

L_2 -norm posterior contraction in Gaussian models with unknown variance

Seonghyun Jeong

^aDepartment of Statistics and Data Science, Department of Applied Statistics, Yonsei University, 50 Yonsei-ro, Seodaemun-gu, Seoul, 03722, Republic of Korea

Abstract

The testing-based approach is a fundamental tool for establishing posterior contraction rates. Although the Hellinger metric is attractive owing to the existence of a desirable test function, it is not directly applicable in Gaussian models, because translating the Hellinger metric into more intuitive metrics typically requires strong boundedness conditions. When the variance is known, this issue can be addressed by directly constructing a test function relative to the L_2 -metric using the likelihood ratio test. However, when the variance is unknown, existing results are limited and rely on restrictive assumptions. To overcome this limitation, we derive a test function tailored to an unknown variance setting with respect to the L_2 -metric and provide sufficient conditions for posterior contraction based on the testing-based approach. We apply this result to analyze high-dimensional regression and nonparametric regression.

Keywords: Bayesian nonparametrics, High-dimensional regression, Nonparametric regression, Testing-based posterior contraction

1. Introduction

We suppose that the observation vector $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ follows the Gaussian model given by

$$y \sim N_n(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2 I_n), \quad (1)$$

where $\mu_0 = (\mu_{01}, \dots, \mu_{0n})^T \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma_0^2 > 0$ are the true parameters for data generation. Although σ_0^2 is typically assumed to be fixed and independent of n , we allow it to vary with n for further flexibility. Several interesting models can be incorporated into this framework by appropriately specifying μ_0 . For example, if μ_0 is a sparse vector, one obtains a sparse normal mean model; if $\mu_{0i} = x_i^T \beta_0$ with covariates $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^p$ and a (possibly sparse) coefficient vector $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, the model corresponds to (sparse) regression; and if $\mu_{0i} = f_0(x_i)$ for a function $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, it leads to a nonparametric regression model. Posterior contraction rates in these models have been extensively studied under the assumption that σ_0^2 is known and fixed in the literature (e.g., Castillo and van der Vaart, 2012; Castillo et al., 2015; van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2008; Ročková and van der Pas, 2020; Polson and Ročková, 2018). In contrast, the case of an unknown

Email address: sjeong@yonsei.ac.kr (Seonghyun Jeong)

Preprint submitted to Arxiv

June 26, 2025

σ_0^2 is often addressed in a problem-specific manner (e.g., [Yoo and Ghosal, 2016](#); [Ning et al., 2020](#); [Jeong and Ghosal, 2021b](#); [Song and Liang, 2023](#)). A key reason for this limitation is that assuming a known σ_0^2 simplifies the problem setup, thereby allowing for the establishment of optimal posterior contraction rates by directly exploiting the model structure under mild conditions with appropriately tailored priors (e.g., [Castillo and van der Vaart, 2012](#); [Castillo et al., 2015](#)). Another contributing factor is that, unlike in the known σ_0^2 case, a test function required for testing-based posterior contraction theory is available only in a somewhat restrictive form.

The testing-based approach to posterior contraction was formalized by [Ghosal et al. \(2000\)](#) and [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2007\)](#), showing the fundamental role of tests, as in Schwartz's theory of posterior consistency ([Schwartz, 1965](#)). Typically, though not necessarily, a global test over a sieve—a suitable subset of the parameter space—is constructed from local tests on small subsets that are sufficiently separated from the true parameters, combined with an appropriately controlled covering number, often measured by metric entropy. Consequently, obtaining such a local test function is crucial. Notably, the Hellinger metric and its averaged version always allow for the construction of test functions with exponentially small type-I and type-II errors, regardless of the specified model formulation ([Le Cam, 1973](#); [Birgé, 1983](#)). However, using the Hellinger metric is usually unsatisfactory for Gaussian models, because it is not directly related to a more intuitive metric of the parameters without imposing strong boundedness conditions ([Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2007](#)). To address this issue, when σ_0^2 is known, a direct local test can be constructed relative to the L_2 -norm of μ_0 using the likelihood ratio test ([Birgé, 2006](#)). However, when σ_0^2 is unknown, available results are limited. Lemma 8.27 of [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#) extends the basic result for the known-variance case, but the testing error is not uniformly controlled over small local subsets, making it difficult to apply the result across the entire parameter space without truncation. Proposition S2 of [Naulet and Barat \(2018\)](#) provides a refined result, but their test is not suitable for achieving optimal contraction rates when σ_0^2 varies with n . This study aims to complement the existing results.

Our primary goal is to establish a test function for the general form in (1). To achieve this, we first derive a local test function that distinguishes the true parameters from alternatives lying in small balls that are sufficiently separated in the L_2 -norm. Following the standard entropy approach, we combine these local tests with metric entropy bounds to construct a global test over an appropriately chosen sieve. By employing the testing-based strategy, we establish sufficient conditions for L_2 -norm posterior contraction by ensuring that the prior concentrates on a Kullback-Leibler neighborhood of the true parameters while assigning an exponentially small mass outside the sieve. Unlike [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#) and [Naulet and Barat \(2018\)](#), our results offer a framework for achieving optimal contraction rates with priors supported on $(0, \infty)$ even when σ_0^2 varies with n . Section 2 presents the main results, and Section 3 discusses the applications to high-dimensional regression and nonparametric regression. Section 4 concludes the study with a discussion.

