

Learning from Untrusted Data

Moses Charikar

Stanford University

moses@cs.stanford.edu

Jacob Steinhardt

Stanford University

jsteinha@stanford.edu

Gregory Valiant

Stanford University

valiant@stanford.edu

Abstract

The vast majority of theoretical results in machine learning and statistics assume that the available training data is a reasonably reliable reflection of the phenomena to be learned or estimated. Similarly, the majority of machine learning and statistical techniques used in practice are brittle to the presence of large amounts of biased or malicious data. In this work we consider two frameworks in which to study estimation, learning, and optimization in the presence of significant fractions of arbitrary data.

The first framework, *list-decodable learning*, asks whether it is possible to return a list of answers, with the guarantee that at least one of them is accurate. For example, given a dataset of n points for which an unknown subset of αn points are drawn from a distribution of interest, and no assumptions are made about the remaining $(1 - \alpha)n$ points, is it possible to return a list of $\text{poly}(1/\alpha)$ answers, one of which is correct? The second framework, which we term the *semi-verified* learning model, considers the extent to which a small dataset of trusted data (drawn from the distribution in question) can be leveraged to enable the accurate extraction of information from a much larger but untrusted dataset (of which only an α -fraction is drawn from the distribution).

We show strong positive results in both settings, and provide an algorithm for robust learning in a very general stochastic optimization setting. This general result has immediate implications for robust estimation in a number of settings, including for robustly estimating the mean of distributions with bounded second moments, robustly learning mixtures of such distributions, and robustly finding planted partitions in random graphs in which significant portions of the graph have been perturbed by an adversary.

1 Introduction

What can be learned from data that is only partially trusted? In this paper, we study this question by considering the following setting: we observe n data points, of which αn are drawn independently from a distribution of interest, p^* , and we make no assumptions about the remaining $(1 - \alpha)n$ points—they could be very biased, arbitrary, or chosen by an adversary who is trying to obscure p^* . Our goal is to accurately recover a parameter of interest of p^* (such as the mean), despite the presence of significant amounts of untrusted data. Perhaps surprisingly, we will show that in high dimensions, accurate estimation and learning is often possible, even when the fraction of real data is small (i.e., $\alpha \ll 1$). To do this, we consider two notions of successful learning—the *list decodable* model and the *semi-verified* model—and provide strong positive results for both notions. Our results have implications in a variety of domains, including building secure machine learning systems, performing robust statistics in the presence of outliers, and agnostically learning mixture models.

The goal of accurate robust estimation appears at first glance to be impossible if the fraction α of real data is less than one half. Indeed, in the $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$ case, it is possible that the real and fake data are distributed identically, except that the mean of the fake data is shifted by some large amount; in such a case, it is clearly impossible to differentiate which of these two distributions is “right”. Perhaps, however, such symmetries are the *only* real problem that can occur. It might then be possible to output a short list of possible parameter sets—if $\alpha = \frac{1}{2}$, perhaps a list of two parameter sets—such that at least one is accurate. To this end, we consider a notion of successful learning called *list decodable learning*, first introduced by Balcan et al. (2008). In analogy with list decodable coding theory, the goal is for the learning algorithm to output a short list of possible hypotheses.

Definition (List Decodable Learning). We say that a learning, estimation, or optimization problem is (m, ϵ) *list decodably solvable* if an efficient algorithm can output a set of at most m hypotheses/estimates/answers, with the guarantee that at least one is accurate to within error ϵ .

A central question in this paper concerns which learning problems can be robustly solved in the above sense:

To what extent are learning problems robustly solvable in the list decodable sense? If the dataset consists of only an α -fraction of real data, in what settings is it possible to efficiently output a list of at most $\frac{1}{\alpha}$ or $\text{poly}(\frac{1}{\alpha})$ parameter sets or estimates with the guarantee that at least one closely approximates the solution that could be obtained if one were given only honest data?

The intuition for why strong positive results are obtainable in the list decodable setting is the following. Given a dataset with an α fraction of trusted data, the remaining data might do one of two things: either it can be fairly similar to the good data, in which case it can bias the overall answers by only a small amount, or the adversarial data may be very different from the trusted data. The key is that if a portion of the untrusted data tries too hard to bias the final result, then it will end up looking quite different, and can be clustered out. Given this viewpoint, the question of robust learning in the list decodable model becomes a question of the extent to which an adversary can *completely* obscure the inherent structure possessed by a dataset drawn from a well-behaved distribution.

Our investigation of robust learning has three motivations. First, from a theoretical perspective, it is natural to ask what guarantees are possible in the setting in which a majority of data is untrusted ($\alpha < \frac{1}{2}$). Is it the case that learning really becomes impossible (as is often stated), or can one at least narrow down the possible answers to a small set? Second, in many practical settings, there is a trade-off between the amount of data one can collect, and the quality of the data. For a fixed price, one might be able to collect

either a small and accurate/trusted dataset, or a large but less trusted dataset. It is worth understanding how the quality of models derived from such datasets varies, across this entire range of dataset quality/quantity. Finally, robust learning with $\alpha \ll 1$ provides a new perspective on learning mixtures of distributions—by treating a single mixture component as the real data, and the remaining components as fake data, we can ask to what extent a mixture component can be learned, independently of the structure of the other components. While this perspective may seem to give up too much, we will show, somewhat surprisingly, that it is possible to learn mixtures almost as well under these adversarial assumptions as under stochastic assumptions.

Semi-Verified Learning. When $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, the list decodable model handles symmetries by allowing the learner to output multiple possible answers; an alternative is to break these symmetries with a small amount of side information. In particular, in many practical settings it is possible to obtain a (sometimes extremely small) verified set of data that has been carefully checked, which could be used to determine which of multiple alternative answers is correct. This motivates us to introduce the following new notion of learnability:

Definition (The Semi-Verified Model). In the *semi-verified model*, we observe n data points, of which an unknown αn are “real” data reflecting an underlying distribution p^* , and the remaining $(1 - \alpha)n$ points are arbitrary. Furthermore, we observe k “verified” data points that are guaranteed to be drawn from p^* .

The definition of the semi-verified model is inspired by the *semi-supervised* model of learning (see e.g. [Chapelle et al. \(2006\)](#)). In semi-supervised learning, one is concerned with a prediction/labeling task, and has access to a large amount of unlabeled data together with a small amount of labeled data; the central question is whether the presence of the unlabeled data can reduce the amount of labeled data required to learn. Analogously, in our robust learning setting, we are asking whether the presence of a large amount of untrusted data can reduce the amount of trusted data required for learning. Clearly the answer is “no” if we make no assumptions on the untrusted data. Nevertheless, the assumption that a significant fraction of that data is drawn from p^* seems plausible, and may be sufficient to achieve strong positive results. We therefore ask:

To what extent can the availability of a modest amount of “verified” data facilitate (either computationally or information theoretically) the extraction of the information contained in the larger but untrusted dataset? What learning tasks can be performed in the above semi-verified setting given $k \ll n$ verified data points? How does the amount k of verified data that is needed vary with the setting, the fraction α of honest data, etc.?

The above definition and associated questions reflect challenges faced in a number of practical settings, particularly those involving large crowdsourced datasets, or datasets obtained from unreliable sensors or devices. In such settings, despite the unreliability of the data, it is often possible to obtain a small verified dataset that has been carefully checked. Given its pervasiveness, it is somewhat surprising that neither the theory nor the machine learning communities have formalized this model; we think it is important to develop an understanding of the algorithmic possibilities in this domain. Obtaining theoretical guarantees seems especially important for designing *provably secure* learning systems that are guaranteed to perform well even if an adversary obtains control over some of the training data used by the algorithm.

Relationships between the models. The semi-verified and list decodable models can be reduced to each other. Informally, given m candidate outputs from a list decodable algorithm, we expect to be able to distinguish between them with $\mathcal{O}(\log(m))$ verified data points. Conversely, if a model is learnable with k verified points then we can output $\mathcal{O}((\frac{1}{\alpha})^k)$ candidate parameters in the list decodable setting (since if we

sample that many k -tuples from the untrusted data, at least one is likely to contain only honest data). For simplicity we state most results in the list decodable model.

Our contributions. We provide results on robust learnability in a general stochastic optimization setting, where we observe convex functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ of which αn are sampled from p^* , and want to minimize the population mean $\bar{f} = \mathbb{E}_{p^*}[f]$.¹ Our results are given in terms of a spectral norm bound on the gradients ∇f_i . Therefore, we obtain robustness in any setting where we can establish a matrix concentration inequality on the good data — for instance, if the ∇f_i are sub-Gaussian and Lipschitz, or sometimes even with only bounded second moments.

From our general results (discussed in detail in the next section), we immediately obtain corollaries in specific settings, starting with mean estimation:

- **Robust mean estimation:** When $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ we can robustly estimate the mean of a distribution p^* to ℓ_2 error $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$, where σ^2 is a bound on the second moments of p^* . For α bounded away from 1, this improves upon existing work, which achieves error either $\mathcal{O}(\sigma\sqrt{\log(d)})$ under a 4th moment bound on p^* (Lai et al., 2016) or matches our rate of $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ but assumes p^* is sub-Gaussian (Diakonikolas et al., 2016). For $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$, which was previously unexplored, we can estimate the mean to error $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha})$.

Since our results hold for any stochastic optimization problem, we can also study density estimation, by taking f_i to be the negative log-likelihood:

- **Robust density estimation:** Given an exponential family model $p_\theta(x) \propto \exp(\theta^\top \phi(x))$, we can find a distribution p_θ with $\text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_\theta) \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{\sigma r}{\sqrt{\alpha}})$, where $\text{Cov}_{p_{\theta^*}}[\phi(x)] \preceq \sigma^2 I$ and $r = \|\theta^*\|_2$.

While density estimation could be reduced to mean estimation (via estimating the sufficient statistics), our analysis applies directly, to an algorithm that can be interpreted as approximately maximizing the log likelihood while removing outliers.

In the list decodable setting, our results also yield bounds for learning mixtures:

- **Learning mixture models:** Given a mixture of k distributions each with covariance bounded by σ^2 , and with minimum mixture weight α , we can accurately cluster the points if the means are separated by a distance $\tilde{\Omega}(\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha})$, even in the presence of additional adversarial data. For comparison, even with few/no bad data points, the best efficient clustering algorithms require mean separation $\tilde{\Omega}(\sigma\sqrt{k})$ (Awasthi and Sheffet, 2012; Achlioptas and McSherry, 2005), which our rate matches if $\alpha = \Omega(\frac{1}{k})$.
- **Planted partition models:** In the planted partition model, we can approximately recover the planted partition if the average degree is $\tilde{\Omega}(1/\alpha^3)$, where αn is the size of the smallest piece of the partition. The best computationally efficient result (which assumes all the data is real) requires the degree to be $\Omega(1/\alpha^2)$ (Abbe and Sandon, 2015a;b).

It is fairly surprising that, despite making no assumptions on the structure of the data outside of a mixture component, we nearly match the best computationally efficient results that fully leverage this structure. This suggests that there may be a connection between robustness and computation: perhaps the *computational threshold* for recovering a planted structure in random data (such as a geometric cluster or a high-density subgraph) matches the *robustness threshold* for recovering that structure in the presence of an adversary.

¹ Typically, we actually observe data points x_i , and f_i is the loss function corresponding to x_i .

Technical highlights. Beyond our main results, we develop certain technical machinery that may be of broader interest. Perhaps the most relevant is a novel matrix concentration inequality, based on ideas from spectral graph sparsification (Batson et al., 2012), which holds assuming only bounded second moments:²

Proposition 1.1. *Suppose that p is a distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathbb{E}_p[X] = \mu$ and $\text{Cov}_p[X] \preceq \sigma^2 I$ for some σ . Then, given $n \geq d$ samples from p , with probability $1 - \exp(-\frac{n}{64})$ there is a subset $I \subseteq [n]$ of size at least $\frac{n}{2}$ such that $\lambda_{\max} \left(\frac{1}{|I|} \sum_{i \in I} (x_i - \mu)(x_i - \mu)^\top \right) \leq 24\sigma^2$, where $\lambda_{\max}$ denotes the maximum eigenvalue.*

This result is strong in the following sense: if one instead uses all n samples x_i , the classical result of Rudelson (1999) only bounds the maximum eigenvalue by roughly $\sigma^2 \log(n)$, and even then only in expectation. Even under stronger assumptions, one often needs either at least $d \log(d)$ samples, or incurs a $\log(d)$ factor in the bound on $\lambda_{\max}$. In the planted partition model, this log factor causes natural spectral approaches to fail on sparse graphs, and avoiding the log factor has been a topic of recent interest (Guédon and Vershynin, 2014; Le et al., 2015; Rebrova and Tikhomirov, 2015; Rebrova and Vershynin, 2016).

Proposition 1.1 says that the undesirable log factor only arises due to a manageable fraction of bad samples, which when removed give us sharper concentration. Our framework allows us to exploit this by defining the good data to be the (unknown) set I for which the conclusion of Proposition 1.1 holds. One consequence is that we are able to recover planted partitions in sparse graphs essentially “for free”.

Separately, we introduce a novel regularizer based on minimum trace ellipsoids. This regularizer allows us to control the spectral properties of the model parameters at multiple scales simultaneously, and yields tighter bounds than standard trace norm regularization. We define the regularizer in Section 3, and prove a *local Hölder’s inequality* (Lemma 5.1), which exploits this regularization to achieve concentration bounds solely from deterministic spectral information.

We also employ *padded decompositions*, a space partitioning technique from the metric embedding literature (Fakcharoenphol et al., 2003). Their use is the following: when the loss functions are strongly convex, we can improve our bounds by identifying clusters in the data, and re-running our main algorithm on each cluster. Padded decompositions help us because they can identify clusters even if the remaining data has arbitrary structure. Our clustering scheme is described in Section 6.

Related work. The work closest to ours is Lai et al. (2016) and Diakonikolas et al. (2016), who study high-dimensional estimation in the presence of adversarial corruptions. They focus on the regime $\alpha \approx 1$, while our work focuses on $\alpha \ll 1$. In the overlap of these regimes (e.g. for $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$) our results improve upon these existing results. (The existing bounds are better as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, but do not hold at all if $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$.) The popular robust PCA algorithm (Candès et al., 2011; Chandrasekaran et al., 2011) allows for a constant fraction of the *entries* to be arbitrarily corrupted, but assumes the locations of these entries are sufficiently evenly distributed. However, Xu et al. (2010) give a version of PCA that is robust to arbitrary adversaries if $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$. Bhatia et al. (2015) study linear regression in the presence of adversaries, and obtain bounds for sufficiently large α (say $\alpha \geq \frac{64}{65}$) when the design matrix is *subset strong convex*. Klivans et al. (2009) and Awasthi et al. (2014) provide strong bounds for robust classification in high dimensions for isotropic log-concave distributions.

The only works we are aware of that achieve general adversarial guarantees when $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$ are Hardt and Moitra (2013), who study robust subspace recovery in the presence of a large fraction of outliers, and Steinhardt et al. (2016), which is an early version of this work that focuses on community detection.

²Since the writing of this paper, we were able to prove a stronger version of Proposition 1.1 that requires only bounded first moments.

Balcan et al. (2008) introduce the list-decodable learning model, which was later studied by others, e.g. Balcan et al. (2009) and Kushagra et al. (2016). That work provides bounds for clustering in the presence of some adversarial data, but has two limitations relative to our results (apart from being in a somewhat different setting): the fraction of adversaries tolerated is small ($\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{k})$), and the bounds are not meaningful in high dimensions (e.g. Balcan et al. (2008) output a list of $k^{\mathcal{O}(k/\gamma^2)}$ hypotheses, where γ typically scales as $1/\sqrt{d}$).

Kumar and Kannan (2010) and the follow-up work of Awasthi and Sheffet (2012) find deterministic conditions under which efficient k -means clustering is possible, even in high dimensions. While the goal is different from ours, their condition is similar to the quantities appearing in our error bounds, and there is some overlap in techniques. They also obtain bounds in the presence of adversaries, but only if the fraction of adversaries is smaller than $\frac{1}{k}$ as in Balcan et al. (2008). Our corollaries for learning mixtures can be thought of as extending this line of work, by providing deterministic conditions under which clustering is possible even in the presence of a large fraction of adversarial data.

Separately, there has been considerable interest in *semi-random graph models* (Blum and Spencer, 1995; Feige and Krauthgamer, 2000; Feige and Kilian, 2001; Coja-Oghlan, 2004; Krivelevich and Vilenchik, 2006; Coja-Oghlan, 2007; Makarychev et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2014b; Guédon and Vershynin, 2014; Moitra et al., 2015; Agarwal et al., 2015) and *robust community detection* (Kumar and Kannan, 2010; Moitra et al., 2015; Makarychev et al., 2015; Cai and Li, 2015). In these models, a random graph is generated with a planted structure (such as a planted clique or partition) and adversaries are then allowed to modify some parts of this structure. Typically, the adversary is constrained to only modify $o(n)$ nodes or to only modify the graph in restricted ways, though some of the above work considers substantially stronger adversaries as well.

Robust learning is interesting from not just an information-theoretic but also a computational perspective. Guruswami and Raghavendra (2009) and Feldman et al. (2009) show that learning half-spaces is NP-hard for any $\alpha < 1$, while Hardt and Moitra (2013) show that learning k -dimensional subspaces in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is hard if $\alpha < \frac{k}{d}$. More generally, algorithms for list decodable learning imply algorithms for learning mixture models, e.g. planted partitions or mixtures of sub-Gaussian distributions, which is thought to be computationally hard in at least some regimes.

Finally, there is a large literature on learning in the presence of errors, spanning multiple communities including learning theory (Kearns and Li, 1993) and statistics (Tukey, 1960). We refer the reader to Huber and Ronchetti (2009) and Hampel et al. (2011) for some recent surveys.

Comparison of techniques. We pause to explain how our techniques relate to those of other recent robust learning papers by Diakonikolas et al. (2016) and Lai et al. (2016). At a high level, our algorithm works by solving a convex optimization problem whose objective value will be low if all of the data come from p^* ; then, if the objective is high, by looking at the dual we can identify which points are responsible for the high objective value and remove them as outliers.

In contrast, Diakonikolas et al. (2016) solve a convex *feasibility* problem, where the feasible set depends on the true distribution p^* and hence is not observable. Nevertheless, they show that given a point that is far from feasible, it is possible to provide a separating hyperplane demonstrating infeasibility. Roughly speaking, then, we solve a “tainted” optimization problem and clean up errors after the fact, while they solve a “clean” (but unobserved) optimization problem and show that it is possible to make progress if one is far from the optimum. The construction of the separation oracle in Diakonikolas et al. (2016) is similar to the outlier removal step we present here, and it would be interesting to further understand the relationship between these approaches.

Diakonikolas et al. (2016) also propose another algorithm based on *filtering*. In the case of mean es-

timization, the basic idea is to compute the maximum eigenvector of the empirical covariance of the data — if this eigenvector is too large, then we can find a collection of points that are responsible for it being large, and remove them as outliers. Though it is not phrased this way, it can be thought of—similarly to our approach—as solving a tainted optimization problem (top eigenvalue on the noisy data) and then cleaning up outliers afterwards. Their outlier removal step seems tighter than ours, and it would be interesting to find an approach that obtains such tight bounds for a general class of optimization problems.

Finally, [Lai et al. \(2016\)](#) pursue an approach based on iteratively finding the top $n/2$ eigenvectors (rather than just the top) and projecting out the remaining directions of variation, as well as removing outliers if the eigenvalues are too large. This seems similar in spirit to the filtering approach described above.

