

Characterizing Finite-Dimensional Posterior Marginals in High-Dimensional GLMs via Leave-One-Out

Manuel Sáenz^{†1} and Pragya Sur^{†2}

¹Departamento de Matemática y Ciencias, Universidad de San Andres

²Department of Statistics, Harvard University

January 5, 2026

Abstract

We investigate Bayes posterior distributions in high-dimensional generalized linear models (GLMs) under the proportional asymptotics regime, where the number of features and samples diverge at a comparable rate. Specifically, we characterize the limiting behavior of finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior. We establish that the posterior does not contract in this setting. Yet, the finite-dimensional posterior marginals converge to Gaussian tilts of the prior, where the mean of the Gaussian depends on the true signal coordinates of interest. Notably, the effect of the prior survives even in the limit of large samples and dimensions. We further characterize the behavior of the posterior mean and demonstrate that the posterior mean can strictly outperform the maximum likelihood estimate in mean-squared error in natural examples. Importantly, our results hold regardless of the sparsity level of the underlying signal. On the technical front, we introduce leave-one-out strategies for studying these marginals that may be of independent interest for analyzing low-dimensional functionals of high-dimensional signals in other Bayesian inference problems.

1 Introduction

High-dimensional Bayesian inference has garnered significant recent attention. Early work considered high-dimensional Bayesian regression where the dimension diverges at a rate slower than the sample size, and explored when low-dimensional results continue to hold in such settings [1–3]. Following this, extensive prior work studied the ultra-high-dimensional regime where the number of features p is much larger than the number of samples n , and the underlying signal is sufficiently sparse or approximately sparse [4–11]. This line of work identified conditions under which the posterior contracts, is asymptotically normal or mixture of normals, and Bernstein-von-Mises theorems (BvMs) hold. In this paper, we deviate from both these settings and consider the high-dimensional regime where the number of features and samples diverge at a rate comparable to each other, also known as the proportional asymptotics regime.

This regime has become popular in modern high-dimensional statistics due to the following attractive features. First, asymptotic theory established under this regime exhibits remarkable finite sample behavior, as demonstrated extensively in prior work [12–18]. Second, the regime allows one to move away from traditional strong sparsity assumptions on the underlying signal, and develop

[†]Contact: saenzm@udesa.edu.ar, pragya@fas.harvard.edu.

rigorous procedures that remain valid under sparse to dense signals, leading to methods with impressive practical performance [16, 19–24]. Finally, this regime allows for the precise characterization of new high-dimensional phenomena that may be difficult to track or explain using other mathematical frameworks [16, 25–27]. In light of these attractive properties, several prior work has studied this regime in a frequentist setting.

In the Bayesian context, a long literature in statistical physics and information theory has studied this regime in the so-called matched setting, where the statistician knows the true prior underlying the signal [28–31]. However, from a statistical perspective, the mismatched setting, where the statistician does not know the true underlying prior, is certainly more interesting. Only recently, [32] studied a high-dimensional linear model in a mismatched setting, establishing properties of the log-normalizing constant and mean-squared error of Bayesian estimators in presence of a Gaussian prior. In this paper, we provide for the first time precise characterization of finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior in a high-dimensional Bayesian generalized linear model under the proportional asymptotics regime in the more realistic mismatched setting. Understanding marginals requires a more nuanced analysis than that for understanding the log-normalizing constant or mean-squared errors. For the latter, an “average case” analysis of the model suffices. In our case, a more nuanced leave-one-out technique is necessary that we introduce in our work. We summarize our major contributions below.

1. We provide the first characterization of finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior in the aforementioned setting (Theorem 2). Specifically, we uncover that, unlike in the low-dimensional or ultra-high-dimensional regression literature in statistics, the posterior marginals are Gaussian tilts of the prior, where we precisely pin down the tilting function. The mean of the Gaussian tilt is a constant times the true signal and additional random noise variables.
2. Our result also shows that the effect of the prior does not wash away, even in the limit of large samples and dimensions. This is a critical observation—since this can pave the path for designing priors that help in high-dimensional learning, and constructing credible intervals with low width.
3. Furthermore in this regime, posterior contraction does not occur (Theorem 1), yet our posterior marginal characterization can provide first steps toward conducting inference on pre-specified finite number of coordinates of the signal.
4. As a corollary, our result provides a characterization of the posterior mean in the aforementioned high-dimensional regime (Corollary 1). Once again, the effect of the prior survives even asymptotically.
5. Crucially, based on our aforementioned characterization, we construct an explicit setting where the posterior mean strictly outperforms the MLE (c.f., the left panel of Figure 3), even in a setting where the MLE is well-defined.¹ This regime uncovers a striking departure from classical behavior: the posterior mean no longer converges to the MLE, even in the limit of large samples. Indeed, this divergence is favorable for Bayesian methods, since the MLE is known to perform poorly in high dimensions [16]. But it also consolidates the fact that one should not pursue classical BvMs in this regime since the MLE is strictly sub-optimal. To

¹Note, although we consider a high-dimensional regime where the number of features p and samples n both diverge, we allow them to grow proportionally so that $p/n \rightarrow \kappa$. For $\kappa \in (0, 1)$ the setting is still high-dimensional in that high-dimensional phenomena would emerge but the MLE can still be well-defined for some subset of κ values in this range. The exact subset would depend on the GLM considered.

overcome issues with the MLE, a debiased MLE was introduced in [16]. We illustrate in the right panel of Figure 3 that a function of the posterior mean can strictly outperform this debiased MLE.

6. In terms of technical contributions, this paper provides the first leave-one-out analysis for a high-dimensional Bayesian model with a planted signal and shows how such leave-one-out techniques can be used to investigate posterior marginals. In the frequentist literature, leave-one-out analyses for understanding fluctuations and other properties of estimators have been introduced for high-dimensional linear and logistic regression [13, 14, 16], treatment effect estimation [33] (see [34] for other applications). To the best of our knowledge, in the Bayesian literature, leave-one-out ideas have been employed only for global null models in the statistical physics and probability literature [35, 36]. These settings are distinct from settings of interest to the statistician where there is an unknown underlying signal of interest in the data generating process. Presence of such a planted signal, especially in conjunction with the non-linear link functions in GLMs, raises significant technical difficulties that we overcome in this manuscript.

In recent work, a regime where the posterior does not contract was studied in the context of regression problems through the lens of Variational Bayes [37–39], but their framework does not cover ours. In fact, in our setting, their feature dimension can grow at most negligible to the sample size—thus they work in a setting complementary to ours. The proportional asymptotics regime has been studied for empirical Bayes problems in recent literature, including interesting algorithmic advances [21, 40, 41]. However, these works do not study the behavior of finite-dimensional posterior marginals, and it remains unclear how their tools can be utilized to address this question (see also [42]). Our results also have interesting connections to the literature on Gaussian sequence models [43] and non-parametric Bayes [44–48]. We discuss these connections to prior work in detail in Section 3.

Finally, our leave-one-out analyses provide an analogue of classical local asymptotic analysis in high dimensions. Our key proof idea relies on tilting the full posterior with respect to leave-one-out posteriors that we introduce in Section 2. Subsequently, we establish that the tilt is asymptotically Gaussian, as in traditional Le Cam theory [49, 50]. Our proof heuristics section (Section 4) elaborates on this connection. The analogy with local asymptotic analyses can be particularly observed in (32) and (36), where we express the full posterior in terms of tilts of the leave-a-variable-out and leave-an-observation-out posteriors respectively. We believe this leave-one-out framework can be used to study many other problems in Bayesian inference where low-dimensional functionals of the high-dimensional signal are of interest. Given the emerging interest in this area in the high-dimensional Bayesian community [39, 51], our work here is meant to provide a general-purpose tool for studying such problems in Bayesian inference.

The rest of this manuscript is organized as follows: Section 2 introduces our formal setup and key ingredients required for our leave-one-out analyses. Section 3 introduces our main results and provides a short discussion on immediate applications. Section 4 describes our proof outline—given the technical nature of the paper, we believe this is the most accessible description of our overarching leave-one-out strategies. Finally, we conclude with a discussion of future directions in Section 5.

2 Formal Setup and Leave-one-Out Posteriors

We work in a high-dimensional regime where the number of samples n and features $p(n)$ both diverge with $p(n)/n \rightarrow \kappa > 0$. That is, we consider a sequence of problem instances $\{\mathbf{y}(n), \mathbf{X}(n), \boldsymbol{\beta}_*(n), \mathbf{e}(n)\}_{n \geq 1}$,

where $\mathbf{y}(n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denotes the vector of n outcomes, $\mathbf{X}(n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ the design matrix, $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star(n) \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the unknown signal and $\mathbf{e}(n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the unobserved noise variables. Moving forward, we suppress the dependence on n when it is clear from context. We assume that the samples are i.i.d. with the i -th sample satisfying the following single-index model

$$y_i = f(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, e_i), \quad (1)$$

where \mathbf{X}_i is the i -th row of \mathbf{X} , $f(\cdot)$ is some non-linear function and $e_i \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_i . As a running example, consider logistic regression where $f(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, e_i) = \mathbb{I}_{\{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star \geq \sigma^{-1}(e_i)\}}$ and $\sigma(x) = e^x / (1 + e^x)$ is the sigmoid function.

We seek to study properties of the posterior distribution when the statistician posits an i.i.d. prior $\mu(\cdot)$ on the signal coordinates and assumes the data is generated from a canonical generalized linear model (GLM). For simplicity, we assume that the covariates satisfy $\mathbf{X}_i \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}/n)$. Though this assumption is stylized, we will see that new high-dimensional phenomena emerge in our aforementioned setting even in this simple setting. Defining functions

$$\tilde{T}_i(\cdot) := T \circ f(\cdot, e_i) \text{ and } u_i(x, y) := x \tilde{T}_i(y) - A(x), \quad (2)$$

for some function $T(\cdot)$, the log-likelihood of our canonical GLM takes the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) := \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} - A(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star), \quad (3)$$

for $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and suitable log-normalizing constant $A(\cdot)$.

We often analyze the joint behavior of independent samples from the posterior. For a given realization of the data, we denote l independent samples from a posterior² by $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$. When the superscript is omitted, we assume it equals 1, i.e. $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is used to denote $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}$. Note the log-likelihood involves $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ and \mathbf{b} through the inner products with \mathbf{X}_i 's. We introduce a specific notation for these inner products for convenience. For $m \in [l]$, \mathbf{a}_\star and \mathbf{a}_m will denote the random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n given by

$$\mathbf{a}_\star = (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star), \quad \mathbf{a}_m = (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) \quad (4)$$

As before, when the m subscript is omitted, we assume it equals 1. That is, \mathbf{a} refers to \mathbf{a}_1 . Let $a_{\star,i}$ and $a_{m,i}$ denote the i -th coordinates of \mathbf{a}_\star and \mathbf{a}_m respectively.

Toward understanding the behavior of the posterior distribution, one of our central results quantifies the expected value of a function $g(\cdot)$ applied to l independent samples from the posterior, for any integer l . Note, any such expectation involves two sources of randomness—one coming from the data, and the other coming from sampling from the posterior, given any realization of the data. We will distinguish these sources of randomness, using $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ to denote the expectation with respect to the data randomness and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ to denote the expectation with respect to the posterior. Thus, for a function $g : \mathbb{R}^{pl} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\langle g(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}) \rangle = \frac{1}{Z_n} \int g(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}) \exp \left\{ \sum_{m \in [l]} \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) \right\} \prod_{m \in [l]} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(m)}), \quad (5)$$

where Z_n denotes the appropriate normalizing constant.

²We will use different posteriors for different parts of our calculations; when we refer to samples from a posterior, it should be clear from context which posterior is involved; where this is not the case, we will specify explicitly.

2.1 Leave-one-Out Posteriors

Two critical components in our mathematical analysis are the *leave-an-observation-out* and *leave-a-variable-out* posteriors. The former is the posterior distribution obtained using $n - 1$ observations instead of all n . It corresponds to the log-likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}_{n-1,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i \in [n-1]} u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \quad (6)$$

with i.i.d. prior μ applied to each of the p coordinates. If $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$ are $l \geq 1$ independent samples from the leave-an-observation-out posterior, we will let, with some abuse of notation, $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be defined as the vectors with i -th coordinates $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$, respectively. Again, dropping the m superscript corresponds to taking $m = 1$. Then for $g : \mathbb{R}^{n(l+1)} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ we denote by $\langle g(\mathbf{a}_\star, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l) \rangle_o$ the expectation of $g(\mathbf{a}_\star, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l)$ under the leave-an-observation-out posterior (given the observed data). Thus, formally

$$\langle g(\mathbf{a}_\star, \mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l) \rangle_o := \frac{\int g(\mathbf{X}_1^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}) \prod_{m \in [l]} \left\{ \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n-1,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)})\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j^{(m)}) \right\}}{\int \prod_{m \in [l]} \left\{ \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n-1,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)})\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j^{(m)}) \right\}}. \quad (7)$$

Analogously, the leave-a-variable-out posterior is the posterior distribution obtained on dropping one of the p variables while observing all n samples. Fix $j_0 \in [p]$. We will use the following convention. Given a vector $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we will denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ the vector obtained by dropping the j_0 -th coordinate. Thus, $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star$ denote the vectors $\mathbf{X}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ respectively, with the j_0 -th component removed. Define the leave-a-variable-out log-likelihood as

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} u_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star), \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{b}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$. The leave-a-variable-out posterior is a measure on \mathbb{R}^p corresponding to the log-likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\cdot)$ and prior $\mu^{\otimes p}$. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$ be $l \geq 1$ samples from the leave-a-variable-out posterior. Then, for every integrable $f : \mathbb{R}^{p(l+1)} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we will define expectations under the leave-a-variable-out posterior (given the observed data) to be

$$\left\langle f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}) \right\rangle_v := \frac{\int f(\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}) \prod_{m \in [l]} \left\{ \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(m)})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(m)}) \right\}}{\int \prod_{m \in [l]} \left\{ \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(m)})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(m)}) \right\}}. \quad (9)$$

Observe that, if $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a sample from the leave-a-variable-out measure, then $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is distributed according to a posterior on \mathbb{R}^{p-1} corresponding to log-likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\cdot)$ and prior $\mu^{\otimes p-1}$ and is independent of β_{j_0} (the j_0 -th coordinate of $\boldsymbol{\beta}$), which is distributed according to the prior μ . In analogy to the previous notations, we will let $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_\star$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_l$ be the random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n given by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{a}}_\star = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star)^\top, \quad \tilde{\mathbf{a}}_\ell = (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(\ell)}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(\ell)})^\top, \quad (10)$$

where, again, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(l)}$ are obtained by dropping the j_0 -th coordinate from samples $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$ drawn from the leave-a-variable-out posterior.

As with the notations introduced in (7) and (9), whenever a new relevant posterior arises in our analysis, we refer to its expectation (given the observed data) to be $\langle \cdot \rangle$, adding a suitable subscript to distinguish it from other posterior expectations previously defined. The need to introduce this notation will transpire later when we discuss our proof strategies.

2.2 Assumptions on prior, likelihood and signal

We work with the following regularity conditions on the prior, likelihood and underlying signal. In Section 3.2, we discuss examples where our theory applies—we show that either the following assumptions apply directly or that the example can be well-approximated by a model where the following apply.

Hypothesis 1. *Our assumptions on the prior, likelihood and signal are as follows:*

- (i) $\log \mu : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a \mathcal{C}^2 and strongly concave function;
- (ii) $\tilde{T}_i : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is almost surely (a.s.) \mathcal{C}^3 and there exists a constant $d_1 > 0$ s.t. $\|\tilde{T}_i'\|_\infty, \|\tilde{T}_i''\|_\infty, \|\tilde{T}_i'''\|_\infty < d_1$ a.s.;
- (iii) $A : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a non-negative, \mathcal{C}^3 and convex function s.t. $\|A''\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $\|A'''\|_\infty < d_2$ for some $d_2 > 0$;
- (iv) the signal vectors $\beta_\star \in \mathbb{R}^p$ define a deterministic sequence such that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\beta_\star\|_\infty < \infty$, and as $n \rightarrow \infty$, the empirical measure $p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \delta_{\beta_{\star,j}}(\cdot)$ converges weakly to some limiting distribution $\pi(\cdot)$, with second moments converging; in fact, we assume $\text{Var}(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_\star) = \|\beta_\star\|^2/n$ converges to some finite constant of the form $\kappa\gamma^2 > 0$.
- (v) for $i \in [n]$, $u_i(x, y)$ is an a.s. non-positive function (recall the definition of $u_i(\cdot, \cdot)$ from (2));
- (vi) and, for $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{E}(n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i^2(0))^{2k}$ is a bounded sequence.

In the former, all *almost sure* statements are with respect to the randomness associated to the noise variables e_1, \dots, e_n . Furthermore, the measure $\pi(\cdot)$ in Hypothesis 1(iv) may place a positive mass at zero which would correspond to a fraction of the coordinates of β_\star being zero, i.e. signal vectors with such linear sparsity are allowed within our framework. In this sense, our framework accommodates both sparse and dense signals. We mention the aforementioned conditions as an assumption, but later we will show that all our examples satisfy these conditions. Finally, in addition to Hypothesis 1, our main result requires some control on the moments of a_i as summarized below.

Hypothesis 2. *With $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ as above, we further assume that, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists some $C_k > 0$ s.t. for all $n \geq 1$ we have $\mathbb{E}\langle a_{1,1}^k \rangle \leq C_k$.*

Remark (establishing Hypothesis 2). Note that in contrast to Hypothesis 1, Hypothesis 2 might not be straightforward to check for a given model. In Appendix G, we present general results that allow to check this, and show for our main examples that this indeed holds.

2.3 Auxiliary random measures and fixed point equations

Our main result (Theorem 2) states that the finite-dimensional posterior marginals behave as Gaussian tilts of the prior. To describe the mean and variance of the tilt, we require two auxiliary measures that we introduce here. These measures arise repeatedly in our analysis. Before we describe these, note that the posterior is proportional to $\exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(b_j)$ where the likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b})$ from (3) depends on the data through the quantities $\{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_\star, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}\}_{i \in [n]}$. Thus, for a sample β from the posterior distribution, if we can quantify the limit of the joint distribution of $(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_\star, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta)$ as $n, p \rightarrow \infty$ and $p/n \rightarrow \kappa$, we can establish the behavior of posterior marginals using this characterization. Later, in Proposition 4, we do exactly that: we describe this asymptotic

joint distribution. The main message from the proposition is that $(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta})$ asymptotically converges to $(\theta_\star, \theta) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ where

$$\begin{bmatrix} \theta_\star \\ \theta \end{bmatrix} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} \theta_\star \\ \theta(\xi_B) \end{bmatrix} := \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}\xi_B \end{bmatrix} + \mathcal{N}[\mathbf{0}, \kappa \boldsymbol{\Sigma}], \quad \text{with} \quad \boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \gamma^2 & c_{BB_\star} \\ c_{BB_\star} & c_B \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

The argument in $\theta(\xi_B)$ is used to denote that θ is a function of the dummy variable ξ_B . Recall that γ^2 was defined in Hypothesis 1(iv). Above, v_B, c_B, c_{BB_\star} are constants that we define later. Roughly, they correspond to the (normalized) norm of a typical sample from the posterior, the inner product between two independent samples from the posterior, and the inner product between a sample from the posterior and the true signal (see Proposition 1).

Note that an alternate way of representing θ_\star and $\theta(\xi)$ would be via the following representations:

$$\theta(\xi_B) := \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}\xi_B + \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star} \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \left(\gamma^2 - \frac{c_{BB_\star}^2}{c_B} \right)} \xi_{B_\star} + c_{BB_\star} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{c_B}} z_{BB_\star} \quad (12)$$

if $c_B > 0$ or $\theta(\xi_B) := \sqrt{\kappa v_B} \xi_B$ and $\theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \gamma^2} \xi_{B_\star}$ otherwise. Here, ξ_{B_\star} and z_{BB_\star} are independent standard Gaussian random variables. For now, we keep ξ_B free.

Now let $e \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ independent of everything else and define $\tilde{T}(\theta_\star) := T \circ f(\theta_\star, e)$. Define the following random measure (random since it depends on the random variables e, ξ_{B_\star} and z_{BB_\star}) with density

$$p_s(\xi_B) \propto \exp \left\{ \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) \theta(\xi_B) - A(\theta(\xi_B)) - \frac{\xi_B^2}{2} \right\} \quad (13)$$

Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_s$ denote the expectation under p_s . We will also let $\mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e}(\cdot)$ denote the expectation with respect to $\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star}$, and e . Here G is used to denote the 2-dimensional standard Gaussian vector $(\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star})$. Notice that p_s is the posterior corresponding to a canonical GLM likelihood (recall the form from (3)) where $\theta_\star, \theta(\xi_B)$ respectively play the roles of $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and a Gaussian prior is posited on ξ_B . If \mathcal{L}_s denotes the log-likelihood corresponding to the density p_s , then the scores with respect to both θ_\star and θ will serve critical in our later derivations; we denote this by

$$S_{\theta_\star}(\xi_B) := \partial_{\theta_\star} \mathcal{L}_s = \tilde{T}'(\theta_\star) \theta(\xi_B) \quad \text{and} \quad S_\theta(\xi_B) := \partial_\theta \mathcal{L}_s = \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) - A'(\theta(\xi_B)). \quad (14)$$

With these definitions in place, define the constants r_1, r_2, r_3 as

$$\begin{cases} r_1 := \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \left[\langle A''(\theta(\xi_B)) \rangle_s - \text{Var}_{\langle \cdot \rangle_s}(S_\theta(\xi_B)) \right] \\ r_2 := \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \left[\text{Cov}_{\langle \cdot \rangle_s}(S_{\theta_\star}(\xi_B); S_\theta(\xi_B)) \right] \\ r_3 := \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \left[\langle S_\theta(\xi_B) \rangle_s^2 \right]; \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

where $\text{Var}_{\langle \cdot \rangle_s}$ and $\text{Cov}_{\langle \cdot \rangle_s}$ denote, respectively, the variance and covariance under the measure with density p_s . Note these constants depend on v_B, c_B, c_{BB_\star} that appeared in (11). We now introduce a different auxiliary measure that determines these.

Recalling from Hypothesis 1(iv) that $\pi(\cdot)$ denotes the limiting empirical distribution of the signal sequence $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star(n)$, we define the measure

$$p_h(b) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2v}(b-m)^2} \mu(db) \quad (16)$$

with $B_\star \sim \pi(\cdot)$, $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ independent of everything else, and

$$m = \alpha B_\star + \sigma Z, \quad \alpha := \frac{r_2 + t_\gamma}{r_1}, \quad \sigma := \frac{\sqrt{r_3}}{r_1}, \quad v := \frac{1}{r_1}, \quad t_\gamma = \mathbb{E}[\tilde{T}_1^l(\sqrt{\kappa}\gamma Z)] \quad (17)$$

We denote $\langle \cdot \rangle_h$ and $\mathbb{E}_{Z, B_\star}(\cdot)$ to be the expectations with respect to p_h and (Z, B_\star) respectively.³ Then, let

$$\begin{cases} v_B := \mathbb{E}_{Z, B_\star} \langle \beta^2 \rangle_h \\ c_B := \mathbb{E}_{Z, B_\star} \langle \beta \rangle_h^2 \\ c_{BB_\star} := \mathbb{E}_{Z, B_\star} \langle \beta B_\star \rangle_h \end{cases} \quad (18)$$

Note the RHS of (18) depends on α, σ, v (which in turn depends on r_1, r_2, r_3), whereas the RHS of (15) depends on v_B, c_B, c_{BB_\star} . Thus, (15) and (18) provide a coupled system of equations interdependent on each other. We assume throughout that this coupled system admits a unique solution. Strategies for proving uniqueness of such systems of equations have appeared in the prior frequentist literature [22, 52, 53]. Proving them in our setting would require case-by-case analysis of GLMs, which we refrain from diving into since it draws significant attention away from our main contributions. Numerically, we find that if our other assumptions are met, the system can be solved with extremely high precision. The code for solving this system of equations can be found in [54].

3 Main Results and Applications

3.1 Main Results

Our main result characterizes the behavior of finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior distribution in the setting of Section 2. Before we delve into this, we highlight a major difference between our setting and the more traditional high-dimensional Bayesian literature that posits sparsity-type assumptions on the underlying signal, and considers the setting where the number of features is much larger than the sample size. A central picture that emerges in this traditional regime is that the p -dimensional posterior measure $\mathbb{P}(\cdot | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ concentrates around the true signal—a phenomenon known as posterior consistency. Formally, posterior consistency states that for all $\epsilon > 0$, the probability that the posterior distribution assigns to balls (in a suitable metric) centered at β_\star with radius ϵ converges almost surely or in probability to 1 asymptotically. In our regime, a different picture emerges—the posterior no longer concentrates around the truth. In fact the following holds.

Theorem 1. *In the setting of Section 2, let $f : \mathbb{R}^l \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ grow at most polynomially. Then we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, p/n \rightarrow \kappa} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \frac{1}{p} \sum_{j \in [p]} f(\beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}) \right\rangle = \mathbb{E}_{Z, B_\star} \left\langle f(\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(l)}) \right\rangle_h,$$

where on the left, $\beta_j^{(1)}, \beta_j^{(2)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}$ denote the j -th coordinates of l independent samples from the posterior and on the right, the expectation is over $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(l)}$ drawn from l independent copies of $p_h(\cdot)$ defined in (16). In particular,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, p/n \rightarrow \kappa} \mathbb{E} \langle (p^{-1} \|\beta - \beta_\star\|^2 - c)^2 \rangle \rightarrow 0,$$

where β denotes a sample from the posterior and $c := \gamma^2 + v_B - 2c_{BB_\star}$, with γ^2 defined as in Hypothesis 1(iv) and v_B, c_{BB_\star} defined as in (18).




Figure 1: The asymptotic mean squared error, constant c of Theorem 1, as a function of the aspect ratio κ for a logistic regression model with Beta prior and signal. Specifically, we choose $\mu = \text{Beta}(2, 2)$ and $\pi = \text{Beta}(2, 5)$. Observe the increase in MSE with increase in κ . Computing c requires numerically calculating v_B and c_{BB^*} , which in turn requires solving the fixed point equations (15) and (18). Precise details on how these equations are solved numerically is provided in Appendix (K) and linked in [54].

The proof of this theorem can be found in Appendix A.3. Typically, $c > 0$ as long as $\kappa > 0$. We demonstrate this in Figure 1, where we plot c as a function of κ for a logistic model with Beta prior. Observe that c is positive and increases as a function of the dimension to sample size ratio κ , suggesting that the larger the dimensionality the larger the mean squared error of a typical sample from the posterior. The main takeaway is that since the L_2 distance between a sample from the posterior and the true signal converges in L_2 to a positive constant, the full p -dimensional posterior cannot concentrate around the truth. This highlights the stark contrast between the traditional ultra-high-dimensional (parametric) regime and the proportional asymptotics regime. We remark that in non-parametric and semi-parametric models, there are multiple instances in prior literature where the posterior is inconsistent in a frequentist sense [55–59]. In that sense, our parametric setting behaves similar to these models rather than the high-dimensional parametric ultra-sparse models. Recently, [37, 39] studied such an inconsistency regime as well, but in our framework, their results remain within the $p = o(n)$ regime.

Despite this negative picture about posterior consistency, perhaps fascinatingly, the finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior still contain information about the corresponding coordinates of the true signal. We formalize this in our main result below.

Theorem 2. *In the setting of Section 2, suppose β denotes a sample from the posterior distribution. For each $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and set of distinct indices $j_1, \dots, j_r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\beta_{j_1}, \dots, \beta_{j_r}) \in \mathbb{R}^r$ denote the random vector formed by the j_1, \dots, j_r -th coordinates of β . Then*

$$(\beta_{j_1}, \dots, \beta_{j_r}) \xrightarrow{d} (B_{j_1}, \dots, B_{j_r}),$$

where $(B_{j_1}, \dots, B_{j_r})$ has a joint density on \mathbb{R}^r proportional to $p_{h,j_1} \times \dots \times p_{h,j_r}$, where $p_{h,j}$ is given by

$$p_{h,j}(b) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2v}(b-m_j)^2} \mu(db), \quad \text{with} \quad m_j = \alpha \beta_{\star,j} + \sigma Z_j. \quad (19)$$

³With some abuse of notation, we will use $\langle \cdot \rangle_h$ to denote expectation under multiple independent copies of $p_h(\cdot)$ on some cases later, but this would either be clarified explicitly or be clear from context.

Above $\beta_{\star,j}$ denotes the j -th coordinate of the true signal β_{\star} , the variables Z_j are i.i.d. standard Gaussian independent of everything else, and α, σ, v are as in (17).

