

---

# Robust Risk Minimization for Statistical Learning

---

Muhammad Osama<sup>1</sup> Dave Zachariah<sup>1</sup> Peter Stoica<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

We consider a general statistical learning problem where an unknown fraction of the training data is corrupted. We develop a robust learning method that only requires specifying an upper bound on the corrupted data fraction. The method minimizes a risk function defined by a non-parametric distribution with unknown probability weights. We derive and analyse the optimal weights and show how they provide robustness against corrupted data. Furthermore, we give a computationally efficient coordinate descent algorithm to solve the risk minimization problem. We demonstrate the wide range applicability of the method, including regression, classification, unsupervised learning and classic parameter estimation, with state-of-the-art performance.

## 1. Introduction

Statistical learning problems encompass regression, classification, unsupervised learning and parameter estimation (Bishop, 2006). The common goal is to find a model, indexed by a parameter  $\theta$ , that minimizes some loss function  $\ell_{\theta}(z)$  on average, using training data  $\mathcal{D} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ . The loss function is chosen to target data from a class of distributions, denoted  $\mathcal{P}_o$ .

It is commonly assumed that the training data is drawn from some distribution  $p_o(z) \in \mathcal{P}_o$ . In practice, however, training data is often corrupted by outliers, systematic mislabeling, or even an adversary. Under such conditions, standard learning methods degrade rapidly (Athalye et al., 2018; Goodfellow et al., 2015; Gu et al., 2017; Zoubir et al., 2018). See Figure 1 for an illustration. Here we consider the Huber contamination model which is capable of modeling the inherent corruption of data and is common in

the robust statistics literature (Huber, 1992; 2011; Maronna et al., 2019). Specifically, the training data is assumed to be drawn from the unknown mixture distribution

$$p(z) = (1 - \epsilon)p_o(z) + \epsilon q(z), \quad (1)$$

so that roughly  $\epsilon n$  samples come from a corrupting distribution  $q(z) \notin \mathcal{P}_o$ . The fraction of outliers,  $\epsilon$ , may range between 1 – 10% in routine datasets, but in data collected with less dedicated effort or under time constraints  $\epsilon$  can easily exceed 10% (Hampel et al., 2011, ch. 1).

In the robust statistics literature, several methods have been developed for various applications. A classical approach is to modify a given loss function  $\ell_{\theta}(z)$  so as to be less sensitive to outliers (Huber, 2011; Maronna et al., 2019; Zoubir et al., 2018). Some examples of such functions are the Huber and Tukey loss functions (Huber, 1992; Tukey, 1977). Another approach is to try and identify the corrupted points in the training data based on some criteria and then remove them (Klivans et al., 2009; Bhatia et al., 2015; 2017; Awasthi et al., 2017; Paudice et al., 2018). For example, for mean and covariance estimation of  $z \sim p_o(z)$ , the method presented in (Diakonikolas et al., 2017) identifies corrupted points by projecting the training data onto an estimated dominant signal subspace and then compares the magnitude of the projected data against some threshold. The main limitation of the above approaches is that they are problem-specific and must be tailored to each learning problem. In addition, even for fairly simple learning problems, such as inferring the mean, the robust estimators can be computationally demanding (Diakonikolas & Kane, 2019; Bernholt, 2006; Hardt & Moitra, 2013).

Recent work has been directed toward developing more general and tractable methods for robust statistical learning that is applicable to a wide range of loss functions (Diakonikolas et al., 2019; Prasad et al., 2018; Charikar et al., 2017). These state-of-the-art methods do, however, exhibit some important limitations relating to the choice of certain tuning parameters. For instance, the two-step method in (Charikar et al., 2017) uses a regularization parameter which depends on the unknown  $\epsilon$  that the user may not be able to specify precisely. Similarly, under certain conditions, there exists a parameter setting for the method in (Diakonikolas et al., 2019) that yields performance guarantees, but there is no practical means or criterion for how

---

<sup>\*</sup>Equal contribution <sup>1</sup>Department of Information Technology, Uppsala University, Sweden. Correspondence to: Muhammad Osama <muhammad.osama@it.uu.se>, Dave Zachariah <dave.zachariah@it.uu.se>.




