

Sparse Linear Regression when Noises and Covariates are Heavy-Tailed and Contaminated by Outliers

Takeyuki Sasai * Hironori Fujisawa †

August 5, 2024

Abstract

We investigate a problem estimating coefficients of linear regression under sparsity assumption when covariates and noises are sampled from heavy tailed distributions. Additionally, we consider the situation where not only covariates and noises are sampled from heavy tailed distributions but also contaminated by outliers. Our estimators can be computed efficiently, and exhibit sharp error bounds.

1 Introduction

Sparse estimation has been studied extensively over the past 20 years to handle modern high-dimensional data with [40] as a starting point. Because the advancement of computer technology has made it possible to collect very high dimensional data efficiently, sparse estimation will continue to be an important and effective method for high dimensional data analysis in the future. In this study, we focus on the estimation of coefficients in sparse linear regression. We define sparse linear regression model as follows:

$$y_i = \mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \xi_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.1)$$

where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) random vectors, $\boldsymbol{\beta}^* \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is the true coefficient vector, and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables, and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is the sparse regression coefficient with $s (< d)$ non-zero elements.

In this paper, we focus on constructing tractable estimators from the observation $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, and deriving non-asymptotic error bounds. This problem has been considered in many literature. Many studies dealt with the situation where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are sampled from Gaussian distribution and univariate Gaussian distribution, respectively. Some studies weakens the assumption and deal with the situation where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are sampled from a multivariate sub-Gaussian distribution (Chapter 3 of [41]) and univariate sub-Gaussian distribution (Chapter 2 of [41]), respectively (e.g., [42, 33, 5]).

Several studies investigated robust estimation methods with respect to the tail heaviness of data. For example, [1, 38] considered the case where $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a heavy tailed distribution. However, very few studies tackled the case where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a heavier-tailed distribution than Gaussian and subGaussian [37, 22, 21, 24]. [37, 22] considered the case where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a multivariate sub-exponential distribution (Chapter 3 of [41]), which is a heavier-tailed distribution than multivariate Gaussian. [21, 24] considered a more relaxed assumption where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a finite kurtosis distribution:

*Department of Statistical Science, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, SOKENDAI, Tokyo, Japan. Email: sasai@ism.ac.jp

†The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan. Department of Statistical Science, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies, SOKENDAI, Tokyo, Japan. Center for Advanced Integrated Intelligence Research, RIKEN, Tokyo, Japan. Email: fujisawa@ism.ac.jp

Definition 1.1 (Finite kurtosis distribution). *A random vector $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is said to be sampled from a finite kurtosis distribution if for every $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z} \rangle^4 \leq K^4 (\mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{z} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z} \rangle^2)^2 \left(= K^4 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^4 \right), \quad (1.2)$$

where K is a constant and $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z})(\mathbf{z} - \mathbb{E}\mathbf{z})^\top = \Sigma$.

We note that the finite kurtosis distribution contains multivariate sub-Gaussian and sub-exponential distributions. In the present paper, we assume the finite kurtosis condition on $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and we construct an estimator which has properties similar to the ones of [21, 24] under different assumption on $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and different conditions on β^* , n , s , d and the covariance of $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

Another aspect of robustness is robustness to outliers. Estimation against outliers is very actively studied in recent years [14]. To investigate the robustness against heavy tailed distributions and outliers for estimating coefficients in sparse linear regression, we consider the following model:

$$y_i = \mathbf{X}_i^\top \beta^* + \xi_i + \sqrt{n}\theta_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (1.3)$$

where $\mathbf{X}_i = \mathbf{x}_i + \boldsymbol{\rho}_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $\{\boldsymbol{\rho}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\theta_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are the outliers. We allow the adversary to inject arbitrary values into arbitral o samples of $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let \mathcal{O} be the index set of the injected samples and $\mathcal{I} = (1, \dots, n) \setminus \mathcal{O}$. Therefore, $\boldsymbol{\rho}_i = (0, \dots, 0)^\top$ and $\theta_i = 0$ hold for $i \in \mathcal{I}$. We note that $\{\boldsymbol{\rho}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{O}}$ and $\{\theta_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{O}}$ can be arbitral values and they are allowed to correlate freely among them and correlate with $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Some studies considered the problem of constructing estimators of β^* from (1.3). [11, 4, 25, 34] dealt with the case where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a Gaussian or multivariate subGaussian distribution. However, few studies considered the case where the covariates are sampled from a heavy tailed distribution and contaminated by outliers. An exception to this is [28], and the methods in [28] assume that $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ sampled from a finite kurtosis distribution. In the present paper, we consider the case where $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is sampled from a finite kurtosis distribution, and our estimator attains a shaper error bound than the one of [28].

In Section 2, we describe a method to estimate β^* from (1.1), and present our result, and introduce preceding work related to our result. In Section 3, we describe a method to estimate β^* from (1.3), and present our result, and introduce preceding works related to our result. Proofs of the statements in the main text are given in the appendix.

2 Method, result and related work

In Section 2, we consider the case where there are no outliers. That is, consider the problem of estimating β^* in (1.1). Before presenting our method and result precisely, we roughly introduce our result. For linear regression problem (1.1) with heavy-tailed $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$, our estimator $\hat{\beta}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2 \leq C_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (2.1)$$

where $C_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n}$ is a constant depending on the moment properties of $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Our method is based on simple thresholding for $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and ℓ_1 -penalized Huber loss, and our estimator is tractable. The result is similar to the one of normal lasso under Gaussian data. The difference between our results and the case of normal lasso under Gaussian data is discussed in Section 2.3.

2.1 Method

For the problem of estimating β^* from (1.1), we propose ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION I (Algorithm 1).

THRESHOLDING is a procedure to make covariates bounded, which is originated from [21, 23]. By bounding the covariates through THRESHOLDING, it becomes possible to derive concentration inequalities with sufficient sharpness to handle sparsity. PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION

Algorithm 1 ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION I

Input: $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the tuning parameters $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$, λ_o and λ_s

Output: $\hat{\beta}$

1: $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{THRESHOLDING}(\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \tau_{\mathbf{x}})$

2: $\hat{\beta} \leftarrow \text{PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION}(\{y_i, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \lambda_o, \lambda_s)$

is a Huber regression with ℓ_1 -norm penalization. From the preceding works [31, 12, 38], the ℓ_1 -penalized Huber regression has robustness against heavy-tailed noise ($\{\xi\}_{i=1}^n$) and outliers in the output, while also being capable of handling the sparsity of the coefficient.

In Sections 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, we describe the details of THRESHOLDING and PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION, respectively.

2.1.1 THRESHOLDING

Define the j -th element of \mathbf{x}_i as \mathbf{x}_{ij} . THRESHOLDING (Algorithm 2) makes the covariates bounded to obtain sharp concentration inequalities.

Algorithm 2 THRESHOLDING

Input: data $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and tuning parameter $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$.

Output: thresholded data $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

For $i = 1 : n$

For $j = 1 : d$

$\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{x}_{ij}) \times \min(|\mathbf{x}_{ij}|, \tau_{\mathbf{x}})$

return $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$.

2.1.2 PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION

PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION (Algorithm 3) is a type of regression using the Huber loss with ℓ_1 penalization. Define the Huber loss function as

$$H(t) = \begin{cases} |t| - 1/2 & (|t| > 1) \\ t^2/2 & (|t| \leq 1) \end{cases}, \quad (2.2)$$

and let

$$h(t) = \frac{d}{dt}H(t) = \begin{cases} t & (|t| > 1) \\ \text{sgn}(t) & (|t| \leq 1) \end{cases}. \quad (2.3)$$

We consider the following optimization problem. For any vector \mathbf{v} , define the ℓ_1 norm of \mathbf{v} as $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1$.

Algorithm 3 PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION

Input: Input data $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and tuning parameters λ_o, λ_s .

Output: estimator $\hat{\beta}$.

Let $\hat{\beta}$ be the solution to

$$\underset{\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d}{\text{argmin}} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_o^2 H\left(\frac{y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \beta}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}\right) + \lambda_s \|\beta\|_1, \quad (2.4)$$

return $\hat{\beta}$.

2.2 Result

Before we state our first main result, we introduce the restricted eigenvalue condition of the covariance matrix, which is often used in the context of sparse estimation [9]. For a vector \mathbf{v} and an index set J , define \mathbf{v}_J as the vector such that the i -th element of \mathbf{v}_J and \mathbf{v} is equal for $i \in J$ and i -th element of \mathbf{v}_J is zero for $i \notin J$.

Definition 2.1 (Restricted eigenvalue condition of the covariance matrix). *A covariance matrix Σ is said to satisfy the restricted eigenvalue condition $\text{RE}(s, c_{\text{RE}}, \kappa)$ with some constants $c_{\text{RE}}, \kappa > 0$ if $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2 \geq \kappa\|\mathbf{v}_J\|_2$ for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and any set $J \subset \{1, \dots, d\}$ such that $|J| \leq s$ and $\|\mathbf{v}_{J^c}\|_1 \leq c_{\text{RE}}\|\mathbf{v}_J\|_1$.*

For a $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, define $\|\mathbf{v}\|_0$ as the number of non-zero elements of \mathbf{v} . Then, we state our assumption.

Assumption 2.1. *Assume that*

(i) $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. $d(\geq 3)$ -dimensional random vectors with $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_i = 0$, finite kurtosis with K and $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_{ij}^2 \leq 1$. Additionally, $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_i\mathbf{x}_i^\top = \Sigma$ satisfies $\text{RE}(s, c_{\text{RE}}, \kappa)$, and $\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq s} \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{v} \geq \kappa_1^2 > 0$,

(ii) $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. random variables such that $\mathbb{E}|\xi_i| \leq \sigma$,

(iii) $\mathbb{E}h\left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o\sqrt{n}}\right) \times \mathbf{x}_i = 0$.

Note that assumption (iii) is weaker than independence between $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Define $j = 1, \dots, d$, and $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} |\beta_j^*| = c_\beta$. Our first result is the following.

