
ASYMPTOTIC BREAKDOWN POINT ANALYSIS FOR A GENERAL CLASS OF MINIMUM DIVERGENCE ESTIMATORS

A PREPRINT

Subhrajyoty Roy

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata
subhrajyoty_r@isical.ac.in

Abir Sarkar

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata
abirsarkarrsm@gmail.com

Abhik Ghosh

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata
abhik.ghosh@isical.ac.in

Ayanendranath Basu

Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata
ayanbasu@isical.ac.in

May 16, 2023

ABSTRACT

Robust inference based on the minimization of statistical divergences has proved to be a useful alternative to classical techniques based on maximum likelihood and related methods. [Basu et al. \[1998\]](#) introduced the density power divergence (DPD) family as a measure of discrepancy between two probability density functions and used this family for robust estimation of the parameter for independent and identically distributed data. [Ghosh \[2015\]](#) and [Ghosh et al. \[2017\]](#) proposed a more general class of divergence measures, namely the S-divergence family and discussed its usefulness in robust parametric estimation through several asymptotic properties and some numerical illustrations. In this paper, we develop the results concerning the asymptotic breakdown point for the minimum S-divergence estimators (in particular the minimum DPD estimator) under general model setups. The primary result of this paper provides lower bounds to the asymptotic breakdown point of these estimators which are independent of the dimension of the data, in turn corroborating their usefulness in robust inference under high dimensional data.

Keywords Breakdown Point · Minimum S-divergence Estimator · Density Power Divergence · Power Divergence

1 Introduction

Among different classes of robust estimators for parametric inference, estimators based on the minimization of a statistical divergence between the assumed model density and the “true” density underlying the data, have proved to be extremely useful in different contexts. These estimators include the popular but non-robust maximum likelihood estimator as well as the robust minimum

Hellinger distance estimator. [Basu et al. \[2011\]](#) provide a comprehensive discussion about many such minimum divergence estimators and their useful properties. In a statistical inference problem given the model density, the minimum divergence estimator is defined to be the value of the parameter that minimizes the corresponding divergence between the model density evaluated at that parameter and an empirical density estimate obtained from the data.

Among these minimum divergence estimators, particular classes of divergences require special attention due to their highly robust and efficient behaviours. [Cressie and Read \[1984\]](#) introduced the power divergence family of statistical divergences including several important divergences like Kullback-Leibler divergence, Pearson's chi-square, Neyman's chi-square, Hellinger distance and chi-square type divergences in general. The power divergence is a subclass of the general class of ϕ -divergence [[Csiszár, 1963](#), [Morimoto, 1963](#)]. [Basu et al. \[1998\]](#) introduced the density power divergence family which bridges the non-robust but efficient maximum likelihood estimator with the highly robust but less efficient minimum L_2 divergence estimator through intermediate estimators, thus striking a balance between robustness and asymptotic efficiency. Extending these two families of divergences, [Ghosh \[2015\]](#) and [Ghosh et al. \[2017\]](#) proposed the generalized S-divergence family which connects the power divergence family with the density power divergence family. Apart from their consistency and asymptotic normality properties, several of the minimum S-divergence estimators possess strong robustness properties, which may be viewed as robust and efficient alternatives to the class of the classical M-estimators [[Hampel et al., 2011](#)].

Among different metrics of measuring robustness, the breakdown point of the estimator [[Hampel, 1971](#)] is a popular and global measure. The breakdown point of an estimator refers to the minimum proportion of observations in the sample which can be replaced to arbitrarily modify the value of the estimator. Later in [Section 2.3](#), we discuss the notion of breakdown point in more detail. Among various robust classical estimators of location, the sample median and Hodges-Lehman estimator [[Hodges, 1967](#)] have asymptotic breakdown points as $1/2$ and $(1 - 1/\sqrt{2})$ respectively. To gain more efficiency compared to these classical estimators, [Huber \[1964\]](#) introduced M-estimators which were further developed later on by [Maronna \[1976\]](#) for multivariate location and scatter estimation. However, [Rousseeuw \[1985\]](#) showed that all affine-equivariant M-estimators have the asymptotic breakdown point at most $1/(p + 1)$ where p is the dimension of the data. Therefore, for high-dimensional data, the robustness of the M-estimator can decay rapidly. To counter this, [Rousseeuw \[1985\]](#) introduced minimum volume ellipsoid (MVE) and minimum covariance determinant (MCD) estimators, and [Rousseeuw and Yohai \[1984\]](#) introduced a general class of estimators called "S-estimators", which were shown to be less efficient than M-estimators but with a relatively high asymptotic breakdown point. [Davies \[1987\]](#) extended the S-estimators to the setup of multivariate location and scatter and derived the asymptotic properties of the same for the exponential family of distributions. Till now, numerous studies have investigated both finite-sample and asymptotic breakdown points of different classes of M-estimators and S-estimators; see [Smucler \[2019\]](#), [Fishbone and Mili \[2021\]](#), [Park et al. \[2022\]](#) and the references therein for further details.

Compared to these, the literature on the asymptotic breakdown point of the aforementioned robust minimum divergence estimators is limited. [Park and Basu \[2004\]](#) demonstrated that the asymptotic breakdown point of a minimum divergence estimator within the ϕ -divergence family is $1/2$ when the contaminating distribution is asymptotically singular to the model distribution. However, [Park and Basu \[2004\]](#) restrict their attention to the specific cases of breakdown when the absolute value

of the estimator goes to infinity, which does not encompass all kinds of breakdown, e.g. the breakdown of the scale parameter with the scale going to 0. Ghosh and Basu [2013] established similar results for the minimum density power divergence estimator (MDPDE) of the location parameter for independent but non-homogeneous sample observations from a location-scale family of distributions with a fixed scale parameter. Under a different set of assumptions, the minimum Hellinger distance estimator (MHDE) has been shown to attain an asymptotic breakdown point of at least $1/4$ irrespective of the dimension of the data [Tamura and Boos, 1986], whenever the true distribution belongs to the model family of distribution under consideration. Subsequently, Simpson [1987] showed that the asymptotic breakdown point can be as large as $1/2$ under multinomial setup models with discrete countable support. These specific results are remarkable as they show the highly robust properties of the minimum divergence estimators, by achieving an asymptotic breakdown point free of the dimension of the data, unlike the shrinking bounds offered for the M-estimator. Also, as pointed out in Basu et al. [1998], Ghosh and Basu [2013] and Ghosh et al. [2017], the minimum S-divergence estimators (MSDE) can provide very efficient estimators for suitable values of the tuning parameters, compared to the S-estimators. For a different family of minimum divergence estimator, namely the minimum generalized negative exponential disparity estimator (MGNEDE), Bhandari et al. [2006] proved that the asymptotic breakdown point of MGNEDE is $1/2$ when the true distribution belongs to the model family, under assumptions similar to those of Park and Basu [2004].

In this paper, we aim to extend these aforementioned specific results into a more general result. The key contributions of this paper are as follows.

1. We derive a general result for the asymptotic breakdown point of the minimum divergence estimators within the S-divergence family, for any general parameter (not necessarily location and scale) under fairly general assumptions. As we shall show later, our result encompasses all of these previous results as corollaries and provides a comprehensive treatment for a large class of divergences including the power divergence and density power divergence families, which have developed independently of each other in the literature.
2. We provide two alternative assumptions for our main result which are easily verifiable with the knowledge of the model family of distributions and the family of the contaminating distributions. We also show that these alternative assumptions lead to an asymptotic breakdown point independent of the dimension of the data, suggesting the applicability of the MSDE in multiple setups.
3. A series of examples with supporting simulation studies have been provided to illustrate the applicability of the main result of this paper and the two alternative assumptions mentioned earlier.

The organization of the paper is as follows: In Section 2, we define some preliminary concepts about the MSDE and the breakdown point of an estimator when estimating any general parameter (location, scatter and others). Section 3 contains the main results of our paper and related discussions. In Section 4, we provide some examples and numerical illustrations to specific parametric setups where we apply results from Section 3 and indicate the corresponding asymptotic breakdown points. We conclude the paper with the limitations and possible extensions of the results in Section 5. All the proofs of the results have been deferred till the Appendix for the sake of brevity in presentation.

2 Preliminary Definitions

2.1 Minimum Density Power Divergence Estimator

Basu et al. [1998] introduced the density power divergence (DPD) family as a measure of discrepancy between two probability density functions and used this family for robustly estimating the model parameter under the usual setup of independent and identically distributed data. The DPD measure $d_\alpha(g, f)$ between the densities g and f is defined, as the function of a single tuning parameter α , as

$$d_\alpha(g, f) = \begin{cases} \int \left[f^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{\alpha} f^\alpha g + \frac{1}{\alpha} g^{1+\alpha} \right] & \text{if } \alpha > 0 \\ \int g \ln \left(\frac{g}{f} \right) & \text{if } \alpha = 0. \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

The above definition ensures continuity of the divergence as a function of α at $\alpha = 0$. The parameter α is also called the robustness controlling parameter. By substituting $\alpha = 1$, the density power divergence becomes the same as the squared L_2 distance between f and g which is known to have satisfactory robustness properties when used for parametric estimation. On the other hand, for $\alpha = 0$, the DPD reduces to the Kullback Leibler divergence which results in an efficient but non-robust estimator. The parameter α thus provides a bridge between these two divergences.