Outline. Our paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we present our main results and some of their implications in specific settings. In Section 3 we explain our algorithm and provide some intuition for why it should work. In Section 4 we provide a proof outline for our main results. In Sections 5 and 6, we sharpen our results, first showing how to obtain concentration inequalities on the errors, and then showing how to obtain tighter bounds and stronger guarantees for strongly convex losses. In Section 7 we present lower bounds showing that our results are optimal in some settings. In Section 8 we present some intuition for our bounds, and in Section 9 we prove our main corollaries. The remaining sections are dedicated to deferred proofs.

Acknowledgments. We thank the anonymous reviewers who made many helpful comments that improved this paper. MC was supported by NSF grants CCF-1565581, CCF-1617577, CCF-1302518 and a Simons Investigator Award. JS was supported by a Fannie & John Hertz Foundation Fellowship, a NSF Graduate Research Fellowship, and a Future of Life Institute grant. GV was supported by NSF CAREER award CCF-1351108, a Sloan Foundation Research Fellowship, and a research grant from the Okawa Foundation.

2 Main Results and Implications

We consider a general setting of stochastic optimization with adversaries. We observe convex functions $f_1, \dots, f_n : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where $\mathcal{H} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a convex parameter space. For a subset $I_{\text{good}} \subseteq [n]$ of size αn , $f_i \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} p^*$ for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, and the remaining f_i are chosen by an adversary whose strategy can depend on the f_i for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$.

Let $\bar{f}$ denote the mean of f under p^* , i.e. $\bar{f}(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}_{f \sim p^*}[f(w)]$ for $w \in \mathcal{H}$; our goal is to find a parameter $\hat{w}$ such that $\bar{f}(\hat{w}) - \bar{f}(w^*)$ is small, where w^* is the minimizer of $\bar{f}$. We use r to denote the ℓ_2 -radius of $\mathcal{H}$, i.e. $r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \|w\|_2$.

This stochastic optimization setting captures most concrete settings of interest — for instance, mean estimation corresponds to $f_i(w) = \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, linear regression to $f_i(w) = (y_i - \langle w, x_i \rangle)^2$, and logistic regression to $f_i(w) = \log(1 + \exp(-y_i \langle w, x_i \rangle))$.

A key player: spectral norm of gradients. To state our main results, we need to define the following key quantity, where $\|\cdot\|_{\text{op}}$ denotes the spectral or operator norm:

$$S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|I_{\text{good}}|}} \left\| [\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)]_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} \right\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (1)$$

In words, if we form the matrix of gradients $[\nabla f_{i_1}(w) \cdots \nabla f_{i_{\alpha n}}(w)]$, where $\{i_1, \dots, i_{\alpha n}\} = I_{\text{good}}$, then S measures the difference between this matrix and its expectation in operator norm, maximized over all $w \in \mathcal{H}$. This will turn out to be a key quantity for understanding learnability in the adversarial setting. It acts as an analog of uniform convergence in classical learning theory, where one would instead study the quantity $\max_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \|\frac{1}{|I_{\text{good}}|} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} (\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w))\|_2$. Note that this latter quantity is always bounded above by S .

The fact that $f_i \sim p^*$ is irrelevant to our results—all that matters is the quantity S , which exists even for a deterministic set of functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$. Furthermore, S only depends on the good data and is independent of the adversary.

Scaling of S : examples. The definition (1) is a bit complex, so we go over some examples for intuition. We will see later that for the first two examples below (estimating means and product distributions), our implied error bounds are “good”, while for the final example (linear classification), our bounds are “bad”.

Mean estimation: Suppose that $f_i(w) = \frac{1}{2} \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, where $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)$. Then $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w) = x_i - \mu$, and so S is simply the maximum singular value of $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|I_{\text{good}}|}} [x_i - \mu]_{i \in I_{\text{good}}}$. This is the square root of the maximum eigenvalue of $\frac{1}{|I_{\text{good}}|} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} (x_i - \mu)(x_i - \mu)^\top$, which converges to σ for large n .

Product distributions: Suppose that x_i is drawn from a product distribution on $\{0, 1\}^d$, where the j th coordinate is 1 with probability p_j . Let $f_i(w) = \sum_{j=1}^d x_{ij} \log(w_j) + (1 - x_{ij}) \log(1 - w_j)$. In this case $\bar{f}(w) = \sum_{j=1}^d p_j \log(w_j) + (1 - p_j) \log(1 - w_j)$, and $w_j^* = p_j$, so that $\bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w^*)$ is the KL divergence between p and w .

The j th coordinate of $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$ is $(x_{ij} - p_j)(1/w_j + 1/(1 - w_j))$. In particular, the matrix in the definition of S can be written as $D(w) \cdot [x_i - p]_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} / \sqrt{|I_{\text{good}}|}$, where $D(w)$ is a diagonal matrix with entries $1/w_j + 1/(1 - w_j)$. Suppose that p is *balanced*, meaning that $p_j \in [1/4, 3/4]$, and that we restrict $w_j \in [1/4, 3/4]$ as well. Then $\|D(w)\|_{\text{op}} \leq 16/3$, while the matrix $[x_i - p] / \sqrt{|I_{\text{good}}|}$ has maximum singular value converging to $\max_{j=1}^d p_j(1 - p_j) \leq \frac{1}{4}$ for large enough n . Thus $S = \mathcal{O}(1)$ in this setting.

Linear classification: Suppose that $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I)$ and that $y_i = \text{sign}(u^\top x_i)$ for some unknown vector u . Our loss function is the logistic loss $f_i(w) = \log(1 + \exp(-y_i \langle w, x_i \rangle))$. In this case $\nabla f_i(w) = -\frac{y_i}{1 + \exp(y_i \langle w, x_i \rangle)} x_i$. It is less obvious how to compute S , but Lemma 2.1 below implies that it is $\mathcal{O}(1)$.

Sub-gaussian gradients: A useful general bound on S can be obtained assuming that the f_i have sub-Gaussian gradients. Recall that a random variable X is σ -sub-Gaussian if $\mathbb{E}[\exp(u^\top (X - \mu))] \leq \exp(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|u\|_2^2)$, where $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$. If ∇f_i is sub-Gaussian, then $S = \mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ if $\alpha n \geq \tilde{\Omega}(d)$:

Lemma 2.1. *If $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$ is σ -sub-Gaussian and L -Lipschitz for $f_i \sim p^*$, and αn is at least $d \max(1, \log(\frac{rL}{\sigma})) + \log(1/\delta)$, then $S = \mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ with probability $1 - \delta$.*

In most of our concrete settings (such as mean estimation), sub-Gaussianity of ∇f_i corresponds to sub-Gaussianity of the data points $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In some settings we will be able to obtain bounds on S under weaker (second-moment) conditions, as in Proposition 1.1.

2.1 Main Results

We can now state our main results. Our first result is that, just using the untrusted data, we can output a small ellipse which contains a parameter attaining small error under $\bar{f}$. This meta-result leads directly to our more specific results in the list decoding and semi-verified settings.

Theorem 2.2. Given n data points containing a set I_{good} of αn data points with spectral norm bound S , we can obtain an ellipse $\mathcal{E}_Y = \{w \mid ww^\top \preceq Y\}$ such that $\text{tr}(Y) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\alpha}\right)$ and

$$\min_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} \bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{Sr}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right). \quad (2)$$

Recall here that r is the ℓ_2 -radius of the parameter space $\mathcal{H}$. Also note that when Y is invertible, $ww^\top \preceq Y$ is equivalent to $w^\top Y^{-1}w \leq 1$, so Y really does define an ellipse. Theorem 2.2 shows that the unverified data is indeed helpful, by narrowing the space of possible parameters from all of $\mathcal{H}$ down to the small ellipse $\mathcal{E}_Y$.

To interpret the bound (2), consider the mean estimation example above, where $f_i(w) = \frac{1}{2}\|x_i - w\|_2^2$ with $x_i \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2 I)$. Note that $\bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w^*) = \frac{1}{2}\|w - \mu\|_2^2$. Assuming that $\|\mu\|_2$ is known to within a constant factor, we can take $\mathcal{H}$ to be the ℓ_2 -ball of radius $r = \|\mu\|_2$. This leads to the bound $\|w - \mu\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sigma\|\mu\|_2/\sqrt{\alpha})$, for some w in an ellipse of trace $\frac{\|\mu\|_2^2}{\alpha}$. Note that the ℓ_2 -ball itself has trace $d\|\mu\|_2^2$, so the ellipse $\mathcal{E}_Y$ is much smaller than $\mathcal{H}$ if d is large. Moreover, a random $x_i \sim p^*$ will have $\|x_i - \mu\|_2^2 \approx d\sigma^2$, so w is much closer to μ than a random draw from p^* , assuming that $\|\mu\|_2 \ll d\sigma$.

By applying our algorithm multiple times we can improve the bound $\|w - \mu\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sigma\|\mu\|_2/\sqrt{\alpha})$ to $\|w - \mu\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}(\sigma^2/\alpha)$, so that our bounds are meaningful for large d independent of $\|\mu\|_2$. We discuss this in more detail in Section 6.

For an example where Theorem 2.2 is less meaningful, consider the linear classification example from above. In that case $S = \mathcal{O}(1)$, and r is likely also $\mathcal{O}(1)$, so we obtain the bound $\bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w^*) = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{\alpha})$. However, $\bar{f}(0) = \log(2)$ while $\bar{f}(w^*) \geq 0$, so this bound is essentially vacuous.

List decodable learning. Using Theorem 2.2 as a starting point we can derive bounds for both models defined in Section 1, starting with the list decodable model. Here, we must make the further assumption that the f_i are κ -strongly convex, meaning that $f_i(w') - f_i(w) \geq (w' - w)^\top \nabla f_i(w) + \frac{\kappa}{2}\|w' - w\|_2^2$. The strong convexity allows us to show that for the good f_i , the parameters $\hat{w}_i = \arg \min_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} f_i(w)$ concentrate around w^* , with radius $r' \ll r$. By clustering the $\hat{w}_i$ and iteratively re-running our algorithm on each cluster, we can obtain bounds that do not depend on r , and output a single candidate parameter $\hat{w}_j$ for each cluster. We can thereby show:

Theorem 2.3. Suppose the functions f_i are κ -strongly convex, and suppose there is a set I_{good} of size αn with spectral norm bound S . Then, for any $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, it is possible to obtain a set of $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha} \rfloor$ candidate parameters $\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_m$, such that $\min_{j=1}^m \|\hat{w}_j - w^*\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{S}{\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\frac{2}{\alpha\varepsilon})}{\alpha\varepsilon}}\right)$.

In Section 6 we state and prove a stronger version of this result. A key tool in establishing Theorem 2.3 is *padded decompositions* (Fakcharoenphol et al., 2003), which identify clusters in data while making minimal assumptions on the geometry of points outside of a cluster, and are thus useful in our adversarial setting.

Semi-verified learning. If the f_i are not strongly convex then we cannot employ the clustering ideas above. However, because we have reduced $\mathcal{H}$ to the much smaller set $\mathcal{E}_Y$, we can nevertheless often approximate w^* with only a small amount of verified data. In fact, in some settings we only need a single verified data point:

Lemma 2.4. Suppose that $f(w) = \phi(w^\top x)$, where ϕ is 1-Lipschitz, and suppose that x has bounded q th moments in the sense that $\mathbb{E}_{p^*}[|\langle x - \mathbb{E}[x], u \rangle|^q]^{1/q} \leq \sigma_q$ for all unit vectors u and some $q \geq 2$. Then given Y

from Theorem 2.2 and a single verified $x \sim p^*$, we can obtain a $\hat{w}$ such that $\mathbb{P}_{x \sim p^*} \left[\bar{f}(\hat{w}) \geq \bar{f}(w^*) + C \cdot \frac{(S+t\sigma_q)r}{\sqrt{\alpha}} \right] \leq t^{-q}$, for a universal constant C .

The particular functional form for f_i was needed to obtain a concrete bound, but analogs of Lemma 2.4 should be possible in any setting where we can leverage the low complexity of $\mathcal{E}_Y$ into a bound on $f - \bar{f}$. Note that if we replace $\mathcal{E}_Y$ with $\mathcal{H}$ in Lemma 2.4, then the $\frac{r}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$ dependence becomes $r\sqrt{d}$, which is usually vacuous.

Optimality? The dependence on S , r and κ in the results above seems essentially necessary, though the optimal dependence on α is less clear. In Section 7 we show lower bounds for robust mean estimation even if p^* is known to be Gaussian. These bounds roughly translate to a lower bound of $\Omega(\frac{S}{\kappa} \sqrt{\log(1/\alpha)})$ for strongly convex f_i , and $\Omega(Sr \sqrt{\log(1/\alpha)})$ for linear f_i , and hold in both the list decodable and semi-verified settings. It is unclear whether the optimal dependence on α is $\sqrt{1/\alpha}$ or $\sqrt{\log(1/\alpha)}$ or somewhere between. We do note that any dependence better than $\sqrt{1/\alpha}$ would improve the best known results for efficiently solving k -means for well-separated clusters, which may suggest at least a computational barrier to achieving $\sqrt{\log(1/\alpha)}$.

2.2 Implications

We now go over some implications of our general results in some more specific settings. All of the results below follow as corollaries of our main theorems, and are proved in Section 9.

Robust mean estimation. Suppose we observe points $x_1, \dots, x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, of which αn are drawn from a distribution p^* with bounded covariance, and our goal is to recover the mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}_{x \sim p^*}[x]$. If we take $f_i(w) = \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, then Theorem 2.3, together with the matrix concentration bound Proposition 1.1, implies the following result:

Corollary 2.5. *Suppose that p^* has bounded covariance: $\text{Cov}_{p^*}[x] \preceq \sigma^2 I$. Then, for $n \geq \frac{d}{\alpha}$, with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\alpha n))$ it is possible to output $m \leq \mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{\alpha})$ candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$ such that $\min_{j=1}^m \|\mu - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\sigma \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$. Moreover, if $\alpha \geq 0.51$ then we can take $m = 1$.*

We can compare to the results of Lai et al. (2016) and Diakonikolas et al. (2016), who study mean estimation when $\alpha > \frac{1}{2}$ and one is required to output a single parameter (i.e., $m = 1$). For simplicity take $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$. Roughly, Lai et al. (2016) obtain error $\mathcal{O}(\sigma \sqrt{\log(d)})$ with sample complexity $n = \mathcal{O}(d)$, while requiring a bound on the fourth moments of p^* ; Diakonikolas et al. (2016) obtain error $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ with sample complexity $n = \mathcal{O}(d^3)$, and require p^* to be Gaussian. Corollary 2.5 improves both of these by yielding error $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ with sample complexity $n = \mathcal{O}(d)$, and only requires p^* to have bounded second moments.³ We note that in contrast to our results, these other results obtain error that vanishes as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$ (at a rate of $(1 - \alpha)^{1/2}$ in the first case and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(1 - \alpha)$ in the second case). We thus appear to incur some looseness when $\alpha \approx 1$, in exchange for obtaining results in the previously unexplored setting $\alpha \leq \frac{1}{2}$. It would be interesting to obtain a single algorithm that both applies when $\alpha \ll 1$ and achieves vanishing error as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$.

³ Some fine print: Diakonikolas et al. also estimate the covariance matrix, and their recovery results are stronger if $\Sigma = \text{Cov}[x]$ is highly skewed; they roughly show $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_{\Sigma^{-1}} = \mathcal{O}(1)$. The adversary model considered in both of these other papers is also slightly more general than ours: first n points are drawn from p^* and then an adversary is allowed to corrupt $(1 - \alpha)n$ of the points. However, it is straightforward to show (by monotonicity of the operator norm) that our bounds will be worse by at most a $1/\sqrt{\alpha}$ factor in this stricter setting, which is a constant if $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$.

Learning mixture of distributions. In addition to robust mean estimation, we can use our results to efficiently learn mixtures of distributions, by thinking of a single mixture component as the good data and the remaining mixture components as bad data. Again applying Theorem 2.2 to $f_i(w) = \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, we obtain the following result, which says that we can successfully cluster samples from a mixture of distributions, even in the presence of arbitrary corruptions, provided the cluster means are separated in ℓ_2 distance by $\tilde{\Omega}(\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha})$.

Corollary 2.6. *Suppose we are given n samples, where each sample either comes from one of k distributions $p_1^*, \dots, p_k^*$ (with $\text{Cov}_{p_i^*}[x] \preceq \sigma^2 I$ for all i), or is arbitrary. Let μ_i be the mean of p_i^* , let α_i be the fraction of points from p_i^* , and let $\alpha = \min_{i=1}^k \alpha_i$. Then if $n \geq \frac{d}{\alpha}$, with probability $1 - k \exp(-\Omega(\alpha \varepsilon^2 n))$ we can obtain a partition $T_1, \dots, T_m$ of $[n]$ and corresponding candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$ such that: for all but $\varepsilon \alpha_i n$ of the points drawn from p_i^* , the point is assigned a set T_j and candidate mean $\hat{\mu}_j$ with $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(\frac{2}{\alpha})}{\alpha}}\right)$. Moreover, $m \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$.*

The $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$ dependence can be replaced with $\sqrt{\log(n)/\varepsilon}$, or with $\sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)}$ if the x_i are sub-Gaussian. The only difference is in which matrix concentration bound we apply to the x_i . Corollary 2.6 says that we can partition the points into $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$ sets, such that two points from well-separated clusters are unlikely to end up in the same set. Note however that one cluster might be partitioned into multiple sets. In the adversarial setting, this seems unavoidable, since an adversary could create a fake cluster very close to a real cluster, and one would be forced to either combine the clusters or risk splitting the real cluster in two.

For comparison, the best computationally efficient algorithm for clustering a mixture of k distributions (with few/no corruptions) requires mean separation roughly $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma\sqrt{k})$ (Awasthi and Sheffet, 2012; Achlioptas and McSherry, 2005), which our result matches if $\alpha = \Omega(1/k)$.

Planted partitions. We next consider implications of our results in a version of the planted partition model (McSherry, 2001). In this model we observe a random directed graph, represented as a matrix $A \in \{0, 1\}^{n \times n}$. For disjoint subsets $I_1, \dots, I_k$ of $[n]$, we generate edges as follows: (i) If $u, v \in I_i$, then $p(A_{uv} = 1) = \frac{a}{n}$. (ii) If $u \in I_i, v \notin I_i$, then $p(A_{uv} = 1) = \frac{b}{n}$. (iii) If $u \notin \cup_{i=1}^k I_i$, the edges emanating from u can be arbitrary. In contrast to the typical planted partition model, we allow some number of corrupted vertices not belonging to any of the I_i . In general a and b could depend on the partition indices i, j , but we omit this for simplicity.

Note that the distribution over the row A_u is the same for all $u \in I_i$. By taking this distribution to be the distribution p^* , Theorem 2.3 yields the following result:

Corollary 2.7. *For the planted partition model above, let $\alpha = \min_{i=1}^k \frac{|I_i|}{n}$. Then, with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\alpha n))$, we can obtain sets $T_1, \dots, T_m \subseteq [n]$, with $m \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{\alpha}\right)$, such that for all $i \in [k]$, there is a $j \in [m]$ with $|I_i \triangle T_j| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a \log(\frac{2}{\alpha})}{\alpha^2(a-b)^2}\right) n$, where $\triangle$ denotes symmetric difference.*

This shows that we can approximately recover the planted partition, even in the presence of arbitrary corruptions, provided $\frac{(a-b)^2}{a} \gg \frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^3}$ (since the bound on $|I_i \triangle T_j|$ needs to be less than αn to be meaningful). In contrast, the best efficient methods (assuming no corruptions) roughly require $\frac{(a-b)^2}{a+(k-1)b} \gg k$ in the case of k equal-sized communities (Abbe and Sandon, 2015a;b). In the simplifying setting where $b = \frac{1}{2}a$, our bounds require $a \gg k^3 \log(k)$ while existing bounds require $a \gg k^2$. The case of unequal size communities is more complex, but roughly, our bounds require $a \gg \frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^3}$ in contrast to $a \gg \frac{1}{\alpha^2}$.

