

Valid confidence intervals for regression with best subset selection

Huiming Lin and Meng Li

November 27, 2023

Abstract

Classical confidence intervals after best subset selection are widely implemented in statistical software and are routinely used to guide practitioners in scientific fields to conclude significance. However, there are increasing concerns in the recent literature about the validity of these confidence intervals in that the intended frequentist coverage is not attained. In the context of the Akaike information criterion (AIC), recent studies observe an under-coverage phenomenon in terms of overfitting, where the estimate of error variance under the selected submodel is smaller than that for the true model. Under-coverage is particularly troubling in selective inference as it points to inflated Type I errors that would invalidate significant findings. In this article, we delineate a complementary, yet provably more deciding factor behind the incorrect coverage of classical confidence intervals under AIC, in terms of altered conditional sampling distributions of pivotal quantities. Resting on selective techniques developed in other settings, our finite-sample characterization of the selection event under AIC uncovers its geometry as a union of finitely many intervals on the real line, based on which we derive new confidence intervals with guaranteed coverage for any sample size. This geometry derived for AIC selection enables exact (and typically less than exact) conditioning, circumventing the need for the excessive conditioning common in other post-selection methods. The proposed methods are easy to implement and can be broadly applied to other commonly used best subset selection criteria. In an application to a classical US consumption dataset, the proposed confidence intervals arrive at different conclusions compared to the conventional ones, even when the selected model is the full model, leading to interpretable findings that better align with empirical observations.

1 Introduction

Confidence intervals are fundamental in statistical inference, providing guidance for practitioners in drawing significant conclusions and quantifying uncertainty. Traditional inference procedures assume a pre-specified model before data collection. However, this assumption often does not hold in practice, particularly in cases where models are built using data-driven approaches for efficiency, parsimony, and interpretability. Despite its ubiquity in medical research, data science analysis,

and statistical textbooks (Claeskens and Hjort, 2008; Hyndman and Athanasopoulos, 2018), such practice raises concerns. In particular, it has been increasingly recognized in the recent literature that there is a subtle but important difference between valid inference conditional on a selected model and that on a given model, the former known as post-selection inference. Throughout this article, we focus our discussion of post-selection inference on valid confidence intervals, in which ‘valid’ means the intended frequentist coverage is attained.

Best subset selection is arguably the most popular variable selection method when enumerating all subsets is computationally feasible, and has attracted growing attention recently even in the presence of large-scale covariates (Bertsimas et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2020). One widely used criterion is the Akaike information criterion (AIC), which selects the model with the smallest Akaike information. Given its widespread implementation in statistical software that practitioners in medical and scientific fields use routinely, understanding the validity of confidence intervals after AIC selection is crucial. However, there is little development on post-selection inference with best subset selection. In a recent study, Hong et al. (2018) observed under-coverage issues in traditional confidence intervals when conditioned on AIC-selected models, suggesting an underestimation of noise as a potential cause under the assumption of overfitting (i.e., the selected model is a superset of the true model).

Under-coverage of confidence intervals is particularly troubling as it points to inflated Type I errors that would invalidate significant findings. This raises a critical question: Is the flawed noise estimation the sole factor responsible for this under-coverage, or does it contribute only partially to the problem? In this article, we revisit the experiments by Hong et al. (2018) and find significant coverage loss even with the true noise variance, suggesting that the estimation of noise standard derivation is just the tip of the iceberg. We further explore the other part beyond it and more importantly, propose corrections for post-selection inference. We contribute a constructive answer to this question by deriving exact post-selection inference with AIC, which not only provides valid new confidence intervals but also offers insights into the under-coverage of traditional confidence intervals.

Recent years have witnessed the development of post-selection inference for various model selection methods. Berk et al. (2013) proposed a conservative procedure to achieve universally valid confidence intervals against all model selection methods, and Charkhi and Claeskens (2018) studied asymptotic confidence intervals with AIC. Here we are interested in *exact post-selection* for one particular model selection method in *finite-sample* settings as opposed to universal or asymptotic protection. Along this line, Lee et al. (2016) studied the post-selection correction for the lasso method at a fixed value of the regularization parameter, Tibshirani et al. (2016) investigated the inference problem at any step of the forward stepwise regression, least angle regression, or the lasso, Loftus and Taylor (2014) considered forward stepwise model selection that allowed grouped variables, and Markovic et al. (2017) studied a family of model selection procedures with a highlight on the method’s universal applicability. We contribute to this growing literature by providing exact post-selection with best subset selection criteria, which yield a distinct geometry of the selection event that is arguably more comprehensible than other selection methods studied in the literature. Interestingly, our post-AIC confidence intervals do not rely on extra conditioning as seen in many other selective inference methods (Lee et al., 2016; Tibshirani et al., 2016), and instead offer fur-

ther simplifications such that less than exact conditioning is sufficient—this leads to valid coverage without unnecessarily widening the intervals.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our target in post-selection inference and revisits the experiment in Hong et al. (2018) with new findings. In Section 3, we provide a finite-sample characterization of the selection event under AIC, and uncover its geometry as a union of finitely many intervals on the real line. This leads to a corrected sampling distribution of pivotal quantities in confidence interval construction based on which we derive new confidence intervals with guaranteed coverage. Simulation studies to assess the coverage of the proposed confidence intervals are conducted in Section 5. In Section 6, the proposed method is applied to analyze a classical US consumption dataset, in which we show that the proposed post-selection inference arrives at different conclusions compared to conventional confidence intervals, even when the selected model is the full model. We conclude and discuss extensions to other information-based criteria in Section 7.

2 Post-AIC inference and a motivating example

2.1 Conditional coverage of confidence intervals

Consider the linear model (referred to as the full model)

$$Y = X\beta + \epsilon, \tag{1}$$

where Y is an n -vector of response, X is an $n \times p$ matrix of explanatory variables, β is a p -vector coefficient, and $\epsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I)$ is an n -vector of independent normal errors. Throughout this paper, for an index set $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, we use X_S to denote the submatrix of X that contains the columns corresponding to S , and similarly β_S the subvector of β . We use $|S|$ to denote the cardinality of the set S . We assume that the design matrix X has full column rank $p < n$.

