

Fast Computation of Robust Subspace Estimators

Holger Cevallos Valdiviezo^{*†} Stefan Van Aelst[‡]

December 14, 2024

Abstract

Dimension reduction is often an important step in the analysis of high-dimensional data. PCA is a popular technique to find the best low-dimensional approximation of high-dimensional data. However, classical PCA is very sensitive to atypical data. Robust methods to estimate the low-dimensional subspace that best approximates the regular data have been proposed by Maronna (2005). However, for high-dimensional data his algorithms become computationally expensive. Alternative algorithms for the robust subspace estimators are proposed that are better suited to compute the solution for high-dimensional problems. The main ingredients of the new algorithms are twofold. First, the principal directions of the subspace are estimated directly by iterating the estimating equations corresponding to the estimators. Second, to reduce computation time even further five robust deterministic values are proposed to initialize the algorithms instead of using random starting values. It is shown that the new algorithms yield robust solutions and the computation time is largely reduced, especially for high-dimensional data.

Keywords: Deterministic algorithm, High-dimensional data, Least trimmed squares, M-scale, Principal Component Analysis

1 Introduction

Principal component analysis (PCA) is a popular exploratory tool for multivariate data. In particular, PCA is extremely useful to find a low-dimensional representation of high-dimensional data that yields the best possible approximation to the original data. Classical PCA minimizes the squared euclidean distances between the original observations and their orthogonal projections onto the lower dimensional subspace. However, classical PCA is very sensitive to atypical data due to the use of quadratic loss. Therefore, several approaches to robustify PCA have been proposed.

The earliest and easiest approach to robust PCA consists of taking the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of a robust scatter estimator instead of the standard sample covariance matrix (see e.g. Campbell, 1980; Devlin et al., 1981; Naga

^{*}Escuela Superior Politécnica del Litoral, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Matemáticas, Guayaquil, Ecuador

[†]Ghent University, Department of Applied Mathematics, Computer Science and Statistics, Gent, Belgium

[‡]KU Leuven, Department of Mathematics, Section of Statistics, Leuven, Belgium

and Antille, 1990; Croux and Haesbroeck, 2000; Salibián-Barrera et al., 2006). However, this approach cannot be used for high-dimensional data because calculating high-dimensional robust scatter matrices is computationally complex or even infeasible if the sample size is small compared to the dimension. Moreover, while the efficiency of robust scatter estimators increases with dimension this comes at the expense of a loss of robustness. Therefore, Locantore et al. (1999) introduced spherical PCA which uses the covariance matrix of the data projected onto the unit sphere and is fast to compute.

A second approach to robust PCA sequentially looks for univariate directions that maximize a robust estimator of scale and are orthogonal to each other. This robust projection pursuit (PP) approach has been studied by e.g. Li and Chen (1985) and Croux and Ruiz-Gazen (1996, 2005). A combination of PP and robust scatter estimation was proposed by Hubert et al. (2005).

Instead of looking for one direction at a time as in PP, one can seek for a robust lower-dimensional subspace directly (see e.g. Liu et al., 2003; Croux et al., 2003). The Principal Component Pursuit method (PCP) aims to decompose the data matrix into a low-rank component and a gross outlier component (Candés et al., 2011). See e.g. Chiang et al. (2016) and Rahmani and Atia (2017) for related work. However, PCP may fail to detect outliers in the orthogonal complement of the subspace (cfr. Maronna et al., 2015; She et al., 2016). Therefore, She et al. (2016) and Brahma et al. (2018) modified PCP in order to target such outliers as well. However, these methods estimate all directions orthogonal to the subspace which can become computationally intensive for high-dimensional data.

Maronna (2005) proposed to robustly estimate the best lower-dimensional approximation by minimizing either an M-scale or a least trimmed squares (LTS) scale of the Euclidean distances corresponding to the observations. He also characterized the solutions by the orthogonal complement directions and showed that these directions correspond to the eigenvectors associated with the smallest eigenvalues of a weighted covariance matrix. Based on this characterization Maronna (2005) proposed an iterative algorithm to compute the robust subspace estimators. The robustness of these subspace estimators has been widely investigated empirically. See e.g. Maronna (2005); Serneels and Verdonck (2008) and Tharrault et al. (2008) for the M-scale estimator, and Maronna (2005); Engelen et al. (2005) and Croux et al. (2017) for the LTS-scale estimator. Moreover, Croux et al. (2017) also contains a thorough theoretical study of the properties of the estimator based on the LTS scale.

However, in case of a low-dimensional approximation for high-dimensional data Maronna's orthogonal complement algorithm requires to decompose a high dimensional covariance matrix and needs a large number of its eigenvectors to characterize the solution. This makes computing the subspace estimators time consuming or even infeasible in high dimensions. Therefore, we propose an algorithm for the robust subspace estimators of Maronna (2005) that directly calculates principal directions of the low-dimensional subspace.

The main ingredients of our new algorithm are twofold. First, we use the estimating equations corresponding to the estimator to update the principal directions of the subspace iteratively. This approach only requires low-dimensional vector and matrix operations rather than manipulating high-dimensional covariance matrices. Second, instead of using random starting values, similarly to Hubert et al. (2012) we propose five robust deterministic values to initialize the

algorithm. These starting values yield robust fits that are usually close to the sought after robust solution, so that convergence occurs quickly.

The remainder of the manuscript is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the robust subspace estimators based on an M-scale or the LTS-scale. Our definition is equivalent to but different from the definition in Maronna (2005) and better serves our needs for the development of the new algorithm in Section 3. In Section 4 we explain the robust deterministic values to initialize the algorithm. In Section 5 we compare the solutions calculated with the new algorithm to those obtained with the original algorithm by means of an extensive simulation study. We also include other robust subspace estimators in the simulations to compare their robustness properties. In Section 6 we compare all methods in terms of their computation time, while we empirically evaluate the performance of our new algorithm for high-dimensional data in Section 7. Section 8 contains a real data illustration while Section 9 presents our final conclusions.

2 Robust subspace estimators

Consider a data matrix $\mathbf{X} = (\mathbf{x}_1 \dots \mathbf{x}_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times p}$ which contains the measurements of p variables for n observations. The goal is to approximate the n observations \mathbf{x}_i by points $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ that lie in a q -dimensional subspace. That is, $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}) = \mathbf{m} + \mathbf{B}_q \mathbf{a}_i$ for some $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ and orthogonal matrix $\mathbf{B}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$, i.e. $\mathbf{B}_q^T \mathbf{B}_q = \mathbf{I}_q$. Let $\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_p$ denote the rows of \mathbf{B}_q . The Euclidean distance between \mathbf{x}_i and its approximation $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ is denoted by $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}) = d_i = \|\mathbf{r}_i\|$, where $\mathbf{r}_i = \mathbf{x}_i - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$.