Given an independent and identically distributed sample X_1, \dots, X_n , the minimum DPD estimator (MDPDE) is then defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_\alpha = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} d_\alpha(\hat{g}_n, f_\theta), \quad (2)$$

where f_θ is an element of the model family of distributions $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ indexed by the parameter θ and \hat{g}_n is an empirical density estimate based on the samples X_1, \dots, X_n . Note that, the minimization in (2) does not depend on the last term $\int \hat{g}_n^{1+\alpha}(x) dx / \alpha$, hence one can substitute the integral $\int f_\theta^\alpha(x) \hat{g}_n(x) dx$ by $\int f_\theta^\alpha(x) dG_n(x)$ where G_n is the empirical distribution function of the sample observations X_1, \dots, X_n . This reduces to the objective function of the MDPDE to

$$\hat{\theta}_\alpha = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \left[\int f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) dx - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\theta^\alpha(X_i) \right].$$

Ghosh and Basu [2013] extended this idea for independent but not identically distributed non-homogeneous data by considering a model family of distributions $\mathcal{F}_i = \{f_{\theta,i} : \theta \in \Theta\}$ specific for each sample observation $i = 1, \dots, n$ but parametrized by a common parameter θ . In this case, the MDPDE is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_\alpha = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n d_\alpha(\hat{g}_{n,i}, f_{\theta,i}). \quad (3)$$

Here, $\hat{g}_{n,i}$ is a density estimate of the true density of the i -th observation, based on all the sample observations X_1, \dots, X_n . As in the above, the MDPDE for this setup can be expressed as

$$\hat{\theta}_\alpha = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[\int f_{\theta,i}^{1+\alpha}(x) dx - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) f_{\theta,i}^\alpha(X_i) \right].$$

In Ghosh and Basu [2013] and Basu et al. [1998], the authors have derived the asymptotic breakdown point of the MDPDE for the location parameter in a special class of models. They restricted their

attention towards the model family of distribution of the form

$$\mathcal{F}_\theta = \left\{ \frac{1}{\sigma} f \left(\frac{y - l(\mu)}{\sigma} \right) : \theta = (\mu, \sigma) \in \mathbb{R} \times (0, \infty) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where $l : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is an arbitrary but known one-one function. Under such models, they derived the breakdown point of the MDPDE of the location parameter μ at the model distribution, while the scale parameter σ was assumed to be fixed at σ_0 ; for example, σ can be substituted with any suitable robust scale estimator. They also assumed that the true data generating density g to be in the model family \mathcal{F} (or \mathcal{F}_i in case of independent non-homogeneous setup). They used a generalization of the argument used by [Park and Basu \[2004\]](#) to derive the asymptotic breakdown of these minimum divergence estimators, which turned out to be $1/2$ for the location parameter at the model.

2.2 Minimum S-divergence Estimator

Taking this minimum divergence idea further, the power divergence of [Cressie and Read \[1984\]](#) and the density power divergence of [Basu et al. \[1998\]](#) have later been subsumed in a larger super-class of divergences called the ‘‘S-divergence’’ class; see [Ghosh et al. \[2017\]](#). Note that, the DPD family (indexed by a single tuning parameter α) introduced in (1) connects the Kullback Leibler divergence ($\alpha \rightarrow 0$) with the squared L_2 distance ($\alpha = 1$). Similarly, the S-divergence family (indexed by two tuning parameters α and λ) connects the whole Cressie-Reed family of power divergences (PD) smoothly to the squared L_2 distance at the other end, but also contains the DPD class of divergences as a special case. The S-divergence between two densities g and f is defined as

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f) = \frac{1}{A} \int f^{1+\alpha} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} \int f^B g^A + \frac{1}{B} \int g^{1+\alpha}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$A = 1 + \lambda(1 - \alpha), \quad B = \alpha - \lambda(1 - \alpha). \quad (6)$$

The choice of α is usually restricted in the unit interval $[0, 1]$, but λ is allowed to take any real value. However, the above form of the S-divergence given in (5) is defined when both A and B are nonzero. If either $A = 0$ or $B = 0$, the corresponding cases are defined by the continuous limits of the divergence as $A \rightarrow 0$ and $B \rightarrow 0$, respectively, and are given by

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda:A=0)}(g, f) = \lim_{A \rightarrow 0} S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f) = \int f^{1+\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{f}{g} \right) - \frac{1}{(1+\alpha)} \int (f^{1+\alpha} - g^{1+\alpha}), \quad (7)$$

and

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda:B=0)}(g, f) = \lim_{B \rightarrow 0} S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f) = \int g^{1+\alpha} \ln \left(\frac{g}{f} \right) - \frac{1}{(1+\alpha)} \int (g^{1+\alpha} - f^{1+\alpha}). \quad (8)$$

Note that for $\alpha = 0$, the S-divergence class reduces to the PD family with parameter λ ; for $\alpha = 1$, $S_{1,\lambda}$ equals the robust squared L_2 distance irrespective of the value of λ . On the other hand, $\lambda = 0$ generates the DPD family as a function of α . In [Ghosh et al. \[2017\]](#), it was shown that the above S-divergence family defined in (5)-(8) indeed represents a class of genuine statistical divergence measures in the sense that $S_{\alpha,\lambda}(g, f) \geq 0$ for all pair of densities g, f and all $\alpha \geq 0, \lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, and $S_{\alpha,\lambda}(g, f)$ is equal to zero if and only if $g = f$ almost surely under both f and g . As in the case of MDPDE, the minimum S-divergence (MSD) functional of a distribution G with density g is defined as

$$\hat{\theta}_{(\alpha,\lambda)} = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f_\theta), \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{F} = \{f_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ is the model family of densities. Unfortunately, the empirical objective function corresponding to (9) cannot be used directly to obtain the estimate given a random sample of observations X_1, \dots, X_n . One would require a suitable nonparametric density estimate \hat{g}_n to be substituted in place of g , before the minimization in (9) can be performed. This would make the minimum S-divergence estimator (MSDE) dependent on the choice of the density estimation procedure used and the corresponding bandwidth chosen for the nonparametric estimates; further details can be found in Ghosh [2015] and Ghosh et al. [2017]. However, for the asymptotic breakdown analysis, we restrict our attention to the MSD functional given in (9). Clearly, for a properly chosen bandwidth with a consistent density estimation procedure where the density estimate \hat{g}_n based on sample observations X_1, \dots, X_n uniformly converges to the true density g , the same breakdown analysis presented in this paper will also apply.

2.3 Breakdown Point

The breakdown point is a common criterion for measuring the robustness of an estimator besides the influence function. While the influence function focuses on measuring how local changes in the true data-generating distribution affect the estimator, the breakdown point determines the global reliability of an estimator, which describes up to what distance from the model distribution, the estimator still gives some relevant information. While developing the robust Hodges-Lehman estimator of location, Hodges [1967] motivates the idea of a finite-sample breakdown point of a location estimator as the maximum proportion of incorrect or arbitrary observations in the sample that an estimator can tolerate without making any egregiously unreasonable value. In mathematical terms, given a sample of observations $\mathbf{X} := \{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$ of size n generated from a density with the true location parameter θ_0 , the finite-sample breakdown point of an estimator T_n is defined as

$$\epsilon_n^* := \frac{1}{n} \max \left\{ m \in \mathbb{Z}^+ : \sup_{\mathbf{X}_{(m)}^*} |T_n(\mathbf{X}_{(m)}^*) - \theta_0| < \infty \right\},$$

where $\mathbf{X}_{(m)}^*$ is a contaminated sample of observations where any m of the n observations ($m < n$) are corrupted by arbitrary real numbers $\{x_1^*, \dots, x_m^*\}$ and the remaining $(n - m)$ sample observations are taken from the original set of observations \mathbf{X} . The asymptotic breakdown point of the estimator is defined as the limit of this finite-sample breakdown point, provided that the limit exists. However, such a definition makes sense only in the case of location estimators. For instance, the estimator of the scale parameter can break down when the estimate either “explodes” to infinity or “implodes” to zero [Maronna et al., 2019]. Thus, generalizing the idea of Hodges [1967], Hampel [1971] defines the asymptotic breakdown point ϵ^* of a sequence of estimators $\{T_n : n \geq 1\}$ as

$$\epsilon^* := \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1} \left\{ \epsilon : \text{There exists a compact set } K_\epsilon \subseteq \Theta \text{ such that} \right. \\ \left. \pi(G, G_\epsilon) \leq \epsilon \text{ implies } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} G_\epsilon(\{T_n \in K_\epsilon\}) = 1 \right\}$$

where $\pi(F, G)$ is the Prokhorov distance between the distributions F and G ; G is the true distribution and G_ϵ is the contaminating distribution from which the samples are obtained. In a comprehensive review of breakdown points and the corresponding literature, Huber and Donoho [1983] showed that the class of distributions lying inside the ϵ -neighbourhood of the true distribution G with respect to the Prokhorov distance is complex, and for almost all practical purposes, one can restrict attention

to a smaller class of distributions close to the true distribution G . They considered the class of ϵ -contaminated distributions instead,

$$G_{\epsilon,m} = (1 - \epsilon)G + \epsilon K_m, \quad (10)$$

where $\{K_m\}$ is a sequence of contaminating distributions. Therefore, for any functional T estimating a parameter θ belonging to a metric space (Θ, d) , the asymptotic breakdown point of T is defined as

$$\epsilon^* := \sup_{0 \leq \epsilon \leq 1} \left\{ \epsilon : \inf_{\theta_\infty \in \partial\Theta} \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} d(T(G_{\epsilon,m}), \theta_\infty) = 0 \right\}. \quad (11)$$

Here, $\partial\Theta$ denotes the boundary of the parameter space. We shall use (11) as the working definition of the asymptotic breakdown point for the rest of the paper.