The proof is deferred to Section A.4. The theorem says that the finite-dimensional posterior marginals can be expressed as Gaussian tilts of the prior. Crucially, the tilt itself has a random mean, that is in the form of a constant times the corresponding true signal coordinate plus additional Gaussian noise. Our proof heuristics section (Section 4) further illuminates why the posterior marginals take this form. In particular, our proof uncovers interesting connections with classical Le Cam theory. For instance, we express the full posterior as tilts of the leave-a-variable-out and leave-an-observation-out posteriors introduced in Section 2.1. A key step in our proof is to show the tilt part converges to appropriate Gaussian variables, as in classical local asymptotic analysis of standard estimators such as the MLE [60]. We explain this in further detail in Section 4. Here, we present some discussions surrounding the theorem.

To gain insights, we contrast our theorem with the case of a high-dimensional Gaussian linear model with Gaussian prior, where explicit closed-form formulae are available for the posterior. Specifically, if we assume the observed data comes from a linear model with $y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_{\star} + \epsilon_i$ and $\epsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \mathbb{I}_n)$. In our setting, this means $f(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_{\star}, e_i) = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_{\star} + \Phi_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1}(e_i)$ where $\Phi_{\tilde{\sigma}}^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse Gaussian cdf of a $N(0, \tilde{\sigma}^2 \mathbb{I}_n)$. Suppose that we consider an i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \tilde{v})$ prior on each coordinate. Although we can perform closed-form calculations here, we assume for simplicity $\tilde{\sigma} = \tilde{v} = 1$. The posterior distribution at β is proportional to

$$\exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta\|^2 - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\|\beta\|^2}_{\text{tilt from the prior}}\right\} = \exp\left\{-\frac{1}{2}\beta^\top (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbf{I})\beta + \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{X}\beta\right\}, \quad (20)$$

which is a multivariate Gaussian $N(\mu, \Sigma)$ with $\mu = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I}_p)^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}$, $\Sigma = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I}_p)^{-1}$.

From here the asymptotic distribution of the marginals can be explicitly calculated. We show later (Appendix J.2) that this closed-form calculation and our Theorem 2 indeed match. Here we show the form of the posterior to emphasize that it is indeed a tilt from the prior. Note that the posterior marginals in a Gaussian linear model remains Gaussian due to both the prior and likelihood being Gaussian. Once we move beyond this simple example, the posterior naturally no longer remains Gaussian. Notably, the structure of the posterior being a tilt from the prior still remains, as outlined in (19). Theorem 2 shows that, even for GLMs where the likelihood is far from a Gaussian, the likelihood part still contributes a Gaussian density (with suitable mean and variance) in the limit. This is a non-trivial takeaway and we defer more detailed discussion for why this is the case to the proof heuristics section (Section 4). Unlike many preceding parametric high-dimensional Bayesian settings, the prior effect does not wash away, even in the limit of large sample and dimensions, in our setting.

Among existing works, Theorem 2 is reminiscent of a few concrete settings studied in prior literature. First, in [61], Gaussian sequence models were extensively studied. Letting the prior variance depend on the sample size, the author pinned down the precise relation between the prior variance versus the noise level in the data, as a function of the dimension, that determine when the effect of the prior washes away versus not, in the limit of large samples; the calculations there already allude to the fact that, in a parametric problem when the number of samples and dimensions are diverging at a comparable rate, traditional results such as Bernstein-von-Mises, and effect of the prior washing away, should no longer hold. However, [61] heavily exploited the Gaussian sequence model structure, which ensured the posterior remains Gaussian (since the assumed priors were also Gaussian so the posterior has a neat closed form, analogous to (20) but for the sequence model case). Whereas in our setting, Gaussianity of the posterior is not automatic, and we find that it is a Gaussian tilt of the prior instead.

Second, there are ample examples from the non-parametric Bayes, mixture model, and normal means literature where the effect of the prior does not wash away even in the limit of large samples [44–48] (see also numerical observations reported in [62]). Third, there has been an emerging interest in studying low-dimensional parameters in high-dimensional models in the Bayesian inference literature [39, 51]). We anticipate that our leave-one-out strategies, explained in Section 4, will provide general-purpose tools to advance the study of low-dimensional functionals in high-dimensional Bayesian problems. Finally, a naive mean field and variational Bayes literature has emerged [37, 38, 63], where the posterior has been expressed as tilts of the prior. Translated to our setting, these papers cover the case of $p = o(n)$ which is lower dimensional than ours (see also [64, 65]). In fact, in our setting, naive mean field approximations fail [66–69], thus prior naive mean field-based techniques [37, 63] no longer apply. In some sense, our paper is precisely complementary to this line of work.




Figure 2: Comparison of the coefficients α and σ , from (21) and (22), for the MLE and the posterior mean corresponding to various values of κ . Here, $\pi(\cdot)$ is taken to be a Rademacher distribution and the prior $\mu(\cdot)$ is taken to be standard Gaussian. We choose such a setting with stark difference between $\pi(\cdot)$ and $\mu(\cdot)$ to illustrate that our results allow for such mismatch; this is in fact one of the strengths of our approach. Interestingly, between the MLE and the posterior mean, the growth trends for α and σ see a reversal as a function of κ .

One critical aspect of our result is the form the mean of the Gaussian in the tilt takes on. One would naturally inquire if the finite-dimensional posterior marginals can be connected to the finite-dimensional marginals of the MLE in these models in the same sense that a classical BvM theorem does. At a first pass, we should not expect any traditional BvM to hold here, following observations already pointed out in [61, 70, 71]. However, some connections can still be seen between the posterior marginals and the MLE for models that are well-studied in this proportional asymptotics regime in the frequentist literature. For instance, for logistic models, it is known by now [16, 18] that the j_0 -th marginal of the MLE satisfies

$$\hat{\beta}_{\text{MLE},j_0} \xrightarrow{d} \alpha_{\text{MLE}} \beta_{\star,j_0} + \sigma_{\text{MLE}} Z', \quad (21)$$

$Z' \sim \mathcal{N}(0,1)$, independent of everything else. An analogous result is known for finite-dimensional marginals [16, 18] but we choose a single coordinate here for simplicity. Above, $\alpha_{\text{MLE}}, \sigma_{\text{MLE}}$ are

constants, with α_{MLE} related to the projection of the MLE in the direction of the true signal, and σ_{MLE} given by the norm of the residual.

By our Theorem 2, the mean of the Gaussian tilt for a posterior marginal takes on a similar form but with different constants α, σ . The presence of the prior in the limit (19) makes it hard to relate these constants to simple objects such as projection of the posterior sample in the direction of the signal, etc., as was possible in case of the MLE. It is still worthwhile to compare how similar or different these constants are. Note that if the prior is taken to be Gaussian, then even in logistic models the posterior marginal limit in (19) simplifies—comparing the constants for this setting with the logistic MLE constants from (21) is insightful. Additionally, performing this comparison at the level of means of the posterior marginal is particularly instructive. We present this comparison next, but we first mention the following corollary that describes posterior marginals at the level of means.

Corollary 1. *Under the conditions of Theorem 2, the posterior mean $\langle(\beta_{j_1}, \dots, \beta_{j_r})\rangle$ of the r -tuple $(\beta_{j_1}, \dots, \beta_{j_r})$ converges in distribution toward a random vector $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^r$ with independent coordinates $k \in [r]$ distributed according to*

$$m_k \stackrel{d}{=} \int B p_{h,j_k}(dB),$$

with p_{h,j_k} defined as in (19).

The proof of this corollary can be found in Section A.5. As mentioned earlier, p_{h,j_k} critically retains the effect of the prior. However, if the prior is Gaussian, it serves conjugate to the Gaussian tilt part and the limiting mean distribution simplifies. In fact, for a Gaussian prior, Corollary 1 can be re-written as

$$\langle\beta_{j_0}\rangle \stackrel{d}{\rightarrow} \alpha_{\text{Bayes}}\beta_{\star,j_0} + \sigma_{\text{Bayes}}Z \quad (22)$$

where $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, independent of everything else and we choose $r = 1$ for simplicity. Here the constants $\alpha_{\text{Bayes}}, \sigma_{\text{Bayes}}$ depend on the choice of the GLM and other problem parameters such as the dimension to sample size ratio κ and the signal norm γ^2 (this may also be thought of as a signal-to-noise ratio parameter).

In the specific case where the underlying GLM is taken to be logistic regression, we compare the Bayes constants from (22) with the MLE constants from (21) in Figure 2 and the left plot of Figure 3. For simplicity, we take the prior to be standard Gaussian. Also, note that if the dimensionality is sufficiently large compared to the sample size, the MLE would not exist, since the data would be perfectly linearly separable. We restrict to the regime where the MLE exists as identified in [17]. Notably, the MLE values for α, σ are significantly higher than the Bayes values. This contrasts sharply with classical statistics or other parametric frameworks where the posterior mean asymptotically behaves like the MLE. Remarkably, this difference persists even though we operate within a well-behaved parametric setting—one as simple as logistic regression.

In fact, in our regime, beating the MLE with an exceptionally simple Bayes estimator—the posterior mean with a Gaussian prior—is easy. The left panel in Figure 3 compares the asymptotic MSE of the MLE versus the posterior mean for a marginal. A striking feature is the pronounced gap between the two values: across the full range of κ values considered, the Bayes estimator exhibits substantially smaller error than the MLE. Notably, one does not even need a sophisticated prior to see such gains in performance. Given the issues with the MLE pointed out in [16], this may be unsurprising. But, this reinforces the understanding that seeking a BvM type result with the MLE as the center would be unreasonable to pursue in this regime; since the MLE itself is sub-optimal. Identifying the correct centering frequentist estimator would be an interesting direction to pursue in the future.




Figure 3: The left panel plots the asymptotic MSE of an MLE coordinate versus that of the posterior mean corresponding to that coordinate. The setting is the same as for Figure 2. Due to the relations (21) and (22), the MSEs plotted on the left are given by $(1 - \alpha)^2 + \sigma^2$. The right panel presents the asymptotic MSE of debiased versions, obtained by dividing the MLE and the posterior mean by their respective α coefficients. Thus the MSE plotted on the right is given by $(\sigma/\alpha)^2$. In both cases, the MLE performs worse than the corresponding Bayes procedure. Across the board, the MSEs increase with increase in κ . For the Bayes procedures, the unbiasedness on the right comes at the cost of significant increase in variance.

In [16] the authors proposed a debiased MLE that removes the multiplicative bias in (21) by rescaling the MLE with a consistent estimator of α_{MLE} . One might ask if this rescaled MLE is a better choice for comparing with the posterior mean. But, this comparison is unfair since the posterior mean is biased per (22). This is perhaps unsurprising given observations already seen in [15, 16], which show that traditionally unbiased estimators no longer remain so in this high-dimensional regime. Such bias in the posterior mean has also been observed in semi-parametric Bayesian causal inference problems [72]; for us, this is seen purely due to high-dimensional effects. Since there is no apriori assumed sparsity in the true underlying signal (it could be sparse or dense), the cumulative contribution of all coordinates incurs the bias in the mean for the posterior marginals, in a spirit similar to [16].

The corresponding debiased version of the posterior mean—the one obtained by dividing the mean by α_{Bayes} —would exhibit an asymptotic MSE given by $\sigma_{\text{Bayes}}^2/\alpha_{\text{Bayes}}^2$. In the right panel of Figure 3, we compare this MSE with the debiased MLE MSE given by $\sigma_{\text{MLE}}^2/\alpha_{\text{MLE}}^2$. Once again, the Bayes procedure outperforms the debiased MLE. That said, the debiased Bayes procedure performs worse than the original posterior mean as is evident on comparing the range of the x-axis values between the left and the right panels. This is unsurprising given the phenomenon of Stein shrinkage that we famously know in statistics. The unbiasedness in the debiased Bayes procedure costs sufficient raise in the variance. Hence we do not pursue this debiasing direction further.

Finally, that the effect of the prior survives even in the limit of large samples and dimensions, may be perceived as a blessing of dimensionality, since it implies we can design data-driven priors that help in high-dimensional learning and inference.

Next we turn to explaining the main distributional limit that arises in Theorem 2 further. Critically, the limit involves constants α, σ, v that were defined in (17) based on the systems introduced

in (15) and (18). The quantities that appear in these systems possess specific interpretations. In the remainder of this section, we provide alternate ways of expressing the constants appearing in (15) and (18) that yields additional insights into how these emerge in our results.

To this end, define for $m, m' \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$Q_{mm'} := \frac{1}{p} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m')}, \quad Q_{m\star} := \frac{1}{p} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}, \quad (23)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m')}$ denote two independent samples from the posterior. Proposition 1 below, that forms one of our main intermediate results, shows that the constants (18) can be interpreted as limits of these quantities, in the sense that for any $m \neq m' \in \mathbb{N}$

$$Q_{mm} \rightarrow v_B, \quad Q_{mm'} \rightarrow c_B, \quad Q_{m\star} \rightarrow c_{BB_\star},$$

in an L_2 convergence sense. That is, v_B, c_B, c_{BB_\star} correspond respectively to the (normalized) norm of a typical sample from the posterior, the inner product between two independent samples and the inner product between a sample from the posterior and the true signal. Interestingly, the other set of constants r_1, r_2, r_3 , critical for defining the mean and variance parameters α, σ, v in our main result, Theorem 2, (19), can be interpreted using versions of the score functions introduced in (14).

To see this, define $\mathbf{S}^{(m)}, \mathbf{S}_\star^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to be the vectors with i -th entry given by

$$S_i^{(m)} := \tilde{T}_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) - A'(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) \quad \text{and} \quad S_{\star,i}^{(m)} := \tilde{T}'_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}. \quad (24)$$

where $A'(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) = dA/dx|_{x=\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}}$ and $\tilde{T}'_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) = d\tilde{T}_i/dx|_{x=\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star}$. In other words $\mathbf{S}^m, \mathbf{S}_\star^m$ are vector versions of the scalar scores introduced in (14), with $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ and $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}$ substituted for θ_\star and θ respectively. We then define,

$$\tilde{Q}_{mm'} := n^{-1} \mathbf{S}^{(m)\top} \mathbf{S}^{(m')}, \quad M_{mm'} := n^{-1} \mathbf{S}^{(m)\top} \mathbf{S}_\star^{(m')}, \quad \bar{Q}_{mm'} := n^{-1} \mathbf{S}_\star^{(m)\top} \mathbf{S}_\star^{(m')}. \quad (25)$$

$$\text{and } a_{dp} := \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle A''(\theta) \rangle_s, \quad (26)$$

where recall that $\langle \cdot \rangle_s$ denotes expectations under the measure p_s introduced in (13). With these definitions, we will see below that the constants r_1, r_2, r_3 from (18) are intricately tied to inner products between the scores introduced above. We will sometimes refer to the quantities introduced in (23) and (25) as the *order parameters*.

Proposition 1. *In the setting of Section 2, for any $m \neq m' \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle A''(a_{m,1}) \rangle = a_{dp},$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{mm} - v_B)^2 \rangle, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{mm'} - c_B)^2 \rangle, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{m\star} - c_{BB_\star})^2 \rangle = 0,$$

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (\tilde{Q}_{mm} - \tilde{v})^2 \rangle, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (\tilde{Q}_{mm'} - r_3)^2 \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (M_{mm} - M_{mm'} - r_2)^2 \rangle = 0;$$

where $\tilde{v} := a_{dp} + r_3 - r_1$.

Thus, the mean and variance parameters in our main results (19), which are defined in terms of r_1, r_2, r_3 from (15), essentially arise as limits of (25). Proposition 1 forms a crucial first step for our proofs. Its proof is deferred to Section A.1.

3.2 Applications

Before we delve into the main results of the paper, we provide specific GLM examples where our results apply. We complement the logistic regression example below with numerical experiments showing the efficacy of our results.

Example 1: Linear regression—prototype for checking validity Perhaps the simplest example of a canonical GLM is the classical linear model. Although any prior that satisfies the conditions in Hypothesis 1 works for our theory, we mainly discuss the case of the Gaussian linear model since here closed-form expressions allow us to provide independent validation of the accuracy of our results. Thus we take this example as a means to cross-check our theory, and present non-trivial examples later in this section.

For this example, our observed data arises from the linear model

$$y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star + z_i$$

where z_1, \dots, z_n are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables (we take the variance of these to be 1 for simplicity). The log-likelihood is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) := -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left(y_i - \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} \right)^2$$

so that matching with our formulation in (3) we have that $\tilde{T}_i(x) = f(x, e_i)$, $f(x, e_i) = x + \Phi^{-1}(e_i)$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the cdf of a standard Gaussian and $A(x) = x^2/2$.

It is easy to check that Hypothesis 1 holds for this model. With a bit of work it can be proved, as a consequence of [32, Lemma 5.1] with $u(x) = -\frac{x^2}{2}$, that Hypothesis 2 also holds. We now show how our fixed point equations look for this model. In particular, given these explicit forms for \tilde{T}_i and A , (15) simplifies to yield:

$$\begin{cases} r_1 = 1 + \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} [\langle \theta(\xi) \rangle_s^2] - \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta^2(\xi) \rangle_s \\ r_2 = r_1 - 1 \\ r_3 = \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta(\xi) - \theta_\star - \Phi^{-1}(e) \rangle_s^2, \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

where $\theta(\xi), \theta_\star$ are given by (12) with ξ used for ξ_B to shorten the notation.

For a linear model, (27) can be further simplified by integrating $\mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} [\langle \theta^2(\xi) \rangle_s]$ and $\mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta(\xi) \rangle_s^2$ to yield closed form formulae in terms of v_B , c_B , and c_{BB_\star} . In contrast, (18) cannot in general be integrated due to the presence of the prior. However, in the special case of the Gaussian linear model, these can also be integrated reducing (15), (18) to an explicit system of equations. This is summarized in the next proposition whose proof is delayed to Appendix J.

Proposition 2. *For linear regression, (27) simplifies to*

$$\begin{cases} r_1 = \frac{1}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} \\ r_2 = -\frac{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} \\ r_3 = \frac{\kappa(\gamma^2 + c_B - 2c_{BB_\star}) + 1}{(\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1)^2}. \end{cases}$$

Furthermore, if $\mu(\cdot)$ is standard Gaussian and $\pi(\cdot)$ is a centered distribution, we have

$$\begin{cases} v_B = \frac{1}{r_1 + 1} + c_B \\ c_B = \frac{(r_2 + 1)^2 \gamma^2 + r_3}{(r_1 + 1)^2} \\ c_{BB_\star} = \frac{(r_2 + 1) \gamma^2}{r_1 + 1}, \end{cases}$$

which implies that

$$r_1 = r_2 + 1 = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^2 + 1} - \frac{\kappa}{2}. \quad (28)$$

The Gaussian linear model is particularly instructive since the posterior can be explicitly analyzed in this setting. Specifically, the posterior takes the form (20). In Appendix J.2 we analyze this posterior directly using random matrix theory tools. We use this to check the validity of our results presented in the preceding subsection. Specifically, we check that the posterior limit is indeed in the form given by Theorem 2 and that the expressions for r_1, r_2 that our theory predicts, i.e. (28), match with those obtained from direct random matrix theory computations.

Example 2: Binary Outcome GLMs We now consider GLMs with binary outcomes defined as follows

$$y_i = \mathbb{I}_{\{\sigma(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \geq e_i\}},$$

with e_i an independent $\text{Unif}[0, 1]$ random variable.

When $\sigma(x) = e^x/(1 + e^x)$, the sigmoid function, this yields logistic regression, whereas for $\sigma(x) = \Phi(x)$, the cdf of a standard normal random variable, this leads to probit regression. The log-likelihood becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \{y_i \log \frac{\sigma(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b})}{1 - \sigma(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b})} + \log(1 - \sigma(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}))\}.$$

We show the applicability of our theory for logistic regression where the likelihood simplifies to

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \{y_i \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} - \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}})\},$$

although other binary outcome GLMs would also fall in our framework. Note that

$$\tilde{T}_i(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x \geq \sigma^{-1}(e_i)\}} \quad \text{and} \quad A(x) = \log(1 + e^x).$$

Importantly, \tilde{T} is not differentiable, and therefore does not satisfy Hypothesis 1(ii). However, it can be arbitrarily approximated by smooth functions. To this end, consider a smooth approximation of $\mathbb{I}_{\{x \geq 0\}}$ given by $f_\delta(x) := (\tanh(x/\delta) + 1)/2$, where $\delta > 0$ is small.⁴ Define

$$\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(x) := f_\delta(x - \sigma^{-1}(e_i)).$$

When $\delta \approx 0$, we have $\tilde{T}_{\delta,i} \approx \tilde{T}_i$ (see Appendix I for suitable formalization). The log-likelihood in the smoothed model is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p,\delta}(\mathbf{b}) := \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} - \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}}).$$

⁴In simulations, we consider $\delta = 1/1000$.

It is easy to check that Hypothesis 1 holds for the smoothed model. By Proposition 14 (Appendix G), Hypothesis 2 also holds. Thus our main results hold for the smoothed model. In Proposition 17, we establish that the posterior marginals under the smoothed model approach those under logistic regression as $\delta \rightarrow 0$. Thus, the posterior marginals in logistic regression can be studied using our results through this approximation strategy. Similar approximations can be invoked for other binary outcome GLMs. Any log-concave prior would fall in our framework. As a use-case example, we consider a $\text{Beta}(\alpha, \beta)$ prior with $\alpha > 1, \beta > 1$.

Figure 4 compares the theoretical posterior marginal distribution for a fixed coordinate, as predicted by Theorem 2, with its empirical counterpart obtained from MCMC simulations. In the left panel, the QQ-plot shows a close alignment between the theoretical and empirical quantiles, indicating good agreement between the two distributions. The right panel further illustrates this correspondence by juxtaposing the marginal density obtained from our theory with the histogram of MCMC samples. A notable feature is that the theoretical curve closely tracks the empirical distribution across the full support, including in the vicinity of the true parameter value, marked by the red dashed line. The figure illustrates the applicability of our results in finite samples and dimensions.




Figure 4: Comparison of posterior marginals as predicted by Theorem 2 and MCMC simulations. The setting is that of Figure 1 and $\kappa = 1$. For the MCMC simulations, $n = 1000$, the number of chains was taken to be 4, and 1000 draws were produced with a tune of 2000. The left panel shows QQ-plots for theoretical quantiles, obtained using Theorem (2) versus empirical quantiles obtained from MCMC. The right panel shows the predicted marginal density from our theory versus the MCMC histogram; the true signal value β_{\star, j_0} is marked using a red dashed line.

Example 3: Binomial regression Binomial regression with log-concave priors is naturally covered by our results by extending the calculations from logistic regression. Specifically, in binomial regression, for some fixed $m \in \mathbb{N}$, $y_i \sim \text{Bin}(m, p(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star))$; where $p(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) = \sigma(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)$ with $\sigma(\cdot)$ the sigmoid function. Thus, the log-likelihood is

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \{y_i \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} - m \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}})\}.$$

and the approximations from the prior example can be naturally generalized.

4 Proof heuristics

Our proof strategy for characterizing the posterior marginals relies on relating the posterior measure to the leave-a-variable-out measure, (9), through an appropriate Radon-Nikodym derivative and then approximating this derivative in the proportional high-dimensional limit. We now explain this in further detail.

To study a posterior marginal, say the j_0 -th marginal, we proceed as follows. Recall that for a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, we denote $\tilde{\mathbf{v}} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ and v_{j_0} to be the vector obtained on removing the j_0 -th coordinate, and the j_0 -th coordinate, respectively. Then, by a Taylor expansion, the log-likelihood at \mathbf{b} admits the following decomposition:

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + E_n(\mathbf{b}), \quad \text{where} \quad (29)$$

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) := Y_1(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) b_{j_0} + Y_2(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) \beta_{\star,j_0} - Y_3(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) b_{j_0}^2 + Y_4(\tilde{\beta}_\star) \beta_{\star,j_0} b_{j_0} + Y_5(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) \beta_{\star,j_0}^2 \quad (30)$$

and the Y_i 's are given by

$$\begin{cases} Y_1(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) := \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} \left(\tilde{T}_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) - A'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) \right) \\ Y_2(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) := \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} \tilde{T}'_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \\ Y_3(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^2 A''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) \\ Y_4(\tilde{\beta}_\star) := \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^2 \tilde{T}'_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \\ Y_5(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^2 \tilde{T}''_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}} \end{cases} \quad (31)$$

The arguments in the Y_i 's are spelled out to showcase their dependence on $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}, \tilde{\beta}_\star$ and that these do not depend on β_{\star,j_0} or b_{j_0} . In the sequel, whenever it is clear from context, we will suppress the arguments of the Y_i 's. Further, $E_n(\mathbf{b})$ equals the error term arising from the Taylor expansion, defined in (47). Since it involves sums of terms proportional to $X_{ij_0}^3$, $E_n(\mathbf{b})$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/2})$. Above, the notation $\Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ is used to emphasize that in this term, b_{j_0} and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ are “disentangled” in that b_{j_0} appears only as coefficients to the Y_i 's and $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ appears only in the Y_i 's.

Recall that $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$ stands for expectation with respect to the leave-a-variable-out posterior, defined in (9). By (4), we have that, for $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle &= \frac{\int f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)} \\ &= \frac{\int f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\beta}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\beta}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)} \\ &= \frac{\int f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\beta}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta})\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)} \\ &= \frac{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\beta}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta})\} \prod_{j=1}^p \mu(d\beta_j)} \\ &= \frac{\left\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \right\rangle_v}{\left\langle \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta}) + E_n(\beta)\} \right\rangle_v} = \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \mathcal{D}_n \rangle_v, \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where we defined⁵

$$\mathcal{D}_n := \frac{\exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + E_n(\mathbf{b})\}}{\left\langle \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) + E_n(\boldsymbol{\beta})\} \right\rangle_v}. \quad (33)$$

Note \mathcal{D}_n is the Radon-Nikodym derivative between the full posterior and the leave-a-variable-out posterior, corresponding to (5) and (9) respectively. This calculation is analogous to how local asymptotic distributions are calculated in classical asymptotic statistics [60].

The proof then involves establishing that, in the setting of Section 2 and under $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$, \mathcal{D}_n converges in the proportional high-dimensional limit to the random Gaussian tilt (19), which is a function of the j_0 -th coordinate of the true signal β_{\star, j_0} and additional gaussian noise Z_{j_0} . Note that, as a function of b_{j_0} , $\Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ contains only linear and quadratic terms. Completion of squares naturally yields a Gaussian density in b_{j_0} . To see that this density takes the specific form outlined in (19), in the limit of large sample and dimensions, requires analyzing the limiting behavior of the Y_i 's under $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$. These limits are established in Lemma 4. Plugging in the form of these limits, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{D}_n \approx \frac{\exp\{-\frac{1}{2v}(b_{j_0} - m_{j_0})^2\}}{\int \exp\{-\frac{1}{2v}(\beta_{j_0} - m_{j_0})^2\} \mu(d\beta_{j_0})}, \quad (34)$$

where m_{j_0} is defined as in (19). Thus, essentially, as in classical Le Cam theory, the Radon Nikodym derivative \mathcal{D}_n is also asymptotically Gaussian in our setting. In some sense, our leave-one-out technology allows to build an analogue of classical Le Cam type theory in high dimensions.

This argument can be generalized to studying a single coordinate simultaneously of l independent samples from the posterior. In fact, in its most general form, we obtain Proposition 3 that formalizes our aforementioned argument for a multivariate function applied to a pre-fixed coordinate of the true signal and l -independent samples from the posterior.

Proposition 3. *In the setting of Section 2, let $f : \mathbb{R}^{l+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and polynomially bounded. For any $j \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle f(\beta_{\star, j}, \beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}) \right\rangle = \mathbb{E}_Z \left\langle f(\beta_{\star, j}, \beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}) \right\rangle_{h, j},$$

where on the left, $\beta_j^{(1)}, \beta_j^{(2)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}$ refer to the j -th coordinates of l independent samples from the posterior and on the right $\langle \cdot \rangle_{h, j}$ refers to expectation over $\beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}$ drawn from l independent copies of $p_{h, j}$ defined in (19). Furthermore, $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_l) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_l)$ refers to the Gaussians arising in the respective means for these copies.

The proof is deferred to Section A.2. Proposition 3 is a key result since it directly yields a characterization of moments of all orders for marginals corresponding to a posterior sample. From here, establishing our main result on the limiting behavior of a posterior marginal is straightforward, and described in Section (A.4). The necessity of establishing Proposition (3) in the general version we presented above, instead of simply for $l = 1$, becomes clear on examining our proofs.