Maronna (2005) proposed to robustly estimate the optimal subspace by minimizing a robust scale estimator of the Euclidean distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$. Note that if the nonrobust standard deviation is used, then the estimator minimizes the sum of squared Euclidean distances and thus the classical PCA solution is retrieved. Maronna's estimators are thus robust extensions of classical PCA dimension reduction.

Although the Euclidean distance between each observation \mathbf{x}_i and its projection $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}_i$ onto the q -dimensional subspace is measured in the $p - q$ dimensional orthogonal subspace in Maronna (2005), this is equivalent to our current formulation in the p -dimensional space.

Subspace S-estimator

The subspace S-estimator $(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_S, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_S, \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_S)$ is obtained by minimizing an M-scale of the Euclidean distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$. That is, $(\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_S, \widehat{\mathbf{A}}_S, \widehat{\mathbf{m}}_S)$ is the solution of

$$\min_{\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}} \widehat{\sigma}_M(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})), \quad (1)$$

over all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)^T \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ and orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{B}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$. For any $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$, the corresponding M-scale $\widehat{\sigma}_M(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$ is defined as the solution in s of

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \rho\left(\frac{d_i}{s}\right) = b, \quad (2)$$

where ρ is an even function that is differentiable and nondecreasing on the positive real line with $\rho(0) = 0$ (see e.g. Maronna et al., 2006).

Let $\mathbf{r}_i = (r_{i1}, \dots, r_{ip})$ with $r_{ij} = x_{ij} - m_j - \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{b}_j$, then similarly as in Boente and Salibian-Barrera (2015) we obtain the following first order conditions for the subspace S-estimator by implicitly differentiating the M-scale in (2)

$$\sum_{j=1}^p (x_{ij} - m_j) \mathbf{b}_j = \left(\sum_{j=1}^p \mathbf{b}_j \mathbf{b}_j^T \right) \mathbf{a}_i, 1 \leq i \leq n, \quad (3)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i (x_{ij} - m_j) \mathbf{a}_i = \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{a}_i \mathbf{a}_i^T \right) \mathbf{b}_j, 1 \leq j \leq p, \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i (x_{ij} - \mathbf{a}_i^T \mathbf{b}_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i m_j, 1 \leq j \leq p, \quad (5)$$

with weights

$$w_i \equiv w(d_i) = \rho' \left(\frac{d_i}{\hat{\sigma}_M} \right) \frac{\hat{\sigma}_M}{d_i}. \quad (6)$$

From (3) it can be seen that $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{B}_q^T (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})$. Hence, once \mathbf{B}_q and \mathbf{m} are known, the corresponding scores \mathbf{a}_i of the observations are easily obtained. By combining this result with (5) we can also obtain that $\mathbf{m} = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{x}_i / (\sum_{i=1}^n w_i)$. Note that if we put $w_i = 1$ for all observations, then the solution of these equations becomes the classical PCA solution. Finally, by combining the estimating equations it can also be derived that the subspace S-estimators $(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_S, \hat{\mathbf{m}}_S)$ satisfy the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})^T \mathbf{B} = \mathbf{B} \Lambda \quad (7)$$

where $\Lambda = \mathbf{B}^T \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})^T \mathbf{B}$. From (7) it follows that the columns of $\hat{\mathbf{B}}_S$ correspond to the first q eigenvectors of the weighted covariance matrix

$$\mathbf{C}(\hat{\mathbf{m}}_S, \hat{\mathbf{B}}_S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i (\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_S)(\mathbf{x}_i - \hat{\mathbf{m}}_S)^T, \quad (8)$$

which coincides with expression (9) of Maronna (2005).

Subspace LTS-estimator

The subspace LTS-estimator $(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{LTS}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{LTS}, \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{LTS})$ is obtained by minimizing the LTS-scale of the Euclidean distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$. That is, $(\hat{\mathbf{B}}_{LTS}, \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{LTS}, \hat{\mathbf{m}}_{LTS})$ is a solution of

$$\min_{\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}} \hat{\sigma}_{LTS}(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})), \quad (9)$$

over all $\mathbf{m} \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\mathbf{A}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times q}$ and orthogonal matrices $\mathbf{B}_q \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times q}$. For any $\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}) = (d_1, d_2, \dots, d_n)$, the corresponding LTS scale is defined as

$$\hat{\sigma}_{LTS}^2(\mathbf{d}) = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{i=1}^h d_{(i:n)}^2 \quad (10)$$

where $d_{(1:n)} \leq \dots \leq d_{(n:n)}$ are the ordered Euclidean distances and $h = n - \lfloor n\alpha \rfloor$, $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. A fraction α of the observations is not taken into account when calculating the LTS estimator and thus α determines the robustness of the estimator.

Similarly as in Maronna (2005) it can be shown that the LTS solution satisfies the estimating equations (3)-(5) with weights now given by

$$w_i \equiv w(d_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } d_i \leq d_{(h:n)} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

With these weights the LTS estimator also satisfies (7) and (8) which again coincides with the expression in Maronna (2005).

3 The algorithm

Maronna (2005) characterizes a q -dimensional subspace by an equation $\mathbf{B}_{p-q}^T \mathbf{x} = \mathbf{a}$ with $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^{p-q}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{p-q} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-q)}$ an orthogonal matrix. His algorithm can be summarized by the following steps. First, 50 random orthogonal matrices \mathbf{B}_{p-q} are generated to initialize the algorithm. The corresponding optimal value of \mathbf{a} that minimizes the robust scale can then be calculated easily. A few iterative improvement steps are then applied to each of these starting values. In each iteration the weights w_i of the observations corresponding to the current solution are updated. Based on the updated weights, a new solution is then obtained by calculating the smallest $p - q$ eigenvectors of the weighted covariance matrix in (8). After two iterations, the 10 best solutions are selected and these are iterated further until convergence (with a maximum of 10 iterations).

If p is large and the subspace dimension q is small, Maronna's algorithm requires the storage of a high-dimensional covariance matrix and the calculation of a large number (namely, $p - q$) of its eigenvectors which becomes computationally demanding. To improve the computation time and reduce the memory load, we instead propose to directly calculate the q basis directions of the subspace by iterating the estimating equations (3)-(5). Extensive experiments have shown that iterating the estimating equations only a few times suffices to obtain close approximations to the first eigenvectors of the weighted covariance matrix in (8). Note that our iterations of the estimating equations only require operations with q -dimensional vectors and matrices and thus will be more suitable for high-dimensional settings.

