

The Lasso error is bounded iff its active set size is bounded away from n in the proportional regime

Pierre C Bellec

Abstract. This note develops an analysis of the Lasso \hat{b} in linear models without any sparsity or L1 assumption on the true regression vector, in the proportional regime where dimension p and sample n are of the same order. Under Gaussian design and covariance matrix with spectrum bounded away from 0 and $+\infty$, it is shown that the L2 risk is stochastically bounded if and only if the number of selected variables is bounded away from n , in the sense that

$$(1 - \|\hat{b}\|_0/n)^{-1} = O_P(1) \iff \|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2 = O_P(1)$$

as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$. The right-to-left implication rules out constant risk for dense Lasso estimates (estimates with close to n active variables), which can be used to discard tuning parameters leading to dense estimates.

We then bring back sparsity in the picture, and revisit the precise phase transition characterizing the sparsity patterns of the true regression vector leading to unbounded Lasso risk—or by the above equivalence to dense Lasso estimates. This precise phase transition was established by Miolane and Montanari [30], Celentano et al. [16] using fixed-point equations in an equivalent sequence model. An alternative proof of this phase transition is provided here using simple arguments without relying on the fixed-point equations or the equivalent sequence model. A modification of the well-known Restricted Eigenvalue argument allows to extend the analysis to any small tuning parameter of constant order, leading to a bounded risk on one side of the phase transition. On the other side of the phase transition, it is established the Lasso risk can be unbounded for a given sign pattern as soon as Basis Pursuit fails to recover that sign pattern in noiseless problems.

1. INTRODUCTION

Let n be the sample size and p the dimension. Consider the Lasso estimator

$$(1.1) \quad \hat{b} = \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \frac{1}{2} \|Xb - y\|_2^2 + \lambda \sqrt{n} \|b\|_1$$

where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is a design matrix with iid $N(0, \Sigma)$ rows for some population covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times p}$ with spectrum bounded away from 0 and ∞ , and y follows a linear model

$$y = Xb^* + z$$

where the noise $z \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$ is independent of X .

L1 regularization and the Lasso were introduced almost 30 years ago [35, 18] and are now recognized as a fundamental tool in compressed sensing and high-dimensional

statistics to perform statistical estimation when p is larger than n . we refer the reader to the general introductions in [15] and in the books [14, 24]. Numerous analysis have appeared throughout these three decades to explain the success and limitations of L1 regularization when p is larger than n . While it would be impossible to review all of them in this short note, let us mention two categories of results, corresponding to how large p is compared to n and whether the error $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2$ converges to 0, in which case we will say that the Lasso is consistent. If $p \gg n$ (in the sense that $p/n \rightarrow +\infty$), the Lasso is known to be consistent under the sparsity condition

$$(1.2) \quad \frac{k}{n} \log\left(\frac{p}{k}\right) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{where } k = \|b^*\|_0$$

provided that the tuning parameter λ in (1.1) is correctly chosen. In this regime, numerous works [12, 31, 14, 19] explain this consistency when the tuning parameter λ is chosen slightly larger than $\sigma\sqrt{2\log p}$ and if X satisfies

Rutgers University (e-mail: pierre.bellec@rutgers.edu).

restricted eigenvalue conditions [12]. The tuning parameter can be further reduced to $\sigma\sqrt{2\log\frac{p}{k}}$ [28, 10], although anything smaller by a multiplicate constant, say $0.99\sigma\sqrt{2\log\frac{p}{k}}$, leads to terrible results when $p \gg n$ [4]. Beyond sparsity assumptions on b^* as in (1.2), error bounds and consistency results in the regime $p \gg n$ are also known to hold if $\|b^*\|_1$ is suitably bounded from above: this is the so-called ‘‘slow rate bound’’, see for instance [14, Corollary 6.1]. Consistency and error bounds assuming upper bounds on $\|b^*\|_q, q \in (0, 2)$ can also be obtained [38]. Random design matrices X with iid $N(0, \Sigma)$ rows as in the present paper also benefit from these analysis, since restricted eigenvalue conditions on the population covariance Σ transfer to the random gram matrix $X^T X/n$ with high-probability [32]; the same can be said for subgaussian rows using the tools in [21, 29].

Another regime, the so-called proportional regime, requires the dimension p to be of the same order as n , e.g.,

$$(1.3) \quad 1 \leq p/n < \gamma$$

for some constant γ that stays fixed as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ simultaneously. Inequality (1.3) implies $\lim\frac{p}{n}$ exists and is finite along a subsequence of regression problems, although for the purpose of this note we simply assume (1.3) for each regression problem in the sequence. Results in this proportional regime significantly depart from those in the previous paragraph as consistency typically fails: the error $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|$ is of constant order, and a positive deterministic equivalent α_* such that $(\|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2 - \alpha_*) \xrightarrow{P} 0$ can be precisely determined [2, 30, 16] where \xrightarrow{P} denotes convergence in probability. Precise phase transitions appear in this regime, including the Donoho-Tanner phase transition for the success of Basis Pursuit in compressed sensing [22]. The works [30, 16] later showed that the same phase transition precisely characterizes the sparsity levels of b^* that allow for a uniformly bounded L2 risk of the Lasso for any constant tuning parameter λ in (1.1). We will come back to this in Section 3 which provides an alternative proof of this result.

Contributions

This note assumes the proportional regime throughout, with $1 \leq p/n \leq \gamma$ for some constant γ that stays fixed as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$, similarly to the works [2, 30, 16] discussed in the previous paragraph. Throughout, we assume that the tuning parameter λ in (1.1) and the noise level σ are fixed constants, and that the population covariance Σ has bounded spectrum in the sense that its eigenvalues belong to $[\kappa^{-1}, \kappa]$ for some constant κ . With these normalizations, from the results [2, 30, 16] in this proportional regime, we expect the L2 error $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|$ to be of constant order.

The main contribution of this note is to highlight a surprising behavior of the Lasso in this proportional regime,

free of any assumption on the true regression vector $b^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Theorem 1 that will be stated shortly shows that as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$, for any sequence of regression problems, the Lasso risk $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|$ is bounded if and only if the number of selected variables $\|\hat{b}\|_0$ stays bounded away from n , in the sense that

$$(1.4) \quad (1 - \frac{\|\hat{b}\|_0}{n})^{-1} = O_P(1) \iff \|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2 = O_P(1).$$

As we will discuss more deeply in the next section, this is surprising for at least two reasons.