Summary. For robust mean estimation, we match the best existing error bounds of $\mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ when $\alpha = \frac{3}{4}$, under weaker assumptions. For learning mixtures distributions, we match the best bound of $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(\sigma\sqrt{k})$ when $\alpha = \Omega(1/k)$. For recovering planted partitions, we require average degree $k^3 \log(k)$, in contrast to the best known bound of k^2 . It is pleasing that a single meta-algorithm is capable of matching or nearly matching the best rate in these settings, despite allowing for arbitrary corruptions. We can also achieve bounds for robust density estimation, presented in Section 9.

3 Algorithm

In this section we present our algorithm, which consists of an SDP coupled with an outlier removal step. At a high level, our algorithm works as follows: first, we give *each function* f_i its own parameter vector w_i , and minimize $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w_i)$ subject to regularization which ensures the w_i remain close to each other; formally, we bound the w_i to lie within a small ellipse. The reason for doing this is that the different w_i are now only coupled via this regularization, and so the influence of adversarial data on the good parameters can only come from its effect on the shape of the ellipse. We will show that whenever the adversaries affect the shape of the ellipse more than a small amount, they are necessarily outliers that can be identified and removed. In the remainder of this section, we elaborate on these two steps of regularization and outlier removal, and provide pseudocode.

Per-function adaptivity. If the functions $f_1, \dots, f_n$ were all drawn from p^* (i.e., there are no adversaries), then a natural approach would be to let $\hat{w}$ be the minimizer of $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w)$, which will approximately minimize $\bar{f}(w)$ by standard concentration results.

The problem with using this approach in the adversarial setting is that even a single adversarially chosen function f_i could substantially affect the value of $\hat{w}$. To minimize this influence, we give each f_i its own parameter w_i , and minimize $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w_i)$, subject to a regularizer which encourages the w_i to be close together. The adversary now has no influence on the good w_i except via the regularizer, so the key challenge

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for fitting p^*

```

1: Input:  $f_1, \dots, f_n$ 
2: Initialize  $c \leftarrow [1; \dots; 1] \in \mathbb{R}^n$ 
3: Set  $\lambda \leftarrow \frac{\sqrt{8\alpha n S}}{r}$ 
4: while true do
5:   Let  $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$  be the solution to
      
$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{w_1, \dots, w_n, Y}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(Y) \\ & \text{subject to } w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

6:   if  $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$  then ▷ Check for outliers
7:     return  $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$  ▷ Not many outliers, can return
8:   else
9:      $c \leftarrow \text{UPDATEWEIGHTS}(c, \hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$  ▷ Re-weight points to down-weight outliers
10:  end if
11: end while

```

is to find a regularizer which sufficiently controls statistical error while also bounding the influence of the adversary.

It turns out that the right choice of regularizer in this case is to constrain the w_i to lie within an *ellipse with small trace*. Formally, the centerpiece of our algorithm is the following convex optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{w_1, \dots, w_n, Y}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(Y) \\ & \text{subject to } w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here the coefficients c_i are non-negative weights which will eventually be used to downweight outliers (for now it is fine to imagine that $c_i = 1$). Note that $w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y$ is equivalent to the semidefinite constraint $\begin{bmatrix} Y & w_i \\ w_i^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0$. The problem (4) can be solved in polynomial time in n and d assuming oracle access to the gradients ∇f_i .

Note that the semidefinite constraint $w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y$ is equivalent to $w_i^\top Y^{-1} w_i \leq 1$, which says that w_i lies within the ellipse centered at 0 defined by Y . The regularizer is thus the trace of the minimum ellipse containing the w_i ; penalizing this trace will tend to push the w_i closer together, but is there any intuition behind its geometry? The following lemma shows that $\text{tr}(Y)$ is related to the trace norm of $[w_1 \dots w_n]$:

Lemma 3.1. *For any points $w_1, \dots, w_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, suppose that $Y \succeq w_i w_i^\top$ for all i . Then, letting $\|\cdot\|_*$ denote the trace norm (i.e., sum of singular values) and $W_T = [w_i]_{i \in T}$, we have $\text{tr}(Y) \geq \frac{\|W_T\|_*^2}{|T|}$ for all sets $T \subseteq [n]$.*

The appearance of the trace norm makes sense in light of the intuition that we should be clustering the functions f_i ; indeed, trace norm regularization is a key ingredient in spectral algorithms for clustering (see e.g. Zha et al. (2001); Chen et al. (2014a;b)). Lemma 3.1 says that $\text{tr}(Y)$ simultaneously bounds the trace norm on every subset T of $[n]$, which ends up yielding better results than are obtained by simply penalizing the overall trace norm; we believe that this *local trace norm regularization* likely leads to better results even in non-adversarial spectral learning settings. The most important property of $\text{tr}(Y)$ is that it admits a certain type of local Hölder’s inequality which we will explain in Section 5.

Removing outliers. Solving (4) is not by itself sufficient to achieve robustness. The problem is that a single function f_i could strongly push w_i to a given value w_{target} (e.g. if $f_i(w) = 10^{100} \|w - w_{\text{target}}\|_2^2$) which allows the adversaries to arbitrarily expand the ellipse defined by Y . To combat this, we need some way of removing outlier functions f_i from our dataset. We will do this in a soft way, by assigning a weight c_i to each function f_i , and downweighting functions that seem likely to be outliers.

How can we tell that a function is an outlier? Intuitively, if a function f_i is really drawn from p^* , then there should be many other functions $f_j, j \neq i$, that are “similar” to f_i . We can quantify this by considering whether there are a large number of $j \neq i$ for which the parameter w_j for f_j does a good job of minimizing f_i . Formally, given a solution $(\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_n)$ to (4), we compare $\hat{w}_i$ to $\tilde{w}_i$, which is defined as the solution to the following optimization:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tilde{w}_i, a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in}}{\text{minimize}} \quad f_i(\tilde{w}_i) \\ & \text{subject to } \tilde{w}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j, \quad 0 \leq a_{ij} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha n}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

The optimization (6) roughly asks for a parameter $\tilde{w}_i$ that minimizes f_i , subject to $\tilde{w}_i$ being the average of at least $\frac{\alpha n}{2}$ distinct parameters $\hat{w}_j$. Given the solution $\tilde{w}_i$ to (6), we then downweight the influence of the i th data point based on the value of $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$. In particular, we will multiply the weight c_i by $1 - \eta(f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$ for some appropriate η . Hopefully, this will downweight any outliers by a large amount while only downweighting good points by a small amount (this hope is verified in Lemma 4.5 below).

Pseudocode for our algorithm is given in Algorithms 1 and 2.

4 Approach and Proof Outline

We now provide an outline of the proof of Theorem 2.2, by analyzing the output of Algorithm 1. The structure of our proof has analogies to classical uniform convergence arguments, so we will start by reviewing that case.

Warm-up: Uniform Convergence

In uniform convergence arguments, we assume that all of $f_1, \dots, f_n$ are drawn from p^* , which brings us into the realm of classical learning theory. The analogue to the optimization (3) in Algorithm 1 is regularized empirical risk minimization:

$$\hat{w} = \arg \min_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w) + \lambda h(w), \quad (7)$$

where $h(w)$ is a non-negative regularizer. Uniform convergence arguments involve two parts:

1. **Bound the optimization error:** Use the definition of $\hat{w}$ to conclude that $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\hat{w}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w^*) + \lambda h(w^*)$ (since $\hat{w}$ minimizes (7)). This step shows that $\hat{w}$ does almost as well as w^* at minimizing the empirical risk $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w)$.
2. **Bound the statistical error:** Show, via an appropriate concentration inequality, that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(w)$ is close to $\bar{f}(w)$ for all $w \in \mathcal{H}$. Therefore, $\hat{w}$ is nearly as good as w^* in terms of the true risk $\bar{f}$.

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for updating weights c to downweight outliers.

1: **procedure** UPDATEWEIGHTS($c, \hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$)

2: **for** $i = 1, \dots, n$ **do**

3: Let $\tilde{w}_i$ be the solution to

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{\tilde{w}_i, a_{i1}, \dots, a_{in}}{\text{minimize}} && f_i(\tilde{w}_i) \\ & \text{subject to} && \tilde{w}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j, \quad 0 \leq a_{ij} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha n}, \quad \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

4: Let $z_i \leftarrow f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$

5: **end for**

6: $z_{\max} \leftarrow \max\{z_i \mid c_i \neq 0\}$

7: $c'_i \leftarrow c_i \cdot \frac{z_{\max} - z_i}{z_{\max}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$

8: **return** c'

9: **end procedure**

We will see next that the proof of Theorem 2.2 contains steps similar to these, though bounding the statistical error in the presence of adversaries requires an additional step of removing outliers.

Proof Overview

We will establish a stronger version of Theorem 2.2, which exhibits an explicit $w \in \mathcal{E}_{\hat{Y}}$ with small error:

Theorem 4.1. *Let $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$ be the output of Algorithm 1, and let $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} = (\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \hat{w}_i) / (\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i)$. Then, $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq 18 \frac{Sr}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$. Furthermore, $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} \in \mathcal{E}_{\hat{Y}}$ and $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$.*

To prove Theorem 4.1, recall that Algorithm 1 has at its core the following optimization problem:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underset{w_1, \dots, w_n, Y}{\text{minimize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(Y) \\ & \text{subject to} \quad w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

This optimization asks to minimize $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i)$ while constraining the w_i to lie within the ellipse defined by Y . As in the uniform convergence argument above, there are two sources of error that we need to bound: the *optimization error* $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*))$, and the *statistical error* $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$. Note that the statistical error now measures two quantities: the distance from $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ to $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$, and from $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ to $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$.

Bounding the optimization error requires showing that the ellipse defined by $\hat{Y}$ is not too small (so that it contains w^*), while bounding the statistical error requires showing that the ellipse is not too large (so that we cannot overfit too much). The former turns out to be easy and is shown in Lemma 4.2. The latter is more involved and requires several steps. First, we show in Lemma 4.3 that the statistical error can be bounded in terms of $\text{tr}(Y)$ and S , which verifies the intuition that bounding the statistical error reduces to bounding Y . Next, in Lemma 4.4, we show that the parameters $\tilde{w}_i$ found in Algorithm 2 are bounded by an ellipse $\tilde{Y}$ with small trace, and that $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) \approx f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. By the optimality of $(\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$ for (8), the only way that $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ can be much larger than $\text{tr}(\tilde{Y})$ is therefore if $f_i(\hat{w}_i) \ll f_i(\tilde{w}_i)$ for $i \notin I_{\text{good}}$. In this case, we can identify outliers $i \notin I_{\text{good}}$ by considering the value of $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$, and Lemma 4.5 verifies that we can use this to perform outlier removal. We expand on both the optimization error and statistical error bounds below.

Bounding optimization error on I_{good} . Throughout the argument, we will make use of the optimality of $(\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$ for (8), which implies that

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(Y) \text{ for any feasible } (w_{1:n}, Y). \quad (9)$$

We wish to bound $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i)$, but the preceding bound involves all of $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i)$, not just the f_i for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. However, because the $\hat{w}_i$ are free to vary independently, we can bound $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*))$ in terms of the amount that $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ would need to increase before $w^*(w^*)^\top \preceq \hat{Y}$. In particular, by taking $Y = \hat{Y} + (w^*)(w^*)^\top$ in (9), we can obtain the following bound on the optimization error:

Lemma 4.2. *The solution $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ to (8) satisfies*

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*)) \leq \lambda \|w^*\|_2^2. \quad (10)$$

Bounding the statistical error. We next consider the statistical error. We cannot bound this error via standard uniform convergence techniques, because each f_i has a different argument $\hat{w}_i$. However, it turns out that the operator norm bound S , together with a bound on $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$, yield concentration of the f_i to $\bar{f}$. In particular, we have:

Lemma 4.3. Let $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \hat{w}_i}{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i}$. Then the solution $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$ to (8) satisfies

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq \alpha n S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right), \text{ and} \quad (11)$$

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)) \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(w^*)) + 2\alpha n r S. \quad (12)$$

Lemma 4.3 relates $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ to $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ in (11), and then relates $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ to $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ in (12). Together these allow us to bound the statistical error in terms of $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ and S . The proof is an application of the matrix Hölder's inequality $|\text{tr}(A^\top B)| \leq \|A\|_* \|B\|_{\text{op}}$, with $A_i = \hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$ and $B_i = \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \nabla \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$.

Bounding the trace. We next need to bound $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ itself. We again exploit the optimality constraint (9), which implies that $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \text{tr}(Y) + \frac{1}{\lambda} (\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (f_i(w_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)))$ for any feasible $(w_{1:n}, Y)$. We will take $w_{1:n}$ to be $\tilde{w}_{1:n}$ as defined in equation (5) of Algorithm 2; we then take Y to be $\frac{2}{\alpha n} \hat{W} \hat{W}^\top$, where $W = [w_1 \cdots w_n]$. Lemma 4.4 asserts that $(w_{1:n}, Y)$ is feasible, and uses this to “almost” bound $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$:

Lemma 4.4. For $\tilde{w}_i$ as defined in (6), and $\tilde{Y} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{2}{\alpha n} \hat{W} \hat{W}^\top$, we have $\tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_i^\top \preceq \tilde{Y}$ for all i , and also $\text{tr}(\tilde{Y}) \leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha}$. In addition,

$$\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \right), \quad (13)$$

and if $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2}$ then

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq \alpha n \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right). \quad (14)$$

This “almost” bounds $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ in the following sense: if instead of $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$, (14) gave a bound on $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$, then we could plug in to (13) to obtain (e.g.) $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{n}{\lambda} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right)$, after which solving the quadratic for $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$ would yield a bound. The problem is that $f_i(\tilde{w}_i)$, for $i \notin I_{\text{good}}$, could be arbitrarily large, so additional work is needed.

Outlier removal. This brings us to our final idea of *outlier removal*. The intuition is the following: let $z_i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$. Then either: (i) the average of z_i over all of $[n]$ is not much larger than over I_{good} (in which case the bound (14) extends from I_{good} to $[n]$), or (ii) the average of z_i is much larger on $[n]$ than on I_{good} , in which case it should be possible to downweight the points in $[n] \setminus I_{\text{good}}$ a substantial amount relative to the points in I_{good} . This is the role that the outlier removal step (Algorithm 2) plays, and Lemma 4.5 formalizes its effect on the weights c_i .

Lemma 4.5. Suppose that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \geq \frac{2}{\alpha n} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$. Then, the update step in Algorithm 2 satisfies

$$\frac{1}{\alpha n} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i - c'_i \leq \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i - c'_i. \quad (15)$$

Moreover, the above supposition holds if $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{8\alpha n S}}{r}$ and $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) > \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$.

Lemma 4.5 says that, if the average value of z_i is at least twice as large over $[n]$ as over I_{good} , then the weights c_i decrease at most half as quickly on I_{good} as on $[n]$. Moreover, this holds whenever $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) > \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$.

Combining the results. Lemma 4.5 ensures that eventually we have $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\alpha}\right)$, which allows us to bound the overall statistical error (using Lemma 4.3) by $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha n r S})$. In addition, since $\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha n S}/r)$, the optimization error is bounded (via Lemma 4.2) by $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha n r S})$, as well. Combining the various bounds, we end up obtaining

$$\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \right) (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)) \leq \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha n r S}). \quad (16)$$

Then, since (15) ensures that the c_i decrease twice as quickly over $[n]$ as over I_{good} , we decrease $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$ by at most a factor of 2 over all iterations of the algorithm, so that $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2}$. Dividing (16) through by $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$ then yields Theorem 4.1.

In the remainder of this section, we will prove Lemmas 4.2 through 4.5, then show more formally how Theorem 4.1 follows from these lemmas.

Proof of Lemma 4.2

We want to bound $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i)$. As noted above, the optimality of $(\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$ implies that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(w_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(Y)$ for any feasible point $w_{1:n}, Y$. We will use the particular choice of

$$w_i = \begin{cases} w^* & : i \in I_{\text{good}} \\ \hat{w}_i & : i \notin I_{\text{good}} \end{cases}, \quad Y = \hat{Y} + w^*(w^*)^\top. \quad (17)$$

It is easy to see that this is a feasible point for the optimization: if $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, then $w_i w_i^\top = w^*(w^*)^\top \preceq \hat{Y} + w^*(w^*)^\top$, and if $i \notin I_{\text{good}}$ then $w_i w_i^\top = \hat{w}_i \hat{w}_i^\top \preceq \hat{Y} \preceq \hat{Y} + w^*(w^*)^\top$. Therefore, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i) + \lambda \text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(w^*) + \sum_{i \notin I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i) + \lambda (\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) + \|w^*\|_2^2). \quad (18)$$

Re-arranging yields $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(\hat{w}_i) \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i f_i(w^*) + \lambda \|w^*\|_2^2$, as was to be shown.

Proof of Lemma 4.3

First, by using Hölder's inequality $\text{tr}(A^\top B) \leq \|A\|_{\text{op}} \|B\|_*$, we can show the following:

Lemma 4.6. For any w_0 and any $w_{1:n}$ satisfying $w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y$ for all i , we have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0), w_i \rangle \right| \leq \alpha n \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)} S. \quad (19)$$

To establish (11) from Lemma 4.6, note that

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - \hat{w}_i \rangle \quad (20)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \nabla \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - \hat{w}_i \rangle \quad (21)$$

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \alpha n \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r^2 \right) S, \quad (22)$$

where (i) is by convexity of f_i , (ii) is because

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - \hat{w}_i \rangle &= \langle \nabla \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}), \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - \hat{w}_i) \rangle \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

and (iii) is two applications of Lemma 4.6, with $(w_i, Y) = (\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}, \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^\top)$ and $(w_i, Y) = (\hat{w}_i, \hat{Y})$.

To establish (12), we expand $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)$ as an integral; letting $w(t) = t\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} + (1-t)w^*$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla \bar{f}(w(t)), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^* \rangle dt \quad (23)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(w(t)), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^* \rangle dt \quad (24)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla \bar{f}(w(t)) - \nabla f_i(w(t)), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^* \rangle dt \\ &\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(w(t)), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^* \rangle dt + \int_0^1 2\alpha n r S dt \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(w^*)) \right) + 2\alpha n r S, \quad (26)$$

as claimed. Here (iv) invokes Lemma 4.6 at $w_0 = w(t)$, $w_i = \hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*$, $Y = (\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*)(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*)^\top$.

Proof of Lemma 4.4

Let $\tilde{w}_i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j$ as in (5). We have

$$\tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_i^\top = \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j \right) \left(\sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j \right)^\top \quad (27)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\preceq} \sum_{j=1}^n a_{ij} \hat{w}_j \hat{w}_j^\top \quad (28)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\preceq} \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{2}{\alpha n} \hat{w}_j \hat{w}_j^\top \quad (29)$$

$$= \frac{2}{\alpha n} \hat{W} \hat{W}^\top = \tilde{Y}. \quad (30)$$

Here (ii) is because $a_{ij} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha n}$, while (i) is an instantiation of the inequality $\mathbb{E}[x] \mathbb{E}[x]^\top \preceq \mathbb{E}[xx^\top]$ (using the fact that $\sum_j a_{ij} = 1$). This completes the first claim.

