

Robust and sparse estimation methods for high dimensional linear and logistic regression

Fatma Sevinç Kurnaz^a, Irene Hoffmann^b, Peter Filzmoser^b

^a*Department of Statistics, Yildiz Technical University, 34220, Istanbul, Turkey*

^b*Institute of Statistics and Mathematical Method in Economics, Vienna University of Technology, Wiedner Hauptstraße 8-10, 1040, Vienna, Austria*

Abstract

Fully robust versions of the elastic net estimator are introduced for linear and logistic regression. The algorithms to compute the estimators are based on the idea of repeatedly applying the non-robust classical estimators to data subsets only. It is shown how outlier-free subsets can be identified efficiently, and how appropriate tuning parameters for the elastic net penalties can be selected. A final reweighting step improves the efficiency of the estimators. Simulation studies compare with non-robust and other competing robust estimators and reveal the superiority of the newly proposed methods. This is also supported by a reasonable computation time and by good performance in real data examples.

Keywords: Elastic net penalty, Least trimmed squares, C-step algorithm, High dimensional data, Robustness, Sparse estimation

1. Introduction

Let us consider the linear regression model, which assumes the linear relationship between the predictors $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ and the predictand $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times 1}$,

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}, \quad (1)$$

*Corresponding author

Email address: fskurnaz@yildiz.edu.tr, Tel: +902123837267 (Fatma Sevinç Kurnaz)

where $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_p)^T$ are the regression coefficients and $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ is the error term assumed to have standard normal distribution. For simplicity we assume that $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$ is centered to mean zero, and the columns of \mathbf{X} are mean-centered and scaled to variance one. The ordinary least squares (OLS) regression estimator is the common choice in situations where the number of observations, n , in the data set is greater than the number of predictor variables, p . However, in presence of multicollinearity among predictors, the OLS estimator becomes unreliable, and if p exceeds n it can not even be computed. Several alternatives have been proposed in this case; here we focus on the class of shrinkage estimators which penalize the residual sum-of-squares. The ridge estimator uses an l_2 penalty on the regression coefficients [1], while the lasso estimator takes an l_1 penalty instead [2]. Although this does no longer allow for a closed form solution for the estimated regression coefficients, the lasso estimator gets *sparse*, which means that some of the regression coefficients are shrunk to zero. This means that lasso acts like a variable selection method by returning a smaller subset of variables being relevant for the model. This is appropriate in particular for high dimensional low sample size data sets ($n \ll p$), arising from applications in chemometrics, biometrics, econometrics, social sciences and many other fields, where the data include many uninformative variables which have no effect on the predictand or have very small contribution to the model.

There is also a limitation of the lasso estimator, since it is able to select only at most n variables when $n < p$. If n is very small, or if the number of informative variables (variables which are relevant for the model) is expected to be greater than n , the model performance can become poor. As a way out, the elastic net (*enet*) estimator has been introduced [3], which combines both l_1 and l_2 penalties:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{enet} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + \lambda P_{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\} \quad (2)$$

Here, $\mathbf{y} = (y_1, \dots, y_n)^T$, the observations \mathbf{x}_i^T form the rows of \mathbf{X} , and the

penalty term P_α is defined as

$$P_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\beta}) = (1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{2} \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + \alpha \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 = \sum_{j=1}^p \left[(1 - \alpha) \frac{1}{2} \beta_j^2 + \alpha |\beta_j| \right]. \quad (3)$$

The entire strength of the penalty is controlled by the tuning parameter $\lambda \geq 0$. The other tuning parameter α is the mixing proportion of the ridge and lasso penalties and takes value in $[0, 1]$. The elastic net estimator is able to select
25 variables like in lasso regression, and shrink the coefficients according to ridge. For an overview of sparse methods, see [4].

A further limitation of the previously mentioned estimators is their lack of robustness against data outliers. In practice, the presence of outliers in data is quite common, and thus robust statistical methods are frequently used, see, for example [5, 6]. In the linear regression setting, outliers may appear in the space of the predictand (so-called vertical outliers), or in the space of the predictor variables (leverage points) [7]. The Least Trimmed Squares (LTS) estimator has been among the first proposals of a regression estimator being fully robust against both types of outliers [8]. It is defined as

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{LTS} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^h r_{(i)}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}), \quad (4)$$

where the $r_{(i)}$ are the ordered absolute residuals $|r_{(1)}| \leq |r_{(2)}| \leq \dots \leq |r_{(n)}|$, and $r_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}$ [9]. The number h is chosen between $\lfloor (n + p + 1)/2 \rfloor$ and n , where $\lfloor a \rfloor$ refers to the largest integer $\leq a$, and it determines the robustness properties of the estimator [9]. The LTS estimator also became popular due to the proposal of a quick algorithm for its computation, the so-called FAST-LTS algorithm [10]. The key feature of this algorithm is the “concentration step” or C-step, which is an efficient way to arrive at outlier-free data subsets where the OLS estimator can be applied. This only works for $n > p$, but recently the sparse LTS regression estimator has been proposed for high dimensional problems [11]:

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{sparseLTS} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^h r_{(i)}^2(\boldsymbol{\beta}) + h\lambda \|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_1 \right\}. \quad (5)$$

This estimator adds an l_1 penalty to the objective function of the LTS estimator, and it can thus be seen as a robust counterpart of the lasso estimator. The sparse LTS estimator is robust to both vertical outliers and leverage points, and also
30 a fast algorithm has been developed for its computation [12].

