

DISCUSSION OF “LEAST ANGLE REGRESSION” BY EFRON ET AL.

BY HEMANT ISHWARAN

Cleveland Clinic Foundation

Being able to reliably, and automatically, select variables in linear regression models is a notoriously difficult problem. This research attacks this question head on, introducing not only a computationally efficient algorithm and method, LARS (and its derivatives), but at the same time introducing comprehensive theory explaining the intricate details of the procedure as well as theory to guide its practical implementation. This is a fascinating paper and I commend the authors for this important work.

Automatic variable selection, the main theme of this paper, has many goals. So before embarking upon a discussion of the paper it is important to first sit down and clearly identify what the objectives are. The authors make it clear in their introduction that, while often the goal in variable selection is to select a “good” linear model, where goodness is measured in terms of prediction accuracy performance, it is also important at the same time to choose models which lean toward the parsimonious side. So here the goals are pretty clear: we want good prediction error performance but also simpler models. These are certainly reasonable objectives and quite justifiable in many scientific settings. At the same, however, one should recognize the difficulty of the task, as the two goals, low prediction error and smaller models, can be diametrically opposed. By this I mean that certainly from an oracle point of view it is true that minimizing prediction error will identify the true model, and thus, by going after prediction error (in a perfect world), we will also get smaller models by default. However, in practice, what happens is that small gains in prediction error often translate into larger models and less dimension reduction. So as procedures get better at reducing prediction error, they can also get worse at picking out variables accurately.

Unfortunately, I have some misgivings that LARS might be falling into this trap. Mostly my concern is fueled by the fact that Mallows’ C_p is the criterion used for determining the optimal LARS model. The use of C_p

<p>This is an electronic reprint of the original article published by the Institute of Mathematical Statistics in <i>The Annals of Statistics</i>, 2004, Vol. 32, No. 2, 452–458. This reprint differs from the original in pagination and typographic detail.</p>

often leads to overfitting, and this coupled with the fact that LARS is a forward optimization procedure, which is often found to be greedy, raises some potential flags. This, by the way, does not necessarily mean that LARS per se is overfitting, but rather that I think C_p may be an inappropriate model selection criterion for LARS. It is this point that will be the focus of my discussion. I will offer some evidence that C_p can sometimes be used effectively if *model uncertainty* is accounted for, thus pointing to ways for its more appropriate use within LARS. Mostly I will make my arguments by way of high-dimensional simulations. My focus on high dimensions is motivated in part by the increasing interest in such problems, but also because it is in such problems that performance breakdowns become magnified and are more easily identified. Note that throughout my discussion I will talk only about LARS, but, given the connections outlined in the paper, the results should also naturally apply to the Lasso and Stagewise derivatives.

1. Is C_p the correct stopping rule for LARS? The C_p criterion was introduced by Mallows (1973) to be used with the OLS as an unbiased estimator for the model error. However, it is important to keep in mind that it was not intended to be used *when the model is selected by the data* as this can lead to selection bias and in some cases poor subset selection [Breiman (1992)]. Thus, choosing the model with lowest C_p value is only a heuristic technique with sometimes bad performance. Indeed, ultimately, this leads to an inconsistent procedure for the OLS [Shao (1993)]. Therefore, while I think it is reasonable to assume that the C_p formula (4.10) is correct [i.e., that it is reasonable to expect that $df(\hat{\mu}_k) \approx k$ under a wide variety of settings], there is really no reason to expect that minimizing the C_p value will lead to an optimal procedure for LARS.

In fact, using C_p in a Forward Stagewise procedure of any kind seems to me to be a risky thing to do given that C_p often overfits and that Stagewise procedures are typically greedy. Figure 5 of the paper is introduced (partly) to dispel these types of concerns about LARS being greedy. The message there is that $pe(\hat{\mu})$, a performance measurement related to prediction error, declines slowly from its maximum value for LARS compared to the quick drop seen with standard forward stepwise regression. Thus, LARS acts differently than well-known greedy algorithms and so we should not be worried. However, I see the message quite differently. If the maximum proportion explained for LARS is roughly the same over a large range of steps, and hence models of different dimension, then this implies that there is not much to distinguish between higher-and lower-dimensional models. Combine this with the use of C_p which could provide poor estimates for the prediction error due to selection bias and there is real concern for estimating models that are too large.

