

Variable selection in convex nonparametric least squares via structured Lasso: An application to the Swedish electricity market

Zhiqiang Liao ^{*1}

¹*Aalto University School of Business, 02150 Espoo, Finland*

Abstract

We study the problem of variable selection in convex nonparametric least squares (CNLS). Whereas the least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (Lasso) is a popular technique for least squares, its variable selection performance is unknown in CNLS problems. In this work, we investigate the performance of the Lasso CNLS estimator and find out it is usually unable to select variables efficiently. Exploiting the unique structure of the subgradients in CNLS, we develop a structured Lasso by combining ℓ_1 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm. To improve its predictive performance, we propose a relaxed version of the structured Lasso where we can control the two effects—variable selection and model shrinkage—using an additional tuning parameter. A Monte Carlo study is implemented to verify the finite sample performances of the proposed approaches. In the application of Swedish electricity distribution networks, when the regression model is assumed to be semi-nonparametric, our methods are extended to the doubly penalized CNLS estimators. The results from the simulation and application confirm that the proposed structured Lasso performs favorably, generally leading to sparser and more accurate predictive models, relative to the other variable selection methods in the literature.

Keywords: High-dimensional data, Lasso, Variable selection, Nonparametric regression, Energy regulation

*Corresponding author.

E-mail addresses: zhiqiang.liao@aalto.fi (Z. Liao).

1 Introduction

Convex nonparametric least squares (CNLS) is a classical nonparametric regression problem with known shape constraints, dating back to the seminal paper written by Hildreth (1954). Imposing shape constraints such as monotonicity, concavity, and convexity on the regression function is a natural way to limit the complexity of many statistical estimation problems. A key advantage of the CNLS estimator over more traditional nonparametric estimation is that no tuning parameters (e.g., the bandwidth parameter as in kernel estimation) are required.

Estimation of convex functions spans a diverse array of management and economics applications. Examples include portfolio selection (Hannah and Dunson 2013), inventory management (Curmei and Hall 2023), and housing price prediction (Liao et al. 2024). Other applications include productivity analysis (Kuosmanen and Kortelainen 2012) and economics (Kuosmanen and Johnson 2020), where the production function is assumed to be concave and monotonic. The recent development of nonparametric convex regression is to estimate a sparse model with good data fidelity when high-dimensional data are available. Examples exist in a wide range of applications such as the analysis of productivity of Chilean manufacturing (Yagi et al. 2020), sustainable development evaluation (Dai 2023), and efficiency analysis (Duras et al. 2023).

Variable selection, a well-known problem in statistics and econometrics, is a process of choosing the relevant variables and screening out the irrelevant variables. The irrelevant variables may harm the regression models' interpretation and predictive power due to the sparsity of data (Stone 1980). There is a rich body of literature studying the variable selection in linear models (see, e.g., Tibshirani 1996, Zou 2006, Bertsimas et al. 2016, Hastie et al. 2020 and the references therein). However, variable selection under the framework of CNLS is a notoriously difficult problem. Lee and Cai (2020) and Dai (2023) develop the Lasso-based regularization for the CNLS estimators, by applying the ℓ_1 -norm constraints on the subgradients. It is shown that these methods make the subgradients of irrelevant variables small, but fail to zero them out completely. Dai (2023) further proposed the ℓ_0 -norm regularization for the convex quantile regression, where the author solved the best subset problem through the mixed integer optimization (MIO) formulation. However, the

MIO problem takes much longer to certify its optimality than the standard Lasso (Hastie et al. 2020), and, more importantly, the best subset method may suffer from the overfitting problem (Mazumder et al. 2023).

These difficulties motivate the current study where we develop a structured Lasso (SLasso) method for CNLS problems and formulate the optimization problems for the proposed SLasso-CNLS estimators. As mentioned before, the standard Lasso imposes a ℓ_1 -norm constraint on the subgradients but is oblivious to the structure of the subgradients and, therefore, fails to zero out the irrelevant variables completely. SLasso is different: as shown in Section 2.3, it merges the ℓ_1 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm into a mixed ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm, which encourages entire columns of the subgradient matrix to be zero, thereby screening out irrelevant variables. Moreover, SLasso-CNLS estimators could be recast as a convex optimization problem, which is much easier to solve than the MIO formulation used in the best subset selection (e.g., Bertsimas and Mundru 2021, Dai 2023).

In this paper, the quality of a model is evaluated within two criteria: (a) interpretation of the model—a parsimonious model is preferred when the number of variables is large and (b) accuracy of prediction on unseen data—the poor predictive performance can be seen as the drawback of a model. Like Lasso, SLasso has two effects, variable selection and model shrinkage, which therefore contribute to model sparsity and overfitting reduction, respectively (see, e.g., Meinshausen 2007). However, it seems hard to yield a parsimonious model that has good predictive power at the same time, especially when we use SLasso, which integrates ℓ_∞ -norm (or maximum norm) into the regularization and thus magnifies the shrinkage effect on the selected variables. A few recent attempts have been made to tackle this dilemma in CNLS. For example, Bertsimas and Mundru (2021) separated those two effects by using two penalties, including ℓ_0 -penalty and ℓ_2 -penalty, but it resulted in needing to solve a non-convex problem. Developing a convex relaxation of this non-convex problem warrants the current research.

This study is also motivated by the application in the Swedish electricity distribution networks, where our primary goal is to estimate a cost function that is convex and non-decreasing. Swedish Energy Markets Inspectorate (SEMI) has identified over 40 potential input variables after interviews with several electricity distribution system operators (SEMI 2021). Estimating a sparse cost model based on this high number of variables is

immensely challenging due to the effects of correlation between the input variables. Moreover, when contextual variables (for example, those related to climate and population) are presented in practice, the nonparametric assumption becomes unsuitable, instead, the semi-nonparametric model is often considered in the literature (Kuosmanen and Johnson 2010, Kuosmanen 2012), and consequently, it introduces additional challenges to sparse estimation. To address this problem, we propose the doubly penalized method that imposes two different penalty terms to the parametric and nonparametric components in the CNLS estimator.

We summarize the main contributions as follows.

1. We propose a SLasso technique that combines ℓ_1 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm. It tries to eliminate certain columns from the subgradients matrix and thus screens out the irrelevant variables. To explore a sparser model, we extend SLasso to the adaptive structured Lasso (ASLasso) method by adding weights to the ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm. We also derive convex optimization formulations for solving the SLasos/ASLasso problems (e.g., using commercial solvers like Mosek and Gurobi).
2. Since we integrate ℓ_∞ -norm (or maximum norm) into SLasso, it may lead to an aggressive model that is sparse but has too much shrinkage on the estimated subgradients. To balance the effects of variable selection and model shrinkage, we propose a relaxed version of SLasso with a two-stage procedure and derive explicit optimization formulations to solve the relaxed SLasso problems. A data-dependent way to select the optimal tuning parameter is described. By comparing the finite sample performances through the Monte Carlo (MC) simulation studies, we show that the proposed SLasso outperforms Lasso and that the relaxed version of SLasso performs even better than the standard SLasso.
3. This paper further contributes to the variable selection problem in the semi-nonparametric model. This model specification is important for modeling the heterogeneity of Swedish electricity distribution system operators (DSOs) and their operating environments—for example, it includes the temperatures as a contextual variable that indicates the operating environment of DSOs. Under the semi-nonparametric model assumption, we propose a doubly penalized method for the variable selection

problem in CNLS and then apply it to the SEMI data set. The empirical results show that the doubly penalized method does help estimate a sparse semi-nonparametric regression model.