The contribution of this work is twofold: A new sparse and robust regression estimator is proposed with combined l_1 and l_2 penalties. This robustified elastic net regression estimator overcomes the limitations of lasso type estimators concerning the low number of variables in the models, and concerning the instability of the estimator in case of high multicollinearity among the predictors [2]. As a second contribution, a robust elastic net version of logistic regression is introduced for problems where the response \mathbf{y} is a binary variable, encoded with $y_i \in \{0, 1\}$ referring to the class memberships of two groups. The logistic regression model is $y_i = \pi_i + \varepsilon_i$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$, where π_i denotes the conditional probability for the i th observation,

$$\pi_i = \Pr(y_i = 1 | \mathbf{x}_i) = \frac{e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}}}{1 + e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}}}, \quad (6)$$

and ε_i is the error term assumed to have binomial distribution. The most popular way to estimate the model parameters is the maximum likelihood (ML) estimator which is based on maximizing the log-likelihood function or, equivalently, minimizing the negative log-likelihood function,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{ML} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, y_i), \quad (7)$$

with the deviances

$$d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, y_i) = -y_i \log \pi_i - (1 - y_i) \log(1 - \pi_i) = -y_i \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \log(1 + e^{\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}}). \quad (8)$$

The estimation of the model parameters with this method is not reliable when there is multicollinearity among the predictors and is not feasible when $p > n$. To solve these problems, Friedman et al. [13] suggested to minimize a penalized negative log-likelihood function,

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{enet} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}, y_i) + n\lambda P_{\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Here, $P_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ is the elastic net penalty as given in Equation (3), and thus this estimator extends (2) to the logistic regression setting. Using the elastic net penalty also solves the non-existence problem of the estimator in case of non-overlapping groups [14, 13, 15]. Robustness can be achieved by trimming the
 35 penalized log-likelihood function, and using weights as proposed in the context of robust logistic regression [16, 17]. These weights can also be applied in a reweighting step which increases the efficiency of the robust elastic net logistic regression estimator.

The outline of this paper is as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the robust
 40 and sparse linear regression estimator and provide a detailed algorithm for its computation. Section 3 presents the robust elastic net logistic regression estimator. Some important details which are different from the linear regression algorithm are mentioned here. Section 4 explains how the tuning parameters for the proposed estimators can be selected; we prefer an approach based on
 45 cross-validation. Since LTS estimators possess a rather low statistical efficiency, a reweighting step is introduced in Section 5 to increase the efficiency. The properties of the proposed estimators are investigated in simulation studies in Section 6, and Section 7 shows the performance on real data examples. Section 8 provides some insight into the computation time of the algorithms, and the
 50 final Section 9 concludes.

2. Robust and sparse linear regression with elastic net penalty

A robust and sparse elastic net estimator in linear regression can be defined with the objective function

$$Q(H, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \sum_{i \in H} (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta})^2 + h\lambda P_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\beta}) \quad (10)$$

where $H \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $|H| = h$, $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$, and P_α indicates the elastic net penalty with $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ as in Equation (3). We call this estimator the *enet-LTS* estimator, since it uses a trimmed sum of squared residuals, like the sparse LTS estimator (5). The minimum of the objective function (10) determines the

optimal subset of size h ,

$$H_{opt} = \arg \min_{H \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}: |H|=h} Q(H, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_H), \quad (11)$$

which is supposed to be outlier-free. The coefficient estimates $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_H$ depend on the subset H . The enet-LTS estimator is given for this subset H_{opt} by

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{enetLTS} = \arg \min Q(H_{opt}, \boldsymbol{\beta}). \quad (12)$$

It is not trivial to identify this optimal subset, and practically one has to use an algorithm to approximate the solution. This algorithm uses C-steps: Suppose that the current h -subset in the k th iteration of the algorithm is denoted by H_k , and the resulting estimator by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}$. Then the next subset H_{k+1} is formed by the indexes of those observations which correspond to the smallest h squared residuals

$$r_{k,i}^2 = (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k})^2, \quad \text{for } i = 1, \dots, n. \quad (13)$$

If $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_{k+1}}$ denotes the estimator based on H_{k+1} , then by construction of the h -subsets it follows immediately:

$$Q(H_{k+1}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_{k+1}}) \leq Q(H_{k+1}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}) \leq Q(H_k, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}) \quad (14)$$

This means that the C-steps decrease the objective function (10) successively, and lead to a local optimum after convergence. The global optimum is approximated by performing the C-steps with several initial subsets. However, in order to keep the runtime of the algorithm low, it is crucial that the initial subsets are chosen carefully. As motivated in [11], for a certain combination of the penalty parameters α and λ , elemental subsets are created consisting of the indexes of three randomly selected observations. Using only three observations increases the possibility of having no outliers in the elemental subsets. Let us denote these elemental subsets by

$$H_{el}^s = \{j_1^s, j_2^s, j_3^s\}, \quad (15)$$

where $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, 500\}$. The resulting estimators based on the three observations are denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_{el}^s}$. Now the squared residuals $(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_{el}^s})^2$ can be

computed for all observations $i = 1, \dots, n$, and two C-steps are carried out,
55 starting with the h -subset defined by the indexes of the smallest squared residuals. Then only those 10 h -subsets with the smallest values of the objective function (10) are kept as candidates. With these candidate subsets, the C-steps are performed until convergence (no further decrease), and the best subset is defined as that one with the smallest value of the objective function. This *best*
60 *subset* also defines the estimator for this particular combination of α and λ .

Basically, one can apply this procedure now for a grid of values in the interval $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$. Practically, this may still be quite time consuming, and therefore, for a new parameter combination, the best subset of the neighboring grid value of α and/or λ , is taken, and the C-steps are started from this best
65 subset until convergence. This technique, called *warm starts*, is repeated for each combination over the grid of α and λ values, and thus the start based on the elemental subsets is carried out only once.

The choice of the optimal tuning parameters α_{opt} and λ_{opt} is detailed in Section 4. The subset corresponding to the optimal tuning parameters is the
70 optimal subset of size h . The enet-LTS estimator is then calculated on the optimal subset with α_{opt} and λ_{opt} .

3. Robust and sparse logistic regression with elastic net penalty

Based on the definition (9) of the elastic net logistic regression estimator, it is straightforward to define the objective function of its robust counterpart based on trimming,

$$Q(H, \beta) = \sum_{i \in H} d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \beta, y_i) + h\lambda P_\alpha(\beta), \quad (16)$$

where again $H \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ with $|H| = h$, and P_α is the elastic net penalty as defined in Equation (3). As outlined in the last Section 2, the task is to
75 find the optimal subset which minimizes the objective function and defines the robust sparse elastic net estimator for logistic regression. It turns out that the algorithm explained previously in the linear regression setting can be successfully

used to find the approximative solution. In the following we will explain the modifications that need to be carried out.

