

Simultaneous Feature Selection and Outlier Detection with Optimality Guarantees

Luca Insolia*

Faculty of Sciences, Scuola Normale Superiore

Ana Kenney

Dept. of Statistics, Penn State University

Francesca Chiaromonte

Dept. of Statistics, Penn State University

Inst. of Economics & EMbeDS, Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies

Giovanni Felici

Istituto di Analisi dei Sistemi ed Informatica, Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche

Abstract

Sparse estimation methods capable of tolerating outliers have been broadly investigated in the last decade. We contribute to this research considering high-dimensional regression problems contaminated by multiple *mean-shift outliers* which affect both the response and the design matrix. We develop a general framework for this class of problems and propose the use of *mixed-integer programming* to simultaneously perform feature selection and outlier detection with provably optimal guarantees. We characterize the theoretical properties of our approach, i.e. a necessary and sufficient condition for the *robustly strong oracle property*, which allows the number of features to exponentially increase with the sample size; the optimal estimation of the parameters; and the breakdown point of the resulting estimates. Moreover, we provide computationally efficient procedures to tune integer constraints and to warm-start the algorithm. We show the superior performance of our proposal compared to existing heuristic methods through numerical simulations and an application investigating the relationships between the human microbiome and childhood obesity.

KEY WORDS: Sparse estimation; Mixed-integer programming; Strong oracle property; Robust regression; Breakdown point.

*This work was partially funded by the NIH B2D2K training grant and the Huck Institutes of the Life Sciences of Penn State. Computation was performed on the Institute for Computational and Data Sciences Advanced CyberInfrastructure (ICDS-ACI; Penn State University).

1 Introduction

High-dimensional regression problems have become ubiquitous in most application domains. In these problems the number of features recorded on each observation (or case) is very large – possibly larger than the sample size, and often growing with the sample size itself. The availability of ever larger numbers of potential predictors increases both the chances that some substantial portion of them are irrelevant, and the chances of contamination in the data (i.e. some cases following a different model). Thus, it is critical to employ estimation approaches that address both *sparsity* and *statistical robustness*. The *Mean-Shift Outlier Model* (MSOM) is a common paradigm leading to the exclusion of outliers from the fit (Beckman and Cook 1983). In the high-dimensional setting, traditional approaches focused on robustifying information criteria or resampling methods (Müller and Welsh 2005). In the last decade several *robust penalization methods* have been introduced in the literature. They generally rely on a robustification of soft-selection procedures (Alfons et al. 2013), adopting a case-wise robust counterpart of *Maximum Likelihood Estimation* (MLE). The MSOM can be equivalently parametrized with the inclusion of binary variables (Cook and Weisberg 1982), transforming outlier detection into a feature selection problem (Morgenthaler et al. 2004) and motivating the development of methods for *simultaneous feature selection and outlier detection* (SFSOD).

In contrast to existing methodologies which extensively rely on heuristics, we propose a discrete and provably optimal approach to perform SFSOD, highlighting its connections with other approaches. The L_0 constraint has been used separately in the context of feature selection (Bertsimas et al. 2016; Bertsimas and Van Parys 2020) and robust estimation (Zioutas et al. 2009; Bertsimas and Mazumder 2014) – both of which can be formulated as a *Mixed-Integer Program* (MIP) and solved with optimality guarantees. We combine these two approaches into a novel formulation and take advantage of existing heuristics to provide effective big- \mathcal{M} bounds and warm-starts to reduce the computational burden of MIP. We provide theoretical guarantees for our approach, including its high breakdown point, a necessary and sufficient condition to achieve the *robustly strong oracle property* – which holds also in the ultra-high dimensional case with the number of features exponentially increasing with the sample size – and optimal parameter estimation. In contrast to existing methods, our approach requires weaker assumptions and allows both the feature sparsity level and the amount of contamination to depend on the number of predictors and the sample size, respectively. Moreover, we propose criteria to tune, in a computationally efficient and data-driven way, both the sparsity of the solution and the estimated amount of contamination.

The article is organized as follows: Section 2 discusses the relevant background for outlier detection and feature selection. Section 3 details our proposal – including a general framework for SFSOD, the MIP formulation and its theoretical properties. Section 4 presents a simulation study comparing our proposal with state-of-the-art methods and

Section 5 presents our real data application investigating the relationships between child obesity and the human microbiome. Final remarks are included in Section 6 and additional details are provided in the Supplementary Material.

2 Background

Consider a regression model of the form $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the response vector, $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ the error vector with a $N(\mathbf{0}, \sigma^2 \mathbf{I}_n)$ distribution (\mathbf{I}_n is the identity matrix of size n), $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ the design matrix, and $\boldsymbol{\beta} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ the vector of regression coefficients. In the following, we describe the relevant background for our proposal. In particular, we briefly review methods for outlier detection, and present the equivalent formulation as a feature selection problem. We then discuss approaches for model selection, focusing on the use of an L_0 constraint for best subset selection.

We consider a case-wise contamination mechanism, where each outlying unit might be contaminated in some (or even all) of its dimensions. In particular, we assume that outliers are generated by an MSOM, where the set of outliers $M = \{i \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \varepsilon_i \sim N(\lambda_{\varepsilon_i}, \sigma^2), \lambda_{\varepsilon_i} \neq 0\}$ has cardinality $|M| = n_0$. For a given dimension $p < n - n_0$, it is well-known that MLE leads to the removal of outliers from the fit (Cook and Weisberg 1982). Moreover, as is customary, we assume that the MSOM can also affect the design matrix \mathbf{X} with mean shifts $\lambda_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ (Maronna et al. 2006).

If a regression comprises a single outlier, its position corresponds to the unit with largest absolute Studentized residual, which is a monotone transformation of the deletion residual $t_i = (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(i)}) / (\hat{\sigma}_{(i)} (1 + \mathbf{x}_i^T (\mathbf{X}_{(i)}^T \mathbf{X}_{(i)})^{-1} \mathbf{x}_i)^{1/2})$, where the subscript (i) indicates the removal of the i -th unit (Atkinson 1985). Under the null model, t_i is distributed as a Student's t with $n - p - 1$ degrees of freedom, which can be computed from an MLE fit based on all units and used as a test for outlying-ness of single data points (Cook and Weisberg 1982). The same idea can be easily generalized to regressions with multiple outliers. Operationally though, this was considered ineffective – due to the high likelihood of masking (undetected outlying cases) and swamping (non-outlying cases flagged as outliers) effects (Huber and Ronchetti 2009) – and computationally intractable (Bernholt 2006). This motivated the development of high-breakdown point estimators such as the Least Trimmed Squares (LTS), S, and MM (Maronna et al. 2006, see Section 3.3 for more details); outlier detection and high-breakdown point estimation are historically distinct but closely related areas of statistical research (Huber and Ronchetti 2009).

Assuming without loss of generality that outliers occupy the first n_0 positions in the data, the MSOM can be equivalently parametrized as $\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta} + \mathbf{D}_{n_0}\boldsymbol{\phi} + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$, where the original design matrix \mathbf{X} is augmented with a binary matrix $\mathbf{D}_{n_0} = [\mathbf{I}_{n_0}, \mathbf{0}]^T$ of size $n \times n_0$ indexing the n_0 outliers (Morgenthaler et al. 2004). If $p < n - n_0$, the MLE for $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^{n_0}$ provides prediction residuals for the n_0 units excluded from the fit; i.e. their residuals under a model which excludes them from the estimation process. This is given by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}} =$

$[\mathbf{I}_{n_0} - \mathbf{H}_{MM}]^{-1}(\mathbf{y}_M - \mathbf{X}_M^T \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{(M)})$, where $\mathbf{H}_{MM} = \mathbf{X}_M(\mathbf{X}^T \mathbf{X})^{-1} \mathbf{X}_M^T$, and the associated t -statistics \mathbf{t}_M provide (multiple) deletion residuals. However, masking and swamping effects can again arise if \mathbf{D}_{n_0} does not index all possible outliers.

Outlier detection in low-dimensional problems can be performed substituting the identity matrix \mathbf{I}_n in place of \mathbf{D}_{n_0} and applying feature selection methods to $\boldsymbol{\phi} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ to identify outlying cases. The literature contains examples of both convex (McCann 2006; Taylan et al. 2014; Liu and Jiang 2019) and non-convex (She and Owen 2011; Liu et al. 2017; Gómez 2019; Barratt et al. 2020) penalization methods applied to this problem; notably, the latter are necessary to achieve high-breakdown point estimates.

Penalization methods are also the hallmark of feature selection in high dimensional problems, where they seek to induce sparsity estimating $p_0 < p$ non-zero coefficients in $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ – whose dimension p can exceed n . Soft penalization methods such as Lasso (Tibshirani 1996), SCAD (Fan and Li 2001), adaptive Lasso (Zou 2006) and MCP (Zhang 2010) rely on non-differentiable continuous penalties, which can be convex or non-convex. They can be formulated as $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} = \arg \min_{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_2^2 + R_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$, where the penalty function $R_{\omega}(\boldsymbol{\beta})$ depends on a tuning parameter ω .

Best subset selection, a traditional hard penalization method, solves feature selection combinatorially, comparing all possible models of size p_0 (Miller 2002). This can be formulated as a MIP through an L_0 constraint on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$, where the L_0 pseudo-norm is defined as $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}\|_0 = \sum_j I(\beta_j \neq 0)$ ($I(\cdot)$ is the indicator function). The MIP formulation of best subset selection is computationally intractable (Natarajan 1995) and was previously considered impossible to solve with optimality guarantees for regression problems with p larger than a few tens (Hastie et al. 2015). Nevertheless, improvements in optimization solvers and hardware components, which experienced a 450 billion factor speed-up between 1991 and 2015 alone, now allow one to efficiently solve problems of realistic size with provable optimality (Bertsimas et al. 2016). Modern MIP solvers are based on implicit enumeration methods along with constraints such as *cutting planes* that tighten the relaxed problem (*Branch & Bound* and *Branch & Cut*, Schrijver 1986). Optimality is certified monitoring the gap between the best feasible solution and the relaxation of the problem. Importantly, MIP methods can recover the subset of true active features (i.e. they satisfy oracle properties, see Section 3.3) under weaker assumptions compared to soft penalization methods.

3 Proposed methodology

We focus on a regression comprising both outliers and inactive features, where one has to tackle at the same time an *unlabeled* MSOM problem (i.e. one where the identity, number and strength of outliers are unknown, Beckman and Cook 1983) and the sparse estimation

of β . SFSOD can be framed as an optimization problem; namely:

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{\beta}, \hat{\phi}] &= \arg \min_{\beta, \phi} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(y_i, f(\mathbf{x}_i; \beta) + \phi_i) \\ \text{s.t. } & R_\omega(\beta) \leq c_\beta \\ & R_\gamma(\phi) \leq c_\phi, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\rho(\cdot)$ is a loss function, $f(\cdot)$ defines the relation between predictors and response vector, and $R_\omega(\beta)$ and $R_\gamma(\phi)$ are penalties subject to sparsity-inducing constraints, which may depend on tuning constants ω and γ . Non-zero coefficients in $\hat{\beta}$ and $\hat{\phi}$ identify active features and outlying units, respectively. Although in this article we focus on linear regression the framework in (1) is very general; it comprises Generalized Linear Models, several classification techniques and non-parametric methods.