For further details on the comprehensive definition of breakdown points, the readers are referred to [Huber and Ronchetti \[2011\]](#), [Wilcox \[2012\]](#) and [Maronna et al. \[2019\]](#).

3 Theoretical Breakdown Point Results under General Model Setups

In this section, we investigate the asymptotic breakdown properties of the MSD functional for independent and identically distributed data. The results pertaining to the MDPDE will then follow from the same with $\lambda = 0$. Also, with $\alpha = 0$, the S-divergence family reduces to the power divergence family. Hence, this general result also provides a lower bound to the asymptotic breakdown of the minimum power divergence estimator (including MLE as it is the minimum KL-divergence estimator) under a wide range of situations.

As discussed before in Section 2.2, the form of the S-divergence in (5) is valid for all (α, λ) such that both $A = 1 + \lambda(1 - \alpha)$ and $B = \alpha - \lambda(1 - \alpha)$ are nonzero. Technically, therefore, one can allow the tuning parameter α to go beyond 1. However, as discussed in [Basu et al. \[1998\]](#), choices of $\alpha > 1$ lead to unacceptably low efficiencies, and are generally avoided in practical implementations. Therefore, we assume $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$ throughout this section. Also, we will restrict our attention to the subclass of the S-divergence family such that both A and B are non-negative, i.e., $-1/(1 - \alpha) \leq \lambda \leq \alpha/(1 - \alpha)$. These choices include the special classes of density power divergence ($\lambda = 0$) and S-Hellinger distance (SHD) ($\lambda = -1/2$) as introduced in [Ghosh et al. \[2017\]](#).

Given the true distribution G with density g and a model family of distributions $\mathcal{F} = \{F_\theta : \theta \in \Theta\}$ with corresponding densities f_θ , the MSD functional $T_s(G)$ is defined as the value of the parameter $\theta \in \Theta$ such that the S-divergence $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f_\theta)$ is minimized. Given a sample $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$, the MSDE is then $T_s(G_n)$ where G_n is the empirical distribution function for the specific sample of observations. This quantity is theoretically given by the minimizer of $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\hat{g}_n, f_\theta)$ where \hat{g}_n is a non-parametric density estimate of the g based on the observed sample. In the special case of the MDPDE, such a density estimation step can be avoided as the integral $\int f_\theta^\alpha(x) dG(x)$ can be empirically estimated by $\int f_\theta^\alpha(x) dG_n(x)$, which is simply $n^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\theta^\alpha(X_i)$.

Let, the distributions $G_{\epsilon,m}$, G and K_m mentioned in the contamination model (10) have densities $g_{\epsilon,m}$, g and k_m respectively. To investigate the asymptotic breakdown point of $T_s(G)$, we shall look into how $T_s(G_{\epsilon,m})$ changes as a function of ϵ as m tends to infinity. The main theorem of our paper follows an approach similar to that of [Park and Basu \[2004\]](#). In the following, we present the key assumptions underlying our results. These are similar in spirit but cover more general model

setups, compared to the assumptions considered by Ghosh and Basu [2013] to obtain the asymptotic breakdown point of the MDPDE for the location parameter.

(BP1) $\int \min\{f_\theta(x), k_m(x)\}dx \rightarrow 0$ uniformly as $m \rightarrow \infty$ and θ is bounded away from the boundary $\partial\Theta$.

(BP2) $\int \min\{g(x), f_{\theta_m}(x)\}dx \rightarrow 0$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$ if $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta_\infty$ where θ_∞ is any point on the boundary $\partial\Theta$.

(BP3) There exists $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)} \in [0, 1/2]$ such that for all $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$, the S-divergence between ϵk_m and f_{θ_m} satisfy the inequality

$$\liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m}) > \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\epsilon^{(1+\alpha)}}{B} M_{k_m} + \left[\frac{1}{A} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} (1-\epsilon)^A \right] M_g, \quad (12)$$

where $\{\theta_m\}_{m=1}^\infty$ is a sequence of parameters such that $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta_\infty \in \partial\Theta$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Here, $M_f = \int f^{1+\alpha}(x)dx$. Note that ϵk_m is not a density per se, but there is no mathematical difficulty in constructing the quantity $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m})$ in the usual way as in (5).

The first Assumption (BP1) ensures that the sequence of contaminating distributions is asymptotically singular to the model family of distributions for the parameters lying in the interior of the parameter space. Similarly, Assumption (BP2) ensures that the true distribution is asymptotically singular to the model family of distributions with parameters tending towards the boundary of the parameter space. Finally, Assumption (BP3) compares the extremity of the contaminating distribution with respect to the model family of the distributions when the parameter tends to a point lying on the boundary of the parameter space. It is similar to the Assumption (BP3) in Ghosh and Basu [2013] and Ghosh et al. [2017] in spirit, but with a more complicated lower bound of the divergence between ϵk_m and f_{θ_m} . Assumption (BP3) is difficult to verify in practice in different setups, hence, we would later provide two sufficient conditions which will imply Assumption (BP3) and will be easily verifiable under different parametric setups. We will also demonstrate some examples of these later in Section 4. Now, we present the main theorem of our paper.

Theorem 3.1. *Under Assumptions (BP1)-(BP3), if the true density g belongs to the model family of distributions \mathcal{F} , i.e., $g = f_{\theta^g}$ for some $\theta^g \in \Theta$, then the MSD functional $T_s(G)$ minimizing $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f_\theta)$ has an asymptotic breakdown point at least as large as $\min\{1/2, \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}\}$, where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$ is as in Assumption (BP3).*

The result in Theorem 3.1 depends heavily on the Assumption (BP3) to provide the choice of $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$, which acts as a lower bound of the breakdown point ϵ^* . Since this is difficult to verify in practice, in the following discussion, we shall show several other sufficient conditions which imply Assumption (BP3) and help in deriving the exact value of the lower bound $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$ for any general setup. With the knowledge of the model family of distributions and the contaminating distributions, one can easily confirm these alternative assumptions.

We start with a lemma that provides a lower bound to the S-divergence itself.

Lemma 3.2. *Let, f and g be two densities and let $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(g, f)$ denote the S-divergence between these two densities for $\alpha \geq 0$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Also, let $\epsilon \leq [B/(1+\alpha)]^{1/A}$ where A and B are as defined in (6) and $M_f \geq M_g$ where $M_f = \int f^{1+\alpha}(x)dx$. Then, $S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon g, f) \geq S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon g, g)$.*

A corollary of the above lemma yields a similar bound in the case of the DPD which immediately follows by taking $A = 1$ and $B = \alpha$.

Corollary 1. *Let, f and g be two densities and let $d_\alpha(g, f)$ denote the DPD between these two densities for $\alpha \geq 0$. Also, let $\epsilon \leq \alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ and $M_f = \int f^{1+\alpha}(x)dx$. Now if $M_f \geq M_g$, then $d_\alpha(\epsilon g, f) \geq d_\alpha(\epsilon g, g)$.*

Now, we turn to describe our first alternative assumption which can provide a sufficient condition for Assumption (BP3) to hold.

(BP4) The contaminating densities $\{k_m\}$ satisfy the inequality $M_{k_m} \leq M_{f_{\theta_m}}$ for all sufficiently large m . In other words,

$$\liminf_{\theta_m \rightarrow \theta_\infty \in \partial\Theta} M_{f_{\theta_m}} \geq \limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} M_{k_m}.$$

Under Assumption (BP4), an application of Lemma 3.2 implies Assumption (BP3) for a suitable choice of $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$. Therefore, we can swap Assumption (BP3) in Theorem 3.1 with Assumption (BP4) and still obtain a similar result.

Theorem 3.3. *Under Assumptions (BP1)-(BP2) and (BP4), if the true density g belongs to the model family of distributions \mathcal{F} , i.e., $g = f_{\theta^g}$ for some $\theta^g \in \Theta$, then the MSD functional minimizing $S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g, f_\theta)$ has an asymptotic breakdown point at least as large as $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$, where*

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)} = \min \left\{ \left(\frac{B}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{1/A}, 1 - \left(\frac{B}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{1/A} \right\}.$$

The analogous result for MDPDE follows from substituting $A = 1$ and $B = \alpha$ in Theorem 3.3.