In Section 2, we propose two new structured Lasso approaches and extend them to the relaxed version of SLasso or ASLasso. Then we design the convex optimization problems for solving the proposed CNLS estimators. In Section 3, we evaluate the finite sample performances of the proposed methods through MC simulations. An empirical application, where the semi-nonparametric model is considered, is prepared in Section 4. Section 5 concludes this paper.

2 Methodological Framework

2.1 Convex nonparametric least squares

Suppose we observe n pairs of input and output data $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$. We consider the following nonparametric convex regression problem

$$y_i = f_0(\mathbf{x}_i) + \varepsilon_i \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1)$$

where ε_i is a random variable with $E(\varepsilon_i) = 0$ and $\text{Var}(\varepsilon_i) = \sigma^2 < \infty$. The goal is to fit an unknown convex function $f_0 : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ from the given finite n observations. The least squares estimator is probably the most natural way to fit this convex regression function. The CNLS estimator is defined by solving the following optimization problem, that is,

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2, \quad (2)$$

where \mathcal{F} is the space of globally convex functions on \mathbb{R}^d . In a high-dimensional setting, we aim to choose the subset of variables that could recover the support of function f_0 . That is, we hope to recover the nonzero elements—also referred to as supports—in function f that are supported on $S \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ with the cardinality $|S| = s \leq d$. A popular way to achieve this is to add a sparse penalty to problem (2), leading to an objective of the form $\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - f(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 + \lambda P(f)$, where $P(\cdot)$ is the penalty function.¹ We refer the readers to Hastie et al. (2020) for more complete descriptions of sparse penalty functions.

¹One can recover the original CNLS problem as λ is close to zero (Kuosmanen and Johnson 2010).

This described infinite-dimensional optimization problem typically can be reduced to a finite-dimensional problem characterized by a piecewise affine convex function with n supporting hyperplanes (see, e.g., Kuosmanen (2008), Seijo and Sen (2011), Lim and Glynn (2012)). Specifically, with the sparse penalty function $P(\cdot)$, problem (2) can be rewritten as the following quadratic programming problem

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda P(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where θ_i represents the value of $f(\mathbf{x}_i)$, and $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the subgradient of the convex function f at point \mathbf{x}_i . For $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, d$, ξ_i^k is the k -th element in the vector $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$. Given the solution $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i, \hat{\theta}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to problem (3), we can express the estimated convex function as (Kuosmanen 2008)

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \{\hat{\theta}_i + \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^T (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)\}. \quad (4)$$

The objective function in problem (3) takes the form of *loss + penalty*, and λ is the tuning parameter that can be selected through cross-validation. The constraints in (3) are so-called shape constraints for imposing convexity (or, equivalently, concavity by setting “ \geq ” in the constraints). Note that by setting $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i = \boldsymbol{\xi}_j, \theta_i = \theta_j \forall i, j = 1, \dots, n$, we obtain the penalized linear regression model from problem (3).

2.2 The variable selection problem

In this paper, we consider the variable selection problem in CNLS. The most popular choice for such a problem is using Lasso, which adds the ℓ_1 -norm regularization to the estimators (Tibshirani 1996), due to its computational and theoretical advantages compared with other variable selection methods like best subset and forward stepwise (see the recent work of Hastie et al. 2020). Adding the ℓ_1 -norm regularization, the problem (3) takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_1$ is the ℓ_1 -norm. Note that there are nd individual subgradients ξ_i^k , for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, d$, in the penalty function. That is, we need to work with a matrix

$\boldsymbol{\xi} = [\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n] \in n \times d$ in CNLS problems. Specifically, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $k = 1, \dots, d$, let

$$\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_i^k)_{n \times d} = \begin{bmatrix} \xi_1^1 & \xi_1^2 & \dots & \xi_1^d \\ \xi_2^1 & \xi_2^2 & \dots & \xi_2^d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \xi_n^1 & \xi_n^2 & \dots & \xi_n^d \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

The sparsity problem in CNLS suggests a structured relationship (overlapping) between nd variables—it requires a column (n individual subgradients) in matrix $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ to be selected or set to zero simultaneously (see a demonstration below). The resulting nonzeros—also referred to as the supports of the subgradients of f —should share the overlapping structure in $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. For example, assuming the cardinality to be $s = d - 1$, we may desire a sparse model with the estimates as follows

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}} = (\hat{\xi}_i^k)_{n \times d} = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{\xi}_1^1 & \hat{\xi}_1^2 & \dots & \hat{\xi}_1^d \\ \hat{\xi}_2^1 & \hat{\xi}_2^2 & \dots & \hat{\xi}_2^d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \hat{\xi}_n^1 & \hat{\xi}_n^2 & \dots & \hat{\xi}_n^d \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

For demonstration purposes, we just canceled out the first column of the matrix $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}$, and other alternative columns of estimated subgradients could be set to zero when the number of variables is large.

Recently, during the preparation of this work, we became aware of the papers by Lee and Cai (2020) and Dai (2023), where two different formulations of Lasso were proposed and studied (we referred to as Lasso1 and Lasso2, respectively; see their explicit formulations in Section B.1 of the supplementary file). However, when regularizing with the ℓ_1 -norm constraints, the subgradients are treated as individual coefficients and, thus, their proposed Lasso methods may ignore the overlapping structure. Dai (2023) found that Lasso1 and Lasso2 cannot completely screen out the irrelevant variables in most cases. A similar observation can be found in the study of Xu et al. (2016): attempting to select variables by regularizing the subgradients with Lasso is ineffective; also see the work of Liao et al. (2024).

2.3 Structured Lasso

The above discussion suggests that the traditional Lasso methods may be oblivious to the overlapping structure among subgradients—they cannot select a block of subgradients (a column in the matrix (6)) or set them to zero simultaneously. This section builds SLasso and its adaptive extension ASLasso for the sparse regression problem in CNLS.

Given a parameter $q \in [1, \infty]$, we define the ℓ_1/ℓ_q -norm that combines ℓ_1 -norm and ℓ_q -norm as:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_q} = \sum_{k=1}^d \|(\xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \dots, \xi_n^k)\|_q, \quad (8)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}$ is the $n \times d$ matrix defined in (6) and $\|\cdot\|_q$ is the ℓ_q -norm. A key ingredient in ℓ_1/ℓ_q -norm is the combination of two norms where $\|\cdot\|_q$ operates on all elements of k -th column in matrix (6) and the sum of d components imposes the ℓ_1 -penalty. When setting $q = 1$ in (8), the ℓ_1/ℓ_q -norm reduces to the penalty term used by Lee and Cai (2020), where it operates on the *component-wise* subgradients and ignores their *column-wise* structure. For $q = 2$, the penalty term in (8) is frequently referred to as ridge regularization, which has been used in the penalized CNLS estimator to alleviate the overfitting problem (Keshvari 2017, Bertsimas and Mundru 2021).

With the target of variable selection, this paper focuses on an aggressive scheme with ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm penalty where we need to set q as infinity in problem (9). The main motivation for using the ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm penalty stems from the *shared sparsity* among the columns of subgradients $\boldsymbol{\xi}$. Intuitively, the ℓ_∞ -norm (namely, maximum norm or infinity norm) takes the maximum value over the elements $(\xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \dots, \xi_n^k)$ for a given column $k = 1, \dots, d$, and then the ℓ_1 -norm encourages the maximum element of a column to be zero or nonzero. Indeed, imposing the column-wise sparsity, namely eliminating all subgradients for the corresponding irrelevant variable, is the key motivation for using the ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm.

