

## Strong Consistency of Lasso Estimators

A. Chatterjee

*Indian Statistical Institute, New Delhi, India*

S. N. Lahiri

*Texas A&M University, USA*

---

### Abstract

In this paper, we study the strong consistency and rates of convergence of the Lasso estimator. It is shown that when the error variables have a finite mean, the Lasso estimator is strongly consistent, provided the penalty parameter (say,  $\lambda_n$ ) is of *smaller* order than the sample size (say  $n$ ). We also show that this condition on  $\lambda_n$  cannot be relaxed. More specifically, we show that consistency of the Lasso estimators fail in the cases where  $\lambda_n/n \rightarrow a$  for some  $a \in (0, \infty]$ . For error variables with a finite  $\alpha$ th moment,  $1 < \alpha < 2$ , we also obtain convergence rates of the Lasso estimator to the true parameter. It is noted that the convergence rates of the Lasso estimators of the non-zero components of the regression parameter vector can be *worse* than the corresponding least squares estimators. However, when the design matrix satisfies some orthogonality conditions, the Lasso estimators of the zero components are surprisingly accurate; The Lasso recovers the zero components *exactly*, for large  $n$ , almost surely.

*AMS (2000) subject classification.* 62J07; secondary: 60F15, 62E20

*Keywords and phrases.* Penalized regression, strong law, convergence rates

---

### 1 Introduction

Consider the following regression model

$$y_i = \mathbf{x}_i' \boldsymbol{\beta} + \epsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.1)$$

where,  $y_i$  is the response,  $\mathbf{x}_i' = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,p})$  is a  $p \times 1$  covariate vector,  $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)'$  is the regression parameter and  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  are *iid* errors. We

assume that  $p$  is fixed. The Lasso estimator of  $\beta$  is defined as the minimizer of the  $l_1$ -penalized least square criterion function,

$$\hat{\beta}_n := \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}'_i \mathbf{u})^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{j=1}^p |u_j|, \quad (1.2)$$

where,  $\lambda_n$  is a penalty or regularization parameter. The Lasso estimate was introduced by Tibshirani (1996) as an estimation and variable selection method. Recently the Lasso has emerged as a very popular method for both estimation as well as model selection. Two main benefits of the Lasso are: (i) the nature of regularization used in the Lasso leads to sparse solutions, which automatically leads to parsimonious model selection (see Zhao and Yu (2006), Wainwright (2006), Zou (2006)) and (ii) it is computationally feasible (see Efron et. al (2004), Osborne et al. (2000), Fu (1998)), even in high dimensional settings.

The asymptotic properties of the Lasso was first studied by Knight and Fu (2000) for the finite dimensional regression model (1.1). In addition to finding the asymptotic distribution of the Lasso estimator, Knight and Fu (2000) also showed that the Lasso was weakly consistent under some mild regularity conditions. In this paper, we investigate the problem of strong consistency of the Lasso estimator under different moment conditions on the error variables  $\epsilon_i$ 's in (1.1). It is shown that when  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$  and the regularization parameter  $\lambda_n = o(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the Lasso estimator of the regression parameter  $\beta$  is strongly consistent. However, if  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n/n \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty]$ , then the Lasso fails to be strongly consistent, and converges to a different limiting quantity. Thus, when  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$ , one needs to choose  $\lambda_n = o(n)$  to guarantee consistency of the Lasso estimator.

Next we consider the rate of almost sure convergence of  $\|\hat{\beta}_n - \beta\|$  when the error variables have a finite  $\alpha$ th absolute moment for some  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ . Theorem 2.3 below shows that for  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$ ,  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ ,

$$\|\hat{\beta}_n - \beta\| = O\left(n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}\right) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

Further, for the Lasso estimators of the non-zero components of  $\beta$ , we also obtain a lower bound on the rate of convergence (cf. Theorem 2.4), which shows that the *exact* convergence rate of the Lasso estimators of the non-zero parameter components is  $n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . This is an interesting finding as it allows one to compare the relative performances of the Lasso estimator and the ordinary least squares (OLS) estimator of  $\beta$ . It can be shown that

under the regularity conditions of Theorem 2.4 on the design matrix, for  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$ ,  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , the OLS estimator  $\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{OLS}}$  of  $\beta$  satisfies

$$\|\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{OLS}} - \beta\| = o\left(n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}\right) \quad \text{with probability 1.}$$

Thus, the penalization used in the definition of the Lasso estimator results in a loss of accuracy for the non-zero components of  $\beta$  compared to the OLS estimator, which uses no penalty. For the zero-components of  $\beta$ , however, this is not necessarily true. When the design matrix satisfies an orthogonality condition and  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$ ,  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ , Theorem 2.5 shows that the Lasso estimator of the zero-components of  $\beta$  recovers the true values *exactly* for large  $n$ , almost surely. Thus, in this case, the rate of convergence of the Lasso estimator of the zero-components is  $O(b_n)$  for any  $b_n \rightarrow 0$ , with probability (w.p.) 1. On the other hand, when the orthogonality condition on the design matrix fails, the convergence rate of the Lasso estimator of the zero-components also can be  $n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$  exactly (like the non-zero components), making it worse than the OLS.

Finally, we also consider the case where  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ . In this case, the mean of the error variables may not even exist. Theorem 2.6 shows that under suitable regularity conditions,  $\hat{\beta}_n$  converges to the zero-vector, almost surely. Hence, it follows that for the (strong) consistency of the Lasso estimator, finiteness of  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|$  cannot be dispensed with.

We now conclude this section with a brief literature review. For the case of ordinary least squares estimators, results on strong consistency were studied by Lai et al. (1978) and Drygas (1976), Knight and Fu (2000) proved consistency of the Lasso estimator and derived its asymptotic distribution under the moment condition  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1^2) < \infty$ , in the finite dimensional case. Recently, Lounici (2008) showed that the  $\ell_\infty$  distance  $\|\hat{\beta}_n - \beta\|_\infty$  converges *weakly* to zero, and also derived the rate of convergence. There has been a large amount work on asymptotic properties of the Lasso in high dimensional settings in the context of model-selection. For further details, see the works of Huang et al. (2008), Meinshausen and Yu (2009), Zhang and Huang (2008), Meinshausen and Bühlmann (2006), Bickel et al. (2009) and references therein.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The main results on strong consistency and rates of convergence are stated in Section 2. The proofs of our results are given in Section 3.

