

# Trimming Stability Selection increases variable selection robustness

Tino Werner\*

November 24, 2021

Contamination can severely distort an estimator unless the estimation procedure is suitably robust. This is a well-known issue and has been addressed in Robust Statistics, however, the relation of contamination and distorted variable selection has been rarely considered in literature. As for variable selection, many methods for sparse model selection have been proposed, including Stability Selection which is a meta-algorithm based on some variable selection algorithm in order to immunize against particular data configurations. We introduce the variable selection breakdown point that quantifies the number of cases resp. cells that have to be contaminated in order to let no relevant variable be detected. We show that particular outlier configurations can completely mislead model selection and argue why even cell-wise robust methods cannot fix this problem. We combine the variable selection breakdown point with resampling, resulting in the Stability Selection breakdown point that quantifies the robustness of Stability Selection. We propose a trimmed Stability Selection which only aggregates the models with the lowest in-sample losses so that, heuristically, models computed on heavily contaminated resamples should be trimmed away. We provide a short simulation study that reveals both the potential of our approach as well as the fragility of variable selection, even for an extremely small cell-wise contamination rate.

## 1 Introduction

Feature selection in machine learning became popular once Tibshirani introduced the Lasso (Tibshirani [1994]). This opened the path for a plethora of feature selection methods in regression (e.g., Bühlmann and Yu [2003], Efron et al. [2004], Zou [2006], Yuan and Lin [2006], Simon et al. [2013]), classification (Park and Hastie [2007], Meinshausen [2007], Van de Geer [2008]), clustering (e.g., Witten and Tibshirani [2010], Alelyani et al. [2013] and references therein), ranking (Tian et al. [2011], Lai et al. [2013], Laporte et al. [2014]) and sparse covariance or precision matrix estimation (Banerjee et al. [2008], Friedman et al. [2008], Van de Geer [2016]). It has been observed that single regularized models often tend to overfit which was the starting point for a more sophisticated concept that combines ensemble models with feature selection, namely Stability Selection (Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010]). Roughly speaking, in Stability Selection one considers subsamples of the training data, performs feature selection on each subsample and aggregates the models to get a final stable model at the end. Stability Selection can be interpreted as meta-algorithm for which algorithms like the usual Lasso but also Lasso variants and Boosting (Hofner et al. [2015]) can enter as base algorithm for feature selection.

---

\*Institute for Mathematics, Carl von Ossietzky University Oldenburg, P/O Box 2503, 26111 Oldenburg (Oldb), Germany, [tino.werner1@uni-oldenburg.de](mailto:tino.werner1@uni-oldenburg.de)

All non-ensemble non-robust feature selection algorithms, including standalone Boosting models, usually get distorted once the training data are contaminated. Safeguarding against such contamination is done by methods of Robust Statistics (e.g., Maronna et al. [2019], Huber and Ronchetti [2009], Hampel et al. [2011], Rieder [1994]). Although outlier detection strategies (e.g., Rocke and Woodruff [1996], Shieh and Hung [2009], Filzmoser et al. [2008], Rousseeuw and Hubert [2011], Rousseeuw and Van Den Bossche [2018]) are extremely important for data cleaning so that a classical algorithm may be applied, robust learning algorithms can directly cope with contaminated data. The main idea (see Huber and Ronchetti [2009], Hampel et al. [2011]) is to bound the effects of contamination by replacing unbounded loss functions like the squared loss by a loss function with a bounded derivative or, even better, by a redescender whose derivative tends to zero for large arguments. Robust techniques have successfully entered sparse feature selection like robust Lasso algorithms (Rosset and Zhu [2007], Chen et al. [2010a], Chen et al. [2010b], Chang et al. [2018]), robust  $L_2$ -Boosting (Lutz et al. [2008]) and SLTS (Alfons et al. [2013]), among several other variants.

A real problem, especially for high-dimensional data, are however cell-wise outliers (Alqallaf et al. [2009]), so single cells are allowed to be contaminated, independently from whether the other cells in the respective instance are contaminated. For high-dimensional data, this can cause each instance to be contaminated while the fraction of outliers, measured in cells and not in rows, can still remain very low. This causes even the sophisticated robust methods that are tailored for row-wise outliers to break down since they can only handle at most a fraction of contaminated instances of one half. Nevertheless, there are already some algorithms that can cope with cell-wise outliers like the robust clustering algorithm that trims outlying cells from García-Escudero et al. [2021], cell-wise robust location and scatter matrix estimation algorithms (Agostinelli et al. [2015], Leung et al. [2017]) and several regression approaches (Bottmer et al. [2021], Leung et al. [2016], Filzmoser et al. [2020a]). There are also notable algorithms for detecting and imputing cell-wise outliers like the DDC from Rousseeuw and Van Den Bossche [2018] or the cellHandler from Raymaekers and Rousseeuw [2019].

A common robustness measure is given by the breakdown point. In contrast to the prominent influence curve which quantifies the local robustness of an estimator, i.e., only allowing for an infinitesimal fraction of the data to be contaminated, the breakdown point (BDP), introduced in [Hampel, 1971, Sec. 6] in a functional version and in Donoho and Huber [1983] in a finite-sample version, studies the global robustness of an estimator. The finite-sample BDP from Donoho and Huber [1983] quantifies the minimum fraction of instances in a data set that guarantees the estimator to “break down” when being allowed to be contaminated arbitrarily while the functional BDP essentially quantifies the minimum Prokhorov distance of the ideal and contaminated distribution that leads to such a breakdown. There has already been a lot of work on BDPs, see for example Rousseeuw [1984], Rousseeuw [1985], Davies [1993] and Hubert [1997], Genton [1998], Becker and Gather [1999] or Gather and Hilker [1997] which cover location, scale, regression and spatial estimators and Hubert et al. [2008] who study the BDP for multivariate estimators. Recently, BDP concepts for classification (Zhao et al. [2018]), multiclass-classification (Qian et al. [2019]) and ranking (Werner [2021]) have been proposed. Another type of breakdown point which relates the quotient of the number of variables and observations to the sparsity of the true model was studied in Donoho and Stodden [2006], illuminating that in high-dimensional settings, classical model selection procedures like Lasso can only find a reliable model provided

that the true model is sufficiently sparse.

Despite the recent successes of robust model selection methods and path-breaking theoretical results concerning model selection consistency (see, e.g., Bühlmann and Van De Geer [2011]), the question how contamination affects variable selection is seldomly addressed, leaving the connection of the paradigms of sparse model selection (select a small fraction of columns), stability (select variables that are appropriate for the majority of the data, i.e., a majority of the rows) and robustness (focus on a certain “clean” majority of the rows) still opaque. Although the frequency of contamination in real data is high and although the issue that non-aggregated feature selection models are usually unstable and tend to overfit is well-known, combining both stability and robustness seems to have rarely been considered in literature so far. A robust Stability Selection based on cleaned data has been introduced in Uraibi et al. [2015]. Uraibi [2019] apply a weighted LAD-Lasso (Arslan [2012]) as base algorithm for the Stability Selection where the weights are computed according to a robust distance in order to downweigh leverage points. Park et al. [2019] proposed a robust Stability Selection where the term “robust” however refers to an immunization against a specific regularization parameter of the underlying Lasso models, therefore considers a different goal than we do. Notable work on aggregating robust estimators has been done in Salibián-Barrera and Zamar [2002], Salibián-Barrera et al. [2008] who propose a linear update rule for robust MM-estimators in order to avoid computing it on each of the drawn Bootstrap samples, see also Salibián-Barrera [2006] for fixed-design regressor matrices and Salibián-Barrera et al. [2006] for robust PCA estimators. While these techniques do not consider variable selection, Salibián-Barrera and Van Aelst [2008] extend their method to variable selection where a backward selection strategy according to a minimization of the expected prediction error is applied.

We aim at making a tiny step towards the connection of robustness, stability and sparsity by introducing the variable selection breakdown point, which describes the number of outliers that can make variable selection completely unreliable, and the Stability Selection breakdown point, which corresponds to a sufficiently high probability that a stable model becomes completely unreliable. We will, based on optimistic and pessimistic scenarios due to the absence of concrete results on the effects of contamination to model selection in literature, study the relative robustness improvement that a Stability Selection grants, compared to a single model selection algorithm. It turns out that a rank-based Stability Selection where a fixed number of best variables enters the stable model is generally more robust than a threshold-based Stability Selection where all variables whose aggregated selection frequency exceeds the threshold enters the stable model. We propose a trimmed Stability Selection (TrimStabSel), analyze its Stability Selection BDP and provide a few but very insightful and surprising numerical results that prove that even an extremely small cell-wise contamination rate can already have a severe impact on variable selection.

**Our contribution is threefold:** **i)** We propose BDP definitions for (stable) variable selection; **ii)** We propose (oracle) outlier schemes that can completely distort model selection with usually very few outliers; **iii)** We lift the popular concept of trimming from single instances to whole models that allows for contamination rates exceeding 50% while maintaining the 50%-bound for the standard BDPs of the underlying model selection algorithms.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 compiles relevant notions from Robust Statistics which are contamination models and the breakdown point. We also recapitulate the concept of

Stability Selection. Section 3 is devoted to the definition of our variable selection BDP and to a discussion on resampling BDPs which are required for our Stability Selection. Our BDP concept for Stability Selection is introduced in Section 4. Section 5 introduces the Trimmed Stability Selection. Section 6 provides a small simulation study that compares the performances of the standard Stability Selection and the Trimmed Stability Selection.

## 2 Preliminaries

Let  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+k)}$  be the data matrix consisting of a regressor matrix  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$  and a response matrix  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$ . If univariate responses are considered,  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is a response column. We denote the  $i$ -th row of  $X$  by  $X_i$  and the  $j$ -th column of  $X$  by  $X_{\cdot,j}$ . The  $i$ -th row of  $Y$  is denoted by  $Y_i$  and for  $k = 1$ ,  $Y_i$  denotes the  $i$ th component of  $Y$ . Let  $n_{sub} < n$  always be the number of instances in subsamples resp. Bootstrap samples.

We start by recapitulating contamination models and the breakdown point concept. The last subsection is devoted to Stability Selection.

### 2.1 Contamination models

We begin with the definition of contamination balls ([Rieder, 1994, Sec. 4.2]).

**Definition 2.1.** *Let  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  be a measurable space. Let  $\mathcal{P} := \{P_\theta \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$  be a parametric model where each  $P_\theta$  is a distribution on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  and where  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  is some parameter space. Let  $P_{\theta_0}$  be the ideal distribution (“model distribution”, [Rieder, 1994, Sec. 4.2]). Then, a **contamination model** is the set of all distributions given by the system  $\mathcal{U}_*(\theta_0) := \{U_*(\theta_0, r) \mid r \in [0, \infty[ \}$  of **contamination balls**  $U_*(\theta_0, r) = \{Q \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{A}) \mid d_*(P_{\theta_0}, Q) \leq r\}$  for the set  $\mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{A})$  of probability distributions on  $\mathcal{A}$ . The radius  $r$  is also called “contamination radius”.*

To emphasize different standard types of contamination balls, a subscript (here represented by the “\*”) is usually added to concretize the contamination model.

**Example 2.1.** *A convex contamination model  $\mathcal{U}_c(\theta_0)$  is the system of contamination balls*

$$U_c(\theta_0, r) = \{(1-r)_+ P_{\theta_0} + \min(1, r) Q \mid Q \in \mathcal{M}_1(\mathcal{A})\}.$$

Many other metrics have entered the theory of Robust Statistics, see [Rieder, 1994, Sec. 4.2] for an overview. While in standard estimation problems like estimating a location or scale parameter one just has a sample of observations, there is far more flexibility to define outliers in for example regression settings. See Kohl [2005] and Rieder [1994] for more details.

**Remark 2.1 (Regression outliers).** *If we allow for contaminated observations from error-free-variables neighborhoods, we speak of  $Y$ -outliers while contamination in the regressors is referred to as  $X$ -outliers.*

**Remark 2.2 (Leverage points).** *It has already been mentioned for example in Alfons et al. [2013] and studied in Maronna et al. [2019] that  $X$ -outliers are in general more difficult to handle than  $Y$ -outliers. Such  $X$ -outliers are often called “leverage points” but one has to distinguish between “good” leverage points that are still near the regression hyperplane, producing only small residuals, and “bad” leverage points that may be interpreted as outliers w.r.t. the regression model which can drastically mislead the regression hyperplane (see also Rousseeuw and Hubert [2011]).*

In the contamination model in Def. 2.1, we considered case-wise (row-wise/instance-wise) outliers, i.e., either a whole row in the regressor matrix or in the response is contaminated or not. A more realistic scenario where the entries (cells) of the regressor matrix are allowed to be perturbed independently (cell-wise outliers) has been introduced in Alqallaf et al. [2009]. See also Agostinelli et al. [2015] for the notation.

**Definition 2.2.** Let  $X_i \sim P_{\theta_0}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, n$  where  $P_{\theta_0}$  is a distribution on some measurable space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  and let  $X$  be the  $n \times p$ -matrix consisting of the  $X_i$  as rows. Let  $U_1, \dots, U_p \sim \text{Bin}(1, r)$  i.i.d.. Then the **cell-wise convex contamination model** considers all sets

$$U^{\text{cell}}(\theta_0, r) := \{Q \mid Q = \mathcal{L}(UX + (1 - U)\tilde{X})\}$$

where  $\tilde{X} \sim \tilde{Q}$  for any distribution  $\tilde{Q}$  on  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$  and the matrix  $U$  with diagonal entries  $U_i$ .

**Remark 2.3.** Alqallaf et al. [2009] pointed out that if all  $U_j$  are perfectly dependent, one either gets the original row or a fully contaminated row which is just the classical convex contamination model in Def. 2.1.

**Remark 2.4.** Note that for response matrices, one can similarly construct cell-wise outliers.

In the cell-wise contamination model, the curse of dimensionality becomes drastically more apparent since the probability that at least one case is contaminated grows with the dimension  $p$ . Note that a single contaminated cell already makes an observation an outlier. This has been pointed out in Öllerer and Croux [2015], Croux and Öllerer [2016] who concentrated on precision matrix estimation, see also Loh and Tan [2018].

### 2.1.1 The breakdown point concept

The goal of Robust Statistics is to provide robust estimators, i.e., estimators that tolerate a certain amount of contaminated data without being significantly distorted. In order to define the term “robustness” more rigorously, one first has to distinguish between quantitative and qualitative robustness. Qualitative robustness goes back to Hampel [1971] and essentially refers to the continuity of the underlying statistical functionals.