Many approaches have been recently developed to solve (1) using *Ordinary Least Squares* (OLS) as the loss function $\rho(\cdot)$. Both penalties $R_\omega(\beta)$ and $R_\gamma(\phi)$ are generally convex (Morgenthaler et al. 2004; Menjoge and Welsch 2010; Lee et al. 2012; Kong et al. 2018) although some non-convex procedures have been considered (She and Owen 2011). Similar ideas have been explored from a Bayesian perspective (Hoeting et al. 1996) and for the estimation of units' weights (Li 2012; Xiong and Joseph 2013). Robust soft penalization methods also can be cast into (1), abandoning the explicit use of ϕ and adopting a robust loss $\rho(\cdot)$ in place of the OLS. These include MM-estimators for ridge regression (Maronna 2011), sparse-LTS (Alfons et al. 2013), bridge MM-estimators (Smucler and Yohai 2017), enet-LTS (Kurnaz et al. 2017), penalized elastic net S-estimators (Freue et al. 2019), and penalized M-estimators (Loh 2017; Chang et al. 2018; Amato et al. 2020), as well as their re-weighted counterparts. Indeed, through specific penalties, M-estimators can be equivalently formulated as feature selection problems (She and Owen 2011). Related approaches include the robust LARS (Khan et al. 2007), robust adaptive Lasso (Machkour et al. 2017), and penalized exponential squared loss (Wang et al. 2013).

While (1) highlights an important parallel between SFSOD and robust soft penalization, existing heuristic methods suffer several drawbacks. Some rely on restrictive assumptions or their finite-sample and asymptotic performance in terms of feature selection and outlier detection is not well-established. Others rely heavily on an initial subset of cases identified as non-outlying. Yet others provide a down-weighting of all units, which complicates interpretation and the objective identification of outliers, or have an asymptotic breakdown point of 0%, so they in fact do not tolerate outliers in the first place. Finally, some methods require tuning of several parameters in addition to ω and γ , which can severely increase computational burden. Our proposal solves (1) with optimality guarantees, from both optimization and theoretical perspectives. This preserves the intrinsic discreteness of the problem, facilitating implementation, interpretation, and generalizations.

3.1 MIP formulation

We impose two separate integer constraints on β and ϕ in (1), combining in a single framework the use of L_0 constraints for feature selection (Bertsimas et al. 2016; Kenney et al. 2018; Bertsimas and Van Parys 2020) and outlier detection (Bertsimas and Mazumder 2014; Zioutas et al. 2009). In particular, we consider the following MIP formulation:

$$[\hat{\beta}, \hat{\phi}] = \arg \min_{\beta, z^\beta, \phi, z^\phi} \frac{1}{n} \rho(\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\beta - \phi) \quad (2)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad -\mathcal{M}_j^\beta z_j^\beta \leq \beta_j \leq \mathcal{M}_j^\beta z_j^\beta \quad (2a)$$

$$-\mathcal{M}_i^\phi z_i^\phi \leq \phi_i \leq \mathcal{M}_i^\phi z_i^\phi \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^p \beta_j^2 \leq \lambda \quad (2c)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^p z_j^\beta \leq k_p \quad (2d)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n z_i^\phi \leq k_n \quad (2e)$$

$$\beta_j \in \mathbb{R}, \quad z_j^\beta \in \{0, 1\}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p \quad (2f)$$

$$\phi_i \in \mathbb{R}, \quad z_i^\phi \in \{0, 1\}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (2g)$$

where \mathcal{M}^β and \mathcal{M}^ϕ in constraints (2a) and (2b) are the so-called big- \mathcal{M} bounds (Schrijver 1986). In our proposal these are vectors of lengths p and n , respectively, which can be tailored for each β_j and ϕ_i . In the L_0 -norm constraints (2d) and (2e), k_p and k_n are positive integers modulating sparsity for feature selection and outlier detection, respectively – for the latter, we can think of sparsity as a level of trimming (i.e. outlier removal). In the L_2 -norm ridge-like constraint (2c), λ is a positive scalar that can be used to counteract strong collinearities among the features (Hoerl and Kennard 1970). Here it also modulates a trade-off between continuity and unbiasedness in the estimation of β , and allows one to calibrate the intrinsic discreteness of the problem – making its solutions more stable with respect to small data perturbations (Breiman 1995) and weak signal-to-noise ratio regimes (Hastie et al. 2017).

Although solving (2) plainly with state-of-the-art software may be computationally intractable for large dimensions, with the appropriate implementation it can be used to tackle many real-world applications optimally and efficiently. Another important advantage of our framework from an application standpoint is that it allows one to easily incorporate additional constraints to leverage structure in the data – such as groups (Zou and Hastie 2005), ranked features (Tibshirani et al. 2005), hierarchical interactions (Bien et al. 2013) and compositional information (Lin et al. 2014). Moreover, the L_0 -penalty (also called entropy penalty) is not equivalent to the L_0 constrained formulation used in MIP due to

non-convexity (Shen et al. 2013).

3.2 Some implementation details

As customary in feature selection problems, we do not penalize the intercept and we standardize features at the outset. Because the regressions we focus on comprise outliers, we use a robust standardization; both \mathbf{y} and \mathbf{X} are centered to have zero medians, and each \mathbf{X}_j is also scaled to have unit median absolute deviation (MAD); results in the output are given in the original scale. Although binary features are often standardized (Tibshirani 1997), since the constraints on β and ϕ are separate, we do not standardize the binary variables used in the outlier detection component of the problem. Note that the interpretation of the entries in ϕ as prediction residuals indicates that they are already on the same scale under the null model.

Setting the big- \mathcal{M} bounds for (2) is made even more complicated due to the “double” nature of SFSOD. A robust estimator of the regression coefficients, say $\tilde{\beta}$, can be used to set $\mathcal{M}^\beta = \tilde{\beta}c$ and $\mathcal{M}^\phi = (\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}\tilde{\beta})c = \tilde{e}c$, where $c \geq 1$ is a suitable multiplicative constant. We generalize this approach using an *ensemble* $\tilde{\beta}_t$ (for $t = 1, \dots, T$) of preliminary estimators and setting $\mathcal{M}_j^\beta = \max_t(|\tilde{\beta}_{tj}|)c$ and $\mathcal{M}_i^\phi = \max_t(|\tilde{e}_{ti}|)c$. The ensemble guarantees that, if at least one of the $\tilde{\beta}_t$ ’s is reasonably close to the optimal solution, the MIP will easily recover such solution. Importantly, having also non-robust or non-sparse estimators in the ensemble does not negatively affect solution quality but only convergence speed.

The MIP formulation in (2) critically depends on the big- \mathcal{M} bounds; they should be large enough to retain the optimal solution, yet small enough to avoid unnecessary computations and numerical instability. If identifying suitable bounds is not possible, we use an alternative strategy based on *Specially Ordered Sets of Type 1* (SOS-1) (Bertsimas et al. 2016). These allow only one variable in the set to be non-zero, e.g., $(1 - z_j^\beta, \beta_j) = 0 \iff (1 - z_j^\beta, \beta_j) : \text{SOS-1}$. Hence, constraints (2a) and (2b) can be equivalently formulated as:

$$(1 - z_j^\beta, \beta_j) : \text{SOS-1}, \quad j = 1, \dots, p \tag{3a}$$

$$(1 - z_i^\phi, \phi_i) : \text{SOS-1}, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \tag{3b}$$

which can be solved via modern MIP solvers such as Gurobi or CPLEX. SOS-1 constraints in (2) guarantee that the global optimum can be reached, and generally outperform big- \mathcal{M} bounds when these are difficult to reasonably set.

The formulation in (2) also, and critically, requires the tuning of k_p , k_n and, if a ridge-like constraint is included in the model, λ . Performing this simultaneously along an extensive grid of values can be computationally unviable for MIP. We therefore proceed as follows: **(i)** fix λ (possibly, in turn, to a few values in a meaningful range); **(ii)** fix k_n to a starting value larger than a reasonable expectation on the amount of contamination in the problem (n_0); **(iii)** holding fixed the k_n starting value from (ii), tune k_p through cross-validation or

an information criterion; **(iv)** holding fixed the k_p value selected in (iii), refine downward the value of k_n .

For cross-validation in (iii) we use the computationally efficient integrated scheme introduced in Kenney et al. (2018), robustifying the performance measure (the mean squared prediction error) with an upper trimmed sum. Choosing the trimming level is again not trivial, because cross-validation folds might contain different proportions of outliers. In order to be conservative, we fix the trimming proportion to $3k_n/n$ on the test fold and to $2k_n/n$ on the training folds. For information criteria in (iii) the situation is more straightforward, as one can compute robust values for them using only cases identified as non-outlying in any given MIP run. Refining k_n downward in (iv) improves efficiency in estimating β , which can be low if the starting k_n in (ii) is substantially larger than the true n_0 , excluding non-outlying cases from the fit. Assuming that the selected model of size k_p in (iii) is close to the true p_0 active features, iteratively reducing k_n provides an effective strategy to pinpoint when outliers start to be included in the fit. Similarly to the Forward Search algorithm (Atkinson and Riani 2000), this can be done monitoring an appropriate statistic (e.g., the minimum absolute deletion residuals) along iterations.

3.3 Theoretical results

In this Section, we characterize the theoretical properties of our proposal through two groups of results. The first comprises properties established under the general framework introduced in (2). The second comprises key properties established under an L_2 -norm loss function ($\rho(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_2^2$); namely, the *robustly strong oracle property* and *optimal parameter estimation* for SFSOD. All proofs are provided in the Supplementary Material.

Without much loss of generality, we assume that (2) has a unique global minimum, and that the loss function is such that $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ with $\rho(\mathbf{0}) = 0$ (this is the case for OLS and many other instances, such as estimation in quantile regression and robust estimators). Our first result connects our proposal to a large class of penalized methods based on trimming.

Proposition 1 (Sparse trimming). For any λ , n , p , k_n and k_p , the $\hat{\beta}$ estimator produced solving (2) is the same as the one produced solving

$$\begin{aligned} \arg \min_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n} (\rho(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta))_{i:n} &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n} (\rho(e_i))_{i:n} \\ \text{s.t.} \quad &(2a), (2c), (2d), (2f) \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where e_i (for $i = 1, \dots, n$) are the residuals, and $(\rho(e_1))_{1:n} \leq \dots \leq (\rho(e_n))_{n:n}$ the order statistics of their $\rho(\cdot)$ transformation.

Proposition 1 demonstrates the equivalence of our formulation to a trimmed loss problem, where the level of trimming is directly controlled by the L_0 constraint on ϕ . This extends a well-known result for unpenalized OLS and motivates the formulation in (1) as a general

framework for SFSOD. In particular, (4) includes as special cases the LTS and the Trimmed Likelihood Estimator (Rousseeuw and Yohai 1984; Hadi and Luceño 1997). Thus, our MIP approach for SFSOD inherits the desirable properties of these robust estimators.

The largest proportion of outliers that an estimator can tolerate before becoming arbitrarily biased is referred to as the *breakdown point*. In symbols, consider a sample $\mathbf{Z} = (\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n)$ with $\mathbf{z}_i = (y_i, \mathbf{x}_i^T)$. The *maximum bias* for an estimator, say $\boldsymbol{\tau}$, is $b^*(n_0; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{Z}) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}} \|\boldsymbol{\tau}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}) - \boldsymbol{\tau}(\mathbf{Z})\|_2$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}}$ represents \mathbf{Z} after the replacement of n_0 points by arbitrary values. The *finite-sample replacement breakdown point* (BdP henceforth), defined as $\epsilon^*(\boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{Z}) = \min_{n_0} [n_0/n : b^*(n_0; \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{Z}) \rightarrow \infty]$, represents the maximum proportion of observations that, when arbitrarily replaced, still provide bounded estimates (Donoho and Huber 1983). Our second result shows that our MIP approach for SFSOD achieves arbitrarily large BdP.

Proposition 2 (Breakdown point). For any λ, n, p, k_n and k_p , the the BdP of the $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$ estimator produced solving (2) is $\epsilon^* = (k_n + 1)/n$.

