

High-dimensional outlier detection using random projections

P. Navarro-Esteban^{1,2}

J.A. Cuesta-Albertos¹

Abstract

There exist multiple methods to detect outliers in multivariate data in the literature, but most of them require to estimate the covariance matrix. The higher the dimension, the more complex the estimation of the matrix becoming impossible in high dimensions. In order to avoid estimating this matrix, we propose a novel random projections-based procedure to detect outliers in Gaussian multivariate data. It consists in projecting the data in several one-dimensional subspaces where an appropriate univariate outlier detection method, similar to Tukey's method but with a threshold depending on the initial dimension and the sample size, is applied. The required number of projections is determined using sequential analysis. Simulated and real datasets illustrate the performance of the proposed method.

Keywords: Outlier detection; Multivariate data; High-dimensional data; Random projections; Sequential analysis

1 Introduction

Outliers are often identified as observations obtained from a distribution different from that one producing the bulk of the data set. Notwithstanding the fact that this definition has sometimes been handled (see, for instance, [21]), it is more convenient in practice to consider as outliers those points lying at a distance greater than a given threshold from the centre of the sample, independently of the distribution which produced them. Detecting outliers in a sample is one of the first steps when handling data, since they may lead to model misspecification, biased parameter estimation and incorrect results in general, see Aggarwal [1] for instance. Despite the fact that other settings can also be handled with our method, in this paper we focus on testing outlyingness of some vectors \mathbf{x} in \mathbb{R}^d with respect to a sample of iid (independent and identically distributed) rv's (random vectors) $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ in \mathbb{R}^d with normal distribution $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and Σ are respectively the mean vector and the covariance matrix. Thus, the hypotheses to be tested are

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \mathbf{x} \text{ is not an outlier} \quad \text{vs.} \quad \mathbf{H}_1 : \mathbf{x} \text{ is an outlier.} \quad (1)$$

Our method can be applied to any combination of sample sizes and dimensions, but our principal interest is in the cases in which $d > n$. This method uses projections as a dimensionality-reduction technique to avoid the estimation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and mostly Σ . Our procedure declares \mathbf{x} to be an outlier if the distance of a one-dimensional projection of \mathbf{x} to the centre of the projected sample exceeds a data driven threshold. It is noteworthy that we avoid imposing any structure to the covariance matrix thus including high dimensional and/or very correlated data.

There exists an abundant literature on multidimensional outliers for d low or moderate in comparison with n (see, for instance Barnett and Lewis [3] and Aggarwal [1] and references therein). When the dimension is higher than the sample size the literature is not so abundant but we can mention Filzmoser et al. [22] and Ro et al. [34]. The first paper is based on the properties of principal components analysis (PCA). However, the principal components are difficult to be estimated in very high-dimensional settings, see Johnstone et al. [27]. For instance, it occurs that it is only possible to obtain the asymptotic distribution for $O(n^{1/5})$ coefficients in the linear functional regression model when a PCA-based estimator is used, Cardot et al. [5]. On the other hand, the method introduced in Ro et al. [34] is based on a modification of the Mahalanobis

¹Departamento de Matemáticas, Estadística y Computación, Universidad de Cantabria, Santander (Spain).

²Corresponding author, e-mail: paula.navarro@unican.es.

distance which involves only the diagonal elements of Σ . Thus, it is equivalent to consider uncorrelated marginals and this does not usually occur in practice.

Our proposal is based on that an outlier is a point lying far away from the centre of a given data set. Then, according to the Stahel-Donoho estimators, Stahel [37] and Donoho [18], we look for a univariate projection that makes an observation outlier, because “... if a point is a multivariate outlier, then there must be some one-dimensional projection of the data for which the point is a (univariate) outlier”, see Maronna and Yohai [31]. Hence we only handle one-dimensional projections and thus we avoid the estimation of Σ .

The idea that an outlier is a point too separated from the centre of a data set can dated back to 1968 in Healy [23]. It was made more precise in Davies and Gather [17] for dimension $d = 1$ and in Becker and Gather [4] for multidimensional data. Those papers propose computing (robust) estimators of the centre and of the covariance matrix of the data set at hand, and, then declaring outliers those points whose Mahalanobis distances to the estimated centre are greater than a previously fixed threshold. An important characteristic is that the threshold depends on both d and n (see Theorem 1 below). Some computational problems were reported, for instance, in Cerioli et al. [7] and Cerioli [6], albeit they have not appeared in our implementation here.

A possibility of implementing the idea is using projection pursuit. However this technique, in principle, requires to examine all the possible directions, what is impossible in practice. To overcome this problem, there exist procedures which only involve many finite deterministic data-dependent projections such as Peña and Prieto [33] and Serfling and Mazumder [36], but they require to estimate the covariance matrix, and Pan et al. [32] who do not provide the exact number of the required directions.

As an alternative, we propose to use a number of random directions independently chosen from the sample at hand. Johnson and Lindenstrauss’ Lemma [26] is the basis of the feasibility of random projections. Their most useful property for us is a result stated in Cuesta-Albertos et al. [14]. From there, it is known that a.s. just a one-dimensional random projection is enough to distinguish between two distributions defined on a separable Hilbert space if one of them satisfies a certain condition on their moments: if two distributions are given, and a one-dimensional marginal of them is randomly chosen, we have that almost surely, the two distributions are different/equal if and only if the two marginals are different/equal. Thus, this procedure projects the original high-dimensional data into a one-dimensional randomly chosen subspace. Since handling only one random direction gives a low power under the alternative hypothesis, we handle several random directions.

Random projections have been applied to solve other problems such as in goodness of fit (Cuesta-Albertos et al. [11], [10] and [15]), analysis of variance (Cuesta-Albertos and Febrero-Bande [13]), testing linearity in functional regression (Cuesta-Albertos et al. [16]), constructing depths (Cuesta-Albertos and Nieto-Reyes [12]), etc. A common problem in those results is that no clear guidance on the number of the required projections was given. We propose the use of the sequential analysis to solve this, the same idea could be used in the above referred papers.

A sequential method is characterized by a stopping rule that decides whether to stop the observation process with $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ or to get an additional observation \mathbf{X}_{n+1} for each $n \geq 1$. Therefore, the number of observations needed by the procedure is random. Those methods are a powerful technique because they need on average smaller sample sizes than fixed sample size procedures to achieve the same power, Tartakovski et al. [38]. In our case, this criteria leads to select a low number of random directions, K_n , what makes the method run quite fast, in $O(K_n n)$ time. For instance, the computations usually require a little less than 2 seconds for $d = 500$ and $n = 100$, albeit some particularly difficult cases could require at most 12 seconds. The sketch of the procedure to test (1) is the following:

1. Select $a, b \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $a \leq b$.
2. Take a rv \mathbf{V} with $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$ distribution and make $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}/\|\mathbf{V}\|$.
3. Project \mathbf{x} and the sample on the subspace generated by \mathbf{V} , i.e. compute $\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{V}$ and $\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V}, \dots, \mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V}$, and calculate $\hat{\nu}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{V}}$ estimators of the centre and of the dispersion of the projections $\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V}, \dots, \mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V}$.
4. Compute $y^{\mathbf{V}} := (\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{V} - \hat{\nu}_{\mathbf{V}})/\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{V}}$.

5. If $|y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in [a, b]$ go back to Step 2., else:
- The point \mathbf{x} is declared as an outlier if $|y^{\mathbf{V}}| > b$.
 - The point \mathbf{x} is declared as non-outlier if $|y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a$.

The choice of parameters a and b is discussed in Section 3. It turns out that they depend on the sample size, on the dimension of the space and on Σ , see (8) and Proposition 3. This dependency will be analysed in Section 3 through the expected number of required projections to reach the decision about the point we are classifying. Concerning the estimation of $\hat{\nu}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{\lambda}_{\mathbf{V}}$ we begin using the sample mean and the sample standard deviation. Next we will replace them by the sample median and the sample median absolute deviation, MAD, respectively.

Despite the fact that we propose some expressions determining a , b and $E(K_n)$, the specific computation of their values has happened to be impossible for us. This has led us to consider numerical approximation, including the asymptotic values as $n \rightarrow \infty$ with d fixed and $\Sigma = I_d$. Some theoretical work, now in progress, suggests that this solution could work for many covariance matrices, for large values of d (see Subsection 7.3 in the Appendix). Moreover, extensive simulations reinforce this feeling because they have provided empirical evidence that the proposed procedure is rather stable with respect to variations on d , n and even on Σ and, consequently, those asymptotic values can be applied in practice for all combinations of d and n (including those with $d > n$) as well as with many different Σ 's (see Subsection 3.4).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we make the definition of outlier precise and include a result on the asymptotic behaviour (on d and on n) of the threshold (Theorem 1). Section 3 gives the main theoretical results on which our method is based. Guidelines for its practical implementation are given in Section 4. A comprehensive simulation study and two real data applications are presented in Section 5. An independent technical Appendix contains the proofs of the results obtained in the paper and several tables showing computational results not included in the main text.

All along the paper, we assume that all the rv's are defined on the same, rich enough, probability space $(\Upsilon, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$.

2 Definition of an outlier

In this section we make the definition of outlier precise and analyse some properties of the threshold involved in such definition. Essentially, the idea is that if a point is outside a certain ball centred at the centre of the sample, then it is an outlier. The shape of the ball should be determined by Σ . Those ideas lead to Definition 1, which is based on the well known fact that if \mathbf{X} is $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, then the square of its Σ -based Mahalanobis distance to $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ follows a chi-squared distribution with d degrees of freedom, χ_d^2 . Given $0 < \delta < 1$, denote by $C_n^d(\delta)$ the square root of the δ -quantile of the maximum of a random sample with size n and distribution χ_d^2 , i.e. $C_n^d(\delta)$ is the solution of the equation:

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\max \{ \|\mathbf{X}_1 - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma}, \dots, \|\mathbf{X}_n - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} \} \geq C_n^d(\delta) \right) = \delta, \quad (2)$$

where $\|\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} = \|\Sigma^{-1/2}(\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu})\|$, with $\|\cdot\|$ being the Euclidean norm and $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ iid rv's with distribution $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$. Thus, $C_n^d(\delta)$ is the square root of the $(1 - \delta)^{1/n}$ -quantile of the distribution χ_d^2 . To ease the notation we omit δ in $C_n^d(\delta)$ when its value is clear from the context or its exact value is irrelevant.

Definition 1. Let $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We say that \mathbf{x} is an outlier at the level δ with respect to a simple random sample with size n and a distribution $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$, if $\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} \geq C_n^d(\delta)$.

According to this definition, (1) becomes

$$\mathbf{H}_0 : \|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} \leq C_n^d(\delta) \quad \text{vs.} \quad \mathbf{H}_1 : \|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} > C_n^d(\delta). \quad (3)$$

Note that Definition 1 is easily modified to cover dependent data. The only difference in the dependent case will be the expression for $C_n^d(\delta)$ which will be more complex. Extensions to elliptical non-normal distributions are straightforward.

Theorem 1 gives the asymptotic behaviour of C_n^d .

Theorem 1. *Let C_n^d be as defined in (2). Then $C_n^d \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ or $d \rightarrow \infty$ while the other parameter remains fixed with rates $\log(n)$ and $d^{1/2}$ respectively.*

An illustration of Theorem 1 appears in Table 12 in Subsection 7.1 in the Appendix, which shows the values of $C_n^d(\delta)$ for some values of d and n , and $\delta = 0.05$.

3 The proposed outlier-detection method

If Σ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ are known it is simple to check if a given point satisfies Definition 1 or not. However, in practice, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and Σ must be estimated and, consequently, it is not possible to be completely sure if the definition holds. To test (3), we propose the procedure sketched in the Introduction, paying attention to the determination of a and b . We also provide the expected number of projections required to declare a point as an outlier or as regular. We begin with some results related to statistics based on the sample mean and variance; later, in Subsection 3.3, we will introduce their robust versions.

Under \mathbf{H}_0 , the only relevant quantity is the value of $t = \|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_\Sigma$, so instead of assuming that we have a fixed point, we will replace the point \mathbf{x} by a random point in the Mahalanobis sphere associated to Σ with centre at $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ and radius t . Being more precise, we will replace the point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by a rv \mathbf{X} whose distribution is $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$ given that $\|\mathbf{X} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_\Sigma = t$. We begin with two assumptions and some notation:

(A1) \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$ are iid rv's with distribution $N_d(\boldsymbol{\mu}, \Sigma)$.

(A2) \mathbf{V} and $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_n$ are iid rv's with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$ which also are independent from the rv's in (A1).

Notation Denote the beta and error function as $B(a, b)$ and $\text{erf}(\cdot)$ respectively. We define $\Omega_\Sigma^{d-1}(t) := \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\mathbf{x}\|_\Sigma = t\}$, the Mahalanobis hypersphere of radius t . With an abuse of notation, Ω_t^{d-1} denotes such a sphere when $\Sigma = I_d$, ω_t^d is its surface area; thus, $\omega_t^d = 2\pi^{d/2}t^{d-1}/\Gamma(d/2)$. The sample mean and the covariance matrix are denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$. Initially the centre and the dispersion of the projected sample $\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V}, \dots, \mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V}$ are estimated by its sample mean, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\mathbf{V}}$, and standard deviation $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}$.

Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), denote

$$Y^{\mathbf{V}} := \frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V} - \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\mathbf{V}}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}}. \quad (4)$$

The denominator in (4) can be zero for some \mathbf{V} 's, however the subset of \mathbf{V} 's satisfying this has null Lebesgue measure even in the case $d > n$. Although $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ depends on the sample, we omit this dependency to ease the notation. On the other hand, the distribution of $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ does not depend on $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ nor on an scale. Since our method relies on $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$, we can assume w.l.o.g. that $\boldsymbol{\mu} = \mathbf{0}$ and that the smaller eigenvalue of Σ is one.

When $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{V}_k$, we simplify the notation writing Y^k instead of $Y^{\mathbf{V}_k}$. The rv number of random projections which we need to decide if \mathbf{X} is an outlier or not with respect to a sample of size n is denoted by $K_n^{a,b}(\Sigma)$. Thus, given $0 < a \leq b$,

$$K_n^{a,b}(\Sigma) = \inf \left\{ k : |Y^k| < a \text{ or } |Y^k| > b \right\}. \quad (5)$$

If there is no possibility of confusion, or the values of a, b or Σ are not important, we omit them and simplify to K_n . Note that if K_n is finite, then $|Y^{K_n}|$ is well defined.

For $y, t > 0$, $\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, S and Σ two $d \times d$ semi-positive and positive definite matrices, \mathbf{X} with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and \mathbf{Z} with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$, denote

$$\begin{aligned} y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}} &:= (\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{m})' \mathbf{V} / (\mathbf{V}' S \mathbf{V})^{1/2}, \\ F(y, t) &:= \mathbf{P}(|\mathbf{Z}' \mathbf{V}| < y \mid \|\mathbf{Z}\| = t), \\ F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) &:= \mathbf{P}(|Y^{K_n}| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t), \\ \|\mathbf{x}\|_S &:= \|(S^+)^{1/2} \mathbf{x}\| \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where S^+ is the Moore-Penrose inverse of S . The pdf of \mathbf{X} given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$ will be denoted by f_t .

3.1 Some properties of the distribution of $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$

We begin obtaining an explicit expression for the conditional cdf of $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ given $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma}$. Then, Proposition 2 gives an expression of the cdf of the standardized random projection of a given d -dimensional vector. In this proposition we suppose that S is diagonal, which entails no loss of generality, since a rotation of the coordinates axes allows us to obtain this kind of matrix. Notice that we make no assumption on the number of non-null eigenvalues of S as long as there exist two positive ones at least.

Proposition 1. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), the cdf of $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$, with $t > 0$, does not depend on Σ and its value is*

$$\mathbf{P}(Y^{\mathbf{V}} < y \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) = \begin{cases} -\tau \int_{-\infty}^y \int_{-\infty}^0 \int_{-\infty}^{-t} g_t(s, x, z) ds dx dz, & y < 0, \\ \frac{1}{2} + \tau \int_0^y \int_0^{\infty} \int_{-t}^t g_t(s, x, z) ds dx dz, & y > 0, \end{cases}$$

where $g_t(s, x, z) = \frac{x^{n-1}}{z^n} \exp\left\{-\frac{(n-1)x^2}{2z^2}\right\} (t^2 - s^2)^{(d-3)/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{n}{2}(s-x)^2\right\}$, $\tau := 2^{\frac{3-n}{2}} t^{2-d} \sqrt{\frac{n}{2\pi}} (n-1)^{\frac{n-1}{2}} / (\Gamma(\frac{n-1}{2}) B(\frac{d-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}))$.

Proposition 2. *Let $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)' \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_d)' \in \mathbb{R}^d$, S is diagonal with eigenvalues $0 = s_{\ell+1}^2 = \dots = s_d^2$ and $0 < s_1^2 \leq \dots \leq s_{\ell}^2$ with $2 \leq \ell \leq d$ and that $t := \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{m}\|_S > 0$. If \mathbf{V} is uniformly distributed on Ω_1^{d-1} , then the distribution of $y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}$ is supported by $[-t, t]$ and*

$$\mathbf{P}(y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}} \leq z) = \begin{cases} \tau \int_{A_{-}^{\mathbf{V}}} \Delta(z) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^d v_i^2} d\mathbf{v}_{-1}, & -t < z < -\frac{|u_1|}{s_1}, \\ \frac{1}{2} - \text{sign}(z) \tau \int_{A_{+}^{\mathbf{V}}} \Delta(y) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^d v_i^2} d\mathbf{v}_{-1}, & -\frac{|u_1|}{s_1} \leq z \leq \frac{|u_1|}{s_1}, \\ 1 - \tau \int_{A_{+}^{\mathbf{V}}} \Delta(z) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=2}^d v_i^2} d\mathbf{v}_{-1}, & \frac{|u_1|}{s_1} < z < t, \end{cases}$$

with $\tau := (2^{\frac{d+3}{2}} \pi^{\frac{d-1}{2}})^{-1}$, $\Delta(z) := \text{erf}(h_{+}(z)/\sqrt{2}) - \text{erf}(h_{-}(z)/\sqrt{2})$, $\mathbf{v}_{-1} := (v_2, \dots, v_d)$, $h_{\pm}(z) = \left(u_1 \psi_{\mathbf{v}} \pm |z| \sqrt{(u_1)^2 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}} + s_1^2 \psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2 - s_1^2 z^2 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}\right) / (s_1^2 z^2 - (u_1)^2)$, $A_{+}^{\mathbf{V}} := \{\mathbf{v}_{-1} : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0\}$ and $A_{-}^{\mathbf{V}} := \{\mathbf{v}_{-1} : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} < 0\}$ and where $\psi_{\mathbf{v}} := \sum_{i=2}^d u_i v_i$, $\varphi_{\mathbf{v}} := \sum_{i=2}^{\ell} s_i^2 v_i^2$, and $u_i = x_i - m_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$.