There are two concepts which are summarized as quantitative robustness, namely global and local robustness. Local robustness considers the effect of small perturbations of the data where “small” refers to the relative fraction of contaminated instances which should be infinitesimal, so for real data, one considers one single contaminated instance. Local robustness is measured by the well-known influence curves going back to Hampel [1968]. Global robustness in contrast allows for a large fraction of the data points being contaminated arbitrarily. The minimum fraction of outliers that can lead to a breakdown of the estimator is called the breakdown point (BDP) of this particular estimator. The finite-sample BDP of Donoho and Huber [1983] is defined as follows.

**Definition 2.3.** Let  $Z_n$  be a sample consisting of instances  $(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$ . The **finite-sample breakdown point** of the estimator  $\hat{\beta}$  is defined by

$$\varepsilon^*(\hat{\beta}, Z_n) = \min \left\{ \frac{m}{n} \mid \sup_{Z_n^m} (\|\hat{\beta}(Z_n^m)\|) = \infty \right\} \quad (2.1)$$

where  $Z_n^m$  denotes any sample with  $(n-m)$  instances in common with the original sample  $Z_n$ , so one can arbitrarily contaminate  $m$  instances of  $Z_n$ , and where  $\hat{\beta}(Z_n)$  is the estimated coefficient on  $Z_n^m$ .

In this definition, one implicitly assumes that  $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . If w.l.o.g. a compact set  $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^p$  is considered, one may define a breakdown in the sense that  $\hat{\beta}$  is located at the boundary of  $\Theta$ . It has been discussed in Davies and Gather [2005] whether attaining a boundary value should be considered as a breakdown. See the rejoinder of Davies and Gather [2005] for some discussions on that topic where the authors suggest a metric which becomes infinity once one of the boundary values is attained.

There are already a lot of BDP concepts in literature, for example for regression (Stromberg and Ruppert [1992] and Sakata and White [1995]), for location-scale estimators (Sakata and White [1998]), for time series (Genton and Lucas [2003], Genton [2003]) and for variogram estimators (Genton [1998]). Donoho and Stodden [2006] propose a BDP for model selection while Kanamori et al. [2004] studied the BDP for SVMs. A BDP variant for clustering was introduced in Hennig [2008] who called their concept the “dissolution point”. The situation of heavy-tailed original data has been addressed in Ruckdeschel and Horbenko [2012] with the expected BDP that takes the ideal distribution of the original data into account.

## 2.2 Stability Selection

The Stability Selection is an ensemble model selection technique that has been introduced in Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010], mainly with the goal to reduce the number of false positives (non-relevant variables that are selected by the algorithm) and also motivated by the fact that the true predictor set  $S_0 \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$  is often not derivable by applying a single model selection procedure. In short, one draws  $B$  subsamples from the data of usually around  $n/2$  instances and performs a model selection algorithm on each subsample which leads to a set  $\hat{S}^{(b)} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$  of selected variables for each  $b = 1, \dots, B$ . The next step is to aggregate the selection frequencies of all variables, i.e., the binary indicators whether a particular variable has been selected in a specific predictor set. More precisely, one computes

$$\hat{\pi}_j := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B I(j \in \hat{S}^{(b)}) \quad (2.2)$$

for all  $j$ .

In the original Stability Selection from Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010], one defines a threshold  $\pi_{thr}$  based on an inequality derived in [Meinshausen and Bühlmann, 2010, Thm. 1] that bounds the expected number of false positives (the per-family error rate) by a quantity in terms of this threshold, the number  $p$  of variables and the expected number of selected variables. The stable set then consists of all variables  $j$  for which  $\hat{\pi}_j \geq \pi_{thr}$ .

There are some variants of this Stability Selection, most notably the one in Hofner et al. [2015] that makes it applicable for Boosting while the original one is tailored to algorithms that invoke a regularization term like the Lasso or the Graphical Lasso. An excellent implementation of the Stability Selection can be found in the R-packages `mboost` (Hothorn et al. [2017], Hofner et al. [2014], Hothorn et al. [2010], Bühlmann and Hothorn [2007], Hofner et al. [2015], Hothorn and Bühlmann [2006]) and `stabs` (Hofner and Hothorn [2017], Hofner et al. [2015], Thomas et al.

[2018]).

As for the selection of the stable set according to the aggregated selection frequencies, another paradigm that defines a number  $q$  of variables that have to enter the stable model so that the  $q$  variables with the highest selection frequencies are chosen has been suggested in literature (e.g., Zhou et al. [2013]) since the threshold-based approach is less intuitive for the user due to the number of stable variables not being predictable in the first place.

### 3 Breakdown of variable selection

In this section, we first define a BDP for variable selection. Based on this definition, we discuss why this BDP may be very small and outline the path from the robustness of single algorithms concerning variable selection to ensembles of such algorithms.

#### 3.1 Variable selection breakdown point

Donoho and Stodden [2006] already provided a very insightful work where the notion of a “breakdown of model selection” has been introduced. They computed phase diagrams that show under which configurations of the dimensionality of the data and the sparsity level of the true underlying model a successful model selection is possible. More precisely, they derive that the underlying model has to be sufficiently sparse, expressed in the fraction of the true dimensionality  $q$  of the model and the number  $n$  of observations, the question whether model selection is possible depends on the fraction  $n/p$  for  $p$  being the number of predictors.

Our idea also considers to compute a breakdown for model selection, but we restrict ourselves to the standard setting of Robust Statistics where we want to examine how many outliers can be tolerated for model selection. In order not to confuse our BDP concept with the one in Donoho and Stodden [2006], we call our concept the **variable selection breakdown point (VSBDP)**.

**Definition 3.1.** *Let  $D$  be a data set with  $n$  instances and predictor dimension  $p$ . Let  $k \in \mathbb{N}$  be the dimension of the responses.*

*a) The **case-wise variable selection breakdown point (case-VSBDP)** is given by*

$$\frac{m^*}{n}, \quad m^* = \min\{m \mid \hat{\beta}_j(Z_n^m) = 0 \ \forall j : \beta_j \neq 0\} \quad (3.1)$$

*where  $Z_n^m$  again denotes any sample that has  $(n - m)$  instances in common with  $Z_n$ .*

*b) The **cell-wise variable selection breakdown point (cell-VSBDP)** is given by*

$$\frac{\tilde{m}^*}{(p + k)n}, \quad \tilde{m}^* = \min\{m \mid \hat{\beta}_j(\tilde{Z}_{cell}^m) = 0 \ \forall j : \beta_j \neq 0\} \quad (3.2)$$

*where  $\tilde{Z}_{cell}^m$  denotes the data set where  $m$  cells can be modified arbitrarily and where all other cell values remain as in the original data.*

In other words, the VSBDP quantifies the relative number of rows resp. cells that have to be contaminated in order to guarantee that none of the relevant variables are selected. The fraction of outlying cells as a breakdown measure has for example already been considered in Velasco et al. [2020]. Let us now formulate a very simple but highly striking and enlightening result.

**Theorem 3.1.** *Let  $q \leq p$  be the true dimension of the underlying model and let again  $k$  be the response dimension and  $n$  be the number of instances in the data set.*

**a)** *Then the cell-VSB DP is at most  $\frac{\min(q,k)}{p+k}$ .*

**b)** *Let  $p = p(n)$  so that it grows when  $n$  grows. If  $q$  or  $k$  stays constant, the asymptotic cell-VSB DP is zero.*

**c)** *Let  $p = p(n)$  and  $q = q(n)$  so that both quantities grows when  $n$  grows. Let contamination only be allowed on the predictor matrix. Then the asymptotic cell-VSB DP is given by  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \frac{q(n)}{p(n)} \right)$ .*

**Proof.** **a)** *If  $q \geq k$ , just replace the entries  $X_{ij}$  for all  $i$  and for all  $j$  corresponding to the relevant variables by zeroes, so that one has to modify  $qn$  cells of the data set, more precisely only of the predictor matrix. Then the originally relevant columns remain without any predictive power and therefore will not be selected. If  $q < k$ , replace all entries of the response matrix with zeroes which would result in an empty model since no predictor column remains correlated with the response.*

**b)+c)** *Directly follow from a).* □

Intuitively, this statement is evident since the sparser the underlying true model is, so the smaller the fraction of cells of the data on which the underlying model is based on is, the more fragile the data set becomes against contamination of these cells. This **universal result**, regardless of the data structure or the applied algorithms, is extremely important since even highly sophisticated robust algorithms that are guaranteed to still compute a non-broken coefficient in the sense of the original regression BDP, i.e., a coefficient with a bounded norm regardless of the outlier scheme, are forced to **output a completely wrong model**. In other words, they end up in using noise variables for making a robust fit which will definitely have poor prediction quality for out of sample data. In fact, **the usual understanding of robustness does not cover the case of variable selection**. Note that one does not necessarily have to replace the predictor cells by zeroes since replacing them with a fixed valued  $c$  will also de-correlate them completely from each response column. For the outliers in the response matrix outlined in the proof above, no variable would be selected, ending up in an empty model which is not useful at all. The reason is that existing robust methods are concentrating on finding reasonable coefficients, but our analysis is based on an interplay between model selection and coefficient estimation so that the ultimate goal is to achieve both sub-goals in order to get a reliable model. Let us therefore pose the following provoking statement:

***From the perspective of retrieving the correct model, all robust regression and classification models are doomed to have a breakdown point less than  $q/p$ .***

## 3.2 Discussion

The perfect column structure of the proposed contamination scheme corresponds to a perfect correlation of the binomial variables in the cell-wise convex contamination model in Def. 2.2. Having  $n$  rows and denoting the respective binomial variable that decides whether cell  $(i, j)$  of the data matrix is contaminated by  $U_{ij}$ , column-wise contamination means that all  $U_{ij}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , are perfectly correlated, in contrast to case-wise contamination where the  $U_{ij}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, p$  (or  $j = 1, \dots, p + k$  if the response matrix is also considered), are perfectly correlated.<sup>1</sup> Such a

<sup>1</sup>The column-wise outliers we defined do not coincide with the ones in Machkour et al. [2017] that also have been termed “column-wise outliers”. In the reference, the idea is to corrupt columns with column-wise additive outliers.

setting however is generally not interesting for the robustness concepts that are tailored to coefficient estimation. In fact, it corresponds to the minimum cell-wise outlier structure that contaminates all instances and for cell-wise robust algorithms, **column-wise contamination is the least dangerous one for coefficient estimation** provided that one has less than  $\lceil \tilde{c}p \rceil$  fully contaminated columns, so it will not distort estimators that have a cell-wise BDP of  $\tilde{c}$ , neither on the original data set nor on any resample (which obviously also have a fraction of less  $\tilde{c}$  of cell-wise outliers). However, at the same time, column-wise contamination is the **most dangerous contamination structure for model selection**. Even more precisely, **column-wise outliers have to be classified into relevant and non-relevant ones where the terminology refers to the relevance of the column which they contaminate**. Evidently, it turns out that *the fraction of cell-wise outliers has to be sufficiently small both on the whole data set, on the regressor matrix reduced to the relevant columns and on the response matrix*.

We also want to emphasize that randomization strategies w.r.t. the columns of the data set as for example applied in Random Forests do not provide any defense against this outlier scheme since it still ends up in only considering the non-relevant variables and never will split w.r.t. a relevant variable due to no splitting being possible if the variable only takes one single value. Nevertheless, one should not give up the efforts to robustify machine learning algorithms that already led to brilliant techniques. Our statement is however correct and in line with the pessimistic BDP perspective which only considers worst cases, i.e., harmful outliers that, depending on the concrete application and BDP notion, may not even be likely in practice. When having simulated data and a random cell-wise outlier scheme, it is extremely unlikely that such column-wise outliers that make the true model irretrievable would appear, so this situation should at most very rarely occur in a random simulation as for example done in Filzmoser et al. [2020a] where first a set of instances is selected and for each of these instances, a random fraction of cells are contaminated. We do not dare to make a definite statement whether column-wise outliers can occur in practice, but, for example, Filzmoser et al. [2020a] identify the column values with measurements made by a specific sensor, so if this sensor is corrupted across a whole study, one indeed would have column-wise outliers.

There are some methods that solve regression problems by first identifying cell-wise outliers in the data matrix corresponding to a regression problem (Agostinelli et al. [2015], Leung et al. [2016]) and by down-weighting them. Note that in the presence of column-wise contamination, such methods and even the very sophisticated outlier detection and imputation procedure (DDC) from Rousseeuw and Van Den Bossche [2018] would not work. The column-wise outliers all have the same value, so considering each column separately, no outlier would be detected. Even if one somehow would flag the whole column as outlying column, an imputation based on the other variables would not work since the outlying columns are not correlated with any other column by construction. However, replacing the cells by zeroes would be detected by the cellHandler from Raymaekers and Rousseeuw [2019] if the instance-wise mean sufficiently deviates from zero, but if the attacker is aware of the cellHandler, he could replace the cells by this mean instead of zero so that they become invisible even to that clever algorithm.

From a practical perspective, it is important to make an assumption **how much information an attacker has**. Since Robust Statistics mainly focuses on deriving robust algorithms that can cope with a certain fraction of contamination but not on attacking algorithms that unveil

weaknesses of the algorithms by targetedly producing dangerous contamination, this topic has gained less attraction than in the Deep Learning community. There, one considers adversarial attacks (Goodfellow et al. [2014]), which minimally perturb instances so that an already trained model makes wrong predictions, and poisoning attacks (Jagielski et al. [2018]), which are perturbations that are injected into the data before the model is trained and which therefore are stronger related to Robust Statistics. However, these perturbations are usually bounded by a matrix norm and not by a contamination radius as in convex contamination schemes which nevertheless has also been considered in Robust Statistics (e.g. Burgard et al. [2021]). The success of such attacks depends on the amount of knowledge that the attacker has both on the victim model as well as on the data and the underlying model. Coming back to our column-wise outliers, an attacker that randomly would inject column-wise outliers to the predictor matrix would hardly contaminate the relevant variables by chance unless it is an oracle attacker that is aware of the relevant variables, maybe due to him intercepting and analyzing the data first.

### 3.3 From variable selection to stability

Usually, there is an empirical counterpart of a BDP, often called sample BDP (e.g., Zhao et al. [2018]), which replaces the ideal, unknown parameter with the estimated parameter on the original data. Such a breakdown point of model selection for non-ensemble techniques like the Lasso or Boosting does, in our opinion, not make much sense.

Lasso-type model selection is non-probabilistic in the sense that either a variable has been selected or not. Moreover, it is well-known that the Lasso tends to overfit of real data (e.g., Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010]), so from this perspective, an empirical version of the VS-BDP would be higher for models that tend to overfit which does not seem to be reasonable. One could try to build up on the results concerning variable selection consistency of the Lasso (Bühlmann and Van De Geer [2011]) in the sense that assuming that the necessary conditions (ir-representability condition resp. compatibility condition) are satisfied for the ideally distributed data, one inspects how much contamination would be necessary in order to invalidate these conditions so that the asymptotic guarantees were lost. We will not pursue this idea further in this work since it strongly deviates from the usual BDP notions and since variable selection consistency is an asymptotic property that is impossible to be translated to an empirical version. Boosting-type model selection like in  $L_2$ -Boosting (Bühlmann and Yu [2003], Bühlmann [2006]) outputs a relative part of iterations in which the respective variable has been selected and which can be interpreted as a probability, but unless a subsequent Stability Selection is executed, a variable enters the model once it has been selected in at least one iteration, so we would get the same problems as for hard Lasso-type variable selection. Moreover, Vogt [2018] provided a data matrix structure so that  $L_2$ -Boosting reliably selects wrong variables. This is a severe issue since the simple empirical counterpart of the VSBDP would be zero here, so the original data would already lead to a breakdown.

