

The poison of dimensionality

Lê-Nguyên Hoang

Calicarpa, Tournesol Association
len@calicarpa.com

September 27, 2024

Abstract

This paper advances the understanding of how the size of a machine learning model affects its vulnerability to poisoning, despite state-of-the-art defenses. Given isotropic random honest feature vectors and the geometric median (or clipped mean) as the robust gradient aggregator rule, we essentially prove that, perhaps surprisingly, linear and logistic regressions with $D \geq 169H^2/P^2$ parameters are subject to *arbitrary model manipulation* by poisoners, where H and P are the numbers of honestly labeled and poisoned data points used for training. Our experiments go on exposing a fundamental tradeoff between augmenting model expressivity and increasing the poisoners’ *attack surface*, on both synthetic data, and on MNIST & FashionMNIST data for linear classifiers with random features. We also discuss potential implications for source-based learning and neural nets.

1 Introduction

The classical theory of learning [Val84, GBD92, KW96] suggests that, given N training data, learning models should have $D = \Theta(N)$ parameters. But a vast empirical and theoretical literature on the *double descent* phenomenon [ZBH⁺17, BHMM19, MVS19, NKB⁺20, MM22, HMRT22] instead suggests that better performance could be obtained by letting $D \rightarrow \infty$. In any case, massive data collection has led to ever larger learning models [BMR⁺20, FZS22, CND⁺23], with now trillions, if not hundreds of trillions (10^{14}) of parameters [LYZ⁺22].

However, these theories arguing that the number D of parameters should grow at least linearly with the number N of data all make two underlying assumptions: that all training data are “honest” and that they should be generalized. In large-scale applications like content recommendation and language processing, this is deeply *unrealistic* and *ethically questionable* [KZ18, BGMS21]. After all, many of these systems fit social media activity and web-crawled datasets [SSP⁺13, CND⁺23], which are heavily *poisoned* by doxed personal data, hate speech and state-sponsored propaganda [Woo23, Yur19, And23]. In fact, the survey [KNL⁺20] found that such *data poisoning*, i.e. injections of misleading inputs in training datasets [BNL12, SMS⁺21], has become the leading AI security concern in the industry.

Meanwhile, a growing line of research has been suggesting that high-dimensional training facilitates persistent poisoning attacks [HDM⁺24], even when state-of-the-art defenses are deployed [EFG⁺22]. The theoretical case has mostly relied on a mathematical impossibility to bring the norm of the gradient at termination below $\Omega(\sqrt{D})$. However, it is unclear whether the poisoned model is then worse than if trained with fewer parameters. Perhaps closest to this intuition is [WLF22b], who prove that the “lethal dose” decreases with model expressivity.

Our paper advances the understanding of how model size D affects machine learning security, given H honestly labeled data and P poisoned data. Crucially, for $P = \Theta(H)$ (e.g. 1 our results completely diverge from the common wisdom $D \geq \Theta(N) = \Theta(H)$). In fact, in this regime, D should not increase with H . More precisely, we make the following contributions.

Contributions. First, when $D \geq 169H^2/P^2$, we essentially prove that using state-of-the-art poisoning defenses (gradient descent with the geometric median or clipped mean) actually provides *zero* resilience guarantee, at least for the two most standard learning problems (linear and logistic regression). In fact, we prove *arbitrary model manipulation* by poisoners.

Second, we empirically show the value of *dimension reduction* under poisoning. We expose this both on synthetic data for linear and logistic regression, and on the MNIST & FashionMNIST datasets given a random-feature linear classification model. Our experiments robustly highlight a tradeoff between model expressivity and restricted *attack surface*, when training under attack.

Third, we prove and leverage a property of random vector subspaces to informally discuss the applicability of our analysis to “sandboxed learning” and nonlinear models.

Literature review. Poisoning attacks have recently gained a lot of attention, see surveys [BR18, FYL⁺22, WKZH22, WMW⁺23, TCLY23, XCYM23]. Some of the most common attacks include label flip [RWRK20, CLX⁺23], where some honest data’s labels are changed, clean label [PMG⁺17, HGF⁺20, CLX⁺23], where the poisons are required to be classified correctly by the training classifier or a human, and pattern back-dooring [WXK⁺23]. Our paper considers a more general class of poisoning, where the attacker can optimize both the data and its labels.

The main classes of defenses against poisoning include outlier removal [HA04, JOB⁺18, MKB20, BCF⁺21, ZCJG22, CWW22] and ensemble filtering [JCG21, LF21, WLF22a, LKY23]. Another defense class has relied on robust aggregation rules implemented during gradient descent training [BMGS17, YB19, LXC⁺19, MZH19, SHCM20, HCK⁺20]. While such defenses were introduced to secure decentralized learning, [FGHV22] proved a deep connection with data poisoning.

Our results contribute to a growing body of work on the theoretical impossibility of securing learning [MGR18, JSHO21, EFG⁺21, FLL⁺22, GKVZ22, KHJ22, AGG⁺23]. As summarized by [EFG⁺22], the impossibility especially arises under data heterogeneity and in high dimension. However, to the best of our knowledge, we provide the first *arbitrary model manipulation* result despite the use of a state-of-the-art defense.

Structure. In the sequel, Section 2 precisely defines the setting of our analysis. Section 3 introduces our main theorem and the key intuition underlying it. Section 4 presents further incriminating experimental results. Section 5 informally discusses generalizations. Section 6 concludes.

2 Setting

Given a list $\mathbf{D} \triangleq \{(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2), \dots, (x_N, y_N)\} \in (\mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{Y})^N$ of N training feature-label pairs, also known as the *training dataset*, we learn a linear prediction $\alpha^T x$ of labels y . The error on a feature-label pair (x, y) is given by the prediction error, which we write $\ell(\alpha|x, y)$.

We assume that (honest) feature vectors are independent and identically distributed, as $x_n \sim \mathcal{X}$, while (honest) labels are only dependent on a “ground truth” conditional distribution $\mathcal{Y}(x)$. In the theoretical section of this paper, we focus on the two most standard machine learning models, linear regression and logistic regression, where \mathcal{Y} is parameterized by a vector β .

Linear regression (without noise). In least square linear regression¹, it is common to assume a hidden true vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^D$ such that $\mathbb{Y} \triangleq \mathbb{R}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_\beta(x)$ is the Dirac distribution reporting $\beta^T x$. The loss is given by $\ell(\alpha|x, y) \triangleq \frac{1}{2}(\alpha^T x - y)^2$. Its gradient is $\nabla \ell(\alpha|x, y) = (\alpha^T x - y)x$.

Logistic regression. Logistic regression also depends on a hidden vector $\beta \in \mathbb{R}^D$. But now $\mathbb{Y} \triangleq \{0, 1\}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_\beta(x)$ is a Bernoulli distribution with $\mathbb{P}[y = 1|\beta, x] = \sigma(\beta^T x)$, where σ is the sigmoid function $\sigma(t) =$

¹Our main theorem still holds with noise, see Appendix.

$(1 + e^{-t})^{-1}$. The cross-entropy loss on an input (x, y) is $\ell(\alpha|x, y) \triangleq -\ln \sigma(\alpha^T x)$ if $y = 1$ and $\ell(\alpha|x, y) \triangleq -\ln(1 - \sigma(\alpha^T x))$ if $y = 0$. The gradient is $\nabla \ell(\alpha|x, y) = (\sigma(\alpha^T x) - y)x$.

Assuming that all data are correctly labeled, a common solution to the learning problem is to minimize an empirical error. Considering the average empirical loss yields:

$$\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{D}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \ell(\alpha|x_n, y_n). \quad (1)$$

While it is not uncommon to add a regularization, several works on “ridgless regression” [BHX20] suggested optimal performances with no regularization (assuming honest data only).

For linear regression, in the regime $N \geq D$, i.e. there are more data than parameters, it is well-known that, with probability 1, \mathcal{L} is strongly convex, and thus has a unique minimum. In the case of logistic regression, further assumptions are needed to guarantee the existence of a minimum; but it can be guaranteed with high probability for $N = \Omega(D)$. In both cases, for a fixed D and in the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, assuming the data (x_n, y_n) to be independent with $x_n \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$ and $y_n \sim \mathcal{Y}_\beta(x)$, the learned model essentially converges to the true model, see e.g. [FGHV22].

2.1 Poisoning attacks

In the sequel, we consider an adversarial setting where not all data are correctly labeled. More precisely, the training dataset is assumed to result from the merging of two sets $\mathbf{H} \triangleq \{(x_h, y_h)\}_{h \in [H]}$ and $\mathbf{P} \triangleq \{(x_{H+p}, y_{H+p})\}_{p \in [P]}$, which respectively contain *honest* (x_h, y_h) and *poisonous* (x_{H+p}, y_{H+p}) data. Their respective cardinalities are H and P , with $H + P = N$. Like previously, the honest data are assumed to be i.i.d., with, for all $h \in [H]$, $x_h \sim \mathcal{X}$ and $y_h \sim \mathcal{Y}(x_h)$. However, each poisonous data may be arbitrarily chosen in $\mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{Y}$, potentially by an adversary.