Figure 1. Illustration of statistical learning from data with an unknown fraction  $\epsilon$  of corrupted samples. (a) Regression, where  $\theta$  parameterizes a linear model. Learned models using standard least squares (ERM) vs. proposed method (RRM) using two different upper bounds  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  on  $\epsilon$ . The target  $\theta^*$  is illustrated in black dots. The proposed method learns and assigns weights to each observed data point (shown in color scale). The weights of the outlier points are very small and, in turn, contribute marginally to learning the regression line. (b) Binary classification, where  $\theta$  parameterizes a separating hyperplane. The label data  $y$  is blue for ‘0’ and green for ‘1’. Learned models using standard logistic regression (ERM) vs. proposed method (RRM) using an upper bound  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ . The target  $\theta^*$  is illustrated in black dots.

to tune this parameter. The cited methods rely on removing data points based on some score function and comparing to a specified threshold. The extent to which the choice of scoring function is problem dependent is unknown and the choice of threshold depends in practice on some user-defined parameter.

The main contribution of this paper is a general robust method with the following properties:

- it is applicable to any statistical learning problem that minimizes an expected loss function,
- it requires only specifying an upper bound on the corrupted data fraction  $\epsilon$ ,
- it is formulated as a minimization problem that can be solved efficiently using a blockwise algorithm.

We illustrate and evaluate the robust method in several standard statistical learning problems.

## 2. Problem formulation

Consider a set of models indexed by a parameter  $\theta \in \Theta$ . The predictive loss of a model  $\theta$  is denoted  $\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ , where  $\mathbf{z} \sim p_o(\mathbf{z})$  is a randomly drawn datapoint. The target model is that which minimizes the expected loss, or *risk*, i.e.,

$$\theta^* = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{p_o} [\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z})], \quad (2)$$

Because the target distribution  $p_o(\mathbf{z})$  is typically unknown, we use  $n$  independent samples  $\mathcal{D} = \{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^n$  drawn from

$p(\mathbf{z})$  in (1). A common learning strategy is to find the empirical risk minimizing (ERM) parameter vector

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{ERM}} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}_i) \quad (3)$$

**Example 1** In regression problems, data consists of features and outcomes,  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, y)$ , and  $\theta$  parameterizes a predictor  $\hat{y}_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ . The standard loss function  $\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}) = (y - \hat{y}_\theta(\mathbf{x}))^2$  targets distributions with thin-tailed noise.

**Example 2** In general parameter estimation problems, a standard loss function is  $\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}) = -\ln p_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ , which targets distributions spanned by  $p_\theta(\mathbf{z})$ . For this choice of loss function, (3) corresponds to the maximum likelihood estimator.

In real applications, a certain fraction  $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$  of the data is *corrupted* such that the risk under the unknown data-generating process  $p(\mathbf{z})$  exceeds the minimum in (2). That is,

$$\mathbb{E}_p[\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z})] \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_o}[\ell_{\theta^*}(\mathbf{z})], \quad \forall \theta, \quad (4)$$

with equality if and only if  $\epsilon = 0$ . Under such corrupted data conditions, ERM degrades rapidly as  $p(\mathbf{z})$  diverges from  $p_o(\mathbf{z})$ . While  $\epsilon$  in (1) is unknown, it can typically be upper bounded, that is,  $\epsilon \leq \tilde{\epsilon}$  (Hampel et al., 2011, ch. 1). This implies that there are effectively at least  $(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n$  uncorrupted samples in  $\mathcal{D}$ . For learning problems with unregularized loss functions, this sample size must therefore be at least as great as the dimension of  $\theta$ . Our goal is to formulate a general method of risk minimization, which given  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ , learns a model  $\theta$  that is robust against corrupted training samples.




Figure 2.