## 2 Main Results

### 2.1 Strong Consistency

Consider the regression model (1.1) with iid error variables  $\epsilon_i$ 's where  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Although the Lasso criterion function is used mainly for the case where the second moment of  $\epsilon_1$  is finite, the Lasso estimators (and also the least squares estimators) are well-defined even when the second moment of  $\epsilon_1$  does not exist. Here we consider the problem of strong consistency of the Lasso estimator assuming only finiteness of the first moment, and some mild regularity conditions on the design vectors  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's. The first result asserts strong consistency of the Lasso estimator when the penalty  $\lambda_n$  is  $o(n)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

**THEOREM 2.1.** *Let  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  be iid random variables with  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Suppose that there exists a nonsingular matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  such that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i' \rightarrow \mathbf{C}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.1)$$

*If  $\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ , then  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\beta}$ , w.p. 1.*

Theorem 2.1 extends the weak consistency results of Knight and Fu (2000) who established the convergence in probability of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$ , under the assumption that  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1^2) < \infty$ . It also shows that strong consistency of the Lasso estimator holds merely under the finiteness of the first moment of  $\epsilon_1$ , provided  $\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \rightarrow 0$ . When the regularization parameter  $\lambda_n$  grows at a faster rate, the strong consistency of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$  may fail, as shown by the following result.

**THEOREM 2.2.** *Let  $\{\epsilon_i\}$  be iid random variables with  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Assume that (2.1) holds as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

(a) *If  $\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty)$ , then*

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta} \longrightarrow \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} V_\infty(\mathbf{u}, a),$$

$$\text{where } V_\infty(\mathbf{u}, a) = \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{u} + a \sum_{i=1}^p (|\beta_i + u_i| - |\beta_i|).$$

(b) *If  $\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \rightarrow \infty$ , then  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ , w.p. 1.*

Theorem 2.2 shows that, in general, the Lasso estimator is inconsistent whenever  $\lambda_n$  grows precisely at the rate  $n$  or faster. Under part (a), consider the special case where all  $\beta_j = 0$ . In this case, it is easy to check

that  $\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} V_{\infty}(\mathbf{u}, a) = \mathbf{0}$  and therefore,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$  is consistent for the zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . Part (b) says that for  $\lambda_n \gg n$ , the Lasso estimators are consistent for the zero components, but not for the non-zero components. Thus, to ensure strong consistency of the Lasso estimators for all components, the regularization parameter  $\lambda_n$  should be chosen in a such way that it grows at a rate slower than the sample size  $n$ .

## 2.2 Rates of convergence

In this section, we consider the rate of almost sure convergence of the Lasso estimator under a stronger moment condition on the error variables, where we assume that  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $1 < \alpha < 2$ . In this case, we have the following rate bound:

**THEOREM 2.3.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $1 < \alpha < 2$  and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Also suppose that (2.1) holds and that*

$$\max \left\{ \|\mathbf{x}_i\| : 1 \leq i \leq n \right\} = O(1), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (2.2)$$

*If, in addition,  $\lambda_n/n^{1/\alpha} \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , then*

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}\| = O\left(n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}\right), \quad \text{w.p. } 1$$

Thus for  $1 < \alpha < 2$ ,  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$  converges to  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  at the rate of  $O(n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha})$ , w.p. 1. For  $\alpha \geq 2$ , the results in Knight and Fu (2000) shows that  $n^{1/2}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta})$  has a non-degenerate limit distribution and therefore, an almost sure bound on the difference  $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}\|$  similar to that in Theorem 2.3 for values of  $\alpha \in [2, \infty)$  is, in general, not possible. Also, note that in Theorem 2.3, we set the regularization parameter  $\lambda_n$  to grow at the rate  $n^{1/\alpha}$  which, in particular, satisfies the requirement of Theorem 2.1.

In general, the rate bound given in Theorem 2.3 cannot be improved upon for the Lasso estimators of the non-zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . The next theorem gives a lower bound on the almost sure rate of convergence for the non-zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  which shows that under some additional conditions, the rate  $n^{-(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$  is *optimal*. To state the result, let  $\gamma_0$  denote the smallest eigen-value of the matrix  $\mathbf{C}$  (cf. (2.1)) and let  $\gamma^*$  denote the largest eigen-value of the submatrix of  $\mathbf{C}$  corresponding to the non-zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . Also, define

$$y_0 = (1 - p_0^{-1}), \quad (2.3)$$

where  $p_0$  is the number of nonzero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , i.e.,  $p_0 = |\{j : 1 \leq j \leq p, \beta_j \neq 0\}|$ . Note that  $y_0 \in [0, 1)$  for  $p_0 \geq 1$ . *Without loss of generality, for the rest of the paper, we will suppose that  $\beta_j \neq 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, p_0$  (if  $p_0 > 0$ ) and  $\beta_j = 0$  for  $j = p_0 + 1, \dots, p$ .* With this notation, we are now ready to state the lower bound result.

**THEOREM 2.4.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $1 < \alpha < 2$ ,  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ , and  $\lambda_n/n^{1/\alpha} \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Also, suppose that (2.1) and (2.2) hold, and that  $p_0 > 0$  and  $\gamma_0/\gamma^* > y_0$ . Then, there exists a constant  $K_1 \in (0, \infty)$ , such that for all  $1 \leq j \leq p_0$ ,*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left| \hat{\beta}_{n,j} - \beta_j \right| n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha} > K_1 > 0, \quad \text{w.p. 1} \quad (2.4)$$

Thus, for nonzero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ , its Lasso estimator  $\hat{\beta}_{n,j}$  has an almost sure convergence rate that is precisely  $n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$  when the conditions of Theorem 2.4 are satisfied. Note that for  $p_0 = 1$ ,  $y_0 = 0$  and hence,  $\gamma_0/\gamma^* > y_0$ . That is, if  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  has a single non-zero component, then the corresponding Lasso estimator cannot converge at an almost sure rate faster than  $n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$ . More generally, the condition  $\gamma_0/\gamma^* > y_0$  holds in the case of ‘balanced’ designs where the eigen-values of  $\mathbf{C}$  are equal. In particular, when the covariates  $\mathbf{x}_i$ ’s are given by realizations of a collection of normalized iid random vectors with the identity covariance matrix, (2.1) holds with  $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{I}_p$ , the identity matrix of order  $p$ . In this case,  $\gamma_0/\gamma^* = 1$ , which is greater than  $y_0$ , and the Lasso estimator of the non-zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  has the exact rate  $n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha}$  of almost sure convergence.

The convergence rate of the Lasso estimator from Theorems 2.3, 2.4, may be compared with the corresponding rate for the (ordinary) least squares estimator  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{\text{OLS}}$  of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . For iid, zero-mean error variables  $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots$ , with  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$ ,  $1 < \alpha < 2$  in (1.1), by a weighted version of the Marcinkiewz-Zygmund strong law of large numbers (SLLN) (cf. Lemma 3.2 below), it follows that

$$\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n^{\text{OLS}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}\| = o\left(n^{(\alpha-1)/\alpha}\right), \quad \text{w.p. 1.} \quad (2.5)$$

Hence, under the conditions of Theorem 2.4, the Lasso estimator of the nonzero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  has a *slower rate* of convergence than the OLS estimator of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . The penalization leads to a loss of accuracy of the Lasso estimator of nonzero components, compared to the ordinary least squares estimation with no penalty.