Evidently, the difficulty arises when the training set \mathbf{D} does not distinguish honest from poisoning data². To account for the ignorance of the learning model, we demand that our training be invariant to shuffles of data indices $n \in [N]$. Note that minimizing \mathcal{L} indeed does so.

In this setting, as long as $P \geq 1$, learning by minimizing a regularized empirical loss is highly insecure. To prove this, we leverage the well-known gradient inversion lemma.

Lemma 1 (Gradient inversion). *Consider linear or logistic regression. For any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and $g \in \mathbb{R}^D$, there exists $(x, y) \in \mathbb{R}^D \times \mathbb{Y}$ such that $\nabla \ell(\alpha|x, y) = g$.*

Proof. Define $(g, \alpha^T g - 1)$ for linear regression, and $(\frac{g}{\sigma(\alpha^T g)}, 0)$ for logistic regression. \square

It then follows that, for all learning dimensions D , linear and logistic regressions without defenses are vulnerable to *arbitrary model manipulation* by a single poisoner.

Proposition 1 (Arbitrary model manipulation by a single poisoner). *Consider linear or logistic regression. For any model size $D \in \mathbb{N}$, any target vector $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$ and any subset $\mathbf{H} \triangleq \{(x_h, y_h)\}_{h \in [H]}$ of H data, there is a data $\mathbf{P} \triangleq \{(x_{H+1}, y_{H+1})\}$ such that α minimizes $\mathcal{L}(\cdot|\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$.*

Proof. Let $g \triangleq -\nabla \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{H})$. By Lemma 1, we know that there exists (x_{H+1}, y_{H+1}) such that $\nabla \ell(\alpha|x_{H+1}, y_{H+1}) = g$. We then have $\nabla \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P}) = \nabla \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{H}) + g = 0$, which proves that α minimizes the convex loss \mathcal{L} . \square

In practice, there may be restrictions on the poisoning feature vector x . Typically, images x may be constrained to belong to³ $([0, 255] \cap \mathbb{N})^D \subset \mathbb{R}^D$. In particular, bounding the set of allowed feature vectors x

²Formally, we may consider that there is a random permutation $s : [N] \rightarrow [N]$ such that the n -th observed element $(x_n^{\mathbf{D}}, y_n^{\mathbf{D}})$ in the training dataset \mathbf{D} is $(x_n^{\mathbf{D}}, y_n^{\mathbf{D}}) \triangleq (x_{\sigma(n)}, y_{\sigma(n)})$. By considering permutation-invariant learning rules, the training then remains the same no matter which random permutation is selected.

³Or be drawn from a specific distribution to which legitimate data are assumed to belong.

then prevents gradient inversion, and thus *arbitrary model manipulation* by a single poison. Note however, that the key intuition of our main theorem (Section 3.2) nevertheless applies, as it leverages the direction of poison-based gradient (not its size). This suggests that arbitrary model manipulation still holds for $D \geq \Omega(H^2/P^2)$, even given feature space constraints.

2.2 Securing learning with the geometric median or clipped mean

To secure training against poisoning, we propose to aggregate the gradients coming from each data using so-called *Byzantine-resilient gradient aggregation rules* [BMGS17, MGR18]. To understand, first observe that the gradient of \mathcal{L} can be written

$$\nabla \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{D}) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \nabla \ell(\alpha|x_n, y_n), \quad (2)$$

which is subject to *arbitrary gradient manipulation* by a single poisonous gradient. Given the gradient inversion lemma (Lemma 1), this implies *arbitrary model manipulation* (Proposition 1).

To secure the training, [BMGS17] replaces the average by a robust mean estimator. In the theoretical part of our paper, we focus on the Δ -clipped mean [KHJ22, KMC⁺23] and the *geometric median* [Lop89, Min15, KHJ22, AHJ⁺22, EFGH23]. Recall their definitions.

Definition 1. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and given any vectors $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{R}^D$, the Δ -clipped mean is given clipping the vectors whose norms exceed Δ , and by averaging the clipped vectors, i.e.

$$\text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta(z_1, \dots, z_N) \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\Delta}{\|z_n\|_2} \right\} z_n. \quad (3)$$

Definition 2. For any $N \in \mathbb{N}$, and given any vectors $z_1, \dots, z_N \in \mathbb{R}^D$, the set $\text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_N)$ of geometric medians is defined as the minimum of the sum of distances to the z_n 's, i.e.

$$\text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_N) \triangleq \arg \min_{g \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{n \in [N]} \|g - z_n\|_2. \quad (4)$$

Whenever the inputs z_1, \dots, z_N are not along a line (or if N is odd), the geometric median is known to be unique. In our setting, because the vectors x_n have a continuous probability distribution over \mathbb{R}^d , and since gradients are colinear with x_n , with probability 1, the geometric median is uniquely defined. $\text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_N)$ is then invariant up to index labeling, as demanded to model the prior ignorance about which data is poisonous.

Following [BMGS17], to increase poisoning resilience, we modify the standard gradient descent algorithm, by replacing (2) with the following robustified gradient:

$$\widehat{\nabla} \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{D}) \triangleq \text{AGG}(\nabla \ell(\alpha|x_1, y_1), \dots, \nabla \ell(\alpha|x_N, y_N)). \quad (5)$$

Assuming $H > P$, both $\text{AGG} = \text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta$ and $\text{AGG} = \text{GEOMED}$ are well-known to be resilient to *arbitrary gradient manipulation* [Lop89, EFGH23]. But does this imply that gradient descent with such aggregation rules also prevents *arbitrary model manipulation*? To formally answer this question, let us define stationary points.

Definition 3. We say that $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$ is a (AGG, \mathbf{D}) -stationary point if $\widehat{\nabla} \mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{D}) = 0$.

Stationary points are of special interest as, if the gradient descent with AGG ever reaches such a point, then it will be stuck at this point.

3 Main result

Our main result is essentially that, when $D \geq 169H^2/P^2$, even though they *cannot* arbitrarily manipulate the robustified gradient, poisoners can still arbitrarily manipulate the trained model. *Arbitrary model manipulation* does not require *arbitrary gradient manipulation*.

Theorem 1. Consider linear or logistic regression, and $\text{AGG} \in \{\text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta, \text{GEOMED}\}$ (for any $\Delta \geq 0$). Suppose the honest feature vector distribution \mathcal{X} is isotropic, i.e. invariant under orthogonal transformations. Assume $D \geq 1024$. $H \geq 6272D \ln D$ and $D \geq 169H^2/P^2$. Take any target model $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Then, with probability at least $1 - 2/D$ over the random honest set \mathbf{H} of cardinal H , there exists a poisonous set \mathbf{P} of cardinal P such that α is a $(\text{AGG}, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point.

3.1 Five remarks on the main theorem

Before discussing the proof of Theorem 1, we make five remarks on its limits and implications.

High probability. Our theorem should have been concerning even if the probability of vulnerability was barely positive. However, for large D , we prove that vulnerability is essentially a guarantee.

The overparameterized regime. It is straightforward to modify the final step of our proof (Appendix E), to derive *arbitrary model manipulation* even when $H \leq 6272D \ln D$, assuming $P \geq 728\sqrt{H \ln D}$. In fact, informally, in the overparameterized regime $D \geq \tilde{\Omega}(H)$, then the number P of poisons to arbitrarily manipulate the model need only be sublinear in H .

Independence to signal-to-noise ratio. Perhaps surprisingly, our theorem does not depend on the noise in honest data. In fact, since the result only follows from the isotropy of random honest feature vectors x and the fact that $\nabla \ell(\cdot|x, y)$ is colinear with x , it is *independent* from how honest data is labeled. Even for labeling completely different from what we assumed, our theorem holds.

The attack. Especially in the case of the geometric median, the poisoning is remarkably easy to implement. Namely, poisoners merely need to provide data (x_{H+p}, y_{H+p}) for which $\nabla \ell(\alpha|\pi_d(x_{H+p}), y_{H+p}) = 0$. For linear regression, this can be done by drawing $x_{H+p} \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$, and by adding the label $y_{H+p} \triangleq \alpha^T x_{H+p}$, thereby making poisonous feature vectors statistically indistinguishable from honest feature vectors.

Quantitative implication. Assuming $H/P = 100$ (i.e. roughly only 1 secure training demands $D \leq 1.7 \cdot 10^6$). Thus linear models that have over millions of parameters and whose training involves web-crawled data must be considered *highly insecure*.

3.2 Key intuition

While our proof of Theorem 1 is specific to CLIPMEAN_Δ and GEOMED -gradient descent, it relies on a remarkably simple insight, which might suggest a more fundamental learning impossibility under poisoning in high dimension.

Namely, the key intuition is that, if the gradient of the loss for a random honest data is isotropically distributed in \mathbb{R}^D , then, with high probability, it will be almost orthogonal to the right learning direction (towards β), as well as to any other honest gradient (see Figure 1). This makes each honest data poorly informative.