Corollary 2. *Under Assumptions (BP1)-(BP2) and (BP4), the MDPDE minimizing $d_\alpha(g, f_\theta)$ has an asymptotic breakdown point at least as large as $\alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ for $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, if the true density g belongs to the model family of distributions \mathcal{F} , i.e., $g = f_{\theta^g}$ for some $\theta^g \in \Theta$.*

This is remarkable as unlike the shrinking breakdown offered by the usual M-estimators for multivariate location and scatter as introduced by Maronna [1976], the MDPDE has an asymptotic breakdown point with a lower bound independent of the dimension of the data. This allows the MDPDE to be suited for robust inference of the parameters for arbitrarily high-dimensional data. In Figure 1, we show the quantity $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$ as a heatmap for different combinations of α and λ in case of the S-divergence. The choices of α and λ for which either $A < 0$ or $B < 0$ are indicated by the black region. For these situations, the assumptions do not hold, hence our analysis does not guarantee any useful lower bound of the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSDE. It clearly follows that, as α increases, the asymptotic breakdown point also increases considerably, while increasing λ has the opposite effect of reducing the breakdown point. This figure is in agreement with Figure 5 of Ghosh et al. [2017] where the authors indicate the region where both A and B are positive and the corresponding MSDE has an asymptotic breakdown point of $1/2$ for location estimators. Figure 1 also depicts that the MSDE is highly robust for a wide range of choices of α and λ ; the majority of the choices of α and λ lead to an estimator with an asymptotic breakdown point at least $1/4$, for which the corresponding contour is denoted by the solid white line.

Remark 3.1. When $\alpha = 1$ in the MSD functional, MSDE coincides with the robust minimum L_2 distance estimator irrespective of the value of λ . It has an asymptotic breakdown point of $1/2$ which can also be seen from Figure 1.

Remark 3.2. One of the important divergences among the S-divergence family of divergences is the Hellinger distance ($A = B = 1/2$). Minimum Hellinger Distance Estimator (MHDE) which aims




Figure 1: Lower bound $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$ of the asymptotic breakdown point of MSDE for different choices of α and λ .

to minimize the Hellinger distance between the empirical density and the model density function has been found to be extremely robust, and is often a popular choice for multivariate location and scatter estimate. [Tamura and Boos \[1986\]](#) showed that under some suitable assumptions, the asymptotic breakdown point of MHDE is at least $1/4$, independent of the data dimension. This is actually a special case of [Theorem 3.3](#) where under a different set of assumptions we obtain the same asymptotic breakdown point of MHDE.

Remark 3.3. When the parameter of interest is the location parameter and the support of the model family of distribution is the whole \mathbb{R}^d , where d is the dimension of the parameter, [Assumption \(BP4\)](#) is satisfied automatically if the contaminating distribution also belongs to the same family. In such cases, [Theorem 3.3](#) implies that the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSDE is at least as large as $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$, regardless of the dimension d . The breakdown results obtained for the robust location estimators in [Basu et al. \[1998\]](#) and [Ghosh and Basu \[2013\]](#) are special cases of this situation.

[Theorem 3.3](#) also tells us that the determining quantity of the breakdown point is $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$ and whether it is less than $1/2$ or greater than $1/2$. To see this, note that [Assumption \(BP3\)](#) can be rewritten as

$$M_{f_{\theta_m}} - \frac{1 + \alpha}{B} \epsilon^A \int f_{\theta_m}^B(x) k_m^A(x) dx > \left[1 - \frac{1 + \alpha}{B} (1 - \epsilon)^A \right] M_g, \quad (13)$$

for all sufficiently large m and for all $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$, where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)} \leq 1/2$ is a predetermined quantity. Since M_g is the integral corresponding to the true density g which is unknown, it can be arbitrarily large or arbitrarily small. Therefore, if $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A} < 1/2$, (which holds for the special cases of the DPD family of divergence and the S-Hellinger distance with $A = B = 1/2$) then the right-hand side of the [\(13\)](#) can be made equal to any negative real number, hence the only way for [\(13\)](#) to hold true is to ensure that the left-hand side is nonnegative for sufficiently large m . On the other hand, if $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A} > 1/2$, then for all $\epsilon < 1 - (B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$ the same conclusion will hold true.

The other choices for ϵ , i.e., for all $1/2 > \epsilon > 1 - (B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$, the right-hand side of (13) can be made arbitrarily large positive real number, hence the left-hand side must diverge to ∞ as m tends to ∞ . As $\epsilon > 0$, it means that $M_{f_{\theta_m}}$ must diverge to infinity faster than $\int f_{\theta_m}^B(x)k_m^A(x)dx$. This only happens if the contaminating densities k_m are sufficiently light-tailed compared to f_{θ_m} . However, this situation is already captured through Assumption (BP4), hence need not be investigated separately.

Based on the above discussion, we present another assumption which can be used to obtain an explicit value of the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSD functional and is another sufficient condition for Assumption (BP3).

(BP5) The contaminating densities k_m satisfy

$$L := \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty, \theta_m \rightarrow \theta_\infty} \frac{M_{f_{\theta_m}}}{\int f_{\theta_m}^B(x)k_m^A(x)dx} > 0,$$

where $\theta_\infty \in \partial\Theta$.

Theorem 3.4. *Under Assumptions (BP1)-(BP2) and (BP5), if the true density g belongs to the model family of distributions \mathcal{F} , i.e., $g = f_{\theta^g}$ for some $\theta^g \in \Theta$, then the MSD functional minimizing $S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g, f_\theta)$ has an asymptotic breakdown point at least as large as $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$, where*

$$\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)} = \min \left\{ \left(\frac{BL}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{1/A}, 1 - \left(\frac{B}{1 + \alpha} \right)^{1/A}, \frac{1}{2} \right\},$$

and L is as given in Assumption (BP5).

Remark 3.4. In Remark 3.3, we obtained a lower bound of the breakdown point as $(\frac{B}{1+\alpha})^{1/A}$ using Theorem 3.3. However, a better lower bound can be obtained by applying Theorem 3.4. Since the model family is a location family of distributions, the quantity $M_{f_{\theta_m}}$ is independent of the choice of m . In view of Assumption (BP1) and (BP2), the asymptotic singularity of model densities f_θ and contaminating densities k_m implies that the integral $\int f_{\theta_m}^B(x)k_m^A(x)dx$ can be made arbitrarily small as $m \rightarrow \infty$ when both A and B are positive. Hence, for $A > 0$ and $B > 0$, $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$ turns out to be equal to $1/2$. Therefore, the asymptotic breakdown point for MSDE when both $A > 0$ and $B > 0$ is $1/2$ for the location parameter when both the model family and the contaminating distributions are from the same location family of distributions. The same result is also obtained independently by Ghosh et al. [2017] via investigating this special case separately.

The two Assumptions (BP4) and (BP5) capture complementary behaviour of the tailedness of the contaminating distributions compared to the model family of distributions, and both of these with proper choices of $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$ provide sufficient conditions for Assumption (BP3).

4 Examples and Illustrations

In this section, we discuss various special cases of Theorems 3.3 and 3.4 for different model families of distributions and different kinds of contaminating distributions. We shall also empirically investigate how the performance of the MSD functional behaves in different levels of contamination under these model families.

4.1 Normal Location Model (Univariate)

This example concerns the popular parametric setup regarding the estimation of location in a Gaussian family of distributions with a known variance. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that the known variance is 1. Therefore, we have the true distribution $N(\theta^g, 1)$ and the model family of distributions is $N(\theta, 1)$ for $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$. Let us also assume that the contaminating densities $\{k_m\}$ also belong to the same model family with location parameters θ_{k_m} such that $|\theta_{k_m}| \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. The Assumptions (BP1) and (BP2) clearly hold for this choice of contaminating density. Also note that, both $M_{f_{\theta_m}}$ and M_{k_m} are equal to $(2\pi)^{-\alpha/2}(1 + \alpha)^{-1/2}$ for all m , which implies Assumption (BP4) also holds. Therefore, Theorem 3.3 ensures that the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSD functional in this case is at least $\min\{(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}, 1 - (B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}\}$. For the MDPDE, this lower bound of the asymptotic breakdown point is $\alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ for all $\alpha \in [0, 1]$.

However, the breakdown point for this setup when $\alpha > 0$ is actually $1/2$, which is much larger than the lower bound of $\alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ obtained through Theorem 3.3. To see this, one can note that $b_m = M_g/M_{k_m} = 1$ in this setup, which simplifies the inequality in Assumption (BP3) into

$$\epsilon^A - (1 - \epsilon)^A < 0,$$

which in turn implies $\epsilon < 1/2$ for all $A > 0, B > 0$. Our analysis for the general setup considers the worst-case scenario where $b_m \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, which does not happen in this setup.

The above analysis also holds true when we have any location family as the model family of distributions, since in such cases also $b_m = 1$. In all such scenarios, the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSD functional is $1/2$ whenever both A and B are positive as indicated in Remark 3.4. The same result has been separately obtained by Ghosh et al. [2017] by considering this special case.

4.2 Normal Scale Model (Univariate)

Another popular parametric setup is estimating the scale parameter for a known location parameter in the Gaussian family of distributions. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that the known location parameter is 0, otherwise, the same inference can be applied to the difference between the sample observations and the known location parameter. Let, $N(0, (\sigma^g)^2)$ is the true distribution, while the model family of distributions is $N(0, \sigma^2)$ where $\sigma \in (0, \infty)$ with corresponding densities f_σ . Therefore, breakdown occurs if the estimate of the variance parameter σ either “implodes” to 0 or “explodes” to ∞ . Let us also assume that the contaminating density k_m belongs to the same Gaussian family of distributions namely $N(\eta, \sigma_{k_m}^2)$ such that $\sigma_{k_m}^2$ either tends to 0 or tends to ∞ as $m \rightarrow \infty$.

