\kappa}$  and the same for  $||\mu_k - \mu_j||$ .

Assumption 6. Suppose  $rank(\mathbf{M}) = r \leq K$ , and there is a constant  $c_M > 0$  so that

$$\lambda_r(\boldsymbol{M}) \ge c_M \|\boldsymbol{M}\|, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_k\| \ge c_M \sqrt{s}\kappa, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\mu}_k - \boldsymbol{\mu}_j\| \ge c_M \sqrt{s}\kappa, \quad 1 \le k \ne j \le K.$$

**Theorem 3.4.** Suppose Assumptions 1, 3, and 4–6 hold, and  $\epsilon = p^{-\beta}$  for  $0 < \beta < 1$ . If the signal strength  $\kappa > \sqrt{\max\{16 - 16\beta, 14\} \log p/(c_D n)}$ , and  $\kappa > \frac{6\sqrt{K}}{\rho^{3/2} c_M^2} \frac{\sqrt{\tilde{s}} + \sqrt{N}}{\sqrt{Ns}}$ , then with a high probability, the clustering error by Algorithm 2 follows that

$$Err = \frac{1}{N} \min_{\text{permutation } \pi: [K] \to [K]} I\{\pi(\hat{\ell}(i)) \neq \ell(i)\} \le \frac{(\hat{s} + N)}{2Ns\kappa^2}.$$

In particular, if  $\kappa^2 > (\hat{s} + N)/(Ns)$ , then there are no misclassified nodes.

According to Corollary 3.1 and Theorem 3.3, if  $\kappa \geq \sqrt{(c_{\beta}/c_D) \log p/n}$ , the number of selected covariates  $\hat{s} \leq s(1 + C \log^2 p/s)$  with a high probability. With this bound on  $\hat{s}$ , Theorem 3.4 guarantees the strong consistency when  $\kappa \geq C\sqrt{\log p} \max\{1/\sqrt{n}, 1/\sqrt{s}\}$  for a sufficiently large p. The term  $1/\sqrt{n}$  is the required signal strength for successful covariate selection, and  $1/\sqrt{s}$  is for the success of clustering. It is consistent with the statistical bound for clustering in Jin et al. (2017), which fills the gap between the statistical bound and the computational tractable bound there.

Lastly, we emphasize that our clustering consistency holds even when M has a rank  $r \leq K$ , the number of clusters. The covariate loading matrix M can be non-full rank.

#### 3.5 Regression under the RDPG model

Let A and  $\tilde{X}$  be the network and covariate data for n data points in study 1. Let  $\tilde{X}_{(2)}$ and z be the covariate and response for N - n data points in study 2. Let  $\tilde{Y}$  and  $\tilde{Y}_{(2)}$  denote the latent factor matrix for n data points in study 1 and N - n data points in study 2, respectively. Let M denote the covariate loading matrix. Here,  $\tilde{Y}, \tilde{Y}_{(2)}$  and M cannot be observed. Our goal is to predict  $\mathbb{E}[z|\mathbf{x}]$ .

Our discussion is built under the assumption of the RDPG model. It is a special case of the latent position model, which assumes each node has a low-dimensional latent position to decide network connections (Lyzinski et al., 2014; Athreya et al., 2017; Rubin-Delanchy et al., 2022). In detail, the network edge  $A_{ij}|[\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_j] \sim Bernoulli(\rho_n \boldsymbol{y}_i^{\top} \boldsymbol{y}_j)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  and  $\boldsymbol{y}_j$  are the latent positions of nodes i and j, respectively, and  $\rho_n$  is the overall connection density. In the matrix form,  $\mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{A}|\tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}] = \boldsymbol{P}_Y - diag(\boldsymbol{P}_Y)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{P}_Y = \rho_n \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{Y}}^{\top}$ . Suppose the latent positions  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$ 's are independently drawn from a common distribution F, then the model is denoted as RDPG(F). We further make some assumptions on F and  $\rho_n$  so that  $\boldsymbol{A}$  is informative.

