

Debiased Bayesian Inference for High-dimensional Regression Models

Qihui Chen*
CUHK-Shenzhen

Zheng Fang†
Emory University

Ruixuan Liu‡
CUHK

December 11, 2025

Abstract

There has been significant progress in Bayesian inference based on sparsity-inducing (e.g., spike-and-slab and horseshoe-type) priors for high-dimensional regression models. The resulting posteriors, however, in general do not possess desirable frequentist properties, and the credible sets thus cannot serve as valid confidence sets even asymptotically. We introduce a novel debiasing approach that corrects the bias for the entire Bayesian posterior distribution. We establish a new Bernstein-von Mises theorem that guarantees the frequentist validity of the debiased posterior. We demonstrate the practical performance of our proposal through Monte Carlo simulations and two empirical applications in economics.

*School of Management and Economics and Shenzhen Finance Institute, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen (CUHK-Shenzhen); qihuichen@cuhk.edu.cn

†Department of Economics, Emory University; zheng.fang@emory.edu

‡CUHK Business School, Chinese University of Hong Kong; ruixuanliu@cuhk.edu.hk

1 Introduction

Applied researchers now routinely work with regression models that feature a large number of covariates. A primary inferential goal in econometrics is to estimate the *ceteris paribus* effect of a specific variable while controlling for other variables (Belloni et al., 2013a, 2018). The prevailing practice interprets the coefficient on a regressor as a causal effect, conditional on the included controls. As the plausibility of conditional unconfoundedness is often argued using a large set of covariates, practitioners have increasingly embraced high-dimensional regression models. This setting has been extensively studied, predominantly using frequentist methods.

Bayesian inference, on the other hand, has long been valued for its coherent framework for handling uncertainty in statistical analysis. As highlighted by Rubin (1984), Bayesian methods provide direct answers to many empirical questions by quantifying uncertainty about unknown parameters conditional on the observed data.¹ This appeal has grown among applied researchers, who often seek probabilistic statements about particular parameters of interest given the specific dataset at hand. Bayesian posterior distributions conveniently encapsulate both sampling variation and parametric uncertainty, unifying estimation and inference in a way that aligns well with the needs of empirical work.

In addressing the challenges posed by high dimensionality, recent methodological advances have substantially expanded the Bayesian toolkit for regression models with many covariates. Notable progress includes the development of spike-and-slab priors (Mitchell and Beauchamp, 1988; George and McCulloch, 1993) and horseshoe priors (Carvalho et al., 2010), as well as scalable approximate Bayesian inference techniques (Ray and Szabó, 2022). These innovations have attracted a growing interest in economics, as illustrated by Giannone et al. (2021). However, while much of this literature focuses on model selection and estimation, relatively less attention has been devoted to delivering valid inference for a particular parameter of interest in the presence of high-dimensional controls—a central need in many empirical applications. This paper aims to fill this gap.

Specifically, we develop a novel inferential procedure for high-dimensional linear regression that introduces a debiasing step for the Bayesian posterior distribution of the parameter of interest. Building on the concept of debiased point estimators, which is well established in the frequentist literature, we instead debias the entire posterior distribution, yielding a new debiased Bayesian approach. Our method is tailored to

¹In discussing the commonly-used rule-of-thumb confidence interval, Rubin (1984) states that “the interval is—at least in my experience—nearly always interpreted Bayesianly, that is, as providing a fixed observed interval in which the unknown (parameter of interest) μ lies with 95% probability.” As advocated by Imbens (2021), it may even be preferable to adopt Bayesian inference in cases where Bayesian and frequentist procedures lead to different conclusions.

high-dimensional settings and constructs credible sets from the debiased posterior, while remaining faithful to Bayesian principles by conditioning on the observed data.

The core theoretical contribution of our work is the establishment of new Bernstein-von Mises (BvM) results for the debiased Bayesian procedure. Our framework allows the number of covariates p to exceed the sample size n , with p growing exponentially in n . These results formally justify the asymptotic normality of the debiased posterior and ensure that credible sets achieve correct frequentist coverage under repeated sampling, thereby helping to bridge the gap between Bayesian and frequentist inference. Importantly, our results show that, after debiasing, Bayesian credible sets can match the performance of debiased frequentist methods—such as double machine learning (Chernozhukov et al., 2018)—in high-dimensional regimes. This effort also echoes an important point made by Rubin (1981) regarding the assessment of Bayesian procedures under repeated sampling. Our framework is notably general. It is agnostic to the choice of prior for the regression coefficients and permits flexible selection of pilot estimators for the precision matrix. The specific implementations we present in Section 4.2 illustrate how the method can be practically adapted to high-dimensional settings. This flexibility allows the procedure to be tailored to a wide range of empirical applications without sacrificing computational scalability.

Another key advantage of our approach is its compatibility with computationally efficient approximate Bayesian inference, such as variational Bayes (Ray and Szabó, 2022). Traditional spike-and-slab priors, while theoretically appealing, often entail substantial computational cost due to the reliance on Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) sampling. In contrast, variational Bayes delivers approximate posteriors within seconds, while still attaining optimal contraction rates in high-dimensional settings. However, without debiasing, credible sets constructed from such approximate posteriors are not guaranteed to achieve correct frequentist coverage. By incorporating our debiasing procedure, the variational Bayes posterior becomes a principled tool for valid uncertainty quantification.

Our approach parallels an important line of work in the frequentist literature, in particular the debiasing of LASSO-type estimators (Javanmard and Montanari, 2014; van de Geer et al., 2014; Zhang and Zhang, 2014). The LASSO estimator itself can be viewed as the posterior mode under a Laplace prior, yet it typically exhibits bias and therefore requires post-estimation correction. Whereas debiased frequentist methods adjust a point estimator and then rely on its asymptotic properties for inference, our Bayesian debiasing method extends this idea to the entire posterior distribution. Because the debiasing step is applied at the posterior level, we develop new technical arguments to establish its large-sample properties. Monte Carlo simulations show that our procedure delivers substantial improvements over standard (uncorrected) Bayesian methods and remains competitive with debiased frequentist procedures in terms of cov-

erage and estimation accuracy. In particular, when regression coefficients are large, our method offers pronounced advantages over debiased frequentist approaches, providing practitioners with a powerful tool for empirical analysis in high-dimensional settings.

Our work contributes to the active literature on the frequentist validity of Bayesian inference in high-dimensional regression. Early contributions by Ghosal (1999) and Bontemps (2011) established asymptotic normality of the posterior in Gaussian linear regression when the number of covariates grows slowly with the sample size. However, these results do not accommodate sparsity and require the ambient dimension to remain smaller than the sample size (see Bontemps (2011, p. 2563)). More recently, Castillo et al. (2015) analyzed Bayesian posteriors under spike-and-slab priors, establishing mixed normality under strong signal conditions; see also Wu et al. (2023) for extensions. Yang (2019) introduced a debiasing approach based on reparameterization and targeted prior modification, assigning a data-dependent Gaussian prior to the parameter of interest. Building on this idea, Castillo et al. (2024) incorporated mean-field approximation strategies to distinguish between high-dimensional nuisance parameters and parameters of interest. In contrast, our approach attains debiasing via a post-processing step applied to the posterior, preserving standard Bayesian modeling and computation and allowing practitioners to directly leverage existing Bayesian methods for high-dimensional regression.

Our paper also connects with broader developments in semiparametric Bayesian inference and correction methods for posterior or prior distributions (Ray and van der Vaart, 2020; Breunig et al., 2025a, 2024, 2025b; Yiu et al., 2025). These works depart from naive plug-in principles to achieve robust large-sample properties under weak conditions. We contribute to this literature by explicitly addressing high-dimensional regression with sparsity-inducing priors and by showing that debiasing can be performed on approximate posteriors. Theoretically, we also establish BvM results for a growing subset of coefficients, which is a novel contribution in this context. Recently, DiTraglia and Liu (2025) proposed a Bayesian analog of double machine learning for linear regression when the number of covariates is relatively small, in the sense that $p = o(n)$. Their approach relies on priors for reduced-form covariance matrices to remain consistent with the likelihood principle (Walker, 2023). However, when p is large relative to n , practical computation of posteriors for high-dimensional covariance matrices remains challenging.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces our inferential procedure and discusses implementation details, while Section 3 presents two empirical applications. In Section 4, we develop our main theoretical results under high-level conditions, which are then verified under more primitive assumptions. Section 5 examines the finite-sample performance of our procedure through Monte Carlo simulations. Section 6 concludes. All proofs and supporting results are relegated to the appendices, which also contain additional simulation evidence.

2 Debiased Bayesian Inference

Consider the prototypical linear regression model:

$$Y_i = X_i^\top \beta_0 + \varepsilon_i, \quad \mathbb{E}_0[X_i \varepsilon_i] = 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where $\{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent and identically distributed (*i.i.d.*) and $\mathbb{E}_0[\cdot]$ is the population expectation. The covariate X_i is a p -dimensional vector, with p potentially exceeding the sample size n . The true regression coefficient vector β_0 is assumed to be sparse, in the sense that only a small subset of regressors have nonzero effects. We denote the population covariance matrix of X_i by $\Omega_0 := \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^\top]$, and its inverse, the precision matrix, by $\Theta_0 := \Omega_0^{-1}$.

Since the seminal work of [Tibshirani \(1996\)](#), the LASSO has become the default method for estimating the high-dimensional linear regression model, owing to its ability to perform model selection and coefficient estimation simultaneously. It is well known that the LASSO estimator, as a penalized least-squares estimator, can be interpreted as a Bayesian point estimator—specifically, the posterior mode under independent Laplace priors on the regression coefficients (see [Remark 4.2](#)). However, when one considers the entire posterior distribution rather than only its mode, the Laplace prior alone fails to induce sparsity: the resulting posterior remains non-sparse and does not contract toward the true parameter at the optimal rate, unlike its mode. As shown in [Theorem 7 of Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#), the full Bayesian posterior corresponding to the Laplace prior lacks desirable asymptotic properties.²

Our method is inspired by the frequentist literature on debiased inference ([Zhang and Zhang, 2014](#)), which applies a debiasing step to the LASSO estimator. Let $\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{Pilot}}$ denote any pilot estimator of β_0 , and let $\hat{\Theta}_n$ be a pilot estimator of the precision matrix Θ_0 . The celebrated debiased inference procedure is based on the following construction:

$$\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{Debias}} = \hat{\beta}_n^{\text{Pilot}} + \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_n^{\text{Pilot}}) \right]. \quad (2)$$

It is well established that the individual coordinates of the debiased estimator $\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{Debias}}$ are asymptotically normal, enabling valid statistical inference.

Our debiased Bayesian inference procedure departs from the frequentist approach in several key respects. The Bayesian modeling perspective treats the unknown regression coefficient as the random vector β . We begin by assigning a sparsity-inducing prior, such as a spike-and-slab prior or a horseshoe-type prior, and computing the (approximate)

²[Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#) remark that “the LASSO is essentially non-Bayesian, in the sense that the corresponding full posterior distribution is a useless object” (p.1988). In practice, sampled posterior distributions of regression coefficients under the Laplace prior are indeed non-sparse ([Bai et al., 2021](#)).

mate) initial posterior distribution of β , denoted by $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | \{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n)$. Under sparsity, the resulting posterior achieves (near-)optimal contraction rates (Castillo et al., 2015; Gao et al., 2020; Song and Liang, 2023). We then debias the entire posterior distribution using a correction term analogous to the frequentist construction. In this step, however, we replace the uniform weights $1/n$ with Bayesian bootstrap weights. Specifically, the Bayesian bootstrap weights are defined by normalizing independent standard exponential random variables (independent of $\{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the prior of β):

$$W_{ni} = \frac{\omega_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j}, \quad \{\omega_j\}_{j=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Exp}(1) \quad , i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

In summary, we study the debiased posterior of the form:

$$\tilde{\beta} = \beta + \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta) \right], \quad (4)$$

where $\beta \sim \Pi_\beta(\cdot | \{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n)$ and $\hat{\Theta}_n$ is as introduced above. The pseudo-code for generating draws from the debiased posterior is provided in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Debiased Bayesian Procedure

Input: Data $\{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$; number of posterior draws B .

Prior Specification: Select a sparsity-inducing prior for β .

Pilot Estimation: Choose a pilot estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n$ of the precision matrix Θ_0 .

Posterior Computation:

for $b = 1, \dots, B$ **do**

(a) Draw β^b from the initial posterior $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | \{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n)$.

(b) Generate Bayesian bootstrap weights:

$$W_{ni}^b = \frac{\omega_i^b}{\sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j^b}, \quad \{\omega_j^b\}_{j=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Exp}(1), \quad i = 1, \dots, n.$$

(c) Compute the debiased posterior draw:

$$\tilde{\beta}^b = \beta^b + \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni}^b X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^b) \right].$$

end for

Output: $\{\tilde{\beta}^b : b = 1, \dots, B\}$

Several remarks are in order. First, the weight replacement is essential. To see this, consider the case $p < n$, where one may take $\hat{\Theta}_n = (\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top / n)^{-1}$. Without the weight replacement, the expression simplifies to $\tilde{\beta} = (\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top)^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i Y_i$, which exhibits no posterior uncertainty. Second, the debiasing step introduces no additional

computational burden. Since the Bayesian bootstrap weights are independent of the posterior draws of β , steps (a) and (b) of Algorithm 1 can be parallelized efficiently to save time. Moreover, the one-time computation of $\hat{\Theta}_n$ can be carried out simultaneously, which remains computationally efficient as known in the frequentist literature (see the additional discussion in Section 4.3). Third, step (c) of Algorithm 1 admits a natural interpretation as a Bayesian version of the residual bootstrap. Specifically, consider the case $p < n$ with $\hat{\Theta}_n = (\sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top / n)^{-1}$. For a given posterior draw β^b , define bootstrap residuals ε_i^{b*} as $\varepsilon_i^b = Y_i - X_i^\top \beta^b$ weighted by the Bayesian bootstrap weights W_{ni}^b . Construct the pseudo responses $Y_i^{b*} = X_i^\top \beta^b + \varepsilon_i^{b*}$ and regress Y_i^{b*} on X_i . The resulting estimator coincides with $\tilde{\beta}^b$. Thus, each debiased posterior draw $\tilde{\beta}^b$ can be viewed as the regression coefficient obtained from a “Bayesian residual bootstrap,” where residuals are reweighted via Bayesian bootstrap rather than resampled as in the classical residual bootstrap. While other bootstrap weights can be employed, the Bayesian bootstrap weights provide a natural Bayesian interpretation (see Section 4.3).