Figure 1: In high dimension, correct gradients fail to point in the right direction, which makes poisoning vastly more devastating.

In contrast, the poisoners may select feature vectors whose direction is fully aligned with their preferred update direction. Thereby, intuitively, *each poison can be made \sqrt{D} times more disinformative than how informative each honest data is*. This suggests that, when $P\sqrt{D} \gg H$, i.e. $D \geq \Theta(H^2/P^2)$, defending against poisoned data might be hopeless, perhaps regardless of which (reasonable) gradient aggregation rule is used.

Note that our case strongly relies on the full control of attacks on the poisonous feature vectors. In particular, this suggests that, in high dimension, label-flipping attacks are \sqrt{D} times less harmful, and should thus not be regarded as a gold standard of poisoning. Typically, artists may leverage AIs to optimize images (feature) with misleading captions (label) to fool generative algorithms [SCW⁺23] while online propaganda may both generate (feature) and like (label) social media content to manipulate recommendation algorithms [CBQ⁺24].

3.3 Proof sketch

We now provide a brief sketch of our four-step proof. The full proof is detailed in the appendix.

First, in Appendix B, using the gradient inversion lemma, we observe that α can be made (GEOMED, $\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P}$)-stationary, if the sum $\sum_{h \in [H]} \frac{g_h}{\|g_h\|_2}$ of normalized honest gradients is at most P . Indeed, the poisoners may then simply report data (x_{H+p}, y_{H+p}) such that $\nabla \ell(\alpha | \pi_d(x_{H+p}), y_{H+p}) = 0$. A similar property holds for clipped mean (in this case, the sum of clipped honest gradients needs to be at most ΔP).

Second, because the honest gradients g_h are colinear with the feature vectors x_h , which are isotropically distributed, especially in high dimension, g_h is unlikely to point towards its expected value. As a result, the expectation of normalized (or clipped) gradients, which is an average of “misguided” unit/clipped vectors, cannot be large, especially in high dimension. In fact, in Appendix C, we prove the norm to be at most $12/\sqrt{D}$ for normalized gradients, and $12\Delta/\sqrt{D}$ for Δ -clipped gradients.

Third, in Appendix D, we use concentration bounds to guarantee that the empirical sum of normalized/clipped gradients is roughly its expectation. Deriving explicit constants for these bounds is the most technical part of the proof. Isotropy is leveraged to prove that, along directions orthogonal to its expected value, normalized/clipped gradients are sub-Gaussian with a parameter $O(1/\sqrt{D})$.

Combining it all yields the main theorem (Appendix E).

4 Experiments on dimension reduction

Clearly, Theorem 1 calls for *dimension reduction* to secure model training. In this section, we formalize this strategy, and empirically study the impact of the learning dimension d on robust training under poisoning, on both synthetic data and on MNIST.

4.1 Synthetic data experiments

We first consider synthetic data, which provides insights into the value of dimension reduction.

Dimension reduction: Limit the attack surface Consider a map $\pi_d : \mathbb{R}^D \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$. Dimension reduction merely corresponds to training from $(\pi_d(x_n), y_n)$, instead of (x_n, y_n) . Essentially, we force our algorithms to be blind to some inputs; perhaps to their overwhelming majority. In this section, π_d is simply defined as the orthogonal projection on the first d coordinates.

Now, intuitively, this may appear to be bizarre. How can removing information increase security? Our key insight is that this literally reduces the *attack surface*⁴, i.e. the combinatorial space that the adversary can exploit. In particular, the adversary can only attack with P vectors of dimension d , instead of P vectors of dimension D . But which value of d should be selected? To address this question, we consider the following experimental setup.

⁴“Attack surface” is a terminology widely used in classical cybersecurity. In our setting, amusingly, it takes a literal mathematical meaning, as it describes the subspace of attack feature vectors that the adversary can exploit.

True model. To simulate the fact that the system designer may successfully prioritize the dimensions with the largest signal, we consider a true model of the form $\beta \triangleq (1^{-\omega}, 2^{-\omega}, \dots, D^{-\omega})$, for $\omega \geq 0$. Our simulations are run with $\omega \triangleq 0.5$.

Statistical error. Our (poisoned) trained model is evaluated by the statistical error:

$$\text{ERR}(\alpha|\mathcal{Y}) \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\ell(\alpha|x, y) | x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D), y \sim \mathcal{Y}(x)]. \quad (6)$$

As shown in the Appendix, for dimension-reduced linear regression, this equals $\|\beta\|_2^2 + \|\alpha - \pi_d(\beta)\|_2^2$.

Poisoning defense. For more completeness, instead of the geometric median⁵ and of clipped mean, our experiments consider two other state-of-the-art robust mean estimators, namely the *coordinate-wise median* (CWMed⁶) and the *P-trimmed mean* (CWTM⁷ [YCRB18, EFG⁺21]), for which *arbitrary model manipulation* does not hold in general⁸.

Poisoning attack. By virtue of the gradient inversion lemma, without loss of generality, like [FGHV22], we consider gradient attacks instead of data poisoning. We focus on the “antimodel gradient attack”, which is closely related to gradient ascent of the statistical error. Given parameters α , the right training direction points from α to $\pi_d(\beta)$. This prompts us to define poisoned gradients by $g^{(P)} \triangleq \Lambda(\pi_d(\beta) - \alpha)$, with a large multiplier $\Lambda \geq 0$. Our experiments are run with $\Lambda \triangleq 10^3$.

Hyperparameters. We consider $H \triangleq 5000$ honest data, with $\mathcal{X} \triangleq \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$. We set $D \triangleq 5000$ for linear regression, and $D \triangleq 1000$ for logistic regression, to generate honest data.

Reproducibility. Our experiments are repeated using 10 seeds (see Supplementary Material), which define the random honest training dataset \mathbf{H} . The results are averaged. We also plot the variance between runs with different seeds.




Figure 2: Statistical errors under poisoning, for varying model sizes d and number P of poisons.

⁵The error of state-of-the-art algorithms [CLM⁺16, PKH22] grow proportionally to the sum-of-distance loss, which can itself be made arbitrarily large by vectors. Adapting them to force an attack-independent error unfortunately allows attackers to arbitrarily slow their runtime.

⁶The output vector is, for each coordinate, the median of the inputs’ values on this coordinate.

⁷For each coordinate, the P most extreme inputs are discarded. The remaining values are averaged).

⁸This is especially the case for β colinear with a basis vector, as the problem is then reduced to one-dimensional training.

Results The statistical errors of our trained models are depicted in Figure 2. In all cases, we observe an initial gain of increasing the dimension, followed by a harm that eventually outweighs the no-training error⁹ ($\alpha = 0$). In particular, the plots suggest that *arbitrary model manipulation* may often hold beyond the particular case of GEOMED-based and CLIPMEAN-based defense.

Note that, in our experiments, logistic regression suffers from overfitting data, even in the absence of poisons. Moreover, the statistical errors do not vanish without poisons under coordinate-wise median defense. This is not unexpected, as the coordinate-wise median diverges from the mean. Overall, only the case of linear regression with trimmed mean has a vanishing statistical error as $d = D$.

Perhaps surprisingly, training is extremely vulnerable to small amounts of poisoning. In particular, the P -trimmed mean for linear regression is deeply harmed by merely 2 poisons out of 5,002 data. Even the visibly more resilient coordinate-wise median is deeply harmed by less than 1% of poisoning inputs, despite still relatively modest values of d , like $d = 1000$ in the context of logistic regression. Our experiments thus expose the fact that the “safe” regime $d \ll H^2/P^2$ is actually far from safe.

Intriguingly, the optimal learning dimension d is observed to be a decreasing function of the number P of poisoned data. In fact, the experiments invites us to conjecture that the optimal learning dimension d is closely connected to the ratio H/P . Note that it evidently also depends on ω . Larger values of ω likely decrease the optimal value of d , as larger coordinates quickly become highly uninformative.

4.2 Experiments on standard datasets

In this subsection, we further evaluate the impact of high-dimensional training on the performance of robustified models under poisoning attack, but now for the MNIST dataset [LeC98] and the FashionMNIST dataset [XRV17], which both consist of feature-label pairs $(x_n, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{784} \times \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$.

Random feature linear classifier. We consider a linear classifier model based on d random features, in the spirit of e.g. [RR07, MM22]. More precisely, we draw d random vectors $w_1, \dots, w_d \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_{784})$. Each feature $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^{784}$ is then replaced by the vector $\tilde{x}_n = (\sigma(w_1^T x_n), \dots, \sigma(w_d^T x_n)) \in \mathbb{R}^d$, where σ is an activation function. Here, we consider the sigmoid function. A linear classifier is then trained on the pairs $(\tilde{x}_n, y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$ (which executes softmax on linear forms of \tilde{x}_n). The number of parameters of this model is $10d$. Note that the classifier can be regarded as a two-layer fully connected neural net with a random fixed first layer.

Attack. In this section, we again consider gradient (ascent) attacks instead of data poisoning. We also assume that, during training, each batch of size $b = 1000$ is contaminated by $\lfloor P/H \rfloor$ poisons. Given that the MNIST and FashionMNIST training sets each have 60,000 entries, the “60 poisons” setting corresponds to 1 poisonous input per batch.

