

Robust Coreset for Continuous-and-Bounded Learning (with Outliers)

Zixiu Wang^{1*} Yiwen Guo² Hu Ding¹

¹School of Computer Science and Technology,
University of Science and Technology of China

²ByteDance AI Lab

Abstract

In this big data era, we often confront large-scale data in many machine learning tasks. A common approach for dealing with large-scale data is to build a small summary, *e.g.*, coreset, that can efficiently represent the original input. However, real-world datasets usually contain outliers and most existing coreset construction methods are not resilient against outliers (in particular, the outliers can be located arbitrarily in the space by an adversarial attacker). In this paper, we propose a novel robust coreset method for the *continuous-and-bounded learning* problem (with outliers) which includes a broad range of popular optimization objectives in machine learning, like logistic regression and *k*-means clustering. Moreover, our robust coreset can be efficiently maintained in fully-dynamic environment. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first robust and fully-dynamic coreset construction method for these optimization problems. We also conduct the experiments to evaluate the effectiveness of our robust coreset in practice.

1 Introduction

As the rapid increasing of data volume in this big data era, we often need to develop low-complexity (*e.g.*, linear or even sublinear) algorithms for machine learning tasks. Moreover, our dataset is often maintained in a dynamic environment so that we have to consider some more complicated issues like data insertion and deletion. For example, as mentioned in the recent article [GGVZ19], Ginart *et al.* discussed the scenario that some sensitive training data has to be deleted due to the reason of privacy preserving. Obviously, it is prohibitive to re-train our model when the training data is changed dynamically, if the data size is extremely large. To remedy these issues, a natural way is to construct a small-sized summary of the training data so that we can run existing algorithm on the summary rather than the whole data. **Coreset** [Fel20], which was originally studied in the community of computational geometry [AHV04], has become a widely used data summary for large-scale machine learning. As a succinct data compression technique, coreset also enjoys a number of other nice properties. For instance, coreset is usually composable thus can be applied in the environment like distributed computing [IMMM14]. Also, small coreset can be obtained for the streaming algorithms [AHV04, BS80] and the fully-dynamic algorithms in the dynamic setting with data insertion and deletion [HK20].

However, the existing coreset construction methods are still far from being satisfactory in practice. A major bottleneck is that most of them are sensitive to outliers. We are aware that real-world dataset is usually noise and may contain outliers; note that the outliers can be located arbitrarily in the space and even one outlier can significantly destroy the

*wzx2014@mail.ustc.edu.cn

final machine learning result. A typical example is poisoning attack, where an adversarial attacker may inject several specially crafted samples into the training data which can make the decision boundary severely deviate and cause unexpected misclassification [BR18]. To see why the existing coresets methods are sensitive to outliers, we can take the popular sampling based coreset framework [FL11] as an example. The framework needs to compute a “sensitivity” for each data item, which measures the importance degree of the data item to the whole data set; however, it tends to assign high sensitivities to the points who are far from the majority of the data, that is, an outlier is likely to have a high sensitivity and thus has a high chance to be selected to the coreset. Obviously, the coreset obtained by this way is not appropriate since we expect to contain more inliers rather than outliers in the coreset. It is also more challenging to further construct a fully-dynamic robust coreset. The existing robust coreset construction methods [FL11, HJLW18] often rely on simple uniform sampling and are efficient only when the number of outliers is a constant factor of the input size (we will discuss this issue in Section 3.1). Note that other outlier-resistant data summary methods like [GKL⁺17, CAZ18] usually yield large approximation factors and are unlikely to be maintained in a fully dynamic scenario, to our knowledge.

1.1 Our Contributions

In this paper, we propose a **unified fully-dynamic robust coreset framework** for a class of optimization problems which is termed *continuous-and-bounded learning*. This type of learning problems actually covers a broad range of optimization objectives in machine learning [SSBD14, Chapter 12.2.2]. Roughly speaking, “continuous-and bounded learning” requires that the optimization objective is a continuous function (*e.g.*, smooth or Lipschitz), and meanwhile the solution is restricted within a bounded region. We emphasize that this “bounded” assumption actually is quite natural in real machine learning scenarios. We can consider the unsupervised optimization problem, *facility location*, as an example. Suppose we are going to build a supermarket in a city. Though there are many available candidate locations in the city, we often restrict our choice within some specific districts due to some other practical factors. Moreover, it is also reasonable to bound the solution range in a dynamic environment because one single update (insertion or deletion) is not quite likely to dramatically change the solution.

Our coreset construction is a novel hybrid framework. First, we suppose that there exists an ordinary coreset construction method \mathcal{A} for the given continuous-and bounded optimization objective (without considering outliers). We partition the input data into two parts: the “suspected” inliers and the “suspected” outliers, where the ratio of the sizes of these two parts is a carefully designed parameter λ . For the “suspected” inliers, we run the method \mathcal{A} (as a black box); for the “suspected” outliers, we directly take a small sample uniformly at random; finally, we prove that these two parts together yield a robust coreset. Our framework can be also efficiently implemented under the merge-and-reduce framework for dynamical setting (even though the original merge-and-reduce framework is not designed for the case with outliers) [BS80, HM04]. A cute feature of our framework is that we can easily tune the parameter λ for updating our coreset dynamically, if the fraction of outliers is changed in the dynamic environment.

The other contribution of this paper is that we propose two different coreset construction methods for continuous-and-bounded optimization objectives (*i.e.*, the aforementioned black box \mathcal{A}). The first method is based on the importance sampling framework [FL11], and the second one is based on a space partition idea. Our coreset sizes depend on the doubling dimension of the solution space rather than the VC (shattering) dimension (this property is particularly useful if the VC dimension is too high or not easy to obtain). Our methods can be applied for a broad range of widely studied optimization objectives, such as logistic regression [MSSW18], Bregman clustering [BMDG05] and truth discovery [LGM⁺15]. It is worth noting that although some coreset construction methods have been proposed for some of these continuous-and-bounded objectives (like [MSSW18, TF18, LBK16]), they are all problem-dependent and we are the first, to the best of our knowledge, to study them from a unified perspective.

2 Preliminaries

Suppose \mathcal{P} is the parameter space. In this paper, we consider the learning problem whose objective function is the weighted sum of the cost over the training data, *i.e.*,

$$f(\theta, X) := \sum_{x \in X} w(x)f(\theta, x), \quad (1)$$

where X is the input data and $w(x) \geq 0$ indicates weight of each data item x ; $f(\theta, x)$ is the cost contributed by x with the parameter vector $\theta \in \mathcal{P}$. The goal is to find an appropriate θ so that objective function $f(\theta, X)$ is minimized. Assuming that there are $z \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ outliers in X , we then define the objective function with z outliers:

$$f_z(\theta, X) := \min_{O \subset X, |O|=z} f(\theta, X \setminus O).$$

We use (X, z) to denote a given instance X with z outliers. Actually, the above definition comes from the popular “trimming” method [RL87] that has been widely used for robust optimization problems. Several other notations used throughout this paper is shown in Table 1. We always assume $|X| = n$ if the data items are unit-weighted; otherwise, we assume the total weight $\llbracket X \rrbracket = n$.

Table 1: List of Notations

$ Y $	the number of data items in a set Y
$\llbracket Y \rrbracket$	the total weight of the data items in Y
$\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) := \frac{f(\theta, X)}{\llbracket X \rrbracket}$	the average form of $f(\theta, X)$
$\mathbb{f}_z(\theta, X) := \frac{1}{\llbracket X \rrbracket - z} f_z(\theta, X)$	the average form of $f_z(\theta, X)$

We further impose some reasonable assumption to the function $f(\theta, x)$. Let \mathcal{D} be a metric space. A function $g : \mathcal{D} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is α -Lipschitz continuous if for any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, $|g(\theta_1) - g(\theta_2)| \leq \alpha \|\Delta\theta\|$, where $\Delta\theta = \theta_1 - \theta_2$ and $\|\cdot\|$ is some specified norm in \mathcal{D} . A differentiable (*resp.*, twice-differentiable) function $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is α -Lipschitz continuous gradient (*resp.*, α -Lipschitz continuous Hessian) if its gradient (*resp.*, Hessian matrix) ∇g (*resp.*, $\nabla^2 g$) is α -Lipschitz continuous. An α -Lipschitz continuous gradient function is also called α -smooth. For any $\theta_1, \theta_2 \in \mathcal{D}$, the α -Lipschitz continuous gradient and α -Lipschitz continuous Hessian also imply the bounds of the difference between $g(\theta_1)$ and $g(\theta_2)$, which are

$$|g(\theta_1) - g(\theta_2) - \langle \nabla g(\theta_2), \Delta\theta \rangle| \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\theta\|^2, \quad (2)$$

$$|g(\theta_1) - g(\theta_2) - \langle \nabla g(\theta_2), \Delta\theta \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \nabla^2 g(\theta_2) \Delta\theta, \Delta\theta \rangle| \leq \frac{\alpha}{6} \|\Delta\theta\|^3. \quad (3)$$

Below we show the formal definition of the continuous-bounded learning problem.