We obtain now some properties of the distribution of Y^{K_n} which will be key in the practical determination of a and b . Given $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, the intended error of type I, our goal is to obtain $0 < a \leq b$ such that $\mathbf{P}(K_n < \infty) = 1$, and the probability of declaring a point \mathbf{X} as outlier when it is not is less or equal than α , i.e.

$$\sup_{t \leq C_n^d} F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) = \alpha. \quad (7)$$

Trivially we need to exclude the case $a = 0$, because for any \mathbf{x} and any sample we have a.s. $\mathbf{x} \neq \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ and $\mathbf{P}(|y^{\mathbf{V}}| \leq 0) = 0$ a.s. Thus, Fubini's Theorem implies that the probability of not rejecting \mathbf{H}_0 is zero for any \mathbf{x} .

Proposition 3. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), if a, b, t are strictly positive constants such that $a \leq b$, then*

$$F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) = \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d^2}} g_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) f_t(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(d\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{x},$$

where $g_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) := \mathbf{P}\left(|y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b\right) / \left(\mathbf{P}\left(|y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(|y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a\right)\right)$, $\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ is the Wishart distribution with parameters n and Σ , and $\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ is the $N_d(\mathbf{0}, n^{-1}\Sigma)$.

From the proof of Proposition 3, it is clear the following corollary.

Corollary 1. *Under the assumptions in Proposition 3, we have that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(|Y^{K_n}| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t, \mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n\right) = \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} g_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma}) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Proposition 4 leads to an easier expression of Proposition 3 for $\Sigma = I_d$ provided in Corollary 2. The quantities in such corollary can be computed from Proposition 1.

Proposition 4. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2) the rv's Y^1, \dots, Y^k defined in (4) are conditionally independent given $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma}$ if and only if $\Sigma = I_d$.*

Corollary 2. *Under assumptions in Proposition 3. If $\Sigma = I_d$, then*

$$F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) = \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t\right)}{1 - \mathbf{P}\left(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t\right)}.$$

Proposition 5 shows that the probabilities involved in (7) are monotone on t . Thus (7) can be simplified to

$$F_{\Sigma}(a, b, C_n^d) = \alpha. \quad (8)$$

Proposition 5. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), if a, b and t are positive constants such that $0 < a \leq b$, then, the function $F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t)$ is strictly increasing in t .*

3.2 Moments of K_n

Proposition 6 gives an expression of the variance and the expected number of projections that we need to declare a point as an outlier or as regular. Its proof is not included because it is similar to that of Proposition 3.

Proposition 6. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), assume that a, b and t are positive numbers such that $a \leq b$ and consider K_n defined as in (5), then*

$$\begin{aligned} E(K_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) &= \iiint_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) f_t(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(d\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{x}, \\ \text{Var}(K_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) &= \iiint_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) (2\bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) - 1) f_t(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(d\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\quad - \left(\iiint_{\mathcal{D}} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) f_t(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}(d\mathbf{m}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) = \left(\mathbf{P}\left(|y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(|y_{\mathbf{m}, S}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a\right)\right)^{-1}$, $\mathcal{D} := \Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$, and $\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}$ and $\mathbf{P}_{\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}}$ are the Wishart distribution with parameters n and Σ , and the $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma/n)$, respectively.

Propositions 4 and 6 allow to obtain Corollary 3.

Corollary 3. *Under assumptions in Proposition 6, if $\Sigma = I_d$, then*

$$E(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) = \frac{1}{1 - \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)},$$

$$\text{Var}(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) = \frac{\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < b | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) - \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)}{1 - (\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t))^2}.$$

It is clear from Corollary 3 that $E(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)$ and $\text{Var}(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)$ do not depend on either the specific value of t or the dimension, but rather, only on the probability $\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)$. A graphical representation of those functions appears in Figure 5 in Subsection 7.2 in the Appendix.

3.3 Robust versions of K_n and $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$

The results in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 fix the problem when we have a clean sample and we want to decide on a point which is not in the sample. However, usually, we are interested in detecting outliers inside the sample, which may affect the estimation of the mean and the standard deviation. Thus, we propose to replace $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}$ in (4) by some robust counterparts. Our selections are the median, $m_{\mathbf{V}}$, and the MAD, $M_{\mathbf{V}}^*$.

It is well known that under normality the MAD overestimates the standard deviation (see Maronna et al. [30]). To make it consistent (see *ibid*), we use the normalized MAD, abridged to MADN: $M_{\mathbf{V}} = M_{\mathbf{V}}^*/q_3$, where q_3 is the third quantile of a $N_1(0, 1)$ distribution. We will denote by $\hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}}$ to the sample median and MADN respectively. Furthermore, since both of them may not be unique, the notation $\hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}}$ refers to the choice of any of the available possibilities. To reflect the change, we replace $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ and K_n by $\tilde{Y}^{\mathbf{V}}$ and L_n , respectively. Now, (8) becomes

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\tilde{Y}^{L_n}\right| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = C_n^d\right) = \alpha. \quad (9)$$

As it usually occurs with robust estimators (see for instance Cerioli et al. [6] or Becker and Gather [4]), it is difficult to obtain the conditional exact distribution of \tilde{Y}^{L_n} . Because of this we prove, in Theorem 3, that asymptotically on n this distribution coincides with that of Y^{K_n} . Afterwards, in Section 5, we will present simulations suggesting that this approximation gives acceptable results in many cases for small sample sizes and arbitrary values of the dimension.

Theorem 2 is an auxiliary result to obtain Theorem 3. However, we state it separately because it could have some independent interest.

Theorem 2. *Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), there exists $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mathbf{P}(A_0) = 1$ such that if $\omega \in A_0$, then*

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}} |\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}} - m_{\mathbf{v}}| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}} |\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}} - M_{\mathbf{v}}| \rightarrow 0. \quad (10)$$

Theorem 3. *Let us consider $g_a^b(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ as defined in Proposition 3. Assume (A1) and (A2). If a, b and t are positive constants such that $0 < a \leq b$, and \tilde{Y}^{L_n} is defined as above, then, a.s.*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\tilde{Y}^{L_n}\right| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t\right) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} g_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Next proposition gives the asymptotic behaviour of the first two moments of L_n . Its proof is similar to that one of Theorem 3 and we do not include it.

Proposition 7. *Let us consider $\bar{g}_a^b(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ as defined in Proposition 6. Assume (A1) and (A2). If a, b and t are positive constants such that $0 < a \leq b$, then, a.s.*

$$E(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x},$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = t) &\rightarrow \int_{\Omega_\Sigma^{d-1}(t)} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma) \left(2\bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma) - 1 \right) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \\ &\quad - \left(\int_{\Omega_\Sigma^{d-1}(t)} \bar{g}_a^b(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x} \right)^2, \end{aligned}$$

The expressions of Theorem 3 and Proposition 7 simplify in the case $\Sigma = I_d$ as shown in the following corollary.

Corollary 4. *With the assumptions and the notation in Theorem 3, consider $F(\cdot, t)$ as defined in (6). If $\Sigma = I_d$, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, a.s.,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\left| \tilde{Y}^{L_n} \right| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t \right) &\rightarrow (1 - F(b, t)) / (1 - F(b, t) + F(a, t)), \\ E(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) &\rightarrow (1) / (1 - F(b, t) + F(a, t)), \\ \text{Var}(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) &\rightarrow (F(b, t) - F(a, t)) / \left((1 - F(b, t) + F(a, t))^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Remark 1. *Denote $\mathbb{X}_n = \{\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n\}$. From the proofs of Theorem 3 and Proposition 7 it is clear that the a.s. limits of the expressions $\mathbf{P} \left(\left| \tilde{Y}^{L_n} \right| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = t, \mathbb{X}_n \right)$, $E(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = t, \mathbb{X}_n)$ and $\text{Var}(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = t, \mathbb{X}_n)$ coincide with those shown in Proposition 7.*

3.4 Computation of the constants a and b

The explicit computation of a and b requires to find a solution of (9) satisfying that $E(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = C_n^d)$ equals to a pre-specified value. This problem has been impossible for us even in the non-robust version (8) which handles the function $F_\Sigma(a, b, t)$.

Proposition 3 gives an explicit expression for $F_\Sigma(a, b, t)$; the problem being that the integrand in this expression is so involved that, excepting if $a = b$, we have not been able to compute the integral even when $\Sigma = I_d$ (note that a and b depend on the covariance matrix). In addition, the complexity increases when $\Sigma \neq I_d$, because of the dependency of the projections given $\|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma$ as Proposition 4 showed.

An option to solve (8) as an approximation to (9) would be take $a = b = a_\alpha$, the conditional $(1 - \alpha)$ -quantile of $Y^\mathbf{V}$ given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = C_n^d$; but this does not seem very sensible because this means taking the decision based on one single random projection. However, according to Proposition 8 below, for every $a \in (0, a_\alpha)$, there exists a unique b_a such that the pair (a, b_a) gives a test at the level α for the covariance matrix under consideration. Moreover, the lower the a , the larger the number of required projections, what increases the chances to take the right decision (at the price of a higher computational time).

Proposition 8. *Given $a > 0$ with $\mathbf{P}(|Y^\mathbf{V}| < a) \leq \alpha$, there exists a unique b_a such that $F_\Sigma(a, b_a, C_n^d) = \alpha$. Moreover, the map $a \mapsto b_a$ is strictly decreasing on a .*

Proposition 9 somehow eases the computation of a and b because it states that given $0 < a \leq b$, then asymptotically on n the expected number of observations required to reach a decision is minimal if the sample comes from a $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$. Therefore, if we use for a general covariance matrix the constants of the identity, then we will make the decision using the pre-specified number of projections or more.

Proposition 9. *Let us assume (A1) and (A2) and let $t > 0$ and $0 < a \leq b$. Let $\Sigma \neq I_d$ be a positive definite matrix. Let $\mathbb{X}^\Sigma := \{\mathbf{X}_n^\Sigma\}$ and $\mathbb{X}^{I_d} := \{\mathbf{X}_n^{I_d}\}$ be two random samples taken from the $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$ respectively. Then, almost surely,*

$$\lim_n E \left(L_n^{a,b} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_\Sigma = t, \mathbb{X}^\Sigma \right) > \lim_n E \left(L_n^{a,b} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t, \mathbb{X}^{I_d} \right).$$

After Proposition 9, our proposal consists of using a and b computed for the $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$. However, Proposition 9 leaves two open points: the level of the test obtained when using those constants with $\Sigma \neq I_d$; and

some hints on the expected number of observations when n is low, mostly, when $\Sigma \neq I_d$. We have obtained no theoretical result on this line, but we have produced practical evidence suggesting that the situation is reasonably good. Specifically, we have selected several covariance matrices and we have conducted numerical experiments using pairs (a, b) computed for $\Sigma = I_d$ with the following results (see Subsections 3.4.1 and 3.4.2):

- 1) The obtained rejection levels with $\Sigma \neq I_d$ are close to the levels of the identity.
- 2) The results obtained for sample sizes as low as $n = 50$ are similar to those predicted by Proposition 9. I.e., for sample sizes $n \geq 50$ and covariance matrices $\Sigma \neq I_d$, the mean of the obtained values for L_n are mostly larger than the expected for the identity and they are seldom only slightly lower.
- 3) The mean of the values obtained for L_n when $\Sigma \neq I_d$ are generally similar to those obtained when $\Sigma = I_d$ but sometimes they are much higher.

Notation We denote by l_Σ^r to $E(L_n \| X \|_\Sigma = r C_n^d(\delta))$, when $\delta = .05$. Its sample mean along the simulations we do will be represented by \hat{l}_Σ^r . However, to ease the notation, we will write $l_I^r, \hat{l}_I^r, l_i^r$ and \hat{l}_i^r when $\Sigma = I_d$ or $\Sigma = \Sigma_i^d, i = 1, \dots, 4$ for the matrices $\Sigma_1^d, \dots, \Sigma_4^d$ defined in the next subsection respectively.

3.4.1 Computation of $(a, b), \Sigma = I_d$

In this subsection, given $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we want to compute the constants a and b giving a power α -test with a given value $h \geq 1$ for l_I^1 . To this, taking into account the expressions in Corollary 4, we could solve the equations

$$\begin{cases} h &= (1 - v + u)^{-1} \\ \alpha &= (1 - v)(1 - v + u)^{-1}, \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

and then to look for a, b satisfying that $u = \tilde{F}(a, C_n^d)$ and $v = \tilde{F}(b, C_n^d)$, where $\tilde{F}(y, t) = \mathbf{P}(|\tilde{Y}^{\mathbf{V}}| < y \| \mathbf{X} \| = t)$.

The solution of (11) is $u = (1 - \alpha)/h$ and $v = 1 - \alpha/h$. Only remains to find the u and v quantiles of the distribution $\tilde{F}(\cdot, C_n^d)$. Since we have no explicit expressions for them, we have decided to begin computing a and b by the Monte Carlo method.

The computation is done as follows: we fix N large and for $j = 1, \dots, N$, i) generate $\mathbf{X}_0^j, \mathbf{X}_1^j, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n^j$ and \mathbf{V}^j iid rv's with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, I_d)$, ii) consider $\mathbf{X}^j = C_n^d \mathbf{X}_0^j / \|\mathbf{X}_0^j\|$, iii) compute $\tilde{Y}^j = |(\mathbf{X}^j)' \mathbf{V}^j - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}^j}| / \hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}^j}$, iv) take a and b equal to the quantiles u and v of the sample $\tilde{Y}^1, \dots, \tilde{Y}^N$.

Regrettably, some simulations have shown that the test associated to the obtained pair has generally power lower than α because the value b is lower than desired. To fix this point we recalculate b , keeping a fixed, by simulations with the bisection method. This procedure has proved to give tests at the right level.

Table 1 shows the values of the constants a and b for different values of l_I^1 . Those values have been computed with the above explained methodology with $N = 10^6$.

The choice of the values of the dimension and the sample size attempts to represent the scenarios when the dimension is higher/smaller than the sample size. From this table, the bigger l_I^1 , the wider the interval (a, b) according to Corollary 3. However, the larger the sample size, the narrower the interval (a, b) . This is due to the fact that the estimation of the parameters is more stable for greater sample sizes.

3.4.2 Computation of $(a, b), \Sigma \neq I_d$

Based on Proposition 9, our idea is using the values obtained for $\Sigma = I_d$ to handle any covariance matrix. We firstly check if those values are suitable for general matrices. Since we think that the worst situation with those constants could occur in matrices with sparse eigenvalues, we have chosen three families with large variation among them, while Σ_4^d 's are a matrices with little variation. The considered families are:

Table 1: Obtained values of (a, b) when $\Sigma = I_d$ for different values of n, d and l_I^1 and $C_n^d \equiv C_n^d(0.05)$.

d	$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 500$			
	$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
50	0.0325	4.9714	0.0163	5.3212	0.0326	4.6374	0.0163	4.9143	0.0336	4.4525	0.0167	4.6989
100	0.0303	4.7184	0.0150	5.0936	0.0303	4.3539	0.0151	4.6495	0.0304	4.1478	0.0156	4.3910
500	0.0268	4.3039	0.0133	4.6239	0.0267	3.9230	0.0133	4.2078	0.0266	3.7278	0.0132	3.9520
1000	0.0263	4.1916	0.0130	4.5217	0.0261	3.8253	0.0128	4.0909	0.0259	3.6096	0.0130	3.8197

Table 2: Values of b_Σ giving the greatest difference $|b_I - b_\Sigma|$ for $\Sigma = \Sigma_i^d, i = 1, \dots, 4$, and different values of d and n . a 's are taken from Table 1. Columns Σ tell the matrices in which b_Σ were obtained.

d	$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 500$			
	$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$		$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$		$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$	
	b_Σ	Σ	b_Σ	Σ	b_Σ	Σ	b_Σ	Σ	b_Σ	Σ	b_Σ	Σ
50	5.1413	Σ_3^d	5.4932	Σ_3^d	4.6194	Σ_4^d	4.9504	Σ_3^d	4.4439	Σ_3^d	4.6858	Σ_3^d
100	4.8813	Σ_3^d	5.1857	Σ_3^d	4.3497	Σ_4^d	4.6387	Σ_2^d	4.1399	Σ_3^d	4.3691	Σ_3^d
500	4.3244	Σ_2^d	4.6946	Σ_3^d	4.0248	Σ_3^d	4.2460	Σ_3^d	3.7509	Σ_4^d	3.9143	Σ_3^d
1000	4.3129	Σ_3^d	4.6166	Σ_3^d	3.9221	Σ_3^d	4.1094	Σ_3^d	3.6276	Σ_1^d	3.8363	Σ_2^d

- Σ_1^d is a matrix with the half of their eigenvalues 1's and others d^2 .
- Σ_2^d is a matrix with equally spaced eigenvalues from 1 to d^2 .
- Σ_3^d is a matrix whose eigenvalues are 1's $d - 1$ times and one is d^2 .
- The eigenvalues of Σ_4^d vary between 1 and 2. They are the ratio between two equispaced sequences between d^2 and 2 and between d^2 and 1 respectively.

From this point, for each combination of dimension and sample size, we have computed a pair (a_I, b_I) giving an α -level test for the identity matrix as explained in Subsection 3.4.1. We have kept a_I and, for every $\Sigma = \Sigma_i^d, i = 1, \dots, 4$, we have computed (using the same procedure as in Subsection 3.4.1 with $N = 10^4$ simulations) the value b_Σ such that the pair (a_I, b_Σ) is an α -level test.