Thus, $k_n \geq n_0$ is the only requirement to achieve the largest possible BdP. Similar results were obtained for the low-dimensional Least Quantile Estimator (Bertsimas and Mazumder 2014), the LTS estimator with a Lasso penalty (Alfons et al. 2013), and MM-estimators with a ridge or elastic net penalty (Maronna 2011; Kurnaz et al. 2017). However, there are two caveats: the BdP can be misleading for non-equivariant estimators (Smucler and Yohai 2017), and it only guarantees against the worst-case scenario – infinite maximum bias – as it does not account for the presence of large but finite biases in $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$. This motivates the development of the robustly strong oracle property as well as optimal parameter estimation under the L_2 -norm to provide additional theoretical guarantees.

Next, we exclude the ridge-like penalty and take $\rho(\cdot) = \|\cdot\|_2^2$, making (2) a *Mixed-Integer Quadratic Program* (MIQP). In this setting, we prove that under certain conditions our approach satisfies the *robustly strong oracle property* (see Definition 1, based on Fan et al. 2014). In the following, we use the L_0 sparsity assumption on $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ and $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ as in Zhang and Zhang (2012). Recall that MSOM leads to outlier removal (see Section 2), and we showed in Proposition 1 that the L_0 constraint on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ controls the level of trimming from the fit, thus this sparsity assumption on $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ is equivalent to the presence of MSOM outliers. In our SFSOD problem, as customary in feature selection literature, let $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\beta}_0^T, \boldsymbol{\phi}_0^T)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{p+n}$ be the true parameter vector, and decompose it as $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathcal{S}}^T, \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^T)^T = [(\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_\beta}^T, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{S}_\phi}^T), (\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_\beta^c}^T, \boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{S}_\phi^c}^T)]^T$ where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\mathcal{S}}$ contains only the true non-zero regression coefficients. Let $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ be the *robust oracle estimator* $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0 = (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}} = [\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}_\beta}, \mathbf{I}_{\mathcal{S}_\phi}]$ is the $n \times (p_0 + n_0)$ matrix restricted to the active features belonging to \mathcal{S}_β and the outlying cases belonging to \mathcal{S}_ϕ . $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0$ behaves as if the sets of active features and outliers are both known in advance.

Definition 1 (Robustly strong oracle property). An estimator $\hat{\beta}$ with support $\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta$ satisfies the robustly strong oracle property if (asymptotically) there exists tuning parameters which guarantee $P(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta = \mathcal{S}_\beta) \geq P(\hat{\beta} = \hat{\beta}_0) \rightarrow 1$ in presence of MSOM outliers.

Such robust version of the oracle property is stronger and more general than the oracle property in the sense of [Fan and Li \(2001\)](#), as it implies both SFSOD consistency and sign consistency (see also [Bradic et al. 2011](#)). Thus, SFSOD consistency depends on the achievability of the robust oracle estimator which we investigate by extending the theoretical framework developed by [Shen et al. \(2013\)](#) for feature selection. This requires weaker assumptions compared to other penalization methods ([Zhang and Zhang 2012](#)), and we generalize it to the presence of MSOM outliers. Intuitively, if the robust oracle estimator is achievable (i.e. if it has the lowest in-sample mean squared error for models of the same size), it is also the solution of our MIQP when the integer constraints are set to $k_p = p_0$ and $k_n = n_0$. Achievability depends on the difficulty of the problem, as measured by the *minimal degree of separation* between the true model and a least favorable model – indexed by the supports \mathcal{S} and $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}$, respectively. This is defined as

$$\Delta_\theta(\mathbf{A}) = \min_{\theta_{\mathcal{S}:\tilde{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}}, |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\beta| \leq p_0, |\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_\phi| \leq n_0} \frac{\|\mathbf{A}_\mathcal{S}\theta_\mathcal{S} - \mathbf{A}_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}\theta_{\tilde{\mathcal{S}}}\|_2^2}{n \max(|\mathcal{S} \setminus \tilde{\mathcal{S}}|, 1)},$$

which relates to the signal-to-noise-ratio and can be bounded as $\Delta_\theta \leq \Delta_\beta + \Delta_\phi$ (with Δ_β and Δ_ϕ defined similarly to Δ_θ using \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{I}_n , respectively). We control this level of difficulty in [Proposition 3](#), which provides a *necessary* condition for SFSOD consistency over $B(u, l) = \{\theta : \|\theta\|_0 \leq u, \Delta_\theta \geq l\}$, the L_0 -band with upper and lower radii u and l , respectively (a subset of the L_0 -ball $B(u, 0)$ excluding a neighborhood of the origin).

Proposition 3 (Necessary condition for SFSOD consistency). For any support estimate $\hat{\mathcal{S}}$ and $u > l > 0$, $\sup_{\theta_0 \in B(u, l)} P(\hat{\mathcal{S}} = \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 1$ implies that

$$\Delta_\theta \geq l = \frac{\sigma^2}{n} \max\{d_\beta \log(p), d_\phi \log(n)\}, \quad (5)$$

where $d_\beta > 0$ (which may depend on \mathbf{X}) and $d_\phi > 0$ are constants independent of n and p .

This lower bound on Δ_θ indicates one can focus on solving the most difficult task between outlier detection and feature selection; if this is achievable, *a fortiori*, the other will be as well. Next, we provide a *sufficient* condition for SFSOD consistency based on a finite-sample result bounding the probability that our proposal differs from the robust oracle estimator. Note that for our formulation $\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{L_0} = \mathcal{S} \iff \hat{\theta}_{L_0} = \hat{\theta}_0$.

Proposition 4 (Oracle reconstruction for MIQP). For any n, p, n_0 and p_0 , the $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0}$ estimator produced solving (2) with $k_p = p_0$ and $k_n = n_0$ is such that

$$P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \leq \frac{5e-1}{e-1} \max \left\{ \exp \left(-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left[\Delta_{\beta_0} - 36\sigma^2 \frac{\log(p)}{n} \right] \right), \right. \\ \left. \exp \left(-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left[\Delta_{\phi_0} - 36\sigma^2 \frac{\log(n)}{n} \right] \right) \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Based on these results, one can easily prove the robustly strong oracle property as follows.

Proposition 5 (MIQP robustly strong oracle property). Assume that $u_\theta = u_\phi + u_\beta$, where $u_\phi < n - k_p$ and $u_\beta < \min(n - k_n, p)$, and that there exists a constant $d_\theta > 36$ such that $l_\theta = d_\theta \sigma^2 / n \max\{\log(p), \log(n)\}$. Then, under (5) and for $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$, the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0}$ produced solving (2) with $k_p = p_0$ and $k_n = n_0$ satisfies

1. Robustly strong oracle property: $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in B(u_\theta, l_\theta)} P(\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{L_0} = \mathcal{S}) \geq \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in B(u_\theta, l_\theta)} P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \rightarrow 1$ uniformly over $B(u_\theta, l_\theta) = \{\boldsymbol{\theta} : \|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_0 = (p_0 + n_0) \leq u_\theta, \Delta_\theta \geq l_\theta\}$.
2. Asymptotic normality: $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow^d N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta^{-1})$, where $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta = \sigma^2(\mathbf{A}_S^T \mathbf{A}_S / n)^{-1}$.

Proposition 5(1) provides a sufficient condition for SFSOD consistency and the robust oracle reconstruction up to a constant term d_θ . Note that the number of features is allowed to exponentially increase with the sample size – so these properties hold also in ultra-high dimensional settings where $p = O(e^{n^\alpha})$ with $\alpha = \frac{\Delta_\theta}{d_\theta \sigma^2} > 0$. Proposition 5(2) guarantees asymptotic efficiency of MIQP estimates, which achieve the Cramér–Rao lower bound as if the true sets of features and outliers are known a priori, and allows one to perform statistical inference. Importantly, existing penalized M-estimators provide weaker results under stronger assumptions (Loh 2017; Smucler and Yohai 2017; Amato et al. 2020). We conclude with a result showing that our proposal attains optimal parameter estimation with respect to the L_2 -norm in the presence of MSOM outliers.

Proposition 6 (Optimal parameter estimation). Under the same conditions of Proposition 5, the estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0}$ produced solving (2) with $k_p = p_0$ and $k_n = n_0$ provides

1. Optimal L_2 -norm prediction error: $n^{-1} E \|\mathbf{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|_2^2 = \sigma^2(p_0 + n_0)/n$.
2. Risk-minimax optimality for parameter estimation: $\sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in B(u_\theta, l_\theta)} n^{-1} E \|\mathbf{A}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|_2^2 = \inf_{\boldsymbol{\tau}_n} \sup_{\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in B(u_\theta, l_\theta)} n^{-1} E \|\mathbf{A}(\boldsymbol{\tau}_n - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0)\|_2^2 = \sigma^2 u_\theta / n$.

Finally, we note that the theoretical guarantees developed in this Section can be extended in a similar fashion to other penalization methods, albeit under stronger assumptions. For instance, one might consider the regularized L_0 -penalty or the trimmed L_1 -penalty. Importantly, our results do hold also when p_0 depends on p and/or n_0 depends on n which

has yet to be established for other methods in the literature (Shen et al. 2013). We stress the fact that all results for the proposed formulation rely on the identification of the true k_p and k_n tuning parameters. While this is a standard requirement to establish oracle properties (see Fan and Li 2001), it highlights the importance of proper tuning for these bounds (see Section 3).

4 Simulation study

We use simulations to investigate the performance of our proposal and compare it with state-of-the-art heuristic methods. The simulated data is generated as follows. The first column of the $n \times p$ design matrix \mathbf{X} comprises all 1's (for the model intercept) and we draw the remaining entries of each row independently from a $(p - 1)$ -variate Gaussian $N(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma_X)$, we fix the values of the p -dimensional coefficient vector β as to comprise p_0 non-zero entries (including the intercept), and we draw each entry of the n -dimensional error vector ϵ independently from a univariate Gaussian $N(0, \sigma_{\text{SNR}}^2)$. Here the positive scalar σ_{SNR}^2 is used to modulate the signal-to-noise-ratio $\text{SNR} = \text{var}(\mathbf{X}\beta)/\sigma_{\text{SNR}}^2$ characterizing each experiment. Next, without loss of generality, we contaminate the first n_0 cases with an MSOM, adding the scalar mean shifts λ_ϵ and λ_X , respectively, to the errors and each of the $p_0 - 1$ active predictors.

Specific simulation scenarios are defined through the values of the parameters listed above. Here, we present results for $\Sigma_X = \mathbf{I}_{p-1}$ (uncorrelated features), $p_0 = 5$ active features with $\beta_j = 2$ (without loss of generality these correspond to $j = 1, \dots, 5$), $\text{SNR} = 5$, fraction of contamination $n_0/n = 0.1$, mean shifts $\lambda_\epsilon = -10$ and $\lambda_X = 10$, increasing sample sizes $n = 50, 100, 150$, and a “low”- and a “high”-dimensional setting with $p = 50, 200$. Results for additional simulation scenarios are provided in the Supplementary Material.

Replicating each scenario a certain number of (independent) times, say q , and creating (independent) test data, say $(\mathbf{y}^*, \mathbf{X}^*)$, from the same generating scheme but without contamination, we compare methods with a variety of criteria, namely: (i) out-of-sample prediction performance, measured by the *root mean squared prediction error* $\text{RMSPE} = \sqrt{n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i^* - \mathbf{x}_i^* \hat{\beta})^2}$; (ii) estimation accuracy for β , measured by the *average mean squared error* $\text{MSE}(\hat{\beta}) = p^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^p \text{MSE}(\hat{\beta}_j)$, where for each $\hat{\beta}_j$ we form $\text{MSE}(\hat{\beta}_j) = q^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^q (\hat{\beta}_{ji} - \beta_j)^2 = (\bar{\beta}_j - \beta_j)^2 + q^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^q (\hat{\beta}_{ji} - \bar{\beta}_j)^2$, decomposed in squared bias and variance (here $\bar{\beta}_j = q^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^q \hat{\beta}_{ji}$); (iii) feature selection accuracy, measured by the *false positive rate* $\text{FPR}(\hat{\beta}) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \hat{\beta}_j \neq 0 \wedge \beta_j = 0\}| / |\{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \beta_j = 0\}|$ and the *false negative rate* $\text{FNR}(\hat{\beta}) = |\{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \hat{\beta}_j = 0 \wedge \beta_j \neq 0\}| / |\{j \in \{1, \dots, p\} : \beta_j \neq 0\}|$; (iv) outlier detection accuracy, which is similarly measured by $\text{FPR}(\hat{\phi})$ and $\text{FNR}(\hat{\phi})$; (v) computational burden, measured as CPU time in seconds (this is used as a rough evaluation, since software implementations of different methods are not entirely comparable).