**Example 3** To illustrate the degradation of ERM as  $p(z)$  diverges from  $p_o(z)$ , consider a linear regression problem where  $\mathbf{z} = (x, y) \sim p(z)$ , using the squared-error loss. Fig. 2a illustrates the target distribution  $p_o(z)$ , which is a zero-mean two-dimensional Gaussian, and  $q(z)$  as a point mass distribution generating corrupted leverage points at equal distances to the origin. The figure also illustrates two contrasting regression models  $\{\tilde{\theta}, \theta^*\}$ . Fig. 2b shows how the risk  $\mathbb{E}_p[\ell_{\tilde{\theta}}(z)]$  increases for these two models, as the distance of the corrupted points from the training data increases. In the large-sample case, ERM minimizes this risk and will therefore drastically degrade as it opts for  $\tilde{\theta}$  over  $\theta^*$  at a certain distance. We note, however, that  $\mathbb{E}_p[\ell_{\tilde{\theta}}(z)] \geq \mathbb{E}_{p_o}[\ell_{\theta^*}(z)]$  (more generally, (4) holds). That is, by retaining only an  $1 - \epsilon$  fraction of uncorrupted data from  $p_o(z)$ , it is possible to identify  $\theta^*$  with lower risk than an alternative model  $\tilde{\theta}$ . This principle will be exploited in the next section.

### 3. Method

We define the risk evaluated at a distribution  $p_{\pi}(z)$  as

$$R(\theta, \pi) = \mathbb{E}_{p_{\pi}}[\ell_{\theta}(z)] \quad (5)$$

We consider the following nonparametric class of distributions, indexed by  $\pi$ ,

$$\left\{ p_{\pi} : p_{\pi}(z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i \delta(z - z_i), \pi \in \Pi \right\} \quad (6)$$

where  $z_i \in \mathcal{D}$  and the weights belong to the simplex  $\Pi = \{\pi \in \mathbb{R}_+^n : \mathbf{1}^{\top} \pi = 1\}$ . Let the entropy of  $p_{\pi}(z)$  be denoted as

$$\mathbb{H}(\pi) \triangleq - \sum_i \pi_i \ln \pi_i \in [0, \ln n],$$

then it is readily seen that ERM in (3) minimizes the risk  $R(\theta, \pi)$  under the maximum-entropy distribution  $\pi = n^{-1} \mathbf{1}$  (Cover & Thomas, 2012). When  $\epsilon = 0$ , it is well known this choice yields an asymptotically consistent estimate of  $\theta^*$  under standard regularity conditions.

#### 3.1. Robust risk minimization

If the support of  $p_{\pi}$  only covers  $(1 - \epsilon)n$  samples drawn from  $p_o$ , its maximum entropy is at least  $\ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n]$  since  $\tilde{\epsilon} \geq \epsilon$ . The risk  $R(\theta^*, \pi)$  will then tend to be lower than  $R(\theta^*, n^{-1} \mathbf{1})$ , since the latter includes  $\epsilon n$  corrupted samples, cf. (4). We propose learning  $\theta$  by utilizing the distribution in (6) that yields the minimum risk, subject to its entropy  $\mathbb{H}(\pi)$  being at least  $\ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n]$ . That is, the following robust risk minimization (RRM) approach

$$\hat{\theta}_{\text{RRM}} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \min_{\pi \in \Pi : \mathbb{H}(\pi) \geq \ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n]} R(\theta, \pi) \quad (7)$$

The entropy constraint ensures that  $\theta$  is learned using an effective sample size of  $(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n$ .

We now study the optimal weights  $\pi^*(\theta)$  of the inner problem in (7) to understand how the proposed method yields robustness against corrupted samples. Note that the objective function in (7),  $R(\theta, \pi) = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i \ell_{\theta}(z_i)$ , is linear in  $\pi$ , and that the entropy constraint is convex. The inner optimization problem satisfies Slater's condition, since  $\pi = n^{-1} \mathbf{1}$  is a strictly feasible point. Hence strong duality holds and the optimal weights  $\pi^*$  can be obtained using the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions (Boyd & Vandenberghe, 2004). The Lagrangian of the optimization problem with respect to  $\pi$  equals

$$L(\pi, \lambda, \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \pi_i \ell_{\theta}(z_i) + \lambda (\ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n] - \mathbb{H}(\pi)) + \nu (\mathbf{1}^{\top} \pi - 1)$$