The good news is that in all cases we have considered, we have found that the values b_I and b_Σ are very similar. In fact, we include in Subsection 7.3 in the Appendix some guidelines of an ongoing research to find conditions allowing to use the constants a_I, b_I with other covariance matrices when d is large. In fact, the reasoning there suggests that this selection could work for matrices fulfilling a not too restrictive condition on their eigenvalues and that the selection could be not too different even for those matrices not satisfying it (see Remarks 2 and 4 in the Appendix). Moreover, excepting if $\Sigma = \Sigma_3^d$, the expected numbers of projections l_I^1 and l_Σ^1 are also very similar.

For each pair of sample size and dimension, Table 2 shows the b_Σ maximizing the difference $|b_I - b_\Sigma|$ along the four covariance matrices and the matrix producing it. All obtained b_Σ 's are in Table 13 in Subsection 7.4.1 in the Appendix.

4 Practical implementation

Here we give some advices on the practical implementation of the method. We pay attention to how to fix the number of expected projections (Subsection 4.1) and how many simulated values of \tilde{Y}^V we should produce to compute a and b (Subsection 4.2). Subsection 4.3 contains an algorithm to analyse all points in a sample. Subsection 4.4 shows a procedure to reduce the role of the randomness in the process

Table 3: Obtained values of (a, b) when $\Sigma = I_d$ for different values of n, d and l_I^1 and $C_n^d \equiv C_n^d(0.05)$. Only 10^5 simulated values in the of \tilde{Y}^V in the first step.

d	$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 500$			
	$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$	
	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b	a	b
50	0.0333	4.9870	0.0168	5.3563	0.0326	4.6579	0.0165	4.9365	0.0340	4.4449	0.0170	4.6927
100	0.0297	4.7470	0.0149	5.1214	0.0300	4.3772	0.0150	4.6435	0.0312	4.1760	0.0154	4.3896
500	0.0262	4.3144	0.0131	4.6484	0.0269	3.9731	0.0140	4.2024	0.0275	3.7194	0.0136	3.9522
1000	0.0256	4.1863	0.0122	4.5825	0.0262	3.8331	0.0134	4.0953	0.0257	3.6629	0.0123	3.8329

Table 4: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\| = C_n^d$, when $\Sigma = I_d$, for several values of n, d using a, b obtained in Table 3.

d	$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 500$			
	$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$		$l_I^1 = 50$		$l_I^1 = 100$	
	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1	Prob.	\hat{l}_I^1
50	0.0528	48	0.0440	98	0.0518	51	0.0454	100	0.0466	48	0.0470	97
100	0.0464	51	0.0474	103	0.0534	50	0.0516	101	0.0460	50	0.0482	100
500	0.0530	50	0.0480	102	0.0506	48	0.0508	94	0.0492	49	0.0492	99
1000	0.0540	50	0.0532	110	0.0482	49	0.0494	96	0.0440	51	0.0524	104

4.1 Which value should we choose for l_Σ^r ?

In principle, the higher the l_Σ^r the higher the power under the alternative, but also the computational effort increases. The simulations we present below show a detectable increment in power from $l_\Sigma^r = 50$ to $l_\Sigma^r = 100$. However, this increment is not too striking and, of course, the improvement slows down for values of l_Σ^r above 100.

Hence, our advice is to fix this parameter at 50, or at most at 100. In fact, in Subsection 5.3 we use $l_\Sigma^r = 50$, while we choose $l_\Sigma^r = 100$ in Subsection 5.4.

4.2 How many simulated values of \tilde{Y}^V are required to compute a, b ?

The algorithm we proposed in Subsection 3.4.1 to compute a, b requires a large number N of replicas of \tilde{Y}^V . In this paper we have chosen $N = 10^6$, but this is quite time consuming. Some computations suggest that $N = 10^4$ could do it depending on the involved percentiles, but it seems that $N = 10^5$ offers a reasonable trade-off between time and precision. Table 14, in Subsection 7.4.2 in the Appendix, shows the computational times for some combinations of d, n and l_I^1 . Those times range from 40 seconds to 33 minutes in a four cores processor 3.2 GHz Intel Core i5.

The results obtained with $N = 10^5$ are not so bad. To see this, it is enough to compare the results in Tables 3 and 4 with those in Tables 1 and 15: there are some differences among the parameters (due to greater uncertainty in the estimation of the involved quantiles) but, in our opinion, they are inside reasonable margins.

4.3 Algorithm to analyse a sample

An algorithm to analyse all points in a sample goes as follows: Let \mathcal{X} be the set containing all points in the sample at hand and fix the set of the regular points, \mathcal{X}_R , equal to the empty set. Then follow the steps

- i.* Take a random projection and analyse all points in \mathcal{X} .

- ii. If some points have been declared as outliers, delete them from \mathcal{X} , set $\mathcal{X}_R = \emptyset$, and go to step 1. Else, add the points declared as non-outliers to \mathcal{X}_R .
- iii. If $\mathcal{X}_R \neq \mathcal{X}$ go to step 1. Else, return \mathcal{X}_R .

Notice that the algorithm always ends. Moreover, some points declared regular in initial rounds, could later be declared as outliers, because in step 2 we make $\mathcal{X}_R = \emptyset$ every time a new outlier is identified. This is done so to reduce the masking effect.

4.4 How to reduce the role of the randomness in deciding if a point is outlier or not?

Some people can feel uncomfortable with the randomness of the procedure. As stated, the larger l_Σ^r the lower the role of the randomness. A possibility to reduce further this role is to repeat a not so large number of times, T , the process using a significance level α . Thus, since points \mathbf{x} satisfying that $\|\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\|_\Sigma = C_n^d(\alpha)$ are declared as outliers a proportion α of times, we could resort to declare as outliers those points which have been identified as outliers more than a proportion α of times along the T repetitions. We have applied this criteria in Subsection 5.4, with $T = 100$.

The criteria can be strengthened (resp. relaxed) identifying as outliers only the points declared as outliers a number of times higher (resp. lower) than the 0.95 (resp. 0.05) quantile of a binomial with parameters T and α .

5 Numerical studies

In this section we analyse the behaviour of the method thorough simulated experiments and real datasets. Here, only the results for $n = 50$ are shown (the complete results are in the Appendix). We also compare our procedure with existing methods.

The computations of the constants a and b determining the tests are carried out as described in Subsections 3.4.1 with $N = 10^6$ simulated values of \tilde{Y}^V .

5.1 Simulations

We use the notation introduced at the end of Subsection 3.4. All the results are obtained from 5000 replicated simulations.

Table 5 shows the proportion of times we have declared a point with Mahalanobis norm $C_n^d(\delta)$ with $\delta = 0.05$ as an outlier for $n = 50$ and several values of d . More results including the cases $n = 100, 500$ are in Table 15 in Subsection 7.4.3 in the Appendix. The results are not bad because the proportions are close to the intended: the percentiles 0.025 and 0.975 of the obtained proportions are 0.044 and 0.0562 and the price we pay to achieve robustness seems to be a slightly conservative test, since we obtain 18 (out of 120) proportions outside those values, all of them in the upper part, but with the maximum (equal to 0.0668) being close to the target.

The mean number of projections $\hat{l}_1^1, \dots, \hat{l}_4^1$ are always greater or very close to l_1^1 (giving support to the fact that the asymptotical result shown in Proposition 9 also holds for finite sample sizes), being \hat{l}_3^1 always the largest one.

Moreover \hat{l}_1^1, \hat{l}_2^1 and \hat{l}_4^1 are always reasonably similar to \hat{l}_1^1 , which, in turn, are close to the goal l_1^1 . The values obtained for \hat{l}_3^1 increase with the dimension and, when $d = 500, 10^3$, they are an order of magnitude larger than intended.

Table 6 shows the estimations of the probability of declaring a point as an outlier when its Mahalanobis norm is $1.2C_n^d$ or $2C_n^d$ and $n = 50$. Complete results are in Tables 16 and 17 in Subsection 7.4.3 in the Appendix. The values corresponding to I_d and Σ_4^d are the highest, being those of the identity slightly better. The worst results (and the highest number of required projections) are obtained for Σ_3^d ; the remaining ones being similar to those corresponding to the identity. Obviously when l_1^1 increases, so does the probability to detect the outliers. We also see an increase of the power when n becomes larger and a slight decrease when d

Table 5: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = C_n^d$, for $n = 50$ and several values of d and Σ . We also show the sample means of L_n .

d	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^1	I_d	\hat{l}_1^1	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^1	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^1	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^1	Σ_4^d
50	50	51	0.0528	49	0.0571	49	0.0541	186	0.0668	50	0.0569
	100	98	0.0560	99	0.0558	103	0.0553	366	0.0580	99	0.0572
100	50	49	0.0507	48	0.0496	50	0.0501	249	0.0628	50	0.0489
	100	100	0.0538	101	0.0519	100	0.0526	526	0.0603	98	0.0494
500	50	49	0.0481	50	0.0507	50	0.0518	552	0.0628	50	0.0483
	100	100	0.0520	102	0.0509	99	0.0545	1111	0.0589	101	0.0538
1000	50	50	0.0496	50	0.0538	49	0.0534	790	0.0586	50	0.0500
	100	100	0.0520	101	0.0476	102	0.0507	1601	0.0549	99	0.0553

Table 6: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = rC_n^d$, $r = 1.2, 2$ with $n = 50$. We also show the sample means of L_n .

d	$\ \mathbf{X}\ _{\Sigma}$	l_I^r	\hat{l}_I^r	I_d	\hat{l}_1^r	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^r	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^r	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^r	Σ_4^d
50	$1.2C_n^d$	50	48	.2378	48	.2247	48	.2338	163	.1752	48	.2333
		100	93	.2729	96	.2412	95	.2617	313	.1867	92	.2639
	$2C_n^d$	50	12	.8817	13	.8660	12	.8830	47	.6575	12	.8912
		100	16	.9259	19	.9061	16	.9153	74	.6985	16	.9229
100	$1.2C_n^d$	50	48	.2235	49	.2093	48	.2146	223	.1729	49	.2191
		100	97	.2387	97	.2236	95	.2320	460	.1723	96	.2487
	$2C_n^d$	50	13	.8829	13	.8678	13	.8734	70	.6289	13	.8743
		100	18	.9150	19	.9081	18	.9115	113	.6738	18	.9160
500	$1.2C_n^d$	50	50	.2160	48	.2132	49	.2168	518	.1711	50	.2198
		100	97	.2454	99	.2375	96	.2399	973	.1761	97	.2412
	$2C_n^d$	50	13	.8771	13	.8617	13	.8780	150	.6139	13	.8726
		100	18	.9166	18	.9185	18	.9075	249	.6513	18	.9090
1000	$1.2C_n^d$	50	49	.2202	51	.2136	49	.2159	700	.1632	49	.2156
		100	98	.2470	97	.2338	97	.2429	1383	.1616	96	.2366
	$2C_n^d$	50	13	.8797	13	.8728	13	.8729	214	.6128	13	.8674
		100	19	.9116	19	.9134	19	.9093	360	.6551	19	.9124

becomes larger. This makes sense because for larger values of n , the estimation of the parameters is more accurate, while the larger d , the greater the noise in the sample.

Other features of the procedure are analysed later. In particular, the masking and swamping effects as well as the size of the outliers are analysed in Subsection 5.2 and the proportion of observations wrongly classified as outliers in Subsection 5.3. Finally, it is also worth seeing the effect in the analysis of large outliers. This task is done in Subsection 5.4.1 using real data because the data set analysed there contains a quite large outlier and we compare the result of the analysis with and without this point.

5.2 Masking and Swamping

In order to analyse the masking and the swamping effects in our procedure, we have generated samples with sizes $n = 50, 100$ and dimensions $d = 50, 500, 1000$ for the covariance matrices I_d and $\Sigma_i^d, i = 1, \dots, 4$. Those samples contain 10% outliers. More precisely, when $n = 50$ (resp. $n = 100$), we take one point (resp. two) with the distribution of \mathbf{X} given $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = rC_n^d$ with $r = 1.05, 1.25, 2, 3$.

Moreover, since the introduced outliers have different sizes, this analysis is also useful to analyse the effect of the size of the outliers in their detection.

The results of those simulations appear in Table 18 in Subsection 7.4.3 in the Appendix. More exactly, this table shows the proportion of regular observations which are incorrectly identified as outliers (swamping effect) in column $< C_n^d$ and, also, the proportion of genuine outliers which are declared as outliers (masking effect) in the rest of the columns. We see that the swamping effect increases with the dimension and depends on the covariance matrix (Σ_3^d is the worst case), but it is always small (below 0.03 excepting when $\Sigma = \Sigma_3^d$ in which the value 0.05 happens once). This phenomenon decreases with n . Obviously, the proportion of real outliers declared as outliers increases with their Mahalanobis norm and also, there is a slight increase when d or n increase.

More precisely, when we have points with Mahalanobis norm close to the limit value C_n^d , for instance $1.05C_n^d$, we have proportions of detected outliers from 0.061 to 0.1030 (depending on Σ , the dimension and the sample size), while when we move away from that, for instance to $3C_n^d$, these proportions increase to values from 0.7840 to 0.9775. In addition, we see that Σ_3^d gives the slowest increase.

5.3 Comparison with other procedures

Here we compare our method (denoted RP) with other ones proposed for high-dimensional data, such as the principal component outlier detection (PCOut), Filzmoser et al. [22], and the minimum diagonal product (MDP), Ro et al. [34].

Main interest in this subsection is twofold: first to check how d and Σ affect those methods, second to see the capability of the procedures to detect multiple outliers once the parameters have been fixed to have a similar behaviour under the null.

To this, we use two settings: in the first one we handle clean samples and compute how many points are declared as outliers. In the second one the samples contain 10% outliers and analyse the proportion of them which are detected by the procedures.

In both settings, we have employed $n = 50, 100, d = 50, 500, 1000$ and seven covariance matrices: first one is the identity, the second one is $S_2 = (e^{-|i-j|/d})$. Then, we generate a matrix A whose elements are iid $N(0, 1)$ and take $S_3 = A'A$. Remaining matrices are the Σ_i^d 's defined in Subsection 3.4.2. The results obtained with the Σ_i^d 's are in Subsection 7.4.4 in the Appendix. We report here those corresponding to I_d, S_2 and S_3 , covering a situation with independent marginals, another one with relatively high correlations and a third one with randomly chosen correlations.

In the three settings that we handle here, we have generated data for $\Sigma = I_d$ and we have multiplied them by the appropriate matrix to obtain the desired covariance; thus, somehow, we handle the same data with the three covariance matrices. We have done 500 simulations. Matrix A varies from simulation to simulation.

PCOut and MDP are implemented in the functions `pcout` and `rmdp` in the R packages `mvoutlier` and `Rfast`, respectively. We have kept the default parameters of those functions excepting that when we use `rmdp`, we fix `itertime = d^{1.5}` in order to keep the suggestion of the help that this parameter should be similar to d for sample sizes equal to 50, from where we have concluded that for higher sample sizes, the number of iterations should be greater than the sample size. Regrettably, this makes MDP quite slow and we do not report their results when $d = 1000$ because it took 364.18 seconds to compute five values when $n = 50$ in the first setting.

The default options of the functions `pcvout` and `rmdp` lead to a claim of around 10% of outliers in the clean samples. Thus, for each pair n, d , we have fixed the parameters a, b for RP in order to declare around this percentage of outliers. This is achieved taking a, b such that $E(L_n \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = q_d^n) = 50$ and $\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{X} \text{ declared outlier} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = q_d^n) = 0.1$, where q_d^n is the 0.75-quantile of the square roots of a random sample with size n taken from a χ_d^2 . Those parameters have been used in both settings.

The results obtained when using the covariance matrices Σ_i^d are similar to those obtained when $\Sigma = S_3$. Those cases are handled as described before, excepting for the fact that we have used a randomly chosen basis in order to prevent the matrices Σ_i^d being diagonal. We did not this before because RP is invariant against those rotations. However, on the one hand, it seems that MDP may depend on when Σ is diagonal or not; and, on the other hand, the first step in PCOut is to standardise the data, thus making all cases in which Σ is diagonal equivalent to $\Sigma = I_d$.

Table 7: Proportion of outliers found in a clean data set for several covariance matrices.

n	d	MDP			PCOut			RP		
		I_d	S_2	S_3	I_d	S_2	S_3	I_d	S_2	S_3
50	50	.1360	.1190	.1158	.1025	.1377	.1110	.1108	.0909	.1085
	500	.1404	.0320	.0585	.0950	.1308	.1003	.1149	.1003	.1101
	1000	—	—	—	.1028	.1317	.1018	.1132	.1000	.1141
100	50	.0735	.0896	.0739	.1022	.1219	.1086	.1044	.0790	.1020
	500	.0827	.0187	.0498	.0829	.1235	.0813	.1104	.0810	.1104
	1000	—	—	—	.0787	.1232	.0808	.1108	.0830	.1098

5.3.1 Handling a clean sample

Here we generate a sample from a $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ without outliers and compute the proportion of the points in the sample the procedures declare as outliers. Since there are no outliers in the sample, no observation should be declared as outlier. However, the proportion of outliers is not interesting here (because you can get the right proportion tuning appropriately the parameters). Here, we are only interested in detecting the stability of the procedures; more precisely in seeing if the dimension or the covariance matrix affect to the capacity of the procedures to detect outliers.

The conclusion of those simulations (see Tables 7 and 19 in Subsection 7.4.4 in the Appendix) seems to be that the behaviour of MDP is very different depending on when Σ is diagonal or not and, when $\Sigma \neq I_d$, the dimension also affects its behaviour. The increment of the sample size decreases the number of wrongly detected outliers.

PCOut and RP are quite stable when the dimension varies, in spite of PCOut tends to declare more outliers when $n = 50$. This effect is more noticeable in the results in Table 19. Additionally, PCOut seems to declare less outliers when the dependence is not too strong while the oposite happens with RP. Overall, results from RP are more stable than those from MDP or PCOut.