2. Main results

For $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma^2 > 0$, let $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma}$ denote the expectation operator under $N_n(\mu, \sigma^2 I_n)$ and $P_{\mu, \sigma}$ be the corresponding probability measure. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_p$ the L_p -norm of a vector. For any $\mu_1, \mu_2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\sigma_1, \sigma_2 \in (0, \infty)$, we define the metric d as $d^2((\mu_1, \sigma_1), (\mu_2, \sigma_2)) = n^{-1} \|\mu_1 - \mu_2\|_2^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_2|^2$, which can be viewed as the L_2 -distance between the vectors $(n^{-1/2} \mu_1^T, \sigma_1)^T$ and $(n^{-1/2} \mu_2^T, \sigma_2)^T$. A key contribution of this study is the construction of a test

function that distinguishes the true parameters from alternative values that lie in a small ball sufficiently separated from the true parameters with respect to d .

Theorem 1 (Local test). *For any $\epsilon \in (0, \sigma_0)$ and any (μ_1, σ_1) satisfying $d((\mu_1, \sigma_1), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq \epsilon$, there exists a test $\varphi_n \in \{0, 1\}$ such that, for a universal constant $K > 0$,*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_n \leq e^{-K n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}, \quad \sup_{(\mu, \sigma): d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_1, \sigma_1)) \leq \epsilon/6} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_n) \leq e^{-K n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}.$$

Proof. Let $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be a Gaussian random vector. For $M_1 > 1$, we separate the range of the parameters as follows.

Case 1: $\sigma_1 \geq M_1 \sigma_0$. We define the test function $\varphi_{1,n} = \mathbb{1}\{\|y - \mu_0\|_2^2 / \sigma_0^2 > M_0^2 n\}$ for $M_0 > 0$. Under the law $y \sim P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}$, $\|y - \mu_0\|_2^2 / \sigma_0^2$ has a chi-squared distribution with n degrees of freedom. Let $\chi_{k,y}^2$ denote a chi-squared random variable with k degrees of freedom and noncentrality parameter γ . It is known (Laurent and Massart, 2000, Lemma 1) that chi-squared distributions satisfy the tail bounds: for any $t > 0$, $\Pr\{\chi_{k,0}^2 - k \geq 2\sqrt{kt} + 2t\} \leq e^{-t}$ and $\Pr\{\chi_{k,0}^2 - k \leq -2\sqrt{kt}\} \leq e^{-t}$. Therefore, if M_0 is sufficiently large, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{1,n} \leq e^{-K_1 n} \leq e^{-K_1 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_1 > 0$, since $\epsilon \in (0, \sigma_0)$. Under the law $y \sim P_{\mu, \sigma}$, $\|y - \mu_0\|_2^2 / \sigma^2$ has a noncentral chi-squared distribution with n degrees of freedom and noncentrality parameter $\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 / \sigma^2$. Thus, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_{1,n}) = \Pr\{\chi_{n, \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 / \sigma^2}^2 \leq \sigma_0^2 M_0^2 n / \sigma^2\} \leq \Pr\{\chi_{n,0}^2 \leq \sigma_0^2 M_0^2 n / \sigma^2\}$, where we have used the fact that $\Pr\{\chi_{n,a}^2 \leq \cdot\} \leq \Pr\{\chi_{n,b}^2 \leq \cdot\}$ for every $a \geq b$ (by the monotonicity of the Marcum Q-function). We obtain $\sigma \geq \sigma_1 - |\sigma - \sigma_1| \geq M_1 \sigma_0 - \epsilon/6 \geq M_1 \sigma_0 - \sigma_0/6 \geq M_1 \sigma_0/2$. Therefore, once M_1 is chosen to be sufficiently large to dominate M_0 , the tail bound of the chi-squared distribution gives $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_{1,n}) \leq e^{-K_2 n}$ for some $K_2 > 0$, which is further bounded by $e^{-K_2 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ since $\epsilon \in (0, \sigma_0)$.

Case 2: $\sigma_1 < M_1 \sigma_0$ and $7\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 > n|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2$. We define the test $\varphi_{2,n} = \mathbb{1}\{(\mu_1 - \mu_0)^T (y - \mu_0) > \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 / 2\}$. Since $8n^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 \geq n^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2 \geq \epsilon^2$, we easily obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{2,n} = \Phi(-\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2 / (2\sigma_0)) \leq e^{-K_3 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_3 > 0$, using the Gaussian concentration inequality. For the type-II error, observe that $2(\mu_1 - \mu_0)^T (\mu - \mu_0) = \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 + \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 - \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2$ and $\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 \geq \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 / 2 - \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_{2,n}) &= P_{\mu, \sigma} \left\{ (\mu_1 - \mu_0)^T (y - \mu) \leq \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2 / 2 - \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 / 2 \right\} \\ &\leq P_{\mu, \sigma} \left\{ \frac{(\mu_1 - \mu_0)^T (y - \mu)}{\sigma \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2} \leq \frac{\|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2}{\sigma \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2} - \frac{\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2}{4\sigma} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As $\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 \geq n\epsilon^2/8$ and $\|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon^2/36$, the rightmost side is bounded by $\Phi(-\sqrt{n}\epsilon/(72\sqrt{2}\sigma))$. Using the inequality $\sigma \leq |\sigma - \sigma_1| + \sigma_1 \leq \epsilon/6 + M_1 \sigma_0 \leq 2M_1 \sigma_0$, the probability is further bounded by $\Phi(-\sqrt{n}\epsilon/(144\sqrt{2}M_1 \sigma_0)) \leq e^{-K_4 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_4 > 0$.