Using the robust oracle estimator as a benchmark, we compare the following estimators: (a) sparse-LTS (Alfons et al. 2013), (b) enet-LTS (Kurnaz et al. 2017), and (c) our proposal described in Section 3 (denoted MIP in result tables). All methods trim the true number of outliers ($k_n = n_0$) and only their feature sparsity level k_p is tuned. Additional implementation details can be found in the Supplementary Material.

Table 1 provides means and standard deviations (SD) of simulation results over $q = 100$ replications. Our proposal substantially outperforms competing methods in most criteria. In particular, for the low-dimensional setting ($p = 50$), its RMSPE converges faster to the oracle solution and the variance of its $\hat{\beta}$ decreases faster as n increases (the bias is essentially non-existent for all methods). Notably, the $\text{FPR}(\hat{\beta})$ of sparse-LTS and enet-LTS increases with the sample size, while our approach avoids these type II errors. Even with these sparser solutions, we retain comparable (and at times lower) $\text{FNR}(\hat{\beta})$. Our method struggles most when $n = 50$, suggesting that additional work for tuning MIP may be beneficial in under-sampled problems. All methods perform very well in terms of $\text{FPR}(\hat{\phi})$ and $\text{FNR}(\hat{\phi})$, though enet-LTS is slightly worse for $n = 50$. As expected, the computational burden of our procedure is substantially higher than that of the competing heuristic methods – though we note that averages here are not representative, as there is a marked right skew in the distribution of computing times across replications. For comparison we provide medians and MAD in Table B.3 of the Supplementary Material and find that results are even stronger. For example, the average computing time with $n = 150$ and $p = 200$ is 946.07 minutes compared to a median of 599 minutes. Our experience suggests that the growth in computational burden is mainly due to increases in the absolute number of outliers as the sample size increases.

Similar conclusions hold under the high-dimensional scenario with $n < p = 200$. Our proposal outperforms other methods in most criteria and converges faster to the oracle solution as n increases. The increased problem complexity causes right skews in the distributions across replications (see again Table B.3 of the Supplementary Material for results in terms of medians and MADs), and increases the computational burden of all methods. Also notably, $\text{FPR}(\hat{\phi})$ and $\text{FNR}(\hat{\phi})$ for outlier detection are higher compared to the low-dimensional setting.

In the Supplementary Material we report results for additional simulation scenarios, e.g., with weaker SNR and collinear features. Our method outperformed others in most of these settings as well (see Supplementary Material for details and further discussion).

5 Application

In this Section we investigate the relation between childhood obesity and the human microbiome using our approach. We use data from Craig et al. (2018) – who linked child weight gain to oral and gut microbiota compositions as part of the *Intervention Nurses Start Infants Growing on Healthy Trajectories* (INSIGHT) study (Paul et al. 2014). We note that

Table 1: Mean (SD in parenthesis) of RMSPE, variance and squared bias for $\hat{\beta}$, FPR and FNR for feature selection and outlier detection, and computing time, based on 100 simulation replications.

n	p	Method	RMSPE	$\text{var}(\hat{\beta})$	$\text{bias}(\hat{\beta})^2$	FPR($\hat{\beta}$)	FNR($\hat{\beta}$)	FPR($\hat{\phi}$)	FNR($\hat{\phi}$)	Time
50	50	Oracle	1.91(0.29)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.56(0.97)	0.05(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.20(0.23)	0.03(0.12)	0.01(0.02)	0.04(0.17)	14.72(0.68)
		SparseLTS	2.52(0.44)	0.06(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.53(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	1.53(0.21)
		MIP	2.22(0.80)	0.04(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.08(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	11.21(9.86)
100	50	Oracle	1.86(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.01(0.21)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.27(0.22)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	12.26(0.22)
		SparseLTS	2.15(0.20)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.66(0.08)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	2.23(0.34)
		MIP	1.91(0.32)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.01(0.06)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	40.62(30.78)
150	50	Oracle	1.81(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	1.92(0.19)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.39(0.27)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.67(0.22)
		SparseLTS	1.99(0.19)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.68(0.08)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	4.32(0.84)
		MIP	1.82(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.03)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	433.42(246.43)
50	200	Oracle	1.89(0.25)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	3.28(1.19)	0.03(0.00)	0.02(0.00)	0.17(0.10)	0.19(0.32)	0.02(0.03)	0.16(0.30)	44.50(2.84)
		SparseLTS	2.95(1.04)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.16(0.01)	0.08(0.21)	0.01(0.03)	0.09(0.25)	3.44(0.54)
		MIP	2.44(1.30)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.11(0.25)	0.01(0.03)	0.07(0.23)	23.32(33.84)
100	200	Oracle	1.81(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.74(1.20)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.25(0.16)	0.09(0.21)	0.02(0.03)	0.14(0.31)	55.36(5.37)
		SparseLTS	2.31(0.26)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.31(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	11.29(2.25)
		MIP	1.88(0.36)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.02(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	421.32(826.02)
150	200	Oracle	1.81(0.15)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.59(1.29)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.25(0.14)	0.07(0.16)	0.02(0.03)	0.12(0.28)	75.70(180.69)
		SparseLTS	2.25(0.20)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.41(0.04)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	18.91(2.74)
		MIP	1.84(0.23)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.01(0.03)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	946.07(987.32)

all data are publicly available; raw microbiota reads were deposited in SRA under BioProject number PRJNA420339 (see www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/bioproject/PRJNA420339) and phenotype information was deposited under dbGaP study number phs001498.v1.p1 (see www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/projects/gap/cgi-bin/study.cgi?study_id=phs001498.v1.p1). While previous work (Goodson et al. 2009; Haffajee and Socransky 2009; Zeigler et al. 2012) focused on the relationship between adult and/or adolescent obesity and microbiome compositions, Craig et al. (2018) connected infant weight gain (which is known to be predictive of obesity later in life, Taveras et al. 2009) to oral and gut microbiota of the child, as well as oral microbiome of the mother. The goal of our analysis is to further study these relationships – selecting relevant bacterial types (features) while accounting for potential outliers in the data.

Based on the pre-processing in Craig et al. (2018), we retained 215 child oral, 189 child gut, and 215 maternal oral samples. Correspondingly, we considered the abundances of 77, 74 and 78 bacterial “types”, respectively – which the original authors obtained aggregating phylogenetically very sparse and correlated abundance data (we further filtered based on those with a MAD of zero). We also focused on one among the phenotypes studied in Craig et al. (2018); namely, *Conditional Weight Gain Score* (CWG) – a continuous measure computed from weight gain between birth and six months, which is commonly used in pediatric research (Griffiths et al. 2009; Savage et al. 2016) (a positive CWG indicates an accelerated weight gain).

We thus applied our approach along with enet-LTS, sparse-LTS and classical Lasso to

three main models; the regressions of CWG on bacterial types abundances in child oral, child gut, and maternal oral samples. The problem sizes were thus 215×78 , 189×75 , and 215×79 with the addition of an intercept term. For each regression we split the data at random into a training ($n^{\text{tr}} \approx 0.8n$) and a test ($n^{\text{te}} \approx 0.2n$) set, and followed the approach in [Mishra \(2019\)](#) to produce a (robustly) *scaled prediction error* estimate (SPE; see Supplementary Material for more details). We fixed the trimming proportion to 10% for robust procedures, and we repeated the analysis on five different training and test splits for all methods. Table 2 provides, for each of the three regressions, means and SD of results over the five splits – including SPE, number of features selected on the training set (\hat{p}_0^{tr}), and number of *non-outlying* cases identified in the test set ($n^{\text{te}} - \hat{n}_0^{\text{te}}$); medians and MADs are in Table C.1 of the Supplementary Material. The last column contains the total number of features selected on the full data (\hat{p}_0^{full}).

Table 2: Mean (SD in parenthesis) of SPE, number of features selected on the training set, and number of non-outlying points identified in the test set, based on five train-test splits. Last column: number of features selected on the full data. Robust methods use 10% trimming.

Data	n^{tr}	n^{te}	p	Method	SPE	\hat{p}_0^{tr}	$n^{\text{te}} - \hat{n}_0^{\text{te}}$	\hat{p}_0^{full}
Child oral	172	43	78	EnetLTS	0.27(0.11)	58.8(0.86)	34.0(1.79)	60
				SparseLTS	0.34(0.08)	57.4(6.2)	33.8(1.50)	55
				MIP	0.30(0.04)	2.8(0.8)	34.4(1.33)	2
				Lasso	0.52(0.05)	3.6(2.14)	34.4(1.60)	10
Child gut	152	38	75	EnetLTS	0.43(0.13)	57.6(0.24)	28.6(1.17)	54
				SparseLTS	0.33(0.02)	57.4(4.69)	30.0(1.30)	74
				MIP	0.29(0.04)	4.0(1.26)	30.8(0.97)	2
				Lasso	0.60(0.13)	3.2(1.05)	31.4(1.54)	1
Maternal oral	172	43	79	EnetLTS	0.42(0.03)	63.6(1.63)	34.2(1.07)	65
				SparseLTS	0.42(0.14)	56.6(5.32)	34.2(1.02)	60
				MIP	0.35(0.09)	4.0(1.05)	36.8(0.80)	6
				Lasso	0.75(0.09)	1.0(0.00)	37.2(0.97)	1

Our proposal outperforms competing methods for the child gut and maternal oral regressions (with SPEs lower by 14-52% and 15-53%, respectively). For the child oral regression, it has SPE 13% higher than enet-LTS but still produces lower SPE than sparse-LTS and Lasso by 10% and 42% – while selecting substantially sparser solutions (we also note that based on the median SPE in Table C.1 our method is actually 22% better than enet-LTS). Unsurprisingly, the non-robust Lasso results in the weakest solutions in terms of prediction error. Outliers within the training data of each split may pull it towards very sparse but poorly predictive solutions. In comparison, our solutions are equally sparse (we select on average 1-3 features in addition to the intercept) but with much better prediction power.

When applied to the full datasets, enet-LTS and sparse-LTS select a very large number of bacterial type abundances, hindering interpretation. In contrast, our procedure produces very sparse solutions. In the child oral and gut microbiota, it selects only one bacterial type – in both cases belonging to the Firmicutes phylum and having a positive effect on CWG ([Craig et al. 2018](#) identified different bacteria types, but always from the Firmicutes and with positive effects). In the mother oral microbiome, our method selects five bacterial

types – one from the Bacteroidetes (positive effect), two from the Firmicutes (both positive), one from the Fusobacteria (negative), and one from the Proteobacteria (negative). These too do not coincide with the bacterial types selected in [Craig et al. \(2018\)](#) – except for the Fusobacteria type. However, other Bacteroidetes and Proteobacteria types were selected by [Craig et al. \(2018\)](#) and the signs of the effects are all consistent with ours.