If $\sigma_{k_m}^2$ “explodes” to ∞ , then M_{k_m} tends to 0 as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Clearly, in such cases, Assumption (BP4) is satisfied. Thus, the asymptotic breakdown point is at least $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$ for the MSD functional and $\alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ for the MDPDE. This is the more important case of scale breakdown as pointed out by Dasiou and Moysiadis [2001] and Huber and Ronchetti [2011].

On the other hand, if $\sigma_{k_m}^2$ “implodes” to 0, then both $M_{f_{\sigma_m}}$ and M_{k_m} tend to ∞ as $m \rightarrow \infty$. As the contaminating density becomes degenerate, the corresponding MSDE should also exhibit the same kind of degeneracy if a breakdown occurs, this is due to the asymptotic consistency of the estimator. Therefore, the event that the estimated variance σ_m^2 goes to ∞ while the variances of the contaminating densities $\sigma_{k_m}^2$ go to 0 happens with 0 probability under f_{σ_m} . If the estimated variance

σ_m^2 decreases faster than $\sigma_{k_m}^2$, then again Assumption (BP4) holds and the asymptotic breakdown point becomes at least $(B/(1+\alpha))^{1/A}$ for the MSD functional and $\alpha/(1+\alpha)$ for the MDPDE. Alternatively, if σ_m^2 decreases slower than $\sigma_{k_m}^2$, then Assumption (BP4) does not hold, and we turn to Assumption (BP5). Some calculations yield that

$$L = \sigma_m^{-A} \sigma_{k_m}^{(A-1)} \sqrt{\frac{(B\sigma_{k_m}^2 + A\sigma_m^2)}{1+\alpha}} \exp\left[\frac{AB\eta^2}{2(B\sigma_{k_m}^2 + A\sigma_m^2)}\right].$$

Now, as $(\sigma_{k_m}/\sigma_m)^2 \rightarrow 0$, if $A > 1$, then $L \rightarrow 0$, then it follows from Theorem 3.4 that the asymptotic breakdown point is at least 0, which provides no information. If $A = 1$, i.e., for MDPDE, we have $L = \lim_{\sigma \rightarrow 0} (1+\alpha)^{-1/2} \exp[\alpha\eta^2/2\sigma^2]$ and this limit depends on the choice of η . Then, we have the asymptotic breakdown point of the MDPDE as

$$\epsilon^* = \begin{cases} \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^{3/2}} & \text{if } \eta = 0 \\ 1/2 & \text{if } \eta \neq 0 \end{cases}.$$

For $0 < A < 1$, which includes the ‘‘Minimum Hellinger Distance Estimator’’ (MHDE), L diverges to ∞ , and the corresponding asymptotic breakdown point is again $1/2$. Since, we do not have control over the rate at which the estimated variance σ_m^2 will converge to 0, in summary, we have the following asymptotic breakdown points:

$$\epsilon^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A > 1, \\ \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^{3/2}} & \text{if } A = 1, \eta = 0, \\ \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)} & \text{if } A = 1, \eta \neq 0, \\ \min\left\{1/2, \left(\frac{B}{1+\alpha}\right)^{1/A}\right\} & \text{if } 0 < A < 1, \end{cases}$$

whenever the contaminating distribution k_m is $N(\eta, \sigma_{k_m}^2)$ with $\sigma_{k_m}^2 \rightarrow 0$.

While the above discussion directly uses the theory developed in the paper to obtain the asymptotic breakdown points, we can also empirically verify the fact by observing the behaviour of the estimate as a function of the contaminating proportion ϵ . Let us assume, without loss of generality, that the true distribution is the standard normal distribution. We have the contaminating distribution as $N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$ where μ_0 and σ_0^2 are to be chosen according to the type of contamination. The model family of distributions is $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ for $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sigma \geq 0$. Assume that the samples come from the contaminated mixed model with $(1-\epsilon)$ proportion of the data coming from the standard normal distribution and ϵ proportion of the data coming from the $N(\mu_0, \sigma_0^2)$ distribution. Now, in view of (5), the MSD functional for this contaminated density can be obtained by minimizing the objective function

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{A} \int \sigma^{-(1+\alpha)} \phi^{(1+\alpha)}\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right) dx \\ & - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} \int \sigma^{-B} \phi^B\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right) \left[(1-\epsilon)\phi(x) + \epsilon\sigma_0^{-1} \phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_0}{\sigma_0}\right) \right]^A dx, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\phi(x)$ is the standard normal density. However, it is difficult to obtain a closed form of the S-divergence for general α and λ values because of the second term. Only when $\lambda = 0$ (i.e., $A = 1$), the corresponding S-divergence reduces to the density power divergence which has a neat solution. The MDPD functional minimizes the objective function




Figure 2: Behaviour of MDPD estimates (same as MSDE with $\lambda = 0$) under normal location model as a function of the contamination




Figure 3: Behaviour of MSDE under normal location model as a function of the contamination for different choices of α and λ (denoted in the title of individual plots)

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{(1+\alpha)/2} \sigma^{1+\alpha}} \exp\left(-\frac{(1+\alpha)(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) dx - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{(1+\alpha)/2} \sigma^\alpha} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}\right) \left[(1-\epsilon)e^{-x^2/2} + \frac{\epsilon}{\sigma_0} e^{-(x-\mu_0)^2/2\sigma_0^2}\right] dx,$$

which simplifies to

$$(2\pi)^{-\alpha/2} \left[\frac{\sigma^{-\alpha}}{\sqrt{1+\alpha}} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha}\right) \sigma^{(1-\alpha)} \left\{ \frac{(1-\epsilon)}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \alpha}} e^{-\alpha\mu^2/2(\sigma^2 + \alpha)} + \frac{\epsilon}{\sqrt{\sigma^2 + \alpha\sigma_0^2}} e^{-\alpha(\mu-\mu_0)^2/2(\sigma^2 + \alpha\sigma_0^2)} \right\} \right]. \quad (15)$$

Now for any choice of μ_0, σ_0^2 , one can obtain the minimizer μ and σ^2 as a function of the contaminating proportion ϵ . In the first experiment, we emulate a setup similar to the Example 4.1 where we assume the knowledge of $\sigma = \sigma_0 = 1$ and fix $\mu_0 = 5$ and aim to obtain the MDPDE of the location parameter μ as a function of ϵ . The resulting estimate is depicted in Figure 2. It is clearly seen that as α increases to 1, the breakdown point of the estimator increases to 0.5.

For $\lambda \neq 0$, the resulting S-divergence between the contaminated density and the model family of densities cannot be obtained in a closed form, due to the integral present in the second term of (14). For the empirical study, we express this quantity as

$$\int \sigma^{-B} \phi^B\left(\frac{x-\mu}{\sigma}\right) \left[(1-\epsilon)\phi(x) + \epsilon\sigma_0^{-1}\phi\left(\frac{x-\mu_0}{\sigma_0}\right) \right]^A dx = \sigma^{-(B-1)} \mathbb{E}_X \left[\phi^B\left(\frac{X-\mu}{\sigma}\right) \left[(1-\epsilon)\phi(X) + \epsilon\sigma_0^{-1}\phi\left(\frac{X-\mu_0}{\sigma_0}\right) \right]^A \right],$$

where \mathbb{E}_X denote the expectation operator with respect to a random variable X following a normal distribution with mean μ and variance σ^2 . Therefore, to calculate this integral, we perform a Monte Carlo integration technique with 10000 resamples. The next steps follow similar to the case for MDPDE. The resulting estimates as a function of the contamination proportion are demonstrated in Figure 3. For $\lambda < 0$, the resulting estimates exhibit high robustness property for all values of $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, but for $\lambda > 0$, the robustness is maintained only for high values of α close to 1.

In the second experiment, we fix $\mu_0 = 5$ as before but take $\sigma_0 = 0.01$, emulating the setup where the variance of the contaminating distribution “implodes” to zero. Here, we aim to simultaneously obtain the MDPDE of location and scale parameters. The resulting estimates are shown in Figure 4. Due to the very small σ_0 , the contaminating distribution is extremely spiky and almost singular to the true distribution, thus, even for a very small $\alpha > 0$, the resulting MDPDE for location parameter exhibits a high breakdown point near 0.5. This agrees with the theoretical bounds provided earlier. However, for $\alpha = 0$, the resulting estimate is the maximum likelihood estimate, which is a linear function of the contamination proportion ϵ , hence the MLE breaks down at any positive ϵ . A very interesting situation ensues for the estimates of the scale parameter. For $\alpha = 0$, the resulting MLE for the precision parameter becomes linear in ϵ , which translates to the circular arc as shown in Figure 4 (right panel) for the variance (or scale) parameter. For $\alpha > 0$, the scale estimator remains close to the true value of 1 up to $\epsilon \in (0.2, 0.4)$ depending on the value of α , after that, it immediately increases to a very high value and around $\epsilon = 0.5$, the estimator drops to the neighbourhood of 0 as the majority of the data then comes from $N(5, 0.01^2)$ distribution.




Figure 4: Behaviour of MDPD estimates under normal location-scale model as a function of the contamination proportion ϵ , with the location parameter in the left panel and the scale parameter in the right panel.

In Figure 5, we show the MSDE for different values of λ . A similar phenomenon of increase in estimate of the variance parameter is also observed here across all values of λ , for contamination proportion between 0.3 and 0.5.