where  $\lambda$  and  $\nu$  are the dual variables. The KKT conditions can then be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \nabla_{\pi} L(\pi^*, \lambda^*, \nu^*) &= 0, \quad \mathbf{1}^{\top} \pi^* = 1, \quad \lambda^* \geq 0, \\ \lambda^* (\ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n] - \mathbb{H}(\pi^*)) &= 0, \\ \mathbb{H}(\pi^*) &\geq \ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n] \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Here  $(\lambda^*, \nu^*)$  are the dual optimal solutions. Solving the above KKT conditions leads to the following optimal weights,

$$\pi_i^*(\theta) = c^* \exp \left[ -\frac{\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}_i)}{\lambda^*(\tilde{\epsilon})} \right] \geq 0, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (9)$$

where  $c^*$  is a proportionality constant which ensures that the probability weights sum to 1. It is immediately seen that  $\pi^*(\theta)$  downweights the data points with high losses for any given  $\theta$ . As the corruption fraction bound  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  vanishes, the attenuation factor  $1/\lambda^*(\tilde{\epsilon})$  goes to zero, thereby yielding uniform weights  $\pi^*(\theta) \rightarrow n^{-1}\mathbf{1}$  as expected.

Plugging  $\pi^*(\theta)$  back into (7) yields the equivalent concentrated problem

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \exp \left[ -\frac{\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}_i)}{\lambda^*(\tilde{\epsilon})} \right] \ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}_i), \quad (10)$$

which focuses the learning of  $\theta$  on the set of  $(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n$  samples with lowest losses. By downweighting corrupted samples that increase the risk at every  $\theta$ , the equivalent problem (7) provides robustness against outliers in  $\mathcal{D}$  in the learning of  $\theta^*$  (see (4)). This is achieved without tailoring a new robustified loss function or tuning a loss-specific user parameter to a given problem. Instead, the user needs only specify an upper bound of the corruption fraction,  $\tilde{\epsilon}$ .

### 3.2. Blockwise minimization algorithm

We now propose an efficient computational method of finding a solution of (7). Given fixed parameters  $\tilde{\theta}$  and  $\tilde{\pi}$ , we define for given  $\tilde{\theta}$

$$\hat{\pi}(\tilde{\theta}) = \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi : \mathbb{H}(\pi) \geq \ln[(1 - \tilde{\epsilon})n]} R(\tilde{\theta}, \pi), \quad (11)$$

which is the solution to a convex optimization problem and can be computed efficiently using standard numerical packages, e.g. barrier methods (Grant & Boyd, 2014) which have polynomial-time complexity. For a given  $\tilde{\pi}$ , the minimizer

$$\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi}) = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} R(\theta, \tilde{\pi}), \quad (12)$$

is the solution to a standard weighted risk minimization problem. Solving both problems in a cyclic manner constitutes blockwise coordinate descent method which we summarize in Algorithm 1. When the parameter set  $\Theta$  is closed and convex, the algorithm is guaranteed to converge to a critical point of (7), see (Grippo & Sciandrone, 2000).

The general form of the proposed method renders it applicable to a diverse range of learning problems in which ERM is conventionally used. In the next section, we illustrate the performance and generality of the proposed method using numerical experiments for different supervised and unsupervised machine learning problems. The code for the different experiments can be found at [github](#).

---

### Algorithm 1 Robust Risk Minimization (RRM)

---

- 1: Input:  $\mathcal{D}$  and  $\tilde{\epsilon}$
  - 2: Set  $k := 0$  and  $\pi^{(0)} = n^{-1}\mathbf{1}$
  - 3: **repeat**
  - 4:  $\theta^{(k+1)} = \hat{\theta}(\pi^{(k)})$
  - 5:  $\pi^{(k+1)} = \hat{\pi}(\theta^{(k+1)})$
  - 6:  $k := k + 1$
  - 7: **until convergence**
  - 8: Output:  $\hat{\theta} = \theta^{(k)}, \hat{\pi} = \pi^{(k)}$
- 

## 4. Numerical experiments

We illustrate the generality of our framework by addressing four common problems in regression, classification, unsupervised learning and parameter estimation. For the sake of comparison, we also evaluate the recently proposed robust SEVER method (Diakonikolas et al., 2019), which was derived on very different grounds as a means of augmenting gradient-based learning algorithms with outlier rejection capabilities. We use the same threshold settings for the SEVER algorithm as were used in the experiments in (Diakonikolas et al., 2019), with  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  in lieu of the unknown fraction  $\epsilon$ .