For a given tuning parameter $\lambda > 0$, the SLasso-CNLS estimator with ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm penalty can be recast as the following problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{SLasso-CNLS.} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Above, given a tuning parameter λ , SLasso might penalize the subgradients unfairly because the ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm assigns the same weights to d components $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ in (8). In such a case, SLasso may lose its advantage of making the model sparse enough. For high-dimensional CNLS problems, we desire a sparse estimator that applies a small penalty to relevant variables (to avoid overfitting) and a large penalty to irrelevant variables (to impose sparsity).

Leveraging the benefits of the adaptive Lasso (Zou 2006), we extend the ℓ_1/ℓ_q -norm to its weighted version. Given a parameter $q \in [1, \infty]$, we define the weighted ℓ_1/ℓ_q -norm as:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_q}^{ada} = \sum_{k=1}^d w_k \|(\xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \dots, \xi_n^k)\|_q, \quad (10)$$

where $\boldsymbol{w} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is a known weight vector. Again, by setting $q = \infty$ the weighted ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm helps encourage the maximum value in $(\xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \dots, \xi_n^k)$ to be zero or nonzero and, hence, impose sparsity on the estimated models. For a given $\lambda > 0$, suppose that we know the real-valued weights vector \boldsymbol{w} , thereby obtaining the ASLasso-CNLS estimator as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{ASLasso-CNLS.} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty}^{ada} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\boldsymbol{x}_j - \boldsymbol{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Note that the (weighted) ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm is convex, and both (9) and (11) refer to the convex optimization problem. Hence, we can use modern convex optimization techniques to solve (9) and (11) at low computational costs, such as using interior point solvers implemented in MOSEK and Gurobi, as stated in Seijo and Sen (2011). In this paper, we observe that the weights can be appropriately chosen through a data-driven method; see details in Section B.2 of the supplementary file.

While preparing this paper, we learned the work of Bertsimas and Mundru (2021) and Dai (2023), where the authors proposed and studied the best subset selection methods under the framework of CNLS. Bertsimas and Mundru (2021) proposed the sparse convex regression model with a cardinality constraint (where instead of using the convex and continuous norm, the authors study the non-convex and discrete ℓ_0 -norm). Dai (2023) studied ℓ_0 -norm regularized convex quantile regression. The ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm in (8) can be seen as a convex surrogate of ℓ_0 -norm, and SLasso can be seen as solving a convex optimization

problem. This allows us to solve the problem at low implementation and computational costs. Further, SLasso with ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm regularization has the effect of avoiding overfitting; in contrast, the ℓ_0 -norm does not have shrinkage effects on the nonzero variables. See Mazumder et al. (2023) for a discussion of the overfitting problem in best subset estimators.

2.4 A relaxed version of structured Lasso

The ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm regularization in SLasso/ASLasso (9) and (11) has two effects, variable selection and model shrinkage. On the one hand, the sparse regularization enforces a certain set of subgradients to zero and screens out irrelevant variables from the estimated models. On the other hand, it has shrinkage effects on the selected variables to avoid overfitting. However, it is not immediately obvious whether these two effects are tuned to be optimal using one single parameter λ , especially because we use the maximum norm in the ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -norm regularization.

In addition to SLasso, we consider a relaxed version of the structured Lasso for CNLS problems, motivated by the work of Meinshausen (2007). Meinshausen (2007) has shown that the relaxed Lasso, characterized by a two-stage procedure, outperforms the regular Lasso estimator. We utilize a similar two-stage method to build the relaxed SLasso-CNLS estimator. Let $\hat{f}^{slasso}(\lambda)$ denote the estimator defined in problem (9), implementing on the active set \mathcal{M}_λ that contains all nonzeros in SLasso solution. Let $\hat{f}^{cnls}(\lambda)$ be the original CNLS estimator (2), using nonzero variables that match the nonzeros of the SLasso solution. The relaxed version of SLasso is defined as

$$\hat{f}^{relax}(\lambda, \gamma) = \gamma \hat{f}^{slasso}(\lambda) + (1 - \gamma) \hat{f}^{cnls}(\lambda) \quad (12)$$

The relaxed SLasso-CNLS estimator \hat{f}^{relax} involves a pair of tuning parameters, $\lambda > 0$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. In the first stage, the parameter λ can thus determine the size of active set \mathcal{M}_λ by solving the SLasoo (or ASLasso) problems. The second stage gives rise to bias-variance trade-offs as we vary the relaxation parameter γ in problem (12). In effect, the relaxed SLasso tries to mitigate the aggressive shrinkage inherent in SLasso via controlling tuning parameter γ . When $\gamma = 0$, we estimate the original CNLS model with nonzero variables obtained from SLasso. If $\gamma = 1$, the relaxed SLasso would reduce to the original SLasso defined in (9). Given a value of γ between 0 and 1, the shrinkage on the estimated

subgradients will be relaxed to smaller magnitudes when compared to the original SLasso problem.

The reason we consider a relaxed method is straightforward: since we combine the maximum norm (or ℓ_∞ -norm) with ℓ_1 -norm in the structured Lasso, SLasso may impose an unnecessarily large amount of shrinkage on the estimated subgradients and thus cannot estimate an accurate model with low prediction errors. In this sense, we expect a relaxed estimator that could separate the two effects of variable selection and model shrinkage. The relaxed SLasso utilizes a two-stage procedure and controls these two effects by two separate tuning parameters: in the first stage, SLasso is implemented to control the number of nonzeros in the active set \mathcal{M}_λ , depending on the tuning parameter λ ; in the second stage, the estimator is tuned with γ to improve predictive accuracy. The simulated results show evidence of how the two tuning parameters could balance those two effects; for a graphical demonstration, see Section B.3 in the supplementary file.

Given the tuning parameters $\lambda > 0$ and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, we rewrite (12) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Relaxed SLasso-CNLS.} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \gamma \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty} \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda, i}^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}$ indicates that the estimated subgradients satisfy the requirements $\hat{\xi}_i^k = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and all $k \notin \mathcal{M}_\lambda$. The convex programming in (13) provides a solvable formulation for the relaxed SLasso-CNLS estimator. It can be easily extended to ASLasso by replacing the penalty with $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty}^{ada}$.

Theorem 1. For given parameters λ and γ , problems (12) and (13) are identical.

Proof. Proof See Section A in the supplementary file. ■

To choose the tuning parameters λ and γ , we propose to use cross-validation with grid search. Let $\hat{f}(\lambda, \gamma)$ denote a solution delivered by the optimization problem (13) (we drop the superscript “relax” for notational convenience). We consider a two-dimensional grid of tuning parameters in $\lambda \times \gamma = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_m\} \times \{\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_r\}$ with $\lambda_i > \lambda_{i+1}$ and $\gamma_i > \gamma_{i+1}$ for all i . We set $\lambda_1 = \|\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty}$ and $\lambda_m = 0$, and $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Let

$$\text{loss}(\lambda, \gamma) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{f}(\lambda, \gamma) - f^*)^2$$

denote the loss when estimating f^* with $\hat{f}(\lambda, \gamma)$. We would like to choose optimal λ and γ by minimizing $loss(\cdot)$. In cross-validation, the averaged loss value $loss^{avg}(\cdot)$ can be calculated by randomly splitting the data (see Hastie et al. 2009). Therefore, we choose the optimal parameters by $\lambda^*, \gamma^* = \arg \min_{\lambda \times \gamma} loss^{avg}(\lambda, \gamma)$. In our simulated results, we observed that five-fold cross-validation works quite well.