Results. The performance is measure with cross-entropy on the MNIST and FashionMNIST validation sets. Again we observe U-shaped curves, with very poor performance for high-dimensional models, despite an extremely small amount of poisoning ($P/H \leq 1\%$). Additional details about the experiments are provided in Appendix G.




Figure 3: Cross-entropy of a random feature linear classifier on MNIST (left) and FashionMNIST (right), trained using gradient descent with trimmed mean on the training sets, and evaluated on the validation sets, as a function of the number of parameters of these models.

⁹ $\alpha = 0$ implies a statistical error of $\|\beta\|_2^2$ for linear regression, and of $\ln 2 \approx 0.693$ for logistic regression.

5 Informal discussions on more general cases

Let us now sketch informal arguments to estimate the generalizability of our theoretical and empirical results, thereby providing further insights into high-dimensional poisoning. Our subsequent discussions are based on the following bound, which intuitively says that the informativeness of a sampled gradient projected on a d -dimensional random subspace of \mathbb{R}^D grows as $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{d/D})$.

Proposition 2. *Let V be an isotropically random d -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^D . Suppose v is a random unit vector that must be in V . Then $\|\mathbb{E}[v]\|_2 \leq 1150\sqrt{\frac{d \ln(1+d)}{D}}$.*

Proof sketch. Denote $u = \frac{\mathbb{E}[v]}{\|\mathbb{E}[v]\|_2}$ the direction of the expectation of v . V can be constructed as the subspace spanned by d i.i.d normal vectors w_1, \dots, w_d , which form a quasi-orthonormal basis of V (up to scaling). Formalizing this (with concentration bounds) allows to bound the coordinates of $v \in V$ in this basis, given that v is unitary. Now, $u^T v$ is a sum of terms $u^T w_1, \dots, u^T w_d$, weighted by such coordinates. Using concentration bounds on terms $u^T w_i$ then guarantees that $u^T v$ is unlikely to be large. We conclude by taking a union bound over a partition into extreme values of $|u^T v|$. The full proof is in Appendix F. \square

5.1 Source-based learning

To increase security, it is useful to partition data based on their sources [FGHV22, EFG⁺22], i.e. to write $\mathbf{D} = \bigcup_{s \in [S]} \mathbf{D}_s$, where $[S] \triangleq \{1, 2, \dots, S\}$ is now a set of data sources and where $\mathbf{D}_s \triangleq \{(x_n, y_n)\}_{n \in [N_s]}$ is the data from source s , which is of cardinal N_s . The loss for source s can then be written $\ell(\alpha | \mathbf{D}_s) \triangleq \frac{1}{N_s} \sum_{s \in [N_s]} \ell(\alpha | x_k, y_k)$. This may be called *source-based learning*, as it puts each source’s data in a separate sandbox, rather than in a common pool.

Now, it is the set $[S]$ of sources that can be partitioned into two subsets of cardinalities H and P , where the former is a subset of honest sources, and the latter is the subset of poisoning sources. We may then use a robust aggregation AGG to combine the gradients from the different sources, as

$$\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{L}}(\alpha | \mathbf{D}) \triangleq \text{AGG}(\nabla \ell(\alpha | \mathbf{D}_1), \dots, \nabla \ell(\alpha | \mathbf{D}_S)). \quad (7)$$

Assuming that data of honest users are labeled using \mathcal{Y}_β , sandboxed learning with a robust aggregator will increase security. First, the security no longer depends on the amount of poisonous data; it will rather depend on the fraction of poisoner users accepted in the system. But there is more.

Because the gradient $\nabla \ell(\alpha | \mathbf{D}_h)$ of an honest source $h \in [H]$ cumulates N_h data, and will thus be more informative. In fact, assuming the feature vectors labeled by source h are i.i.d. and isotropic, we know that $\nabla \ell(\alpha | \mathbf{D}_h)$ is an isotropic random N_h -dimensional subspace. Thus Proposition 2 applies, and suggests that source h ’s data are $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{N_h/D})$ times less informative than an optimized poison.

Following the key intuition (Section 3.2), it seems that *arbitrary model manipulation* would arise if $P \geq \tilde{\Omega}\left(\frac{\sum_h \sqrt{N_h}}{\sqrt{D}}\right)$. This is equivalent to $D \geq \tilde{\Omega}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\sqrt{N_S}\right]^2 H^2/P^2\right)$, where N_S is the number of data provided by a random honest source. In particular, if all honest sources $h \in [H]$ report $N_h = N_S$ honest data, then this corresponds to $D \geq \tilde{\Omega}(N_S H^2/P^2)$.

Unfortunately, we fall short of a proof, because the concentration analysis (Appendix D) does not straightforwardly generalize. We leave this conjecture open.

Besides, an additional difficulty arises in practice. Namely, in most applications, especially language models and recommendation AIs, different sources h may use different distributions \mathcal{Y}_{β_h} . This is what [EFG⁺22] refers to as *fundamental heterogeneity*. Yet [FGHV22] proved that $\beta_h \neq \beta_k$ for different honest users $h \neq k$ further increases the vulnerability to poisoners.

5.2 Neural networks

Assume y is predicted by $f_\alpha(x)$, where f_α is a neural network, with $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Theorem 1 no longer applies. Nevertheless, the key intuition of Section 3.2 suggests the following.

Regression. Suppose that $\mathbb{Y} \triangleq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ and that the loss on input (x, y) can be written $\ell(f_\alpha|x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \|f_\alpha(x) - y\|_2^2$. We then have $\nabla_\alpha \ell = (\nabla_\alpha f_\alpha(x))(f_\alpha(x) - y)$, which must belong to the image of matrix $\nabla_\alpha f_\alpha(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d_y}$. Thus the gradient is constrained to lie in a d_y -dimensional random vector subspace. The intuition of Theorem 1 might then apply. As a result, we might have to fear *arbitrary model manipulation* in the regime $D \geq \tilde{\Omega}(d_y H^2/P^2)$.

Classification. Suppose \mathbb{Y} is a finite set. Given x , the gradient on data (x, y) must be one of $|\mathbb{Y}|$ possible values $\nabla_\alpha \ell(\alpha|x, y)$, for $y \in \mathbb{Y}$, which span a random $|\mathbb{Y}|$ -dimensional subspace. As previously, this suggests *arbitrary model manipulation* for $D \geq \tilde{\Omega}(|\mathbb{Y}| H^2/P^2)$.

In both cases, two additional difficulty arises to turn these arguments into a rigorous proof. First, gradient inversion is no longer guaranteed, even though empirical studies successfully perform it some some contexts, by training neural nets, often in the context of breaking privacy in federated learning [JKL⁺21, WCGW23]. Second, the random vector subspaces that we discussed for neural nets are unlikely to be isotropically distributed. Their distribution will depend on the particular model architecture and the training set. Because of this, in practice, we expect general results to be very hard to obtain, and the *arbitrary model manipulation* regime to appear for larger values of D .

5.3 Adding a regularization

It is common to add a regularization term, e.g. defining $\mathcal{L}(\alpha|\mathbf{D}) \triangleq \frac{\lambda}{2} \|\alpha\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n \in [N]} \ell(\alpha|x_n, y_n)$. A natural gradient descent robustification uses the following robust gradient estimate:

$$\lambda\alpha + \text{AGG}(\nabla\ell(\alpha|x_1, y_1), \dots, \nabla\ell(\alpha|x_N, y_N)). \quad (8)$$

Targeting α now requires manipulating AGG into $-\lambda\alpha$. This analysis is significantly harder than what we have, as it breaks symmetries that are widely exploited by our proof. Nevertheless, when $\|\alpha\|_2 \ll 1/\lambda$, the effect of regularization vanishes, thereby suggesting manipulability towards α . Regularization can however rule out the manipulation towards values of α whose norm exceeds $1/\lambda$.

6 Conclusion

This paper provided security arguments for $D \leq 169H^2/P^2$. Essentially, this is because, in high dimension, poisons can be made far more disinformative than honest data are informative. In particular, numerical applications suggest that, to secure learning systems, at least in many highly adversarial settings, e.g. language processing and content recommendation, model sizes should not exceed the billions, even when the models are trained on ever more data.

Our results are far from conclusive though, and leave numerous important gaps to be filled. For instance, it should be investigated whether *arbitrary model manipulation* is specific to the defense with the geometric median and the clipped mean, or if it could be generalized to all robust aggregation rules, or to even more general defenses. More importantly, despite our informal arguments, the more general (and less tractable) case of nonlinear models, such as neural nets, remains to be analyzed.