### 4.1. Linear Regression

Consider data  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, y)$ , where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$  and  $y \in \mathbb{R}$  denote feature vectors and outcomes, respectively. We consider a class of predictors  $\hat{y} = \mathbf{x}^\top \theta$ , where  $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{10}$ , and a squared-error predictive loss  $\ell_\theta(\mathbf{x}, y) = (y - \mathbf{x}^\top \theta)^2$ . This loss function targets thin-tailed distributions with a linear conditional mean function.

We learn  $\theta$  using  $n = 40$  i.i.d training samples drawn from

$$p(\mathbf{x}, y) = (1 - \epsilon)p(\mathbf{x})p_o(y|\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon p(\mathbf{x})q(y|\mathbf{x}), \quad (13)$$

where

$$p_o(y|\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}^\top \theta^*, \sigma^2), \quad q(y|\mathbf{x}) = t(\mathbf{x}^\top \theta^*, \nu), \quad (14)$$

and  $p(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{U}([-5, 5]^{10})$ . The above data generator yields observations concentrated around a hyperplane, where roughly  $\epsilon$  observations are corrupted by heavy-tailed t-distributed noise. Data is generated with  $\theta^* = \mathbf{1}$  and noise standard deviation  $\sigma = 0.25$ .

We evaluate the distribution of estimation errors  $\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|$  relative to  $\|\theta^*\|$  using 100 Monte Carlo runs. In the first experiment, we set  $\epsilon$  to 20% and  $\nu = 1.5$ , in which case the tails of  $q(y|\mathbf{x})$  are so heavy that the variance is undefined. We apply RRM with  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0.40$ , which is a conservative upper bound. Note that  $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi})$  is a weighted least-squares problem with a closed-form solution. The distribution of




Figure 3. Linear regression. a) Box plot of distribution of relative error  $\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}\|/\|\theta^*\|$  when  $\epsilon = 20\%$ . Each box spans the 25<sup>th</sup> to 75<sup>th</sup> quantiles and the red dots show the means. The whiskers extend to the minimum and maximum values of error. b) Expected relative error versus percentage of corrupted samples  $\epsilon$ . Throughout we use the upper bound  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 40\%$ .

errors for ERM, SEVER and RRM are summarized in Figure 3a. We also include the Huber method, which is tailored specifically for linear regression (Zoubir et al., 2018, ch. 2.6.2). Both RRM and SEVER perform similarly in this case and are substantially better than ERM, reducing the errors by almost a half.

Next, we study the performance as the percentage of corrupted data  $\epsilon$  increases from 0% to 40%. We set  $\nu = 2.5$  so that the variance of the corrupting distribution is defined. Figure 3b shows the expected relative error against  $\epsilon$  for the different methods, where the robust methods, once again, perform similarly to one another, and much better than ERM.

## 4.2. Logistic Regression

Consider data  $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, y)$  where  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  is a feature vector and  $y \in \{0, 1\}$  an associated class label. We consider the

cross-entropy loss

$$\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}, y) = -y \ln(\sigma_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})) - (1-y) \ln(1 - \sigma_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})), \quad (15)$$

where

$$\sigma_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = \left(1 + \exp(-\phi^{\top}(\mathbf{x})\theta)\right)^{-1}$$

and  $\phi(\mathbf{x}) = [1, \mathbf{x}]^{\top}$ . Thus the loss function targets distributions with linearly separable classes.