Algorithm 1 contains a detailed description of the main part of our modified algorithm in pseudo-code. The algorithm requires initial values of \mathbf{B}_q and \mathbf{m} as input. It also depends on tuning parameters N_1 , N_2 , N_3 and tol . tol specifies the precision with which the solution is calculated. The tuning parameters N_1 and N_2 play the same role as in Maronna's original algorithm. That is, for each initial orthogonal matrix \mathbf{B}_q first N_1 iterations are performed to improve the corresponding estimates of the location \mathbf{m} and the scores matrix \mathbf{A}_q while keeping \mathbf{B}_q fixed. In the next N_2 iterations, the estimates of all three quantities \mathbf{B}_q , \mathbf{m} and \mathbf{A}_q are updated. Since these updates are now calculated by iterating the estimating equations (3)-(5), an additional tuning parameter N_3 specifies how often these estimating equations are iterated. Using a similar proof as in Maronna (2005), it can easily be shown that either the M-scale $\hat{\sigma}_M$ or LTS

scale $\hat{\sigma}_{\text{LTS}}$ decrease in each iteration of our algorithm. Moreover, our algorithm yields the same solution as Maronna's algorithm if both algorithms start from the same initial \mathbf{B}_q and the same location estimate \mathbf{m} .

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for the subspace S and LTS estimators

1. Set $it \leftarrow 1$.
 - a. Compute $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)^T$ with $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{B}_q^T(\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
 - b. Compute distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
 - c. Compute $\hat{\sigma}_0 = \hat{\sigma}_M(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$ or $\hat{\sigma}_0 = \hat{\sigma}_{\text{LTS}}(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$.
 2. Do until $it = N_1 + N_2$ or $\Delta \leq \text{tol}$.
 - a. Compute w_i from (6) or (11) and update $\mathbf{m} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \mathbf{x}_i}{\sum_{i=1}^n w_i}$.
 - b. If $it > N_1$:
 - (1) Set $iter \leftarrow 1$ and $s_0^2 \leftarrow \hat{\sigma}_0^2$.
 - (2) Do until $iter = N_3$ or $\tilde{\Delta} \leq \text{tol}$.
 - i. Compute $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)^T$, $\mathbf{B}_q = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_p)^T$ and \mathbf{m} from (3)-(5).
 - ii. Compute distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
 - iii. Compute $s = \hat{\sigma}_M(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$ or $s = \hat{\sigma}_{\text{LTS}}(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$.
 - iv. Set $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$, $\tilde{\Delta} \leftarrow 1 - s^2/s_0^2$ and $s_0^2 \leftarrow s^2$.
 - (3) End do.
 - c. Compute $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_n)^T$ using (3) and update distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, n$.
 - d. Compute $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}_M(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$ or $\hat{\sigma} = \hat{\sigma}_{\text{LTS}}(\mathbf{d}(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m}))$.
 - e. Set $\Delta \leftarrow 1 - \hat{\sigma}^2/\hat{\sigma}_0^2$ and $\hat{\sigma}_0^2 \leftarrow \hat{\sigma}^2$.
 - f. Set $it \leftarrow it + 1$.
 3. End do.
-

For the subspace S-estimator we have used the popular Tukey biweight loss function $\rho(y) = \min(3y^2 - 3y^4 + y^6, 1)$ to calculate the M-scales. Two standard choices for the tuning parameters are $c = 1.54764, b = 0.5$ which yields the maximal breakdown point (BDP) of 50% and $c = 3, b = 0.2426$ which yields a better compromise between efficiency and robustness (breakdown point $\approx 25\%$). For the subspace LTS estimator the trimming fraction α determines the breakdown point. The most common choices are $\alpha = 0.5$ (50% BDP) and $\alpha = 0.25$ (25% BDP). See Maronna (2005) for more details on the breakdown point.

4 Starting values

It is well-known that the objective functions in (1) and (9) are nonconvex and thus may have several local minima. Not all of these minima correspond to robust solutions. A standard approach is to aim for the global minimum in (1) or (9) by generating many starting values. The solution that corresponds to the smallest value of the objective function that is reached by iterating these starting values is then the approximation for the global optimum (see e.g. Rousseeuw and Driessen, 1999; Salibián-Barrera and Yohai, 2006). In Maronna's algorithm 50 random initial orthogonal matrices \mathbf{B}_q are generated while the initial esti-

mate for the location \mathbf{m} is the coordinatewise median of the data. Each of these starting values is iterated $N_1 = 3$ times with \mathbf{B}_q fixed, followed by $N_2 = 2$ iterations to improve the estimates of \mathbf{B}_q , \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{m} together. Then, the 10 best solutions (with the lowest scale) are selected and these are iterated further until convergence ($tol = 0.001$) with a maximum of $N_2' = 10$ iterations. Extensive experiments by Maronna (2005) revealed that the algorithm shows good performance with these choices for the tuning parameters. Following Maronna (2005) we denote the solutions obtained with his algorithm by S-M when the M-scale is minimized and by S-L when the LTS scale is minimized.

Empirical comparisons have confirmed that if we use the same starting values for our new algorithm as well as the same settings for the tuning parameters, then we also obtain the same solutions as Maronna's algorithm. Note that our algorithm requires the additional tuning parameter N_3 which determines the number of iterations to calculate the updated estimates by iterating the estimating equations (3)-(5). Extensive experiments showed that it suffices to use $N_3 = 3$ iterations to obtain good approximations that yield stable results. Note that while Maronna's algorithm uses the fast-to-compute coordinatewise median as starting value for \mathbf{m} , we prefer to use as default the orthogonal invariant spatial median which can also be computed efficiently (Vardi and Zhang, 2000). Moreover, we generate random orthogonal matrices \mathbf{B}_q as starting values by the method of Stewart (1980) which consists of orthogonalizing a matrix of normal random numbers while Maronna (2005) instead orthogonalizes a matrix of uniform random numbers. When the M-scale is used, we denote the solutions of our algorithm by subS which stands for subspace S-estimator and by subLTS when the LTS scale is used.

While our adaptation of Maronna's algorithm is indeed faster for high-dimensional data (see results in the next section), the computation time remains considerable because a sufficient number of random starting values is needed to obtain a robust solution. While the default setting is to use a fixed number of 50 random orthogonal matrices as starting values, it is clear that the search space increases dramatically with increasing dimension. Hence, it can be expected that for high-dimensional data (many) more random starting values may be needed to find a stable robust solution. Many algorithms for robust estimators encounter the same issue. To address this issue for the calculation of the minimum covariance determinant (MCD) estimator of multivariate location and scatter in high dimensions, Hubert et al. (2012) introduced a deterministic MCD algorithm (see also Hubert et al., 2015). The main idea is to replace the random starting values by a few well-chosen robust starting values. These robust starting values should be fast to compute while at the same time they are expected to lie close to a robust minimum of the objective function, which in our case is given by (1) or (9). Hence, instead of exploring the whole parameter space to find the optimum, a few robust starting values should point us to that part of the parameter space where robust solutions can be found. Since convergence from the robust starting values to their closest local minimum is generally fast as well, this results in an algorithm with a much lower computation time which allows us to handle problems in higher dimensions.