Next, $\text{tr}(\tilde{Y}) = \frac{2}{\alpha n} \text{tr}(\hat{W} \hat{W}^\top) = \frac{2}{\alpha n} \|\hat{W}\|_F^2 \leq \frac{2}{\alpha n} \cdot nr^2 = \frac{2r^2}{\alpha}$. This completes the second claim. The inequality (13) then follows from (9), by optimality of $(\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$ and feasibility of $(\tilde{w}_{1:n}, \tilde{Y})$.

Finally, by taking $a_{ij} = \frac{c_j}{\sum_{j' \in I_{\text{good}}} c_{j'}}$, we see that $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} = \sum_{j \in I_{\text{good}}} \left(\frac{c_j}{\sum_{j' \in I_{\text{good}}} c_{j'}} \right) \hat{w}_j$ is a feasible point for $\tilde{w}_i$ (note that $a_{ij} \leq \frac{2}{\alpha n}$, since $c_j \leq 1$ and $\sum_{j' \in I_{\text{good}}} c_{j'} \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2}$ by assumption). We therefore have $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) \leq f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ for all i , and in particular for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. Therefore, $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$, which is bounded by $\alpha n S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\tilde{Y})} + r \right)$ by Lemma 4.3. This establishes (14) and completes the lemma.

Proof of Lemma 4.5

First, note that $\tilde{w}_i \tilde{w}_i \preceq \hat{Y}$, since it is a convex combination of the $\hat{w}_j$, and so replacing $\hat{w}_i$ with $\tilde{w}_i$ yields a feasible point for the optimization. Therefore, $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) \geq f_i(\hat{w}_i)$, and so $z_i \geq 0$.

Now, remember that $c'_i = c_i \cdot \frac{z_{\max} - z_i}{z_{\max}}$. Then for any $S \subseteq [n]$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in S} c_i - c'_i = \sum_{i \in S} c_i \cdot \frac{z_i}{z_{\max}} \quad (31)$$

$$= \frac{1}{z_{\max}} \sum_{i \in S} c_i z_i. \quad (32)$$

Taking $S = I_{\text{good}}$ and $S = [n]$, it follows that

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i - c'_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i - c'_i} = \frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i} \quad (33)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad (34)$$

where (i) is by the supposition $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i \geq \frac{2}{\alpha n} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$. This establishes (15).

Next, suppose that $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{8\alpha n S}}{r}$ and $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) > \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$. In this case we must show that the supposition $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i \geq \frac{2}{\alpha n} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$ necessarily holds. Note that

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \quad (35)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \quad (36)$$

$$\leq \alpha n S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) \quad (37)$$

by Lemma 4.3 and (11). Now let $x = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$, and assume for the sake of contradiction that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i < \frac{2}{\alpha} x$. Then by (13) in Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \stackrel{(13)}{\leq} \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i \right) \quad (38)$$

$$< \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\frac{2}{\alpha} x \right) \quad (39)$$

$$\stackrel{(37)}{\leq} \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{2nS}{\lambda} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right). \quad (40)$$

Solving the quadratic for $\hat{Y}$, we obtain (see Lemma C.1) $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{4r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{4rnS}{\lambda} + \frac{4n^2S^2}{\lambda^2}$. Using the value $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{8\alpha n S}}{r}$, we have $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$, which is ruled out by assumption and is thus a contradiction. This establishes the claim that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i \geq \frac{2}{\alpha} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$ and completes the lemma.

Proof of Theorem 4.1

First, we note that $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2}$; this is because the invariant $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i$ holds throughout the algorithm by Lemma 4.5. In particular, Algorithm 1 does eventually return, since Algorithm 2 zeros out at least one additional c_i each time, and this can happen at most $n - \frac{\alpha n}{2}$ times before $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$ would drop below $\frac{\alpha n}{2}$ (which we established is impossible).

Now, let $(\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y})$ be the return value of Algorithm 1. By Lemma 4.2, we have $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*)) \leq \lambda r^2$. Also, by assumption we have $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{6r^2}{\alpha}$. By Lemma 4.3 we then have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)) \stackrel{(12)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(w^*)) + 2\alpha n r S \quad (41)$$

$$\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*)) + 3\alpha n r S + \sqrt{6\alpha n r} S \quad (42)$$

$$\stackrel{(10)}{\leq} \lambda r^2 + 3\alpha n r S + \sqrt{6\alpha n r} S \quad (43)$$

$$= 3\alpha n r S + (\sqrt{6} + \sqrt{8})\sqrt{\alpha n r} S \quad (44)$$

$$\leq 9\sqrt{\alpha n r} S. \quad (45)$$

Since $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{\alpha n}{2}$, dividing through by $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$ yields $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq 18 \frac{Sr}{\sqrt{\alpha}}$, as was to be shown.

5 Concentration of Errors: A Local Hölder's Inequality

Most of the bounds in Section 4 are bounds on an average error: for instance, Lemma 4.2 bounds the average difference between $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ and $f_i(w^*)$, and Lemma 4.3 bounds the average difference between $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ and $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$. One might hope for a stronger bound, showing that the above quantities are close together for almost all i , rather than only close in expectation. This is relevant, for instance, in a clustering setting, where we would like to say that almost all points are assigned a parameter $\hat{w}_i$ that is close to the true cluster center. Even beyond this relevance, asking whether we obtain concentration of errors in this adversarial setting seems like a conceptually natural question:

If the good data is sub-Gaussian, then can we obtain sub-Gaussian concentration of the errors, or can the adversaries force the error to only be small in expectation? What properties of the good data affect concentration of errors in the presence of an adversary?

In this section, we will show that we can indeed obtain sub-Gaussian concentration, at least for the statistical error. In particular, we will characterize the concentration behavior of the errors $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ using a *local Hölder's inequality*, which depends upon a refined notion of S that we denote by S_ε . Before defining S_ε , we will state the local Hölder's inequality:

Lemma 5.1. *Suppose that the weights $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, and that the parameters w_i satisfy $w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y$. Then, for any $w_0 \in \mathcal{H}$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle w_i, \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0) \rangle \right| \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)} S_\varepsilon. \quad (46)$$

We call this a local Hölder's inequality because it is a sharpening of Lemma 4.6, which established via Hölder's inequality that

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle w_i, \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0) \rangle \right| \leq \alpha n \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)} S. \quad (47)$$

By taking $b_i = \mathbb{I}[\langle w_i, \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0) \rangle > \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)} S_\varepsilon]$, Lemma 5.1 implies in particular that $\langle w_i, \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0) \rangle \leq \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)} S_\varepsilon$ for all but $\varepsilon \alpha n$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}$.

A local spectral norm bound. We now define S_ε . The quantity S_ε is essentially the maximum value of S over any subset of I_{good} of size at least $\varepsilon |I_{\text{good}}|$:

$$S_\varepsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{w \in \mathcal{H}} \max_{T \subseteq I_{\text{good}}, |T| \geq \lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \left\| [\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)]_{i \in T} \right\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (48)$$

(As a special case note that $S_1 = S$.) The quantity S_ε bounds not just the operator norm of all of the points in I_{good} , but also the operator norm on any large subset of I_{good} . We will see later that it is often possible to obtain good bounds on S_ε .

Concentration of statistical error. Using S_ε , we can obtain an improved version of the bounds (11) and (12) from Lemma 4.3, showing that $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ is close to a nominal value $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b)$ for almost all $i \in I_{\text{good}}$:

Lemma 5.2. *Let the weights $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, and define $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \hat{w}_i}{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i}$. Then the solution $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$ to (8) satisfies*

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \left(f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \right) \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) S_\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right). \quad (49)$$

Moreover, for any $w, w' \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (\bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w')) - \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(w) - f_i(w')) \right| \leq 2 \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) r S_\varepsilon. \quad (50)$$

Relative to Lemma 4.3, the main differences are: The bounds now hold for any weights b_i (with $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$ replaced by $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b$), and both (49) and (50) have been strengthened in some minor ways relative to (11) and (12) — in (49) we are now bounding the linearization $\langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle$, and (50) holds at all w, w' instead of just $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}, w^*$. These latter strengthenings are trivial and also hold in Lemma 4.3, but were omitted earlier for simplicity. The important difference is that the inequalities hold for any b_i , rather than just for the original weights c_i .

It is perhaps unsatisfying that (49) holds relative to $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b$, rather than $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$. Fortunately, by exploiting the fact that $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$ is nearly optimal for $\bar{f}$, we can replace $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b$ with $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$ at the cost of a slightly weaker bound:

Corollary 5.3. *Let the weights $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfy $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, and suppose that $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{1}{2} \alpha n$. Then the solution $\hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$ to (8) satisfies*

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \left(S_\varepsilon \left(3\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 9r \right) + \frac{2\lambda r^2}{\alpha n} \right). \quad (51)$$

In particular, if $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\alpha}\right)$ and $\lambda = \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\alpha n} S_\varepsilon / r)$, then $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \leq \mathcal{O}(S_\varepsilon r / \sqrt{\alpha})$ for all but $\varepsilon \alpha n$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}$.

Corollary 5.3 shows that no matter what the adversary does, the function errors $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ will be relatively tightly concentrated (at least assuming S_ε is small; we will address the typical size of S_ε later). Looking ahead, we will also be able to show that, in the case that the f_i are strongly convex, $\|w_i - w^*\|_2^2$ is also small for almost all $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. We give this result as Lemma 6.3 in Section 6.

Preserving inliers. Our outlier removal step can be modified based on S_ε so that almost none of the good points are removed. This is not strictly necessary for any of our later results, but is an intuitively appealing property for our algorithm to have. That we can preserve the good points is unsurprising in light of Corollary 5.3, which says that the good points concentrate, and hence should be cleanly separable from any outliers. The modified outlier removal step is given as Algorithm 3.

Algorithm 3 is almost identical to Algorithm 2. The only difference from Algorithm 2 is that, instead of setting z_i to $f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$, we set z_i to $\max(f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau, 0)$ for an appropriately chosen τ . This

creates a buffer such that we do not start to downweight points until their function error passes the threshold τ , which helps to make sure that very little mass is removed from the good points (because we do not start to take away mass until we are fairly sure that a point is bad). Formally, we have the following result for Algorithm 3, which is analogous to Lemma 4.5 for Algorithm 2:

Lemma 5.4. *Suppose that $\lambda = \frac{\sqrt{8\alpha n}S}{r}$ and $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) > \frac{35r^2}{\alpha}$. Then, the update step in Algorithm 3 satisfies*

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i - c'_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon \alpha}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i - c'_i. \quad (52)$$

This shows that the rate at which mass is removed from I_{good} is at most $\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ the rate at which mass is removed overall.

Interpreting S_ε . We end this section by giving some intuition for the typical scale of S_ε . Recall that Lemma 2.1 shows that, when the gradients of f_i are sub-Gaussian with parameter σ , then $S \leq \mathcal{O}(\sigma)$ assuming $n \gg d/\alpha$. A similar bound holds for S_ε , with an additional factor of $\sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)}$:

Lemma 5.5. *If $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$ is σ -sub-Gaussian and L -Lipschitz, then with probability $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$S_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O} \left(\sigma \left(\sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)} + \sqrt{\frac{d \max(1, \log(\frac{rL}{\sigma})) + \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon \alpha n}} \right) \right). \quad (53)$$

In particular, if $n \geq \frac{1}{\varepsilon \alpha} (d \max(1, \log(\frac{rL}{\sigma})) + \log(1/\delta))$, then $S_\varepsilon = \mathcal{O}(\sigma \sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)})$ with probability $1 - \delta$, where $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ masks only absolute constants.

Lemma 5.5 together with Corollary 5.3 show that, if the gradients of f_i are sub-Gaussian, then the errors between $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}})$ and $f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ are also sub-Gaussian, in the sense that the fraction of i for which $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \geq \Omega(\sigma \sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)/\alpha})$ is at most ε . Inverting this, for sufficiently large t the fraction of i for which $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \geq t\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha}$ is at most $\exp(-\Omega(t^2))$. In other words, no matter what the adversary does, it cannot prevent the function errors from concentrating in a sub-Gaussian manner, provided the good data itself is sub-Gaussian.

Algorithm 3 Algorithm for updating weights c to downweight outliers.

```

1: procedure UPDATEWEIGHTS( $c, \hat{w}_{1:n}, \hat{Y}$ )
2:    $\tau \leftarrow S_\varepsilon \left( 3\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 9r \right)$ 
3:   for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do
4:     Let  $\tilde{w}_i$  be the solution to (5) as in Algorithm 2.
5:     Let  $z_i \leftarrow \max(f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau, 0)$ 
6:   end for
7:    $z_{\max} \leftarrow \max\{z_i \mid c_i \neq 0\}$ 
8:    $c'_i \leftarrow c_i \cdot \frac{z_{\max} - z_i}{z_{\max}}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ 
9:   return  $c'$ 
10: end procedure

```

A general Chebyshev bound. What happens if the function errors are not sub-Gaussian, but we still have a bound on $S = S_1$? We can then bound S_ε in terms of S by exploiting the monotonicity of the operator norm.

Lemma 5.6. *For any $\varepsilon_1 \leq \varepsilon_2$, $S_{\varepsilon_1} \leq \sqrt{\frac{\lfloor \varepsilon_2 \alpha n \rfloor}{\lfloor \varepsilon_1 \alpha n \rfloor}} S_{\varepsilon_2} \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon_2}{\varepsilon_1}} S_{\varepsilon_2}$.*

When coupled with Corollary 5.3, this shows that the function errors concentrate in a Chebyshev-like manner: The fraction of i for which $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)$ exceeds $\Omega(\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha\varepsilon})$ is at most ε , and so the fraction of i for which $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \geq t\sigma/\sqrt{\alpha}$ is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{t^2})$. Note that this is already a strengthening of the naïve bound from Markov's inequality, which would only say that the fraction is $\mathcal{O}(\frac{1}{t})$. The local Hölder's inequality in Lemma 5.1 thus leads to a tighter analysis even without any further bounding of S_ε .

Proof of Lemma 5.1

Throughout this section we will for convenience use Δ_i to denote $\nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0)$. We start with a helper lemma that translates information about S_ε into a more useful form:

Lemma 5.7. *For any $b_i \in [0, 1]$ with $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor$, and any matrix $Y \succeq 0$, we have*

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \Delta_i^\top Y \Delta_i \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \text{tr}(Y) S_\varepsilon^2. \quad (54)$$

Proof. Since the inequality is linear in b_i , it is enough to check it at the extreme values of b_i . These consist of $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ such that $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i = \lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor$, which exactly correspond to subsets S of I_{good} of size $\lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor$.⁴ It thus suffices to check (54) at these points, which amounts to showing that

$$\sum_{i \in T} \Delta_i^\top Y \Delta_i \leq |T| \text{tr}(Y) S_\varepsilon^2 \text{ for all sets } T \text{ of size } \lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor. \quad (55)$$

Letting $D_T = [\Delta_i]_{i \in T}$, we show this as follows:

$$\sum_{i \in T} \Delta_i^\top Y \Delta_i = \text{tr} \left(Y \sum_{i \in T} \Delta_i \Delta_i^\top \right) \quad (56)$$

$$= \text{tr} \left(Y D_T D_T^\top \right) \quad (57)$$

$$\leq \text{tr}(Y) \|D_T D_T^\top\|_{\text{op}} \quad (58)$$

$$\leq \text{tr}(Y) \|D_T\|_{\text{op}}^2 \quad (59)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \text{tr}(Y) |T| S_\varepsilon^2, \quad (60)$$

as was to be shown. Here (i) invokes the definition of S_ε , which implies that $S_\varepsilon \geq \max_{|T|=\lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor} \frac{\|D_T\|_{\text{op}}}{\sqrt{|T|}}$. $\square$

We are now ready to prove Lemma 5.1.

⁴There is also an extreme point corresponding to $S = I_{\text{good}}$, which we ignore as its analysis is identical.

Proof of Lemma 5.1. We have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle w_i, \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0) \rangle \right| = \left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle w_i, \Delta_i \rangle \right| \quad (61)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle w_i, \Delta_i \rangle^2} \quad (62)$$

$$= \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \Delta_i^\top w_i w_i^\top \Delta_i} \quad (63)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \Delta_i^\top Y \Delta_i} \quad (64)$$

$$\stackrel{(54)}{\leq} \sqrt{\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right)^2 \text{tr}(Y) S_\varepsilon^2} \quad (65)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) S_\varepsilon \sqrt{\text{tr}(Y)}, \quad (66)$$

as was to be shown. Here (i) is Cauchy-Schwarz and (ii) uses the condition $w_i w_i^\top \preceq Y$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma 5.2

First, note that $(f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle$ by convexity of f_i , so only the second inequality in (49) is interesting. Similarly to how we established (11) in Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) - \nabla \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle \quad (67)$$

$$\stackrel{(46)}{\leq} \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) S_\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right). \quad (68)$$

In the final step we invoke (46) twice, identically to Lemma 4.3.

For (50), we follow an identical argument to (12) from Lemma 4.3. Defining $w(t) = tw + (1-t)w'$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (\bar{f}(w) - \bar{f}(w')) = \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla \bar{f}(w_t), w - w' \rangle dt \quad (69)$$

$$= \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(w_t), w - w' \rangle dt + \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla \bar{f}(w_t) - \nabla f_i(w_t), w - w' \rangle dt \quad (70)$$

$$\stackrel{(46)}{\leq} \int_0^1 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(w_t), w - w' \rangle dt + \int_0^1 2 \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) r S_\varepsilon dt \quad (71)$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(w) - f_i(w')) \right) + 2 \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) r S_\varepsilon. \quad (72)$$

This yields (50) and completes the lemma.

Proof of Corollary 5.3

We need to bound $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b))$. By (50) in Lemma 5.2, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b)) \stackrel{(50)}{\leq} \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) + 2S_\varepsilon r) \quad (73)$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*) + 2S_\varepsilon r). \quad (74)$$

On the other hand, by Lemmas 4.3 and 4.2, we also have

$$\left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \right) (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*)) \stackrel{(12)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(w^*)) + 2\alpha n S r \quad (75)$$

$$\stackrel{(11)}{\leq} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i (f_i(\hat{w}_i) - f_i(w^*)) + \alpha n S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 3r \right) \quad (76)$$

$$\stackrel{(10)}{\leq} \lambda r^2 + \alpha n S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 3r \right). \quad (77)$$

Dividing through by $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$ and using the condition $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha n$, we obtain $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq \frac{2\lambda r^2}{\alpha n} + 2S \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 3r \right)$. Using $S \leq S_\varepsilon$ and substituting into (74) yields

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b)) \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) \left(S_\varepsilon \left(2\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 8r \right) + \frac{2\lambda r^2}{\alpha n} \right).$$

Combining this with the bound on $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) - f_i(\hat{w}_i))$ from (49) then gives the desired inequality (51). The rest of Corollary 5.3 follows by setting $b_i = \mathbb{I}[f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) > C \cdot S_\varepsilon r / \sqrt{\alpha}]$ for an appropriate absolute constant C .

Proof of Lemma 5.4

Recall that $z_i = \max(f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau, 0)$. Our goal is to show that $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i \leq \frac{\varepsilon \alpha}{2} \sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i$. If we can show this, then the result follows identically to the first part of Lemma 4.5.

To start, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} (c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0]) \cdot (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau) \quad (78)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} (c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0]) \cdot (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau) \quad (79)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \max \left(\varepsilon \alpha n, \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0] \right) \tau - \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0] \tau \quad (80)$$

$$= \max \left(\varepsilon \alpha n - \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0], 0 \right) \tau \quad (81)$$

$$\leq \varepsilon \alpha n \tau. \quad (82)$$

Here (i) is because $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} (c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0]) (f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \leq (\sum_i c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0]) \tau$ by Lemma 5.2 if $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0] \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, and if the sum is less than $\varepsilon \alpha n$, we can always arbitrarily increase the weights beyond $c_i \mathbb{I}[z_i > 0]$ until their sum is large enough (since $f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \geq 0$, this will only make the resulting inequality stronger).