Definition 1 (Continuous-and-Bounded Learning [Zin03, SSSS09, SSBD14]). *Let $\alpha, \ell > 0$. A learning problem is called Lipschitz-and-bounded with the parameters α, ℓ if the following two conditions hold:*

1. *There exists a fixed parameter vector $\tilde{\theta}$ such that θ is always restricted within \mathcal{B} , the ball centered at $\tilde{\theta}$ with radius ℓ in the parameter space \mathcal{P} .*
2. *For each $x \in X$, the loss function $f(\cdot, x)$ is α -Lipschitz.*

Similarly, we can define the smooth-and-bounded and Lipschitz Hessian-and-bounded learning problems. In general, we call all these three problems “continuous-and-bounded learning”.

As mentioned in Section 1.1, many practical optimization objectives fall under the umbrella of the continuous-and-bound learning problems.

We also define the coresot for continuous-and-bounded learning problems below. We assume each $x \in X$ has unit weight (*i.e.*, $w(x) = 1$), and it is not hard to extend our method to weighted case.

Definition 2 (ε -coreset and (ε, ν) -coreset). Let $\varepsilon, \nu > 0$. Given a dataset X and the objective function $f(\theta, X)$, we say that a weighted set C is an ε -coreset of X if for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\theta, X). \quad (4)$$

The set C is called an (ε, ν) -coreset if for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon(\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) + \nu). \quad (5)$$

Remark 1. The purpose for proposing the (ε, ν) -coreset is that we will use it as a bridge to achieve an ε -coreset in our analysis. Actually it is not difficult to see the relation between ε -coreset and (ε, ν) -coreset. Suppose $\varepsilon' = \min\{\varepsilon\pi/2\nu, \varepsilon/2\}$, where $\pi = \inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$. Then an (ε', ν) -coreset should be an ε -coreset as well, because $\varepsilon'(\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) + \nu)$ is no larger than $\varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$ for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$.

Following Definition 2, we define the corresponding *robust coreset* which was introduced in [FL11, HJLW18] before.

Definition 3 (robust coreset). Let $\varepsilon, \nu > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$. Given the dataset X and the objective function $f(\theta, x)$, we say that a weighted dataset C is a (β, ε) -robust coreset of X if for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1+\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{|X| - z} \leq \frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{|C| - z} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{|X| - z}. \quad (6)$$

The set C is called an $(\beta, \varepsilon, \nu)$ -robust coreset if for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$,

$$(1 - \varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1+\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{|X| - z} - \varepsilon\nu \leq \frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{|C| - z} \leq (1 + \varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{|X| - z} + \varepsilon\nu \quad (7)$$

For the case without outliers, it is not difficult to see that the optimal solution of the ε -coreset is a $(1 + 3\varepsilon)$ -approximate solution of the full data. Specifically, let θ_C^* be the optimal solution of an ε -coreset and θ_X^* be the optimal solution of the original dataset X ; then for $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$, we have

$$f(\theta_C^*, X) \leq (1 + 3\varepsilon)f(\theta_X^*, X). \quad (8)$$

But when considering outliers, this result only holds for $(0, \varepsilon)$ -robust coreset (*i.e.*, $\beta = 0$). If $\beta > 0$, we can derive a weaker result.

Lemma 2. Given two parameters $0 < \varepsilon < 1/3$ and $0 \leq \beta < 1/2$, suppose C is a (β, ε) -robust coreset of X with $(1 + 2\beta)z$ outliers. Let θ_C^* be the optimal solution of $(C, (1 + 2\beta)z)$, θ_X^* be the optimal solution of (X, z) respectively. Then we have

$$f_{(1+4\beta)z}(\theta_C^*, X) \leq (1 + 3\varepsilon)f_z(\theta_X^*, X) \quad (9)$$

Proof. For $\beta \in [0, 1/2)$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/3)$, we have $1 + 4\beta \geq (1 + 2\beta)(1 + \beta)$, $(1 + 2\beta)(1 - \beta) \geq 1$ and $\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} < 1 + 3\varepsilon$. Thus we can obtain the following bound:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(1+4\beta)z}(\theta_C^*, X) &\leq f_{(1+2\beta)(1+\beta)z}(\theta_C^*, X) \leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f_{(1+2\beta)z}(\theta_C^*, C) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} f_{(1+2\beta)z}(\theta_X^*, C) \leq \frac{1+\varepsilon}{1-\varepsilon} f_{(1+2\beta)(1-\beta)z}(\theta_X^*, X) \\ &\leq (1 + 3\varepsilon)f_z(\theta_X^*, X) \end{aligned}$$

□

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 3, we introduce our robust coreset framework and show how to realize it in a fully-dynamic environment. In Section 4, we propose two different ordinary coreset (without outliers) construction methods for continuous-and-bound learning problems, which can be used as the black box in our robust coreset framework of Section 3.

3 Our Robust Coreset Framework

As the warm-up, we first consider the simple uniform sampling as the robust coreset in Section 3.1. Then, we introduce our major contribution, the hybrid framework for robust coreset construction and its fully-dynamic realization in Section 3.2 and 3.3 respectively.

3.1 Warm-Up: Uniform Sampling

As mentioned before, the existing robust coreset construction methods [FL11, HJLW18] are based on uniform sampling. Note that their methods are only for the clustering problems (*e.g.*, k -means/median clustering). Thus a natural question is that whether the uniform sampling idea also works for the general continuous-and-bounded optimization problems studied in this paper. Below, we answer this question in the affirmative.

Definition 4 (f -induced range space). *Suppose \mathcal{X} is an arbitrary metric space. Given the cost function $f(\theta, x)$ as (1) over \mathcal{X} , we let*

$$\mathfrak{R} = \left\{ \{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(\theta, x) \leq \ell\} \mid \forall \ell \geq 0, \forall \theta \in \mathcal{P} \right\}, \quad (10)$$

then $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{R})$ is called the f -induced range space.

The following “ δ -sample” concept comes from the theory of VC dimension [LLS01]. Given a range space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{R})$, let C and X be two finite subsets of \mathcal{X} . Suppose $\delta \in (0, 1)$. We say C is a δ -sample of X if $C \subseteq X$ and $\left| \frac{|X \cap R|}{|X|} - \frac{|C \cap R|}{|C|} \right| \leq \delta$ for any $R \in \mathfrak{R}$. Denote by vc dim the VC dimension of the range space of Definition 4, then we can achieve a δ -sample with probability $1 - \eta$ by uniformly sampling $O(\frac{1}{\delta^2}(\text{vc dim} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}))$ points from X [LLS01]. The value of vc dim depends on the function “ f ”. For example, if “ f ” is the loss function of logistic regression in \mathbb{R}^d , then vc dim can be as large as $\Theta(d)$ [MSSW18]. The following theorem shows that a δ -sample can serve as a robust coreset when z is a constant factor of n .

Theorem 1. *Let X be an instance of the continuous-and-bounded learning problem (2). If C is a δ -sample of X in the f -induced range space. Then we have*

$$f_{z+\delta n}(\theta, X) \leq f_z(\theta, C) \leq f_{z-\delta n}(\theta, X) \quad (11)$$

for any $\theta \in \mathcal{P}$ and any $\delta \in (0, z/n]$. In particular, if $\delta = \beta z/n$, C is a $(\beta, 0)$ -robust coreset of X .

Proof. Let A and B be two subsets of \mathcal{X} and we assume that they are δ -approximate, where the range space is induced by $f(\theta, x)$. Let $|A| = a$, $|B| = b$ and $O = ab$. We create a new weighted set A' by setting the weight of each element in A to be b ; it can be simply thought as making b copies of each element in A . Similarly, we create B' that each point has weight a . Then we have $\llbracket A' \rrbracket = \llbracket B' \rrbracket = O$.

We arrange elements in Y in the order of $f(\theta, y)$ and use y_i to denote the i -th element. First we claim that for all $1 \leq i \leq (1 - \delta)O$, we have

$$f(\theta, a'_{i+\delta O}) \geq f(\theta, b'_i) \quad (12)$$

If not, there must be some j with $f(\theta, a'_{j+\delta O}) < f(\theta, b'_j)$. Consider a set $R = \{x \in \mathcal{X} \mid f(\theta, x) \leq f(\theta, a'_{j+\delta O})\}$. We have $R \in \mathfrak{R}$, $\llbracket A' \cap R \rrbracket \geq j + \delta O$ and $\llbracket B' \cap R \rrbracket < j$. (We define the intersection of a weighted set and a unit-weighted set to be a weighted set such that each element should belong to both sets and it keeps its weight from the weighted set.) Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|A \cap R|}{|A|} &= \frac{\llbracket A' \cap R \rrbracket / b}{|A|} \geq \frac{(j + \delta O) / b}{a} = \frac{j}{O} + \delta \\ \frac{|B \cap R|}{|B|} &= \frac{\llbracket B' \cap R \rrbracket / a}{|B|} < \frac{j / a}{b} = \frac{j}{O}, \end{aligned}$$

We see that A and B are not δ -approximate, which contradicts the assumption. Thus we proved (12).