Assumption 7. Suppose A is generated by RDPG(F) with parameter  $\rho_n$ , where D is the domain of F, and the following conditions hold.

- 1. (Model identifibility)  $\max_{\boldsymbol{y}_i \in D} \|\boldsymbol{y}_i\| = 1$  and  $0 \leq \boldsymbol{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{y}_j \leq 1$  for any  $\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_j \in D$ .
- 2. (Non-degenerate) The covariance matrix  $cov(\boldsymbol{y}_i)$  has a full rank of K.
- 3. (Density (i)) There is a constant c > 0, so that  $\boldsymbol{y}_i^\top \mathbb{E}[\boldsymbol{y}_j] \ge c$  for any  $\boldsymbol{y}_i, \boldsymbol{y}_j \sim F$ .
- 4. (Density (ii)) There is a constant  $c_d > 0$ , so that  $n\rho_n \ge c_d \log n$ .

These are regular conditions. Condition 1 guarantees that the maximum norm of  $\boldsymbol{y}$  is 1 and the inner-product can be used as a probability. Condition 2 is a non-degenerate condition that K is the intrinsic dimension. Conditions 3 and 4 guarantee the network is sufficiently dense.

Under the assumptions, we derive the relationship between  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}})$  and  $\kappa$ , where  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) = \tau(\Xi(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K}))$  or  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) = \tau(\Xi(\mathbf{L}; \hat{K}))$  from the network. The results are as follows.

**Theorem 3.5.** Suppose Assumptions 1–3 and 7 hold. Consider the NGCS algorithm with  $\hat{K} \geq K$ . Then there is a constant  $c_{lp}$ , so that with probability 1 - O(1/n),  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) \geq nc_{lp}\kappa^2$ , for  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) = \tau(\Xi(\mathbf{A}; \hat{K}))$  or  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}}) = \tau(\Xi(\mathbf{L}; \hat{K}))$ .

Combining it with Corollary 3.1, when  $\kappa \gtrsim \sqrt{\log p/n}$ , then  $\tau(\Xi_{\hat{K}})^2 \ge c_\beta \log p$  and it follows that  $\hat{S} \supset S$  and  $|\hat{S}/S| \le C \log^2 p$ . Therefore, the NGCS algorithm exactly recovers S. Comparing the condition  $\kappa \gtrsim \sqrt{\log p/n}$  to the boundary  $\kappa \gtrsim n^{-1/4}$  when only  $\tilde{X}$ is available in Jin and Wang (2016), the network A significantly improves the covariate selection power.

The NG-reg algorithm uses  $\tilde{X}_{(2)}^{\hat{S}}$  and z to build the prediction model. Suppose the underlying model is

$$z|[\boldsymbol{y}_i] = \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \boldsymbol{y}_i + \delta_i, \quad \delta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\delta^2), \qquad i \in [N]/[n].$$
(3.9)

However, the latent factor  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  is not available. We have to use  $\boldsymbol{x}_i$  to estimate  $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{\top} \boldsymbol{y}_i$ . To achieve this goal, the linear effects of the latent factor  $\boldsymbol{y}_i$  can be summarized by  $\boldsymbol{x}_i$ .

Assumption 8. Suppose  $rank(\mathbf{M}) = K$ , and  $\lambda_K(\mathbf{M}) \ge c_M \|\mathbf{M}\|$  for a constant  $c_M > 0$ .