4.3 Normal Location Model and Scale Model (Multivariate)

For the location parameter estimation under the multivariate normal setup, the contaminating densities k_m are assumed to be multivariate normal with mean $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k_m}$ and known dispersion matrix with $\|\boldsymbol{\mu}_{k_m}\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $m \rightarrow \infty$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the Euclidean L_2 norm. The same conclusion as in Example 4.1 also follows for this case; the MSD functional achieves the highest possible asymptotic breakdown of $1/2$ whenever both A and B are positive, irrespective of the data dimension p .

For the scatter matrix estimation under the multivariate normal setup, we assume that the contaminating densities k_m are also multivariate normal densities which converge to a singular normal distribution as $m \rightarrow \infty$. Using an approach similar to that of Example 4.2, it turns out, together with an application of Theorem 3.4, that the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSDE is

$$\epsilon^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A > 1, \\ \alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-(1+p/2)} & \text{if } A = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta} = 0, \\ \alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-1} & \text{if } A = 1, \boldsymbol{\eta} \neq 0, \\ \min \left\{ 1/2, \left(\frac{B}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1/A} \right\} & \text{if } 0 < A < 1, \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

where p is the dimension of the data and $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ is the known location of the contaminating densities k_m . Therefore, except for the particular case when the location of the true data-generating distribution coincides with the location of the contaminating distribution, the breakdown point remains independent of the dimension p .

Remark 4.1. In contrast to Example 4.3, if we perform simultaneous estimations of location and scale under the normal distribution setup, the asymptotic breakdown point of MDPDE can decrease exponentially in the dimension of the data. Since, for enough outlying points, the difference between the estimated location and the location of the contaminated density can be made arbitrary. In the worst case, the asymptotic breakdown point of MDPDE will take on the value $\min\{\alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-1}, \alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-(1+p/2)}\}$, i.e., $\alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-(1+p/2)}$ in view of (16). This same result is also provided




Figure 5: Behaviour of MSDE under normal location-scale model as a function of the contamination proportion ϵ , with the location parameter in the left panel and the scale parameter in the right panel, for different choices of λ (denoted in the title of the individual plots)

by Basu et al. [1998] for the univariate case ($p = 1$). They restrict the contaminating distribution to the Dirac delta distribution which is a limit of the $N(\eta_m, \sigma_m^2)$ distribution with $\sigma_m^2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\eta_m \rightarrow \infty$. However, for $A \neq 0$ (non-MDPDE cases), the provided lower bounds to the asymptotic breakdown point do not get affected by simultaneous location and scatter estimation.

4.4 Exponential Distribution

In this example, we restrict our attention to the exponential family of distributions as the model family. Let the true distribution be $\exp(\lambda_g)$ where λ_g is the true rate parameter. We assume that the contaminating distribution k_m also belongs to the same family with rate parameters λ_{k_m} for $m = 1, 2, \dots$, such that λ_{k_m} either converges to 0 or to ∞ . It turns out if $f(x)$ is the density function of the exponential distribution with rate λ , then $M_f = \lambda^\alpha / (1 + \alpha)$.

If $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow 0$, then clearly Assumption (BP4) holds and by Theorem 3.3, the asymptotic breakdown point turns out to be at least $(B/(1 + \alpha))^{1/A}$ for the MSD functional and $\alpha/(1 + \alpha)$ for the MDPDE.

On the other side as $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow \infty$, the same breakdown analysis applies if the estimated rate parameter λ_m diverges faster than λ_{k_m} . However, if λ_m diverges at a slower rate compared to λ_{k_m} , then we

turn to Assumption **(BP5)**. Some calculations then yield

$$L = \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{(1 + \alpha)} \left(\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{k_m}} \right)^{(A-1)} \left(B \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{k_m}} + A \right).$$

Again depending on the choice of A , we have different asymptotic breakdown points as obtained using Theorem 3.4. For $A > 1$, as $L \rightarrow 0$, the asymptotic breakdown is 0; for $A = 1$, the MDPD functional has an asymptotic breakdown of $\alpha(1 + \alpha)^{-2}$; and for $0 < A < 1$, L diverges to ∞ and hence the asymptotic breakdown point is $1/2$. Since we do not have any control over the rate of convergence of λ_m , in summary, we get the following asymptotic breakdown point

$$\epsilon^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } A > 1, \\ \frac{\alpha}{(1+\alpha)^2} & \text{if } A = 1, \\ \min \left\{ 1/2, \left(\frac{B}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1/A} \right\} & \text{if } 0 < A < 1, \end{cases}$$

when the rate parameter of the contaminating exponential distribution goes to ∞ , i.e., the mean of the contaminating exponential distribution goes to 0.

For this setup also, we perform an exercise similar to that in Example 4.2. Let us assume, without loss of generality, that the true distribution is the standard exponential distribution with rate parameter 1. Under ϵ -level contamination ($\epsilon \in [0, 1]$), we assume that the sample observations follow a mixture of the standard exponential distribution with mixing proportion $(1 - \epsilon)$ and the contaminating exponential distribution with rate parameter λ_0 . The model family of distributions under consideration is again a family of exponential distributions with unknown rate parameter λ with $\lambda > 0$. As in Example 4.2, we restrict our attention to only the MDPD functional, which aims to minimize the objective function

$$\int \lambda^{(1+\alpha)} e^{-(1+\alpha)\lambda x} dx - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \left[\int \lambda^\alpha e^{-\alpha\lambda x} \left\{ (1 - \epsilon)e^{-x} + \epsilon\lambda_{k_m} e^{-\lambda_{k_m} x} \right\} dx \right].$$

It simplifies to

$$\lambda^\alpha \left[\frac{1}{1 + \alpha} - \left(1 + \frac{1}{\alpha} \right) \left(\frac{1 - \epsilon}{(\alpha\lambda + 1)} + \frac{\epsilon\lambda_{k_m}}{(\alpha\lambda + \lambda_{k_m})} \right) \right].$$

Given a choice of λ_0 , we can obtain the minimizer of the above objective function with respect to λ and visualize how the MDPDE behaves as a function of the contamination proportion ϵ . As indicated before, the rate parameter of the contaminating distribution can either implode to zero or explode to infinity, in view of Assumption **(BP1)**. So, in the first experiment, we choose $\lambda_0 = 10$ and in the second experiment, we consider $\lambda_0 = 0.01$. The corresponding absolute biases of the MDPDE of the inverse rate parameter as a function of ϵ for varying tuning parameter α have been illustrated in Figure 6. For both cases, $\lambda_0 = 10$ and $\lambda_0 = 0.01$, the resulting MDPDE of the inverse rate parameter corresponding to $\alpha = 0$ (i.e., the MLE) turns out to be a linear function of the contamination proportion ϵ , and the absolute bias also remains linear in ϵ . When $\lambda_0 = 10$, for higher values of α , the bias increases as a convex function of ϵ and the curvatures of those functions increase in α , resulting in an estimator with a higher breakdown. On the other hand, when $\lambda_0 = 0.01$, the robust behaviour of the MDPDE can be effectively seen from Figure 6. As the contamination proportion ϵ increases, the resulting MDPDE moves away from the true inverse rate parameter 1 to the contaminated value $1/\lambda_0 = 100$, but at a very slow rate for $\alpha \geq 0.25$.




Figure 6: Behaviour of MDPD estimates under exponential model as a function of the contamination proportion ϵ , for two $\lambda_0 = 10$ (Left) and $\lambda_0 = 0.01$ (Right).

4.5 Gamma distribution

We can generalize Example 4.4 to consider the family of Gamma distributions with a fixed shape parameter t and unknown inverse-scale parameter λ . The contaminating densities k_m are also assumed to belong to the same family with inverse-scale parameter λ_{k_m} such that $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow 0$ or $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow \infty$. If $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow 0$, then the asymptotic breakdown point of the MSD functional becomes $(B/(1+\alpha))^{1/A}$.

On the other hand, if $\lambda_{k_m} \rightarrow \infty$, then calculations similar to those in Example 4.4, we obtain that

$$L = (1 + \alpha)^{\alpha - (1+\alpha)t} \left(\frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{k_m}} \right)^{\alpha - Bt} \left(A + B \frac{\lambda_m}{\lambda_{k_m}} \right)^{(1+\alpha)t - \alpha},$$

and the asymptotic breakdown point for the MSD functional turns out to be

$$\epsilon^* = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \alpha > Bt, \\ \alpha A^{At} (1 + \alpha)^{-(1+At)} & \text{if } \alpha = Bt, \\ \min \left\{ 1/2, \left(\frac{B}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1/A} \right\} & \text{if } \alpha < Bt. \end{cases}$$

We also analyze the behaviour of the resulting estimate under different levels of contamination as in Examples 4.2 and 4.4. The results are very similar to the results obtained in Example 4.4 with the exception that the choice of the shape parameter t governs the curvatures of the curves shown in Figure 6; increasing t results in more robust behaviours of MDPDE with $\alpha > 0$.