We denote by $\gamma = (n - z)/n$ the proportion of inliers, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f_{(1-\gamma)|A|}(\theta, A) &= \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma a} f(\theta, a_i) = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^{\gamma O} f(\theta, a'_i) \\
&\geq \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1+\delta O}^{\gamma O} f(\theta, a'_i) \quad \text{because } f(\theta, \cdot) \geq 0 \\
&= \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^{(\gamma-\delta)O} f(\theta, a'_{i+\delta O}) \geq \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^{(\gamma-\delta)O} f(\theta, b'_i) \quad \text{by the claim } f(\theta, a'_{i+\delta O}) \geq f(\theta, b'_i) \\
&= \frac{a}{b} \sum_{i=1}^{(\gamma-\delta)b} f(\theta, y_i) \\
&= f_{(1-(\gamma-\delta))|B|}(\theta, B).
\end{aligned}$$

For simplicity we assume that δO is an integer, and it is easy to see that this result still holds when δO is not integral.

C is a δ -sample of X , so they are δ -approximate. Let A be C and B be X , we have $f_{z+\delta n}(\theta, X) \leq f_z(\theta, C)$. Let B be C , A be X and $\gamma = \gamma + \delta$, we have $f_z(\theta, C) \leq f_{z-\delta n}(\theta, X)$. \square

Remark 3. *Though the uniform sampling is simple and easy to implement, it has two major drawbacks. First, it always involves an error on the number of outliers (otherwise, if $\delta = 0$, the sample should be the whole X). Also, it is useful only when z is a constant factor of n . For example, if $z = \sqrt{n}$, the obtained sample size can be as large as n . Our following hybrid robust framework in Section 3.2 can well avoid these two issues.*

3.2 The Hybrid Framework for (β, ε) -Robust Coreset

Our idea for building the robust coreset is inspired by the following intuition. In an ideal scenario, if we know who are the inliers and who are the outliers, we can simply construct the coresets for them separately. In reality, though we cannot obtain such a clear classification, the properties of the continuous-and-bounded objective function (from Definition 1) can guide us to obtain a ‘‘coarse’’ classification. Furthermore, together with some novel insights in geometry, we prove that such a hybrid framework can yield a (β, ε) -robust coreset.

Suppose the cost function f is continuous-and-bounded as Definition 1. Specifically, the parameter vector θ is always restricted within the ball centered at $\tilde{\theta}$ with radius ℓ . First, we partition X into two parts according to the value of $f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$. Let $Z := (1 + 1/\varepsilon)z$, and $x_c \in X$ be the point who has the Z -th largest cost $f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ among X . We let $\tau = f(\tilde{\theta}, x_c)$, and thus we have

$$|\{x \in X : f(\tilde{\theta}, x) \geq \tau\}| = Z. \quad (13)$$

We call these Z points as the ‘‘suspected outliers’’ and the remaining $n - Z$ points as the ‘‘suspected inliers’’. If we fix $\theta = \tilde{\theta}$, the set of the ‘‘suspected outliers’’ contains at least $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}z$ real inliers (since $Z = (1 + 1/\varepsilon)z$). This immediately implies the following inequality:

$$\tau z \leq \varepsilon f_z(\tilde{\theta}, X). \quad (14)$$

Our robust coreset construction is as follows. Suppose we have an ordinary coreset construction method \mathcal{A} as the black box (we will discuss it in Section 4). We build an ε -coreset for the suspected inliers by \mathcal{A} , and build a δ -sample for the suspected outliers with $\delta = \frac{\beta\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$ (as Theorem 1). If we set $\beta = 0$, we just directly take all the suspected outliers as the δ -sample. We denote these two coresets as C_{si} and C_{so} respectively. Finally, we return $C = C_{si} \cup C_{so}$ as the robust coreset.

To prove the correctness of this construction, we imagine the following partition on X . For any parameter vector θ in the parameter space, X is also partitioned into the real inliers

(i.e., the set of $n - z$ points who have the smallest cost $f(\theta, x)$) and the real outliers (i.e., the set of z points who have the largest cost $f(\theta, x)$). Therefore, together with the suspected inliers and outliers, X is partitioned into 4 parts:

- X_I : the points belonging to the real inliers and also the suspected inliers. X_I is not empty because we assume that suspected outliers are less than inliers ($Z < n - z$).
- X_{II} : the points belonging to the real inliers and the suspected outliers. X_{II} is not empty because the number of the suspected outliers is larger than the number of outliers ($Z > z$).
- X_{III} : the points belonging to the real outliers and also the suspected outliers. X_{III} can be empty iff all the real outliers are suspected inliers.
- X_{IV} : the points belonging to the real outliers and the suspected inliers. X_{IV} can be empty iff all the real outliers are suspected outliers.

Similarly, C is partitioned into 4 parts in the same way.

For continuous-and-bounded learning problems, we can bound $|f(\theta, x) - f(\tilde{\theta}, x)|$ by a low degree polynomial function. For example, if $f(\cdot, x)$ is α -Lipschitz, the polynomial is $\xi(\ell) = \alpha\ell$; if $f(\cdot, x)$ is α -smooth, the polynomial is $\xi(h; \ell) = h\ell + \alpha\ell^2/2$, where $h = \max_{x \in X} \|\nabla f(\theta, x)_{|\tilde{\theta}}\|$. For conciseness, we use the $\xi(\ell)$ in the following statement.

Theorem 2. *For continuous-and-bounded learning problems defined in Definition 1, given an ε -coreset method with size $|C_{si}|$ for the “suspected inliers”, we can construct a $(\beta, 5\varepsilon, 2\xi(\ell))$ -robust coreset method of size $|C_{si}| + \min \left\{ O \left(\frac{1}{\beta^2 \varepsilon^2} (\text{vc dim} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}) \right), O \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon} \right) \right\}$ with probability at least $1 - \eta$. In particular, when $\beta = 0$, our coreset has no error on the number of outliers and its size is $|C_{si}| + O \left(\frac{z}{\varepsilon} \right)$.*

Proof (sketch). In this proof we omit technical details and the entire proof is put in the supplement.

Our aim is to prove that $f_z(\theta, C) \approx f_z(\theta, X)$. We have $f_z(\theta, C) = f(\theta, C_I + C_{II}) = f(\theta, C_I) + f(\theta, C_{II})$. Hence we need to bound $f(\theta, C_I)$ and $f(\theta, C_{II})$ respectively. The upper bound of $f(\theta, C_I)$ comes from the definition of ε -coreset. We have $f(\theta, C_I) \leq f(\theta, C_I + C_{IV}) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f(\theta, X_I + X_{IV})$ since $C_I + C_{IV}$ is an ε -coreset of $X_I + X_{IV}$.

The upper bound of $f(\theta, C_{II})$ is a little complex. We give two different upper bounds depending on C_{IV} is empty or not:

$$f(\theta, C_{II}) \leq \begin{cases} f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) & \text{if } C_{IV} = \emptyset \\ f(\theta, X_{II}) + 2z(\tau + \xi(\ell)) & \text{if } C_{IV} \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

By adding the upper bound of $f(\theta, C_I)$ and $f(\theta, C_{II})$, we obtain an upper bound of $f_z(\theta, C)$:

$$f_z(\theta, C) \leq \begin{cases} (1 + \varepsilon)f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 4z\xi(\ell) & \text{if } C_{IV} = \emptyset \\ (1 + \varepsilon)f_z(\theta, X) + 4z\tau + 4z\xi(\ell) & \text{if } C_{IV} \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

Merging two cases together, we have that

$$f_z(\theta, C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 4z\tau + 4z\xi(\ell) \quad (17)$$

We have $z\tau \leq \varepsilon f_z(\theta, X) + \varepsilon(n - z)\xi(\ell)$ and $z\xi(\ell) \leq \varepsilon(n - z)\xi(\ell)$. Substitute these into (17) and take the average, we have

$$\frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{n - z} \leq (1 + 5\varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{n - z} + 10\varepsilon \cdot \xi(\ell) \quad (18)$$

Similarly, we can derive

$$\frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{n - z} \geq (1 - 5\varepsilon) \frac{f_{(1+\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{n - z} - 10\varepsilon \cdot \xi(\ell) \quad (19)$$

We conclude that C is a $(\beta, 5\varepsilon, 2\xi(\ell))$ -robust coreset of X .

□

Finally, we can obtain a (β, ε) -robust coreset with the procedure stated in Remark 1.

3.3 The Fully-Dynamic Implementation

In this section, we show that our robust coreset of Section 3.2 can be efficiently implemented in a fully-dynamic environment, even if the number of outliers z is dynamically changed.