Now let $x = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$, and assume for the sake of contradiction that $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i < \frac{2}{\varepsilon \alpha} x$. By Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i)) \right) \quad (83)$$

$$\leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n c_i (\tau + \max(f_i(\tilde{w}_i) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) - \tau, 0)) \right) \quad (84)$$

$$\leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\lambda} \left(n\tau + \frac{2}{\varepsilon \alpha} x \right) \quad (85)$$

$$\leq \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{3n\tau}{\lambda} = \frac{2r^2}{\alpha} + \frac{3r}{\sqrt{8\alpha}} \left(3\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + 9r \right) \quad (86)$$

$$\leq \frac{12r^2}{\alpha} + \sqrt{\frac{11r^2 \text{tr}(\hat{Y})}{\alpha}}. \quad (87)$$

By Lemma C.1 applied to $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$, we have $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \frac{35r^2}{\alpha}$. This contradicts the assumption of the lemma, so we indeed have $\sum_{i=1}^n c_i z_i \geq \frac{\varepsilon \alpha}{2} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i z_i$, from which the desired result follows.

Proof of Lemma 5.6

Let M be any matrix, and $T_1 \subseteq T_2$ be subsets of the rows of M . Then it is easy to see that $\|M_{T_1}\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|M_{T_2}\|_{\text{op}}$. Using this, it is then clear from the definition (48) that $S_{\varepsilon_1} \leq \sqrt{\frac{|\varepsilon_2 \alpha n|}{|\varepsilon_1 \alpha n|}} S_{\varepsilon_2}$, since any subset T appearing in the definition of S_{ε_1} can be extended to a set T' appearing in the definition of S_{ε_2} , whose size is at most $\frac{|\varepsilon_2 \alpha n|}{|\varepsilon_1 \alpha n|}$ times bigger.

6 Bounds for Strongly Convex Losses

We now turn our attention to the special case that the functions f_i are strongly convex in w , in the sense that for all $w, w' \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$f_i(w') \geq \langle w' - w, \nabla f_i(w) \rangle + \frac{\kappa}{2} \|w' - w\|_2^2. \quad (88)$$

In this case, we will obtain stronger bounds by iteratively clustering the output $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ of Algorithm 1 and re-running the algorithm on each cluster. The main theorem in this section is a recovery result in the list decoding model, for an algorithm (Algorithm 4) that formalizes this clustering intuition:

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose that $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$ and let $\mathcal{U}$, $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ be the output of Algorithm 4. Then $\mathcal{U}$ has size at most $\lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha} \rfloor$, and $\min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \|u - w^*\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{S_\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)}}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$. Moreover, $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{S_\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)}}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$ for all but $\varepsilon \alpha n$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}$.*

Note, interestingly, that the bound does not depend on the radius r . Since the list decoding model can be reduced to the semi-verified model, Theorem 6.1 also yields strengthened results in the semi-verified model when the functions are strongly convex (we omit these for brevity).

Algorithm and proof overview. Algorithm 4 works at a high level as follows: first, run Algorithm 1 to obtain $\hat{w}_i$ that are (as we will show in Proposition 6.2) relatively close to w^* for most $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. Supposing that the good $\hat{w}_i$ are within distance $r' \ll r$ of w^* , we can cluster $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ into balls of radius $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}(r')$, and re-run Algorithm 1 on each cluster; Theorem 4.1 will now yield bounds in terms of r' instead of r . By repeating this enough times, we can shrink our hypothesis space to a small ball around w^* , thus obtaining substantially better bounds. A key piece of machinery which will allow us to obtain a satisfactory clustering is the notion of a *padded decomposition*, originally due to Fakcharoenphol et al. (2003), which we explain in more detail later in this section.

Pseudocode for Algorithm 4 is provided above: We keep track of an upper bound $r^{(t)}$ on the distance from the $\hat{w}_i$ to w^* , which is initially r and decreases by a factor of 2 each time. If this radius drops below a threshold, then we perform a final greedy clustering and exit. Otherwise we use padded decompositions to cluster the points, and run Algorithm 4 on each cluster to obtain new assignments for each $\hat{w}_i$ (since the padded decomposition is randomized, we repeat this several times to ensure correctness with high probability). We can show (Lemma 6.5) that these new assignments $\hat{w}_i$ will be within distance $\frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$ to w^* for almost all $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, which is the key to proving correctness of the algorithm.

The rest of this section consists of three parts: First, we will show that if the f_i are strongly convex, and $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ is the output of Algorithm 1, then $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2$ is small for most $i \in I_{\text{good}}$ (this requires some work, since applying Theorem 4.1 directly would only imply that $\|\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*\|_2$ is small). Next, we will introduce the notion of a padded decomposition, and show (following ideas in Fakcharoenphol et al. (2003)) that padded decompositions of small diameter exist in our setting. Finally, we will combine these two results to analyze Algorithm 4 and establish Theorem 6.1.

Establishing concentration of $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2$. We will first show that $\hat{w}_i$ is close to w^* for almost all $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. This is captured in Proposition 6.2:

Proposition 6.2. *For some absolute constant C and for any $\omega \geq 1$, the output $\hat{w}_{1:n}$ of Algorithm 1 satisfies $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2^2 \leq C\omega \cdot \frac{rS_\varepsilon}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}$ for all but $\frac{\varepsilon\alpha n}{\omega^2}$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}$.*

The key to establishing Proposition 6.2 lies in leveraging the bound on the statistical error from Lemma 5.2, together with the strong convexity of f_i . Recall that Lemma 5.2 says that for any $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle \leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) S_\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right). \quad (89)$$

Algorithm 4 Iterative clustering algorithm for approximating w^*

```

1:  $B(u; s)$  denotes the ball of radius  $s$  centered at  $u$ 
2:  $A(u; s)$  denotes the output of Algorithm 1 with hypothesis space  $\mathcal{H} \cap B(u; s)$ , radius  $s$ , origin shifted to  $u$ 
3: procedure FINDCLUSTERS
4:    $\hat{w}_{1:n}^{(1)} \leftarrow A(0; r)$  ▷ initialize  $\hat{w}$ 
5:    $r^{(1)} \leftarrow r$ 
6:   for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
7:      $\mathcal{W} \leftarrow \{\hat{w}_i^{(t)} \mid \hat{w}_i^{(t)} \text{ is assigned}\}$ 
8:     if  $r^{(t)} < C_1 \cdot \frac{S_\varepsilon \log(2/\alpha)}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}$  then ▷ if radius is small, compute a clustering and exit
9:       Let  $r_{\text{final}} = C_2 \cdot \frac{S_\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)}}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}$  ▷  $C_1, C_2$  are absolute constants
10:      Greedily find a maximal set of points  $u_1, \dots, u_m$  such that:
11:        (i)  $|B(u_j; 2r_{\text{final}}) \cap \mathcal{W}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$  for all  $j$ 
12:        (ii)  $\|u_j - u_{j'}\|_2 > 4r_{\text{final}}$  for all  $j \neq j'$ .
13:      return  $\mathcal{U} = \{u_1, \dots, u_m\}$  as well as  $\hat{w}_{1:n}^{(t)}$ .
14:    end if
15:
16:    for  $h = 1, \dots, 112 \log\left(\frac{t(t+1)}{\delta}\right)$  do ▷ compute candidate assignment  $\bar{w}_{1:n}(h)$ 
17:       $\bar{w}_{1:n}(h) \leftarrow \text{unassigned}$ 
18:      Let  $\mathcal{P}_h$  be a  $(\rho, 2r^{(t)}, \frac{7}{8})$ -padded decomposition of  $\mathcal{W}$  with  $\rho = \mathcal{O}\left(r^{(t)} \log\left(\frac{2}{\alpha}\right)\right)$ .
19:      for each  $T \in \mathcal{P}_h$  do ▷ run Algorithm 1 on each piece of the decomposition
20:        Let  $B(u, \rho)$  be a ball containing  $T$ 
21:        For  $i$  with  $\hat{w}_i^{(t)} \in T$ , assign  $\bar{w}(h)_i$  based on the output of  $A(u; \rho + r^{(t)})$ 
22:      end for
23:    end for
24:    for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  do ▷ pick an assignment that most of the  $\bar{w}_i(h)$  agree on
25:      Find a  $h_0$  such that  $\|\bar{w}_i(h_0) - \bar{w}_i(h)\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{3}r^{(t)}$  for at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the  $h$ 's.
26:      Set  $\hat{w}_i^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \bar{w}_i(h_0)$  (leave unassigned if  $h_0$  does not exist)
27:    end for
28:     $r^{(t+1)} \leftarrow \frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$ 
29:  end for
30: end procedure

```

By strong convexity of f_i , we then have

$$0 \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \left(f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b) - f_i(\hat{w}_i) \right) \quad (90)$$

$$\leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \left(\langle \nabla f_i(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b), \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b - \hat{w}_i \rangle - \frac{\kappa}{2} \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b\|_2^2 \right) \quad (91)$$

$$\leq \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \right) S_\varepsilon \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) - \frac{\kappa}{2} \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b\|_2^2. \quad (92)$$

Therefore:

Lemma 6.3. *For any $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \geq \varepsilon \alpha n$, we have*

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b\|_2^2}{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i} \leq \frac{2}{\kappa} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) S_\varepsilon. \quad (93)$$

By applying Lemma 6.3 to $b'_i = \frac{1}{2} \left(b_i + \frac{\sum_j b_j}{\sum_j c_j} c_i \right)$, we obtain the following corollary, which gives bounds in terms of $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$ rather than $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^b$:

Corollary 6.4. *For any $b_i \in [0, 1]$ satisfying $\varepsilon \alpha n \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$, we have*

$$\frac{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2}{\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i} \leq \frac{16}{\kappa} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) S_\varepsilon. \quad (94)$$

In particular, at most $\varepsilon \alpha n$ points $i \in I_{\text{good}}$ have $\|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2 \geq \frac{16}{\kappa} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) S_\varepsilon$.

Corollary 6.4 is crucial because it shows that all but an ε fraction of the $\hat{w}_i$, for $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, concentrate around $\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}$.

Note that we also have $\|\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*\|_2^2 \leq \frac{2}{\kappa} (\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*))$, which is bounded by Theorem 4.1; moreover, Theorem 4.1 also bounds $\text{tr}(\hat{Y})$. Finally, we have $S_{\varepsilon/\omega^2} \leq 2\omega S_\varepsilon$ by Lemma 5.6. Combining all of these inequalities, we can obtain Proposition 6.2.

Padded decompositions. Proposition 6.2 says that the output $\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_n$ of Algorithm 1 satisfies $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2 \leq s$ for almost all $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, for some $s \ll r$. We would then ideally like to partition the $\hat{w}_i$ into sets of small diameter (say $2s$), such that all of I_{good} is in a single piece of the partition (so that we can then run Algorithm 4 on each piece of the partition, and be guaranteed that at least one piece has most of I_{good}).

In general, this may not be possible, but we can obtain a probabilistic version of the hoped for result: We will end up finding a partition into sets of diameter $\mathcal{O}(s \log(2/\alpha))$ such that, with probability $\frac{7}{8}$, all of I_{good} is in a single piece of the partition. This leads us to the definition of a padded decomposition:

Definition. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be points in a metric space. A (ρ, τ, δ) -padded decomposition is a (random) partition $\mathcal{P}$ of $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ such that: (i) each element of $\mathcal{P}$ has diameter at most ρ , and (ii) for each x_i , with probability $1 - \delta$ all points within distance τ of x_i lie in a single element of $\mathcal{P}$.

Fakcharoenphol et al. (2003) show that for any τ and δ , a (ρ, τ, δ) -padded decomposition exists with $\rho = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\tau \log(n)}{\delta}\right)$. Moreover, the same proof shows that, if every x_i is within distance τ of at least $\Omega(\alpha n)$ other x_i , then we can actually take $\rho = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\tau \log(2/\alpha)}{\delta}\right)$. In particular, in our case we can obtain a $(\mathcal{O}(s \log(2/\alpha)), 2s, 7/8)$ -padded decomposition of the $\hat{w}_i$ output by Algorithm 1; we show this formally in Lemma A.1. This probabilistic notion of clustering turns out to be sufficient for our purposes.

Analyzing Algorithm 4. We are now prepared to analyze Algorithm 4. In each iteration, Algorithm 4 independently samples $l = 112 \log \left(\frac{t(t+1)}{\delta} \right)$ padded decompositions of the $\hat{w}_i$. For each decomposition $\mathcal{P}_h$, it then runs Algorithm 1 on each component of the resulting partition, and thereby obtains candidate values $\bar{w}_1(h), \dots, \bar{w}_n(h)$. Finally, it updates $\hat{w}_i$ by finding a point close to at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the candidate values $\bar{w}_i(h)$, across $h = 1, \dots, l$.

The idea for why this works is the following: since $\frac{7}{8}$ of the time, the padded decomposition $\mathcal{P}_h$ succeeds in preserving I_{good} , it is also the case that roughly $\frac{7}{8}$ of the candidate assignments $\bar{w}_i(h)$ are “good” assignments close to w^* . Therefore, any point that is close to at least $\frac{1}{2}$ of the $\bar{w}_i(h)$ is, by pigeonhole, close to one of the good $\bar{w}_i(h)$, and therefore also close to w^* .

If we formalize this argument, then we obtain Lemma 6.5, which controls the behavior of the update $\hat{w}_{1:n}^{(t)} \rightarrow \hat{w}_{1:n}^{(t+1)}$ on each iteration of the loop:

Lemma 6.5. *Algorithm 4 satisfies the following property: at the beginning of iteration t of the outer loop, let $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ denote the set of points $i \in I_{\text{good}}$ for which $\|\hat{w}_i^{(t)} - w^*\|_2 \leq r^{(t)}$. Also suppose that $|I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$ and $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Then, with probability $1 - \frac{\delta}{t(t+1)}$ over the randomness in the padded decompositions, $\|\hat{w}_i^{(t+1)} - w^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$ for all but $C_0 \cdot \left(\frac{S_\varepsilon \log(2/\alpha)}{\kappa r^{(t)} \sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^2 \cdot \varepsilon \alpha n$ points in $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$, for some absolute constant C_0 .*

Essentially, Lemma 6.5 shows that if almost all of the good points are within $r^{(t)}$ of w^* at the beginning of a loop iteration, then almost all of the good points are within $\frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$ of w^* at the end of that loop iteration, provided $r^{(t)}$ is large enough. Using Lemma 6.5, we can establish Theorem 6.1.

Proof of Theorem 6.1

Using Lemma 6.5 we can prove Theorem 6.1. The key is to show that the precondition $|I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$ of Lemma 6.5 holds throughout Algorithm 4, for appropriate choices of the absolute constants C_1 and C_2 .

We will actually prove the stronger claim that $|I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}| \geq (1 - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon)\alpha n$ for all t . Lemma 6.5 shows that $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ decreases in size by at most $C_0 \left(\frac{S_\varepsilon \log(2/\alpha)}{\kappa r^{(t)} \sqrt{\alpha}} \right)^2 \varepsilon \alpha n$ at iteration t . Now take $C_1 = \sqrt{2C_0}$. In the final iteration before halting, since $r^{(t)} \geq \sqrt{2C_0} \frac{S_\varepsilon \log(2/\alpha)}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}$, we can conclude by Lemma 6.5 that at most $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon n$ points leave $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ in this iteration of the algorithm. But if we look back to previous iterations of the algorithm, the bound on the number of points leaving from $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ decreases by a factor of 4 each time t decreases (because $r^{(t)}$ increases by a factor of 2). Therefore, the total number of points that leave $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ over all iterations of the algorithm is at most $\frac{1}{2}\varepsilon n \left(1 + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{16} + \dots \right) = \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon n < \varepsilon n$. This establishes that $|I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}| \geq (1 - \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon)\alpha n$ for all iterations of the algorithm.

Now, consider the points $\hat{w}_{1:n}^{(T)}$ obtained in the final iteration T of Algorithm 4. By invoking Proposition 6.2 with $\omega = \sqrt{3}$, we have for an appropriate choice of C_2 that $\|\hat{w}_i^{(T)} - w^*\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\frac{r^{(T-1)} S_\varepsilon}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}}} \right) = C_2 \cdot \frac{S_\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(2/\alpha)}}{\kappa \sqrt{\alpha}} = r_{\text{final}}$ for all but $\frac{1}{3}\varepsilon \alpha n$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}^{(T-1)}$, and hence for all but $\varepsilon \alpha n$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. Call the set of points satisfying this condition $I_{\text{good}}^{\text{final}}$.

To finish, observe that by construction, $\mathcal{U}$ is a maximal set of centers u such that: (i) $|B(u; 2r_{\text{final}}) \cap \mathcal{W}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$ and (ii) $B(u; 2r_{\text{final}}) \cap B(u'; 2r_{\text{final}}) = \emptyset$ for $u \neq u'$. But for $i \in I_{\text{good}}^{\text{final}}$, we have $B(\hat{w}_i^{(T)}; 2r_{\text{final}}) \supseteq B(w^*; r_{\text{final}}) \supseteq \{\hat{w}_i^{(T)} \mid i \in I_{\text{good}}^{\text{final}}\}$, and hence $|B(\hat{w}_i^{(T)}; 2r_{\text{final}}) \cap \mathcal{W}| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$.

Therefore, $B(\hat{w}_i^{(T)}; 2r_{\text{final}})$ must intersect $B(u; 2r_{\text{final}})$ for some $u \in \mathcal{U}$, as otherwise we could add $\hat{w}_i^{(T)}$ to $\mathcal{U}$. This implies that $\|\hat{w}_i^{(T)} - u\|_2 \leq 4r_{\text{final}}$, so that $\|w^* - u\|_2 \leq 5r_{\text{final}}$, and hence $\|\hat{w}_{i'}^{(T)} - u\|_2 \leq 6r_{\text{final}}$ for all $i' \in I_{\text{good}}^{\text{final}}$. Therefore, the center u satisfies the required property that $\|u - w^*\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(r_{\text{final}})$ and $\|\hat{w}_i^{(T)} - u\|_2 = \mathcal{O}(r_{\text{final}})$ for all but $\varepsilon\alpha n$ elements of I_{good} .

We finally note that, for $u \in \mathcal{U}$, the sets $B(u; 2r_{\text{final}})$ are disjoint and each contain at least $(1 - \varepsilon)\alpha n$ points, so there can be at most $\lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha} \rfloor$ elements in $\mathcal{U}$.

Proof of Proposition 6.2

By Corollary 6.4, we have that $\|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) + r^2} S_{\varepsilon/\omega^2}}{\kappa}\right)$ for all but $\frac{\varepsilon\alpha}{\omega^2}n$ points $i \in I_{\text{good}}$. But $\text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{r^2}{\alpha}\right)$, and $S_{\varepsilon/\omega^2} \leq 2\omega S_{\varepsilon}$, so we have $\|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\omega \cdot \frac{rS_{\varepsilon}}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$ for all but $\frac{\varepsilon\alpha}{\omega^2}n$ points.

In addition, by Theorem 2.2 we have $\bar{f}(\hat{w}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{rS}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$, which by the strong convexity of $\bar{f}$ implies that $\|\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{rS}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$. Combining these, we have $\|\hat{w}_i - w^*\|_2^2 \leq 2(\|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2 + \|\hat{w}_{\text{avg}} - w^*\|_2^2) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\omega \cdot \frac{rS_{\varepsilon}}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}} + \frac{rS}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\omega \cdot \frac{rS_{\varepsilon}}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$, as was to be shown.