First, this result is free of any assumption on b^* : no sparsity is assumed, and no upper bound is assumed on $\|b^*\|_1$ or other norms: in the proportional regime (1.4) holds for any b^* of growing dimension as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$. This contrasts with most of the literature mentioned above, with sparsity assumptions on b^* , or weak sparsity assumptions (such as bounds on $\|b^*\|_q$ for some $q \in (0, 2)$).

Second, we know that constant error bounds on $\|\hat{b}^R - b^*\|$ can be achieved where \hat{b}^R is the Ridge regression estimate or the minimum norm least-squares solution [3, 26]. Since \hat{b}^R is dense, constant error bounds with dense estimators are possible. The above implication $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2 = O_P(1) \Rightarrow (1 - \|\hat{b}\|_0/n)^{-1} = O_P(1)$ is thus unexpected particularly surprising. A situation of a dense Lasso \hat{b} (dense in the sense $\|\hat{b}\|_0 = n$ or $1 - \|\hat{b}\|_0/n \ll 0$) achieving a constant error is formally ruled out by the above equivalence, whereas dense estimates such as Ridge regression have no issues achieving constant error bounds with more than n active variables. This has practical application: tuning parameters λ leading to $\|\hat{b}\|_0/n \approx 1$ can be discarded, as they lead to unbounded risk.

In Section 3, we bring back sparsity in the picture, and discuss the phase transition established in [30, 16] characterizing the sign patterns $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^p$ of the true regression vector for which (1.4) holds. An alternative proof of this precise phase transition is provided.

2. THE LASSO ERROR $\|\hat{b} - \beta^*\|^2$ IS BOUNDED IF AND ONLY IF $\|\hat{b}\|_0$ IS BOUNDED AWAY FROM n

Let us now state formally the main result of the paper and its working assumption.

ASSUMPTION 1. *Let $\gamma \geq 1$ and $\kappa, \sigma, \lambda > 0$ be constants such that*

$$(2.1) \quad 1 \leq p/n \leq \gamma, \quad \kappa^{-1}I_p \preceq \Sigma \preceq \kappa I_p$$

in the sense of psd matrices, X has iid $N(0, \Sigma)$ rows and $\varepsilon \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$ is independent of X .

THEOREM 1. *Let Assumption 1 be fulfilled. For any $s_0 \in (0, 1)$, there exists $r'_0 > 0$ and an event $\Omega_n(s_0)$ with*

$\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n(s_0)) \rightarrow 1$ as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ while $\lambda, \sigma, \gamma, \kappa, s_0$ remain fixed such that, in $\Omega_n(s_0)$,

$$(2.2) \quad \|\hat{b}\|_0 \leq (1 - s_0)n \Rightarrow \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \leq r'_0.$$

For any $r_0 \in (0, 1)$, there exists $s'_0 > 0$ and an event $\Omega_n(s_0)$ with $\mathbb{P}(\Omega_n(r_0)) \rightarrow 1$ as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ while $\lambda, \sigma, \gamma, \kappa, r_0$ remain fixed such that, in $\Omega_n(r_0)$,

$$(2.3) \quad \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \leq r_0 \Rightarrow \|\hat{b}\|_0 \leq (1 - s'_0)n.$$

Consequently, for any sequence of regression problems with $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ while $\lambda, \sigma, \gamma, \kappa$ remain fixed, (1.4) holds.

Above, the $O_P(1)$ notation may hide constants depending on γ, κ, λ : a random variable W is $O_P(1)$ if for any $\epsilon > 0$ there exists a constant $C = C(\epsilon, \gamma, \kappa, \lambda)$ such that $\mathbb{P}(|W| > C) \leq \epsilon$.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1, IMPLICATION (2.2). We first prove (2.2) which is simpler and less surprising than (2.3): as we detail below, in the event $\|\hat{b}\|_0 \leq (1 - s_0)n$ in which the Lasso has sparsity bounded away from n ,

$$(2.4) \quad \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \leq c_{s_0, \gamma} \|X(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 n^{-1/2}$$

for some constant $c_{s_0, \gamma} > 0$ depending only on s_0, γ . This follows because

$$(2.5) \quad \mathbb{P}\left(\inf_{\substack{t \in \mathbb{R}, b \in \mathbb{R}^p: b \neq tb^*, \\ \|b\|_0 \leq (1-s_0)n}} \frac{\|X(b - tb^*)\|_2}{\|\Sigma^{1/2}(b - tb^*)\|_2} \geq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{c_{s_0, \gamma}}\right) \rightarrow 1$$

as a consequence of bounds on the explicit density [23] of the smallest eigenvalue of a Wishart(n) matrix in dimension $1 + \lfloor (1 - s_0)n \rfloor$, and a union bound over $\binom{n}{\lfloor (1-s_0)n \rfloor}$ possible subspaces. This argument to obtain (2.5) is detailed in [13, Proposition 2.10] for $\Sigma = I_p$ and [8, Appendix B] where (2.5) is proved using a slightly modified argument to handle $\Sigma \neq I_p$ and a deterministic bias b^* .

Now, in the event (2.4), obtaining a bound on the L2 risk is straightforward: Using that the objective function of the Lasso at \hat{b} is smaller than at b^* we find

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2 &\leq 2\epsilon^T X(\hat{b} - b^*) + 2\lambda\sqrt{n}(\|b^*\|_1 - \|\hat{b}\|_1) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon^T X(\hat{b} - b^*) + 2\lambda\sqrt{\gamma\kappa}n\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \\ &\leq (2\|\epsilon\|_2 + 2\lambda\sqrt{\gamma\kappa}\sqrt{nc_{s_0, \gamma}})\|X(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

thanks to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the first term and $\|b^*\|_1 - \|\hat{b}\|_1 \leq \|b^* - \hat{b}\|_1 \leq \sqrt{p\kappa}\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2$ combined with (2.4) for the second term. Since $\|\epsilon\|_2^2/\sigma^2$ has χ_n^2 distribution,

$$(2.6) \quad \mathbb{P}(\|\epsilon\|_2 \leq 2\sigma\sqrt{n}) \geq 1 - e^{-n/2},$$

by [27, Lemma 1] so that using (2.4) combined with the previous display grants a constant order upper bound on $\|X(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 n^{-1/2}$, and using (2.4) again grants the desired constant order upper bound on $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2$. \square