Model selection is tailored to the respective loss function which can easily be checked by applying for example Gradient Boosting with different loss functions on a given data set (see, e.g., Werner and Ruckdeschel [2019]). Moreover, an empirical VSBDP that compares the selected model on the original data with the selected model on contaminated data would be highly misleading when considering a single model since the selected model can be interpreted as a single realization of the random variable that maps the data distribution onto the power set of  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ . This

motivates our idea to lift the BDP concept to ensemble models.

### 3.4 Resampling and robustness

For Bootstrapping, the probability that in a particular resample there is at least one contaminated instance is given by

$$a_{1/n, n_{sub}, B}^{Boot}(\hat{\varepsilon}) := 1 - P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, \hat{\varepsilon}) = 0)^B \quad (3.3)$$

where  $\hat{\varepsilon} = m/n$  indicates the empirical rate of outlying rows in the data set. Similarly, for subsamples, it is given by

$$a_{1/n, n_{sub}, B}^{Subs}(\hat{\varepsilon}) := 1 - P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{sub}) = n_{sub})^B \quad (3.4)$$

where  $\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{sub})$  is the hypergeometrical distribution describing the number of clean instances (successes) for  $(n - m) = (1 - \hat{\varepsilon})n$  clean instances in the “urn”. This observation has already been made in literature, more precisely, in Berrendero [2007] for Bootstrap samples and in Camponovo et al. [2012] for subsampling. [Filzmoser et al., 2020b, Sec. 3.5] also derive the necessary number of Bootstrap samples so that the probability of having at least one clean resample is sufficiently large. This paradigm has been extended for the bagged median in Berrendero [2007]. A general condition so that a bagged robust estimator where the estimator on each resample has the BDP  $c$  does break down is given by

$$a_{c, n_{sub}, B}^{Boot}(\hat{\varepsilon}) := 1 - P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, \hat{\varepsilon}) < \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)^B \quad (3.5)$$

for Bootstrapping and by

$$a_{c, n_{sub}, B}^{Subs}(\hat{\varepsilon}) := 1 - P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{sub}) > \lfloor (1 - c)n_{sub} \rfloor)^B \quad (3.6)$$

for subsampling. This also consistently covers the case of  $c = 1/n$  since  $n_{sub}/n < 1$ .

The last two formulae correspond to non-robust resampling aggregation with robust estimators. Berrendero [2007] also considered a robust aggregation procedure called Bragging which was introduced in an earlier version of Städler and Bühlmann [2012] which just replaces the mean aggregation by a median aggregation of the individual estimators. The condition for a breakdown of the bragged estimator changes to at least  $\lfloor (B+1)/2 \rfloor$  resamples being sufficiently contaminated to let these resample-individual estimators break down, see also Berrendero [2007]. Similar results are clearly available if one considers trimmed bagging (Croux et al. [2007]). See also Salibián-Barrera and Zamar [2002] for such a resampling BDP for Bootstrapped robust quantile estimators.

We now recapitulate the resampling breakdown point introduced in Berrendero [2007] and use a slightly modified definition to make it more consistent with other BDP concepts.

**Definition 3.2.** *Let  $n$  be the number of observations in a data set and let  $B$  be the number of Bootstrap resp. subsamples with  $n_{sub} < n$  observations each. Let  $c \in [0, 1[$  be the BDP of each estimator applied on the individual Bootstrap samples resp. subsamples. For a tolerance level*

$\alpha \in [0, 1[$ , the  $\alpha$  **resampling BDP for Bootstrap resp. subsampling** is given by

$$(\varepsilon^\perp(c, n_{sub}, B, \alpha))^* := \inf\{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\} \mid a_{c, n_{sub}, B}^\perp(\varepsilon) > \alpha\} \quad (3.7)$$

for  $\perp \in \{Boot, Subs\}$ .

This resampling BDP defines the maximum fraction of contaminated instances in the data so that the probability that a mean aggregation breaks down exceeds the tolerance level. This definition is important since it lifts the worst-case BDP concept to a probabilistic concept that respects that the worst case is often very unlikely and that solely reporting it would be too pessimistic.

Now, after this exposition, let us first emphasize that the idea from the rejoinder of Davies and Gather [2005] to map the boundary values of a bounded image set of an estimator to infinite values is extremely important when assessing the effects of resampling on the robustness. Grandvalet [2000] claim that Bagging never improves the BDP. This is not true if the value set is bounded. We first formally spell out why Bagging is usually not robust, although this fact has already been observed in literature.

**Proposition 3.1.** *Let  $B$  be the number of resamples and let  $S_n$  be some estimator, mapping onto an unbounded domain, for a data set with  $n$  observations. If the (classical) BDP of the estimator is  $c$ , so it is for the bagged estimator.*

**Proof.** *Since the BDP of the estimator is  $c$ , manipulating a relative fraction of  $c$  instances in one single resample  $b$  suffices to let the estimator  $S_n^{(b)}$  on this resample to break down, i.e., the norm of the estimated value is fully controlled by the outliers. Then, due to the bagged estimator being the empirical mean of all  $S_n^{(b)}$ ,  $b = 1, \dots, B$ , its norm is also fully controlled.  $\square$*

The proof is rather unusual since it assumes that one can targetedly contaminate a selected resample. Usually, the attacker should only have access to the whole training data set. Then, a probabilistic statement in the spirit of the resampling BDP becomes more appropriate.

**Proposition 3.2.** *Let  $B$  be the number of resamples and let  $S_n$  be some estimator, mapping onto an unbounded domain, for a data set with  $n$  observations. If the (classical) BDP of the estimator is  $c$ , the resampling BDP of the bagged estimator equals  $(\varepsilon^\perp(c, n_{sub}, B\alpha))^*$  for  $\perp = Boot$  for Bootstrap resp. for  $\perp = Subs$  for subsampling.*

**Proof.** *Evidently, if at least one resample is contaminated to an extent such that the estimator breaks down, due to the unbounded domain and the mean aggregation, the bagged estimator breaks down. By definition of the resampling BDP, this happens with a probability of more than  $\alpha$  if the fraction of contaminated rows is  $(\varepsilon^\perp(c, n_{sub}, B\alpha))^*$ .  $\square$*

**Remark 3.1.** *a) These results can be trivially extended to the case of cell-wise contamination. b) Note that if the fraction of outlying instances/cells is smaller than the case-BDP  $c$  resp. the cell-BDP  $\tilde{c}$  of the applied estimator, not letting it break down, resampling induces a certain probability, namely  $a_{c, n_{sub}, B}^\perp(\hat{\varepsilon})$ , that the bagged estimator indeed suffers a breakdown. One has to keep in mind that this probability may become rather high on specific configurations. Consider Bagging with  $B = 100$  Bootstrap samples,  $n = 200$ ,  $n_{sub} = 100$  and  $m = 90$  outlying instances and let  $c = 0.5$ . Then, the probability that a single Bootstrap sample is sufficiently clean is*

$P(\text{Bin}(100, 0.45) < 50) \approx 0.817$ , but the probability that the **bagged estimator breaks down** is  $a_{0.5, 100, 100}^{\text{Boot}}(0.45) \approx 1$ . In this case, Bagging would completely de-robustify the estimator. This fact is well-known (see e.g. Salibián-Barrera et al. [2008]), but we need it for comparison with Stability Selection, i.e., a bagged variable selection which operates on a **finite space**.

As for **bounded domains** however, the situation becomes dramatically different.

**Proposition 3.3. a)** Let  $B$  be the number of resamples and let  $S_n$  be some estimator, mapping onto a bounded domain, for a data set with  $n$  observations from which no one takes any of the boundary values. If the (classical) BDP of the estimator is  $c$ , the resampling BDP of the bagged estimator is

$$\inf\{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\} \mid (P(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{\text{sub}}, \varepsilon) \geq \lceil cn_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) = B) > \alpha\} \quad (3.8)$$

for Bootstrapping resp.

$$\inf\{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\} \mid P(B, (P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - \varepsilon n, n_{\text{sub}}) \leq \lceil (1 - c)n_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) = B) > \alpha\} \quad (3.9)$$

for subsampling.

**b)** For Bragging, the resampling BDP becomes

$$\inf\{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\} \mid (P(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{\text{sub}}, \varepsilon) \geq \lceil cn_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) \geq \lfloor (B + 1)/2 \rfloor) > \alpha\} \quad (3.10)$$

for Bootstrapping resp.

$$\inf\{\varepsilon \in \{0, 1/n, \dots, 1\} \mid P(B, (P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - \varepsilon n, n_{\text{sub}}) \leq \lceil (1 - c)n_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) \geq \lfloor (B + 1)/2 \rfloor) > \alpha\} \quad (3.11)$$

for subsampling.

**Proof. a)** If at least one estimator does not break down, it takes a value in the interior of the domain by assumption. Hence, the aggregated estimated value will also lie in the interior of the domain, so there is no breakdown. A breakdown occurs if and only if all estimators break down to the same boundary value (which, by the worst-case perspective of the BDP concept, can be assumed to be possible).

**b)** When taking the median of the estimated values, it suffices that at least the half estimators have broken down to the same boundary value. □

This is an extremely strange result since **the median aggregation (and any other trimmed aggregation) is less robust than the mean aggregation**. This artifact, resulting from a **wrong notion of robustness for estimation**, shows that a breakdown has to be defined very carefully if the domain is bounded.

### 3.5 Relation of model selection and classification

The question is now how this relates to the VSB DP that we already defined and that does not map any value to infinity. The reason is the different perspective. The statements in the previous subsection focused on an estimation of for example some location, scale or regression parameter for which one can clearly define unreasonable values that correspond to a breakdown. There are

other situations in which it is much more difficult to define a breakdown, see for example the angular BDP for classification (Zhao et al. [2018]) or the order-inversal BDP for ranking (Werner [2021]). When regarding model selection, the situation becomes even more difficult since the index set of the columns is just a **finite set without a defined boundary** (due to permuting the columns does not have any effect) and no ordering. However, variable selection can be interpreted as a classification where the variables get the labels “relevant” or “non-relevant”. Thus, the VSB DP addresses the case that all relevant predictor variables are missed, i.e., that the true positive rate (TPR) is zero. This is already the worst case since neglecting all relevant variables usually leads to a significantly decreased generalization performance of the model, regardless if noise variables are included in the model or not.

## 4 Stability Selection and robustness

Important work on stability of feature selection resp. feature ranking has been done in Nogueira and Brown [2016], Nogueira et al. [2017a], Nogueira et al. [2017b]. Nogueira et al. [2017b] point out that stable feature selection is either represented by a hard subset selection of the candidate variables or by a ranking of the variable or individual weights which, given some threshold for the ranks resp. the weights, eventually leads to a subset of variables as well (see Sec. 2.2). The cited works propose similarity metrics in order to quantify the stability of feature selection resp. feature ranking. Nogueira et al. [2017b] consider the stability of feature selection as a robustness measure for the feature preferences. Note that this robustness notion differs from the definition of robustness in the sense of Robust Statistics.

Our work goes into a different direction, namely to assess the impact of Stability Selection on the variable selection robustness. Regardless if the intermediate output of the Stability Selection is given by ranks or weights, one has to distinguish between further Stability Selection variants when considering robustness. If weights are given, one defines the stable predictor set as the set of all those variables whose weights exceed a threshold which is either pre-defined (e.g., (Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010], Hofner et al. [2015]) or data-driven (e.g., Werner [2019]). If ranks are given, one selects the top variables where the respective number is either pre-defined (e.g., Zhou et al. [2013]) or data-driven (Werner [2019]). Selecting the top variables is often more intuitive for the user since it is very difficult to anticipate the exact number of selected variables when defining a weight threshold.

For classification and ranking, there already exist BDP notions, see Zhao et al. [2018], Qian et al. [2019], Werner [2021]. These BDP concepts however are not applicable for the Stability Selection setting since they assume a model that maps the features onto a predicted score which induces the classification resp. the ranking. In contrast, we do not learn a model for the variable’s weights resp. ranks in a Stability Selection. This has to be explained carefully: In classification/ranking problems, a scoring function is learned on the training data so that once future feature vectors are observed, one can predict a score for these feature vectors which leads to a classification of each instance resp. a ranking of them. A variable selection model like the Lasso in contrast learns a sparse model and a corresponding scoring function and once new instances arrive, it makes a real-valued prediction for each instance, so the selected model is nothing but a tool for prediction and stays fixed after training, hence there is no “prediction

for variable selection” in the sense that it directly predicts a sparse variable set for new data. This is also true for the variable-individual weights, i.e., there is no prediction model for these weights that would generalize to other data distributions. In our opinion, training such a model that predicts model selection would be nearly impossible due to the lack of a known ground truth for either the variable selection resp. weights where the latter do not even has a known ground truth on simulated data. These aspects are the reasons why existing BDP notions cannot directly enter quantitative robustness of Stability Selection.

#### 4.1 The Stability Selection BDP

An empirical VSB DP for case-wise contamination could be defined as follows.

**Definition 4.1.** *Under the assumptions of Def. 3.1, the **empirical case-VSB DP** is*

$$\frac{m^*}{n}, \quad m^* = \min\{m \mid \hat{\beta}_j(Z_n^m) = 0 \ \forall j \in S^{stab}(Z_n)\} \quad (4.1)$$

where  $Z_n$  again denotes the original data set with  $n$  instances and  $S^{stab}(Z_n)$  denotes the stable set derived from  $Z_n$  by a Stability Selection.

However, this definition would not be helpful as it would not quantify the robustness of Stability Selection, which is only indirectly considered. This is the reason why for Stability Selection, we need a more suitable BDP concept. Having the VSB DP and the resampling BDP defined, we are ready to define a BDP for Stability Selection itself.

**Definition 4.2.** *Let  $n$  be the number of instances in a data set and let  $n_{sub}$  be the number of instances in each resample. Let  $B$  be the number of resamples for the Stability Selection and let  $R$  be the resampling distribution. Let  $S^{stab}(\perp, n_{sub}, B, Z_n)$  denote the stable set derived from  $B$  resamples according to  $\perp = \text{Boot}$  or  $\perp = \text{Subs}$  with  $n_{sub}$  instances from the data set  $Z_n$ .*

**a)** *Then the **case-wise Stability Selection BDP (case-Stab-BDP)** for tolerance level  $\alpha$  is given by*

$$\varepsilon_{Stab}^*(\perp, c, n_{sub}, B, \alpha) := \min \left\{ \frac{m}{n} \mid P_R(\forall j \in S_0 : j \notin S^{stab}(\perp, n_{sub}, B, Z_n^m)) \geq \alpha \right\} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $c$  represents the case-BDP of the underlying model selection algorithm.