5.3.2 Handling a sample with 10% outliers

Here we generate a clean sample with size $.9n$ from a $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ and we add $n_{out} = .1n$ outliers with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$ given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = p_i, i = 1, \dots, n_{out}$; where we take $q_i, i = 1, \dots, n_{out}$, an equispaced sequence from .95 to .99 and, then, the p_i 's are the square roots of the q_i 's-quantiles of the χ_d^2 distribution. Tables 8 and 20 (last one in Subsection 7.4.4 in the Appendix) show the proportion of outliers which were correctly identified along 500 repetitions; thus, the higher the proportions, the better. MDP does a good work when $\Sigma = I_d$, with better results than PCOut, but its behaviour seems to deteriorate in the other two situations in Table 8, mostly when d increases. In the situations handled in Table 20 this method gives the best results when $\Sigma = \Sigma_3^d$. It is not too bad when $d = 50$ with the remaining matrices, but its behaviour deteriorates noticeably when d increases.

Broadly speaking, we can say that PCOut is the winner when $\Sigma = S_2$ while RP is the choice in the remaining cases with $\Sigma \neq \Sigma_3^d$. Those results suggest that, on highly dependent situations, the user could benefit from using PCOut; while he should use RP in no so dependent ones.

5.4 The procedure in practice: Two real data examples

The practical relevance of the proposed test is illustrated on two well-known real data sets. They have been studied by Hubert et al. [25]. Those data are functional; however, all observations in both two sets have been measured on the same values of the independent variable, and they can be also considered as d -dimensional. We compute a and b as in Section 3.4.1 with $\mathbf{P}\left(\left|\tilde{Y}^{L_n}\right| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = C_n^d\right) = 0.05, l_I^1 = 100$ and $N = 10^6$. Consequently, a point \mathbf{x} such that $\|\mathbf{x}\|_{\Sigma} = C_n^d$ should be identified as outlier 5% of times.

Table 8: Samples contain 10% of real outliers. Columns show the proportion of them correctly identified.

n	d	MDP			PCOut			RP		
		I_d	S_2	S_3	I_d	S_2	S_3	I_d	S_2	S_3
50	50	.1959	.1216	.1357	.1564	.2912	.1684	.2856	.2032	.2844
	500	.1842	.0340	.0688	.1196	.1756	.1040	.1568	.1056	.1420
	1000	—	—	—	.1060	.1552	.1112	.1576	.1092	.1424
100	50	.1301	.0902	.0905	.2112	.3120	.2282	.3076	.1816	.2864
	500	.1424	.0185	.0610	.0856	.1808	.0928	.1790	.1138	.1642
	1000	—	—	—	.0812	.1598	.0852	.1478	.1064	.1526

We have applied the method $T = 100$ times to every point in the sample at hand and we have declared as outliers those points who were identified as outliers 5% of times or more, following the procedure described in Subsection 4.4.

In the analysis we show the outliers identified by the procedures introduced in this paper (denoted RP), in Hubert et al. [25] (denoted Hub), in Filzmoser et al. [22], (denoted PCOut), and Ro et al. [34] (denoted MDP). PCOut and MDP are handled with their default parameters, excepting that we take $itertime = d$ in MDP according to the suggestion that this value should be similar to the dimension when $n = 50$.

5.4.1 Wine Data

This dataset contains the proton nuclear magnetic resonance spectra of 40 different wine samples, Larsen et al. [28]. As in Hubert et al. [25], we select the region between wavelengths 5.37 and 5.62, on which each sample has $d = 397$ measurements.




Figure 1: The left panel shows the outliers which are also detected in [25]. The right panel shows the outliers detected with the proposed method but not in [25].

Table 9 shows the data identified as outliers by the considered procedures. Those curves are represented in Figure 1 with coloured lines. We see that the curve 37 has large peaks around wavelength 5.4 and may be considered an isolated outlier. To see if this curve has a big effect in the analysis (I.e. to give an idea of the robustness of the method), we have carried out the same procedure eliminating it. The results of RP, Hub and MDP are similar to those in Table 9 (see Table 10), however they are not so for PCOut method. Therefore, in this case, we can conclude that including extreme outliers, as the curve 37, does not affect too much the result of our procedure.

Table 9: Wines identified as outliers. Each number in row RP (resp. PCOut) is the proportion of times this wine was declared outlier by RP (resp. the weight of this wine. Low weights identify potential outliers).

	1	2	3	6	12	13	17	18	19	23	27	35	37
RP	0.89	0.16	0.24	0.05	0.67	0.32	0.63		0.64	0.61	0.06	0.19	1.00
Hub		X	X							X		X	X
PCOut	0.04	0.06	0.16	0.20	0.04	0.08		0.16	0.04	0.14			0.04
MDP													X

Table 10: Wines identified as outliers deleting the wine 37. The description of Table 9 applies.

	1	2	3	6	9	12	13	14	17	18	19	20	23	27	29	35
RP	0.92	0.19	0.30	0.08		0.57	0.21		0.47		0.59		0.57	0.08		0.26
Hub		X	X										X			X
PCOut	0.04			0.20	0.52	0.04	0.08	0.66		0.16	0.04	0.35	0.14	0.78	0.27	
MDP																

The curves 1, 12, 17 and 19 oscillate too much, as shown in Figure 2, where the boxplot of the indicators of the oscillation $\sum_{j=1}^d (X_{j+1}^i - X_j^i)^2$ computed for each point $\mathbf{X}^i, i = 1, \dots, 40$ appear. Unlike Hub, RP and PCOut declare them as outliers (except for 17 which is not declared by PCOut): RP with probability greater than 0.6 and PCOut with weights 0.04 (weights close to zero indicate potential outliers).

RP, PCOut and Hub also declare the curves 2, 3 and 23 as outliers. Curve 35 is only identified by RP and Hub. Figure 1 shows that those curves are in the external part of the bulk of the data: 2 and 3 in the bottom and 23 and 35 in the top part. RP and PCOut additionally detect 13 as outlier; this curve is in the bottom part of the data just above of 2 and 3 (see Figure 1). RP detects the curves 6 and 27 (in coloured lines in Figure 1), PCOut only the curve 6, and Hub none of them. We see that curve 6 starts to increase before the other curves; while 27 has a similar shape of the curve 3 (which is declared as an outlier by Hub) but in the top part of the data. However, the number of times these curves have been detected by RP (well below the .95-quantile of a binomial with parameters 100 and .05, which is 9) make them doubtful as outliers from the RP point of view. PCOut gives the maximum weight, 0.2, to 6, i.e. among all the outliers that PCOut detects, this curve is the least anomalous.

The difference between the detected curves by PCOut and RP is that PCOut detects the curve 18 (with the same weight that curve 3), and RP detects the curves 17, 27 and 35. Figure 3 shows these curves. It seems the curve 18 has some fluctuation however this curve does not appear as outlier in the boxplot in Figure 2.

In conclusion, it seems that PCOut and RP detect better the shape outliers than Hub. RP also detects curves that have little peculiarities or those which are in the border of the bulk of the data albeit with lower probability.

5.4.2 Octane data

This data set consists of 39 near infrared spectra of gasoline samples over $d = 226$ wavelengths ranging from 1102 nm to 1552 nm with measurements every two nm. It is known that samples 25, 26 and 36-39 have a very different spectrum because they contain added ethanol, Esbensen et al. [19], Rousseeuw et al. [35] and Hubert et al. [25]. Table 11 shows the data identified as outliers by the considered procedures.

All those curves are plotted with coloured lines in Figure 4. Curiously, Hub and MDP (resp. PCOut and



Figure 2: Boxplot of the squared of the differences among the components of each point in the wine data.




Figure 3: The left panel shows the outlier which was detect by PCOut but not with our method. The right panel shows the outliers detected with our method but not with PCOut.

Table 11: Outliers in the gasolines. Each number in row RP (resp. PCOut) is the proportion of times this wine was declared outlier by RP (resp. the weight of this wine. Low weights identify potential outliers).

	6	23	25	26	34	36	37	38	39
RP	0.11	0.06	0.99	1.00	0.28	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.99
Hub			X	X		X	X	X	X
PCOut		0.10	0.04	0.04	0.08	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.04
MDP			X	X		X	X	X	X

RP) detect the same curves as outliers. Clearly the curves 25, 26, 36, 37, 38 and 39, represented in the left panel, are persistently outlying from wavelength 1390 onward and all procedures detect them. The curves 23 and 34, represented in the right panel, are declared outliers by PCOut and RP but not by Hub and MDP. Additionally, RP detects the curve 6. We see that these three curves are in the border of the bulk of the data and they are slightly separated from the rest on wavelengths around 1150, 1195 and 1390. Anyhow, curve 23 is only declared as outlier 6% of times what makes it doubtful from the point of view of RP. This is the curve with the highest weight, 0.1, when we apply PCOut.




Figure 4: Outliers detected in octane data with the proposed method: the left panel shows the outliers which are also detected in [25] and the right panel shows the outliers detected with our method but not with the method proposed in [25].

Similarly to the wine dataset, it seems that PCOut and RP detect the outliers which are far away from the bulk of the data (curves 25, 26 and 36 to 39) and those which always are in the border of the data (23 and 34, and additionally RP detects 6).

References

- [1] Aggarwal, C.C.: *Outlier Analysis*. Springer (2017)
- [2] Anderson, T.W.: The integral of a symmetric unimodal function over a symmetric convex set and some probability inequalities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **6**(2), 170–176 (1955)
- [3] Barnett, V., Lewis, T.: *Outliers in Statistical Data*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley (1994)
- [4] Becker, C., Gather, U.: The masking breakdown point of multivariate outlier identification rules. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **94**(447), 947–955 (1999)
- [5] Cardot, H., Mas, A., Sarda, P.: Clt in functional linear regression models. *Probab. Theory and Related Fields* **138**(3-4), 325–361 (2007)
- [6] Cerioli, A.: Multivariate outlier detection with high-breakdown estimators. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **105**(489), 147–156 (2010)
- [7] Cerioli, A., Riani, M., Atkinson, A.C.: Controlling the size of multivariate outlier tests with the mcd estimator of scatter. *Stat. Comput.* **19**(3), 341–353 (2009)
- [8] Chang, S., Cosman, P.C., Milstein, L.B.: Chernoff-type bounds for the gaussian error function. *IEEE Trans. Commun.* **59**(11), 2939–2944 (2011)
- [9] Csorgo, M.: *Quantile processes with statistical applications*, vol. 42. Siam (1983)
- [10] Cuesta-Albertos, J., del Barrio, E., Fraiman, R., Matrán, C.: The random projection method in goodness of fit for functional data. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **51**(10), 4814 – 4831 (2007)
- [11] Cuesta-Albertos, J., Fraiman, R., Ransford, T.: Random projections and goodness-of-fit tests in infinite-dimensional spaces. *Bull. Braz. Math. Soc.* **37**(4), 477–501 (2006)

- [12] Cuesta-Albertos, J., Nieto-Reyes, A.: The random Tukey depth. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **52**(11), 4979 – 4988 (2008)
- [13] Cuesta-Albertos, J.A., Febrero-Bande, M.: A simple multiway anova for functional data. *TEST* **19**(3), 537–557 (2010)
- [14] Cuesta-Albertos, J.A., Fraiman, R., Ransford, T.: A sharp form of the Cramér–Wold theorem. *J. Theor. Probab.* **20**(2), 201–209 (2007)
- [15] Cuesta-Albertos, J.A., Gamboa, F., Nieto-Reyes, A.: A random-projection based procedure to test if a stationary process is gaussian. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **75**, 124–141 (2014)
- [16] Cuesta-Albertos, J.A., García-Portugués, E., Febrero-Bande, M., González-Manteiga, W.: Goodness-of-fit tests for the functional linear model based on randomly projected empirical processes. *Ann. Stat.* **47**(1), 439–467 (2019)
- [17] Davies, L., Gather, U.: The identification of multiple outliers. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **88**(423), 782–792 (1993)
- [18] Donoho, D.L.: Breakdown properties of multivariate location estimators. Ph.D. qualifying paper (1982)
- [19] Esbensen, K., Guyot, D., Westad, F., Houmoller, L.: *Multivariate Data Analysis in Practice : an Introduction to Multivariate Data Analysis and Experimental Design.* CAMO (2002)
- [20] Fang, K., Zhang, Y.: *Generalized Multivariate Analysis.* Berlin ; New York : Springer-Verlag (1990)
- [21] Febrero, M., Galeano, P., González-Manteiga, W.: A functional analysis of NO_x levels: location and scale estimation and outlier detection. *Comput. Statist.* **22**(3), 411–427 (2007)
- [22] Filzmoser, P., Maronna, R., Werner, M.: Outlier identification in high dimensions. *Comput. Statist. Data Anal.* **52**(3), 1694–1711 (2008)
- [23] Healy, M.J.R.: Multivariate normal plotting. *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C. Appl. Stat.* **17**(2), 157–161 (1968)
- [24] Hu, T., Móricz, F., Taylor, R.: Strong laws of large numbers for arrays of rowwise independent random variables. *Acta Math. Hung.* **54**, 153–162 (1989)
- [25] Hubert, M., Rousseeuw, P.J., Segaert, P.: Multivariate functional outlier detection. *Stat. Methods Appl.* **24**(2), 177–202 (2015)
- [26] Johnson, W., Lindenstrauss, J.: Extensions of Lipschitz maps into a Hilbert space. *Contemporary Mathematics* **26**, 189–206 (1984)
- [27] Johnstone, I.M., Lu, A.Y.: On consistency and sparsity for principal components analysis in high dimensions. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **104**(486), 682–693 (2009)
- [28] Larsen, F.H., van den Berg, F., Engelsens, S.B.: An exploratory chemometric study of ^1H NMR spectra of table wines. *J. Chemom.* **20**(5), 198–208 (2006)
- [29] Laurent, B., Massart, P.: Adaptive estimation of a quadratic functional by model selection. *Ann. Math. Statist.* **28**(5), 1302–1338 (2000)
- [30] Maronna, R.A., Martin, R.D., Yohai, V.J., Salibián-Barrera, M.: *Robust statistics: theory and methods (with R).* John Wiley & Sons (2019)
- [31] Maronna, R.A., Yohai, V.J.: The behavior of the Stahel-Donoho robust multivariate estimator. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.* **90**(429), 330–341 (1995)

- [32] Pan, J., Fung, W., Fang, K.: Multiple outlier detection in multivariate data using projection pursuit techniques. *J. Statist. Plann. Inference* **83**(1), 153 – 167 (2000)
- [33] Peña, D., Prieto, F.J.: Multivariate outlier detection and robust covariance matrix estimation. *Technometrics* **43**(3), 286–310 (2001)
- [34] Ro, K., Zou, C., Wang, Z., Yin, G.: Outlier detection for high-dimensional data. *Biometrika* **102**(3), 589–599 (2015)
- [35] Rousseeuw, P.J., Debruyne, M., Engelen, S., Hubert, M.: Robustness and outlier detection in chemometrics. *Crit. Rev. Anal. Chem.* **36**(3–4), 221–242 (2006)
- [36] Serfling, R., Mazumder, S.: Computationally easy outlier detection via projection pursuit with finitely many directions. *J. Nonparametr. Stat.* **25**(2), 447–461 (2013)
- [37] Stahel, W.A.: Breakdown of covariance estimators. *Fachgruppe fur Statistik* (1981)
- [38] Tartakovsky, A., Nikiforov, I., Basseville, M.: *Sequential analysis: Hypothesis testing and changepoint detection*. Chapman and Hall/CRC (2014)

6 Appendix I. Proofs

6.1 Proofs of Section 2

Two lemmas are required to prove Theorem 1. Here F_d^{-1} denotes the quantile function of the distribution χ_d^2 . Lemma 1 gives an upper bound of F_d^{-1} and is the first part in Lemma 1 of Laurent and Massart [29]. Lemma 2 follows applying twice L'Hôpital's rule.

Lemma 1. [Laurent and Massart] Let $d \geq 1$. Then

$$F_d^{-1}(s) \leq d + \log\left(\frac{1}{1-s}\right) + 2\sqrt{d \log\left(\frac{1}{1-s}\right)}, \quad s \in (0, 1).$$

Lemma 2. Let f and g functions such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} f(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} g(t) = 0$ and $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f'(t)}{g'(t)} = c \in \mathbb{R}$. Then

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\log(f(t))}{\log(g(t))} = 1.$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Firstly, we obtain the limit when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and d is fixed. From (2) we have that if $q_{n,d} := F_d^{-1}((1-\delta)^{1/n})$, then $q_{n,d} = (C_n^d(\delta))^2$. Lower bound: By definition we have $(1-\delta)^{1/n} = \mathcal{P}(d/2, q_{n,d}/2)$, where $\mathcal{P}(a, x) := \gamma(a, x)/\Gamma(a)$ is the regularized lower gamma function, with $\gamma(a, x) := \int_0^x y^{a-1} e^{-y} dy$ the incomplete lower gamma function. For $d = 1$,

$$(1-\delta)^{1/n} = \mathcal{P}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{q_{n,1}}{2}\right) = \int_0^{q_{n,1}/2} t^{-1/2} e^{-t} dt,$$

Take $\beta = 2$ and $\alpha = \sqrt{e/(2\pi)}$ in Theorem 2 in [8] to obtain

$$(1-\delta)^{1/n} < 1 - \sqrt{e/(2\pi)} \exp\{-q_{n,1}\},$$

from where, taking into account that the quantiles of a chi-squared increase with the dimension, we have that for any $d \geq 1$:

$$q_{n,d} > -\log(1 - (1-\delta)^{1/n}) + \log(\sqrt{e/(2\pi)}).$$

Upper bound: By Lemma 1, for any n and d we have that

$$q_{n,d} \leq d - 2 \log\left(1 - (1-\delta)^{1/n}\right) + 2\sqrt{-d \log\left(1 - (1-\delta)^{1/n}\right)}.$$

As the third term of the above inequality has a lower order than the second one when $n \rightarrow \infty$ and d is fixed, we have that both upper and lower bounds have the same order. Take $f(n) := 1 - (1-\delta)^{1/n}$ and $g(n) := n^{-1}$. Both functions $f(n)$ and $g(n)$ trivially go to zero when $n \rightarrow \infty$. Furthermore

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f'(n)}{g'(n)} = -\log(1-\delta).$$

Hence Lemma 2 gives that $q_{d,n}$ has the same order than $\log(n)$ when $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Secondly, analyse the limit of C_n^d when $d \rightarrow \infty$ and fixed $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let Y_d be a rv with distribution χ_d^2 . Thus, Y_d is the sum of d iid rv's with distribution χ_1^2 whose mean is 1 and whose variance is 2. Then, by the Central Limit Theorem, for $a \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$F_{Y_d^*}(a) \rightarrow \Phi(a), \tag{12}$$

where $F_{Y_d^*}$ denotes the d.f. of $Y_d^* := (Y_d - d)/\sqrt{2d}$. Instead of in a fixed a , we are interested in computing this limit on $a_d := ((C_n^d)^2 - d)/\sqrt{2d}$.