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Suppose that the parameters $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}, \lambda_o$ and λ_s satisfy*

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(d/\delta)}}, \quad \lambda_o\sqrt{n} \geq 18K^4(\sigma + 1), \quad \lambda_s = c_s \frac{c_{\text{RE}} + 1}{c_{\text{RE}} - 1} \lambda_o\sqrt{n} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (2.5)$$

where $c_s \geq 16$, and r_Σ, r_1 and r_2 satisfy

$$r_\Sigma = 12c_{r_1}\sqrt{s}\lambda_s, \quad r_1 = c_{r_1}\sqrt{sr_\Sigma}, \quad r_2 = c_{r_2}r_\Sigma, \quad (2.6)$$

where $c_{r_1} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa$, $c_{r_2} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa_1$ and $c_r \geq 6$. Assume that $r_\Sigma \leq 1$ and

$$\max \left\{ 9K^2c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \frac{K^4}{c_{r_1}} c_\beta^{\frac{1}{4}} s^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{7}{8}}, \|\beta^*\|_1 K^4 \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \right\} \leq 1. \quad (2.7)$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, the output of ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION I $\hat{\beta}$ satisfies

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma, \quad \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_1 \leq r_1, \quad \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 \leq r_2. \quad (2.8)$$

Remark 2.1. *When we set $c_s = 1$, $c_r = 6$ and $\lambda_o\sqrt{n} = 18K^4(\sigma + 1)$ in Theorem 2.1. Then, the error bounds become*

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2 \lesssim_{C_{\text{RE}}} \frac{K^4(1 + \sigma)}{\kappa} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (2.9)$$

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 \lesssim_{C_{\text{RE}}} \frac{K^4(1 + \sigma)}{\kappa\kappa_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (2.10)$$

where $\lesssim_{C_{\text{RE}}}$ is an inequality up to numerical and C_{RE} factor.

Remark 2.2. Consider the case of normal lasso estimator when $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are sampled from Gaussian distributions with $\mathbb{E}\xi_i^2 = \sigma^2$ when $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ is estimated by normal lasso estimator. The error bound of this case is $\lesssim_{C_{\text{RE}}} \sigma \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right)$. The result (2.9) is similar to this. However, the error bound of our estimator does not converge to 0 when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, and our estimator has a cross term such that $\sqrt{s} \times \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}$. Whether one can construct tractable estimators without these limitations in our situation is a future work.

2.3 Related work

In this section, we introduce related work which dealt with estimating coefficients in sparse linear regression by tractable estimator under finite kurtosis condition without outlier contamination.

One of the tractable estimation methods proposed in [21] can be applied to estimate $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$ from the data $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is derived from (1.1). Let the obtained estimator be denoted by $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$ and λ_{\min} as smallest eigenvalue of Σ . Then, $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1$ demonstrates the following error bound: for any $\gamma > 0$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_1 - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2 \lesssim \frac{1}{\lambda_{\min}} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma s \log d}{n}} \right) \geq 1 - d^{1-\gamma}, \quad (2.11)$$

when $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_i = 0$, $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ are independent, $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1$, $\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \xi_i)^4$ and $s\sqrt{\frac{\log d}{n}}$ are sufficiently small. The advantage of our results compared to (2.11) lies in more relaxed assumption on $\boldsymbol{\beta}^*$, the moment of the noise, the minimum eigenvalue of Σ and sample complexity.

One of the estimation methods introduced in [24] can also be applicable. The estimator $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_2$ demonstrates the following error bound:

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_2 - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2 \lesssim \rho^{\frac{5}{2}} \sigma \sqrt{\frac{s \log d}{n}} \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{d^2}, \quad (2.12)$$

under the condition $\mathbb{E}\xi_i = 0$, $\mathbb{E}\xi_i^2 = \sigma^2$ and $\rho^7 s (\log d) \times \log \left(\frac{\mu_\alpha \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2}{\rho^{\frac{5}{2}} \sigma} \sqrt{\frac{n}{s \log d}} \right) \lesssim n$, where $\rho = \mu_L / \mu_\alpha$, and μ_L and μ_α are ‘smoothness’ and ‘strong-convexity’ parameters, respectively. Depending on the shape of the covariance matrix, ‘smoothness’ and ‘strong-convexity’ parameters can be significantly large and small, respectively, and [24] does not explicitly evaluate these parameters. The explicit evaluation of the effect of the covariance and more relaxed moment assumption on $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is the advantage of our results over (2.12). On the other hand, the error bound in (2.12) has exact recovery when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$.

None of the methods, including ours, have been able to eliminate the dependence on $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2$. Constructing an estimator that is independent of $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2$ while preserving the exact recovery when $\sigma \rightarrow 0$ remains a challenge for future work.

3 Case of contamination

Before presenting our method and result precisely, we roughly introduce our result. For linear regression problem (1.3) with heavy-tailed $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$, our estimator satisfies

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_2 \leq C_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left(\sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{n}} \right) \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (3.1)$$

for sufficiently large n such that $s^2 \lesssim_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1} n$, where $\lesssim_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1}$ is a inequality up to the moment properties of $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1$. Our method is based on simple thresholding for $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, mitigating the impact of outliers on $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ by robust sparse PCA and ℓ_1 -penalized Huber loss, and our estimator is tractable. The impact of outliers on the error bound depends

solely on the proportion of outliers. However, the requirement for the number of samples n being proportional to the square of the sparsity s^2 is different from the usual lasso. This point is discussed in Section 3.2.

3.1 Method

To estimate β^* in (1.3), we propose ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION II (Algorithm 4), which is an extension of ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION-I. ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION II is inspired by a method proposed in [32]. [32] proposed some methods for estimating β^* when β^* has no sparsity, and derived sharp error bounds. One of the methods in [32] consists of two steps: (i) pre-processing covariates, and (ii) executing the Huber regression with pre-processed covariates. Our method is based on this one. However, we follow different pre-processings (THRESHOLDING and COMPUTE-WEIGHT) and use the ℓ_1 -penalized Huber regression to enable us to tame the sparsity of β^* .

Algorithm 4 ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION II

Input: $\{y_i, \mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and the tuning parameters $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}, \lambda_*, \tau_{suc}, \varepsilon, \lambda_o$ and λ_s

Output: $\hat{\beta}$

- 1: $\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{THRESHOLDING}(\{\mathbf{X}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \tau_{\mathbf{x}})$
 - 2: $\{\hat{w}_i\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{COMPUTE-WEIGHT}(\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \lambda_*, \tau_{suc}, \varepsilon)$
 - 3: $\hat{\beta} \leftarrow \text{PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION}(\{\hat{w}_i y_i, \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i\}_{i=1}^n, \lambda_o, \lambda_s)$
-

COMPUTE-WEIGHT relies on the semi-definite programming developed by [4], which provides a method for sparse PCA to be robust to outliers. [4] considered a situation where samples are drawn from a Gaussian distribution and contaminated by outliers. THRESHOLDING enables us to cast our heavy tailed situation into the framework of [4]. In Section 3.1.1, we describe the details of COMPUTE-WEIGHT.

3.1.1 COMPUTE-WEIGHT

Define the j -th element of \mathbf{X}_i as \mathbf{X}_{ij} . For a matrix $M \in \mathbb{R}^{d_1 \times d_2} = \{m_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \leq d_1, 1 \leq j \leq d_2}$, define

$$\|M\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^{d_1} \sum_{j=1}^{d_2} |m_{ij}|, \quad \|M\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq i \leq d_1, 1 \leq j \leq d_2} |m_{ij}|. \quad (3.2)$$

For a symmetric matrix M , we write $M \succeq 0$ if M is positive semidefinite. For a vector \mathbf{v} , define the ℓ_∞ norm of \mathbf{v} as $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty$, and for a matrix M , define the absolute maximum element of M as $\|M\|_\infty$. Define the following two convex sets:

$$\mathfrak{M}_r = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \text{Tr}(M) \leq r^2, M \succeq 0\}, \quad \mathfrak{U}_\lambda = \{U \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : \|U\|_\infty \leq \lambda, U \succeq 0\}, \quad (3.3)$$

where $\text{Tr}(M)$ for matrix M is the trace of M . To reduce the effects of outliers of covariates, we require COMPUTE-WEIGHT (Algorithm 5) to compute the weight vector $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = (\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_n)$ such that the following quantity is sufficiently small:

$$\sup_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top M) - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where λ_* is a tuning parameter. Evaluation of (3.4) is required in the analysis of WEIGHTED-PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION and the role of (3.4) is revealed in the proof of Proposition 3.2. For COMPUTE-WEIGHT, we use a variant of Algorithm 4 of [4]. define the probability simplex Δ^{n-1} as

$$\Delta^{n-1} = \left\{ \mathbf{w} \in [0, 1]^n : \sum_{i=1}^n w_i = 1, \quad \|\mathbf{w}\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \right\}. \quad (3.5)$$

COMPUTE-WEIGHT is as follows.

Algorithm 5 COMPUTE-WEIGHT

Input: data $\{\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and tuning parameters λ_* , τ_{suc} and ε .

Output: weight estimate $\hat{\mathbf{w}} = \{\hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_n\}$.

Let $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ be the solution to

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{n-1}} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \langle \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) \quad (3.6)$$

if the optimal value of (3.6) $\leq \tau_{suc}$

return $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$

else

return *fail*

We note that, from the arguments of [43, 29, 30], we have

$$\min_{\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{n-1}} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \langle \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) = \min_{\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{n-1}} \min_{U \in \mathfrak{U}_{\lambda_*}} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left\langle \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top - U, M \right\rangle. \quad (3.7)$$

COMPUTE-WEIGHT and Algorithm 4 of [4] are very similar. For any fixed \mathbf{w} , our objective function and the constraints are the same as the ones in Section 3 of [43] except for the values of the tuning parameters, and we can efficiently find the optimal $M \in \mathfrak{M}_r$. Therefore, COMPUTE-WEIGHTS can be solved efficiently for the same reason as Algorithm 4 of [4].

To analyze COMPUTE-WRIGHT, we introduce the following proposition. The poof of the following proposition is provided in the appendix (Section F).

Proposition 3.1. *Assume (i) of Assumption 2.1 holds. For any matrix $M \in \mathfrak{M}_r$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle}{n} \leq \left(\sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right) \|M\|_1 + \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} r^2, \quad (3.8)$$

where $\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}$ is the operator norm of Σ .