**b)** *Similarly, the **cell-wise Stability Selection BDP (cell-Stab-BDP)** for tolerance level  $\alpha$  is given by*

$$\tilde{\varepsilon}_{Stab}^*(\perp, \tilde{c}, n_{sub}, B, \alpha) := \min \left\{ \frac{\tilde{m}}{n(p+k)} \mid P_R(\forall j \in S_0 : j \notin S^{stab}(\perp, n_{sub}, B, \tilde{Z}_{cell}^m)) \geq \alpha \right\} \quad (4.3)$$

with the cell-BDP  $\tilde{c}$  of the underlying model selection algorithm.

Intuitively, the Stab-BDP denotes the minimum fraction of outliers required so that the probability that the reported stable model does not contain any relevant variable is sufficiently large.

#### 4.2 Discussion on the Stability Selection BDP

We want to emphasize the difference between the aggregation of selection frequencies in a Stability Selection and the aggregation of estimators in Bagging. We already showed in Prop. 3.1

that Bagging inherits the BDP of the underlying estimation procedure if one could contaminate resamples targetedly and that the BDP for a bagged model is essentially the resampling BDP. This also carries over to sparse coefficient estimation if one would aggregate for example Lasso models. We state the following obvious corollary for clarification.

**Corollary 4.1.** *Let  $B$  be the number of resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from a data set with  $n$  instances and let  $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}$  be the estimated (sparse) coefficient on resample  $b$  with BDP  $1/n$ . Then the probability that the bagged estimator  $\sum_b \hat{\beta}^{(b)}/B$  breaks down is  $a_{1/n, n_{sub}, B}^\perp(m/n)$  if  $m$  instances are contaminated.*

So why do we need the Stab-BDP at all if aggregated sparse models inherit the resampling BDP? The answer is that Stability Selection does not work as in the corollary, more precisely it **never aggregates coefficients**. Stability Selection just **aggregates indicator functions so that the influence of a model computed on a single resample is bounded by  $1/B$**  in the sense that the aggregated selection frequencies computed on the original data can be at most distorted by  $1/B$  (for certain  $j$ ) if one single resample is (sufficiently) contaminated, see Eq. 2.2. In other words, **the influence of the individual models from the resamples on the stable model is bounded**.

**Example 4.1** (Random Lasso). *Before we analyze the Stab-BDP, we want to emphasize that this robustification effect gets lost if the model aggregation is based on values from unbounded sets. An exemplar for this model type is the Random Lasso from Wang et al. [2011] which, for  $b = 1, \dots, B$ , does not only draw resamples from the rows but also randomly selects several columns from a uniform distribution over the columns. Then, a Lasso model is computed on each resample, leading to coefficients  $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}$ . The importance of the columns, say, a “column measure” (cf. Werner and Ruckdeschel [2019])  $\nu$  on  $\{1, \dots, p\}$ , is then computed by  $|\sum_b \hat{\beta}^{(b)}|/B$  and in a second stage, one draws again resamples from the rows but for each resample one draws columns from  $\nu$ , computes again the Lasso on each subsample and aggregates the coefficients. Neither the randomization over the columns nor the computation of  $\nu$  provides any robustness advantage. One just needs to be able to produce an arbitrarily large coefficient for a non-relevant variable on one single resample. This will cause the column measure to be arbitrarily close to 1 in this component and therefore arbitrarily close to 0 in all other components, especially those corresponding to the relevant variables which therefore will not be selected in the second stage. Therefore, the variable selection robustness of Random Lasso can be quantified by the resampling BDP  $(\varepsilon^\perp(1/n, n_{sub}, B, \alpha))^*$  for case-wise outliers and by  $(\varepsilon^\perp(1/(n(p+1)), n_{sub}, B, \alpha))^*$  for cell-wise outliers, provided that one outlying instance resp. cell can **promote a non-relevant variable**.*

### 4.3 Can (non-relevant) variables be targetedly promoted in practice?

Research in this direction has recently been done in the context of poisoning attacks, i.e., injecting contamination into the training data so that one can targetedly manipulate the trained model. In contrast to the BDP concept where one can modify a certain fraction of the data arbitrarily, poisoning attacks generally allow to contaminate all data instances but with a bound on some  $\|\cdot\|_p$ -norm for the contamination vector resp. matrix. Li et al. [2020], Li et al. [2021] prove that **poisoning attacks can indeed targetedly affect model selection in the sense that variables selected by the attacker can be suppressed resp. promoted**, i.e., the attacker

can inject variables to the selected model resp. discard variables. According to their attack scheme, there is essentially no limitation in the number of promoted resp. suppressed variables, but note that they propose  $l_p$ -attacks for  $p \geq 1$ , i.e., one does not change a single instance but in principle each instance/cell. Nevertheless, applying their method with an  $l_0$ -constraint as already done for crafting sparse adversarial attacks (e.g., Su et al. [2019], Carlini and Wagner [2017]) would indeed exactly fit our setting and seems to be a highly interesting topic for future work. Note that this issue has the rather astounding consequence that one **cannot** assume that cell-wise outliers in the non-relevant columns would not affect the model.

To the best of our knowledge, a concise statement on the impact of such a fraction of outliers to model selection itself like how many relevant variables can be suppressed or how many non-relevant variables can be promoted has not yet been proposed in literature. Therefore, we propose an optimistic and a pessimistic scenario concerning this impact.

**Case-wise scenarios:** In this scenario, we assume that for a variable selection method with instance-BDP  $c$ , a number of  $\lceil cn \rceil$  outliers in the regressor matrix, the response matrix or the regressor matrix reduced to the relevant columns

- is able to promote any subset of non-relevant variables resp. suppress any subset of relevant variables which means that we assume that this outlier fraction can indeed, at least theoretically, cause that all relevant variables are ignored so that the set of selected variables solely consists of non-relevant variables (**pessimistic case-wise scenario**);
- is able to targetedly suppress all relevant but promote only one single variable (**optimistic case-wise scenario**).

**Cell-wise scenarios:** We assume that for a cell-BDP of  $\tilde{c}$ , a fraction of at least  $\tilde{c}$  of outlying cells in the regressor matrix, the response matrix or the regressor matrix reduced to the relevant columns

- can promote  $\min(p - s_0, \tilde{c})$  non-relevant variables where  $s_0 = |S_0|$  resp. suppress any subset of relevant variables (**pessimistic cell-wise scenario**). This scenario is indeed extremely pessimistic since even in Li et al. [2020], Li et al. [2021], it seems that one at least has to manipulate the regressor matrix and the response vector which would at least require two outlying cells for an estimator with  $\tilde{c} = 0$ ;
- is able to targetedly suppress all relevant variables but to promote only one single variable (**optimistic cell-wise scenario**).

Before computing explicit results, we first want to emphasize that the universal bound from Thm. 3.1 obviously also holds for Stability Selection since replacing all entries corresponding to relevant variables clearly induces zero columns in the resamples so in each individual model, the relevant variables are suppressed. Note that if the non-relevant variables have, on a given data set, sufficiently low correlation (in absolute value) with the response vector resp. the response matrix, it is likely that there will be no variable whose aggregated selection frequency exceeds the threshold so threshold-based Stability Selection will end up in selecting no variable at all. This does not contradict our breakdown definition since an empty model clearly does not contain any relevant variable. We will not debate here whether an empty model or a model containing solely noise variables is less reasonable, the only important aspect here is that both can be considered

as a breakdown, making the paradigm of the variable selection breakdown suitable for Stability Selection.

**Remark 4.1.** *In the threshold-based version (Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010]), a breakdown requires all aggregated selection frequencies of the relevant variables to be decreased below this threshold. On the other hand, a breakdown for the Stability Selection variant where one selects the best  $q$  variables, i.e., the  $q$  ones with the highest aggregated selection frequencies, requires that the aggregated selection frequencies are modified so that the best relevant variable after contamination has at most the  $(q + 1)$ -highest aggregated selection frequency. In an even more sophisticated manner, Werner [2019] suggest a loss-based Stability Selection where the optimal  $q$  is derived by checking the performance of the resulting candidate models with  $q$  predictors for different  $q$  according to validation data. Since they consider a grid for  $q$ , one would require here that the best relevant variable after contamination has at most the  $q_{max}$ -highest aggregated selection frequency if  $q_{max}$  is the maximum value of the grid.*

We still need one more ingredient. When considering the results of the Stability Selection on the original data, we have to postulate how the aggregated selection frequencies look like. Therefore, our results are conditioned on these values, more precisely, on the distances between these values for the relevant variables to the aggregated selection frequencies of the non-relevant variables resp. to the threshold. Large original distances carry over to a higher robustness. Note that this relates our work to Goren et al. [2018] where point-wise and pair-wise robustness for ranking problems have been defined where similar distances are considered.

#### 4.4 Threshold-based Stability Selection

We now quantify the robustness of threshold-based Stability Selection. We assume that there is a fixed selection of instances resp. cells in the data matrix which are contaminated, so we quantify how large the probability in this case is that due to resampling, the Stability Selection breaks down.

**Theorem 4.1.** *Let  $\pi$  be the threshold for the Stability Selection based on  $B$  resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from a data set with  $n$  instances, a fixed selection of  $m$  of them contaminated, and let  $c$  be the BDP of the applied model selection algorithm. Let  $\hat{\pi}_j^+$  be the aggregated selection frequencies on the original data where  $\hat{\pi}_j^+ \geq \pi \exists j$  for  $j \in S_0$ . Then, in both the optimistic and the pessimistic case-wise scenario, the probability that the Stability Selection breaks down is **i)** given by*

$$P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{sub}) \leq \lfloor (1 - c)n_{sub} \rfloor)) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil) \quad (4.4)$$

*if the resamples are drawn by subsampling;*

**ii)** *given by*

$$P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil) \quad (4.5)$$

*if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping.*

**Proof.** *First, note that the selection frequencies of the non-relevant variables are not important here, so one does not distinguish between the pessimistic and the optimistic scenario. According*

to our assumption, there is no immediate breakdown on the original data. A breakdown is achieved once each relevant variable no longer appears in the stable set, i.e., if all aggregated selection frequencies are below the threshold  $\pi$ . Regarding the variable  $j^* = \operatorname{argmax}_j(\hat{\pi}_j^+)$ , there are more than  $\lceil B(\hat{\pi}_{j^*}^+ - \pi) \rceil$  sufficiently contaminated resamples required since each such resample can decrease the aggregated selection frequency by at most  $1/B$ . Sufficiently contaminated means that at least  $\lceil cn_{sub} \rceil$  instances in the resample have to be contaminated. Putting everything together, we get the stated probabilities.  $\square$

Note that the column-wise outliers do not have to be considered in the theorem above since it is impossible to have a column-wise contamination rate higher than  $c$  without having a case-wise contamination rate higher than  $c$  which already is a breakdown, so one does not have to distinguish between contamination in the relevant or non-relevant or response columns here. The situation becomes somewhat different when considering cell-wise contamination as shown in the following theorem where we assume univariate responses.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Let  $\pi$  be the threshold for the Stability Selection based on  $B$  resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from a data set with  $n$  instances and let  $\tilde{c}$  be the cell-BDP of the applied model selection algorithm. Let, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ , a fixed selection of  $c_i$  cells in instance  $i$  be contaminated, let  $Z_l$ ,  $l = 0, 1, \dots, p+1$ , be the number of instances for with  $c_i = l$  and let  $\tilde{m} := \sum_i c_i$ . Let further  $Z_l^{rel}$ ,  $l = 1, \dots, s_0$ , denote the number of instances with  $l'$  outlying cells in the relevant columns. Let  $m$  be the number of outliers in the response column. Let  $\hat{\pi}_j^+$  be the aggregated selection frequencies on the original data where  $\hat{\pi}_j^+ \geq \pi \exists j$  for  $j \in S_0$ . Then, in both the optimistic and the pessimistic cell-wise scenario, the probability that the Stability Selection breaks down is*

- i)** one if the fraction of cell-wise outliers exceeds  $\tilde{c}$  in the relevant columns or in the response column;
- ii)** zero if  $c_i \leq \lfloor \tilde{c}(p+1) \rfloor \forall i$  resp. one if  $c_i > \lfloor \tilde{c}(p+1) \rfloor \forall i$ ;
- iii)** given by  $\min(P_1, P_2, P_3)$  for

$$P_1 := P(\operatorname{Bin}(B, p_1) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil)$$

for

$$p_1 := \sum_{z_0, \dots, z_{p+1}: \sum_l lz_l \geq \lceil \tilde{c}n_{sub}(p+1) \rceil} f_{Z, n_{sub}}(z_0, \dots, z_{p+1})$$

where  $f_{Z, n_{sub}}$  for  $Z = (Z_0, \dots, Z_{p+1})$  represents the probability function of a multivariate hypergeometric distribution with values in  $\{(z_0, \dots, z_{p+1}) \mid z_0 + \dots + z_{p+1} = n_{sub}\}$ , i.e.,  $f_{Z, n_{sub}}(z_0, \dots, z_{p+1})$  is the probability that when sampling  $n_{sub}$  instances without replacement, one gets  $z_0$  out of the  $Z_0$  instances without cell-wise outliers,  $z_1$  out of the  $Z_1$  instances with one cell-wise outlier and so forth; for

$$P_2 := P(\operatorname{Bin}(B, p_2) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil)$$

for

$$p_2 := \sum_{\tilde{z}_0, \dots, \tilde{z}_{s_0}: \sum_l l\tilde{z}_l \geq \lceil \tilde{c}n_{sub}s_0 \rceil} f_{Z^{rel}, n_{sub}}(\tilde{z}_0, \dots, \tilde{z}_{s_0})$$

for  $Z^{rel} = (Z_0^{rel}, \dots, Z_{s_0}^{rel})$ ; and for  $P_3$  being the quantity in Eq. 4.4, if the resamples are drawn by subsampling and if none the conditions in i) or ii) are satisfied;

iv) given by  $\min(\check{P}_1, \check{P}_2, \check{P}_3)$  for

$$\check{P}_1 := P(\text{Bin}(B, \check{p}_1 > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil))$$

for

$$\check{p}_1 := \sum_{z_0, \dots, z_{p+1}: \sum_l lz_l \geq \lceil \tilde{c}n_{sub}(p+1) \rceil} f_{Mult}(z_0, \dots, z_{p+1})$$

where  $f_{Mult}$  represents the density of a multinomial distribution with parameters  $n_{sub}$  and  $(Z_0 / \sum_l Z_l, \dots, Z_{p+1} / \sum_l Z_l)$ ; for

$$\check{P}_2 := P(\text{Bin}(B, \check{p}_2 > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil))$$

for

$$\check{p}_2 := \sum_{\tilde{z}_0, \dots, \tilde{z}_{s_0}: \sum_l l\tilde{z}_l \geq \lceil \tilde{c}n_{sub}s_0 \rceil} f_{Mult}(\tilde{z}_0, \dots, \tilde{z}_{s_0});$$

and for  $\check{P}_3$  as in Eq. 4.5, if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping and if none the conditions in i) or ii) are satisfied.