Proof of Corollary 6.4

For notational convenience, let $B = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i$ and $C = \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i$. We have

$$\sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}\|_2^2 \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sum_{i, j \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \cdot \frac{c_j}{C} \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_j\|_2^2 \quad (95)$$

$$= \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i, j \in I_{\text{good}}} b_i \cdot \left(\frac{B}{C} c_j\right) \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_j\|_2^2 \quad (96)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{i, j \in I_{\text{good}}} (b_i + \frac{B}{C} c_i)(b_j + \frac{B}{C} c_j) \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_j\|_2^2, \quad (97)$$

where the first inequality is convexity of $\|\cdot\|_2^2$, and the second is because we only added positive terms to the sum.

Now, we will apply Lemma 6.3 at the value $b'_i = \frac{1}{2}(b_i + \frac{B}{C} c_i)$. This satisfies $b'_i \in [0, 1]$ (since $\sum_j c_j \geq \sum_j b_j$), and also $\sum_i b'_i = \sum_i b_i \geq \varepsilon\alpha n$. We can therefore invoke Lemma 6.3 to obtain

$$\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i, j \in I_{\text{good}}} (b_i + \frac{B}{C} c_i)(b_j + \frac{B}{C} c_j) = \frac{4}{B} \sum_{i, j \in I_{\text{good}}} b'_i b'_j \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_j\|_2^2 \quad (98)$$

$$= 8 \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} b'_i \|\hat{w}_i - \hat{w}_{\text{avg}}^{b'}\|_2^2 \quad (99)$$

$$\leq \frac{16}{\kappa} \left(\sqrt{\text{tr}(\hat{Y})} + r \right) S_{\varepsilon}, \quad (100)$$

as was to be shown.

Proof of Lemma 6.5

Call a partition $\mathcal{P}_h$ *good* if the set $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ lies within a single piece of $\mathcal{P}_h$, and let H be the set of iterations for which $\mathcal{P}_h$ is good, and $l = 112 \log \left(\frac{t(t+1)}{\delta} \right)$ be the total number of iterations. Note that each h is good with probability $\frac{7}{8}$ independently, so by the Chernoff bound, the probability that $|H| < \frac{3}{4}l$ is at most $\exp \left(-\frac{l}{112} \right) = \frac{\delta}{t(t+1)}$.

Note that, for any good h , if T is the element of $\mathcal{P}_h$ containing $I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$, then w^* is within distance $r^{(t)}$ of T , and hence if $T \subseteq B(u, \rho)$ then $w^* \in B(u, \rho + r^{(t)})$. Therefore, the hypothesis space for $A(u, \rho + r^{(t)})$ contains w^* and so Proposition 6.2 implies that, for any good h ,

$$\|\bar{w}_i(h) - w^*\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\omega \cdot \frac{(\rho + r^{(t)})S_\varepsilon}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}} \right) = \mathcal{O} \left(\sqrt{\omega \cdot \frac{r^{(t)}S_\varepsilon \log(\frac{2}{\alpha})}{\kappa\sqrt{\alpha}}} \right) \quad (101)$$

for all but $\frac{\varepsilon\alpha n}{\omega^2}$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$. We will take ω such that the right-hand-side of (101) is $\frac{1}{6}r^{(t)}$, which yields $\omega = \Omega \left(\frac{\kappa r^{(t)}\sqrt{\alpha}}{S_\varepsilon \log(\frac{2}{\alpha})} \right)$.

Next, call an $i \in I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$ *bad* if $\|\bar{w}_i(h) - w^*\|_2 > \frac{1}{6}r^{(t)}$ for more than $\frac{l}{8}$ of the good h . Averaging over the good h , there are therefore at most $\frac{8\varepsilon\alpha n}{\omega^2}$ bad values of i (since each such bad value would constitute $\frac{l}{8}$ violations of (101), and we know that there are at most $l \cdot \frac{\varepsilon\alpha n}{\omega^2}$ violations in total).

Now if i is not bad, then $\|\bar{w}_i(h) - w^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{6}r^{(t)}$ for at least $\frac{5l}{8}$ values of h (because it is small for all but $\frac{l}{8}$ of the at least $\frac{3l}{4}$ good h). Now, consider any $\bar{w}_i(h_0)$ that is within distance $\frac{1}{3}r^{(t)}$ of at least $\frac{l}{2}$ of the $\bar{w}_i(h)$. By the pigeonhole principle, $\bar{w}_i(h_0)$ is therefore close to at least one of these good $\bar{w}_i(h)$, and so satisfies $\|\bar{w}_i(h_0) - w^*\|_2 \leq \|\bar{w}_i(h_0) - \bar{w}_i(h)\|_2 + \|\bar{w}_i(h) - w^*\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$. Moreover, such a h_0 exists since any of the good $\bar{w}_i(h)$ be within distance $\frac{1}{3}r^{(t)}$ of the other good $\bar{w}_i(h')$.

In sum, the assigned value $\hat{w}_i^{(t+1)} = \bar{w}_i(h_0)$ has distance at most $\frac{1}{2}r^{(t)}$ to w^* for all but $\frac{8\varepsilon\alpha n}{\omega^2}$ values of $i \in I_{\text{good}}^{(t)}$, which yields the desired result.

7 Lower Bounds

In this section we prove lower bounds showing that the dependence of our bounds on S is necessary even if p^* is a multivariate Gaussian. For α , we are only able to show a necessary dependence of $\sqrt{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$, rather than the $\sqrt{1/\alpha}$ appearing in our bounds. Determining the true worst-case dependence on α is an interesting open problem.

One natural question is whether S , which typically depends on the maximum singular value of the covariance matrix, is really the right dependence, or whether we could achieve bounds based on e.g. the average singular value instead. Lemma 7.1 rules this out, showing that it would require $\Omega(2^k)$ candidates in the list-decodable setting to achieve dependence on even the k th singular value of the covariance matrix.

Lemma 7.1. *Suppose that p^* is known to be a multivariate Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ with covariance $\Sigma \preceq \Sigma_0$, where μ and Σ are otherwise unknown. Also let σ_k^2 denote the k th largest singular value of Σ_0 . Then, given any amount of data, an α -fraction of which is drawn from p^* , any procedure for outputting at most $m = 2^{k-1}$ candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$ must have, with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$, $\min_{j=1}^m \|\hat{\mu}_j - \mu\|_2 \geq \frac{\sigma_k}{4} \cdot \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$.*

By the reduction from the semi-verified to the list-decodable model, we obtain a lower bound in the semi-verified setting as well:

Corollary 7.2. *Any algorithm that has $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 < \frac{\sigma_k}{4} \cdot \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$ with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$ in the semi-verified model requires at least $\frac{k-2}{\log_2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$ verified samples.*

We remark that the same proofs show lower bounds for non-strongly convex losses as well. For instance, while mean estimation corresponds to $f_i(w) = \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, we could also estimate the direction of a vector by taking $f_i(w) = -w^\top x_i$, and constraining $\|w\|_2 \leq r$; in this case the minimizer of $\bar{f}(w)$ is $w^* = r \cdot \frac{\mu}{\|\mu\|_2}$, where $\mu = \mathbb{E}[x]$. An essentially identical argument to Lemma 7.1 and Corollary 7.2 shows that at least $2^{\Omega(k)}$ candidates $\hat{w}_j$ are necessary to obtain $\min_j \bar{f}(\hat{w}_j) - \bar{f}(w^*) \leq r \cdot \frac{\sigma_k}{4} \cdot \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$ with probability greater than $\frac{1}{2}$, and at least $\Omega\left(\frac{k}{\log_2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}\right)$ verified samples are needed in the semi-verified model. To avoid repetition we omit these.

Proof of Lemma 7.1

Let us suppose that the unverified data has distribution $\hat{p} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$, which is possible iff $\hat{p} \geq \alpha p^*$. We start with a lemma characterizing when it is possible that the true distribution p^* has mean μ :

Lemma 7.3. *Let $\hat{p} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$ and $p^* = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma_0 - \lambda \mu \mu^\top)$. Then $\hat{p} \geq \alpha p^*$ provided that $\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu \leq \frac{\log^2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$ and $\lambda = \frac{1}{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$.*

As a consequence, if $\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu \leq t^2$ for $t = \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$, then p^* could have mean μ . Now, consider the space spanned by the k largest eigenvectors of Σ_0 , and let B_k be the ball of radius $t\sigma_k$ in this space. Also let $\mathcal{P}$ be a maximal packing of B_k of radius $\frac{t}{4}\sigma_k$. A simple volume argument shows that $|B_k| \geq 2^k$. On the other hand, every element μ of B_k is a potential mean because it satisfies $\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu \leq \frac{\|\mu\|_2^2}{\sigma_k^2} \leq t^2$. Therefore, if the true mean μ is drawn uniformly from B_k , any 2^{k-1} candidate means $\hat{\mu}_j$ must miss at least half of the elements of B_k (in the sense of being distance at least $\frac{t}{4}\sigma_k$ away) and so with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$, $\|\hat{\mu}_j - \mu\|_2$ is at least $\frac{t}{4}\sigma_k$ for all j , as was to be shown.

Proof of Corollary 7.2

Suppose that we can obtain $\hat{\mu}$ satisfying $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 < \frac{\sigma_k}{4} \cdot \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$ with $m \leq \frac{k-2}{\log_2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$ samples, with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}$. If we sample m elements uniformly from the unverified samples, with probability α^m we will obtain only samples from p^* , and therefore with probability $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^m$ we can obtain (by assumption) a candidate mean $\hat{\mu}$ with $\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 < \frac{\sigma_k}{4} \cdot \frac{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{\sqrt{1+\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}}$. If we repeat this $\frac{2}{\alpha^m}$ times, then with probability $1 - (1 - \frac{1}{2}\alpha^m)^{\frac{2}{\alpha^m}} \geq 1 - \frac{1}{e} > \frac{1}{2}$, at least one of the candidate means will be close to μ . But by Lemma 7.1, this implies that $\frac{2}{\alpha^m} \geq 2^{k-1}$, and so $m \geq \frac{k-2}{\log_2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$, as claimed.

8 Intuition: Stability Under Subsets

In this section, we establish a sort of “duality for robustness” that provides intuition underlying our results. Essentially, we will show the following:

If a statistic of a dataset is approximately preserved across every large subset of the data, then it can be robustly recovered even in the presence of a large amount of additional arbitrary/adversarial data.

To be a bit more formal, suppose that for a set of points $\{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ lying in $\mathbb{R}^d$, there is a subset $I \subseteq [n]$ with the following property: *for any subset $T \subseteq I$ of size at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$, the mean over T is ε -close to the mean over I .* In symbols,

$$\|\mu_T - \mu_I\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \text{ for all } T \subseteq I \text{ with } |T| \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n, \text{ where } \mu_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} x_i. \quad (102)$$

In such a case, can we approximate the mean of I , even if I is not known and the points in $[n] \setminus I$ are arbitrary?

If we do not care about computation, the answer is yes, via a simple exponential-time algorithm. Call a set of points J α -stable if it satisfies the following properties: $|J| \geq \alpha n$, and (102) holds with I replaced by J (i.e., the mean moves by at most ε when taking subsets of J of size at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$). Then, we can run the following (exponential-time) algorithm:

1. Initialize $\mathcal{U} = []$.
2. Find an α -stable set J which has overlap at most $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$ with all elements of $\mathcal{U}$.
3. Append J to $\mathcal{U}$ and continue until no more such sets exist.

A simple inclusion-exclusion argument⁵ shows that $k \leq \frac{2}{\alpha}$. Therefore, the above algorithm terminates with $|\mathcal{U}| \leq \frac{2}{\alpha}$. On the other hand, by construction, I must have overlap at least $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$ with at least one element of $\mathcal{U}$ (as otherwise we could have also added I to $\mathcal{U}$). Therefore, for some $J \in \mathcal{U}$, $|I \cap J| \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$. But then, letting $T = I \cap J$, we have $\|\mu_I - \mu_J\|_2 \leq \|\mu_I - \mu_T\|_2 + \|\mu_T - \mu_J\|_2 \leq 2\varepsilon$. Therefore, the mean over I is within distance 2ε of at least one of the μ_J , for $J \in \mathcal{U}$.

We have therefore established our stated duality property for robustness: *if a statistic is stable under taking subsets of data, then it can also be recovered if the data is itself a subset of some larger set of data.*

Can we make the above algorithm computationally efficient? First, can we even *check* if a set J is α -stable? This involves checking the following constraint:

$$\left\| \sum_{i \in J} c_i (x_i - \mu_J) \right\|_2 \leq \varepsilon \|c\|_1 \text{ for all } c \text{ such that } c_i \in \{0, 1\}, \sum_{i \in J} c_i \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n. \quad (103)$$

It is already unclear how to check this constraint efficiently. However, defining the matrix $C_{ij} = c_i c_j \in [0, 1]^{J \times J}$, we can take a semi-definite relaxation of C , resulting in the constraints $C_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ and $\text{tr}(C) \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$. Letting $A_{ij} = (x_i - \mu_J)^\top (x_j - \mu_J)$, this results in the following sufficient condition for α -stability:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr}(A^\top C) &\leq \varepsilon^2 \text{tr}(C)^2 \text{ for all } C \text{ such that} \\ C &\succeq 0, C_{ij} \in [0, 1], \text{tr}(C) \geq \frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n. \end{aligned} \quad (104)$$

⁵ Specifically, k sets of size αn with pairwise overlap $\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2 n$ must have a union of size at least $k\alpha n - \frac{1}{2}\binom{k}{2}\alpha^2 n$, which implies $k \leq \frac{2}{\alpha}$.

This is still non-convex due to the presence of $\text{tr}(C)^2$. However, a sufficient condition for (104) to hold is that $\text{tr}(A^\top C) \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2\alpha^2n \text{tr}(C)$ for all $C \succeq 0$, which is equivalent to $\|A\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{2}\varepsilon^2\alpha^2n$, or, letting X be the matrix with rows $x_i - \mu_J$, $\varepsilon \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{\alpha}} \cdot \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha n}}\|X\|_{\text{op}}\right)$, where $\frac{1}{\sqrt{\alpha n}}\|X\|_{\text{op}}$ is essentially our definition of S . From this, we can directly see why $S/\sqrt{\alpha}$ appears in our bounds: it is a convex relaxation of the α -stability condition. Our main optimization (4) can (somewhat less directly) also be thought of as a semidefinite relaxation which attempts to represent the means of all $\frac{2}{\alpha}$ of the α -stable sets simultaneously (this is done implicitly, via the major axes of the ellipse Y).

As an aside, we note that the above discussion, together with the bound (Lemma B.3) on the operator norm of samples from a sub-Gaussian distribution, implies that a set of samples from a sub-Gaussian distribution is α -stable with high probability, and in particular the mean of any large subset of samples is close to the mean of the overall set. Moreover, even if a distribution has only bounded second moments, Proposition B.1 shows that a suitable subset of samples from the distribution will be α -stable.

9 Applications

In this section we present several applications of our main results.

9.1 Gaussians and Mixtures of sub-Gaussians

For robustly learning the mean of a distribution with bounded variance, we have the following result:

Corollary 9.1. *Let p^* be a distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with mean μ and bounded covariance: $\text{Cov}_{p^*}[x] \preceq \sigma^2 I$. Suppose that we observe $n \geq \frac{d}{\alpha}$ points, of which αn are drawn from p^* . Then, for any $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\varepsilon^2 \alpha n))$, it is possible to output parameters $\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_m$, where $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{\alpha - \varepsilon} \rfloor$, such that $\min_{j=1}^m \|\hat{w}_j - \mu\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$.*

Proof. Define $f_i(w) = \|w - x_i\|_2^2$, which is 1-strongly convex and has $w^* = \mu$. In this case, $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla f(w) = x_i - \mu$, and so Proposition B.1 implies that with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\varepsilon^2 \alpha n))$ there is a subset of $(1 - \varepsilon/2)\alpha n$ of the good points satisfying $S = \mathcal{O}(\sigma/\sqrt{\varepsilon})$, and hence (by Lemma 5.6) $S_{\varepsilon/2} = \mathcal{O}(\sigma/\varepsilon)$. Theorem 6.1 then says that we can output parameters $\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_m$, where $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon/2)^2\alpha} \rfloor \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha} \rfloor$, such that $\min_{j=1}^m \|\hat{w}_j - \mu\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$, as was to be shown. $\square$

For robustly learning a mixture of distributions, we have the following result:

Corollary 9.2. *Suppose we are given n samples, where each sample either comes from one of k sub-Gaussian distributions $p_1^*, \dots, p_k^*$ (with $\text{Cov}_{p_i^*}[x] \preceq \sigma^2 I$), or is arbitrary. Let I_i , α_i , and μ_i denote respectively the set of points drawn from p_i^* , the fraction of points drawn from p_i^* , and the mean of p_i^* , and let $\alpha = \min_{i=1}^k \alpha_i$. Suppose that $n \geq \frac{d}{\alpha}$. Then for any $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$, with probability $1 - k \exp(-\Omega(\varepsilon^2 \alpha n))$, we can output a partition $T_1, \dots, T_m$ of $[n]$ and candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$ such that:*

1. $m \leq \lfloor \frac{1}{(1-\varepsilon)\alpha} \rfloor$.
2. For all but $\varepsilon \alpha_i n$ of the elements of I_i , i is assigned a partition T_j such that $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$, where $\mathcal{O}(\cdot)$ masks only absolute constants.

Proof. We apply Theorem 6.1 in the same way as in Corollary 9.1, letting the candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$ be the cluster centers $\mathcal{U}$ output by Algorithm 4. For each i , we then know that $\|\hat{\mu}_j - \mu_i\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$ for at least one of the means $\hat{\mu}_j$.⁶ Moreover, we know that the $\hat{w}_h$ output by Algorithm 4 satisfy $\|\hat{w}_h - \mu_i\|_2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}}\right)$ for all but $\varepsilon\alpha_i n$ elements of $h \in I_i$. We can therefore define T_j to be the set of h for which $\hat{w}_h$ is closer to $\hat{\mu}_j$ than to any of the other $\hat{\mu}_{j'}$. It is then easy to see that any $h \in I_i$ which is close to w_i will be assigned a mean $\hat{\mu}_j$ that is also close to w_i . This yields the desired result. $\square$

For the planted partition model, we have the following result:

Corollary 9.3. *Let $I_1, \dots, I_k$ be disjoint subsets of $[n]$, and consider the following random directed graph with vertex set $[n]$:*

- *If $u, v \in I_i$, the probability of an edge from u to v is $\frac{a}{n}$.*
- *If $u \in I_i, v \notin I_i$, the probability of an edge from u to v is $\frac{b}{n}$.*
- *If $u \notin \cup_{i=1}^k I_i$, the edges emanating from u can be arbitrary.*

Let $\alpha = \min_{i=1}^k \frac{|I_i|}{n}$. Then with probability $1 - k \exp(-\Omega(\alpha n))$, we can output sets $T_1, \dots, T_m \subseteq [n]$, with $m \leq \frac{4}{\alpha}$, such that for all $i \in [k]$, there is a $j \in [m]$ with $|I_i \triangle T_j| \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a \log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^2(a-b)^2} n\right)$, where $\triangle$ denotes the symmetric difference of two sets.

Proof. It turns out that this problem reduces to mean estimation as well, though we will need to be more careful in how we apply our matrix concentration bound.

Let A be the adjacency matrix of the graph. We will let $f_u(w) = \|w - A_u\|_2^2 = \sum_{v=1}^n (w_v - A_{uv})^2$. Note that for $u \in I_i$, we have $\mu_i = \mathbb{E}[A_{uv}] = \frac{b}{n} + \frac{a-b}{n} \mathbb{I}[v \in I_i]$, and $\text{Cov}[A_u]$ is a diagonal matrix with entries that are all either $\frac{a}{n}$ or $\frac{b}{n}$, so that in particular $\|\text{Cov}[A_u]\|_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{a}{n}$, and hence $\sigma = \sqrt{\frac{a}{n}}$.