Suppose for a contradiction that $\{a_d\}$ is unbounded. Then there exists a subsequence $\{a_{d_k}\}$ such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} a_{d_k} = \infty$. By (12) since $F_{Y_{d_k}^*}$ is increasing, for any $a > 0$, we have that

$$1 \geq \overline{\lim} F_{Y_{d_k}^*}(a_{d_k}) \geq \underline{\lim} F_{Y_{d_k}^*}(a_{d_k}) \geq \lim F_{Y_{d_k}^*}(a) = \Phi(a).$$

On the other hand, since $\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \Phi(t) = 1$, we would have that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} F_{Y_{d_k}^*}(a_{d_k}) = 1$. This is a contradiction because by definition $F_{Y_{d_k}^*}\left((C_n^{d_k})^2\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{d_k}^* \leq (C_n^{d_k})^2\right) = (1 - \delta)^{1/n} \neq 1$ (remember that n is fixed now). Thus $\{a_d\}$ is bounded.

Suppose now that $\{a_d\}$ does not converge, i.e. suppose that there exist two subsequences $\{d_k^1\}$ and $\{d_k^2\}$ such that $a_{d_k^1} \rightarrow a_1$ and $a_{d_k^2} \rightarrow a_2$, with $a_1 < a_2$. Let $a_1 < x_1 < x_2 < a_2$. From an index k onward:

$$(1 - \delta)^{1/n} = \mathbf{P}\left(\chi_{d_k^1}^2 \leq (C_n^{d_k^1})^2\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{d_k^1}^* \leq a_{d_k^1}\right) \leq \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{d_k^1}^* \leq x_1\right) \rightarrow \Phi(x_1), \quad (13)$$

$$(1 - \delta)^{1/n} = \mathbf{P}\left(\chi_{d_k^2}^2 \leq (C_n^{d_k^2})^2\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{d_k^2}^* \leq a_{d_k^2}\right) \geq \mathbf{P}\left(Y_{d_k^2}^* \leq x_2\right) \rightarrow \Phi(x_2), \quad (14)$$

where the convergence follow from (12). Since (13) and (14) are simultaneously impossible, because $\Phi(x_1) \neq \Phi(x_2)$, we conclude that $\{a_d\}$ does converge.

Let $a := \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} a_d$, then $0 < (1 - \delta)^{1/n} = \lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} F_{Y_d^*}(a_d) = \Phi(a)$ and we have that $a \neq 0$. Then, the result follows from the fact that for any $\epsilon > 0$, from an index onward

$$(a - \epsilon)\sqrt{2d} + d \leq (C_n^d)^2 \leq (a + \epsilon)\sqrt{2d} + d.$$

□

6.2 Proofs of Section 3.1

To prove Proposition 1, the equality $Y^{\mathbf{V}} = \left(\frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} - \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{V}}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}}\right) \frac{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}}$ leads us to consider the following rv's:

$$Y_1 := \frac{\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}}, \quad Y_2 := \frac{\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{V}}}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}}, \quad Y_3 := \frac{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}}{\hat{\sigma}_{\mathbf{V}}}. \quad (15)$$

We next obtain the pdf's of those rv's given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$, with $t > 0$. Since we compute the conditional pdf's given the norm of the point, the rv Y_1 does not follow a standard normal distribution. Recall also that the sample mean and the sample variance are calculated using only the sample and therefore, Y_1 is the only rv which depends on \mathbf{X} . We need Lemma 3 which gives the cdf of the marginal of a uniform distribution on Ω_1^{d-1} .

Lemma 3. *Let $\mathbf{U} = (U_1, \dots, U_d)'$ be a rv with distribution uniform on Ω_1^{d-1} . The cdf of U_1 , denoted by F_{U_1} , is given by the following expression:*

$$F_{U_1}(u) = \text{sign}(u) \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{I}_{u^2} \left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{d-1}{2} \right) + \frac{1}{2}, \quad u \in [-1, 1].$$

Proof. By (2.5.11) in Fang and Zhang [20],

$$F_{U_1}(u) = \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{d}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(\frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \int_{-1}^u (1 - y^2)^{(d-3)/2} dy.$$

The change of variable $y^2 = s$, gives

$$F_{U_1}(u) = \frac{1}{2\mathbf{B}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{d-1}{2}\right)} \left(\text{sign}(u) \mathbf{B}\left(u^2; \frac{1}{2}, \frac{d-1}{2}\right) + \mathbf{B}\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{d-1}{2}\right) \right).$$

The result is deduced from the definition of the incomplete beta function. □

Lemma 4. Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), the pdf's of the rv's Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 , defined in (15) given that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$ with $t > 0$, are

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Y_1}^t(u) &= \left(B\left(\frac{d-1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) \right)^{-1} t^{2-d} (t^2 - u^2)^{(d-3)/2}, \text{ if } u \in [-t, t] \text{ and null otherwise,} \\ f_{Y_2}(u) &= \left(\frac{n}{2\pi}\right)^{1/2} \exp\{-nu^2/2\}, u \in \mathbb{R}, \\ f_{Y_3}(u) &= \frac{(n-1)^{(n-1)/2}}{2^{(n-3)/2} \Gamma\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)} u^{-n} \exp\left\{-\frac{n-1}{2u^2}\right\}, \text{ for } u \in [0, \infty) \text{ and null otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Firstly, fix $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{v}$. Using Lemma 3, it is easily seen that the pdf of Y_1 given \mathbf{v} and that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$ coincide with the expression we propose for $f_{Y_1}^t$. Secondly, for Y_2 , since $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{v}}$ follows a $N_1(0, \Sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^2/n)$ distribution, then the rv $\hat{\mu}_{\mathbf{v}}/\Sigma_{\mathbf{v}}$ follows a $N_1(0, 1/n)$ distribution. For Y_3 , it is known that $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{v}}^2(n-1)/\Sigma_{\mathbf{v}}^2$ follows a χ_{n-1}^2 distribution. Then, a change of variable gives that the pdf of Y_3 given \mathbf{v} is $f_{\chi_{n-1}^2}((n-1)u^{-2})2(n-1)u^{-3}$, which writing the expression of $f_{\chi_{n-1}^2}$ gives the function we propose for f_{Y_3} . The result follows because none of those distributions depend on the chosen \mathbf{v} . \square

Proof of Proposition 1. The rv's Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 defined in (15) are conditionally independent given \mathbf{V} . If $y < 0$, then the pdf of the rv $Y^{\mathbf{V}}$ given $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{Y^{\mathbf{V}}}^t(y) &= f_{(Y_1 - Y_2)Y_3}^t(y) \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{Y_1 - Y_2}^t(x) f_{Y_3}(y/x) |x|^{-1} dx \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{Y_3}(y/x) |x|^{-1} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} f_{Y_1}^t(s) f_{Y_2}(s-x) ds \right) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Write the expressions of the pdf's of the rv's Y_1, Y_2, Y_3 , given by Lemma 4 and obtain the first equality of this proposition. The reasoning when y is positive is identical. \square

Lemma 5 and Corollary 5, which are proved next, will be used in the proof of Proposition 2. In the sets \mathcal{R}_i in Lemma 5, we assume $v_2 \neq 0$ just to simplify the writing. It is enough that $v_i \neq 0$ for some $i \in \{2, \dots, \ell\}$.

Lemma 5. With the assumptions and the notation of Proposition 2, the map $\mathcal{H} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ given by

$$\mathcal{H}(v_1, \dots, v_d) := \left(\frac{u_1 v_1 + \psi_{\mathbf{v}}}{(s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi_{\mathbf{v}})^{1/2}}, v_2, \dots, v_d \right)'$$

is injective when restricted to each of the following regions:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_1 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{v} : v_1 < \frac{u_1 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}{s_1^2 \psi_{\mathbf{v}}}, \psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0, v_2 \neq 0 \right\}; \mathcal{R}_2 := \left\{ \mathbf{v} : v_1 < \frac{u_1 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}{s_1^2 \psi_{\mathbf{v}}}, \psi_{\mathbf{v}} < 0, v_2 \neq 0 \right\} \\ \mathcal{R}_3 &:= \left\{ \mathbf{v} : v_1 > \frac{u_1 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}{s_1^2 \psi_{\mathbf{v}}}, \psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0, v_2 \neq 0 \right\}; \mathcal{R}_4 := \left\{ \mathbf{v} : v_1 > \frac{u_1 \varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}{s_1^2 \psi_{\mathbf{v}}}, \psi_{\mathbf{v}} < 0, v_2 \neq 0 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. To ease the notation, we omit the subindex \mathbf{v} in $\psi_{\mathbf{v}}$ and $\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}$. Note firstly that the last $d-1$ components of \mathcal{H} coincide with the identity function, which is obviously injective. Therefore we assume that v_2, \dots, v_d are fixed and study the monotonicity of the function $\mathcal{H}^1(v_1) = (u_1 v_1 + \psi) / (s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi)^{1/2}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\mathcal{H}^1(v_1)}{dv_1} &= \frac{u_1 (s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi)^{1/2} - (u_1 v_1 + \psi) s_1^2 v_1 (s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi)^{-1/2}}{s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi} \\ &= \frac{u_1 \varphi - \psi s_1^2 v_1}{(s_1^2 v_1^2 + \varphi)^{3/2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then $\frac{d\mathcal{H}^1(v_1)}{dv_1} = 0$ if and only if $v_1 = \frac{u_1 \varphi}{s_1^2 \psi}$, or $\psi = 0$ and $u_1 = 0$. It is easy to check that \mathcal{H}^1 is strictly increasing on \mathcal{R}_1 and \mathcal{R}_4 while it is strictly decreasing on \mathcal{R}_2 and \mathcal{R}_3 . Consequently, the result is proven. \square

For the sake of brevity we denote the function \mathcal{H} restricted to the regions $\mathcal{R}_1, \mathcal{R}_2, \mathcal{R}_3$ and \mathcal{R}_4 as $\mathcal{H}_1, \mathcal{H}_2, \mathcal{H}_3,$ and \mathcal{H}_4 , respectively.

Corollary 5. *With the notation above introduced, the inverse of \mathcal{H}_i , $i = 1, \dots, 4$ are*

- On $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}_1) = \left(-\frac{u_1}{s_1}, \sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}\right) \times \{(v_2, \dots, v_d)' : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0\}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_1^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d) = \begin{cases} (h_+(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', & y < \frac{|u_1|}{s_1}, \\ (h_-(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', & \frac{|u_1|}{s_1} < y < \sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}, \end{cases}$$

- On $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}_2) = \left(-\sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}, -\frac{u_1}{s_1}\right) \times \{(v_2, \dots, v_d)' : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} < 0\}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_2^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d) = (h_+(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', \quad -\sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}} < y < -\frac{|u_1|}{s_1}$$

- On $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}_3) = \left(\frac{u_1}{s_1}, \sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}\right) \times \{(v_2, \dots, v_d)' : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0\}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_3^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d) = (h_+(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', \quad \frac{|u_1|}{s_1} < y < \sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}$$

- On $\mathcal{H}(\mathcal{R}_4) = \left(-\sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}, \frac{u_1}{s_1}\right) \times \{(v_2, \dots, v_d)' : \psi_{\mathbf{v}} < 0\}$:

$$\mathcal{H}_4^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d) = \begin{cases} (h_-(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', & -\sqrt{\frac{u_1^2}{s_1^2} + \frac{\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2}{\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}} < y < -\frac{|u_1|}{s_1} \\ (h_+(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)', & y < \frac{|u_1|}{s_1} \end{cases}$$

where $h_{\pm}(y) := \left(u_1\psi_{\mathbf{v}} \pm |y|\sqrt{u_1^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}} + s_1^2\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2 - y^2s_1^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}\right) / (s_1^2y^2 - u_1^2)$.

Proof. From Lemma 5, we write explicitly the inverse of \mathcal{H} :

$$\mathcal{H}^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d) = (h_{\pm}(y), v_2, \dots, v_d)'.$$

It remains to determine when the first coordinate of $\mathcal{H}^{-1}(y, v_2, \dots, v_d)$ is h_+ or h_- . Suppose $\psi_{\mathbf{v}} > 0$ and $y > |x_1|$, (the rest of the cases are analogous), then

$$\frac{u_1\psi_{\mathbf{v}} + |y|\sqrt{u_1^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}} + s_1^2\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2 - s_1^2y^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}{s_1y^2 - u_1^2} > \frac{x_1\psi_{\mathbf{v}} - |y|\sqrt{u_1^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}} + s_1^2\psi_{\mathbf{v}}^2 - s_1^2y^2\varphi_{\mathbf{v}}}}{s_1y^2 - u_1^2}.$$

Hence, by the definition of the regions \mathcal{R}_i , we have that $(h_-(y), v_2, \dots, v_d) \in \mathcal{H}_1^{-1}$ and $(h_+(y), v_2, \dots, v_d) \in \mathcal{H}_3^{-1}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 2. To ease the notation, we often omit the sub-indices \mathbf{v} , \mathbf{m} and S of the functions. Due to the symmetry of the distribution of \mathbf{V} , we assume $x_i \geq 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, d$. It is clear that $y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}} \in [-t, t]$. Take the transformation \mathcal{H} defined on Lemma 5.

We have that if B is a Borel set on \mathbb{R} and $\mathbf{V}^1, \dots, \mathbf{V}^4$ are rv's such that the distribution of \mathbf{V}^i is that of \mathbf{V} given that $\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{R}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$, then:

$$\mathbf{P}(y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}} \in B) = \sum_{i=1}^4 \mathbf{P}(\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{R}_i) \mathbf{P}(\mathcal{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{V}^i) \in B), \quad (16)$$

where, as stated, $\mathcal{H}_i = (\mathcal{H}_{i,1}, \dots, \mathcal{H}_{i,d})'$ is the restriction of \mathcal{H} to the set \mathcal{R}_i . Since all \mathcal{H}_i are injective and derivable we have that

$$\mathbf{P}(\mathcal{H}_{i,1}(\mathbf{V}^i) \in B) = \int_B \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{V}^i}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_i}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| d\mathbf{v}_{-1} dz, \quad (17)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{V}^i}$ is the pdf of the rv \mathbf{V}^i . We trivially have that

$$|J_{\mathcal{H}_i}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| = \left| \frac{(\partial \mathcal{H}_i)_1^{-1}(z)}{\partial z} \right|$$

and

$$f_{\mathbf{V}^i}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) = \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}(\mathbf{V} \in \mathcal{R}_i)} f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) 1_{\mathcal{R}_i}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})),$$

this expression jointly with (16) and (17) gives

$$\mathbf{P}(y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}} \in B) = \int_B \sum_{i=1}^4 \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d-1}} f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_i}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| d\mathbf{v}_{-1} dz, \quad (18)$$

where we have used the fact that, by definition, $1_{\mathcal{R}_i}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) = 1$.

We study now the sign of the determinant of the Jacobian. By Corollary 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{(\partial \mathcal{H}_i)_1^{-1}(z)}{\partial z} \right| &= \left| \frac{\partial h_{\pm}(z)}{\partial z} \right| \\ &= \frac{|\mp u_1^4 \varphi + u_1^2 s_1^2 (\pm z^2 \varphi \mp \psi^2) \mp \psi^2 z^2 s_1^4 - 2\psi s_1^2 u_1 z (\psi^2 s_1^2 + \varphi (u_1^2 - s_1^2 z^2))|^{1/2}}{(u_1^2 - s_1^2 z^2)^2 (\psi^2 s_1^2 + \varphi (u_1^2 - s_1^2 z^2))^{1/2}}, \end{aligned}$$

where the signs depend on the particular index and z .

We have that $\left| \frac{\partial h_{\pm}(z)}{\partial z} \right| = 0$ only when $z \in \{0, \pm u_1/s_1\}$. As those values are not in the mentioned regions, we state

$$\begin{aligned} \text{If } z > 0, & \quad \text{then } \partial h_+(z)/\partial z < 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial h_-(z)/\partial z > 0. \\ \text{If } z < 0, & \quad \text{then } \partial h_+(z)/\partial z > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \partial h_-(z)/\partial z < 0. \end{aligned}$$

Take $B = (-\infty, r]$ in (18) with $r \in (-t, -|u_1/s_1|)$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}} < r) &= \int_{A_+^{\mathbf{V}}} \left(\int_{-t}^r f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_1^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-t}^r f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_3^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_3}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| dz \right) d\mathbf{v}_{-1} \\ &\quad + \int_{A_-^{\mathbf{V}}} \left(\int_{-t}^r f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_2^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_2}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{-t}^r f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_4^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_4}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| dz \right) d\mathbf{v}_{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

We have $f_{\mathbf{V}}(\mathcal{H}_i^{-1}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})) |J_{\mathcal{H}_i}(z, \mathbf{v}_{-1})| = 0$ when $r \in \left(-t, -\sqrt{u_1^2/s_1^2 + \psi^2/\varphi}\right)$ for $i = 1, \dots, 4$ and, using Corollary 5,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}(y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}} < r) &= \int_{A_-^{\mathbf{V}}} \left(\int_{-\sqrt{u_1^2/s_1^2 + \psi^2/\varphi}}^r e^{-\frac{1}{2}(h_+^2(z) + v_2^2 + \dots + v_d^2)} \frac{\partial h_+(z)}{\partial z} dz \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{-\sqrt{u_1^2/s_1^2 + \psi^2/\varphi}}^r e^{-\frac{1}{2}(h_-^2(z) + v_2^2 + \dots + v_d^2)} \frac{\partial h_-(z)}{\partial z} dz \right) d\mathbf{v}_{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

From $h_- \left(-\sqrt{u_1^2/s_1^2 + \psi^2/\varphi} \right) = h_+ \left(-\sqrt{u_1^2/s_1^2 + \psi^2/\varphi} \right)$, the result is obtained. The case $-|u_1/s_1| < r < 0$ is analogous and the cases when $r > 0$ are deduced by symmetry. \square

Lemma 6 is obvious and it is stated for further reference.