**Proof. i) + ii)** Obvious and already partially discussed earlier.

**iii)** There are three ways how to achieve a breakdown as already mentioned when defining the cell-wise scenarios.  $P_1$  quantifies the probability that due to subsampling, the fraction of cell-wise outliers in the whole data matrix becomes at least  $\tilde{c}$  while  $P_2$  quantifies the analogous probability for the set of relevant columns. The stated probabilities  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  quantify that this happens for one resample, so  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  quantify that this happens in sufficiently many resamples.  $P_3$  quantifies the probability that a fraction of at least  $\tilde{c}$  of the responses are contaminated which also can cause the wrong variables to be selected according to the assumption in the cell-wise scenarios. Assuming that  $m$  outliers are apparent in the response column, we get the same formula as in Thm. 4.1.

iv) As iii). □

The Stab-BDP for tolerance  $\alpha$  then is the maximum fraction of outliers, i.e., the maximum fraction  $m/n$  resp.  $\tilde{m}/(n(p+1))$  such that the respective probability that the Stability Selection breaks down exceeds  $\alpha$ .

**Remark 4.2. i)** The cases corresponding to  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  resp. to  $\check{P}_1$  and  $\check{P}_2$  in Thm. 4.2 have to be considered separately since having only contamination in the relevant columns makes it impossible that the whole predictor matrix is contaminated too much provided that the number of relevant variables is low and that  $\tilde{c}$  is high. Similarly, if contamination only occurs in the non-relevant columns, a breakdown can still be possible due to promoting effects of the contamination.

**ii)** In Thm. 4.2, we considered the case of univariate responses. For multivariate responses with  $k$  response columns, one has to distinguish between the seemingly unrelated regression case (Zellner [1962]) where one fits a model for each response column separately and the general case that the response columns are correlated so that the response matrix should enter as a whole as input for a unified model. In the second case, the probability of a breakdown would be one if the

relative part of contaminated cells in the response matrix is at least  $\tilde{c}$ , in the first case however, the relative part of outliers has to be larger than  $\tilde{c}$  for one resp. for each response column if a breakdown of the set of the resulting  $k$  models is defined in the sense that at least one resp. each of the individual models breaks down.

**Remark 4.3.** *Our analysis has revealed an important **connection between cell-wise and case-wise contamination**: If cell-wise outliers in the response column are allowed, **cell-wise robustness breaks down to case-wise robustness**. As already pointed out, even in the presence of a clean regressor matrix, no regression (or other supervised machine learning method) procedure has a chance to infer the correct model if too many responses are contaminated. Even worse, if the model cannot be inferred, the contaminated responses cannot be suitably imputed in contrast to outlying cells as for example in Filzmoser et al. [2020a].*

*Therefore, it is extremely important to carefully decide which type of cell-wise contamination one can assume. In the simulations in Filzmoser et al. [2020a], they restricted themselves to cell-wise contamination in the regressor matrix while Leung et al. [2016] and Velasco et al. [2020] also allowed for (a small amount of) contamination in the response vector. From a practical perspective, assuming that contamination cannot appear in the responses is a very heavy assumption since if one allows for all  $p$  measurement vectors of the variables to be contaminated, it is difficult to argue why of all things the response measurements should be clean.*

## 4.5 Rank-based Stability Selection

The robustness of the rank-based Stability Selection additionally depends on the aggregated selection frequencies of the non-relevant variables.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Let  $q$  be the pre-scribed number of stable variables for the Stability Selection based on  $B$  resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from a data set with  $n$  instances,  $m$  of them contaminated, and let  $c$  be the BDP of the applied model selection algorithm. Let  $\hat{\pi}_j^+$  for  $j \in S_0$  resp.  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus S_0$  be the aggregated selection frequencies on the original data where we assume that  $\sum_k I(\hat{\pi}_k^- \geq \hat{\pi}_j^+) < q - 1 \exists j \in S_0$ .*

**a)** *In the pessimistic scenario, let  $s$  be the number of relevant variables in the top- $q$  variables. Then, w.l.o.g., let  $\hat{\pi}_1^+, \dots, \hat{\pi}_s^+$  be the corresponding aggregated selection frequencies of these variables on the original data, similarly, let  $\hat{\pi}_1^-, \dots, \hat{\pi}_{q-s}^-$  be the aggregated selection frequencies of the  $(q - s)$  non-relevant variables among the top- $q$  variables. Let  $\hat{\pi}_{q-s+1}^-, \dots, \hat{\pi}_q^-$  be the aggregated selection frequencies of the next best  $s$  non-relevant variables. Then the probability that the Stability Selection breaks down is*

**i)** *given by*

$$P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{sub}) \leq \lfloor (1 - c)n_{sub} \rfloor)) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s}(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q}(\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil) \quad (4.6)$$

*if the resamples are drawn by subsampling;*

**ii)** *given by*

$$P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s}(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q}(\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil) \quad (4.7)$$

*if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping.*

**b)** *In the optimistic scenario, the respective probability*

i) lies in the interval

$$\begin{aligned} & [P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{\text{sub}}) \leq \lfloor (1 - c)n_{\text{sub}} \rfloor)) > \lceil B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil)], \\ P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Hyp}(n, n - m, n_{\text{sub}}) \leq \lfloor (1 - c)n_{\text{sub}} \rfloor)) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil) \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

if the resamples are drawn by subsampling;

ii) lies in the interval

$$\begin{aligned} & [P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{\text{sub}}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) > \lceil B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil)], \\ P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{\text{sub}}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{\text{sub}} \rceil)) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil) \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping.

**Proof.** On the original data, there is no immediate breakdown according to the assumption. A breakdown is achieved once the top relevant instance has an aggregated selection frequency which is below  $q$  aggregated selection frequencies of non-relevant variables.

a) Therefore, it suffices to have more than  $\lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil$  contaminated resamples since in each one, both the non-relevant variables corresponding to  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, q$ , can be promoted and at the same time, the relevant variables can be suppressed, so the quantities  $\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+)$  and  $\min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)$  move towards each other by  $2/B$  steps per contaminated resample. Hence, after  $\lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil$  such steps, they are equal or have already crossed, so after one more contaminated resample, they definitely can have crossed, so that the formerly best relevant variable has a lower aggregated selection frequency than the formerly  $q$ -th best non-relevant variable. The probabilities are then computed as in Thm. 4.1.

b) In the optimistic scenario, we can only targetedly promote one non-relevant variable. Therefore, it depends on the terms  $s$ ,  $q$ ,  $\max_j (\hat{\pi}_j^+)$  and all  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$  for  $k = 1, \dots, q$ , so one cannot make a universal precise statement. However, there are two extreme cases. If for

$$\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-) =: \Delta$$

the difference between  $\max_j (\hat{\pi}_j^+)$  and  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$  for  $(q - 1)$  indices  $k$  from  $\{1, \dots, q\}$  is exactly  $\Delta/2$ , except for  $k^* := \operatorname{argmin}_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)$  for which it is  $\Delta$ , then more than  $0.5 \lceil B\Delta \rceil$  contaminated samples suffice for a breakdown if the variable corresponding to  $\hat{\pi}_{k^*}^-$  is promoted in each of these resamples since the same reasoning as in a) applies, i.e., the selection probabilities for the worst non-relevant and best relevant variable move towards each other with a step size of  $2/B$ . The other extreme case is that all  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$  are equal. Then, if  $s > \lceil B\Delta \rceil$ , even after promoting each of these non-relevant variables in one single contaminated resample does not suffice for a breakdown since there will be at least one remaining one whose aggregated selection frequency was still not promoted. In that case, we can treat  $\hat{\pi}_{k^*}^-$  (in general,  $\min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)$ ) as threshold so that the results from Thm. 4.1 are applicable, so the relevant variables have to be suppressed in so many resamples such that the selection frequency of the best of them finally crosses the threshold.

□

**Corollary 4.2.** *Let  $q$  be the pre-scribed number of stable variables for the Stability Selection based on  $B$  resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from a data set with  $n$  instances and let  $\tilde{c}$  be the cell-BDP of the applied model selection algorithm. Let, for  $i = 1, \dots, n$ ,  $c_i$  cells in instance  $i$  be contaminated, let  $Z_l$ ,  $l = 0, 1, \dots, p+1$ , be the number of instances for with  $c_i = l$  and let  $\tilde{m} := \sum_i c_i$ . Let further  $Z_{l'}^{rel}$ ,  $l' = 1, \dots, s_0$ , denote the number of instances with  $l'$  outlying cells in the relevant columns. Let  $\hat{\pi}_j^+$  for  $j \in S_0$  resp.  $\hat{\pi}_k^-$  for  $k \in \{1, \dots, p\} \setminus S_0$  be the aggregated selection frequencies on the original data where we assume that  $\sum_k I(\hat{\pi}_k^- \geq \hat{\pi}_j^+) < q - 1 \exists j \in S_0$ .*

**a)** *one if the fraction of cell-wise outliers exceeds  $\tilde{c}$  in the relevant columns or in the response column;*

**b)** *zero if  $c_i \leq \lfloor \tilde{c}(p+1) \rfloor \forall i$  resp. one if  $c_i > \lfloor \tilde{c}(p+1) \rfloor \forall i$ ;*

**c)** *Let none of the conditions in a) or b) hold. In the pessimistic scenario, let the notation and assumptions be as in part a) of Thm. 4.3. Then, the probability that the Stability Selection breaks down is*

**i)** *given by  $\min(P_1, P_2, P_3)$  for*

$$P_v := P(\text{Bin}(B, p_v) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil \rceil)$$

*for  $v = 1, 2$  with  $p_1$  resp.  $p_2$  as in Thm. 4.2 and for  $P_3$  as in Eq. 4.6 if the resamples are drawn by subsampling;*

**ii)** *given by  $\min(\check{P}_1, \check{P}_2, \check{P}_3)$  for*

$$\check{P}_v := P(\text{Bin}(B, \check{p}_v) > \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil \rceil)$$

*with  $\check{p}_1$  and  $\check{p}_2$  from Thm. 4.2 and  $\check{P}_3$  as in Eq. 4.7 if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping.*

**d)** *Let none of the conditions in a) or b) hold. In the optimistic scenario, the respective probability*

**i)** *lies in one of the intervals*

$$\begin{aligned} & [P(\text{Bin}(B, p_v) > \lceil B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil), P(\text{Bin}(B, p_v) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)] > \\ & \quad \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil \rceil \end{aligned}$$

*for  $v = 1, 2$  with  $p_1$  and  $p_2$  from Thm. 4.2 or in the interval given in Eq. 4.8 if the resamples are drawn by subsampling;*

**ii)** *lies in one of the intervals*

$$\begin{aligned} & [P(\text{Bin}(B, \check{p}_v) > \lceil B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil), P(\text{Bin}(B, \check{p}_v) > \\ & \quad \lceil 0.5B(\max_{j=1, \dots, s} (\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \min_{k=q-s+1, \dots, q} (\hat{\pi}_k^-)) \rceil \rceil) \end{aligned}$$

*for  $v = 1, 2$  with  $\check{p}_1$  and  $\check{p}_2$  from Thm. 4.2 or in the interval given in Eq. 4.9 if the resamples are drawn by Bootstrapping.*

**Proof.** *Parts a), b) and c) directly follow from Thm.s 4.3 and 4.2. Statement d) is more tricky since one has intervals due to the argumentation in part b) of the proof of Thm. 4.3. For a concrete data set and a concrete model selection algorithm, one value in the respective intervals is realized so that the probability of a breakdown of the Stability Selection is the minimum of them which obviously lies in one of these intervals.*

□

## 4.6 Stability Selection increases robustness

We learned from the results in the previous subsections that Stability Selection does not suffer from the numerical instabilities (cf. Salibián-Barrera et al. [2008] for this notion) of resampling that can lead to some resamples having a larger fraction of outlying instances/cells than the whole training data to that extent as standard bagged estimators do. We already recapitulated that a bagged estimator breaks down once one single resample is sufficiently contaminated while the number of contaminated resamples in the Stability Selection is usually much higher.

We can extract one interesting recommendation for the Stability Selection variant. For the threshold-based Stability Selection, the robustness depends on the difference of the aggregated selection frequency of the best relevant variable and the threshold. It is however not evident that there even exists such a variable. This problem has been studied in Werner [2019] for very noisy data. Due to the combination of a high noise level, a large number  $p$  of candidate variables and a rather sparse true model, one often faces the situation that no variable (including non-relevant variables) can pass the threshold, leading to an empty model, i.e., an immediate breakdown. One can argue that one may just decrease the threshold, but this contradicts the suggestions in Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010] and Hofner et al. [2015] who recommend to use a threshold of at least 0.5 (which may not be realistic for noisy data). On the other hand, the rank-based Stability Selection is very unlikely to suffer from this phenomenon since, even on very noisy data, although the aggregated selection frequencies may be rather low, at least some relevant variables are usually ranked higher than the non-relevant variables according to these selection frequencies. More precisely, rank-based Stability Selection implicitly also defines a threshold, namely a value between the aggregated selection frequencies of the variable with the lowest selection frequency that enters the stable model and the variable with the highest selection frequency that does not enter the stable model (excluding this value).