To extend to multiple but finitely many coordinates, e.g, to r coordinates as in the statement of Theorem 2, we adopt a leave- r -variables-out strategy. To this end, the starting point would be a log-likelihood decomposition of the form

$$\mathcal{L}_{n, p}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathcal{L}_{n, p-r}(\mathbf{b}_{-[j_1, \dots, j_r]}) + \Delta\mathcal{L}(b_{j_1}, b_{j_2}, \dots, b_{j_r}, \mathbf{b}_{-[j_1, \dots, j_r]}) + E_n(\mathbf{b}_{-[j_1, \dots, j_r]}),$$

⁵Our notational convention is that dummy variables used for arguments of log-likelihoods and any term without integrals are represented by \mathbf{b} and its variants, whereas variables over which integration is performed are represented using $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and its variants.

where $\mathbf{b}_{-[j_1, \dots, j_r]}$ refers to all but the j_1, j_2, \dots, j_r -th coordinates of \mathbf{b} and $\Delta\mathcal{L}$ is given by a suitable analogue of (30) and (31) that isolates the effect of the r coordinates from the rest. As long as r is finite, the arguments for our analyses remain essentially the same as $r = 1$.

In the aforementioned proof description, the main detail that was skipped pertained to how the limits of the Y_i 's are derived under $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$. We describe this step next. Note that under $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$, the Y_i 's are functions of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ refers to all but the j_0 -th coordinate of a sample from the leave-a-variable-out posterior introduced in 9. Thus, understanding the joint distribution of these under $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$ should allow us to characterize the limiting behavior of the Y_i 's. Our main observation is that for any function g , asymptotically,

$$\left\langle g(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\rangle_v \approx \left\langle g(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\rangle. \quad (35)$$

That is, in the limit of large sample and dimensions, functions of $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$, where $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ is all but the j_0 -th coordinate of a sample from the leave-a-variable-out measure, behave similarly to functions of $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a sample from the full posterior. To understand the behavior of the Y_i 's, we will therefore study the RHS in (35). Next observe that

$$\left\langle g(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\rangle = \frac{\left\langle g(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \exp\{u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)\} \right\rangle_o}{\left\langle \exp\{u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)\} \right\rangle_o} = \left\langle g(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \bar{\mathcal{D}}_n \right\rangle_o, \quad (36)$$

where we define

$$\bar{\mathcal{D}}_n := \frac{\exp\{u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)\}}{\left\langle \exp\{u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star)\} \right\rangle_o}. \quad (37)$$

Note $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_n$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative between the full posterior and the leave-an-observation-out posterior defined in (7). Again, the remaining argument involves computing the limit of $\bar{\mathcal{D}}_n$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_o$. In fact, we show in Subsection B.2.1, c.f., (B.2.1) that asymptotically

$$\left\langle g(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}) \bar{\mathcal{D}}_n \right\rangle_o \approx \frac{\int g(\theta) \exp\{u(\theta, \theta_\star)\} \phi(\xi_B) d\xi_B}{\int \exp\{u(\theta, \theta_\star)\} \phi(\xi_B) d\xi_B}, \quad (38)$$

where θ, θ_\star are as defined in (11), $u(\theta, \theta_\star) = \tilde{T}(\theta_\star)\theta - A(\theta)$, and $\phi(\cdot)$ denotes the standard Gaussian density. Subsequently, using the definitions of θ and θ_\star , the RHS of (38) can be expressed in terms of the measure $p_s(\cdot)$ introduced in (13).

Proposition 4 states this formally for the more general case where we consider a multivariate function of $a_{\star, i}, a_{1, i}, \dots, a_{l, i}$ where recall from (4) that $a_{\star, i} = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $a_{m, i} = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}$ with $m \in [l]$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(l)}$ independent samples from the full posterior.

Proposition 4. *In the setting of Section 2, let $g : \mathbb{R}^{l+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and polynomially bounded. Then for any $i \in [n]$*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{\star, i}, a_{1, i}, \dots, a_{l, i}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle g(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_l) \rangle_s, \quad (39)$$

where, for $m \in [\ell]$, when $c_B > 0$,

$$\theta_m := \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)} \xi_B^{(m)} + \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star} \text{ and } \theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \left(\gamma^2 - \frac{c_{BB_\star}^2}{c_B} \right)} \xi_{B_\star} + c_{BB_\star} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{c_B}} z_{BB_\star}, \quad (40)$$

else $\theta_m = \sqrt{\kappa v_B} \xi_B^{(m)}$ and $\theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \gamma^2} \xi_{B_\star}$. Here, $\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star}$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian variables, independent of everything else and $G = (\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star})$. Furthermore, in (39), $\langle \cdot \rangle_s$ denotes expectation over $\xi_B^{(1)}, \dots, \xi_B^{(l)}$ that have density proportional to

$$\prod_{m=1}^l \exp \left\{ \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) \theta(\xi_B^{(m)}) - A(\theta(\xi_B^{(m)})) - \frac{(\xi_B^{(m)})^2}{2} \right\}, \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) = T \circ f(\theta_\star, e),$$

and $e \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ independent of everything else.

The proof is deferred to Section A.2. Propositions 3 and 4 can be thought of as contrasts to each other. The key idea underlying the former is to relate the full posterior (involving n samples and p variables) to the leave-a-variable-out posterior where one of the variables has been dropped from the log-likelihood. In contrast, the key idea underlying Proposition (4) is to relate the full posterior and the leave-an-observation-out posterior, where a sample is dropped but all variables are retained. Such leave-one-out arguments have appeared in the prior statistics and optimization literature for frequentist problems [13, 16, 34, 73] and in the statistical physics/spin glasses literature either for models where the statistician knows the true signal distribution and uses it during the fitting process (the Bayes optimal setting) or for global null models, where there is no underlying signal [28, 30, 74, 75]. A major technical contribution of our paper is to rigorously develop this machinery, for the first time, for commonly used statistical models, e.g., GLMs, under a general Bayesian setting (and not the Bayes optimal setting) for which prior leave-one-out approaches do not apply; significant additional heavy-lifting is necessary in this case, as is evident from our proofs.

5 Discussion

An outstanding question that emerges from this work is whether our posterior characterization can be used to provide intervals with valid frequentist coverage for finite-dimensional marginals of the true signal. Although we do not develop this here, with some work we believe this would be feasible. In particular, our main result shows that finite-dimensional marginals of the posterior are suitable Gaussian tilts of the prior where the tilt parameters are determined by a system of equations that we characterize. Utilizing this, one can develop a method of moments based approach where we equate empirical moments under the posterior distribution with population moments. We require three moments to estimate the parameters α, σ, v in our limiting distribution. Thus, for distributions where third moments exist, we can calculate data-driven estimates for these parameters. Subsequently, a function inversion technique should allow us to infer about finite-dimensional marginals of the true signal. Another direction of future work could involve understanding to what extent our current assumptions can be relaxed. For instance, we believe the Gaussianity assumption on the covariates can be relaxed using independent universality arguments as done in the recent frequentist literature [76–81]. It would be important to establish this formally.

Finally, the fact that the effect of the prior does not wash away raises an interesting question: given an inference problem, could we identify the optimal prior that would lead to credible intervals (or transformations thereof) with valid frequentist coverage and minimal possible length? In settings where the prior effect has mattered in previous literature, authors have exploited this phenomenon for suitable Bayesian inference [46, 82], but thus far, this has been understood for quite different settings than the one considered in our work. These aspects would be important to explore in the future. For this manuscript, we focused on introducing the leave-one-out technology for GLMs with planted signals (the case of no signal had already been done in [74]) and demonstrate how it can

help characterize finite-dimensional marginals of high-dimensional posteriors without traditional sparsity-type assumptions on the true underlying signal.

6 Acknowledgements

P.S. and M.S. would like to thank Jean Barbier for insightful discussions in the early stages of the project. P.S. would like to thank Filippo Ascolani, Marta Catalano, Iain Johnstone, Sumit Mukherjee, Igor Pruenster, Subhabrata Sen and Surya Tokdar for helpful discussions and pointers to the literature. M.S. would like to thank Ernesto Mordecki for valuable discussions. P.S. was supported by the NSF CAREER Award.

References

- [1] Subhashis Ghosal. Normal approximation to the posterior distribution for generalized linear models with many covariates. *Mathematical Methods of Statistics*, 6(3):332–348, 1997.
- [2] Subhashis Ghosal. Asymptotic normality of posterior distributions in high-dimensional linear models. *Bernoulli*, 5(2):315–331, 1999.
- [3] Subhashis Ghosal. Asymptotic normality of posterior distributions for exponential families when the number of parameters tends to infinity. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 74(1): 49–68, 2000.
- [4] Wenxin Jiang. Bayesian variable selection for high dimensional generalized linear models: Convergence rates of the fitted densities. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(4):1487 – 1511, 2007.
- [5] Ismaël Castillo, Johannes Schmidt-Hieber, and Aad Van der Vaart. Bayesian linear regression with sparse priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1986–2018, 2015.
- [6] Naveen Naidu Narisetty and Xuming He. Bayesian variable selection with shrinking and diffusing priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 42(2):789 – 817, 2014.
- [7] Qifan Song and Faming Liang. Nearly optimal bayesian shrinkage for high-dimensional regression. *Science China Mathematics*, 66(2):409–442, 2023.
- [8] Yves A. Atchadé. On the contraction properties of some high-dimensional quasi-posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 45(5):2248 – 2273, 2017.
- [9] Bo Ning, Seonghyun Jeong, and Subhashis Ghosal. Bayesian linear regression for multivariate responses under group sparsity. *Bernoulli*, 26(3):2353 – 2382, 2020.
- [10] Chao Gao, Aad W. van der Vaart, and Harrison H. Zhou. A general framework for Bayes structured linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(5):2848 – 2878, 2020.
- [11] Ran Wei and Subhashis Ghosal. Contraction properties of shrinkage priors in logistic regression. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 207:215–229, 2020.
- [12] David L Donoho, Arian Maleki, and Andrea Montanari. Message-passing algorithms for compressed sensing. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 106(45):18914–18919, 2009.

- [13] Nouredine El Karoui. On the impact of predictor geometry on the performance on high-dimensional ridge-regularized generalized robust regression estimators. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 170:95–175, 2018.
- [14] Nouredine El Karoui, Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Chinghway Lim, and Bin Yu. On robust regression with high-dimensional predictors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14557–14562, 2013.
- [15] Pragya Sur, Yuxin Chen, and Emmanuel J Candès. The likelihood ratio test in high-dimensional logistic regression is asymptotically a rescaled chi-square. *Probability theory and related fields*, 175:487–558, 2019.
- [16] Pragya Sur and Emmanuel J Candès. A modern maximum-likelihood theory for high-dimensional logistic regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(29):14516–14525, 2019.
- [17] Emmanuel J Candès and Pragya Sur. The phase transition for the existence of the maximum likelihood estimate in high-dimensional logistic regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(1):27–42, 2020.
- [18] Qian Zhao, Pragya Sur, and Emmanuel J Candes. The asymptotic distribution of the mle in high-dimensional logistic models: Arbitrary covariance. *Bernoulli*, 28(3):1835–1861, 2022.
- [19] Michael Celentano, Andrea Montanari, and Yuting Wei. The lasso with general gaussian designs with applications to hypothesis testing. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(5):2194–2220, 2023.
- [20] Pierre C Bellec and Cun-Hui Zhang. Debiasing convex regularized estimators and interval estimation in linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):391–436, 2023.
- [21] Xinyi Zhong, Chang Su, and Zhou Fan. Empirical bayes pca in high dimensions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 84(3):853–878, 2022.
- [22] Yufan Li and Pragya Sur. Spectrum-aware debiasing: A modern inference framework with applications to principal components regression. *The Annals of Statistics (to appear)*, 2025.
- [23] Yanke Song, Xihong Lin, and Pragya Sur. Hede: Heritability estimation in high dimensions by ensembling debiased estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11184*, 2024.
- [24] Xingyu Chen, Lin Liu, and Rajarshi Mukherjee. Method-of-moments inference for glms and doubly robust functionals under proportional asymptotics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06103*, 2024.
- [25] Francesca Mignacco, Florent Krzakala, Yue Lu, Pierfrancesco Urbani, and Lenka Zdeborova. The role of regularization in classification of high-dimensional noisy gaussian mixture. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 6874–6883. PMLR, 2020.
- [26] Trevor Hastie, Andrea Montanari, Saharon Rosset, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(2):949–986, 2022.
- [27] Yanke Song, Sohom Bhattacharya, and Pragya Sur. Generalization error of min-norm interpolators in transfer learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13944*, 2024.
- [28] Lenka Zdeborová and Florent Krzakala. Statistical physics of inference: Thresholds and algorithms. *Advances in Physics*, 65(5):453–552, 2016.

- [29] Jean Barbier, Florent Krzakala, Nicolas Macris, Léo Miolane, and Lenka Zdeborová. Optimal errors and phase transitions in high-dimensional generalized linear models. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(12):5451–5460, 2019.
- [30] Andrea Montanari and Subhabrata Sen. A friendly tutorial on mean-field spin glass techniques for non-physicists. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 17(1):1–173, 2024.
- [31] Oliver Y Feng, Ramji Venkataramanan, Cynthia Rush, and Richard J Samworth. A unifying tutorial on approximate message passing. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 15(4):335–536, 2022.
- [32] Jean Barbier, Wei-Kuo Chen, Dmitry Panchenko, and Manuel Sáenz. Performance of bayesian linear regression in a model with mismatch. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.06936*, 2021.
- [33] Kuanhao Jiang, Rajarshi Mukherjee, Subhabrata Sen, and Pragya Sur. A new central limit theorem for the augmented ipw estimator: Variance inflation, cross-fit covariance and beyond. *The Annals of Statistics*, 53(2):647–675, 2025.
- [34] Yuxin Chen, Yuejie Chi, Jianqing Fan, and Cong Ma. Spectral methods for data science: A statistical perspective. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 14(5):566–806, 2021.
- [35] Michel Talagrand. *Mean field models for spin glasses: Volume I: Basic examples*, volume 54. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [36] Jean Barbier and Manuel Sáenz. Marginals of a spherical spin glass model with correlated disorder. *Electronic Communications in Probability*, 27:1–12, 2022.
- [37] Sumit Mukherjee and Subhabrata Sen. Variational inference in high-dimensional linear regression. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(304):1–56, 2022.
- [38] Sumit Mukherjee, Bodhisattva Sen, and Subhabrata Sen. A mean field approach to empirical bayes estimation in high-dimensional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16843*, 2023.
- [39] Seunghyun Lee, Nabarun Deb, and Sumit Mukherjee. Clt in high-dimensional bayesian linear regression with low snr. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2507.23285*, 2025.
- [40] Zhou Fan, Leying Guan, Yandi Shen, and Yihong Wu. Gradient flows for empirical bayes in high-dimensional linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.12708*, 2023.
- [41] Zhou Fan, Justin Ko, Bruno Loureiro, Yue M Lu, and Yandi Shen. Dynamical mean-field analysis of adaptive langevin diffusions: Replica-symmetric fixed point and empirical bayes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.15558*, 2025.
- [42] Philipp Sterzinger and Ioannis Kosmidis. Diaconis-ylvisaker prior penalized likelihood for $p/n \rightarrow \kappa \in (0, 1)$ logistic regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.07419*, 2023.
- [43] Iain M Johnstone. On the distribution of the largest eigenvalue in principal components analysis. *The Annals of statistics*, 29(2):295–327, 2001.
- [44] Eugenio Regazzini, Antonio Lijoi, and Igor Prünster. Distributional results for means of normalized random measures with independent increments. *The Annals of Statistics*, 31(2):560–585, 2003.

- [45] Lancelot F James, Antonio Lijoi, and Igor Prünster. Posterior analysis for normalized random measures with independent increments. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 36(1):76–97, 2009.
- [46] Judith Rousseau and Kerrie Mengersen. Asymptotic behaviour of the posterior distribution in overfitted mixture models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 73(5):689–710, 2011.
- [47] Pierpaolo De Blasi, Antonio Lijoi, and Igor Prünster. An asymptotic analysis of a class of discrete nonparametric priors. *Statistica Sinica*, pages 1299–1321, 2013.
- [48] Subhashis Ghosal and Aad W Van der Vaart. *Fundamentals of nonparametric Bayesian inference*, volume 44. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- [49] Lucien Le Cam. On the asymptotic theory of estimation and testing hypotheses. In *Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, Volume 1: Contributions to the Theory of Statistics*, volume 3, pages 129–157. University of California Press, 1956.
- [50] Aad van der Vaart. The statistical work of lucien le cam. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(3):631–682, 2002.
- [51] Ismael Castillo, Alice L’Huillier, Kolyan Ray, and Luke Travis. A variational bayes approach to debiased inference for low-dimensional parameters in high-dimensional linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.12659*, 2024.
- [52] Pierre C Bellec and Takuya Koriyama. Existence of solutions to the nonlinear equations characterizing the precise error of m-estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.13254*, 2023.
- [53] Andrea Montanari, Feng Ruan, Youngtak Sohn, and Jun Yan. The generalization error of max-margin linear classifiers: Benign overfitting and high dimensional asymptotics in the overparametrized regime. *The Annals of Statistics*, 53(2):822–853, 2025.
- [54] Manuel Sáenz and Pragya Sur. mean-field-glm github repository, 2025. URL <https://github.com/nuez-semanal/mean-field-glm>.
- [55] Persi Diaconis and David Freedman. On the consistency of bayes estimates. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1–26, 1986.
- [56] Yongdai Kim and Jaeyong Lee. On posterior consistency of survival models. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 666–686, 2001.
- [57] Subhashis Ghosal. The dirichlet process, related priors and posterior asymptotics. *Bayesian nonparametrics*, 28:35, 2010.
- [58] Jeffrey W Miller and Matthew T Harrison. Inconsistency of pitman-yor process mixtures for the number of components. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):3333–3370, 2014.
- [59] Louise Alamichel, Daria Bystrova, Julyan Arbel, and Guillaume Kon Kam King. Bayesian mixture models (in) consistency for the number of clusters. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 51(4):1619–1660, 2024.
- [60] Aad W Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 2000.

- [61] Iain M Johnstone. High dimensional bernstein-von mises: simple examples. *Institute of Mathematical Statistics Collections*, 6:87, 2010.
- [62] Kolyan Ray and Botond Szabó. Variational bayes for high-dimensional linear regression with sparse priors. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 117(539):1270–1281, 2022.
- [63] Sumit Mukherjee, Jiaze Qiu, and Subhabrata Sen. On naive mean-field approximation for high-dimensional canonical glms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.15247*, 2024.
- [64] Anya Katsevich. Improved dimension dependence in the bernstein–von mises theorem via a new laplace approximation bound. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 14(3):iaaf020, 2025.
- [65] Anya Katsevich and Philippe Rigollet. On the approximation accuracy of gaussian variational inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 52(4):1384–1409, 2024.
- [66] Jiaze Qiu and Subhabrata Sen. The tap free energy for high-dimensional linear regression. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 33(4):2643–2680, 2023.
- [67] Jiaze Qiu. Sub-optimality of the naive mean field approximation for proportional high-dimensional linear regression. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:63874–63893, 2023.
- [68] Zhou Fan, Song Mei, and Andrea Montanari. Tap free energy, spin glasses and variational inference. *The Annals of Probability*, 49 (1):1–45, 2021.
- [69] Michael Celentano, Zhou Fan, Licong Lin, and Song Mei. Mean-field variational inference with the tap free energy: Geometric and statistical properties in linear models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.08442*, 2023.
- [70] Dennis D Cox. An analysis of bayesian inference for nonparametric regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 903–923, 1993.
- [71] David Freedman. Wald Lecture: On the Bernstein-von Mises theorem with infinite-dimensional parameters. *The Annals of Statistics*, 27(4):1119 – 1141, 1999.
- [72] Kolyan Ray and Aad van der Vaart. Semiparametric bayesian causal inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48 (5):2999–3020, 2020.
- [73] Derek Bean, Peter J Bickel, Nouredine El Karoui, and Bin Yu. Optimal m-estimation in high-dimensional regression. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 110(36):14563–14568, 2013.
- [74] Michel Talagrand. *Spin glasses: a challenge for mathematicians: cavity and mean field models*, volume 46. Springer Science & Business Media, 2003.
- [75] Marc Mézard, Giorgio Parisi, and Miguel Angel Virasoro. *Spin glass theory and beyond: An Introduction to the Replica Method and Its Applications*, volume 9. World Scientific Publishing Company, 1987.
- [76] Hong Hu and Yue M Lu. Universality laws for high-dimensional learning with random features. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 69(3):1932–1964, 2022.

- [77] Tengyuan Liang and Pragma Sur. A precise high-dimensional asymptotic theory for boosting and minimum-l1-norm interpolated classifiers. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(3):1669–1695, 2022.
- [78] Andrea Montanari and Basil N Saeed. Universality of empirical risk minimization. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4310–4312. PMLR, 2022.
- [79] Rishabh Dudeja, Subhabrata Sen, and Yue M Lu. Spectral universality in regularized linear regression with nearly deterministic sensing matrices. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 2024.
- [80] Qiyang Han and Yandi Shen. Universality of regularized regression estimators in high dimensions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(4):1799–1823, 2023.
- [81] Samriddha Lahiry and Pragma Sur. Universality in block dependent linear models with applications to nonparametric regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00344*, 2023.
- [82] Filippo Ascolani, Antonio Lijoi, Giovanni Rebaudo, and Giacomo Zanella. Clustering consistency with dirichlet process mixtures. *Biometrika*, 110(2):551–558, 2023.
- [83] Adrien Saumard and Jon A Wellner. Log-concavity and strong log-concavity: a review. *Statistics surveys*, 8:45, 2014.
- [84] Patrick Billingsley. *Probability and measure*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- [85] Roman Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1011.3027*, 2010.
- [86] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press, 2013.
- [87] Herm Jan Brascamp and Elliott H Lieb. On extensions of the brunn-minkowski and prékopa-leindler theorems, including inequalities for log concave functions, and with an application to the diffusion equation. *Inequalities: Selecta of Elliott H. Lieb*, pages 441–464, 2002.
- [88] Dmitry Panchenko. *The Sherrington-Kirkpatrick model*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2013.
- [89] William F Ames and BG Pachpatte. *Inequalities for differential and integral equations*, volume 197. Elsevier, 1997.
- [90] Felix Otto and Cédric Villani. Generalization of an inequality by talagrand and links with the logarithmic sobolev inequality. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 173(2):361–400, 2000.
- [91] Vladimir Alexandrovich Marchenko and Leonid Andreevich Pastur. Distribution of eigenvalues for some sets of random matrices. *Matematicheskii Sbornik*, 114(4):507–536, 1967.

A Proofs of the main results: Proposition 1 and Theorems 1 and 2

Before we start our proofs, we state some basic notations that would be useful throughout. Recalling the definitions of \mathbf{a}_\star and \mathbf{a}_ℓ from (4), we define $\mathbf{A}^{(l)}$, $\mathbf{A}'^{(l)}$, and $\mathbf{A}''^{(l)}$ to be the random vectors in \mathbb{R}^n with coordinates given, for $i \in [n]$, by $A_i^{(l)} := A(a_{\ell,i})$, $A_i'^{(l)} := dA/dx|_{x=a_{\ell,i}}$, and $A_i''^{(l)} :=$

$d^2 A/dx^2|_{x=a_{\ell,i}}$ respectively. Again, when the ℓ index is omitted, it is taken to be equal to 1. Recalling from the discussions before (3) that $\tilde{T}_i(x) := T(f(x, e_i))$, we denote by $\tilde{\mathbf{T}}, \tilde{\mathbf{T}}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the random vectors with coordinates $\tilde{T}_i := \tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i})$ and $\tilde{T}'_i := d\tilde{T}_i/dx|_{x=a_{\star,i}}$, respectively. With these abbreviated notations, the log-likelihood (3) at $\beta^{(\ell)}$ can be re-expressed as $\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\beta^{(\ell)}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i a_{\ell,i} - A_i^{(\ell)}$ which for $\ell = 1$ simplifies by our notations to $\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i a_i - A_i$.

A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

The proof of Proposition 1 relies on the following variants of Propositions 3 and 4. The difference between the original propositions and the following lies in the fact that the below assumes certain limits exist and then conclude relevant convergence results. For this subsection and Section B, we redefine constants used earlier in the manuscript as follows. Subsequently, in Proposition 7, we establish that if these constants were defined as in Propositions 5 and 6, they also satisfy the system of equations based definitions provided in (15) and (18). In the proof of Proposition 1, we will invoke the next two propositions along sub-subsequences.

Proposition 5 (Variant of Proposition 3). *In the setting of Section 2, assume that the following limits hold,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{Q}_{11} \rangle &=: \tilde{v}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{Q}_{12} \rangle =: \tilde{q}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle M_{11} \rangle =: \tilde{m}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle M_{12} \rangle =: \bar{m} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle A''(a_1) \rangle &=: a_{dp}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{Q}_{11} \rangle =: \bar{v}, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{Q}_{12} \rangle =: \bar{q} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{T}'_i (\mathbf{X}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} \rangle =: c_g, \end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{Q}_{mm'}, M_{mm'}, \bar{Q}_{mm'}$ are defined as in (25). Define

$$r_1 := a_{dp} + \tilde{q} - \tilde{v}, r_2 := \tilde{m} - \bar{m}, r_3 := \tilde{q} \quad (41)$$

For $l \geq 1$, let $f : \mathbb{R}^{l+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous and polynomially bounded function. We then have that, for every $j \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle f(\beta_{\star,j}, \beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_Z \langle f(\beta_{\star,j}, \beta_j^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_j^{(l)}) \rangle_{h,j} \quad (42)$$

where $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_l) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_l)$ independent of everything else and $\langle \cdot \rangle_{h,j}$ here refers to expectation under density $\prod_{m=1}^l p(b_m)$ with $p(b_m)$ proportional to

$$p(b_m) \propto e^{-(r_1/2)(b_m - m_j)^2} \text{ where } m_j = \frac{r_2 + t_\gamma}{r_1} \beta_{\star,j} + \frac{\sqrt{r_3}}{r_1} Z_m. \quad (43)$$

Proposition 6 (Variant of Proposition 4). *In the setting of Section 2, assume that the following limits hold*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle =: v_B, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{12} \rangle =: c_B, \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle =: c_{BB\star}. \quad (44)$$

For $l \geq 1$, let $g : \mathbb{R}^{l+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous and polynomially bounded function. We then have that, for every $i \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{\star,i}, \dots, a_{l,i}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle g(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_l) \rangle_s, \quad (45)$$

where we define (for $m \in [\ell]$) when $c_B > 0$,

$$\theta_m := \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)} \xi_B^{(m)} + \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB\star} \text{ and } \theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \left(\gamma^2 - \frac{c_{BB\star}^2}{c_B} \right)} \xi_{B\star} + c_{BB\star} \sqrt{\frac{\kappa}{c_B}} z_{BB\star} \quad (46)$$

else $\theta_m = \sqrt{\kappa v_B} \xi_B^{(m)}, \theta_\star := \sqrt{\kappa \gamma^2} \xi_{B_\star}$. Here, $\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star}$ are i.i.d. standard Gaussian random variables, independent of everything else and $G = (\xi_{B_\star}, z_{BB_\star})$. Furthermore, $\langle g(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_l) \rangle_s$ denotes expectation of $g(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_l)$ with respect to $\xi_B^{(1)}, \dots, \xi_B^{(l)}$ that have density proportional to

$$\prod_{m=1}^l \exp \left\{ \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) \theta(\xi_B^{(m)}) - A(\theta(\xi_B^{(m)})) - \frac{(\xi_B^{(m)})^2}{2} \right\} \quad \text{where} \quad \tilde{T}(\theta_\star) = T \circ f(\theta_\star, e),$$

and $e \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ independent of everything else.

We present the proofs for the aforementioned propositions in Section B.

Proposition 7. *Under the assumptions of Propositions 5 and 6, the constants r_1, r_2, r_3 from (41) and v_B, c_B, c_{BB_\star} from (44) satisfy the fixed point equations (15) and (18) respectively, and a_{dp} satisfies (25).*

Proof of Proposition 7. For the constants r_1, r_2, r_3 , this follows directly from the definitions (41) on an application of (45). For the other set of constants we start from the definition (44) and use (42). Analogous arguments hold for the constant a_{dp} .

Proof of Proposition 1 Recall definitions (23) and (25). By Lemma 14 the expectations

$$\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{12} \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle$$

define bounded sequences in n . By Hypothesis 2, the same holds true for

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{Q}_{11} \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{Q}_{12} \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{Q}_{11} \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle \bar{Q}_{12} \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle A''(a_1) \rangle, \quad \mathbb{E} \langle M_{11} \rangle, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \langle M_{12} \rangle.$$

Therefore, for every subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1} \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ there is a sub-subsequence $(n_{k_l})_{l \geq 1}$ such that all these expectations converge to constants.