For the deterministic version of our algorithm, we could use as starting values for \mathbf{B}_q the q largest eigenvectors corresponding to the robust starting values for the p -dimensional scatter matrix proposed by Hubert et al. (2012). However, we want to avoid having to calculate p -dimensional scatter matrices which may

be unstable for large p and consumes a lot of memory. Therefore, inspired by Hubert et al. (2012) we propose five robust starting values for \mathbf{B}_q which are obtained by the following procedure:

Step 1. Robustly standardize each variable X_j by subtracting its median and dividing by its Q_n scale estimate (Rousseeuw and Croux, 1993). Let $\mathbf{z}_1, \dots, \mathbf{z}_n$ denote the standardized observations and Z_1, \dots, Z_p the standardized variables.

Step 2. Consider the following transformations of the standardized data which aim to reduce the effect of potential outliers.

- 1) Hyperbolic tangent (sigmoid) transformation: Let $H_j = \tanh(Z_j)$, $j = 1, \dots, p$ and set $\mathbf{U}_1 = (H_1, \dots, H_p)$.
- 2) Rank transformation: Let R_j be the vector of ranks of column Z_j , $j = 1, \dots, p$. Set $\mathbf{U}_2 = (R_1, \dots, R_p)$.
- 3) Normal scores: Compute normal scores from the ranks R_j : $T_j = \Phi^{-1}[(R_j - 1/3)/(n + 1/3)]$, where $\Phi(\cdot)$ is the normal cumulative distribution function. Set $\mathbf{U}_3 = (T_1, \dots, T_p)$.
- 4) Spatial signs: Let $\mathbf{s}_i = \mathbf{z}_i / \|\mathbf{z}_i\|$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Set $\mathbf{U}_4 = (\mathbf{s}_1, \dots, \mathbf{s}_n)^T$.

Robustly standardize the columns of each of the matrices U_k , $k = 1, \dots, 4$ obtained above by subtracting their median and dividing by their Q_n scale estimate.

Step 3. For the standardized data matrix obtained in step 1 and the 4 transformed data matrices obtained from Step 2, select the $l = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ rows with smallest Euclidean norm. For $k = 1, \dots, 5$, let $\mathcal{I}_k \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ denote the indices of the selected rows.

Step 4. Set $\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k = \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{I}_k}$ for $k = 1, \dots, 5$. For each of these five reduced data matrices, calculate the classical q -dimensional PCA subspace using Algorithm 2 with $\mathbf{Y} = \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_k$. The resulting estimates of \mathbf{B}_q and \mathbf{m} are the starting values for Algorithm 1.

The first three steps of the procedure aim to identify subsets of the data with only regular observations. The last step then calculates the classical PCA subspace corresponding to each of the obtained subsets of the data matrix to obtain promising starting values for Algorithm 1. Note that Algorithm 2 calculates the q -dimensional PCA subspace without performing singular value decomposition of a high-dimensional matrix, but only requires operations with q -dimensional vectors and matrices. Similarly as for orthogonal starting values, each of these five starting values is iterated $N_2 = 2$ times to improve the estimates of \mathbf{B}_q , \mathbf{a} and \mathbf{m} . Then, the best solution (with the lowest scale) is selected and iterated further until convergence ($tol = 0.001$) with a maximum of $N'_2 = 10$ iterations. We denote our algorithm with deterministic starting values by detS when the M-scale is minimized and by detLTS when the LTS scale is minimized.

Algorithm 2 PCA subspace algorithm

1. Set $\mathbf{B}_q = (\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_q)$, i.e. the canonical basis, and $\mathbf{m} = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l \mathbf{y}_i$
 2. Compute $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l)^\top$ with $\mathbf{a}_i = \mathbf{B}_q^\top (\mathbf{y}_i - \mathbf{m})$.
 3. Compute distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, l$.
 4. Set $iter \leftarrow 1$ and compute $\hat{s}_0^2 = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l d_i^2$.
 5. Do until $iter = N_3$ or $\tilde{\Delta} \leq tol$
 - i. Compute $\mathbf{A}_q = (\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_l)^\top$, $\mathbf{B}_q = (\mathbf{b}_1, \dots, \mathbf{b}_p)^\top$ and \mathbf{m} from (3)-(5) with weights $w_i = 1$, $i = 1, \dots, l$.
 - ii. Compute distances $d_i(\mathbf{B}_q, \mathbf{A}_q, \mathbf{m})$, $i = 1, \dots, l$.
 - iii. Compute $\hat{s}^2 = \frac{1}{l} \sum_{i=1}^l d_i^2$.
 - iv. Set $iter \leftarrow iter + 1$, $\tilde{\Delta} \leftarrow 1 - \hat{s}^2 / \hat{s}_0^2$ and $\hat{s}_0^2 \leftarrow \hat{s}^2$.
 6. End do.
-

5 Performance comparison

To compare our new algorithms to Maronna's original algorithms, we start by repeating the simulations of Maronna (2005). We use our algorithms with random orthogonal matrices as starting values as well as with deterministic starting values. For the simulations we choose the tuning parameters for the M-scale and LTS scale that yield the maximal breakdown point.

Two alternative methods for robust principal components analysis that obtain a low-dimensional approximation to high-dimensional data in a computationally efficient way are projection pursuit (PP) (Li and Chen, 1985) and Spherical PCA (SPC) (Locantore et al., 1999). For robust PP we use the algorithm of Croux and Ruiz-Gazen (1996, 2005) and maximize the LTS scale with $\alpha = 0.5$. This PPLTS estimator can thus be considered a competitor for the LTS subspace estimator. Note that PP based on the M-scale was already considered in Maronna (2005).

Following Maronna (2005) we generated $M = 200$ samples of size $n = 100$ and dimension $p = 10$. The regular observations are generated according to $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{\Sigma})$ with $\mathbf{\Sigma} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_p)$ where the following two designs are considered for the diagonal elements.

- a) An abrupt increase of the eigenvalues: $\lambda_j = 1 + 0.1j$ for $1 \leq j \leq (p - q)$ and $\lambda_j = 20(1 + 0.5(j - p + q))$ for $(p - q + 1) \leq j \leq p$.
- b) A smooth increase of the eigenvalues: $\lambda_j = 2^{j-1}$ for $1 \leq j \leq p$.

A fraction $\epsilon = 0\%$, 10% or 20% of outlying observations is generated from $N(k\mathbf{x}_0, 0.25\mathbf{\Sigma})$, where \mathbf{x}_0 is a vector of length p with $x_{0j} = 1$ for $j \leq (p - q)$ and 0 otherwise. The value of k runs between 0 and 20 with steps of 0.5. All methods are applied for $q = 2$, so the best two-dimensional linear subspace approximation is estimated.