The standard ε -coreset usually has two important properties. If C_1 and C_2 are respectively the ε -coresets of two disjoint sets X_1 and X_2 , their union $C_1 \cup C_2$ should be an ε -coreset of $X_1 \cup X_2$. Also, if C_1 is an ε_1 -coreset of C_2 and C_2 is an ε_2 -coreset of C_3 , C_1 should be an $(\varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + \varepsilon_1\varepsilon_2)$ -coreset of C_3 . Based on these two properties, one can build a coreset for incremental data stream by using the merge-and-reduce technique [BS80, HM04]. Very recently, Henzinger and Kale [HK20] extended it to the more general fully-dynamic setting, where data items can be deleted and updated as well.

Roughly speaking, the merge-and-reduce technique uses a sequence of “buckets” to maintain the coreset for the input streaming data, and the buckets are merged by a bottom-up manner. However, it is challenging to directly adapt this strategy to the case with outliers, because we cannot determine the number of outliers in each bucket. A cute aspect of our hybrid robust coreset framework is that we can easily resolve this obstacle by using an $O(n)$ size auxiliary table \mathcal{L} together with the merge-and-reduce technique (note that even for the case without outliers, maintaining a fully-dynamic coreset needs $\Omega(n)$ space [HK20]). Due to the space limit, we briefly introduce our idea below, and leave the full details to our supplement.




Figure 1: The illustration for our fully-dynamic robust coreset construction.

Recall that we partition the input data X into two parts: the $n - Z$ “suspected inliers” and the Z “suspected outliers”, where $Z = (1 + 1/\varepsilon)z$. We follow the same notations used in Section 3.2. For the first part, we just apply the vanilla merge-and-reduce technique to obtain a fully-dynamic coreset C_{si} ; for the other part, we can just take a δ -sample or take the whole set (if we require β to be 0), and denote it as C_{so} . Moreover, we maintain a table \mathcal{L} to record the key values $x.value = f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ and its position $x.position$ in the merge-and-reduce tree, for each $x \in X$; they are sorted by the $x.values$ in the table. To deal with the dynamical updates (*e.g.*, deletion and insertion), we also maintain a critical pointer p pointing to the data item x_c (recall x_c has the Z -th largest cost $f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ among X defined in Section 3.2).

When a new data item x is coming or an existing data item x is going to be deleted, we just need to compare it with $f(\tilde{\theta}, x_c)$ so as to decide to update C_{si} or C_{so} accordingly; after the update, we also need to update x_c and the pointer p in \mathcal{L} . If the number of outliers z is changed, we just need to update x_c and p first, and then update C_{si} and C_{so} (for example, if z is increased, we just need to delete some items from C_{so} and insert some items to C_{si}). To assist these updating operations, we also set one bucket as the “hot bucket”, which serves as a shuttle to execute all the data shifts. See Figure 1 for the illustration. Let M be the size of each leaf bucket; our time complexity for insertion and deletion is $O(M \log n)$; for updating z to $z \pm \Delta z$, our time complexity is $O(\frac{\Delta z}{\varepsilon} M \log n)$, where ε is the error bound for the robust coreset in Definition 3.

4 Coreset for Continuous-Bounded Learning Problems

As mentioned in Section 3.2, we need a black box ordinary coreset (without considering outliers) construction method \mathcal{A} in the hybrid robust coreset framework. In this section, we provide two general ε -coreset construction methods for the continuous-and-bounded learning problems.

4.1 Importance Sampling Based Coreset Construction

We follow the importance sampling based approach [LS10]. For each data point x , it has a sensitivity $\sigma(x) = \sup_{\theta} \frac{f(\theta, x)}{f(\theta, X)}$ that measures its importance to the whole input data X . Computing the sensitivity is often challenging but an upper bound of the sensitivity actually is often sufficient for the coreset construction. Suppose $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and we denote $\sigma(x_i)$ by σ_i for convenience. Assume s_i is an upper bound of σ_i and let $S = \sum_{i=1}^n s_i$. The coreset construction is as follows. We sample a subset C from X , where each element of C is sampled *i.i.d.* with probability $p_i = s_i/S$; we assign a weight $w_i = \frac{S}{s_i|C|}$ to each sampled data item x_i of C .

Theorem 3 ([BFL16]). *Let vcdim be the VC dimension (or shattering dimension) of the range space induced from $f(\theta, x)$. If the size of C is $\Theta\left(\frac{S}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{vcdim} \cdot \log S + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$, then C is an ε -coreset with probability $1 - \eta$.*

Therefore the only remaining issue is how to compute the s_i s. We denote $f(\theta, x_i)$ by $f_i(\theta)$ for short. Recall that we assume our cost function to be α -Lipschitz (or α -smooth, α -Lipschitz continuous Hessian) in Definition 1. That is, we can bound the difference between $f_i(\theta)$ and $f_i(\tilde{\theta})$. For example, if we assume the cost function to be α -smooth, we have $f_i(\theta) \leq f_i(\tilde{\theta}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\tilde{\theta}), \Delta\theta \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\theta\|^2$ and $f_i(\theta) \geq f_i(\tilde{\theta}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\tilde{\theta}), \Delta\theta \rangle - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\theta\|^2$, where $\Delta\theta = \theta - \tilde{\theta}$. Consequently, we obtain an upper bound of σ_i :

$$\sup_{\Delta\theta \in \mathbb{R}^d, \|\Delta\theta\| \leq \ell} \frac{f_i(\tilde{\theta}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\tilde{\theta}), \Delta\theta \rangle + \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\theta\|^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\tilde{\theta}) + \langle \nabla f_i(\tilde{\theta}), \Delta\theta \rangle - \frac{\alpha}{2} \|\Delta\theta\|^2}. \quad (20)$$

In our supplement, we further show that computing such an upper bound is equivalent to solving a quadratic fractional programming. This programming can be reduced to a semi-definite programming [BT09], which can be solved in $O(\text{poly}(d))$ time. So the total running time of the coreset construction is $O(n \cdot \text{poly}(d))$.

A drawback of Theorem 3 is that the coreset size depends on the VC dimension vcdim induced by $f(\theta, x)$. For some objectives, vcdim can be very large or difficult to obtain. Here, we prove that for a continuous-and-bounded cost function, the coreset size can be independent of vcdim ; instead, it depends on the doubling dimension ddim [CGMZ16] of the parameter space \mathcal{P} . Doubling dimension is a widely used measure to describe the growth rate of the data, which can also be viewed as a generalization of the Euclidean dimension. For example, the doubling dimension of a d -dimensional Euclidean space is $\Theta(d)$. The proof of Theorem 4 is placed in the supplement.

Theorem 4. *Suppose the cost function $f(\theta, x)$ is continuous-and-bounded as described in Definition 1, and let ddim be the doubling dimension of the parameter space. Then, if we run the importance sampling based coreset construction method with the sample size $|C| = \Theta\left(\frac{S^2}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{ddim} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$, C is an ε -coreset with probability $1 - \eta$. The hidden constant of $|C|$ depends on α and $\inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$.*

Remark 4. *The major advantage of Theorem 4 over Theorem 3 is that we do not need to know the VC dimension induced by the cost function. On the other hand, the doubling dimension is often much easier to know (or estimate), e.g., the doubling dimension of a given instance in \mathbb{R}^d is just $\Theta(d)$, no matter how complicated the cost function is. The reader is also referred to [HJLW18] for a more detailed discussion on the relation between VC (shattering) dimension and doubling dimension.*

4.2 Spatial Partition Based Coreset Construction

The reader may realize that the coreset size presented in Theorem 4 (and also Theorem 3) is **data-dependent**. That is, the coreset size depends on the value S , which can be different for different input instance X (because the formula (20) depends on X). To achieve a **data-independent** coreset size, we introduce the following method based on spatial partition, which is partly inspired by the previous k -median/means clustering coreset construction idea

of [Che09]. We extend their method to the continuous-and-bounded learning problems and call it as *Generalized Exponential Layer (GEL)* method.

We set $\varrho = \min_{x \in X} f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ and $T = \frac{1}{|X|} f(\tilde{\theta}, X)$. Then, we partition all the data points to different layers according to their cost with respect to $\tilde{\theta}$. Specifically, we assign a point x to the $\lfloor \log(\frac{f(\tilde{\theta}, x) - \varrho}{T}) \rfloor$ -th layer if $f(\tilde{\theta}, x) - \varrho \geq T$; otherwise we assign it to the 0-th layer. It is easy to see the number of the layers L is $O(\log n)$. We denote the set of points falling in the j -th layer as X_j . From each X_j , we take a small sample C_j uniformly at random, where each point of C_j is assigned the weight $|X_j|/|C_j|$. Finally, the union set $\bigcup_{j=0}^L C_j$ form our final coreset.