**Theorem 3.6.** Consider  $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{(2)}^{\hat{S}} \in \mathcal{R}^{(N-n) \times |\hat{S}|}$  as the post-selection matrix with  $\hat{S} \supset S$ . Let s = |S| and  $\hat{s} = |\hat{S}|$ . Suppose Assumption 8 holds and  $\kappa > 3(\sqrt{N-n} + \sqrt{\hat{s}})/\sqrt{(N-n)s}$ . Then for a new data point  $\mathbf{x}_0$  with latent factor  $\mathbf{y}_0$ , with probability 1 - O(1/n), for a constant C > 0,  $\hat{\gamma}$  defined in (2.4) follows that

$$|\hat{\boldsymbol{\gamma}}^{\top} \boldsymbol{x}_{0}^{\hat{\mathcal{S}}} - \mathbb{E}[z|\boldsymbol{y}_{0}]| \leq C \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\| \frac{\sqrt{N-n} + \sqrt{\hat{s}}}{\kappa \sqrt{(N-n)s}} + \frac{C\sigma_{\delta}}{\sqrt{N-n}}.$$

This error bound has two parts. The first part is related to the underlying coefficients of  $\mathbb{E}[z|\boldsymbol{y}_0]$ , and the second part comes from the noise  $\delta_i$  in the response vector.

**Corollary 3.2.** Consider the model (3.9) for z and RDPG(F) for the network, where Assumptions 1–3 and 7–8 hold. When  $\kappa \gg C(1/\sqrt{N-n} + 1/\sqrt{s})$ , the prediction error of Algorithm 3 goes to  $\sigma_{\delta}/\sqrt{N-n}$ , the same order with the ordinary linear regression on N-n data points.

## 4 Simulation

We conduct some numerical experiments to examine our new algorithms. Let  $n_1 = n = 800$ ,  $n_2 = N - n = 200$ , p = 1200, and  $|\mathcal{S}| = 50$  informative covariates. The dimension of the latent space is K = 3 under DCSBM and K = 10 under the RDPG. More simulation settings can be found in supplementary materials.

Experiment 1 (DCSBM) Generate the class labels  $\ell(i) \in [K]$  with equal probability. The latent factors  $\boldsymbol{y}_i \in \mathcal{R}^3$ , with  $\ell(i)$ -th element being 1 and others are 0. The network  $A_{ij} \sim \text{Bernoulli}(\theta_i \theta_j \boldsymbol{y}_i^\top \boldsymbol{B} \boldsymbol{y}_j)$ , where  $\theta_i \sim |\mathcal{N}(0.1, 0.2)|$  independently and  $\boldsymbol{B}$  has  $\sin^2 a$  on diagonals and  $(\cos^2 a)/2$  on off-diagonals. The covariates  $\boldsymbol{X}_j = \boldsymbol{Y} \boldsymbol{M}_j + \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{I})$  for  $j \in [p]$ . Here,  $\boldsymbol{M}_j = 0$  for  $j \notin S$  and  $M_{ij} \sim \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(0.3, 0.05^2) + \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{N}(-0.3, 0.05^2)$  for  $j \in S$ . We let  $a \in [\pi/4, 5\pi/4]$  to explore the effects of network assortativity and fixing  $a = \pi/4$  to discuss the covariate selection and clustering problem.

Experiment 2 (RDPG). Let the latent factor  $\boldsymbol{y}_i \sim \mathcal{N}(2 * \mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$  is a blockdiagonal matrix. Each block has diagonals as 1 and off-diagonals as Unif(0, 1) random variables. The network is thus generated by  $A_{ij} \sim Bernoulli(0.01\boldsymbol{y}_i^{\top}\boldsymbol{y}_j)$  independently. The covariate  $\boldsymbol{X}$  is the same with Experiment 1, with  $M_{ij} \sim \frac{1}{2}$ Unif $(0.05, \mu) + \frac{1}{2}$ Unif $(-\mu, -0.05)$ if  $j \in S$  and 0 otherwise. Specifically, to investigate the power of our network-guided algorithm versus supervised learning, we generate a coefficient vector  $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \boldsymbol{I})$  and a response variable for 200 samples,  $z_i = \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\top} \boldsymbol{y}_i + \delta_i$ , where  $\delta_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 0.5)$ . Let loading effects parameter  $\mu \in [0.05, 1]$  to examine the aggregated signal strength and then fix  $\mu = 0.3$  for comparison of covariate selection methods.