Model (1) is commonly assumed in the model selection literature, known as the \mathcal{M} -closed case (Bernardo and Smith, 1994; Li and Dunson, 2020), under which we use $S^* \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ to indicate the true model. However, our developed methods are generally applicable for any $Y \sim N(EY, \sigma^2 I)$, allowing for the case that model (1) is misspecified; see Section 4.1 for a more detailed discussion.

Suppose that one first selects a subset S_0 of explanatory variables using data-driven approaches and subsequently bases inference on the selected model. For a parameter of interest $\eta^T EY$ with non-stochastic $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we aim to find a data-dependent interval (L, U) such that

$$\Pr(\eta^T EY \in (L, U) \mid S_0 \text{ is selected}) \geq 1 - \alpha, \tag{2}$$

for a given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, where the selection method is best subset selection with the AIC. The conditional coverage in (2) reflects the shifted goal in post-selection inference compared to classical regimes where the model is given (Berk et al., 2013). It additionally controls (positive) false discovery type of criterion for variable selection (Lee et al., 2016), and also trivially yields unconditional coverage by marginalizing the statement ‘ S_0 is selected’ (Tibshirani et al., 2016).

The target parameter $\eta^T EY$ is $\eta^T X\beta$ under model (1). In the presence of model selection, naively applying the classical statistical inference procedure to the selected model may lead to mis-calibrated coverage without properly accounting for the randomness in the selection step. In particular, for the selected model S , the classical $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for $\eta^T X\beta$ given by

$$C(\eta, S, \alpha) = \eta^T X_S \hat{\beta}_S \pm t_{n-|S|-1, \alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_S \{\eta^T X_S (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T \eta\}^{1/2} \quad (3)$$

has no statistical guarantee to achieve the conditional coverage in (2); here $t_{n-|S|-1, \alpha/2}$ is the upper $\alpha/2$ quantile of t distribution with degrees of freedom $n - |S| - 1$, $\hat{\beta}_S$ is the least square estimate of β_S under the model S , $\hat{\sigma}_S^2 = \text{RSS}(S)/(n - |S| - 1)$ is the estimate of σ , and $\text{RSS}(S)$ is the residual sum of squares of the model using variables in S . One piece of numerical evidence for the invalid coverage is the experiment in [Hong et al. \(2018\)](#), where the classical confidence intervals above with the AIC-selected model have a coverage smaller than $1 - \alpha$. Specifically, the empirical conditional coverage was about 0.86 with $\alpha = 0.05$, which is the default confidence level throughout the numerical studies in this article. This significant loss of coverage can be replicated, as we next introduce a motivating experiment similar to [Hong et al. \(2018\)](#) but with new findings.

2.2 Motivating example: quantifying coverage loss and contributing factors

We use the same data generation model (1) as in [Hong et al. \(2018\)](#) with $n = 50$, $p = 10$, and $\sigma = 1$. The ground truth $\beta^* = (1, 2, 3, 0, 0, \dots, 0)$ has 3 nonzero components, and the rows of X are independently generated from multivariate Gaussian with mean 0 and a first-order autoregressive correlation matrix (AR(1)) with correlation parameter $\rho = 0.5$. We evaluate the coverage probability of the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for the predicted mean at 10 new points $\{x^i\}_{i=1}^{10}$, each generated from the same distribution of rows in X . With unknown σ , the naive $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval at point x is $C(x, S, \alpha)$ by substituting $\eta = \eta(x) = X_S (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} x$ in (3).

[Hong et al. \(2018\)](#) proved a lower bound on the probability of $\hat{\sigma}_S < \hat{\sigma}_{S^*}$ when $S \supset S^*$. Since it is common for AIC to select a strictly overfitted model, they attributed the under-coverage of $C(x, S, \alpha)$ to the under-estimated $\hat{\sigma}_S$, resulting in a narrower confidence interval. However, it remains unclear that (i) *to what extent can the loss of coverage be explained by $\hat{\sigma}_S$* , and (ii) *how can the under-coverage be corrected*. The rest of this section will address the first question, while the following sections will resolve the second.

For the first question, we provide an empirical quantification by comparing the coverage of confidence intervals for known σ , i.e.,

$$C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha) = x_S^T \hat{\beta}_S \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sigma \{x_S^T (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} x_S\}^{1/2}, \quad (4)$$

with that of $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$, where $z_{\alpha/2}$ is the upper $\alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution. Since $C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ eliminates the effect of $\hat{\sigma}_S$, its improvement of coverage over $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ quantifies the contribution of the ground truth σ over the under-estimate $\hat{\sigma}_S$, while its coverage loss corresponds to factors other than $\hat{\sigma}_S$. Consequently, we can use

$$1 - \frac{1 - \alpha - \min\{1 - \alpha, \text{coverage of } C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha)\}}{1 - \alpha - \min\{1 - \alpha, \text{coverage of } C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)\}} \quad (5)$$




Figure 1: Left: frequency of AIC-selected model size in 5000 simulations. Right: 95% confidence interval for the coverage of $C_\sigma(\eta(x); S; 0.05)$ (red) and $C(\eta(x); S; 0.05)$ (blue) at 10 new x points.

to assess how much the under-coverage of $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ can be explained by $\hat{\sigma}_S$ alone.

We run 5000 simulations to compute the empirical coverage probability of the confidence intervals. A common fixed X is used in each simulation and a new set of Y is generated. We estimate the coverage probability of the confidence intervals by counting their frequency of containing the true mean value $(x^i)^T \beta$, for each of the ten new data points $\{x^i : 1 \leq i \leq 10\}$, respectively.