To compare the methods we measure their prediction performance as in Maronna (2005). Hence, we measure the proportion of variance in independent regular data that remains unexplained by their approximation according to the

estimated subspace. More formally, let \mathbf{x} be a $N(\mathbf{0}, \boldsymbol{\Sigma})$ vector independent of the random sample used to obtain $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q$. Then, the variability of \mathbf{x} around the subspace generated by $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q$ equals

$$E\|\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q^T \mathbf{x}\|^2 = \text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}] - \text{tr}[\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q],$$

and the prediction proportion of unexplained variance is given by

$$u_q^{\text{pred}} = \frac{E\|\mathbf{x} - \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q^T \mathbf{x}\|^2}{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}]} = 1 - \frac{\text{tr}[\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_q]}{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}]}. \quad (12)$$

Since Maronna's algorithms characterize the subspace by an estimate $\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{p-q} \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times (p-q)}$ of its orthogonal complement, the corresponding prediction proportion of unexplained variability in this case becomes:

$$u_q^{\text{pred}} = \frac{\text{tr}[\widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{p-q}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \widehat{\mathbf{B}}_{p-q}]}{\text{tr}[\boldsymbol{\Sigma}]}. \quad (13)$$

Comparing this prediction error with the optimal value, given by

$$u_q^{\text{opt}} = \frac{\sum_{j=q+1}^p \lambda_j}{\sum_{j=1}^p \lambda_j}, \quad (14)$$

yields the relative prediction error

$$e_{\text{pred}} = \frac{u_q^{\text{pred}}}{u_q^{\text{opt}}} - 1. \quad (15)$$

When the subspace dimension q is unknown, it is often selected based on an estimate \widehat{u}_q of the proportion of unexplained variability. To measure the accuracy of this estimate Maronna (2005) proposed to use the relative estimation error, given by

$$e_{\text{est}} = \max\left(\frac{\widehat{u}_q}{u_q^{\text{pred}}}, \frac{u_q^{\text{pred}}}{\widehat{u}_q}\right) - 1.$$

Since PPLTS and spherical PCA yield eigenvalue estimates $\widehat{\lambda}_j$, $j = 1, \dots, p$, the estimator

$$\widehat{u}_q = \frac{\sum_{j=q+1}^p \widehat{\lambda}_j}{\sum_{j=1}^p \widehat{\lambda}_j},$$


can be used for these methods. For the robust subspace estimators, Maronna (2005) proposed the estimator

$$\widehat{u}_q = \frac{\widehat{\sigma}_q^2}{\widehat{\sigma}_0^2}. \quad (16)$$

where $\widehat{\sigma}_q$ is the minimal scale in (1) or (9), respectively. $\widehat{\sigma}_0$ is the corresponding minimal scale that is obtained for $q = p$ and thus yields a robust estimate of the total variability in the data.

Table 1: Mean of relative prediction errors: \bar{e}_{pred} .

Design ϵ	k	SPC	S-M	subS	detS	PPLTS	S-L	subLTS	detLTS	
a)	0%	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.32	0.07	0.07	0.06	
	10%	1.0	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.41	0.10	0.11	0.08
		3.0	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.72	0.07	0.07	0.06
		6.0	0.05	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.93	0.07	0.07	0.07
	20%	1.5	0.09	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.78	1.18	0.96	0.29
		2.0	0.15	0.03	0.03	0.03	1.34	1.31	0.84	0.07
		3.0	0.44	0.17	0.03	0.03	1.86	0.11	0.11	0.06
		3.5	0.57	0.11	0.03	0.03	1.92	0.09	0.08	0.06
	4.5	0.77	0.03	0.03	0.03	1.80	0.07	0.07	0.06	
	b)	0%	0.05	0.04	0.04	0.04	0.27	0.14	0.14	0.11
10%		1.0	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.07	0.34	0.23	0.22	0.18
		1.5	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.40	0.24	0.20	0.14
		2.0	0.16	0.10	0.09	0.07	0.46	0.15	0.16	0.12
		4.0	0.19	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.49	0.11	0.12	0.11
		5.0	0.20	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.45	0.11	0.11	0.11
20%		1.5	0.46	0.45	0.44	0.37	0.67	0.71	0.70	0.57
		2.0	0.55	0.67	0.66	0.38	0.78	0.75	0.74	0.35
		3.0	0.60	0.71	0.71	0.27	0.73	0.49	0.44	0.15
		3.5	0.61	0.71	0.70	0.18	0.68	0.24	0.19	0.12
	5.0	0.62	0.69	0.69	0.07	0.57	0.11	0.11	0.11	

**Figure 1:** Mean relative unexplained variance (\bar{e}_{pred}) corresponding to the estimated 2 dimensional subspace as a function of k for eigenvalue configuration a) and $\epsilon = 20\%$.

We present the results of the simulations as in Maronna (2005). Table 1 shows the mean of the relative prediction errors over $M = 200$ samples. The values of k included in Table 1 are those values at which some estimator attains its maximal error. Standard errors are not shown because they were small (below 0.08) in all cases. For $\epsilon = 20\%$ of contamination, Figures 1 and 2 show the mean relative prediction errors as a function of k . From $k = 10$ onwards these prediction errors stabilize so we only show results up to $k = 10$. From these results it can be seen that the estimates of our new subS and




Figure 2: Mean relative unexplained variance (\bar{e}_{pred}) corresponding to the estimated 2 dimensional subspace as a function of k for eigenvalue configuration b) and $\epsilon = 20\%$.

subLTS algorithms are very similar to the results of Maronna’s S-M and S-L algorithms, as expected. Moreover, these results clearly show that the detS and detLTS algorithms often succeed in obtaining more robust estimates than their counterparts based on random starts. The advantage of using robust starting values is most pronounced when the outliers are at a small to moderate distance of the majority ($k \leq 6$) as can be seen from Figures 1 and 2.

Looking at the robust competitors, we can see that PPLTS turns out to be inefficient for $\epsilon = 0\%$, similarly as for the PP methods considered by Maronna (2005). Moreover, also for contaminated data PPLTS gives worse results in these settings. Spherical PCA is generally better than PPLTS but its performance decreases considerably for $\epsilon = 20\%$


Table 2 contains the maxima over k of the relative estimation error e_{est} averaged over the $M = 200$ samples. Moreover, Figure 3 shows the average relative estimation error as a function of the outlier distance k for design b) with $\epsilon = 20\%$. The results for the other scenarios are pretty similar. Since the S-M and S-L results were very similar to the subS and subLTS results, respectively, we only show results of the latter in Figure 3. From Table 2 and Figure 3 it can be seen that detS and PPLTS both estimate their proportion of unexplained variance u_q^{pred} very well, even when outliers are close to the regular data. The detLTS algorithm also performs quite well. The algorithms with deterministic starting values do not only have a lower prediction error, but generally they also estimate the amount of unexplained variance more accurately than their counterparts based on random starts in these settings.