4.6 Binomial Model

Here we consider an example from Basu et al. [2011]. Let the model family of distributions be a binomial distribution with size parameter 12 and unknown success probability $\theta \in [0, 1]$. We assume that the true value of θ is 0.5 which is the target quantity to estimate. Clearly, this discrete setup does not naturally come under the paradigm of minimum S-divergence estimation which assumes the existence of the densities for the model distribution. Additionally, the Assumption (BP1) and (BP2) do not hold for any choice of the contaminating distribution which has bounded support in $[0, 12]$. Despite this, we can still obtain an estimator analogous to the MSDE by minimizing a discretized version of S-divergence, where we replace the densities with corresponding probability

mass functions. To satisfy the asymptotic singularity as required by Assumption (BP1) and (BP2), we may consider the contaminating distribution as the Dirac delta distribution at 12. This also yields the maximum effect of contamination possible in this discrete setup. Therefore, we denote

$$g_\epsilon(x) = (1 - \epsilon)2^{-12} \binom{12}{x} + \epsilon \delta_{12}(x), \quad x \in \{0, 1, \dots, 12\}, \quad (17)$$

as the contaminated probability mass function (pmf) at level $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$ from which the samples are assumed to be generated. Here, $\delta_{12}(x)$ is identically equal to 0 for all $x \in \{0, 1, \dots, 11\}$ but at $x = 12$, it is equal to 1. Now, in view of (5), the definition of the S-divergence can be readily extended to measure the statistical discrepancy between two probability mass functions in discrete setup, and hence the MSD functional for this particular setup can be written as

$$\hat{\theta}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon) = \arg \min_{\theta \in [0, 1]} \left(\frac{1}{A} \sum_{x=0}^{12} f_\theta^{1+\alpha}(x) - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} \sum_{x=0}^{12} f_\theta^B(x) g_\epsilon^A(x) + \frac{1}{B} \sum_{x=0}^{12} g_\epsilon^{1+\alpha}(x) \right),$$

where $g_\epsilon(x)$ is as defined in (17) and $f_\theta(x)$ is the probability mass function of the binomial distribution with size parameter 12 and success probability θ evaluated at x .

In Figure 7, we plot the values of $\hat{\theta}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon)$ for different choices of α and λ as a function of ϵ . For $\alpha = 0$ and $\lambda = 0$, when the MSD functional corresponds to the minimum Kullback-Leibler divergence functional (or the maximum likelihood functional), the estimate becomes a linear function of the contamination proportion ϵ . For $\lambda = 0$, as α increases to 1, the estimate becomes more robust. As shown in Figure 7, for values of α closer to 1, the estimator remains near 0.5 when $\epsilon < 0.5$ and jumps rapidly to 1 when $\epsilon > 0.5$. For $\lambda < 0$, a wider range of α ensures this robust behaviour. However, when $\lambda > 0$, only comparatively higher values of α (usually $\alpha > 0.5$) demonstrate this robust behaviour.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we generalize the existing scattered results on the asymptotic breakdown point of different minimum divergence functionals under location-scale families of distributions, and extend it in both ways, by encompassing a generalized MSD functional and different model distributions including the location-scale families. Our result in Theorem 3.4 illustrates how the asymptotic breakdown point is affected by the choice of the contaminating distributions. Throughout different examples in Section 4, we also show how our results can be applied to specific settings to obtain the asymptotic breakdown points. We also validate these results by empirically looking at the behaviour of the estimated parameter under varying contamination proportions. For many such examples, the asymptotic breakdown point turns out to be free of the dimension of the data for various choices of contaminating distributions. This justifies the application of the MSDE (MDPDE, in particular) as a viable robust alternative for high dimensional parametric inference.

Our breakdown point results assume that the true distribution g belongs to the model family of distributions \mathcal{F} . However, it is important to know how the breakdown points of the minimum divergence estimators change under model misspecifications. Also, in our entire analysis, we do not allow A or B to be negative, which restricts the choice of λ given the choice of α in S-divergence. Based on the empirical evidence, we believe that for $\lambda < (-1/(1 - \alpha))$, the asymptotic breakdown point would remain 1/2 while for $\lambda > \alpha/(1 - \alpha)$, the breakdown will reduce to 0. One of the other




Figure 7: Minimum S-divergence estimate of probability under different levels of contamination in binomial model for different choices of α and λ (λ is denoted in the title of each individual plots)

interesting cases to investigate would be to see the behaviour of the asymptotic breakdown point for sparse contamination. For instance, in high-dimensional inference with real-life applications, the contamination is usually present in only a few of the coordinates of the data. In such cases, because the set of contaminating distributions is restricted, we expect that the breakdown would be higher than the lower bounds derived in this paper. However, we do not have a proof for this claim at this point in time. We expect to tackle these problems in the future.

A Proofs of the Results

A.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

We shall follow the approach by [Park and Basu \[2004\]](#). Let, $\epsilon (< \epsilon^*)$ be a fixed level of contamination where the breakdown occurs. This means, there exists a sequence of densities $\{k_m\}$ for contamination such that the minimum S-divergence (MSD) functional

$$\theta_m = \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta}),$$

satisfy $\theta_m \rightarrow \theta_{\infty}$ where θ_{∞} is a boundary point of Θ . Note that

$$S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) = \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) + \int_{A_m^c} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}),$$

where $\mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g, f) = \frac{1}{A} f^{1+\alpha} - \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} f^B g^A + \frac{1}{B} g^{1+\alpha}$ and

$$A_m = \{x : g(x) > \max\{k_m(x), f_{\theta_m}(x)\}\}.$$

From Assumption [\(BP1\)](#)-[\(BP2\)](#), it then follows that

$$\int_{A_m} k_m(x) dx \rightarrow 0, \text{ also, } \int_{A_m} f_{\theta_m}(x) dx \rightarrow 0,$$

as $m \rightarrow \infty$, which means under both k_m and f_{θ_m} , the event A_m has asymptotically zero probability. Therefore, on the set A_m ,

$$\mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1 - \epsilon)g, 0) = \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{1+\alpha}}{B} g^{1+\alpha}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) - \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_g \right| \\ &= \left| \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) - \int_{g>0} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1 - \epsilon)g, 0) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) - \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1 - \epsilon)g, 0) \right| + \left| \int_{A_m} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1 - \epsilon)g, 0) - \int_{g>0} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1 - \epsilon)g, 0) \right| \\ &\rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Again, by using Assumption [\(BP1\)](#) and [\(BP2\)](#) we obtain that

$$\int_{A_m^c} g(x) \rightarrow 0, \text{ as } m \rightarrow \infty.$$

By a similar argument as before, it follows that

$$\left| \int_{A_m^c} \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) - \int \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m}) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Therefore, as $m \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\left| S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) - \frac{(1 - \epsilon)^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_g - S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) \right| \rightarrow 0.$$

Let us call $a_1(\epsilon) = \liminf_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta_m}) + \frac{(1-\epsilon)^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_g$. Now, we will have a contradiction to our Assumption that ϵ is a breakdown point if we can show that there is a constant value θ^* away from the boundary $\partial\Theta$ such that for the same sequence of contaminating distributions $\{k_m\}$ it satisfies

$$\limsup_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta^*}) < a_1(\epsilon), \quad (18)$$

so then the sequence $\{\theta_m\}$ could not minimize for every m . Since the true distribution g also belongs to the model family of distributions, it is natural to take $\theta^* = \theta^g$, the true value of the parameter. We will now show that (18) is true for this choice of θ^* . To show this, we again partition the sample space as $B_m \cup B_m^c$ where

$$B_m = \{x : k_m(x) > \max\{g(x), f_{\theta^*}(x)\}\}.$$

It then follows by Assumptions (BP1) and (BP2), the set B_m is asymptotically null set under both $g(x)$ and f_{θ^*} and the set B_m^c is asymptotically null set under k_m . By a similar argument as before, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(g_{\epsilon, m}, f_{\theta^g}) \\ \rightarrow & \int \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, 0) + \int \mathcal{S}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}((1-\epsilon)g, f_{\theta^g}) \\ = & \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_{k_m} + r_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(1-\epsilon) M_{f_{\theta^g}} \\ = & \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_{k_m} + r_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(1-\epsilon) M_g, \end{aligned}$$

where for $\epsilon \in [0, 1]$,

$$r_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon) = \left[\frac{1}{A} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} \epsilon^B + \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} \right].$$

Therefore, asymptotically there is no breakdown at ϵ if for sufficiently large m we have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(1-\epsilon)^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_g + S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m}) > \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_{k_m} + r_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(1-\epsilon) M_g, \\ \Leftrightarrow & S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m}) > \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_{k_m} + \left[\frac{1}{A} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} (1-\epsilon)^A \right] M_g. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, Assumption (BP3) ensures that the above inequality is true for all $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha, \lambda)}$. This completes the proof.

A.2 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Using the form of S-divergence as in (5) and applying Hölders' inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} S_{(\alpha, \lambda)}(\epsilon g, f) &= \frac{1}{A} \int f^{1+\alpha} dx - \frac{\epsilon^A (1+\alpha)}{AB} \int f^B g^A dx + \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} \int g^{1+\alpha} dx \\ &\geq M_f - \frac{\epsilon^A (1+\alpha)}{AB} M_f^{B/(1+\alpha)} M_g^{A/(1+\alpha)} + \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_g \end{aligned}$$

since $A + B = (1 + \alpha)$.