80 **C-steps:** In the linear regression case, the C-steps were based on the squared residuals (13). Now the h -subsets are determined according to the indexes of those observations with the smallest values of the deviances $d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}, y_i)$. However, here it needs to be made sure that the original group sizes are in the same proportion. Denote n_0 and n_1 the number of
85 observations in both groups, with $n_0 + n_1 = n$. Then $h_0 = \lfloor (n_0 + 1)h/n \rfloor$ and $h_1 = h - h_0$ define the group sizes in each h -subset. A new h -subset is created with the h_0 indexes of the smallest deviances $d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}, y_i = 0)$ and with the h_1 indexes of the smallest deviances $d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{H_k}, y_i = 1)$.

Elemental subsets: In the linear regression case, the elemental subsets consisted of the indexes of three randomly selected observations, see (15). Now four observations are randomly selected to form the elemental subsets, two from each group. This allows to compute the estimator, and the two C-steps are based on the h smallest values of the deviances. As before, this is carried out for 500 elemental subsets, and only the “best” 10 h -subsets are kept. Here, “best” refers to an evaluation that is borrowed from a robustified deviance measure proposed in Croux and Haesbroeck [16] in the context of robust logistic regression (but not in high dimension). These authors replace the deviance function (8) used in (7) by a function φ_{BY} to define the so-called Bianco Yohai (BY) estimator

$$\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{BY} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(\mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta}; y_i), \quad (17)$$

a highly robust logistic regression estimator, see also [17]. The form of the
90 function φ_{BY} is shown in Figure 1, see [16] for details.

We use this function as follows: Positive scores $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ of group 1, i.e. $y_i = 1$, refer to correct classification and receive the highest values for φ_{BY} , while negative scores refer to misclassification, with small or zero φ_{BY} values. For the scores of group 0 we have the reverse behavior, see Figure 1. When

95 evaluating an h -subset, the sum over the h values of $\varphi_{BY}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_H)$ for $i \in H$ is computed, and this sum should be as large as possible. This means that we aim at identifying an h -subset where the groups are separated as much as possible. Points on the wrong side have almost no contribution, but also the contribution of outliers on the correct side is bounded. In this way, outliers will not dominate the sum.

100 With the best 10 h -subsets we continue the C-steps until convergence. Finally, the subset with the largest sum $\varphi_{BY}(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_H)$ over all $i \in H$ forms the best index set.




Figure 1: Function φ_{BY} used for evaluating an h -subset, based on the scores $\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ for the two groups.

The selection of the optimal parameters α_{opt} and λ_{opt} is discussed in Section 4. The subset corresponding to these optimal tuning parameters is defined as the optimal subset of size h . The enet-LTS logistic regression estimator is then calculated on the optimal subset with α_{opt} and λ_{opt} .

Note that at the beginning of the algorithm for linear regression, the predictand is centered, and the predictor variables are centered robustly by the median and scaled by the MAD. Within the C-steps of the algorithm, we additionally mean-center the response variable and scale the predictors by their

arithmetic means and standard deviations, calculated on each current subset, see also [11]. The same procedure is applied for logistic regression, except for centering the predictand. In the end, the coefficients are back-transformed to
115 the original scale.

4. Selection of the tuning parameters

Sections 2 and 3 outlined the algorithms to arrive at a best subset for robust elastic net linear and logistic regression, for each combination of the tuning parameters $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$. In this section we define the strategy to
120 select the optimal combination α_{opt} and λ_{opt} , leading to the optimal subset. For this purpose we are using k -fold cross-validation (CV) on those best subsets of size h , with $k = 5$. In more detail, for k -fold CV, the data are randomly split into k blocks of approximately equal size. In case of logistic regression, each block needs to consist of observations from both classes with approximately the
125 same class proportions as in the complete data set. Each block is left out once, the model is fitted to the “training data” contained in the $k - 1$ blocks, using a fixed parameter combination for α and λ , and it is applied to the left-out block with the “test data”. In this way, h fitted values are obtained from k models, and they are compared to the corresponding original response by using
130 the following evaluation criteria:

- For linear regression we take the root mean squared prediction error (RM-SPE)

$$\text{RMSPE}(\alpha, \lambda) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{h} \sum_{i=1}^h r_i^2(\hat{\beta}_{\alpha, \lambda})} \quad (18)$$

where $r_i = y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_{\alpha, \lambda}$ presents the test set residuals from the models estimated on the training sets with a specific α and λ (for simplicity we omitted here the index k denoting the models where the k -th block was left out and the corresponding test data from this block).

- For logistic regression we use the mean of the negative log-likelihoods or

deviances (MNLL)

$$\text{MNLL}(\alpha, \lambda) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{i=1}^h d_i(\hat{\beta}_{\alpha, \lambda}), \quad (19)$$

135 where $d_i = d(\mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}_{\alpha, \lambda}, y_i)$ presents the test set deviances from the models
estimated on the training sets with a specific α and λ .

Note that the evaluation criteria given by (18) and (19) are robust against outliers, because they are based on the best subsets of size h , which are supposed to be outlier free.

140 In order to obtain more stable results, we repeat the k -fold CV five times and take the average of the corresponding evaluation measure. Finally, the optimal parameters α_{opt} and λ_{opt} are defined as that couple for which the evaluation criterion gives the minimal value. The corresponding best subset is determined as the optimal subset.