The proof of (2.3) is more subtle and the result itself is more surprising: Without any assumption on the sparsity of b^* , it is unexpected that a bounded risk for \hat{b} would imply an upper bound on the number $\|\hat{b}\|_0$ of active variables. Below, let $a_+ = \max(a, 0)$ be the positive part of a and for a convex regularized estimator

$$(2.7) \quad \hat{b} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|y - Xb\|_2^2/2 + g(b)$$

where $g: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex, define its degrees-of-freedom in the sense of [33] as

$$(2.8) \quad \hat{\text{df}} = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\partial}{\partial y_i} (x_i^T \hat{b}).$$

We refer to [7] and the references therein for the existence of the derivatives in (2.8) for almost every y and concentration properties of $\hat{\text{df}}$.

LEMMA 1. *Let Assumption 1 be fulfilled. Consider a convex regularized estimator (2.7) for some convex function $g: \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Denote $R = \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2$ for brevity. Then for any $\mu \in (0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\|X\hat{b} - y\|_2}{\sqrt{n}} - \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}R}{2\sigma^2}\right)_+\right] \leq 3\sqrt{\mu} + \frac{C\gamma^{5/4}}{\mu n^{1/4}}$$

for some absolute constant $C > 0$.

The proof of Lemma 1 is given in Appendix A. Below, we will take $\mu = n^{-1/8}$ so that if R is bounded as in $R = O_P(1)$, the term $\sqrt{\mu}R/\sigma^2$ is negligible (it converges to 0 in probability), and the upper bound $3\sqrt{\mu} + \frac{C\gamma^{5/4}}{\mu n^{1/4}}$ also converges to 0. Lemma 1 thus gives us the implication

$$(2.9) \quad R = O_P(1) \Rightarrow \frac{\|X\hat{b} - y\|_2}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} \leq \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right) + o_P(1).$$

The main result of [5] for the square loss is that under assumptions such as strong convexity, or if the Lasso has small enough sparsity with high-probability, the approximation

$$\frac{\|X\hat{b} - y\|_2/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} = \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right) + o_P(1).$$

is granted. This result is sometimes referred to as the consistency of Generalized Cross-Validation (GCV) for the generalization error $\sigma^2 + R$, where GCV is the estimator $\|X\hat{b} - y\|_2^2/(n(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)^2)$. Lemma 1 is an one-sided extension of this result under the only assumption that the risk $R = \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2$ is stochastically bounded, that is, $R = O_P(1)$. It is one-sided because only the inequality (2.9) holds, and not the reverse. It is unclear at this point if the reverse inequality holds in general only under the assumption that $R = O_P(1)$.

To prove (2.3), we need to bound from below $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)$ in the case of the Lasso, where $\hat{\text{df}} = \|\hat{b}\|_0$ [36].

The starting point is Lemma 1 and the one-sided inequality in (2.9) is that it allows us to control from below $(1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n)$ with no a-priori assumption on \hat{b} other than its risk $R = \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2$ is bounded. The second ingredient is the lower bound

$$n\lambda^2\|\hat{b}\|_0 \lesssim \|y - X\hat{b}\|_2^2$$

that we will formally prove below. Combined with (2.9), this gives obtain a bound of the form $(\|\hat{b}\|_0/n)^{1/2} \lesssim (1 - \|\hat{b}\|_0/n)$ which prevents $\|\hat{b}\|_0/n$ from being close to 1. We now make this precise.

PROOF OF THEOREM 1, IMPLICATION (2.3). (2.7), Set $g(b) = \lambda\sqrt{n}\|b\|_1$ in (2.7) so that \hat{b} is the Lasso (1.1). By Lemma 1 with $\mu = n^{-1/8}$ and Markov's inequality, (2.10)

$$\frac{\|X\hat{b} - y\|_2}{\sqrt{n}(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} - \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right) \leq n^{-1/32} + \frac{n^{-1/16}R}{2\sigma^2}$$

has probability tending to 1 as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$ as $\lambda, \sigma^3, r_0, \gamma$ are held fixed. Consider also the event

$$(2.11) \quad \|X\Sigma^{-1/2}\|_{op} \leq \sqrt{n}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})$$

which has probability tending to 1 as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$, see for instance [20, Theorem II.13] or [37, Corollary 7.3.3]. The KKT conditions of \hat{b} give

$$(2.12) \quad e_j^T X^T (y - X\hat{b}) \in \{-\sqrt{n}\lambda, \sqrt{n}\lambda\}$$

for each $j \in [p]$ such that $\hat{b}_j \neq 0$. Summing the squares of the previous display for all $j \in [p]$ such that $\hat{b}_j \neq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} n\lambda^2 \hat{\text{df}} &= n\lambda^2 \|\hat{b}\|_0 \leq \|y - X\hat{b}\|_2^2 \|X \sum_{j=1}^p e_j e_j^T X^T\|_{op} \\ &\leq \|y - X\hat{b}\|_2^2 (2 + \sqrt{\gamma})^2 \kappa n \end{aligned}$$

in the event (2.11) for the last inequality. In the intersection of the events (2.11), (2.10) and $\{R \leq r_0^2\}$, we have that for n large enough,

$$\frac{\lambda}{\sqrt{\kappa}(2 + \sqrt{\gamma})\sqrt{\sigma^2 + r_0^2}} \left(\frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right)^{1/2} - \left(1 - \frac{\hat{\text{df}}}{n}\right) \leq \frac{2}{n^{1/32}}.$$

If $\hat{\text{df}}/n \leq 1/2$ there is nothing to prove, and if $\hat{\text{df}}/n \geq 1/2$ we lower bound the first term so that the above display provides a constant lower bound on $1 - \hat{\text{df}}/n$. Taking $\Omega^n(r_0)$ as the intersection of (2.11) and (2.10), the proof is complete. \square

3. THE PHASE TRANSITION IN [30, 16]

In this section, we bring sparsity of b^* back into the picture, and discuss under which conditions the number of selected variables is bounded away from n , in the sense

$$(1 - \|\hat{b}\|_0/n)^{-1} = O_P(1).$$

By the equivalence (1.4), under the assumptions of Theorem 1, this is equivalent to boundedness of the risk, i.e., $\|\hat{b} - b^*\|_2 = O_P(1)$.