References

- [AGG⁺23] Youssef Allouah, Rachid Guerraoui, Nirupam Gupta, Rafaël Pinot, and Geovani Rizk. Robust distributed learning: Tight error bounds and breakdown point under data heterogeneity. *CoRR*, abs/2309.13591, 2023.
- [AHJ⁺22] Anish Acharya, Abolfazl Hashemi, Prateek Jain, Sujay Sanghavi, Inderjit S. Dhillon, and Ufuk Topcu. Robust training in high dimensions via block coordinate geometric median descent. In Gustau Camps-Valls, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, and Isabel Valera, editors, *International Conference*

on *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, AISTATS 2022, 28-30 March 2022, Virtual Event*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 11145–11168. PMLR, 2022.

- [And23] Cécile Andrzejewski. “team jorge”: In the heart of a global disinformation machine. *Forbidden Stories*, 2023.
- [BCF⁺21] Eitan Borgnia, Valeriia Cherepanova, Liam Fowl, Amin Ghiasi, Jonas Geiping, Micah Goldblum, Tom Goldstein, and Arjun Gupta. Strong data augmentation sanitizes poisoning and backdoor attacks without an accuracy tradeoff. In *IEEE International Conference on Acoustics, Speech and Signal Processing, ICASSP 2021, Toronto, ON, Canada, June 6-11, 2021*, pages 3855–3859. IEEE, 2021.
- [BGMS21] Emily M. Bender, Timnit Gebru, Angelina McMillan-Major, and Shmargaret Shmitchell. On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? In Madeleine Clare Elish, William Isaac, and Richard S. Zemel, editors, *FAccT ’21: 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency, Virtual Event / Toronto, Canada, March 3-10, 2021*, pages 610–623. ACM, 2021.
- [BHMM19] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, Siyuan Ma, and Soumik Mandal. Reconciling modern machine-learning practice and the classical bias–variance trade-off. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 116(32):15849–15854, 2019.
- [BHX20] Mikhail Belkin, Daniel Hsu, and Ji Xu. Two models of double descent for weak features. *SIAM J. Math. Data Sci.*, 2(4):1167–1180, 2020.
- [BMGS17] Peva Blanchard, El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Julien Stainer. Machine learning with adversaries: Byzantine tolerant gradient descent. In Isabelle Guyon, Ulrike von Luxburg, Samy Bengio, Hanna M. Wallach, Rob Fergus, S. V. N. Vishwanathan, and Roman Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2017, December 4-9, 2017, Long Beach, CA, USA*, pages 119–129, 2017.
- [BMR⁺20] Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. Language models are few-shot learners. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [BNL12] Battista Biggio, Blaine Nelson, and Pavel Laskov. Poisoning attacks against support vector machines. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2012, Edinburgh, Scotland, UK, June 26 - July 1, 2012*. icml.cc / Omnipress, 2012.
- [BR18] Battista Biggio and Fabio Roli. Wild patterns: Ten years after the rise of adversarial machine learning. *Pattern Recognit.*, 84:317–331, 2018.
- [CBQ⁺24] Zhen Chen, Taiyu Bao, Wenchao Qi, Dianlong You, Linlin Liu, and Limin Shen. Poisoning qos-aware cloud API recommender system with generative adversarial network attack. *Expert Syst. Appl.*, 238(Part B):121630, 2024.
- [CLM⁺16] Michael B. Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Gary L. Miller, Jakub Pachocki, and Aaron Sidford. Geometric median in nearly linear time. In Daniel Wichs and Yishay Mansour, editors, *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016*, pages 9–21. ACM, 2016.

- [CLX⁺23] Kangjie Chen, Xiaoxuan Lou, Guowen Xu, Jiwei Li, and Tianwei Zhang. Clean-image backdoor: Attacking multi-label models with poisoned labels only. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023.
- [CND⁺23] Aakanksha Chowdhery, Sharan Narang, Jacob Devlin, Maarten Bosma, Gaurav Mishra, Adam Roberts, Paul Barham, Hyung Won Chung, Charles Sutton, Sebastian Gehrmann, Parker Schuh, Kensen Shi, Sasha Tsvyashchenko, Joshua Maynez, Abhishek Rao, Parker Barnes, Yi Tay, Noam Shazeer, Vinodkumar Prabhakaran, Emily Reif, Nan Du, Ben Hutchinson, Reiner Pope, James Bradbury, Jacob Austin, Michael Isard, Guy Gur-Ari, Pengcheng Yin, Toju Duke, Anselm Levskaya, Sanjay Ghemawat, Sunipa Dev, Henryk Michalewski, Xavier Garcia, Vedant Misra, Kevin Robinson, Liam Fedus, Denny Zhou, Daphne Ippolito, David Luan, Hyeontaek Lim, Barret Zoph, Alexander Spiridonov, Ryan Sepassi, David Dohan, Shrivani Agrawal, Mark Omernick, Andrew M. Dai, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Marie Pellat, Aitor Lewkowycz, Erica Moreira, Rewon Child, Oleksandr Polozov, Katherine Lee, Zongwei Zhou, Xuezhi Wang, Brennan Saeta, Mark Diaz, Orhan Firat, Michele Catasta, Jason Wei, Kathy Meier-Hellstern, Douglas Eck, Jeff Dean, Slav Petrov, and Noah Fiedel. Palm: Scaling language modeling with pathways. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:240:1–240:113, 2023.
- [CWW22] Weixin Chen, Baoyuan Wu, and Haoqian Wang. Effective backdoor defense by exploiting sensitivity of poisoned samples. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [EFG⁺21] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Sadegh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, Arsany Guirguis, Lê-Nguyên Hoang, and Sébastien Rouault. Collaborative learning in the jungle (decentralized, byzantine, heterogeneous, asynchronous and nonconvex learning). In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 25044–25057, 2021.
- [EFG⁺22] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Sadegh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, Nirupam Gupta, Lê-Nguyên Hoang, Rafael Pinot, and John Stephan. On the impossible safety of large AI models. *CoRR*, abs/2209.15259, 2022.
- [EFGH23] El-Mahdi El-Mhamdi, Sadegh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, and Lê-Nguyên Hoang. On the strategyproofness of the geometric median. In Francisco J. R. Ruiz, Jennifer G. Dy, and Jan-Willem van de Meent, editors, *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics, 25-27 April 2023, Palau de Congressos, Valencia, Spain*, volume 206 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2603–2640. PMLR, 2023.
- [FGHV22] Sadegh Farhadkhani, Rachid Guerraoui, Lê Nguyễn Hoang, and Oscar VILLEMAUD. An equivalence between data poisoning and byzantine gradient attacks. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 6284–6323. PMLR, 2022.
- [FLL⁺22] Zhen Fang, Yixuan Li, Jie Lu, Jiahua Dong, Bo Han, and Feng Liu. Is out-of-distribution detection learnable? In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [FYL⁺22] Jiaxin Fan, Qi Yan, Mohan Li, Guanqun Qu, and Yang Xiao. A survey on data poisoning attacks and defenses. In *7th IEEE International Conference on Data Science in CyberSpace, DSC 2022, Guilin, China, July 11-13, 2022*, pages 48–55. IEEE, 2022.
- [FZS22] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 23:120:1–120:39, 2022.

- [GBD92] Stuart Geman, Elie Bienenstock, and René Doursat. Neural networks and the bias/variance dilemma. *Neural computation*, 4(1):1–58, 1992.
- [GKVZ22] Shafi Goldwasser, Michael P. Kim, Vinod Vaikuntanathan, and Or Zamir. Planting undetectable backdoors in machine learning models : [extended abstract]. In *63rd IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2022, Denver, CO, USA, October 31 - November 3, 2022*, pages 931–942. IEEE, 2022.
- [HA04] Victoria J. Hodge and Jim Austin. A survey of outlier detection methodologies. *Artif. Intell. Rev.*, 22(2):85–126, 2004.
- [HCK+20] Sanghyun Hong, Varun Chandrasekaran, Yigitcan Kaya, Tudor Dumitras, and Nicolas Papernot. On the effectiveness of mitigating data poisoning attacks with gradient shaping. *CoRR*, abs/2002.11497, 2020.
- [HDM+24] Evan Hubinger, Carson Denison, Jesse Mu, Mike Lambert, Meg Tong, Monte MacDiarmid, Tamera Lanham, Daniel M Ziegler, Tim Maxwell, Newton Cheng, et al. Sleeper agents: Training deceptive llms that persist through safety training. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.05566*, 2024.
- [HGF+20] W. Ronny Huang, Jonas Geiping, Liam Fowl, Gavin Taylor, and Tom Goldstein. Metapoisson: Practical general-purpose clean-label data poisoning. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [HMRT22] Trevor Hastie, Andrea Montanari, Saharon Rosset, and Ryan J Tibshirani. Surprises in high-dimensional ridgeless least squares interpolation. *Annals of statistics*, 50(2):949, 2022.
- [JCG21] Jinyuan Jia, Xiaoyu Cao, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Intrinsic certified robustness of bagging against data poisoning attacks. In *Thirty-Fifth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2021, Thirty-Third Conference on Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence, IAAI 2021, The Eleventh Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2021, Virtual Event, February 2-9, 2021*, pages 7961–7969. AAAI Press, 2021.
- [JKL+21] Jinwoo Jeon, Jaechang Kim, Kangwook Lee, Sewoong Oh, and Jungseul Ok. Gradient inversion with generative image prior. In Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Alina Beygelzimer, Yann N. Dauphin, Percy Liang, and Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2021, NeurIPS 2021, December 6-14, 2021, virtual*, pages 29898–29908, 2021.
- [JOB+18] Matthew Jagielski, Alina Oprea, Battista Biggio, Chang Liu, Cristina Nita-Rotaru, and Bo Li. Manipulating machine learning: Poisoning attacks and countermeasures for regression learning. In *2018 IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2018, Proceedings, 21-23 May 2018, San Francisco, California, USA*, pages 19–35. IEEE Computer Society, 2018.
- [JSHO21] Matthew Jagielski, Giorgio Severi, Niklas Poussette Harger, and Alina Oprea. Subpopulation data poisoning attacks. In Yongdae Kim, Jong Kim, Giovanni Vigna, and Elaine Shi, editors, *CCS ’21: 2021 ACM SIGSAC Conference on Computer and Communications Security, Virtual Event, Republic of Korea, November 15 - 19, 2021*, pages 3104–3122. ACM, 2021.
- [KHJ22] Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Lie He, and Martin Jaggi. Byzantine-robust learning on heterogeneous datasets via bucketing. In *The Tenth International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2022, Virtual Event, April 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net, 2022.

