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Supplementary Figures

Figure S1: Ranking (A), prediction (B) and selection (C,D) performance versus the rescaled sample size \( r = n/(s_0 \log(p - s_0)) \) for synthetic independence design scenarios. As Figure 1 in Main Text, but with SNR=0.5 (instead of SNR=2).
Figure S2: Ranking (A), prediction (B) and selection (C,D) performance versus the rescaled sample size $r = n/(s_0 \log(p - s_0))$ for a semisynthetic “high”-correlation design scenario. As Figure 1 in Main Text, but for a semisynthetic “high”-correlation design with SNR=2 and $s_0^p = 5$. 
Figure S3: Difference in performance between Dantzig and Lasso (Dantzig - Lasso) versus Lasso performance for ranking (A), prediction (B) and selection (C,D) in synthetic data scenarios. Each point plotted represents a synthetic data scenario (both independence design and correlation design scenarios are plotted). For A, C and D, negative values on the y-axis indicate that Lasso is outperforming Dantzig. For B, a positive value indicates the same.
Figure S4: A comparison of method performance in synthetic independence design scenarios: ranking. Each panel plots the ranking performance of one method versus the ranking performance of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to an independence design scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S5: A comparison of method performance in the synthetic independence design and semisynthetic “low” correlation design. Each panel shows a different metric and each data point within a panel corresponds to a specific scenario (defined by \( n, p, s_0 \) and SNR), with color indicating method.
Figure S6: A comparison of method performance in semisynthetic “low”-correlation design scenarios: ranking. Each panel plots the ranking performance of one method versus the ranking performance of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to a scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S7: Ranking performance (pAUC) versus $s_0^B$ (number of signals per block) for a subset of semisynthetic “high”-correlation designs. As Figure 3 in Main Text, but with $p=500$ (instead of $p=2000$) and all values of SNR are shown.
Figure S8: Ranking performance (pAUC) versus $\rho$ (correlation strength) for a subset of synthetic pairwise correlation designs. As Figure 4 in Main Text, but with SNR=2 and 4 (instead of SNR=1).
Figure S9: A comparison of method performance in synthetic independence design scenarios: prediction. Each panel plots the prediction performance of one method versus the prediction performance of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to an independence design scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S10: A comparison of method performance in semisynthetic “low”-correlation design scenarios: prediction. Each panel plots the prediction performance of one method versus the prediction performance of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to a scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S11: Prediction performance (RMSE) versus $s_0^B$ (number of signals per block) for a subset of semisynthetic “high”-correlation designs. As Figure 6 in Main Text, but with $p=500$ (instead of $p=2000$) and all values of SNR are shown.
Figure S12: Prediction performance (RMSE) versus $\rho$ (correlation strength) for a subset of synthetic pairwise correlation designs. As Figure 7 in Main Text, but with SNR=2 and 4 (instead of SNR=1).
Figure S13: A comparison of method performance in synthetic independence design scenarios: selection - TPR. Each panel plots TPR of one method versus TPR of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to an independence design scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S14: A comparison of method performance in synthetic independence design scenarios: selection - PPV. Each panel plots PPV of one method versus PPV of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to an independence design scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size \( r \) (categorized).
Figure S15: A comparison of method performance in semisynthetic “low”-correlation design scenarios: selection - TPR. Each panel plots TPR of one method versus TPR of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to a scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S16: A comparison of method performance in semisynthetic “low”-correlation design scenarios: selection - PPV. Each panel plots PPV of one method versus PPV of another method. Each data point within a panel corresponds to a scenario with color indicating SNR and symbol representing the value of the rescaled sample size $r$ (categorized).
Figure S17: Selection performance (TPR and PPV) versus $s_0^B$ (number of signals per block) for a subset of semisynthetic “high”-correlation designs. As Figure 9 in Main Text, but with $p=500$ (instead of $p=2000$) and all values of SNR are shown.
Figure S18: Selection performance (TPR and PPV) versus $\rho$ (correlation strength) for a subset of synthetic pairwise correlation designs. As Figure 10 in Main Text, but with SNR=2 and 4 (instead of SNR=1).
Figure S19: Comparison between Toeplitz correlation and pairwise correlation designs for ranking, prediction and selection performance. As Figure 11 in Main Text, but with SNR=1 (instead of SNR=2).
Figure S20: Comparison between Toeplitz correlation and pairwise correlation designs for ranking, prediction and selection performance. As Figure 11 in Main Text, but with SNR=4 (instead of SNR=2).
Figure S21: Semisynthetic (TCGA ovarian cancer expression) data analysis: “low”-correlation scenario with non-Gaussian error distribution. Semisynthetic training and test datasets were generated as described in the Main Text for the “low”-correlation scenario with $n = 100$, $p = 1000$ and $s_0 = 10$, but with 95% of error terms drawn from $N(0, \sigma^2)$ and the other 5% drawn from $N(0, (\tau \sigma)^2)$, with $\sigma$ set such that SNR=4 and $\tau \in \{1, \ldots, 10\}$. $\tau = 1$ represents the standard set-up with noise drawn from a single Gaussian distribution. Ranking (A), prediction (B) and selection (C,D) performance are plotted against $\tau$. Line color indicates method and results are averages over 100 replicates.