The simulation results are summarized in Figure 1. The left panel shows the distribution of the size of selected models. AIC always selects the oracle model or its superset, consistent with the observation in Hong et al. (2018). Therefore, we expect a likely under-estimated σ and therefore under-coverage of $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$. The right panel confirms this, showing an empirical coverage of 0.883, which is close to the 0.86 in the original study.

However, there is an additional interesting finding: the coverage of $C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ over $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ only improves slightly; that is, the confidence interval continues to significantly deviate from the nominal level of 0.95 even with the ground truth $\sigma = 1$. Table 1 delineates the effect of unknown σ and other factors. The upper half reports the average coverage probability of $C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ and $C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$ across different x 's, which are 0.883 and 0.894, respectively. In particular, the percentage defined in (5) is $1 - 5.64/6.74 = 16.32\%$, indicating that the under-estimation $\hat{\sigma}_S$ contributes less than 20% of the coverage loss. The remaining 83.68% of the coverage loss can only be attributed to other factors. Empirical coverage at the point x^1 is also provided in the lower half of Table 1, and is consistent with what is shown in the upper half of the table.

In the following sections, we study the distribution of the point estimator $\eta^T Y$ conditional on the selection event under AIC, which provides a constructive answer to decipher the other factors behind coverage mis-calibration and leads to new valid confidence intervals.

3 Statistical inference with post-selection correction

In this section, we describe post-AIC inference to construct valid confidence intervals when the same data is used for both model selection and model fitting. We begin with a characterization of the AIC selection event, which uncovers an interesting geometry unique to best subset selection. Extensions to other best subset selection criteria are straightforward and are discussed in Section 7. We note that our developments in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 only assume $Y \sim N(EY, \sigma^2 I)$ and a given fixed design matrix X , and do not rely on the linear model assumption associating them as in (1).

	Uncorrected CI		Corrected CI			
	$C(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$	$C_\sigma(\eta(x), S, \alpha)$	known σ	mse_aic	mse_full	olasso
Coverage	0.883	0.894	0.947	0.936	0.944	0.974
Relative loss (%)	6.74	5.64	0.32	1.47	0.63	0
	$C(\eta(x^1), S, \alpha)$	$C_\sigma(\eta(x^1), S, \alpha)$	known σ	mse_aic	mse_full	olasso
Coverage	0.892	0.905	0.949	0.938	0.945	0.975
Standard error	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002
Relative loss (%)	6.15	4.76	0.11	1.22	0.57	0

Table 1: Empirical coverage of confidence intervals (CIs) with confidence level $1 - \alpha = 0.95$. The upper half of the table is for averaged coverage across 10 x points, while the lower half is for x^1 . The relative coverage loss is $1 - \{(\text{empirical coverage})/0.95\}$ (set to zero if it is negative). ‘Uncorrected CI’ is for classical CIs. Their under-coverage is corrected by the proposed methods in the last four columns (‘Corrected CI’), obtained with known σ and estimated σ using mse_aic, mse_full, and olasso, respectively; see Section 5 for more detail.

This generality is compatible with one premise of using AIC, which does not assume that the considered model list contains the true model.

3.1 Characterizing the AIC selection event

For the linear regression model (1), the AIC of a model S is

$$\text{AIC}(S) = 2|S| + n \log\{\text{RSS}(S)\} \quad (6)$$

up to an additive constant shared by all models. The model S_0 with the smallest AIC value is selected. Letting \mathcal{S} be the set of all possible submodels (including the full model), we have

$$\{\text{AIC selects } S_0\} = \bigcap_{S \in \mathcal{S}: S \neq S_0} \{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)\}. \quad (7)$$

Hence, the characterization of the selection event $\{\text{AIC selects } S_0\}$ boils down to that of the intersection of individual comparisons $\{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)\}$ for all $S \neq S_0$. Let $P_S = I - X_S(X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T$ denote the residual maker matrix of the model S . For a general comparison $\{\text{AIC}(\tilde{S}) < \text{AIC}(S)\}$, the definition of AIC in (6) gives

$$\{\text{AIC}(\tilde{S}) < \text{AIC}(S)\} = \left\{ \frac{Y^T P_S Y}{Y^T P_{\tilde{S}} Y} > \omega(\tilde{S}, S) \right\}, \quad (8)$$

where $\omega(\tilde{S}, S) = \exp\{2(|\tilde{S}| - |S|)/n\}$ when using AIC. A more useful representation of (8) for studying an estimator’s sampling distribution conditioning on the selection event depends on the estimator itself, as shown below.

Consider a linear estimator $\eta^T Y$ in its most general form for some non-stochastic $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^n$; the specification of η depends on the parameter of interest and will be concretized in special examples later. As commonly done in post-selection inference such as Lee et al. (2016), we decompose Y into two components such that (i) the first component is multiplicative of $\eta^T Y$, and (ii) the two components are independent. Let $\tilde{\eta} = \eta(\eta^T \eta)^{-1}$ and $z = Y - (\eta^T Y)\tilde{\eta} = (I - \eta(\eta^T \eta)^{-1}\eta^T)Y$. It is straightforward to verify that z and $\eta^T Y$ are uncorrelated and thus independent of each other for normally distributed Y . Therefore, we arrive at the decomposition $Y = (\eta^T Y)\tilde{\eta} + z$ as the sum of two independent components. Substituting this decomposition into (8), for a given \tilde{S} , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \{\text{AIC}(\tilde{S}) < \text{AIC}(S)\} &= \{[\tilde{\eta}^T \{P_S - \omega(\tilde{S}, S)P_{\tilde{S}}\}\tilde{\eta}] \cdot (\eta^T Y)^2 \\ &\quad + 2[z^T \{P_S - \omega(\tilde{S}, S)P_{\tilde{S}}\}\tilde{\eta}] \cdot (\eta^T Y) + z^T \{P_S - \omega(\tilde{S}, S)P_{\tilde{S}}\}z > 0\}. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The right-hand side of (9) is a quadratic inequality of $\eta^T Y$ when its leading term is nonzero. Depending on the sign of $\tilde{\eta}^T \{P_S - \omega(\tilde{S}, S)P_{\tilde{S}}\}\tilde{\eta}$, the feasible region for $\eta^T Y$ is either a single interval or two intervals. The inequality becomes linear when the leading term is zero, and the feasible region is a single interval. Therefore, the inequality in (9) can be rewritten in a unified manner as

$$\{\text{AIC}(\tilde{S}) < \text{AIC}(S)\} = \{\eta^T Y \in (a_1(z|\tilde{S}, S), b_1(z|\tilde{S}, S)) \cup (a_2(z|\tilde{S}, S), b_2(z|\tilde{S}, S))\}, \quad (10)$$

where some of the interval endpoints may take values ∞ when appropriate.