The phase transition for the boundedness of the risk was characterized by Miolane and Montanari [30] for $\Sigma = I_p$, and by Celentano et al. [16] for Σ with spectrum bounded away from 0 and ∞ . A formulation of this phase transition from [16] is as follows.

We say below that b^* has sign pattern $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^p$ if $b_j^* \neq 0 \Rightarrow \text{sign}(b_j^*) = \mathbf{s}_j$ for all $j \in [p]$. For any cone T of \mathbb{R}^p , define the Gaussian width

$$\mathcal{G}(T, \Sigma) = \mathbb{E}_{g \sim N(0, I_p)} \left[\sup_{h \in T: h^T \Sigma h = 1} h^T \Sigma^{1/2} g \right].$$

Define $S = \{j \in [p] : |\mathbf{s}_j| = 1\}$, $S^c = \{j \in [p] : \mathbf{s}_j = 0\}$.

THEOREM 2 ([30] for $\Sigma = I_p$, [16] for $\Sigma \neq I_p$). *Let Assumption 1 be fulfilled. Let $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}^p$ and define*

$$(3.1) \quad K = \{h \in \mathbb{R}^p : \sum_{j \in S^c} |h_j| \leq -\mathbf{s}^T h\}.$$

If $\Delta > 0$ is a constant independent of n, p such that

$$(3.2) \quad \mathcal{G}(K, \Sigma)/\sqrt{n} \leq 1 - 2\Delta,$$

then for any b^* with sign pattern \mathbf{s} it holds $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 = O_P(1)$ as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$. On the other hand, if

$$(3.3) \quad \mathcal{G}(K, \Sigma)/\sqrt{n} \geq 1 + \Delta,$$

then for any arbitrarily large constant $r_0 > 0$, there exists a sequence of regression problems with b^* having sign pattern \mathbf{s} such that $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 = O_P(1)$ does not hold as $n, p \rightarrow +\infty$.

Since the constant Δ is allowed to be arbitrarily small in (3.2)-(3.3), this establishes a sharp phase transition depending on the sign of $\mathcal{G}(K, \Sigma)/\sqrt{n} - 1$. For isotropic designs $\Sigma = I_p$, this phase transition coincides with the Donoho-Tanner phase transition for the success of Basis Pursuit.

The works [30, 16] prove this phase transition for the boundedness of the Lasso risk using the Convex Gaussian Min-Max Theorem (CGMT) of [34], by characterizing the limit in probability of the Lasso risk through a system of two nonlinear equations defined using an equivalent sequence model, and by showing all quantities of interest concentrate uniformly if the problem parameters stay bounded away from the phase transition as in (3.2).

In the next two subsections, we provide an alternative proof of this beautiful phase transition on the boundedness of Lasso risk, without relying on the CGMT. Section 3.1 shows that a restricted eigenvalue condition coupled with a simple deterministic argument is sufficient to prove that the Lasso risk is bounded. Section 3.2 shows that the failure of Basis Pursuit for a given sign pattern

in noiseless compressed sensing implies the unboundedness of the Lasso risk in a related regression problem. As we explain next, the restricted eigenvalue value condition (3.4) below is implied by (3.2) for Gaussian designs, and the failure of Basis Pursuit is implied by (3.3), so that the results of the next two subsections provide a simple alternative proof of this phase transition in [30, 16].

3.1 From restricted eigenvalue to bounded Lasso risk

For the cone K in (3.1) and some constant $\Delta_* > 0$, consider the restricted eigenvalue condition [12]

$$(3.4) \quad \forall v \in K, \quad \Delta_* \|v\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|Xv\|_2.$$

Gordon's Escape Through a Mesh theorem [25] is sufficient to prove that assumption (3.2) implies (3.4): Gordon's Escape Through a Mesh theorem [25] gives

$$(3.5) \quad \inf_{h \in K: h^T \Sigma h = 1} \|Xh\|_2 \geq \sqrt{n-1} - \mathcal{G}(L, \Sigma) - t$$

with probability at least $1 - e^{-t^2/2}$. Taking $t = \Delta \sqrt{n} + \sqrt{n-1} - \sqrt{n}$ in (3.5) combined with (3.2) gives the restricted eigenvalue condition (3.4) with exponentially large probability for Gaussian design X . Gordon's result has been extensively used to develop sharp compressed sensing recovery guarantees [17, and references therein] or restricted isometry/restricted eigenvalue conditions for Gaussian designs [32]. The next proposition presents a simple deterministic argument that the restricted eigenvalue value condition (3.4) is all that is needed to prove that the Lasso risk is bounded. Combined with the above consequence of Gordon's result, this gives an alternative proof of the boundedness of the Lasso risk under (3.2).

The classical restricted eigenvalue argument of [12] or its variants show that the error vector $h = \hat{b} - b^*$ belongs to a cone of a similar form as (3.1). This argument requires the tuning parameter to be large enough as discussed after (1.2). Since we are interested in the proportional regime setting where the tuning parameter λ in (1.1) is an arbitrarily small constant, the classical argument fails. The following proposition instead shows that the perturbation v of the error vector h in (3.9) below belongs to K (in particular, it is not claimed throughout the following proof that $h \in K$).