Our debiased Bayesian procedure provides simultaneous point estimation and uncertainty quantification. For $j = 1, \dots, p$, let $\beta_{0,j}$ and $\tilde{\beta}_j^b$ be the j th coordinate of β_0 and $\tilde{\beta}^b$ respectively. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, a $100(1 - \alpha)\%$ credible set for the regression coefficient $\beta_{0,j}$ is defined as:

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha, B) = [\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2, B), \hat{c}_{n,j}(1 - \alpha/2, B)], \quad (5)$$

where $\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha, B)$ denotes the α th quantile of the posterior draws $\{\tilde{\beta}_j^b : b = 1, \dots, B\}$. The Bayesian point estimator (posterior mean) is obtained by averaging the simulation draws: $\tilde{\beta}_j = \sum_{b=1}^B \tilde{\beta}_j^b / B$ for each $j = 1 \dots, p$.

3 Insights from Empirical Applications

Our paper aims not only to present a comprehensive theoretical development, but also to demonstrate the empirical benefits through concrete empirical applications. Before presenting the theoretical properties of our debiased Bayesian inference method, we first demonstrate its practical utility through two empirical examples adapted from [Giannone et al. \(2021\)](#). In both cases, our goal is not to determine the overall sparsity of the regressors, but rather to evaluate the significance of a particular regressor—an objective well suited to our inference procedure.

For each application, we begin by presenting standard Bayesian inference results for the coefficient of interest using both a spike-and-slab prior and a horseshoe-type prior. The prior specifications and hyperparameter settings follow those used in our Monte Carlo simulations. For the spike-and-slab prior, we obtain the posterior distribution via the variational Bayesian approximation described in [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#), draw-

ing 8,000 samples from the resulting approximate posterior. The posterior under the horseshoe prior is generated using the MCMC algorithm of [Kim et al. \(2020\)](#), with a total of 16,000 draws and the first 8,000 discarded as burn-in. In both applications, the spike-and-slab posterior collapses to a point mass at zero. Under the horseshoe prior, the posterior exhibits greater dispersion, though in the second application the density remains tightly concentrated near zero. In both cases, the 95% credible intervals include zero, implying that the effects are insignificant at the 5% level.

To implement the debiasing adjustment, we estimate the precision matrix using the nodewise LASSO regression method of [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#), adopting the default tuning parameters from the R package `hdi` ([Dezeure et al., 2015](#)). For the Bayesian bootstrap, we generate 8,000 additional sets of bootstrap weights in parallel with the posterior draws of the regression coefficients. After applying the debiasing step, the posterior densities become approximately Gaussian, providing empirical support for our theoretical results. Overall, the debiased inference reveals a significant effect in the first application but no significant effect in the second.

3.1 Determinants of Economic Growth

The influential work of [Barro \(1991\)](#) initiated a long-standing debate over what drives long-term economic growth across countries. Researchers have identified numerous potential predictors, many of which are included in the original data set compiled by [Barro \(1991\)](#). In line with [Belloni et al. \(2013b\)](#), we use this data set to analyze average GDP growth between 1960 and 1985 for 90 countries. The data set contains 60 candidate predictors, covering pre-1960 measures of a wide range of socio-economic, institutional, and geographical factors. Using standard Bayesian inference methods, we find that all of the posterior results are statistically insignificant. However, applying our debiased Bayesian approach uncovers a significant negative association between the initial GDP level and subsequent growth. This suggests the presence of catch-up effect, everything else equal, which is in line with the neoclassical economic growth theory.

3.2 Decline in Crime Rates

Using U.S. state-level data, [Donohue III and Levitt \(2001\)](#) identified a strong relationship between the legalization of abortion following the 1973 *Roe v. Wade* decision and the subsequent decline in crime rates. In their analysis, the dependent variable is the change in log per capita murder rates between 1986 and 1997 across states. This outcome is regressed on a measure of the effective abortion rate—which is always included as a predictor alongside twelve year dummy variables—and a collection of controls capturing alternative determinants of crime, such as the number of police officers and prisoners per 1,000 residents, among others. [Belloni et al. \(2014\)](#) extended the set of controls




Figure 1: Posterior distribution with 95% credible set

by incorporating these variables in various forms, including levels, differences, squared differences, cross-products, initial conditions, and interactions with linear and quadratic time trends, resulting in a database of 284 variables and 576 observations. When analyzing this expanded model, the coefficient on the abortion rate is consistently found to be insignificant across all methods. Note that the horseshoe induced posterior places almost all of its posterior mass at zero, which is close to the degenerate (at zero) posterior of the spike-and-slab. Therefore, these two debiased posteriors—whether based on the spike-and-slab or horseshoe priors—are largely indistinguishable in this application. In this example, standard Bayesian approaches place (nearly) all posterior mass at zero, while our debiased Bayesian procedure yields more nuanced posterior distributions that may better capture estimation uncertainty.




Figure 2: Posterior distribution with 95% credible set (blue and red overlap)

4 Main Theoretical Results

Various features of posterior distributions are used by empirical researchers for frequentist type inference. In particular, regions with high posterior probabilities, known as credible sets, are often interpreted as confidence sets. The frequentist validity of the debiased posterior distributions serves as a theoretical justification for the proposed Bayesian procedure. In this section, we present the main theoretical results, beginning with a generic BvM theorem formulated under a set of high-level conditions. The result applies broadly and is not restricted to specific prior choices.

For the reader's convenience, we introduce notation that will be used throughout the paper. Let I_p denote the $p \times p$ identity matrix, e_j its j th column, and E_J the matrix formed by any J columns of I_p . For $1 \leq q < \infty$, we write $\|v\|_q$ for the standard ℓ_q -norm of a vector v , that is, $\|v\|_q := (\sum_j |v_j|^q)^{1/q}$. We use $\|v\|_0$ to denote the number of nonzero entries of v , and $\|v\|_\infty$ for its sup-norm. For a matrix A , $\|A\|_q$ denotes the induced (operator) ℓ_q -norm for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, and $\|A\|_{\max}$ the elementwise sup-norm. For two positive sequences a_n and b_n , we write $a_n \lesssim b_n$ if $a_n \leq Cb_n$ for some constant C and all n , and $a_n \asymp b_n$ if $a_n \lesssim b_n$ and $b_n \lesssim a_n$. Let $Z^{(n)} := \{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the data and $W^{(n)} := \{W_{ni}\}_{i=1}^n$ the Bayesian bootstrap weights. As previously, $\mathbb{E}_0[\cdot]$ indicates that the expectation is evaluated with respect to the distribution of $Z^{(n)}$ under $\beta = \beta_0$, while $\Pi_W(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ denotes the conditional distribution of $W^{(n)}$ given $Z^{(n)}$. Since $W^{(n)}$ is independent of $Z^{(n)}$, this conditional distribution does not depend on $Z^{(n)}$. For a positive sequence r_n , the asymptotic symbols $o_{P_0}(r_n)$ and $O_{P_0}(r_n)$ are defined with respect to the same underlying probability measure P_0 . The sub-Gaussian norm of a random variable Z , denoted by $\|Z\|_{\psi_2}$, is defined as $\|Z\|_{\psi_2} := \inf\{t > 0 : \mathbb{E}_0[\exp(Z^2/t^2)] \leq 2\}$. For a random vector Z , its sub-Gaussian norm is defined as $\|Z\|_{\psi_2} := \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Z^\top x\|_{\psi_2}$.

4.1 Bernstein-von Mises Theorem

We begin by establishing the result under high-level assumptions that specify the posterior contraction rate of $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$, the convergence rate of the precision matrix estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n$, a frequentist point estimator that centers the debiased posterior distribution, and suitable moment and regularity conditions.

Assumption 4.1 (Contraction rate of $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$). *There exist some constant $C > 0$ and a positive sequence $\epsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi_\beta(\|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 \geq C\epsilon_n | Z^{(n)})] \rightarrow 0.$$

Assumption 4.2 (Convergence rate of $\hat{\Theta}_n$). *Let $\hat{\Omega}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top / n$. There exist*

positive sequences $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\delta_n \rightarrow 0$ such that

$$\|\hat{\Theta}_n \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} = O_{P_0}(\gamma_n) \text{ and } \|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\infty} = O_{P_0}(\delta_n).$$

Assumption 4.3 (Centering point estimator). *There exists a point estimator $\hat{\beta}_n$ (depending only on $Z^{(n)}$) such that the following expansion holds*

$$\hat{\beta}_n = \beta_0 + \Theta_0 \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i + \Delta_n, \text{ where } \|\Delta_n\|_{\infty} = o_{P_0}(n^{-1/2}).$$

Assumption 4.4 (Moment and regularity conditions). *(i) $\{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. and satisfy the model (1); (ii) X_i 's are sub-Gaussian random vectors with $\|X_i\|_{\psi_2} \in (0, \infty)$; (iii) ε_i 's are sub-Gaussian random variables with $\|\varepsilon_i\|_{\psi_2} \in (0, \infty)$; (iv) $\mathbb{E}_0[e_j^T \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i]^3 < \infty$ for each $j = 1, \dots, p$.*

Assumption 4.1 imposes a contraction rate on the initial posterior distribution of β . We later provide primitive conditions under which this assumption holds for both spike-and-slab priors and horseshoe-type priors (Castillo et al., 2015; Song and Liang, 2023). Importantly, we allow for either the exact posterior or an approximate posterior for β . The exact posterior arises directly from the Bayes' rule, given a prior and the likelihood function. In low-dimensional settings, standard MCMC algorithms can deliver fairly accurate approximations to this exact posterior. In contrast, in high-dimensional problems, it may no longer be feasible. For example, the point-mass spike-and-slab prior is often considered theoretically ideal for sparse Bayesian problems. However, exploring the full posterior over the entire model space using point-mass spike-and-slab priors can be computationally prohibitive, because of the combinatorial complexity of updating the discrete indicators whether to include each variable or not. Recently, the variational Bayesian approximation has become increasingly popular where one relies on an approximate posterior that minimizes the Kullback–Leibler divergence to the true posterior within a restricted family, such as the mean-field variational family. We provide sufficient conditions to ensure that Assumption 4.1 holds for mean-field variational approximations under spike-and-slab priors (Ray and Szabó, 2022).

Assumption 4.2 specifies the convergence rate of the precision matrix estimator. When the dimensionality p is fixed, this condition is trivially satisfied by the plug-in estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n = \hat{\Omega}_n^{-1}$ with $\gamma_n = 0$ and $\delta_n = n^{-1/2}$ under mild moment assumptions. In high-dimensional settings ($p \rightarrow \infty$), we will present primitive conditions under which the assumption holds when $\hat{\Theta}_n$ is obtained from the nodewise LASSO regressions of van de Geer et al. (2014) or the CLIME approach of Cai et al. (2011). Assumption 4.3 requires the existence of a frequentist point estimator that serves as the center of the debiased posterior. It is satisfied by the OLS estimator when p is fixed and by the debiased LASSO estimator in high-dimensional models (van de Geer et al., 2014).

under the primitive conditions provided in Section 4.2. Besides LASSO, other types of pilot estimators have also been studied in the literature; see Remark 4.2. Finally, Assumption 4.4 imposes sub-Gaussianity on both the regressors and the error terms. These regularity conditions are standard in the high-dimensional inference literature and ensure well-behaved concentration of sample quantities.

The debiased posterior distribution is jointly determined by the initial posterior distribution of β and the distribution of the Bayesian bootstrap weights. Specifically, the debiased posterior distribution is determined by

$$\Pi(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) := \Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) \times \Pi_W(\cdot | Z^{(n)}), \quad (6)$$

where $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ and $\Pi_W(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ are, respectively, the initial posterior distribution of β and the distribution of the Bayesian bootstrap weights conditional on the data. For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, let $\mathcal{L}_\Pi(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) | Z^{(n)})$ denote the posterior law of $e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$ given $Z^{(n)}$. We study the weak convergence of these posterior laws, which we measure using the bounded Lipschitz distance d_{BL} . For probability measures P and Q on \mathbf{R}^k , the bounded Lipschitz distance is defined as

$$d_{BL}(P, Q) := \sup \left\{ \left| \int f d(P - Q) \right| : \|f\|_{BL} \leq 1 \right\}, \quad (7)$$

where the bounded Lipschitz norm of a measurable function $f : \mathbf{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is given by

$$\|f\|_{BL} := \sup_{x \in \mathbf{R}^k} |f(x)| + \sup_{x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|_\infty}. \quad (8)$$

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose Assumptions 4.1-4.4 hold. If $\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n\|\Theta_0\|_\infty + \delta_n)(\sqrt{\log p/n} + \log^2 n \log^2 p/n) \rightarrow 0$, then for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,*

$$d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_\Pi(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) | Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0,$$

where $\sigma_{0,j}^2 := e_j^\top \Theta_0 \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^\top \varepsilon_i^2] \Theta_0 e_j$. That is, the posterior law of each coordinate of $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$ converges weakly to a normal distribution in probability.

Theorem 4.1 establishes a coordinatewise BvM result for the debiased posterior. In particular, the asymptotic variance $\sigma_{0,j}^2$ for the j th coordinate of $\sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$ coincides with the asymptotic variance for the centering point estimator in Assumption 4.3 under general, possibly heteroskedastic, errors. The rate conditions $\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$ and $\sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n\|\Theta_0\|_\infty + \delta_n)(\sqrt{\log p/n} + \log^2 n \log^2 p/n) \rightarrow 0$ ensure two key properties: (i) the bias stemming from the initial posterior and the error from estimating the precision matrix are asymptotically negligible; and (ii) the residual posterior uncertainty, after the debiasing correction, is asymptotically Gaussian. Importantly, the theorem accommodates a high-dimensional regime in which the dimensionality p may grow exponentially

with the sample size n . As will be shown later, under spike-and-slab or horseshoe priors for β and nodewise LASSO or CLIME estimation for Θ_0 , the quantities ϵ_n , γ_n , and δ_n can all be of order $\sqrt{\log p/n}$ if the sparsity levels of β_0 and Θ_0 are bounded (implying $\|\Theta_0\|_\infty$ is bounded). Hence, the result remains valid as long as $\log^{5/2} p$ grows at most linearly with n , up to logarithmic factors.