3 Monte Carlo simulations

3.1 Setup

Given n (number of observations), d (problem dimensions), s (sparsity level), ρ (correlation level), and SNR (noise level), we generate the synthetic data with observed response as (see, e.g., Bertsimas and Mundru (2021))

$$y_i = \sum_{k \in S^*} (x_i^k)^2 + \varepsilon_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n,$$

where $S^* \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ is the true support set with sparsity level $|S^*| = s$. We generate $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_i^1, \dots, x_i^d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from a normal distribution with zero mean and correlation matrix Σ , where $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ has entry (i, j) equal to $\rho^{|i-j|}$, $1 \leq i, j \leq d$, for some correlation ρ .² We draw ε_i from the normal distribution $N(0, \sigma^2)$, where σ is determined by the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR), $SNR = \frac{\text{Var}(f_0)}{\sigma^2}$. We note that the higher the value of SNR is, the lower the data noise level.

Selecting the tuning parameters. To choose the optimal tuning parameters, tuning is performed by minimizing prediction error with five-fold cross-validation on a separate validation set of size n ; see, e.g., Hastie et al. (2009). Lasso2 is tuned over 50 values of λ ranging from 0.1 to 5. SLasso and ASLasso are tuned over 50 values of λ ranging from $\lambda_{max} = \|\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{y}\|_{\ell_1 / \ell_\infty}$ to a small fraction of λ_{max} , and Lasso1 is tuned over the same 50 values of λ . When the relaxed version of SLasso is applied, 11 equally-spaced values of $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ are used for grid searching (500 tuning parameter values in total).

In the following experiments, we use the standard solver Mosek (9.2.44) within the Python/CVXPY package to implement optimization problems. All computations are

²Note that when $\rho = 0$, the variables are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.), and the higher ρ is, the larger the correlation among the variables.

performed on Aalto University’s high-performance computing cluster Triton with Xeon @2.8 GHz, 10 CPUs, and 8 GB RAM per CPU. The source code and data are available at the GitHub repository (<https://github.com/zhiqiangliao/HDCR>).

3.2 Statistical performance

We present a comparison of the finite sample performance of the proposed Lasso methods with the state-of-the-art methods on synthetic data sets with varying values of n , d , s , ρ , and SNR. We study how they perform for each combination of these parameters when the underlying model is sparse.

3.2.1 Evaluation metrics

Let $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ denote the estimated convex function in problem (4) using CNLS estimators with n training data. We draw $N = 1000$ independent test data $\{\mathbf{x}_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ (see Section 3.1 for detailed setup) and randomly sample the support set with size s from $\{1, \dots, d\}$. We consider the following evaluation metrics:

Prediction error: the prediction error (or relative accuracy) metric is defined as (Bertsimas et al. 2016)

$$\text{Prediction error} = \sum_{i=1}^N |\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) - f_0(\mathbf{x}_i)|^2 / \sum_{i=1}^N |f_0(\mathbf{x}_i)|^2,$$

where $\hat{f}(\cdot)$ denotes the estimated convex function and $f_0(\cdot)$ is the true convex function (i.e., $f_0 = \sum_{k \in S^*} (x_i^k)^2$). A perfect score is 0 (e.g. when $\hat{f}(\cdot) = f_0(\cdot)$), and the larger the prediction error is, the worse the predictive performance will be.³

Test error: this measures the test error,

$$\text{Test error} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i|^2.$$

Again, a larger test error indicates a worse estimator. We propose using this metric when the true functions are unknown, as is common in empirical studies.

³We note that Dai (2023) measured the “in-sample” prediction errors, whereas our prediction error metric is “out-of-sample”, where we take average value over the new $N = 1000$ test data instead of the training values $\mathbf{x}_i, i = 1, \dots, n$.

nonzeros: this is the number of nonzeros, corresponding to the nonzero columns in estimated subgradients matrix (7).

F-score: unlike the simple nonzeros, this metric measures the accuracy of the variable selection. The accuracy metric is also studied by Hastie et al. (2020), defined as

$$\text{F-score} = \frac{2}{\text{recall}^{-1} + \text{precision}^{-1}},$$

where recall is the true positive rate and precision is the positive predictive value. A perfect value of the F-score is 1.

3.2.2 Accuracy results

To appreciate the finite sample performance of the relaxed SLasso/ASLasso, we consider the variable selection accuracy and predictive accuracy; the average results appear in Tables 1 and 2 over 100 runs. We fix the sample size $n = 100$ and correlation level $\rho = 0.3$. We summarize our simulated results below:

Variable selection accuracy: to assess the variable selection performance of the relaxed SLasso/ASLasso, we study how they select the variables when we know the true support set. We present the results for varying parameters $d \in \{10, 50\}$, $s \in \{2, 4\}$, $\text{SNR} \in \{0.5, 2, 7\}$. The results of # nonzeros and F-score are presented in Table 1, with bold numbers indicating better results when we compare SLasso and ASLasso. We observed that ASLasso tends to obtain # nonzeros closer to the true support set size and yields higher F-scores than SLasso. Note that the higher the F-score is, the better the performance. In this sense, ASLasso selected a denser model than SLasso. When the dimensionality is high ($d = 50$), recovering the true support set becomes harder for them compared to the scenarios in the low dimensionality setting. We contend that increasing the number of variables (d) usually decreases the variable selection accuracy for both methods, especially when the SNR is small. The results for Lasso1 and Lasso2 are omitted from Table 1 because they are inefficient in selecting variables; additional experiments, demonstrating their effects on variable selection are presented in Section B.4 in the supplementary file.

Table 1: # nonzeros and F-score for relaxed SLasso/ASLasso for $n = 100$ and $\rho = 0.3$.

			# nonzeros		F-score	
			SLasso	ASLasso	SLasso	ASLasso
SNR = 0.5	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	8.00	3.15	0.463	0.858
		$d = 50$	35.30	5.60	0.188	0.517
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	10.00	5.20	0.571	0.855
		$d = 50$	41.35	5.85	0.173	0.522
SNR = 2	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	3.60	2.70	0.833	0.915
		$d = 50$	21.05	3.20	0.407	0.852
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	9.20	4.80	0.614	0.921
		$d = 50$	30.95	5.70	0.262	0.747
SNR = 7	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	3.20	2.45	0.823	0.940
		$d = 50$	3.95	2.15	0.885	0.973
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	8.05	4.50	0.678	0.951
		$d = 50$	24.55	5.75	0.338	0.819

Predictive accuracy: the predictive accuracy results are presented in Table 2. As expected, ASLasso seems to work the best regarding predictive accuracy. We observe that SLasso outperforms Lasso1 and Lasso2, though lags behind the ASLasso in terms of accuracy. The predictive power of SLasso and ALasso deteriorates fast when SNR becomes extremely small (e.g., SNR = 0.5), but they are still competitive compared to Lasso1 and Lasso2 across all SNR levels. All methods benefit from a lower noise level. A similar observation can be found in Dai (2023). In summary, the two new methods, the relaxed SLasso and ASLasso, show the best predictive performance overall. Next, we will compare the finite sample performance of the relaxed version of SLasso/ASLasso to that of the standard competitors.

Table 2: Prediction errors for Lasso1, Lasso2, and relaxed SLasso/ASLasso for $n = 100$ and $\rho = 0.3$.