- [KMC⁺23] Anastasia Koloskova, Ryan McKenna, Zachary Charles, John Keith Rush, and H. Brendan McMahan. Gradient descent with linearly correlated noise: Theory and applications to differential privacy. In Alice Oh, Tristan Naumann, Amir Globerson, Kate Saenko, Moritz Hardt, and Sergey Levine, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 36: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2023, NeurIPS 2023, New Orleans, LA, USA, December 10 - 16, 2023*, 2023.
- [KNL⁺20] Ram Shankar Siva Kumar, Magnus Nyström, John Lambert, Andrew Marshall, Mario Goertzel, Andi Comissoneru, Matt Swann, and Sharon Xia. Adversarial machine learning-industry perspectives. In *2020 IEEE Security and Privacy Workshops, SP Workshops, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 21, 2020*, pages 69–75. IEEE, 2020.
- [KW96] Ron Kohavi and David H. Wolpert. Bias plus variance decomposition for zero-one loss functions. In Lorenza Saitta, editor, *Machine Learning, Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference (ICML '96), Bari, Italy, July 3-6, 1996*, pages 275–283. Morgan Kaufmann, 1996.
- [KZ18] Nathan Kallus and Angela Zhou. Residual unfairness in fair machine learning from prejudiced data. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2444–2453. PMLR, 2018.
- [LeC98] Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998.
- [LF21] Alexander Levine and Soheil Feizi. Deep partition aggregation: Provable defenses against general poisoning attacks. In *9th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2021, Virtual Event, Austria, May 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net, 2021.
- [LKY23] Yiwei Lu, Gautam Kamath, and Yaoliang Yu. Exploring the limits of model-targeted indiscriminate data poisoning attacks. In Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato, and Jonathan Scarlett, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2023, 23-29 July 2023, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA*, volume 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 22856–22879. PMLR, 2023.
- [Lop89] Hendrik P Lopuhaa. On the relation between s-estimators and m-estimators of multivariate location and covariance. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1662–1683, 1989.
- [LXC⁺19] Liping Li, Wei Xu, Tianyi Chen, Georgios B. Giannakis, and Qing Ling. RSA: byzantine-robust stochastic aggregation methods for distributed learning from heterogeneous datasets. In *The Thirty-Third AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI 2019, The Thirty-First Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence Conference, IAAI 2019, The Ninth AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence, EAAI 2019, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA, January 27 - February 1, 2019*, pages 1544–1551. AAAI Press, 2019.
- [LYZ⁺22] Xiangru Lian, Binhang Yuan, Xuefeng Zhu, Yulong Wang, Yongjun He, Honghuan Wu, Lei Sun, Haodong Lyu, Chengjun Liu, Xing Dong, Yiqiao Liao, Mingnan Luo, Congfei Zhang, Jingru Xie, Haonan Li, Lei Chen, Renjie Huang, Jianying Lin, Chengchun Shu, Xuezhong Qiu, Zhishan Liu, Dongying Kong, Lei Yuan, Hai Yu, Sen Yang, Ce Zhang, and Ji Liu. Persia: An open, hybrid system scaling deep learning-based recommenders up to 100 trillion parameters. In Aidong Zhang and Huzefa Rangwala, editors, *KDD '22: The 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 14 - 18, 2022*, pages 3288–3298. ACM, 2022.

- [MGR18] El Mahdi El Mhamdi, Rachid Guerraoui, and Sébastien Rouault. The hidden vulnerability of distributed learning in byzantium. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3518–3527. PMLR, 2018.
- [Min15] Stanislav Minsker. Geometric median and robust estimation in banach spaces. *Project Euclid*, 2015.
- [MKB20] Nicolas M. Müller, Daniel Kowatsch, and Konstantin Böttinger. Data poisoning attacks on regression learning and corresponding defenses. In *25th IEEE Pacific Rim International Symposium on Dependable Computing, PRDC 2020, Perth, Australia, December 1-4, 2020*, pages 80–89. IEEE, 2020.
- [MM22] Song Mei and Andrea Montanari. The generalization error of random features regression: Precise asymptotics and the double descent curve. *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 75(4):667–766, 2022.
- [MVS19] Vidya Muthukumar, Kailas Vodrahalli, and Anant Sahai. Harmless interpolation of noisy data in regression. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory, ISIT 2019, Paris, France, July 7-12, 2019*, pages 2299–2303. IEEE, 2019.
- [MZH19] Yuzhe Ma, Xiaojin Zhu, and Justin Hsu. Data poisoning against differentially-private learners: Attacks and defenses. In Sarit Kraus, editor, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI 2019, Macao, China, August 10-16, 2019*, pages 4732–4738. ijcai.org, 2019.
- [NKB⁺20] Preetum Nakkiran, Gal Kaplun, Yamini Bansal, Tristan Yang, Boaz Barak, and Ilya Sutskever. Deep double descent: Where bigger models and more data hurt. In *8th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, April 26-30, 2020*. OpenReview.net, 2020.
- [PKH22] Krishna Pillutla, Sham M. Kakade, and Zaïd Harchaoui. Robust aggregation for federated learning. *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, 70:1142–1154, 2022.
- [PMG⁺17] Nicolas Papernot, Patrick D. McDaniel, Ian J. Goodfellow, Somesh Jha, Z. Berkay Celik, and Ananthram Swami. Practical black-box attacks against machine learning. In Ramesh Karri, Ozgur Sinanoglu, Ahmad-Reza Sadeghi, and Xun Yi, editors, *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM on Asia Conference on Computer and Communications Security, AsiaCCS 2017, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, April 2-6, 2017*, pages 506–519. ACM, 2017.
- [RR07] Ali Rahimi and Benjamin Recht. Random features for large-scale kernel machines. In John C. Platt, Daphne Koller, Yoram Singer, and Sam T. Roweis, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 20, Proceedings of the Twenty-First Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, December 3-6, 2007*, pages 1177–1184. Curran Associates, Inc., 2007.
- [RWRK20] Elan Rosenfeld, Ezra Winston, Pradeep Ravikumar, and J. Zico Kolter. Certified robustness to label-flipping attacks via randomized smoothing. In *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 July 2020, Virtual Event*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8230–8241. PMLR, 2020.
- [SCW⁺23] Shawn Shan, Jenna Cryan, Emily Wenger, Haitao Zheng, Rana Hanocka, and Ben Y. Zhao. Glaze: Protecting artists from style mimicry by text-to-image models. In Joseph A. Calandrino and Carmela Troncoso, editors, *32nd USENIX Security Symposium, USENIX Security 2023, Anaheim, CA, USA, August 9-11, 2023*, pages 2187–2204. USENIX Association, 2023.