We learn  $\theta \in \Theta = \mathbb{R}^3$  using  $n = 100$  i.i.d points drawn from

$$p(\mathbf{x}, y) = (1 - \epsilon)p_o(\mathbf{x})p_o(y|\mathbf{x}) + \epsilon q(\mathbf{x})q(y|\mathbf{x}), \quad (16)$$

where  $p_o(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ 0.5 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0.25 & -0.25\rho \\ -0.25\rho & 0.25 \end{pmatrix}\right)$

with  $\rho = 0.99$ . An illustration of  $p_o(\mathbf{x}, y)$  is given in Figure 4a, where the separating hyperplane corresponds to  $\theta^* = [-1, 1, 1]$ . The corrupting distribution is

given by  $q(\mathbf{x}) = \mathcal{N}\left(\begin{pmatrix} 0.5 \\ 1.25 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 0.01 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.01 \end{pmatrix}\right)$  and  $q(y = 0|\mathbf{x}) \equiv 1$  as illustrated in Figure 4b.

Data is generated according to (16) with  $\epsilon$  equal to 5%.

We apply RRM with  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0.30$ . Note that  $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi})$  is readily computed using the standard iterative re-weighted least square or MM algorithms (Bishop, 2006), with minor modifications to take into account the fact that the data points are weighted by  $\pi$ . Figure 4b shows the learned separating planes, parameterized by  $\theta$ , for a single realization. We observed that the plane learned by ERM and the robust SEVER is shifted towards the outliers. By contrast, the proposed RRM method is marginally affected by the corrupting distribution. Figure 4c summarizes the distribution of angles between  $\theta^*$  and  $\hat{\theta}$ , i.e.,  $\arccos \frac{\hat{\theta}^{\top} \theta^*}{\|\hat{\theta}\| \|\theta^*\|}$ , using 100 Monte Carlo simulations. RRM outperforms the other two methods in this case.

## 4.3. Principal Component Analysis

Consider data  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  where we assume  $\mathbf{z}$  to have zero mean. Our goal is to approximate  $\mathbf{z}$  by projecting it onto a subspace. We consider the loss  $\ell_{\theta}(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{P}_{\theta}\mathbf{z}\|_2^2$  where  $\mathbf{P}_{\theta}$  is an orthogonal projection matrix. The loss function targets distributions where the data is concentrated around a linear subspace. In the case of a one-dimensional subspace  $\mathbf{P}_{\theta} = \theta\theta^{\top}$ , where  $\Theta = \{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \|\theta\| = 1\}$ .

We learn  $\theta$  using  $n = 40$  i.i.d datapoints drawn from

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = (1 - \epsilon) \underbrace{p_o(z_2|z_1)p_o(z_1)}_{p_o(\mathbf{z})} + \epsilon q(\mathbf{z}), \quad (17)$$

where

$$p_o(z_2|z_1) = \mathcal{N}(2z_1, \sigma^2), \quad p_o(z_1) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \quad (18)$$




Figure 4. Logistic regression: data points with labels 0 and 1 are shown in blue and green, respectively. (a) Single realization from target distribution  $p_o(\mathbf{z})$  with linearly separable classes with true hyperplane  $\theta^*$ , (b) Samples from corrupting distribution  $q(\mathbf{z})$  (denoted by stars) along with estimated separating hyperplanes  $\hat{\theta}$  using ERM and robust SEVER and RRM methods. (d) Box plot of angle (in degrees) between the true hyperplane  $\theta^*$  and estimated hyperplanes  $\hat{\theta}$  for different methods.




Figure 5. Principal component analysis. Box plot of subspace misalignment error  $1 - |\cos(\hat{\theta}^\top \theta^*)|$ .

and  $q(\mathbf{z}) = t(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}, \nu)$  for outliers. Note that  $p_o(\mathbf{z})$  in (17) corresponds to a subspace parameterized by  $\theta^* = [\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}, \frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}]^\top$ .

Data is generated with  $\sigma = 0.25$ ,  $\nu = 1.5$  and  $\epsilon$  is set to 20%. We apply RRM with  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0.40$ . Note that  $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi})$  can be obtained as

$$\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi}) = \arg \max_{\theta \in \Theta} \theta^\top \mathbf{R} \theta, \quad (19)$$

which is equivalent to maximizing the Rayleigh quotient and the solution is simply the dominant eigenvector of the covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{R} = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\pi}_i \mathbf{z}_i \mathbf{z}_i^\top. \quad (20)$$

We evaluate the misalignment of the subspaces using the metric  $1 - |\cos(\hat{\theta}^\top \theta^*)|$  evaluated over 100 Monte Carlo simulations. Figure 5 summarizes the distribution of errors for the three different methods. For this problem, RRM outperforms both ERM and SEVER.