Next consider the zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ . It turns out that the scenario can be drastically different for the Lasso estimators of the zero-components

of  $\beta$ . Under some structural conditions on the design matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ , the Lasso estimators of the zero component can capture the true parameter value *exactly*, as shown in Theorem 2.5 below :

**THEOREM 2.5.** *Suppose that the conditions of Theorem 2.4 hold. Let  $\mathbf{C}_{12} = \{(c_{i,j}), 1 \leq i \leq p_0, (p_0 + 1) \leq j \leq p\}$ , denote the upper right sub-matrix of  $\mathbf{C}$  of order  $p_0 \times p_1$ , where  $p_1 = p - p_0$ . Suppose that  $\mathbf{C}_{12} = \mathbf{O}$ . Then,*

$$\widehat{\beta}_{n,j} = 0, \quad \text{eventually w.p. 1 for all } j = (p_0 + 1), \dots, p,$$

*i.e., there exists a set  $A$  with  $\mathbf{P}(A) = 1$  such that for all  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that  $\widehat{\beta}_{n,j}(\omega) = 0$  for all  $j = (p_0 + 1), \dots, p$ , whenever  $n \geq n_\omega$ .*

The condition ' $\mathbf{C}_{12} = \mathbf{O}$ ' can be thought of as some sort of an orthogonality condition and can be achieved by suitably choosing the matrix  $\mathbf{X}_n$  in applications that allow design of experiments. Thus, unlike the Lasso estimators of the non-zero components of  $\beta$ , the Lasso estimator is more accurate than the OLS of the zero components, and reproduce the exact true value of the unknown parameter when this orthogonality condition is satisfied.

It is worth pointing out that the remarkable property of the Lasso estimators of the zero components may fail for a general  $\mathbf{C}$  matrix when  $\mathbf{C}_{12} \neq \mathbf{O}$ , as shown by the following example.

**EXAMPLE 2.1.** Let  $\{\epsilon_i\}_{i \geq 1}$  be *iid* with  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $\alpha \in (1, 2)$ ,  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Suppose that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \lambda_n n^{-1/\alpha} = a \in (0, \infty)$ , and that  $\beta_j > 0$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, p_0$  and  $\beta_p = 0$ , where  $p = (p_0 + 1)$ . Also, suppose that (2.1) and (2.2) hold and  $\mathbf{C}$  is of the form

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{bmatrix} M\mathbf{I}_{p_0} & \gamma\mathbf{1} \\ \gamma\mathbf{1}' & m \end{bmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{I}_{p_0}$  is the identity matrix of order  $p_0$ ,  $\mathbf{1} \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$  is a vector of 1's, and  $m, M, \gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ . Then, there exists a choice of  $m, \gamma$  and  $M$  satisfying  $0 < m < \gamma \leq 1$  and  $M > \gamma p_0$  and a constant  $K_0 = K_0(m, \gamma, M, p_0) \in (0, \infty)$  such that

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left| \widehat{\beta}_{n,j} - \beta_j \right| \geq K_0 > 0, \quad \text{for all } j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (2.6)$$

A proof of (2.6) is given in Section 3. This example shows that in general, the Lasso estimators of the zero components also cannot converge at a rate faster than  $n^{-(2-\alpha)/\alpha}$ .

Thus, for a general design matrix  $\mathbf{C}$ , the rate bound given in Theorem 2.3 is optimal.

### 2.3 The infinite mean case

For the sake of completeness, we also investigate almost sure behavior of  $\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n$  when the error variables have a finite  $\alpha$ th absolute moment for some  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . Note that in this case, the mean of the  $\epsilon_i$ 's is not necessarily well defined. As a result, for the regression model (1.1) to make sense, some symmetry conditions (such as the median of  $\epsilon_1$  is zero) on the distribution of  $\epsilon_1$  is needed. The next result, is however, valid without such symmetry assumptions.

**THEOREM 2.6.** *Suppose that  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and that (2.1) hold. Suppose  $\lambda_n/n^{1/\alpha} \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty]$ . Then,*

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{0}, \quad w.p. \ 1.$$

Theorem 2.6 shows that even for such heavy-tailed error distributions, the Lasso estimators of the zero components of  $\boldsymbol{\beta}$  are strongly consistent, but those for the non-zero components are not.

## 3 Proofs

Let  $\mathbf{C}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i'$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . Let  $\gamma_{0,n}$  = the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}_n$  and  $\gamma_n^*$  = the largest eigenvalue of the the  $p_0 \times p_0$  submatrix of  $\mathbf{C}_n$  consisting of the first  $p_0$  rows and  $p_0$  columns. In the proofs below, we write  $C, C(\cdot)$  to denote generic constants that depends on its arguments, but not on  $n$ . Let *i.o.* stand for ‘infinitely often’. Also, let  $\text{sgn}(\cdot)$  denote the sign function, i.e.,  $\text{sgn}(x) = -1, 0, 1$  according as  $x < 0, x = 0, x > 0$ . Let  $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$  denotes the indicator function. Unless otherwise specified, the limits in the order symbols and elsewhere are taken by letting  $n$  tend to infinity.

**LEMMA 3.1.** *Suppose  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$  and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ . Also, suppose that*

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|\mathbf{x}_i\|^2 = O(1). \quad (3.1)$$

*Then,  $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \epsilon_i \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , w.p. 1.*

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.1. Since it is enough prove the almost sure convergence componentwise, for notational simplicity, w.l.g., we assume that the  $\mathbf{x}_i$ 's are scalars. Let

$$\check{\epsilon}_i = \epsilon_i \mathbb{1}(|\epsilon_i| \leq i), \quad i \geq 1.$$

Since,  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty$ ,

$$\mathbf{P}(\epsilon_i \neq \check{\epsilon}_i, i.o.) = \mathbf{P}(|\epsilon_i| > i, i.o.) = 0.$$

Note that  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1 \mathbb{1}(|\epsilon_1| \leq i)) \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$  as  $i \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{E}(\check{\epsilon}_i) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \mathbf{E}\{\epsilon_i \mathbb{1}(|\epsilon_i| \leq i)\} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n x_i^2 \right)^{1/2} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbf{E}\{\epsilon_1 \mathbb{1}(|\epsilon_1| \leq i)\} \right)^2 \right)^{1/2} \\ &\rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty. \end{aligned}$$

By Kronecker's Lemma, it is now enough to show that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \frac{x_i}{i} (\check{\epsilon}_i - \mathbf{E}(\check{\epsilon}_i)) \quad \text{converges w.p. 1.} \quad (3.2)$$