			Lasso1	Lasso2	SLasso	ASLasso
SNR = 0.5	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	0.332	0.275	0.208	0.093
		$d = 50$	0.474	0.478	0.394	0.291
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	0.226	0.187	0.182	0.143
		$d = 50$	0.325	0.308	0.292	0.241
SNR = 2	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	0.199	0.174	0.070	0.040
		$d = 50$	0.380	0.380	0.260	0.082
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	0.153	0.137	0.125	0.069
		$d = 50$	0.270	0.267	0.206	0.126
SNR = 7	$s = 2$	$d = 10$	0.131	0.122	0.035	0.022
		$d = 50$	0.307	0.302	0.099	0.027
	$s = 4$	$d = 10$	0.114	0.108	0.081	0.042
		$d = 50$	0.237	0.237	0.153	0.067

3.2.3 Comparison between the standard and relaxed SLasso

As mentioned in Section 2.4, the relaxed SLasso aims to achieve both sparsity and predictive accuracy, whereas the standard SLasso may struggle to balance these two objectives. This section graphically compares the relaxed SLasso/ASLasso methods with their standard counterparts, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2. For SLasso in Figure 1, we see that the standard SLasso cannot make the estimated models sparse (see # nonzeros in Figure 1). In effect, we tune the parameter λ by minimizing the prediction error; in other words, the selected λ may not be optimal for a sparse model. The relaxed SLasso, with an additional tuning parameter γ , consistently delivers a sparser model than the standard SLasso. As is confirmed by the prediction error and F-score plots, the relaxed SLasso achieves the two goals simultaneously: it produces lower prediction errors and higher F-scores than the standard method.

The relaxed ASLasso, as shown in Figure 2, also produces a sparser model than its standard counterpart. However, unlike the standard SLasso, the standard ASLasso screens out some irrelevant variables. It can do so by utilizing the adaptively weighted ℓ_1/ℓ_∞ -penalty, which imposes extra penalties on the irrelevant variables. We observe that the relaxed ASLasso still outperforms the standard ASLasso, selecting a sparser model and obtaining higher predictive accuracy. Hastie et al. (2020) reported similar observations for relaxed Lasso as SNR varies.




Figure 1: Prediction error, test error, # nonzeros, and F-score for relaxed S_Lasso and standard S_Lasso as SNR varies, in the setting with $n = 100, d = 10, s = 2$, and $\rho = 0.3$.




Figure 2: Prediction error, test error, # nonzeros, and F-score for relaxed AS_Lasso and standard AS_Lasso as SNR varies, in the setting with $n = 100, d = 10, s = 2$, and $\rho = 0.3$.

4 Application

In this section, we experimentally investigate the performance of the proposed methods, in terms of variable selection and predictive accuracy, using data from SEMI over the years 2016-2019. SEMI annually collects technical, accounting, and market data from the Swedish electricity distribution system operators (DSOs). This data set has been applied in the work of Duras et al. (2023), where they study the variable selection problem in CNLS using the Lasso regularization. However, on the one hand, their method does not isolate the effect of contextual variables (or z variables) from production variables and, thus, suffers from the heterogeneity of the DSOs and their operating environments. On the other hand, selecting variables via Lasso seems inefficient in the context of convex function estimation, especially when we desire an accurate predictive model. In this section, we consider a semi-nonparametric, partial linear model to control the heterogeneity of the DSOs and then employ the relaxed SLasso to select a sparse predictive model.

4.1 The regulation of Swedish electricity distribution system operators

The DSOs usually enjoy a natural local monopoly due to expensive construction fees. In many countries, the energy regulator aims to monitor the electricity distribution networks, reduce their local monopoly power, and encourage them to reduce the total cost (Kuusmanen 2012). The regulation of electricity distribution networks typically involves two procedures: cost function estimation and cost efficiency analysis. Estimating an appropriate cost function is a fundamental and crucial step in the energy regulation problem. In this paper, we apply the proposed SLasso method for cost function estimation, which is assumed to be convex and non-decreasing, using the data provided by SEMI.⁴ In the second-stage analysis, SEMI could use the efficiency analysis method to calculate the level of economic efficiency for each DSO (see, e.g., Kuusmanen 2012). This paper focuses on the task in the first stage: estimation of cost functions.

After excluding some small DSOs that are outliers, we used 145 out of 154 Swedish distribution firms. The number of input and output variables is 25, and they have been commonly used in the literature (see, e.g., Kuusmanen and Nguyen 2020, Duras et al.

⁴The data are available in the study of Duras et al. (2023).

2023). Like the SEMI’s current model, we use the total cost (*TOTEX*) as the single output variable. The input variables (\boldsymbol{x}) and contextual variables (\boldsymbol{z}) are described in Section B.5 in the supplementary file, and a total of 24 variables are included. Inspecting the data, we notice that some variables dominate others in magnitude, indicating that the large variable is likely to dominate the function estimation. To eliminate the influence of this magnitude, we standardize the input and output variables for a more reliable estimation of cost functions.

4.2 Variable selection in the semi-nonparametric model

Many researchers have identified the parametric and linear characteristics of the contextual variables in the problem of cost function estimation (see, e.g., Kuosmanen 2012, Kuosmanen and Nguyen 2020, Yagi et al. 2020). They consider a semi-nonparametric model that retains the virtues of both parametric and nonparametric modeling. Unlike the nonparametric model used in Duras et al. (2023), we relax the nonparametric assumption to semi-nonparametric, partial linear when estimating the cost function. Suppose that we are given data $\{(y_i, \boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{z}_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we consider a semi-nonparametric, partial linear extension of the nonparametric regression model (1) as follows

$$y_i = g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \boldsymbol{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i \quad \forall i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (14)$$

where $g(\cdot)$ is a monotonic increasing and convex function and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is the coefficients of the contextual variables. Thus, we see that $f(\boldsymbol{x}_i, \boldsymbol{z}_i) = g(\boldsymbol{x}_i) + \boldsymbol{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ is a partial linear function: $\boldsymbol{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ represents the parametric and linear component and $g(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$ is the nonparametric and convex component.

While the semi-nonparametric model has been well-studied in the literature, the variable selection problem is a new research topic in the context of semi-nonparametric convex regression problems. Variable selection is a challenging task under the semi-nonparametric model because it includes selecting significant variables in both the nonparametric and the parametric components. To meet this challenge, we propose a doubly penalized CNLS estimator for the semi-nonparametric model by solving the following

optimization problem

$$\min_{g \in \mathcal{F}; \boldsymbol{\beta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - g(\mathbf{x}_i) - \mathbf{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + \lambda P_1(g) + \mu P_2(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (15)$$

where \mathcal{F} is a class of non-decreasing and globally convex functions. P_1 and P_2 are different penalty functions with corresponding tuning parameters $\lambda > 0$ and $\mu > 0$. Similar to problem (3), the infinite-dimensional problem (15) can be solved by the following convex finite dimensional optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}; \boldsymbol{\beta}} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i - \mathbf{z}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + \lambda P_1(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n) + \mu P_2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ & \boldsymbol{\xi}_i \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i \geq 0$ is the shape constraint for monotonicity. Note that problems (15) and (16) are equivalent. Before we define the explicit form of the estimated partial linear function, let us briefly discuss how to choose the penalty functions. First, we could replace function P_1 with SLasso or ASLasso and their relaxed extensions. Regarding P_2 for the linear regression part, let $P_2(\cdot)$ simply to be the Lasso regularization where $P_2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{k=1}^d |\beta_k|$.