The Lasso also produces sparse solutions, though for the child gut and mother oral microbiota it only selects the intercept. In the child oral microbiome, Lasso selects 9 bacterial types – one from Actinobacteria (positive effect), two from Bacteroidetes (both negative), four from Firmicutes (three negative, one positive), and two from Proteobacteria (one positive, one negative) groups. Of those, two of the Firmicutes types were also selected in [Craig et al. \(2018\)](#), and one other was selected by our approach. The effects of these types do not appear consistent with those found in [Craig et al. \(2018\)](#) – even at the broad level of phyla. For instance, Bacteroidetes types were found to have positive effects in previous work (and in our results), but the effect is negative in the Lasso solution. Similarly, Firmicutes types were found to have positive effects, but in the Lasso solution three of the four selected ones have negative effects. Overall, these results demonstrate not only that our proposal is very competitive in terms of predictive power (compared to other robust and non-robust methods), but also that it provides parsimonious, interpretable and informative solutions consistent with findings in existing literature.

6 Final remarks

Our proposal provides a general framework to simultaneously perform sparse estimation and outlier detection that can be used for Linear Models, as well as Generalized Linear Models and several classification and non-parametric methods. In our main results, we focus specifically on Linear Models (as do existing heuristic approaches) – but we directly tackle the original problem and preserve its discrete nature; this facilitates implementation, interpretation, and generalizations. Importantly, we provide optimal guarantees from both optimization and theoretical perspectives, and verify that these hold in numerical experiments.

Specifically, our approach relies on L_0 constraints – extending prior work where they were used separately for feature selection or outlier detection. Our simultaneous MIP formulation can handle problems of considerable size, and produces solutions that improve upon existing heuristic methods. Although our formulation provides provably optimal solutions from the optimization perspective, it is crucial to tune its integer constraints. Thus, we also provide computationally efficient, data-driven approaches to induce sparsity in the coefficients and the estimated amount of contamination.

Theoretical properties characterizing our proposal include its high breakdown point, the *robustly strong oracle property* – which holds in ultra-high dimensional settings where the number of predictors grows exponentially with the sample size – and optimality in

parameter estimation with respect to the L_2 -norm (i.e. optimal prediction error and risk-minimality). Notably, our proposal requires weaker assumptions than prior methods in the literature and, unlike such methods, it allows the sparsity level and/or the amount of contamination to grow with the number of predictors and/or the sample size.

In addition to performing numerical experiments, we presented a real-world application investigating the relationship between childhood obesity and the human microbiome. Our proposal outperformed existing heuristic methods in terms of predictive power, robustness and solution sparsity, and produced results consistent with prior childhood obesity studies.

The work presented here can be expanded in several directions. Even with modern solvers, larger problems and optimal tuning can make utilizing MIPs computationally challenging. We are pursuing ways to reduce the computational burden – e.g., efficiently and effectively exploring the graph built by Branch & Bound algorithms (Gatu et al. 2007), extending the *perspective formulation* (Frangioni and Gentile 2006) to the presence of MSOM outliers, and generating high-quality initial solutions for warm-starts and big- \mathcal{M} bounds through continuous methods (Bertsimas and Mazumder 2014). To improve solution quality, we are further exploring the addition of a ridge-like term, which would naturally benefit from the extension of the perspective formulation, as well as robust versions of whitening methods for feature de-correlation (Kenney et al. 2018). Finally, we are particularly interested in the class of Generalized Linear Models and Gaussian graphical models, where the use of L_0 constraints for sparse estimation has already been investigated from a theoretical perspective (Shen et al. 2012). However, an effective implementation in modern MIP solvers is not trivial and the possible presence of adversarial contamination has not received much attention in the literature.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Appendix A: Theoretical results

Proof of Proposition 1. For the considered loss function $\rho(\cdot)$, with an additional ridge penalty and L_0 constraints on β and ϕ , any feasible solution behaves similarly to the unpenalized OLS case – whose proof is usually based on the Sherman–Morrison formula (Atkinson 1985; Chatterjee and Hadi 1988). Indeed, the additional k_n degrees of freedom in (2) are used to zero-out the largest transformed residuals as in (4). We can write (2) as

follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\min_{\substack{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k_p \\ \|\beta\|_2^2 \leq \lambda \\ \|\phi\|_0 \leq k_n}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta - \phi_i) &= \min_{\substack{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k_p \\ \|\beta\|_2^2 \leq \lambda}} \min_{\|\phi\|_0 \leq k_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \beta - \phi_i) \\
&= \min_{\substack{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k_p \\ \|\beta\|_2^2 \leq \lambda}} \min_{\|\phi\|_0 \leq k_n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(e_i - \phi_i) \\
&= \min_{\substack{\|\beta\|_0 \leq k_p \\ \|\beta\|_2^2 \leq \lambda}} T(\beta).
\end{aligned}$$

Then for fixed and feasible β , we evaluate $T(\beta)$ before performing the outer minimization. Since $\rho(\mathbf{x}) \geq 0$ and $\rho(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ at $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{0}$, each $\rho(e_i - \phi_i)$ in $T(\beta)$ is minimized at $\phi_i = e_i$. However, only at most k_n of the $\rho(e_i - \phi_i)$ with $\rho(e_i) \neq 0$ can achieve this minimum as $n - k_n$ or more of ϕ_i must be set to 0. Hence, it follows that $T(\beta) = n^{-1}[\sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n} (\rho(e_i - 0))_{i:n} + \sum_{i=n-k_n+1}^n (\rho(e_i - e_i))_{i:n}] = n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^{n-k_n} (\rho(e_i))_{i:n}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. Our approach is similar to [Bertsimas and Mazumder \(2014\)](#) and [Alfons et al. \(2013\)](#) and is not affected by the presence of an L_0 constraint on β . For the first part of the proof, consider the presence of $n_0 \leq k_n = n - h$ outliers, so that $n - n_0 \geq h$ units are non-outlying. Let $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = [\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}]$ be the contaminated sample and $M_y = \max_{1, \dots, n} |y_i|$. If $\hat{\beta} = \mathbf{0}$ (possibly excluding the intercept term), the corresponding loss $Q(\hat{\beta})$ in (2) satisfies $Q(\mathbf{0}) = \sum_{i=1}^h [\rho(\tilde{\mathbf{y}})]_{1:n} \leq \sum_{i=1}^h [\rho(\mathbf{y})]_{1:n} \leq h\rho(M_y)$, where the first inequality follows from the fact that the contamination is arbitrary but not necessarily adversarial, as well as the result in Proposition 1. Take any other estimate $\hat{\beta}$ such that $\|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \geq l_1$, where $l_1 = (h\rho(M_y) + 1)/\lambda^*$ is independent from the contamination structure. It follows that $Q(\hat{\beta}) \geq \lambda^* \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \geq h\rho(M_y) + 1 > Q(\mathbf{0})$, leading to a contradiction since $Q(\mathbf{0}) \geq Q(\hat{\beta})$ (i.e. the objective is non-decreasing in the number of active features). Thus, $\|\hat{\beta}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}})\|_2^2 \leq l_1$ shows that the MIP estimator in (2) does not breakdown for $n_0 \leq k_n$ (i.e. $\epsilon^* \geq (k_n + 1)/n$).

For the second part of the proof, we need to show that $\epsilon^* \leq (k_n + 1)/n$. We assume that the estimator does not breakdown, so that $\|\hat{\beta}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}})\|_2^2 \leq u_1$. Let $n_0 > k_n$ and denote the corresponding contaminated sample as $\tilde{\mathbf{Z}} = (\tilde{\mathbf{y}}, \tilde{\mathbf{X}}) = \mathbf{Z} + (\Delta_y, \Delta_x)$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(\hat{\beta}) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n-n_0} [\rho(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\beta})]_{i=1:n} + \sum_{j=n-n_0+1}^{n-k_n} [\rho(\tilde{\mathbf{y}} - \tilde{\mathbf{X}} \hat{\beta})]_{j=1:n} + \lambda^* \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2 \\
&\geq [\rho((y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^T \hat{\beta}) + (\Delta_{y_i} - \Delta_{x_i}^T \hat{\beta}))]_{i=n-n_0+1} + \lambda^* \|\hat{\beta}\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

since at least one outlier is included in the fit; namely, the unit corresponding to the $(n - n_0 + 1)$ -th position of the ordered transformed residuals. Thus, the possible unboundedness

of (A.1), as both terms Δ_{y_i} and Δ_{x_i} may take arbitrarily large values, contradicts the assumption that $\|\hat{\beta}(\tilde{\mathbf{Z}})\|_2^2 \leq u_1$. \square

Proof of Proposition 3. The following proof provides a necessary condition for any method to achieve SFSOD consistency. This has been proved for feature selection with an L_0 constraint (Shen et al. 2012, 2013), and also extended to the presence of group constraints (Xiang et al. 2015). Here we extend this further to account for the presence of, and identify, MSOM outliers. The main difference being that variable selection in (2) is performed on two disjoint sets of coefficients β and ϕ . Similarly to Theorem 1 in Shen et al. (2013), we consider a least favorable scenario where Fano's inequality can be applied. Let $\mathcal{C}_\beta = \{\beta_j\}_{j=0}^p$ be a collection of parameters with components equal to γ_β or 0 (e.g., one can think of β_0 as being the true model). Similarly, define $\mathcal{C}_\phi = \{\phi_i\}_{i=0}^n$ as a collection of parameters with components equal to γ_ϕ or 0. Assume also that $\|\beta_j - \beta_{j'}\|_2^2 \leq 4\gamma_\beta^2$ for any $j, j' \in 0, 1, \dots, p$, and $\|\phi_i - \phi_{i'}\|_2^2 \leq 4\gamma_\phi^2$ for any $i, i' \in 0, 1, \dots, n$. Let $\Delta_\beta^* = \min_{\beta_0: |\beta_0| \geq 1, \beta_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\beta, |\mathcal{S}_\beta| \leq p_0} \Delta_\beta$ and $\Delta_\phi^* = \min_{\phi_0: |\phi_0| \geq 1, \phi_0 \in \mathcal{S}_\phi, |\mathcal{S}_\phi| \leq n_0} \Delta_\phi$ such that $r_\beta = \max_{1 \leq j \leq p} \|\mathbf{X}_j\|_2^2 [n\Delta_\beta^*]^{-1}$ and $r_\phi = [n\Delta_\phi^*]^{-1}$. For any $\beta_j, \beta_{j'} \in \mathcal{C}_\beta$ with densities $q(\beta_j)$ and $q(\beta_{j'})$, respectively, the corresponding Kullback-Leibler information is equal to $D[q(\beta_j), q(\beta_{j'})] = \|\mathbf{X}(\beta_j - \beta_{j'})\|_2^2 \leq 2 \max_{1 \leq k \leq p} \|\mathbf{X}_k\|_2^2 \gamma_\beta^2 / (n\sigma^2) \leq 2r_\beta \Delta_\beta / \sigma^2$. Here the first bound is obtained using sub-additivity and the triangle inequality, and the second one is based on Lemma 1 in Shen et al. (2013). Similarly, $D[q(\phi_i), q(\phi_{i'})] = \|\phi_i - \phi_{i'}\|_2^2 \leq 2\gamma_\phi^2 / (n\sigma^2) \leq 2r_\phi \Delta_\phi / \sigma^2$. Thus, for any estimates \mathbf{T}_β and \mathbf{T}_ϕ , it follows from Fano's inequality that: $F_\beta = (p+1)^{-1} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{C}_\beta} P(\mathbf{T}_\beta = j) \leq (2nr_\beta \Delta_\beta + \sigma^2 \log 2) / (\sigma^2 \log(p))$ and $F_\phi = (n+1)^{-1} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{C}_\phi} P(\mathbf{T}_\phi = i) \leq (2nr_\phi \Delta_\phi + \sigma^2 \log 2) / (\sigma^2 \log(n))$. Using the fact that $P(\hat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) = P[(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta \neq \mathcal{S}_\beta) \cup (\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi \neq \mathcal{S}_\phi)] = 1 - P[(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta = \mathcal{S}_\beta) \cap (\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi = \mathcal{S}_\phi)] \geq 1 - \min\{P(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta = \mathcal{S}_\beta), P(\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi = \mathcal{S}_\phi)\}$ leads to the following lower bound:

$$\sup_{(\theta, A): \Delta_\theta \leq R^*} P(\hat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) \geq 1 - \min(F_\beta, F_\phi), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $R^* = \max\{(1 - c_\beta^*)\sigma^2 \log(p) / (2nr_\beta), (1 - c_\phi^*)\sigma^2 \log(n) / (2nr_\phi)\}$ and $c_\beta^*, c_\phi^* > 0$. For $\sup_{\theta_0 \in B_0(u, l)} P(\hat{\mathcal{S}} \neq \mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 0$ as in Proposition 3, it follows from (A.2) that the L_0 -band $B(u, l)$ cannot interact with the L_0 -ball $B(R^*, 0)$. Thus, a necessary condition for any estimator to achieve SFSOD consistency is that $l \geq \sigma^2/n \max\{\log(p)/(4r_\beta), \log(n)/4r_\phi\}$; this provides a tighter bound compared to a naïve substitution of $p+n$ in place of p in Theorem 1 of Shen et al. (2013). \square