To that end, write  $s_n^2 = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j^2$ ,  $n \geq 1$ . By condition (3.1),  $s_n^2 \leq Cn$  for all  $n \geq 1$ . Hence, for any  $m \geq 1, j \geq 1$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=j}^{j+m} x_i^2 i^{-2} &= \sum_{i=j}^{j+m} s_i^2 i^{-2} - \sum_{i=j-1}^{j+m-1} s_i^2 (i+1)^{-2} \\ &= \sum_{i=j}^{j+m} s_i^2 (i^{-2} - (i+1)^{-2}) + s_{j+m}^2 (j+m+1)^{-2} - s_{j-1}^2 j^{-2} \\ &\leq C \sum_{i=j}^{j+m} i(2i+1) [i(i+1)]^{-2} + C(j+m)(j+m+1)^{-2} \\ &\leq c \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} i^{-2} + c(j+m)^{-1} \leq Cj^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Using (3.3) we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{Var} \left( i^{-1} x_i (\check{\epsilon}_i)^2 \right) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} i^{-2} x_i^2 \mathbf{E} \left\{ \epsilon_1^2 \mathbf{1}(|\epsilon_1| \leq i) \right\} \\
& = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} \left\{ \epsilon_1^2 \mathbf{1}((j-1) < |\epsilon_1| \leq j) \right\} \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} i^{-2} x_i^2 \\
& \leq C \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} \left\{ |\epsilon_1| \mathbf{1}((j-1) < |\epsilon_1| \leq j) \right\} = C \cdot \mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1| < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, by Theorem 8.34 of Athreya and Lahiri (2006), (3.2) follows.  $\square$

LEMMA 3.2. *Suppose that  $\epsilon_i$ 's are iid with  $\mathbf{E}|\epsilon_1|^\alpha < \infty$  for some  $\alpha \in (0, 2)$ , and  $\mathbf{E}(\epsilon_1) = 0$ , if  $\alpha \geq 1$ . Suppose that (2.1) and (2.2) hold. Then,*

$$n^{-1/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \epsilon_i \rightarrow \mathbf{0}, \quad w.p. \ 1. \quad (3.4)$$

PROOF OF LEMMA 3.2. Under (2.2), one can easily modify the steps in the proof of Theorem 8.44 of Athreya and Lahiri (2006) (Marcinkiewicz-Zygmund SLLN) to prove (3.4). We omit the details.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.1. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n &= \underset{\mathbf{t}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{t})^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |t_i| \\
&= \underset{\mathbf{t}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \epsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i' (\mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right]^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + t_i - \beta_i| \\
\Rightarrow (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n (\epsilon_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{u})^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i|.
\end{aligned}$$

Recall that  $\mathbf{C}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i'$ ,  $\gamma_{0,n}$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}_n$  and  $\gamma_0$  is the smallest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}$ . Let  $\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \epsilon_i$ . Since  $\sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i^2$  does not involve  $\mathbf{u}$ , discarding this term from the criterion function above and dividing the resulting expression by  $\mathbf{u}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2 \overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + \frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p [|\beta_i + u_i| - |\beta_i|] \right\} \\
&\equiv \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} V_n(\mathbf{u}), \quad (\text{say}). \quad (3.5)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} V_n(\mathbf{u}) &\geq \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| - \frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i| \\ &\geq \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| - \frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sqrt{p} \|\mathbf{u}\|. \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

Next fix  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ . Since  $\lambda_n/n = o(1)$ , there exists a  $n_0 \in (0, \infty)$  such that  $\lambda_n/n \leq \eta$  and  $\gamma_{0,n} > \gamma_0/2$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ . On the set  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq \eta\}$ , by (3.6), for any  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , with  $\|\mathbf{u}\| > \eta(4 + 2\sqrt{p})/\gamma_{0,n}$ ,

$$V_n(\mathbf{u}) \geq \|\mathbf{u}\| \left( \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| - 2\eta - \sqrt{p}\eta \right) \geq \gamma_{0,n} \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|^2}{2} > 0.$$

Since  $V_n(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ , it follows that for  $n \geq n_0$ , the minimum of  $V_n(\mathbf{u})$  cannot be attained in the set  $\{\mathbf{u} : \|\mathbf{u}\| > \eta(4 + 2\sqrt{p})/\gamma_{0,n}\}$ , whenever  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq \eta\}$ . Hence, it follows that for  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq \eta\}$  implies

$$\left( \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) = \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} V_n(\mathbf{u}) \in \left\{ \mathbf{u} : \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq \frac{\eta(4 + 2\sqrt{p})}{\gamma_{0,n}} \right\}.$$

In particular,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left( \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}\| > \frac{2\eta(4 + 2\sqrt{p})}{\gamma_0}, \text{ i.o.} \right) &\leq \mathbf{P} \left( \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}\| > \frac{\eta(4 + 2\sqrt{p})}{\gamma_{0,n}}, \text{ i.o.} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}(\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| > \eta, \text{ i.o.}) = 0, \end{aligned}$$

which follows from Lemma 3.1. Since  $\eta \in (0, \infty)$  is arbitrary, this completes the proof.  $\square$

**PROOF OF THEOREM 2.2.** First, consider part (a). Let  $V_n(\cdot)$  be as in (3.5). Note that for each  $i$ ,

$$\left| |\beta_i + u_i| - |\beta_i| \right| \leq |u_i|.$$

Since  $\frac{\lambda_n}{n} \rightarrow a \in (0, \infty)$ , for any compact set  $\mathbf{K} \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{K}} |V_n(\mathbf{u}) - V_\infty(\mathbf{u}, a)| \\ &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{K}} \left[ \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \|\mathbf{C}_n - \mathbf{C}\| + 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + |n^{-1}\lambda_n - a| \sum_{i=1}^p |u_i| \right] \\ &= o(1) \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{w.p. 1.} \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

Let  $n_0 \geq 1$  be such that for all  $n \geq n_0$ ,  $\lambda_n/n < 2a$  and  $\gamma_{0,n} > \gamma_0/2$ . From (3.6), for all  $n \geq n_0$ , on the set  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq a\}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} V_n(\mathbf{u}) &\geq \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| - \frac{\lambda_n}{n} \sqrt{p} \right] \\ &\geq \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ \frac{\gamma_0}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\| - 2a - 2a\sqrt{p} \right] \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{u}\|}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\|\mathbf{u}\| > [1 + 4a(1 + \sqrt{p})]/\gamma_0 \equiv c_0$ . Since,  $V_n(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ , this implies  $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}\| \leq c_0$ , whenever  $n \geq n_0$  and  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq a\}$ . Thus, the minimizer of  $V_n(\mathbf{u})$  lies in a compact set for all  $n \geq n_0$ , provided  $\{\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \leq a\}$ . Since  $V_\infty(\cdot; a)$  is a convex function, by (3.7) and Lemma 3.1, part (a) follows.