Note that the optimal couple α_{opt} and λ_{opt} is searched on a grid of values $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and $\lambda \in [0, \lambda_0]$. In our experiments we used 41 equally spaced values for α , and λ was varied in steps of size $0.025\lambda_0$. For determining λ_0 in the linear regression case we used the same approach as in Alfons et al. [11] which is based on the Pearson correlation between y and the j th predictor variable x_j on winsorized data. For logistic regression we replaced the Pearson correlation by a robustified point-biserial correlation: denote by n_0 and n_1 the group sizes of the two groups, and by m_j^0 and m_j^1 the medians of the j th predictor variable for the data from the two groups, respectively. Then the robustified point-biserial correlation between y and x_j is defined as

$$r_{pb}(y, x_j) = \frac{m_j^1 - m_j^0}{\text{MAD}(x_j)} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{n_0 n_1}{n(n-1)}},$$

145 where $\text{MAD}(x_j)$ is the MAD of x_j , and $n = n_0 + n_1$.

5. Reweighting step

The LTS estimator has a low efficiency, and thus it is common to use a reweighting step [8]. This idea is also used for the estimators introduced here.

Generally, in a reweighting step the outliers according to the current model are identified and downweighted. For the linear regression model we will use the same reweighting scheme as proposed in Alfons et al. [11], which is based on standardized residuals. In case of logistic regression we compute the Pearson residuals which are approximately standard normally distributed and given by

$$r_i^s = \frac{y_i - \pi_i}{\pi_i(1 - \pi_i)}, \quad (20)$$

with π_i the conditional probabilities from (6).

For simplicity, denote the standardized residuals from the linear regression case also by r_i^s . Then the weights are defined by

$$w_i = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } |r_i^s| \leq \Phi^{-1}(1 - \delta) \\ 0, & \text{if } |r_i^s| > \Phi^{-1}(1 - \delta) \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \quad (21)$$

where $\delta = 0.0125$, such that 2.5% of the observations are flagged as outliers in the normal model. The reweighted enet-LTS estimator is defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_{reweighted} = \arg \min_{\beta} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n w_i f(\mathbf{x}_i; y_i) + \lambda_{upd} n_w P_{\alpha_{opt}}(\beta) \right\}, \quad (22)$$

where w_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$ stands for the vector of binary weights (according to the current model), $n_w = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i$, and f corresponds to squared residuals for linear regression or to the deviances in case of logistic regression. Since $h \leq n_w$, and because the optimal parameters α_{opt} and λ_{opt} have been derived with h observations, the penalty can act (slightly) differently in (22) than for the raw estimator. For this reason, the parameter λ_{opt} has to be updated, while the α_{opt} regulating the tradeoff between the l_1 and l_2 penalty is kept the same. The updated parameter λ_{upd} is determined by 5-fold CV, with the simplification that α_{opt} is already fixed.

6. Simulation studies

In this section, the performance of the new estimators is compared with different sparse estimators in different scenarios. We consider both the raw and

160 the reweighted versions of the enet-LTS estimators, and therefore aim to show
how the reweighting step improves the methods. The raw and reweighted enet-
LTS estimators are compared with their classical, non-robust counterparts, the
linear and logistic regression estimators with elastic net penalty [13]. In case of
linear regression we also compare with the reweighted sparse LTS estimator of
165 [11]. All robust estimators are calculated taking the subset size $h = \lfloor (n + 1) \cdot$
 $0.75 \rfloor$ such that their performances are directly comparable.

For each replication, we choose the optimal tuning parameters α_{opt} and λ_{opt}
over the grids α and λ with 5-times repeated 5-fold CV as described in Section
4. To select the tuning parameters for the classical estimators with elastic net
170 penalty, we first draw the same grid for α , namely $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, with 41 equally
spaced grid points. Then we use 5-fold CV as provided by the R package *glmnet*,
which automatically checks the model quality for a sequence of values for λ ,
taking the mean squared error as an evaluation criterion. Finally, the tuning
parameters corresponding to the smallest value of the minimum cross-validated
175 error are determined as the optimal tuning parameters. In order to be coherent
with our evaluation, the tuning parameters for the sparse LTS estimator are
determined in the same way as for the enet-LTS estimator. All simulations are
carried out in R [18].

Note that we simulated the data sets with intercept. As described at the end
180 of Section 3, the data are centered and scaled at the beginning of the algorithm
and only in the final step the coefficients are back-transformed to the original
scale, where also the estimate of the intercept is computed.

Sampling schemes for linear regression: Let us consider two different
scenarios by means of generating a “low dimensional” data set with $n = 150$
185 and $p = 60$ and a “high dimensional” data set with $n = 50$ and $p = 100$.
We generate a data matrix where the variables are forming correlated blocks,
 $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_{a_1}, \mathbf{X}_{a_2}, \mathbf{X}_b)$, where \mathbf{X}_{a_1} , \mathbf{X}_{a_2} and \mathbf{X}_b have the dimensions $n \times p_{a_1}$, $n \times p_{a_2}$
and $n \times p_b$, with $p = p_{a_1} + p_{a_2} + p_b$. Such a block structure can be assumed
in many application, and it mimics different underlying hidden processes. The
190 observations of the blocks are generated independently from each other, from

a multivariate normal distribution $\mathcal{N}_{p_{a_1}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{a_1})$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{a_1} = \rho_{a_1}^{|j-k|}$, $1 \leq j$, $k \leq p_{a_1}$, $\mathcal{N}_{p_{a_2}}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_{a_2})$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_{a_2} = \rho_{a_2}^{|j-k|}$, $1 \leq j$, $k \leq p_{a_2}$, and $\mathcal{N}_{p_b}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_b)$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b = \rho_b^{|j-k|}$, $1 \leq j$, $k \leq p_b$, respectively. While the first two blocks belong to the informative variables with sizes of $p_{a_1} = 0.05p$ and $p_{a_2} = 0.05p$, the third
195 block represents uninformative variables with $p_b = 0.9p$. Furthermore, we take $\rho_{a_1} = \rho_{a_2} = 0.9$ to allow for a high correlation among the informative variables, and $\rho_b = 0.2$ to have low correlation among the uninformative variables.

To create sparsity, the true parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ consists of zeros for the last 90% of the entries referring to the uninformative variables, while the first 10% of the entries are assigned to one. The response variable is calculated by

$$y_i = 1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i, \quad (23)$$

where the error term ε_i is distributed according to a standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, for $i = 1, \dots, n$.