We consider the succeeding condition of Algorithm 5. Define λ_* and $\{w_i^\circ\}_{i=1}^n$ as

$$\lambda_* = c_* \left(\sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right), \quad w_i^\circ = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{n(1-\varepsilon)} & i \in \mathcal{I} \\ 0 & i \in \mathcal{O} \end{cases}, \quad (3.9)$$

where $c_* \geq \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}$. Then, we have, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i \langle \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} w_i^\circ \langle \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) \\ &= \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} w_i^\circ \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n(1-\varepsilon)} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) \\ &= \max_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_*(1-\varepsilon) \|M\|_1 \right) \times \frac{1}{1-\varepsilon} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} r^2}{1-\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where (a) follows from the optimality of \hat{w}_i , $o/n \leq \varepsilon$ and $\{w_i^o\}_{i=1}^n \in \Delta^{n-1}$, (b) follows from positive semi-definiteness of M , and (c) follows from Proposition 3.1 and the definition of λ_* . Therefore, when $\tau_{suc} \geq \frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{1-\varepsilon} r^2$, we see that COMPUTE-WEIGHT succeed and return $\hat{\mathbf{w}}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. We note that (3.10) is used in the proof of the following proposition, which plays an important role in the proof of Theorem 3.1.

Proposition 3.2. *Assume that (i) of Assumption 2.1 holds and λ_* satisfies (3.9). Let r_Σ be some positive constant, and $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$, $r = r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$, where $c_{r_1} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa$, $c_{r_2} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa_1$ and $c_r \geq 6$. Further, let $\varepsilon = c_\varepsilon \frac{o}{n}$ and $\tau_{suc} = \frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{1-\varepsilon} r_2^2$, where $c_\varepsilon \geq 1$. Lastly, assume $1 - \varepsilon > 0$, and define $c'_* = \max\{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, c_*\}$. Suppose that (3.10) holds and COMPUTE-WEIGHT returns \hat{w} . Then, for any $\|\mathbf{u}\| \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq c$ for a numerical constant c and for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_i u_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \right| \leq 2cc'_* \left(c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \sqrt{K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}}} \right) r_\Sigma, \quad (3.11)$$

Proof of the proposition above in the appendix (Section F).

3.2 Result

Under Assumption 2.1, we have the following theorem.

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1, and assumptions in Proposition 3.2 holds. As Proposition 3.2, let $\varepsilon = c_\varepsilon \frac{o}{n}$, where $c_\varepsilon \geq 1$ and $c'_* = \max\{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, c_*\}$. Suppose that the parameters λ_o , $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ and λ_s satisfy $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \geq 18K^4(\sigma + 1)$,*

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \left(\frac{n}{\log(d/\delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \quad \lambda_s = c_s \frac{c_{\text{RE}} + 1}{c_{\text{RE}} - 1} \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + c'_* \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \frac{c_{r_2}}{c_{r_1}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{sn}} \right), \quad (3.12)$$

where $c_s \geq 16$, and r_Σ , r_1 , r and r_2 satisfies

$$r_\Sigma = 12c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s, \quad r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma, \quad r = r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma, \quad (3.13)$$

where $c_{r_1} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa$, $c_{r_2} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa_1$ and $c_r \geq 6$. and $\tau_{suc} = \frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{1-\varepsilon} r_2^2$. Assume that $r_\Sigma \leq 1$ and

$$\max \left\{ K^4 \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \frac{K^4}{c_{r_1}} c_\beta^{\frac{1}{4}} s^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{16}}, \frac{3K^4 c_{r_1}^2}{c_{r_2}^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}} s \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right\} \leq 1. \quad (3.14)$$

and

$$\max \left\{ K^4 \|\beta^*\|_1 \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}, 72K^4 c_{r_1}^2 s \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right\} \leq 1. \quad (3.15)$$

Then, with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$, the output of ROBUST-SPARSE-ESTIMATION II $\hat{\beta}$ satisfies

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma, \quad \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_1 \leq r_1, \quad \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 \leq r_2. \quad (3.16)$$

Remark 3.1. *When we set $c_s = 16$, $c_r = 6$, $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} = 18K^4(\sigma + 1)$ and $c'_* = 2$. Then, the error bounds become*

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2 \lesssim_{c_{\text{RE}}} K^4(1 + \sigma) \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}}{\kappa_l} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} \right), \quad (3.17)$$

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2 \lesssim_{c_{\text{RE}}} K^4(1 + \sigma) \left(\frac{1}{\kappa \kappa_l} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}}{\kappa_l^2} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} \right), \quad (3.18)$$

for sufficiently large n such that $s^2 \lesssim_{\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n, \|\beta^*\|_1} n$. When $d = 1$, this result is nearly optimal, however not optimal because the term containing o in optimal convergence rate is $(o/n)^{\frac{3}{4}}$ [3]. Whether one can construct optimal and tractable estimator in our situation is a future work.

Remark 3.2. In Theorem 3.1, we require n is sufficiently larger than $s^2 \log(d/s)$, and this is a stronger condition than the ones of Theorem 2.1. This phenomenon is due to sparse PCA in COMPUTE-WEIGHT. [43] revealed that there is no randomized polynomial time algorithm to estimate the top eigenvector in a scheme where n is proportional to s (in [43], s is the number of non-zero elements of the top eigenvector of covariance matrices) under the assumptions of intractability of a variant of Planted Clique Problem. In addition to this research, other studies such as [17, 8] suggested that a sparse PCA may inevitably have a dependence on n of s^2 even in the absence of outliers when using polynomial-time algorithms. Therefore, with our framework, it would be difficult to avoid the dependence on s^2 of n , even with a different analysis from ours. Recently, various studies on sparse estimation problems have emerged, suggesting that the unnatural dependence on s^2 might be unavoidable for polynomial-time algorithms, using frameworks such as SQ lower bounds and low-degree tests (i.e., [26, 36, 2, 20, 16]). These works considered sparse clustering, mixed sparse regression, robust sparse mean estimation, tensor pca. Deriving tradeoffs between statistical and computational tradeoffs for problem similar to ours remains a future challenge.

3.3 Related work

There are not many papers dealing with robust sparse estimation problem from data following heavy-tailed distributions with outliers. For instance, [15, 13] addressed estimation problem of sparse mean vector, while [28] dealt with sparse linear regression. Here, we will provide a detailed introduction to [28], which shares a common problem setting with our paper. [28] proposed some robust gradient methods for some objective functions and they are applicable to estimating β^* from the data $\{y_i, \mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ from (1.3) with slightly strong assumption on $\{\varrho_i, \theta_i\}$. That is to say, the assumption is $\{\mathbf{x}_i, \xi_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{I}}$ remains i.i.d.. Applying the method in [28] for squared loss as the objective function, after T step starting from β^0 with $\|\beta^0 - \beta^*\|_1 \leq R$, we have an estimator $\hat{\beta}_3$ such that,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{\beta}_3 - \beta^*\|_2 \lesssim \frac{R}{2^{T/2} \sqrt{s}} + \frac{(1 + \sigma^2) \sqrt{s}}{\min_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}, \|\mathbf{v}\|_0 \leq 2s} \mathbf{v}^\top \Sigma \mathbf{v}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta')}{n'}} + \sqrt{\frac{o}{n'}} \right) \right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (3.19)$$

where $n' = n/T$ and $\delta' = \delta/T$, under the condition that finite kurtosis for $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1}^n$, $\mathbb{E}\|y_i \mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ and $\mathbb{E}y_i^2$ are infinite. Note that, their gradient method is applicable for different objective functions and this condition can be made weaker. Our error bound is sharper from the perspective of convergence rate because our result avoid the coss term such that $\sqrt{so/n}$. However, the method in [28] has some merits than ours. For example, the sample complexity is smaller than ours and their method does not require the assumption such that $s^2 \lesssim n$. The computational cost required in [28] is significantly lighter than ours, and the extensive numerical experiments in [28] demonstrate the practical effectiveness of their method.

Constructing an estimator with sharp error bounds that can be computed with light computational burden is considered a very interesting challenge.

References

- [1] Pierre Alquier, Vincent Cottet, and Guillaume Lecué. Estimation bounds and sharp oracle inequalities of regularized procedures with lipschitz loss functions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(4):2117–2144, 2019.
- [2] Gabriel Arpino and Ramji Venkataramanan. Statistical-computational tradeoffs in mixed sparse linear regression. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 921–986. PMLR, 2023.

- [3] Ainesh Bakshi and Adarsh Prasad. Robust linear regression: Optimal rates in polynomial time. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 102–115, 2021.
- [4] Sivaraman Balakrishnan, Simon S Du, Jerry Li, and Aarti Singh. Computationally efficient robust sparse estimation in high dimensions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 169–212. PMLR, 2017.
- [5] Pierre C Bellec, Guillaume Lecué, and Alexandre B Tsybakov. Slope meets lasso: improved oracle bounds and optimality. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(6B):3603–3642, 2018.
- [6] Stéphane Boucheron, Gábor Lugosi, and Pascal Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford university press, 2013.
- [7] Olivier Bousquet. A bennett concentration inequality and its application to suprema of empirical processes. *Comptes Rendus Mathématique*, 334(6):495–500, 2002.
- [8] Matthew Brennan, Guy Bresler, Samuel B Hopkins, Jerry Li, and Tselil Schramm. Statistical query algorithms and low-degree tests are almost equivalent. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.06107*, 2020.
- [9] Peter Bühlmann and Sara Van De Geer. *Statistics for high-dimensional data: methods, theory and applications*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- [10] Xi Chen and Wen-Xin Zhou. Robust inference via multiplier bootstrap. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(3):1665–1691, 2020.
- [11] Yudong Chen, Constantine Caramanis, and Shie Mannor. Robust sparse regression under adversarial corruption. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 774–782. PMLR, 2013.
- [12] Arnak Dalalyan and Philip Thompson. Outlier-robust estimation of a sparse linear model using ℓ_1 -penalized Huber’s m -estimator. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*, pages 13188–13198. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019.
- [13] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, Jasper Lee, and Ankit Pensia. Outlier-robust sparse mean estimation for heavy-tailed distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:5164–5177, 2022.
- [14] Ilias Diakonikolas and Daniel M Kane. *Algorithmic high-dimensional robust statistics*. Cambridge university press, 2023.
- [15] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, Sushrut Karmalkar, Ankit Pensia, and Thanasis Pittas. Robust sparse mean estimation via sum of squares. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4703–4763. PMLR, 2022.
- [16] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, and Alistair Stewart. Statistical query lower bounds for robust estimation of high-dimensional gaussians and gaussian mixtures. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 73–84. IEEE, 2017.
- [17] Yunzi Ding, Dmitriy Kunisky, Alexander S Wein, and Afonso S Bandeira. Subexponential-time algorithms for sparse pca. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, pages 1–50, 2023.
- [18] Sjoerd Dirksen. Tail bounds via generic chaining. *Electronic Journal of Probability*, 20:1–29, 2015.
- [19] Jianqing Fan, Han Liu, Qiang Sun, and Tong Zhang. I-lamm for sparse learning: Simultaneous control of algorithmic complexity and statistical error. *Annals of statistics*, 46(2):814, 2018.