Next consider part (b). Let  $a_n^2 = \lambda_n/n$ . Then,  $a_n \rightarrow \infty$ . Also, let  $\mathbf{B}_n = \{\mathbf{u} : \|\mathbf{u}\| \leq a_n, |\beta_i + u_i| \geq a_n^{-1} \text{ for at least one } i = 1, \dots, p\}$ . By Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \left[ a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| \right] \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \left[ a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \sup\{\|\mathbf{u}\| : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{B}_n\} \right] \\ &= \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_n} \left[ a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| a_n \right] \\ &\geq a_n \left[ 1 - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right] \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ w.p. } 1. \end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

Also, by Lemma 3.1,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\| > a_n} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\
& \geq \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\| > a_n} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| \right] \\
& \geq \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\| > a_n} \left[ \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| \right] \\
& = \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\| > a_n} \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right] \\
& \geq a_n \left[ a_n \gamma_{0,n} - 2\|\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right] \rightarrow \infty, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ w.p. } 1. \tag{3.9}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, with  $\mathbf{B}_{1,n} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} : |\beta_i + u_i| \leq a_n^{-1}, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, p \right\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\
& \leq \mathbf{u}'_0 \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u}_0 - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u}_0 + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_{0,i}|, \\
& = \mathbf{u}'_0 \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u}_0 - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u}_0 \quad (\text{where, } \mathbf{u}_0 = (u_{0,1}, \dots, u_{0,p})' = -\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}), \\
& \rightarrow \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{C} \boldsymbol{\beta} \in [0, \infty), \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty, \text{ w.p. } 1. \tag{3.10}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for any sequence  $\{\mathbf{u}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ , with  $\mathbf{u}_n \in \mathbf{B}_n$ ,  $\|\mathbf{u}_n + \boldsymbol{\beta}\| \leq a_n^{-1} \sqrt{p} \rightarrow 0$ , as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Hence, from (3.8)- (3.10) and (3.5), it follows that there exists a set  $A$  with  $\mathbf{P}(A) = 1$  and for all  $\omega \in A$ , there exists a  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left( \widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) = \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} V_n(\mathbf{u}) \\
& = \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\
& = \underset{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left[ \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\overline{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + a_n^2 \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\
& \rightarrow -\boldsymbol{\beta}, \quad \text{as } n \rightarrow \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of part (b). □

PROOF. PROOF OF THEOREM 2.3. Since

$$\widehat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n = \underset{\mathbf{t}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ \epsilon_i - \mathbf{x}'_i(\mathbf{t} - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right]^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + t_i - \beta_i|,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& n^{1/\alpha}(\widehat{\beta}_n - \beta) \\
&= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \epsilon_i - n^{-1/\alpha} \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{u} \right)^2 + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p \left| \beta_i + n^{-1/\alpha} u_i \right| \\
&= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} \left[ n^{-2/\alpha} \mathbf{u}' \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i' \right) \mathbf{u} - 2n^{-1/\alpha} \mathbf{u}' \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \epsilon_i \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p \left( \left| \beta_i + n^{-1/\alpha} u_i \right| - |\beta_i| \right) \right] \\
&\equiv \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}), \quad (\text{say}).
\end{aligned}$$

Write  $\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n = n^{-1/\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{x}_i \epsilon_i$ . Then, by Lemma 3.2,  $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| = o(1)$ , almost surely. Define the sets

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{B}_{1,n} &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : \|\mathbf{u}\| > K_1 n^{(3-\alpha)/2\alpha} \right\} \\
\mathbf{B}_{2,n} &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}^c, \max_{1 \leq i \leq p} |u_i| > K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \right\} \\
\mathbf{B}_{3,n} &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : K_3 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} < |u_i| \leq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \forall i = 1, \dots, p_0; \right. \\
&\quad \left. |u_i| \leq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \forall i = (p_0 + 1), \dots, p \right\} \text{ and,} \\
\mathbf{B}_{4,n} &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : |u_i| \leq K_3 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \text{ for some } i = 1, \dots, p_0; \right. \\
&\quad \left. |u_j| \leq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, p \right\},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where,

$$K_1 = \left[ 8a \left( \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| + 1 \right) \gamma_0^{-1} \right]^{1/2}$$

and  $K_2, K_3$  are any given real numbers (not depending on  $n$ ) satisfying

$$K_2 \in \left[ 4a(p+1)\gamma_0^{-1}, \infty \right) \quad \text{and} \quad K_3 \in \left( 0, 1 - \sqrt{p_0 \left( 1 - \frac{\gamma_0}{\gamma^*} \right) \frac{a}{2\gamma_0}} \right).$$

The sets  $\mathbf{B}_{3,n}$  and  $\mathbf{B}_{4,n}$  would be used in the proof of the next result. Let

$$A = \{ \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \}.$$

Then for all  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \\
& \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - 2 \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p \left( n^{-1/\alpha} |u_i| - 2|\beta_i| \right) \right] \\
& \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \left[ \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| - 2 \|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| + \lambda_n n^{-1/\alpha} \right] - 2\lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \right] \\
& \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \left[ \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| + \frac{a}{2} \right] - 2\lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \right] \\
& \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}} \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 \frac{\gamma_0}{2} \right] - 2\lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \\
& = \left[ \gamma_0/2 \right] K_1^2 n^{(1-2/\alpha)} n^{(3-\alpha)/\alpha} - 2\lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \\
& \geq C n^{1/\alpha}. \tag{3.12}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $\alpha > 1$ ,  $(3 - \alpha)/[2\alpha] < \alpha^{-1}$ , and therefore

$$\sup \left\{ \|\mathbf{u}\| n^{-1/\alpha} : \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}^c \right\} = o(1).$$

Hence for  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{1,n}^c$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &= n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} - 2\mathbf{u}' \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n + \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{1/\alpha}} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} \text{sgn}(\beta_j) u_j + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |u_j| \right] \\
&= n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{C}_n \mathbf{u} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} u_j \left( \text{sgn}(\beta_j) n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\widetilde{W}_{j,n} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |u_j| \left( n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\widetilde{W}_{j,n} \text{sgn}(u_j) \right). \tag{3.13}
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to check that for any  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$ , such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \\
 & \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}} \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^p |u_j| \left( n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2|\check{W}_{j,n}| \right) \right] \\
 & \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}} \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \|\mathbf{u}\| (p+1)^{1/2} \right] \\
 & = \inf_{\|\mathbf{u}\| \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}} \|\mathbf{u}\| \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\| - n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n (p+1)^{1/2} \right] \\
 & \geq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left[ n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_{0,n} K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} - n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n (p+1)^{1/2} \right] \\
 & \geq C n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}. \tag{3.14}
 \end{aligned}$$

Since, by (3.13),  $\check{V}_n(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ ,

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}^c} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \leq \check{V}_n(\mathbf{0}) = 0 < \min \left\{ C n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}, C n^{1/a} \right\}.$$

Hence by (3.12) and (3.14),  $\inf_{\mathbf{u}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}^c} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u})$  for  $n \geq n_\omega$  for all  $\omega \in A$ . This completes the proof.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.4. Next consider Theorem 2.4 and let  $A$  be defined as before, *i.e.*

$$A = \left\{ \|\check{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty \right\}.$$

Then, for each  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$ , such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ , by (3.11),

$$\begin{aligned}
 \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{4,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) & \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{4,n}} \left[ n^{1-2/\alpha} \gamma_{0,n} \|\mathbf{u}\|^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} |u_j| \left( n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2|\check{W}_{j,n}| \right) \right. \\
 & \quad \left. + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |u_j| \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{\sqrt{n}} - 2|\check{W}_{j,n}| \right) \right] \\
 & \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{4,n}} \left[ n^{1-2/\alpha} \gamma_{0,n} \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} u_j^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} |u_j| \left( n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2\|\check{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right) \right] \\
 & \geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{4,n}} \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} \left\{ n^{1-2/\alpha} \gamma_{0,n} u_j^2 - |u_j| \left( n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2\|\check{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right) \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Now, consider the function  $f(x) = c_1x^2 - c_2x$ ,  $x \geq 0$ ,  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ . This function is strictly decreasing on  $\left(0, \frac{c_2}{2c_1}\right)$ , strictly increasing on  $\left(\frac{c_2}{2c_1}, \infty\right)$ , and attains its minimum at  $x = \frac{c_2}{2c_1}$ . The minimum value of  $f(\cdot)$  is given by  $f\left(\frac{c_2}{2c_1}\right) = -\frac{c_2^2}{4c_1}$ , and  $\min_{0 \leq x \leq x_0} f(x) = f(x_0)$  for all  $x_0 \in \left[0, \frac{c_2}{2c_1}\right]$ .