200 This is the design for the simulations with clean data. For the simulation scenarios with outliers we replace the first 10% of the observations of the block of informative variables by values coming from independent normal distributions $\mathcal{N}(20, 1)$ for each variable. Further, the error terms for these 10% outliers are replaced by values from $\mathcal{N}(20\hat{\sigma}_y, 1)$ instead of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, where $\hat{\sigma}_y$ represents the
205 estimated standard deviation of the clean predictand vector. In this way, the contaminated data consist of both vertical outliers and leverage points.

Sampling schemes for logistic regression: We also consider two different scenarios for logistic regression, a “low dimensional” data set with $n = 150$ and $p = 50$ and a “high dimensional” data set with $n = 50$ and $p = 100$. The
210 data matrix is $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{X}_a, \mathbf{X}_b)$, where \mathbf{X}_a has the dimension $n \times p_a$ and \mathbf{X}_b is of dimension $n \times p_b$, with $p = p_a + p_b$. The data matrices are generated independently from $\mathcal{N}_{p_a}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_a)$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_a = \rho_a^{|j-k|}$, $1 \leq j$, $k \leq p_a$, and $\mathcal{N}_{p_b}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma}_b)$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma}_b = \rho_b^{|j-k|}$, $1 \leq j$, $k \leq p_b$, respectively. While the first block consists of the informative variables with $p_a = 0.1p$, the second block represents unin-
215 formative variables with $p_b = 0.9p$. We take $\rho_a = 0.9$ for a high correlation among the informative variables, and $\rho_b = 0.5$ for moderate correlation among

the uninformative variables.

The coefficient vector $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ consists of ones for the first 10% of the entries, and zeros for the remaining uninformative block. The elements of the error term ε_i are generated independently from $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. The grouping variable is then generated according to the model

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } 1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i \leq 0 \\ 1, & \text{if } 1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \boldsymbol{\beta} + \varepsilon_i > 0 \end{cases} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (24)$$

With this setting, both groups are of approximately the same size.

Contamination is introduced by adding outliers only to the informative variables. Denote n_0 the number of observations in class 0. Then the first $\lfloor 0.1n_0 \rfloor$ observations of group 0 are replaced by values generated from $\mathcal{N}(20, 1)$. In order to create “vertical” outliers in addition to leverage points, we assign those first $0.1n_0$ observations of class 0 a wrong class membership.

Performance measures: For the evaluation of the different estimators, training and test data sets are generated according to the explained sampling schemes. The models are fit to the training data and evaluated on the test data. The test data are always generated without outliers.

As performance measures we use the root mean squared prediction error (RMSPE) for linear regression,

$$\text{RMSPE}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(y_i - \hat{\beta}_0 - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \right)^2}, \quad (25)$$

and the mean of the negative log-likelihoods or deviances (MNLL) for logistic regression,

$$\text{MNLL}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d(\hat{\beta}_0 + \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, y_i), \quad (26)$$

where y_i and \mathbf{x}_i , $i = 1, \dots, n$, indicate the observations of the test data set, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ denotes the coefficient vector and $\hat{\beta}_0$ stands for the estimated intercept term obtained from the training data set. In logistic regression we also calculate the misclassification rate (MCR), defined as

$$\text{MCR} = \frac{m}{n} \quad (27)$$

where m is the number of misclassified observations from the test data after fitting the model on the training data. Further, we consider the precision of the coefficient estimate as a quality criterion, defined by

$$\text{PRECISION}(\hat{\beta}) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^p (\beta_i - \hat{\beta}_i)^2}, \quad (28)$$

In order to compare the sparsity of the coefficient estimators, we evaluate the False Positive Rate (FPR) and the False Negative Rate (FNR), defined as

$$\text{FPR}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{|\{j = 0, \dots, p : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0 \wedge \beta_j = 0\}|}{|\{j = 0, \dots, p : \beta_j = 0\}|}, \quad (29)$$

$$\text{FNR}(\hat{\beta}) = \frac{|\{j = 0, \dots, p : \hat{\beta}_j = 0 \wedge \beta_j \neq 0\}|}{|\{j = 0, \dots, p : \beta_j \neq 0\}|}. \quad (30)$$

The FPR is the proportion of non-informative variables that are incorrectly included in the model. On the other hand, the FNR is the proportion of informative variables that are incorrectly excluded from the model. A high FNR usually has a bad effect on the prediction performance since it inflates the variance of the estimator.

These evaluation measures are calculated for the generated data in each of 100 simulation replications separately, and then summarized by boxplots. The smaller the value for these criteria, the better the performance of the method.

Results for linear regression: The outcome of the simulations for linear regression is summarized in Figures 2–5. The left plots in these figures are for the simulations with low dimensional data, and the right plots for the high dimensional configuration. Figure 2 compares the RMSPE. All methods yield similar results in the low dimensional non-contaminated case, while in the high dimensional clean data case the elastic net method is clearly better. However, in the contaminated case, elastic net leads to poor performance, which is also the case for sparse LTS. Enet-LTS performs even slightly better with contaminated data, and there is also a slight improvement visible in the reweighted version of this estimator. The PRECISION in Figure 3 shows essentially the same behavior. The FPR in Figure 4, reflecting the proportion of incorrectly added

noise variables to the models, shows a very low rate for sparse LTS. Here, the elastic net even improves in the contaminated setting, and the same is true for enet-LTS. A quite different picture is shown in Figure 5 with the FNR. Sparse LTS and elastic net miss a high proportion of informative variables in the contaminated data scenario, which is the reason for their poor overall performance. Note that the outliers are placed in the informative variables, which seems to be particularly difficult for sparse LTS.




Figure 2: Root mean squared prediction error (RMSPE) for linear regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 60$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 3: Precision of the estimators (PRECISION) for linear regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 60$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 4: False positive rate (FPR) for linear regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 60$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 5: False negative rate (FNR) for linear regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 60$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).