#### 4.4. Covariance Estimation

Consider data  $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^2$  with an unknown mean  $\mu$  and covariance  $\Sigma$ . We consider the loss function

$$\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z}) = -(\mathbf{z} - \mu)^\top \Sigma^{-1} (\mathbf{z} - \mu) + \ln |\Sigma|$$

where  $\theta = (\mu, \Sigma)$ . This loss function targets sub-Gaussian distributions.

We learn  $\theta$  using  $n = 50$  i.i.d samples drawn from

$$p(\mathbf{z}) = (1 - \epsilon)p_o(\mathbf{z}) + \epsilon q(\mathbf{z}) \quad (21)$$

where  $p_o(\mathbf{z}) = \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma^*)$  and  $q(\mathbf{z}) = t(\mu, \Sigma^*, \nu)$ . Data is generated using (21) with  $\mu = \mathbf{0}$  and  $\Sigma^* = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.8 \\ 0.8 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ , and with  $\epsilon = 20\%$ . We set  $\nu = 1.5$ , which means that the corrupting distribution  $q(\mathbf{z})$  has no finite covariance matrix.

We apply RRM with upper bound  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0.30$ . Note that  $\hat{\theta}(\tilde{\pi})$  has a closed-form solution, given by the weighted sample mean and covariance matrix with the weight vector equal to  $\tilde{\pi}$ . We evaluate the error  $\|\Sigma^* - \hat{\Sigma}\|_F$  relative to  $\|\Sigma^*\|_F$  over 100 Monte Carlo simulations and show it in Figure 6. We see that SEVER is prone to break down due to the heavy-tailed outliers, whereas RRM is stable.

#### 5. Real data

Finally, we test the performance of RRM on real data. We use the Wisconsin breast cancer dataset from the UCI repository (UCI). The dataset consists of  $n = 683$  points, with features  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^9$  and labels  $y \in \{0, 1\}$ . The class labels 0 and 1 correspond to ‘benign’ and ‘malignant’ cancers, respectively. 60% of the data was used for training, which was subsequently corrupted by flipping the labels of 40 class 1 datapoints to 0 ( $\epsilon \approx 10\%$ ). The goal is to estimate a linear separating plane to predict the class labels of test data. We use the cross-entropy loss function  $\ell_\theta(\mathbf{z})$  in




Figure 6. Covariance estimation. Box plot of distribution of relative errors  $\|\Sigma^* - \hat{\Sigma}\|_F / \|\Sigma^*\|_F$ . Note that the expected relative error for SEVER is too large to be contained in the given plot.

(15) and apply the proposed RRM method with  $\tilde{\epsilon} = 0.15$ . For comparison, we also use the standard ERM and the robust SEVER methods.

Tables 1 for ERM, 2 for SEVER and 3 for RRM summarize the results using the confusion matrix as the metric. The classification accuracy for the RRM method is visibly higher than that of ERM and SEVER for class 1.

$n = 274$	Predicted 1	Predicted 0
Actual 1	69	28
Actual 0	1	176

Table 1. Confusion matrix for ERM. Classification accuracy 89.42%.

$n = 274$	Predicted 1	Predicted 0
Actual 1	71	26
Actual 0	3	174

Table 2. Confusion matrix for SEVER. Classification accuracy 89.42%.

$n = 274$	Predicted 1	Predicted 0
Actual 1	76	21
Actual 0	3	174

Table 3. Confusion matrix for RRM. Classification accuracy 91.24%.

## 6. Conclusion

We proposed a general risk minimization approach which provides robustness in a wide range of statistical learning problems in cases where a fraction of the observed data comes from a corrupting distribution. Unlike existing general robust methods, our approach does not depend on any problem-specific thresholding techniques to remove

the corrupted data points, as are used in existing literature, nor does it rely on a correctly specified corruption fraction  $\epsilon$ . We illustrated the wide applicability and performance of our method by testing it on several classical supervised and unsupervised statistical learning problems using both simulated and real data.