- [20] Jianqing Fan, Han Liu, Zhaoran Wang, and Zhuoran Yang. Curse of heterogeneity: Computational barriers in sparse mixture models and phase retrieval. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06996*, 2018.
- [21] Jianqing Fan, Weichen Wang, and Ziwei Zhu. A shrinkage principle for heavy-tailed data: High-dimensional robust low-rank matrix recovery. *Annals of statistics*, 49(3):1239, 2021.
- [22] Martin Genzel and Christian Kipp. Generic error bounds for the generalized lasso with sub-exponential data. *Sampling Theory, Signal Processing, and Data Analysis*, 20(2):15, 2022.
- [23] Yuan Ke, Stanislav Minsker, Zhao Ren, Qiang Sun, and Wen-Xin Zhou. User-friendly covariance estimation for heavy-tailed distributions. *Statistical Science*, 34(3):454–471, 2019.
- [24] Liu Liu, Tianyang Li, and Constantine Caramanis. High dimensional robust m -estimation: Arbitrary corruption and heavy tails. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.08237*, 2019.
- [25] Liu Liu, Yanyao Shen, Tianyang Li, and Constantine Caramanis. High dimensional robust sparse regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 411–421. PMLR, 2020.
- [26] Matthias Löffler, Alexander S Wein, and Afonso S Bandeira. Computationally efficient sparse clustering. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 11(4):1255–1286, 2022.
- [27] Gabor Lugosi and Shahar Mendelson. Risk minimization by median-of-means tournaments. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 22(3):925–965, 2019.
- [28] Ibrahim Merad and Stéphane Gaïffas. Robust methods for high-dimensional linear learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(165):1–44, 2023.
- [29] Arkadi Nemirovski. Prox-method with rate of convergence $o(1/t)$ for variational inequalities with lipschitz continuous monotone operators and smooth convex-concave saddle point problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 15(1):229–251, 2004.
- [30] Yu Nesterov. Smooth minimization of non-smooth functions. *Mathematical programming*, 103(1):127–152, 2005.
- [31] Nam H Nguyen and Trac D Tran. Robust lasso with missing and grossly corrupted observations. *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 59(4):2036–2058, 2012.
- [32] Ankit Pensia, Varun Jog, and Po-Ling Loh. Robust regression with covariate filtering: Heavy tails and adversarial contamination. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.12976*, 2020.
- [33] Garvesh Raskutti, Martin J Wainwright, and Bin Yu. Restricted eigenvalue properties for correlated gaussian designs. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2241–2259, 2010.
- [34] Takeyuki Sasai and Hironori Fujisawa. Outlier robust and sparse estimation of linear regression coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11592*, 2022.
- [35] Takeyuki Sasai and Hironori Fujisawa. Outlier robust and sparse estimation of linear regression coefficients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.11592*, 2022.
- [36] Tselil Schramm and Alexander S Wein. Computational barriers to estimation from low-degree polynomials. *The Annals of Statistics*, 50(3):1833–1858, 2022.
- [37] Vidyashankar Sivakumar, Arindam Banerjee, and Pradeep K Ravikumar. Beyond sub-gaussian measurements: High-dimensional structured estimation with sub-exponential designs. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
- [38] Qiang Sun, Wen-Xin Zhou, and Jianqing Fan. Adaptive Huber regression. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 115(529):254–265, 2020.

- [39] Michel Talagrand. *Upper and lower bounds for stochastic processes*, volume 60. Springer, 2014.
- [40] Robert Tibshirani. Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, 58(1):267–288, 1996.
- [41] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [42] Martin J Wainwright. Sharp thresholds for high-dimensional and noisy sparsity recovery using ℓ_1 -constrained quadratic programming (lasso). *IEEE transactions on information theory*, 55(5):2183–2202, 2009.
- [43] Tengyao Wang, Quentin Berthet, and Richard J Samworth. Statistical and computational trade-offs in estimation of sparse principal components. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(5):1896–1930, 2016.

A Key propositions for Theorems 2.1 and Theorems 3.1

In this section, we provide four propositions needed to prove Theorems 2.1 and 3.1. First, we introduce Proposition A.1, which is used in the proof of both Theorems 2.1 and 3.1. Proposition A.1 pertains to the ℓ_1 -penalized Huber loss and is stated without considering the randomness of the input and output, i.e., it does not take Assumption 2.1 into account. The applicability of Proposition A.1 under Assumption 2.1 is ensured by the subsequent propositions.

Proposition A.1. *Define the input data for PENALIZED-HUBER-REGRESSION as $\{\mathbf{Z}_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Suppose that, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1\mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2\mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma\mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$,*

$$\left| \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \right| \leq r_{a,\Sigma} r_\Sigma, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

and for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1\mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2\mathbb{B}_2^d$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$,

$$b \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2^2 - r_{b,\Sigma} r_\Sigma \leq \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \mathbf{v}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where $r_{a,\Sigma}, r_{b,\Sigma} \geq 0$ and $b > 0$. Suppose that $\mathbb{E}\mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top = \Sigma$ satisfies $\text{RE}(s, c_{\text{RE}}, \kappa)$ with $\kappa_l > 0$, and

$$\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} > 0, \quad \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}} \leq c_{\text{RE}}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$r_\Sigma \geq \frac{2}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s), \quad r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma \quad r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma \quad (\text{A.4})$$

hold, where $c_{r_1} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa$, $c_{r_2} = c_r(1 + c_{\text{RE}})/\kappa_l$ and $c_r \geq 6$. Then, we have the following:

$$\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 \leq r_1, \quad \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_2 \leq r_2, \quad \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}})\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

In [35], a proposition almost identical to Proposition A.1 was introduced, and for completeness, we provide a proof. We note that Proposition A.1 is a modification of the claim found in [27, 1] to deal with the case where the covariance of the covariate has a general form (not identity). The proof of Proposition A.1 is provided in Sections C and D.

Second, we introduce Propositions A.2 and A.3. By these propositions, we see that (A.1) and (A.2) are satisfied with high probability for appropriate values of $b > 0, r_{a,\Sigma}, r_{b,\Sigma}, r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma \geq 0$ under the assumptions in Theorem 2.1.

Proposition A.2. *Suppose that the Assumption 2.1 holds and $r_1 = c_{r_1}\sqrt{s}r_\Sigma$, $r_2 = c_{r_2}r_\Sigma$, where c_{r_1}, c_{r_2} are some positive constants. Then, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1\mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2\mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma\mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \\ & \leq 4 \left(c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + c_{r_1} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + K^4 c_{r_1} \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} + K^4 c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{1}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \right)^{3-\frac{1}{4}} \right) r_\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Proposition A.3. *Suppose that the Assumption 2.1 holds and $r_1 = c_{r_1}\sqrt{s}r_\Sigma$, $r_2 = c_{r_2}r_\Sigma$, where c_{r_1}, c_{r_2} are some positive constants. Assume that $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \geq 18K^4(\sigma + 1)$. Then, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1\mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2\mathbb{B}_2^d$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$, where $r_\Sigma \leq 1$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \\ & \geq \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \left(1 - K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \left(\sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1} \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} + \sqrt{1 + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} \right) - 12K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right) \\ & \quad - 3\lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \left(1 + \frac{K^2}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\mathbf{v}\|_2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

To prove Theorem 3.1, we need the following propositions (Propositions A.4 and A.5), in addition to the propositions above. The poof of the propositions are provided in Section F. Define I_m as the index set such that $|I_m| = m$.

Proposition A.4. *Suppose that (3.8) holds. For any $\mathbf{u} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\|\mathbf{u}\|_\infty \leq c$ for a numerical constant c and for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1\mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2\mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma\mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have*

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_m} \frac{1}{n} u_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \right| \leq 2c \left(c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \sqrt{K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}} \right) r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Let $I_<$ and I_\geq be the sets of the indices such that $w_i < 1/(2n)$ and $w_i \geq 1/(2n)$, respectively.

Proposition A.5. *Suppose $0 < \varepsilon < 1$. Then, for any $\mathbf{w} \in \Delta^{n-1}$, we have $|I_<| \leq 2n\varepsilon$.*

B Auxiliary lemmas

For an event E , define the indicator function of E as \mathbb{I}_E . For a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote the i -th element of the vector as \mathbf{v}_i . In this section, we introduce some useful lemmas.

Lemma B.1. *Define $z \in \mathbb{R}$ as a random variable such that $\mathbb{E}z^4 \leq \sigma_{z,4}^4$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}_{|z| \geq \tau_z} \leq \frac{\sigma_{z,4}^4}{\tau_z^4}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

Proof.

$$\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}_{|z| \geq \tau_z} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}(|z| \geq \tau_z) \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \frac{|z|^4}{\tau_z^4} \leq \frac{\sigma_{z,4}^4}{\tau_z^4}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

where (a) follows from the relationship between expectation and probability, and (b) follows from Markov's inequality. \square

Lemma B.2. Define $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as a random vector such that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{z}_j^4 \leq \sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4$, and define $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ as a random vector such that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{z}_j) \min(\tau_{\mathbf{z}}, |\mathbf{z}_j|)$ with a positive constant $\tau_{\mathbf{z}}$. Then for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$-4 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq 4 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2. \quad (\text{B.3})$$

Proof. From simple algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 &= \mathbb{E}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i^\top - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle + \mathbb{E}\langle \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

and we have

$$-|\mathbb{E}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle| + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq |\mathbb{E}\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top - \mathbf{z}\mathbf{z}^\top, \mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^\top \rangle| + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2, \quad (\text{B.5})$$

For any $1 \leq j, k \leq d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{z}_k)| &= |\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_k) + \mathbf{z}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j))| \\ &\leq |\mathbb{E}\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_k)| + |\mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_k(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_k| + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_k| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j| \\ &= \mathbb{E}|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_k| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_k| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_k| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_j| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_k - \mathbf{z}_k| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_k| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} + \mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_k| |\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} \\ &\leq 2\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_j| |\mathbf{z}_k| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_k| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} + 2\mathbb{E}|\mathbf{z}_k| |\mathbf{z}_j| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} \\ &\leq 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_j^2 \mathbf{z}_k^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_k| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}}} + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_k^2 \mathbf{z}_j^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}}} \\ &= 4\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbf{z}_j^2 \mathbf{z}_k^2} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_k| > \tau_{\mathbf{z}}}} \leq 4 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma B.1 and $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{z}_j^4 \leq \sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4$.