Case 3: $\sigma_0 \leq \sigma_1 < M_1 \sigma_0$ and $7\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 \leq n|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2$. We define the test $\varphi_{3,n} = \mathbb{1}\{n^{-1}\|y - \mu_0\|_1 - \sqrt{2/\pi}\sigma_0 > \sqrt{2/\pi}(\sigma_1 - \sigma_0)/12\}$. Let $z \sim N_n(0_n, I_n)$ and observe that $\mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 = n\sqrt{2/\pi}$. Then,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{3,n} = \Pr \left\{ \|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 > \frac{\sqrt{2/\pi}n}{12\sigma_0} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) \right\} \leq \Pr \left\{ \|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 > \frac{\sqrt{7}n\epsilon}{24\sqrt{\pi}\sigma_0} \right\},$$

since $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_0$ and $(1 + 1/7)|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2 \geq n^{-1}\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 + |\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2 \geq \epsilon^2$. Note that $\|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1$ is the sum of independent sub-Gaussian random variables with mean zero. It thus satisfies the

concentration inequality of the form $\Pr\{|\|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1| > t\} \leq e^{-K't^2/n}$ for any $t > 0$ and some $K' > 0$ (Wainwright, 2019, Proposition 2.5). This gives $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{3,n} \leq e^{-K_5 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_5 > 0$. Observe also that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma}(1 - \varphi_{3,n}) &\leq P_{\mu, \sigma} \left\{ n^{-1} \|y - \mu\|_1 - \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma_0 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2/\pi}}{12} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) + n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2 \right\} \\ &= \Pr \left\{ \|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 \leq \frac{n}{\sigma} \left[\frac{\sqrt{2/\pi}}{12} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) + \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_0 - \sigma) + n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2 \right] \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

The term in the bracket is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}& -\frac{11}{12} \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) + \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_1 - \sigma) + n^{-1/2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2 + n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2 \\ & \leq \left(-\frac{11}{12} \sqrt{2/\pi} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{7}} \right) (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) + n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2 + |\sigma - \sigma_1| \\ & \leq -\frac{7}{20} (\sigma_1 - \sigma_0) + \sqrt{2(n^{-1} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2 + |\sigma - \sigma_1|^2)},\end{aligned}$$

where we use the inequality $\sigma_1 \geq \sigma_0$. Using the fact that $(1 + 1/7)|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2 \geq \epsilon^2$, the rightmost side can be further bounded by $[-(7/20) \sqrt{7/8} + \sqrt{2}/6] \epsilon < -\epsilon/11$. Therefore, using the inequality $\sigma \leq 2M_1 \sigma_0$ (as in Case 2), we obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma}(1 - \varphi_{3,n}) \leq \Pr\{\|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 \leq -n\epsilon/(22M_1\sigma_0)\} \leq e^{-K_6 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_6 > 0$.

Case 4: $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1$ and $7\|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2^2 \leq n|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2$. Define the test function $\varphi_{4,n} = \mathbb{1}\{n^{-1}\|y - \mu_0\|_1 - \sqrt{2/\pi} \sigma_0 \leq \sqrt{2/\pi}(\sigma_1 - \sigma_0)/12\}$. Since $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1$ and $(1 + 1/7)|\sigma_1 - \sigma_0|^2 \geq \epsilon^2$, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{4,n} \leq \Pr\{\|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 \leq -\sqrt{7}n\epsilon/(24\sqrt{\pi}\sigma_0)\} \leq e^{-K_7 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_7 > 0$, similar to Case 3. Also observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma}(1 - \varphi_{4,n}) \leq \Pr \left\{ \|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 > \frac{n}{\sigma} \left[\frac{-\sqrt{2/\pi}}{12} (\sigma_0 - \sigma_1) + \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_0 - \sigma) - n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_0\|_2 \right] \right\}.$$

Similar to Case 3, using $\sigma_0 > \sigma_1$, the term in the bracket is bounded below by

$$\begin{aligned}& \frac{11}{12} \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_0 - \sigma_1) + \sqrt{2/\pi} (\sigma_1 - \sigma) - n^{-1/2} \|\mu_1 - \mu_0\|_2 - n^{-1/2} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2 \\ & \geq \frac{7}{20} (\sigma_0 - \sigma_1) - \sqrt{2(n^{-1} \|\mu - \mu_1\|_2^2 + |\sigma - \sigma_1|^2)} \\ & \geq \epsilon/11.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using the inequality $\sigma \leq |\sigma - \sigma_1| + \sigma_1 < \epsilon/6 + \sigma_0 \leq 7\sigma_0/6$, we have $\mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma}(1 - \varphi_{4,n}) \leq \Pr\{\|z\|_1 - \mathbb{E}\|z\|_1 > 6n\epsilon/(77\sigma_0)\} \leq e^{-K_8 n \epsilon^2 / \sigma_0^2}$ for some $K_8 > 0$.