Given the appropriate chosen penalty functions, we aim to estimate a sparse semi-nonparametric model $\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z})$. Let $\{\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i, \hat{\theta}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\}_{i=1}^n$ be the solution of problem (16). Then the estimated semi-nonparametric, partial linear model is defined as

$$\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{z}) = \max_{i=1, \dots, n} \{\hat{\theta}_i + \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^T (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)\} + \mathbf{z}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}.$$

where $\max_{i=1, \dots, n} \{\hat{\theta}_i + \hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i^T (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_i)\}$ (or simply denoted as $\hat{g}_n(\mathbf{x})$) is the estimator for nonparametric part and $\mathbf{z}^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ represents the linear regression estimator. The regularization in the doubly penalized CNLS estimator takes the form of “nonparametric penalty+parametric penalty”. As a by-product of our estimator, we derive an optimization problem in (16) that can be solved faster than the original problem defined in (3). This is because we separate the linear and convex variables, and estimating the linear part is much easier than estimating the convex component.

4.3 Variable selection and estimates

For the Swedish DSO application, we first compare the performance of the methods in terms of variable selection. We also compare our proposed semi-nonparametric model with SEMI’s current model, which is assumed to be nonparametric. In addition, we added three green energy variables, namely *Wind Power*, *Local Energy*, and *Solar Power*. By considering these green energy variables, we could evaluate the impact of renewable energy sources on the total cost of DSOs.

We also use the five-fold cross-validation procedure described in Section 3 to select the optimal tuning parameters λ and μ . In particular, we consider a two-dimensional grid of tuning parameters in $\lambda \times \mu$, where λ takes equally spaced 50 values over $[1, \dots, 100]$, while μ has 10 equally-spaced values in $[0.1, \dots, 10]$. Since we also compare with the relaxed methods, an additional parameter γ is tuned over 11 equally-spaced values between 0 and 1.

The results are presented in Table 3. “SEMI” represents the current model used by SEMI, “Lasso1” and “Lasso2” refer to the penalty term P_1 in (16), and standard and relaxed SLasso/ASLasso are also considered in the doubly penalized CNLS estimator. We observe that SLasso and ASLasso perform well in selecting variables for the semi-nonparametric model (14).⁵ However, SLasso obtains more variables than ASLasso generally. Additionally, ASLasso includes the variables that SEMI finds important in its report (Inspectorate 2021). Further, we see that the relaxed methods produce sparser models than the standard ones—they zero out all green energy and contextual variables.

Table 3 also provides evidence to show whether renewable energy production increases the monetary cost (shadow prices) of DSOs in Sweden. Considering the green energy variables in the Swedish energy system, we calculate the shadow prices for wind power, locally generated energy, and solar power. While the standard SLasso selected two relevant variables (wind power and local energy) as the principal variable, three methods (the standard ASLasso, the relaxed SLasso, and the relaxed ASLasso) screened out all green energy variables. This observation indicates that delivering renewable energy resources may not increase the total operational costs of DSOs in Sweden.

⁵Note that the blank space indicates a variable being zeroed out, except in SEMI, which considers only seven variables in its current model.

Table 3: Selected variables of the semi-nonparametric model by using different methods

Variables	SEMI	Lasso1	Lasso2	standard		Relaxed	
				SLasso	ASLasso	SLasso	ASLasso
Production variables							
LV Energy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
HV Energy	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LV Subs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
HV Subs	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
T-Power	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
S-Power	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Networks	✓	✓	✓		✓	✓	✓
ULVOL		✓	✓			✓	✓
ILVOL		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
LVUL		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	
UHVOL		✓	✓	✓		✓	
IHVOL		✓	✓	✓		✓	
HVUL			✓	✓			
Wind Power		✓	✓	✓			
Local Energy		✓	✓	✓			
Solar Power		✓	✓				
Contextual variables							
Temp		✓	✓	✓			
Industry							
Public							
Household							
Agriculture							
Commerce							
Density							
Growth							

4.4 Predictive performance

We now compare the predictive performance of the methods on the SEMI data set. We randomly split the data set into ten folds, train all the models on nine-fold data, and, for each model, calculate test errors and # nonzeros on the remaining one-fold data. The results are averaged over ten random splits. Note that the lower the test error is, the better the predictive performance. Recall that SEMI selected seven variables for their current model. This is a procedure based on interviews conducted with several Swedish DSOs and statistical hypothesis tests by researchers (see the report issued by SEMI 2021). Our

methods are different—the variable selection process is implemented automatically using the proposed methods.

Figure 3 shows that Lasso1 leads to the highest averaged test errors and Lasso2 yields the most selected variables. Similar to the results in MC studies, these two methods show difficulties in variable selection tasks under the semi-nonparametric model assumption. The SLasso/ASLasso shows a clear gain over the SEMI model in terms of predictive accuracy. Specifically, the test errors of our proposed methods, including SLasso and ASLasso, are much lower than the SEMI model. However, ASLasso outperforms SLasso in terms of predictive performance and model sparsity. Interestingly, the relaxed approaches have extra advantages over the standard ones: they selected sparser models and obtained lower test errors than the standard competitors. We note that the data variance in this empirical case seems to be high (for details, see Section B.5 in the supplementary file), thus adding extra difficulty to the variable selection task in this study.




Figure 3: Test errors and the number of nonzeros of the semi-nonparametric model by using various methods on the SEMI data set.

5 Conclusions

In this paper, we developed a framework for variable selection in CNLS estimation. Because of the special structure of the estimated subgradients, the standard Lasso penalty appears to be inefficient in estimating a sparse model—it can make many estimated subgradients small but might not completely zero out the subgradients of the corresponding

irrelevant variables. We, therefore, introduced the structured Lasso methods, including SLasso and ASLasso, for sparse CNLS estimation. The main idea behind these methods is to identify the unique structure of the subgradients by combining ℓ_1 -norm and ℓ_∞ -norm. A relaxed version of SLasso/ASLasso is further proposed to control variable selection and model shrinkage, thereby improving predictive power while preserving model sparsity.

The evidence from the MC study suggests that our proposed Lasso methods generally perform better than previous methods in the literature in terms of predictive accuracy and model sparsity. The conventional Lasso methods, Lasso1 and Lasso2, often fail to eliminate the irrelevant variables compared with the true support set, although they make most subgradients of these variables small. In contrast, SLasso and ASLasso can zero out all subgradients of the irrelevant variables and thus make the model sparse. We also observe that the relaxed version of SLasso/ASLasso obtains extra accuracy gains compared to the standard one, especially when the values of SNR are large.

When contextual variables are presented, a semi-nonparametric model is considered in the empirical study of Swedish electricity distribution networks. The doubly penalized CNLS estimator was introduced to yield a sparse semi-nonparametric model. The results suggest that the relaxed SLasso and ASLasso are the most effective methods for eliminating irrelevant variables and producing accurate predictive models.

We expect that the convex assumption can be weakened in the future; for example, considering estimating a quasiconvex or s-shaped function. Identifying the convex and linear patterns of the variables is another interesting direction for future research.

Acknowledgments

The author acknowledges the computational resources provided by the Aalto Science-IT project. The author gratefully acknowledges financial support from the Jenny and Antti Wihuri Foundation [grant no. 00230213] and the Foundation for Economic Education (Liikesivistysrahasto) [grant no. 230261].