## References

- Athalye, A., Engstrom, L., Ilyas, A., and Kwok, K. Synthesizing robust adversarial examples. In Dy, J. and Krause, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 284–293, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm Sweden, 10–15 Jul 2018. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/athalye18b.html>.
- Awasthi, P., Balcan, M. F., and Long, P. M. The power of localization for efficiently learning linear separators with noise. *J. ACM*, 63(6):50:1–50:27, January 2017. ISSN 0004-5411. doi: 10.1145/3006384. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3006384>.
- Bernholt, T. Robust estimators are hard to compute. Technical report, Technical Report, 2006.
- Bhatia, K., Jain, P., and Kar, P. Robust regression via hard thresholding. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 721–729, 2015.
- Bhatia, K., Jain, P., Kamalaruban, P., and Kar, P. Consistent robust regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pp. 2110–2119, 2017.
- Bishop, C. M. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. springer, 2006.
- Boyd, S. and Vandenberghe, L. *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- Charikar, M., Steinhardt, J., and Valiant, G. Learning from untrusted data. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2017, pp. 47–60, New York, NY, USA, 2017. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-4528-6. doi: 10.1145/3055399.3055491. URL <http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/3055399.3055491>.
- Cover, T. M. and Thomas, J. A. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 2012.
- Diakonikolas, I. and Kane, D. M. Recent advances in algorithmic high-dimensional robust statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.05911*, 2019.

- Diakonikolas, I., Kamath, G., Kane, D. M., Li, J., Moitra, A., and Stewart, A. Being robust (in high dimensions) can be practical. In *Proc. 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, vol. 70, pp. 999–1008, 2017. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=3305381.3305485>.
- Diakonikolas, I., Kamath, G., Kane, D., Li, J., Steinhart, J., and Stewart, A. Sever: A robust meta-algorithm for stochastic optimization. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 1596–1606, Long Beach, California, USA, 09–15 Jun 2019. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v97/diakonikolas19a.html>.
- Goodfellow, I., Shlens, J., and Szegedy, C. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6572>.
- Grant, M. and Boyd, S. Cvx: Matlab software for disciplined convex programming, version 2.1, 2014.
- Grippo, L. and Sciandrone, M. On the convergence of the block nonlinear gauss–seidel method under convex constraints. *Operations research letters*, 26(3):127–136, 2000.
- Gu, T., Dolan-Gavitt, B., and Garg, S. Badnets: Identifying vulnerabilities in the machine learning model supply chain. *IEEE*, 2017.
- Hampel, F. R., Ronchetti, E. M., Rousseeuw, P. J., and Stahel, W. A. *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions, chapter 1*, volume 196. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- Hardt, M. and Moitra, A. Algorithms and hardness for robust subspace recovery. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pp. 354–375, 2013.
- Huber, P. J. Robust estimation of a location parameter. In *Breakthroughs in statistics*, pp. 492–518. Springer, 1992.
- Huber, P. J. *Robust statistics*. Springer, 2011.
- Klivans, A. R., Long, P. M., and Servedio, R. A. Learning halfspaces with malicious noise. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 10(Dec):2715–2740, 2009.
- Maronna, R. A., Martin, R. D., Yohai, V. J., and Salibián-Barrera, M. *Robust statistics: theory and methods (with R)*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- Paudice, A., Muñoz-González, L., Gyorgy, A., and Lupu, E. C. Detection of adversarial training examples in poisoning attacks through anomaly detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.03041*, 2018.
- Prasad, A., Suggala, A. S., Balakrishnan, S., and Ravikumar, P. Robust estimation via robust gradient estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.06485*, 2018.
- Tukey, J. Exploratory data analysis. *Reading: Addison-Wesley*, 1977.
- UCI. Breast Cancer Wisconsin UCI repository. [https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/breast+cancer+wisconsin+\(original\)](https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/breast+cancer+wisconsin+(original)).
- Zoubir, A. M., Koivunen, V., Ollila, E., and Muma, M. *Robust statistics for signal processing*. Cambridge University Press, 2018.