## 4.7 Robustness surplus of Stability Selection

The **robustness surplus** of a Stability Selection in comparison to a bagged estimator can be quantified based on the previous results. Observe that a bagged estimator with BDP  $c$  resp.  $\tilde{c}$  breaks down once the relative part of contaminated instances resp. cells is at least as large as this value in **one single resample**. Note that for bagged regression estimators, they break down if the fraction of contaminated cells on the predictor matrix reduced to the relevant columns resp. on the response column is too large. The Stability Selection in contrast **allows for a certain fraction of resamples to be sufficiently contaminated** to let the individual estimator on that resample break down. In order to quantify this robustness surplus, one can compute the fraction of the breakdown probabilities where the probabilities computed in Thm.s 4.1 and 4.3, part iii) and iv) of Thm. 4.2 resp. part c) and d) of Cor. 4.2 are the nominator. As for the denominator, one replaces the number of resamples that have to be sufficiently contaminated by 0 so that the condition  $> 0$  appears in the probability brackets. For example, the robustness surplus of the threshold-based Stability Selection with Bootstrapping with a robust Lasso with case-BDP  $c$  in comparison to a bagged robust Lasso with case-BDP  $c$  is given by

$$\frac{P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil)}{P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > 0)}. \quad (4.10)$$

Alternatively, one could quantify the robustness surplus by computing the fraction of the actual Stability resp. resample BDPs for some tolerance level  $\alpha$ , so the ratio of the minimum fractions of outliers required for a breakdown. In the example above it would be

$$\frac{\min\{m \mid P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > \lceil B(\max(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi) \rceil) > \alpha\}}{\min\{m \mid P(\text{Bin}(B, P(\text{Bin}(n_{sub}, m/n) \geq \lceil cn_{sub} \rceil)) > 0) > \alpha\}}.$$

#### 4.8 Beyond 50% contamination

There is another very important feature that Stability Selection allows in contrast to a simple bagged estimator, namely that it **in principle allows for more than the half of the instances/cells being contaminated without violating equivariance properties (cf. Davies and Gather [2005]) of the underlying algorithm** that prevent BDPs from exceeding 0.5. We first have to elaborate why this setting is reasonable since the main idea of robust statistics is to base an estimation on a (clean) majority of the data. This is indeed true and for standard estimation procedures like location or scatter estimation, any other paradigm would be misleading because it would focus on a minority of the data. Maybe there could be some structure in the data so that the original observations are located on some manifold so that one may indeed detect them, but in general, one can doubt that such a procedure would work well without additional assumptions.

In machine learning problems, especially regression, the situation is somewhat different due to the assumption that there is an underlying model from which the clean data have been generated (so here, they lie indeed on some manifold). Even if the relative fraction of outlying instances exceeds a half, say it is 60%, then it is nevertheless a desirable goal to infer the model which describes the correspondence structure of the responses and the predictors of the clean observations. There is no qualitative hindrance to aim at finding the underlying model due to the standard assumption that outliers do not have structure and just stem from some unknown, arbitrary distribution.

In order to clarify the argumentation, consider the awkward case-wise contamination situation that the outliers had structure, i.e., additionally to the underlying model  $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  that relates the responses and the predictors of the clean observations one had another model  $g : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$  from which the outlying instances are generated. In this artificial setting, one would indeed try to infer  $g$  instead of  $f$  and treat the actual clean instances as the outliers, more precisely, as the outliers w.r.t. the model  $g$ .

The main problem, even for a Stability Selection, would be that the probability to draw resamples that are sufficiently contaminated to let the applied algorithm break down would become rather high if the fraction of outlying instances already exceeds 0.5 on the original data. Therefore, an additional robustification step is necessary which will be discussed in the next section.

### 5 Robustifying Stability Selection

Let us recapitulate the SLTS algorithm from Alfons et al. [2013]: It computes the loss function  $L$  (the squared loss) for all instances and defines the “clean subset” that enters the next iteration as the  $h < n$  instances with the lowest in-sample losses. By iterating this strategy and by immunizing against running into a local minimum of the trimmed objective  $\sum_{i=1}^h (L(Y, X, \beta))_{i:n}$

by starting with multiple initial configurations, the SLTS outputs essentially the optimal sparse coefficients according to the empirical trimmed risk.

Regarding Stability Selection, the instances in a resample cannot be treated individually since one aims at aggregating column information from whole resamples (note that one clearly can compute a robust model, for example using SLTS, on each resample, similarly as in Uraibi [2019] who used a weighted LAD-Lasso). One can however individualize the resamples themselves and the corresponding selected sets of variables. In other words, we aim at **lifting the trimming concept from instances in estimation problems to resamples in a model aggregation problem**.

## 5.1 Related approaches

### 5.1.1 Other trimming ideas

Let us first point out the differences to other trimming procedures. The already mentioned Bragging (Bühlmann [2012]) replaces the mean aggregation by a median aggregation which, for binary-valued measurements like in the Stability Selection, would not be appropriate since it would only result in a clear decision whether to include a specific variable into the stable model or not, besides being tailored to a threshold of 50% in the sense that only variables that have been selected in at least half of the resamples enter the stable model. One could argue that when using Boosting as base algorithm, one would get more information on the resamples, namely the relative fraction of Boosting iterations in which a specific variable has been selected. A possible aggregation variant in a Stability Selection would be to aggregate these resample-wise selection frequencies which was mentioned in Werner [2019]. However, due to these selection frequencies being contained in a discrete subset of the interval  $[0, 1]$ , a median computation could be misleading due to the problem how to define outlyingness on such a set as already elaborated in Prop. 3.3. Also, mapping the relative selection frequencies 0 and 1 to  $-\infty$  resp.  $\infty$  would make no sense here since at least a relative Boosting-wise selection frequency of zero is natural for the most variables and inevitable once  $p$  exceeds the number of Boosting iterations. Another Bagging robustification is trimmed Bagging (Croux et al. [2007]) which we intend to apply here. In contrast to Croux et al. [2007], we do not bag classifiers nor other learners but predictor sets themselves.

A close approach to our intended Trimmed Stability Selection is the approach in Zhang et al. [2019] where general ensemble variable selection techniques are pruned. Their motivation came from the perspective of strongly correlated members of the ensemble in contrast to the perspective of robustness as in our work. They extend the approach in Zhang et al. [2017] where the members with the highest prediction errors are trimmed in the sense that Zhang et al. [2019] define a so-called variable selection loss which is a squared distance between the aggregated selection frequencies (called “importances” there) and a reference importance vector. Zhang et al. [2019] are aware of the fact that the true importance vector is not known so they try to approximate it with their reference vector whose components are computed by  $|\hat{\beta}_j| / \sum_j |\hat{\beta}_j|$  for some estimated coefficient  $\hat{\beta}$ . Note the difference to the first stage of the Random Lasso from Wang et al. [2011] where an ensemble of such coefficients is used. In the context of high-dimensional data, this method is questionable since it relies on a single regression model when computing the reference vector and even well-founded algorithms like  $L_2$ -Boosting (Bühlmann and Yu [2003],

Bühlmann [2006]) or the Lasso (Tibshirani [1994]) are known to overfit on real data, so the false positives are unintentionally promoted, even if their corresponding coefficients usually are rather low compared to the coefficients of the relevant variables.

A weighted aggregation in the sense that a weighted trimmed mean of the indicators is computed has already been outlined in Werner [2019] but in a slightly different setting.

### 5.1.2 Fast and Robust Bootstrap

A very important related algorithm is the fast and robust Bootstrap (FRB), initially introduced in Salibián-Barrera and Zamar [2002], Salibián-Barrera et al. [2008] for regression MM-estimators. The main idea is that standard Bootstrapping of robust estimators would take a long computational time and that a simple uniform Bootstrapping may result in having resamples with more than half of the instances being contaminated with a considerable probability. They derived a linear update rule for the robust estimator that downweights outlying instances. solves the issue of applying the expensive robust estimation procedure multiple times. These weights are derived by a robust MM-estimator which allows for identifying such instances according to the absolute value of their regression residual. The FRB has also been successfully applied to PCA (Salibián-Barrera et al. [2006]) and fixed design regression (Salibián-Barrera [2006]).

Model selection using the FRB has been proposed by Salibián-Barrera and Van Aelst [2008]. The idea is to approximate the prediction error of the model built on a particular set of predictors by using FRB and to select the predictor set for which the prediction error, optionally regularized with some complexity penalty term, was minimal. They show in [Salibián-Barrera and Van Aelst, 2008, Thm. 1] under which conditions this strategy is variable selection consistent, i.e., the probability that the selected predictor set equals the true predictor set converges to 1 for  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . One has to admit that their strategy suffers from a major weakness which is the lack of scalability for data sets with a large number of predictors. Since they have to compute the prediction error for all possible models whose total number is  $2^p - 1$ , it will soon become infeasible. Even the backward strategy to start with all models of a certain complexity  $p' < p$ , to find the optimal one and to consider only the sub-models of this model will also not work since the number of these  $p'$  models is  $\binom{p}{p'}$  which also becomes infeasibly large for a high  $p$ . Another difference from their model selection FRB and the Stability Selection is that in model selection FRB, one derives one single predictor set which is considered to be optimal. Since the aggregation step appeared only when computing the prediction error, there is no ranking of the variables which contradicts the stability paradigm of Meinshausen and Bühlmann [2010].

### 5.1.3 Out of sample losses

Trimming certain weights in a Stability Selection has also been proposed in Werner [2019] but with the difference that they consider out-of-sample losses. They assume that the validation data is clean which however would not be valid in real applications. This issue has been for example described in [Filzmoser et al., 2020b, Sec. 8.2] where they assume that one performs cross-validation. We will not pursue this topic any further since it is an own research area. Nevertheless, one can assume that contamination can render the validation data so unreliable that even the true model would suffer a large loss there. The structured contamination according to another regression model that we mentioned in the previous section may even promote wrong

models that would suffer only a small loss on the contaminated validation data. One could think about defining something like a “**validation breakdown point**” which measures the fraction of instances resp. cells in the validation data that need to be corrupted in order to completely mislead the validation process in the sense that even the optimal model would not appear as optimal or that one could targetedly promote a wrong model, in future research.

## 5.2 Trimmed Stability Selection

In this paper, we do not consider validation data since assuming that the training data are contaminated while the validation data are clean would be awkward, so we intend to measure the quality of the resample-specific models. As already elaborated, assuming non-structured outliers enables a detection of unreliable models on an in-sample loss basis, similarly as outlying instances are detected by their individual in-sample loss as for example in Alfons et al. [2013]. More precisely, if the contamination of a certain resample has caused the algorithm to select wrong variables, the in-sample loss should be high compared to another resample where a sufficiently well model has been selected which contains enough of the true predictors. Note that computing a regression loss only allows for detecting bad leverage points which are far away from the regression hyperplane but no good leverage points that are located near the hyperplane. From a pure modeling perspective, this is not problematic since such points do not distort neither the model selection nor the coefficient estimation. Clearly, in real applications, the input values resp. predicted responses of such points can be misleading, but that is another topic which is beyond the scope of this paper and goes into the direction of outlier detection itself.

Our trimmed Stability Selection works as follows. We generate  $B$  resamples of size  $n_{sub}$  from the training data and apply the model selection algorithm, for example, Lasso or Boosting, on each resample which selects a model  $\hat{S}^{(b)} \subset \{1, \dots, p\}$  for  $b = 1, \dots, B$  and which produces coefficients  $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}$  whose actual value is however not relevant here (only the decision whether it is zero or not). Let  $I^{(b)}$  be the index set of the rows that have been selected by the resampling algorithm, i.e.,  $I^{(b)} \in \{1, \dots, n\}^{n_{sub}}$  for Bootstrapping resp.  $I^{(b)} \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  with  $|I^{(b)}| = n_{sub}$  and  $I_k^{(b)} \neq I_l^{(b)} \forall k \neq l, k, l = 1, \dots, n_{sub}$ , for subsampling. For the  $b$ -th resample, we compute the in-sample loss

$$L^{(b)} = \frac{1}{n_{sub}} \sum_{i \in I^{(b)}} L(Y_i, X_i \hat{\beta}^{(b)}) \quad (5.1)$$

for a loss function  $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow [0, \infty[$ . Although, in regression, losses are usually continuous, we cannot exclude that there are ties, for example, if two resamples are identical or if a trimmed loss is used. In this case, we perform random tie breaking. Note that there is no evidence that the models computed on identical resamples are identical since the model selection algorithm may include stochastic components like the SLTS whose result depends on the randomly chosen initial configurations.

For the set

$$I^{trim}(\gamma) := \left\{ b \in \{1, \dots, B\} \mid \sum_{b'=1}^B I(L^{(b')} \geq L^{(b)} \leq \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor) \right\} \quad (5.2)$$

with the trimming rate  $\gamma \in [0, 1[$ , we compute the trimmed aggregated selection frequencies

$$\hat{\pi}_j^\gamma = \frac{1}{B - \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor} \sum_{b \in \{1, \dots, B\} \setminus I^{trim}(\gamma)} I(j \in \hat{S}^{(b)}) \quad (5.3)$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, p$ , and let  $\hat{\pi}^\gamma := (\hat{\pi}_j^\gamma)_{j=1}^p$ . The actual identification of the stable set works as usual, based on the  $\hat{\pi}_j^\gamma$ .

The **Trimmed Stability Selection (TrimStabSel)** is described by the following algorithm:

**Initialization:** Data  $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times (p+1)}$ , number  $n_{sub}$  of instances per resample, resampling procedure, number  $B$  of resamples, either threshold  $\pi_{thr}$  or number  $q$  of stable variables, model selection algorithm, loss function  $L$ , trimming rate  $\gamma$ ;

**for**  $b = 1 : B$  **do**

    Draw a resample  $D^{(b)} = (X^{(b)}, Y^{(b)}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{sub} \times (p+1)}$  from  $D$ ;

    Apply the model selection algorithm to  $D^{(b)}$ ;

    Get a predictor set  $\hat{S}^{(b)}$  and coefficients  $\hat{\beta}^{(b)}$ ;

    Evaluate the in-sample loss  $L^{(b)}$  from Eq. 5.1

**end**

Flag the  $\lfloor \gamma B \rfloor$  resamples with the highest losses as outlying;

Compute the trimmed aggregated selection frequencies as in Eq. 5.3;

Compute the stable set according to  $\pi_{thr}$  or  $q$  and  $\hat{\pi}^\gamma$ ;

**Algorithm 1:** Trimmed Stability Selection

Now, we have to analyze the effect of this trimming procedure on the Stab-BDP. We abstain from detailing out each of the cases considered in Subsections 4.4 and 4.5 again but formulate a universal result which can be easily adapted to all the individual cases.