Figure 1: Summary of experimental results.

For these experiments, we first evaluate the aggregated signal strength  $\tau(\Xi)$ . In the oracle case  $\boldsymbol{Y}$  is known, we take  $\boldsymbol{\Xi} = \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{Y})$ , denoted as Oracle. We also consider  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}$  from the network:  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A}, K), \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{L}, K), \boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{A}, 2K)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\Xi}(\boldsymbol{L}, 2K)$ . The results over 50 repetitions are summarized in the left panel of Figure 1. The signal strength for NGCS is close to the oracle case, except the case  $\boldsymbol{A}$  is not informative. With  $\hat{K} \in \{K, 2K\}$ , NGCS gives a consistent  $\tau(\boldsymbol{\Xi})$  for all experiments, which proves the robustness with respect to  $\hat{K}$ .

We then examine the false discovery rate (FDR) for four sets of covariate selection methods: 1) NGCS with  $\boldsymbol{Y}$  given (Oracle); 2) NGCS with  $(\boldsymbol{A}, K)$  and  $(\boldsymbol{L}, K)$ ; 3) ranking methods based on  $\boldsymbol{X}$ , including the marginal chi-square statistics (Chi), forward selection component analysis (Puggini and McLoone, 2017) (FSCA), and sparse k-means (Witten and Tibshirani, 2010) (SKmeans); and 4) ranking methods based on X and the response z in Experiment 2, including the marginal statistics (Marginal), and the accuracy decrease impact using random forests (Janitza et al., 2016) (RF). Since most methods only give a ranking of covariates, we examine the FDR when the number of selected positives  $|\hat{S}|$  changes from 5 to 100. Our NGCS algorithms always outperform other approaches, even in the presence of z. Specifically, HC always yields an almost-perfect selection of threshold, with FDR around 0.05. The results demonstrate that the inclusion of network information effectively transforms the unsupervised learning problem into a supervised learning task.

We then explore the clustering task, where our goal is to identify  $\ell_i$  for  $i \in [1000]$  in Experiment 1. Let the number of covariates p range from  $e^6$  to  $e^{13}$ . We consider two sets of clustering methods: 1) NG-clu algorithm with A and K; 2) X-based high-dimensional clustering methods, including spectral clustering (Spec), influential covariates PCA (IF-PCA) in Jin and Wang (2016), Sparse K-means (SKmeans) in Witten and Tibshirani (2010), and Sparse Alternate Sum clustering (SAS) in Arias-Castro and Pu (2017). Our proposed NG-clu algorithm consistently outperforms other methods. The exponential increase in pleads to a rapid increase in error rates for all X-based methods, whereas our approach experiences only a slight increase. It underscores the effectiveness of the NG-clu algorithm.

The regression task is explored under the Experiment 2 setting, where our goal is to predict the responses z. We compare our proposed NG-reg algorithm with popular high-dimensional regression approaches, including: penalized high-dimensional regression with Lasso (Lasso), Minimax Concave Penalty (MCP), and Smoothly Clipped Absolute Deviation (SCAD) penalty, Principal Component Regression (PCR in Liu et al. (2003)), and high-dimensional regression using correlation-adjusted marginal correlation (CAR in Zuber and Strimmer (2011)). The mean squared error between the estimation  $\hat{z}$  and  $Y\alpha$  is used to assess the performance. Figure 1 shows that our NG-reg algorithm outperforms all the other methods for all  $\mu \in [1, 2]$ , with larger improvements for a smaller  $\mu$ . It highlights that enhancing data quality by additional network information is crucial for complex data.