From (B.5) and (B.6), we have

$$-4 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq 4 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{z}^\top \mathbf{v})^2. \quad (\text{B.7})$$

□

Lemma B.3. Define $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as a random vector such that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{z}_j^4 \leq \sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4$, and define $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ as a random vector such that for any $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{z}_j) \min(\tau_{\mathbf{z}}, |\mathbf{z}_j|)$ with a positive constant $\tau_{\mathbf{z}}$. Then for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| \leq 2\|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^3} \quad (\text{B.8})$$

Proof. From simple algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}|\langle \tilde{\mathbf{z}} - \mathbf{z}, \mathbf{v} \rangle| &= \mathbb{E} \left| \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} (\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{v}_j \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} |(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_j - \mathbf{z}_j) \mathbf{v}_j| \\
&\leq 2 \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{z}}} \mathbf{v}_j| \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{=} 2 \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} \left(\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{z}_j \mathbf{v}_j|^4 \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{I}_{|\mathbf{z}_j| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{z}}})^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} 2 \sum_{1 \leq j \leq d} |\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4} \mathbf{v}_j| \left(\frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^4} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} = 2 \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \frac{\sigma_{\mathbf{z},4}^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{z}}^3}, \tag{B.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Hölder's inequality, and (b) follows from Lemma B.1. \square

Lemma B.4. Define $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as a sequence of i.i.d. d -dimensional random vector such that $\max_{1 \leq j \leq d} \mathbb{E} \mathbf{z}_{i,j}^2 \leq 1$. For any $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq d$ define $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_{i,j} = \text{sgn}(\mathbf{z}_{i,j}) \min(\tau_{\mathbf{z}}, |\mathbf{z}_{i,j}|)$ with a positive constant $\tau_{\mathbf{z}}$. Define $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n$ as a sequence of i.i.d. Rademacher random variables which are independent of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Then we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \right| \leq \sqrt{2 \frac{\log d}{n}} r_1 + \tau_{\mathbf{z}} \frac{\log d}{n} r_1. \tag{B.10}$$

Proof. We note that $\mathbb{E} \alpha_i^2 \tilde{z}_{i,j}^2 \leq 1$ and $\mathbb{E} \alpha_i^p |\tilde{z}_{i,j}|^p \leq \tau_{\mathbf{z}}^{p-2} \mathbb{E} \tilde{z}_{i,j}^2 \leq \tau_{\mathbf{z}}^{p-2}$. Then, we have $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \alpha_i^p |\tilde{z}_{i,j}|^p \leq \tau_{\mathbf{z}}^{p-2}$. From Lemma 14.12 of [9] and $d \geq 3$, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{2 \frac{\log d}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{z}} \frac{\log d}{n}. \tag{B.11}$$

Lastly, from Hölder's inequality, the proof is complete. \square

C Preparation of proof of Proposition A.1

For $\eta \in (0, 1)$, let

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*, \quad \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta = (\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*) \eta. \tag{C.1}$$

We introduce the following four lemmas, that are used in the proof of Proposition A.1.

Lemma C.1. Suppose that (A.1), (A.3), $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 \leq r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 = r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$, where $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$ hold. Then, for any fixed $\eta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq 3 \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \tag{C.2}$$

Lemma C.2. Suppose that (A.1), (A.3), $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 = r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$, where $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$ hold. Then, for any fixed $\eta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 \leq 3 \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa} \sqrt{s} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \tag{C.3}$$

Lemma C.3. Suppose that (A.1), (A.2), $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 \leq r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 = r_\Sigma$, where $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$ hold. Then, for any $\eta \in (0, 1)$, we have

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s). \tag{C.4}$$

C.1 Proof of Lemma C.1

For a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$, define $\{v_1^\#, \dots, v_d^\#\}$ as a non-increasing rearrangement of $\{|v_1|, \dots, |v_d|\}$, and $\mathbf{v}^\# \in \mathbb{R}^d$ as a vector such that $\mathbf{v}^\#|_i = v_i^\#$. For the sets $S_1 = \{1, \dots, s\}$ and $S_2 = \{s+1, \dots, d\}$, let $v^{\#1} = v_{S_1}^\#$ and $v^{\#2} = v_{S_2}^\#$.

In Section C.1.1, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \quad (\text{C.5})$$

assuming $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$, and in Section C.1.2, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq 2\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \leq \frac{2}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \quad (\text{C.6})$$

assuming $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \geq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$. From the above two inequalities, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \frac{3 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.7})$$

C.1.1 Case I

In Section C.1.1, suppose that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$. Let

$$Q'(\eta) = \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}. \quad (\text{C.8})$$

From the proof of Lemma F.2. of [19], we have $\eta Q'(\eta) \leq \eta Q'(1)$ and this means

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \\ & \leq \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \eta \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Let $\partial \mathbf{v}$ be the sub-differential of $\|\mathbf{v}\|_1$. Adding $\eta \lambda_s (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1)$ to both sides of (C.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta + \eta \lambda_s (\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1) \\ & \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \eta \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \hat{\boldsymbol{\theta}} + \eta \lambda_s \langle \partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \rangle \\ & \stackrel{(b)}{=} \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

where (a) follows from $\|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1 - \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \leq \langle \partial \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}, \boldsymbol{\theta} \rangle$, which is the definition of the sub-differential, and (b) follows from the optimality of $\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}$.

From the convexity of Huber loss, the first term of the left hand side of (C.10) is positive and we have

$$0 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

From (A.1), the first term of the right-hand side of (C.11) is evaluated as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{Z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \leq r_{a,\Sigma} r_\Sigma \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}} r_2 \stackrel{(b)}{=} \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2} \sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1, \quad (\text{C.12})$$

where (a) follows from $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$, (b) follows from the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 = r_2$ and (c) follows from the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$. From (C.11), (C.12) and the assumption $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$, we have

$$0 \leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1). \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Define \mathcal{J}_a as the index set of non-zero entries of \mathbf{a} , and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_a}$ as a vector such that $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_a}|_i = \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta|_i$ for $i \in \mathcal{J}_a$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_a}|_i = 0$ for $i \notin \mathcal{J}_a$. Furthermore, we see

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1) \\ &\leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}} (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}^c}\|_1) + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}^c}\|_1) \\ &= \left(\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1 + \left(-\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}^c}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

Then, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}^c}\|_1 \leq \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_2}\sqrt{s}}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1}\sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1}\sqrt{s}}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1 \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} c_{\text{RE}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta,\mathcal{J}_{\beta^*}}\|_1, \quad (\text{C.15})$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $c_{r_2} \geq c_{r_1}$ and (b) follows from (A.3), and from the definition of $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_1$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_1 \leq c_{\text{RE}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_1. \quad (\text{C.16})$$

Then, from the standard shelling argument, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=s+1}^d (\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=s+1}^d |\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_i| \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s |\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_j| \right) \leq \frac{1}{s} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_1 \leq \frac{c_{\text{RE}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_1^2}{s} \leq c_{\text{RE}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2^2. \quad (\text{C.17})$$

and from the definition of κ_l , we have

$$\kappa_l^2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2^2 \leq \kappa_l^2 (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_2^2) \leq \kappa_l^2 (1 + c_{\text{RE}}) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2^2 \leq (1 + c_{\text{RE}}) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2^2. \quad (\text{C.18})$$

C.1.2 Case II

In Section C.1.2, suppose that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \geq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1/\sqrt{s}$.

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_2^2 = \sum_{i=s+1}^d (\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_i)^2 \leq \sum_{i=s+1}^d |\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_i| \left(\frac{1}{s} \sum_{j=1}^s |\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#}|_j| \right) \leq \frac{1}{s} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_1 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_1 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.19})$$

Then, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2^2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#2}\|_2^2 \leq \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \Rightarrow \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq 2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2, \quad (\text{C.20})$$

and we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq 2 \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \leq \frac{2}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta^{\#1}\|_2 \leq \frac{2}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2. \quad (\text{C.21})$$

C.2 Proof of Lemma C.2

From the same argument of the proof of Lemma C.1, we have (C.11). From (A.1), the first term of the right-hand side of (C.11) is evaluated as

$$\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \leq r_{a,\Sigma} r_\Sigma \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{1}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} r_{a,\Sigma} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1. \quad (\text{C.22})$$

where (a) follows from $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$. From (C.11) and (C.22), we have

$$0 \leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1). \quad (\text{C.23})$$

Furthermore, we see

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1) \\ &\leq \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} (\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}^c}\|_1) + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}^* - \hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}_{\mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}^c}\|_1) \\ &= \left(\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 + \left(-\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} \right) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}^c}\|_1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

Then, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}^c}\|_1 \leq \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} c_{\text{RE}} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1, \quad (\text{C.25})$$

where (a) follows from (A.3), and we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 = \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 + \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}^c}\|_1 \leq (1 + c_{\text{RE}}) \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_1 \leq (1 + c_{\text{RE}}) \sqrt{s} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_2. \quad (\text{C.26})$$

From (C.25) and the restricted eigenvalue condition, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 \leq (1 + c_{\text{RE}}) \sqrt{s} \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta, \mathcal{J}_{\boldsymbol{\beta}^*}}\|_2 \leq \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa} \sqrt{s} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.27})$$

C.3 Proof of Lemma C.3

From the same argument of the proof of Lemma C.1, we have (C.11). From (C.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \\ &\leq \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta + \eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.28})$$

We evaluate each term of (C.28). From (A.2) and from $r_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2$, the left-hand side of (C.28) is evaluated as

$$\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \geq b \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2^2 - r_{b,\Sigma} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.29})$$

From (A.1) and $r_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2$, the first term of the right-hand side of (C.28) is evaluated as

$$\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{Y_i - \langle \mathbf{Z}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \mathbf{z}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \leq r_{a,\Sigma} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.30})$$

From $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2$, the second term of the right-hand side of (C.28) is evaluated as

$$\eta \lambda_s (\|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 - \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}}\|_1) \leq \lambda_s \|\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_1 \leq c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2. \quad (\text{C.31})$$

Combining the inequalities above, we have

$$b \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2^2 \leq (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2, \quad (\text{C.32})$$

and from $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \geq 0$, we have

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s), \quad (\text{C.33})$$

and the proof is complete.

