## Recap: High-dimensional additive models

$$
Y_{i}=\mu+\sum_{j=1}^{p} f_{j}\left(X_{i}^{(j)}\right)+\varepsilon_{i}(i=1, \ldots, n), \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{j}\left(X_{i}^{(j)}\right)=0 \forall j
$$

parameterization: $\quad f_{j}(\cdot) \approx \sum_{k=1}^{K} \beta_{j, k} \underbrace{h_{j, k}(\cdot)}_{\text {basis fct.s }}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \left(H_{j}\right)_{i, k}=h_{j, k}\left(X_{i}^{(j)}\right), \\
& \beta_{j}=\left(\beta_{j, 1}, \ldots, \beta j, K\right)^{T}, \beta=\left(\beta_{1}, \ldots, \beta_{p}\right)^{T}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\leadsto$ approximation with basis functions at observed data points:

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{j} \underbrace{H_{j}}_{n \times K}
$$

## Naive estimation with (prediction) Group Lasso penalty

$$
\hat{\beta}=\operatorname{argmin}_{\beta}\left\|Y-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{j} H_{j}\right\|_{2}^{2} / n+\underbrace{\lambda \sum_{j=1}^{p}\left\|H_{j} \beta_{j}\right\|_{2} / \sqrt{n}}_{\text {scaled pred. Group Lasso pen. }}
$$

for $f_{j}=\left(f_{j}\left(X_{1}^{(j)}\right), \ldots, f_{j}\left(X_{n}^{(j)}\right)\right)^{T}$ and $\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{n}^{2}=\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{2}^{2} / n$

$$
\hat{\beta}=\operatorname{argmin}_{\beta}\left\|Y-\sum_{j=1}^{p} \beta_{j} H_{j}\right\|_{2}^{2} / n+\sum_{j=1}^{p}\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{n}
$$

doesn't take smoothness into account!

## Natural cubic splines

the special case with natural cubic splines
(Ch. 5.3.2 in Bühlmann and van de Geer (2011)) consider the estimation problem wit the SSP penalty:
$\hat{f}_{1}, \ldots, \hat{f}_{p}=\operatorname{argmin}_{f_{1}, \ldots, f_{p} \in \mathcal{F}}\left(\left\|Y-\sum_{j=1}^{p} f_{j}\right\|_{n}^{2}+\lambda_{1}\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{n}+\lambda_{2} I\left(f_{j}\right)\right)$
where $\mathcal{F}=$ Sobolev space of functions on $[a, b]$ that are continuously differentiable with square integrable second derivatives

Proposition 5.1 in Bühlmann and van de Geer (2011) Let $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $a<\min _{i, j}\left(X_{i}^{(j)}\right)$ and $b>\max _{i, j}\left(X_{i}^{(j)}\right)$. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be as above. Then, the $\hat{f}_{j}$ 's are natural cubic splines with knots at $X_{i}^{(j)}, i=1, \ldots, n$.
implication: the optimization over functions is exactly representable as a parametric problem with $\operatorname{dim} \approx 3 n p$

## SSP penalty of group Lasso type

for easier computation: instead of

$$
\text { SSP penalty }=\lambda_{1} \sum_{j}\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{n}+\lambda_{2} \sum_{j} I(f j)
$$

one can also use as an alternative:

$$
\text { SSP Group Lasso penalty }=\lambda_{1} \sum_{j} \sqrt{\left\|f_{j}\right\|_{n}^{2}+\lambda_{2} I^{2}\left(f_{j}\right)}
$$

in parameterized form, the latter becomes:
$\lambda_{1} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sqrt{\left\|H_{j} \beta_{j}\right\|_{2}^{2} / n+\lambda_{2}^{2} \beta_{j}^{T} W_{j} \beta_{j}}=\lambda_{1} \sum_{j=1}^{p} \sqrt{\beta_{j}^{T}\left(H_{j}^{T} H_{j} / n+\lambda_{2}^{2} W_{j}\right) \beta_{j}}$
$\leadsto$ for every $\lambda_{2}$ : a generalized Group Lasso penalty R-package hgam
simulated example: $n=150, p=200$ and 4 active variables






dotted line: $\lambda_{2}=0$
$\sim \lambda_{2}$ seems not so important: just consider a few candidates
motif regression: $n=287, p=195$


## Uncertainty quantification:

 p -values and confidence intervals (slides, denoted as Ch. 10)
frequentist
uncertainty quantification
(in contrast to Bayesian inference)
classical concepts but in very high-dimensional settings

## Toy example: Motif regression ( $p=195, n=143$ )

Lasso estimated coefficients $\widehat{\beta}\left(\hat{\lambda}_{\mathrm{CV}}\right)$

$p$-values/quantifying uncertainty would be very useful!

$$
Y=X \beta^{0}+\varepsilon(p \gg n)
$$

classical goal: statistical hypothesis testing
or $H_{0, G}: \beta_{j}^{0}=0 \forall j \in \underbrace{G}_{\subseteq\{1, \ldots, p\}}$ versus $H_{A, G}: \exists j \in G$ with $\beta_{j}^{0} \neq 0$
background: if we could handle the asymptotic distribution of the Lasso $\hat{\beta}(\lambda)$ under the null-hypothesis
$\leadsto$ could construct p-values
this is very difficult! asymptotic distribution of $\hat{\beta}$ has some point mass at zero,... Knight and Fu (2000) for $p<\infty$ and $n \rightarrow \infty$
because of "non-regularity" of sparse estimators "point mass at zero" phenomenon $\leadsto$ "super-efficiency"

$~$ standard bootstrapping and subsampling should not be used
$\leadsto$ de-sparsify/de-bias the Lasso instead