To study this issue, let me start by reanalyzing the diabetes data (which was the basis for generating Figure 5). In this analysis I will compare LARS to a Bayesian method developed in Ishwaran and Rao (2000), referred to as SVS (short for Stochastic Variable Selection). The SVS procedure is a hybrid of the spike-and-slab model approach pioneered by Mitchell and Beauchamp (1988) and later developed in George and McCulloch (1993). Details for SVS can be found in Ishwaran and Rao (2000, 2003). My reason for using SVS as a comparison procedure is that, like LARS, its coefficient estimates are derived via shrinkage. However, unlike LARS, these estimates are based on model averaging *in combination* with shrinkage. The use of model averaging is a way of accounting for model uncertainty, and my argument will be that models selected via C_p based on SVS coefficients will be more stable than those found using LARS thanks to the extra benefit of model averaging.

Figures 1 and 2 present the C_p values for the main effects model and the quadratic model from both procedures (the analysis for LARS was based on S-PLUS code kindly provided by Trevor Hastie). The C_p values for SVS were computed by (a) finding the posterior mean values for coefficients, (b) ranking covariates by the size of their absolute posterior mean coefficient values (with the top rank going to the largest absolute mean) and (c) computing the C_p value $C_p(\tilde{\mu}_k) = \|\mathbf{y} - \tilde{\mu}_k\|^2 / \bar{\sigma}^2 - n + 2k$, where $\tilde{\mu}_k$ is the OLS estimate based on the k top ranked covariates. All covariates were standardized. This technique of using C_p with SVS was discussed in Ishwaran and Rao (2000).

We immediately see some differences in the figures. In Figure 1, the final model selected by SVS had $k = 6$ variables, while LARS had $k = 7$ variables. More interesting, though, are the discrepancies for the quadratic model seen in Figure 2. Here the optimal SVS model had $k = 8$ variables in contrast to the much higher $k = 15$ variables found by LARS. The top eight variables from SVS (some of these can be read off the top of the plot) are bmi, ltg, map, hdl, sex, age.sex, bmi.map and glu.2. The last three variables are interaction effects and a squared main effects term. The top eight variables from LARS are bmi, ltg, map, hdl, bmi.map, age.sex, glu.2 and bmi.2. Although there is a reasonable overlap in variables, there is still enough of a discrepancy to be concerned. The different model sizes are also cause for concern. Another worrisome aspect for LARS seen in Figure 2 is that its C_p values remain bounded away from zero. This should be compared to the C_p values for SVS, which attain a near-zero minimum value, as we would hope for.

2. High-dimensional simulations. Of course, since we do not know the true answer in the diabetes example, we cannot definitively assess if the LARS models are too large. Instead, it will be helpful to look at some simulations for a more systematic study. The simulations I used were designed following the recipe given in Breiman (1992). Data was simulated in all cases by using i.i.d. $N(0, 1)$ variables for ε_i . Covariates x_i , for $i = 1, \dots, n$,




FIG. 1. C_p values from main effects model for diabetes data: thick line is values from SVS; thin dashed line is from LARS. Covariates listed at the top of the graph are ordered by importance as measured by their absolute posterior mean.

were generated independently from a multivariate normal distribution with zero mean and with covariance satisfying $E(x_{i,j}x_{i,k}) = \rho^{|j-k|}$. I considered two settings for ρ : (i) $\rho = 0$ (uncorrelated); (ii) $\rho = 0.90$ (correlated). In all simulations, $n = 800$ and $m = 400$. Nonzero β_j coefficients were in 15 clusters of 7 adjacent variables centered at every 25th variable. For example, for the variables clustered around the 25th variable, the coefficient values were given by $\beta_{25+j} = |h - j|^{1.25}$ for $|j| < h$, where $h = 4$. The other 14 clusters were defined similarly. All other coefficients were set to zero. This gave a total of 105 nonzero values and 295 zero values. Coefficient values were adjusted by multiplying by a common constant to make the theoretical R^2 value equal to 0.75 [see Breiman (1992) for a discussion of this point]. Please note that, while the various parameters chosen for the simulations might appear specific, I also experimented with other simulations (not reported) by considering different configurations for the dimension m , sample size n , correlation ρ and the number of nonzero coefficients. What I found was consistent with the results presented here.