Let $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$ be some subsequence and $(n_{k_l})_{l \geq 1}$ a sub-subsequence such that these expectations converge to finite limits. By Propositions 5-7, the limit of these expectations must define solutions to the fixed point equations (15) and (18). However, we operate in the regime where this system admits a unique solution, implying that these expectations converge to the same value for some sub-subsequence of each subsequence $(n_k)_{k \geq 1}$. Hence, these expectations converge along the entire sequence. Since the concentration in L^2 of these quantities is proved in Propositions 12 and 8, this completes the result.

A.2 Proofs of Propositions 3 and 4

Proofs of Propositions 3 and 4 follow from Propositions 1, 5 and 6.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 1

Recalling the definitions from (23), notice that

$$\frac{1}{p} \|\beta - \beta_\star\|^2 = Q_{11} + \gamma_n^2 - 2Q_{1\star}.$$

Then, if we let $c := v_B + \gamma^2 - 2c_{BB_\star}$,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (p^{-1} \|\beta - \beta_\star\|^2 - c)^2 \rangle \leq 16 \left(\mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - v_B)^2 \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle (\gamma_n^2 - \gamma)^2 \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{1\star} - 2c_{BB_\star})^2 \rangle \right).$$

The result then follows by combining Hypothesis 1(iv) and Proposition 1.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 2

By considering moments, this can be proved directly as a corollary of Proposition 3. Here we show the proof in the special case where $r = 1$. The general case follows identically. Notice that the random density from (19) defined up to normalization by

$$p_{h,j_1}(db) \propto e^{-\frac{1}{2v}(b-m_{j_1})^2} \mu(db)$$

is strongly log-concave and thus is sub-exponential (see [83, Theorem 5.1]). This implies that its moment generating function is defined in an open interval containing 0 and thus p_{h,j_1} is *determined by its moments* (see [84, Chapter 30]). Furthermore, by Lemma 14, all the moments of β_{j_1} are defined and by Proposition 3 they converge to the moments of p_{h,j_1} . Then, by [84, Theorem 30.2] the proof is complete.

A.5 Proof of Corollary 1

For every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ let $g_m(x_1, \dots, x_m) := \prod_{l \in [m]} x_l$. Similarly as in the previous proof, from Proposition 3 applied to $g_m(\beta_{j_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_1}^{(m)})$ we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \beta_{j_1} \rangle^m = \mathbb{E} \left\langle g_m(\beta_{j_1}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_1}^{(m)}) \right\rangle \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\int b p_{h,j_1}(db)}{\int p_{h,j_1}(db)} \right)^m.$$

The result then follows, by [84, Theorem 30.2].

B Leave-one-out arguments: Proofs of Propositions 5 and 6

B.1 Proof of Proposition 5

Let $j_0 \in [p]$ be the index of the marginal of interest. For any vector \mathbf{b} , we will denote $\tilde{\mathbf{b}}$ and b_{j_0} to be the vector with the j_0 -th coordinate removed and the j_0 -th coordinate of \mathbf{b} respectively. We begin by expanding the log-likelihood into the following terms

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) &= \mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + b_{j_0} \underbrace{\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} (\tilde{T}_i(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) - A'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}))}_{Y_1} + \beta_{\star,j_0} \underbrace{\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} \tilde{T}_i'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_{Y_2} \\ &\quad + \beta_{\star,j_0} b_{j_0} \underbrace{\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^2 \tilde{T}_i'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star)}_{Y_4} + \beta_{\star,j_0}^2 \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^2 \tilde{T}_i''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}}_{Y_5} - b_{j_0}^2 \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} A''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) X_{ij_0}^2}_{Y_3} + E_n(\mathbf{b}), \\ &= \mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + \Delta \mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}}) + E_n(\mathbf{b}), \end{aligned}$$

where recall that $\Delta \mathcal{L}(b_{j_0}, \tilde{\mathbf{b}})$ and Y_1, \dots, Y_5 were introduced in (30) and (31) respectively. Above the error term E_n is defined as follows

$$\begin{aligned} E_n(\mathbf{b}) &:= -\frac{b_{j_0}^3}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} A'''(\xi_i) X_{ij_0}^3 + \frac{\beta_{\star,j_0}^3}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i'''(\chi_i) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\mathbf{b}} X_{ij_0}^3 \\ &\quad + \frac{\beta_{\star,j_0}^2 b_{j_0}}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) X_{ij_0}^3 + \frac{\beta_{\star,j_0}^3 b_{j_0}}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i'''(\chi_i) X_{ij_0}^4 \end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

with ξ_i some value in the interval between $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} + X_{ij_0} \beta_{j_0}$ and χ_i a value in the interval between $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_\star + X_{ij_0} \beta_{\star, j_0}$.

The first hurdle encountered in the proof of Proposition 5 is that $\beta_{j_0}, Y_1, \dots, Y_5$ are unbounded under $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle$ and that E_n cannot be a priori neglected. To mitigate this, in the next subsection, we present two intermediate results which establish that expectations under $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle$ can be well-approximated by expectations with respect to a measure $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \cdot \rangle'_K$ that is much easier to handle. This is done in Section B.1.1. The final technical component involves establishing the asymptotic properties of Y_1, \dots, Y_5 ; the result is stated and proved in Section B.1.2.

B.1.1 Simplification of the leave-a-variable-out measure

The simplification of the leave-a-variable-out measure will consist of two steps. We will first show that expectations under the full posterior can be asymptotically approximated by expectations conditional on certain quantities being bounded. In a second step we will show that dropping the Taylor error terms E_n does not substantially change these expectations.

Conditioning argument Let $\|\cdot\|_{op}$ stand for the *operator norm*. For $K > 0$, consider the following events

$$A_K := \{|\beta_{j_0}|, |Y_1|, \dots, |Y_5| \leq K\} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \{\|\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}\|, \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} \leq 3\} \quad (48)$$

with

$$\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0} = (X_{1j_0}, \dots, X_{nj_0}) \in \mathbb{R}^n. \quad (49)$$

Notice that, if we define $F : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}^6$ and $G : \mathbb{R}^{p \times n} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^2$ as

$$F(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (K - |\beta_{j_0}|, K - |Y_1|, \dots, K - |Y_5|) \quad \text{and} \quad G(\mathbf{X}) = (3 - \|\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}\|, 3 - \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}),$$

we can then write $A_K = \{F(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \geq 0\}$ and $B = \{G(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0\}$ —this is the version of events we work with later in Appendix F.

Let $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ denote expectation w.r.t. (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}) conditional on event B . That is, for $f : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \times \mathbb{R}^n \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}))$ is defined according to

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}(f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e})) = \frac{\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}) \mathbb{I}_B)}{\mathbb{P}(B)}. \quad (50)$$

Notice that this quantity is well defined as $\mathbb{P}(B) > 0$. In fact, $\mathbb{P}(B) \rightarrow 1$ in our high-dimensional setting. Next we take $K > 0$ large enough and define for $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K := \frac{\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle}{\langle \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle} \mathbb{I}_B. \quad (51)$$

Notice that, $\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K$ is non-zero only on the event B . Furthermore, on B for sufficiently large $K > 0$, a.s. $\langle \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle > 0$. Hence, (51) is well-defined. The following lemma controls the difference of expectations of functions under $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle$ and $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \cdot \rangle_K$. This allows us to work, in the proof of Proposition 5, under the latter measure instead of the original one.

Lemma 1. *For $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ bounded, there are vanishing sequences $(\varepsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$ and $(\varepsilon'_K)_{K \geq 1}$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle_K| \leq \|f\|_\infty (\varepsilon_n + \varepsilon'_K).$$

The proof of this lemma is delayed to Appendix C.

Taylor approximation Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, define the expectation $\langle \cdot \rangle'_K$ according to

$$\langle f(\beta) \rangle'_K := \frac{\langle f(\beta) \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \exp\{-E_n\} \rangle}{\langle \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \exp\{-E_n\} \rangle} \mathbb{I}_B. \quad (52)$$

That is, $\langle \cdot \rangle'_K$ is the posterior expectation conditional on A_K (and on B) with respect to a modified log-likelihood that drops the Taylor error terms E_n . The following lemma controls the difference of expectations of functions under $\langle \cdot \rangle_K$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle'_K$.

Lemma 2. *For every continuous $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ there is a constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} |\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K - \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K| \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}.$$

The proof of this lemma is also delayed to Appendix C.

B.1.2 Asymptotics of Y_1, \dots, Y_5 under the leave-a-variable-out measure

Let $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(\ell)}$ denote independent samples from the leave-a-variable-out measure defined in (9). This means that $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ denote all but the j_0 -th coordinates of these and that $\beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}$ are independent samples from the prior. In the next section, we will see that, proving Proposition 5 requires analyzing the limit of functions of the random vector $Z_n^{(m)} \in \mathbb{R}^6$ defined as $(\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}, Y_1^{(m)}, Y_2^{(m)}, Y_3^{(m)}, Y_4^{(m)}, Y_5^{(m)})$ where we choose $Y_1^{(m)} := Y_1(\tilde{\beta}^{(m)}, \tilde{\beta}_\star), \dots, Y_5^{(m)} := Y_5(\tilde{\beta}^{(m)}, \tilde{\beta}_\star)$ defined as in (31).

Lemma 3. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4, for $r \geq 1$, let $f_1, \dots, f_r : \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and polynomially bounded functions and $\mathbf{V}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{V}^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be random vectors with coordinates, for each $m \in [r]$ and $i \in [n]$, given by $V_i^{(m)} := f_m(a_{\star, i}, a_{m, i})$. Then for every $m, m' \in [r]$, if $\hat{Q}_{m, m'} := n^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{(m)\top} \mathbf{V}^{(m')}$, then*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q}_{m, m'} \rangle = \hat{q} \quad \text{implies that} \quad \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q}_{m, m'} \rangle_v = \hat{q}.$$

Proof. To see this, for every $t \in [0, 1]$, let $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ be expectation with respect to the posterior corresponding to the log-likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}_{n, p, t}(\mathbf{b}) := t(\Delta L + E_n) + \mathcal{L}_{n, p-1}(\tilde{\mathbf{b}}).$$

That is, for each $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\langle f(\beta) \rangle_t := \frac{\int f(\beta) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, t}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, t}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}.$$

Clearly $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ is equal to $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$ (expectation under the leave-a-variable-out posterior) and $\langle \cdot \rangle_1$ to $\langle \cdot \rangle$ (expectation under the full posterior). Now, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_s \Big|_{s=t} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \frac{\int \hat{Q} \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)} \right] \Big|_{s=t} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int \hat{Q} (\Delta L + E_n) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)} \right] \Big|_{s=t} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int \hat{Q} \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j) \int (\Delta L + E_n) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\left(\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n, p, s}(\beta)\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j) \right)^2} \right] \Big|_{s=t} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\Delta L + E_n) (\hat{Q} - \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_t) \right\rangle_t; \end{aligned}$$

where, for the first equality, we used [35, Proposition A.2.1] to exchange differentiation and expectation and, for the second one, we used that $\frac{d}{ds}\mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) = \Delta L + E_n$. By straightforward adaptations of Propositions 6 and 8 to $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ we have that the right hand side of this last equation is $o(1)$. From this and the Mean Value Theorem we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[\langle \hat{Q} \rangle_v - \mathbb{E}\langle \hat{Q} \rangle] = 0.$$

■

For each distinct pair $m, m' \in [l]$, let \tilde{Q}_{mm} , $\tilde{Q}_{mm'}$, M_{mm} , and $M_{mm'}$ as in (25), but with $\beta^{(1)}, \dots, \beta^{(\ell)}$ drawn from the leave a variable-out measure. Recall t_γ from (17). Furthermore, under the conditions of the Proposition, by Lemma 3 we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle A''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}) \right\rangle_v &= a_{dp}, \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{T}'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star)(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}))^2 \right\rangle_v &= \bar{v} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{T}'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star)^2 \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(m)} \mathbf{X}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(m')} \right\rangle_v &= \bar{q} \\ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \frac{1}{2} \tilde{T}''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} \right\rangle_v &= c_g. \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

Here we will state a lemma that characterizes the limit in distribution of the random vectors $Z_n^{(m)}$. For $m \in [l]$, let $\tilde{\theta}_m := \tilde{\xi}_m + \tilde{z}'$ and $\bar{\theta}_m := \bar{\xi}_m + \bar{z}$; with $(\tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_l, \bar{\xi}_1, \dots, \bar{\xi}_l) \in \mathbb{R}^{2l}$ a Gaussian random vector with covariance matrix given, for $m, m' \in [l]$, by

$$\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\xi}_m \tilde{\xi}_{m'}) = (\tilde{v} - \tilde{q})\delta_{mm'}, \quad \mathbb{E}(\bar{\xi}_m \bar{\xi}_{m'}) = (\bar{v} - \bar{q})\delta_{mm'}, \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\xi}_m \bar{\xi}_{m'}) = (\tilde{m} - \bar{m})\delta_{mm'} \tag{54}$$

and $(\tilde{z}', \bar{z}) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ a Gaussian random vector independent of $(\tilde{\xi}_m, \bar{\xi}_m)$ with covariance matrix given by $\mathbb{E}\tilde{z}'^2 = \tilde{q}$, $\mathbb{E}\bar{z}^2 = \bar{q}$, and $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{z}'\bar{z}) = \bar{m}$. Then, for $m \in [l]$, let

$$\zeta_m := (\beta_m, \tilde{\theta}_m, \bar{\theta}_m, a_{dp}/2, t_\gamma, c_g) \tag{55}$$

with β_1, β_2, \dots independent samples from the prior $\mu(\cdot)$. We then have the following limiting characterization.

Lemma 4. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 5, for every $l \geq 1$ and every continuous and bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^l \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we have that*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle f(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(l)}) \right\rangle_v \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_l)).$$

The proof is deferred to Appendix C.4. In Lemma 4, there are two kinds of limits involved— Y_3 , Y_4 , and Y_5 involve second moments of X_{ij_0} and thus converge to constants. To prove these we will resort to Proposition 8 which establishes the concentration in L^2 of certain functions of the fitted values $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_1^\top \tilde{\beta}, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_n^\top \tilde{\beta}$. On the other hand, by the results of Appendix E, Y_1 and Y_2 converge to Gaussians. The convergence holds since $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\beta}^{(l)}$ are independent of $\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}$ thus conditionally on $\tilde{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \tilde{\beta}^{(l)}$, the random variables $\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}^\top \tilde{\beta}^{(l)}$ are jointly Gaussian with a covariance matrix which converges to a suitable limit due, again, to Proposition 8.

By a similar argument as in Lemma 12, we can extend this convergence in distribution to convergence under $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_v$.

Corollary 2. *Let $l \geq 1$ be some arbitrary integer. Then, for every continuous and bounded function $f : \mathbb{R}^l \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle f(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(l)}) \right\rangle_v \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_l)).$$

B.1.3 Leave-a-variable-out argument

Here we will present the proof for $\ell = 1$, but the general case follows in an analogous manner. Furthermore, we will prove the result for continuous and bounded functions $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$. The extension to continuous polynomially bounded functions follows by appealing to the uniform integrability of β_{j_0} under expectation $\mathbb{E}\langle \cdot \rangle$, obtained as a consequence of Lemma 14. Recall that our goal is to analyze the limit of $\mathbb{E}\langle f(\beta_{\star, j_0}, \beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}) \rangle$ where $\beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}$ denotes the j_0 -th coordinate of ℓ independent samples from the posterior. That is,

$$\mathbb{E}\langle f(\beta_{\star, j_0}, \beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int f(\beta_{\star, j_0}, \beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}) \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} e^{\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\beta^{(m)})} \mu^{\otimes p}(d\beta^{(m)})}{\int \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} e^{\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\beta^{(m)})} \mu^{\otimes p}(d\beta^{(m)})} \right],$$

which recall from Section (4) simplifies to the following

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\langle f(\beta_{\star, j_0}, \beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(\ell)}) \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}, \tilde{\beta}^{(m)}) + E_n(\beta^{(m)})\} \rangle_v}{\langle \prod_{m=1}^{\ell} \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}, \tilde{\beta}^{(m)}) + E_n(\beta^{(m)})\} \rangle_v} \right], \quad (56)$$

Crucially, by definition, under the $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$ measure, $\tilde{\beta}^{(m)}$'s are independent draws from a density proportional to $e^{\mathcal{L}_{n,p-1}(\tilde{\beta}^{(m)})} \mu^{\otimes p-1}(\tilde{\beta}^{(m)})$ whereas $\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}$'s are independent draws from the prior $\mu(\cdot)$. We work with this definition of the $\tilde{\beta}^{(m)}$'s and $\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}$'s. Our goal is to then show that (56) converges to the RHS of (42).

To this end, recall the definition of $Z_n^{(m)}$ from Section B.1.2 and that of $\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \tilde{\beta})$ from (30). For convenience we redefine $\Delta\mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}^{(m)}, \tilde{\beta}^{(m)})$ to be

$$\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n^{(m)}) := Y_1^{(m)} \beta_{j_0}^{(m)} + Y_2^{(m)} \beta_{\star, j_0} - \beta_{j_0}^{(m)2} Y_3^{(m)} + \beta_{\star, j_0} \beta_{j_0}^{(m)} Y_4^{(m)} + \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 Y_5^{(m)},$$

to emphasize the dependence of this quantity on the entries of $Z_n^{(m)}$. For K large enough, define the event $A_K^{(m)} := \{\|Z_n^{(m)}\|_{\infty} \leq K\}$. Notice that due to the definition of $A_K^{(m)}$, there is some small enough $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta e^{\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \leq 1/2$. Fix $\delta > 0$ such that this holds. Let $L \geq 1$.

$$g_k(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(k)}) := f(\beta_{j_0}^{(1)}) \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n^{(1)})\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K^{(1)}} \prod_{m=2}^k (1 - \delta \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n^{(m)})\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K^{(m)}}), \quad (57)$$

where we let $\prod_{j=2}^1(\dots) = 1$. As per our Hypothesis 1, the definition of $A_K^{(m)}$ and the fact that f is continuous and bounded, the functions g_k are also continuous and bounded. By (52), we have that

$$\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \frac{\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{-E_n\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle}{\langle \exp\{-E_n\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle} \mathbb{I}_B = \frac{\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n)\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v}{\langle \exp\{\Delta\mathcal{L}(Z_n)\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v} \mathbb{I}_B, \quad (58)$$

where the last equality follows by definition of $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$ from (9).

Recall the formula for the partial sums of the geometric series; that is, for all $r > 0$,

$$\sum_{0 \leq k \leq L-1} r^k = \frac{1 - r^L}{1 - r}. \quad (59)$$

By equation (58) and this last formula we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{\mathbb{E}}\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K &= \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L) \right] \\
&\quad + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right] \\
&= \delta \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\frac{\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v}{\delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v} (1 - (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L) \right] \\
&\quad + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right] \\
&= \delta \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \right\rangle_v \frac{1 - (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L}{\delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v} \right] \\
&\quad + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right] \\
&= \delta \sum_{1 \leq k \leq L} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle g_k(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(k)}) \rangle_v + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - \delta \langle e^{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)} \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right];
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

where the first equality follows by adding and subtracting a term, the second one by using equation (58), and the last one by using (59) and the definition from (57).

Using Corollary 2, under $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \cdot \rangle_v$ we have that

$$(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(l)}) \xrightarrow{d} (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_l),$$

where, for $m \geq 1$, ζ_m is as in (55). By Hypothesis 1 and the fact that f and $\Delta \mathcal{L}$ are continuous and bounded in A_K , the g_k are all continuous and bounded. This and Corollary 2 imply that

$$\sum_{k \leq L} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle g_k(Z_n^{(1)}, \dots, Z_n^{(k)}) \rangle_v \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \leq L} \mathbb{E} g_k(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k). \tag{61}$$

For a proper constant $C > 0$ and assuming w.l.g. that L is even, the following bound for the second term holds

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K (1 - \delta \langle \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n) \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right] \right| &\leq C \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[(1 - \delta \langle \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n) \mathbb{I}_{A_K} \rangle_v)^L \right] \\
&= C \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[(1 - \delta \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n) \mathbb{I}_{A_K})_v^L \right] \\
&\leq C \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle (1 - \delta \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n) \mathbb{I}_{A_K})^L \rangle_v,
\end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where in the first line we used that f is bounded and in the last Jensen's inequality. Let

$$\tilde{A}_K := \{\|\zeta\|_\infty \leq K\},$$

and define

$$\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_m) := -\frac{a_{dp}}{2} \beta_m^2 + \beta_m \tilde{\theta}_m + \beta_m \beta_{\star, j_0} t_\gamma + \beta_{\star, j_0} \bar{\theta}_m + c_g \beta_{\star, j_0}^2.$$

Here, $\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_m)$ is essentially $\Delta \mathcal{L}(\beta_{j_0}, \bar{\beta})$ with Y_1, \dots, Y_5 replaced by their corresponding limits as in Lemma 4. Likewise, the event \tilde{A}_K is the analogous of A_K where Y_1, \dots, Y_5 have been replaced by their limits. In the same way as above, we then have that

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle (1 - \delta \exp \{\Delta \mathcal{L}(Z_n)\} \mathbb{I}_{A_K})^L \rangle_v \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} (1 - \delta \exp \{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K})^L. \tag{63}$$

Thus, combining equations (60) through (63), we have for every $L \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \delta \sum_{1 \leq k \leq L} \mathbb{E} g_k(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mathbb{E} (1 - \delta \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K})^L \right). \quad (64)$$

Now, by the definition of the functions g_k and (59) we have

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \sum_{1 \leq k \leq L} \mathbb{E} g_k(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) &= \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \frac{1 - \left(1 - \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)\right)^L}{\delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \right] \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \left(1 - \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)\right)^L \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We would like to bound the second term of the last line, which represents the error term resulting of the approximation of the full series $\delta \sum_{k \geq 1} g_k$ by its first L terms $\delta \sum_{1 \leq k \leq L} g_k$. For this we use that f is a bounded function to get that, for some $K \geq 0$,

$$\left| \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \left(1 - \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)\right)^L \right] \right|$$

is smaller or equal to

$$K \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left(1 - \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)\right)^L.$$

Moreover, by Jensen's inequality, because the map $x \mapsto x^L$ is convex, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left(1 - \delta \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)\right)^L &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left(\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int (1 - \delta \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K}) \mu(d\beta) \right)^L \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(1 - \delta \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K}\right)^L. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with (65) we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \sum_{1 \leq k \leq L} \mathbb{E} g_k(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_k) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O} \left(\mathbb{E} \left(1 - \delta \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K}\right)^L \right). \end{aligned}$$

Above, $(\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}, \tilde{z}', \tilde{z})$ have the same joint distribution as described for the $(\tilde{\xi}_1, \tilde{\xi}_1, \tilde{z}', \tilde{z})$'s in (54). We then conclude that, for every $L \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \right] + \mathcal{O} \left(\mathbb{E} (1 - \delta \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1) \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K})^L \right). \quad (65)$$

Note that, by the choice of δ , we have that $1 - \delta \exp \Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1) \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K}$ is a.s smaller than 1/2. Taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ in (65), by dominated convergence we then have that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \tilde{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mathbb{I}_{\tilde{A}_K} \mu(d\beta)} \right].$$

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \bar{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \bar{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \bar{\xi}} \int \exp\{\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)\} \mu(d\beta)} \right]. \quad (66)$$

Notice that, by the definition of $\Delta \mathcal{L}(\zeta_1)$ and those of $\tilde{\theta}_1$ and $\bar{\theta}_1$, the right hand side of (66) is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}', \bar{z}} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \bar{\xi}} \int f(\beta) \exp\{-\frac{a_{dp}}{2} \beta^2 + \beta(\tilde{\xi} + \tilde{z}') + \beta \beta_{\star, j_0} t_\gamma + \beta_{\star, j_0}(\bar{\xi} + \bar{z}) + c_g \beta_{\star, j_0}^2\} \mu(d\beta)}{\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}, \bar{\xi}} \int \exp\{-\frac{a_{dp}}{2} \beta^2 + \beta(\tilde{\xi} + \tilde{z}') + \beta \beta_{\star, j_0} t_\gamma + \beta_{\star, j_0}(\bar{\xi} + \bar{z}) + c_g \beta_{\star, j_0}^2\} \mu(d\beta)} \right]; \quad (67)$$

Recall the formula, valid for all $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, for the generating function of two jointly Normal random variables ξ and ξ' of means $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ and covariance matrix $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^2$

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi, \xi'}(\exp\{a\xi + b\xi'\}) = \exp\{a\mu_1 + b\mu_2 + (a, b)\Sigma(a, b)^\top / 2\}. \quad (68)$$

We can then use (54) and (68) to integrate $\tilde{\xi}$ and $\bar{\xi}$ obtaining that (67) is equal to

$$\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\int f(\beta) \exp\{-(a_{dp} + \tilde{q} - \tilde{v})\frac{\beta^2}{2} + (\tilde{m} - \bar{m} + t_\gamma)\beta \beta_{\star, j_0} + \sqrt{\tilde{q}}\beta \tilde{z}\} \mu(d\beta)}{\int \exp\{-(a_{dp} + \tilde{q} - \tilde{v})\frac{\beta^2}{2} + (\tilde{m} - \bar{m} + t_\gamma)\beta \beta_{\star, j_0} + \sqrt{\tilde{q}}\beta \tilde{z}\} \mu(d\beta)} \right], \quad (69)$$

where $\tilde{z} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, independent of everything else. Observe that, in this last equation, the terms $\beta_{\star, j_0} \bar{z}$ and c_g in the exponents are missing as we have simplified the ones occurring in the numerator with those of the denominator.

From the above, we then conclude that

$$\lim_{K \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{z}} \left[\frac{\int f(\beta) \exp\{-(a_{dp} + \tilde{q} - \tilde{v})\frac{\beta^2}{2} + (\tilde{m} - \bar{m} + t_\gamma)\beta \beta_{\star, j_0} + \sqrt{\tilde{q}}\beta \tilde{z}\} \mu(d\beta)}{\int \exp\{-(a_{dp} + \tilde{q} - \tilde{v})\frac{\beta^2}{2} + (\tilde{m} - \bar{m} + t_\gamma)\beta \beta_{\star, j_0} + \sqrt{\tilde{q}}\beta \tilde{z}\} \mu(d\beta)} \right].$$

Combining this with Lemmas 1 and 2, we conclude that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_Z \langle f(\beta) \rangle_{h, j_0},$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_{h, j_0}$ is given by (43).

This proves the proposition in the case in which $r = 1$ and f is bounded. The extension to general $r \geq 1$ follows in the same way.

B.2 Proof of Proposition 6: leave-an-observation-out argument

Recall definitions (2) and (6)–(7) and that $\mathbf{a}_\star = (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \beta_\star, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \beta_\star)^\top$, $\mathbf{a}_m = (\mathbf{X}_1^\top \beta^{(m)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \beta^{(m)})^\top$. Isolating the dependence of the log-likelihood on the last observation we get that

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) = \mathcal{L}_{n-1,p}(\mathbf{b}) + u_n(\mathbf{X}_n^\top \mathbf{b}, a_{\star, n}), \quad (70)$$

where $a_{\star, n}$ denotes the n -th coordinate of \mathbf{a}_\star . This implies that we can express the following expectation under the full posterior in terms of the leave-an-observation-out measure, defined in (7), according to

$$\mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{\star, n}, a_{1, n}, \dots, a_{\ell, n}) \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\left\langle g(a_{\star, n}, a_{1, n}, \dots, a_{\ell, n}) \exp\{\sum_{m \in [\ell]} u_n(a_{m, n}, a_{\star, n})\} \right\rangle_o}{\langle \exp u_n(a_{1, n}, a_{\star, n}) \rangle_o^\ell} \right], \quad (71)$$

where note that the denominator is obtained by noticing that $\langle \prod_{m=1}^\ell \exp\{u_n(a_{m, n}, a_{\star, n})\} \rangle_o = \langle \exp u_n(a_{1, n}, a_{\star, n}) \rangle_o^\ell$.

Note that on the right hand side, within the expectation, we have expectations w.r.t. the leave-an-observation-out measure. The latter does not involve the n -th observation, thus a sample from the posterior induced by this measure will be independent of \mathbf{X}_n . For calculating the limits of these expectations, it will be enough to track the joint distribution of the following $\ell + 1$ variables

$$(a_{\star,n}, a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{\ell,n}) = (\mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(\ell)}),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(\ell)}$ are independent samples from the leave-an-observation-out measure. By Gaussianity of \mathbf{X}_n , and the fact that $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}$ is independent of \mathbf{X}_n , these are zero mean multivariate Gaussian, so it suffices to track only their covariance matrix.

Now the asymptotic representation theorem of Appendix E (Lemma 10), by Proposition 12, holds under the hypothesis of this proposition which states that the expectations of Q_{11} , Q_{12} , and $Q_{1\star}$ converge, and we obtain under the leave-an-observation-out measure,

$$(a_{\star,n}, a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{\ell,n}) \xrightarrow{d} (\theta_\star, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell). \quad (72)$$

We will use (72) later in this section. Before we present the rest of the proof we comment on the different sources of randomness in the aforementioned display.