Now, apply this to each of the  $p_0$  terms and use the definition of  $\mathbf{B}_{4,n}$  to conclude that for all  $\omega \in A$  and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{4,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &\geq (p_0 - 1) \left[ -\frac{\left(n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\|\right)^2}{4\gamma_{0,n} n^{1-2/\alpha}} \right] \\
&\quad + \left[ n^{1-2/\alpha} \gamma_{0,n} K_3^2 n^{2(2-\alpha)/\alpha} - K_3 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{1/\alpha}} + 2\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right) \right] \\
&= n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left[ \gamma_{0,n} K_3^2 - K_3 \left( \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{1/\alpha}} + 2\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - (p_0 - 1) \frac{\left(n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n + 2\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\|\right)^2}{4\gamma_{0,n}} \right] \\
&\geq -n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left[ -\gamma_0 K_3^2 + K_3 a + (p_0 - 1) \frac{a^2}{4\gamma_0} \right] (1 + \eta); \tag{3.15}
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider  $\check{V}_n(\mathbf{u})$  for  $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}$ . Let,

$$\mathbf{u}_0 = \left( -\text{sgn}(\beta_1), \dots, -\text{sgn}(\beta_{p_0}), 0, \dots, 0 \right)' K_4 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha},$$

with  $K_4 = a/2\gamma^*$ .

Then, for all  $\omega \in A$  and  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \leq \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}_0) \quad (\text{as } \mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}) \\
 & \leq n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \gamma_n^* \|\mathbf{u}_0\|^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} u_{j,0} \left( \text{sgn}(\beta_j) n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\check{W}_{j,n} \right) \\
 & \leq n^{1-2/\alpha} \gamma_n^* p_0 K_4^2 n^{2(2-\alpha)/\alpha} - p_0 n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n K_4 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} + 2K_4 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} |\check{W}_{j,n}| \\
 & = -n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left[ K_4 p_0 n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - K_4^2 p_0 \gamma_n^* - 2K_4 \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} |\check{W}_{j,n}| \right] \\
 & \leq -n^{-(2-\alpha)/\alpha} [K_4 p_0 a - K_4^2 p_0 \gamma^*] (1 - \eta) \tag{3.16}
 \end{aligned}$$

Now check that by the condition,  $\gamma_0 > \gamma^* (1 - p_0^{-1})$ , we have

$$[K_4 p_0 a - K_4^2 p_0 \gamma^*] > \left[ -\gamma_0 K_3^2 + K_3 a + \frac{(p_0 - 1) a^2}{4\gamma_0} \right].$$

Hence, there exists  $\eta_0 \in (0, 1)$  such that for all  $\eta \in (0, \eta_0)$ ,

$$[K_4 p_0 a - K_4^2 p_0 \gamma^*] (1 - \eta) > \left[ -\gamma_0 K_3^2 + K_3 a + \frac{(p_0 - 1) a^2}{4\gamma_0} \right] (1 + \eta). \tag{3.17}$$

By choosing  $\eta < \eta_0$ , and using (3.12)-(3.17), it follows that for all  $\omega \in A$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}). \tag{3.18}$$

Theorem 2.4 follows from this.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.5. Write

$$\mathbf{C} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & \mathbf{C}_{12} \\ \mathbf{C}_{21} & \mathbf{C}_{22} \end{pmatrix},$$

where  $\mathbf{C}_{11}$  is  $p_0 \times p_0$ . From the proof of Theorem 2.4 (cf. (3.18)), it follows that

$$n^{1/\alpha} \left( \hat{\beta}_n - \beta \right) = \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\text{argmin}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \underset{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}}{\text{argmin}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}),$$

where  $\check{V}_n(\mathbf{u})$  has the representation (3.13), and

$$\mathbf{B}_{3,n} = \left\{ \mathbf{u} : K_3 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} < |u_i| \forall i = 1, \dots, p_0; \right. \\ \left. |u_j| \leq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \forall j = 1, \dots, p \right\}$$

with  $K_2$  and  $K_3$  as defined in (3.11). Fix

$$\mathbf{u}^{(1)} = (u_1, \dots, u_{p_0})' \in [K_3 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}, K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}],$$

and let

$$\mathbf{B}_{3,n}^{(1)} = \left\{ \mathbf{u}^{(2)} : |u_j| \leq K_2 n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}, (p_0 + 1) \leq j \leq p \right\}.$$

Note that, as  $\mathbf{C}_{12} = \mathbf{0}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}^{(1)}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}^{(1)}, \mathbf{u}^{(2)}) \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}^{(1)}} n^{(1-2/\alpha)} \left\{ (\mathbf{u}^{(2)})' \mathbf{C}_{22} \mathbf{u}^{(2)} + 2(\mathbf{u}^{(1)})' \mathbf{C}_{12} \mathbf{u}^{(2)} \right\} \\ & \quad + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |u_j| \left[ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\widetilde{W}_{j,n} \operatorname{sgn}(u_j) \right] \\ &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}^{(2)} \in \mathbf{B}_{2,n}^{(1)}} n^{(1-2/\alpha)} (\mathbf{u}^{(2)})' \mathbf{C}_{22} \mathbf{u}^{(2)} + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |u_j| \left[ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\widetilde{W}_{j,n} \operatorname{sgn}(u_j) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| = o(1)$  w.p. 1, for every  $\omega \in A \equiv \{\|\widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| = o(1)\}$ , there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$ , such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2|\widetilde{W}_{j,n}| > \frac{a}{2} > 0, \quad \text{for all } j = (p_0 + 1), \dots, p.$$

Hence, by the positive definiteness of  $\mathbf{C}_{22}$ , the minimizer of the expression above is  $\mathbf{u}^{(2)} = \mathbf{0}$ . This proves the theorem.  $\square$

PROOF OF EXAMPLE 2.1. Let  $\mathbf{y} = n^{-(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \mathbf{u}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{u} = n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \mathbf{y}$ , and,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{B}_3 &= n^{-(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \mathbf{B}_{3,n} \\ &= \{ \mathbf{y} : K_3 < |y_i| \leq K_2, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, p_0, \text{ and} \\ & \quad |y_i| \leq K_2 \text{ for } i = (p_0 + 1), \dots, p \}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}\check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &= \check{V}_n\left(n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}\mathbf{y}\right) \\ &= n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \left[ \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{C}_n\mathbf{y} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} y_j \left\{ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) - 2\check{W}_{j,n} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \left\{ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\check{W}_{j,n} \operatorname{sgn}(y_j) \right\} \right],\end{aligned}$$

and  $\mathbf{u} = n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha}\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n} \Leftrightarrow \mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_3$ .