Combining (10) and (7) yields the following characterization of the AIC selection event

$$\{\text{AIC selects } S_0\} = \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z|S_0)\}, \quad (11)$$

where the feasible region

$$\text{Re}(z|S_0) = \bigcap_{S: S \neq S_0} \{(a_1(z|S_0, S), b_1(z|S_0, S)) \cup (a_2(z|S_0, S), b_2(z|S_0, S))\} \quad (12)$$

is a union of finitely many intervals. The simple geometry in (12) has analytical forms and is different from the polyhedra conditioning sets derived in Lee et al. (2016) for the lasso. Unlike other post-selection methods that additionally condition on the sign of the selected variable (Lee et al., 2016) or other enlarged events (Tibshirani et al., 2016), our characterization for AIC leads to *exact conditioning*; this helps shorten the obtained intervals than extra conditioning. In fact, less than exact conditioning is generally sufficient for post-AIC inference—see Section 4.2.

For notational simplicity and with the understanding that the selected model is always being conditional on, hereafter we drop the dependence on S_0 of these intervals and use $\text{Re}(z)$ to denote this feasible region; this is similar to that the design matrix X is often being conditional on in linear models and hence omitting such dependence in notations should not cause confusion. Similarly, we will also use $\omega(S)$ to denote $\omega(S_0, S)$.

3.2 Post-AIC confidence intervals

We now construct confidence intervals for the parameter $\eta^T EY$ for a general η ; apparently, $\eta^T Y$ is an unbiased estimator of this parameter. Characterizing the AIC selection event in the preceding

section leads to the conditional distribution of $\eta^T Y$. For any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, we have

$$\eta^T Y | \{\text{AIC selects } S_0, z = z_0\} = \eta^T Y | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z), z = z_0\} \stackrel{d}{=} \eta^T Y | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z_0)\}, \quad (13)$$

where the last step uses the independence of z and $\eta^T Y$. The conditional distribution in (13) is truncated normal—this shift from a normal distribution as would otherwise be assumed in classical statistical inference makes post-selection correction imperative to attain valid coverage.

Let $F_{\mu, \lambda, R}$ denote the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of a normal random variable with mean μ and standard deviation λ truncated to a region $R \subset \mathbb{R}$ that is a union of finitely many intervals, i.e.,

$$F_{\mu, \lambda, R}(x) = \Phi((-\infty, x] \cap R; \mu, \lambda) / \Phi(R; \mu, \lambda),$$

where $\Phi(\cdot; \mu, \lambda)$ is the probability measure of a $N(\mu, \lambda^2)$ random variable. Under the normal assumption of Y , we have $\eta^T Y \sim N(\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma^2 \eta^T \eta)$. Therefore, in view of (13), for any $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}$, the cdf of $\eta^T Y | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z), z = z_0\}$ is $F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z_0)}(\cdot)$. Applying the probability integral transform yields

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z), z = z_0\} \\ & \stackrel{d}{=} F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z_0)}(\eta^T Y) | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z_0)\} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1), \end{aligned}$$

where the second equation uses the independence between $\eta^T Y$ and z as in the derivation of (13). Hence, conditioning on the event $\{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z)\}$, the distribution of $F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y)$ given $z = z_0$ does not depend on z_0 ; subsequently, the marginal distribution of $F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y)$ derived by integrating out z is also $\text{Unif}(0, 1)$. This can be formally written as

$$F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) | \{\eta^T Y \in \text{Re}(z)\} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1).$$

Combining the display above with (11), we arrive at the following.

$$F_{\eta^T \text{E}Y, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) | \{\text{AIC selects } S_0\} \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1), \quad (14)$$

which gives a pivotal quantity conditional on the selection event that can be used to construct confidence intervals. Indeed, when σ is known, a $1 - \alpha$ confidence region for $\eta^T \text{E}Y | \{\text{AIC selects } S_0\}$ based on (14) is

$$\{t : \alpha/2 \leq F_{t, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) \leq 1 - \alpha/2\}.$$

Furthermore, because the normal distribution has a monotone likelihood ratio in its mean parameter, the cdf of the truncated normal is also monotone decreasing in mean (see Lemma A.1, Lee et al. (2016)). Therefore, the above $1 - \alpha$ confidence region is in fact an interval (L, U) that satisfies

$$F_{L, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) = 1 - \alpha/2, \quad F_{U, \sigma \sqrt{\eta^T \eta}, \text{Re}(z)}(\eta^T Y) = \alpha/2. \quad (15)$$

Such confidence interval construction can be applied to any estimator in the form of $\eta^T Y$. A confidence interval (L, U) satisfying (15) is always a valid $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval for $\eta^T \text{E}(Y)$.

Next, we apply our corrected confidence intervals to specific parameters, including the mean response at a given point and individual regression coefficients, which are commonly of significant interest in practical applications. This is done by substituting η in (15), but with interesting simplifications and implications detailed below.

4 Applications to linear combinations of coefficients

4.1 Parameters of interest and model assumption

We study the widely used plug-in least squares estimator $c_{S_0}^T \hat{\beta}_{S_0}$, where $\hat{\beta}_{S_0} = (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} X_{S_0}^T Y$ is the least squares estimator of regression coefficients in the selected model. Rewrite this estimator into $c_{S_0}^T \hat{\beta}_{S_0} = \eta^T Y$, with $\eta = X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} c_{S_0}$ which depends only on X_{S_0} and c_{S_0} . Therefore, we can apply (15) to construct confidence intervals for $c_{S_0}^T E \hat{\beta}_{S_0}$. We next make explicit the class of parameters of interest our developed methods can address.