D Proof of Proposition A.1

D.1 Step1

We derive a contradiction if $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ hold. Assume that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$. Then we can find $\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta'_2 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_1}\|_1 = r_1$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_2}\|_2 = r_2$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_2}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$ hold. Define $\eta_3 = \min\{\eta_1, \eta_2, \eta'_2\}$. We consider the case $\eta_3 = \eta'_2$ in Section D.1.1, the case $\eta_3 = \eta_2$ in Section D.1.2, and the case $\eta_3 = \eta_1$ in Section D.1.3.

D.1.1 Step 1(a)

Assume that $\eta_3 = \eta'_2$. We see that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold. Then, from Lemma C.3, we have

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s). \quad (\text{D.1})$$

The case $\eta_3 = \eta'_2$ is a contradiction from $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$ and (A.4).

D.1.2 Step 1(b)

Assume that $\eta_3 = \eta_2$. We see that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 = r_2$ hold. Then, from Lemma C.1, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq \frac{3 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa_l} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq \frac{3 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa_l} r_\Sigma \leq 3 \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa_l} r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{D.2})$$

The case $\eta_3 = \eta_2$ is a contradiction from $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 = r_2$ and (A.4).

D.1.3 Step 1(c)

Assume that $\eta_3 = \eta_1$. We see that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$, $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_1 = r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold. Then, from Lemma C.2, for $\eta = \eta_3$, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_1 \leq \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa} \sqrt{s} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_2 \leq \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma \leq 3 \frac{1 + c_{\text{RE}}}{\kappa} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{D.3})$$

The case $\eta_3 = \eta_1$ is a contradiction from $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_3}\|_1 = r_1$ and (A.4).

D.2 Step 2

From the arguments in Section D.1, we have $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ or $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ or $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ holds.

- (a) In Section D.2.1, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.
- (b) In Section D.2.2, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.
- (c) In Section D.2.3, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.
- (d) In Section D.2.4, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.
- (e) In Section D.2.5, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.
- (f) In Section D.2.6, assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold and then derive a contradiction.

Finally, we have

$$\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}(\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*)\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma, \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_2 \leq r_2, \text{ and } \|\hat{\boldsymbol{\beta}} - \boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \leq r_1, \quad (\text{D.4})$$

and the proof is complete.

D.2.1 Step 2(a)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold, and then we can find $\eta_4, \eta'_4 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_4}\|_1 = r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_4}\|_2 = r_2$ hold. We note that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_4}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_4}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Sections D.1.2 and D.1.3, we have a contradiction.

D.2.2 Step 2(b)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold, and then we can find $\eta_5, \eta'_5 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_5}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_5}\|_2 = r_2$ hold. We note that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_5}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_5}\|_1 \leq r_1$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Sections D.1.1 and D.1.2, we have a contradiction.

D.2.3 Step 2(c)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and, then we can find $\eta_6, \eta'_6 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_6}\|_1 = r_1$ and $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_6}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$ hold. We note that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_6}\|_2 \leq r_2$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta'_6}\|_2 \leq r_2$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Sections D.1.1 and D.1.3, we have a contradiction.

D.2.4 Step 2(d)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and, then we can find $\eta_7 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_7}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$ holds. We note that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_7}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_7}\|_2 \leq r_2$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Section D.1.1, we have a contradiction.

D.2.5 Step 2(e)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 > r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_2$ hold and, then we can find $\eta_8 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_8}\|_1 = r_1$ holds. We note that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_8}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_8}\|_2 \leq r_2$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Section D.1.3, we have a contradiction.

D.2.6 Step 2(f)

Assume that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_1 \leq r_1$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_2 > r_2$ hold and, then we can find $\eta_9 \in (0, 1)$ such that $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_9}\|_2 = r_2$ holds. We note that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_9}\|_2 \leq r_\Sigma$ and $\|\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta_9}\|_1 \leq r_1$ also hold. Then, from the same arguments of Section D.1.2, we have a contradiction.

E Proof of Proposition A.2

Proof. From simple algebra, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \\
&= \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right) \\
&\leq \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle}_{T_1} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left\{ \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right\}}_{T_2} \\
&\quad + \underbrace{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left\{ \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right\}}_{T_3}. \quad (\text{E.1})
\end{aligned}$$

First, we evaluate T_1 . From union bound, we have

$$T_1 \leq \max_{j=1, \dots, d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} \right| r_1. \quad (\text{E.2})$$

We note that, for any $1 \leq j \leq d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E} \left(h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} \right)^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j}^2 \leq \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j}^2 \leq 1, \\
& \mathbb{E} \left(h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} \right)^p \\
& \leq (2\tau_{\mathbf{x}})^{p-2} \mathbb{E} \left(h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} - \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} \right)^2 \leq (2\tau_{\mathbf{x}})^{p-2}, \quad (\text{E.3})
\end{aligned}$$

and from Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 5.1 of [18]), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i,j} \right| \geq \sqrt{2 \frac{t}{n}} + 2 \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{x}} t}{n} \right) \leq e^{-t}, \quad (\text{E.4})$$

and, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$T_1 \leq \left(\sqrt{2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + 2 \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{x}} \log(d/\delta)}{n} \right) r_1. \quad (\text{E.5})$$

Second, we evaluate T_2 .

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left\| \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \mathbf{x}_i) \right\|_{\infty} r_1 \\
&= \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \left| \mathbb{E} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j} - \mathbf{x}_{i_j}) \right| r_1 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j} - \mathbf{x}_{i_j}| r_1 \\
&= \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} \mathbb{E} |\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j} - \mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}} r_1 \\
&\leq \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} 2 \mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}} r_1 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2 \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, d\}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{i_j}^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}})^{\frac{3}{4}} r_1 \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} r_1, \tag{E.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Hölder's inequality, (b) follows from $-1 \leq h(\cdot) \leq 1$, and (c) follows from Lemma B.1.

Lastly, we evaluate T_3 . Define $h'(\cdot)$ as the differential of $h(\cdot)$. Let $0 < v < 1$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_3 &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_{\Sigma} \mathbb{B}_{\Sigma}^d} (\mathbb{E} \langle \mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle^4)^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) - h \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right|^{\frac{4}{3}} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} K r_{\Sigma} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) - h \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right|^v \left| h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) - h \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right|^{\frac{4}{3}-v} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{1-\frac{3v}{4}} K r_{\Sigma} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) - h \left(\frac{\xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right|^v \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 2^{1-\frac{3v}{4}} K r_{\Sigma} \left(\mathbb{E} \left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \rangle^{\top} \boldsymbol{\beta}^*}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right|^v \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} 2^{1-\frac{3v}{4}} K (\mathbb{E} |\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle|^v)^{\frac{3}{4}} r_{\Sigma}, \tag{E.7}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Hölder's inequality, (b) follows from the finite kurtosis property of \mathbf{x}_i , (c) follows from the fact that $|h(\cdot)| \leq 1$, (d) follows from Lipschitz continuity of $h(\cdot)$ and from the fact $|h'(\cdot)| \leq 1$, and (e) follows from $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \geq 1$.

We compute $(\mathbb{E} |\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle|^v)^{\frac{3}{4}}$. Define $\text{dom}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)$ as the set of the indices such that $\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* \neq 0$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbb{E} |\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle|^v)^{\frac{3}{4}} &\leq \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left(\sum_{j \in \text{dom}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* (\mathbf{x}_{i_j} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j})| \right)^v \right\}^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \left(\sum_{j \in \text{dom}(\boldsymbol{\beta}^*)} \mathbb{E} |\boldsymbol{\beta}_j^* (\mathbf{x}_{i_j} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j})|^v \right)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\leq c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{3v}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} (\mathbb{E} |\mathbf{x}_{i_j} - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{i_j}|^v)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\leq 2^{\frac{3v}{4}} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{3v}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}} |\mathbf{x}_{i_j}|^v)^{\frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2^{\frac{3v}{4}} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{3v}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbf{x}_{i_j}^4)^{\frac{v}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}} (\mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_{|\mathbf{x}_{i_j}| \geq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}})^{\frac{4-v}{4} \times \frac{3}{4}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2^{\frac{3v}{4}} c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{3v}{4}} K^3 s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \right)^{3-\frac{3v}{4}}, \tag{E.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from the subadditivity, (b) follows Hölder's inequality, and (c) follows from Lemma B.1.