We can construct the test function φ_n by choosing from $\varphi_{1,n}$ through $\varphi_{4,n}$, depending on the values of (μ_0, σ_0) and (μ_1, σ_1) . \square

We compare our testing errors with those of Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017) and Naulet and Barat (2018). The testing error in Lemma 8.27 of Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017) involves σ_1^2 , requiring the prior for σ^2 to be appropriately truncated. As a result, commonly used priors for σ^2 supported on $(0, \infty)$, such as inverse gamma priors, cannot be used directly. The testing error in Proposition S2 of Naulet and Barat (2018) is free of σ_1^2 but does not decay at a rate

proportional to σ_0^{-2} . Therefore, their test function is not suitable for settings in which σ_0^2 varies with n . (Note that they measure the discrepancy between standard deviations on a logarithmic scale.) In contrast, our decay rate, given by $n\epsilon^2/\sigma_0^2$, properly accounts for such cases, as shown in Section 3.

It should be noted that Theorem 1 provides a test for ϵ -separated balls only when $\epsilon \in (0, \sigma_0)$. This contrasts with the Hellinger metric and the L_2 -metric in Gaussian models with known variance, which allow test functions for ϵ -separated balls for every $\epsilon > 0$. Consequently, Theorem 1 cannot be used for the general ‘shell approach’ (Ghosal and van der Vaart, 2017, Theorem 8.12) to obtain the refined version of contraction theory (see, e.g., Theorem 2.4 of Ghosal et al. (2000) or Theorem 8.11 of Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017)). Nevertheless, when combined with the metric entropy requirement, Theorem 1 is useful for constructing a global test over a sieve for the basic form of contraction theory (see, e.g., Theorem 2.1 of Ghosal et al. (2000) or Theorem 8.9 of Ghosal and van der Vaart (2017)). Below, we denote by $N(\epsilon, \mathcal{E}, \rho)$ the ϵ -covering number of a semi-metric space \mathcal{E} with respect to a semi-metric ρ .

Theorem 2 (Global test). *For a positive sequence $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \rightarrow \infty$, and a sieve $\Theta_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$, suppose that $N(\epsilon_n, \Theta_n, d) \leq e^{Dn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}$ for some constant $D > 0$. Then, for every $M > \max\{\sqrt{D/K}, 6\}$ with K as in Theorem 1, there exists a test $\varphi_n^* \in \{0, 1\}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_n^* \rightarrow 0, \quad \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in \Theta_n : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_n^*) \leq e^{-KM^2n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}.$$

Proof. Let $\{C_1, \dots, C_{N_n}\}$ be an $(M\epsilon_n/6)$ -cover of $\{(\mu, \sigma) \in \Theta_n : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n\}$ with respect to the metric d , where N_n denotes the covering number. Then, for each C_j , with $\epsilon = M\epsilon_n$, the test from Theorem 1 can be constructed, provided that n is sufficiently large so that $M\epsilon_n \leq \sigma_0$. We denote each of these tests by $\varphi_{n,j}$, and define the combined test as $\varphi_n^* = \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \varphi_{n,j}$. Because

$$N_n = N\left(\frac{M\epsilon_n}{6}, \{(\mu, \sigma) \in \Theta_n : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n\}, d\right) \leq N(\epsilon_n, \Theta_n, d),$$

whenever $M > 6$, it follows that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_n^* \leq \sum_{j=1}^{N_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_{n,j} \leq N(\epsilon_n, \Theta_n, d) e^{-KM^2n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2} \leq e^{-(KM^2-D)n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}$. The rightmost side goes to zero whenever $KM^2 > D$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in \Theta_n : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_n^*) &\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in C_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_{n,j}^*) \\ &\leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq N_n} \sup_{(\mu, \sigma) \in C_j} \mathbb{E}_{\mu, \sigma} (1 - \varphi_{n,j}) \\ &\leq e^{-KM^2n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes the proof. \square

The global test in Theorem 2 allows us to apply the testing-based approach for L_2 -norm posterior contraction in the Gaussian model given by (1). The following theorem builds on the results in Ghosal et al. (2000) and Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007).

Theorem 3 (Posterior contraction). *For $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \rightarrow \infty$, suppose that there exists a sieve $\Theta_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n \times (0, \infty)$ such that for some constants $C > 0$, $D > 0$, and a*

sufficiently large constant $E > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon_n^2, |\sigma^2 - \sigma_0^2| \leq \sigma_0\epsilon_n\} &\geq e^{-Cn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}, \\ N(\epsilon_n, \Theta_n, d) &\leq e^{Dn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}, \\ \Pi\{(\mu, \sigma) \notin \Theta_n\} &\leq e^{-En\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Then, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that the posterior satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \Pi\{(\mu, \sigma) : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n \mid y\} \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Our proof follows [Ghosal et al. \(2000\)](#) and [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2007\)](#). For $\delta > 0$, we define the set