For a given S such as the selected model S_0 , let

$$\beta^S = (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T EY = \arg \min_b E \|Y - X_S b\|^2 \quad (16)$$

be the (adjusted) regression coefficient in model S following Lee et al. (2016). This adjustment is customary in post-selection inference, and also allows model misspecification as it does not mandate a linear model on EY (Tibshirani et al., 2016). Then any linear combination of β^S , i.e., $c_S^T \beta^S$, possesses the form $\eta^T EY$, and its confidence interval can be constructed by (15).

Under model (1), the parameter β^S defined this way is model dependent, and generally varies from model to model. To see this, model (1) leads to $EY = X\beta$ and thus $\beta^S = (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T X\beta$. Therefore, the parameter value corresponding to the same regressor may change when we vary S in β^S , leading to a dual dependence of the target parameter on S : not only does the identity of the target parameter change, but the true value of the parameter itself also varies. To this end, Tibshirani et al. (2016) characterized the parameter of interest as a *moving target*. We propose to refer to it as a ‘doubly moving target’ to emphasize that the target exhibits variability in both its identity and its value.

However, doubly moving targets have a simplified interpretation under model (1) with an overfitting assumption, i.e., when the true data-generating model S^* is linear and satisfies that $S^* \subset S$. Under overfitting, we have $EY = X\beta = X_S \beta_S$; hence,

$$\beta^S = (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T EY = (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T X_S \beta_S = \beta_S.$$

Consequently, for any regression coefficient in the selected model S on which we wish to make inference, its value does not depend on the enclosing model S . With this invariance property, our parameters are simply β_S without the need for any adjustment as in (16). The overfitting assumption often holds for the AIC method; see the discussion in Hong et al. (2018) and references therein.

Due to the simplified interpretation and AIC’s provable tendency of overfitting, in the sequel we assume overfitting and construct valid post-AIC confidence intervals for $c_S^T \beta_S$. This is nothing

short of general compared to (16); when the overfitting assumption does not hold, one just needs to replace β_S in our notation with β^S in (16).

4.2 Simplified implementation for post-AIC correction

For the parameter $c_{S_0}^T \beta_{S_0}$, one can use its unbiased estimator $c_{S_0}^T \hat{\beta}_{S_0} = \eta^T Y$ with $\eta = X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} c_{S_0}$ and apply (15) to construct confidence intervals. Interestingly, two simplifications can be derived, one algebraic for simplified expressions and the other distributional for reduced computation.

The first, algebraic simplification follows from that η is in the column space of X_{S_0} . This leads to $P_{S_0} \tilde{\eta} = 0$, and thus $\tilde{\eta}^T P_{S_0} \tilde{\eta} = 0$ and $z^T P_{S_0} \tilde{\eta} = 0$. Substituting these into (9) simplifies the AIC selection event in (9) to

$$\{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)\} = \{(\tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta})(\eta^T Y)^2 + 2(z^T P_S \tilde{\eta})(\eta^T Y) + z^T \{P_S - \omega(S)P_{S_0}\}z > 0\}. \quad (17)$$

Since P_S is idempotent, the leading term is positive unless $P_S \tilde{\eta} = 0$. Here we consider cases where the leading term is positive; the second simplification covers cases when the leading term is zero. Then, for trivial cases where $(z^T P_S \tilde{\eta})^2 - \tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} z^T \{P_S - \omega(S)P_{S_0}\}z < 0$, we have $\{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)\} = (-\infty, \infty)$; hence, this pairwise comparison can be ignored, technically corresponding to setting $a_1(z|S_0, S) = a_2(z|S_0, S) = -\infty$ and $b_1(z|S_0, S) = b_2(z|S_0, S) = \infty$. For non-trivial cases where $(z^T P_S \tilde{\eta})^2 - \tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} z^T \{P_S - \omega(S)P_{S_0}\}z \geq 0$, the endpoints of the feasible region (12) are simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} b_1(z|S_0, S) &= \frac{-z^T P_S \tilde{\eta} - \sqrt{(z^T P_S \tilde{\eta})^2 - \tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} z^T \{P_S - \omega(S)P_{S_0}\}z}}{\tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta}}, \\ a_2(z|S_0, S) &= \frac{-z^T P_S \tilde{\eta} + \sqrt{(z^T P_S \tilde{\eta})^2 - \tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} z^T \{P_S - \omega(S)P_{S_0}\}z}}{\tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta}}, \\ a_1(z|S_0, S) &= -\infty, \quad b_2(z|S_0, S) = \infty. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The second simplification is distributional concerning pairwise comparisons between S_0 and its supersets. In particular, although these comparisons alter the selection event, they do not change the conditional distribution of $\eta^T Y$. This is formulated in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *Suppose $S_0 \subset S$. Then the event $\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)$ is equivalent to $z^T P_S z - \omega(S)z^T P_{S_0} z > 0$. Consequently, the event $\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)$ is independent of $\eta^T Y$.*

Proof. Since η is in the column space of X_{S_0} , it is also in the column space of X_S if $S_0 \subset S$. Hence, we have $P_S \tilde{\eta} = 0$, yielding $\tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} = 0$ and $z^T P_S \tilde{\eta} = 0$. Substituting these into (17) leads to the claimed simplification of the event $\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)$. Noting the independence between $\eta^T Y$ and z completes the proof. \square

Lemma 1 indicates that the comparisons $\{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S) : S \supset S_0\}$ do not affect the conditional distribution of $\eta^T Y$, exhibiting no effect in the conditional coverage of intervals constructed by $\eta^T Y$. In other words, all pairwise comparisons between S_0 and its supersets, of which there are $2^{p-|S_0|} - 1$, can be skipped for constructing valid post-AIC confidence intervals, for any η derived from the selected model S_0 . This ‘less than exact conditioning’ simplifies our post-AIC correction procedure, particularly when S_0 is not large relative to the full model.