# 5 Sina<sup>TM</sup> Dataset

Sina-microblog website is the largest social platform in China, where each user can follow a list of users to read their new microblogs timely. Jia et al. (2017) extracted the followerfollowee network with covariates for thousands of users from this website. In the network, each node represents a user and each directed edge (i, j) represents user *i* following user *j*. We amplified the covariate vector to be  $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathcal{R}^{3000}$ , where 10 out of 3000 are informative covariates and others are noise. The 10 informative covariates give the user's interests on K = 10 topics. Code details can be found on https://tinyurl.com/NGCSandRelated.

Our first goal is to recover the 10 informative covariates. We first investigate NGCS with tuning parameter  $\hat{K} \in [1, 50]$ . For each possible  $\hat{K}$ , we randomly select n = 2000users and apply NGCS with A and  $\hat{K}$ . The average over 50 repetitions are summarized in Figure 2. When  $5 \leq \hat{K} \leq 20$ , NGCS stably recovers 8 or 9 out of 10 informative covariates with the number of all selected covariates  $|\hat{S}| \leq 13$ . Even with a large  $\hat{K} = 50$ , the recovered set  $\hat{S}$  has a relatively small size of  $\leq 25$ . It demonstrates the robustness of NGCS concerning the choice of  $\hat{K}$ . Fixing  $\hat{K} = 10$ , we compare NGCS with the oracle case that Y is known and X-based methods, including sparse k-means (SKmeans) and the marginal Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics (KS) used in Jin and Wang (2016). Our NGCS algorithm outperforms other methods and HC chooses almost the best threshold.

We then investigate the regression problem. Given an informative covariate set S with 9 covariates, the response is given by  $z_i = 1 - \sum_{j \in S} X_{ij} + \mathcal{N}(0, 0.5^2)$ . We take  $n_1 = 2000$  users



Figure 2: Covariate selection results.

with A and  $n_2 \in \{100, 150, \dots, 500\}$  users with z. The covariates  $x_i \in \mathcal{R}^{3000}$  are available for all  $n_1 + n_2$  users. The goal is to estimate  $\mathbb{E}[z_i|x_i]$  for  $i \in [n_1]$ . Compare our NG-reg algorithm with the penalized high-dimensional regression methods on the  $n_2$  users, including Lasso, MCP and SCAD. The root of mean squared error (RMSE =  $\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n_1} (\hat{z}_i - X_{ik})^2/n_1}$ ) on  $n_1$  users is used to evaluate the regression result, summarized in Table 4.

In Table 4, the supervised high-dimensional methods on  $n_2$  users can hardly identify any informative covariates and the RMSE is always around 0.2, due to the large noise. Our method successfully identify 8 informative covariates and gives a more accurate prediction on  $\boldsymbol{z}$ , especially for large  $n_2$ . In supplementary materials, we discuss the combination of NGCS and high-dimensional regression methods.

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

The supplementary material contains all technical proofs and additional numerical analysis (PDF file).