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_n(\delta) &= \left\{ y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \int \frac{p_{\mu, \sigma}}{p_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}}(y) d\Pi(\mu, \sigma) \right. \\ &\geq \left. \Pi\{K(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) \leq n\delta^2, V(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) \leq n\delta^2\} e^{-2n\delta^2} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $K(P, Q) = \int \log(dP/dQ)dP$ and $V(P, Q) = \int (\log(dP/dQ) - K(P, Q))^2 dP$. For any $\delta \geq n^{-1/2}$, it is well known that $P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}(\mathcal{A}_n(\delta)) \geq 1 - (4n\delta^2)^{-1}$; see, for example, Lemma 8.21 of [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#). Using the direct calculations of the Kullback-Leibler divergence K and second-order variation V (see, e.g., Theorem 9 of [Jeong and Ghosal \(2021b\)](#)), and applying the Taylor expansion $\log(1 + w) = w + O(w^2)$ and $1 - (1 + w)^{-1} = w + O(w^2)$ for $w = \sigma^2/\sigma_0^2 - 1$, which are valid when $\sigma^2/\sigma_0^2 \rightarrow 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} K(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) &= \frac{n}{2} \log\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{\sigma_0^2}\right) - \frac{n}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}\right) + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2} = nO(w^2) + \frac{\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2}{2\sigma^2}, \\ V(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) &= \frac{n}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\sigma_0^2}{\sigma^2}\right)^2 + \frac{\sigma_0^2\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2}{\sigma^4} = \frac{nw^2}{2} + nO(w^3) + \frac{\sigma_0^2\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2}{\sigma^4}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, for some $\tilde{C} > 0$, we obtain $\Pi\{K(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) \leq \tilde{C}n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2, V(P_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}, P_{\mu, \sigma}) \leq \tilde{C}n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2\} \geq \Pi\{\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon_n^2, |\sigma^2/\sigma_0^2 - 1| \leq \epsilon_n/\sigma_0\}$, which is further bounded below by $e^{-Cn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}$. Let $\mathcal{B}_n = \{(\mu, \sigma) : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n\}$ for a large $M > 0$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \Pi(\mathcal{B}_n \mid y) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \varphi_n^* + \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \mathbb{1}(\mathcal{A}_n(\tilde{C}^{1/2}\epsilon_n/\sigma_0)^c) \\ &\quad + e^{(2\tilde{C}+C)n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2} \mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \int_{\mathcal{B}_n} (1 - \varphi_n^*) \frac{p_{\mu, \sigma}}{p_{\mu_0, \sigma_0}}(y) d\Pi(\mu, \sigma), \end{aligned}$$

where φ_n^* denotes the test in [Lemma 2](#). The first term on the right-hand side tends to zero according to [Lemma 2](#). The second term also goes to zero based on the probability bound of (3). For the third term, observe by [Theorem 2](#) that $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \int_{\mathcal{B}_n} (1 - \varphi_n^*)(p_{\mu, \sigma}/p_{\mu_0, \sigma_0})(y) d\Pi(\mu, \sigma) \leq e^{-KM^2n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2} + \Pi\{(\mu, \sigma) \notin \Theta_n\}$, which dominates the term $e^{(2\tilde{C}+C)n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}$ if M and E are sufficiently large. This concludes the proof. \square

Although [Theorem 3](#) provides a general framework for posterior contraction, its conditions are somewhat abstract. By assuming that σ^2 is a priori independent of μ and imposing specific conditions on its prior, we derive stronger yet more convenient sufficient conditions.

Theorem 4 (Posterior contraction; sufficient conditions). *Suppose that μ and σ^2 are a priori independent, and that $\sigma_0^2 > n^{-B}$ for some constant $B > 0$. Assume that the prior for σ^2 has a polynomial tail such that $\Pi\{\sigma^2 > t\} = O(t^{-1})$ for any large t , and that its density g is L -Lipschitz on $(0, \infty)$. For $\epsilon_n > 0$ such that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \log n$, suppose that g satisfies*

$$g(\sigma_0^2) \geq 2L\sigma_0\epsilon_n, \quad (4)$$

and that there exists a sieve $\mathcal{M}_n \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ such that for some constants $\bar{C} > 0$, $\bar{D} > 0$, and a sufficiently large constant $\bar{E} > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon_n^2\} &\geq e^{-\bar{C}n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}, \\ N(\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n, \mathcal{M}_n, \|\cdot\|_2) &\leq e^{\bar{D}n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}, \\ \Pi\{\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_n\} &\leq e^{-\bar{E}n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Then, there exists a constant $M > 0$ such that the posterior satisfies $\mathbb{E}_{\mu_0, \sigma_0} \Pi\{(\mu, \sigma) : d((\mu, \sigma), (\mu_0, \sigma_0)) \geq M\epsilon_n \mid y\} \rightarrow 0$.