Proof of Proposition 4. The following result bounds the reconstruction error $P(\hat{\theta}_{L_0} \neq \theta_0) \geq P(\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{L_0} \neq \mathcal{S})$ and extends Theorem 2 in Shen et al. (2013) to the presence of MSOM outliers. Let $\bar{\mathcal{S}} \subset \{1, \dots, (p+n)\}$ be any feasible estimate of the active set such that $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta \neq \mathcal{S}_\beta$ and $\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi \neq \mathcal{S}_\phi$, with $|\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta| \leq p_0$ and $|\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi| \leq n_0$. Note that if $k_p = p_0$ and $k_n = n_0$, it follows that $|\hat{\mathcal{S}}^{L_0}| = |\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta^{L_0}| + |\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi^{L_0}| \leq p_0 + n_0$. To simplify the notation, take $L(\theta, \mathcal{S}_\beta, \mathcal{S}_\phi) =$

$\frac{1}{2}\|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}_\beta}\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{S}_\beta} - \mathbf{I}_{n_{\mathcal{S}_\phi}}\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\mathcal{S}_\phi}\|_2^2$. Partitioning $\bar{\mathcal{S}}$ as $(\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta \setminus \mathcal{S}_\beta) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta \cap \mathcal{S}_\beta) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi \setminus \mathcal{S}_\phi) \cup (\bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi \cap \mathcal{S}_\phi)$, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) &\leq P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0) + P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_0) \\
&\leq \sum_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta^{L_0} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta} P(L(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta^{L_0}) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{S}_\beta) \leq 0) \\
&\quad + \sum_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi^{L_0} \in \bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi} P(L(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi^{L_0}) - L(\boldsymbol{\phi}_0, \mathcal{S}_\phi) \leq 0) \\
&\leq \sum_{i_p=0}^{p_0-1} \sum_{j_p=0}^{p_0-i_p} \binom{p-p_0}{j_p} \binom{p_0}{i_p} P(L(\boldsymbol{\beta}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_\beta^{L_0} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}_\beta(i_p, j_p)) - L(\boldsymbol{\beta}_0, \mathcal{S}_\beta) \leq 0) \\
&\quad + \sum_{i_n=0}^{n_0-1} \sum_{j_n=0}^{n_0-i_n} \binom{n-n_0}{j_n} \binom{n_0}{i_n} P(L(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \hat{\mathcal{S}}_\phi^{L_0} = \bar{\mathcal{S}}_\phi(i_n, j_n)) - L(\boldsymbol{\phi}_0, \mathcal{S}_\phi) \leq 0),
\end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the union bound, the second inequality uses the probability of each feasible solution, and the third upper bound is based on the total number of possible solutions for a given size of correct (i_p and i_n) and incorrect (j_p and j_n) selections for SFSOD. Following the argument in [Shen et al. \(2013\)](#) separately on the two terms $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_0)$ and $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}_0)$ leads to the following result:

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) &\leq 2 \sum_{i_p=1}^{p_0} \sum_{j_p=0}^{i_p} (p-p_0)^{j_p} p_0^{i_p} \exp\left(-\frac{i_p}{18\sigma^2} n \Delta_\beta + \frac{2}{3} j_p\right) \\
&\quad + 2 \sum_{i_n=1}^{n_0} \sum_{j_n=0}^{i_n} (n-n_0)^{j_n} n_0^{i_n} \exp\left(-\frac{i_n}{18\sigma^2} n \Delta_\phi + \frac{2}{3} j_n\right) \\
&\leq \frac{2e}{e-1} \left\{ R\left(\exp\left[-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left(\Delta_\beta - 36 \frac{\log p}{n} \sigma^2\right)\right]\right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + R\left(\exp\left[-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left(\Delta_\phi - 36 \frac{\log n}{n} \sigma^2\right)\right]\right) \right\} \\
&\leq \frac{4e}{e-1} \max \left\{ R\left(\exp\left[-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left(\Delta_\beta - 36 \frac{\log p}{n} \sigma^2\right)\right]\right), \right. \\
&\quad \left. R\left(\exp\left[-\frac{n}{18\sigma^2} \left(\Delta_\phi - 36 \frac{\log n}{n} \sigma^2\right)\right]\right) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $R(x) = x/(1-x)$. Using the fact that $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \leq 1$ establishes the result in (6); this is a tighter bound compared to the naïve extension of Theorem 2 in [Shen et al. \(2013\)](#) using $p+n$ in place of p . \square

Proof of Proposition 5. The result in Proposition 5(1) immediately follows from Proposition 4 through a pointwise bound of (6) to $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 \in B(u_\theta, l_\theta)$. For Proposition 5(2) our

approach is similar to [Liu and Yu \(2013\)](#) and [Zhu et al. \(2020\)](#). Proposition 5(1) guarantees that $P(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_0) \rightarrow 1$ as $(n, p) \rightarrow \infty$. Therefore, with a probability tending to one, it follows that:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} &= (\mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}} \mathbf{y} \\ &\quad (\mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\hat{\mathcal{S}}_{L_0}} (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}) \\ &\quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_0 + (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}.\end{aligned}$$

Using the moment generating function with the fact that $\varepsilon_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ for $i \notin \mathcal{S}_\phi$ leads to $(\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1} \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \sim N(0, \sigma^2 (\mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}}^T \mathbf{A}_{\mathcal{S}})^{-1})$. Consequently, $\sqrt{n}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_0) \rightarrow^d N(0, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_\theta^{-1})$. \square

Proof of Proposition 6. Both results immediately follow from Theorem 2(B) in [Shen et al. \(2013\)](#) considering our SFSOD formulation based on the two disjoint sets \mathcal{S}_β and \mathcal{S}_ϕ . \square

Appendix B: Simulation study

Our simulations were performed through the high-performance computing infrastructure of the *Institute for Computational and Data Sciences Advanced CyberInfrastructure* (ICDS-ACI) at Penn State University. We used basic memory option on the ACI-B cluster with an Intel Xeon 24 core processor at 2.2 GHz and 128 GB of RAM. The multi-thread option in R and Gurobi was limited to a maximum of 24 threads.

We compared the following estimators:

- a. The *sparse-LTS* estimator combines an L_1 -penalty with the LTS estimator ([Alfons et al. 2013](#)). Similarly to other methods, we do not perform a final re-weighting step. The algorithm starts with 1000 initial subsamples, where 20 subsamples with the lowest value of the objective function are used to compute additional concentration-steps until convergence. The sparsity level is tuned according to the BIC-type criterion proposed by the authors. Our implementation is based on the parallelized `sparseLTS` function of the `robustHD` package ([Alfons 2019](#)) in R (we use the R version 3.6.1).
- b. The *enet-LTS* estimator combines an elastic-net penalty with the LTS loss function ([Kurnaz et al. 2017](#)). Also here we use a Lasso penalty and the algorithm starts with 1000 initial subsamples, where 20 subsamples with the lowest value of the objective function are used to compute additional concentration-steps until convergence. The sparsity level is tuned through a robust 10-folds cross-validation as advocated by the authors. It is implemented using the `enetLTS` function (without parallelization) of the homonymous R package ([Kurnaz et al. 2018](#)).
- c. Our *MIP* procedure solves (2) based on the L_2 -loss and excludes the ridge-like penalty. The sparsity level k_p^* ranges from 1 (only the intercept term) to $2p_0$ and is tuned

through a BIC-type criterion (see also Section 3.2). This is computed as: $\text{BIC}(k_p^*) = k_p^* \log(h) + h \log(L)$, where $h = n - n_0$ and $L = h^{-1} \|\mathbf{y} - \mathbf{A}\hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}}_{L_0}\|_2^2$. Instead of taking the minimum BIC, we aim at finding an elbow across the considered k_p^* values. As a simple approach, our final solution is the one with the largest absolute decrease along consecutive model sizes, i.e. $k_p = \min_{k_p^*} \{\text{BIC}(k_p^*) - \text{BIC}(k_p^* - 1)\}$. For each k_p^* value, the corresponding MIQP is warm-started using the result from the previous model of size $k_p^* - 1$. Big- \mathcal{M} bounds are computed using the ensemble method described in Section 3.2, including all estimators used in our comparison (apart from the oracle). Our implementation is based on the Julia programming language (version 0.6.0) in connection with the MIP commercial solver Gurobi (version 8.1.1) through the JuMP package. Our code can run in parallel and is provided in Appendix D. Each job runs with a scheduled time limit of 300 seconds.

Table B.1 shows our results in terms of medians and MADs for the simulation setting discussed in Section 4. A comparison with Table 1 highlights the skewness of most metrics, with all methods performing better, especially our proposal (denoted MIP).

Table B.1: Median (MAD in parenthesis) of RMSPE, variance and squared bias for $\hat{\beta}$, FPR and FNR for $\hat{\beta}$ and outlier detection, and computing time, based on 100 simulation replications for the simulation setting in Section 4.

n	p	Method	RMSPE	$\text{var}(\hat{\beta})$	$\text{bias}(\hat{\beta})^2$	FPR($\hat{\beta}$)	FNR($\hat{\beta}$)	FPR($\hat{\phi}$)	FNR($\hat{\phi}$)	Time
50	50	Oracle	1.90(0.23)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.35(0.42)	0.05(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.11(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	14.74(0.73)
		SparseLTS	2.45(0.48)	0.06(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.53(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	1.55(0.23)
		MIP	1.95(0.40)	0.04(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	8.82(3.85)
100	50	Oracle	1.86(0.15)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.00(0.18)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.22(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.21(0.20)
		SparseLTS	2.14(0.20)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.67(0.08)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	2.20(0.38)
		MIP	1.86(0.16)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	33.02(10.98)
150	50	Oracle	1.80(0.13)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	1.88(0.14)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.30(0.21)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.65(0.24)
		SparseLTS	1.96(0.17)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.67(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	4.51(0.92)
		MIP	1.80(0.14)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	415.14(331.70)
50	200	Oracle	1.88(0.22)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.86(0.74)	0.03(0.00)	0.02(0.00)	0.17(0.04)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	43.99(2.48)
		SparseLTS	2.66(0.51)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.16(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	3.37(0.57)
		MIP	1.92(0.31)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	6.91(4.22)
100	200	Oracle	1.80(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.28(0.45)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.24(0.09)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	53.96(3.34)
		SparseLTS	2.29(0.25)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.31(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	11.40(2.48)
		MIP	1.80(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	65.80(27.63)
150	200	Oracle	1.82(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.07(0.24)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.21(0.14)	0.00(0.00)	0.01(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	56.98(3.41)
		SparseLTS	2.25(0.21)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.42(0.04)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	19.09(3.37)
		MIP	1.82(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	599.00(360.73)

We also explored weak SNR scenarios. The following simulation setting is the same as in Section 4, with the only difference being that the signal-to-noise-ratio is reduced to $\text{SNR} = 3$. Table B.2 shows simulation results in term of medians and MADs. A comparison with Table 1 shows that similar conclusions hold, although all methods experience an overall

decrease in performance. Our approach generally outperforms other methods and converges faster to the oracle solution. However, for scenarios with small sample sizes, the FNR in $\hat{\beta}$ for our method is worse. Moreover, while computing time for heuristic methods remains similar to the stronger SNR scenario, our proposal shows a marked increase.