Set $v = 1/3$. Combining the arguments above, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \\
& \leq \left(\sqrt{2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + 2 \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{x}} \log(d/\delta)}{n} \right) r_1 + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} r_1 + 4K^4 c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{1}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \right)^{3-\frac{3v}{4}} r_\Sigma \\
& \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 4 \left(c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + c_{r_1} \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + K^4 c_{r_1} \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} + K^4 c_{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^{\frac{1}{4}} s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \right)^{3-\frac{1}{4}} \right) r_\Sigma, \tag{E.9}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from $c_{r_1} \sqrt{sr_\Sigma} = r_1$. \square

E.1 Proof of Proposition A.3

Proof. Define

$$\mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma = \{ \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d, \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_\Sigma \}. \tag{E.10}$$

This proposition is proved in a manner similar to the proof of Proposition B.1 of [10]. The L.H.S of (A.7) divided by λ_o^2 can be expressed as

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}. \tag{E.11}$$

From the convexity of the Huber loss, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \tag{E.12}$$

$$\geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \mathbf{I}_{E_i}. \tag{E.13}$$

Define the functions

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} x^2 & \text{if } |x| \leq 1/4 \\ (x - 1/4)^2 & \text{if } 1/4 \leq x \leq 1/2 \\ (x + 1/4)^2 & \text{if } -1/2 \leq x \leq -1/4 \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > 1/2 \end{cases} \quad \text{and } \psi(x) = \mathbf{I}_{(|x| \leq 1/2)}. \tag{E.14}$$

Let $f_i(\mathbf{v}) = \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)$ and we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \\
& \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \mathbf{I}_{E_i} \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}), \tag{E.15}
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from $\varphi(v) \geq v^2$ for $|v| \leq 1/2$. We note that

$$f_i(\mathbf{v}) \leq \varphi(v_i) \leq \min \left\{ \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2, \frac{1}{4} \right\}. \tag{E.16}$$

To bound $\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v})$ from below, for any fixed $\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) \geq \mathbb{E}f(\mathbf{v}) - \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) \right|. \quad (\text{E.17})$$

Define the supremum of a random process indexed by $\mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma$:

$$\Delta := \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) \right|. \quad (\text{E.18})$$

From (E.15) and (E.14), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n f_i(\mathbf{v}) \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\theta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2}. \quad (\text{E.19})$$

For $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2$, from Lemma B.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 &\geq -4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 = -2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \\ &\geq -4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} r_1^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} -4K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} r_\Sigma^2 + \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \left(-4K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} + 1 \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.20})$$

where (a) follows from $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and (b) follows from $r_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2$.

For $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} &= \mathbb{E} \mathbf{v}^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top - \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top + \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \mathbf{v} \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^4} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2}} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \sqrt{2} K^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}(|\langle \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \rangle| + |\langle \mathbf{x}_i^\top - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle|)}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + K^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \sqrt{r_\Sigma + \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} \\ &\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \left(4K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} + K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \sqrt{1 + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.21})$$

where (a) follows from (B.6) in the proof of Lemma B.2, (b) follows from Hölder's inequality, (c) follows from the finite kurtosis property of \mathbf{x}_i , the relationship of expectation of indicator function and probability, and Markov's inequality, (d) follows from Lemma B.2 and the definition of \mathbf{x}_i , and (e) follows from $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$, $r_\Sigma \leq 1$ and $r_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2$.

For $\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right)^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} &= \mathbb{E} \mathbf{v}^\top (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top - \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top + \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top) \mathbf{v} \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}(\mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^4} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \mathbb{I}_{\left| \frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right| \geq 1/2}} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + K^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} (|\xi_i| + |\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle|)} \\
&\stackrel{(d)}{\leq} 4 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + K^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^3}} \\
&\stackrel{(e)}{\leq} \left(4K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_x^2} + K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^3}} \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2, \quad (\text{E.22})
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from Lemma B.2, (b) follows from Hölder's inequality, (c) follows from the definition of \mathbf{x}_i , the relationship of expectation of indicator function and probability, Markov's inequality and the triangular inequality, (d) follows from Lemma B.3, and (e) follows from $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s r_\Sigma}$ and $r_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2$.

Consequently, from (E.15), (E.17), (E.19) (E.20), (E.21) and (E.22), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2 &\left(1 - K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \left(\sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^3}} + \sqrt{1 + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \frac{K^4}{\tau_x^3}} \right) - 12K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_x^2} \right) - \lambda_o^2 \Delta \\
&\leq \lambda_o^2 \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} - \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}. \quad (\text{E.23})
\end{aligned}$$

Next we evaluate the stochastic term Δ defined in (E.18). From (E.16) and Theorem 2.1 of [7], with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\Delta \leq \mathbb{E} \Delta + \sqrt{\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{V}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}(f_i(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E} f_i(\mathbf{v}))^2} \sqrt{2 \log(1/\delta)} + \frac{1}{3} \log(1/\delta). \quad (\text{E.24})$$

From (E.16) and $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s r_\Sigma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}(f_i(\mathbf{v}) - \mathbb{E} f_i(\mathbf{v}))^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} f_i^2(\mathbf{v}) \leq \mathbb{E} \frac{f_i(\mathbf{v})}{4} \leq \mathbb{E} \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle^2}{4 \lambda_o^2 n} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_o^2 n} \left(\frac{K^4}{\tau_x^2} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \frac{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2}{4} \right) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_o^2 n} \left(K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_x^2} + \frac{1}{4} \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2. \quad (\text{E.25})
\end{aligned}$$

Combining this and (E.24), from the triangular inequality, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_o^2 \Delta &\leq \lambda_o^2 \mathbb{E} \Delta + \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(K^2 c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{\tau_x^2 n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{2n}} \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2 + \lambda_o^2 \frac{1}{3} \log(1/\delta) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lambda_o^2 \mathbb{E} \Delta + \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(K^2 c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{\tau_x^2 n}} + \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{2n}} \right) \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2 + \lambda_o^2 n \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{3n} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \lambda_o^2 \mathbb{E} \Delta + \lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \left(\frac{K^2}{\tau_x} + 1 \right) \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2, \quad (\text{E.26})
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) follows from $\log(1/\delta) \leq \log(d/\delta)$ and $s \geq 1$ and (b) follows from $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \leq r_\Sigma$, $s \geq 1$ and $c_{r_1} \geq 1$. For $\mathbb{E}\Delta$, from symmetrization inequality (Lemma 11.4 of [6]), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\Delta &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in \mathfrak{B}_{r_1, r_2, r_\Sigma}^\Sigma} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right| \\ &\leq 2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.27})$$

where $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is a sequence of i.i.d. Rademacher random variables which are independent of $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. We denote \mathbb{E}^* as a conditional expectation of $\{b_i\}_{i=1}^n$ given $\{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$. From Exercise 2.2.2 of [39], for any $\mathbf{v}_0 \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right| \\ \leq \mathbb{E}^* \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}_0}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right| + \mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.28})$$

For the first term of (E.28), we set $\mathbf{v}_0 = 0$. For the second term of (E.28), from contraction principle (Theorem 11.5 of [6]), we have

$$\mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \leq \mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right), \quad (\text{E.29})$$

and from the fact that φ is $\frac{1}{2}$ -Lipschitz and $\varphi(0) = 0$, and contraction principle (Theorem 11.6 in [6]),

$$\mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \mathbb{E}^* \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}. \quad (\text{E.30})$$

and from the basic property of the expectation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_o^2 \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n b_i \varphi \left(\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \psi \left(\frac{\langle \mathbf{x}_i - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle + \xi_i}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right| \\ \leq \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \mathbb{E} \sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} b_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \\ \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(\sqrt{2 \frac{\log d}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{\log d}{n} \right) r_1 \\ \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \left(\sqrt{2} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.31})$$

where (a) follows from Lemma B.4 and (b) follows from $\log(d) \leq \log(d/\delta)$, $1 \leq \log(d/\delta)$, $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s r_\Sigma}$ and $c_{r_1} \geq 1$.

Combining (E.26) and (E.31), we have

$$\lambda_o^2 \Delta \leq 3 \lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \left(1 + \frac{K^2}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2, \quad (\text{E.32})$$

and combining (E.23), the proof is complete. \square

F Proofs of Propositions 3.1, 3.2 and A.4, and Lemma A.5

F.1 Proof of Proposition 3.1

Proof. We note that this proof is similar to the one of Lemma 2 of [21]. For any $M \in \mathfrak{M}_r$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \underbrace{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle}_{T_4} - \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle + \mathbb{E} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle. \quad (\text{F.1})$$

First, we evaluate T_4 . We note that, for any $1 \leq j_1, j_2 \leq d$,

$$\mathbb{E} \tilde{x}_{ij_1}^2 \tilde{x}_{ij_2}^2 \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \tilde{x}_{ij_1}^4} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \tilde{x}_{ij_2}^4} \leq K^4, \quad \mathbb{E} \tilde{x}_{ij_1}^{2p} \tilde{x}_{ij_2}^{2p} \leq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{2(p-2)} \mathbb{E} \tilde{x}_{ij_1}^2 \tilde{x}_{ij_2}^2 \leq \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^{2(p-2)} K^4. \quad (\text{F.2})$$

From Bernstein's inequality (Lemma 5.1 of [18]), we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^\top - \mathbb{E} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^\top \geq K^2 \sqrt{2 \frac{t}{n}} + \frac{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 t}{n} \right) \leq e^{-t}. \quad (\text{F.3})$$

From the union bound, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^\top - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij} \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_{ij}^\top \right\|_{\infty} \leq \sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{F.4})$$

From Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(T_1 \leq \sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|M\|_1 + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \|M\|_1 \right) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (\text{F.5})$$

Next, we evaluate $\mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top - \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top, M \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top - \Sigma, M \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle \Sigma, M \rangle \\ &= \mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top - \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top, M \rangle + \mathbb{E} \langle \Sigma, M \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.6})$$

From Hölder's inequality and the positive semi-definiteness of M , we have

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \Sigma, M \rangle \leq \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} \|M\|_* = \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} \text{Tr}(M) = \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} r^2. \quad (\text{F.7})$$

From (B.6) and Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top - \mathbf{x}_i \mathbf{x}_i^\top, M \rangle \leq 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \|M\|_1. \quad (\text{F.8})$$

Finally, combining the arguments above, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top, M \rangle}{n} \right| \leq \left(\sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right) \|M\|_1 + \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} r^2. \quad (\text{F.9})$$

□

Define $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{v}, r_2} = \{M \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d} : M = \mathbf{v} \mathbf{v}^\top, \|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_2\}$.

F.2 Proof of Proposition 3.2

We note that, from Hölder's inequality and $|w_i| \leq 1/n$,

$$\left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_i u_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \right|^2 \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} c^2 \frac{\rho}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i |\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}|^2. \quad (\text{F.10})$$

We focus on $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_i |\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}|^2$. For any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 &= \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i (\tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 - \lambda_* \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 + \lambda_* \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sup_{M \in \mathfrak{M}_r} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \hat{w}_i \langle \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top, M \rangle - \lambda_* \|M\|_1 \right) + \lambda_* \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \tau_{suc} + \lambda_* \|\mathbf{v}\|_1^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.11})$$

where (a) follows from the fact that $\mathfrak{M}_{\mathbf{v}, r_2} \subset \mathfrak{M}_{r_2}$, and (b) follows from (3.10). Combining the arguments above, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \hat{w}_i u_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sqrt{2} c \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}} \sqrt{\tau_{suc}} + \sqrt{2} c \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}} \sqrt{\lambda_*} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \\ &= \sqrt{2} c \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{\|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}}}{1-\varepsilon} r_2^2} + \sqrt{2} c \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}} \sqrt{c_* \left(\sqrt{2} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right)} \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} 2c c'_* \left(c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \sqrt{K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}}} \right) r_\Sigma, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F.12})$$

where (a) follows the triangular inequality and (b) follows from $c'_* = \max\{\frac{1}{1-\varepsilon}, c_*\}$, $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$.