The BvM theorem enables the construction of marginal credible intervals for any coordinate of the regression coefficient from the debiased posterior. For $0 < \alpha < 1$, let $q_{n,j}(\alpha)$ denote the α th quantile of the debiased posterior distribution for the j th coefficient—that is, the α th conditional quantile of $\tilde{\beta}_j$ (the j th coordinate of $\tilde{\beta}$) given $Z^{(n)}$. We study the asymptotic frequentist coverage of the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ credible intervals, defined for $j = 1, \dots, p$ as

$$\mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha) = [q_{n,j}(\alpha/2), q_{n,j}(1 - \alpha/2)]. \quad (9)$$

In practice, $\mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha)$ is infeasible but can be approximated by its simulated counterpart $\mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha, B)$ defined in (5) by taking a large B .

Corollary 4.1. *Under the conditions of Theorem 4.1, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, if in addition $\sigma_{0,j}^2$ is bounded away from zero, then*

$$P_0(\beta_{0,j} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha)) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha.$$

This corollary provides an important frequentist implication of Theorem 4.1: the Bayesian credible intervals derived from the debiased posterior achieve asymptotically correct frequentist coverage for each regression coefficient. In other words, for large samples, the posterior-based uncertainty quantification coincides with the frequentist notion of confidence intervals, thereby unifying Bayesian and frequentist inference in high-dimensional settings.

We next consider simultaneous inference for a growing number of coefficients. Without loss of generality, we focus on the first J coordinates. For this purpose, we strengthen Assumption 4.4(iv) to the following condition.

Assumption 4.5 (Moment condition for simultaneous inference). *(i) The eigenvalues of $\Sigma_{0,J}^2 := E_J^\top \Theta_0 \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^\top \varepsilon_i^2] \Theta_0 E_J$ are bounded; (ii) there exists a sequence $\nu_J > 0$ such that $\{\mathbb{E}_0[\|E_J^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i\|_\infty^3]\}^{1/3} = O(\nu_J)$.*

Assumption 4.5(i) is satisfied if, for example, $\mathbb{E}_0[\varepsilon_i^2 | X_i]$ is constant and the eigenvalues of Ω_0 are bounded away from zero. Assumption 4.5 (ii) holds with $\nu_J = O(\log J)$ when the random vectors $\Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i$ are sub-exponential.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose Assumptions 4.1-4.3, 4.4(i)-(iii), and 4.5 hold. If $\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$,*

$\sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n \|\Theta_0\|_\infty + \delta_n)(\sqrt{\log p/n} + \log^2 n \log^2 p/n) \rightarrow 0$, and $\nu_J^6 J^3 \log^9(1+J)/n \rightarrow 0$, then

$$d_{BL}\left(\mathcal{L}_\Pi(E_J^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \Sigma_{0,J}^2)\right) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0.$$

Theorem 4.2 extends the marginal BvM result in Theorem 4.1 to simultaneous inference on a growing subset of regression coefficients. Specifically, the result establishes joint asymptotic normality of the debiased posterior for any subvector of $\tilde{\beta}$ of size J , provided that J increases with the sample size n at a suitable rate. This rate is derived from the strong approximation result for the exchangeable bootstrap in Fang et al. (2023). The condition $\nu_J^6 J^3 \log^9(1+J)/n \rightarrow 0$ captures the complexity of the simultaneous inference problem, balancing the growth of the subset dimension against sample size and moment bounds. If we assume enough moment restrictions on $\|E_J^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i\|_\infty$ (e.g., $\mathbb{E}_0[\|E_J^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i\|_\infty^4]$ being bounded uniformly in n and p), we can obtain Theorem 4.2 under $J/n^2 \rightarrow \infty$ (up to logarithmic factors) by Theorem B.2.

4.2 Primitive Conditions

We now verify the high-level conditions in Assumptions 4.1-4.3 by introducing a set of primitive conditions. For concreteness, we focus on a benchmark specification in which the regression coefficients are assigned a spike-and-slab prior, the precision matrix is estimated via the nodewise LASSO procedure, and the centering point estimator is constructed by the debiased LASSO. The general theoretical framework, however, extends to global-local shrinkage priors, including the horseshoe family, and other estimation approaches for the precision matrix, including the CLIME approach. Detailed results for these additional cases are provided in the Appendix.

We follow the construction of Castillo et al. (2015), who specify the spike-and-slab prior through the following hierarchical mixture for $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$,

$$\pi(\beta|r, \lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^p [(1-r) \delta_0(\beta_j) + r \psi(\beta_j|\lambda)], \quad (10)$$

where δ_0 denotes a point mass at zero, and $\psi(\beta_j|\lambda) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \exp(-\lambda|\beta_j|)$ is the Laplace density with hyperparameter $\lambda > 0$. The mixing weight r controls the proportion of nonzero coefficients³ and thus governs the degree of model sparsity. Following Castillo et al. (2015), we assign a Beta hyper-prior

$$r \sim \text{Beta}(1, p^u), \quad (11)$$

³If r were taken to be deterministic, it would represent the expected number of nonzero coefficients *a priori*.

with hyperparameter $u > 1$, large values of which favor sparse models by placing most of the prior mass on small values of r .

The point mass in the spike-and-slab prior is designed for explicit variable selection. However, the posterior under this prior places mass over all 2^p candidate models, which is computationally prohibitive in high dimensions. We therefore adopt a variational Bayesian approximation scheme. The variational posterior is defined as the best approximation of the posterior within a given class. The crux is to choose this class both sufficiently rich to approximate the exact posterior well, while at the same time also simple enough so that the minimization problem can be efficiently solved. For this purpose, we consider the following mean-field family from [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#) for $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_p)^\top$, $\sigma^2 = (\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_p^2)^\top$, and $\gamma = (\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_p)^\top$,

$$\mathcal{P}_{MF} := \left\{ P_{\mu, \sigma^2, \gamma} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^p [\gamma_j N(\mu_j, \sigma_j^2) + (1 - \gamma_j) \delta_0] : \mu_j \in \mathbf{R}, \sigma_j^2 > 0, \gamma_j \in [0, 1] \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where γ_j plays the role of a variational inclusion probability. The resulting variational Bayesian approximate posterior is defined as the minimizer of the Kullback-Leibler divergence with respect to the exact posterior:

$$\tilde{\Pi}_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) = \arg \min_{P_{\mu, \sigma^2, \gamma} \in \mathcal{P}_{MF}} \text{KL} \left(P_{\mu, \sigma^2, \gamma} \parallel \Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) \right), \quad (13)$$

where $\text{KL}(P \parallel Q) := \int \log(dP/dQ) dP$ for two probability distributions P and Q , and $\Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ is the exact posterior. Note that the above mean-field class enforces substantial independence in the approximated posterior. By doing so, it significantly reduces the model complexity, because there are only p inclusion variables γ_j to consider, rather than a total of 2^p models which the exact posterior puts mass on.

The mean-field class approximates the posterior distribution by a product-form distribution, thereby ignoring dependence among different coordinates. Nevertheless, it has been shown to achieve the desired rate of contraction to the true parameter ([Ray and Szabó, 2022](#)), which is essential for our high-level conditions to ensure the asymptotic normality of the debiased posterior. Without the debiasing step, however, the variational posterior generally fails to deliver asymptotically correct coverage, even in low-dimensional parametric settings ([Wang and Blei, 2019](#)). This highlights the versatility of our debiasing proposal from a complementary perspective. The trade-off for relaxing the exactness of the posterior distribution lies in the substantial computational gains. Component-wise coordinate-ascent variational inference algorithms for $\tilde{\Pi}_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ are given in [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#). Beyond the mean-field family, our arguments also extend to other closely related variational classes that allow dependence among the nonzero coordinates (see Equation (9) in [Ray and Szabó, 2022](#)), yielding analogous theoretical guarantee.

Turning to Assumption 4.2, we consider the nodewise LASSO regression following van de Geer et al. (2014). Let $X_{j,i}$ denote the j th component of X_i and let $X_{-j,i} \in \mathbf{R}^{p-1}$ be the subvector of X_i excluding its j th entry. For each $j = 1, \dots, p$, we define the following LASSO regression:

$$\hat{\theta}_j := \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathbf{R}^{p-1}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{j,i} - X_{-j,i}^\top \theta)^2 + 2\lambda_j \|\theta\|_1, \quad (14)$$

with the corresponding residual variance given by

$$\hat{\tau}_j^2 := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (X_{j,i} - X_{-j,i}^\top \hat{\theta}_j)^2 + \lambda_j \|\hat{\theta}_j\|_1, \quad (15)$$

where $\lambda_j > 0$ is a tuning parameter. Writing $\hat{\theta}_j = (\hat{\theta}_{j,1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{j,j-1}, \hat{\theta}_{j,j+1}, \dots, \hat{\theta}_{j,p})$, we construct the estimated precision matrix $\hat{\Theta}_n$ as

$$\hat{\Theta}_n = \begin{pmatrix} 1/\hat{\tau}_1^2 & -\hat{\theta}_{1,2}/\hat{\tau}_1^2 & \cdots & -\hat{\theta}_{1,p}/\hat{\tau}_1^2 \\ -\hat{\theta}_{2,1}/\hat{\tau}_2^2 & 1/\hat{\tau}_2^2 & \cdots & -\hat{\theta}_{2,p}/\hat{\tau}_2^2 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ -\hat{\theta}_{p,1}/\hat{\tau}_p^2 & -\hat{\theta}_{p,2}/\hat{\tau}_p^2 & \cdots & 1/\hat{\tau}_p^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

The estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n$ is motivated by noting that the restriction $\Omega_0^{-1} \Omega_0 = I_p$ amounts to first order conditions of p linear projections after parametrizing Ω_0^{-1} in the same structure as $\hat{\Theta}_n$.

We choose the centering point estimator as the debiased LASSO estimator. For $\hat{\Theta}_n$ given in (14)-(16), the debiased LASSO estimator is given by

$$\hat{\beta}_n = \hat{\beta}_n^{\text{LASSO}} + \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_n^{\text{LASSO}}) \right], \quad (17)$$

where $\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{LASSO}}$ is a LASSO estimator given by

$$\hat{\beta}_n^{\text{LASSO}} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta)^2 + \rho \|\beta\|_1, \quad (18)$$

where $\rho > 0$ is a tuning parameter.

We adopt the following standard notation in analyzing the high-dimensional regression. For a vector $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top \in \mathbf{R}^p$ and a subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ of indices, let β_S be the vector $(\beta_j)_{j \in S} \in \mathbf{R}^{|S|}$, where $|S|$ is the cardinality of S . Let $S_\beta := \{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \beta_j \neq 0\}$ denote the index set of nonzero components of β , and $s_\beta := |S_\beta|$ denote the sparsity level of β . Recall that $\hat{\Omega}_n = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top / n$. Define $\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n) := \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sqrt{e_j^\top \hat{\Omega}_n e_j}$ as the square root of the largest diagonal element of $\hat{\Omega}_n$.

Assumption 4.6 (Model Specification). (i) X_i and ε_i are independent with $\mathbb{E}_0[X_i] = 0$ and $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$; (ii) the eigenvalues of Ω_0 are bounded away from zero and the diagonal entries of Ω_0 are bounded, that is, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} e_j^\top \Omega_0 e_j < \infty$.

Assumption 4.7 (Hyper/Tuning Parameters). (i) $\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)\sqrt{n}/p \leq \lambda \leq 4\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)\sqrt{n \log p}$ holds with probability one; (ii) $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \lambda_j \asymp \sqrt{\log p/n}$; (iii) $\rho \asymp \sqrt{\log p/n}$.

Assumption 4.8 (Sparsity and Dimensionality). The following conditions hold:

$$s_{\beta_0} \|\Theta_0\|_\infty \frac{\log p}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \frac{\log^{3/2} p \log^2 n}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \rightarrow 0$$

and

$$\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \frac{\log p}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \frac{\log^{3/2} p \log^2 n}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \rightarrow 0,$$

where $s_{\Theta_0, j} := s_{\Theta_0 e_j}$ denotes the sparsity level of the j th row/column of Θ_0 .

All the assumptions are standard in the literature. Following [Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#), we assume $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$ for simplicity. In the case of an unknown variance, $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_0^2)$, one may rescale the data using an estimate of σ_0^2 , thereby adopting an empirical Bayes approach. Alternatively, a fully Bayesian treatment can be employed by assigning a prior to σ_0^2 , for instance, an inverse-Gamma prior. In contrast to [Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#) and [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#), we provide primitive conditions for their high-level conditions on compatibility numbers. Since $\|\Theta_0\|_\infty = O(\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \sqrt{s_{\Theta_0, j}})$, Assumption 4.8 involves the sparsity levels of β_0 and Θ_0 and the dimension p . However, the requirements are slightly different from those in the frequentist inference literature. For example, [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) require $s_{\beta_0} \log p / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ and $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \log p / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$. When the sparsity levels of β_0 and Θ_0 are bounded, Assumption 4.8 requires $\log^{5/2} p = o(n / \log^2 n)$, which is slightly more restrictive than $\log p = o(\sqrt{n})$ required in [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#). As in the literature on frequentist inference, p is allowed to grow exponentially with n .

Proposition 4.1. Consider the prior in (10)-(11), the precision matrix estimator in (14)-(16), and the centering point estimator defined by (17)-(18). Suppose Assumptions 4.4-4.8 hold and $\nu_j^6 J^3 \log^9(1 + J)/n \rightarrow 0$. The conclusions of Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 hold for the exact posterior. If $\lambda = O_{P_0}(\sqrt{n \log p} / s_{\beta_0})$, the conclusions also hold for the variational Bayesian approximate posterior in (12)-(13).

Remark 4.1. [Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#) provide thorough theoretical analysis of the exact posterior in high-dimensional settings. They establish a distributional approximation result, showing that the posterior can be approximated by a mixture of normal distributions. Under suitable conditions on the hyperparameter λ and a standard *beta-min* condition, the posterior credible sets achieve correct asymptotic coverage for nonzero coefficients, while assigning asymptotic point mass at zero for truly zero coefficients.