For each ρ correlation setting, simulations were repeated 100 times independently. Results are recorded in Table 1. There I have recorded what I call TotalMiss, FDR and FNR. TotalMiss is the total number of misclassified variables, that is, the total number of falsely identified nonzero β_j coefficients and falsely identified zero coefficients; FDR and FNR are the false discovery




FIG. 2. C_p values from quadratic model: best model from SVS is $k = 8$ (thick line) compared with $k = 15$ from LARS (thin dashed line). Note how the minimum value for SVS is nearly zero.

and false nondiscovery rates defined as the false positive and false negative rates for those coefficients identified as nonzero and zero, respectively. The TotalMiss, FDR and FNR values reported are the averaged values from the 100 simulations. Also recorded in the table is \hat{m} , the average number of variables selected by a procedure, as well as the performance value $pe(\hat{\mu})$ [cf. (3.17)], again averaged over the 100 simulations.

Table 1 records the results from various procedures. The entry “svsCp” refers to the C_p -based SVS method used earlier; “Step” is standard forward stepwise regression using the C_p criterion; “svsBMA” is the Bayesian model averaged estimator from SVS. My only reason for including svsBMA is to gauge the prediction error performance of the other procedures. Its variable selection performance is not of interest. Pure Bayesian model averaging leads to improved prediction, but because it does no dimension reduction at all it cannot be considered as a serious candidate for selecting variables.

The overall conclusions from Table 1 are summarized as follows:

1. The total number of misclassified coefficients and FDR values is high in the uncorrelated case for LARS and high in the correlated case for stepwise regression. Their estimated models are just too large. In comparison, svsCp does well in both cases. Overall it does the best in terms of selecting variables by maintaining low FDR and TotalMiss values. It also maintains good performance values.

TABLE 1
Breiman simulation: $m = 400$, $n = 800$ and 105 nonzero β_j

	$\rho = 0$ (uncorrelated X)					$\rho = 0.9$ (correlated X)				
	\hat{m}	$\text{pe}(\hat{\mu})$	TotalMiss	FDR	FNR	\hat{m}	$\text{pe}(\hat{\mu})$	TotalMiss	FDR	FNR
LARS	210.69	0.907	126.63	0.547	0.055	99.51	0.962	75.77	0.347	0.135
svsCp	126.66	0.887	61.14	0.323	0.072	58.86	0.952	66.38	0.153	0.164
svsBMA	400.00	0.918	295.00	0.737	0.000	400.00	0.966	295.00	0.737	0.000
Step	135.53	0.876	70.35	0.367	0.075	129.24	0.884	137.10	0.552	0.208




FIG. 3. C_p values from simulations where $\rho = 0$ (left) and $\rho = 0.9$ (right): bottom curves are from SVS; top curves are from LARS. The lines seen on each curve are the mean C_p values based on 100 simulations. Note how the minimum value for SVS is near zero in both cases. Also superimposed on each curve are error bars representing mean values plus or minus one standard deviation.

2. LARS's performance values are good, second only to svsBMA. However, low prediction error does not necessarily imply good variable selection.

3. LARS C_p values in orthogonal models. Figure 3 shows the C_p values for LARS from the two sets of simulations. It is immediately apparent that the C_p curve in the uncorrelated case is too flat, leading to models which are too large. These simulations were designed to reflect an orthogonal design setting (at least asymptotically), so what is it about the orthogonal case that is adversely affecting LARS?

We can use Lemma 1 of the paper to gain some insight into this. For this argument I will assume that m is fixed (the lemma is stated for $m = n$ but applies in general) and I will need to assume that $X_{n \times m}$ is a random orthogonal matrix, chosen so that its rows are exchangeable. To produce such an X , choose m values $\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{i_m}$ without replacement from $\{\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_n\}$, where \mathbf{e}_j is defined as in Section 4.1, and set $X = [\mathbf{e}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{i_m}]$. It is easy to see that this ensures row-exchangeability. Hence, μ_1, \dots, μ_n are exchangeable

and, therefore, $Y_i = \mu_i + \varepsilon_i$ are exchangeable since ε_i are i.i.d. I will assume, as in (4.1), that ε_i are independent $N(0, \sigma^2)$ variables.