Results for logistic regression: Figures 6–10 summarize the simulation
 255 results for logistic regression. As before, the left plots refer to the low dimensional case, and the right plots to the high dimensional data. Within one plot, the results for uncontaminated and contaminated data are directly compared. The misclassification rate in Figure 6 is around 10% for all methods, and it is slightly higher in the high dimensional situation. In case of contamination,
 260 however, this rate increases enormously for the classical method elastic net.

The average deviances in Figure 7 show that the reweighting of the enet-LTS estimator clearly improves the raw estimate in both the low and high dimensional cases. It can also be seen that elastic net is sensitive to the outliers. The precision of the parameter estimates in Figure 8 reveal a remarkable improve-
 265 ment for the reweighted enet-LTS estimator compared to the raw version, while there is not any clear effect of the contamination on the classical elastic net estimator.

The FPR in Figure 9 shows a certain difference between uncontaminated and contaminated data for the elastic net, but otherwise the results are quite
 270 comparable. A different picture is visible from the FNR in Figure 10, where especially in the low dimensional case the elastic net is very sensitive to the outliers. Overall we conclude that the enet-LTS performs very well in case of contamination even though this was not clearly visible in the precision, and it also yields reasonable results for clean data.

275 7. Applications to real data

In this section we focus on applications with logistic regression, and compare the non-robust elastic net estimator with the robust enet-LTS method. The model selection is conducted as described in Section 4. Model evaluation is done with leave-one-out cross validation, i.e. each observation is used as test
 280 observation once, a model is estimated on the remaining observations, and the negative log-likelihood is calculated for the test observation. In these real data examples it is unknown if outliers are present. In order to avoid an influence of




Figure 6: Misclassification rate for logistic regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 50$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 7: The mean of negative likelihood (MNLL) function for logistic regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 50$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 8: Precision of the estimators (PRECISION) for logistic regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 50$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 9: False positive rate (FPR) for logistic regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 50$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).




Figure 10: False negative rate (FNR) for logistic regression. Left: low dimensional data set ($n = 150$ and $p = 50$); right: high dimensional data set ($n = 50$ and $p = 100$).

potential outliers on the evaluation of a model, the 25% trimmed mean of the negative log-likelihoods is calculated to compare the models.

285 7.1. Analysis of meteorite data

The time-of-flight secondary iron mass spectroscope COSIMA [19] was sent to the comet Churyumov-Gerasimenko in the Rosetta space mission by the ESA to analyze the elemental composition of comet particles which were collected there [20]. As reference measurements, samples of meteorites provided
290 by the Natural History Museum Vienna were analyzed with the same type of spectroscope at Max Planck Institute for Solar System Research in Göttingen.

Here we apply our proposed method for logistic regression to the measurements from particles from the meteorites Ochansk and Renazzo with 160 and 110 spectra, respectively. We restrict the mass range to 1-100mu, consider only
295 mass windows where inorganic and organic ions can be expected as described in [21] and variables with positive median absolute deviation. So we obtain $p = 1540$ variables. Further, the data is normalized to have constant row sum 100.

Table 1 summarizes the results for the comparison of the methods. The
300 trimmed MNLL is much smaller for the enet-LTS estimator than for the classical

elastic net method. The reweighting step improves the quality of the model further. The selected tuning parameter α_{opt} is much smaller for enet-LTS than for the classical elastic net method which strongly influences the number of variables in the models.

	number variables	trimmed MNLL
elastic net	136	0.00866
enet-LTS raw	294	0.00030
enet-LTS	397	0.00014

Table 1: Renazzo and Ochansk: Number of variables in the optimal models and trimmed mean negative log-likelihood from leave-one-out cross validation of the optimal models.

Figure 11 compares the Pearson residuals of the elastic net model and the enet-LTS model. In the classical approach no abnormal observations can be detected. With the enet-LTS model several observations are identified as outliers by the 1.25% and 98.25% quantiles of the standard normal distribution, which are marked as horizontal lines in Figure 11. Closer investigation showed that these spectra lie on the outer border of the measurement area and are potentially measured on the target instead of the meteorite particle. Their multivariate structure for those variables which are included in the model is visualized in Figure 12, where we can see that in some variables they have particularly large values compared to the majority of the group.

7.2. Analysis of the glass vessels data

Archaeological glass vessels were analyzed with electron-probe X-ray micro-analysis to investigate the chemical concentrations of elements in order to learn more about their origin and the trade market at the time of their making in the 16th and 17th century [22]. Four different groups were identified, i.e. sodic, potassic, potasso-calcic and calcic glass vessels. For demonstration of the performance of logistic regression, two groups are selected from the glass vessels data set. The first group is the potassic group with 15 spectra, the second group




Figure 11: Renazzo and Ochansk: the Pearson residuals of elastic net and the raw enet-LTS estimator. The horizontal lines indicate the 0.0125 and the 0.9875 quantiles of the standard normal distribution.




Figure 12: The index refers to the index of the variables included in the model of raw enet-LTS. The detected outliers are visualized by grey lines, while the black lines represent the 5% and 95% quantile of the non-outlying spectra for Ochansk (left) and Renazzo (right).

the potasso-calcic group with 10 spectra. As in [23] we remove variables with MAD equal to zero, resulting in $p = 1905$ variables.

325 The quality of the selected models is described in Table 2. The trimmed mean of the negative log likelihoods is much smaller for enet-LTS than for elastic net. The reweighting step in enet-LTS hardly improves the model, but includes more variables. Again, both enet-LTS models include more variables than the elastic net model. In the elastic net model the penalty gives higher emphasis on the l_1 term, i.e. $\alpha_{opt} = 0.8$; for enet-LTS it is $\alpha_{opt} = 0.05$.

	number variables	trimmed MNLL
elastic net	50	0.004290
enet-LTS raw	375	0.000345
enet-LTS	448	0.000338

Table 2: Glass vessel data: number of variables in the optimal models, and trimmed mean negative log-likelihood from leave-one-out cross validation of the optimal models.