Proof. Using (4) and the Lipschitz continuity of g , we observe that

$$\Pi\{|\sigma^2 - \sigma_0^2| \leq \sigma_0\epsilon_n\} \geq 2\sigma_0\epsilon_n \inf_{s:|s-\sigma_0^2| \leq \sigma_0\epsilon_n} g(s) \geq 2\sigma_0\epsilon_n[g(\sigma_0^2) - L\sigma_0\epsilon_n] \geq 2L\sigma_0^2\epsilon_n^2 \geq \frac{2L\log n}{n^{2B+1}}.$$

From the a priori independence and the first condition of (5), the first condition of (2) holds, since $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \log n$. Next, we choose $\Theta_n = \sqrt{2}\mathcal{M}_n \times (0, \sqrt{2}e^{Rn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}]$ for a large constant $R > 0$. Then, $N(\epsilon_n, \Theta_n, d) \leq N(\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n, \mathcal{M}_n, \|\cdot\|_2) \times N(\epsilon_n, (0, e^{Rn\epsilon_n^2}], |\cdot|)$, which is bounded as required by the second condition of (2), since $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \log n$. Finally, observe that $\Pi\{(\mu, \sigma^2) \notin \Theta_n\} \leq \Pi\{\mu \notin \sqrt{2}\mathcal{M}_n\} + \Pi\{\sigma^2 > 2e^{2Rn\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2}\}$. Since the prior of σ^2 has a polynomially decaying right tail, the last condition of (2) is satisfied provided that \bar{E} and R are sufficiently large. \square

In summary, the prior for σ^2 should be L -Lipschitz and exhibit a polynomially decaying right tail, and its density at the true σ_0^2 should satisfy the lower bound in (4). The polynomial decay is certainly a mild requirement. If σ_0^2 is bounded away from both zero and infinity, the condition in (4) is automatically satisfied whenever g is independent of n and is supported on $(0, \infty)$. To accommodate decreasing or increasing σ_0^2 , we consider the following two widely used priors for variance parameters. Below, $a_n \ll b_n$ means $a_n/b_n \rightarrow 0$.

Example 1 (Inverse gamma). Suppose that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \leq n^{-\xi}$ for some $\xi \in (0, 1/2)$, and let $g(s) \propto s^{-a-1} \exp(-b/s)$ denote the inverse gamma density with shape $a > 0$ and scale $b > 0$. It is easy to see that g is Lipschitz continuous, exhibits a polynomially decaying right tail, and that (4) holds if $b/(\xi \log n) \leq \sigma_0^2 \ll n^{\xi/(a+2)}$.

Example 2 (Half-Cauchy). Suppose that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \leq n^{-\xi}$ for some $\xi \in (0, 1/2)$, and let $g(s) \propto (r^2 + s^2)^{-1}$ denote the half-Cauchy density with scale $r > 0$. It is straightforward to verify that g is Lipschitz continuous, has a polynomially decaying right tail, and that (4) is satisfied if $\sigma_0^2 \ll n^{\xi/2}$.

3. Application

3.1. High-dimensional regression

Consider a high-dimensional regression model with $\mu_0 = X\beta_0$, where $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ is the design matrix and $\beta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p$ is a sparse vector. In other words, we assume $p > n$ but many components of β_0 are zero. We denote by $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ the maximum norm for both vectors and matrices. The support of the true signal S_0 and its cardinality $|S_0|$ are unknown. When σ_0^2 is known, the contraction rate of this model was studied by Castillo et al. (2015) under mild conditions. Here, we extend the analysis to the case of an unknown σ_0^2 under the additional restrictions that $\|\beta_0\|_\infty = O(\log p)$ and $\|X\|_\infty = O(\log p)$. We adopt a prior for σ^2 that satisfies the conditions for Theorem 4, and assume that $n^{-B} \leq \sigma_0^2 \leq n^B$ for some $B > 0$. We put a prior on the support S such that $\Pi\{S = \tilde{S}\} \propto \binom{p}{|\tilde{S}|}^{-1} e^{-A|\tilde{S}|\log p}$ for a constant $A > 0$. Denoting by β_S the components of β in S , we use the priors $\beta_S | S \sim N_{|S|}(0_{|S|}, \tau^2 I_{|S|})$ for $\tau^2 > 0$ and $\beta_{S^c} | S \sim \delta_0$, where δ_0 is the point mass at zero. The target rate is $\epsilon_n = \sigma_0 \sqrt{(|S_0| \log p)/n}$. We assume $|S_0| > 0$ and $(|S_0| \log p)/n \rightarrow 0$ such that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \log n$.

First, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\|X(\beta - \beta_0)\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon_n^2\} &\geq \Pi\{S = S_0\} \Pi\{\|X_S(\beta_S - \beta_{0,S})\|_2^2 \leq n\epsilon_n^2 | S = S_0\} \\ &\geq \Pi\{S = S_0\} \Pi\{\|\beta_S - \beta_{0,S}\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon_n^2 / (\|X\|_\infty^2 |S|) | S = S_0\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from $\|X_S\beta_S\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n|S|} \times \|X\|_\infty \|\beta_S\|_2$. Following the calculation in Section 7.7 of Ghosal and van der Vaart (2007) and using the lower bound for the chi-squared distribution function, $\Pr\{\chi_{k,0}^2 \leq t\} \geq (t/2)^{k/2} e^{-t/2} / \Gamma(k/2 + 1)$ for $t > 0$, it can be shown that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\|\beta_S - \beta_{0,S}\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon_n^2 / (\|X\|_\infty^2 |S|) | S = S_0\} &\geq 2^{-|S_0|/2} e^{-\|\beta_0\|_2^2} \Pi\{\|\beta_S\|_2^2 \leq \epsilon_n^2 / (2\|X\|_\infty^2 |S|) | S = S_0\} \\ &\geq e^{-C_1|S_0|\log p}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_1 > 0$. Since $\Pi\{S = S_0\} \geq e^{-C_2|S_0|\log p}$ for some $C_2 > 0$, the prior concentration condition follows. Next, choose the sieve $\mathcal{M}_n = \{\mu = X_S\beta_S : \|\beta\|_\infty \leq n, |S| \leq M_0|S_0|\}$ for a sufficiently large $M_0 > 0$. Noting that $\|X_S\beta_S\|_2 \leq \sqrt{n|S|} \times \|X\|_\infty \|\beta_S\|_\infty$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} N(\sqrt{n}\epsilon_n, \mathcal{M}_n, \|\cdot\|_2) &\leq \sum_{S:|S| \leq M_0|S_0|} N\left(\frac{\epsilon_n}{\|X\|_\infty|S|}, \{\|\beta_S\|_\infty \leq n\}, \|\cdot\|_\infty\right) \\ &\leq \binom{p}{M_0|S_0|} \left(\frac{3\|X\|_\infty|S_0|n}{\epsilon_n}\right)^{M_0|S_0|} \\ &\leq e^{C_3|S_0|\log p}, \end{aligned}$$

for some $C_3 > 0$, thereby verifying the entropy condition. Lastly, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\mu \notin \mathcal{M}_n\} &\leq \Pi\{|S| > M_0|S_0|\} + \sum_{\tilde{S}:|\tilde{S}| \leq M_0|S_0|} \Pi\{S = \tilde{S}\} \Pi\{\|\beta_S\|_\infty > n | S = \tilde{S}\} \\ &\leq 2e^{-AM_0|S_0|\log p} + 2M_0|S_0|e^{-n^2/(2\tau^2)}, \end{aligned}$$

which is further bounded by $e^{-C_4|S_0|\log p}$ for a sufficiently large C_4 , provided that M_0 is chosen to be sufficiently large. Therefore, the posterior contraction rate is ϵ_n with respect to $n^{-1/2}\|X(\beta - \beta_0)\|_2 + |\sigma - \sigma_0|$. The rate for $\|\beta - \beta_0\|_2$ can be obtained by imposing suitable compatibility conditions (see, e.g., Castillo et al. (2015) and Jeong and Ghosal (2021a)).

3.2. Adaptive nonparametric regression

We consider nonparametric regression with the target function f_0 belonging to the α -smooth Hölder space \mathcal{H}^α over a bounded domain, for $\alpha > 0$ (see Definition C.4 of [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#)). Although various Bayesian nonparametric methods have been proposed, including Gaussian processes ([van der Vaart and van Zanten, 2008](#)), we adopt a basis expansion approach ([Shen and Ghosal, 2015](#)). For simplicity, we focus on the univariate case with $p = 1$ although our approach can be readily extended to multivariate settings. To approximate f_0 , we employ B-spline basis functions, though alternative bases, such as the Fourier basis or wavelets ([Donoho et al., 1995](#)), can also be used. Let ψ_J be the q -degree B-spline basis of dimension J with K interior uniform knots, such that $J = q + K + 1$, and let β_J be the corresponding coefficients; that is, $f = \psi_J^T \beta_J$ and $\mu = B_J \beta_J$, where $B_J \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times J}$ is the basis matrix. For a precise definition of B-splines and their use in Bayesian nonparametrics, refer to Section D of [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2017\)](#) and [Shen and Ghosal \(2015\)](#). We assign priors $\Pi\{J = j\} \propto e^{-A_j \log j}$ for $A > 0$, $\beta_J \mid J \sim N_J(0_J, \tau^2 I_J)$ for $\tau^2 > 0$, and a prior for σ^2 that satisfies the conditions for Theorem 4. The target rate is $\epsilon_n = ((\sigma_0^2 \log n)/n)^{\alpha/(2\alpha+1)}$, for which we assume that $((\log n)/n)^{2\alpha} \ll \sigma_0^2 \leq n/\log n$ so that $\epsilon_n/\sigma_0 \rightarrow 0$ and $n\epsilon_n^2/\sigma_0^2 \geq \log n$.