**Theorem 5.1.** *For the robustness surplus in the sense of Eq. 4.10 of TrimStabSel with trimming level  $\gamma$  in comparison with the untrimmed Stability Selection, the probabilities computed in Thm.s 4.1 and 4.3, part iii) and iv) of Thm. 4.2 resp. part c) and d) of Cor. 4.2 enter as the denominator. Let the number of contaminated models in the Gaussian brackets in the right hand side of the logical expressions in  $P(\cdot)$ -brackets be denoted by  $K$ . Assuming that there are  $k_\gamma$  broken models in the set of the  $\lfloor \gamma B \rfloor$  trimmed models,  $k_\gamma \in \{0, 1, \dots, \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor\}$ , the nominator of the surplus becomes the respective probability where the number  $K$  is replaced by  $k_\gamma + (B - \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor)K/B$  resp.  $2k_\gamma + B - \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor K/B$  in the upper interval bounds in Thm. 4.3 and Cor. 4.2.*

**Proof.** *Since the number of aggregated models decreases from  $B$  to  $B - \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor$ ,  $K$  has to be multiplied by  $(B - \lfloor \gamma B \rfloor)/B$  in order to take the increasing effect of the individual non-trimmed models into account. The only missing feature is the number  $k_\gamma$  of contaminated trimmed models which increases the allowed number of sufficiently contaminated resamples by  $k_\gamma$ . In the mentioned special cases in Thm. 4.3 and Cor. 4.2, one has to account for the factor 0.5 before the Gaussian bracket.*  $\square$

**Example 5.1.** *Let, for the threshold-based Stability Selection,  $\max_j(\hat{\pi}_j^+) - \pi_{thr} = 0.2$  and let  $B = 100$ . Then, in Thm. 4.1, the Stability Selection does break down if at least  $\lceil 100 \cdot 0.2 \rceil = 20$  models have broken down. If  $\gamma = 0.2$  so that 20 models are trimmed and if  $k_\gamma = 20$ , there are 20 broken models allowed due to trimming and additional  $\lceil 80 \cdot 0.2 \rceil - 1 = 15$  models due to the inherit robustness of the Stability Selection, requiring 36 broken models for a breakdown. Note that for  $k_\gamma = 0$ , i.e., only good models are trimmed, the number of sufficiently contaminated resamples*

for a breakdown decreases from initially 20 to 16 which would be the price for trimming good models away.

**Remark 5.1.** *Another robustness gain could be achieved by putting more mass on “good” instances during resampling. This idea has been proposed for FRB in Salibián-Barrera et al. [2008] who propose to apply a robust MM-estimator first in order to detect bad leverage points which are downweighted during their updating scheme. A similar approach can be very beneficial for TrimStabSel by applying such a robust model selection algorithm first on the whole data set when assuming case-wise contamination resp. a cell-wise robust model selection algorithm like the Sparse Shooting S from Bottmer et al. [2021] so that suspicious instances can be identified and downweighted in the resampling procedure.*

We did not consider multivariate responses in Alg. ???. The reason is that it depends on the question whether one aims at finding one stable model that relates the whole response matrix to the predictor matrix or one stable model for each response column separately. In the former case, provided that one had a suitable algorithm for multivariate responses, the Stability Selection can be performed as usual. In the latter case, one may perform the Stability Selection as usual for each response column or tries to extract a unified model from the individual models for which an initial idea has been outlined in Werner [2019].

### 5.3 Post robust model selection robustification

Even if we have performed a doubly-robustified Stability Selection by combining TrimStabSel with a robust internal model selection algorithm, the data analysis task is not finished since the Stability Selection outputs nothing but a set of stable variables. The standard way to proceed from here is to compute, for example, a linear regression model or some simple classification model based on all training instances but only on the stable predictor set. This is evidently an inappropriate strategy if the data is potentially contaminated.

Therefore, depending on the contamination model assumption, one would compute the final model by applying a robust algorithm on the reduced data set. The positive side effect of the stable model selection is the sparseness of the model, i.e., even a robust model will be computed very quickly. Note that the variable selection has already been fully done during the Stability Selection, so the coefficient estimation is done by a standard algorithm that does not perform variable selection again, in a regression context this may be LTS or some cell-wise robust algorithm.

## 6 Simulation study

We investigate both the impact of replacing cells in relevant columns with zeroes as well as the performance of our TrimStabSel in contrast to a traditional Stability Selection when the data are contaminated.

We consider 15 scenarios that differ by  $n$ ,  $p$ , the fraction of outlying cells and the signal to noise ratio (SNR). In all scenarios, there are  $s^0 = 5$  relevant variables and the corresponding components of the coefficient  $\beta$  are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}(4, 1)$ -distributed. The columns of the regressor matrix are i.i.d.  $\mathcal{N}_n(5_n, I_n)$ -distributed where  $5_n$  denotes the vector of length  $n$  where each component has the value 5 and where  $I_n$  denotes the identity matrix of dimension  $n \times n$ . The

responses are computed by  $Y = X\beta + \epsilon$  with  $\epsilon \sim \mathcal{N}_n(0, \sigma^2)$  where  $\sigma^2$  is set so that a specific signal to noise ratio is valid. As for the **outlier configuration**, we fix a number  $\tilde{m} \leq n$  and randomly select  $\tilde{m}$  rows of the regressor matrix so that in each of the selected rows, the value in the cells corresponding to the five relevant variables are replaced by zero (of course, after computing  $Y$ ). In all scenarios, we apply the traditional Stability Selection and three variants of TrimStabSel with the parameters given in Table 1. The stable model is always derived rank-based with  $q = 5$ . We append an a), b) or c) to the scenario number for an SNR of 5, 2 or 1, respectively. The details for the scenarios are as listed in Table 1.

Scenario	$p$	$n$	$\tilde{m}$	$n_{sub}$	StabSel	TrimStabSel					
					$B$	$B$	$\gamma$	$B$	$\gamma$	$B$	$\gamma$
1	25	50	2	25	100	100	0.5	100	0.75	100	0.9
2	50	100	2	50	100	100	0.5	100	0.75	100	0.9
3	50	100	5	50	100	100	0.75	100	0.9	1000	0.95
4	200	200	20	100	100	100	0.5	100	0.75	1000	0.9
5	500	200	10	100	100	100	0.75	1000	0.95	1000	0.99

Table 1: Scenario specification

All experiments are based on 1000 independent data sets. We evaluate the performance of the Stability Selection variants by computing the mean number of correctly recovered predictors (i.e., the TPR), the number of cases where the whole true model has been identified (TPR=1) and the number of cases where no relevant variable has been identified (TPR=0). The TPR for scenarios 1 to 3 are reported in Fig. 1, the TPR for scenarios 4 and 5 in Fig. 2. See Table 2 for details.




Figure 1: Mean TPR for scenarios 1 to 3; “Trim  $k$ ” represents the first, second resp. third specification for TrimStabSel in Table 1,  $k = 1, 2, 3$




Figure 2: Mean TPR for scenarios 4 and 5; “Trim  $k$ ” represents the first, second resp. third specification for TrimStabSel in Table 1,  $k = 1, 2, 3$

Scen.	Mean TPR				Cases with TPR=1				Cases with TPR=0			
	SS	T1	T2	T3	SS	T1	T2	T3	SS	T1	T2	T3
1a	2.042	3.476	<b>4.591</b>	4.492	2	119	<b>630</b>	531	23	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
1b	1.731	2.809	<b>3.541</b>	3.521	0	21	<b>137</b>	130	61	6	4	<b>2</b>
1c	1.470	2.081	<b>2.487</b>	2.421	0	1	11	<b>14</b>	102	24	<b>15</b>	31
2a	2.912	4.031	<b>4.906</b>	4.887	17	298	<b>908</b>	889	3	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2b	2.563	3.573	<b>4.559</b>	4.540	5	123	<b>596</b>	577	9	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
2c	2.192	2.938	3.476	<b>3.536</b>	1	8	103	<b>124</b>	18	3	<b>0</b>	1
3a	1.638	2.174	2.709	<b>4.126</b>	0	2	42	<b>355</b>	57	23	13	<b>0</b>
3b	1.376	1.767	2.262	<b>3.474</b>	0	0	19	<b>108</b>	99	46	38	<b>0</b>
3c	1.176	1.414	1.620	<b>2.131</b>	0	0	1	<b>5</b>	164	117	92	<b>25</b>
4a	1.116	1.113	1.124	<b>1.205</b>	0	0	0	0	149	145	153	<b>129</b>
4b	0.916	0.968	0.938	<b>1.016</b>	0	0	0	0	227	222	240	<b>191</b>
4c	0.723	0.718	<b>0.754</b>	0.750	0	0	0	0	374	383	<b>364</b>	376
5a	1.816	1.968	2.280	<b>2.421</b>	0	0	0	<b>4</b>	25	17	9	<b>7</b>
5b	1.598	1.712	1.976	<b>2.070</b>	0	0	1	<b>2</b>	47	36	<b>20</b>	30
5c	1.294	1.328	<b>1.478</b>	1.466	0	0	0	0	124	123	<b>93</b>	108

Table 2: Scenario specification; “SS” abbreviates the standard Stability Selection, “T1”, “T2” and “T3” the three specifications of the Trimmed Stability Selection

The results in Fig. 1 show that our TrimStabSel reliably improves the mean number of detected relevant variables, in some cases even drastically. One can observe that the benefit decreases for decreasing signal to noise ratios which is not surprising since a low SNR makes it more difficult

to detect the model. In scenarios 1 and 2, it turns out that trimming too many models away generally slightly decreases the performance of TrimStabSel in comparison with a TrimStabSel that trims less models away. However, scenario 3 reveals that increasing the number  $B$  of resamples and trimming away a high percentage of them again improves the performance. We believe that this is due to two reasons, namely that the more resamples one has, the more different data configurations can be observed in the resamples and secondly, that the number of non-trimmed models increases as well, maintaining the stability of the stable model.

Table 2 reveals that the best performances, measured in either the mean TPR, the number of cases where the whole model has been detected or the number of cases where none of the relevant variables have been detected, are always achieved by one of our TrimStabSel configurations. In addition, there are only a few scenarios where any of our TrimStabSel configurations resulted in a worse performance than the standard Stability Selection, but the worsening is always insignificant.

Summarizing, the experiments have shown that our TrimStabSel indeed has the potential to robustify model selection. One has to keep in mind that the rate of outlying cells is extremely low in all scenarios, ranging from 50/100200 in scenario 5 to 10/1300 in scenario 1, revealing the alarming fact that such a low contamination rate can already severely mislead the Stability Selection if they are targetedly placed onto the relevant columns. The rate of outlying cells on the relevant columns ranges from 2% in scenario 2 to 10% in scenario 4.

## 7 Conclusion

We intended to unify sparse model selection, robustness and stability. To this end, we started with the introduction of the variable selection breakdown point which is the relative fraction of outlying instances resp. cells that can make variable selection completely meaningless in the sense that no relevant variable will be selected. We tried to make a step towards lifting the understanding of robustness from the rows of a data matrix to the columns and investigated how contamination can affect model selection. Our results seem to be discouraging since a very small number of contaminated cells can, in theory, completely distort variable selection, making a robustification in the usual sense that provides coefficients whose norm is always bounded obsolete if no relevant variable is considered. Our results motivate to consider robustness simultaneously for the coefficients and the actual selected model itself. We further proved that robustness itself has to be carefully defined, especially when facing discrete or bounded spaces, by showing that a wrong robustness notion can lead to meaningless statements where a mean is more robust than a median.

We extended the notion of the resampling breakdown point that quantifies the relative fraction of outlying instances so that the probability that a resample is contaminated too much, depending on the robustness of the applied estimator on the resample, exceeds some threshold. We provided a Stability Selection BDP that essentially combines the variable selection BDP and the resampling BDP and computed it for different scenarios where we postulate different effects of outliers onto model selection due to the absence of concrete results in literature. Our analysis reveals that a Stability Selection where the stable set is given by the best  $q$  variables for a pre-defined  $q$  can be expected to be more robust than the standard threshold-based Stability Selection.

Finally, we propose a Trimmed Stability Selection which considers only the best resamples, based on the in-sample losses, when aggregating the models. A short simulation study reveals the potential of this Trimmed Stability Selection, although it evidently inherits the necessity to find appropriate hyperparameter configurations. The simulations also prove the alarming fragility of variable selection, even for an extremely low number of outlying cells.

Future research is necessary in order to study the potential of outliers for targeted variable promotion or suppression further. We want to emphasize that although our proposed outlier schemes seem to be artificial so that they most probably would not occur by chance, one has to be aware of the attacking paradigm emerging from the deep learning community. There are also situations where models have to be inferred before attacks can be crafted (see e.g. Papernot et al. [2017]). Similarly, one could intercept a data transfer, try to detect relevant variables and suppress them targetedly or try to detect certainly non-relevant variables (for example by Sure Independence Screening, see Fan and Lv [2008]) in order to targetedly promote them.

## Bibliography

- C. Agostinelli, A. Leung, V. J. Yohai, and R. H. Zamar. Robust estimation of multivariate location and scatter in the presence of cellwise and casewise contamination. *Test*, 24(3): 441–461, 2015.
- S. Alelyani, J. Tang, and H. Liu. Feature selection for clustering: a review. *Data clustering: algorithms and applications*, 29(110-121):144, 2013.
- A. Alfons, C. Croux, and S. Gelper. Sparse least trimmed squares regression for analyzing high-dimensional large data sets. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 7(1):226–248, 2013.
- F. Alqallaf, S. Van Aelst, V. J. Yohai, and R. H. Zamar. Propagation of outliers in multivariate data. *The Annals of Statistics*, 37(1):311–331, 2009.
- O. Arslan. Weighted lad-lasso method for robust parameter estimation and variable selection in regression. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 56(6):1952–1965, 2012.
- O. Banerjee, L. E. Ghaoui, and A. d’Aspremont. Model selection through sparse maximum likelihood estimation for multivariate gaussian or binary data. *Journal of Machine learning Research*, 9(Mar):485–516, 2008.
- C. Becker and U. Gather. The masking breakdown point of multivariate outlier identification rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 94(447):947–955, 1999.
- J. R. Berrendero. The bagged median and the bragged mean. *The American Statistician*, 61(4):325–330, 2007.
- L. Bottmer, C. Croux, and I. Wilms. Sparse regression for large data sets with outliers. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2021.
- P. Bühlmann. Boosting for high-dimensional linear models. *The Annals of Statistics*, 34(2): 559–583, 2006.
- P. Bühlmann. Bagging, boosting and ensemble methods. In *Handbook of computational statistics*, pages 985–1022. Springer, 2012.

- P. Bühlmann and T. Hothorn. Boosting algorithms: Regularization, prediction and model fitting. *Statistical Science*, 22(4):477–505, 2007.
- P. Bühlmann and S. Van De Geer. *Statistics for high-dimensional data: Methods, theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- P. Bühlmann and B. Yu. Boosting with the  $L_2$  loss: Regression and Classification. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 98(462):324–339, 2003.
- J. P. Burgard, J. Krause, D. Kreber, and D. Morales. The generalized equivalence of regularization and min–max robustification in linear mixed models. *Statistical Papers*, pages 1–27, 2021.
- L. Camponovo, O. Scaillet, and F. Trojani. Robust subsampling. *Journal of Econometrics*, 167(1):197–210, 2012.
- N. Carlini and D. Wagner. Towards evaluating the robustness of neural networks. In *2017 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 39–57. IEEE, 2017.
- L. Chang, S. Roberts, and A. Welsh. Robust lasso regression using Tukey’s biweight criterion. *Technometrics*, 60(1):36–47, 2018.
- X. Chen, Z. J. Wang, and M. J. McKeown. Asymptotic analysis of the Huberized lasso estimator. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Acoustics Speech and Signal Processing (ICASSP)*,, pages 1898–1901. IEEE, 2010a.
- X. Chen, Z. J. Wang, and M. J. McKeown. Asymptotic analysis of robust lassos in the presence of noise with large variance. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(10):5131–5149, 2010b.
- C. Croux and V. Öllerer. Robust and sparse estimation of the inverse covariance matrix using rank correlation measures. In *Recent Advances in Robust Statistics: Theory and Applications*, pages 35–55. Springer, 2016.
- C. Croux, K. Joossens, and A. Lemmens. Trimmed bagging. *Computational statistics & data analysis*, 52(1):362–368, 2007.
- P. Davies. Aspects of robust linear regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 21(4):1843–1899, 1993.
- P. L. Davies and U. Gather. Breakdown and groups. *The Annals of Statistics*, 33(3):977–1035, 2005.
- D. Donoho and V. Stodden. Breakdown point of model selection when the number of variables exceeds the number of observations. In *The 2006 IEEE international joint conference on neural network proceedings*, pages 1916–1921. IEEE, 2006.
- D. L. Donoho and P. J. Huber. The notion of breakdown point. *A Festschrift for Erich L. Lehmann*, pages 157–184, 1983.
- B. Efron, T. Hastie, I. Johnstone, and R. Tibshirani. Least angle regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(2):407–499, 2004.