These assumptions are substantially stronger. More importantly, the computational burden of evaluating the exact posterior makes it infeasible in real high-dimensional problems. As our Monte Carlo simulations demonstrate, when using the variational Bayes approximation, the method performs poorly in finite samples related to nonzero coefficients, highlighting the practical limitations of the existing spike-and-slab framework in large-scale problems. ■

Remark 4.2. It is well known that the LASSO estimator corresponds to the posterior mode under the prior: for $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$,

$$\pi(\beta|\lambda) = \prod_{j=1}^p \frac{\lambda}{2} \exp(-\lambda|\beta_j|), \quad (19)$$

where $\lambda > 0$ corresponds to the tuning parameter in LASSO controlling the amount of shrinkage and sparsity. Consequently, the frequentist debiasing approach can be viewed as applying a correction to a Bayesian point estimator. Beyond using the LASSO as the pilot estimator, the literature has also explored other Bayesian point estimators. For instance, [Zhang and Politis \(2022\)](#) focus on ridge regression, which corresponds to the posterior mode under Gaussian priors on the regression coefficients, while [Bai et al. \(2022\)](#) study the posterior mode in the additive regression, arising from a continuous spike-and-slab prior ([Ročková, 2018](#)). Our general debiased Bayesian inference encompasses these and other classes of priors. ■

4.3 Additional Discussions

Our proposal can be seen as performing one-step update based on the identity $\beta_0 = \chi(\beta_0, \Theta_0, F_0)$, where F_0 denotes the distribution of (Y_i, X_i) , and χ is a mapping from the space of (β_0, Θ_0, F_0) to that of β_0 defined by

$$\chi(\beta, \Theta, F) = \beta + \Theta \int x [y - x^\top \beta] dF(y, x). \quad (20)$$

We consider the posterior law of F , denoted by $\Pi_F(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$, to be the Bayesian bootstrap law, which can be viewed as the posterior of F in a nonparametric Bayesian model with a Dirichlet process prior having a degenerate (zero-mass) base measure ([Rubin, 1981](#)). Then, (4) can be expressed as

$$\tilde{\beta} = \chi(\beta, \hat{\Theta}_n, F), \quad (21)$$

where $(\beta, F) | Z^{(n)} \sim \Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) \times \Pi_F(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$. Informally speaking, the debiased posterior is obtained by plugging in the frequentist estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n$ for Θ_0 , the initial posterior for β , and the Bayesian bootstrap for F . Note that the evaluation of $\Pi_F(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$ boils down to $\Pi_W(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$, whose randomness involves the weighted exponential random vari-

ables. Since the two posteriors are conditionally independent, the debiased posterior distribution arises from the product of the initial posterior distribution of β and the posterior distribution of F . Next, we discuss the comparison of our approach with a number of recent proposals in the literature.

Our debiased posterior aligns with the one-step posterior framework of [Yiu et al. \(2025\)](#), which studies scalar parameters of interest in general semiparametric models. Nonetheless, our proposal is distinct in several important ways. First, we consider a high-dimensional regime where the number of covariates may exceed the sample size, and we allow for simultaneous inference for a growing number of coefficients. The one-step correction term in [Yiu et al. \(2025\)](#) involves the influence function perturbed by the Bayesian bootstrap weights. In a linear regression model, the j th regression coefficient $\beta_{0,j}$ has the influence function $(y, x^\top)^\top \mapsto e_j^\top \Theta_0 x (y - x^\top \beta_0)$ at the truth. This representation permits the application of their one-step posterior in fixed-dimensional settings. In contrast, our framework explicitly employs sparsity-inducing priors in high-dimensional regimes. Moreover, the debiasing construction applies to the entire vector of regression coefficients, allowing the number of covariates to exceed the sample size while both n and p diverge. The resulting general BvM theorems enable inference on subvectors of regression coefficients whose dimension can grow with (n, p) .

Second, we estimate Θ_0 via a frequentist method rather than a Bayesian one, which substantially improves computational efficiency. This necessitates addressing non-trivial technical challenges and developing new theoretical results. Suppose the covariates $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are *i.i.d.* draws from $N(0, \Theta_0^{-1})$. The likelihood of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as a function of the precision matrix Θ_0 is

$$L(\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n | \Theta) = \frac{\det(\Theta)^{n/2}}{(2\pi)^{np/2}} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i^\top \Theta X_i \right). \quad (22)$$

A natural Bayesian approach would place a sparsity-inducing prior, such as a spike-and-slab prior or a horseshoe-type prior, on the entries of Θ_0 ([Atchade, 2019](#)). However, computing the posterior distribution of a high-dimensional precision matrix is prohibitive in practice. Our proposal instead adopts a more pragmatic strategy: we simply plug in a frequentist estimator. In particular, one may compute $\hat{\Theta}_n$ either by running p nodewise LASSO regressions or by solving p linear programming problems in CLIME, both of which are computationally efficient. This plug-in approach is feasible because our procedure only requires $\hat{\Theta}_n$ to satisfy certain convergence rate conditions. Since our primary inferential target is the regression coefficients β_0 , and Θ_0 only plays a supporting role, this frequentist plug-in approach is both theoretically valid and practically effective.

Third, we accommodate a broad class of bootstrap weights beyond the Bayesian bootstrap weights; while the Bayesian bootstrap weights provide a natural Bayesian interpretation, alternative weights can be incorporated. A closer look at proofs indicates

that other common exchangeable weights may also be employed. The Bayesian bootstrap law corresponds to the posterior law when the empirical distribution of $\{Y_i, X_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is equipped with a Dirichlet process prior with degenerate (zero-mass) base measure. For more general base measures, however, the resulting posterior law becomes substantially more cumbersome both theoretically and computationally; see Equation (2.1) in [Ray and van der Vaart \(2021\)](#) for a representation of the posterior in this case.

5 Monte Carlo Simulations

In this section, we evaluate the finite-sample performance of the proposed debiased Bayesian inference method through a series of Monte Carlo experiments. Specifically, we examine the frequentist coverage of the Bayesian credible sets and assess estimation accuracy in terms of bias and root mean squared error (RMSE). Beyond the stylized linear model with standard Gaussian errors presented in Section 4, we further demonstrate the robustness and effectiveness of our approach across a range of more complex data-generating processes. We highlight that current results are all based on the default choices of hyper-parameters and tuning parameters in the existing R packages, which do not require additional interventions from users.

We compare our debiased Bayes method with both standard Bayesian inference based on the spike-and-slab prior and a frequentist benchmark—specifically, the debiased inference procedure using a LASSO pilot estimator. The methods under comparison are summarized as follows.

Table 1: Methods Compared in the Simulation Study

Method	Description
Bayes	Standard Bayesian inference using the spike-and-slab prior, where the posterior is approximated via variational Bayes.
Debiased-Bayes	Our proposed debiased Bayesian inference procedure.
Debiased-LASSO	The debiased LASSO estimator of van de Geer et al. (2014) .

Simulation design. We fix the sample size at $n = 100$ and vary the ambient dimensionality of the covariates by setting $p = 50, 100$, and 200 , respectively. The true regression coefficient vector β_0 is sparse with 5 nonzero entries. Specifically, the first five elements of β_0 are set to $(0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 2)$, while the remaining coefficients are zero.

Data-generating processes. We consider six simulation scenarios designed to examine the robustness of each method:

S1 (Homoskedastic Normal): $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, 1)$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$.

S2 (Non-Normal Errors): $\varepsilon_i \sim \chi^2(3) - 3$, i.e., centered chi-squared noise.

S3 (Heteroskedastic Normal): $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma_i^2)$, where $\sigma_i = 1 + |X_{1,i}|$.

The heteroskedastic specification in S3 is similar to that in Section 4.2 of [Hou et al. \(2023\)](#). For S1–S3, the regressors are drawn independently as $X_i \sim N(0, \Theta_0^{-1})$, where Θ_0 is a $p \times p$ diagonal matrix with entries $(1, 2, \dots, p)$ on the diagonal.

S4–S6 (Correlated Covariates): The error terms are specified as in S1–S3, but the covariates X_i are sampled from a correlated Gaussian distribution $N(0, \Theta_0^{-1})$, where Θ_0 is a banded precision matrix with its ij th element defined by

$$\theta_{0,ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } i = j, \\ 0.5, & \text{if } |i - j| = 1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Each simulation scenario is replicated 1,000 times.

Implementation details. For the standard Bayesian method, we employ the variational Bayes algorithm of [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#) to approximate the posterior distribution. Each posterior sample consists of $B = 8,000$ draws from the variational Bayes approximated posterior. The spike-and-slab prior uses a Laplace slab with $\lambda = 1$ and a $\text{Beta}(1, p^u)$ hyperprior on the inclusion probability with $u = 1$. No additional tuning is performed. For the precision matrix estimator $\hat{\Theta}_n$, we adopt the nodewise LASSO regression of [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#), as implemented in the R package `hdi` ([Dezeure et al., 2015](#)). This estimator is used for both the Debiased Bayes and the Debiased LASSO methods to ensure comparability. Our numerical experiments suggest that the default tuning parameters in the package yield stable and robust performance. We anticipate that further optimization of hyper-parameters could potentially improve finite-sample performance, such exploration is beyond the scope of the present study.

Figures 3 and 4 illustrate the empirical coverage probabilities of the 95% credible or confidence sets for the regression coefficients across the simulation scenarios. Specifically, Figure 3 reports results under specifications S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column), with each row corresponding to a different dimensionality setting: $p = 50$, $p = 100$, and $p = 200$. On the horizontal axis, the label 0 represents the average coverage across all zero coefficients in β_0 , whereas labels 1–5 correspond to the coverage probabilities for the nonzero coefficients $(0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1, 2)$, respectively. Figure 4 displays the analogous coverage results for specifications S4–S6, following the same layout and interpretation. We also compare the estimation accuracy of the posterior mean of the debiased posterior distribution against the standard Bayesian posterior

mean and the frequentist debiased estimator. Figures 5 and 6 report the empirical bias of the three estimators, while Figures 7 and 8 present the corresponding RMSE.




Figure 3: Coverage rates corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column). The dashed line represents the 95% benchmark.

We summarize our findings as follows. The standard Bayesian approach based on the spike-and-slab prior performs well in identifying the zero coefficients, as reflected by favorable average coverage, low bias, and small RMSE for these components. However, its performance deteriorates substantially for the nonzero coefficients,⁴ and becomes more fragile when the error distribution departs from the baseline homoscedastic Gaussian specification. In contrast, our proposed debiased Bayes approach consistently outperforms the standard method, achieving markedly better estimation accuracy and more reliable uncertainty quantification across all designs. Relative to the frequentist debiased LASSO benchmark, our method delivers comparable performance under the independent-covariate settings (S1–S3). Notably, in the more challenging correlated-

⁴By contrast, [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#) considered much larger nonzero entries of β_0 (as large as 10), whereas ours are more moderate.




Figure 4: Coverage rates corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S4 (first column), S5 (second column), and S6 (third column). The dashed line represents the 95% benchmark.

covariate scenarios (S4–S6), the debiased Bayes procedure tends to attain substantially improved coverage, lower bias, and smaller RMSE for relatively larger coefficients. Overall, these results demonstrate the robustness and accuracy of the debiased Bayes approach across diverse conditions and the importance of debiasing standard Bayesian procedures in high-dimensional settings. It provides clear improvements over conventional Bayesian inference and exhibits complementary strengths relative to the leading frequentist benchmark.




Figure 5: Bias corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column).

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we develop a new debiased Bayesian inferential method for high-dimensional linear regression models. The construction resembles the frequentist debiasing step, whereas the key difference is that we correct the entire posterior distribution rather than the point estimator. Our approach is tailored to building confidence intervals based on sparsity-inducing priors such as spike-and-slab or horseshoe type priors of the regression coefficients. We establish the frequentist validity of our proposal in the general setup and also provide low-level conditions. It is straightforward to observe that our debiasing step easily extends to other parametric or semiparametric models. To demonstrate the versatility of our general methodology, we mention two possible extensions.

One may consider the generalized linear model for the conditional density function




Figure 6: Bias corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S4 (first column), S5 (second column), and S6 (third column).

of the dependent variable given covariates as follows:

$$p(y|x) \propto \exp(y \cdot x^\top \beta_0 - d(x^\top \beta_0)),$$

where d is a convex link function. In this case, our debiased Bayesian method builds on

$$\tilde{\beta} = \beta + \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i (Y_i - d'(X_i^\top \beta)) \right],$$

where $\hat{\Theta}_n$ stands for a regularized inverse of the Hessian matrix $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n d''(X_i^\top \hat{\beta}_n) X_i X_i^\top$, given some pilot estimator $\hat{\beta}_n$.

One may also incorporate group structure which often occurs in additive models (Bai et al., 2022), multivariate outcome variables regression, and regressors collected over mixed frequencies (Mogliani and Simoni, 2021). For example, consider the linear




Figure 7: RMSE corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S4 (first column), S5 (second column), and S6 (third column).

regression specified by the following form:

$$Y = \sum_{g=1}^G X_g^\top \beta_{g,0} + \varepsilon, \quad (23)$$

where $\beta_{g,0}$ is an $m_g \times 1$ vector of coefficients, and X_g is an $m_g \times 1$ vector of covariates corresponding to group $g = 1, \dots, G$. The number of groups G is potentially larger than the sample size n . In this case, our debiasing procedure is based on

$$\tilde{\beta}_g = \beta_g + \mathcal{E}_g^\top \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i (Y_i - X_i^\top \beta) \right],$$

where \mathcal{E}_g here is the matrix formed by columns of I_p such that $\mathcal{E}_g \beta = \beta_g$ with $\beta = (\beta_1^\top, \dots, \beta_G^\top)^\top$ and $p = m_1 + \dots + m_G$, $X_i = (X_{1,i}^\top, \dots, X_{G,i}^\top)^\top$, and the initial posterior for β can be obtained by the group spike-and-slab prior from [Bai et al. \(2022\)](#).




Figure 8: RMSE corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S4 (first column), S5 (second column), and S6 (third column).

For both extensions, we believe our debiased Bayesian inference offers interesting new insights. We will defer the detailed theoretical development, as well as practical performance to some future work.