330 Different behavior of the coefficient estimates can be expected. Figure 13 (left) shows coefficients of the reweighted enet-LTS model corresponding to variables associated with potassium and calcium. The band which is associated with potassium has positive coefficients, i.e. high values of these variables correspond to the potassic group which is coded with ones in the response. High values of 335 the variables in the band which is associated with calcium will favor a classification to the potasso-calcic group (coded with zero), since the coefficients for these variables are negative. Further, it can be observed that neighboring variables, which are correlated, have similar coefficients. This is favored by the 340 l_2 term in the elastic net penalty. In Figure 13 (right) the coefficient estimates of the elastic net model are visualized. Fewer coefficients are non-zero than for enet-LTS which was favored by the l_1 term in the elastic net penalty, but in the second block of non-zero coefficients neighboring variables receive very different coefficient estimates.




Figure 13: Glass vessels: coefficient estimate of the reweighted enet-LTS model (left) and coefficient estimate of the elastic net mode (right) for a selected variable range.

8. Computation time

For our algorithm we employ the classical elastic net estimator as it is implemented in the R package *glmnet* [15]. So, it is natural to compare the computation time of our algorithm with this method. In the linear regression case we also compare with the sparse LTS estimator implemented in the R package *robustHD* [12]. For calculating the estimators we take a grid of five values for both tuning parameters α and λ . The data sets are simulated as in Section 6 for a fixed number of observations $n = 150$, but for a varying number of variables p in a range from 50 to 2000. In Figure 14 (left: linear regression, right: logistic regression), the CPU time is reported in seconds, as an average over 5 replications. In order to show the dependency on the number of observations n , we also simulated data sets for a fixed number of variables $p = 100$ with a varying number of observations $n = 50, 100, \dots, 500$. The results for linear and logistic regression are summarized in Figure 15. The computations have been performed on an Intel Core 2 Q9650 @ 3000 GHz×4 processor.

Let us first consider the dependency of the computation time on the number of variables p for linear regression, shown in the left plot of Figure 14. Sparse LTS increases strongly with the number of variables p since it is based on the LARS algorithm which has a computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(p^3 + np^2)$ [24].




Figure 14: CPU time in seconds (log-scale), averaged over 5 replications, for fixed $n = 150$ and varying p ; left: for linear regression; right: for logistic regression.




Figure 15: CPU time in seconds (log-scale), averaged over 5 replications, for fixed $p = 100$ and varying n ; left: for linear regression; right: for logistic regression.

Also for the smallest number of considered variables, the computation time
 365 is considerably higher than for the other two methods. The reason is that
 for each value of λ and each step in the CV the best subset is determined
 starting with 500 elemental subsets. In this setting at least 25,000 estimations
 of a Lasso model are needed, because for each cross validation step at each
 of the 5 values of λ , two C-steps for 500 elemental subsets are carried out,
 370 and for the 10 subsamples with lowest value of the objective function, further
 C-steps are performed. In contrast, the enet-LTS estimator starts with 500
 elemental subsets only for one combination of α and λ , and takes the *warm start*
 strategy for subsequent combinations. This saves computation time, and there
 is indeed only a slight increase with p visible when compared to the elastic net
 375 estimator. In total approximately 1,700 elastic net models are estimated in this
 procedure, which are considerably fewer than for the sparse LTS approach. The
 computation time of sparse LTS also increases with n due to the computational
 complexity of LARS, while the increase is only minor for enet-LTS, see Figure 15
 (left).

380 The results for the computation time in logistic regression are presented
 in Figure 14 (right) and 15 (right). Here we can only compare the classical
 elastic net estimator and the proposed robustified enet-LTS version. The dif-
 ference in computation time between elastic net and enet-LTS is again due to
 the many calls of the `glmnet` function within enet-LTS. The robust estimator is
 385 considerably slower in logistic regression when compared to linear regression for
 the same number of explanatory variables or observations. The reason is that
 more C-steps are necessary to identify the optimal subset for each parameter
 combination of α and λ .

9. Conclusions

390 In this paper, robust methods for linear and logistic regression using the
 elastic net penalty were introduced. This penalty allows for variable selection,
 can deal with high multicollinearity among the variables, and is thus very ap-
 propriate in high dimensional sparse settings. Robustness has been achieved

by using trimming. This usually leads to a loss in efficiency, and therefore a
 395 reweighting step was introduced. Overall, the outlined algorithms for linear and
 logistic regression turned out to yield good performance in different simulation
 settings, but also with respect to computation time. Particularly, it was shown
 that the idea of using “warm starts” for parameter tuning allows to save com-
 putation time, while the precision is still preserved. A competing method for
 400 robust high dimensional linear regression, the sparse LTS estimator [12], does
 not use this idea, and is thus much less attractive concerning computation time,
 especially in case of many explanatory variables. We should also admit that for
 other simulation settings (not shown here), the difference between sparse LTS
 and the enet-LTS estimator is not so big, or even marginal, depending on the
 405 exact setting.

For this reason, a further focus was on the robust high dimensional logistic
 regression case. We consider such a method as highly relevant, since in many
 modern applications in chemometrics or bio-informatics, one is confronted with
 data information from two groups, with the task to find a classification rule and
 410 to identify marker variables which support the rules. Outliers in the data are
 frequently a problem, and they can affect the identification of the marker vari-
 ables as well as the performance of the classifier. For this reason it is desirable
 to treat outliers appropriately. It was shown in simulation studies as well as in
 data examples, that in presence of outliers the new proposal still works well,
 415 while its classical non-robust counterpart can lead to poor performance.

Note that in [25] a logistic regression method with elastic net penalty is
 proposed using weights to reduce the influence of outliers. Their approach is
 to perform outlier detection in a PCA space, obtain weights based on robust
 Mahalanobis distances in the PCA score space and derive weights from these
 420 distances. These weights are then used to down-weight the negative log like-
 lihoods in the penalized objective function to reduce the influence of outliers.
 However, it is not guaranteed that outliers can be detected in the PCA score
 space. An increasing number of uninformative variables will disguise observa-
 tions deviating from the majority only in few informative variables, but these

425 hidden outlying observations can still distort the model. Therefore, model based
outlier detection is highly recommended as proposed in our algorithm.