Next, we will need the following auxiliary result that proves concentration of Q_{11} , Q_{12} , $Q_{1\star}$ defined in (23) under the leave-an-observation-out measure.

Lemma 5. *There exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - v_B)^2 \rangle_o, \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{12} - c_B)^2 \rangle_o, \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{1\star} - c_{BB\star})^2 \rangle_o \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}},$$

where $v_B, c_B, c_{BB\star}$ are defined as in (44).

In the above lemma, since the expectations are taken under the leave-an-observation-out measure, it means that $Q_{11} = \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} / n$, where $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a sample from the leave-an-observation-out measure.

Proof. This proof is analogous to that of Lemma 3. Here we will prove the conclusion for Q_{11} but the result follows analogously for the others parameters. First notice that Proposition 12 applies to the leave-an-observation-out posterior. We then have that, for some v'_B ,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - v'_B)^2 \rangle_o \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

We thus only need to prove that $v'_B = v_B$.

To see this, for every $t \in [0, 1]$, let $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ be expectation with respect to the posterior corresponding to the log-likelihood

$$\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t}(\mathbf{b}) := t u_n(\mathbf{X}_n^\top \mathbf{b}, a_{\star,n}) + \sum_{i \in [n-1]} u_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}, a_{\star,i}).$$

That is, for each $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, we define

$$\langle f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle_t := \frac{\int f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t}(\boldsymbol{\beta})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}.$$

Clearly $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ is equal to $\langle \cdot \rangle_o$ (expectation under the leave-an-observation-out posterior) and $\langle \cdot \rangle_1$ to $\langle \cdot \rangle$ (expectation under the full posterior). Now, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_s \big|_{s=t} &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \frac{\int \hat{Q} \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)} \right] \big|_{s=t} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int \hat{Q} (\Delta L + E_n) \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)} \right] \big|_{s=t} \\ &\quad - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\int \hat{Q} \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j) \int u_n(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n}) \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\left(\int \exp \{ \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) \} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j) \right)^2} \right] \big|_{s=t} \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\Delta L + E_n)(\hat{Q} - \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_t) \right\rangle_t; \end{aligned}$$

where, for the first equality, we used [35, Proposition A.2.1] to exchange differentiation and expectation and, for the second one, we used that $\frac{d}{ds} \mathcal{L}_{n,p,s}(\beta) = (\Delta L + E_n)$. Then, for every fixed $t \in [0, 1]$,

$$\left| \frac{d}{ds} \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_s \big|_{s=t} \right| \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \langle u_n^2(a_{\star,n}, a_{1,n}) \rangle_t \mathbb{E} \langle (\hat{Q} - \langle \hat{Q} \rangle_t)^2 \rangle_t} \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/4}},$$

where, for the last inequality, we used that Propositions 12 and 14 can be straightforwardly adapted to $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$. From this and the Mean Value Theorem we conclude that $v'_B = v_B$ which proves the lemma. \blacksquare

B.2.1 Proof of Proposition 6

We first prove this for g continuous and bounded. For simplicity we will write the proof with $l = 1$ but the derivation follows in a completely similar way for larger values of l . Let $M \geq 1$. For conciseness of notation, below we use $u(x, a_{\star,n})$ to denote $u_n(x, a_{\star,n})$ as defined in (3). For each $k \leq M$ define

$$f_k(a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{k,n}, a_{\star,n}) := g(a_{1,n}) \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n}) \prod_{m=2}^k (1 - \exp u(a_{m,n}, a_{\star,n})); \quad (73)$$

where we let $\prod_{j=2}^1(\dots) = 1$. By Hypothesis 1 and the fact that g is continuous and bounded, the functions f_k are also continuous and bounded.

By equation (71) and the geometric series formula,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle (1 - (1 - \langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o)^M) \right] + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle (1 - \langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o)^M \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g(a_{1,n}) e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o \frac{1 - (1 - \langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o)^M}{\langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o} \right] + \mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle (1 - \langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o)^M \\ &= \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} \langle f_k(a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{k,n}, a_{\star,n}) \rangle_o + \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle (1 - \langle e^{u(a_{1,n}, a_{\star,n})} \rangle_o)^M \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

As noted above, by Hypothesis 1 and the fact that g is continuous and bounded, the f_k are all continuous and bounded. Then, by (72),

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} \langle f_k(a_{1,n}, \dots, a_{k,n}, a_{\star,n}) \rangle_o \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} f_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_{\star}), \quad (75)$$

where recall the definition of θ_m 's and θ_* from (46). For a proper constants $K > 0$, the second term can be bounded in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle (1 - \langle \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n}) \rangle_o)^M \right] \right| &\leq K \mathbb{E} (1 - \langle \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n}) \rangle_o)^M \\ &\leq K \mathbb{E} \langle (1 - \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n}))^M \rangle_o, \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

where in the first line we used that g is bounded and in the second Jensen's inequality. Now, because $(1 - \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n}))^M$ is a continuous and bounded function of $(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n})$ by Lemma 10 we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (1 - \exp u(a_{1,n}, a_{*,n}))^M \rangle_o \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} (1 - \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*))^M, \quad (77)$$

where on the RHS we use $u(x, \theta_*)$ to denote $\tilde{T}(\theta_*)x - A(x)$ with $\tilde{T}(\theta_*) = f(\theta_*, e)$ and $e \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$ independent of everything else. Thus, combining equations (74) through (77), we have so far that for every fixed $M \geq 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle g(a_{1,n}) \rangle = \sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} f_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_*) + \mathcal{O} \left(\mathbb{E} (1 - \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*))^M \right). \quad (78)$$

Because this holds for every fixed $M \geq 1$, taking the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$ after the limit in n , by dominated convergence theorem, which holds because the functions f_k are continuous and bounded, we get that

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} f_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_*) \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E} f_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_*) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} (1 - \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*))^M \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} 0. \quad (79)$$

Note that $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ denotes expectation w.r.t. $(G, e, \xi_1, \xi_2, \dots)$, and we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E} f_k(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_k, \theta_*) &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \int \phi(d\xi_1) \cdots \phi(d\xi_k) g(\theta_1) \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*) \prod_{m=2}^k (1 - \exp u(\theta_m, \theta_*)) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \int \phi(d\xi_1) g(\theta_1) \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*) \prod_{m=2}^k \int \phi(d\xi_m) (1 - \exp u(\theta_m, \theta_*)) \\ &= \sum_{k \geq 1} \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \int \phi(d\xi_1) g(\theta_1) \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*) \left(\int \phi(d\xi_2) (1 - \exp u(\theta_2, \theta_*)) \right)^{k-1} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \int \phi(d\xi_1) g(\theta_1) \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*) \sum_{k \geq 1} \left(\int \phi(d\xi_2) (1 - \exp u(\theta_2, \theta_*)) \right)^{k-1} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \left(\frac{\int \phi(d\xi_1) g(\theta_1) \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*)}{\int \phi(d\xi_2) \exp u(\theta_2, \theta_*)} \right) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle g(\theta_1) \rangle_s, \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

where $\phi(d\xi_m)/d\xi_m$ denotes the standard Gaussian density and for the fourth equality we used dominated convergence to exchange summation and integration and in the fifth we used the formula for geometric series.

Then, combining equations (78)–(80) we obtain that

$$\sum_{1 \leq k \leq M} \mathbb{E} f_k \xrightarrow{M \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle g(\theta_1) \rangle_s. \quad (81)$$

Finally, to see that the second term goes to 0, note that $1 - \exp u(\theta_1, \theta_*) < 1$ since u is non-positive a.s. The limit then follows by another use of dominated convergence.

Notice that if g is polynomially bounded, by Proposition 14 we have that $g(a_n)$ is uniformly integrable. We can thus, for computing its expectation, approximate it by a continuous and bounded function. The same proof as above subsequently applies.

C Proofs of intermediate results for Proposition 5

C.1 Proof of Lemma 1

For this result, we require some uniform bounds on $\mathbb{E}\langle Y_1^2 \rangle, \dots, \mathbb{E}\langle Y_5^2 \rangle$, as established in the following.

Lemma 6. *Assume Hypothesis 1 and 2 hold. Then, there exists a constant $C > 0$ s.t., for all $n \geq 1$, we have $\mathbb{E}\langle Y_1^2 \rangle, \dots, \mathbb{E}\langle Y_5^2 \rangle \leq C$.*

Proof. We present the proof for Y_1 . In this case, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\langle Y_1^2 \rangle = \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}\langle X_{ij_0}^2 F_{ii} \rangle + \sum_{i \neq i' \in [n]} \mathbb{E}\langle X_{ij_0} X_{i'j_0} F_{ii'} \rangle = n \mathbb{E}\langle X_{1j_0}^2 F_{11} \rangle + n(n-1) \mathbb{E}\langle X_{1j_0} X_{2j_0} F_{12} \rangle;$$

where, for $i, j \in [n]$, we denote $(\tilde{T}_i(\tilde{a}_{*,i}) - A'(\tilde{a}_i))(\tilde{T}_j(\tilde{a}_{*,j}) - A'(\tilde{a}_j))$ by F_{ij} ; where \tilde{T}_i is defined as in (2) and $\tilde{a}_i, \tilde{a}_{*,i}$ are defined as in (10), but with $\beta^{(i)}$ referring to a random sample from the full posterior with the j_0 -th coordinate left out. The first term on the RHS is easy to bound. Indeed, by Hypothesis 1 there exists $K > 0$ such that

$$n \mathbb{E}\langle X_{1j_0}^2 F_{11} \rangle \leq nK(\mathbb{E}X_{1j_0}^2 + \mathbb{E}(X_{1j_0}^2 \tilde{T}_1^2(\tilde{a}_{*,1}))) \leq nK \left(\mathbb{E}X_{1j_0}^2 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(X_{1j_0}^4) \mathbb{E}(\tilde{T}_1^4(\tilde{a}_{*,1}))} \right) \leq K', \quad (82)$$

where we use that, because \tilde{T}_1' is bounded, $\mathbb{E}(\tilde{T}_1^4(\tilde{a}_{*,1})) \leq K(1 + \mathbb{E}\tilde{a}_{*,1}^4)$ to see that it is a bounded sequence. For the second term, by Gaussian integration by parts, as in [35, Appendix A.4], with respect to X_{1j_0} and X_{2j_0} we obtain that $n^2 \mathbb{E}\langle X_{1j_0} X_{2j_0} F_{12} \rangle$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \beta_{*,j_0}^2 \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' \tilde{T}_2' a_{1,1} a_{2,1} \rangle - \beta_{*,j_0}^2 \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' \tilde{T}_2' a_{1,1} a_{2,2} \rangle - \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' a_{1,1} A_2'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \rangle \\ & + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' a_{1,1} A_2'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \rangle - \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \tilde{T}_2' a_{2,1} \rangle + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \tilde{T}_2' a_{2,2} \rangle \\ & - \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(1)} A_2'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)2} \rangle + \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(1)} A_2'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \rangle - \beta_{*,j_0}^2 \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' \tilde{T}_2' a_{1,2} a_{2,1} \rangle \\ & - \beta_{*,j_0}^2 \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' \tilde{T}_2' a_{1,2} a_{2,2} \rangle + 2\beta_{*,j_0}^2 \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' \tilde{T}_2' a_{1,2} a_{2,3} \rangle + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' a_{1,2} A_2'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \rangle \\ & + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' a_{1,2} A_2'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \rangle - 2\beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} \tilde{T}_1' a_{1,2} A_2'^{(3)} \beta_{j_0}^{(3)} \rangle + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \tilde{T}_2' a_{2,1} \rangle \\ & + \beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \tilde{T}_2' a_{2,2} \rangle - 2\beta_{*,j_0} \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} \tilde{T}_2' a_{2,3} \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} A_2'^{(1)} \beta_{j_0}^{(1)} \rangle \\ & - \mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} A_2'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)2} \rangle + 2\mathbb{E}\langle F_{12} A_1'^{(2)} \beta_{j_0}^{(2)} A_2'^{(3)} \beta_{j_0}^{(3)} \rangle; \end{aligned}$$

where we heavily relied in notations introduced in previous sections to compress this expression. Despite the complexity of this expression, it is easy to notice that in every term, all the finite moments of all factors inside the expectation are uniformly bounded. These bounds follow, similarly

to (82), from Hypothesis 1, Lemma 14, and Proposition 14. From this and multiple applications of Cauchy-Schwarz, we conclude that for some $K' > 0$

$$n(n-1)\mathbb{E}\langle X_{1j_0}X_{2j_0}F_{12}\rangle \leq K'. \quad (83)$$

Combining equations (82) and (83) we see that $\mathbb{E}\langle Y_1^2 \rangle \leq C$. A completely analogous argument proves the result for Y_2 .

The random variables Y_3 and Y_4 have second moments that are easier to bound. For example, by Hypothesis 1 we have $\mathbb{E}\langle Y_3^2 \rangle \leq d_2\mathbb{E}\|\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}\|^4$; where the RHS is easily seen to be bounded. A similar argument applies for Y_4 .

Finally, for Y_5 observe that by Hypothesis 1 and Cauchy-Schwarz $|Y_5| \leq d_1\sqrt{\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\beta}\|^2\|\mathbf{X}_{\bullet j_0}\|^4}$. We then have

$$\mathbb{E}\langle Y_5^2 \rangle \leq d_1^2 \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\beta}\|^4 \rangle \mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^4\right)^2}. \quad (84)$$

where $\mathbb{E}\left(\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^4\right)^2$ is easily seen to be of order $\mathcal{O}(n^{-2})$. Finally, combining the fact that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op}$ is bounded with very high probability by $3 + \delta$ and Corollary 3, we obtain that $n^{-2}\mathbb{E}\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\tilde{\beta}\|^4 \rangle$ is uniformly bounded. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

The conclusion of Lemma 1 is then given by an application of Proposition 13 in the special case of $\|f\|_\infty < \infty$ and letting $\varepsilon_n := 2\sqrt{\mathbb{P}(B^c)}$ and $\varepsilon'_K := 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbb{I}_{A_K^c} \rangle}$. The fact that ε'_K goes to 0 as $K \rightarrow \infty$ is a direct consequence of Lemma 6.

C.2 Proof of Lemma 2

For proving this we will use the following version of [36, Proposition 4.5].

Lemma 7. *For every $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ bounded we a.s. have that*

$$|\langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K - \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K| \leq 2\|f\|_\infty(\langle |E_n| \rangle_K + \langle |E_n| \rangle'_K),$$

where E_n as defined in (47).

By Lemma 7, it suffices to control $\mathbb{E}\langle |E_n| \rangle_K$ and $\mathbb{E}\langle |E_n| \rangle'_K$ to bound the effect of dropping the term E_n . If we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_{n,1} &:= -\frac{\beta_{j_0}^3}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} A'''(\xi_i) X_{ij_0}^3, \quad E_{n,2} := \frac{\beta_{\star, j_0}^3}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}'''(\chi_i) \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} X_{ij_0}^3, \\ E_{n,3} &:= \frac{\beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \beta_{j_0}}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}''(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star) X_{ij_0}^3, \quad \text{and} \quad E_{n,4} := \frac{\beta_{\star, j_0}^3 \beta_{j_0}}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}'''(\chi_i) X_{ij_0}^4 \end{aligned}$$

we then have that $E_n = E_{n,1} + E_{n,2} + E_{n,3} + E_{n,4}$ and we can thus bound the absolute values of these four terms separately. We will now do this in an orderly fashion.

For the first term, by Hypothesis 1 and exchangeability, we have that there is some constant $C > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}\langle |E_{n,1}| \rangle_K \leq \frac{d_2}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\langle |\beta_{j_0}|^3 \rangle |X_{ij_0}|^3) \leq \frac{d_2 K^3}{6} n \mathbb{E}|X_{1j_0}|^3 \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/2}}.$$

Notice that Proposition 9 and Corollary 3 easily extend to $\langle \cdot \rangle_K$. For the second term, we use Hypothesis 1 and Cauchy-Schwarz to see there is a constant $C' > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,2}| \rangle_K &\leq \frac{d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}|^3}{6} \sum_{i \in [n]} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left(\langle |\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}| \rangle_K |X_{ij_0}|^3 \right) \\ &\leq \frac{d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}|^3}{6} \left(\bar{\mathbb{E}} \left(\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\beta}\|^2 \rangle_K \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^6 \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{3d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}|^3}{2} \left(n \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left(\langle \|\tilde{\beta}\|^2 \rangle_K X_{1j_0}^6 \right) \right)^{1/2} \\ &\leq \frac{3d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}|^3}{6} \left(n^2 \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \|\tilde{\beta}\|^4 \rangle_K \bar{\mathbb{E}} X_{1j_0}^{12} \right)^{1/4} \leq \frac{C'}{n^{1/2}},\end{aligned}$$

where in the last inequality we used the extension of Corollary 3 to $\langle \cdot \rangle_K$. While for the third term, we similarly have for some constant $C'' > 0$

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,3}| \rangle_K \leq \frac{d_1 \beta_{\star,j_0}^2}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \bar{\mathbb{E}} (\langle |\beta_{j_0}| \rangle_K |X_{ij_0}|^3) \leq \frac{d_1 \beta_{\star,j_0}^2 K}{2} n \bar{\mathbb{E}} |X_{1j_0}|^3 \leq \frac{C''}{n^{1/2}}.$$

Finally, for the fourth, we readily see there exists a constant $C''' > 0$ such that

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,4}| \rangle_K \leq \frac{d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}^3|}{6} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left(\langle |\beta_{j_0}| \rangle_K \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^4 \right) \leq \frac{d_1 |\beta_{\star,j_0}^3| K}{6} n \bar{\mathbb{E}} X_{1j_0}^4 \leq \frac{C'''}{n}.$$

Analogous bounds for $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,1}| \rangle'_K$, $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,2}| \rangle'_K$, $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,3}| \rangle'_K$, and $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |E_{n,4}| \rangle'_K$ follow from straightforward adaptations of the previous bounds and generalizations of Proposition 9 and Corollary 3 to the measure $\langle \cdot \rangle'_K$.

Finally, by the definition of event A_K , $|\beta_{j_0}| \leq K$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_K$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle'_K$. Let \bar{f} be the restriction of f to the interval $[-K, K]$. Because $|\beta_{j_0}| \leq K$, then

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K = \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \bar{f}(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle'_K \quad \text{and} \quad \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle f(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K = \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \bar{f}(\beta_{j_0}) \rangle_K.$$

Finally, $\|\bar{f}\|_\infty < \infty$ because f is continuous and $[-K, K]$ is compact. We then have the desired result.

C.3 Concentration of functions of the fitted values

From a straight forward adaptation of the proof of Proposition 4 for the case in which two observations are left out and using Lemma 11, we obtain the following which proves the asymptotic decorrelation of the different coordinates of functions of a_1, \dots, a_n . For this, notice that if $f, g : \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are continuous and polynomially bounded, then $F : \mathbb{R}^6 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ given by $F(x, y) = f(x)g(y)$ is also continuous and polynomially bounded.

Lemma 8. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4, let $f, g : \mathbb{R}^3 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and polynomially bounded functions. We then have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle f(a_{\star,1}, a_{1,1}, a_{2,1}) g(a_{\star,2}, a_{1,2}, a_{2,2}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle f(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \theta_2) \rangle_s \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle g(\theta_\star, \theta_1, \theta_2) \rangle_s,$$

with $\mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e}(\cdot)$ defined as in Section 2.3 and $\langle \cdot \rangle_s$ as in Proposition 4.

From this we have the following concentration result used in the proof of Lemma 4.

Proposition 8. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 4, for $r \geq 1$, let $f_1, \dots, f_r : \mathbb{R}^2 \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be continuous and polynomially bounded functions and $\mathbf{V}^{(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{V}^{(r)} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be random vectors with coordinates, for each $m \in [r]$ and $i \in [n]$, given by $V_i^{(m)} := f_m(a_{\star, i}, a_{m, i})$. Then for every $m, m' \in [r]$, if $\hat{Q}_{m, m'} := n^{-1} \mathbf{V}^{(m)\top} \mathbf{V}^{(m')}$, we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle (\hat{Q}_{m, m'} - \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q}_{m, m'} \rangle)^2 \rangle = 0.$$

Proof. First notice that by the exchangeability of the variables $a_{\star, 1}, \dots, a_{\star, n}$ and $a_{m, 1}, \dots, a_{m, n}$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle (\hat{Q}_{m, m'} - \mathbb{E} \langle \hat{Q}_{m, m'} \rangle)^2 \rangle &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle V_i^{(m)2} V_i^{(m')2} \rangle + \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq i' \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle V_i^{(m)} V_i^{(m')} V_{i'}^{(m)} V_{i'}^{(m')} \rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}^2 \langle V_i^{(m)} V_i^{(m')} \rangle - \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i \neq i' \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle V_i^{(m)} V_i^{(m')} \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle V_{i'}^{(m)} V_{i'}^{(m')} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \left(\mathbb{E} \langle V_n^{(m)2} V_n^{(m')2} \rangle - \mathbb{E}^2 \langle V_n^{(m)} V_n^{(m')} \rangle \right) \\ &\quad + \frac{n(n-1)}{n^2} \left(\mathbb{E} \langle V_n^{(m)} V_n^{(m')} V_{n-1}^{(m)} V_{n-1}^{(m')} \rangle - \mathbb{E} \langle V_n^{(m)} V_n^{(m')} \rangle \mathbb{E} \langle V_{n-1}^{(m)} V_{n-1}^{(m')} \rangle \right). \end{aligned}$$

It is easy to see that the first term of the last line converges to zero by the polynomial boundedness condition in the hypothesis and Proposition 14. Moreover, by Lemma 8, the last line converges to zero. \blacksquare

C.4 Proof of Lemma 4

By a simple interpolation argument (analogous to the proof of Lemma 5), Proposition 8, and the assumption that the assumptions of Proposition 5, we have that, for $m \neq m' \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \langle (\tilde{Q}_{mm} - \tilde{v})^2 \rangle_v, \mathbb{E} \langle (\bar{Q}_{mm} - \bar{v})^2 \rangle_v, \mathbb{E} \langle (M_{mm} - \tilde{m})^2 \rangle_v, \\ &\mathbb{E} \langle (\tilde{Q}_{mm'} - \tilde{q})^2 \rangle_v, \mathbb{E} \langle (\bar{Q}_{mm'} - \bar{q})^2 \rangle_v, \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \langle (M_{mm'} - \bar{m})^2 \rangle_v, \end{aligned}$$

all go to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Recall definition (9) of the leave-a-variable-out measure. It is clear then that, if β is a sample from the measure induced by $\langle \cdot \rangle_v$, the random vector $\tilde{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ (the vector without the j_0 -th coordinate of β) is independent of $\mathbf{X}_{\bullet, j_0}$. Moreover, by the L^2 concentrations of \tilde{Q}_{mm} , $\tilde{Q}_{mm'}$, M_{mm} , and $M_{mm'}$ argued above and a simple adaptation of Lemma 10 to this setting we obtain that

$$(Y_1^{(1)}, Y_2^{(1)}, \dots, Y_1^{(l)}, Y_2^{(l)}) \xrightarrow{d} (\tilde{\theta}_1, \bar{\theta}_1, \dots, \tilde{\theta}_l, \bar{\theta}_l),$$

under the measure induced by $\mathbb{E}[\langle \cdot \rangle_v]$, where $\tilde{\theta}, \bar{\theta}$ are defined as in (54). From the independence of $\tilde{\beta}$ from $\mathbf{X}_{\bullet, j_0}$ we can also easily prove that, for every $m \leq l$,

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (Y_3 - a_{dp}/2)^2 \rangle_v, \mathbb{E} \langle (Y_4 - t_\gamma)^2 \rangle_v, \text{ and } \mathbb{E} \langle (Y_5 - c_g)^2 \rangle_v$$

all go to 0 as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Finally, under the leave-a-variable-out measure $\beta_{j_0}^{(1)}, \dots, \beta_{j_0}^{(l)}$ are all independent and distributed according to $\mu(\cdot)$. We then conclude the convergence stated in Lemma 4.

D Concentration in L^2 of order parameters (23)

In this section we will prove that, under $\mathbb{E}\langle \cdot \rangle$, the order parameters Q_{11} , Q_{12} , and Q_{1*} , as defined in (23), concentrate. The formal statement is provided in Proposition 12 at the end of this section. We use this concentration result critically in the proof of Proposition 1 earlier.

By the Hypothesis 1, the Hessian $H[\mathcal{L}_{n,p}]$ of $\mathcal{L}_{n,p}$ is positive definite. This is so because, for all $j, j' \in [p]$,

$$\partial_{b_j, b_{j'}}^2 \mathcal{L}_{n,p} = - \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij} X_{ij'} A''(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b})$$

and $A'' > 0$. Furthermore, by Hypothesis 1, the coordinate-wise prior $\mu(\cdot)$ is strongly log-concave. Then, there are some $\varepsilon > 0$ and $a \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\log \mu(x) < -\varepsilon(x - a)^2. \quad (85)$$

Because this constant can be eliminated by a simple translation of the coordinates, we will assume w.l.g. that $a = 0$. All this implies the crucial fact that the posterior measure is strongly log-concave. To show that the order parameters concentrate we will introduce the following tilted log-likelihood

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(2)}) := \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}^{(1)}) + \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}) + \lambda_n \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \gamma_n \mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{b}^{(2)} + \chi_n \beta_\star^\top \mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \quad (86)$$

for $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\chi_n)_{n \geq 1} \subseteq [0, \varepsilon/2]$, three vanishing sequences to be selected later. Note that, unlike the log-likelihoods introduced before, this one involves two p -dimensional vectors. Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^{2p} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, then⁶

$$\left\langle f(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}) \right\rangle_T := \frac{1}{\tilde{Z}_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n}} \int \exp\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(1)}) \mu(d\beta_j^{(2)}), \quad (87)$$

is the posterior expectation associated to (86) with $\tilde{Z}_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n} > 0$ a suitable normalizing constant. We will either write $\mathbf{\Gamma}$ or $(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})$ to refer to samples from the tilted posterior. In this section, we will denote the scaled log-normalizing constant of the posterior measure by

$$F_n := n^{-1} \log Z_n. \quad (88)$$

In the same way, we will let the log-normalizing constant of the tilted posterior be

$$\tilde{F}_n := n^{-1} \log \tilde{Z}_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n}. \quad (89)$$

First, we will give an exponential control of the norm $\|\beta^{(1)}\|^2$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ (i.e., we control the square-norm of the first p coordinates of a sample from the tilted posterior). We will then use this bound to control all the finite moments of $n^{-1} \|\beta^{(1)}\|^2$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$. This control is needed to account for the fact that the samples from this measure are not necessarily bounded.

Proposition 9. *Assume Hypothesis 1 holds. Then there exists some constant $C \geq 0$ such that for all $t, (\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\chi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $[0, \varepsilon/4]$ and $n \geq 1$ it holds that*

$$\log \left\langle \exp t \|\beta^{(1)}\|^2 \right\rangle_T, \log \left\langle \exp t \|\beta^{(2)}\|^2 \right\rangle_T \leq Cn(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 + 1)^2,$$

where, as above, $\beta^{(1)}$ and $\beta^{(2)}$ are random vectors containing the first and last p coordinates of a sample from the tilted posterior (87), respectively.

⁶Note here we use $(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})$ to refer to a sample from the tilted posterior (87), instead of referring to two independent samples from the full posterior as in the rest of the manuscript. But, since we refer to these under the expectation $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$, the meaning is clear from context.