	NG-reg		Lasso			MCP			SCAD			
$n_2$	RMSE	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}} $	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}}\cap\mathcal{S} $	RMSE	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}} $	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}}\cap\mathcal{S} $	RMSE	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}} $	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}}\cap\mathcal{S} $	RMSE	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}} $	$ \hat{\mathcal{S}}\cap\mathcal{S} $
100	0.25	11.9 (1.79)	8 (0.00)	0.23	12.7 (23.30)	0.2(0.42)	0.27	4.5 (7.21)	0.2(0.42)	0.23	10.5(16.39)	0.2(0.42)
150	0.21	12.5 (4.01)	8 (0.00)	0.20	14.0(21.75)	0.3 (0.67)	0.21	5.9(6.37)	0.3(0.67)	0.20	9.3 (16.91)	0.5(0.85)
200	0.17	12.2(2.25)	8 (0.00)	0.20	2.4(5.15)	$0.1 \ (0.32)$	0.20	1.4(2.17)	0.1 (0.32)	0.19	3.7(4.99)	0.3(0.48)
250	0.14	10.3(1.16)	8 (0.00)	0.22	43.2 (51.47)	0.2(0.42)	0.19	3.2(5.79)	0.0 (0.00)	0.20	20.7 (28.23)	0.0 (0.00)
300	0.13	11.0 (2.10)	8 (0.00)	0.19	11.5(22.18)	0.6(0.70)	0.19	5.4(8.42)	0.5(0.53)	0.20	13.9 (21.89)	0.5 (0.53)
350	0.13	11.3 (1.64)	8 (0.00)	0.19	3.0 (7.15)	0.2(0.42)	0.19	2.6(4.86)	0.2(0.42)	0.19	9.5 (16.66)	0.4 (0.52)
400	0.11	12.5(2.84)	8 (0.00)	0.19	12.9 (19.02)	0.5(0.97)	0.19	4.6 (7.49)	0.4(0.70)	0.19	5.1 (8.71)	0.4(0.70)
450	0.11	11.3 (1.77)	8 (0.00)	0.19	6.6 (7.82)	0.7 (0.95)	0.19	3.1 (4.63)	0.5(0.71)	0.19	5.6(6.69)	0.6(0.84)
500	0.11	12.2(2.53)	8 (0.00)	0.19	10.5(10.83)	0.8(0.79)	0.19	6.7(6.88)	0.7(0.82)	0.19	13.5 (13.00)	1.0(1.05)

Table 4: Summary table for regression.

# References

- Abbe, E., J. Fan, and K. Wang (2022). An  $\ell_p$  theory of pca and spectral clustering. The Annals of Statistics 50(4), 2359–2385.
- Arias-Castro, E. and X. Pu (2017). A simple approach to sparse clustering. Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 105, 217–228.
- Athreya, A., D. E. Fishkind, M. Tang, C. E. Priebe, Y. Park, J. T. Vogelstein, K. Levin,
  V. Lyzinski, and Y. Qin (2017). Statistical inference on random dot product graphs: a survey. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18(1), 8393–8484.
- Azizyan, M., A. Singh, and L. Wasserman (2013). Minimax theory for high-dimensional gaussian mixtures with sparse mean separation. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 26.
- Bickel, P. J. and A. Chen (2009). A nonparametric view of network models and newman-

girvan and other modularities. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 106(50), 21068–21073.

- Binkiewicz, N., J. T. Vogelstein, and K. Rohe (2017). Covariate-assisted spectral clustering. Biometrika 104(2), 361–377.
- Chen, J. and B. Yuan (2006). Detecting functional modules in the yeast protein–protein interaction network. *Bioinformatics* 22(18), 2283–2290.
- Deshpande, Y., S. Sen, A. Montanari, and E. Mossel (2018). Contextual stochastic block models. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31.
- Donoho, D. and J. Jin (2008). Higher criticism thresholding: Optimal feature selection when useful features are rare and weak. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 105(39), 14790–14795.
- Donoho, D. and J. Jin (2009). Feature selection by higher criticism thresholding achieves the optimal phase diagram. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A 367*, 4449–4470.
- Donoho, D. L. (2000). High-dimensional data analysis: The curses and blessings of dimensionality. AMS Math Challenges Lecture 1(2000), 32.
- Donoho, D. L. and J. Jin (2015). Higher criticism for large-scale inference, especially for rare and weak effects. *Statistical Science* 30(1), 1–25.
- Fan, J. and J. Lv (2008). Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 70(5), 849–911.
- Friedman, J. H. and J. J. Meulman (2004). Clustering objects on subsets of attributes (with discussion). Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 66(4), 815–849.