PROPOSITION 1. *Let $\lambda, \Delta_* > 0$ be constants. Let $\mathbf{s} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$ be a sign pattern with k nonzero entries. Assume that there exist c_1, c_2, c_3 such that*

$$(3.6) \quad \frac{\|X\mathbf{s}\|_2}{\sqrt{nk}} \leq c_1, \quad \frac{\sqrt{n}}{\sqrt{k}} \leq c_2, \quad \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2}{\sqrt{n}} \leq c_3.$$

Assume the restricted eigenvalue condition (3.4) for the cone K in (3.1). Then for the Lasso error $h = \hat{b} - b^$,*

$$(3.7) \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|Xh\|_2 \leq \Delta_*^{-1} [\lambda \sqrt{k/n} + c_1 c_2 c_3],$$

$$(3.8) \quad \|h\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \|Xh\|_2 \left[\frac{c_2 c_3}{\lambda} + \Delta_*^{-1} \left(1 + \frac{c_1 c_2 c_3}{\lambda} \right) \right].$$

The constant c_2 can be obtained as long as the sparsity k is of the same order as n . If X has iid centered rows with finite covariance with (2.1), and the noise ε centered iid components with variance σ^2 , for any $\epsilon > 0$ the existence of c_1, c_3 such that (3.6) holds with probability $1 - \epsilon$ follows from Markov's inequality. Thus the assumption (3.6) is mild and can be satisfied in typical settings of the proportional regime where sparsity, sample size and dimension are of the same order. If $\Delta_*, \lambda, c_1, c_2, c_3$ are of constant order, (3.7)-(3.8) show that the risk of the Lasso is bounded as desired.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1. The KKT conditions of the Lasso problem (see, e.g., Lemma 1 in [9]) provide

$$\begin{aligned} \|X(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2 &\leq \varepsilon^T X(\hat{b} - b^*) + \lambda \sqrt{n} (\|b^*\|_1 - \|\hat{b}\|_1) \\ &\leq \varepsilon^T Xh + \lambda \sqrt{n} (-\mathbf{s}^T h - \|h_{S^c}\|_1) \end{aligned}$$

where $h = \hat{b} - b^*$. The first term $\varepsilon^T Xh$ in the second line is bounded from above by $\|\varepsilon\|_2 \|Xh\|_2$. We force the introduction of an inner product with the sign vector \mathbf{s} using

$$\|\varepsilon\|_2 \|Xh\|_2 = \lambda \sqrt{n} \mathbf{s}^T \left(\mathbf{s} \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2 \|Xh\|_2}{\lambda \sqrt{n} k} \right)$$

where $k = \|\mathbf{s}\|_2^2$ is the number of nonzero signs. Then

$$\|Xh\|_2^2 \leq \lambda \sqrt{n} \left[\mathbf{s}^T \left(\mathbf{s} \frac{\|Xh\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2}{k \lambda \sqrt{n}} - h_S \right) - \|h_{S^c}\|_1 \right]$$

Since the left-hand side is non-negative, the vector

$$(3.9) \quad v = \mathbf{s} \frac{\|Xh\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2}{k \lambda \sqrt{n}} - h$$

satisfies $v \in K$, hence by (3.4) it holds $\Delta_* \sqrt{n} \|v\|_2 \leq \|Xv\|_2$. Using the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $\mathbf{s}^T v \leq \sqrt{k} \|v\|_2$ we find

$$\|Xh\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\lambda \sqrt{k} \|Xv\|_2}{\Delta_*} \leq \frac{\lambda \sqrt{k} \|Xh\|_2}{\Delta_*} \left[1 + \frac{\|X\mathbf{s}\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2}{\lambda k \sqrt{n}} \right]$$

by the triangle inequality for the second inequality. Simplifying both sides by $\|Xh\|_2$ gives (3.7).

We now prove (3.8) by using the triangle inequality, in order to transfer to one-sided isometry inequality (3.4) from v in (3.9) to the error vector $h = \hat{b} - b^*$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|h\|_2 &\leq \|\mathbf{s}\|_2 \|Xh\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2 / (k \lambda \sqrt{n}) + \|v\|_2 \\ &\leq \|Xh\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2 / (\sqrt{k} \lambda \sqrt{n}) + \|Xv\|_2 / (\sqrt{n} \Delta_*) \\ &\leq \frac{\|Xh\|_2}{\sqrt{n}} \left[\frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2}{\sqrt{k} \lambda} + \frac{1}{\Delta_*} \left(1 + \frac{\|X\mathbf{s}\|_2 \|\varepsilon\|_2}{k \lambda \sqrt{n}} \right) \right] \end{aligned}$$

by the triangle inequality and (3.9). This proves (3.8). \square

3.2 From failure of basis pursuit to unbounded risk

Consider a true signal $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with sign pattern \mathbf{s} , and the Basis Pursuit problem

$$(3.10) \quad \tilde{b}_0 = \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} \|b\|_1 \text{ subject to } Xb = Xb_0.$$

Amelunxen et al. [1] establish a sharp phase transition for the success of Basis Pursuit in recover b_0 : if (3.2) holds then b_0 is the unique solution to (3.10) (in other words, (3.10) succeeds at recover b_0), while if (3.3) holds then there exists \tilde{b}_0 different than b_0 with \tilde{b}_0 solution to (3.10) (i.e., (3.10) fails to recover b_0). This follows from Theorem II of [1] for Gaussian design with covariance Σ : The failure of (3.10) to recover b_0 under (3.3) is established by showing that the kernel of $X\Sigma^{-1/2}$ has intersection with $\Sigma^{1/2}K$ larger than $\{0\}$, where K is the closed convex cone in (3.1). This implies that the solution set of (3.10) is not equal to the singleton $\{b_0\}$ with high-probability:

$$\exists \tilde{b}_0 \neq b_0 \text{ such that } \|\tilde{b}_0\|_1 \leq \|b_0\|_1.$$

For the application below, it is useful to obtain a strict inequality $\|\tilde{b}_0\|_1 < \|b_0\|_1$ using the following argument. The kernel of $X\Sigma^{-1/2}$ has dimension $p - n$ and rotationally invariant distribution. Thus, with probability one, its intersection with any deterministic hyperplane is $\{0\}$. Since $\Sigma^{1/2}K$ is an intersection of a finite number of half-spaces, it follows that with probability one, if $X\Sigma^{-1/2}$ has a non-trivial intersection with $\Sigma^{1/2}K$ then it has a non-trivial intersection with the interior of $\Sigma^{1/2}K$ and in this case there exists $h_0 \in \operatorname{interior}(K)$ such that $Xh_0 = 0$, and $h_0 \in \operatorname{interior}(K)$. This implies $\|b_0 + th_0\|_1 < \|b_0\|_1$ for $t > 0$ small enough. This argument shows that for Gaussian design, under (3.3), the solution (3.10) has L1 norm strictly smaller than $\|b_0\|_1$ and

$$(3.11) \quad \mathbb{P}(\exists \tilde{b}_0 \neq b_0 : \|\tilde{b}_0\|_1 < \|b_0\|_1, Xb_0 = X\tilde{b}_0) \geq 0.9.$$

holds. The result of [1] is stronger and shows that this probability converges to 1 exponentially fast; for simplicity of exposition we use the explicit absolute constant 0.9.