Observe that $\|\mu - \mu_0\|_2 = \sqrt{n}\|f - f_0\|_n$, where $\|f\|_n = \sqrt{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n |f(x_i)|^2}$ denotes the empirical L_2 -norm. Classical approximation theory shows that for any $f_0 \in \mathcal{H}^\alpha$, provided that $q + 1 \geq \alpha$, there exists $\hat{\beta}_J$ with bounded $\|\hat{\beta}_J\|_\infty$ such that $\|\psi_J^T \hat{\beta}_J - f_0\|_\infty \leq C_1 \|f_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha} J^{-\alpha}$ for some $C_1 > 0$ (e.g, [De Boor, 1978](#)), where $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ denotes the supremum norm of a function (with a slight abuse of notation) and $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha}$ denotes the Hölder norm. We assume that $\|f_0\|_{\mathcal{H}^\alpha}$ is bounded. Since the B-splines satisfy the sum-to-unity property $\psi_J^T 1_J = 1$, it follows that $\|\psi_J^T \beta_J\|_\infty \leq \|\beta_J\|_\infty$. Therefore, for $\hat{J} = \lfloor C_2(n/(\sigma_0^2 \log n))^{1/(2\alpha+1)} \rfloor$ with a sufficiently large $C_2 > 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi\{\|f - f_0\|_n \leq \epsilon_n\} &\geq \Pi\{J = \hat{J}\} \Pi\{\|f - \psi_J^T \hat{\beta}_J\|_\infty \leq \epsilon_n/2 \mid J = \hat{J}\} \\ &\geq \Pi\{J = \hat{J}\} \Pi\{\|\beta_J - \hat{\beta}_J\|_2 \leq \epsilon_n/(2\sqrt{J}) \mid J = \hat{J}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Similar to Section 3.1, this is bounded below by $e^{-C_3 \hat{J} \log n}$ for some $C_3 > 0$, since $\|\hat{\beta}_J\|_\infty$ is bounded. Next, choose the sieve $\mathcal{M}_n = \{\mu = B_J \beta_J : \|\beta_J\|_\infty \leq n, J \leq M_0 \hat{J}\}$ for a sufficiently large M_0 . Using the inequality $\|B_J \beta_J\|_2 = \sqrt{n} \|\psi_J^T \beta_J\|_n \leq \sqrt{n} \|\beta_J\|_\infty$, the remaining conditions can be easily verified as in Section 3.1. Consequently, the contraction rate is ϵ_n with respect to $\|f - f_0\|_n + |\sigma - \sigma_0|$.

4. Discussion

In this study, we establish a local test function for the general Gaussian model in (1) and derive sufficient conditions for posterior contraction using a global test based on metric entropy. Although our applications focus on high-dimensional regression and nonparametric regression, the framework also accommodates other models, including sparse mean models and change-point models. The techniques for constructing our local test may be extended to other Gaussian models, such as time series and white noise models (see Sections D.6 and D.7 of [Ghosal and van der Vaart \(2007\)](#)).

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT) (2022R1C1C1006735, RS-2023-00217705).

References

- Birgé, L. (1983). Robust testing for independent non identically distributed variables and Markov chains. In *Specifying Statistical Models: From Parametric to Non-Parametric, Using Bayesian or Non-Bayesian Approaches*, pages 134–162. Springer.
- Birgé, L. (2006). Model selection via testing: an alternative to (penalized) maximum likelihood estimators. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques*, 42(3):273–325.
- Castillo, I., Schmidt-Hieber, J., and van der Vaart, A. (2015). Bayesian linear regression with sparse priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(5):1986–2018.
- Castillo, I. and van der Vaart, A. (2012). Needles and straw in a haystack: posterior concentration for possibly sparse sequences. *The Annals of Statistics*, 40(3):1367–1391.
- De Boor, C. (1978). *A Practical Guide to Splines*, volume 27. Springer-Verlag New York.
- Donoho, D. L., Johnstone, I. M., Kerkyacharian, G., and Picard, D. (1995). Wavelet shrinkage: asymptopia? *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)*, 57(2):301–337.
- Ghosal, S., Ghosh, J. K., and van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). Convergence rates of posterior distributions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(2):500–531.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2007). Convergence rates of posterior distributions for noniid observations. *The Annals of Statistics*, 35(1):192–223.
- Ghosal, S. and van der Vaart, A. (2017). *Fundamentals of Nonparametric Bayesian Inference*, volume 44. Cambridge University Press.
- Jeong, S. and Ghosal, S. (2021a). Posterior contraction in sparse generalized linear models. *Biometrika*, 108(2):367–379.
- Jeong, S. and Ghosal, S. (2021b). Unified Bayesian theory of sparse linear regression with nuisance parameters. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 15(1):3040–3111.
- Laurent, B. and Massart, P. (2000). Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *The Annals of Statistics*, 28(5):1302–1338.
- Le Cam, L. (1973). Convergence of estimates under dimensionality restrictions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 1(2):38–53.
- Naulet, Z. and Barat, E. (2018). Some aspects of symmetric gamma process mixtures. *Bayesian Analysis*, 13(3):703–720.
- Ning, B., Jeong, S., and Ghosal, S. (2020). Bayesian linear regression for multivariate responses under group sparsity. *Bernoulli*, 26(3):2353–2382.
- Polson, N. G. and Ročková, V. (2018). Posterior concentration for sparse deep learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31, pages 930–939.
- Ročková, V. and van der Pas, S. (2020). Posterior concentration for Bayesian regression trees and forests. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(4):2108–2131.
- Schwartz, L. (1965). On Bayes procedures. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*, 4(1):10–26.
- Shen, W. and Ghosal, S. (2015). Adaptive Bayesian procedures using random series priors. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, 42(4):1194–1213.
- Song, Q. and Liang, F. (2023). Nearly optimal Bayesian shrinkage for high-dimensional regression. *Science China Mathematics*, 66(2):409–442.
- van der Vaart, A. W. and van Zanten, J. H. (2008). Rates of contraction of posterior distributions based on Gaussian process priors. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(3):1435–1463.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-Dimensional Statistics: A Non-Asymptotic Viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge University Press.
- Yoo, W. W. and Ghosal, S. (2016). Supremum norm posterior contraction and credible sets for nonparametric multivariate regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(3):1069–1102.