- J. Fan and J. Lv. Sure independence screening for ultrahigh dimensional feature space. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(5):849–911, 2008.
- P. Filzmoser, R. Maronna, and M. Werner. Outlier identification in high dimensions. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(3):1694–1711, 2008.
- P. Filzmoser, S. Höppner, I. Ortner, S. Serneels, and T. Verdonck. Cellwise robust M regression. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 147:106944, 2020a.
- P. Filzmoser, S. Serneels, R. Maronna, and C. Croux. Robust multivariate methods in chemometrics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.01617*, 2020b.
- J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. *Biostatistics*, 9(3):432–441, 2008.
- L. A. García-Escudero, D. Rivera-García, A. Mayo-Iscar, and J. Ortega. Cluster analysis with cellwise trimming and applications for the robust clustering of curves. *Information Sciences*, 573:100–124, 2021.
- U. Gather and T. Hilker. A note on Tyler’s modification of the mad for the stahel-donoho estimator. *Annals of statistics*, 25(5):2024–2026, 1997.
- M. Genton. Breakdown-point for spatially and temporally correlated observations. In *Developments in Robust Statistics*, pages 148–159. Springer, 2003.
- M. G. Genton. Spatial breakdown point of variogram estimators. *Mathematical Geology*, 30(7):853–871, 1998.
- M. G. Genton and A. Lucas. Comprehensive definitions of breakdown points for independent and dependent observations. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 65(1):81–94, 2003.
- I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6572*, 2014.
- G. Goren, O. Kurland, M. Tennenholtz, and F. Raiber. Ranking robustness under adversarial document manipulations. In *The 41st International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research & Development in Information Retrieval*, pages 395–404, 2018.
- Y. Grandvalet. Bagging down-weights leverage points. In *Proceedings of the IEEE-INNS-ENNS International Joint Conference on Neural Networks. IJCNN 2000. Neural Computing: New Challenges and Perspectives for the New Millennium*, volume 4, pages 505–510. IEEE, 2000.
- F. Hampel. *Contributions to the theory of robust estimation*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, Calif, USA, 1968.
- F. Hampel, E. Ronchetti, P. Rousseeuw, and W. Stahel. *Robust statistics: The approach based on influence functions*, volume 114. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- F. R. Hampel. A general qualitative definition of robustness. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42(6):1887–1896, 1971.

- C. Hennig. Dissolution point and isolation robustness: robustness criteria for general cluster analysis methods. *Journal of multivariate analysis*, 99(6):1154–1176, 2008.
- B. Hofner and T. Hothorn. *stabs: Stability Selection with Error Control*, 2017. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=stabs>. R package version 0.6-3.
- B. Hofner, A. Mayr, N. Robinzonov, and M. Schmid. Model-based Boosting in R: A Hands-on Tutorial Using the R Package mboost. *Computational Statistics*, 29(1-2):3–35, 2014.
- B. Hofner, L. Boccuto, and M. Göker. Controlling false discoveries in high-dimensional situations: Boosting with stability selection. *BMC Bioinformatics*, 16(1):144, 2015.
- T. Hothorn and P. Bühlmann. Model-based boosting in high dimensions. *Bioinformatics*, 22(22):2828–2829, 2006.
- T. Hothorn, P. Bühlmann, T. Kneib, M. Schmid, and B. Hofner. Model-based boosting 2.0. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Aug):2109–2113, 2010.
- T. Hothorn, P. Bühlmann, T. Kneib, M. Schmid, and B. Hofner. *mboost: Model-Based Boosting*, 2017. URL <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mboost>. R package version 2.8-1.
- P. J. Huber and E. Ronchetti. *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, 2009.
- M. Hubert. The breakdown value of the  $L_1$  estimator in contingency tables. *Statistics & probability letters*, 33(4):419–425, 1997.
- M. Hubert, P. J. Rousseeuw, and S. Van Aelst. High-breakdown robust multivariate methods. *Statistical Science*, pages 92–119, 2008.
- M. Jagielski, A. Oprea, B. Biggio, C. Liu, C. Nita-Rotaru, and B. Li. Manipulating machine learning: Poisoning attacks and countermeasures for regression learning. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy (SP)*, pages 19–35. IEEE, 2018.
- T. Kanamori, T. Takenouchi, S. Eguchi, and N. Murata. The most robust loss function for boosting. In *Neural Information Processing*, pages 496–501. Springer, 2004.
- M. Kohl. *Numerical contributions to the asymptotic theory of robustness*. PhD thesis, University of Bayreuth, 2005.
- H. Lai, Y. Pan, C. Liu, L. Lin, and J. Wu. Sparse learning-to-rank via an efficient primal-dual algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 62(6):1221–1233, 2013.
- L. Laporte, R. Flamary, S. Canu, S. Déjean, and J. Mothe. Nonconvex regularizations for feature selection in ranking with sparse SVM. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 25(6):1118–1130, 2014.
- A. Leung, H. Zhang, and R. Zamar. Robust regression estimation and inference in the presence of cellwise and casewise contamination. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 99:1–11, 2016.
- A. Leung, V. Yohai, and R. Zamar. Multivariate location and scatter matrix estimation under cellwise and casewise contamination. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 111:59–76, 2017.

- F. Li, L. Lai, and S. Cui. On the adversarial robustness of feature selection using LASSO. In *2020 IEEE 30th International Workshop on Machine Learning for Signal Processing (MLSP)*, pages 1–6. IEEE, 2020.
- F. Li, L. Lai, and S. Cui. On the adversarial robustness of LASSO based feature selection. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 69:5555–5567, 2021.
- P.-L. Loh and X. L. Tan. High-dimensional robust precision matrix estimation: Cellwise corruption under  $\epsilon$ -contamination. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 12(1):1429–1467, 2018.
- R. W. Lutz, M. Kalisch, and P. Bühlmann. Robustified  $L_2$  boosting. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(7):3331–3341, 2008.
- J. Machkour, B. Alt, M. Muma, and A. M. Zoubir. The outlier-corrected-data-adaptive lasso: A new robust estimator for the independent contamination model. In *2017 25th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO)*, pages 1649–1653. IEEE, 2017.
- R. A. Maronna, R. D. Martin, V. J. Yohai, and M. Salibián-Barrera. *Robust statistics: theory and methods (with R)*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- N. Meinshausen. Relaxed lasso. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(1):374–393, 2007.
- N. Meinshausen and P. Bühlmann. Stability selection. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 72(4):417–473, 2010.
- S. Nogueira and G. Brown. Measuring the stability of feature selection. In *Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases*, pages 442–457. Springer, 2016.
- S. Nogueira, K. Sechidis, and G. Brown. On the use of spearman’s rho to measure the stability of feature rankings. In *Iberian conference on pattern recognition and image analysis*, pages 381–391. Springer, 2017a.
- S. Nogueira, K. Sechidis, and G. Brown. On the stability of feature selection algorithms. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):6345–6398, 2017b.
- V. Öllerer and C. Croux. Robust high-dimensional precision matrix estimation. In *Modern Nonparametric, Robust and Multivariate Methods*, pages 325–350. Springer, 2015.
- N. Papernot, P. McDaniel, I. Goodfellow, S. Jha, Z. B. Celik, and A. Swami. Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia conference on computer and communications security*, pages 506–519, 2017.
- H. Park, M. Yamada, S. Imoto, and S. Miyano. Robust sample-specific stability selection with effective error control. *Journal of Computational Biology*, 26(3):202–217, 2019.
- M. Y. Park and T. Hastie.  $L_1$ -regularization path algorithm for generalized linear models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 69(4):659–677, 2007.
- C. Qian, Q. Tran-Dinh, S. Fu, C. Zou, and Y. Liu. Robust multicategory support matrix machines. *Mathematical Programming*, 176(1-2):429–463, 2019.

- J. Raymaekers and P. J. Rousseeuw. Handling cellwise outliers by sparse regression and robust covariance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.12446*, 2019.
- H. Rieder. *Robust asymptotic statistics*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1994.
- D. M. Rocke and D. L. Woodruff. Identification of outliers in multivariate data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 91(435):1047–1061, 1996.
- S. Rosset and J. Zhu. Piecewise linear regularized solution paths. *Annals of statistics*, 35(3):1012–1030, 2007.
- P. J. Rousseeuw. Least median of squares regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 79(388):871–880, 1984.
- P. J. Rousseeuw. Multivariate estimation with high breakdown point. *Mathematical Statistics and Applications*, 8(283-297):37, 1985.
- P. J. Rousseeuw and M. Hubert. Robust statistics for outlier detection. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 1(1):73–79, 2011.
- P. J. Rousseeuw and W. Van Den Bossche. Detecting deviating data cells. *Technometrics*, 60(2):135–145, 2018.
- P. Ruckdeschel and N. Horbenko. Yet another breakdown point notion: EFSBP. *Metrika*, 75(8):1025–1047, 2012.
- S. Sakata and H. White. An alternative definition of finite-sample breakdown point with applications to regression model estimators. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 90(431):1099–1106, 1995.
- S. Sakata and H. White. High breakdown point conditional dispersion estimation with application to S & P 500 daily returns volatility. *Econometrica*, pages 529–567, 1998.
- M. Salibián-Barrera. Bootstrapping MM-estimators for linear regression with fixed designs. *Statistics & probability letters*, 76(12):1287–1297, 2006.
- M. Salibián-Barrera and S. Van Aelst. Robust model selection using fast and robust bootstrap. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(12):5121–5135, 2008.
- M. Salibián-Barrera and R. H. Zamar. Bootstrapping robust estimates of regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 30(2):556–582, 2002.
- M. Salibián-Barrera, S. Van Aelst, and G. Willems. Principal components analysis based on multivariate MM estimators with fast and robust bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):1198–1211, 2006.
- M. Salibián-Barrera, S. Van Aelst, and G. Willems. Fast and robust bootstrap. *Statistical Methods and Applications*, 17(1):41–71, 2008.
- A. D. Shieh and Y. S. Hung. Detecting outlier samples in microarray data. *Statistical applications in genetics and molecular biology*, 8(1):1–24, 2009.

- N. Simon, J. Friedman, T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani. A sparse-group lasso. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 22(2):231–245, 2013.
- N. Städler and P. Bühlmann. Missing values: sparse inverse covariance estimation and an extension to sparse regression. *Statistics and Computing*, 22(1):219–235, 2012.
- A. J. Stromberg and D. Ruppert. Breakdown in nonlinear regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 87(420):991–997, 1992.
- J. Su, D. V. Vargas, and K. Sakurai. One pixel attack for fooling deep neural networks. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 23(5):828–841, 2019.
- J. Thomas, A. Mayr, B. Bischl, M. Schmid, A. Smith, and B. Hofner. Gradient boosting for distributional regression: faster tuning and improved variable selection via noncyclical updates. *Statistics and Computing*, 28(3):673–687, 2018.
- Y. Tian, Y. Shi, X. Chen, and W. Chen. AUC maximizing support vector machines with feature selection. *Procedia Computer Science*, 4:1691–1698, 2011.
- R. Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*, 58:267–288, 1994.
- H. S. Uraibi. Weighted lasso subsampling for highdimensional regression. *Electronic Journal of Applied Statistical Analysis*, 12(1):69–84, 2019.
- H. S. Uraibi, H. Midi, and S. Rana. Robust stability best subset selection for autocorrelated data based on robust location and dispersion estimator. *Journal of Probability and Statistics*, 2015, 2015.
- S. Van de Geer. *Estimation and testing under sparsity*. Springer, 2016.
- S. A. Van de Geer. High-dimensional generalized linear models and the lasso. *The Annals of Statistics*, 36(2):614–645, 2008.
- H. Velasco, H. Laniado, M. Toro, V. Leiva, and Y. Lio. Robust three-step regression based on comedian and its performance in cell-wise and case-wise outliers. *Mathematics*, 8(8):1259, 2020.
- M. Vogt. On the differences between  $L_2$ -boosting and the lasso. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.05421*, 2018.
- S. Wang, B. Nan, S. Rosset, and J. Zhu. Random lasso. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5(1):468, 2011.
- T. Werner. *Gradient-Free Gradient Boosting*. PhD thesis, Carl von Ossietzky Universität Oldenburg, 2019.
- T. Werner. Global quantitative robustness of instance ranking problems. *Available on arXiv, arXiv: 2103.07198*, 2021.
- T. Werner and P. Ruckdeschel. The column measure and gradient-free gradient boosting. *Available on arXiv, arXiv: 1909.10960*, 2019.

- D. M. Witten and R. Tibshirani. A framework for feature selection in clustering. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 105(490):713–726, 2010.
- M. Yuan and Y. Lin. Model selection and estimation in regression with grouped variables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 68(1):49–67, 2006.
- A. Zellner. An efficient method of estimating seemingly unrelated regressions and tests for aggregation bias. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 57(298):348–368, 1962.
- C. Zhang, Y. Wu, and M. Zhu. Pruning variable selection ensembles. *Statistical Analysis and Data Mining: The ASA Data Science Journal*, 12(3):168–184, 2019.
- C.-X. Zhang, J.-S. Zhang, and Q.-Y. Yin. A ranking-based strategy to prune variable selection ensembles. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 125:13–25, 2017.
- J. Zhao, G. Yu, and Y. Liu. Assessing robustness of classification using angular breakdown point. *Annals of statistics*, 46(6B):3362, 2018.
- J. Zhou, J. Sun, Y. Liu, J. Hu, and J. Ye. Patient risk prediction model via top-k stability selection. In *Proceedings of the 2013 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 55–63. SIAM, 2013.
- H. Zou. The adaptive lasso and its oracle properties. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101:1418–1429, 2006.