Theorem 5. *Suppose the cost function $f(\theta, x)$ is continuous-and-bounded as described in Definition 1, and let ddim be the doubling dimension of the parameter space. The above coreset construction method GEL can achieve an ε -coreset of size $\Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{ddim} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$ in linear time. The hidden constant of $|C|$ depends on α and $\inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$.*

To prove Theorem 5, the key is show that each C_j can well represent the layer X_j with respect to any θ in the bounded region (*i.e.*, the ball centered at $\tilde{\theta}$ with radius l in the parameter space as described in Definition 1). First, we use the continuity property to bound the difference between $f(\theta, x)$ and $f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ for each $x \in X_j$ with a fixed θ ; then, together with the doubling dimension, we can generalize this bound to any θ in the bounded region. The full proof is shown in the supplement.

5 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we propose a robust coreset framework for the continuous-and-bounded learning problems (with outliers). Our framework can be efficiently implemented in the dynamical setting. We put our experimental results in the supplement due to the space limit. In future, it is interesting to consider constructing (dynamic) robust coresets for other types of optimization problems in machine learning.

References

- [AHV04] Pankaj K. Agarwal, Sariel Har-Peled, and Kasturi R. Varadarajan. Approximating extent measures of points. *J. ACM*, 51(4):606–635, 2004.
- [BD99] Jock A. Blackard and Denis J. Dean. Comparative accuracies of artificial neural networks and discriminant analysis in predicting forest cover types from cartographic variables. *Computers and Electronics in Agriculture*, 24(3):131–151, 1999.
- [BFL16] Vladimir Braverman, Dan Feldman, and Harry Lang. New frameworks for offline and streaming coreset constructions. *CoRR*, abs/1612.00889, 2016.
- [BMDG05] Arindam Banerjee, Srujana Merugu, Inderjit S. Dhillon, and Joydeep Ghosh. Clustering with bregman divergences. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 6:1705–1749, 2005.
- [BR18] Battista Biggio and Fabio Roli. Wild patterns: Ten years after the rise of adversarial machine learning. *Pattern Recognit.*, 84:317–331, 2018.
- [BS80] Jon Louis Bentley and James B. Saxe. Decomposable searching problems I: static-to-dynamic transformation. *J. Algorithms*, 1(4):301–358, 1980.
- [BT09] Amir Beck and Marc Teboulle. A convex optimization approach for minimizing the ratio of indefinite quadratic functions over an ellipsoid. *Mathematical Programming*, 118:13–35, 2009.
- [CAZ18] Jiecao Chen, Erfan Sadeqi Azer, and Qin Zhang. A practical algorithm for distributed clustering and outlier detection. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, 3-8 December 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 2253–2262, 2018.

- [CG13] Sanjay Chawla and Aristides Gionis. k-means--: A unified approach to clustering and outlier detection. In *SDM*, 2013.
- [CGMZ16] T.-H. Hubert Chan, Anupam Gupta, Bruce M. Maggs, and Shuheng Zhou. On hierarchical routing in doubling metrics. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 12(4):55:1–55:22, 2016.
- [Che09] Ke Chen. On coresets for k-median and k-means clustering in metric and euclidean spaces and their applications. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 39(3):923–947, 2009.
- [Fel20] Dan Feldman. Introduction to core-sets: an updated survey. *CoRR*, abs/2011.09384, 2020.
- [FL11] Dan Feldman and Michael Langberg. A unified framework for approximating and clustering data. In Lance Fortnow and Salil P. Vadhan, editors, *Proceedings of the 43rd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2011, San Jose, CA, USA, 6-8 June 2011*, pages 569–578. ACM, 2011.
- [GGVZ19] Antonio Ginart, Melody Y. Guan, Gregory Valiant, and James Zou. Making AI forget you: Data deletion in machine learning. In Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Alina Beygelzimer, Florence d’Alché-Buc, Emily B. Fox, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2019, NeurIPS 2019, December 8-14, 2019, Vancouver, BC, Canada*, pages 3513–3526, 2019.
- [GKL⁺17] Shalmoli Gupta, Ravi Kumar, Kefu Lu, Benjamin Moseley, and Sergei Vassilvitskii. Local search methods for k-means with outliers. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 10(7):757–768, March 2017.
- [Hau92] David Haussler. Decision theoretic generalizations of the PAC model for neural net and other learning applications. *Inf. Comput.*, 100(1):78–150, 1992.
- [HJLW18] Lingxiao Huang, Shaofeng H.-C. Jiang, Jian Li, and Xuan Wu. Epsilon-coresets for clustering (with outliers) in doubling metrics. In Mikkel Thorup, editor, *59th IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2018, Paris, France, October 7-9, 2018*, pages 814–825. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [HK20] Monika Henzinger and Sagar Kale. Fully-dynamic coresets. In Fabrizio Grandoni, Grzegorz Herman, and Peter Sanders, editors, *28th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms, ESA 2020, September 7-9, 2020, Pisa, Italy (Virtual Conference)*, volume 173 of *LIPICs*, pages 57:1–57:21. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2020.
- [HM04] Sarel Har-Peled and Soham Mazumdar. On coresets for k-means and k-median clustering. In László Babai, editor, *Proceedings of the 36th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, Chicago, IL, USA, June 13-16, 2004*, pages 291–300. ACM, 2004.
- [IMMM14] Piotr Indyk, Sepideh Mahabadi, Mohammad Mahdian, and Vahab S. Mirrokni. Composable core-sets for diversity and coverage maximization. In Richard Hull and Martin Grohe, editors, *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM SIGMOD-SIGACT-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database Systems, PODS’14, Snowbird, UT, USA, June 22-27, 2014*, pages 100–108. ACM, 2014.
- [KYJ13] Manohar Kaul, Bin Yang, and Christian S. Jensen. Building accurate 3d spatial networks to enable next generation intelligent transportation systems. In *2013 IEEE 14th International Conference on Mobile Data Management, Milan, Italy, June 3-6, 2013 - Volume 1*, pages 137–146, 2013.
- [LBK16] Mario Lucic, Olivier Bachem, and Andreas Krause. Strong coresets for hard and soft bregman clustering with applications to exponential family mixtures. In Arthur Gretton and Christian C. Robert, editors, *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2016, Cadiz, Spain, May 9-11, 2016*, volume 51 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 1–9. JMLR.org, 2016.
- [LGM⁺15] Yaliang Li, Jing Gao, Chuishi Meng, Qi Li, Lu Su, Bo Zhao, Wei Fan, and Jiawei Han. A survey on truth discovery. *SIGKDD Explor.*, 17(2):1–16, 2015.

- [LLS01] Yi Li, Philip M Long, and Aravind Srinivasan. Improved bounds on the sample complexity of learning. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 62(3):516–527, 2001.
- [LS10] Michael Langberg and Leonard J. Schulman. Universal epsilon-approximators for integrals. In Moses Charikar, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 2010, Austin, Texas, USA, January 17-19, 2010*, pages 598–607. SIAM, 2010.
- [LXY20] Shi Li, Jinhui Xu, and Minwei Ye. Approximating global optimum for probabilistic truth discovery. *Algorithmica*, 82(10):3091–3116, 2020.
- [MSSW18] Alexander Munteanu, Chris Schwiegelshohn, Christian Sohler, and David P. Woodruff. On coresets for logistic regression. In Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Hugo Larochelle, Kristen Grauman, Nicolò Cesa-Bianchi, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 31: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2018, NeurIPS 2018, December 3-8, 2018, Montréal, Canada*, pages 6562–6571, 2018.
- [RL87] Peter J. Rousseeuw and Annick Leroy. *Robust Regression and Outlier Detection*. Wiley, 1987.
- [SSBD14] Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding Machine Learning - From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [SSSS09] Shai Shalev-Shwartz, Ohad Shamir, Nathan Srebro, and Karthik Sridharan. Stochastic convex optimization. In *COLT 2009 - The 22nd Conference on Learning Theory, Montreal, Quebec, Canada, June 18-21, 2009*, 2009.
- [TF18] Elad Tolochinsky and Dan Feldman. Generic coreset for scalable learning of monotonic kernels: Logistic regression, sigmoid and more, 2018.
- [Zin03] Martin Zinkevich. Online convex programming and generalized infinitesimal gradient ascent. In *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Twentieth International Conference (ICML 2003), August 21-24, 2003, Washington, DC, USA*, pages 928–936, 2003.

A Instances of Continuous-and-Bounded Learning Problems

Logistic Regression For $x, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $y \in \{\pm 1\}$, the loss function of Logistic regression is

$$f(\theta, x) = \ln(1 + \exp(-y \cdot \langle \theta, x \rangle)) \quad (21)$$

This function is $\|x\|$ -Lipschitz and $\frac{\|x\|^2}{4}$ -smooth.

Bregman Divergence [BMDG05] Let function $\phi : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be strictly convex and differentiable, then the Bregman divergence between $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ respect to ϕ is

$$d_\phi(y, x) = \phi(y) - \phi(x) - \langle \nabla \phi(x), y - x \rangle. \quad (22)$$

If $\|\nabla \phi(x)\| \leq L$ for $\forall x \in \mathcal{B}$, then we have

$$d_\phi(y, x) \leq L\|y - x\| + \|\nabla \phi(x)\|\|y - x\| \leq 2L\|y - x\|.$$

In this case, Bregman divergence is $2L$ -Lipschitz.