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &= \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{B}_{3,n}} n^{-(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \check{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \\ &= n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_3} \left[ \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{C}_n\mathbf{y} + \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} y_j \left\{ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) - 2\check{W}_{j,n} \right\} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \left\{ n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n - 2\check{W}_{j,n} \operatorname{sgn}(y_j) \right\} \right] \\ &= n^{(2-\alpha)/\alpha} (1 + o(1)) \\ &\quad \times \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_3} \left[ \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} + a \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} \operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) y_j + \sum_{j>p_0}^p |y_j| \right\} \right], \text{ w.p. 1. (3.19)}\end{aligned}$$

Since  $\operatorname{sgn}(\beta_j) = 1$  for  $1 \leq j \leq p_0$ , for any  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned}Q(y) &\equiv \mathbf{y}'\mathbf{C}\mathbf{y} + a \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} y_j + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^p c_{i,i} y_i^2 + 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p c_{i,j} y_i y_j + a \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} y_j + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \right) \\ &\geq \sum_{i=1}^p c_{i,i} y_i^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p c_{i,j} |y_i| |y_j| - a \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} |y_j| + a \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \\ &= Q(\mathbf{g}(y)),\end{aligned}$$

where,  $g_j(\mathbf{y}) = -|y_j|$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq p_0$  and  $g_j(\mathbf{y}) = |y_j|$ ,  $(p_0 + 1) \leq j \leq p$ . Hence, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbf{B}_3} \mathbf{y}' \mathbf{C} \mathbf{y} + a \left( \sum_{j=1}^{p_0} y_j + \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p |y_j| \right) \\ = & \operatorname{argmin}_{\substack{K_3 \leq y_i \leq K_2, i=1, \dots, p_0 \\ 0 \leq y_j \leq K_2, j=p_0+1, \dots, p}} \sum_{i=1}^p c_{i,i} y_i^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p c_{i,j} y_i y_j - a \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} y_i + a \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p y_j. \end{aligned}$$

Next consider the quadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} Q_1(\mathbf{y}) & \equiv \sum_{i=1}^p c_{i,i} y_i^2 - 2 \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p c_{i,j} y_i y_j - a \sum_{i=1}^{p_0} y_i + a \sum_{j=p_0+1}^p y_j \\ & = \mathbf{y}' \mathbf{A} \mathbf{y} - 2 \mathbf{b}' \mathbf{y}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11} & -\mathbf{C}_{12} \\ -\mathbf{C}'_{12} & \mathbf{C}_{22} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b} = \left( \underbrace{-a, \dots, -a}_{p_0}, \underbrace{a, \dots, a}_{(p-p_0)} \right)'.$$

It is easy to check that  $Q_1(\mathbf{y})$  attains its minimum (over  $\mathbb{R}^p$ ) at  $\mathbf{y}_0 = \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b}$ . Now from Rao (1973) (pp. 33),

$$\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{C}_{11}^{-1} + \mathbf{F} \mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{F}' & -\mathbf{F} \mathbf{E}^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{E}^{-1} \mathbf{F}' & -\mathbf{E}^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{F} & = -\mathbf{C}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{12} = -\frac{\gamma}{M} \mathbf{1}, \quad \text{and,} \\ \mathbf{E} & = \mathbf{C}_{22} - \mathbf{C}'_{12} \mathbf{C}_{11}^{-1} \mathbf{C}_{12} = m - \frac{\gamma^2}{M} \mathbf{1}' \mathbf{1} = \left( m - \frac{p_0 \gamma}{M} \right) \\ \Rightarrow \mathbf{A}^{-1} & = \begin{bmatrix} M^{-1} \mathbf{I}_{p_0} + \left( \frac{\gamma}{M} \right)^2 \frac{\mathbf{1} \mathbf{1}'}{\mathbf{E}} & \frac{\gamma}{M \mathbf{E}} \mathbf{1} \\ \frac{\gamma}{M \mathbf{E}} \mathbf{1}' & \mathbf{E}^{-1} \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus for all  $1 \leq i \leq p_0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b})_i & = \text{the } i\text{-th coordinate of } \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{b} = -a \left[ M^{-1} + \frac{\gamma^2 p_0}{M^2 \mathbf{E}} \right] + \frac{a \gamma}{M \mathbf{E}} \\ & = \frac{a}{M \mathbf{E}} \left[ \gamma + \frac{p_0 \gamma}{M} - m - \frac{\gamma^2 p_0}{M} \right] \\ & = \frac{a}{M \mathbf{E}} \left[ \gamma - m + \frac{p_0 \gamma}{M} (1 - \gamma) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

and for  $i = p_0 + 1$ ,

$$(\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b})_{p_0+1} = \frac{a}{E} \left[ 1 - \frac{\gamma p_0}{M} \right].$$

Clearly

$$m < \gamma \leq 1 \quad \text{and} \quad M > \gamma p_0, \quad (3.20)$$

makes all co-ordinates of  $\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b}$  positive. Also, note that the eigenvalues of  $\mathbf{C}$  are given by (cf. pp. 32, Rao (1973) ):

$$\begin{aligned} \det(\mathbf{C} - \lambda \mathbf{I}) &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \begin{vmatrix} (M - \lambda) \mathbf{I} & \gamma \mathbf{1} \\ \gamma \mathbf{1}' & (m - \lambda) \end{vmatrix} &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow (M - \lambda)^{p_0-1} [(m - \lambda)(M - \lambda) - \gamma^2 p_0] &= 0 \\ \Rightarrow \lambda_i = M, \quad \text{for } (p_0 - 1) \text{ many } i\text{'s and} \\ \lambda &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (m + M) \pm \left\{ (M - m)^2 + 4\gamma^2 p_0 \right\}^{1/2} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $M$  large,  $(M + m) > \left[ (M - m)^2 + 4\gamma^2 p_0 \right]^{1/2}$ , and hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_0 &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (M + m) - \left\{ (M - m)^2 + 4\gamma^2 p_0 \right\}^{1/2} \right] \quad \text{and,} \\ \gamma_p &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ (M + m) + \left\{ (M - m)^2 + 4\gamma^2 p_0 \right\}^{1/2} \right], \end{aligned}$$

where  $\gamma_p$  is the largest eigenvalue of  $\mathbf{C}$ . Since  $K_2^{-1}$  and  $K_3$  can be chosen arbitrarily small, it is easy to find a set of  $m, \gamma, M$  such that (3.20) holds,  $\gamma_0 > 0$  and  $\mathbf{y}_0 \equiv \mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b} \in \mathbf{B}_3$ . For any such choice of  $m, \gamma_0, M$ ,  $y_{0,p_0+1} = (\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{b})_{p_0+1} \in (0, \infty)$ , and therefore, by (3.19), (2.6) holds.  $\square$