PROPOSITION 2. *Assume that the sign pattern \mathbf{s} is such that we can find a deterministic $b_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with sign pattern \mathbf{s} such that (3.11) holds. Then for any arbitrarily large $r_0 > 0$, there exists $b^* \in \mathbb{R}^p$ with sign pattern \mathbf{s} such that the Lasso error is at least r_0 with positive probability in the sense $\mathbb{P}(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2 \geq r_0) \geq 0.6$.*

In other words, as soon as basis pursuit does not recover b_0 as in (3.11), we can construct a related regression problem in which the Lasso has unbounded risk. This argument relies on (3.11) only and not in the Gaussian design assumption. The proof argument given below is a variant of the lower bound in [4, Theorem 3.1] that the Lasso risk is bounded from below by the compatibility constant.

Together with the fact that (3.11) holds under (3.3) by the discussion preceding (3.11), this provides an alternative proof of the unbounded risk of the Lasso for some sparse regression vector when (3.3) holds, which was initially established in Proposition 14 in [16] as a consequence of the CGMT.

PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2. Given this deterministic b_0 , set as the true regression vector b^* , and define a random \tilde{b} , by

$$(3.12) \quad b_* = tb_0, \quad \tilde{b} = t\tilde{b}_0$$

for some $t > 0$ that will be chosen later.

Let $\mu \in (0, 1]$. For a convex $g : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, consider

$$(3.13) \quad b^\mu = \operatorname{argmin}_{b \in \mathbb{R}^p} L_\mu(b),$$

where the objective function has an extra quadratic term:

$$L_\mu(b) := \frac{1}{2}\|Xb - y\|_2^2 + g(b) + \frac{\mu n}{2}\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2.$$

Since b^μ minimizes $L_\mu(\cdot)$ we have if $g(b) = \lambda\sqrt{n}\|b\|_1$

$$\begin{aligned} L_\mu(b^\mu) &= L_0(b^\mu) + (\mu n/2)\|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2^2 \\ &\leq L_\mu(\hat{b}) = L_0(\hat{b}) + (\mu n/2)\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

and since $L_0(\hat{b}) \leq L_0(b^\mu)$ we obtain

$$(3.14) \quad \|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2^2 \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2.$$

That is, the risk of b^μ is always smaller or equal than that of \hat{b} . Since we are trying to prove a lower bound on $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2$, due to (3.14) it is sufficient to obtain a lower bound on $\|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2$. For brevity, set $h^\mu = b^\mu - b^*$. The KKT conditions of b^μ read

$$0 \in \lambda\sqrt{n}\partial\|b^\mu\|_1 + X^T(Xh^\mu - \varepsilon) + \mu n\Sigma h^\mu.$$

Multiplying these KT conditions by $\tilde{b} - b^\mu$, using that $X\tilde{b} = Xb^*$, we find

$$(3.15) \quad 0 \leq \varepsilon^T Xh^\mu - \|Xh^\mu\|_2^2 + \mu n(\tilde{b} - b^*)\Sigma h^\mu + \lambda\sqrt{n}(\|\tilde{b}\|_1 - \|b^\mu\|_1) - \mu n\|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2^2.$$

We have $\varepsilon^T Xh^\mu - \|Xh^\mu\|_2^2 \leq \|\varepsilon\|_2^2/4$ for the first two terms in the first line thanks to $ab - a^2 \leq b^2/4$. Next, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and (2.1)

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda\sqrt{n}(\|b^*\|_1 - \|b^\mu\|_1) &\leq \lambda\sqrt{n}\sqrt{p}\|h^\mu\|_2 \\ &\leq \lambda\sqrt{n}\sqrt{p}\|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2\sqrt{\kappa} \\ &\leq \lambda^2 p\kappa/(4\mu) + \mu n\|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

again thanks to $ab \leq b^2/4 + a^2$. Summing these inequalities with (3.15) gives

$$\lambda\sqrt{n}(\|b^*\|_1 - \|\tilde{b}\|_1) \leq \frac{\lambda^2 p\kappa}{4\mu} + \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2^2}{4} + \mu n(\tilde{b} - b^*)\Sigma h^\mu.$$

We bound the rightmost term by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality $(\tilde{b} - b^*)\Sigma h^\mu \leq \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b} - b^*)\|_2 \|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2$, and divide by $\mu n \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b} - b^*)\|_2$, which gives

$$\frac{\lambda\sqrt{n}(\|\tilde{b}^*\|_1 - \|\tilde{b}\|_1)}{\mu n \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b} - b^*)\|_2} \leq \frac{\lambda^2 p\kappa + \mu\|\varepsilon\|_2^2}{4\mu^2 n \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b} - b^*)\|_2} + \|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2.$$

We now find an event of positive probability such that, for well chosen μ and t in (3.12), the left-hand side is at least $2r_0$, and the first term on the right-hand side is smaller than r_0 . Since all vectors involved in the left-hand side are proportional to t by (3.12), the left-hand side equals

$$\frac{1}{\mu}W, \quad W = \frac{\lambda\sqrt{n}(\|b_0\|_1 - \|\tilde{b}_0\|_1)}{n\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b}_0 - b_0)\|_2}.$$

By (3.11), the random variable W satisfies $\mathbb{P}(W > 0) \geq 0.9$. By continuity of the probability, there exists a positive deterministic $\rho > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(W > \rho) \geq 0.8$. Set $\mu = \rho/(2r_0)$ so that $\mathbb{P}(2r_0 \leq W/\mu) \geq 0.8$. Now μ is fixed, and we can still choose $t > 0$. The first term in the right-hand side is

$$\frac{1}{t}W' \quad \text{where} \quad W' = \frac{\lambda^2 p\kappa + \mu\|\varepsilon\|_2^2}{4\mu^2 n \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\tilde{b}_0 - b_0)\|_2}.$$