The algorithms to compute the proposed estimators are implemented in R
functions, which are available upon request from the authors. The basis for the
computation of the robust estimator is the R package *glmnet* [15]. This package
430 also implements the case of multinomial and Poisson regression. Naturally, a
further extension of the algorithms introduced here could go into these direc-
tions. Further work will be devoted to the theoretical properties of the family
of enet-LTS estimators.

Acknowledgments

435 This work is partly supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF), project
P 26871-N20 and by grant TUBITAK 2214/A from the Scientific and Techno-
logical Research Council of Turkey (TUBITAK).

The authors thank F. Brandstätter, L. Ferrière, and C. Koeberl (Natural
History Museum Vienna, Austria) for providing meteorite samples, C. Engrand
440 (Centre de Sciences Nucléaires et de Sciences de la Matière, Orsay, France) for
sample preparation, and M. Hilchenbach (Max Planck Institute for Solar System
Research, Göttingen, Germany) for TOF-SIMS measurements. The authors are
grateful to Kurt Varmuza for valuable feedback on the results of the meteorite
data.

445 References

References

- [1] A. Hoerl, R. Kennard, Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthog-
onal problems, *Technometrics* 12 (1970) 55–67.
- [2] R. Tibshirani, Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso, *Journal of*
450 *the Royal Statistical Society: Series (Methodological)* 58(1) (1996) 267–
288.

- [3] H. Zou, T. Hastie, Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net, Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B 67(2) (2005) 301–320.
- [4] P. Filzmoser, M. Gschwandtner, V. Todorov, Review of sparse methods in regression and classification with application to chemometrics, Journal of Chemometrics 26(3–4) (2012) 42–51.
- [5] Y.-Z. Liang, O. Kvalheim, Robust methods for multivariate analysis – a tutorial review, Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems 32 (1) (1996) 1–10.
- [6] K. Liang, Y.Z. and Fang, Robust multivariate calibration algorithm based on least median of squares and sequential number theory optimization method, Analyst 121 (8) (1996) 1025–1029.
- [7] R. Maronna, R. Martin, V. Yohai, Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods, Wiley, New York, 2006.
- [8] P. Rousseeuw, A. Leroy, Robust Regression and Outlier Detection, Wiley 2nd edition: John Wiley & Sons, New York, 2003.
- [9] P. J. Rousseeuw, Least median of squares regression, Journal of the American Statistical Association 79(388) (1984) 871–880.
- [10] P. J. Rousseeuw, K. Van Driessen, Computing LTS regression for large data sets, Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 12(1) (2006) 29–45.
- [11] A. Alfons, C. Croux, S. Gelper, Sparse least trimmed squares regression for analyzing high-dimensional large data sets, The Annals of Applied Statistics 7(1) (2013) 226–248.
- [12] A. Alfons, robustHD: Robust methods for high dimensional data, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, R package version 0.4.0 (2013).
URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=robustHD>

- [13] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent, *Journal of Statistical Software* 33(1) (2010) 1–22.
- [14] A. Albert, J. Anderson, On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates in logistic regression models, *Biometrika* 71 (1984) 1–10.
- [15] J. Friedman, T. Hastie, N. Simon, R. Tibshirani, *glmnet: Lasso and Elastic Net Regularized Generalized Linear Models*, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, R package version 2.0-5 (2016).
URL <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=glmnet>
- [16] C. Croux, G. Haesbroeck, Implementing the Bianco and Yohai estimator for logistic regression, *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis* 44(1–2) (2003) 273–295.
- [17] V. Bianco, A.M. Yohai, Robust Estimation in Logistic Regression Model, in *robust Statistics, Data Analysis, and Computer Intensive Methods*, 17–34; *Lecture Notes in Statistics* **109**, Springer Verlag, Ed. H., Rieder: New York, 1996.
- [18] R Development Core Team, *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*, Vienna, Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, ISBN 3-900051-07-0 (2017).
URL <http://www.R-project.org>
- [19] J. Kissel, K. Altwegg, B. Clark, L. Colangeli, H. Cottin, S. Czempiel, J. Eibl, C. Engrand, H. Fehring, B. Feuerbacher, et al., COSIMA–high resolution time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometer for the analysis of cometary dust particles onboard Rosetta, *Space Science Reviews* 128 (1–4) (2007) 823–867.
- [20] R. Schulz, M. Hilchenbach, Y. Langevin, J. Kissel, J. Silen, C. Briois, C. Engrand, K. Hornung, D. Baklouti, A. Bardyn, et al., Comet

- 505 67P/Churyumov-Gerasimenko sheds dust coat accumulated over the past
four years, *Nature* 518(7538) (2015) 216–218.
- [21] K. Varmuza, C. Engrand, P. Filzmoser, M. Hilchenbach, J. Kissel,
H. Krüger, J. Silén, M. Trieloff, Random projection for dimensionality re-
duction - applied to time-of-flight secondary ion mass spectrometry data,
510 *Analytica Chimica Acta* 705(1) (2011) 48–55.
- [22] K. Janssens, I. Deraedt, A. Freddy, J. Veekman, Composition of 15-
17 th century archeological glass vessels excavated in Antwerp, Belgium,
Mikrochimica Acta 15 (1998) 253–267.
- [23] P. Filzmoser, R. Maronna, W. M., Outlier identification in high dimensions,
515 *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* 52(3) (2008) 1694–1711.
- [24] B. Efron, T. Hastie, I. Johnstone, R. Tibshirani, Least angle regression,
The Annals of Statistics 32(2) (2004) 407–499.
- [25] Robust logistic regression modelling via the elastic net-type regularization
and tuning parameter selection, *Journal of Statistical Computation and*
520 *Simulation* 86 (7) (2016) 1450–1461.