Since $\epsilon \leq [B/(1+\alpha)]^{1/A}$, hence $0 < \epsilon^A(1+\alpha)/B < 1$. Using $M_f \geq M_g$, we obtain the following two inequalities;

$$M_f \left[\frac{1}{A} - \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} \right] \geq M_g \left[\frac{1}{A} - \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} \right], \quad (19)$$

and

$$\epsilon^B \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} M_f \geq \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} M_f^{B/(1+\alpha)} M_g^{A/(1+\alpha)}. \quad (20)$$

Summing up both inequalities (19) and (20), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{A} M_f - \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} M_f^{B/(1+\alpha)} M_g^{A/(1+\alpha)} \geq \frac{1}{A} M_g - \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} M_g. \quad (21)$$

Adding $\epsilon^{\alpha+1} M_g/B$ to both sides of the above inequality (21) yields the result.

A.3 Proof of Theorem 3.3

Under Assumption (BP4), an application of Lemma 3.2 yields that for all $\epsilon < (B/(1+\alpha))^{1/A}$,

$$S_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon k_m, f_{\theta_m}) \geq r_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon) M_{k_m}, \text{ for sufficiently large } m$$

where $r_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon) = \left[\frac{1}{A} - \frac{1+\alpha}{AB} \epsilon^B + \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} \right]$. Therefore, Assumption (BP3) follows if we can show that the following inequality holds true for all $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$, where $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$ is to be chosen. To this end, we have

$$\begin{aligned} r_{(\alpha,\lambda)}(\epsilon) M_{k_m} &> \frac{\epsilon^{1+\alpha}}{B} M_{k_m} + \left[\frac{1}{A} - \frac{(1+\alpha)}{AB} (1-\epsilon)^A \right] M_g \\ \iff M_{k_m} - M_{k_m} \frac{(1+\alpha)}{B} \epsilon^A &> M_g - \frac{(1+\alpha)}{B} (1-\epsilon)^A M_g \\ \iff (\epsilon^A b_m - (1-\epsilon)^A) &< \frac{B}{(1+\alpha)} (b_m - 1) \\ \iff b_m \left(\epsilon^A - \frac{B}{(1+\alpha)} \right) + \left(\frac{B}{(1+\alpha)} - (1-\epsilon)^A \right) &< 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $b_m = M_{k_m}/M_g$. This inequality holds true if $\epsilon < (B/(1+\alpha))^{1/A}$ and $\epsilon < 1 - (B/(1+\alpha))^{1/A}$. Picking $\tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)}$ now as given in Theorem 3.3 completes the proof.

A.4 Proof of Theorem 3.4

If $\epsilon < \tilde{\epsilon}_{(\alpha,\lambda)} < \left(\frac{BL}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1/A}$, it follows that

$$M_{f_{\theta_m}} - \epsilon^A \frac{(1+\alpha)}{B} \int f_{\theta_m}^B(x) k_m^A(x) dx \geq 0$$

for all sufficiently large m . On the other hand, as $\epsilon < 1 - \left(\frac{B}{1+\alpha} \right)^{1/A}$, we have the right-hand side of (13) as some negative real number. Therefore, (13) will hold which in turn, will imply Assumption (BP3). Finally, an application of Theorem 3.1 now completes the proof.

References

- Ayanendranath Basu, Ian R. Harris, Nils L. Hjort, and M. C. Jones. Robust and Efficient Estimation by Minimising a Density Power Divergence. *Biometrika*, 85(3):549–559, 1998. ISSN 00063444. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2337385>.
- Ayanendranath Basu, Hiroyuki Shioya, and Chanseok Park. *Statistical Inference: The Minimum Distance Approach*. Chapman & Hall/CRC Monographs on Statistics & Applied Probability. CRC Press, 2011. ISBN 9781420099669. URL https://books.google.co.in/books?id=C-10IgDp5_0C.
- Subir K. Bhandari, Ayanendranath Basu, and Sahadeb Sarkar. Robust Inference in Parametric Models using the Family of Generalized Negative Exponential Disparities. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Statistics*, 48(1):95–114, 2006. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2006.00428.x>. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/j.1467-842X.2006.00428.x>.
- Noel Cressie and Timothy R. C. Read. Multinomial Goodness-of-Fit Tests. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*, 46(3):440–464, 1984. ISSN 00359246. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2345686>.
- Imre Csiszár. Eine informationstheoretische ungleichung und ihre anwendung auf beweis der ergodizitaet von markoffschen ketten. *Magyer Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutato Int. Koezl.*, 8:85–108, 1963.
- Despina Dasiou and Chronis Moyssiadis. The 50% breakdown point in simultaneous M-estimation of location and scale. *Statistical Papers*, 42(2):243–252, Apr 2001. ISSN 1613-9798. doi: [10.1007/s003620100053](https://doi.org/10.1007/s003620100053). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s003620100053>.
- P. L. Davies. Asymptotic Behaviour of S-Estimates of Multivariate Location Parameters and Dispersion Matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, 15(3):1269–1292, 1987. ISSN 00905364. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2241828>.
- Justin A. Fishbone and Lamine Mili. New Highly Efficient High-Breakdown Estimator of Multivariate Scatter and Location for Elliptical Distributions, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.13567>.
- Abhik Ghosh. Asymptotic Properties of Minimum S-Divergence Estimator for Discrete Models. *Sankhya A*, 77(2):380–407, Aug 2015. ISSN 0976-8378. doi: [10.1007/s13171-014-0063-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13171-014-0063-2). URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13171-014-0063-2>.
- Abhik Ghosh and Ayanendranath Basu. Robust estimation for independent non-homogeneous observations using density power divergence with applications to linear regression. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 7(none):2420 – 2456, 2013. doi: [10.1214/13-EJS847](https://doi.org/10.1214/13-EJS847). URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-EJS847>.
- Abhik Ghosh, Ian R. Harris, Avijit Maji, Ayanendranath Basu, and Leandro Pardo. A generalized divergence for statistical inference. *Bernoulli*, 23(4A):2746–2783, 2017.
- Frank R. Hampel. A General Qualitative Definition of Robustness. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 42(6):1887 – 1896, 1971. doi: [10.1214/aoms/1177693054](https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177693054). URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177693054>.

- Frank R. Hampel, Elvezio M. Ronchetti, Peter J. Rousseeuw, and Werner A. Stahel. *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2011. ISBN 9781118150689. URL <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=XK3uhrVefXQC>.
- Joseph L. Hodges. Efficiency in normal samples and tolerance of extreme values for some estimates of location. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability*, volume 1, pages 163–186, 1967.
- Peter J. Huber. Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73 – 101, 1964. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177703732. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aoms/1177703732>.
- Peter J. Huber and David L. Donoho. The notion of breakdown point. *A Festschrift for Erich L. Lehmann*, 1983.
- Peter J. Huber and Elvezio M. Ronchetti. *Robust Statistics*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2011. ISBN 9781118210338. URL https://books.google.co.in/books?id=j10hquR_j88C.
- Ricardo A. Maronna. Robust M-Estimators of Multivariate Location and Scatter. *The Annals of Statistics*, 4(1):51 – 67, 1976. doi: 10.1214/aos/1176343347. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1176343347>.
- Ricardo A. Maronna, R. Douglas Martin, Victor J. Yohai, and Matías Salibián-Barrera. *Robust Statistics: Theory and Methods (with R)*. Wiley Series in Probability and Statistics. Wiley, 2019. ISBN 9781119214687. URL <https://books.google.co.in/books?id=K5RxDwAAQBAJ>.
- Tetsuzo Morimoto. Markov Processes and the H-Theorem. *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan*, 18(3):328–331, March 1963. doi: 10.1143/JPSJ.18.328.
- Chanseok Park and Ayanendranath Basu. Minimum disparity estimation: Asymptotic normality and breakdown point results. *Bulletin of Informatics and Cybernetics*, pages 19–33, 2004. doi: 10.5109/12576. URL <https://doi.org/10.5109/12576>.
- Chanseok Park, Haewon Kim, and Min Wang. Investigation of Finite-sample Properties of Robust Location and Scale Estimators. *Communications in Statistics - Simulation and Computation*, 51(5):2619–2645, 2022. doi: 10.1080/03610918.2019.1699114. URL <https://doi.org/10.1080/03610918.2019.1699114>.
- Peter J. Rousseeuw. Multivariate Estimation with High Breakdown Point. *Mathematical Statistics and Applications*, 8(283-297):37, 1985.
- Peter J. Rousseeuw and Victor J. Yohai. Robust Regression by Means of S-Estimators. In Jürgen Franke, Wolfgang Härdle, and Douglas Martin, editors, *Robust and Nonlinear Time Series Analysis*, pages 256–272, New York, NY, 1984. Springer US. ISBN 978-1-4615-7821-5.
- Douglas G. Simpson. Minimum Hellinger Distance Estimation for the Analysis of Count Data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 82(399):802–807, 1987. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2288789>.
- Ezequiel Smucler. Asymptotics for Redescending M-estimators in Linear Models with Increasing Dimension. *Statistica Sinica*, 29(2):1065–1081, 2019. ISSN 10170405, 19968507. URL <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26705501>.

Roy N. Tamura and Dennis D. Boos. Minimum Hellinger Distance Estimation for Multivariate Location and Covariance. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 81(393):223–229, 1986. ISSN 01621459. URL <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2287994>.

Rand Wilcox. Chapter 3 - Estimating Measures of Location and Scale. In Rand Wilcox, editor, *Introduction to Robust Estimation and Hypothesis Testing*, Statistical Modeling and Decision Science, pages 43–101. Academic Press, Boston, third edition edition, 2012. ISBN 978-0-12-386983-8. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-386983-8.00003-2>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780123869838000032>.