PROOF OF THEOREM 2.6. Note that,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n &= \underset{\mathbf{t}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \frac{1}{n^{1/\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i' \mathbf{t})^2 + \frac{\lambda_n}{n^{1/\alpha}} \sum_{i=1}^n |t_i| \\ \Rightarrow (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) &= \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} n^{-1/\alpha} \left( \mathbf{u}' \mathbf{X}_n' \mathbf{X}_n \mathbf{u} \right) - 2 \widetilde{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \\ &= \underset{\mathbf{u}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \widetilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \quad (\text{say}). \end{aligned}$$

Fix  $\eta \in (0, \max\{1, \delta\})$ , where  $\delta = \max\{|\beta_i| : 1 \leq i \leq p_0\}$ . (Set  $\delta = 0$  if  $p_0 = 0$ ). Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{D}_1 &= \{\mathbf{u} : \|\mathbf{u}\| > (4p\delta + 1)\}, \\ \mathbf{D}_2 &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : |\beta_i + u_i| > \eta, \text{ for some } i, 1 \leq i \leq p ; \mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_1^c \right\}, \\ \mathbf{D}_3 &= \left\{ \mathbf{u} : |\beta_i + u_i| \leq \eta, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, p \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, there exists a set  $A$  with  $P(A) = 1$  such that for all  $\omega \in A$ , there exists a  $n_\omega \geq 1$  such that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ , the following inequalities hold:

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_1} \tilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u}} \left[ -2\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n' \mathbf{u} + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u}} \left[ -2\|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \left( \|\mathbf{u}\| - \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \right) \right] \\ &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u}} \left[ \|\mathbf{u}\| \left( -2\|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \right) - n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \right] \\ &= (4p\delta + 1) \frac{a}{2} - 2a \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i| \geq \frac{a}{2}; \end{aligned}$$

Similarly,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_2} \tilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) &\geq \inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_2} \left[ -2\|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| \|\mathbf{u}\| + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \sum_{i=1}^p |\beta_i + u_i| \right] \\ &\geq -2\|\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n\| (4p\delta + 1) + n^{-1/\alpha} \lambda_n \eta \\ &\geq \frac{a\eta}{2}, \quad \text{w.p. 1.}; \end{aligned}$$

and, using the fact that  $0 < \alpha < 1$ ,

$$\inf_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_3} \tilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \leq V_n(-\boldsymbol{\beta}) \leq n^{(1-1/\alpha)} \boldsymbol{\beta}' \mathbf{C}_n \boldsymbol{\beta} + 2\tilde{\mathbf{W}}_n' \boldsymbol{\beta} \leq \frac{a\eta}{4}.$$

Hence, for all  $\omega \in A$  (where  $P(A) = 1$ ), there exists  $n_\omega \geq 1$  and that for all  $n \geq n_\omega$ ,

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u}} \tilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\mathbf{u} \in \mathbf{D}_3} \tilde{V}_n(\mathbf{u}) \Rightarrow (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \in \mathbf{D}_3$$

Hence, it follows that  $(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n - \boldsymbol{\beta}) \rightarrow -\boldsymbol{\beta}$  almost surely, which implies  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_n \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$  almost surely.  $\square$

## References

- ATHREYA, K. B. and LAHIRI, S. N. (2006). *Measure theory and Probability theory*. Springer Texts in Statistics, Springer, New York.
- BICKEL, P. J., RITOV, Y. and TSYBAKOV, A. B. (2009). Simultaneous analysis of lasso and dantzig selector. *Ann. Statist.*, **37**, 1705-1732
- DRYGAS, H. (1976). Weak and strong consistency of the least squares estimators in regression models. *Z. Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verw. Gebiete*, **34**, 119-127.
- EFRON, B., HASTIE, T., JOHNSTONE, I. and TIBSHIRANI, R. (2004). Least angle regression. *Ann. Statist.*, **32**, 407-499. With discussion, and a rejoinder by the authors.
- FU, W. J. (1998). Penalized regressions: the bridge versus the lasso. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, **7**, 397-416.
- HUANG, J., HOROWITZ, J. L. and MA, S. (2008). Asymptotic properties of bridge estimators in sparse high-dimensional regression models. *Ann. Statist.*, **36**, 587-613.
- KNIGHT, K. and FU, W. (2000). Asymptotics for lasso-type estimators. *Ann. Statist.*, **28**, 1356-1378.
- LAI, T. L., ROBBINS, H. and WEI, C. Z. (1978). Strong consistency of least squares estimates in multiple regression. *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.*, **75**, 3034-3036.
- LOUNICI, K. (2008). Sup-norm convergence rate and sign concentration property of Lasso and Dantzig estimators. *Electron. J. Stat.*, **2**, 90-102.
- MEINSHAUSEN, N. and Bühlmann, P. (2006). High-dimensional graphs and variable selection with the lasso. *Ann. Statist.*, **34**, 1436-1462.
- MEINSHAUSEN, N. and YU, B. (2009). Lasso-type recovery of sparse representations for high-dimensional data. *Ann. Statist.*, **37**, 246-270.
- OSBORNE, M. R., PRESNELL, B. and TURLACH, B. A. (2000). On the LASSO and its dual. *J. Comput. Graph. Statist.*, **9**, 319-337.
- RAO, C. R. (1973). *Linear statistical inference and its applications*. John Wiley & Sons, New York London-Sydney, second edition. Wiley Series in Probability and Mathematical Statistics.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996). Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *J. Roy. Statist. Soc.*, **Ser. B**, **58**, 267-288.
- WAINWRIGHT, M. J. (2006). Sharp thresholds for high-dimensional and noisy recovery of sparsity. Technical report, Dept. of Statistics, UC Berkeley. preprint available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/math/0605740>.
- ZHANG, C.-H. and HUANG, J. (2008). The sparsity and bias of the lasso selection in high-dimensional linear regression. *Ann. Statist.*, **36**, 1567-1594.
- ZHAO, P. and YU, B. (2006). On model selection consistency of Lasso. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, **7**, 2541-2563.
- ZOU, H. (2006). The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, **101**, 1418-1429.

A. CHATTERJEE  
STAT-MATH UNIT  
INDIAN STATISTICAL INSTITUTE  
7, SJSS MARG  
NEW DELHI 110016  
INDIA  
E-mail: cha@isid.ac.in

S. N. LAHIRI  
DEPARTMENT OF STATISTICS  
TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY  
3143 TAMU  
COLLEGE STATION, TX, 77843  
USA  
E-mail: snlahiri@stat.tamu.edu

Paper received: August 2009; revised: February 2010.