Lemma 6. *Let $\mathbf{V}_1, \dots, \mathbf{V}_k$ be iid rv's, then Y^1, \dots, Y^k defined in (4) are conditionally iid given the d -dimensional vectors \mathbf{X} and $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$.*

Proof of Proposition 3. Denote $\mathbb{X}_n := (\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n)'$. Taking into account Lemma 6 and that $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{\mathbf{V}} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}' \mathbf{V}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}_{\mathbf{V}} = \sqrt{\mathbf{V}' \hat{\Sigma} \mathbf{V}}$, the result follows from the reasoning:

$$\begin{aligned}
F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) &= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{P}(\text{declare } \mathbf{X} \text{ as an outlier with } k \text{ proy} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) \\
&= \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \mathbf{E} \left(\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| > b \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbb{X}_n) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) \mid \mathbf{X}, \mathbb{X}_n)^{k-1} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t \right) \\
&= \mathbf{E} \left(\frac{1 - \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < b)}{1 - \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < b) + \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a)} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t \right) \\
&= \mathbf{E}(g_{a,b}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t).
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Proposition 4. Let $t > 0$ and $\mathbf{w} := (\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) \in \Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t) \times \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$. Define $\delta(\mathbf{w}) := \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \mathbb{W} = \mathbf{w}) - \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t)$, where $\mathbb{W} = (\mathbf{X}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma})$. Proposition 2 gives that the map $\mathbf{w} \mapsto \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid (\mathbf{X}, \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}, \hat{\Sigma}) = \mathbf{w})$ is continuous and not constant on \mathbf{x} for $a \in (0, t)$ if $\Sigma \neq I_d$.

Thus $\int \delta^2(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) > 0$. However, by definition of $\delta(\mathbf{w})$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) &= \int \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \mathbb{W} = \mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
&= \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) + \int \delta(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}),
\end{aligned}$$

and, consequently, $\int \delta(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) = 0$. Denote $g(a, t) := \mathbf{P}(Y^{\mathbf{V}_1} < a, Y^{\mathbf{V}_2} < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t)$, then, by Lemma 6,

$$\begin{aligned}
g(a, t) &= \int \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}_1}| < a, |Y^{\mathbf{V}_2}| < a \mid \mathbb{W} = \mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
&= \int \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \mathbb{W} = \mathbf{w})^2 \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
&= \int \left(\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t)^2 + \delta^2(\mathbf{w}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2\delta(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t) \right) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
&= \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t)^2 + \int \delta^2(\mathbf{w}) \mathbf{P}_{\mathbb{W} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t}(d\mathbf{w}) \\
&> \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t)^2.
\end{aligned}$$

However, if $\Sigma = I_d$, then $\mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| < a | \mathbb{W} = w)$ is constant on \mathbf{X} and the same reasoning shows the independence in this case. \square

Before proving Proposition 5, we need some previous results.

Lemma 7. *Let $d > 1$ and let S and Σ be $d \times d$ semi-positive symmetric matrices and \mathbf{Z} be a d -dimensional rv. The function $r \mapsto f(r)$ is increasing on r , where*

$$f(r) := \mathbf{P}(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{Z} \text{ be declared outlier w.r.t. } N_d(\mathbf{0}, S) \mid \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}\| = r).$$

Proof. Let $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and let $r = \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}\|$. Since the distribution of $\mathbf{V} = (V_1, \dots, V_d)'$ is rotation invariant, we can compute $F_{\mathbf{Z}}(\cdot)$ in any basis we choose. Thus, let us consider a basis on \mathbb{R}^d such that $\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}/\|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}\| = (1, 0, \dots, 0)'$, then

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z})'\mathbf{V}|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > b\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{\|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}\||V_1|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > b\right) = \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|V_1|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > \frac{b}{r}\right),$$

which is increasing on r and that does not depend on \mathbf{z} . A similar reasoning implies that the map $r \mapsto \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z})'\mathbf{V}|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} < a\right)$ decreases on r and the result follows from.

$$\begin{aligned} f(r) &= \int \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z})'\mathbf{V}|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > b\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z})'\mathbf{V}|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > b\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z})'\mathbf{V}|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} < a\right)} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Z} \mid \|\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{Z}\|}(d\mathbf{z}) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|V_1|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > \frac{b}{r}\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|V_1|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} > \frac{b}{r}\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|V_1|}{\Sigma_{\mathbf{V}}} < \frac{a}{r}\right)}. \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 8. *Let $\delta < 1$, $c < 1$, Σ be a semi positive definite symmetric matrix and \mathbf{Z} be a rv with distribution $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \delta I_d)$. If $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$, then for any g increasing function*

$$E[g(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{x})\|)] \geq E[g(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Z} + c\mathbf{x})\|)].$$

Proof. The second part in Corollary 2 in [2] gives that if $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $h(w) = w$, then

$$\mathbf{P}(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Z} + c\mathbf{x})\| \leq r) \geq \mathbf{P}(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Z} + \mathbf{x})\| \leq r).$$

From here, the lemma trivially follows. \square

Proof of Proposition 5. Given $\mathbf{z} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ and $S \in \mathbb{R}^{d^2}$, let us consider

$$G_{\mathbf{z}, S}(t) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(t\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{y})'\mathbf{V}|}{\|S^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} > b\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(t\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{y})'\mathbf{V}|}{\|S^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} > b\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|(t\Sigma^{1/2}\mathbf{z}-\mathbf{y})'\mathbf{V}|}{\|S^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} < a\right)} f_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{y}) d\mathbf{y},$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ follows a $N_d(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma/n)$ distribution. The proposition will be proved if we show that $G_{\mathbf{z}, S}(t)$ is increasing because

$$F_{\Sigma}(a, b, t) = \frac{1}{\omega_1^d} \int_{\Omega_1^{d-1}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d^2}} G_{\mathbf{z}, S}(t) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) d\mathbf{z},$$

where $\hat{\Sigma}$ follows a Wishart distribution with parameters n and Σ . Given the rv \mathbf{Z} , let $\{\mathbf{z} \text{ outlier wrt } N_d(\mathbf{0}, S)\}$ denote the set where \mathbf{Z} is declared outlier with respect to $N_d(\mathbf{0}, S)$. Then

$$\mathbf{P}\{\mathbf{Z} \text{ outlier wrt } N_d(\mathbf{0}, S)\} = \int \frac{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}'\mathbf{V}|}{\|\mathbf{S}^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} > b\right)}{\mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}'\mathbf{V}|}{\|\mathbf{S}^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} > b\right) + \mathbf{P}\left(\frac{|\mathbf{z}'\mathbf{V}|}{\|\mathbf{S}^{1/2}\mathbf{V}\|} < a\right)} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{Z}}(d\mathbf{z}).$$

If we take $\mathbf{Y}_n = \Sigma^{-1/2}\hat{\mu}$ and f is the function defined in Lemma 7,

$$\begin{aligned} G_{\mathbf{z}, S}(t) &= \mathbf{P}(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Y}_n + t\mathbf{z}) \text{ outlier wrt } N_d(\mathbf{0}, S)) \\ &= \int_0^\infty \mathbf{P}(\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Y}_n + t\mathbf{z}) \text{ outlier wrt } N_d(\mathbf{0}, S) \mid \|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Y}_n + t\mathbf{z})\| = r) \mathbf{P}(dr) \\ &= \mathbf{E}[f(\|\Sigma^{1/2}(\mathbf{Y}_n + t\mathbf{z})\|)], \end{aligned}$$

and the result is deduced from Lemmas 7 and 8. \square

6.3 Proofs of Section 3.3

We first state some additional notation which is needed to prove Theorem 2. Under assumptions (A1) and (A2), denote $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{V}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{V}}$ the probability distribution of $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}$ and of $|\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{V}|$, respectively, and let

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\mathbf{V}}^n &:= \{\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V}, \dots, \mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V}\} \\ T_{\mathbf{V}}^n &:= \{|\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V}|, \dots, |\mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V}|\} \\ S_{\mathbf{V}}^n &:= \{|\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V} - m_{\mathbf{V}}|, \dots, |\mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V} - m_{\mathbf{V}}|\} \\ \hat{S}_{\mathbf{V}}^n &:= \{|\mathbf{X}'_1\mathbf{V} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}}|, \dots, |\mathbf{X}'_n\mathbf{V} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}}|\}. \end{aligned}$$

Given $S \subset \mathbb{R}$ finite (respectively the real rv X) and $\alpha \in (0, 1)$, $m(S)$ and $M(S)$ (resp. $m(X)$ and $M(X)$) denote the sets of its medians and MADNs, $[q_\alpha(S), \bar{q}_\alpha(S)]$ (resp. $[q_\alpha(X), \bar{q}_\alpha(X)]$) is the interval of the α -quantiles of S (resp. X); we define $[\underline{M}_\alpha(S), \bar{M}_\alpha(S)] := \cup_{m \in m(S)} [q_\alpha(|S - m|), \bar{q}_\alpha(|S - m|)]$, and similarly for $[\underline{M}_\alpha(X), \bar{M}_\alpha(X)]$. Thus, $m(S) = [q_{\frac{1}{2}}(S), \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}}(S)]$ and $M(S) = [\underline{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(S), \bar{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(S)]$.

Since, by assumption, all random quantities we handle are defined on $(\Upsilon, \mathcal{A}, \mathbf{P})$, all of them will depend on some $\omega \in \Upsilon$. Very often this dependence is not made explicit, however, when required, ω will appear as super-index as in $\hat{m}_{\mathbf{V}}^\omega$, or in $S_{\mathbf{V}}^{m, \omega}$.

Lemma 9. *Let U and V be two real rv's such that there exist δ and γ and $\mathbf{P}\{|U - V| \leq \delta\} \geq 1 - \gamma$. Then for every $\alpha \in [\gamma, 1 - \gamma]$,*

$$[q_\alpha(U), \bar{q}_\alpha(U)] \subset [q_{\alpha-\gamma}(V) - \delta, \bar{q}_{\alpha+\gamma}(V) + \delta] \quad (19)$$

$$[\underline{M}_\alpha(U), \bar{M}_\alpha(U)] \subset [\underline{M}_{\alpha-\gamma}(V) - (2\delta + \delta_\gamma^*), \bar{M}_{\alpha+\gamma}(V) + (2\delta + \delta_\gamma^*)], \quad (20)$$

where $\delta_\gamma^* = \max\{q_{\frac{1}{2}}(V) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(V), \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(V) - \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}}(V)\}$.

Proof. Let $q \in [q_\alpha(U), \bar{q}_\alpha(U)]$. Then, by definition of quantile:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha &\leq \mathbf{P}\{U \leq q\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{|U - V| \leq \delta, U \leq q\} + \mathbf{P}\{|U - V| > \delta\} \\ &\leq \mathbf{P}\{V \leq q + \delta\} + \gamma. \end{aligned}$$

Hence $\alpha - \gamma \leq \mathbf{P}\{V \leq q + \delta\}$, which implies $q + \delta \geq q_{\alpha-\gamma}(V)$. And then $q_\alpha(U) \geq q_{\alpha-\gamma}(V) - \delta$. Analogously, we can prove $\bar{q}_\alpha(U) \leq \bar{q}_{\alpha+\gamma}(V) + \delta$ and (19) is shown.

To prove (20), consider $m^U \in m(U)$. Take $\alpha = 1/2$ in (19). There exists $m^V \in m(V)$ such that $|m^U - m^V| \leq \delta + \delta_\gamma^*$. Hence, if $|U - V| \leq \delta$, then

$$\left| |U - m^U| - |V - m^V| \right| \leq |U - V| + |m^U - m^V| \leq 2\delta + \delta_\gamma^*,$$

and (20) follows from the definition of MAD and (19). \square

Corollary 6. Under hypotheses in Lemma 9, $m(U) \subset [q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(V) - \delta, \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(V) + \delta]$.

If we apply Lemma 9 to rv's uniformly distributed on finite sets with the same cardinal, we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 7. If $S = \{s_1, \dots, s_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $R = \{r_1, \dots, r_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}$ satisfy that there exist δ, γ such that $\#\{i : |s_i - r_i| \leq \delta\} \geq n(1 - \gamma)$, then for every $\alpha \in [\gamma, 1 - \gamma]$,

$$[q_\alpha(S), \bar{q}_\alpha(S)] \subset [q_{\alpha-\gamma}(R) - \delta, \bar{q}_{\alpha+\gamma}(R) + \delta] \quad (21)$$

$$[\underline{M}_\alpha(S), \bar{M}_\alpha(S)] \subset [\underline{M}_{\alpha-\gamma}(R) - (2\delta + \delta_\gamma^*), \bar{M}_{\alpha+\gamma}(R) + (2\delta + \delta_\gamma^*)], \quad (22)$$

where $\delta_\gamma^* = \max \left\{ q_{\frac{1}{2}}(R) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(R), \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(R) - \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}}(R) \right\}$.

Lemma 10. For every $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$, there exists a probability one set A such that for every $\omega \in A$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in (\gamma, 1-\gamma)} \left(\max \left\{ |q_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}})|, |\bar{q}_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}})| \right\} \right) &\rightarrow 0, \\ \sup_{\alpha \in (\gamma, 1-\gamma)} \left(\max \left\{ |q_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}})|, |\bar{q}_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}})| \right\} \right) &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\mathbf{X}'\mathbf{v}$ is a normal rv, then the assumptions in Corollary 1.4.3 in [9] are satisfied. Therefore, (1.4.24) in [9] holds and first statement here is verified. A similar reasoning leads to the second one. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. We first apply the Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem to the iid rv's $\{\|\mathbf{X}_i\|\}$ and we have that a.s.

$$\sup_{r>0} \left| \frac{\#\{i \leq n : \|\mathbf{X}_i\| \leq r\}}{n} - \mathbf{P}(\|\mathbf{X}_1\| \leq r) \right| \rightarrow 0. \quad (23)$$

Given $h \in \mathbb{N}$, since Ω_1^{d-1} is compact, there exist $\mathbf{v}_1^h, \dots, \mathbf{v}_{J_h}^h \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ such that for every $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ there exists $i_{\mathbf{v}} \in \{1, \dots, J_h\}$ such that $\|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h\| \leq h^{-1}$. Lemma 10 gives that there exists $A_h \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\mathbf{P}(A_h) = 1$ and for every $\omega \in A_h$, (23) is satisfied and for every $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in (\gamma, 1-\gamma)} \left(\max_{i \leq J_h} \left\{ |q_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{v}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}_i^h})|, |\bar{q}_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{v}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}_i^h})| \right\} \right) &\rightarrow 0, \\ \sup_{\alpha \in (\gamma, 1-\gamma)} \left(\max_{i \leq J_h} \left\{ |q_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{v}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}_i^h})|, |\bar{q}_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{v}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}_i^h})| \right\} \right) &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Denote $A_0 = \bigcap_{h \in \mathbb{N}} A_h$. Obviously $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\mathbf{P}(A_0) = 1$. Let $\omega \in A_0$ be a point which will remain fixed along the proof. We begin proving the first statement in (10). Let $\varepsilon > 0$. Let λ_d be the largest eigenvalue of Σ . Given $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ and $\gamma \in (0, 1/2)$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}}) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}}) &= (\mathbf{v}'\Sigma\mathbf{v}) \left(q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(N_1(0, 1)) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(N_1(0, 1)) \right) \\ &\leq \lambda_d \left(q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma}(N_1(0, 1)) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma}(N_1(0, 1)) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, there exists $\gamma_1 \in (0, 1/2)$ such that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}} \left(q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma_1}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}}) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma_1}(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}}) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (25)$$

Analogously, we can prove that there exists $\gamma_2 \in (0, 1/2)$ such that,

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}} \left(q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma_2}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}}) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma_2}(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}}) \right) < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \quad (26)$$

Take $\gamma = \inf\{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \varepsilon\}$. Let $r > 0$ such that $\mathbf{P}(\|\mathbf{X}_1\| \leq r) > 1 - \gamma$ and let $h \in \mathbb{N}$ be such that $r/h < \varepsilon/3$ and $2d\lambda_d M_1/h < \varepsilon/3$, where M_1 is the MADN of a $N_1(0, 1)$.