For simplicity take $\sigma^2 = \bar{\sigma}^2 = 1$. Let V_j , for $j = 0, \dots, m-1$, denote the $(j+1)$ st largest value from the set of values $\{|Y_{i_1}|, \dots, |Y_{i_m}|\}$. Let k_0 denote the true dimension, that is, the number of nonzero coordinates of the true β , and suppose that k is some dimension larger than k_0 such that $1 \leq k_0 < k \leq m \leq n$. Notice that $V_k \leq V_{k_0}$, and thus, by Lemma 1 and (4.10),

$$\begin{aligned} C_p(\hat{\mu}_k) - C_p(\hat{\mu}_{k_0}) &= (V_k^2 - V_{k_0}^2) \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{|Y_{i_j}| > V_{k_0}\} + V_k^2 \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{V_k < |Y_{i_j}| \leq V_{k_0}\} \\ &\quad - \sum_{j=1}^m Y_{i_j}^2 \mathbb{1}\{V_k < |Y_{i_j}| \leq V_{k_0}\} + 2(k - k_0) \\ &\leq -\Delta_k B_k + 2(k - k_0), \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta_k = V_{k_0}^2 - V_k^2 \geq 0$ and $B_k = \sum_{j=1}^m \mathbb{1}\{|Y_{i_j}| > V_{k_0}\}$. Observe that by exchangeability B_k is a Binomial($m, k_0/m$) random variable. It is a little messy to work out the distribution for Δ_k explicitly. However, it is not hard to see that Δ_k can be reasonably large with high probability. Now if $k_0 > k - k_0$ and k_0 is large, then B_k , which has a mean of k_0 , will become the dominant term in $\Delta_k B_k$ and $\Delta_k B_k$ will become larger than $2(k - k_0)$ with high probability. This suggests, at least in this setting, that C_p will overfit if the dimension of the problem is high. In this case there will be too much improvement in the residual sums of squares when moving from k_0 to k because of the nonvanishing difference between the squared order statistics $V_{k_0}^2$ and V_k^2 .

4. Summary. The use of C_p seems to encourage large models in LARS, especially in high-dimensional orthogonal problems, and can adversely affect variable selection performance. It can also be unreliable when used with stepwise regression. The use of C_p with SVS, however, seems better motivated due to the benefits of model averaging, which mitigates the selection bias effect. This suggests that C_p can be used effectively if model uncertainty is accounted for. This might be one remedy. Another remedy would be simply to use a different model selection criteria when using LARS.

REFERENCES

- BREIMAN, L. (1992). The little bootstrap and other methods for dimensionality selection in regression: X -fixed prediction error. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **87** 738–754. [MR1185196](#)
- GEORGE, E. I. and MCCULLOCH, R. E. (1993). Variable selection via Gibbs sampling. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **88** 881–889.
- ISHWARAN, H. and RAO, J. S. (2000). Bayesian nonparametric MCMC for large variable selection problems. Unpublished manuscript.

- ISHWARAN, H. and RAO, J. S. (2003). Detecting differentially expressed genes in microarrays using Bayesian model selection. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **98** 438–455. [MR1995720](#)
- MALLOWS, C. (1973). Some comments on C_p . *Technometrics* **15** 661–675.
- MITCHELL, T. J. and BEAUCHAMP, J. J. (1988). Bayesian variable selection in linear regression (with discussion). *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **83** 1023–1036. [MR997578](#)
- SHAO, J. (1993). Linear model selection by cross-validation. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **88** 486–494. [MR1224373](#)

DEPARTMENT OF BIostatISTICS/WB4
CLEVELAND CLINIC FOUNDATION
9500 EUCLID AVENUE
CLEVELAND, OHIO 44195
USA
E-MAIL: ishwaran@bio.ri.ccf.org