4.3 Special examples

We consider two commonly used examples for linear combinations of regression coefficients:

Example 1 We revisit the motivating example introduced in Section 2, where the parameter of interest is the response mean at some new data point x , namely $x^T \beta = x_{S_0}^T \beta_{S_0}$. Consider the plug-in least squares estimator $x_{S_0}^T \hat{\beta}_{S_0} = \eta^T Y$, with $\eta = X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} x_{S_0}$.

Example 2 Consider the parameter β_i for any $i \in S_0 \subset \{1, 2, \dots, p\}$. Note that we are only interested in the regression coefficients included in the selected model S_0 . Let $e_i =: e_i^{S_0}$ denote a unit vector in which the element corresponding to β_i is one, while all other elements are zero, i.e., $\beta_i = e_i^T \beta_{S_0}$. Our estimator is $\eta^T Y := \hat{\beta}_i = e_i^T (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} X_{S_0}^T Y$, with $\eta = X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} e_i$.

For both examples, we can apply (15) with the two simplifications in Section 4.2 to construct confidence intervals for the parameter of interest.

Up to this point, we have constructed valid confidence intervals after model selection using AIC. Additionally, the developed tools in this article provide insights into the reasons behind the coverage loss experienced with the classical confidence intervals. Using Example 2 as a demonstration, a classical $(1 - \alpha)$ -level confidence interval for β_i is based on inverting an event in the form of $(\eta^T Y - \beta_i)^2 \leq c_\alpha$, whose probability is $(1 - \alpha)$ under the classical regime when a model is given. The pivotal quantity $\eta^T Y - \beta_i$ is normally distributed centering around 0. However, the following lemma shows that a subset of pairwise AIC comparisons removes the highest density region in this normal distribution when β_i is a true null. While Lemma 1 considered comparisons with $\{S : S_0 \subset S\}$, we now look at the case where $S \subset S_0$.

Lemma 2. *Suppose $S \subset S_0$. If model S does not contain β_i , then the event $AIC(S_0) < AIC(S)$ is equivalent to*

$$\frac{1}{\|\eta\|_2^2} (\eta^T Y)^2 > \omega(S) z^T P_{S_0} z - z^T P_S z. \quad (19)$$

Consequently, a superset of the event $\{AIC \text{ selects } S_0\}$ is

$$\bigcap_{S: S \subset S_0 \setminus \{i\}} \{AIC(S_0) < AIC(S)\} = \left\{ (\eta^T Y)^2 > \|\eta\|_2^2 \max_{S \subset S_0 \setminus \{i\}} \{\omega(S) z^T P_{S_0} z - z^T P_S z\} \right\}. \quad (20)$$

Proof. It suffices to show (19). Since $S \subset S_0$, there exists a matrix A_S with entries of either zero or one such that A_S extracts the corresponding rows of $X_{S_0}^T$, that is, $X_S^T = A_S X_{S_0}^T$. If S does not contain i , then $A_S e_i = 0$. Now we have $X_S^T \eta = X_S^T \cdot X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} e_i = A_S X_{S_0}^T \cdot X_{S_0} (X_{S_0}^T X_{S_0})^{-1} e_i = A_S e_i = 0$. Hence, we have $X_S (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T \eta = 0$, and thus $P_S \eta = \eta - X_S (X_S^T X_S)^{-1} X_S^T \eta = \eta$. Then it is straightforward to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\eta}^T P_S \tilde{\eta} &= (\eta^T \eta)^{-2} \eta^T P_S \eta = \frac{1}{\|\eta\|_2^2}, \\ z^T P_S \tilde{\eta} &= z^T \eta (\eta^T \eta)^{-1} = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Substituting them into (17) completes the proof. \square

Lemma 2 states that when $S \subset S_0$, if model S does not contain β_i , the comparison $\{\text{AIC}(S_0) < \text{AIC}(S)\}$ is equivalent to placing a lower bound on $|\eta^T Y|$. If β_i is a true null, i.e., $\beta_i = 0$, then the right-hand side of (20) becomes

$$(\eta^T Y - \beta_i)^2 > \|\eta\|_2^2 \max_{S \subset S_0 \setminus \{i\}} \{\omega(S_0) z^T P_{S_0} z - z^T P_S z\}, \quad (21)$$

which rules out a high-density area in a centered normal distribution. Consequently, it tends to decrease the coverage probability of the classical confidence interval, yielding increasingly more claimed significance (false discoveries) than a procedure with valid post-selection correction. Interestingly, this is particularly the case when the selected model is the full model where all other models are nested in the selected model, where Type I errors of classical confidence intervals are expected to inflate and post-selection correction is more likely to be needed.

5 Simulation

In this section, we conduct numerical experiments to assess the coverage probability of our proposed confidence intervals. The coverage probability is empirically calculated based on 5000 simulations. We use the same data generated in the motivating example in Section 2. The confidence level is $1 - \alpha = 0.95$ with $\alpha = 0.05$. Recall that in this experiment AIC always selected the true or overfitted models.

We first consider the scenario where $\sigma = 1$ is known. Figure 2 reports the empirical coverage of the classical confidence intervals in (4) without post-AIC correction, and that of the corrected confidence intervals constructed using our proposed method. The left panel indicates that the uncorrected confidence interval at each of the ten new x points gives a coverage probability significantly smaller than the nominal level 95%; this loss of coverage is corrected by our method as we no longer observe a significant deviation of the coverage from 0.95. Table 1 reports that the average coverage probability after correction across the 10 new x points is 0.947, which is much closer to the target compared to the coverage of 0.894 before correction.