By (23) and (24), there exists N^ω such that if $n \geq N^\omega$, then $\#\{i \leq n : \|\mathbf{X}_i(\omega)\| < r\} > n(1 - \gamma)$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}-\gamma, \frac{1}{2}+\gamma)} \left(\max_{i \leq J_h} \left\{ \left| q_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}) \right|, \left| \bar{q}_\alpha(R_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}) \right| \right\} \right) &< \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \\ \sup_{\alpha \in (\frac{1}{2}-\gamma, \frac{1}{2}+\gamma)} \left(\max_{i \leq J_h} \left\{ \left| q_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}) \right|, \left| \bar{q}_\alpha(T_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}^{n,\omega}) - q_\alpha(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{V}_i^h}) \right| \right\} \right) &< \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Let $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$, if $\|\mathbf{X}_j(\omega)\| \leq r$,

$$\left| (\mathbf{X}_j(\omega))' \mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{X}_j(\omega))' \mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h \right| \leq \|\mathbf{X}_j(\omega)\| \|\mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h\| \leq rh^{-1} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \quad (28)$$

and therefore, by Corollary 7 with $\alpha = 1/2$, we have that,

$$\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega \in \left[q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \frac{\varepsilon}{3}, \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) + \frac{\varepsilon}{3} \right],$$

and (27) gives

$$\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega \in \left[q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right) - \frac{2\varepsilon}{3}, q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} \right]. \quad (29)$$

On the other hand, we have that

$$|\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - m_{\mathbf{v}}| \leq |\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - m_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}| + |m_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} - m_{\mathbf{v}}|. \quad (30)$$

Moreover, $m_{\mathbf{v}} = 0$ for every \mathbf{v} because all probabilities $\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}}$ are normal with mean zero. Thus, the second addend in (30) is null. However, (29) and (25) imply

$$|\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - m_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}| < \varepsilon. \quad (31)$$

Then, the first item in (10) is proved because by (30) and (31) we have that, if $n > N^\omega$

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v}} |\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - m_{\mathbf{v}}| < \varepsilon. \quad (32)$$

Concerning to the second item in (10), notice that if $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ and $h \in \mathbb{N}$, then

$$|\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - M_{\mathbf{v}}| \leq |\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^\omega - \hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^\omega| + |\hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^\omega - M_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}| + |M_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} - M_{\mathbf{v}}|. \quad (33)$$

If $n \geq N^\omega$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$, from (32) (remember that $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{0}$) we have

$$\left| |(\mathbf{X}_i(\omega))' \mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}| - |(\mathbf{X}_i(\omega))' \mathbf{v}| \right| \leq |\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}| < \varepsilon. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, we can apply Corollary 7 with $\alpha = 1/2$, $\delta = \varepsilon$ and $\gamma = 0$ to obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \left[\underline{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(R_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}), \bar{M}_{\frac{1}{2}}(R_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) \right] &= \left[q_{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{S}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}), \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{S}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) \right] \\ &\subset \left[q_{\frac{1}{2}}(T_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) - 2\varepsilon, \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}}(T_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}) + 2\varepsilon \right] \end{aligned}$$

which joined to (27) and the fact that $M_{\mathbf{v}} = m(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}})$ gives that if $n \geq N^\omega$

$$\left| \hat{M}_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^\omega - M_{\mathbf{V}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right| < 2\varepsilon + \frac{\varepsilon}{3}.$$

Concerning the third addend in (33), notice that $M_{\mathbf{v}} = m(\bar{\mathbf{Q}}_{\mathbf{v}})$ coincides with $\mathbf{v}'\Sigma\mathbf{v}M_1$. Thus, if we write $\mathbf{v} = (v^1, \dots, v^d)'$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |M_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}}^h - M_{\mathbf{v}}| &= \left| \mathbf{v}'\Sigma\mathbf{v} - (\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h)' \Sigma \mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h \right| M_1 \\ &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^d (v^j)^2 \lambda_j - \sum_{j=1}^d \left((\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h)^j \right)^2 \lambda_j \right| M_1 \\ &\leq \lambda_d M_1 \sum_{j=1}^d \left| (v^j)^2 - \left((\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h)^j \right)^2 \right| \\ &\leq 2\lambda_d M_1 \sum_{j=1}^d \left| v^j - (\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h)^j \right| \\ &\leq 2d\lambda_d M_1 \left\| \mathbf{v} - \mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h \right\| \leq \frac{2d\lambda_d M_1}{h} < \frac{\varepsilon}{3}. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us pay attention to the first addend in (33). According to (28) and (22) in Corollary 7, we have that

$$|\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}} - \hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}}^h| \leq \bar{M}_{\frac{1}{2}+\alpha} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{M}_{\frac{1}{2}-\alpha} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} + \delta_{\gamma}^*. \quad (35)$$

First, (27) and (25) give that

$$\delta_{\gamma}^* \leq \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{q}_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) \leq q_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right) - q_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right) + \frac{2\varepsilon}{3} < \varepsilon.$$

For the first addend in (35), by Corollary 7 with $\gamma = 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{M}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{M}_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) &= \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(S_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(S_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^{n,\omega} \right) \\ &\leq \bar{q}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(T_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{q}_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(T_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) + 2 \left| \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right|, \end{aligned}$$

and from (27), (26) and (32) we have that

$$\bar{M}_{\frac{1}{2}+\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) - \underline{M}_{\frac{1}{2}-\gamma} \left(R_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h}^{n,\omega} \right) < 3\varepsilon.$$

And the proof ends because (35) and previous inequalities give that if $\omega \in A_0$ and $n \geq N^{\omega}$, then

$$\left| \hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}} - \hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}_{i_{\mathbf{v}}}^h} \right| < 6\varepsilon.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 3. Let $\omega \in \Upsilon$ and denote

$$g_{a,b}^{n,\omega}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{\mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}|}{\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}} > b \right)}{\mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}|}{\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}} > b \right) + \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}|}{\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}} < a \right)}.$$

Notice that the probabilities involved in this expression are conditioned given the sample $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_n$. It is clear that if we integrate on the samples

$$\mathbf{P} \left(|\tilde{Y}^{L_n}| > b \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t \right) = \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \left(\int_{\Upsilon} g_{a,b}^{n,\omega}(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{P}(\omega) \right) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}.$$

Let us prove that the map $g_{a,b}^{n,\omega}$ is well defined. As before we denote by M_1 , the MADN of the $N_1(0, 1)$. If $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$, then $M_{\mathbf{v}} = (\mathbf{v}'\Sigma\mathbf{v})^{1/2} M_1 \geq \lambda_1 M_1$.

According to Theorem 2, there exists a set $A_0 \in \mathcal{A}$ with $\mathbf{P}(A_0) = 1$ such that for every $\omega \in A_0$, there exists N^ω such that if $n \geq N^\omega$ then for every $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$, $\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} > \lambda_1 M_1/2$ and $|\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}| < a\lambda_1 M_1/4$. Then, if $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}|}{M_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}} < a \right) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} \in \left(\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} - a\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}, \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} + a\hat{M}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} \in \left(\hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} - \frac{a\lambda_1 M_1}{2}, \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega} + \frac{a\lambda_1 M_1}{2} \right) \right) \\ &\geq \mathbf{P} \left(\mathbf{v} : \mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} \in \left(-\frac{a\lambda_1 M_1}{4}, \frac{a\lambda_1 M_1}{4} \right) \right) > 0, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from the fact that $\{\mathbf{v} : |\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v}| < a\lambda_1 M_1/4\} \neq \emptyset$. Additionally, for every $\omega \in A_0$, $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)$

$$1_{\left\{ \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v} - \hat{m}_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}|}{M_{\mathbf{v}}^{n,\omega}} > b \right\}} \rightarrow 1_{\left\{ \frac{|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v}|}{M_{\mathbf{v}}} > b \right\}} \quad (36)$$

unless \mathbf{v} satisfies that $|\mathbf{x}'\mathbf{v}| = bM_{\mathbf{v}}$, but this equality only happens for \mathbf{v} in a set (depending on \mathbf{x}) with Lebesgue measure equal to zero. Consequently, for every $\omega \in A_0$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)$, the convergence in (36) holds for almost every $\mathbf{v} \in \Omega_1^{d-1}$. Since the involved functions are bounded, (36) gives that, for every $\omega \in A_0$,

$$g_{a,b}^{n,\omega}(\mathbf{x}) \rightarrow \tilde{g}_{a,b}(\mathbf{x}).$$

The fact that $0 \leq g_{a,b}^{n,\omega}(\mathbf{x}) \leq 1$ for every \mathbf{x} , allows to apply the dominated convergence theorem and the result is proven. \square

6.4 Proofs of Section 3.4

Proof of Proposition 8. We know $a \leq b$. If $a = b$, then

$$\alpha = \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(C_n^d)} \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d^2}} \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b) f_{\hat{\mu}}(\mathbf{m}) f_t(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{P}_{\hat{\Sigma}}(dS) d\mathbf{m} d\mathbf{x}. \quad (37)$$

This condition determines b because the function $b \mapsto \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b)$ is strictly decreasing and continuous for any \mathbf{m} , S , and \mathbf{x} . Let b_0 be the unique solution of (37). If $a < b_0$, there exists a unique b_a such that

$$\alpha = F_{\Sigma}(a, b_a, C_n^d),$$

because the integrand which implicitly appears in $F_{\Sigma}(a, b, C_n^d)$ (see Proposition 3) is strictly increasing on b and continuous.

If $a_1 < a_2$, then $g_{a_2}^{b_{a_1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S) < g_{a_1}^{b_{a_1}}(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{m}, S)$ since $\mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a_1) < \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{m},S}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a_2)$. Hence $F_{\Sigma}(a_2, b_{a_1}, t) > F_{\Sigma}(a_1, b_{a_1}, t)$, then $b_{a_2} < b_{a_1}$. \square

Proof of Proposition 9. Remark 1 gives that, for a general Σ , a.s.

$$E \left(L_n^{a,b} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = t, \mathbb{X}_n^{\Sigma} \right) \rightarrow \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0},\Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b) + \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0},\Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a)} f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \quad (38)$$

which, in the case $\Sigma = I_d$, (see Corollary 3) becomes that a.s.

$$E \left(L_n^{a,b} \mid \|\mathbf{X}\| = t, \mathbb{X}_n^{I_d} \right) \rightarrow \frac{1}{1 - F(b, t) + F(a, t)}. \quad (39)$$

However, Jensen's inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{1 - F(b, t) + F(a, t)} &= \frac{1}{\int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b) + \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a) f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}} \\ &< \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma}^{d-1}(t)} \frac{1}{\mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b) + \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a)} f_t(\mathbf{x}) d\mathbf{x}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality comes from the fact that the map $\mathbf{x} \mapsto \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| > b) + \mathbf{P}(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma}^{\mathbf{V}}| < a)$ is not a.s. constant. \square

7 Appendix II. Additional material

7.1 Behaviour of $C_n^d(\delta)$

Table 12 illustrates the variation of C_n^d . In this table, it is evident that, even for small sizes, the value of C_n^d grows faster on the dimension than on the sample size.

Table 12: Values of $C_n^d(\delta)$ for different dimensions, sample sizes and $\delta = 0.05$.

d	$n = 10$	$n = 20$	$n = 50$	$n = 100$	$n = 200$	$n = 1000$
50	8.91	9.09	9.30	9.46	9.79	9.93
200	15.97	16.14	16.35	16.50	16.64	16.95
500	24.19	24.35	24.56	24.71	24.85	25.15
1000	33.44	33.61	33.82	33.96	34.10	34.40

7.2 Graphical representation of the formulae in Corollary 3

Figure 5 shows the curves $t \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t) \pm (\text{Var}(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t))^{1/2}$ and $t \rightarrow \mathbf{E}(K_n | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)$. Since those curves only depend on $p_{a,b}^t := \mathbf{P}(|Y^{\mathbf{V}}| \in (a, b) | \|\mathbf{X}\| = t)$, those are the values that we represent in the axis of abscissas.

7.3 Some notes on the use of the constants a_I and b_I when we handle general Σ 's

In this section we provide some guidelines of a research now in progress to find conditions allowing to use the constants a, b associated to the identity with other covariance matrices when the dimension is large.

An important piece will be the following simple lemma.

Lemma 11. *Let $\{\Sigma^d\}_d$ be a sequence of diagonal $d \times d$ -dimensional matrices with eigenvalues $0 < \sigma_1^d \leq \dots \leq \sigma_d^d$. Let us assume*

A.1 The sequence $\{d\sigma_d^d / \text{trace}(\Sigma^d)\}_d$ is bounded.

If $\{Z_d\}$ is a sequence of integrable iid real rv's, then

$$\frac{1}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^d Z_i \xrightarrow{\text{a.s.}} \mathbf{E}[X_1].$$

Proof. Obviously

$$\left(\frac{1}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^d Z_i \right) - \mathbf{E}[Z_1] = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d \frac{d\sigma_i^d}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} (Z_i - \mathbf{E}[Z_1]).$$

Expected number of random projections




Figure 5: Curves $E(K_n || \mathbf{X} || = t)$ (black) and $E(K_n || \mathbf{X} || = t) \pm (\text{Var}(K_n || \mathbf{X} || = t))^{1/2}$ (blue)

Since the rv's in the sum in the right hand side are stochastically bounded by $\sup_d \left(\frac{d\sigma_d^d}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \right) (|Z_1| + E[|Z_1|])$ which is integrable, we can apply Theorem 2 in [24] and the result follows. \square

Let us assume that the parameters are known. Therefore, the statement in Proposition 3 becomes

$$F_{\Sigma^d}(a, b, t) = \int_{\Omega_{\Sigma^d}^{d-1}(t)} g_a^b(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma^d) f_t(\mathbf{x}_d) d\mathbf{x}_d,$$

where we write \mathbf{x}_d and Σ^d instead of \mathbf{x} and Σ to emphasize their dependence on the dimension. We will denote with $\sigma_1^d, \dots, \sigma_d^d$ to the eigenvalues of Σ^d .

Let us analyse the numerator of $g_a^b(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma^d)$. Let $\{X_d\}$ and $\{V_d\}$ be two iid sequences of one-dimensional standard normal variables. Let us denote $\mathbf{X}_d := (X_1, \dots, X_d)'$ and $\mathbf{V}_d := (V_1, \dots, V_d)'$. Obviously, \mathbf{X}_d and \mathbf{V}_d are two independent rv's with distribution standard normal d -dimensional. We also define

$$\mathcal{F}_d(\mathbf{X}_d, V_d) := \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{X}_d\|} \frac{((\Sigma^d)^{1/2} \mathbf{X}_d)' \mathbf{V}_d}{(\mathbf{V}_d' \Sigma^d \mathbf{V}_d)^{1/2}} = \frac{1}{\|\mathbf{X}_d\|} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d (\sigma_i^d)^{1/2} X_i V_i}{\left(\sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^d V_i^2 \right)^{1/2}}. \quad (40)$$

With this notation, we have that

$$\mathbf{P} \left(|y_{\mathbf{0}, \Sigma^d}^{\mathbf{V}_d}| > b \right) =^d \mathbf{P} \left(t \mathcal{F}_d(\mathbf{X}_d, V_d) > b \mid \mathbf{X}_d = \mathbf{x}_d \right).$$

Next we divide the analysis depending on when Assumption A.1 holds or not.

7.3.1 Case 1: Assume that assumption A.1 holds

Since A.1 holds, Lemma 11 allows us to conclude that

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i V_i^2}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} E[V_1^2] = 1. \quad (41)$$

However, the assumption on the vector \mathbf{V}_d gives that the conditional distribution of the real rv $\sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^{1/2} X_i V_i / (\text{trace}(\Sigma^d))^{1/2}$ given \mathbf{X}_d is centred normal with variance $\frac{1}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i X_i^2$. Now, Lemma 11 gives that, for almost every sequence \mathbf{X}_d , it happens that

$$\frac{1}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i X_i^2 \rightarrow E[X_1^2] = 1.$$

The Strong Law of Large Numbers allows to conclude that, for almost every sequence \mathbf{X}_d , it happens that $\frac{1}{d^{1/2}} \|\mathbf{X}_d\| \rightarrow 1$. Therefore we have that, for almost every sequence \mathbf{X}_d , the expression (40), asymptotically, behaves like a one-dimensional centred normal with variance equal to d^{-1} .

The following lemma follows from Tchebichev's inequality and allows to generalise assumption A.1 at the price of replacing the a.s. convergence by convergence in probability. This would allow to obtain similar conclusions as before with a more elaborated reasoning.

Lemma 12. *If we replace A.1 in Lemma 11 by*

$$\lim_d \frac{(\sigma_1^d)^2 + \dots + (\sigma_d^d)^2}{(\sigma_1^d + \dots + \sigma_d^d)^2} = 0.$$

and we assume that $\text{Var}(Z_1) < \infty$, then

$$\frac{1}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^d Z_i \xrightarrow{c.p.} E[Z_1].$$

Remark 2. *Since $\sigma_1^d \geq 1$, the fact that $\{d\sigma_d^d/\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)\}_d$ is bounded holds every time the sequence $\{\sigma_d^d\}$ is bounded, but it also holds for the matrices Σ_1^d and Σ_2^d (notice that in the last case, $\text{trace}(\Sigma_2^d) \geq \frac{d}{2} \frac{d^2}{2}$). This shows that all those cases behave similarly and, in particular, that the term in the numerator of $g_a^b(\mathbf{x}_d, \mathbf{0}, \Sigma^d)$ behaves similarly to the case in which Σ^d is the identity.*

Since the second term in the denominator is similar to that one in the numerator, we can make an educated guessing that, when the dimension is large, if we handle matrices which satisfy A.1, then the constants a, b chosen for the identity should be very similar to the required for the specific matrix at hand.

7.3.2 Case 2: Assume that assumption A.1 fails

This case is clearly more tricky than the previous one and here some situations appear in which the equivalence with the identity fails.

For an example, let us consider the case of the sequence of matrices Σ_3^d . Remember that here $1 = \sigma_1^d = \dots = \sigma_{d-1}^d$ and $\sigma_d^d = d^2$. Thus, $\text{trace}(\Sigma_3^d) = d - 1 + d^2$, and consequently,

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^d V_i^2}{\text{trace}(\Sigma^d)} \approx V_d^2,$$

$$\frac{1}{(\text{trace}(\Sigma^d))^{1/2}} \sum_{i=1}^d \sigma_i^{1/2} X_i V_i \approx \mathbf{X}_d V_d,$$

therefore, in this case, the behaviour of the three terms in $\mathcal{F}_d(\mathbf{X}_d, V_d)$ asymptotically on d is determined by the distribution of the real rv $d^{-1/2} \frac{X_1}{|V_1|}$, which is of the same order as the normal appearing in Case 1 but different from that.

It seems plausible this being the reason of the different behaviour of this covariance matrix w.r.t. the others.

Remark 3. Obviously many different combinations of asymptotical distributions can be obtained in this scheme, however, we conjecture that all of them will involve random variables with order $d^{-1/2}$ which may explain why the constants obtained for the identity are not so different from the real ones when we consider Σ_3^d .

Remark 4. Notice that the precise value of σ_d^d is not so important as the number of times in which it is reached, because $\sigma_d^d = d^2$ for $\Sigma_i^d, i = 1, 2, 3$, the difference being that the order of the maximum is reached only in a value for Σ_3^d and in a half (or more) of them for $\Sigma_i^d, i = 1, 2$.

Thus, we conjecture that the constants of the identity could be used for every covariance matrix, excepting those included in a sequence such that $\sigma_d^d/d \rightarrow \infty$ and that, additionally, satisfies something similar to the existence of $\{p_d\} \subset \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$p_d \leq d, \frac{p_d}{d} \rightarrow 1 \text{ and } \frac{1}{\sigma_d^d} \sum_{i=1}^{p_d} \sigma_i^d \rightarrow 0.$$

7.4 Additional tables

7.4.1 Computation of a, b for general covariance matrices

Table 13 shows the values of b for some covariance matrices Σ, n and d .