Proof. Here we prove this for $\beta^{(1)}$. The proof for $\beta^{(2)}$ follows in a similar way. For any $\mathbf{b}^{(1)}, \mathbf{b}^{(2)}$, because $0 \leq t, \lambda_n \leq \varepsilon/4$,

$$(t + \lambda_n) \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2$$

Similarly, because $2\mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{b}^{(2)} \leq \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\|^2$ and $0 \leq \gamma_n \leq \varepsilon/4$,

$$\gamma_n \mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{b}^{(2)} \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\|^2).$$

And because $2\mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \beta_\star \leq \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \|\beta_\star\|^2$ and $0 \leq \chi_n \leq \varepsilon/4$,

$$\chi_n \mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \beta_\star \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8} (\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \|\beta_\star\|^2).$$

Finally, notice that by (85),

$$\sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{j \in [p]} \log \mu(b_j^{(m)}) \leq -\varepsilon (\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\|^2).$$

By the above bounds,

$$(t + \lambda_n) \|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + \gamma_n \mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{b}^{(2)} + \chi_n \mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \beta_\star + \sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{j \in [p]} \log \mu(b_j^{(m)})$$

is then smaller or equal to

$$-\frac{\varepsilon}{8} \left(2\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|^2 + 7\|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\|^2 - \|\beta_\star\|^2 \right).$$

Also, as $A(\cdot)$ is by Hypothesis 1(iii) non-negative,

$$\sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(m)} - A(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(m)}) \leq \tau^\top (\mathbf{b}^{(1)} + \mathbf{b}^{(2)}); \quad (90)$$

where, for $j \in [p]$, $\tau_j := \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta_\star) X_{ij}$. Because Hypothesis 1(iv) states that $\sup_{n \geq 1} \|\beta_\star\|_\infty < \infty$, there is some $L > 0$ such that $\|\beta_\star\| \leq \sqrt{n}L$ for all $n \geq 1$. Then, because $\|\tilde{T}'_i\|_\infty \leq d_1$ by Hypothesis 1(ii), it follows that for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$, $\tilde{T}_i(x) \leq d_1|x| + \tilde{T}_i(0)$. Then, for some $K, K' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{a}_\star)\|^2 &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i^2(a_{\star,i}) \leq \sum_{i \in [n]} (d_1|a_{\star,i}| + \tilde{T}_i(0))^2 \\ &\leq K \left(\|\mathbf{X} \beta_\star\|^2 + \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 \right) \\ &\leq K' n \left(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

where, in the last line, we used that $\|\beta_\star\|^2 \leq nL^2$. We then obtain that, for some appropriate $K'', K''' > 0$,

$$\log \int \exp\{t\|\beta^{(1)}\|^2 + \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(1)}) \mu(d\beta_j^{(2)})$$

is smaller or equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int \exp\{\tau^\top (\beta^{(1)} + \beta^{(2)}) - \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|\Gamma\|^2\} \prod_{j \in [p]} d\beta_j^{(1)} d\beta_j^{(2)} &\leq \frac{K''}{\varepsilon} \|\tau\|^2 + \frac{\|\beta_\star\|^2}{8} - p \log(K'' \varepsilon) \\ &\leq \frac{K''}{\varepsilon} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{a}_\star)\|^2 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n \left(\frac{L}{8} - \kappa \log(K'' \varepsilon) \right) \\ &\leq nK''' \left(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 + 1 \right)^2; \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

where we used (85) and (90) and that, for all $a \in \mathbb{R}_{>0}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$, $\int e^{-ax^2+bx} dx = (\pi/a)^{1/2} e^{\frac{b^2}{4a}}$.

Now we need to show an analogous lower bound on the log-normalizing constant. Define the set $B_n := \{\|\mathbf{b}^{(1)}\|_\infty + \|\mathbf{b}^{(2)}\|_\infty \leq 1\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{2p}$ and $M := \int_{-1}^1 \mu(dx)$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $M > 0$. If this were not the case, it would suffice to adapt the argument by changing the interval $[-1, 1]$ to one with positive μ -mass. Notice that, because the integrand is non-negative,

$$Z_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n} \geq \int_{B_n} \exp\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j^{(1)}) \mu(d\beta_j^{(2)}). \quad (93)$$

Furthermore, in the set B_n we have, by Cauchy-Schwarz and the fact that in B_n the norms of $\mathbf{b}^{(1)}$ and $\mathbf{b}^{(2)}$ are bounded by \sqrt{p} ,

$$|\mathbf{b}^{(1)\top} \mathbf{b}^{(2)}| \leq \kappa n, \quad \text{and} \quad |\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star^\top \mathbf{b}^{(1)}| \leq \sqrt{\kappa n} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star\|.$$

This implies that inside B_n

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p} \geq \mathcal{L}_{n,p} - (\gamma_n + L\chi_n)\kappa n; \quad (94)$$

where $L > 0$ is as above. On the other hand, inside B_n , by Cauchy-Schwarz and the fact that $\|\mathbf{b}(1)\| \leq \sqrt{p}$, there is some $K^{(4)} > 0$ for which

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(1)} &\geq -\|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{a}_\star)\| \|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}^{(1)}\| \\ &\geq -\sqrt{n} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(\mathbf{a}_\star)\| \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} \\ &\geq -K^{(4)} n \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} \sqrt{\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2} \\ &\geq -K^{(4)} n \sqrt{\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^4 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 \\ &\geq -K^{(4)} n \sqrt{\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^4 + 2n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^4} \\ &= -K^{(4)} n \left(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

where, for the third bound, we used (91). In a similar way, by Hypothesis 1(iii) we have that $\|A''\|_\infty \leq 1$, which implies that there are constants $a, b, > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have that $-A(x) \geq -(x^2 + b|x| + c)$. Thus inside B_n we have some $K^{(5)} > 0$ s.t., for $m = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} -\sum_{i \in [n]} A(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(m)}) &\geq -K^{(5)} \left(\|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}^{(m)}\|^2 + \sum_{i \in [n]} |\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(m)}| + n \right) \\ &\geq -K^{(5)} \left(\|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}^{(m)}\|^2 + \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}^{(m)}\| + n \right) \\ &\geq -K^{(5)} \left(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 \|\mathbf{b}^{(m)}\|^2 + \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} \|\mathbf{b}^{(m)}\| + n \right) \\ &\geq -K^{(5)} n (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + 1)^2; \end{aligned}$$

where we used that, by Cauchy-Schwarz, $\sum_{i \in [n]} |\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}^{(m)}| \leq \sqrt{n} \|\mathbf{X} \mathbf{b}^{(m)}\|$. Combining this last inequality with (93), (94), and (95) we obtain that for some $K^{(6)}$

$$\log \tilde{Z}_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n} \geq -K^{(6)} n \left(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 + n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{T}}(0)\|^2 + 1 \right)^2, \quad (96)$$

where we used that the Lebesgue measure of B_n is 4^p . Putting equations (92) and (96) together produces the result. \blacksquare

From this, a uniform bound for the finite moments of $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}\|^2/n$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ can be derived as follows.

Corollary 3. *Assume Hypothesis 1 holds. For all $k \geq 1$ there is some $C_k > 0$ such that, for all $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\chi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $[0, \varepsilon/4]$ and $n \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E} \langle \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}\|^{2k} \rangle_T, \mathbb{E} \langle \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}\|^{2k} \rangle_T \leq C_k n^k$.*

Proof. This follows directly from Proposition 9, [35, Lemma 3.1.8], Hypothesis 1, and the fact that all the finite moments of $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}$ are uniformly bounded in n (which follows from [85, Corollary 5.35]). \blacksquare

Next, we will produce a bound for the variance of the log-normalizing constant of the tilted model.

Proposition 10. *Assume Hypothesis 1 holds. Then, there exists some fixed $C > 0$ s.t., for all $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\chi_n)_{n \geq 1}$ in $[0, \varepsilon/4]$, $\text{Var}(\tilde{F}_n) \leq C/\sqrt{n}$.*

Proof. Define the vector $\mathbf{e} := (e_1, \dots, e_n)$. By the law of total variance we have that

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{F}_n) = \mathbb{E} \left(\text{Var}(\tilde{F}_n | \mathbf{e}) \right) + \text{Var} \left(\mathbb{E}(\tilde{F}_n | \mathbf{e}) \right). \quad (97)$$

We will now analyze the two terms separately.

Given a differentiable function on $\mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, we let $\nabla_{\mathbf{X}}$ be the gradient over this space. Notice that, letting \mathbf{e} be fixed, then \tilde{F} is only a function of \mathbf{X} . By Gauss-Poincaré inequality we have that for any given sequence $\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$ as in Hypothesis 1

$$\text{Var}(\tilde{F}_n | \mathbf{e}) \leq \frac{1}{n} \mathbb{E} \left(\|\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{F}_n\|_F^2 | \mathbf{e} \right);$$

where $\|\cdot\|_F$ stands for the *Frobenius norm*.

Note that, for all $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [p]$, the ij -th coordinate of $\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{F}$ is given, interchanging differentiation and integration using [35, Proposition A.2.1], by

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{X_{ij}} \tilde{F}_n &= \frac{1}{n \tilde{Z}_{\lambda_n, \gamma_n, \chi_n}} \int \partial_{X_{ij}} \left(\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}^{(1)}) + \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}^{(2)}) \right) \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(db_j^{(1)}) \mu(db_j^{(2)}) \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} \left\langle \tilde{T}'_i \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)} \beta_{\star,j} + \tilde{T}_i \beta_j^{(m)} - A'(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) \beta_j^{(m)} \right\rangle_T. \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{F}_n = 2 \sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} (\mathbf{U}^{(m)} + \mathbf{V}^{(m)} - \mathbf{W}^{(m)})$$

where, for each $i \in [n]$ and $j \in [p]$, the ij -th component of these matrices are given by

$$U_{ij}^{(m)} = n^{-1} \tilde{T}'_i \beta_{\star,j} \left\langle \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)} \right\rangle_T, \quad V_{ij}^{(m)} = n^{-1} \tilde{T}_i \left\langle \beta_j^{(m)} \right\rangle_T, \quad \text{and} \quad W_{ij}^{(m)} = n^{-1} \left\langle A'(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}) \beta_j^{(m)} \right\rangle_T.$$

We then have, $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{F}_n\|_F^2 \leq 36 \sum_{m \in \{1,2\}} \|\mathbf{U}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{V}\|_F^2 + \|\mathbf{W}\|_F^2$. In a similar way as in Proposition 9, we can see that there is some large enough constant $K > 0$ s.t.

$$\|\mathbf{U}^{(m)}\|_F^2 \leq K \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 \frac{\langle \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^2 \rangle_T}{n}, \quad \|\mathbf{V}^{(m)}\|_F^2 \leq K (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + 1)^2 \frac{\langle \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^2 \rangle_T}{n},$$

$$\text{and } \|\mathbf{W}^{(m)}\|_F^2 \leq \frac{1}{n^2} \left\langle \|\mathbf{A}^{(m)'}\|^2 \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^2 \right\rangle_T \leq K \left\langle \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^2 \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^4}{n^2} + \frac{\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^2}{n} \right\rangle_T.$$

In the bound for $\|\mathbf{W}^{(m)}\|_F^2$ we used that, by Hypothesis 1(iii), $\|A''\|_\infty \leq 1$, which implies that there exists a constant $a > 0$ such that, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $|A'(x)| \leq |x| + a$. Therefore, by the uniform bound for the moments of $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}\|^2/n$ under $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ given in Corollary 3 and the fact that all the finite moments of $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}$ are uniformly bounded in n (direct consequence of the exponential bound in [85, Corollary 5.35]), the mean of $\|\nabla_{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{F}_n\|_F^2$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

For bounding the second term of (97) define $g(\mathbf{e}) := \mathbb{E}(\tilde{F}_n | \mathbf{e})$. We will use Efron-Stein's inequality (see [86, Theorem 3.1]) to control the variance of this function. Given \mathbf{e} define a new random vector according to $\mathbf{e}'_i := (e_1, \dots, e_{i-1}, e'_i, e_{i+1}, \dots, e_n)$ with $e'_i \sim \text{Unif}[0, 1]$ independent of everything else. Also denote by $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}$ the resulting log-likelihood obtained by replacing \mathbf{e} by \mathbf{e}'_i and let $\tilde{F}_{n,i}$ be the corresponding log-normalizing constant. In this setting, the Efron-Stein's inequality takes the form

$$\text{Var}(g(\mathbf{e})) \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(g(\mathbf{e}) - g(\mathbf{e}'_i))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{F}_n - \tilde{F}_{n,i})^2, \quad (98)$$

where in the last relation we just used Jensen's inequality. For estimating the terms on the right hand side of the inequality, first notice that for all $i \in [n]$,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_n - \tilde{F}_{n,i} &= -\frac{1}{n} \log \left\langle \exp\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)})\} \right\rangle_T; \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) \right\rangle_T \end{aligned}$$

by Jensen's inequality for $-\log(x)$. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_{T,i}$ be the expectation resulting from replacing e_i by e'_i in $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$. Similarly as above,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{F}_n - \tilde{F}_{n,i} &= \frac{1}{n} \log \left\langle \exp\{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)})\} \right\rangle_{T,i}; \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n} \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}) \right\rangle_{T,i} \end{aligned}$$

by the concave version of Jensen's inequality for $\log(x)$. In what follows, we omit the arguments of the log-likelihoods to have more compact equations. Combining the above and using Jensen's inequality one more time for the square,

$$\begin{aligned} n^2 \mathbb{E}(\tilde{F}_n - \tilde{F}_{n,i})^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i} \right\rangle_T^2 + \mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i} \right\rangle_{T,i}^2 \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i})^2 \right\rangle_T. \end{aligned} \quad (99)$$

In the last inequality we used that, because e_i and e'_i are i.i.d., then $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_{T,i}$ is equal to $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_T$. Now, the difference of the two log-likelihoods can be readily computed and yields

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p} - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i})^2 &= (T \circ f(a_{*,i}, e_i) - T \circ f(a_{*,i}, e'_i))^2 (a_{1,i} + a_{2,i})^2 \\ &\leq K'(2|a_{*,i}| + T \circ f(0, e_i) - T \circ f(0, e'_i))^2 (a_{1,i}^2 + a_{2,i}^2). \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Observe that, by exchangeability, $\mathbb{E} \langle a_1^4 \rangle_T = n^{-1} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle a_i^4 \rangle_T$. Then,

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle a_i^4 \rangle_T \leq \mathbb{E} \langle \|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^4 \rangle_T \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^8 \mathbb{E} \langle \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^8 \rangle_T}.$$

From this and the bound over the moments of $\|\beta\|^2/n$ of Corollary 3 we have that $\mathbb{E}\langle a_1^4 \rangle_T = \mathcal{O}(n)$. This together with Hypothesis 1 and the easy to check fact that $\mathbb{E}(a_{*,1} + 1)^4 = \mathcal{O}(1)$ imply that, for some $K'' > 0$, for every $i \in [n]$

$$\mathbb{E}\left\langle (\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}) - \tilde{\mathcal{L}}'_{n,p,i}(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)}))^2 \right\rangle_T \leq K''\sqrt{n}. \quad (101)$$

Combining equations (98)-(101) we obtain that $\text{Var}(g(\mathbf{e})) \leq K''/\sqrt{n}$. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

In the following lemma we prove that the tilted posterior is strongly log-concave. For this we will consider its log-density as a function from \mathbb{R}^{2p} to \mathbb{R} . As such, along the proof, we will use a generic deterministic vector $(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2p}$ such that $\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ to evaluate likelihoods and priors. To simplify notations, in the following we will write $\log \mu(\mathbf{b}_1)$ instead of $\sum_{j=1}^p \log \mu(b_{1,j})$ and $\log \mu(\mathbf{b}_2)$ instead of $\sum_{j=1}^p \log \mu(b_{2,j})$.

Lemma 9. *If $0 < \lambda_n, \gamma_n < \varepsilon/4$, then $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_1) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_2)$ is an $\varepsilon/2$ -strongly concave function.*

Proof. Remember that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) = \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_1) + \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_2) + \lambda_n \|\mathbf{b}_1\|^2 + \gamma_n \mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_2 + \chi_n \beta_\star^\top \mathbf{b}_1.$$

By Hypothesis 1 we already know that $\mathcal{L}_{n,p}$ is a concave function and $\log \mu(\mathbf{b}_1)$ and $\log \mu(\mathbf{b}_2)$ are ε -strongly concave. It is then enough to prove that the perturbation terms $\lambda_n \|\mathbf{b}_1\|^2$, $\gamma_n \mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_2$, and $\chi_n \beta_\star^\top \mathbf{b}_1$ do not “break” the strong concavity of the posterior. For this, it is enough to bound their Hessians, in the Lowner order, by matrices proportional to the identity. In the case of $\chi_n \beta_\star^\top \mathbf{b}_1$, this is trivial because its Hessian is the null matrix. Now, let $\mathcal{H}^{(11)}$ be the Hessian of $\lambda_n \|\mathbf{b}_1\|^2$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(12)}$ the one of $\gamma_n \mathbf{b}_1^\top \mathbf{b}_2$. Then, if $\mathbf{v} \in S^{2p-1}(1)$, it is easy to see that

$$\mathbf{v}^T \mathcal{H}^{(11)} \mathbf{v} = \lambda_n \|\mathbf{v}_1\|^2 \leq \lambda_n \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{v}^T \mathcal{H}^{(12)} \mathbf{v} = \gamma_n (\mathbf{v}_1 \cdot \mathbf{v}_2)^2 \leq \gamma_n,$$

where $\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ are such that $\mathbf{v} = (\mathbf{v}_1, \mathbf{v}_2)$. Because $0 < \lambda_n, \gamma_n < \varepsilon/4$, we then have that

$$\mathcal{H}^{(11)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \mathbb{I} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{H}^{(12)} - \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \mathbb{I}$$

are both negative-definite matrices for all values of \mathbf{b}_1 and \mathbf{b}_2 . By the ε -strong concavity of $\mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_1) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_1) + \mathcal{L}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_2) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_2)$, we then conclude that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_1) + \log \mu(\mathbf{b}_2)$$

is $\varepsilon/2$ -strongly concave. \blacksquare

The next proposition proves the concentration of some of the order parameters. For this, recall the definitions of Q_{11} , Q_{12} , and $Q_{1\star}$ from (23). In this proposition, the definitions are the same but $(\beta^{(1)}, \beta^{(2)})$ are taken to be samples from the tilted posterior.

Proposition 11. *Let $(\lambda_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\gamma_n)_{n \geq 1}, (\chi_n)_{n \geq 1} \in [0, \varepsilon/4]$. Then, for some fixed $C > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\langle (Q_{11} - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T, \quad \mathbb{E}\langle (Q_{12} - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{12} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T, \quad \mathbb{E}\langle (Q_{1\star} - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/4}}.$$

Proof. We will present the proof for Q_{11} but the arguments for Q_{12} and $Q_{1\star}$ are completely analogous. Since the tilted posterior is $\varepsilon/2$ -strongly log-concave, by Brascamp-Lieb's inequality (see [87, Theorem 5.1]), we have that

$$\langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T \leq \frac{\langle \|\nabla Q_{11}\|^2 \rangle_T}{\varepsilon/2} = 8 \frac{\langle \|\beta^{(1)}\|^2 \rangle_T}{\varepsilon n^2}; \quad (102)$$

where we used that $\nabla Q_{11} = p^{-1} \nabla \|\beta^{(1)}\|^2 = 2p^{-1} \beta$.

Taking expectation on both sides, we obtain by Corollary 3 that there is some constant $K > 0$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T \leq \frac{K}{n}. \quad (103)$$

Now, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{\lambda_n} \tilde{F}_n &= \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T, & \partial_{\lambda_n}^2 \tilde{F}_n &= n \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T \geq 0, \\ \partial_{\lambda_n} \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_n &= \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T, & \partial_{\lambda_n}^2 \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_n &= n \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \rangle_T \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Also, by a standard lemma (see for example [88, Lemma 3.2]), we have that if $G, g : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ are two convex functions, for any $\delta > 0$ it holds that

$$|G'(\theta) - g'(\theta)| \leq g'(\theta + \delta) - g'(\theta - \delta) + \delta^{-1} \sum_{y \in \{\theta - \delta, \theta, \theta + \delta\}} |G(y) - g(y)|. \quad (104)$$

For the calculation below, we rename \tilde{F}_n to be $\tilde{F}_{\lambda_n \gamma_n \chi_n}$ to emphasise its dependence on λ_n , γ_n , and χ_n . Note that $\tilde{F}_{\lambda_n \gamma_n \chi_n}$ and $\mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{\lambda_n \gamma_n \chi_n}$ are convex in λ_n , so taking $g = \tilde{F}_{\lambda_n \gamma_n \chi_n}$ and $G = \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{\lambda_n \gamma_n \chi_n}$ we have that for all $\delta > 0$

$$|\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T| \leq \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n + \delta} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n - \delta} + \delta^{-1} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n, \chi_n} - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n, \chi_n}|, \quad (105)$$

with $\mathcal{Y} := \{\lambda_n - \delta, \lambda_n, \lambda_n + \delta\}$. In this last equation, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\lambda_n \pm \delta}$ stands for a posterior mean of the form $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ where the perturbation parameter λ_n has been replaced by $\lambda_n \pm \delta$ respectively. By the mean value theorem $\exists x \in (\lambda_n - \delta, \lambda_n + \delta)$ such that

$$\langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n + \delta} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n - \delta} = 2\delta n \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n = x})^2 \rangle_{\lambda_n = x}.$$

Since an analogous bound as in (102) holds for $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\lambda_n = x}$, we have that for all $\delta > 0$, small enough,

$$\langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n + \delta} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n - \delta} \leq \frac{2\delta}{\varepsilon n} \langle \|\beta^{(1)}\|^2 \rangle_{\lambda_n = x}. \quad (106)$$

On the other hand, since the bound on the variance in Proposition 10 does not depend on λ_n , we have that

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n} - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n}| \right)^2 \leq \frac{9K'}{\sqrt{n}}; \quad (107)$$

where we used that

$$\left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_i \right)^2 \leq |\mathcal{I}|^2 \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_i^2 \leq |\mathcal{I}|^2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} a_i^2 \quad (108)$$

which holds for the arbitrary finite index sets \mathcal{I} and terms $(a_i)_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$. Squaring (105) and using equations (106)-(107), inequality (108), and Proposition 10 we have that, for some $K' > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \left(\langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n + \delta} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n - \delta} + \delta^{-1} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n, \chi_n} - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n, \chi_n}| \right)^2 \\ &\leq 4 \left(\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n + \delta} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_{\lambda_n - \delta})^2 + \frac{1}{\delta^2} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n} - \mathbb{E} \tilde{F}_{y, \gamma_n}| \right)^2 \right) \\ &\leq 4 \left(\frac{4\delta^2}{\varepsilon^2} \frac{\mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^4 \rangle_T}{n^2} + \frac{9K'}{\delta^2 \sqrt{n}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

By Corollary 3, $n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^4 \rangle_T$ is a bounded sequence. Then, letting $\delta_n = n^{-1/8}$ we obtain there is a positive constant $K'' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2 \leq \frac{K''}{n^{1/4}}. \quad (109)$$

Combining (103) and (109) concludes the proof. \blacksquare

The last step to prove the concentration of the order parameters of the model is to show that the conclusion of Proposition 11 extends to our original untilted posterior measure. We establish this conclusion by a simple interpolation argument.

Proposition 12. *Assume Hypothesis 1 holds. Then, there exists a positive constant $C > 0$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle)^2 \rangle, \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{12} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{12} \rangle)^2 \rangle, \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{1\star} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle)^2 \rangle \leq \frac{C}{n^{1/4}}.$$

Proof. Again we will prove this for Q_{11} but the proofs for Q_{12} and $Q_{1\star}$ are completely analogous. For simplicity, we will set γ_n and χ_n to be equal to 0. The proof may be extended to non null values of γ_n and χ_n in a straightforward way.

Define an interpolating log-likelihood $\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t} := \mathcal{L}_{n,p} + t\lambda_n n Q_{11}$ for $t \in [0, 1]$. Clearly, $\mathcal{L}_{n,p,0} = \mathcal{L}_{n,p}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{n,p,1} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}$. Let $\langle \cdot \rangle_t$ be the posterior expectation with respect to this log-likelihood. That is, for each $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, we let

$$\langle f(\beta) \rangle_t := \frac{\int f(\mathbf{b}) \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t}(\mathbf{b})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(db_j)}{\int \exp\{\mathcal{L}_{n,p,t}(\mathbf{b})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(db_j)}.$$

In this way we have that $\langle \cdot \rangle_1$ is equal to $\langle \cdot \rangle_T$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle_0$ to $\langle \cdot \rangle$. Note that by Brascamp-Lieb inequality (see [87, Theorem 5.1]) we have

$$\langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_t)^2 \rangle_t \leq 2 \frac{\langle \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_t}{\varepsilon n^2}. \quad (110)$$

Then, for all $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\frac{d}{dt} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_t = n\lambda_n \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_t)^2 \rangle_t \leq \frac{2\lambda_n}{\varepsilon n} \langle \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_t$$

and

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{11} \rangle_t = n\lambda_n \mathbb{E} \langle (Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_t)^2 \rangle_t \leq \frac{2\lambda_n}{\varepsilon n} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_t,$$

which implies by the Mean Value Theorem that, for some $K > 0$,

$$|\langle Q_{11} \rangle - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T| \leq \frac{\lambda_n K}{\varepsilon} (\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + 1)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T| \leq \frac{\lambda_n K}{\varepsilon}, \quad (111)$$

where for the first relation we used Proposition 9 together with Jensen's inequality while for the second we used Corollary 3. We then have that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle)^2} &\leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} - \langle Q_{11} \rangle)^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} \rangle - \langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{(\mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T - \mathbb{E}\langle Q_{11} \rangle_T)^2}. \end{aligned}$$

By choosing $\lambda_n = n^{-1/4}$, we have that owing to Proposition 11, the fact that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}$ has uniformly bounded moments, and equations (110)-(111) the RHS of this last inequality is $\mathcal{O}(n^{-1/4})$. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

E Distributional limits of projections of random vectors

As seen earlier, quantifying properties of the posterior in GLMs requires analyzing the joint behavior of terms of the form $\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}, \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}$, for suitable choices of $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^{(2)}$. If these vectors were independent of \mathbf{X}_i , quantifying the joint distribution of these terms would be easy. In this appendix, we record some such basic results, considering general sequences of random vectors (without using our specific problem structure), which we use in intermediate steps in our proofs. For $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, we will let $\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be sequences of random vectors. In Lemmas 10 and 11 below, we prove an asymptotic representations for products of normal vectors with these sequences of random vectors.

Assumption 1 (order parameters concentration). *The sequence of random vectors $\mathbf{V}_0, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell$ satisfies the following property: there exist constants $0 \leq c_0, c \leq v, v_0$ such that for all distinct $m, m' \in [r]$ we have that $\mathbb{E}(p^{-1} \mathbf{V}_0^\top \mathbf{V}_m - c_0)^2$, $\mathbb{E}(p^{-1} \mathbf{V}_m^\top \mathbf{V}_{m'} - c)^2$, $\mathbb{E}(p^{-1} \mathbf{V}_0^\top \mathbf{V}_0 - v_0)^2$, and $\mathbb{E}(p^{-1} \mathbf{V}_m^\top \mathbf{V}_m - v)^2$ go to 0 as $p \rightarrow \infty$.*

In this section, results are proved for general sequences of random vectors \mathbf{V}_m 's that satisfy Assumption 1. These results are used in Section B to prove Proposition 5 and 6 where the \mathbf{V}_m 's are chosen to be specific random vectors of interest.

Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be some sequence of standard normal vectors independent of $(\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell)$. And for every $m \in [\ell] \cup \{0\}$, let $S_m := \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{V}_m / \sqrt{p}$.

Lemma 10. *Assume $0 < c \leq v$ and $c_0^2 \leq v_0 c$ and let $\theta_0 := \sqrt{v_0 - c_0^2} c \xi_0 + c_0 / \sqrt{c} z$ and (for $m \in [\ell]$) $\theta_m := \sqrt{v - c} \xi_m + \sqrt{c} z$; where $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_\ell, z$ are i.i.d. standard normal random variables. Under Assumption 1 we then have that, as $p \rightarrow \infty$,*

$$(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell) \xrightarrow{d} (\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell).$$

Proof. Throughout the proof, $f : \mathbb{R}^{m+1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ will be some continuous bounded function. Notice that for fixed values of $\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell$, the quantity $(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^{\ell+1}$ is a normal random vector with covariance matrix $\Sigma_p \in \mathbb{R}^{(\ell+1) \times (\ell+1)}$ with entries $\Sigma_{p,mm'} = p^{-1} \mathbf{V}_m^\top \mathbf{V}_{m'}$. Because f is continuous and bounded, we thus have that there exists some continuous and bounded $g : \mathbb{R}^{(\ell+1) \times (\ell+1)} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$\mathbb{E}[f(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell)] = \mathbb{E}[g(\Sigma_p)]. \quad (112)$$

By Assumption 1, $\Sigma_p \xrightarrow{L^2} \Sigma$ as $p \rightarrow \infty$; where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{(\ell+1) \times (\ell+1)}$ is a symmetric matrix s.t. for all distinct $m, m' \in [\ell] \cup \{0\}$ its elements are given by $\Sigma_{00} = v_0$, $\Sigma_{0m} = c_0$, $\Sigma_{mm'} = c$, and $\Sigma_{mm} = v$. In other words,

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} v_0 & c_0 & \dots & c_0 \\ c_0 & & & \\ \vdots & & \Sigma' & \\ c_0 & & & \end{pmatrix},$$

with $\Sigma' \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times m}$ a symmetric matrix with elements equal to v on the diagonal and c on the off the diagonal. Then, by the continuous mapping theorem, $\mathbb{E}[g(\Sigma_p)] \rightarrow g(\Sigma)$. Notice that the normal vector $(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ has covariance matrix Σ . By the definition of g , we then have that $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell)] = g(\Sigma)$. This proves that $\mathbb{E}[f(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell)]$ converges to $\mathbb{E}[f(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell)]$ and, because f is a generic continuous bounded function, it concludes the proof. \blacksquare

Remark. The other scenario in which we will need a result of this kind is when $c_0 = c = 0$. In this case, the result trivially holds for $\theta_0 := \sqrt{v_0}\xi_0$ and $\theta_l := \sqrt{v}\xi_l$.