Truth Discovery [LXY20] For $\theta, x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and the function of truth discovery is $f(\theta, x) = f_{truth}(\|\theta - x\|)$, where

$$f_{truth}(t) = \begin{cases} t^2 & 0 \leq t < 1 \\ 1 + \log t^2 & t \geq 1 \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

We can prove that $f(\theta, x)$ is 2-Lipschitz.

k -median The loss function of 1-median is 1-Lipschitz. However, if $k \geq 2$, we cannot conclude the Lipschitzness of k -median, whose loss function is $f(P, x) = \min_{p \in P} d(p, x)$, where P is a set of k points. But we can still consider it as an 1-Lipschitz function if we make some modifications of the definition of continuous-and-bounded learning problems. In the previous discussion, we imply the parameter θ is an atom element. As for problems like k -median, the parameter is a collection of several atom parameters, i.e., $P = (p_1, p_2, \dots, p_k)$. In this case, we require that the parameter space \mathcal{B} is the direct product of every atom parameter space \mathcal{B}_i . Each \mathcal{B}_i is a ball of radius ℓ centered at $\tilde{\theta}_i$. Let $f(\tilde{\theta}_{j_1}, x) = f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ and $f(\theta_{j_2}, x) = f(\theta, x)$. If $f(\theta_i, x)$ is continuous for each parameter θ_i , we still have $f(\theta, x) = f(\theta_{j_2}, x) \leq f(\theta_{j_1}, x) \leq f(\tilde{\theta}_{j_1}, x) + \xi(\ell) = f(\tilde{\theta}, x) + \xi(\ell)$. Therefore, for problems like k -clustering, we only need to consider the 1-clustering case.

B Proofs

B.1 Proof of Theorem 2




Figure 2: The partition of dataset determined by θ and $\tilde{\theta}$.

Recall that $C_{\text{I}} + C_{\text{IV}}$ is an ε -coreset of $X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}}$, $C_{\text{II}} + C_{\text{III}}$ is a δ -sample of $X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}$, where $\delta = \frac{\beta\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$.

We have $f_z(\theta, X) = f(\theta, X_I + X_{II})$ and $f_z(\theta, C) = f(\theta, C_I + C_{II})$. So our aim is to prove

$$f(\theta, C_I + C_{II}) = f(\theta, C_I) + f(\theta, C_{II}) \approx f(\theta, X_I + X_{II}).$$

We will bound $f(\theta, C_I)$ and $f(\theta, C_{II})$ respectively at first and then bound their sum. We present the following claim.

Claim 5. *We have the following results for the partition made by θ and $\tilde{\theta}$.*

1. *These are from the definition of $X_I, X_{II}, X_{III}, X_{IV}$ and $C_I, C_{II}, C_{III}, C_{IV}$.*

$$\begin{aligned} |X_I + X_{II}| = \llbracket C_I + C_{II} \rrbracket = n - z, & \quad |X_{III} + X_{IV}| = \llbracket C_{III} + C_{IV} \rrbracket = z, \\ |X_I + X_{IV}| = \llbracket C_I + C_{IV} \rrbracket = n - Z, & \quad |X_{II} + X_{III}| = \llbracket C_{II} + C_{IV} \rrbracket = Z. \end{aligned}$$

2. *These are from the construction method immediately.*

$$C_I + C_{IV} \subseteq X_I + X_{IV}, \quad C_{II} + C_{III} \subseteq X_{II} + X_{III}$$

3. x_A is any element in set A , then

$$f(\theta, x_{I+II}) \leq f(\theta, x_{III+IV}), \quad f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{I+IV}) \leq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II+III})$$

4. *Because of the definition of τ and the continuity of $f(\theta, x)$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} f(\tilde{\theta}, x_I) &\leq \tau, \quad f(\theta, x_I) \leq \tau + \xi(\ell) \\ f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{III}) &\geq \tau, \quad f(\theta, x_{III}) \geq \tau - \xi(\ell) \\ f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II}) &\geq \tau, \quad f(\theta, x_{II}) \geq \tau - \xi(\ell) \end{aligned}$$

5. *If X_{IV} (C_{IV}) is not empty, then*

$$\begin{aligned} \tau - 2\xi(\ell) &\leq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{IV}) \leq \tau, \quad \tau - \xi(\ell) \leq f(\theta, x_{IV}) \leq \tau + \xi(\ell) \\ \tau &\leq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II}) \leq \tau + 2\xi(\ell), \quad \tau - \xi(\ell) \leq f(\theta, x_{II}) \leq \tau + \xi(\ell) \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The proofs of 1 ~ 4 are straightforward. As for 5, if X_{IV} (C_{IV}) is not empty, combining the result of 3 and 4, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta, x_{IV}) &\geq f(\theta, x_{II}) \geq \tau - \xi(\ell) \\ f(\theta, x_{IV}) &\leq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{IV}) + \xi(\ell) \leq \tau + \xi(\ell) \\ f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{IV}) &\leq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II}) \leq \tau \\ f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{IV}) &\geq f(\theta, x_{IV}) - \xi(\ell) \geq \tau - 2\xi(\ell) \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can derive

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta, x_{II}) &\leq f(\theta, x_{IV}) \leq \tau + \xi(\ell) \\ f(\theta, x_{II}) &\geq f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II}) - \xi(\ell) \geq \tau - \xi(\ell) \\ f(\tilde{\theta}, x_{II}) &\leq f(\theta, x_{II}) + \xi(\ell) \leq \tau + 2\xi(\ell) \end{aligned}$$

□

To prove theorem 2, we need to prove the following key lemmas first.

Lemma 6. *We have*

$$\left| f_z(\theta, X) - f_z(\tilde{\theta}, X) \right| \leq (n - z)\xi(\ell). \quad (24)$$

Proof. Note that $f_z(\theta, X) = f(\theta, X_I + X_{II})$ and $f_z(\tilde{\theta}, X) = f(\tilde{\theta}, X_I + X_{IV})$. Because $|X_{II} + X_{III}| = |X_{III} + X_{IV}| = z$, we have $|X_{II}| = |X_{IV}| \leq z$.

Then

$$f_z(\theta, X) = f(\theta, X_I + X_{II})$$




Figure 3: Illustration of Lemma 6

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq f(\tilde{\theta}, X_I + X_{II}) - \xi(\ell)(n - z) \\
&= f(\tilde{\theta}, X_I) + f(\tilde{\theta}, X_{II}) - f(\tilde{\theta}, X_{IV}) + f(\tilde{\theta}, X_{IV}) - \xi(\ell)(n - z) \\
&\geq f(\tilde{\theta}, X_I + X_{IV}) - \xi(\ell)(n - z) + \left(f(\tilde{\theta}, X_{II}) - f(\tilde{\theta}, X_{IV}) \right) \{ \geq 0 \} \\
&\geq f_z(\tilde{\theta}, X) - \xi(\ell)(n - z).
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we have $f_z(\theta, X) \leq f_z(\tilde{\theta}, X) + \xi(\ell)(n - z)$. \square

Lemma 7.

$$f(\theta, C_{II}) \leq \begin{cases} f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) & \text{if } C_{IV} = \emptyset \\ f(\theta, X_{II}) + 2z(\tau + \xi(\ell)) & \text{if } C_{IV} \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

Proof. It is easy to show that $Z - z \leq |X_{II}| \leq Z$ and $Z - z \leq \llbracket C_{II} \rrbracket \leq Z$. Then it follows that

$$\left| \llbracket C_{II} \rrbracket - |X_{II}| \right| \leq z. \quad (26)$$

Let $\iota = 1 - z/n$ be the proportion of inliers of a dataset A and we define $f_{[\iota]}(\theta, A) := f_{(1-\iota)n}(\theta, A)$. Let the proportion of inliers of $X_{II} + X_{III}$ and $C_{II} + C_{III}$ be γ and γ' respectively. Then we have

$$f(\theta, X_{II}) = f_{[\gamma]}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) \quad (27)$$

$$f(\theta, C_{II}) = f_{[\gamma']}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) \quad (28)$$

Note that $\gamma, \gamma' \geq \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}$ and thus $|\gamma - \gamma'| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$.