- [SHCM20] Jy-yong Sohn, Dong-Jun Han, Beongjun Choi, and Jaekyun Moon. Election coding for distributed learning: Protecting signsgd against byzantine attacks. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.
- [SMS⁺21] Fnu Suya, Saeed Mahloujifar, Anshuman Suri, David Evans, and Yuan Tian. Model-targeted poisoning attacks with provable convergence. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 July 2021, Virtual Event*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 10000–10010. PMLR, 2021.
- [SSP⁺13] Jason R. Smith, Herve Saint-Amand, Magdalena Plamada, Philipp Koehn, Chris Callison-Burch, and Adam Lopez. Dirt cheap web-scale parallel text from the common crawl. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2013, 4-9 August 2013, Sofia, Bulgaria, Volume 1: Long Papers*, pages 1374–1383. The Association for Computer Linguistics, 2013.
- [TCLY23] Zhiyi Tian, Lei Cui, Jie Liang, and Shui Yu. A comprehensive survey on poisoning attacks and countermeasures in machine learning. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(8):166:1–166:35, 2023.
- [Val84] Leslie G. Valiant. A theory of the learnable. *Commun. ACM*, 27(11):1134–1142, 1984.
- [Ver18] Roman Vershynin. *High-dimensional probability: An introduction with applications in data science*, volume 47. Cambridge university press, 2018.
- [Wai19] Martin J Wainwright. *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press, 2019.
- [WCGW23] Ruihan Wu, Xiangyu Chen, Chuan Guo, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Learning to invert: Simple adaptive attacks for gradient inversion in federated learning. In Robin J. Evans and Ilya Shpitser, editors, *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, UAI 2023, July 31 - 4 August 2023, Pittsburgh, PA, USA*, volume 216 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2293–2303. PMLR, 2023.
- [WKZH22] Zhilin Wang, Qiao Kang, Xinyi Zhang, and Qin Hu. Defense strategies toward model poisoning attacks in federated learning: A survey. In *IEEE Wireless Communications and Networking Conference, WCNC 2022, Austin, TX, USA, April 10-13, 2022*, pages 548–553. IEEE, 2022.
- [WLF22a] Wenxiao Wang, Alexander Levine, and Soheil Feizi. Improved certified defenses against data poisoning with (deterministic) finite aggregation. In Kamalika Chaudhuri, Stefanie Jegelka, Le Song, Csaba Szepesvári, Gang Niu, and Sivan Sabato, editors, *International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2022, 17-23 July 2022, Baltimore, Maryland, USA*, volume 162 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 22769–22783. PMLR, 2022.
- [WLF22b] Wenxiao Wang, Alexander Levine, and Soheil Feizi. Lethal dose conjecture on data poisoning. In Sanmi Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, Danielle Belgrave, K. Cho, and A. Oh, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 35: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2022, NeurIPS 2022, New Orleans, LA, USA, November 28 - December 9, 2022*, 2022.
- [WMW⁺23] Zhibo Wang, Jingjing Ma, Xue Wang, Jiahui Hu, Zhan Qin, and Kui Ren. Threats to training: A survey of poisoning attacks and defenses on machine learning systems. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 55(7):134:1–134:36, 2023.

- [Woo23] Samuel Woolley. *Manufacturing consensus: Understanding propaganda in the era of automation and anonymity*. Yale University Press, 2023.
- [WXK⁺23] Maurice Weber, Xiaojun Xu, Bojan Karlas, Ce Zhang, and Bo Li. RAB: provable robustness against backdoor attacks. In *44th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy, SP 2023, San Francisco, CA, USA, May 21-25, 2023*, pages 1311–1328. IEEE, 2023.
- [XCYM23] Geming Xia, Jian Chen, Chaodong Yu, and Jun Ma. Poisoning attacks in federated learning: A survey. *IEEE Access*, 11:10708–10722, 2023.
- [XRV17] Han Xiao, Kashif Rasul, and Roland Vollgraf. Fashion-mnist: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1708.07747, 2017.
- [YB19] Zhixiong Yang and Waheed U. Bajwa. Byrdie: Byzantine-resilient distributed coordinate descent for decentralized learning. *IEEE Trans. Signal Inf. Process. over Networks*, 5(4):611–627, 2019.
- [YCRB18] Dong Yin, Yudong Chen, Kannan Ramchandran, and Peter L. Bartlett. Byzantine-robust distributed learning: Towards optimal statistical rates. In Jennifer G. Dy and Andreas Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML 2018, Stockholmsmässan, Stockholm, Sweden, July 10-15, 2018*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5636–5645. PMLR, 2018.
- [Yur19] Kaya Yurieff. Facebook removed 2.2 billion fake accounts in three months. *CNN*, 2019.
- [ZBH⁺17] Chiyuan Zhang, Samy Bengio, Moritz Hardt, Benjamin Recht, and Oriol Vinyals. Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization. In *5th International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2017, Toulon, France, April 24-26, 2017, Conference Track Proceedings*. OpenReview.net, 2017.
- [ZCJG22] Zaixi Zhang, Xiaoyu Cao, Jinyuan Jia, and Neil Zhenqiang Gong. Fldetector: Defending federated learning against model poisoning attacks via detecting malicious clients. In Aidong Zhang and Huzefa Rangwala, editors, *KDD '22: The 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, Washington, DC, USA, August 14 - 18, 2022*, pages 2545–2555. ACM, 2022.

Appendix

Appendix A proves a simple closed form of the statistical error for linear regression.

Appendices B to E yield the proof of the main theorem (Theorem 1). The proof is divided into four sections. Appendix B analyzes the manipulability of the geometric median. Appendix C proves that the expected gradient has a vanishingly small norm in high dimension. Appendix D derives concentration bounds on the sum of normalized gradients. Finally, Appendix E concludes.

Appendix F provides a proof of Proposition 2.

A Statistical errors in linear regression

The statistical error for linear regression has a simple closed form, which we prove for a noisy true model $\mathcal{Y}_{\beta,\sigma}(x) = \mathcal{N}(\beta^T x, \sigma^2)$.

Proposition 3. $\text{ERR}(\alpha|\mathcal{Y}_{\beta,\sigma}) = \|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2 + \sigma^2$.

Proof. Note that $\alpha^T x - y = (\alpha - \beta)^T x + (\beta^T x - y)$, which is the sum of two independent terms. Thus $\mathbb{E} \left[\|\alpha^T x - y\|_2^2 \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[((\alpha - \beta)^T x)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E} [\varepsilon^2]$, where $\varepsilon \triangleq \beta^T x - y$ is the random noise, whose distribution is $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$. Clearly $\mathbb{E} [\varepsilon^2] = \sigma^2$.

The former term $\mathbb{E} \left[((\alpha - \beta)^T x)^2 \right]$ is then $\|\alpha - \beta\|_2^2$ times the expectation of the square of the random coordinate of x along the direction $\alpha - \beta$. By rotational invariance of $\mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$, we know that this random coordinate has the same distribution as any coordinate, which is $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Thus its expectation is the variance of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, which is one. Combining it all yields the lemma. \square

B The manipulability of “robust” aggregation rules

B.1 Preliminaries about the geometric median

Recall that the set of geometric medians is defined by

$$\text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_N) \triangleq \operatorname{argmin}_{g \in \mathbb{R}^d} \sum_{n \in [N]} \|g - z_n\|_2. \quad (9)$$

To understand the vulnerability of GEOMED-based gradient descent, it is useful to study the first order condition. For any vector $z \in \mathbb{R}^d - \{0\}$, let us denote $\mathbf{u}(z) \triangleq z / \|z\|_2$ the unit vector in the direction of z , and $\mathbf{u}_\Delta(z) \triangleq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{\Delta}{\|z\|_2} \right\} z$ the Δ -clipping of z . We also define $\mathbf{u}(0) \triangleq \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \|z\|_2 \leq 1\}$ as the unit ball. We then have the following characterization.

Proposition 4. G is a geometric median of (z_1, \dots, z_N) if and only if $0 \in \sum_{n \in [N]} \mathbf{u}(G - z_n)$.

Proof. This is the first order condition. By convexity of the Euclidean norm, this condition is sufficient. \square

We now characterize the manipulability of the geometric median.

Proposition 5. Consider H vectors $z_1, \dots, z_H \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $G \in \mathbb{R}^d$ a target vector. Then there exists P vectors $z_{H+1}, \dots, z_{H+P} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $G \in \text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_{H+P})$, if and only if, for each $h \in [H]$, there exists $u_h \in \mathbf{u}(z_h - G)$ such that $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} u_h \right\|_2 \leq P$.

Proof. Assume $g \in \text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_{H+P})$. Then $0 \in \sum_{n \in [H+P]} \mathbf{u}(G - z_n)$. Thus there exists $u_n \in \mathbf{u}(G - z_n)$ for all $n \in [H+P]$ such that $\sum u_n = 0$. But then, this implies that

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} u_h \right\|_2 = \left\| - \sum_{p \in [P]} u_{H+p} \right\|_2 \leq \sum_{p \in [P]} \|u_{H+p}\|_2 \leq P. \quad (10)$$

This concludes the first implication.

Conversely, assume that $u_h \in \mathbf{u}(z_h - G)$ for all $h \in [H]$ with $\|\sum u_h\|_2 \leq P$. Define $u^{(P)} \triangleq -\frac{1}{P} \sum u_h$. We then have $\|u^{(P)}\|_2 \leq 1$. Now define $z_{H+p} \triangleq G$ for all $p \in [P]$. Since $\mathbf{u}(z_{H+p} - G) = \mathbf{u}(0)$ which is the unit ball, we know that $u_{H+p} \triangleq u^{(P)} \in \mathbf{u}(z_{H+p} - G)$. Thus $u_n \in \mathbf{u}(z_n - G)$ for all $n \in [H+P]$, with $\sum_{n \in [H+P]} u_n = \sum_{h \in [H]} u_h + P u^{(P)} = 0$. This proves that $G \in \text{GEOMED}(z_1, \dots, z_{H+P})$, and concludes the proof. \square

B.2 A necessary and sufficient condition for learning manipulability

Combining Lemma 1 to Proposition 5 now leads the simple characterization of vectors α that can be made stationary points by a poisoning attack. To state it, for $h \in [H]$, let us denote $g_h(\alpha) \triangleq \nabla \ell(\alpha | x_h, y_h)$.