- Gu, Q. and J. Han (2011). Towards feature selection in network. In Proceedings of the 20th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, pp. 1175–1184.
- Hu, Y. and W. Wang (2024). Network-adjusted covariates for community detection. Biometrika 111(4), 1221–1240.
- Janitza, S., G. Tutz, and A.-L. Boulesteix (2016). Random forest for ordinal responses: prediction and variable selection. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis 96*, 57–73.
- Jia, C., Y. Li, M. B. Carson, X. Wang, and J. Yu (2017). Node attribute-enhanced community detection in complex networks. *Scientific Reports* 7(1), 2626.
- Jin, J. (2015). Fast community detection by score. The Annals of Statistics 43(1), 57–89.
- Jin, J., Z. T. Ke, and W. Wang (2017). Phase transitions for high dimensional clustering and related problems. *The Annals of Statistics* 45(5), 2151–2189.
- Jin, J. and W. Wang (2016). Influential features pca for high dimensional clustering. *The* Annals of Statistics 44(6), 2323–2359.
- Joseph, A. and B. Yu (2016). Impact of regularization on spectral clustering. *The Annals* of *Statistics* 44(4), 1765–1791.
- Karrer, B. and M. E. Newman (2011). Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical Review E 83*(1), 016107.
- Leskovec, J. and J. Mcauley (2012). Learning to discover social circles in ego networks. Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 25.
- Li, C. and H. Li (2008). Network-constrained regularization and variable selection for analysis of genomic data. *Bioinformatics* 24(9), 1175–1182.

- Liu, R., J. Kuang, Q. Gong, and X. Hou (2003). Principal component regression analysis with spss. *Computer Methods and Programs in Biomedicine* 71(2), 141–147.
- Lyzinski, V., D. L. Sussman, M. Tang, A. Athreya, and C. E. Priebe (2014). Perfect clustering for stochastic blockmodel graphs via adjacency spectral embedding. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 8, 2905–2922.
- Newman, M. E. (2013). Spectral methods for community detection and graph partitioning. *Physical Review E* 88(4), 042822.
- Newman, M. E. and A. Clauset (2016). Structure and inference in annotated networks. *Nature Communications* 7(1), 1–11.
- Puggini, L. and S. McLoone (2017). Forward selection component analysis: Algorithms and applications. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence 39*(12), 2395–2408.
- Raftery, A. E. and N. Dean (2006). Variable selection for model-based clustering. *Journal* of the American Statistical Association 101(473), 168–178.
- Rubin-Delanchy, P., J. Cape, M. Tang, and C. E. Priebe (2022). A statistical interpretation of spectral embedding: The generalised random dot product graph. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 84 (4), 1446–1473.
- Sporns, O. and R. F. Betzel (2016). Modular brain networks. Annual Review of Psychology 67, 613.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B 58(1), 267–288.

- Wang, J.-H. and Y.-H. Chen (2021). Network-adjusted kendall's tau measure for feature screening with application to high-dimensional survival genomic data. *Bioinformatics* 37(15), 2150–2156.
- Witten, D. M. and R. Tibshirani (2010). A framework for feature selection in clustering. Journal of the American Statistical Association 105(490), 713–726.
- Wu, M., L. Zhu, and X. Feng (2018). Network-based feature screening with applications to genome data. The Annals of Applied Statistics 12(2), 1250–1270.
- Yan, B. and P. Sarkar (2021). Covariate regularized community detection in sparse graphs. Journal of the American Statistical Association 116(534), 734–745.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010). Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty. *The Annals of Statistics* 38(2), 894–942.
- Zhao, J., X. Liu, H. Wang, and C. Leng (2022). Dimension reduction for covariates in network data. *Biometrika* 109(1), 85–102.
- Zhao, Y., E. Levina, and J. Zhu (2012). Consistency of community detection in networks under degree-corrected stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics* 40(4), 2266– 2292.
- Zhu, X., X. Chang, R. Li, and H. Wang (2019). Portal nodes screening for large scale social networks. *Journal of Econometrics* 209(2), 145–157.
- Zuber, V. and K. Strimmer (2011). High-dimensional regression and variable selection using car scores. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology* 10(1).