The right panel of Figure 2 delineates the coverage performance by the selected model size, which compares the coverage loss for different levels of overfitting in AIC selection; here we only show the model sizes that appear more than 5% of times during the 5000 simulations. Note that in our experiments, when the selected model size is three, the true model is always selected; this is also observed in Hong et al. (2018). When the true model is selected, it is unsurprising that classical confidence intervals do not suffer from coverage loss with or without correction, evidenced by the close-to-0 coverage loss when the selected model size is three. However, in other cases where AIC selects a strictly overfitted model, the coverage loss becomes substantial if no correction is made, and a greater coverage loss is associated with a larger selected model. The deterioration of the coverage performance when AIC does not select the oracle model explains the overall under-coverage of the uncorrected confidence intervals. With the proposed correction, the under-coverage is eliminated: for all selected model sizes, the difference between the actual coverage frequency and the target 0.95 is minimal. This suggests the effectiveness of our proposed method.




Figure 2: Coverage of uncorrected and corrected confidence intervals (CIs) when σ is known. Left: Coverage probabilities (with error bars for the 95% confidence intervals) at each new data point. Right: Boxplots of differences between the actual coverage and 0.95 (negative values indicate under-coverage), grouped by the selected model size.

To gain more insight into the conditional truncated normal distribution due to the conditioning on AIC selection, Table 2 reports the truncated-out region in four examples, one for each of the four selected model size $\{3, 4, 5, 6\}$, and compares the confidence intervals with and without correction. The ground truth value of the estimand is 9.53, which is the mean parameter μ in the truncated normal; therefore, the density near 9.53 on the real line is higher than in other areas before truncation. We can see that for model size 3 or 4, the excluded region is non-empty but the confidence intervals are minimally affected by the correction. This is because the excluded region has a negligible density in the corresponding normal distribution before truncation. For the example with model size 6, the excluded region covers the highest density region of a normal distribution with mean of 9.53, and this leads to a much more visible change in the corrected intervals. Once the correction changes the confidence interval, it will be wider to compensate for the coverage loss. Overall, the probability mass of the employed pivotal quantity on the excluded region drives the difference between the corrected and uncorrected confidence intervals.

size	excluded region	confidence interval	
		uncorrected	corrected
3	$(-7.2, -4.8) \cup (-0.4, 1.5) \cup (12.4, 14.2)$	(9.38, 10.77)	(9.38, 10.77)
4	$(-9.7, -6.8) \cup (1.4, 8.6) \cup (11.2, 13.2)$	(9.11, 10.51)	(9.10, 10.51)
5	$(-17.8, -13.8) \cup (-1.9, 0.8) \cup (9.8, 13.0) \cup (14.2, 16.6)$	(8.60, 10.18)	(8.61, 10.99)
6	$(-19.5, -15.6) \cup (-2.5, -0.2) \cup (9.4, 14.6)$	(8.36, 9.95)	(8.41, 11.74)

Table 2: Examples of the excluded region of the conditional truncated normal estimator and the confidence intervals before and after correction, for different selected model sizes by AIC.

For unknown σ , we first obtain a point estimator $\tilde{\sigma}$, on which there has been a rich literature with strong theoretical guarantees, and then construct corrected confidence intervals using our proposed method. In particular, we implement the organic lasso estimator proposed by Yu and Bien (2019) (labeled as ‘olasso’), which converges to σ with probability approaching

one under mild conditions. In addition, we consider two mean squared error-based estimators $\tilde{\sigma}^2 = \text{RSS}(S)/(n - |S| - 1)$: one uses the full model for S , labeled as ‘mse_full’, and the other uses the selected model S_0 for S , labeled as ‘mse_aic’. The former gives a consistent estimator of σ if the true model is nested in the full model; the latter is typically implemented in classical settings when the model is given as fixed, but may only work well under stronger assumptions such as that the selected model is the true model in the post-selection regime.

Table 1 reports the empirical coverage for the three methods, averaged across the 10 new x points. Comparing ‘mse_aic’ with the classical confidence intervals, which attained a coverage of 0.883, shows that our proposed correction substantially mitigates under-coverage as with the same estimate of σ the coverage increases to nearly the nominal level 0.95. With the ‘olasso’ estimate, we no longer observe under-coverage, and instead see an over-coverage of 0.974, which still yields valid inference in terms of controlling Type I error. The method of ‘mse_full’ strikes a balance between the two, yielding confidence intervals with coverage probability closest to 0.95. Inspecting the estimated σ from the three strategies in 5000 replications, we find that ‘mse_aic’ tends to slightly under-estimate σ (mean 0.961), ‘olasso’ over-estimate it (mean 1.34), while ‘mse_full’ produce estimates (mean 0.996) closest to the ground truth. Therefore, in this experiment, an over-estimated σ is associated with over-coverage of the corrected confidence interval, and vice versa. Table 1 also reports the results for x^1 , which are similar to the averaged coverages; the methods of ‘mse_full’ and ‘olasso’ yield a coverage not significantly lower than 0.95, indicating that the under-coverage experienced with the classical intervals is corrected.

6 Real data application

We now apply the post-AIC confidence inference procedure to the US consumption dataset used in a textbook (Hyndman and Athanasopoulos, 2018), which uncovers interesting and interpretable findings. In this application, four predictors, namely personal disposable income or Income, Production, Savings, and unemployment rate or Unemployment, are used to predict the percentage changes in quarterly personal consumption expenditure from 1970 to 2016. The sample size is $n = 198$. This dataset is available in the R package **fpp3** under the name ‘us.change’.

In Section 7.5 of the textbook, it was shown that AIC selected the full model. However, what is interesting is the clear separation in the AIC value between models containing both Income and Savings and models missing at least one of them. In particular, the AIC value of the former type of model ranges from -456.6 to -435.7, while the smallest AIC value among the latter is -262.3. The increase in AIC is dramatic if excluding Income or Savings, but excluding either Unemployment or Production from the full model has little effect on the AIC value. As the authors pointed out, this indicates that Income and Savings are both more important variables than Production and Unemployment. However, with a significance level $\alpha = 0.05$, the traditional 95% confidence intervals of Income, Savings, and Productions all exclude zero (see Table 3), indicating statistical significance. This shows no differentiation between (Income, Savings) and Production.