APPENDIX A Proofs of Main Results

We provide some heuristic discussions of the proofs of our theoretical results. Starting from the definition of $\tilde{\beta}$ in (4) and the expansion of $\hat{\beta}_n$ in Assumption 4.3, we obtain

from the model (1) the following decomposition:

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n &= \underbrace{\Theta_0 \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \right) X_i \varepsilon_i \right]}_{S_n} + \underbrace{(\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0) \left[\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i \varepsilon_i \right]}_{R_{1n}} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\left\{ \left[I_p - \hat{\Theta}_n \hat{\Omega}_n \right] - \hat{\Theta}_n \left[\sum_{i=1}^n \left(W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n} \right) X_i X_i^\top \right] \right\}}_{R_{2n}} (\beta - \beta_0) - \Delta_n \\
&= S_n + R_{1n} + R_{2n}(\beta - \beta_0) - \Delta_n.
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

The decomposition in (A.1) forms the foundation of our analysis. The leading term S_n captures the first-order stochastic component of the debiased posterior and drives its asymptotic Gaussianity. Considering its close connection to the bootstrap central limit theorem, we rely on the recent strong approximation result for the exchangeable bootstrap in the high dimensional setup in Fang et al. (2023); see also Theorem B.2 for a version of the result. We show that, for every $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\Pi(\sqrt{n}\|R_{1n}\|_\infty > \epsilon \mid Z^{(n)}) = o_{P_0}(1), \quad \Pi(\sqrt{n}\|R_{2n}(\beta - \beta_0)\|_\infty > \epsilon \mid Z^{(n)}) = o_{P_0}(1), \tag{A.2}$$

and that $\sqrt{n}\|\Delta_n\|_\infty = o_{P_0}(1)$, which follows from Assumption 4.3. Hence, the remainder terms R_{1n} , $R_{2n}(\beta - \beta_0)$, and Δ_n are uniformly negligible across coordinates, ensuring that the asymptotic behavior of $\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n$ is fully characterized by the leading term S_n . The subtle difference about R_{1n} and $R_{2n}(\cdot)$ is whether it depends on $\beta - \beta_0$ or not. As a consequence, one needs to show the convergence of certain random matrices in the operator norm or in the elementwise sup-norm in proving the corresponding negligibility.

Throughout, we denote by $\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[\cdot]$ the expectation evaluated under the joint distribution of $Z^{(n)}$ and $W^{(n)}$. For a sequence $r_n > 0$, the symbols $o_{P_{Z,W}}(r_n)$ and $O_{P_{Z,W}}(r_n)$ are defined with respect to the same underlying probability measure $P_{Z,W}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. As shown in the sequel, it suffices to establish the conditional weak convergence of $e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$ restricted to some set Γ_n such that $\Pi(\Gamma_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}) = o_{P_0}(1)$. To construct this set Γ_n , let $\eta_n := \sqrt{\log p/n + \log^2 n \log^2 p/n}$. Since $\sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n \|\Theta_0\|_\infty + \delta_n) \eta_n \rightarrow 0$, there exists a positive sequence ξ_n such that $\xi_n \rightarrow \infty$ and $\xi_n \sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n \|\Theta_0\|_\infty +$

$\delta_n)\eta_n \rightarrow 0$. Given the positive constant C in Assumption 4.1, define the following sets:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}_n &:= \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\infty} \leq C \xi_n \eta_n \right\}, \\ \mathcal{B}_n &:= \left\{ \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) X_i X_i^{\top} \right\|_{\max} \leq C \xi_n \eta_n \right\}, \\ \mathcal{C}_n &:= \{\|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 \leq C \epsilon_n\}.\end{aligned}\tag{A.3}$$

Then, we take $\Gamma_n := \mathcal{A}_n \cap \mathcal{B}_n \cap \mathcal{C}_n$. Since $\xi_n \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi_W(\mathcal{A}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)})] = P_{Z,W}(\mathcal{A}_n^c) \rightarrow 0$ and $\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi_W(\mathcal{B}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)})] = P_{Z,W}(\mathcal{B}_n^c) \rightarrow 0$ by Lemma B.1. And by Assumption 4.1, $\mathbb{E}_0[\Pi_{\beta}(\mathcal{C}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)})] \rightarrow 0$. Using both results, Markov inequality yields

$$\Pi(\Gamma_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}) \leq \Pi_W(\mathcal{A}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}) + \Pi_W(\mathcal{B}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}) + \Pi_{\beta}(\mathcal{C}_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0,\tag{A.4}$$

where the inequality holds since $\Pi(\cdot \mid Z^{(n)}) = \Pi_{\beta}(\cdot \mid Z^{(n)}) \times \Pi_W(\cdot \mid Z^{(n)})$, and both \mathcal{A}_n^c and \mathcal{B}_n^c do not depend on β while \mathcal{C}_n^c does not depend on $W^{(n)}$.

By the triangle inequality, for each $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned}& d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \\ & \leq d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \\ & \quad + d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) \mid Z^{(n)}), \mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{A.5}$$

By Lemma B.2, the first term on the right hand side of the inequality in (A.5) is convergent to zero in probability since $\mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)})$ is identical to $\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)})$. For the second term, it follows from (A.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}& d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) \mid Z^{(n)}), \mathcal{L}_{\Pi}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}) \right) \\ & = \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \left| \int [f((e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)) - f(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n)] d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} \mid Z^{(n)}) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \left| \int_{\Gamma_n} [f((e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)) - f(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n)] d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} \mid Z^{(n)}) \right| \\ & \quad + \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \int_{\Gamma_n^c} \left| [f((e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)) - f(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n)] \right| d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} \mid Z^{(n)}) \\ & \quad + \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \int_{\Gamma_n^c} \left| f(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n) \right| d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} \mid Z^{(n)}) \\ & \leq \int_{\Gamma_n} |e_j^{\top} [\sqrt{n} R_{1n} + \sqrt{n} R_{2n}(\beta - \beta_0) - \sqrt{n} \Delta_n]| d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} \mid Z^{(n)}) \\ & \quad + 2\Pi(\Gamma_n^c \mid Z^{(n)}),\end{aligned}\tag{A.6}$$

where the first inequality holds by the triangle inequality, and the second inequality

holds since $\sup_x |f(x)| \leq 1$ and $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for any x, y whenever $\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1$.

By (A.4), it remains to show that the first term on the right hand side of the inequality in (A.6) is convergent to zero in probability. By simple algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\Gamma_n} |e_j^\top [\sqrt{n}R_{1n} + \sqrt{n}R_{2n}(\beta - \beta_0) - \sqrt{n}\Delta_n]| d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathcal{A}_n \cap \mathcal{B}_n \cap \mathcal{C}_n} (\|\sqrt{n}R_{1n}\|_\infty + \|\sqrt{n}R_{2n}\|_{\max} \|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 + \|\sqrt{n}\Delta_n\|_\infty) d\Pi(\beta, W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \int_{\mathcal{B}_n} \|\sqrt{n}R_{2n}\|_{\max} d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \int_{\mathcal{C}_n} \|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 d\Pi_\beta(\beta | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \quad + \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|\sqrt{n}R_{1n}\|_\infty d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) + \|\sqrt{n}\Delta_n\|_\infty, \tag{A.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $\|Ax\|_\infty \leq \|A\|_{\max}\|x\|_1$ for matrix A and vector x , and the second inequality holds since $\Pi(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) = \Pi_\beta(\cdot | Z^{(n)}) \times \Pi_W(\cdot | Z^{(n)})$. We next show that each term on the right hand side of the second inequality in (A.7) is convergent to zero in probability. First, $\|\sqrt{n}\Delta_n\|_\infty \xrightarrow{P_0} 0$ by Assumption 4.3. Second,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \|\sqrt{n}R_{1n}\|_\infty d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_\infty \int_{\mathcal{A}_n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_\infty d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_\infty C \xi_n \eta_n \xrightarrow{P_0} 0, \tag{A.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $\|Ax\|_\infty \leq \|A\|_\infty \|x\|_\infty$, and the convergence holds due to Assumption 4.2 and $\xi_n \sqrt{n} \delta_n \eta_n \rightarrow 0$. Third, similarly,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \int_{\mathcal{B}_n} \|\sqrt{n}R_{2n}\|_{\max} d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\Theta}_n \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} + \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\Theta}_n\|_\infty \int_{\mathcal{B}_n} \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) X_i X_i^\top \right\|_{\max} d\Pi_W(W^{(n)} | Z^{(n)}) \\
& \leq \sqrt{n} \|\hat{\Theta}_n \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} + \sqrt{n} (\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_\infty + \|\Theta_0\|_\infty) C \xi_n \eta_n, \tag{A.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality holds since $\|AB\|_{\max} \leq \|A\|_\infty \|B\|_{\max}$ for matrices A and B , and trivially,

$$\int_{\mathcal{C}_n} \|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 d\Pi_\beta(\beta | Z^{(n)}) \leq C \epsilon_n. \tag{A.10}$$

Combining (A.9) and (A.10) implies the first term on the right hand side of the second inequality in (A.7) is convergent to zero in probability due to Assumption 4.2, $\sqrt{n} \epsilon_n \gamma_n \rightarrow 0$, and $\xi_n \sqrt{n} \epsilon_n \eta_n \|\Theta_0\|_\infty \rightarrow 0$. This completes the proof of the theorem. \blacksquare

Proof of Corollary 4.1. The essential idea is to establish the proper convergence of percentiles of the debiased posterior distribution of $e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$. We also make use of the symmetry of the limiting Gaussian distribution to show the validity of the debiased Bayesian credible interval.

By Lemma B.3, there exists some Gaussian $\mathbb{G}_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(|e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) - \mathbb{G}_j| > \eta_n) = 0, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for some $\eta_n \downarrow 0$. By Lemmas B.2, (A.1), and the inequalities used in the arguments of (A.4), (A.7), and (A.8) and by making η_n larger if necessary, we have that, for a copy $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j$ of \mathbb{G}_j that is independent of $Z^{(n)}$,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_0[\Pi(|e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) - \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j| > \eta_n \mid Z^{(n)})] = 0. \quad (\text{A.12})$$

By Markov's inequality, Fubini's theorem, and (A.12), there is some $\varpi_n \downarrow 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \Pi(|e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n) - \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j| > \eta_n \mid Z^{(n)}) = o_{P_0}(\varpi_n). \quad (\text{A.13})$$

For $0 < \tau < 1$, let $c_j(\tau)$ be the τ th quantile of $N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ and $\hat{c}_{n,j}(\tau)$ be the τ th conditional quantile of $e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\tilde{\beta} - \hat{\beta}_n)$ given $Z^{(n)}$. Since $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j$ is independent of $Z^{(n)}$, we note that $c_j(\tau)$ is also the τ th conditional quantile of $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j$ given $Z^{(n)}$. By Lemma 11 in Chernozhukov et al. (2013), it follows from (A.13) that, with probability approaching one, for some $\varsigma_n = o(\varpi_n)$, and for any $\tau \in (0, 1 - \varsigma_n)$,

$$\hat{c}_{n,j}(\tau) \leq c_j(\tau + \varsigma_n) + \eta_n, \quad c_j(\tau) \leq \hat{c}_{n,j}(\tau + \varsigma_n) + \eta_n. \quad (\text{A.14})$$

By equivariance of quantiles (see, e.g., Koenker (2005, p.39)), we note that

$$P_0(\beta_{0,j} \in \mathcal{C}_{n,j}(\alpha)) = P_0\left(-\hat{c}_{n,j}(1 - \alpha/2) \leq e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) \leq -\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2)\right). \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Let H_j be the cdf of $N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$. By (A.11) and (A.14), we have:

$$\begin{aligned} & \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) \leq -\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2)) \\ & \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(\mathbb{G}_j - \eta_n \leq -c_j(\alpha/2 - \varsigma_n) + \eta_n) \\ & = \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_j(-c_j(\alpha/2 - \varsigma_n) + 2\eta_n). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

Since $\sigma_{0,j}^2$ is bounded away from zero by assumption, the density of H_j is bounded. Thus, the fundamental theorem of calculus implies

$$H_j(-c_j(\alpha/2 - \varsigma_n) + 2\eta_n) - H_j(-c_j(\alpha/2 - \varsigma_n)) = O(\eta_n). \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Note that $H_j(-c_j(\alpha/2 - \varsigma_n)) = 1 - \alpha/2 + \varsigma_n$ by the symmetry of $N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ around zero. Since $\varsigma_n \vee \eta_n = o(1)$, we may then obtain from (A.16) and (A.17) that

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) \leq -\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2)) \leq 1 - \alpha/2. \quad (\text{A.18})$$

For the reverse direction, we have by (A.11) and (A.14) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) \leq -\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2)) \\ & \geq \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(\mathbb{G}_j + \eta_n \leq -c_j(\alpha/2 + \varsigma_n) - \eta_n) \\ & = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} H_j(-c_j(\alpha/2 + \varsigma_n) - 2\eta_n) = 1 - \alpha/2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.19})$$

where the last step follows by another application of the fundamental theorem of calculus and $\varsigma_n \vee \eta_n = o(1)$. Combining (A.18) and (A.19) yields:

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) \leq -\hat{c}_{n,j}(\alpha/2)) = 1 - \alpha/2. \quad (\text{A.20})$$

By similar arguments, we may also obtain that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_0(e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) < -\hat{c}_{n,j}(1 - \alpha/2)) = \alpha/2. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

The conclusion of the corollary then follows from (A.15), (A.20), and (A.21). \blacksquare

Proof of Theorem 4.2. The proof of the theorem follows by the similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 4.1. Specifically, (A.5) continues to hold by replacing e_j with E_J and $\sigma_{0,j}^2$ with $\Sigma_{0,J}$. The first term on the right hand side of the inequality after the replacement is convergent to zero in probability by Lemma B.4. The second term also converge in probability to zero by following almost the same arguments in (A.6)-(A.10), where e_j needs to be placed by E_J and $|\cdot|$ by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. In particular, the bound for the remainder terms in (A.7) is uniformly valid over $j = 1, \dots, p$. \blacksquare