Now, let $\mathbf{X}' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ be some sequence of standard normal vectors independent of $(\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell)$ and \mathbf{X} . Analogous to the notations before, let (for $m \in [\ell] \cup \{0\}$) $S'_m := \mathbf{X}'^T \mathbf{V}_m / \sqrt{p}$, $\theta'_0 := \sqrt{v_0 - c_0^2/c} \xi'_0 + c_0/\sqrt{c} z'$, and (for $m \in [\ell]$) $\theta'_m := \sqrt{v - c} \xi'_m + \sqrt{c} z'$; where $\xi'_0, \dots, \xi'_\ell, z'$ are i.i.d. standard normal variables independent of $\xi_0, \dots, \xi_\ell, z$. We then have the following extension.

Lemma 11. Assume $0 < c \leq v$ and $c_0^2 \leq v_0 c$ and let $(\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell)$ and $(\theta'_0, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_\ell)$ be as above. Under Assumption 1 we then have that, as $p \rightarrow \infty$,

$$(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell, S'_0, S'_1, \dots, S'_\ell) \xrightarrow{d} (\theta_0, \theta_1, \dots, \theta_\ell, \theta'_0, \theta'_1, \dots, \theta'_\ell).$$

Proof. For each fixed value of $(\mathbf{V}_0, \mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_\ell)$, $(S_0, S_1, \dots, S_\ell, S'_0, S'_1, \dots, S'_\ell)$ is a normal vector such that, for every $m, m' \in [r] \cup \{0\}$, the covariance of S_m and $S'_{m'}$ is zero. The result then follows in a similar way as in the proof of Lemma 10. \blacksquare

Remark. Again, the analogous result for $c_0 = c = 0$ also trivially holds.

F Conditional posterior measures

In Appendix B.1.1, we require bounding expectations under posterior measures restricted to specific sets. Here we present some basic conditioning arguments that were used as auxiliary results there. We discuss the presented results in broad generality here without reference to specific posteriors. To this end, let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a random matrix and vector, respectively, and $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ be the expectation induced by their joint distribution. Also, define the measure

$$\mathbb{P}(d\boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) := \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp \mathcal{H}_{n,p}(\boldsymbol{\beta} | \mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) \nu(d\boldsymbol{\beta});$$

where, fixing \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{y} , $\mathcal{H}_{n,p} : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is some general log-likelihood, $\nu(\cdot)$ is some appropriate Borel prior. Let $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ denote a random sample from this measure and, assuming the right hand side of this definition is integrable, $Z_n > 0$ is a suitable normalizing constant. For the rest of this section $\langle \cdot \rangle$ will refer to expectation under this generic posterior measure. We use this abuse of notation to avoid introducing new notations that will not be used later on.

Let $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^{n \times p} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be some functions. Define the events $A := \{f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \geq 0\}$ and $B := \{g(\mathbf{X}) \geq 0\}$ and assume that B has a strictly positive probability. Moreover, assume

that $\langle \mathbb{I}_A \rangle > 0$ a.s. Let $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ be the expectation with respect to (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) conditional on the event B . Similarly, for each $h : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$, define

$$\langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle' := \begin{cases} \frac{\langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbb{I}_A \rangle}{\langle \mathbb{I}_A \rangle} & \text{if } \langle \mathbb{I}_A \rangle > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proposition 13. *For all $h : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\mathbb{E} \langle h^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle < \infty$, we have that*

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle'| \leq (\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rangle)^{1/2} \left(\bar{\mathbb{E}}^{1/2} \langle h^2 \rangle + \bar{\mathbb{E}}^{1/2} \langle h^2 \rangle' \right) + (\mathbb{E} \langle h^2 \rangle \mathbb{P}(B^c))^{1/2} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |h| \rangle \mathbb{P}(B^c).$$

Proof. This bound follows easily by the definitions above. By hypothesis, $\mathbb{E} \langle h^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle < \infty$ and this implies that

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle, \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle' < \infty.$$

First, notice that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle = \mathbb{E}[\langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle \mathbb{I}_{B^c}] - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle \mathbb{P}(B^c).$$

By Cauchy-Schwarz, we then have

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle| \leq (\mathbb{E} \langle h^2 \rangle \mathbb{P}(B^c))^{1/2} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle |h(\boldsymbol{\beta})| \rangle \mathbb{P}(B^c).$$

Similarly, we have that

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle' = \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle' \langle \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rangle].$$

As before, this implies that

$$|\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle'| \leq (\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rangle)^{1/2} \left(\bar{\mathbb{E}}^{1/2} \langle h^2 \rangle + \bar{\mathbb{E}}^{1/2} \langle h^2 \rangle' \right).$$

■

Remark. If $\|h\|_\infty < \infty$, this simplifies to

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle - \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle h(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle'| \leq 2\|h\|_\infty \left[(\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \mathbb{I}_{A^c} \rangle)^{1/2} + (\mathbb{P}(B^c))^{1/2} \right]. \quad (113)$$

In Section B, we use this kind of conditioned measures to compare the expectations under the full posterior and suitable conditional posteriors. In that section, we also require a convergence in distribution version of the aforementioned proposition. For this, we first prove two auxiliary results below.

For some fixed $d \geq 1$, let $(\mathbf{V}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be a sequence of random vectors in \mathbb{R}^d and $\mathbf{V} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ another random vector such that $\mathbf{V}_n \xrightarrow{d} \mathbf{V}$. Denote by $\mathbb{P}_n(\cdot)$ the probability measure induced by \mathbf{V}_n , $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ the one by \mathbf{V} , and let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be some set of positive probability w.r.t all the measures $(\mathbb{P}_n)_{n \geq 1}$. Let $(\bar{\mathbf{V}}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ be the sequence of random vectors obtained by conditioning $(\mathbf{V}_n)_{n \geq 1}$ on A and $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$ the one obtained by conditioning \mathbf{V} on A . We then have the following.

Lemma 12. *If A is a closed continuity set of \mathbb{P} and $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, then $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_n \xrightarrow{d} \bar{\mathbf{V}}$.*

Proof. Along the proof we will make several uses of Portmanteau's Theorem. In particular, we will prove the conclusion by showing that for all $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ closed,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(C) \leq \mathbb{P}(C).$$

For this, first notice that, by the convergence in distribution and the fact that A is a continuity set of \mathbb{P} , we have that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(A) = \mathbb{P}(A). \quad (114)$$

Also, by the fact that A is closed and the convergence in distribution, for every closed $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{P}_n(C \cap A) \leq \mathbb{P}(C \cap A) \quad (115)$$

Let $\bar{\mathbb{P}}_n(\cdot)$ be the probability measure induced by $\bar{\mathbf{V}}_n$ and $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ the one induced by $\bar{\mathbf{V}}$. Equations (114) and (115) imply that, for every closed $C \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, there exists a vanishing sequence $(\epsilon_n)_{n \geq 1}$ such that

$$\bar{\mathbb{P}}_n(C) = \frac{\mathbb{P}_n(C \cap A)}{\mathbb{P}_n(A)} \leq \frac{\mathbb{P}(C \cap A) + \epsilon_n}{\mathbb{P}(A) - \epsilon_n}.$$

The result is then obtained by taking \limsup_n on both sides of the last equation and noticing that the right hand side tends to $\bar{\mathbb{P}}(C)$. \blacksquare

From this convergence in distribution result and the fact that $\mathbb{P}_n(A) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(A)$ we then have the following corollary.

Corollary 4. *If A is a closed continuity set of \mathbb{P} and $\mathbb{P}(A) > 0$, then for all $f : A \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ continuous and bounded*

$$\mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{V}_n)\mathbb{I}_A(\mathbf{V}_n)) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}(f(\mathbf{V})\mathbb{I}_A(\mathbf{V})).$$

G General results to establish Hypothesis 2

In this appendix we will derive two general results to prove the uniform boundedness for the moments of a_n assumed in Hypothesis 2.

G.1 Moment control of fitted values under log-polynomial condition

The main result of this subsection will be the following proposition.

Proposition 14. *Assume that Hypothesis 1 holds. Furthermore, suppose for a constant \tilde{C} that $|\tilde{T}| < \tilde{C}$ a.s. and that there exists some polynomial $p(x, y)$ such that $A(x) = \log p(e^x, e^{-x})$. Then, for all $k \geq 1$ there exists some $C_k > 0$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E} \langle a_n^{2k} \rangle \leq C_k$.*

The proof will be based on the following lemma that bounds the exponential moments of a_n under the leave-an-observation-out measure $\langle \cdot \rangle_o$ defined in (7). In this subsection, $\mathbb{E}_n(\cdot)$ will be expectation with respect to the single normal vector \mathbf{X}_n and $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ with respect to $(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{n-1})$. We then have that $\tilde{\mathbb{E}}(\mathbb{E}_n(\cdot))$ is the expectation with respect to \mathbf{X} . Recall that, for $m \geq 1$ and $i \in [n]$, $a_{\star, i} = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star$, $a_{m, i} = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(m)}$ and further that $a_n = \mathbf{X}_n^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^{(1)}$.

Lemma 13. *For all $\alpha > 0$ there exists $C > 0$ such that $\log \mathbb{E}_n \langle \exp\{\alpha a_n\} \rangle_o \leq C(\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2$.*

Proof. Note that

$$\mathbb{E}_n \langle \exp\{\alpha a_n\} \rangle_o = \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp \left\{ \alpha \sum_{j \in [p]} X_{jn} \beta_j \right\} \right\rangle_o = \left\langle \exp \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2 \|\beta\|^2}{2n} \right\} \right\rangle_o.$$

Here, as before, we used [35, Proposition A.2.1] to exchange derivatives and integrals. Analogously as in Proposition 9, we have that for every sufficiently small $t > 0$, for some $K > 0$,

$$\log \langle \exp\{t\|\beta\|^2\} \rangle_o \leq nK(\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2.$$

Choosing some $t > 0$ such that this holds and letting $n \geq 1$ be large enough so that $2nt > \alpha^2$, we obtain that

$$\log \left\langle \exp \left\{ \frac{\alpha^2}{2nt} t \|\beta\|^2 \right\} \right\rangle_o \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{2nt} \log \langle \exp\{t\|\beta\|^2\} \rangle_o \leq \frac{\alpha^2 K}{2t} (\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2,$$

where we used the concave version of Jensen's applied to the function x^a (with $a := \alpha^2/2nt < 1$) to obtain the first inequality. We then have the conclusion choosing $C := \alpha^2 K/2t$. \blacksquare

From here we can obtain the desired bound for the moments of a_n , as argued below.

Proof of Proposition 14. Notice that, for every $f : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle f(a_n) \rangle = \frac{\left\langle f(a_n) \exp\{\tilde{T}_n a_n - A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o}{\left\langle \exp\{\tilde{T}_n a_n - A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o}. \quad (116)$$

Now note that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E}_n \langle \exp\{a_n\} \rangle &\leq \frac{1}{2} \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{(1 + \tilde{T}_n)a_n - A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o^2 + \frac{1}{2} \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{\tilde{T}_n a_n - A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o^{-2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{2(1 + \tilde{T}_n)a_n\} \right\rangle_o + \frac{1}{2} \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{-2\tilde{T}_n a_n + 2A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o, \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

where in the first line we used (116) and Cauchy-Schwarz, and in the second one that $A \geq 0$ and Jensen's on both terms for x^2 and $1/x^2$, respectively. We will now upper bound these terms by functions of $\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op}$. For the first we have, for some $K \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{2(1 + \tilde{T}_n)a_n\} \right\rangle_o &\leq \log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{2(1 + \tilde{C})a_n\} \mathbb{I}_{\{a_n \geq 0\}} + \exp\{2(1 - \tilde{C})a_n\} \mathbb{I}_{\{a_n < 0\}} \right\rangle_o \\ &\leq \log 2 \max \left\{ \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{2(1 + \tilde{C})a_n\} \right\rangle_o, \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{2(1 - \tilde{C})a_n\} \right\rangle_o \right\} \\ &\leq K(\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where in the last line we used the previous lemma. In an analogous manner, we may obtain a similar bound for the second term of the second line of (117). For the second term we explicitly use that $A(x) = \log p(e^x, e^{-x})$ for some polynomial p to arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{-2\tilde{T}_n a_n + 2A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o = \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle e^{-2\tilde{T}_n a_n} p^2(e^{a_n}, e^{-a_n}) \right\rangle_o.$$

Bounding in a similar fashion as done for the first term shows that there is another constant $K' \geq 0$ such that

$$\log \mathbb{E}_n \left\langle \exp\{-2\tilde{T}_n a_n + 2A(a_n)\} \right\rangle_o \leq K'(\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2.$$

Define $Z := K'(\|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} + 1)^2$. Finally, by [35, Lemma 3.1.8], which states that if a random variable X is such that $\log(\mathbb{E}(e^X)) \leq C$, then (for every $k \geq 1$) $\mathbb{E}(X^k) \leq 2^k(k^k + C^k)$, we have that there is some $K'' > 0$ such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle a_n^{2k} \right\rangle \leq K''(1 + \tilde{\mathbb{E}}Z^{2k}).$$

The conclusion follows by fixing $C_k := K''(1 + \sup_{n \geq 1} \tilde{\mathbb{E}}Z^{2k})$ which is finite. \blacksquare

H Moment control of coordinates of posterior samples

In this appendix we will prove that, for all $k \geq 1$, the k -th moment of each coordinate of a sample β from the full posterior is a bounded sequence in n .

Lemma 14. *Suppose Hypothesis 1 holds. Then, for every $k \geq 1$ there exists some $C_k > 0$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$ and $j_0 \in [p]$, $\mathbb{E} \left\langle \beta_{j_0}^{2k} \right\rangle \leq C_k$.*

For this, we will first prove an intermediate result. This will require the definition of the following auxiliary measure. Recall that $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}$ is the design matrix obtained by removing the j_0 -th column and $\tilde{\beta}_\star \in \mathbb{R}^{p-1}$ is the vector obtained by removing the j_0 -th coordinate of the true signal β_\star . Recall definitions (2) and (10)–(9). Fix $j_0 \in [p]$. For $i \in [n]$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, define $\tilde{T}_{i,t} := \tilde{T}_i(tX_{ij_0}\beta_{\star,j_0} + \tilde{a}_{\star,i})$, $\tilde{T}'_{i,t} := \tilde{T}'_i(tX_{ij_0}\beta_{\star,j_0} + \tilde{a}_{\star,i})$, and $\tilde{T}''_{i,t} := \tilde{T}''_i(tX_{ij_0}\beta_{\star,j_0} + \tilde{a}_{\star,i})$, where recall that $\tilde{a}_{\star,i} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}_\star$. For $f : \mathbb{R}^{p-1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ define

$$\langle f(\tilde{\beta}) \rangle_{j_0,t} := \frac{1}{Z_{j_0,t}} \int f(\tilde{\beta}) \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_{i,t} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} - A(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta}) \right\} \prod_{j \in [p] \setminus \{j_0\}} \mu(d\tilde{\beta}_j); \quad (118)$$

with $Z_{j_0,t}$ a suitable normalization constant.

Lemma 15. *Under the same conditions as the previous lemma, there is a constant $C > 0$ s.t. for every $j_0 \in [p]$*

$$\log \langle \exp \frac{1}{4} \beta_{j_0}^2 \rangle \leq C \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle (\tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i}) - A'(\tilde{a}_i)) X_{ij_0} \rangle_{j_0,1} + 1 \right)^2.$$

Proof. The proof follows by adapting [35, Lemma 3.2.6] to our setting. According to [35, Theorem 3.1.4], if the logarithm of the density of the posterior (which we will denote by $\phi(\cdot)$) is such that, for all $\beta, \beta' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and some fixed $K > 0$,

$$\phi \left(\frac{\beta + \beta'}{2} \right) - \frac{\phi(\beta) + \phi(\beta')}{2} \geq K \|\beta - \beta'\|^2, \quad (119)$$

then

$$\left\langle e^{(\beta_{j_0} - \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle)^2} \right\rangle \leq 4. \quad (120)$$

Because of the strong log-concavity of the prior and the convexity of $A(\cdot)$ there is some constant $\delta > 0$ such that $\phi(\cdot) + \delta \|\cdot\|^2$ is concave. We therefore have that

$$\phi \left(\frac{\beta + \beta'}{2} \right) + \delta \left\| \frac{\beta + \beta'}{2} \right\|^2 - \frac{\phi(\beta) + \phi(\beta')}{2} - \delta \frac{\|\beta\|^2 + \|\beta'\|^2}{2} \geq 0$$

or, what is the same,

$$\phi\left(\frac{\beta + \beta'}{2}\right) - \frac{\phi(\beta) + \phi(\beta')}{2} \geq -\delta \left\| \frac{\beta + \beta'}{2} \right\|^2 + \delta \frac{\|\beta\|^2 + \|\beta'\|^2}{2}.$$

Now, notice that

$$-\delta \left\| \frac{\beta + \beta'}{2} \right\|^2 + \delta \frac{\|\beta\|^2 + \|\beta'\|^2}{2} = -\frac{\delta}{4} \|\beta + \beta'\|^2 + \frac{\delta}{2} (\|\beta\|^2 + \|\beta'\|^2) = \frac{\delta}{4} \|\beta - \beta'\|^2.$$

Thus, inequality (119) holds with $K = \delta/4$. The other result we will use is [35, Lemma 3.2.2] which states that if $w : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is concave and achieves its maximum at some $x_* \in \mathbb{R}$, then for all $K' > 0$ such that $w'' \leq -K'$

$$K' \int (x - x_*)^2 e^{w(x)} dx \leq \int e^{w(x)} dx. \quad (121)$$

Define $w : \mathbb{R} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ to be $w(x) = f(x) + \log \mu(x)$; where

$$f(x) := \log \int \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(a_{*,i}) (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} + x X_{ij_0}) - A(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\beta} + x X_{ij_0}) \right\} \prod_{j \in [p] \setminus \{j_0\}} \mu(d\beta_j).$$

Now, notice that the marginal of β_{j_0} will be proportional to $e^{w(\beta_{j_0})}$ and that, for some $\epsilon > 0$, $w'' \leq -\epsilon$ because of the strong log-concavity of w . From (121) and [35, Lemma 3.2.2] we obtain that

$$\langle (\beta_{j_0} - x_*)^2 \rangle \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon}$$

with x_* the maximum of w . This then implies that $|\langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle| \leq \epsilon^{-1/2} + |x_*|$. By the strong concavity of w we also have that $|w'(0)| = |w'(x_*) - w'(0)| \geq \epsilon |x_*|$. Here, with some abuse of notation, refer to the density of $\mu(\cdot)$ as $\mu(x)$. We will also assume without loss of generality that $\mu(0) > 0$. If this is not the case, the argument can be easily adapted to a generic point in the support of the density of $\mu(x)$. Combining the above, we then obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle^2 &\leq \exp \left(\frac{\sqrt{\epsilon} + w'(0)}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \\ &= \exp \left\{ \epsilon^{-2} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon} + f'(0) + \frac{\mu'(0)}{\mu(0)} \right)^2 \right\} \\ &= \exp \left\{ \epsilon^{-2} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sum_{i \in [n]} \langle (\tilde{T}_i - \tilde{A}'_i) X_{ij_0} \rangle_{j_0,1} + \frac{\mu'(0)}{\mu(0)} \right)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

By the convexity of $e^{\frac{x^2}{2}}$ and bounds (120) and (122) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \exp \frac{1}{4} \beta_{j_0}^2 \rangle &= \left\langle \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} (\beta_{j_0} - \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle) \right\}^2 \right\rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \langle \exp \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \exp (\beta_{j_0} - \langle \beta_{j_0} \rangle)^2 \rangle \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2} \exp \left\{ \epsilon^{-2} \left(\sqrt{\epsilon} + \sum_{i \in [n]} \langle (\tilde{T}_i - \tilde{A}'_i) X_{ip} \rangle_{j_0,1} + \frac{\mu'(0)}{\mu(0)} \right)^2 \right\} + 2. \end{aligned}$$

The result then follows by using that if $K'' > 0$ and $x \geq 1$ then $\log(K'' + x) \leq K'' + \log x$. ■

From this result we can then achieve uniform control for the moments of β_{j_0} . By Lemma 15 and [35, Lemma 3.1.8], it is enough to show that there is some $K > 0$ s.t., for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(a_{\mathbf{x}, i}) X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0, 1} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} \leq K.$$

To prove this, we will need the following auxiliary proposition.

Proposition 15. *For all $k \geq 1$, there is some constant $C_k > 0$ such that, for all $n \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, 1]$,*

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle a_1^{2k} \right\rangle_{j_0, t} \leq C_k.$$

Proof. For $K > 0$, define

$$D_K := \{ \|\tilde{\beta}\| \leq \sqrt{n}K \} \quad \text{and} \quad B := \{ \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}}\|_{op} \leq 3 \} \quad (123)$$

Let K be large enough so that $\mu([-K, K]) > 0$. Notice that, for every \mathbf{X} , there is a $K' > 0$ such that

$$\langle \mathbb{I}_{D_K} \rangle_{j_0, t} \geq K' \mu^{\otimes p-1}([-K, K]^{p-1}). \quad (124)$$

As in (50), we define $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ as the conditional expectation with respect to (\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{e}) conditional on event B . Moreover, for every $f : \mathbb{R}^{p-1} \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ we let

$$\left\langle f(\tilde{\beta}) \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} := \frac{\left\langle f(\tilde{\beta}) \mathbb{I}_{D_K} \right\rangle_{j_0, t}}{\langle \mathbb{I}_{D_K} \rangle_{j_0, t}}$$

where $\langle \mathbb{I}_{D_K} \rangle_{j_0, t} > 0$ a.s. since, for almost all \mathbf{X} , the posterior density is strictly non-negative on D_K . In the zero probability event $\{\langle \mathbb{I}_{D_K} \rangle_{j_0, t} = 0\}$ we just define the ratio as 0. From bounds in [85] for $\mathbb{P}(B^c)$ and an adaptation of Proposition 9 to $\langle \cdot \rangle_{j_0, t}$ we can easily see that:

- (i) for some $\alpha > 0$, $\mathbb{P}(B^c) \leq e^{-\alpha n}$;
- (ii) for $K > 0$ large enough, there is an $\alpha' > 0$ s.t. $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \mathbb{I}_{D_K^c} \rangle_{j_0, t} \leq e^{-\alpha' n}$;
- (iii) and, for all $k' \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k'} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \leq n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\langle \|\mathbf{X}\beta\|^{2k'} \right\rangle_{j_0, t} \leq n^{k'-1}$.

Notice that, by (iii), moments of \tilde{a}_i grow at most polynomially under the measure $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_{j_0, t}$ while upper bounds in (i) and (ii) are exponentially decaying. This readily implies that, for all $k \geq 1$, $\mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_i^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_i^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t}$ differ by an $o(1)$ quantity. Similarly, by Proposition 13, we have that the moments $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_i^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t}$ and $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_i^{2k} \rangle'_{j_0, t}$ also differ by an $o(1)$ quantity. We will make repeated uses of this in the rest of the proof. By taking a derivative and using a Gaussian integration by parts we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t} &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) \tilde{T}'_{i,t} X_{ij_0} \beta_{\star, j_0} \rangle_{j_0, t} \\
&= \frac{t}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle_{j_0, t} \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) (\tilde{a}_{1,i} + \tilde{a}_{2,i} - \tilde{a}_{3,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle_{j_0, t} \\
&= \frac{t}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle'_{j_0, t} \\
&\quad + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) (\tilde{a}_{1,i} + \tilde{a}_{2,i} - \tilde{a}_{3,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle'_{j_0, t} + o(1);
\end{aligned}$$

where for the second equality we used Gaussian integration by parts with respect to X_{ij_0} : the first terms comes from the derivative of $\tilde{T}'_{i,t}$ w.r.t. X_{ij_0} and the second term comes from the derivatives of $\exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_{i,t} \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - A(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\}$ and the normalization constant $Z_{j_0, t}$; and for the third equality we used (i)-(iii) along with Proposition 13 to approximate $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ by $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ and, in the second term, $\langle \cdot \rangle_{j_0, t}$ by $\langle \cdot \rangle'_{j_0, t}$, as discussed above. By grouping the terms on the last line correctly and using Hypothesis 1 we see that for some appropriate constants $K', K'' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{t}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle'_{j_0, t} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} (\tilde{a}_{1,i} - \tilde{a}_{2,i}) (\tilde{a}_{1,i} + \tilde{a}_{2,i} - \tilde{a}_{3,i}) \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \rangle'_{j_0, t} \\
&= \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{a}_{1,i} \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} - \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \sum_{i \in [n]} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{2,i} \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \right] \\
&\quad + \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} - \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \left\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \tilde{T}''_{i,t} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \right] \\
&\quad - \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{a}_{1,i} \tilde{a}_{3,i} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} + \frac{t}{n} \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{a}_{2,i} \tilde{a}_{3,i} \beta_{\star, j_0}^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \\
&\leq K'' \left(\bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} n^{-1/2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left(\left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} n^{-1/2} \left\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\| \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left[\left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} n^{-1} \left\langle \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2 \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(1)}\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(2)}\| \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} + \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_{1,1}^{2k} n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(2)}\| \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{(3)}\| \right\rangle'_{j_0, t} \right) \\
&\leq K' \bar{\mathbb{E}} \left\langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \right\rangle'_{j_0, t};
\end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\tilde{T}'_{i,t}$ and $\tilde{T}''_{i,t}$ are bounded, that $\sum_{i \in [n]} |\tilde{a}_i| \leq \sqrt{n} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|$, $\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{a}_i^2 = \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$, and that, by the definitions (123) of the sets D_K and B , under $\bar{\mathbb{E}} \langle \cdot \rangle'_{j_0, t}$ the quantity $n^{-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{X}} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^2$ is uniformly bounded by a constant. Approximating, using Lemmas 1 and 2, $\bar{\mathbb{E}}(\cdot)$ by $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle'_{j_0, t}$ by $\langle \cdot \rangle_{j_0, t}$, we then have that

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t} \leq K' \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \rangle_{j_0, t} + o(1)$$

Let $X(t)$ be a non-negative and differentiable function and $K, K' > 0$ two constants such that, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\frac{dX(t)}{dt} \leq K'X(t) + K.$$

Then Gronwall's inequality, [89, Theorem 1.2.2], implies that

$$X(t) \leq X(0)e^{K't} + \frac{K}{K'}(e^{K't} - 1).$$

In our case, because K , as a sequence of n , is $o(1)$, this becomes

$$X(t) \leq X(0)e^{K't} + o(1).$$

We then obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \right\rangle_{j_0, t} \leq \mathbb{E} \left\langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} \right\rangle_{j_0, 0} \exp\{K't\} + o(1).$$

But, by Hypothesis 2, the right hand side is a bounded sequence. We then conclude the proof. \blacksquare

Proof of Lemma 14. As pointed out before, it is enough to show that there is some $K > 0$ s.t., for all $n \geq 1$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(a_{\star, i}) X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0, 1} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} \leq K. \quad (125)$$

We will then prove both these inequalities separately.

Notice that, by a first order approximation of \tilde{T} , for the first bound it is enough to show that, for some $K > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\tilde{a}_{\star, i}) X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k}, \quad \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \beta_{\star, j_0} X_{ij_0}^2 \right)^{2k} \leq K(1 + \beta_{\star, j_0}^{2k});$$

where we used that \tilde{T}' is a bounded function. From the hypothesis of the lemma and the fact that β_{\star, j_0} is fixed and the X_{ij_0} are i.i.d. of mean 0 and variance $1/n$ we directly see that there is some $K' > 0$ s.t.