Table B.2: Median (MAD in parenthesis) of RMSPE, variance and squared bias for $\hat{\beta}$, FPR and FNR for $\hat{\beta}$ and outlier detection, and computing time, based on 100 simulation replications for a simulation setting similarly to Section 4 with SNR = 3.

n	p	Method	RMSPE	var($\hat{\beta}$)	bias($\hat{\beta}$) ²	FPR($\hat{\beta}$)	FNR($\hat{\beta}$)	FPR($\hat{\phi}$)	FNR($\hat{\phi}$)	Time
50	50	Oracle	2.49(0.34)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	3.09(0.73)	0.14(0.00)	0.06(0.00)	0.18(0.13)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	14.76(0.81)
		SparseLTS	3.30(0.57)	0.15(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.58(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	2.56(0.72)
		MIP	2.93(0.99)	0.10(0.00)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.20(0.30)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	16.17(9.01)
100	50	Oracle	2.42(0.20)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.58(0.26)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.30(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.30(0.21)
		SparseLTS	2.82(0.27)	0.05(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.71(0.10)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	2.40(0.26)
		MIP	2.48(0.30)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	60.97(38.33)
150	50	Oracle	2.29(0.16)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.48(0.23)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.50(0.25)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.82(0.18)
		SparseLTS	2.57(0.21)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.76(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	4.05(1.26)
		MIP	2.31(0.21)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	751.73(302.70)
50	200	Oracle	2.44(0.31)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	3.93(1.28)	0.04(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.18(0.05)	0.00(0.00)	0.01(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	45.94(2.43)
		SparseLTS	3.67(1.06)	0.04(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.17(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	4.22(1.19)
		MIP	3.30(1.51)	0.05(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.20(0.30)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	18.76(17.94)
100	200	Oracle	2.40(0.27)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	3.18(0.65)	0.03(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.30(0.10)	0.00(0.00)	0.01(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	55.32(3.40)
		SparseLTS	3.09(0.30)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.33(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	13.58(4.58)
		MIP	2.46(0.41)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	107.57(74.31)
150	200	Oracle	2.37(0.21)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.76(0.31)	0.02(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.28(0.14)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	56.74(3.69)
		SparseLTS	2.98(0.34)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.45(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.60(0.89)
		MIP	2.39(0.22)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	840.34(519.30)

We also explored simulation settings with multicollinearity structures. Table B.3 presents our results for a simulation scenario which mimics that of Section 4 (reporting medians and MADs), with the only difference being that Σ_X has an autoregressive correlation structure $\Sigma_{X,ij} = 0.3^{|i-j|}$. Though this could be considered a “mild” level of correlation, we note that the addition of contamination increases the amount of multicollinearity present. Here our approach is often outperformed by other methods for small sample sizes, however as the latter increase we can again notice that our proposal converges faster to the oracle solution and results like those in Table 1 hold.

Smaller SNR regimes and stronger correlation structures were also explored; results are not reported as all methods performed quite poorly. In these settings, as advocated in [Hastie et al. \(2017\)](#), a ridge-like penalty may be beneficial.

Table B.3: Median (MAD in parenthesis) of RMSPE, variance and squared bias for $\hat{\beta}$, FPR and FNR for $\hat{\beta}$ and outlier detection, and computing time, based on 100 simulation replications for a simulation setting similarly to Section 4 in presence of multicollinearity.

n	p	Method	RMSPE	$\text{var}(\hat{\beta})$	$\text{bias}(\hat{\beta})^2$	FPR($\hat{\beta}$)	FNR($\hat{\beta}$)	FPR($\hat{\phi}$)	FNR($\hat{\phi}$)	Time
50	50	Oracle	2.34(0.26)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.75(0.36)	0.05(0.00)	0.02(0.00)	0.07(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	14.71(0.55)
		SparseLTS	2.92(0.49)	0.08(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.51(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	1.39(0.22)
		MIP	3.00(0.59)	0.09(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.11(0.03)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	9.05(2.67)
100	50	Oracle	2.30(0.21)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.43(0.23)	0.01(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.09(0.10)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	12.63(0.18)
		SparseLTS	2.57(0.25)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.56(0.10)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	1.77(0.20)
		MIP	2.46(0.26)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.04(0.03)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	26.37(8.51)
150	50	Oracle	2.21(0.17)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.36(0.17)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.18(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	13.13(0.16)
		SparseLTS	2.38(0.19)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.54(0.05)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	3.23(0.82)
		MIP	2.31(0.20)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.02(0.03)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	340.60(175.80)
50	200	Oracle	2.33(0.33)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	3.19(0.96)	0.04(0.00)	0.01(0.00)	0.16(0.05)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	44.68(2.70)
		SparseLTS	3.01(0.55)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.16(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	3.48(0.82)
		MIP	3.01(0.74)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.02(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	8.30(5.25)
100	200	Oracle	2.27(0.23)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.63(0.32)	0.02(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.18(0.12)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	54.46(2.21)
		SparseLTS	2.76(0.32)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.29(0.02)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	8.74(1.75)
		MIP	2.75(0.29)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	66.16(20.62)
150	200	Oracle	2.24(0.20)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)
		EnetLTS	2.46(0.24)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.16(0.10)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	59.83(2.19)
		SparseLTS	2.67(0.23)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.35(0.05)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.01)	0.00(0.00)	14.67(2.96)
		MIP	2.55(0.21)	0.01(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.03(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	0.00(0.00)	375.21(247.13)

Appendix C: Application study

Our analysis of the real datasets was performed through the same high-performance computing infrastructure as our simulations. We used an Intel Xeon 24 core processor at 2.2 GHz and 128 GB of RAM. The multi-thread option in R and Gurobi was limited to a maximum of 24 threads.

Since the test set may contain any number of outliers, we utilized a (robustly) scaled estimation procedure as proposed in Mishra (2019) for our comparisons in Table 2. After tuning k_p , we compute the training and test residuals (ϵ_{tr} and ϵ_{te}), training and test scaling parameter (s_{tr} and s_{te}), and scaled test error (r_{te}) as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{tr}} &= \mathbf{y}_{\text{tr}} - \mathbf{X}_{\text{tr}}\hat{\beta} - \hat{\phi} \\ s_{\text{tr}} &= \sqrt{\|\epsilon_{\text{tr}}\|_2^2/n_{\text{tr}}} \\ \epsilon_{\text{te}} &= \mathbf{y}_{\text{te}} - \mathbf{X}_{\text{te}}\hat{\beta} \\ s_{\text{te}} &= \text{MAD}(\mathbf{r}_{\text{te}}) \\ \mathbf{r}_{\text{te}} &= \epsilon_{\text{te}}/s_{\text{tr}}. \end{aligned}$$

Outliers from \mathbf{r}_{te} are identified and removed based on the threshold rule $|\mathbf{r}_{\text{te}}| > 1.345s_{\text{te}}$ (as specified in Mishra 2019) and the average SPE is taken over the estimated non-outlying

points.

Lastly, we provide the median results across replications in Table C.1 corresponding to the same instances provided in Table 2 of the main text. We compare SPE values across robust approaches, enet-LTS, sparse-LTS and our MIP proposal (described in Appendix B) as well as a classic Lasso. More specifically, we use a Lasso penalty and tune via 10-fold cross-validation across a grid of at most 100 tuning parameters. It is implemented using the `cv.glmnet` function within the `glmnet` R package (Friedman et al. 2010).

Table C.1: Median (MAD in parenthesis) of SPE, estimated nonzero coefficients on training data, and estimated number of non-outlying points on test data, based on 5 replications, and estimated nonzero coefficients on the full data, for the human microbiome analysis using 10% trimming for robust methods.

Data	n^{tr}	n^{te}	p	Method	SPE	\hat{p}_0^{tr}	$n^{\text{te}} - \hat{n}_0^{\text{te}}$	\hat{p}_0^{full}
Child oral	172	43	78	EnetLTS	0.41(0.11)	58(0.86)	35(1.79)	60
				SparseLTS	0.43(0.08)	56(6.2)	33(1.50)	55
				MIP	0.32(0.04)	2(0.8)	34(1.33)	2
				Lasso	0.51(0.05)	1(2.14)	33(1.60)	10
Child gut	152	38	75	EnetLTS	0.33(0.13)	58(0.24)	29(1.17)	54
				SparseLTS	0.34(0.02)	54(4.69)	30(1.30)	74
				MIP	0.31(0.04)	2(1.26)	30(0.97)	2
				Lasso	0.68(0.13)	1(1.05)	33(1.54)	1
Maternal oral	172	43	79	EnetLTS	0.45(0.03)	64(1.63)	34(1.07)	65
				SparseLTS	0.36(0.14)	58(5.32)	34(1.02)	60
				MIP	0.38(0.09)	3(1.05)	37(0.80)	6
				Lasso	0.78(0.09)	1(0.00)	36(0.97)	1

Appendix D: Code

Our code is available upon request.

References

- Alfons, A. (2019), *robustHD: Robust Methods for High-Dimensional Data*. R package version 0.6.1.
URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=robustHD>
- Alfons, A., Croux, C. and Gelper, S. (2013), ‘Sparse least trimmed squares regression for analyzing high-dimensional large data sets’, *The Annals of Applied Statistics* pp. 226–248.
- Amato, U., Antoniadis, A., De Feis, I. and Gijbels, I. (2020), ‘Penalised robust estimators for sparse and high-dimensional linear models’, *Statistical Methods & Applications* pp. 1–48.
- Atkinson, A. C. (1985), *Plots, transformations, and regression: an introduction to graphical methods of diagnostic regression analysis*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Atkinson, A. C. and Riani, M. (2000), *Robust Diagnostic Regression Analysis*, Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Barratt, S., Angeris, G. and Boyd, S. (2020), ‘Minimizing a sum of clipped convex functions’, *Optimization Letters* pp. 1–17.