In this case we have $d = n$, so Proposition B.1 implies that we can find a subset of I_i of size at least $|I_i|/2 \geq \frac{\alpha}{2}n$ such that $S = \mathcal{O}\left(\sigma \sqrt{1 + \frac{d}{\alpha n}}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\sqrt{\frac{a}{\alpha n}}\right)$. Invoking Theorem 6.1 with $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{2}$, we obtain candidate means $\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_m$, with $m \leq \frac{4}{\alpha}$, such that $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2^2 \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{S^2 \log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha}\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a \log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^2 n}\right)$.

Now, we define the set T_j such that $u \in T_j$ iff $(\hat{\mu}_j)_u \geq \frac{a+b}{2n}$. Suppose for some $u, u \in I_i$ but $u \notin T_j$. Then we must have $(\hat{\mu}_j)_u < \frac{a+b}{2n}$, but $(\mu_i)_u = \frac{a}{n}$. Therefore, any $u \in I_i$ with $u \notin T_j$ contributes at least $\frac{(a-b)^2}{4n^2}$ to $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2^2$. Similarly, any $u \in T_j$ with $u \notin I_i$ similarly contributed at least $\frac{(a-b)^2}{4n^2}$. We can conclude that $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2^2 \geq \frac{(a-b)^2}{4n^2} |I_i \triangle T_j|$. In particular, if $\|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_j\|_2^2 = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a \log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^2 n}\right)$, then $|I_i \triangle T_j| = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{a \log(2/\alpha)}{\alpha^2(a-b)^2} n\right)$, as was to be shown. $\square$

Finally, we have the following corollary for density modeling:

Corollary 9.4. *Let $p_\theta(x) = \exp(\theta^\top \phi(x) - A(\theta))$, where $A(\theta)$ is the log-normalization constant. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be points such that αn are drawn from p^* , and $\text{Cov}_{p^*}[\phi(x)] \preceq \sigma^2 I$. Also suppose that $\phi(x) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $n \geq \frac{d}{\alpha}$. Then with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\alpha n))$, the following hold:*

⁶ One might worry that, because different hyper-parameters are needed for different values of α , a single instance of Algorithm 4 cannot find all of the μ_i for different i . However, Algorithm 4 will run correctly given any $\alpha \leq |I_{\text{good}}|/n$, so we can in fact recover all the μ_i simultaneously.

- Given a single verified sample $x \sim p^*$, we can output $\hat{\theta}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_{\hat{\theta}}) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma r}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)]$, where θ^* is the minimizer of $\mathbb{E}[-\log p_{\theta}(x)]$.
- We can output $m = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{\alpha}\right)$ candidates $\hat{\theta}_j$ such that, with probability $1 - \delta$, $\min_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[\text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_{\hat{\theta}_j})]$ is at most $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma r}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$.

Note that $\text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_{\theta}) = (\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mu + A(\theta) - A(\theta^*)$, where $\mu = \mathbb{E}[\phi(x)]$, so Corollary 9.4 roughly asks for θ to have large inner product with μ , but with the additional goal of keeping $A(\theta)$ small.

Proof of Corollary 9.4. Define the loss $f_i(\theta) = -\log p_{\theta}(x_i) = A(\theta) - \theta^\top \phi(x_i)$. We observe that $\bar{f}(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta^*) = \mathbb{E}_{p^*}[(\theta^* - \theta)^\top \phi(x) + A(\theta) - A(\theta^*)] = (\theta^* - \theta)^\top \mu + A(\theta) - A(\theta^*) = \text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_{\theta})$, so bounding $\text{KL}(p_{\theta^*} \parallel p_{\theta})$ is equivalent to bounding $\bar{f}(\theta) - \bar{f}(\theta^*)$.

Note that $\nabla f_i(\theta) - \nabla \bar{f}(\theta) = x_i - \mu$. Therefore, Proposition B.1 implies that with probability $1 - \exp(-\Omega(\alpha n))$ there is a set of at least $\frac{\alpha}{2}n$ samples x_i with spectral norm bound $S = \mathcal{O}(\sigma)$. Theorem 4.1 then implies that we obtain an ellipse $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{Y}}$ and samples $\hat{\theta}_{1:n}$ such that $\hat{\theta}_i \hat{\theta}_i^\top \preceq \hat{Y}$ and $\bar{f}(\hat{\theta}_{\text{avg}}) - \bar{f}(\theta^*) \leq \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma r}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$.

Now take a single verified sample $x \sim p^*$, and define $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \mathcal{E}_{\hat{Y}}} A(\theta) - \theta^\top \phi(x)$. Similarly to Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\bar{f}(\hat{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\theta^*) = (\hat{\theta}^* - \theta)^\top \mu + A(\hat{\theta}) - A(\theta^*) \quad (105)$$

$$= (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top (\mu - \phi(x)) + (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top \phi(x) + A(\hat{\theta}) - A(\theta^*) \quad (106)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top (\mu - \phi(x)), \quad (107)$$

where (i) is because $\hat{\theta}$ minimizes the right-hand term in (106). On the other hand, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x[(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top (\mu - \phi(x))]^2 = \mathbb{E}_x[(\mu - \phi(x))^\top (\theta^* - \hat{\theta})(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top (\mu - \phi(x))] \quad (108)$$

$$\leq 4\mathbb{E}_x[(\mu - \phi(x))^\top \hat{Y}(\mu - \phi(x))] \quad (109)$$

$$= 4\text{tr}(\text{Cov}[\phi(x)]^\top \hat{Y}) \quad (110)$$

$$\leq 4\sigma^2 \text{tr}(\hat{Y}) \quad (111)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma^2 r^2}{\alpha}\right). \quad (112)$$

In particular, $\mathbb{E}[(\theta^* - \hat{\theta})^\top (\mu - \phi(x))] = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\sigma r}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right)$, which together with the preceding inequality yields the desired bound in $\bar{f}(\hat{\theta}) - \bar{f}(\theta^*)$.

The above gives us the desired result in the semi-verified model. But then, we can reduce the semi-verified model to the list decodable model by sampling random points from the untrusted data, which gives us the list decodable result as well. $\square$

A Padded Decompositions

The following lemma is essentially from [Fakcharoenphol et al. \(2003\)](#).

Lemma A.1. Let $x_1, \dots, x_n$ be points in a metric space, and let $I \subseteq [n]$ be such that $d(x_i, x_j) \leq r$ for all $i, j \in I$. Consider the following procedure:

- Initialize $X = \{1, \dots, n\}$, $\mathcal{P} = \emptyset$, and sample k uniformly from 2 to $k_{\max}$, where $k_{\max} \geq 1 + \frac{1}{\delta} \log(\frac{n}{|I|})$.
- While there are points remaining in S :
 - Sample i uniformly from $\{1, \dots, n\}$
 - Let T be the set of points in X within distance kr of x_i .
 - Update $X \leftarrow X \setminus T$, $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P} \cup \{T\}$.
- Output the partition $\mathcal{P}$.

Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, all elements of I are in a single element of $\mathcal{P}$.

Proof. It suffices to show the following: if T contains any element of I , then with probability at least $\frac{3}{4}$ it contains all elements of I .

To see this, let $N(k)$ denote the set of points within distance kr of at least one point in I . Then, for a fixed k , the probability that T intersects I is $\frac{|N(k)|}{n}$; but since all points in I are within distance r of each other, the probability that T contains all of I is at least $\frac{|N(k-1)|}{n}$. Letting $a_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} |N(k)|$, the conditional probability that T contains I , given that it intersects I , is therefore at least $\frac{a_{k-1}}{a_k}$. Marginalizing over k , the probability is at least

$$\frac{1}{k_{\max} - 1} \sum_{k=2}^{k_{\max}} \frac{a_{k-1}}{a_k} \stackrel{(i)}{\geq} \left(\prod_{k=2}^{k_{\max}} \frac{a_{k-1}}{a_k} \right)^{\frac{1}{k_{\max}-1}} \quad (113)$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{|I|}{n} \right)^{\frac{\delta}{\log(n/|I|)}} \quad (114)$$

$$= e^{-\delta} \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (115)$$

as was to be shown. Here (i) is the good old AM-GM inequality. $\square$

B Matrix Concentration Bounds

B.1 Concentration from Second Moments

The following is proved using techniques from [Batson et al. \(2012\)](#). However, the bound itself appears to be novel.

Proposition B.1. Suppose that p is a distribution on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathbb{E}_p[X] = \mu$ and $\text{Cov}_p[X] \preceq \sigma^2 I$ for some σ . Then, given n samples from p , with probability $1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{16}\right)$ there is a subset $J \subseteq [n]$ of size at least $(1 - \varepsilon)n$ such that $\lambda_{\max}\left(\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{i \in J} (x_i - \mu)(x_i - \mu)^\top\right) \leq \frac{4\sigma^2}{\varepsilon} \left(1 + \frac{d}{(1-\varepsilon)n}\right)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality we will take $\mu = 0$. Our proof relies on the following claim:

Lemma B.2. For a matrix M , suppose that $M \prec cI$ and $\text{tr}((cI - M)^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$. Then, for $x \sim p$, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$ we have $M + \varepsilon x x^\top \prec (c + 4\sigma^2)I$ and $\text{tr}(((c + 4\sigma^2)I - (M + \varepsilon x x^\top))^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$.

We prove this claim below, first showing how Proposition B.1 follows from the claim. We will go through the stream of n samples, and keep a running set J and matrix M . Initially $J = \emptyset$ and $M = 0$. For each index i in the stream, we will add i to J (and update M to $M + \varepsilon x_i x_i^\top$) if the conclusion of Lemma B.2 holds for $c = 4\sigma^2(d + |J|)$. Note that then, by induction, the precondition of Lemma B.2 always holds for $c = 4\sigma^2(d + |J|)$, since it holds when $J = \emptyset$ and the condition for adding i to J ensures that it continues to hold.

At the end of the stream, we therefore obtain J and M such that $M \preceq 4\sigma^2(d + |J|)I$, which implies that $\lambda_{\max}(\frac{1}{|J|} \sum_{i \in J} x_i x_i^\top) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon |J|} \lambda_{\max}(M) \leq \frac{4\sigma^2}{\varepsilon} \left(1 + \frac{d}{|J|}\right)$. It remains to show that $|J| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)n$ with high probability.

To see this, note that for each element i , $|J|$ increases by 1 with probability at least $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$. The distribution of $|J|$ is therefore lower-bounded by the sum of n independent Bernoulli variables with bias $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, which by the Chernoff bound is greater than $(1 - \varepsilon)n$ with probability at least $1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2 n}{16}\right)$. $\square$

Proof of Lemma B.2. This is essentially Lemma 3.3 of [Batson et al. \(2012\)](#). Instead of $M + \varepsilon x x^\top$, it will be helpful later to consider $M + t x x^\top$ for arbitrary $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$. By the Sherman-Morrison matrix inversion formula, we have

$$((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M - t x x^\top)^{-1} = ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1} + t \frac{((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1} x x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1}}{1 - t x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1} x}. \quad (116)$$

Therefore, letting $\Phi_c(M)$ denote $\text{tr}((cI - M)^{-1})$, we have

$$\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M + t x x^\top) = \Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M) + \frac{x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-2} x}{1/t - x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1} x}. \quad (117)$$

We want to have $\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2 I}(M + t x x^\top) \leq \Phi_c(M)$, which in light of the above is equivalent to the condition

$$\frac{1}{t} \stackrel{?}{\geq} x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1} x + \frac{x^\top ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-2} x}{\Phi_c(M) - \Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M)}. \quad (118)$$

Let us compute the expectation of the right-hand-side. Since $\mathbb{E}[x^\top A x] = \text{tr}(A^\top \text{Cov}[x])$ and $\text{Cov}[x] \preceq \sigma^2 I$, the right-hand-side of (118) has expectation at most

$$\sigma^2 \left(\text{tr}(((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1}) + \frac{\text{tr}(((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-2})}{\Phi_c(M) - \Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M)} \right) \leq \sigma^2 \left(\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M) + \frac{1}{4\sigma^2} \right), \quad (119)$$

where the second step is in light of the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_c(M) - \Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M) &= \text{tr}((cI - M)^{-1} - ((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-1}) \\ &\geq 4\sigma^2 \text{tr}(((c + 4\sigma^2)I - M)^{-2}). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M) \leq \Phi_c(M) \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$, the right-hand-side of (118) is at most $\frac{1}{2}$ in expectation. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$, it is at most $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, in which case (118) holds for all $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$.

This certainly implies that $\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M + \varepsilon x x^\top) = \text{tr}(((c + 4\sigma^2)I - (M + \varepsilon x x^\top))^{-1}) \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$. Moreover, we also have that $\Phi_{c+4\sigma^2}(M + t x x^\top) \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2} < \infty$ for all $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$. Since the eigenvalues of $M + t x x^\top$ are a continuous function of t , we therefore know that the maximum eigenvalue of $M + t x x^\top$ never crosses $c + 4\sigma^2$ for $t \in [0, \varepsilon]$, and so $M + \varepsilon x x^\top \prec (c + 4\sigma^2)I$ as well (since $M \prec cI \prec (c + 4\sigma^2)I$ by assumption). $\square$

B.2 Concentration for sub-Gaussians

In this section we provide a matrix concentration result for sub-Gaussian variables, which underlies Lemma 5.5. The proofs closely mirrors Theorem 5.39 of Vershynin (2010).

Lemma B.3. *Let p be a distribution over vectors $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that (i) $\mathbb{E}[X] = 0$, and (ii) $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\langle \lambda, X \rangle)] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \|\lambda\|_2^2\right)$ for some constant σ . Then, if M is an $m \times d$ matrix with each row drawn i.i.d. from p , with probability $1 - \delta$ the following holds simultaneous for all subsets T of the rows of M with $|T| \geq s$:*

$$\|M_T\|_{\text{op}}^2 \leq 18\sigma^2 (d + s \log(e/\beta) + \log(1/\delta)), \quad (120)$$

where $\beta = s/m$.

Proof. We will bound

$$\max_{|T| \geq s} \frac{\|M_T\|_{\text{op}}^2 - Q}{|T|}, \quad (121)$$

where $Q = 18\sigma^2 (d + \log(1/\delta))$.

Let $\mathcal{N}$ be a $(1/4)$ -net of the sphere S^{d-1} , meaning that all points in S^{d-1} are within distance at most $\frac{1}{4}$ of a point in $\mathcal{N}$. As shown in Vershynin (2010), $\mathcal{N}$ can be taken to have size at most 9^d , and moreover one has $\max_{u \in \mathcal{N}} 2\|M_T u\|_2^2 \geq \max_{\|u\|_2 \leq 1} \|M_T u\|_2^2 = \|M_T\|_{\text{op}}^2$. Using these results, we can bound (121) as

$$\max_{|T| \geq s} \frac{\|M_T\|_{\text{op}}^2 - Q}{|T|} \leq \max_{u \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{|T| \geq s} \frac{2\|M_T u\|_2^2 - Q}{|T|} \quad (122)$$

$$= \frac{2}{s} \max_{u \in \mathcal{N}} \max_{|T|=s} \left(\sum_{i \in T} \langle M_i, u \rangle^2 \right) - Q/2. \quad (123)$$

We will focus on bounding the inner expression for a fixed T , then union bound over the $9^d \binom{m}{s}$ possibilities for $|T|$ and u . Let $Z_i = \langle M_i, u \rangle^2$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[Z_i] = u^\top \text{Cov}[X] u \leq \sigma^2$. In addition, $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \langle M_i, u \rangle)] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2\right)$ (since $\|u\|_2 = 1$), and so (see Lemma C.3) we have $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda (Z_i - \sigma^2))] \leq \exp(16\sigma^4 \lambda^2)$ for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$. By independence, it follows that $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda \sum_{i \in T} (Z_i - \sigma^2))] \leq \exp(16s\sigma^4 \lambda^2)$, again for $0 \leq \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$. By a Chernoff argument, at $\lambda = \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i \in T} (\langle M_i, u \rangle)^2 \geq s\sigma^2 + t \right] \leq \exp \left(s - \frac{t}{4\sigma} \right). \quad (124)$$

We need the right-hand-side to be smaller than $\frac{\delta}{9^d \binom{m}{s}}$, for which we can take

$$t = 4\sigma^2 (d \log(9) + s + s \log(me/s) + \log(1/\delta)) \quad (125)$$

$$\leq 4\sigma^2 (2.2d + s + s \log(e/\beta) + \log(1/\delta)). \quad (126)$$

Overall, we have that with probability $1 - \delta$,

$$\sum_{i \in T} (\langle M_i, u \rangle)^2 \leq \sigma^2 (8.8d + 5s + 4s \log(e/\beta) + 4 \log(1/\delta)) \quad (127)$$

$$\leq 9\sigma^2 (d + s \log(e/\beta) + \log(1/\delta)) \quad (128)$$

for all T of size s and all $u \in \mathcal{N}$. In particular, (123) can be bounded by $18\sigma^2 \log(e/\beta)$, which completes the proof. $\square$

C Deferred Proofs

C.1 Bounding Quadratics

Lemma C.1. Suppose that $z \leq a + \sqrt{bz + c^2}$ where $a, b, c, \geq 0$. Then, $z \leq 2a + b + c$.

Proof. Re-arranging to remove the square-root, we have $z^2 - (2a + b)z + (a^2 - c^2) \leq 0$. Now suppose that $z > 2a + b + c$. Then, $z^2 - (2a + b)z + (a^2 - c^2) = z(z - 2a - b) + (a^2 - c^2) > (2a + b + c)c + (a^2 - c^2) = a^2 + (2a + b)c > 0$, which is a contradiction. $\square$

C.2 Proof of Lemma 2.1

We omit this as it is a special case of Lemma 5.5, proved below.

C.3 Proof of Lemma 2.4

We start by showing that $\mathbb{E} [\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |f(w) - \bar{f}(w)|^q]^{1/q} \leq \sqrt{2 \text{tr}(Y)} \sigma_q$. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}[x]$ and $\Sigma = \text{Cov}[x]$. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_f \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |f(w) - \bar{f}(w)|^q \right] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |\phi(w^\top x) - \mathbb{E}_{x'}[\phi(w^\top x')]|^q \right] \quad (129)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |\mathbb{E}_{x'}[\phi(w^\top x) - \phi(w^\top x')]|^q \right] \quad (130)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} \mathbb{E}_{x'}[|\phi(w^\top x) - \phi(w^\top x')|^2]^{q/2} \right] \quad (131)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} \mathbb{E}_{x'}[(w^\top (x - x'))^2]^{q/2} \right] \quad (132)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} \left(w^\top \left(\Sigma + (x - \mu)(x - \mu)^\top \right) w \right)^{q/2} \right] \quad (133)$$

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\text{tr}(Y^\top \left(\Sigma + (x - \mu)(x - \mu)^\top \right))^{q/2} \right] \quad (134)$$

$$\stackrel{(iv)}{\leq} 2^{q/2-1} \left(\text{tr}(Y^\top \Sigma)^{q/2} + \mathbb{E}_x[(((x - \mu)^\top Y (x - \mu))^{q/2})] \right), \quad (135)$$

where (i) and (iv) are applications of the power mean inequality, (ii) is because ϕ is 1-Lipschitz, and (iii) is because $ww^\top \preceq Y$.