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We first verify Assumption 4.1 for the exact posterior under the spike-and-slab prior. By Examples 4 and 5 of Castillo et al. (2015), their Assumption 1 is satisfied by the spike-and-slab prior. Let A be the value of the fourth constant 1 is satisfied by the spike-and-slab prior. We define the following notation. For a subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$, define the compatibility number

$$\phi(S) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{|S| \beta^\top \hat{\Omega}_n \beta}}{\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n) \|\beta_S\|_1} : \|\beta_{S^c}\|_1 \leq 7 \|\beta_S\|_1, \beta_S \neq 0 \right\}. \quad (\text{A.22})$$

For a sparsity level $s \leq p$, define the uniform compatibility number for sparse vectors

$$\bar{\phi}(s) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{|S_\beta| \beta^\top \hat{\Omega}_n \beta}}{\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n) \|\beta\|_1} : 0 \neq |S_\beta| \leq s \right\}. \quad (\text{A.23})$$

The posterior contraction rate in Theorem 2 of [Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#) depends on both ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ through the following quantity: for a subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\bar{\psi}(S) = \bar{\phi} \left(\left[2 + \frac{3}{A} + \frac{33}{\phi(S)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} \right] |S| \right), \quad (\text{A.24})$$

where λ is the hyperparameter in the Laplace density for the slab part in (10), and $\bar{\lambda} = 2\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)\sqrt{n \log p}$. Note that (A.22), (A.23), and (A.24) are Definitions 2.1 and 2.2 and Equation (2.5) of [Castillo et al. \(2015\)](#), respectively. Their condition (2.1) is satisfied by Assumption 4.7(i). Thus, by the law of iterated expectation and the dominated convergence theorem, Theorem 2 implies that

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\Pi_\beta \left(\|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 > \frac{M}{\phi(S_{\beta_0})^2 \bar{\psi}(S_{\beta_0})^2 \nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)} s_{\beta_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \middle| Z^{(n)} \right) \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A.25})$$

for sufficiently large $M > 0$. Below we show that $\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)$, $\phi(S_{\beta_0})$, and $\bar{\psi}(S_{\beta_0})$ are bounded away from zero with probability approaching one, so that Assumption 4.1 holds with

$$\epsilon_n = s_{\beta_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}. \quad (\text{A.26})$$

First, by Assumptions 4.4(i) and (ii), following the same arguments as in the proof of Lemma B.1 (see (B.3)), we have

$$\|\hat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_0\|_{\max} = O_{P_0} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \right) = O_{P_0}(1). \quad (\text{A.27})$$

Since the eigenvalues of Ω_0 are bounded away from zero, it follows from (A.27) that $\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)$ is bounded away from zero with probability approaching one. Second, since $\|\beta_S\|_1 \leq |S|^{1/2} \|\beta_S\|_2 \leq |S|^{1/2} \|\beta\|_2$, it suffices to show that $\phi^*(S_{\beta_0})$ and $\bar{\psi}^*(S_{\beta_0})$ are bounded away from zero with probability approaching one, where

$$\phi^*(S) := \inf \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{\beta^\top \hat{\Omega}_n \beta}}{\|\beta\|_2} : \|\beta_{S^c}\|_1 \leq 7 \|\beta_S\|_1, \beta_S \neq 0 \right\} \quad (\text{A.28})$$

and, for $\bar{\phi}^*(s) := \inf \left\{ \sqrt{\beta^\top \hat{\Omega}_n \beta} / \|\beta\|_2 : 0 \neq |S_\beta| \leq s \right\}$,

$$\bar{\psi}^*(S) = \bar{\phi}^* \left(\left[2 + \frac{3}{A} + \frac{33}{\phi^*(S)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} \right] |S| \right). \quad (\text{A.29})$$

By Theorem 1 (or Corollary 1) of [Raskutti et al. \(2010\)](#) and its sub-gaussian extension ([Zhou, 2009](#)), there is a constant $L > 0$ such that $\phi^*(S) \geq L$ with probability approaching one uniformly over all subsets $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$ such that $|S| = o(n/\log p)$. So, $\phi^*(S_{\beta_0})$ is bounded away from zero with probability approaching one, since $s_{\beta_0} \log p / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$. The uniformity further implies that $\bar{\phi}^*(s) \geq L$ with probability approaching one for $s = o(n/\log p)$, since $0 = \|\beta_{S_\beta^c}\|_1 \leq 7\|\beta_{S_\beta}\|_1$ is always true. Given the range of λ in Assumption 4.7 (i), $\bar{\psi}^*(S_{\beta_0}) \leq \bar{\phi}^*(\eta_n s_{\beta_0})$ with probability approaching one for any $\eta_n \rightarrow \infty$. So, $\bar{\psi}^*(S_{\beta_0})$ are bounded away from zero with probability approaching one.

For the variational Bayesian approximate posterior in (12) and (13), we apply Theorem 1 in [Ray and Szabó \(2022\)](#). The posterior contraction rate depends on both ϕ and $\bar{\phi}$ instead through the following quantity: for a subset $S \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$,

$$\bar{\psi}_M(S) = \bar{\phi} \left(\left[2 + \frac{4M}{A} \left(1 + \frac{16}{\phi(S)^2} \frac{\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} \right) \right] |S| \right) \text{ for } M > 0. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

Since the diagonal elements of Ω_0 are bounded, it follows from (A.27) that $\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)$ is bounded with probability approaching one. Thus, $\lambda = O_{P_0}(\nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)\sqrt{n \log p}/s_{\beta_0})$. Again by the law of iterated expectation and the dominated convergence theorem, Theorem 1 implies that there exists a constant $M_1 > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\tilde{\Pi}_\beta \left(\|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 > \frac{M_1 \eta_n}{\phi(S_{\beta_0})^2 \bar{\psi}_{\eta_n}(S_{\beta_0})^2 \nu(\hat{\Omega}_n)} s_{\beta_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \mid Z^{(n)} \right) \right] \rightarrow 0 \quad (\text{A.31})$$

for any $\eta_n \rightarrow \infty$ (arbitrarily slowly). By the same arguments as above, $\psi_{\eta_n}(S_{\beta_0})$ is bounded away from zero with probability approaching one when $s_{\beta_0} \eta_n = o(n/\log p)$. It follows that Assumption 4.1 holds with

$$\epsilon_n = s_{\beta_0} \rho_n \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \quad (\text{A.32})$$

for any $\rho_n \rightarrow \infty$ such that $s_{\beta_0} \rho_n = o(\sqrt{n/\log p})$.

We next verify Assumption 4.2 for $\hat{\Theta}_n$ obtained by the nodewise LASSO regression. A rate for $\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_\infty$ is directly available from the first result in Theorem 2.4 of [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) such that the second condition of Assumption 4.2 holds with

$$\delta_n = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}. \quad (\text{A.33})$$

For the second condition, we make use of (10) in [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#): $\|\hat{\Theta}_n \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \lambda_j / \hat{\tau}_j$. By the proof of Theorem 2.4 in [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#) (p.1196), $\sup_{1 \leq j \leq p} |\hat{\tau}_j^{-1} - \tau_j^{-1}| = O_{P_0}(\sqrt{\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \log p / n})$ for some τ_j which is uniformly bounded away zero from over j . Since $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \lambda_j = O(\sqrt{\log p / n})$, it then follows that the first condition of Assumption 4.2 holds with

$$\gamma_n = \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}. \quad (\text{A.34})$$

We now verify Assumption 4.3 for the debiased LASSO estimator. By Theorem 2.4 of [van de Geer et al. \(2014\)](#), we have

$$\hat{\beta}_n = \beta_0 + \hat{\Theta}_n \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i + \Delta_{1n}, \quad \text{where } \|\Delta_{1n}\|_{\infty} = o_{P_0}(n^{-1/2}). \quad (\text{A.35})$$

Since $\|\sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i / n\|_{\infty} = O_{P_0}(\sqrt{\log p / n})$, it follows from (A.33) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| (\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\infty} &\leq \|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\infty} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\infty} \\ &= O_{P_0} \left(\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \frac{\log p}{n} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.36})$$

Therefore, Assumption 4.3 holds with $\Delta_n = (\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0) \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \varepsilon_i / n + \Delta_{1n}$ by noting that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0, j} \log p / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$.

We lastly verify the rate conditions in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2. First, $\sqrt{n} \epsilon_n \gamma_n = s_{\beta_0} \log p / \sqrt{n} \rightarrow 0$ for ϵ_n in (A.26). For ϵ_n in (A.32), the condition continues to hold for a sufficiently slow rate ρ_n . The condition $\sqrt{n}(\epsilon_n \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty} + \delta_n)(\sqrt{\log p / n} + \log^2 n \log^2 p / n) \rightarrow 0$ can be also similarly verified. This completes the proof of the proposition. \blacksquare

APPENDIX B Technical Lemmas and Proofs

Lemma B.1. *Suppose Assumptions 4.4(i)-(iii) hold. Then*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\infty} = O_{P_{Z, W}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} + \frac{\log^2 n \log^2 p}{n} \right)$$

and

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) X_i X_i^{\top} \right\|_{\max} = O_{P_{Z, W}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} + \frac{\log^2 n \log^2 p}{n} \right).$$

Proof. We prove the results by applying a maximal inequality for sub-Weibull random variables (see Theorem B.1). We first prove the first result. Since $W_{ni} = \omega_i / \sum_{j=1}^n \omega_j$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$ where $\{\omega_i\}_{i=1}^n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{Exp}(1)$, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} X_i \varepsilon_i = \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i X_i \varepsilon_i. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Since $\sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i/n \xrightarrow{P_{Z,W}} 1$ by the law of large numbers, by (B.1) it suffices to show

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i X_i \varepsilon_i \right\|_{\infty} = O_{P_{Z,W}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} + \frac{\log^2 n \log^2 p}{n} \right). \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since both X_i and ε_i are sub-Gaussian by Assumptions 4.4(ii) and (iii), $\omega_i X_i \varepsilon_i$ is sub-Weibull of order $\theta = 1/2$ (Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty, 2022). Thus, (B.2) is obtained by applying Theorem B.1 (by taking $t = M \log p$ for sufficiently large M).

For the second result, since $\sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - n^{-1}) = 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) X_i X_i^{\top} \right\|_{\max} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n (W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) \{X_i X_i^{\top} - \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^{\top}]\} \right\|_{\max} \\ &\leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^n W_{ni} \{X_i X_i^{\top} - \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^{\top}]\} \right\|_{\max} + \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{X_i X_i^{\top} - \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^{\top}]\} \right\|_{\max}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where the inequality follows by the triangle inequality. Since X_i is sub-Gaussian by Assumption 4.4, $X_i X_i^{\top} - \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^{\top}]$ is sub-exponential and $\omega_i \{X_i X_i^{\top} - \mathbb{E}_0[X_i X_i^{\top}]\}$ is sub-Weibull of order $\theta = 1/2$. The second result follows by following the arguments as in (B.1) and (B.2). This completes the proof of the lemma. \blacksquare

Lemma B.2. *Let Assumptions 4.4(i) and (iv) hold and S_n be given as in (A.1). Then for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, there is some $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ independent of $Z^{(n)}$ such that*

$$e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n = \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j + o_{P_{Z,W}}(1),$$

and thus, for $\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)})$ the conditional law of $e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n$ given $Z^{(n)}$,

$$d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(e_j^{\top} \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0.$$

Proof. We prove the first result by applying a strong approximation result for the ex-

changeable bootstrap (see Theorem B.2). It is observed that

$$\begin{aligned} e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n n(W_{ni} - \frac{1}{n}) e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n n W_{ni} \left(e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Consider random variables $\{e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and exchangeable weights $\{n W_{ni}\}_{i=1}^n$. First, Assumption B.1 is satisfied by Assumption 4.4(i) and (iv) and Lyapunov's inequality. Since W_{ni} follows the distribution $\text{Beta}(1, n-1)$ by Corollary G.4 in Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017), Theorem 1 in Skorski (2023) implies that, for all $t > 0$ and $n > 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z,W}(|n W_{ni} - \mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[n W_{ni}]| > t) &= P_{Z,W} \left(W_{ni} - \mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[W_{ni}] > \frac{t}{n} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{\frac{2(n-1)}{n+1} + \frac{4(n-2)}{3(n+2)} t} \right\} \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left\{ -\frac{t^2}{2 + 2t} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

By simple algebra, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (n W_{ni} - n \bar{W}_n)^2 - 1 = \frac{1}{\bar{\omega}_n^2} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \omega_i^2 - 2 = O_{P_{Z,W}}(n^{-1/2}), \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where the last equality follows by the central limit theorem together with $\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[\omega_i] = 1$ and $\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[\omega_i^2] = 2$. By the virtue of $W_{ni} \sim \text{Beta}(1, n-1)$, we may obtain that

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[|n W_{ni}|^3] = n^3 \frac{1}{n} \frac{2}{n+1} \frac{3}{n+2} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

which is uniformly bounded in n . Thus, together results (B.5), (B.6), and (B.7) verify Assumptions B.2(ii) and (iii), while Assumptions B.2(i) and (iv) are trivially satisfied with $q = 3/2$. By Theorem B.2, we may conclude that there exists some $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ that is independent of $Z^{(n)}$ and

$$e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n = \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j + O_{P_{Z,W}}(n^{-1/12}). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The first result of the lemma follows from (B.8).