On the other hand, when the full model is selected as in this application, our lemma 2 suggests that insignificant variables could gain significance if one uses the classical inference procedure on the selected model without accounting for randomness in AIC selection. We apply the proposed

post-AIC correction for confidence intervals, and report the 95% post-AIC confidence interval for each regression coefficient in Table 3. Here we estimate the noise level using the strategies described in Section 5, noting that ‘mse_aic’ coincides with ‘mse_full’ as the full model is selected. It turns out that after correction, only Income and Savings are significant, and Production is no longer significant because its corrected 95% confidence interval contains 0. This observation is consistent for both estimates of σ . Therefore, we arrive at a different conclusion when applying the proposed post-AIC inference, which interestingly better aligns with the empirical observation regarding the relative importance of the considered explanatory variables.

	uncorrected	corrected (mse_full)	corrected (olasso)
Income	(0.6615, 0.8197)	(0.6620, 0.8245)	(0.6550, 0.8345)
Production	(0.0015, 0.0928)	(−0.0109, 0.1148)	(−0.0135, 0.1172)
Savings	(−0.0587, −0.0471)	(−0.0593, −0.0472)	(−0.0601, −0.0467)
Unemployment	(−0.3631, 0.0137)	(−0.4564, 0.0623)	(−0.4661, 0.0744)

Table 3: 95% confidence intervals of each coefficient with and without post-AIC correction. Uncorrected: traditional 95% confidence interval from the AIC selected model without post-selection correction. Corrected (mse_full): post-AIC corrected 95% confidence interval, with σ estimated from the full model. Corrected (olasso): post-AIC corrected 95% confidence interval, with σ estimated by organic lasso.

7 Discussion

Classical confidence intervals after AIC selection are widely implemented in statistical software and are routinely used to guide practitioners in medical and scientific fields to conclude significance. However, there are increasing concerns about the validity of these confidence intervals. In this paper, we construct confidence intervals with post-selection correction for linear models selected by AIC. Conditioning on the AIC selection event, the distribution of a linear estimator is no longer normally distributed, and corrections are made based on the truncated normal distribution. This altered sampling distribution leads to corrected confidence intervals for a large class of linear combinations of regression coefficients. The AIC selection event is equivalent to an interval set. Our calculation shows that post-AIC confidence intervals do not require extra conditioning and instead typically simplify to less than exact conditioning.

The correction method straightforwardly extends to best subset selection using other information-based criteria, as these often differ from AIC primarily in the strength of the penalty imposed on the model size. For example, the developed post-selection inference is readily applicable to the Bayesian information criterion (BIC) and the corrected AIC (AICc) by adjusting $\omega(S)$ in (18) accordingly. In particular, $\omega(S)$ is $\exp\{\log n(|S_0| - |S|)/n\}$ for BIC, and becomes $\exp\{2(\frac{|S_0|}{n-|S_0|-1} - \frac{|S|}{n-|S|-1})\}$ for AICc. The provided code to implement the proposed method, available on GitHub at

https://github.com/hlingit/post_selection_confidence_inference,

includes AIC, BIC, and AICc. We note that Mallows's C_p also falls within the scope of our methodology in that conditioning on the selected model is equivalent to a sequence of quadratic constraints on the estimator, although the correction requires more modifications than changing $\omega(S)$.

One possible direction for future research is a scalable post-AIC confidence inference procedure suited for high-dimensional models. Finding the best model that minimizes information-based objective functions requires evaluating exponentially many candidate models, which become computationally infeasible in high-dimensional settings. Lemma 1 is a useful result to reduce computational burden in deriving the conditional sampling distribution, but it does not change the complexity in searching for the selected model. Recently there have been advances in accelerating best subset selection using various techniques including mixed-integer programming (Bertsimas et al., 2016) and a polynomial algorithm in Zhu et al. (2020), with substantial speedup for large-scale selection. It is interesting to build on these developments for scalable characterization of the selection event and subsequently fast construction of post-selection confidence inference for large datasets.

References

- Berk, R., Brown, L., Buja, A., Zhang, K., and Zhao, L. (2013). Valid post-selection inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 41(2):802–837.
- Bernardo, J. M. and Smith, A. F. M. (1994). *Bayesian Theory*. Wiley, New York, NY.
- Bertsimas, D., King, A., and Mazumder, R. (2016). Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(2):813–852.
- Charkhi, A. and Claeskens, G. (2018). Asymptotic post-selection inference for the Akaike information criterion. *Biometrika*, 105(3):645–664.
- Claeskens, G. and Hjort, N. L. (2008). *Model Selection and Model Averaging*, volume 330. Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Hong, L., Kuffner, T. A., and Martin, R. (2018). On overfitting and post-selection uncertainty assessments. *Biometrika*, 105(1):221–224.
- Hyndman, R. J. and Athanasopoulos, G. (2018). *Forecasting: Principles and Practice*. OTexts.
- Lee, J. D., Sun, D. L., Sun, Y., and Taylor, J. E. (2016). Exact post-selection inference, with application to the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):907–927.
- Li, M. and Dunson, D. B. (2020). Comparing and weighting imperfect models using D-probabilities. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(531):1349–1360.
- Loftus, J. R. and Taylor, J. E. (2014). A significance test for forward stepwise model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1405.3920*.

- Markovic, J., Xia, L., and Taylor, J. (2017). Unifying approach to selective inference with applications to cross-validation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.06559*.
- Tibshirani, R. J., Taylor, J., Lockhart, R., and Tibshirani, R. (2016). Exact post-selection inference for sequential regression procedures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):600–620.
- Yu, G. and Bien, J. (2019). Estimating the error variance in a high-dimensional linear model. *Biometrika*, 106(3):533–546.
- Zhu, J., Wen, C., Zhu, J., Zhang, H., and Wang, X. (2020). A polynomial algorithm for best-subset selection problem. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 117(52):33117–33123.