The random variable W' is positive and finite with probability at least 0.9 by (3.11), so we may find $\rho' > 0$ such that $\mathbb{P}(W' \leq \rho') \geq 0.8$. Choosing $t = \rho'/r_0$ and using the union bound, we have with probability at least 0.6 that $2r_0 \leq r_0 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}h^\mu\|_2$ as desired. \square

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF LEMMA 1

PROOF OF LEMMA 1. Consider again the oracle b^μ in (3.13) and recall that the monotonicity property (3.14) holds. We now prove that $\|y - Xb^\mu\|/\sqrt{n}$ and $\|y - X\hat{b}\|/\sqrt{n}$ are close when μ is small. Since b^μ minimizes both L_μ and $b \mapsto L_\mu(b) - \|X(b^\mu - b)\|_2^2/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L_\mu(b^\mu) &\leq L_\mu(\hat{b}) - \|X(\hat{b} - b^\mu)\|_2^2/2 \\ &\leq L_0(\hat{b}) + \frac{\mu n}{2} \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2 - \|X(\hat{b} - b^\mu)\|_2^2/2. \end{aligned}$$

We further bound the right-hand side using $L_0(\hat{b}) \leq L_0(b^\mu) \leq L_\mu(b^\mu)$ and conclude that

$$(A.1) \quad \|X(\hat{b} - b^\mu)\|_2^2 \leq \mu n \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\hat{b} - b^*)\|_2^2.$$

By Theorem 3.1 in [5] and thanks to the strong convexity term proportional to μ in the objective function of b^μ ,

$$\text{Rem}_0 := \left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}f^\mu}{n}\right)^2 - \frac{\|y - Xb^\mu\|_2^2/n}{(\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2^2)},$$

where $\hat{d}f^\mu$ is the degrees of freedom of b^μ defined as in (2.8) with \hat{b} replaced by b^μ , satisfies

$$(A.2) \quad \mathbb{E}[\|\text{Rem}_0\|] \leq C\gamma^{5/2}\mu^{-2}n^{-1/2}.$$

While the dependence on (γ, μ) in the right-hand side is not explicit in [5], it is made explicit in [11, Theorem 1] with $c = 1$ and $m = l$. Using $(\sqrt{a} - \sqrt{b})^2 \leq |a - b|$ for positive a, b , we obtain that

$$\text{Rem} = \frac{\|y - Xb^\mu\|_2/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2^2)^{1/2}} - \left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}f^\mu}{n}\right)$$

satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\text{Rem}^2] \leq C\gamma^{5/2}\mu^{-2}n^{-1/2}$, which implies

$$(A.3) \quad \mathbb{E}|\text{Rem}| \leq \sqrt{C}\gamma^{5/4}\mu^{-1}n^{-1/4}.$$

Using the monotonicity (3.14) and (A.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}f^\mu}{n}\right) + \text{Rem} &= \frac{\|y - Xb^\mu\|/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{1/2}(b^\mu - b^*)\|_2^2)^{1/2}} \\ &\geq \frac{\|y - Xb^\mu\|_2/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} \quad \text{by (3.14)} \\ (A.4) \quad &\geq \frac{\|y - X\hat{b}\|_2/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}R^{1/2}}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

It remains to explain that $\hat{d}f$ and $\hat{d}f^\mu$ are close. Conditionally on X , the vector field $f(\varepsilon) = X(\hat{b} - b^\mu)$ is 2-Lipschitz [6]. Applying Proposition 6.4 in [5], there exists $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and two random variables T, \tilde{T} with $\mathbb{E}[T^2] \leq 1, \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}^2] \leq 1$ such that almost surely,

$$\begin{aligned} |\sigma^2 \text{div} f(\varepsilon) - \varepsilon^T f(\varepsilon)| \\ \leq \sigma|Z|\|f(\varepsilon)\| + \sigma^2(2|T| + |Z\tilde{T}|)2\sqrt{n}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\text{div} f(\varepsilon) = \hat{d}f - \hat{d}f^\mu$ by definition of $\hat{d}f$ and $\hat{d}f^\mu$, by the triangle inequality and $|\varepsilon^T f(\varepsilon)| \leq \|\varepsilon\|_2 \|f(\varepsilon)\|_2$, the difference $|\hat{d}f - \hat{d}f^\mu|$ is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} (|Z| + \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2}{\sigma}) \frac{\|f(\varepsilon)\|_2}{\sigma} + (2|T| + |Z\tilde{T}|)2\sqrt{n}. \\ \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mu}(|Z| + \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2}{\sigma})^2}{2} + \frac{\|f(\varepsilon)\|_2^2}{2\sqrt{\mu}\sigma^2} + (2|T| + |Z\tilde{T}|)2\sqrt{n} \end{aligned}$$

thanks to $ab \leq \frac{\sqrt{\mu}a^2}{2} + \frac{b^2}{\sqrt{\mu}}$. We use again (A.1) to bound $\|f(\varepsilon)\|_2^2 \leq \mu n R$ so that, still almost surely,

$$(A.5) \quad \frac{|\hat{d}f - \hat{d}f^\mu|}{n} - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}R}{2\sigma^2} \leq \text{Rem}'$$

where $\text{Rem}' = \frac{\sqrt{\mu}(|Z| + \frac{\|\varepsilon\|_2}{\sigma})^2}{2n} + (2|T| + |Z\tilde{T}|)2n^{-1/2}$. Using that $Z \sim N(0, 1)$ and $\mathbb{E}[T^2] \leq 1, \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}^2] \leq 1$,

$$(A.6) \quad \mathbb{E}[\text{Rem}'] \leq 2\sqrt{\mu} + n^{-1/2}C$$

for an absolute constant $C > 0$. Combining (A.4)-(A.5),

$$\left(1 - \frac{\hat{d}f}{n}\right) + \text{Rem} + \text{Rem}' \geq \frac{\|y - X\hat{b}\|_2/\sqrt{n}}{(\sigma^2 + R)^{1/2}} - \sqrt{\mu} - \frac{\sqrt{\mu}R}{2\sigma^2}$$

With the bounds in expectation on Rem in (A.3) and on Rem' in (A.6), the lemma is proved. \square