If $C_{IV} = \emptyset$, i.e., $\gamma' = \frac{1}{1+\varepsilon}$, we have

$$f(\theta, C_{II}) = f_{[\gamma']}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) \quad (29)$$

$$\leq f_{[\gamma'+\delta]}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) \quad (30)$$

$$= f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) \quad (31)$$

Otherwise $C_{IV} \neq \emptyset$, we have $\tau - \xi(\ell) \leq x_{C_{IV}} \leq \tau + \xi(\ell)$. Moreover, if $\gamma' \leq \gamma$, then

$$f_{[\gamma']}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) \leq f_{[\gamma'-\delta]}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) + z(\tau + \xi(\ell))$$

$$\leq f_{[\gamma']}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) + z(\tau + \xi(\ell))$$

$$\leq f_{[\gamma]}(\theta, X_{II} + X_{III}) + z(\tau + \xi(\ell))$$

If $\gamma' > \gamma$, since $\gamma' - \gamma \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{1+\varepsilon}$, we have

$$f_{[\gamma']}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) \leq f_{[\gamma-\delta]}(\theta, C_{II} + C_{III}) + 2z(\tau + \xi(\ell))$$

$$\leq f_{[\gamma]}(\theta, X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}) + 2z(\tau + \xi(\ell))$$

In the case that $C_{\text{IV}} \neq \emptyset$, we conclude that

$$f(\theta, C_{\text{II}}) \leq f_{[\gamma]}(\theta, X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}) + 2z(\tau + \xi(\ell)) \quad (32)$$

□

Lemma 8.

$$f(\theta, X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}}) + f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}) \leq f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 2z\xi(\ell) \quad (33)$$

Proof. We delete $(1 - \beta)z$ points from $X_{\text{III}} + X_{\text{IV}}$ in $f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X)$, denoted by O .

If $O \cap X_{\text{IV}} = \emptyset$, then

$$f(\theta, X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}}) + f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}) = f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X).$$

If $O \cap X_{\text{IV}} \neq \emptyset$, then we have $x_{\text{II}+\text{III}} \geq \tau - \xi(\ell)$ and $x_{\text{IV}} \leq \tau + \xi(\ell)$. Then

$$f(\theta, X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}}) + f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X_{\text{II}} + X_{\text{III}}) \leq f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 2z\xi(\ell).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 2. We have $f_z(\theta, C) = f(\theta, C_{\text{I}} + C_{\text{II}}) = f(\theta, C_{\text{I}}) + f(\theta, C_{\text{II}})$. Hence we need to bound $f(\theta, C_{\text{I}})$ and $f(\theta, C_{\text{II}})$ respectively. The upper bound of $f(\theta, C_{\text{I}})$ comes from the definition of ε -coreset. We have $f(\theta, C_{\text{I}}) \leq f(\theta, C_{\text{I}} + C_{\text{IV}}) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f(\theta, X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}})$ since $C_{\text{I}} + C_{\text{IV}}$ is an ε -coreset of $X_{\text{I}} + X_{\text{IV}}$.

Together with lemma 7 and lemma 8, we have an upper bound of $f_z(\theta, C)$.

$$f_z(\theta, C) \leq \begin{cases} (1 + \varepsilon)f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 4z\xi(\ell) & \text{if } C_{\text{IV}} = \emptyset \\ (1 + \varepsilon)f_z(\theta, X) + 4z\tau + 4z\xi(\ell) & \text{if } C_{\text{IV}} \neq \emptyset \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

Merging two cases together, we have that

$$f_z(\theta, C) \leq (1 + \varepsilon)f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X) + 4z\tau + 4z\xi(\ell) \quad (35)$$

Also, we have $z\tau \leq \varepsilon f_z(\theta, X) + \varepsilon(n - z)\xi(\ell)$ and $z\xi(\ell) \leq \varepsilon(n - z)\xi(\ell)$ due to lemma 6. Substitute these into (35) and take the average, we have

$$\frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{n - z} \leq (1 + 5\varepsilon)\frac{f_{(1-\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{n - z} + 10\varepsilon \cdot \xi(\ell) \quad (36)$$

Similarly, we can derive

$$\frac{f_z(\theta, C)}{n - z} \geq (1 - 5\varepsilon)\frac{f_{(1+\beta)z}(\theta, X)}{n - z} - 10\varepsilon \cdot \xi(\ell) \quad (37)$$

We conclude that C is a $(\beta, 5\varepsilon, 2\xi(\ell))$ -robust coreset of X .

□

B.2 Proof of Theorem 4

As for the importance sampling framework, we have the following conclusion.

Lemma 9. *We sample m points from X , denoted by C , with the importance sampling framework. If $m \geq \frac{S^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{2}{\eta}$, then $|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$ holds for a fixed θ with probability at least $1 - \eta$.*

Furthermore, we still need to obtain the uniform guarantee. i.e., we hope that $|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$ holds for all $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}$ be an $\varepsilon\ell$ -net of \mathcal{B} , which means that for any $\theta \in \mathcal{B}$, there is a $\theta' \in \mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}$ such that $\|\theta - \theta'\| \leq \varepsilon\ell$. We want $|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$ to hold for all parameters in $\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}$. To make this, we should sample $\frac{S^2}{2\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{2|\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}|}{\eta}$ points. Then we have

$$|\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, C)| \leq |\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) - \mathbb{f}(\theta', X)| + |\mathbb{f}(\theta', X) - \mathbb{f}(\theta', C)| + |\mathbb{f}(\theta', C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, C)|.$$

The first and last item are both no more than $\varepsilon\xi(\ell)$ since $\xi(\varepsilon\ell) \leq \varepsilon\xi(\ell)$. The middle term can be bounded by $\varepsilon(\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) + \xi(\ell))$. Consequently such C is an $(\varepsilon, 3\xi(\ell))$ -coreset of X . Finally we need to compute $|\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}|$ by using the doubling dimension of the parameter space.

\mathcal{M} is a metric space, we say it has *doubling dimension* ddim (ddim is an integer) if any ball in \mathcal{M} can be covered by at most 2^{ddim} balls of half the radius but not by $2^{\text{ddim}-1}$ ones. It is not difficult to derive that a ball of radius r can be covered by at most $(\frac{r}{\varepsilon})^{\text{ddim}}$ balls of radius ε , and, obviously, all centers of these balls constitute an ε -net of the original ball. So we derive that $|\mathcal{B}^{\varepsilon\ell}| = (\frac{\ell}{\varepsilon\ell})^{\text{ddim}} = (\frac{1}{\varepsilon})^{\text{ddim}}$, where ddim is the doubling dimension of the parameter space. So we obtain an $(\varepsilon, \xi(\ell))$ -coreset of size $O\left(\frac{S^2}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{ddim} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$. With the relation between ε -coreset and additive coreset shown in Remark 1, we compute an ε -coreset with size $|C| = \Theta\left(\frac{S^2}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{ddim} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$ with probability $1 - \eta$. The hidden constant of $|C|$ depends on α and $\inf_{\theta \in \mathcal{B}} \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)$.

B.3 Proof of Theorem 5

Recall that for any x in the i -th layer, we have

$$f(\theta, x) \in \begin{cases} [2^{i-1}T - \xi(\ell) + \varrho, 2^iT + \xi(\ell) + \varrho] & i > 0 \\ [\varrho, T + \xi(\ell) + \varrho] & i = 0 \end{cases} \quad (38)$$

Lemma 10 ([Hau92]). *Let $g(\cdot)$ be a function defined on a set V and for all $x \in V$, $g(x) \in [a, b]$ such that $b - a \leq h$. Let $U \subseteq V$ be a set independently and uniformly sampled from V . If $|U| \geq (h^2/2\varepsilon^2) \ln(\frac{2}{\eta})$, then $\Pr\left[\left|\frac{g(V)}{|V|} - \frac{g(U)}{|U|}\right| \geq \varepsilon\right] \leq \eta$.*

Applying (38) to lemma 10, we can prove

Lemma 11. *If we sample $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\log \frac{1}{\eta} + \log \log n\right)\right)$ points independently and uniformly from X_i , denoted by C_i , then for a fixed parameter θ , we have*

$$\left| \frac{f(\theta, X_i)}{|X_i|} - \frac{f(\theta, C_i)}{|C_i|} \right| \leq \begin{cases} \varepsilon(2^{i-1}T + 2\xi(\ell)) & (i \geq 1) \\ \varepsilon(T + \xi(\ell)) & (i = 0) \end{cases} \quad (39)$$

with probability $1 - \eta$.

For each layer i , set the weights of all points in C_i to be $|X_i|/|C_i|$. Let C be the union of C_i s and we can prove that C is an $(\varepsilon, \xi(\ell))$ -coreset for a fixed parameter. The total running time is $O(n)$. Hence we have the following result.

Lemma 12. *We can compute a weighted subset $C \subseteq X$ of size $O\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2} \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)^2$ such that*

$$|\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| \leq \varepsilon(\mathbb{f}(\theta, X) + \xi(\ell)) \quad (40)$$

holds for a fixed parameter θ with probability $1 - \eta$.