- Beckman, R. J. and Cook, R. D. (1983), ‘Outlier. s’, *Technometrics* **25**(2), 119–149.
- Bernholt, T. (2006), Robust estimators are hard to compute, Technical Report 52/2005, University of Dortmund.
- Bertsimas, D., King, A. and Mazumder, R. (2016), ‘Best subset selection via a modern optimization lens’, *The annals of statistics* **44**(2), 813–852.
- Bertsimas, D. and Mazumder, R. (2014), ‘Least quantile regression via modern optimization’, *The Annals of Statistics* pp. 2494–2525.
- Bertsimas, D. and Van Parys, B. (2020), ‘Sparse high-dimensional regression: Exact scalable algorithms and phase transitions’, *The Annals of Statistics* **48**(1), 300–323.
- Bien, J., Taylor, J. and Tibshirani, R. (2013), ‘A lasso for hierarchical interactions’, *Annals of statistics* **41**(3), 1111–1141.
- Bradic, J., Fan, J. and Wang, W. (2011), ‘Penalized composite quasi-likelihood for ultrahigh dimensional variable selection’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)* **73**(3), 325–349.
- Breiman, L. (1995), ‘Better subset regression using the nonnegative garrote’, *Technometrics* **37**(4), 373–384.
- Chang, L., Roberts, S. and Welsh, A. (2018), ‘Robust lasso regression using tukey’s biweight criterion’, *Technometrics* **60**(1), 36–47.
- Chatterjee, S. and Hadi, A. S. (1988), *Sensitivity Analysis in Linear Regression*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Cook, R. D. and Weisberg, S. (1982), *Residuals and influence in regression*, Chapman and Hall, New York.
- Craig, S. J., Blankenberg, D., Parodi, A. C. L., Paul, I. M., Birch, L. L., Savage, J. S., Marini, M. E., Stokes, J. L., Nekrutenko, A., Reimherr, M., Chiaromonte, F. and Makova, K. D. (2018), ‘Child weight gain trajectories linked to oral microbiota composition’, *Scientific reports* **8**(1), 1–14.
- Donoho, D. L. and Huber, P. J. (1983), The notion of breakdown point, in P. Bickel, K. A. Doksum and J. L. H. Jr., eds, ‘A festschrift for Erich L. Lehmann’, Wadsworth, Belmont, California, pp. 157–184.
- Fan, J. and Li, R. (2001), ‘Variable selection via nonconcave penalized likelihood and its oracle properties’, *Journal of the American statistical Association* **96**(456), 1348–1360.
- Fan, J., Xue, L. and Zou, H. (2014), ‘Strong oracle optimality of folded concave penalized estimation’, *Annals of statistics* **42**(3), 819.
- Frangioni, A. and Gentile, C. (2006), ‘Perspective cuts for a class of convex 0–1 mixed integer programs’, *Mathematical Programming* **106**(2), 225–236.
- Freue, G. V. C., Kepplinger, D., Salibián-Barrera, M., Smucler, E. et al. (2019), ‘Robust elastic net estimators for variable selection and identification of proteomic biomarkers’, *The Annals of Applied Statistics* **13**(4), 2065–2090.
- Friedman, J., Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (2010), ‘Regularization paths for generalized linear models via coordinate descent’, *Journal of Statistical Software* **33**(1), 1–22.
URL: <http://www.jstatsoft.org/v33/i01/>
- Gatu, C., Yanev, P. I. and Kontoghiorghes, E. J. (2007), ‘A graph approach to generate all possible regression submodels’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **52**(2), 799–815.

- Gómez, A. (2019), Outlier detection in time series via mixed-integer conic quadratic optimization. Research report AG 19.05, ISE, University of Southern California.
- Goodson, J., Groppo, D., Halem, S. and Carpino, E. (2009), ‘Is obesity an oral bacterial disease?’, *Journal of dental research* **88**(6), 519–523.
- Griffiths, L. J., Smeeth, L., Hawkins, S. S., Cole, T. J. and DeZateux, C. (2009), ‘Effects of infant feeding practice on weight gain from birth to 3 years’, *Archives of disease in childhood* **94**(8), 577–582.
- Hadi, A. S. and Luceño, A. (1997), ‘Maximum trimmed likelihood estimators: a unified approach, examples, and algorithms’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **25**(3), 251–272.
- Haffajee, A. D. and Socransky, S. S. (2009), ‘Relation of body mass index, periodontitis and tannerella forsythia’, *Journal of clinical periodontology* **36**(2), 89–99.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Tibshirani, R. J. (2017), ‘Extended comparisons of best subset selection, forward stepwise selection, and the lasso’. arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.08692.
- Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R. and Wainwright, M. (2015), *Statistical learning with sparsity: the lasso and generalizations*, CRC press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Hoerl, A. E. and Kennard, R. W. (1970), ‘Ridge regression: Biased estimation for nonorthogonal problems’, *Technometrics* **12**(1), 55–67.
- Hoeting, J., Raftery, A. E. and Madigan, D. (1996), ‘A method for simultaneous variable selection and outlier identification in linear regression’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **22**(3), 251–270.
- Huber, P. J. and Ronchetti, E. M. (2009), *Robust Statistics*, John Wiley & Sons, New Jersey.
- Kennedy, A., Chiaromonte, F. and Felici, G. (2018), ‘Efficient and effective l_0 feature selection’. arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.02526.
- Khan, J. A., Van Aelst, S. and Zamar, R. H. (2007), ‘Robust linear model selection based on least angle regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **102**(480), 1289–1299.
- Kong, D., Bondell, H. D. and Wu, Y. (2018), ‘Fully efficient robust estimation, outlier detection and variable selection via penalized regression’, *Statistica Sinica* **28**(2), 1031–1052.
- Kurnaz, F. S., Hoffmann, I. and Filzmoser, P. (2017), ‘Robust and sparse estimation methods for high-dimensional linear and logistic regression’, *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* **172**, 211–222.
- Kurnaz, F. S., Hoffmann, I. and Filzmoser, P. (2018), *enetLTS: Robust and Sparse Methods for High Dimensional Linear and Logistic Regression*. R package version 0.1.0.
URL: <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=enetLTS>
- Lee, Y., MacEachern, S. N. and Jung, Y. (2012), ‘Regularization of case-specific parameters for robustness and efficiency’, *Statistical Science* **27**(3), 350–372.
- Li, W. (2012), Simultaneous variable selection and outlier detection using LASSO with applications to aircraft landing data analysis, PhD thesis, Rutgers University.
- Lin, W., Shi, P., Feng, R. and Li, H. (2014), ‘Variable selection in regression with compositional covariates’, *Biometrika* **101**(4), 785–797.
- Liu, H. and Yu, B. (2013), ‘Asymptotic properties of lasso+ mls and lasso+ ridge in sparse high-dimensional linear regression’, *Electronic Journal of Statistics* **7**, 3124–3169.
- Liu, J., Cosman, P. C. and Rao, B. D. (2017), ‘Robust linear regression via l_0 regularization’, *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing* **66**(3), 698–713.

- Liu, T.-Y. and Jiang, H. (2019), ‘Minimizing sum of truncated convex functions and its applications’, *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* **28**(1), 1–10.
- Loh, P.-L. (2017), ‘Statistical consistency and asymptotic normality for high-dimensional robust m -estimators’, *The Annals of Statistics* **45**(2), 866–896.
- Machkour, J., Alt, B., Muma, M. and Zoubir, A. M. (2017), The outlier-corrected-data-adaptive lasso: A new robust estimator for the independent contamination model, in ‘Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO), 2017 25th European’, IEEE, pp. 1649–1653.
- Maronna, R. A. (2011), ‘Robust ridge regression for high-dimensional data’, *Technometrics* **53**(1), 44–53.
- Maronna, R. A., Martin, R. D. and Yohai, V. J. (2006), *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- McCann, L. (2006), Robust model selection and outlier detection in linear regressions, PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Menjoge, R. S. and Welsch, R. E. (2010), ‘A diagnostic method for simultaneous feature selection and outlier identification in linear regression’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **54**(12), 3181–3193.
- Miller, A. J. (2002), *Subset selection in regression*, (2nd ed.) edn, Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida.
- Mishra, A. (2019), ‘Robust regression with compositional covariates’. arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.04990.
- Morgenthaler, S., Welsch, R. E. and Zenide, A. (2004), Algorithms for robust model selection in linear regression, in M. Hubert, G. Pison, A. Struyf and S. V. Aelst, eds, ‘Theory and Applications of Recent Robust Methods’, Springer–Verlag, Basel, Switzerland, pp. 195–206.
- Müller, S. and Welsh, A. H. (2005), ‘Outlier robust model selection in linear regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **100**(472), 1297–1310.
- Natarajan, B. K. (1995), ‘Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems’, *SIAM journal on computing* **24**(2), 227–234.
- Paul, I. M., Williams, J. S., Anzman-Frasca, S., Beiler, J. S., Makova, K. D., Marini, M. E., Hess, L. B., Rzucidlo, S. E., Verdiglione, N., Mindell, J. A. and Birch, L. L. (2014), ‘The intervention nurses start infants growing on healthy trajectories (insight) study’, *BMC pediatrics* **14**(1), 1–15.
- Rousseeuw, P. J. and Yohai, V. J. (1984), Robust regression by means of s -estimators, in J. Franke, W. Hardle and R. D. Martin, eds, ‘Robust and nonlinear time series analysis’, Springer–Verlag, New York, pp. 256–272.
- Savage, J. S., Birch, L. L., Marini, M., Anzman-Frasca, S. and Paul, I. M. (2016), ‘Effect of the insight responsive parenting intervention on rapid infant weight gain and overweight status at age 1 year: a randomized clinical trial’, *JAMA pediatrics* **170**(8), 742–749.
- Schrijver, A. (1986), *Theory of linear and integer programming*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- She, Y. and Owen, A. B. (2011), ‘Outlier detection using nonconvex penalized regression’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **106**(494), 626–639.
- Shen, X., Pan, W. and Zhu, Y. (2012), ‘Likelihood-based selection and sharp parameter estimation’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **107**(497), 223–232.

- Shen, X., Pan, W., Zhu, Y. and Zhou, H. (2013), ‘On constrained and regularized high-dimensional regression’, *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* **65**(5), 807–832.
- Smucler, E. and Yohai, V. J. (2017), ‘Robust and sparse estimators for linear regression models’, *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis* **111**, 116–130.
- Taveras, E. M., Rifas-Shiman, S. L., Belfort, M. B., Kleinman, K. P., Oken, E. and Gillman, M. W. (2009), ‘Weight status in the first 6 months of life and obesity at 3 years of age’, *Pediatrics* **123**(4), 1177–1183.
- Taylan, P., Yerlikaya-Özkurt, F. and Weber, G.-W. (2014), ‘An approach to the mean shift outlier model by tikhonov regularization and conic programming’, *Intelligent Data Analysis* **18**(1), 79–94.
- Tibshirani, R. (1996), ‘Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* pp. 267–288.
- Tibshirani, R. (1997), ‘The lasso method for variable selection in the cox model’, *Statistics in medicine* **16**(4), 385–395.
- Tibshirani, R., Saunders, M., Rosset, S., Zhu, J. and Knight, K. (2005), ‘Sparsity and smoothness via the fused lasso’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **67**(1), 91–108.
- Wang, X., Jiang, Y., Huang, M. and Zhang, H. (2013), ‘Robust variable selection with exponential squared loss’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **108**(502), 632–643.
- Xiang, S., Shen, X. and Ye, J. (2015), ‘Efficient nonconvex sparse group feature selection via continuous and discrete optimization’, *Artificial Intelligence* **224**, 28–50.
- Xiong, S. and Joseph, R. V. (2013), ‘Regression with outlier shrinkage’, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference* **143**(11), 1988–2001.
- Zeigler, C. C., Persson, G. R., Wondimu, B., Marcus, C., Sobko, T. and Modéer, T. (2012), ‘Microbiota in the oral subgingival biofilm is associated with obesity in adolescence’, *Obesity* **20**(1), 157–164.
- Zhang, C.-H. (2010), ‘Nearly unbiased variable selection under minimax concave penalty’, *The Annals of statistics* **38**(2), 894–942.
- Zhang, C.-H. and Zhang, T. (2012), ‘A general theory of concave regularization for high-dimensional sparse estimation problems’, *Statistical Science* **27**(4), 576–593.
- Zhu, Y., Shen, X. and Pan, W. (2020), ‘On high-dimensional constrained maximum likelihood inference’, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **115**(529), 217–230.
- Zioutas, G., Pitsoulis, L. and Avramidis, A. (2009), ‘Quadratic mixed integer programming and support vectors for deleting outliers in robust regression’, *Annals of Operations Research* **166**(1), 339–353.
- Zou, H. (2006), ‘The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties’, *Journal of the American statistical association* **101**(476), 1418–1429.
- Zou, H. and Hastie, T. (2005), ‘Regularization and variable selection via the elastic net’, *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* **67**(2), 301–320.