For the second result, since $\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j$ is independent of $Z^{(n)}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \\
&= \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} |\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[f(e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n) \mid Z^{(n)}] - \mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[f(\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j) \mid Z^{(n)}]| \\
&\leq \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[|f(e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n) - f(\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j)| \mid Z^{(n)}], \tag{B.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[\cdot \mid Z^{(n)}]$ denotes the conditional expectation given $Z^{(n)}$, and the inequality follows by Jensen's inequality. Fix $\epsilon > 0$. By the triangle inequality and (B.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& d_{BL} \left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2) \right) \\
&\leq \epsilon + \sup_{\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1} \mathbb{E}_{Z,W}[|f(e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n) - f(\bar{\mathbb{G}}_j)| 1\{|e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n - \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j| > \epsilon\} \mid Z^{(n)}] \\
&\leq \epsilon + 2P_{Z,W}(|e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n - \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j| > \epsilon \mid Z^{(n)}), \tag{B.10}
\end{aligned}$$

where $P_{Z,W}(\cdot \mid Z^{(n)})$ denotes the conditional probability given Z^n , and we have used the fact that $\|f\|_{BL} \leq 1$ implies $\sup_x |f(x)| \leq 1$ and $|f(x) - f(y)| \leq |x - y|$ for any x, y . By Markov's inequality, Fubini's theorem, and (B.8), we have that $P_{Z,W}(|e_j^\top \sqrt{n} S_n - \bar{\mathbb{G}}_j| > \epsilon \mid Z^{(n)})$ is convergent to zero in probability for each $\epsilon > 0$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, the second result of the lemma follows from (B.10). \blacksquare

Lemma B.3. *Suppose Assumptions 4.3 and 4.4 (i) and (iv) hold. Then for each $j = 1, \dots, p$, there exists some $\mathbb{G}_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$ satisfying*

$$e_j^\top \sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta}_n - \beta_0) = \mathbb{G}_j + o_{P_0}(1).$$

Proof. By Yurinskii's coupling (see, e.g., Theorem 10.10 in Pollard (2002)), we may obtain that, for each $\delta > 0$ and some $\mathbb{G}_j \sim N(0, \sigma_{0,j}^2)$,

$$P_0 \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i - \mathbb{G}_j \right| > 3\delta \right) \lesssim b_n(1 + |\log b_n|), \tag{B.11}$$

where $b_n = \mathbb{E}_0[|e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i|^3] n^{-1/2} / \delta^3$. Setting $\delta = M(\mathbb{E}_0[|e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i|^3] n^{-1/2})^{1/3}$ in (B.11) for any fixed constant $M > 0$ yields

$$P_0 \left(\left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i - \mathbb{G}_j \right| > 3M \left(\frac{\mathbb{E}_0[|e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i|^3]}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/3} \right) \lesssim \frac{1}{M^3} (1 + 3|\log M|). \tag{B.12}$$

By Assumption 4.4(iv), it follows from (B.12) that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n e_j^\top \Theta_0 X_i \varepsilon_i - \mathbb{G}_j = O_{P_0}(n^{-1/6}). \quad (\text{B.13})$$

The conclusion of the lemma then follows from (B.13) and Assumption 4.3. \blacksquare

Lemma B.4. *Let Assumptions 4.4(i) and 4.5 hold and S_n be given in (A.1). If $\nu_J^6 J^3 \log^9(1+J)/n \rightarrow 0$, there is some $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_J \sim N(0, \Sigma_{0,J}^2)$ independent of $Z^{(n)}$ such that*

$$\|E_J^\top \sqrt{n} S_n - \tilde{\mathbb{G}}_J\|_\infty = o_{P_{Z,W}}(1),$$

and, for $\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(E_J^\top \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)})$ the conditional law of $E_J^\top \sqrt{n} S_n$ given $Z^{(n)}$,

$$d_{BL}\left(\mathcal{L}_{\Pi_W}(E_J^\top \sqrt{n} S_n \mid Z^{(n)}), N(0, \Sigma_{0,J}^2)\right) \xrightarrow{P_0} 0.$$

Proof. Following the arguments in (B.4)-(B.8), there exists some $\tilde{\mathbb{G}}_J \sim N(0, \Sigma_{0,J}^2)$ that is independent of $Z^{(n)}$ and

$$\|E_J^\top \sqrt{n} S_n - \tilde{\mathbb{G}}_J\|_\infty = O_{P_{Z,W}}\left(\left(\frac{\nu_J^2 J \log^3(1+J)}{n^{1/3}}\right)^{1/4}\right). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

The second result of the lemma follows by the arguments in (B.9) and (B.10). \blacksquare

B.1 Technical Tools

We record a maximal inequality for sub-Weibull random variables. Sub-Weibull random variables form a broad class of light-tailed random variables that generalize both sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential distributions. In particular, the sub-Weibull family nests these two as special cases: sub-Gaussian random variables correspond to the sub-Weibull case of order $\theta = 2$, while sub-exponential random variables correspond to $\theta = 1$.

Definition B.1 (Sub-Weibull Random Variable). A real-valued random variable Z is said to be *sub-Weibull of order $\theta > 0$* , denoted by $Z \sim \text{subW}(\theta)$, if

$$\|Z\|_{\psi_\theta} := \inf \left\{ \eta > 0 : \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(|X|^\theta / \eta^\theta) \right] \leq 2 \right\} < \infty.$$

An important property of sub-Weibull random variables is that their products remain sub-Weibull. Specifically, let Z_1, \dots, Z_L be (possibly dependent) random variables such that $\|Z_\ell\|_{\psi_{\theta_\ell}} < \infty$ for each $\ell = 1, \dots, L$. Then the product $\prod_{\ell=1}^L Z_\ell$ is sub-Weibull with order $\bar{\theta} = (\sum_{\ell=1}^L \theta_\ell^{-1})^{-1}$ and satisfies $\|\prod_{\ell=1}^L Z_\ell\|_{\psi_{\bar{\theta}}} \leq \prod_{\ell=1}^L \|Z_\ell\|_{\psi_{\theta_\ell}}$. The following result is taken from Theorem 3.4 of [Kuchibhotla and Chakraborty \(2022\)](#).

Theorem B.1. Suppose Z_1, \dots, Z_n are independent mean zero random vectors in \mathbf{R}^k , such that for some $\theta > 0$ and $K_{n,k} > 0$, $\max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} \|e_j^\top Z_i\|_{\psi_\theta} \leq K_{n,k}$. Define $\Gamma_{n,k} := \max_{1 \leq j \leq k} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[(e_j^\top Z_i)^2]/n$. Then for any $t \geq 0$, with probability $1 - 3\exp(-t)$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i \right\|_\infty \leq 7 \sqrt{\frac{\Gamma_{n,k}(t + \log k)}{n}} + \frac{C_\theta K_{n,k} (\log(2n))^{1/\theta} (t + \log k)^{1/\theta^*}}{n},$$

where $\theta^* := \min\{\theta, 1\}$ and $C_\theta > 0$ is some constant depending only on θ .

We gather a strong approximation result for the exchangeable bootstrap. The following result is a version of Lemma A.5 in Fang et al. (2023).

Assumption B.1. (i) $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are i.i.d. random vectors in \mathbf{R}^k with common law P ; (ii) the eigenvalues of $\Sigma := \text{Var}(Z_i)$ are bounded uniformly in n and k (iii) $\{\mathbb{E}[\|Z_i\|_\infty^3]\}^{1/3} < M_1$ uniformly in n and k for $M_1 \geq 1$.

Assumption B.2. (i) $\{\zeta_{ni}\}_{i=1}^n$ are exchangeable and independent of $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$; (ii) for some $a, b > 0$, $P(|\zeta_{in} - \mathbb{E}[\zeta_{in}]| > t) \leq 2\exp\{-t^2/(b + at)\}$ for all $t \geq 0$ and n ; (iii) $|\sum_{i=1}^n (\zeta_{in} - \bar{\zeta}_n)^2/n - 1| = O_P(n^{-1/2})$ where $\bar{\zeta}_n := \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_{ni}/n$, and $\sup_n \mathbb{E}[|\zeta_{in}|^3] < \infty$; (iv) for some $q \in (1, \infty]$, $\{\mathbb{E}[\|Z_i\|_\infty^{2q}]\}^{1/q} < M_2 < \infty$.

Theorem B.2. Suppose Assumptions B.1 and B.2 hold. Then there exists $\mathbb{G} \sim N(0, \Sigma)$ that is independent of $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \zeta_{ni} (Z_i - \bar{Z}_n) - \mathbb{G} \right\|_\infty = O_P(b_n)$$

provided $b_n := \frac{M_1 \sqrt{k \log(1+n)}}{n^{1/4}} + \left(\frac{M_1 k \log^{5/2}(1+k)}{\sqrt{n}} \right)^{1/3} + \left(\frac{M_2 k \log^3(1+k) n^{1/q}}{n} \right)^{1/4} = o(1)$.

APPENDIX C Additional Theoretical Results

In this appendix, we provide alternative verifications of Assumptions 4.1 and 4.2. The spike-and-slab prior distribution can be viewed as a finite mixture model. Beyond finite mixtures, one may also consider continuous mixtures. One popular choice is the horse-shoe prior of Carvalho et al. (2010), which is a continuous scale mixture of Gaussian distributions. The marginal density of such a prior (after integrating out the random scale) exhibits both a pole at zero and heavy tails; see Bhadra et al. (2019). It is often studied under the framework of global-local shrinkage priors, as it achieves adaptive sparsity through a global shrinkage parameter and selective signal identification through local shrinkage parameters. For the regression coefficients $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$ in (1), the prior is specified as follows: independently for all j ,

$$\beta_j | \kappa_j, \tau \sim N(0, \kappa_j^2 \tau^2), \quad \kappa_j \sim C^+(0, 1), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where $C^+(0, 1)$ denotes the standard half Cauchy distribution on $(0, \infty)$. Here, τ acts as a global shrinkage parameter governing overall sparsity, while κ_j serves as a local shrinkage parameter that allows selective shrinkage of individual coefficients. In general, global-local shrinkage priors shrink small coefficients strongly toward zero, while their heavy tails prevent over-shrinkage of large coefficients. Unlike the spike-and-slab prior, the horseshoe prior typically does not produce exact sparsity in the posterior. For variable selection, additional post-processing methods, such as thresholding or projection techniques, are often employed; see [Carvalho et al. \(2010\)](#).

[Song and Liang \(2023\)](#) consider a general class of shrinkage priors that include the horseshoe prior as a special case. Below we summarize their contraction rate result specialized to the following horseshoe prior: for $\beta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^\top$,

$$\beta_j | \kappa_j, \tau \sim N(0, \kappa_j^2 \tau^2 \sigma_0^2), \quad \kappa_j^2 \sim \pi(\kappa_j^2), \quad \text{independently for all } j, \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where $\sigma_0^2 > 0$ is the variance of the error term in (1) that is assumed to be centered Gaussian, $\tau > 0$ is a global shrinkage parameter, and κ_j 's are local shrinkage parameters. Note that $\kappa_j^2 \tau^2$ and τ^2 correspond to λ_j^2 and s_n respectively in [Song and Liang \(2023\)](#). The density of $\kappa_j^2 \tau^2$ is $x \mapsto \pi(x/\tau^2)/\tau^2$, which is precisely the structure considered in [Song and Liang \(2023, p.419\)](#).

Assumption C.1. (i) The support of X is contained in a fixed bounded set; (ii) $n = O(p)$; (iii) $\pi(x) = Cx^{-\varkappa}L(x)$ for some constant $C > 0$, some constant $\varkappa > 1$, and some function L satisfying $|L(x) - 1| = O(x^{-\varsigma})$ as $|x| \rightarrow \infty$ with $\varsigma > 0$; (iv) τ satisfies $\tau^2 = O(\sqrt{s_{\beta_0} \log p/n}/p^{(\varpi+2\varkappa-1)/(2\varkappa-2)})$ for some $\varpi > 0$.

Assumptions C.1(i) and (ii) are Conditions A1(1) and (2) in [Song and Liang \(2023\)](#). By the arguments below (A.29), with probability approaching one, the smallest eigenvalue of $\sum_{i=1}^n X_{i,S} X_{i,S}^\top / n$ is bounded below by a fixed constant whenever $|S| = o(n/\log p)$ under Assumptions 4.4(i) and 4.6(ii). Thus, their Condition A1 (3) holds with probability one if $s_{\beta_0} = o(n/\log p)$. By their Lemma 3.3, Assumption C.1(iii) implies that the prior of β_j is proportional to $\beta_j^{-(2\varkappa-1)}$ as $|\beta_j| \rightarrow \infty$ (i.e., polynomial-tailed). The assumption is satisfied by the standard half Cauchy distribution with $\varkappa = 2$. To meet Assumption C.1(iv), [Song and Liang \(2023\)](#) suggest choosing τ^2 deterministically. In particular, it is sufficient to choose τ^2 such that $\log \tau^2 = -c \log p$ for some constant $c > 0$ satisfying $c \ll (\varpi + 2\varkappa - 1)/(2\varkappa - 2)$.

The following result follows directly from Corollary 3.2 of [Song and Liang \(2023\)](#).

Proposition C.1. Consider the horseshoe prior in (C.2). Suppose Assumptions 4.4(i), 4.6(ii), and C.1 hold. If in addition $s_{\beta_0} \log p = o(n)$ and $\log \|\beta_0\|_\infty = O(\log p)$, then

$$\mathbb{E}_0 \left[\Pi_\beta \left(\|\beta - \beta_0\|_1 \geq M \sigma_0 s_{\beta_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}} \mid Z^{(n)} \right) \right] \rightarrow 0,$$

for all sufficiently large $M > 0$. That is, Assumption 4.1 is satisfied with

$$\epsilon_n = s_{\beta_0} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}.$$

The CLIME approach of Cai et al. (2011) provides an alternative construction of $\hat{\Theta}_n$. Specifically, we may estimate the precision matrix by $\hat{\Theta}_n$ that solves the following constrained ℓ_1 minimization problem:

$$\min_{\Theta} \sum_{j=1}^p \|\Theta^\top e_j\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\Theta \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} \leq \kappa, \quad (\text{C.3})$$

where $\kappa > 0$ is a tuning parameter. As noted in their Lemma 1, the problem in (C.3) is equivalent to solving p rowwise linear programs:

$$\min_{\theta} \|\theta\|_1 \quad \text{subject to} \quad \|\hat{\Omega}_n \theta - e_j\|_{\max} \leq \kappa, \quad j = 1, \dots, p. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Denoting the solutions to (C.4) by $\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_p$, we have $\hat{\Theta}_n = (\hat{\theta}_1, \dots, \hat{\theta}_p)^\top$. Each subproblem in (C.4) can be solved efficiently by linear programming, making $\hat{\Theta}_n$ computationally attractive. A symmetrized version can be obtained following (2) of Cai et al. (2011).