6 Computation time

The previous section showed that the subS/subLTS algorithms yield similar estimates as the original S-M/S-L algorithms and the detS/detLTS often yield even better results. We now compare the computation times of these algorithms. For this purpose we generalize the data generating model in design a) of the previous section. More specifically, we generate clean data from the p -dimensional normal

Table 2: Maxima over k of mean estimation errors \bar{e}_{est} .

Design	ϵ	SPC	S-M	subS	detS	PPLTS	S-L	subLTS	detLTS
a)	0%	0.17	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.35	0.35	0.36
	10%	0.19	0.29	0.29	0.29	0.19	0.50	0.50	0.53
	20%	0.31	0.59	0.59	0.59	0.29	0.68	0.60	0.57
b)	0%	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.15	0.28	0.29	0.25
	10%	0.17	0.12	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.31	0.30	0.26
	20%	0.60	1.17	1.16	0.40	0.41	1.17	1.16	0.64

**Figure 3:** Mean estimation error \bar{e}_{est} as a function of k for eigenvalue configuration b) and $\epsilon = 20\%$.

distribution with center zero and diagonal covariance matrix. The eigenvalues on the diagonal are set equal to

$$\lambda_j = \begin{cases} 1 + c_{p,q} j & \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq (p - q), \\ 20(1 + 0.5(j - p + q)) & \text{for } (p - q + 1) \leq j \leq p. \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

The constant $c_{p,q}$ is chosen such that the q main directions explain about 80% of the total variability. We consider sample sizes $n = 1000$ or 5000 with dimension $p = 10, 500, 1000$ and $q = 2, 5$. The data contains $\epsilon = 20\%$ of contamination, generated as explained in the previous section.

All algorithms are implemented in R (R Core Team, 2016). For S-M and S-L we use the R function `eigen()` to calculate the smallest $p - q$ eigenvectors of the weighted covariance matrix in (8). This function uses LAPACK (Anderson, E. et al., 1999) routines which are written in FORTRAN. Alternatives such as the R function `svd()` for instance could be used, but the speed difference is generally small. To allow a fair comparison of computation times between these algorithms and our new algorithms, for our algorithms we implemented the iterative updating of the estimates based on the estimating equations (3)-(5) in C++, using R package `RcppArmadillo` (Eddelbuettel and Sanderson, 2014). For spherical PCA we use the function `PcaLocantore()` in R package `rrcov` (Todorov and Filzmoser, 2009). The algorithms were run on a single Intel i7 CPU (3.4GHz) machine running Windows 7.

Table 3 shows the computation time of the algorithms in seconds, averaged over $M = 50$ replications. Not surprisingly, we see that spherical PCA is the

Table 3: Computation times in seconds

		$n = 1000$			$n = 5000$		
p		10	500	1000	10	500	1000
$q = 2$	SPC	0.04	1.34	4.19	0.16	5.67	21.59
	S-M	2.47	121.55	567.92	39.78	1178.71	3195.05
	subS	0.61	25.32	154.42	3.06	57.18	250.19
	detS	0.18	4.33	8.71	0.99	23.19	48.12
	PPLTS	5.75	25.91	52.97	142.07	703.32	1372.31
	S-L	0.60	95.46	502.53	2.66	288.50	1383.55
	subLTS	0.90	24.70	152.38	4.90	52.32	243.24
	detLTS	0.26	3.92	7.99	1.29	21.61	45.03
$q = 5$	SPC	0.04	1.34	4.21	0.18	5.74	22.01
	S-M	2.33	119.93	569.61	35.00	1170.10	3206.02
	subS	0.94	28.70	161.39	4.63	74.42	281.46
	detS	0.29	5.22	10.65	1.51	28.48	58.64
	PPLTS	14.61	64.40	122.36	356.52	1774.19	3385.82
	S-L	0.58	95.11	507.15	2.68	300.09	1369.12
	subLTS	1.70	28.80	161.07	9.25	75.68	282.14
	detLTS	0.44	4.82	9.72	2.23	26.91	54.22

fastest to compute because it does not require any iterative process (see also Maronna, 2005; Wilcox, 2008). For $n = 1000$ and $q = 2$ projection-pursuit is relatively fast to compute regardless of the dimension of the data, as can be seen from Table 3. However, the computation time grows quickly with increasing subspace dimension (case $q = 5$) and/or sample size (case $n = 5000$). The computation time of Maronna’s algorithms is reasonable for low dimensional data, but increases quickly when the dimension grows. This result was expected because these algorithms need to compute a large number ($p - q$) of eigenvectors of a high-dimensional covariance matrix which is very time-consuming. Clearly, our implementations of the new algorithms with random starting values are faster than Maronna’s original algorithms, but computation time still increases quickly with growing dimension. The new algorithms with deterministic starting values are even faster and their computation time increases much slower when the dimension grows. Hence, these results indicate that the algorithms with deterministic starting values do not only show good performance but also are computationally attractive. They make it possible to compute robust estimates for a larger scale of problems.

7 Performance for high dimensional data

In the previous section we have shown that the detS and detLTS algorithms allow to compute the subspace estimators for high-dimensional data. We now

investigate whether their good performance for low-dimensional data as seen in Section 5 also carries over to the high-dimensional setting. To this end we consider the model of the previous section with eigenvalues according to (17) for $q = 2$ or $q = 5$, and $\epsilon = 20\%$ of contamination generated as in Section 5. We let k range between 0 and 20 as before and generated data of size $n = 1000$ in dimension $p = 1000$ or $p = 10000$.

Figure 4 shows the mean relative prediction errors, averaged over $M = 200$ samples, of detS, detLTS, SPC and PPLTS when $p = 1000$. Relative prediction errors again stabilized from $k = 10$ onwards, so we only present results up to $k = 10$. We can see that in high-dimensional settings detS and detLTS behave similar as for low-dimensional data and clearly perform better than both SPC and PPLTS. Figure 5 shows that detS and detLTS keep their excellent performance when the dimension is increased further to $p = 10000$. Here, we do not make a comparison with PPLTS and SPC anymore because these methods require excessive computation time for this setting.




Figure 4: Mean relative prediction errors \bar{e}_{pred} for the case $n = 1000$ and $p = 1000$ with $q = 2$ subspace estimation (left panel) and $q = 5$ subspace estimation (right panel). In both cases the level of contamination is $\epsilon = 20\%$.