F.3 Proof of Proposition A.4

We note that, from Hölder's inequality, we have

$$\left| \sum_{i \in I_m} \frac{u_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v}}{n} \right|^2 \leq \sum_{i \in I_m} \frac{1}{n} u_i^2 \sum_{i \in I_m} \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2 \leq c^2 \frac{m}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} (\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2. \quad (\text{F.13})$$

From the proof of Proposition 3.1 and Hölder's inequality, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v})^2}{n} \leq \left(2K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + 2 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \right) r_1^2 + \|\Sigma\|_{\text{op}} r_2^2. \quad (\text{F.14})$$

From triangular inequality, $r_1 = c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} r_\Sigma$ and $r_2 = c_{r_2} r_\Sigma$, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have

$$\sum_{i \in I_m} \frac{1}{n} u_i \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \leq 2c \left(c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \sqrt{K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \sqrt{\frac{m}{n}}} \right) r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{F.15})$$

G Proofs of Theorems 2.1 and 3.1

G.1 Proof of Theorem 2.1

To prove Theorem 2.1, it is sufficient that we confirm (A.1) - (A.4) hold under the assumption of Theorem 2.1.

G.1.1 Confirming (A.1) and (A.2)

First, we confirm (A.1). We note that, from $\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(d/\delta)}}$,

$$K^4 c_{r_1} \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad K^4 s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}}\right)^{3-\frac{1}{4}} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (\text{G.1})$$

where (a) and (b) follows from (2.7). Then, from Proposition A.2, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_{\Sigma} \mathbb{B}_{\Sigma}^d$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_{\Sigma} \mathbb{B}_{\Sigma}^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \leq 16 c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} r_{\Sigma}. \quad (\text{G.2})$$

Next, we confirm (A.2). We note that, from $\tau_{\mathbf{x}} = \sqrt{\frac{n}{\log(d/\delta)}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \left(\sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} + \sqrt{1 + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} \right) + 12 K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{18(\sigma+1)}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} + \frac{1}{6} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}, \\ & 2 + \frac{K^2}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 4, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.3})$$

where (a) and (c) follows from (2.7), (b) follows from the definition of λ_o .

Then, from Proposition A.3, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_{\Sigma}$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_o}{\sqrt{n}} \left(-h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^{\top} \mathbf{v} \geq \frac{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2}{2} - 12 \lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2. \quad (\text{G.4})$$

Therefore, we see that (A.1) and (A.2) hold with

$$r_{a,\Sigma} = r_{b,\Sigma} = 16 \lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad b = 1/2. \quad (\text{G.5})$$

G.1.2 Confirming (A.3)

Thirdly, we confirm (A.3). From (G.5), we see that

$$\frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} = 16 \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}} = \frac{c_s \frac{\text{CRE}+1}{\text{CRE}-1} + 1}{c_s \frac{\text{CRE}+1}{\text{CRE}-1} - 1} \leq \text{CRE}. \quad (\text{G.6})$$

G.1.3 Confirming (A.4)

Lastly, we confirm (A.4). From (G.5), the definition of λ_s and $c_{\text{RE}} > 1$, we have

$$\frac{2}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s) \leq 12 c_s \frac{c_{\text{RE}} + 1}{c_{\text{RE}} - 1} r_{a,\Sigma} = 12 c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s, \quad (\text{G.7})$$

and we see the condition about r_{Σ} is satisfied. From the definition, conditions about r_1 and r_2 are clearly satisfied.

G.2 Proof of Theorem 3.1

To prove Theorem 3.1, it is sufficient that we confirm (A.1) - (A.4) hold under the assumption of Theorem 3.1.

G.2.1 Confirming (A.1) and (A.2)

We note that, from $r_\Sigma \leq 1$, $\lambda_o \sqrt{n} \geq 1$, we have $(\log(d/\delta))/n \leq 1$. From (3.14), we have

$$\max \left\{ K^4 \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, \frac{K^4}{c_{r_1}} s^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{16}} \right\} \leq 1. \quad (\text{G.8})$$

From $K \geq 1$ and (3.14), we have

$$(K^4 + K^2 + 1) \frac{c_{r_1}^2}{c_{r_2}^2 \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}} s \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \leq 1. \quad (\text{G.9})$$

From $(\log(d/\delta))/n \leq 1$ and (3.15), we have

$$\max \left\{ K^2 \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}, K^4 \max\{\|\beta^*\|_1, c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}\} \left(\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} \right)^{\frac{3}{4}}, 72K^4 c_{r_1}^2 s \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right\} \leq 1. \quad (\text{G.10})$$

First, we confirm (A.1). From $\{1, \dots, n\} = \mathcal{I} \cap I_{\geq} + \mathcal{I} \cap I_{<} + \mathcal{O}$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \\ & \leq \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| + \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O} \cup (\mathcal{I} \cap I_{<})} \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| + \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.11})$$

We note that, from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $(\log(d/\delta))/n \leq 1$ and (G.8), we have

$$\tau_{\mathbf{x}} \frac{\sqrt{s} \log(d/\delta)}{n} \leq \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad K^4 \frac{\sqrt{s}}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3} \leq \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}, \quad K^4 s^{\frac{3}{4}} \left(\frac{1}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} \right)^{3-\frac{1}{4}} \leq c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}}. \quad (\text{G.12})$$

Then, from Proposition A.2, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$, we have

$$\sup_{\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \mathbf{v} \rangle \right| \leq 16c_{r_1} \sqrt{s \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{G.13})$$

We note that, from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ and from (G.9), we have

$$c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \sqrt{K^2 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2 \frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n} + \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2}} \leq c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}}. \quad (\text{G.14})$$

Additionally, note that $-1 \leq h(\cdot) \leq 1$. Then from Proposition 3.2 with $c = 1$, and from Proposition A.4 with $m = 3o$ and $c = 1$, we have

$$\max \left\{ \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right|, \left| \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O} \cup (\mathcal{I} \cap I_{<})} \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \beta^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| \right\} \leq 2c'_* c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{G.15})$$

From the arguments above and from $c_* \geq 1$, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d \cap r_\Sigma \mathbb{B}_\Sigma^d$ we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \leq 16c_{r_1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} r_\Sigma + 4c'_* c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} r_\Sigma. \quad (\text{G.16})$$

Next, we confirm (A.2). From the same calculation of (G.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(-h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \\ & \geq \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \\ & - \left| \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O} \cup (\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}_c)} \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| \\ & - \left| \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \left(-h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.17})$$

We note that

$$\begin{aligned} & K^2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} \left(\sqrt{\sigma + \|\boldsymbol{\beta}^*\|_1 \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} + \sqrt{1 + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \frac{K^4}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^3}} \right) + 12K^4 c_{r_1}^2 \frac{s}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} K^2 \sqrt{\frac{18(\sigma+1)}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}}} + \frac{1}{6} \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{1}{2}, \\ & 2 + \frac{K^2}{\tau_{\mathbf{x}}} + \tau_{\mathbf{x}} \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} \stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 4, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.18})$$

where (a) and (c) follow from the definition of $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ and from (G.10), and (b) follows from the definition of λ_o . Then, from Proposition A.3, for any $\mathbf{v} \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2 = r_\Sigma$, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\lambda_o}{\sqrt{n}} \left(-h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \mathbf{v} \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \mathbf{v} \geq \frac{\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2^2}{2} - 15\lambda_o \sqrt{n} c_{r_1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathbf{v}\|_2. \quad (\text{G.19})$$

From (G.14), Propositions 3.2 and A.4 with $m = 3o$ and $c = 2$ and $c'_* \geq 1$, for any $\boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \in r_1 \mathbb{B}_1^d \cap r_2 \mathbb{B}_2^d$ such that $\|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}} \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta\|_2 = r_\Sigma$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O} \cup (\mathcal{I} \cap \mathcal{I}_c)} \frac{1}{n} \left(-h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{y_i - \langle \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| \\ & + \left| \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{O}} \left(-h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* + \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) + h \left(\frac{\hat{w}_i W_i - \langle \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i, \boldsymbol{\beta}^* \rangle}{\lambda_o \sqrt{n}} \right) \right) \hat{w}_i \tilde{\mathbf{X}}_i^\top \boldsymbol{\theta}_\eta \right| \leq 16c'_* c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} r_\Sigma. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G.20})$$

Therefore, we see that (A.1) and (A.2) holds with $b = 1/2$ and

$$r_{a,\Sigma} = r_{b,\Sigma} = \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(16c_{r_1} \sqrt{\frac{s \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + 16c'_* c_{r_2} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{n}} \right). \quad (\text{G.21})$$

G.2.2 Confirming (A.3)

Thirdly, we confirm (A.3). From (G.21), we see that

$$\frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}} = \lambda_o \sqrt{n} \left(16 \sqrt{\frac{\log(d/\delta)}{n}} + 16c'_* \frac{c_{r_2}}{c_{r_1}} \|\Sigma^{\frac{1}{2}}\|_{\text{op}} \sqrt{\frac{o}{sn}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\lambda_s + \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}}{\lambda_s - \frac{r_{a,\Sigma}}{c_{r_1} \sqrt{s}}} \leq c_{\text{RE}}. \quad (\text{G.22})$$

G.2.3 Confirming (A.4)

From Lastly, we confirm (A.4). From (G.21), the definition of λ_s and $c_{\text{RE}} > 1$, we have

$$\frac{2}{b} (r_{a,\Sigma} + r_{b,\Sigma} + c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s) \leq 12c_s \frac{c_{\text{RE}} + 1}{c_{\text{RE}} - 1} r_{a,\Sigma} = 12c_{r_1} \sqrt{s} \lambda_s, \quad (\text{G.23})$$

and we see the condition about r_Σ is satisfied. From the definition, conditions about r_1 and r_2 are clearly satisfied.