References

- Bertsimas, D., King, A. and Mazumder, R. (2016), Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens, *The Annals of Statistics* 44, 813–852.
- Bertsimas, D. and Mundru, N. (2021), Sparse convex regression, *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 33, 262–279.
- Curmei, M. and Hall, G. (2023), Shape-constrained regression using sum of squares polynomials, *Operations Research* .
- Dai, S. (2023), Variable selection in convex quantile regression: L_1 -norm or L_0 -norm regularization?, *European Journal of Operational Research* 305, 338–355.
- Duras, T., Javed, F., Månsson, K., Sjölander, P. and Söderberg, M. (2023), Using machine learning to select variables in data envelopment analysis: Simulations and application using electricity distribution data, *Energy Economics* 120, 106621.
- Hannah, L. A. and Dunson, D. B. (2013), Multivariate convex regression with adaptive partitioning, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 14, 3153–3188.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. H. and Friedman, J. H. (2009), *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, 2 edn, Springer, New York.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Tibshirani, R. (2020), Best subset, forward stepwise or lasso? Analysis and recommendations based on extensive comparisons, *Statistical Science* 35, 579–592.
- Hildreth, C. (1954), Point estimates of ordinates of concave functions, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 49, 598–619.
- Inspectorate, S. E. M. (2021), Effektiviseringskrav för elnätsföretag - förslag på utveckling av metodik, *Technical report*. Available from: [ei.se](https://www.ei.se).
- Keshvari, A. (2017), A penalized method for multivariate concave least squares with application to productivity analysis, *European Journal of Operational Research* 257, 1016–1029.
- Kuosmanen, T. (2008), Representation theorem for convex nonparametric least squares, *Econometrics Journal* 11, 308–325.
- Kuosmanen, T. (2012), Stochastic semi-nonparametric frontier estimation of electricity distribution networks: Application of the StoNED method in the Finnish regulatory model, *Energy Economics* 34, 2189–2199.
- Kuosmanen, T. and Johnson, A. L. (2010), Data envelopment analysis as nonparametric least-squares regression, *Operations Research* 58, 149–160.
- Kuosmanen, T. and Johnson, A. L. (2020), Conditional yardstick competition in energy regulation, *The Energy Journal* 41, 67–92.
- Kuosmanen, T. and Kortelainen, M. (2012), Stochastic non-smooth envelopment of data: Semi-parametric frontier estimation subject to shape constraints, *Journal of Productivity Analysis* 38, 11–28.
- Kuosmanen, T. and Nguyen, T. (2020), Capital bias in the Nordic revenue cap regulation: Averch-Johnson critique revisited, *Energy Policy* 139, 111355.
- Lee, C. Y. and Cai, J. Y. (2020), Lasso variable selection in data envelopment analysis with small datasets, *Omega* 91, 102019.
- Liao, Z., Dai, S. and Kuosmanen, T. (2024), Convex support vector regression, *European Journal of Operational Research* 313, 858–870.

- Lim, E. and Glynn, P. W. (2012), Consistency of multidimensional convex regression, *Operations Research* 60, 196–208.
- Mazumder, R., Radchenko, P. and Dedieu, A. (2023), Subset selection with shrinkage: Sparse linear modeling when the SNR is low, *Operations Research* 71, 129–147.
- Meinshausen, N. (2007), Relaxed lasso, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 52, 374–393.
- Seijo, E. and Sen, B. (2011), Nonparametric least squares estimation of a multivariate convex regression function, *The Annals of Statistics* 39, 1633–1657.
- Stone, C. J. (1980), Optimal rates of convergence for nonparametric estimators, *The Annals of Statistics* 8, 1348–1360.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B* 58, 267–288.
- Xu, M., Chen, M. and Lafferty, J. (2016), Faithful variable screening for high-dimensional convex regression, *The Annals of Statistics* 44, 2624–2660.
- Yagi, D., Chen, Y., Johnson, A. L. and Kuosmanen, T. (2020), Shape-constrained kernel-weighted least squares: Estimating production functions for Chilean manufacturing industries, *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 38, 43–54.
- Zou, H. (2006), The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 101, 1418–1429.

Appendix

A Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. For a fixed λ , we first write the SLasso-CNLS estimator as

$$\hat{f}^{slasso} = \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\xi}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad (A.1)$$

$$i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

The CNLS estimator leads to the following convex optimization problem:

$$\hat{f}^{cnls} = \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad (A.2)$$

$$i, j = 1, \dots, n.$$

We then define the active set generated from the SLasso-CNLS estimator (A.1) as

$$\mathcal{M}_\lambda = \{1 \leq k \leq d \mid \hat{\xi}_i^k \neq 0, \forall i = 1, \dots, n.\} \quad (A.3)$$

where $\hat{\xi}_i^k, i = 1, \dots, n, k = 1, \dots, d$ indicates the estimated subgradient from (A.1). Therefore, $\mathcal{M}_\lambda \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$ can be seen as a set of indices of nonzero variables.

Given parameter γ , we rewrite the relaxed SLasso-CNLS estimator of problem (12) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{f}^{relax} &= \gamma \hat{f}^{slasso} + (1 - \gamma) \hat{f}^{cnls} \\ &= \gamma \left(\min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty} \right) + \\ &\quad (1 - \gamma) \left(\min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 \right) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda, i}^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad (A.4) \\ &\quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \\ &= \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}, \boldsymbol{\theta}} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \gamma \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}\|_{\ell_1/\ell_\infty} \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda, i}^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \\ &\quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

For simplicity of notation, we refer to $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\mathcal{M}_\lambda}$ as requiring that $\hat{\xi}_i^k = 0$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and all $k \notin \mathcal{M}_\lambda$. ■

B Supplementary Material

B.1 Details of Lasso1 and Lasso2

First, define the ℓ_1 -norm $\|\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{k=1}^d |\xi_i^k|$, Lee and Cai (2020) proposed the equivalent form of problem (5) by solving the following *loss + penalty* optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lasso1-CNLS.} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \sum_{i=1}^n \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_1 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Second, for $c > 0$, Dai (2023) considered a CNLS estimator with ℓ_1 -norm constraints on each subgradient $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$ (see also in Duras et al. 2023)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Lasso2-CNLS.} \quad & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_n; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n, \\ & \quad \|\boldsymbol{\xi}_i\|_1 \leq c, \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We note that Lasso1-CNLS is not equivalent to Lasso2-CNLS (for simplicity, they are also referred to as Lasso1 and Lasso2): Lasso2 imposes a ℓ_1 -norm constraint on each subgradient $\boldsymbol{\xi}_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, instead of the sum of all subgradients in Lasso1.

B.2 Data-driven ASLasso

The values chosen for the weight vector \mathbf{w} are crucial for the ASLasso-CNLS estimator. Here, we present a data-driven method for computing the weights. The weights are obtained as $w_k = 1/\|(\hat{\xi}_1^k, \hat{\xi}_2^k, \dots, \hat{\xi}_n^k)\|_2^2$, where $(\hat{\xi}_1^k, \hat{\xi}_2^k, \dots, \hat{\xi}_n^k)$ is the estimated values of subgradients from Lasso2. The data-driven version of ASLasso is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{\boldsymbol{\xi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}; \boldsymbol{\theta}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \theta_i)^2 + \lambda \sum_{k=1}^d \|(\xi_1^k, \xi_2^k, \dots, \xi_n^k)\|_\infty / \|(\hat{\xi}_1^k, \hat{\xi}_2^k, \dots, \hat{\xi}_n^k)\|_2^2 \\ & \text{s.t.} \quad \theta_i + \boldsymbol{\xi}_i^T (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}_i) \leq \theta_j, \quad i, j = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We used the Lasso2-CNLS estimator for computing the weights in (A.7), but an alternative consistent estimator for $\hat{\boldsymbol{\xi}}_i$ is possible. The Lasso2-CNLS estimator has been proven

to be consistent (Seijo and Sen 2011), and its estimated values of $\hat{\xi}_i$ well reflect the relative importance of variables. That is, as the observations go large ($n \rightarrow \infty$), the weights for relevant variables converge to a finite constant, and the weights for irrelevant variables become infinite.