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \beta_{\star, j_0} X_{ij_0}^2 \right)^{2k} \leq K' \beta_{\star, j_0}^{2k}.$$

For the other bound notice that $\tilde{T}_i(\tilde{a}_{\star, i})$ is independent of X_{ij_0} . Then expanding the power and again using that X_{ij_0} are i.i.d. normal of mean 0 and variance $1/n$ we have that, for some $K'' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(\tilde{a}_{\star, i}) X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_{2k} \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{T}_{i_1}(\tilde{a}_{\star, i_1}) \cdots \tilde{T}_{i_{2k}}(\tilde{a}_{\star, i_{2k}})) \mathbb{E}(X_{i_1 j_0} \cdots X_{i_{2k} j_0}) \\ &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{T}^2(\tilde{a}_{\star, i_1}) \cdots \tilde{T}^2(\tilde{a}_{\star, i_k})) \mathbb{E}(X_{i_1 j_0}^2 \cdots X_{i_k j_0}^2) \\ &\leq K'' \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E}(X_{i_1 j_0}^2 \cdots X_{i_k j_0}^2) = K'' \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} = K'' (2k-1)!!; \end{aligned}$$

where, for the last inequality, we used that, as a consequence of Hypothesis 1, all moments of $\tilde{T}_1(\tilde{a}_{\star,1}), \dots, \tilde{T}_n(\tilde{a}_{\star,n})$ are bounded. This is indeed the case because Hypothesis 1 implies the at most linear growth of \tilde{T} and the moments of $a_{\star,i}$ are easily seen to be finite. Thus, for some $K > 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i}) X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} \leq K(1 + \beta_{\star,j_0}^{2k}).$$

For the second bound of (125), by the Mean Value Theorem, for some $\xi \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0,1} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} &\leq 2^{2k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0,0} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} \\ &\quad + 2^{2k} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle (A'(\tilde{a}_{1,i}) - A'(\tilde{a}_{2,i})) \tilde{a}_{1,i} \rangle_{j_0,\xi} \tilde{T}'_{i,t}(\xi) X_{ij_0}^2 \beta_{\star,j_0} \right)^{2k} \\ &\leq K''' \left[\mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0,0} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} + \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle |\tilde{a}_i| \rangle_{j_0,\xi} X_{ij_0}^2 \right)^{2k} \right]; \end{aligned}$$

for $K''' > 0$ some constant only depending on $k \geq 1$ and where we used that, by Hypothesis 1, A'' and \tilde{T}' are bounded functions and β_{\star,j_0} is a bounded sequence. It is enough then to show that the two expectations on the last line are uniformly bounded in n . For the first expectation, notice that $(\langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0,0})_{i \in [n]}$ are independent of the $(X_{ij_0})_{i \in [n]}$. Furthermore, because the $(X_{ij_0})_{i \in [n]}$ are i.i.d. centered Gaussian r.v.s of variance $1/n$ and by Hypothesis 2 we have as above that, for some $K^{(4)} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} \langle A'(\tilde{a}_i) \rangle_{j_0,0} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} &= \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left(\langle A'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i_1}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \rangle_{j_0,0}^2 \cdots \langle A'(\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_{i_k}^\top \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) \rangle_{j_0,0}^2 \right) \mathbb{E} (X_{i_1 j_0}^2 \cdots X_{i_k j_0}^2) \\ &\leq K^{(4)} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_k \in [n]} \mathbb{E} (X_{i_1 j_0}^2 \cdots X_{i_k j_0}^2) = K^{(4)} \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0} \right)^{2k} \\ &= K^{(4)} (2k-1)!!; \end{aligned}$$

Now, note that the proof of Proposition 9 directly extends, for $j_0 \in [p]$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, to the measures $\langle \cdot \rangle_{j_0,t}$. Therefore, by the analogue of Corollary 3, for every $k \geq 1$ there is a $C_k > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ and $t \in [0, 1]$ it holds that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \|\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|^{2k} \rangle_{j_0,t} \leq C_k n^k.$$

Moreover, the moments of $n \sum_{i \in [n]} X_{ij_0}^4$ are uniformly bounded in n . Thus, for the second term it is enough to see that, for some $K^{(5)} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \langle |\tilde{a}_i| \rangle_{j_0,\xi} n X_{ij_0}^2 \right)^{2k} &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left(\langle |\tilde{a}_i| \rangle_{j_0,\xi} n X_{ij_0}^2 \right)^{2k} \\ &\leq n^{2k} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_1^{2k} X_{1j_0}^{4k} \rangle_{j_0,\xi} \leq n^{2k} \left(\mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{a}_1^{4k} \rangle_{j_0,\xi} \mathbb{E} X^{8k} \right)^{1/2} \leq K^{(5)}; \end{aligned}$$

where we used that $\mathbb{E} X^{8k}$ is $\mathcal{O}(n^{-4k})$ and Proposition 15. ■

I Smooth approximation for logistic regression

In the case of logistic regression, $\tilde{T}_i(x) = \mathbb{I}_{\{x \geq \sigma^{-1}(e_i)\}}$, where $\sigma(\cdot)$ denotes the sigmoid function and $e_i \sim \text{Unif}(0, 1)$, independent of everything else. This function is indeed bounded but is not \mathcal{C}^3 and therefore does not obey Hypothesis 1(ii). For each $\delta > 0$, let $f_\delta(x) := (\tanh(x/\delta) + 1)/2$. However, for each $\delta > 0$, we can approximate $\tilde{T}_i(x)$ by a function $\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(x)$ given by $\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(x) = f_\delta(x - \sigma^{-1}(e_i))$. And Hypothesis 1(ii) does hold for $\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}$. Furthermore, when $\delta \approx 0$ we have that $\tilde{T}_{\delta,i} \approx \tilde{T}_i$.

In the rest of this appendix, we will let $\mathbb{P}(\cdot|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ denote the logistic regression posterior given by

$$\mathbb{P}(d\boldsymbol{\beta}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i}) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} - \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j). \quad (126)$$

In a similar way, we will let $\mathbb{P}_\delta(\cdot|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y})$ be the posterior measure associated to the smooth approximation used. That is, \mathbb{P}_δ is the measure defined according to

$$\mathbb{P}_\delta(d\boldsymbol{\beta}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z_{n,\delta}} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} \tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(a_{\star,i}) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta} - \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}}) \right\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j), \quad (127)$$

where $Z_{n,\delta} > 0$ is a normalizing constant. We will then let $\langle \cdot \rangle_\delta$ denote expectation with respect to (127). Finally, for each $j \in [p]$, we will let \mathbb{P}_j and $\mathbb{P}_{\delta,j}$ denote the j -th marginals of \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}_δ , respectively.

I.1 Convergence of order parameters

In this section we will prove that the values of the asymptotic expectations of the order parameters (23) with respect to $\langle \cdot \rangle_\delta$ approximate the ones with respect to $\langle \cdot \rangle$. This is the content of the following proposition.

Proposition 16. *In the above context, for every $m, m' \in \{1, 2, \star\}$, we have that*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{mm'} \rangle = \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{mm'} \rangle_\delta.$$

For simplicity we will write the proof for $Q_{1\star}$ while the ones for the other variables work in the same way. Consider the posterior corresponding to the log-likelihood

$$\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b}) := \chi \mathbf{b}^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star + \sum_{i \in [n]} ((1-t)\tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i}) + t\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(a_{\star,i})) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b} - A(\mathbf{X}_i^\top \mathbf{b}) \quad (128)$$

and the same prior as the original model. The corresponding posterior expectation will be denoted by $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t}$. We then have that, for $f : \mathbb{R}^p \mapsto \mathbb{R}$,

$$\langle f(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} := \frac{\int f(\mathbf{b}) \exp\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}{\int \exp\{\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n,p}(\mathbf{b})\} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j)}.$$

Notice that the logistic regression log-likelihood is recovered when χ and t are both zero. In the rest of the section let $\epsilon > 0$ be as in Section H.

A key observation will be that the proof of Proposition 9 holds with direct adaptations for this posterior measure. Because for every $t \in [0, 1]$ and $\delta > 0$

$$0 \leq (1-t)\tilde{T}_i(a_{\star,i}) + t\tilde{T}_{\delta,i}(a_{\star,i}) \leq 1,$$

the same derivation proves that there are $a, K > 0$ such that, for every $t \in [0, 1]$, $\delta > 0$ small enough, $0 < \chi < \epsilon/4$, and $n \geq 1$,

$$\log \langle \exp a \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq K(\|\mathbf{X}\|_{op} + 1)^2.$$

This, as in Corollary 3, implies that there is some $K' > 0$ for which

$$n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t}, \quad n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^4 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq K'. \quad (129)$$

From this we get that

$$\mathbb{E} \langle a_1^2 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} = n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\mathbf{X}\beta\|^2 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq \left(\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^4 n^{-2} \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^4 \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \right)^{1/2} \leq K'^{1/2} (\mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{X}\|_{op}^4)^{1/2} \leq K''; \quad (130)$$

for some $K'' > 0$ not depending on n, χ, δ , nor t . Lemma 9 of Section H also holds (uniformly on the parameters χ, δ , and t) for the measure $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\chi, \delta, t}$.

As in equation (110) in the proof of Proposition 12, we have that if $0 < \chi < \epsilon/4$, then for some $K''' > 0$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\delta}| &= \left| \frac{d}{d\chi} \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} \Big|_{\chi=\xi} \right| \chi \\ &= n \mathbb{E} \left\langle (Q_{1\star} - \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\xi, \delta, 1})^2 \right\rangle_{\xi, \delta, 1} \chi \\ &\leq \frac{n \mathbb{E} \langle \|\beta\|^2 \rangle_{\xi, \delta, 1}}{\epsilon n^2} \chi \leq K''' \chi; \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

where, for in the first line we used the Mean Value Theorem, for the second the explicit expression for the derivative, and for the last Brascamp-Lieb, valid by Lemma 9, and equation (129). In an analogous way, again Lemma 9, Brascamp-Lieb, and equation (129) we get

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle| \leq K^{(4)} \chi; \quad (132)$$

where $K^{(4)} > 0$ is some constant and we used that, for every $\delta > 0$, $\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{0, \delta, 0} = \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle$.

Below, Lemma 17 will connect in a similar way the expectation of $Q_{1\star}$ with respect to $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1}$ and $\mathbb{E} \langle \cdot \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}$. Before proving this, we establish an auxiliary lemma.

Lemma 16. *There is a constant $C > 0$ such that for all $n \geq 1$ and $\delta > 0$,*

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_{\delta, i}(a_{\star, i}) - \tilde{T}_i(a_{\star, i})) a_i \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq C \delta^{1/4} n.$$

Proof. Let $I_{\delta, i} := (-\sqrt{\delta} + \sigma^{-1}(e_i), \sqrt{\delta} + \sigma^{-1}(e_i))$. Notice that

$$|\mathbb{I}_{\{x \geq 0\}} - f_{\delta}(x)| = \frac{1}{1 + e^{2|x|/\delta}}.$$

We then have that, for $a_{\star, i} \in I_{\delta, i}^c$, $|\tilde{T}(a_{\star, i}) - \tilde{T}_{\delta, i}(a_{\star, i})|$ is of order $\mathcal{O}(e^{-2/\sqrt{\delta}})$. To control the mean of the first term we use that by Hypothesis 2 and the above, for some $K > 0$,

$$\mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_{\delta, i} - \tilde{T}_i) a_i \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq K \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\tilde{T}_{\delta, i} - \tilde{T}_i)^2} \leq K \sqrt{P(a_{\star, i} \in I_{\delta, i}) + \mathcal{O}(e^{-4/\sqrt{\delta}})}.$$

And $P(a_{\star, i} \in I_{\delta, i})$ is easily seen to be $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\delta})$. We then have that

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_{\delta, i} - \tilde{T}_i) a_i \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \leq K \delta^{1/4} n.$$

■

Lemma 17. *There is some fixed $C > 0$ such that, for every $\delta > 0$ small enough and $\delta^{1/4} < \chi < \epsilon/4$,*

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}| \leq C\delta^{1/4}.$$

Proof. Let $F_{n, \chi, \delta, t}$ be the log-normalizing constant associated with the density corresponding to the log-likelihood $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, p}$. We then have that, by Lemma 16,

$$\left| \frac{d}{dt} \mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, t} \right| = \left| \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_i(a_{\star, i}) - \tilde{T}_{\delta, i}(a_{\star, i})) a_i \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, t} \right| \leq C\delta^{1/4}n.$$

Then, for some constant $K^{(5)} > 0$,

$$|\mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 0}| \leq nK^{(5)}\delta^{1/4}. \quad (133)$$

By taking the first two derivatives of $n^{-1}\mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 1}$ with respect to χ we get

$$n^{-1} \frac{d}{d\chi} \mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 1} = \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} \quad \text{and} \quad n^{-1} \frac{d^2}{d\chi^2} \mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 1} = n^{-1} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (Q_{1\star} - \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1})^2 \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} \geq 0.$$

This proves that, seen as a function of χ , $n^{-1}\mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 1}$ is a convex function whose first derivative gives $\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1}$. Similarly, $n^{-1}\mathbb{E} F_{n, \chi, \delta, 0}$ is a convex function whose first derivative gives $\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}$.

As in (104), for every $d > 0$ sufficiently small we then have that

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}| \leq \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi+d, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi-d, \delta, 1} + \frac{1}{nd} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |\mathbb{E} F_{n, y, 1} - \mathbb{E} F_{n, y, 0}|; \quad (134)$$

with $\mathcal{Y} := \{\chi - d, \chi, \chi + d\}$. As in Lemma 9, as $\chi < \epsilon/4$, the measure associated to $\langle \cdot \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1}$ is ϵ -strongly log-concave for $\epsilon > 0$. Then, by Brascamp-Lieb we have that for every such χ

$$\frac{d}{d\chi} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} = n \left\langle (Q_{1\star} - \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1})^2 \right\rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} \leq \frac{\|\beta_{\star}\|^2}{\epsilon n} \leq K^{(6)} \quad (135)$$

for some $K^{(6)} > 0$. Combining equations (133), (134), and (135) and using the Mean Value Theorem we finally get that there is some $K^{(7)} > 0$ such that, for all $d > 0$ sufficiently small,

$$|\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}| \leq K^{(7)} \left(d + \frac{\delta^{1/2}}{d} \right).$$

The conclusion of the lemma is reached by fixing the value $d = \delta^{1/4}$. ■

Proof of Proposition 16. As mentioned before, we will prove this for $Q_{1\star}$ but the proofs for Q_{11} and Q_{12} follow in a similar way. By equations (131) and (132) and the lemma above, we have that for all $\delta > 0$ sufficiently small and $\delta^{1/4} < \chi < \epsilon/4$

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\delta} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle| &\leq |\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\delta} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1}| + |\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 1} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0}| + |\mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle_{\chi, \delta, 0} - \mathbb{E} \langle Q_{1\star} \rangle| \\ &\leq K^{(8)}(\chi + \delta^{1/4}), \end{aligned}$$

for constants $K^{(8)} > 0$ that do not depend on n , χ , or δ . The result then follows by taking first the limit of $n \rightarrow \infty$ and then $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and $\chi \rightarrow 0$. ■

I.2 Wasserstein convergence of marginals

Recall the definition of the Wasserstein-2 metric between two Borel measures μ and ν on \mathbb{R}^p

$$W_2(\mu, \nu) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Gamma(\mu, \nu)} \left(\int \|\mathbf{X} - \mathbf{Y}\|^2 \gamma(d\mathbf{X}, d\mathbf{Y}) \right)^{1/2}$$

where $\Gamma(\mu, \nu)$ is the set of all couplings of μ and ν .

Here we will prove the following bound on the Wasserstein-2 metric between the j_0 -th marginal under \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}_δ respectively (recall definitions from (126) and (127) respectively). Instead of the empirical measure convergence assumptions in Hypothesis 1(iv), for this section, we will assume that β_\star has i.i.d. coordinates drawn from $\pi(\cdot)$. This is stronger than Hypothesis 1(iv). The rest of our assumptions stay as earlier. For the rest of this section, we will assume that $\mathbb{E}(\cdot)$ stands for expectation with respect to (\mathbf{X}, e) , as before, but also with respect to the randomness in β_\star .

Proposition 17. *In the aforementioned setting, let $j_0 \in [p]$. There exists a constant $C > 0$ that does not depend on n such that $\mathbb{E}W_2^2(\mathbb{P}_{j_0}, \mathbb{P}_{\delta, j_0}) \leq C\delta^{1/4}$, where $\mathbb{P}_{j_0}, \mathbb{P}_{\delta, j_0}$ denoted respectively the j_0 -th marginal induced under \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}_δ .*

Proof. For this proof, denote

$$F_n := \log Z_n \quad \text{and} \quad F_{n, \delta} := \log Z_{n, \delta},$$

with Z_n and $Z_{n, \delta}$ as in (126) and (127). For two Borel measures μ and ν on \mathbb{R}^p such that μ define their *Kullback–Leibler divergence*, $D_{\text{KL}}(\mu||\nu)$ according to

$$D_{\text{KL}}(\mu||\nu) := \int \log \left(\frac{d\mu}{d\nu}(\mathbf{b}) \right) \mu(d\mathbf{b}).$$

By [90, Theorem 1], because the posterior is strongly log-concave, we have that Talagrand's transport inequality holds for it. This means that

$$W_2^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_\delta) \leq 2D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_\delta||\mathbb{P});$$

Now expectation of the KL divergence is given by

$$\mathbb{E}D_{\text{KL}}(\mathbb{P}_\delta||\mathbb{P}) = \sum_{i \in [n]} \mathbb{E} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_{\delta, i} - \tilde{T}_i) a_i \right\rangle_\delta + \mathbb{E}(F_n - F_{\delta, n}).$$

The first term can be directly controlled using Lemma 16. As in the previous subsection, let $F_{n, \chi, \delta, t}$ be the log-normalizing constant associated with the density corresponding to the log-likelihood $\hat{\mathcal{L}}_{n, p}$. In the rest of the proof we fix $\chi = 0$ and thus omit its corresponding subscript. For the second term, notice that

$$\begin{aligned} \left. \frac{dF_{n, \delta, t}}{dt} \right|_{t=\xi} &= \frac{1}{Z_{n, \delta, \xi}} \int \frac{d}{dt} \exp \left\{ \sum_{i \in [n]} (t\tilde{T}_i + (1-t)\tilde{T}_{\delta, i}) \mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta - \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta}) \right\} \Big|_{t=\xi} \prod_{j \in [p]} \mu(d\beta_j) \\ &= \sum_{i \in [n]} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_i - \tilde{T}_{\delta, i}) a_i \right\rangle_{\delta, \xi}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by the Mean Value Theorem with respect to t , Can you please show an intermediate step for the following.

$$F_n - F_{\delta, n} = \sum_{i \in [n]} \left\langle (\tilde{T}_i - \tilde{T}_{\delta, i}) a_i \right\rangle_{\delta, \xi};$$

with $t = \xi$ some value in $(0, 1)$. From this and another use of Lemma 16 we have that

$$\mathbb{E}W_2^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_\delta) \leq C\delta^{1/4}n$$

To conclude, just notice that, because the coordinates of β_\star are exchangeable, then the measures \mathbb{P} and \mathbb{P}_δ are symmetric under exchanges of the coordinates. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}W_2^2(\mathbb{P}, \mathbb{P}_\delta) \geq \sum_{j \in [p]} \mathbb{E}W_2^2(\mathbb{P}_j, \mathbb{P}_{\delta,j}) = p\mathbb{E}W_2^2(\mathbb{P}_{j_0}, \mathbb{P}_{\delta,j_0}).$$

The conclusion then follows because $p/n \rightarrow \kappa$. ■

J Explicit fixed point equations for linear regression

J.1 Proof of Proposition 2

For this subsection, we abbreviate $\theta(\xi_B), \xi_B$ as θ or $\theta(\xi)$ and ξ respectively. Notice that, to have explicit expressions for these equations, it is enough to compute

$$\langle \beta \rangle_h, \langle \beta^2 \rangle_h, \langle \theta(\xi) \rangle_s \text{ and } \langle \theta^2(\xi) \rangle_s.$$

We will compute these by repetitive use of *Gaussian integration by parts*. The first part of the proposition will follow from calculating $\langle \theta(\xi) \rangle_s$ and $\langle \theta^2(\xi) \rangle_s$, which do not require the signal distribution $\mu(\cdot)$ to be Gaussian.

First, notice that

$$\langle \theta \rangle_s = \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)} \langle \xi \rangle_s + \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star}.$$

By suitable completion of squares, note that computing $\langle g(\xi) \rangle_s$ amounts to calculating $E(g(\xi))$ where

$$\xi \sim \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{c_1}{1+c_1^2}(\theta_\star + z - c_2 z_{BB_\star}), \frac{1}{1+c_1^2}\right], \text{ with } c_1 = \sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}, c_2 = \sqrt{\kappa c_B}, \quad (136)$$

where $z = \Phi^{-1}(e) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, independent of everything else. Hence,

$$\langle \xi \rangle_s = \frac{\sqrt{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1}(\theta_\star + z - \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star}).$$

This implies that

$$\langle \theta \rangle_s = \frac{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1}(\theta_\star + z) + \frac{\sqrt{\kappa c_B}}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} z_{BB_\star}. \quad (137)$$

We now compute the second moment of θ .

$$\langle \theta^2 \rangle_s = \kappa(v_B - c_B) \langle \xi^2 \rangle_s + \kappa c_B z_{BB_\star}^2 + 2\kappa \sqrt{(v_B - c_B)c_B} \langle \xi \rangle_s z_{BB_\star}.$$

From (136), we know that

$$\langle \xi^2 \rangle_s = \frac{1}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} \left(1 + \frac{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} (\theta_\star + z - \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star})^2 \right).$$

Putting things together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \theta^2 \rangle_s &= \frac{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} \left(1 + \frac{\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} (\theta_\star + z - \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star})^2 \right) + \kappa c_B z_{BB_\star}^2 \\ &\quad + \frac{2\kappa(v_B - c_B)}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} (\theta_\star + z - \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star}) \sqrt{\kappa c_B} z_{BB_\star}. \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

By the independence of ξ_{B_\star} , z , and z_{BB_\star} and using definitions (12), (14), and (15), we obtain that

$$r_1 = 1 + r_2 = 1 + \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta(\xi) \rangle_s^2 - \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta^2(\xi) \rangle_s = \frac{1}{\kappa(v_B - c_B) + 1} \quad (139)$$

$$\text{and } r_3 = \mathbb{E}_{G \otimes e} \langle \theta(\xi) - \theta_\star - z \rangle_s^2 = \frac{\gamma^2 + c_B - 2c_{BB_\star} + \kappa^{-1}}{\kappa(v_B - c_B + \kappa^{-1})^2}.$$

We will now prove the second part of the proposition. To this end, we assume that the prior $\mu(\cdot)$ is standard Gaussian. and that $\pi(\cdot)$ is centered. In this case, $\langle f(\beta) \rangle_h$ is equivalent to $\mathbb{E}[(f(\beta))]$ where $\beta \sim \mathcal{N}(m/(1+v), v/(1+v))$, with m, v defined as in (17). Plugging in these definitions we have,

$$\langle \beta \rangle_h = \frac{(r_2 + 1)B_\star + \sqrt{r_3}z}{r_1 + 1}, \quad (140)$$

$$\langle \beta^2 \rangle_h = \frac{1}{r_1 + 1} \left(1 + \frac{((r_2 + 1)B_\star + \sqrt{r_3}z)^2}{r_1 + 1} \right). \quad (141)$$

From this, and using the fact that B_\star and z are independent and centered we get that

$$\begin{cases} v_B = \frac{1}{r_1 + 1} + c_B \\ c_B = \frac{(r_2 + 1)^2 \gamma^2 + r_3}{(r_1 + 1)^2} \\ c_{BB_\star} = \frac{(r_2 + 1) \gamma^2}{r_1 + 1} \end{cases} \quad (142)$$

Plugging things in (139), we obtain that

$$r_1^2 + \kappa r_1 - 1 = 0$$

from which we see that

$$r_1 = r_2 + 1 = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^2 + 1} - \frac{\kappa}{2}. \quad (143)$$

J.2 Derivation of r_1 and r_2 by direct arguments

In the setting of linear regression with Gaussian prior, that is, where $\mu(\cdot)$ is Gaussian (for simplicity we assume standard Gaussian), we can validate by direct arguments that Proposition 2 provides accurate expressions. While this could be formally proved for all the constants, here we show the computations for r_1 and r_2 . We choose this example since closed-form expressions exist in this case, allowing us to validate the accuracy of our results. By calculations similar to prior section, it can be shown that our main theorem says a single posterior marginal behaves as $\beta_j \sim \mathcal{N}(m/(1+v), v/(1+v))$ in this setting. The mean and variance simplify to

$$\frac{m}{1+v} = \frac{(r_2 + 1)/r_1 \beta_{\star,j} + \sqrt{r_3}/r_1 Z}{1 + 1/r_1} = (r_2 + 1)/(r_2 + 2) \beta_{\star,j} + \sqrt{r_3}/(r_1 + 1) Z, \quad v/(1+v) = 1/(r_1 + 1), \quad (144)$$

where we used the fact that here $r_1 = r_2 + 1$. Recall the generative model is

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}_\star + \mathbf{z}$$

and the posterior is

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} - \mathbf{y}\|^2 - \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|^2 \right\}.$$

In this case, we can then rewrite the posterior according to

$$\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\beta}|\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{y}) = \frac{1}{Z_n} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\top (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I}) \boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{y}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta} \right\}.$$

This means that the posterior is exactly a Multivariate Normal with mean

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}$$

and covariance matrix

$$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1}.$$

Notice that $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ is the ridge solution to the problem with tuning parameter equals 1 and $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is the resolvent of the Wishart matrix $(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X})$ evaluated at $z = -1$.

Suppose we wanted to compute the marginal associated with β_1 . By the fact this is a Multivariate distribution, the marginal will be a Normal random variable with mean

$$\mu_1 = [(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y}]_1$$

and variance

$$\Sigma_{11} = [(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1}]_{11}.$$

The easiest of these constants to analyze in the limit of n going to infinity is the variance. For this, we have that

$$[(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1}]_{11} = M_n(-1) \xrightarrow{n \rightarrow \infty} a = m(-1);$$

where $M_n(z)$ is the Stieltjes transform of a Wishart matrix of aspect ratio κ and, by [91], $m(z)$ is the solution to the quadratic equation

$$z\kappa m^2(z) - (1 - \kappa - z)m(z) + 1 = 0.$$

Plugging in $m(z) = a$ and $z = -1$, we obtain that

$$a^2 + \left(\frac{2}{\kappa} - 1\right)a - \frac{1}{\kappa} = 0.$$

The only positive solution to this last equation is

$$a = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa} - 1\right)^2 + \frac{4}{\kappa}} + 1 - \frac{2}{\kappa} \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2 + 1} + 1 - \frac{2}{\kappa} \right)$$

Which implies that

$$\begin{aligned} a^{-1} &= \frac{2}{\sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2 + 1} + 1 - \frac{2}{\kappa}} = \frac{2 \left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2 + 1} + \frac{2}{\kappa} - 1 \right)}{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2 + 1 - \left(1 - \frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2} \\ &= \frac{\kappa}{2} \left(\sqrt{\left(\frac{2}{\kappa}\right)^2 + 1} + \frac{2}{\kappa} - 1 \right) = \sqrt{\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^2 + 1} + 1 - \frac{\kappa}{2} \end{aligned}$$

From (143), we see that this equals $r_1 + 1$ as well as $r_2 + 2$, thus indeed the variance of the marginal is $a = 1/(r_1 + 1)$ as suggested by our main theorem (recall (144)).

We next show that part of the mean from direct computations and our main results match

$$\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{y} = (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star + (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{z}.$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star &= (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I}) \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star - (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star \\ &= \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star - (\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star. \end{aligned}$$

From this we see that

$$[(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1} \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} \boldsymbol{\beta}_\star]_1 = (1 - \Sigma_{11}) \beta_{\star,1} - \sum_{j=2}^p [(\mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{X} + \mathbb{I})^{-1}]_{1j} \beta_{\star,j}.$$

Notice, by the preceding argument, the first term converges to $(1-a)\beta_{\star,1}$. But recall that $a^{-1} = r_2 + 2$ from previous calculations. Thus the coefficient of the marginal is $1 - a = \frac{r_2+1}{r_2+2}$ which matches the coefficient as predicted by our main theorem results for linear regression from (144).

K Computation details

To validate the theory of Theorems 1 and 2, we ran numerical experiments as demonstrated by the figures in our main manuscript. They required numerically computing the solution to the fixed point equations (15)–(18). Here we provide details regarding how we proceeded in this regard.

Our approach consisted in treating the right-hand side of (15)–(18) as a map, which was then applied iteratively to the values obtained at the previous step until the constants (v, q, m, r_1, r_2, r_3) stabilized. To this end, the expectations appearing on the right-hand side of equations (15)–(18) were approximated by empirical averages computed from samples of the corresponding measures: $p_s(\cdot)$ for equation (15) and $p_h(\cdot)$ for equation (18). In each case, 1000 samples were drawn using the No-U-Turn Sampler (NUTS), employing the default PyMC configuration with 4 chains and a tuning phase of 2000 iterations. The smoothing parameter δ was fixed throughout at the value $1/1000$. The code used for all simulations is available in the repository [54].