Table 13: Approximated values of b_Σ for $\Sigma = \Sigma_1^d$ and different values of n and d . The a 's are the values obtained in Table 1 for $l_I^1 = 50, 100$. The values of \hat{l}_1^1 are also shown.

		$n = 50$				$n = 100$				$n = 500$			
		$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$		$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$		$l_I^1=50$		$l_I^1=100$	
d	Σ	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1	b_Σ	\hat{l}_1^1
50	Σ_1	5.0236	49	5.3996	99	4.6351	51	4.9236	97	4.4517	48	4.7039	100
	Σ_2	4.9995	50	5.4076	100	4.6284	48	4.9289	99	4.4522	48	4.6932	101
	Σ_3	5.1413	189	5.4932	389	4.6374	192	4.9504	384	4.4439	180	4.6858	381
	Σ_4	5.0236	51	5.3798	125	4.6194	49	4.9075	103	4.4520	51	4.7080	99
100	Σ_1	4.7425	51	5.0891	101	4.3529	51	4.6494	93	4.1477	50	4.4083	99
	Σ_2	4.7425	50	5.1213	100	4.3538	52	4.6387	99	4.1471	49	4.4056	98
	Σ_3	4.8813	260	5.1857	541	4.3539	269	4.6494	525	4.1399	260	4.3691	530
	Σ_4	4.7523	48	5.1052	110	4.3497	51	4.6467	98	4.1458	49	4.3922	100
500	Σ_1	4.3012	51	4.6556	100	3.9438	49	4.2325	99	3.7279	48	3.9533	102
	Σ_2	4.3244	48	4.6361	99	3.9701	49	4.2069	99	3.7421	51	3.9509	97
	Σ_3	4.3244	580	4.6946	1162	4.0248	590	4.2460	1180	3.7421	580	3.9143	1195
	Σ_4	4.3219	49	4.6166	100	3.9613	51	4.2216	101	3.7509	49	3.9475	102
1000	Σ_1	4.2058	50	4.5254	100	3.8623	48	4.1146	101	3.6276	49	3.8192	98
	Σ_2	4.2272	50	4.5385	100	3.8442	48	4.1094	101	3.6236	50	3.8363	101
	Σ_3	4.3129	830	4.6166	1678	3.9221	805	4.1094	1610	3.6080	834	3.8168	1620
	Σ_4	4.2272	49	4.5385	102	3.8442	51	4.1094	100	3.6080	50	3.8326	101

7.4.2 Computational times

Table 14 shows the required time to compute the values of a and b for several combinations of dimensions, sample sizes and expected number of projections. The computation was carried out in a four cores processor

3.2 GHz Intel Core i5. The decrement observed in the cases $n = 100, l_I^1 = 100$ are due to the fact that those cases required a very sort bisection step.

Table 14: Computation times (in seconds) of a, b with $N = 10^5$ simulated values of $\tilde{Y}^{\mathbf{V}}$.

d	$n = 50$		$n = 100$		$n = 500$	
	$l_I^1 = 50$	$l_I^1 = 100$	$l_I^1 = 50$	$l_I^1 = 100$	$l_I^1 = 50$	$l_I^1 = 100$
50	37.972	142.930	74.400	55.347	92.132	321.988
1000	184.780	624.712	282.090	535.981	1047.797	1982.664

7.4.3 Detecting outliers

Table 15 is Table 5 expanded to $n = 100, 500$. It shows the values of \hat{l}_Σ and the proportion of times that a point with Mahalanobis norm C_n^d was identified as an outlier.

Tables 16 and 17 are the expansion of the Table 6 to $n = 100$ and $n = 500$.

7.4.4 Comparison with other methods

In this subsection we present Tables 19 and 20 which show the results obtained with the simulations described in Subsection 5.3 when applied to the families of matrices $\Sigma_i^d, i = 1, \dots, 4$ introduced in Subsection 3.4.2.

Table 15: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = C_n^d$, for several values of n, d and Σ . We also show the sample means of L_n .

		$d = 50$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^1	I_d	\hat{l}_1^1	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^1	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^1	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^1	Σ_4^d
50	50	51	0.0528	49	0.0571	49	0.0541	186	0.0668	50	0.0569
	100	98	0.0560	99	0.0558	103	0.0553	366	0.0580	99	0.0572
100	50	50	0.0497	52	0.0528	50	0.0511	186	0.0566	49	0.0477
	100	102	0.0478	101	0.0535	100	0.0535	382	0.0510	101	0.0539
500	50	50	0.0501	50	0.0537	50	0.0484	194	0.0537	50	0.0558
	100	99	0.0533	99	0.0484	99	0.0492	387	0.0499	98	0.0487
		$d = 100$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^1	I_d	\hat{l}_1^1	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^1	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^1	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^1	Σ_4^d
50	50	49	0.0507	48	0.0496	50	0.0501	249	0.0628	50	0.0489
	100	100	0.0538	101	0.0519	100	0.0526	526	0.0603	98	0.0494
100	50	50	0.0535	51	0.0496	48	0.0548	251	0.0560	49	0.0528
	100	99	0.0479	99	0.0495	99	0.0490	508	0.0540	99	0.0481
500	50	50	0.0547	49	0.0538	50	0.0538	264	0.0573	50	0.0536
	100	97	0.0557	98	0.0572	100	0.0523	516	0.0494	97	0.0507
		$d = 500$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^1	I_d	\hat{l}_1^1	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^1	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^1	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^1	Σ_4^d
50	50	49	0.0481	50	0.0507	50	0.0518	552	0.0628	50	0.0483
	100	100	0.0520	102	0.0509	99	0.0545	1111	0.0589	101	0.0538
100	50	49	0.0543	50	0.0532	50	0.054	571	0.0588	50	0.0527
	100	101	0.0522	102	0.0518	100	0.0511	1136	0.0549	99	0.0550
500	50	51	0.0508	50	0.0530	50	0.0502	596	0.0538	50	0.0506
	100	103	0.0520	100	0.0540	102	0.0470	1199	0.0489	102	0.0505
		$d = 1000$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^1	I_d	\hat{l}_1^1	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^1	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^1	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^1	Σ_4^d
50	50	50	0.0496	50	0.0538	49	0.0534	790	0.0586	50	0.0500
	100	100	0.0520	101	0.0476	102	0.0507	1601	0.0549	99	0.0553
100	50	49	0.0564	50	0.0556	50	0.0509	775	0.0599	50	0.0513
	100	100	0.0516	101	0.0518	101	0.0534	1650	0.0545	101	0.0571
500	50	51	0.0588	50	0.0508	49	0.0536	830	0.0543	49	0.0539
	100	100	0.0500	100	0.0529	98	0.0569	1688	0.0444	100	0.0568

Table 16: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = 1.2C_n^d$, for several values of n, d and Σ . We also show the sample means of L_n .

		$d = 50$									
n	l_I^1	$\hat{l}_I^{1,2}$	I_d	$\hat{l}_1^{1,2}$	Σ_1^d	$\hat{l}_2^{1,2}$	Σ_2^d	$\hat{l}_3^{1,2}$	Σ_3^d	$\hat{l}_4^{1,2}$	Σ_4^d
50	50	48	0.2378	48	0.2247	48	0.2338	163	0.1752	48	0.2333
	100	93	0.2729	96	0.2412	95	0.2617	313	0.1867	92	0.2639
100	50	47	0.2618	48	0.2403	47	0.2530	163	0.1764	47	0.2626
	100	89	0.3057	91	0.2731	88	0.2935	307	0.1968	88	0.3006
500	50	44	0.3079	45	0.2702	44	0.2897	152	0.1957	45	0.2991
	100	82	0.3471	87	0.2985	84	0.3306	296	0.2054	82	0.3412
		$d = 100$									
n	l_I^1	$\hat{l}_I^{1,2}$	I_d	$\hat{l}_1^{1,2}$	Σ_1^d	$\hat{l}_2^{1,2}$	Σ_2^d	$\hat{l}_3^{1,2}$	Σ_3^d	$\hat{l}_4^{1,2}$	Σ_4^d
50	50	48	0.2235	49	0.2093	48	0.2146	223	0.1729	49	0.2191
	100	97	0.2387	97	0.2236	95	0.2320	460	0.1723	96	0.2487
100	50	46	0.2501	47	0.2331	47	0.2527	218	0.1803	47	0.2571
	100	90	0.2795	90	0.2605	91	0.2766	418	0.1832	90	0.2884
500	50	45	0.2930	46	0.2746	45	0.2863	209	0.1917	45	0.3002
	100	84	0.3319	85	0.3080	85	0.3220	409	0.2026	84	0.3296
		$d = 500$									
n	l_I^1	$\hat{l}_I^{1,2}$	I_d	$\hat{l}_1^{1,2}$	Σ_1^d	$\hat{l}_2^{1,2}$	Σ_2^d	$\hat{l}_3^{1,2}$	Σ_3^d	$\hat{l}_4^{1,2}$	Σ_4^d
50	50	50	0.2160	48	0.2132	49	0.2168	518	0.1711	50	0.2198
	100	97	0.2454	99	0.2375	96	0.2399	973	0.1761	97	0.2412
100	50	46	0.2647	47	0.2575	47	0.2569	474	0.1766	47	0.2558
	100	91	0.2795	91	0.2810	90	0.2737	963	0.1821	91	0.2766
500	50	46	0.2690	46	0.2701	46	0.2831	483	0.1844	46	0.2709
	100	89	0.3196	88	0.3139	87	0.3191	961	0.1954	86	0.3104
		$d = 1000$									
n	l_I^1	$\hat{l}_I^{1,2}$	I_d	$\hat{l}_1^{1,2}$	Σ_1^d	$\hat{l}_2^{1,2}$	Σ_2^d	$\hat{l}_3^{1,2}$	Σ_3^d	$\hat{l}_4^{1,2}$	Σ_4^d
50	50	49	0.2202	51	0.2136	49	0.2159	700	0.1632	49	0.2156
	100	98	0.2470	97	0.2338	97	0.2429	1383	0.1616	96	0.2366
100	50	46	0.2545	46	0.2575	47	0.2536	651	0.1720	46	0.2583
	100	92	0.2883	92	0.2828	91	0.2809	1373	0.1778	90	0.2835
500	50	45	0.2790	46	0.2726	46	0.2723	689	0.1823	45	0.2805
	100	88	0.3172	85	0.3210	84	0.3213	1333	0.1963	86	0.3173

Table 17: Estimation of the probability of declaring as an outlier a vector such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = 2C_n^d$, for several values of n, d and Σ . We also show the sample means of L_n .

		$d = 50$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^2	I_d	\hat{l}_1^2	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^2	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^2	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^2	Σ_4^d
50	50	12	0.8817	13	0.8660	12	0.8830	47	0.6575	12	0.8912
	100	16	0.9259	19	0.9061	16	0.9153	74	0.6985	16	0.9229
100	50	50	0.9101	11	0.8880	10	0.9009	40	0.6801	10	0.9053
	100	12	0.9349	15	0.9257	13	0.9372	62	0.7393	13	0.9375
500	50	8	0.9193	9	0.9116	9	0.9185	35	0.7134	8	0.9205
	100	10	0.9506	12	0.9391	11	0.9509	51	0.7658	10	0.9502
		$d = 100$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^2	I_d	\hat{l}_1^2	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^2	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^2	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^2	Σ_4^d
50	50	13	0.8829	13	0.8678	13	0.8734	70	0.6289	13	0.8743
	100	18	0.9150	19	0.9081	18	0.9115	113	0.6738	18	0.9160
100	50	10	0.9009	11	0.8924	11	0.9019	56	0.6631	10	0.9003
	100	13	0.9369	15	0.9251	14	0.9351	90	0.7050	14	0.9353
500	50	9	0.9240	9	0.9109	9	0.9134	49	0.6858	9	0.9182
	100	11	0.9480	12	0.9379	11	0.9434	74	0.7329	11	0.9446
		$d = 500$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^2	I_d	\hat{l}_1^2	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^2	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^2	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^2	Σ_4^d
50	50	13	0.8771	13	0.8617	13	0.8780	150	0.6139	13	0.8726
	100	18	0.9166	18	0.9185	18	0.9075	249	0.6513	18	0.9090
100	50	11	0.8985	11	0.8992	11	0.8981	124	0.6488	11	0.8949
	100	14	0.9355	15	0.9307	14	0.9273	204	0.6901	14	0.9313
500	50	9	0.9089	9	0.9133	9	0.9137	114	0.6708	9	0.9113
	100	12	0.9451	12	0.9421	12	0.9450	173	0.7119	12	0.9410
		$d = 1000$									
n	l_I^1	\hat{l}_I^2	I_d	\hat{l}_1^2	Σ_1^d	\hat{l}_2^2	Σ_2^d	\hat{l}_3^2	Σ_3^d	\hat{l}_4^2	Σ_4^d
50	50	13	0.8797	13	0.8728	13	0.8729	214	0.6128	13	0.8674
	100	19	0.9116	19	0.9134	19	0.9093	360	0.6551	19	0.9124
100	50	11	0.8994	11	0.8986	11	0.8947	182	0.6508	10	0.8956
	100	14	0.9315	15	0.9300	14	0.9300	283	0.6894	14	0.9288
500	50	9	0.9143	9	0.9105	9	0.9136	154	0.6683	9	0.9080
	100	12	0.9409	12	0.9412	12	0.9477	238	0.7128	12	0.9432

Table 18: Samples contain 2% of outliers such that $\|\mathbf{X}\|_{\Sigma} = rC_n^d$ for each $r = 1.05, 1.25, 1.5, 2, 3$. Columns show the proportion of each type of point declared as outlier along 1000 replications, for several covariance matrices and dimensions with $n = 50, 100$.

		$n = 50$					$n = 100$						
d	Σ	$< C_n^d$	1.05	1.25	1.5	2	3	$< C_n^d$	1.05	1.25	1.5	2	3
50	I_d	0.0039	0.0710	0.2620	0.5860	0.8620	0.9650	0.0015	0.0700	0.3125	0.6325	0.8950	0.9790
	Σ_1^d	0.0042	0.0850	0.2470	0.5590	0.8460	0.9670	0.0016	0.0760	0.2700	0.5795	0.8800	0.9655
	Σ_2^d	0.0044	0.0670	0.2730	0.5730	0.8510	0.9710	0.0017	0.0615	0.2810	0.6160	0.8980	0.9710
	Σ_3^d	0.0098	0.0810	0.1950	0.3860	0.6500	0.8670	0.0037	0.0635	0.1975	0.4015	0.6660	0.8795
	Σ_4^d	0.0038	0.1030	0.2750	0.6150	0.8630	0.9690	0.0017	0.0760	0.2975	0.6370	0.8945	0.9715
	500	I_d	0.0199	0.0700	0.2590	0.5880	0.8620	0.9710	0.0167	0.0775	0.3145	0.6085	0.8955
Σ_1^d		0.0211	0.0530	0.2740	0.5410	0.8640	0.9670	0.0168	0.0795	0.2795	0.6250	0.8900	0.9775
Σ_2^d		0.0209	0.0610	0.2880	0.5660	0.8620	0.9590	0.0160	0.0810	0.3025	0.6290	0.8930	0.9725
Σ_3^d		0.0383	0.0790	0.1930	0.3790	0.6080	0.7840	0.0276	0.0815	0.2025	0.3865	0.6450	0.8330
Σ_4^d		0.0219	0.0700	0.2700	0.5820	0.8830	0.9680	0.0166	0.0795	0.3190	0.6170	0.8890	0.9750
10^3		I_d	0.0257	0.0670	0.2740	0.5490	0.8490	0.9690	0.0222	0.0835	0.3080	0.6125	0.8820
	Σ_1^d	0.0276	0.0610	0.2620	0.5550	0.8780	0.9740	0.0212	0.0760	0.2875	0.6265	0.8860	0.9690
	Σ_2^d	0.0272	0.0800	0.2950	0.5840	0.8600	0.9740	0.0223	0.0775	0.3105	0.6215	0.8885	0.9730
	Σ_3^d	0.0500	0.0930	0.2220	0.3580	0.6310	0.8210	0.0351	0.0845	0.2225	0.3850	0.6370	0.8160
	Σ_4^d	0.0265	0.0710	0.2490	0.5800	0.8520	0.9610	0.0217	0.0810	0.2955	0.6260	0.8800	0.9705

Table 19: Proportion of outliers found in a clean data set for several covariance matrices.

		MDP				PCOut				RP			
n	d	Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d	Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d	Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d
50	50	.2460	.1372	.2509	.1348	.1118	.1026	.1082	.1043	.1077	.1160	.1326	.1095
	500	.0884	.0579	.3748	.1291	.0963	.0974	.0964	.0946	.1104	.1104	.1368	.1099
	1000	—	—	—	—	.0978	.1043	.0977	.0970	.1144	.1145	.1462	.1109
100	50	.2209	.0758	.0797	.0746	.1111	.1013	.1056	.1029	.1019	.1046	.1088	.1027
	500	.0702	.0552	.2310	.0833	.0803	.0833	.0794	.0788	.1069	.1106	.1228	.1090
	1000	—	—	—	—	.0813	.0809	.0806	.0784	.1128	.1121	.1249	.1116

Table 20: Samples contain 10% of real outliers. Columns show the proportion of them correctly identified.

n	d	MDP				PCOut				RP			
		Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d	Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d	Σ_1^d	Σ_2^d	Σ_3^d	Σ_4^d
50	50	.2545	.1865	.2886	.1942	.2064	.1636	.1724	.1596	.2736	.2844	.2412	.2868
	500	.0933	.0803	.1826	.1859	.1196	.1224	.1104	.1352	.1636	.1680	.1776	.1604
	1000	—	—	—	—	.1136	.1312	.1184	.1248	.1440	.1452	.1612	.1592
100	50	.2241	.1282	.2581	.1320	.2736	.2360	.2482	.2376	.2812	.3020	.2310	.2986
	500	.0747	.0935	.3330	.1419	.0996	.0964	.0990	.0952	.1636	.1638	.1584	.1760
	1000	—	—	—	—	.0874	.0982	.0892	.0972	.1548	.1504	.1598	.1476