Proof. According to the structure of C , we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f(\theta, C) - f(\theta, X)| &\leq \sum_{i=0}^L |f(\theta, C_i) - f(\theta, X_i)| \\ &= |f(\theta, C_0) - f(\theta, X_0)| + \sum_{i=1}^L |f(\theta, C_i) - f(\theta, X_i)| \\ &\leq \varepsilon|X_0|(T + \xi(\ell)) + \sum_{i=1}^L \varepsilon|X_i|(2^{i-1}T + 2\xi(\ell)) \end{aligned}$$

²We omit the $\log \log(\cdot)$ item.

$$\leq \sum_{i=0}^L \varepsilon |X_i| 2\xi(\ell) + \varepsilon |X_0| T + \sum_{i=1}^L \varepsilon |X_i| (2^{i-1} T)$$

We have $|X_i| 2^{i-1} T \leq f(\tilde{\theta}, X_i)$ for $i \geq 1$. Then it follows

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{f}(\theta, C) - \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)| &\leq \varepsilon \cdot 2\xi(\ell) + \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\tilde{\theta}, X) + \varepsilon \mathbb{f}(\tilde{\theta}, X) \\ &= 2\varepsilon(\xi(\ell) + \mathbb{f}(\tilde{\theta}, X)) \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon(2\xi(\ell) + \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)) \\ &\leq 4\varepsilon(\xi(\ell) + \mathbb{f}(\theta, X)) \end{aligned}$$

The second inequality holds because $|\tilde{\theta}(x) - f(\theta, x)| \leq \xi(\ell)$ for every x . Finally, replace ε with $\varepsilon/4$ then we complete the proof. \square

The following steps are similar to that in section B.2. We connect the uniform guarantee in \mathcal{B} and doubling dimension of the parameter space. The size of our ε -coreset is $\Theta\left(\frac{\log n}{\varepsilon^2} \left(\text{ddim} \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \log \frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$.

C Fully-Dynamic Coreset with Outliers

In the setting of dynamic data, we need to re-construct the coreset once a update happens. To shorten the re-construction time, we imply the properties of coreset to build a tree as shown in Figure 4(a). This method is commonly called merge-and-reduce framework. If we only update a leaf node, we just need to re-construct along the path from this leaf to root. However, this cannot be directly achieved for the same problem with outliers. First, for separated parts of data, we do not know the exact number of outliers in each part. Second, the fully-dynamic setting should be more flexible in the situation containing outliers. Besides the dataset, the number of outliers z is also able to change.




Figure 4: Fully-Dynamic Coreset Implement

As for continuous-and-bounded learning problems, our robust coreset can overcome both challenges at the same time. The key point is that our construction is hybrid. As shown in Figure 4(b), we divide total dataset into two parts (suspected inliers and suspected outliers); then we construct ε -coreset in one part and take uniform sampling in the other one. Therefore we do not have to know the number of outliers in each separated part. When z changes, we can shift the critical point in Figure 4(b), then the problem is reduced to the data insertion and deletion. In fact, we achieve a fully-dynamic robust coreset such that the updating time is $O(M \log n)$. M is the size of the ε -coreset.

We presume that the upper bound of the number of data in the dynamic model is known, denoted it by n . We maintain a list of data \mathcal{L} sorted by the value of each element where $x.value = f(\tilde{\theta}, x)$ for data point x . Due to the construction method in theorem 2, we maintain a critical pointer p pointing to the critical point x_c . Hence all data points after the

critical point are suspected outliers. Then we build the tree for the suspected inliers. Note that for a suspected inlier x , we need $x.position$ to record its position in the tree. Let every leaf be a bucket with volume M thus the number of leaves is less than n/M and the height of the tree is $O(\log n)$. Assuming our coreset construction time is linear, the re-construction time along a bottom-up path is $O(M \log n)$. And we let data be inserted from left to right and deleted from right to left. We call the right-end leaf of the current data *hot bucket*, which could be shifted with the number of current data. All insertions and deletions will take place in the hot bucket. Clearly, all leaves on the left of hot bucket are full boxes and all leaves on the right are empty boxes as shown in Figure 4(b). The next thing we need to do is to expound the concrete reactions to the operations and an analysis of the updating time.

- **INSERT(y)** (A new point y is inserted.) We insert it into the list \mathcal{L} according to $y.value = f(\hat{\theta}, y)$. If $y.value > p \rightarrow value$, shift p one place to the right. i.e., $p \leftarrow p + 1$. If $y.value \leq p \rightarrow value$, insert it into the hot bucket and set $y.position$, then update the coreset tree from hot bucket to the root. Updating time: $O(M \log n)$.
- **DELETE(y)** (A point y is deleted.) If y is a suspected inlier, delete it from its bucket $y.position$ and find another point y' from the hot bucket to re-fill the bucket $y.position$. Then update the tree from these two buckets. Finally we delete y from list \mathcal{L} . If y is a suspected outlier, delete it from \mathcal{L} . Then $p \leftarrow p - 1$ and delete the current critical point from the tree, which is a suspected outlier now. Updating time: $O(M \log n)$.
- **UPDATE(y)** (A point y is updated.) First we update $y.value$ and its place in \mathcal{L} . If the attribute of y (suspected inlier or suspected outlier) is not changed, we just update the tree from bucket $y.position$. Otherwise we **DELETE(y)** and **INSERT(y)**. Updating time: $O(M \log n)$.
- **CHANGE(Δz)** (The number of outliers is updated as $z \leftarrow z + \Delta z$.) Note that the number of suspected outliers $Z(z)$ is an increasing function of z . $p \leftarrow p + Z(z + \Delta z) - Z(z)$. If $\Delta z > 0$, delete these $Z(z + \Delta z) - Z(z)$ points from the tree. If $\Delta z < 0$, insert these points from suspected outliers into the tree. Note that we do not need to update \mathcal{L} in this case. Updating time: $O(\frac{\Delta z}{\epsilon} M \log n)$.

D Experiments

We evaluate the practical performance of our proposed coreset construction methods in this section. Our algorithms and the baselines were implemented in Python and all experiments were run on a PC with 2.3GHz Intel Core i7 CPU and 32GB of RAM. All results were averaged across 5 trials.

The used algorithms and coreset construction methods We consider the machine learning tasks *logistic regression* and *k-means clustering* with outliers. For optimization with outliers problems, a commonly used strategy is alternating minimization (e.g., [CG13]). Namely, it iteratively detects z points with largest cost and run an existing algorithm on the remaining $n - z$ points; then it uses the new solution to update the z points. The strategy repeats this process until convergence. For logistic regression, we call the function from the scikit-learn package. For k -means, we use local search [GKL⁺17] to seed initial centers and then run k -means-- [CG13].

We use the following coreset methods. (1) **Uniform**: the simple uniform sampling method; (2) **GEL**: the generalized exponential layer method proposed in section 4.2; (3) **QR**: a QR-decomposition based importance sampling method proposed by [MSSW18] for logistic regression. For each coreset method name, we add a suffix “+” to denote the corresponding robust coreset enhanced by our hybrid framework in section 3.

Datasets We used the following datasets in our experiments. The Covtype [BD99] is a dataset of size 581012 for predicting forest cover type from 54 cartographic features. There are 7 cover types and we set the dominant one (49%) to be the positive samples and the others to be negative samples. The 3Dspatial [KYJ13] data comprises 434874 road information with 4 features. To generate outliers for the unsupervised learning task k -means clustering,


we randomly generate 10000 points to be outliers, and add the gaussian noisy $\mathcal{N}(0, 200)$ to each dimension for these outliers. For the supervised learning task logistic regression, we just randomly shuffle the labels of randomly selected 10000 points.

Table 2: Logistic regression running time on Covetype


Coreset	Size	Loss Ratio	Speed-up
GEL+	4000	1.046	$\times 26.9$
GEL+	8000	1.031	$\times 19.19$
Uniform+	4000	1.134	$\times 45.8$
Uniform+	8000	1.050	$\times 29.1$
QR+	4000	1.025	$\times 23.4$
QR+	8000	1.012	$\times 17.9$

Table 3: k -means running time on 3Dspatial


Coreset	Size	Loss Ratio	Speed-up
GEL+	5000	1.016	$\times 41.1$
GEL+	10000	1.008	$\times 15.4$
Uniform+	5000	1.029	$\times 78.9$
Uniform+	10000	1.011	$\times 46.9$



(a) Loss Performance



(b) Accuracy Performance



(c) Speed-up with the Merge-and-Reduce Tree (in the Dynamic Setting)

Figure 5: The performances of different coreset methods for logistic regression on covetype. The results are normalized over the results obtained from the original data (without using coreset).

Result Table 2 and Table 3 illustrate the speed-up ratio of running time from different robust coreset methods. So we can see that the robust coreset methods can achieve significant speed-up, and meanwhile the optimization qualities can be still preserved. Figure 5(a) and 5(b) illustrate the performance of the (robust) coreset methods with varying its size. In general, our robust coreset can achieve better performance (in terms of the loss and accuracy) compared with its counterpart without considering outliers. Figure 5(c) illustrates the speed-up ratio of running time in the dynamic setting. Our robust coreset method uses the merge-and-reduce tree in the construction. When the update happens in one bucket, we make a bottom-up re-construction of the coreset. The higher the tree, the smaller the volume of the bucket. This leads to considerable speed-up compared to re-running algorithms on the entire updated dataset.