REFERENCES

- [1] Dennis Amelunxen, Martin Lotz, Michael B McCoy, and Joel A Tropp. Living on the edge: Phase transitions in convex programs with random data. *Information and Inference*, 2014.
- [2] Mohsen Bayati and Andrea Montanari. The lasso risk for gaussian matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(4):1997–2017, 2012.
- [3] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, and Ji Xu. Two models of double descent for weak features. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 2(4):1167–1180, 2020.
- [4] Pierre C Bellec. The noise barrier and the large signal bias of the lasso and other convex estimators. *arXiv:1804.01230*, 2018. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1804.01230.pdf>.
- [5] Pierre C Bellec. Out-of-sample error estimation for m-estimators with convex penalty. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(4):2782–2817, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2008.11840.pdf>.
- [6] Pierre C Bellec and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Bounds on the prediction error of penalized least squares estimators with convex penalty. In *Modern Problems of Stochastic Analysis and Statistics, Selected Contributions In Honor of Valentin Konakov*. Springer, 2017. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1609.06675.pdf>.
- [7] Pierre C. Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Second-order stein: Sure for sure and other applications in high-dimensional inference. *Ann. Statist.*, 49(4):1864–1903, 2021. ISSN 0090-5364. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1811.04121.pdf>.
- [8] Pierre C. Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Debiasing convex regularized estimators and interval estimation in linear models. *Ann. Statist.*, 51(2):391–436, 2023. ISSN 0090-5364. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1912.11943.pdf>.
- [9] Pierre C. Bellec, Arnak S. Dalalyan, Edwin Grapin, and Quentin Paris. On the prediction loss of the lasso in the partially labeled setting. *Electron. J. Statist.*, 12(2):3443–3472, 2018. ISSN 1935-7524. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1606.06179.pdf>.
- [10] Pierre C. Bellec, Guillaume Lecu e, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Slope meets lasso: Improved oracle bounds and optimality. *Ann. Statist.*, 46(6B):3603–3642, 2018. ISSN 0090-5364. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1605.08651.pdf>.
- [11] Pierre C Bellec, Jin-Hong Du, Takuya Koriyama, Pratik Patil, and Kai Tan. Corrected generalized cross-validation for finite ensembles of penalized estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01374*, 2023. URL <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2310.01374>.
- [12] Peter J. Bickel, Ya’acov Ritov, and Alexandre B. Tsybakov. Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *Ann. Statist.*, 37(4):1705–1732, 08 2009. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/08-AOS620>.
- [13] Jeffrey D Blanchard, Coralia Cartis, and Jared Tanner. Compressed sensing: How sharp is the restricted isometry property? *SIAM review*, 53(1):105–125, 2011.
- [14] Peter B uhlmann and Sara Van De Geer. *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Springer, 2011.
- [15] Emmanuel J Cand es. Mathematics of sparsity (and a few other things). In *Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Seoul, South Korea*, volume 123, pages 235–258. Citeseer, 2014.
- [16] Michael Celentano, Andrea Montanari, and Yuting Wei. The lasso with general gaussian designs with applications to hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(5):2194–2220, 2023.
- [17] Venkat Chandrasekaran, Benjamin Recht, Pablo A Parrilo, and Alan S Willsky. The convex geometry of linear inverse problems. *Foundations of Computational mathematics*, 12(6):805–849, 2012.
- [18] Shaobing Chen and David Donoho. Basis pursuit. In *Proceedings of 1994 28th Asilomar Conference on Signals, Systems and Computers*, volume 1, pages 41–44. IEEE, 1994.
- [19] Arnak S Dalalyan, Mohamed Hebiri, and Johannes Lederer. On the prediction performance of the lasso. *Bernoulli*, 23(1):552–581, 2017.
- [20] Kenneth R Davidson and Stanislaw J Szarek. Local operator theory, random matrices and banach spaces. *Handbook of the geometry of Banach spaces*, 1(317-366):131, 2001.
- [21] Sjoerd Dirksen. Tail bounds via generic chaining. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20, 2015.
- [22] David L Donoho and Jared Tanner. Neighborliness of randomly projected simplices in high dimensions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 102(27):9452–9457, 2005.
- [23] Alan Edelman. Eigenvalues and condition numbers of random matrices. *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications*, 9(4):543–560, 1988.
- [24] Christophe Giraud. *Introduction to high-dimensional statistics*, volume 138. CRC Press, 2014.
- [25] Yehoram Gordon. On milman’s inequality and random subspaces which escape through a mesh in rn. In *Geometric Aspects of Functional Analysis*, pages 84–106. Springer, 1988.
- [26] Trevor Hastie, Andrea Montanari, Saharon Rosset, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08560*, 2019.
- [27] B. Laurent and P. Massart. Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Statist.*, 28(5):1302–1338, 10 2000. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/aos/1015957395>.
- [28] Guillaume Lecu e and Shahar Mendelson. Regularization and the small-ball method i: Sparse recovery. *Ann. Statist.*, 46(2):611–641, 04 2018. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/17-AOS1562>.
- [29] Christopher Liaw, Abbas Mehrabian, Yaniv Plan, and Roman Vershynin. A simple tool for bounding the deviation of random matrices on geometric sets. In *Geometric aspects of functional analysis*, pages 277–299. Springer, 2017.
- [30] L eo Miolane and Andrea Montanari. The distribution of the Lasso: uniform control over sparse balls and adaptive parameter tuning. *Ann. Statist.*, 49(4):2313–2335, 2021. ISSN 0090-5364. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/20-aos2038>.
- [31] Sahand N Negahban, Pradeep Ravikumar, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of m-estimators with decomposable regularizers. *Statistical Science*, pages 538–557, 2012.
- [32] Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Restricted eigenvalue properties for correlated gaussian designs. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Aug):2241–2259, 2010.
- [33] Charles M Stein. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1135–1151, 1981.
- [34] Christos Thrampoulidis, Ehsan Abbasi, and Babak Hassibi. Precise error analysis of regularized m-estimators in high dimensions. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 64(8):5592–5628, 2018.
- [35] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, pages 267–288, 1996.
- [36] Ryan J. Tibshirani and Jonathan Taylor. Degrees of freedom in lasso problems. *Ann. Statist.*, 40(2):1198–1232, 04 2012. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1214/12-AOS1003>.

- [37] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [38] Fei Ye and Cun-Hui Zhang. Rate minimaxity of the lasso and dantzig selector for the l_q loss in l_r balls. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Dec):3519–3540, 2010.