8 Real data examples

We illustrate our algorithms on two real high-dimensional datasets with $p \gg n$. In the first example, we consider chemometrics data with moderate dimension p so that the algorithms with both random and deterministic starting values can be applied. In the second example, we consider image data where the dimension p is large so that only the detS and detLTS algorithms can be applied in a reasonable amount of time.

Octane data

The Octane dataset, introduced in Hubert et al. (2005), consists of near-infrared (NIR) absorbance spectra of $n = 39$ gasoline samples with certain octane numbers over $p = 226$ wavelengths. Hence, this is a high-dimensional dataset with




Figure 5: Mean relative prediction errors \bar{e}_{pred} for the case $n = 1000$ and $p = 10000$ with $q = 2$ subspace estimation (left panel) and $q = 5$ subspace estimation (right panel). In both cases the level of contamination is $\epsilon = 20\%$.

$p \gg n$. It is well known that six of the samples contain added alcohol, which makes them potential outliers. These are observations 25, 26, and 36-39. With $q = 2$ components classical PCA explains 98% of the total variability while the considered robust methods explain more than 96% of the total variability. Hence, we retain a 2 dimensional subspace.

To identify outliers in PCA with high-dimensional data Hubert et al. (2005) introduced a diagnostic plot. It plots (robust) orthogonal distances from the observations to the estimated subspace versus (robust) score distances of the projected observations in the subspace with respect to their center. Next to regular observations, three types of outliers can be identified in such a diagnostic plot. An observation with small orthogonal distance to the subspace but far from the regular data within the subspace, i.e. with large score distance, is called a *good leverage point* or *score outlier*. Moreover, an observation is called an *orthogonal outlier* if it lies far from the subspace, but its projection on the subspace is close to the regular data. The worst types of outliers are the so called *bad leverage points*, which are observations that lie far from the subspace and have projections that are also remote from the majority in the subspace. Cutoff values for both the robust orthogonal distances and the robust score distances allow to identify outlying observations. To compute the robust score distances robust estimates for the variances according to the basis directions within the estimated subspace are required. Our algorithms yield the basis directions of the subspace and corresponding scores, but do not yield estimates of the variability in these directions, so we estimate these variances robustly using univariate LTS or M-scales of the scores corresponding to these directions.

Figure 6 shows the diagnostic plots corresponding to six different estimates of the best $q = 2$ dimensional representation of the data. The six considered methods are classical PCA (LS), projection pursuit with LTS scale (PPLTS), subLTS/detLTS (both with $\alpha = 0.5$) and subS/detS (both with $c = 1.5$ and $b = 0.5$). We focus on the six alcohol samples which are potential outliers. The classical diagnostic plot in the upper left corner of Figure 6 shows that classical PCA only identifies observation 26 as mildly outlying. This observation only




Figure 6: Diagnostic plots of the Octane dataset based on six two-dimensional PCA estimates.

falls just above the cutoff lines which suggests that the six alcohol samples do not deviate from the other observations. On the other hand, the diagnostic plots for the five robust methods show a completely different picture. All these methods identify the six samples with added alcohol as outliers. In particular, PPLTS identifies observations 25, 36, 37, 39 as orthogonal outliers while only observations 26 and 38 are flagged as bad leverage points. Moreover, subLTS, detLTS, subS and detS all flag the six samples with added alcohol as bad leverage points, which corresponds to the conclusions of Hubert et al. (2005).

Image data

We now consider a Face Recognition example based on vectorized images from which we obtain a high-dimensional dataset. We use the Extended Yale Face Database B (Georghiades et al., 2001; Lee et al., 2005) which contains aligned grayscale face images of 38 subjects under the same frontal pose and 64 different illumination conditions. This database contains cropped face images which have resolution 192×168 ($=32256$) pixels each. For the analysis we randomly sampled 11 subjects and selected for each subject the 6 images with the highest illumination contrasts, so that the face characteristics are clearly identifiable. In particular, we used the images with the following codes for light conditions: "P00A+000E+00.pgm", "P00A+010E-20.pgm", "P00A-010E-20.pgm", "P00A+000E-20.pgm", "P00A-005E-10.pgm" and "P00A+005E-10.pgm". Similarly to Rahmani and Atia (2017), next to these 66 face images we also sampled 9 non-face images from the Caltech 101 database (Fei-Fei et al., 2007) which constitute potential outliers. Hence, 12% of the observations in the dataset are contamination. The Caltech 101 database contains 9144 color and grayscale images from 102 object categories that includes vehicles, plants, animals and cartoon characters. We only considered grayscale images with a height of at least 192 pixels and a width of at least 168 pixels. We randomly sampled 9 object images from this subset and cropped the sampled images to 192 pixel height and 168 pixel width when necessary. Combining the vectorized face and object images resulted in 75 observations in $p = 192 \times 168 = 32256$ dimensions. The last 9 observations (rows 67-75 in the data matrix) correspond to the object images. Figure 7 displays a random subset of the face images while Figure 8 displays the 9 object images in the data matrix. We estimate the $q = 2$ dimensional subspace which explains about 80% of the robustly estimated total variability.

Figure 9 shows the diagnostic plots corresponding to the solutions obtained by the detLTS and detS algorithms. In both cases the 9 object images are clearly flagged as outliers with respect to the estimated 2-dimensional subspace. Objects 67 (wheelchair), 68 (car side), 71 (Joshua tree), 73 (car side) and 75 (ketch) are flagged as orthogonal outliers, while objects 69 (Stegosaurus), 70 (umbrella), 72 (crab) and 74 (google background) are flagged as bad leverage points. This example thus illustrates that also in very high-dimensional settings our deterministic algorithms are able to robustly estimate a low-dimensional subspace that best represents the regular observations.




Figure 7: Random subset of the face images in the image data example.




Figure 8: Object images in the image data example.




Figure 9: Diagnostic plots for the detLTS algorithm (left-hand side panel) and for the detS algorithm (right-hand side panel) to do Face Recognition with samples from the Extended Yale Face Database B and Caltech 101 database.

9 Conclusions

We proposed new algorithms for the robust subspace estimation methods proposed by Maronna (2005). These algorithms directly estimate principal directions of the subspace, which makes them more suitable for high-dimensional problems. For the starting values of the algorithm we considered random orthogonal matrices, as well as five deterministic starting values. These well-chosen deterministic starting values can be computed fast in high-dimensional settings because they avoid the need to calculate a high-dimensional scatter matrix. Our experiments show that the deterministic algorithms yield results that are as good or better than the results for the algorithms with random starting values, while having a much lower computation time. Moreover, the deterministic algorithms are also able to accurately estimate the amount of unexplained variability of the model and their excellent performance carries over to high-dimensional settings. On multi-core machines the computation time can be reduced further by calculating each of the five starting solutions in parallel on different cores. Implementations of our algorithms in R (R Core Team, 2016) are available from the website <http://wis.kuleuven.be/stat/robust/software>.