B.3 Simulated results for relaxed SLasso

We next show the performance of the relaxed SLasso in Figure 4, with synthetic data when $n = 100$, $f_0 = \sum_{k \in S^*} (x_i^k)^2$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $d = 10$. The support set S^* of size $s = 2$ is randomly sampled from $\{1, \dots, d\}$. Figure 4 gives the results of prediction errors and the number of nonzeros with λ varying between 0.1 and 10. We observe that the standard SLasso (when $\gamma = 1$) faces the challenge of meeting the two goals of variable selection and model shrinkage, that is, tuning the parameter λ cannot produce a model having sparsity and good predictive performance, simultaneously. In contrast, the relaxed SLasso (when $\gamma < 1$) can achieve these two goals: for example, when $\gamma = 0.4$ and $\lambda = 3$, the relaxed SLasso selected a sparse regression model with two nonzero variables and the lowest prediction error around 0.05. The standard SLasso (shown as the purple color line in Figure 4) may obtain low prediction errors but have much more nonzeros than its relaxed version, e.g., when $\lambda = 1$; it may lead to sparse estimates but the resulting prediction error would be higher than the relaxed SLasso, e.g., when $\lambda > 3$. That is, the standard SLasso usually finds it hard to achieve the two goals by tuning the parameter λ . In most cases, the relaxed SLasso performs better than the standard SLasso, as the relaxed SLasso has an additional parameter γ that helps relax the model shrinkage effect.




Figure 4: The simulated prediction errors and the number of nonzero variables (# nonzeros) for the relaxed Slasso as the tuning parameters λ and γ vary. The prediction error is measured by $\mathbb{E}[\sum_{i=1}^n (\hat{f}(\mathbf{x}_i) - f_0(\mathbf{x}_i))^2 / f_0(\mathbf{x}_i)^2]$. Note that changing the value of γ does not affect the results of # nonzeros.

B.4 Illustration of sparsity

In this section, we observe the effects of variable selection of different penalties on the CNLS estimator. To illustrate this, we fix $n = 100$, $d = 10$, $\rho = 0.3$, and $\text{SNR} = 2$. In addition, we fix $s = 2$ and randomly sample the support set.⁶ To observe how different penalties behave in terms of variable selection, we calculate the values of estimated subgradients $\hat{\xi}_i^k$ for $i = 1, \dots, 100$ and $k = 1, \dots, 10$. For illustration, we sum up every ten estimated subgradients along the column. That is, $\hat{\xi}_j^k = \sum_{t=1}^{10} \hat{\xi}_{10j+t}^k$, for $j = 0, \dots, 9$.

Figure 5 shows the estimated values of subgradients based on the four regularization methods. We observe that some components in matrix $\hat{\xi}$ estimated from the Lasso1 and Lasso2 approaches appear to be very small for irrelevant variables (the white blocks in Figures 5a and 5b), but the values in a single column may not be zero completely. Note that when all the estimated values in a column are zero, the corresponding variable is considered to be screened out. We contend that attempting to select variables by regularizing with Lasso1 and Lasso2 is ineffective. In contrast, Slasso and ASlasso enforce certain columns to be zeros (i.e., the white columns in Figures 5), successfully selecting

⁶In this example, we choose two true variables as $S^* = \{3, 9\}$, but choosing different true variables is possible.

the two relevant variables or recovering the union of supports of the subgradients ξ_i^3 and ξ_i^9 for $i = 1, \dots, 100$.




Figure 5: Graphical illustration of the estimated subgradients from four CNLS estimators with sparsity penalties.

B.5 Data from Swedish electricity distribution networks

Table B1: Description of the used variables in empirical application

Variables	Description
TOTEX	(y) The total cost (SEK)
LV Energy	(x_1) Delivered low-voltage energy (MWh)
HV Energy	(x_2) Delivered high-voltage energy (MWh)
LV Subs	(x_3) Number of low-voltage subscriptions (Quantity)
HV Subs	(x_4) Number of high-voltage subscriptions (Quantity)
T-Power	(x_5) Maximum transmitted power (MW)
S-Power	(x_6) Total subscribed power of the network (MW)
Networks	(x_7) Number of network stations (Quantity)
ULVOL	(x_8) Kilometers of uninsulated low-voltage overhead line (km)
ILVOL	(x_9) Kilometers of insulated low-voltage overhead line (km)
LVUL	(x_{10}) Kilometers of low-voltage underground line (km)
UHVOL	(x_{11}) Kilometers of uninsulated high-voltage overhead line (km)
IHVOL	(x_{12}) Kilometers of insulated high-voltage overhead line (km)
HVUL	(x_{13}) Kilometers of high-voltage underground line (km)
Wind Power	(x_{14}) Input energy from small-scale facility (MWh)
Local Energy	(x_{15}) Input energy from local electricity production facility (MWh)
Solar Power	(x_{16}) Input energy from micro-production facility (MWh)
Temp	(z_1) Difference between the average outdoor temperature and the heating requirement
Industry	(z_2) The electricity consumption used by industries (MWh)
Public	(z_3) The electricity consumption used by the public sector (MWh)
Household	(z_4) The electricity consumption used by households (MWh)
Agriculture	(z_5) The electricity consumption used in agriculture (MWh)
Commerce	(z_6) Proportion of the electricity consumption used in commerce (MWh)
Density	(z_7) Density of customers (delivered electricity divided by the number of customers)
Growth	(z_8) Growth of customers (index measuring the growth (or decline) of customers)

Table B2: Descriptive statistics of Swedish electricity distribution networks data

Variables	$n = 145$				
	mean	median	std	min	max
Output variable					
TOTEX	241872.45	83281.13	758530.40	3633.84	6127093.52
Production variables					
LV Energy	460695.10	160271.87	1389008.54	4834.25	10238793.00
HV Energy	171223.19	52767.87	492540.72	0	3905075.25
LV Subs	36985.77	12091.75	116288.14	313.25	831068.25
HV Subs	49.49	18.75	158.89	0	1546.75
T-Power	145.47	50.70	434.38	1	3230.57
S-Power	151.43	51.00	474.66	27	3800.88
Networks	1212.06	312.00	4413.18	0	36376.50
Network variables					
ULVOL	29.41	1.00	165.88	0	1768.00
ILVOL	356.37	54.50	1341.90	25.5	10555.50
LVUL	1784.15	591.00	5885.68	0	50728.00
UHVOL	307.39	59.25	952.59	0	7275.50
IHVOL	200.41	9.50	896.20	0	7720.50
HVUL	662.08	188.75	2201.08	17.25	18537.25
Green variables					
Wind Power	19575.90	2850	66561.51	0	566875.75
Local Energy	84202.26	13063.75	244711.30	0	2030128.76
Solar Power	863.84	209.62	3556.82	0	30197.00
Contextual variables					
Temp	3635.33	3433.63	745.60	2820.75	6616.60
Industry	135107.47	44793.05	341722.33	17.45	3065867.74
Public	49276.51	13608.77	146523.83	129.41	1094052.09
Household	240058.15	77304.93	757564.39	2989.64	5711355.59
Agriculture	10532.64	2183.78	35577.74	1.00	353855.44
Commerce	178946.14	45000.59	567034.70	38.13	4701828.92
Density	18.27	16.76	5.87	8.69	56.05
Growth	101.98	101.79	1.90	98.01	108.27