On the other hand, we have $\Sigma \preceq \sigma_q^2 I$ by the q th moment condition (since $q > 2$), so $\text{tr}(Y^\top \Sigma)^{q/2} \leq \text{tr}(Y)^{q/2} \sigma_q^q$. Also, letting $Y = \sum_i \lambda_i v_i v_i^\top$ be the eigendecomposition of Y , we have

$$\mathbb{E}_x[(((x - \mu)^\top Y (x - \mu))^{q/2})] = \mathbb{E}_x \left[\left(\sum_i \lambda_i (v_i^\top (x - \mu))^2 \right)^{q/2} \right] \quad (136)$$

$$\stackrel{(v)}{\leq} \text{tr}(Y)^{q/2-1} \mathbb{E}_x \left[\sum_i \lambda_i (v_i^\top (x - \mu))^q \right] \quad (137)$$

$$\stackrel{(vi)}{\leq} \text{tr}(Y)^{q/2} \sigma_q^q, \quad (138)$$

where (v) is again the power mean inequality and (vi) uses the q th moment bound $\mathbb{E}[(v_i^\top(x - \mu))^q] \leq \sigma_q^q$.

Combining these, we obtain $\mathbb{E}_f [\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |f(w) - \bar{f}(w)|^q] \leq (2 \operatorname{tr}(Y))^{q/2} \sigma_q^q$. To finish, we simply apply Markov's inequality to this statistic to get a tail bound on $\sup_{w \in \mathcal{E}_Y} |f(w) - \bar{f}(w)|$, after which the result follows from a standard uniform convergence argument.

C.4 Proof of Lemma 3.1

By duality of operator and trace norm, we have (letting z_i be the i th row of the matrix Z)

$$\|W_T\|_*^2 = \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} \operatorname{tr}(W_T^\top Z)^2 \quad (139)$$

$$= \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} \left(\sum_{i \in T} w_i^\top z_i \right)^2 \quad (140)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} |T| \sum_{i \in T} (w_i^\top z_i)^2 \quad (141)$$

$$= \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} |T| \sum_{i \in T} w_i^\top (z_i z_i^\top) w_i \quad (142)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} |T| \sum_{i \in T} \operatorname{tr}(Y z_i z_i^\top) \quad (143)$$

$$= \sup_{\|Z\|_{\text{op}} \leq 1} |T| \operatorname{tr}(Y Z^\top Z) \quad (144)$$

$$= |T| \operatorname{tr}(Y), \quad (145)$$

as was to be shown. Here (i) is Cauchy-Schwarz and (ii) uses the fact that $w_i w_i \preceq Y$.

C.5 Proof of Lemma 4.6

Let F be the matrix whose i th row is $\nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0)$, and let W be the matrix whose i th row is w_i . We consider only the rows $i \in I_{\text{good}}$, so each matrix is $\alpha n \times d$. We have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_{\text{good}}} c_i \langle \nabla f_i(w_0) - \nabla \bar{f}(w_0), w_i \rangle \right| = \operatorname{tr}(F^\top \operatorname{diag}(c) W) \quad (146)$$

$$\leq \|\operatorname{diag}(c) F\|_{\text{op}} \|W\|_* \quad (147)$$

by Hölder's inequality. Furthermore, $\|\operatorname{diag}(c) F\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|\operatorname{diag}(c)\|_{\text{op}} \|F\|_{\text{op}} \leq \|F\|_{\text{op}}$, and furthermore $\|F\|_{\text{op}} \leq \sqrt{\alpha n} S$ by the definition of S . Finally, $\|W\|_* \leq \sqrt{|I_{\text{good}}| \operatorname{tr}(Y)} = \sqrt{\alpha n \operatorname{tr}(Y)}$ by Lemma 3.1. Combining these, we see that (147) is bounded by $\alpha n S \sqrt{\operatorname{tr}(Y)}$, as was to be shown.

C.6 Proof of Lemma 5.5

Proof. Define $S_\varepsilon(w)$ as

$$S_\varepsilon(w) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{|T| \geq \lfloor \varepsilon \alpha n \rfloor} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \|\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)\|_{i \in T} \quad (148)$$

By Lemma B.3 below, at any fixed w it is the case that

$$S_\varepsilon(w) \leq 6\sigma \sqrt{\log(e/\varepsilon) + \frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon\alpha n}}. \quad (149)$$

On the other hand, because $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$ is L -Lipschitz in w , one can check that $S_\varepsilon(w)$ is also L -Lipschitz in w (see Lemma C.2 below). In particular, around any fixed w , it holds that $S_\varepsilon(w) \leq \sigma \left(1 + 6\sqrt{\log(e/\varepsilon) + \frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon\alpha n}}\right)$ for all w' with $\|w' - w\|_2 \leq \frac{\sigma}{L}$. But we can cover $\mathcal{H}$ with $(1 + \frac{2rL}{\sigma})^d$ balls of radius $\frac{\sigma}{L}$. Therefore, a union bound argument yields that, with probability $1 - \delta$, for all $w \in \mathcal{H}$ we have

$$S_\varepsilon(w) \leq \sigma \left(1 + 6\sqrt{\log(e/\varepsilon) + \frac{d(1 + \log(1 + \frac{2rL}{\sigma})) + \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon\alpha n}}\right) \quad (150)$$

$$= \mathcal{O} \left(\sigma \left(\sqrt{\log(2/\varepsilon)} + \sqrt{\frac{d \max(1, \log(\frac{rL}{\sigma})) + \log(1/\delta)}{\varepsilon\alpha n}} \right) \right), \quad (151)$$

as was to be shown. $\square$

Lemma C.2. *If $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$ is L -Lipschitz in w , then $S_\varepsilon(w)$ is also L -Lipschitz in w .*

Proof. It suffices to show that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \left\| [\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)]_{i \in T} \right\|_{\text{op}}$ is L -Lipschitz for each T , since the max of Lipschitz functions is Lipschitz. To show this, let $\Delta_i(w)$ denote $\nabla f_i(w) - \nabla \bar{f}(w)$, and note that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \left| \left\| [\Delta_i(w)]_{i \in T} \right\|_{\text{op}} - \left\| [\Delta_i(w')]_{i \in T} \right\|_{\text{op}} \right| \stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \left\| [\Delta_i(w) - \Delta_i(w')]_{i \in T} \right\|_{\text{op}} \quad (152)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|T|}} \left\| [\Delta_i(w) - \Delta_i(w')]_{i \in T} \right\|_F \quad (153)$$

$$= \sqrt{\frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} \|\Delta_i(w) - \Delta_i(w')\|_2^2} \quad (154)$$

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} \sqrt{\frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{i \in T} L^2 \|w - w'\|_2^2} \quad (155)$$

$$= L \|w - w'\|_2, \quad (156)$$

as was to be shown. Here (i) is the triangle inequality for the operator norm, (ii) is because Frobenius norm is larger than operator norm, and (iii) invokes the assumed Lipschitz property for $\Delta_i(w)$. $\square$

C.7 Proof of Lemma 7.3

Recall that $p^* = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma_0 - \lambda\mu\mu^\top)$ and $\hat{p} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_0)$. We want to show that $\alpha p^* \leq \hat{p}$, which is equivalent to (by expanding the density formula for a Gaussian distribution)

$$(x - \mu)^\top (\Sigma_0 - \lambda\mu\mu^\top)^{-1} (x - \mu) - x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} x + \log \det(I - \lambda\mu\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1}) \stackrel{?}{\geq} 2 \log(\alpha) \text{ for all } x. \quad (157)$$

Let us simplify the above quadratic in x . Letting $s = x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu$ and $t = \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu$, we have

$$(x - \mu)^\top (\Sigma_0 - \lambda \mu \mu^\top)^{-1} (x - \mu) - x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} x \quad (158)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{=} (x - \mu)^\top \left(\Sigma_0^{-1} + \lambda \frac{\Sigma_0^{-1} \mu \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1}}{1 - \lambda \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu} \right) (x - \mu) - x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} x \quad (159)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{=} \lambda \frac{(x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu)^2}{1 - \lambda \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu} - 2 \left(x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu + \lambda \frac{(x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu)(\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu)}{1 - \lambda \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu} \right) + \left(\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu + \lambda \frac{(\mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu)^2}{1 - \lambda \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu} \right) \quad (160)$$

$$= \lambda \frac{s^2}{1 - \lambda t} - 2 \left(s + \frac{\lambda s t}{1 - \lambda t} \right) + \left(t + \lambda \frac{t^2}{1 - \lambda t} \right) \quad (161)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 - \lambda t} (\lambda s^2 - 2s + t), \quad (162)$$

where (i) is the Woodbury matrix inversion lemma, and (ii) is expanding the quadratic. The minimizing value of s is $\frac{1}{\lambda}$, so that we obtain a lower bound (over all x) of

$$(x - \mu)^\top (\Sigma_0 - \lambda \mu \mu^\top)^{-1} (x - \mu) - x^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} x \geq \frac{1}{1 - \lambda t} \left(-\frac{1}{\lambda} + t \right) = -\frac{1}{\lambda}.$$

Plugging back into (157), we obtain the condition

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda} + \log \det(I - \lambda \mu \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1}) \stackrel{?}{\geq} 2 \log(\alpha). \quad (163)$$

Simplifying further and again letting $t = \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu$, we have

$$-\frac{1}{\lambda} + \log \det(I - \lambda \mu \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1}) = -\frac{1}{\lambda} + \log(1 - \lambda \mu^\top \Sigma_0^{-1} \mu) \quad (164)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{\lambda} + \log(1 - \lambda t) \quad (165)$$

$$\geq -\frac{1}{\lambda} - \frac{\lambda t}{1 - \lambda t}, \quad (166)$$

so it suffices to have $\frac{1}{\lambda} + \frac{\lambda t}{1 - \lambda t} \leq 2 \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$. Now, we will take $\lambda = \frac{1}{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$, in which case we need $\frac{t}{\log(\frac{1}{\alpha}) - t} \leq \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$, or equivalently $t \leq \frac{\log^2(\frac{1}{\alpha})}{1 + \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$, as claimed.

C.8 Bounding the square of a sub-Gaussian

Lemma C.3. Suppose that Z is a random variable satisfying $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda X)] \leq \exp\left(\frac{\sigma^2}{2} \lambda^2\right)$. Then, $Y = Z^2 - \mathbb{E}[Z^2]$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda Y)] \leq \exp(16\sigma^4 \lambda^2) \quad (167)$$

for $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$.

Proof. We begin by bounding the moments of Z . We have, for any $p \geq 0$ and u ,

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z|^p] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(p \log |Z|)] \quad (168)$$

$$\stackrel{(i)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(p \left(\log a + \frac{1}{a} |Z| - 1 \right) \right) \right] \quad (169)$$

$$\stackrel{(ii)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[\exp \left(p \left(\log a + \frac{1}{a} Z - 1 \right) \right) + \exp \left(p \left(\log a - \frac{1}{a} Z - 1 \right) \right) \right] \quad (170)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} \left[\exp(p(\log a - 1)) \left(\exp\left(\frac{p}{a} Z\right) + \exp\left(-\frac{p}{a} Z\right) \right) \right] \quad (171)$$

$$\stackrel{(iii)}{\leq} 2 \exp(p(\log a - 1)) \exp\left(\frac{p^2 \sigma^2}{2a^2}\right). \quad (172)$$

Here (i) uses the inequality $\log(z) - \log(a) \leq \frac{1}{a}(z - a)$ (by concavity of $\log$), while (iii) simply invokes the sub-Gaussian assumption at $\lambda = \frac{p}{a}$. The inequality (ii) is used to move from $|Z|$ to Z .

We will take the particular value $a = \sqrt{p}\sigma$, which yields

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z|^p] \leq 2 \exp \left(p \left(\frac{1}{2} \log p + \log(\sigma) - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right) \quad (173)$$

$$= 2\sigma^p \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} p (\log(p) - 1) \right). \quad (174)$$

Now, letting $u = \mathbb{E}[Z^2]$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|Z^2 - u|^p] \leq 2^{p-1} (\mathbb{E}[|Z|^{2p}] + u^p) \quad (175)$$

$$\leq 2^{p-1} (2\sigma^{2p} \exp(p(\log(2p) - 1)) + \sigma^{2p}) \quad (176)$$

$$\leq 2^{p+1} \sigma^{2p} \exp(p(\log(2p) - 1)). \quad (177)$$

Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda Y)] = \mathbb{E}[\exp(\lambda(Z^2 - u))] \quad (178)$$

$$\leq 1 + \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[|Z^2 - u|^p] \frac{|\lambda|^p}{p!} \quad (179)$$

$$\stackrel{(177)}{\leq} 1 + 2 \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} \frac{(2|\lambda|\sigma^2)^p}{p!} \exp(p(\log(2p) - 1)) \quad (180)$$

$$\leq 1 + 2 \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} (2|\lambda|\sigma^2)^p \exp(p(\log(2p) - 1) - p \log(p)) \quad (181)$$

$$= 1 + 2 \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} (2|\lambda|\sigma^2)^p \exp(p(\log(2) - 1)) \quad (182)$$

$$\leq 1 + 2 \sum_{p=2}^{\infty} (2|\lambda|\sigma^2)^p \quad (183)$$

$$= 1 + \frac{8\lambda^2 \sigma^4}{1 - 2|\lambda|\sigma^2}. \quad (184)$$

Clearly, when $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{4\sigma^2}$, the above is bounded by $1 + 16\lambda^2 \sigma^4 \leq \exp(16\sigma^4 \lambda^2)$, as claimed. $\square$

References

- E. Abbe and C. Sandon. Community detection in general stochastic block models: fundamental limits and efficient recovery algorithms. *arXiv*, 2015a.
- E. Abbe and C. Sandon. Detection in the stochastic block model with multiple clusters: proof of the achievability conjectures, acyclic BP, and the information-computation gap. *arXiv*, 2015b.
- D. Achlioptas and F. McSherry. On spectral learning of mixtures of distributions. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2005.
- N. Agarwal, A. S. Bandeira, K. Koiliaris, and A. Kolla. Multisection in the stochastic block model using semidefinite programming. *arXiv*, 2015.
- P. Awasthi and O. Sheffet. Improved spectral-norm bounds for clustering. *Approximation, Randomization, and Combinatorial Optimization*, pages 37–49, 2012.
- P. Awasthi, M. F. Balcan, and P. M. Long. The power of localization for efficiently learning linear separators with noise. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 449–458, 2014.
- M. Balcan, A. Blum, and S. Vempala. A discriminative framework for clustering via similarity functions. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 671–680, 2008.
- M. F. Balcan, H. Röglin, and S. Teng. Agnostic clustering. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 384–398, 2009.
- J. Batson, D. A. Spielman, and N. Srivastava. Twice-Ramanujan sparsifiers. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 41(6):1704–1721, 2012.
- K. Bhatia, P. Jain, and P. Kar. Robust regression via hard thresholding. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 721–729, 2015.
- A. Blum and J. Spencer. Coloring random and semi-random k -colorable graphs. *Journal of Algorithms*, 19(2):204–234, 1995.
- T. T. Cai and X. Li. Robust and computationally feasible community detection in the presence of arbitrary outlier nodes. *The Annals of Statistics*, 43(3):1027–1059, 2015.
- E. J. Candès, X. Li, Y. Ma, and J. Wright. Robust principal component analysis? *Journal of the ACM*, 58(3), 2011.
- V. Chandrasekaran, S. Sanghavi, P. A. Parrilo, and A. S. Willsky. Rank-sparsity incoherence for matrix decomposition. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(2):572–596, 2011.
- O. Chapelle, A. Zien, and B. Scholkopf. *Semi-Supervised Learning*. MIT Press, 2006.
- Y. Chen, A. Jalali, S. Sanghavi, and H. Xu. Clustering partially observed graphs via convex optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 15:2213–2238, 2014a.
- Y. Chen, S. Sanghavi, and H. Xu. Improved graph clustering. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(10):6440–6455, 2014b.

- A. Coja-Oghlan. Coloring semirandom graphs optimally. *Automata, Languages and Programming*, pages 71–100, 2004.
- A. Coja-Oghlan. Solving NP-hard semirandom graph problems in polynomial expected time. *Journal of Algorithms*, 62(1):19–46, 2007.
- I. Diakonikolas, G. Kamath, D. Kane, J. Li, A. Moitra, and A. Stewart. Robust estimators in high dimensions without the computational intractability. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2016.
- J. Fakcharoenphol, S. Rao, and K. Talwar. A tight bound on approximating arbitrary metrics by tree metrics. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 448–455, 2003.
- U. Feige and J. Kilian. Heuristics for semirandom graph problems. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 63(4):639–671, 2001.
- U. Feige and R. Krauthgamer. Finding and certifying a large hidden clique in a semirandom graph. *Random Structures and Algorithms*, 16(2):195–208, 2000.
- V. Feldman, P. Gopalan, S. Khot, and A. K. Ponnuswami. On agnostic learning of parities, monomials, and halfspaces. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(2):606–645, 2009.
- O. Guédon and R. Vershynin. Community detection in sparse networks via Grothendieck’s inequality. *arXiv*, 2014.
- V. Guruswami and P. Raghavendra. Hardness of learning halfspaces with noise. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 39(2):742–765, 2009.
- F. R. Hampel, E. M. Ronchetti, P. J. Rousseeuw, and W. A. Stahel. *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. Wiley, 2011.
- M. Hardt and A. Moitra. Algorithms and hardness for robust subspace recovery. In *Conference on Learning Theory (COLT)*, 2013.
- P. J. Huber and E. M. Ronchetti. *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, 2009.
- M. Kearns and M. Li. Learning in the presence of malicious errors. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 22(4):807–837, 1993.
- A. R. Klivans, P. M. Long, and R. A. Servedio. Learning halfspaces with malicious noise. *Journal of Machine Learning Research (JMLR)*, 10:2715–2740, 2009.
- M. Krivelevich and D. Vilenchik. Semirandom models as benchmarks for coloring algorithms. In *Meeting on Analytic Algorithmics and Combinatorics*, pages 211–221, 2006.
- A. Kumar and R. Kannan. Clustering with spectral norm and the k-means algorithm. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 299–308, 2010.
- S. Kushagra, S. Samadi, and S. Ben-David. Finding meaningful cluster structure amidst background noise. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 339–354, 2016.
- K. A. Lai, A. B. Rao, and S. Vempala. Agnostic estimation of mean and covariance. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, 2016.

- C. M. Le, E. Levina, and R. Vershynin. Concentration and regularization of random graphs. *arXiv*, 2015.
- K. Makarychev, Y. Makarychev, and A. Vijayaraghavan. Approximation algorithms for semi-random partitioning problems. In *Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 367–384, 2012.
- K. Makarychev, Y. Makarychev, and A. Vijayaraghavan. Learning communities in the presence of errors. *arXiv*, 2015.
- F. McSherry. Spectral partitioning of random graphs. In *Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 529–537, 2001.
- A. Moitra, W. Perry, and A. S. Wein. How robust are reconstruction thresholds for community detection? *arXiv*, 2015.
- E. Rebrova and K. Tikhomirov. Coverings of random ellipsoids, and invertibility of matrices with iid heavy-tailed entries. *arXiv*, 2015.
- E. Rebrova and R. Vershynin. Norms of random matrices: local and global problems. *arXiv*, 2016.
- M. Rudelson. Random vectors in the isotropic position. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 164:60–72, 1999.
- J. Steinhardt, G. Valiant, and M. Charikar. Avoiding imposters and delinquents: Adversarial crowdsourcing and peer prediction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, 2016.
- J. W. Tukey. A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. *Contributions to probability and statistics*, 2:448–485, 1960.
- R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. *arXiv*, 2010.
- H. Xu, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Principal component analysis with contaminated data: The high dimensional case. *arXiv*, 2010.
- H. Zha, X. He, C. Ding, H. Simon, and M. Gu. Spectral relaxation for k-means clustering. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NIPS)*, pages 1057–1064, 2001.