Acknowledgments

The research by Van Aelst was supported by the Internal Funds KU Leuven under Grant C16-15-068.

References

- Anderson, E. et al. (1999). *LAPACK Users' Guide. Third Edition*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, Philadelphia, USA.
- Boente, G. and Salibian-Barrera, M. (2015). S-estimators for functional principal component analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 110(511):1100–1111, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2014.946991>.
- Brahma, P. P., She, Y., Li, S., Li, J., and Wu, D. (2018). Reinforced robust principal component pursuit. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, PP(99):1–14.
- Campbell, N. A. (1980). Robust procedures in multivariate analysis i: Robust covariance estimation. *Applied Statistics*, 29:231–237.
- Candés, E. J., Li, X., Ma, Y., and Wright, J. (2011). Robust principal component analysis? *J. ACM*, 58(3):11:1–11:37.
- Chiang, K.-Y., Hsieh, C.-J., and Dhillon, I. S. (2016). Robust principal component analysis with side information. In *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*.
- Croux, C., Filzmoser, P., Pison, G., and Rousseeuw, P. J. (2003). Fitting multiplicative models by robust alternating regressions. *Statistics and Computing*, 13(1):23–36.

- Croux, C., García-Escudero, L. A., Gordaliza, A., Ruwet, C., and Martín, R. S. (2017). Robust principal component analysis based on trimming around affine subspaces. *Statistica Sinica*, 27(3):1437–1459.
- Croux, C. and Haesbroeck, G. (2000). Principal component analysis based on robust estimators of the covariance or correlation matrix: influence functions and efficiencies. *Biometrika*, 87:603–618.
- Croux, C. and Ruiz-Gazen, A. (1996). A fast algorithm for robust principal components based on projection pursuit. In Prat, A., editor, *COMPSTAT: Proceedings in Computational Statistics 12th Symposium held in Barcelona, Spain, 1996*, pages 211–216, Heidelberg. Physica-Verlag HD.
- Croux, C. and Ruiz-Gazen, A. (2005). High breakdown estimators for principal components: The projection-pursuit approach revisited. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 95:206–226.
- Devlin, S. J., Gnanadesikan, R., and Kettenring, J. R. (1981). Robust Estimation of Dispersion Matrices and Principal Components. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 76(374):354–362.
- Eddelbuettel, D. and Sanderson, C. (2014). Rcpparmadillo: Accelerating r with high-performance c++ linear algebra. *Computational Statistics and Data Analysis*, 71:1054–1063.
- Engelen, S., Hubert, M., and Vanden Branden, K. (2005). A Comparison of Three Procedures for Robust PCA in High Dimensions. *Austrian Journal of Statistics*, 34:117–126.
- Fei-Fei, L., Fergus, R., and Perona, P. (2007). Learning generative visual models from few training examples: An incremental bayesian approach tested on 101 object categories. *Comput. Vis. Image Underst.*, 106(1):59–70.
- Georgiades, A. S., Belhumeur, P. N., and Kriegman, D. J. (2001). From few to many: illumination cone models for face recognition under variable lighting and pose. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 23(6):643–660.
- Hubert, M., Rousseeuw, P., Vanpaemel, D., and Verdonck, T. (2015). The dets and detmm estimators for multivariate location and scatter. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 81:64 – 75.
- Hubert, M., Rousseeuw, P. J., and Vanden Branden, K. (2005). ROBPCA: A New Approach to Robust Principal Component Analysis. *Technometrics*, 47:64–79.
- Hubert, M., Rousseeuw, P. J., and Verdonck, T. (2012). A deterministic algorithm for robust location and scatter. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 21:618–637.
- Lee, K.-C., Ho, J., and Kriegman, D. J. (2005). Acquiring linear subspaces for face recognition under variable lighting. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 27(5):684–698.

- Li, G. and Chen, Z. (1985). Projection-pursuit approach to robust dispersion matrices and principal components: primary theory and Monte Carlo. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80:759–766.
- Liu, L., Hawkins, D. M., Ghosh, S., and Young, S. S. (2003). Robust singular value decomposition analysis of microarray data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100:13167–72.
- Locantore, N., Marron, J. S., Simpson, D. G., Tripoli, N., Zhang, J. T., and Cohen, K. L. (1999). Robust principal component analysis for functional data. *Test*, 8(1):1–73.
- Maronna, R. A. (2005). Principal Components and Orthogonal Regression Based on Robust Scales. *Technometrics*, 47:264–273.
- Maronna, R. A., Martin, R. D., and Yohai, V. J. (2006). *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods*. Wiley.
- Maronna, R. A., Méndez, F., and Yohai, V. J. (2015). Robust nonlinear principal components. *Statistics and Computing*, 25(2):439–448.
- Naga, R. A. and Antille, G. (1990). Stability of robust and non-robust principal components analysis. *Comput. Stat. Data Anal.*, 10(2):169–174.
- R Core Team (2016). *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- Rahmani, M. and Atia, G. K. (2017). Coherence pursuit: Fast, simple, and robust principal component analysis. *IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing*, 65(23):6260–6275.
- Rousseeuw, P. J. and Croux, C. (1993). Alternatives to the Median Absolute Deviation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 88:1273–1283.
- Rousseeuw, P. J. and Driessen, K. V. (1999). A fast algorithm for the minimum covariance determinant estimator. *Technometrics*, 41(3):212–223.
- Salibián-Barrera, M., Aelst, S. V., and Willems, G. (2006). Principal components analysis based on multivariate MM estimators with fast and robust bootstrap. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(475):1198–1211, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1198/016214506000000096>.
- Salibián-Barrera, M. and Yohai, V. J. (2006). A Fast Algorithm for S-Regression Estimates. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 15:414–427.
- Serneels, S. and Verdonck, T. (2008). Principal component analysis for data containing outliers and missing elements. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 52(3):1712 – 1727.
- She, Y., Li, S., and Wu, D. (2016). Robust Orthogonal Complement Principal Component Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(514):763–771.
- Stewart, G. W. (1980). The efficient generation of random orthogonal matrices with an application to condition estimators. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 17(3):403–409.

- Tharrault, Y., Mourot, G., and Ragot, J. (2008). Fault detection and isolation with robust principal component analysis. In *2008 16th Mediterranean Conference on Control and Automation*, pages 59–64.
- Todorov, V. and Filzmoser, P. (2009). An object-oriented framework for robust multivariate analysis. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 32(3):1–47.
- Vardi, Y. and Zhang, C.-H. (2000). The multivariate l1-median and associated data depth. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 97(4):1423–1426, <http://www.pnas.org/content/97/4/1423.full.pdf>.
- Wilcox, R. R. (2008). Robust principal components: A generalized variance perspective. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40:102–108.