While Cai et al. (2011) focus on the inverse covariance matrix, we instead consider the inverse of the second moment matrix. Using the same arguments as in Theorem 6 of their paper, we can establish a rate for $\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\max}$. Specifically, if $\kappa \geq \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty} \|\hat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_0\|_{\max}$, then $\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\max} \leq 4\kappa \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty}$. Under Assumptions 4.4(i) and (ii), $\|\hat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_0\|_{\max} = O_{P_0}(\sqrt{\log p/n})$ (also see (A.27)). Hence, by choosing

$$\kappa \asymp \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty} \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}, \quad (\text{C.5})$$

we obtain $\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\max} = O_{P_0}(\|\Theta_0\|_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{\log p/n})$. To establish a bound on $\|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\infty}$, we note that $\|\Theta_0 \hat{\Omega}_n - I_p\|_{\max} \leq \kappa$ for $\kappa \geq \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty} \|\hat{\Omega}_n - \Omega_0\|_{\max}$. Writing $\Theta_0 = (\theta_{0,1}, \dots, \theta_{0,p})^\top$, Θ_0 satisfies the constraint in (C.3), so $\|\hat{\theta}_j\|_1 \leq \|\theta_{0,j}\|_1$ for all j . For any $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^p$ with $\|x\|_1 \leq \|y\|_1$, we have

$$\|x - y\|_1 = \|x_{S_y^c}\|_1 + \|x_{S_y} - y_{S_y}\|_1 \leq 2\|x_{S_y} - y_{S_y}\|_1, \quad (\text{C.6})$$

where the inequality holds since $\|x_{S_y^c}\|_1 = \|x\|_1 - \|x_{S_y}\|_1 \leq \|y\|_1 - \|x_{S_y}\|_1 = \|y_{S_y}\|_1 - \|x_{S_y}\|_1 \leq \|x_{S_y} - y_{S_y}\|_1$. Hence, $\|\hat{\theta}_j - \theta_{0,j}\|_1 \leq 2s_{\Theta_0,j} \|\hat{\Theta}_n - \Theta_0\|_{\max}$ for all $j = 1, \dots, p$. Therefore, the second condition of Assumption 4.2 holds with

$$\delta_n = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} s_{\Theta_0,j} \|\Theta_0\|_{\infty}^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}, \quad (\text{C.7})$$

while the first condition holds with

$$\gamma_n = \|\Theta_0\|_\infty \sqrt{\frac{\log p}{n}}. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

Proposition C.2. *Consider the precision matrix estimator in (C.3). Suppose Assumptions 4.4(i) and (ii) hold. If in addition κ satisfies (C.5), Assumption 4.2 is satisfied with δ_n and γ_n given in (C.7) and (C.8).*

APPENDIX D Additional Simulation Results

In this appendix, we conduct additional Monte Carlo simulations for regression models in Section 5 where the coefficient prior is specified as a horseshoe prior. The horseshoe prior is given by the hierarchical structure: independently for all $j = 1, \dots, p$,

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_j &| \lambda_j \sim \text{Normal}(0, \lambda_j^2), \\ \lambda_j &| \tau \sim \text{Cauchy}^+(0, \tau), \\ \tau &| \sigma \sim \text{Cauchy}^+(0, \sigma), \\ \sigma &\sim \text{Cauchy}^+(0, 10). \end{aligned}$$

Here, the global shrinkage parameter τ governs the overall degree of regularization by pulling all coefficients toward zero, whereas the local parameters λ_j allow individual coefficients to escape this global shrinkage, thereby inducing heavy tails and adaptive sparsity. Posterior draws of β are obtained using the MCMC algorithm of Kim et al. (2020). Specifically, we generate 8,000 posterior samples after discarding the initial 8,000 burn-in iterations.

For each replication, we collect posterior samples and implement our proposed debiased Bayesian inference procedure as described in Algorithm 1. As in the spike-and-slab simulation study, we compare our approach against two benchmarks: (i) standard Bayesian inference under the horseshoe prior, and (ii) debiased inference based on the LASSO estimator. We use the same abbreviations for the methods under comparison as those in Table 1. The simulation design and data-generating processes are identical to those used in the spike-and-slab experiments.

Figures 9 and 10 present the empirical coverage rates for different values of β_0 , where the columns correspond to model specifications and the rows to varying dimensionalities p . The black, red, and blue curves represent, respectively, the standard Bayesian inference, the debiased LASSO, and our proposed debiased horseshoe method. Estimation accuracy—measured by bias and MSE—is summarized in Figures 11–14.

The main findings are as follows. Overall, the results closely mirror those reported in Section 5. The standard Bayesian approach with the horseshoe prior improves esti-

mation for nonzero coefficients relative to the spike-and-slab prior; however, estimation for zero coefficients still exhibits non-negligible RMSE (see Figure 13). Incorporating our debiasing adjustment markedly enhances performance, yielding improved coverage and substantial reductions in both bias and RMSE across all coefficients and simulation scenarios. Compared with the frequentist benchmark, our debiased Bayesian procedure under the horseshoe prior achieves competitive—and, in several correlated-design settings (S4–S6), superior—performance relative to the debiased LASSO.




Figure 9: Coverage rates corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column). The dashed line represents the 95% benchmark.




Figure 10: Coverage rates corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column). The dashed line represents the 95% benchmark.




Figure 11: Bias corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column).




Figure 12: Bias corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column).




Figure 13: RMSE corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column).




Figure 14: RMSE corresponding to different values of β_0 under settings S1 (first column), S2 (second column), and S3 (third column).

References

- ATCHADE, Y. (2019): “Quasi-Bayesian estimation of large Gaussian graphical models,” *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 173, 656–671.
- BAI, R., G. E. MORAN, J. L. ANTONELLI, Y. CHEN, AND M. R. BOLAND (2022): “Spike-and-slab group lassos for grouped regression and sparse generalized additive models,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117, 184–197.
- BAI, R., V. ROČKOVÁ, AND E. GEORGE (2021): “Spike-and-slab meets LASSO: A review of the spike-and-slab LASSO,” *Handbook of Bayesian Variable Selection*, 81–108.
- BARRO, R. J. (1991): “Economic Growth in a Cross Section of Countries,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 106, 407–443.
- BELLONI, A., V. CHERNOZHUKOV, D. CHETVERIKOV, AND Y. WEI (2018): “Uniformly valid post-regularization confidence regions for many functional parameters in z-estimation framework,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 46, 3643 – 3675.
- BELLONI, A., V. CHERNOZHUKOV, AND C. HANSEN (2013a): “Inference for high-dimensional sparse econometric models,” in *Advances in economics and econometrics: Tenth world congress*, ed. by D. Acemoglu, M. Arellano, and E. Dekel, Cambridge University Press, 245–295.
- (2014): “Inference on treatment effects after selection among high-dimensional controls,” *The Review of Economic Studies*, 81, 608–650.
- BELLONI, A., V. CHERNOZHUKOV, AND C. B. HANSEN (2013b): “Inference for High-Dimensional Sparse Econometric Models,” in *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Tenth World Congress*, ed. by D. Acemoglu, M. Arellano, and E. Dekel, Cambridge University Press, Econometric Society Monographs, 245–295.
- BHADRA, A., J. DATTA, N. G. POLSON, AND B. WILLARD (2019): “Lasso meets horseshoe,” *Statistical Science*, 34, 405–427.
- BONTEMPS, D. (2011): “Bernstein–von Mises theorems for Gaussian regression with increasing number of regressors,” *Annals of Statistics*, 39, 2557–2584.
- BREUNIG, C., R. LIU, AND Z. YU (2024): “Semiparametric Bayesian Difference-in-Differences,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.04605*.
- (2025a): “Double Robust Bayesian Inference on Average Treatment Effects,” *Econometrica*, 93, 539–568.
- (2025b): “Robust Semiparametric Inference for Bayesian Additive Regression Trees,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2509.24634*.
- CAI, T., W. LIU, AND X. LUO (2011): “A constrained ℓ_1 minimization approach to sparse precision matrix estimation,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106, 594–607.
- CARVALHO, C. M., N. G. POLSON, AND J. G. SCOTT (2010): “The horseshoe estimator for sparse signals,” *Biometrika*, 97, 465–480.

- CASTILLO, I., A. L'HUILLIER, K. RAY, AND L. TRAVIS (2024): "A variational Bayes approach to debiased inference for low-dimensional parameters in high-dimensional linear regression," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12659*.
- CASTILLO, I., J. SCHMIDT-HIEBER, AND A. VAN DER VAART (2015): "Bayesian linear regression with sparse priors," *The Annals of Statistics*, 1986–2018.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., D. CHETVERIKOV, M. DEMIRER, E. DUFLO, C. HANSEN, W. NEWEY, AND J. ROBINS (2018): "Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters," *The Econometrics Journal*, 21, C1–C68.
- CHERNOZHUKOV, V., S. LEE, AND A. M. ROSEN (2013): "Intersection Bounds: Estimation and Inference," *Econometrica*, 81, 667–737.
- DEZEURE, R., P. BÜHLMANN, L. MEIER, AND N. MEINSHAUSEN (2015): "High-Dimensional Inference: Confidence Intervals, p-values and R-Software hdi," *Statistical Science*, 30, 533–558.
- DI TRAGLIA, F. J. AND L. LIU (2025): "Bayesian Double Machine Learning for Causal Inference," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.12688*.
- DONOHUE III, J. J. AND S. D. LEVITT (2001): "The impact of legalized abortion on crime," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 116, 379–420.
- FANG, Z., A. SANTOS, A. SHAIKH, AND A. TORGOVITSKY (2023): "Inference for Large-Scale Linear Systems with Known Coefficients," *Econometrica*, 91, 299–327.
- GAO, C., A. W. VAN DER VAART, AND H. H. ZHOU (2020): "A general framework for Bayes structured linear models," *The Annals of Statistics*, 48, 2848 – 2878.
- GEORGE, E. AND R. MCCULLOCH (1993): "Variable selection via Gibbs sampling," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88, 881–889.
- GHOSAL, S. (1999): "Asymptotic Normality of Posterior Distributions in High-Dimensional Linear Models," *Bernoulli*, 5, 315.
- GHOSAL, S. AND A. VAN DER VAART (2017): *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*, Cambridge University Press.
- GIANNONE, D., M. LENZA, AND G. E. PRIMICERI (2021): "Economic predictions with big data: The illusion of sparsity," *Econometrica*, 89, 2409–2437.
- HOU, Z., W. MA, AND L. WANG (2023): "Sparse and debiased lasso estimation and inference for high-dimensional composite quantile regression with distributed data," *TEST*, 32, 1230–1250.
- IMBENS, G. W. (2021): "Statistical significance, p-values, and the reporting of uncertainty," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 35, 157–174.
- JAVANMARD, A. AND A. MONTANARI (2014): "Confidence intervals and hypothesis testing for high-dimensional regression," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15, 2869–2909.
- KIM, S., C. LEE, AND S. GUPTA (2020): "Bayesian synthetic control methods," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 57, 831–852.
- KOENKER, R. (2005): *Quantile Regression*, Cambridge University Press.

- KUCHIBHOTLA, A. AND A. CHAKRABORTTY (2022): “Moving beyond sub-Gaussianity in high-dimensional statistics: Applications in covariance estimation and linear regression,” *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11, 1389–1456.
- MITCHELL, T. AND J. BEAUCHAMP (1988): “Bayesian variable selection in linear regression,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 83, 1023–1032.
- MOGLIANI, M. AND A. SIMONI (2021): “Bayesian MIDAS penalized regressions: estimation, selection, and prediction,” *Journal of Econometrics*, 222, 833–860.
- POLLARD, D. (2002): *A User’s Guide to Measure Theoretic Probability*, Cambridge University Press.
- RASKUTTI, G., M. WAINWRIGHT, AND B. YU (2010): “Restricted eigenvalue properties for correlated Gaussian designs,” *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 2241–2259.
- RAY, K. AND B. SZABÓ (2022): “Variational Bayes for high-dimensional linear regression with sparse priors,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117, 1270–1281.
- RAY, K. AND A. VAN DER VAART (2020): “Semiparametric Bayesian causal inference,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 48, 2999–3020.
- (2021): “On the Bernstein-von Mises theorem for the Dirichlet process,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15, 2224–2246.
- ROČKOVÁ, V. (2018): “Bayesian estimation of sparse signals with a continuous spike-and-slab prior,” *The Annals of Statistics*.
- RUBIN, D. (1981): “The Bayesian Bootstrap,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 9, 130–134.
- (1984): “Bayesianly justifiable and relevant frequency calculations for the applied statistician,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 12, 1151–1172.
- SKORSKI, M. (2023): “Bernstein-type bounds for beta distribution,” *Modern Stochastics: Theory and Applications*, 10, 211–228.
- SONG, Q. AND F. LIANG (2023): “Nearly optimal Bayesian shrinkage for high-dimensional regression,” *Science China Mathematics*, 66, 409–442.
- TIBSHIRANI, R. (1996): “Regression Shrinkage and Selection via the Lasso,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 58, 267–288.
- VAN DE GEER, S., P. BÜHLMANN, Y. RITOV, AND R. DEZEURE (2014): “On asymptotically optimal confidence regions and tests for high-dimensional models,” *The Annals of Statistics*, 42, 1166–1202.
- WALKER, C. (2023): “Parametrization, Prior Independence, and the Semiparametric Bernstein-von Mises Theorem for the Partially Linear Model,” Tech. rep., arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03816.
- WANG, Y. AND D. M. BLEI (2019): “Frequentist consistency of variational Bayes,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 114, 1147–1161.
- WU, T., N. N. NARISSETTY, AND Y. YANG (2023): “Statistical inference via conditional Bayesian posteriors in high-dimensional linear regression,” *Electronic Journal*

- of Statistics*, 17, 769–797.
- YANG, D. (2019): “Posterior asymptotic normality for an individual coordinate in high-dimensional linear regression,” *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 13, 3082 – 3094.
- YIU, A., E. FONG, C. HOLMES, AND J. ROUSSEAU (2025): “Semiparametric posterior corrections,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 87, 1025–1054.
- ZHANG, C.-H. AND S. S. ZHANG (2014): “Confidence intervals for low dimensional parameters in high dimensional linear models,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 76, 217–242.
- ZHANG, Y. AND D. N. POLITIS (2022): “Ridge regression revisited: Debiasing, thresholding and bootstrap,” *Annals of Statistics*, 50, 1401–1422.
- ZHOU, S. (2009): “Restricted eigenvalue conditions on subgaussian random matrices,” Tech. rep., arXiv preprint arXiv:0912.4045.