Lemma 2. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Consider an honest dataset \mathbf{H} , for logistic or linear regression. There exists \mathbf{P} such that α is a $(\text{GEOMED}, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point, if and only if, for all $h \in [H]$, there exists $u_h \in \mathbf{u}(g_h(\alpha))$ such that $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} u_h \right\|_2 \leq P$.*

Proof. Recall that α is a $(\text{GEOMED}, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point, if and only if, $0 \in \widehat{\nabla \mathcal{L}}(\alpha | \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$, whose right-hand side is $\widehat{\nabla \mathcal{L}}(\alpha | \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P}) = \text{GEOMED}(\nabla \ell(\alpha | x_1, y_1), \dots, \nabla \ell(\alpha | x_H, y_H), \nabla \ell(\alpha | x_{H+1}, y_{H+1}), \dots, \nabla \ell(\alpha | x_{H+P}, y_{H+P}))$. Here, $G \triangleq 0$ acts like the target vector of Proposition 5. This proposition implies that there exists z_{H+1}, \dots, z_{H+P} such that $0 \in \text{GEOMED}(\nabla \ell(\alpha | x_1, y_1), \dots, \nabla \ell(\alpha | x_H, y_H), z_{H+1}, \dots, z_{H+P})$, if and only if, $\sum \mathbf{u}(g_h(\alpha))$ contains a vector of norm at most P . Lemma 1 then asserts that the existence of z_{H+1}, \dots, z_{H+P} is equivalent to that of \mathbf{P} . \square

Note that, since x_h is drawn from a continuous distribution, for any α , the probability that $g_h(\alpha) = 0$ is zero. Thus for a given α , the condition under which it can be turned into a $(\mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P}, d)$ -stationary point can essentially be written $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h(\alpha)) \right\|_2 \leq P$ (if \mathbf{H} is defined independently from α).

We prove a similar result for Δ -clipped mean.

Lemma 3. *Let $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^D$. Consider an honest dataset \mathbf{H} , for logistic or linear regression. There exists \mathbf{P} such that α is a $(\text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point, if and only if $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) \right\|_2 \leq P\Delta$.*

Proof. Assume α is a $(\text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point. Then we must have

$$0 = \left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) + \sum_{p \in [P]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_{H+p}) \right\|_2 \geq \left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) \right\|_2 - \sum_{p \in [P]} \|\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_{H+p})\|_2 \quad (11)$$

$$\geq \left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) \right\|_2 - P\Delta. \quad (12)$$

Rearranging the terms yields the first implication.

Conversely, for $p \in [P]$, define $g_{H+p} \triangleq -\frac{1}{P} \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h)$. Then $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) \right\|_2 \leq P\Delta$ implies $\|g_{H+p}\|_2 \leq \Delta$. Thus

$$\sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) + \sum_{p \in [P]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_{H+p}) = \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) + \sum_{p \in [P]} g_{H+p} \quad (13)$$

$$= \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) - \sum_{p \in [P]} \frac{1}{P} \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) = 0, \quad (14)$$

which implies that α is a $(\text{CLIPMEAN}_\Delta, \mathbf{H} \cup \mathbf{P})$ -stationary point. \square

C The expectation of normalized/clipped gradient is small

In this section, we prove that the expected value of an honest normalized/clipped gradient is small, especially in very high dimension. More precisely, denote $g \triangleq \nabla \ell(\alpha|x, y)$ a random gradient at 0, where $x \sim \mathcal{X}$ is drawn from an isotropic distribution and $y \sim \mathcal{Y}_{\beta, \sigma}(x)$, where \mathcal{Y} corresponds to either linear or logistic regression.

We will prove that $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]\|_2 \leq 12/\sqrt{D}$ and that $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]\|_2 \leq 12\Delta/\sqrt{D}$.

C.1 Two infinite series bounds

Before detailing the proof, let us first notice the two following bounds on two infinite series.

Lemma 4. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} \leq 6$.

Proof. First note that $\frac{d}{dt}(te^{-t^2/8}) = (1 - \frac{1}{4}t^2)e^{-t^2/8}$. Thus, for $t \geq 2$, $te^{-t^2/8}$ is decreasing. In particular, for $k \geq 3$ and $t \in [k-1, k]$, we have $ke^{-k^2/8} \leq te^{-t^2/8}$. Let $K \geq 3$. Using also $k^2 \geq k$ for $k \geq K$, we have

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} = \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} ke^{-k^2/8} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} e^{-k^2/8} \quad (15)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \int_{k-1}^k te^{-t^2/8} dt + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} e^{-k/8} \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} - 4 \left[e^{-t^2/8} \right]_{t=K-1}^{\infty} + \frac{e^{-K/8}}{1 - e^{-1/8}} \quad (17)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} (k+1)e^{-k^2/8} + 4e^{-(K-1)^2/8} + \frac{e^{-K/8}}{1 - e^{-1/8}}. \quad (18)$$

Plugging $K = 100$ in the computation above yields the lemma. \square

Lemma 5. $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} \leq 1.44$.

Proof. Note that $\frac{k+1}{k} \leq 2$ and $k^2 \geq k$ for $k \geq 1$. Let $K \geq 2$. Then

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} \leq \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} \quad (19)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} + 2 \sum_{k=K}^{\infty} e^{-k/2} \quad (20)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{K-1} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} + \frac{2e^{-K/2}}{1 - e^{-1/2}}. \quad (21)$$

We conclude by taking $K = 13$. \square

C.2 A general form of the gradient

Lemma 6. For both linear and logistic regression, $\mathbf{u}(g) = S(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, for some function S with values in $\{\{+1\}, \{-1\}, [-1, +1]\}$ and a noise ξ independent from x . Moreover, $\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) = S_\Delta(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, where S_Δ takes values in $[-\Delta, \Delta]$.

Proof. In linear regression (with noise), we have $g = (\alpha^T x - y)x = ((\alpha - \beta)^T x + \xi)x$, with some noise $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ that is independent from x . This implies $\mathbf{u}(g) = S_{linear}(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, with $S_{linear}(x, \xi) \triangleq \text{SIGN}((\alpha - \beta)^T x + \xi)$. Moreover we can write $\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) = S_{\Delta, linear}(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, where $S_{\Delta, linear}(x, \xi) = S_{linear}(x, \xi) \min\left\{1, \frac{1}{|(\alpha - \beta)^T x + \xi|}\right\}$ if $(\alpha - \beta)^T x + \xi \neq 0$, and $S_{\Delta, linear}(x, \xi) = 0$ otherwise.

For logistic regression, we have $g = (\sigma(\alpha^T x) - y)x$, where the label y is given by $y = \mathbb{1}[\xi < \sigma(\beta^T x)]$, for a random variable $\xi \sim \mathcal{U}([0, 1])$ independent from x . It follows that $\mathbf{u}(g) = S_{logistic}(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, with $S_{logistic}(x, \xi) \triangleq \text{SIGN}(\sigma(\alpha^T x) - \mathbb{1}[\xi < \sigma(\beta^T x)])$. Again, we can write $\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) = S_{\Delta, logistic}(x, \xi)\mathbf{u}(x)$, where $S_{\Delta, logistic}(x, \xi) = S_{logistic}(x, \xi) \min\left\{1, \frac{\Delta}{|\sigma(\alpha^T x) - \mathbb{1}[\xi < \sigma(\beta^T x)]| \cdot \|x\|_2}\right\}$. \square

C.3 Two classical concentration bounds

Before the sequel, we recall the two following concentration bounds on the random normal vectors and on its norm.

Lemma 7. *Let $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and $\kappa > 0$. Then $\mathbb{P}[Z \geq \kappa] \leq \frac{1}{\kappa\sqrt{\tau}}e^{-\kappa^2/2}$.*

Proof. Considering the variable change $s = t + \kappa$, and denoting $\tau = 6.28318530718\dots$, yields

$$\mathbb{P}[Z \geq \kappa] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \int_{\kappa}^{\infty} e^{-t^2/2} dt = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\kappa^2/2} e^{-\kappa s} e^{-s^2/2} ds \leq \frac{e^{-\kappa^2/2}}{\sqrt{\tau}} \int_0^{\infty} e^{-\kappa s} ds = \frac{e^{-\kappa^2/2}}{\sqrt{\tau}} \left[\frac{e^{-\kappa s}}{\kappa} \right]_{s=0}^{\infty}, \quad (22)$$

where we used $e^{-s^2/2}$. Finishing the computation yields the lemma. \square

Lemma 8 ([Wai19], Example 2.11). *Let $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$ and $\kappa \geq 0$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|x\|_2^2 - D \geq \kappa\sqrt{D}\right] \leq \begin{cases} e^{-\kappa^2/8}, & \text{for } \kappa \leq \sqrt{D}, \\ e^{-\kappa\sqrt{D}/8}, & \text{for } \kappa \geq \sqrt{D}, \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

and similarly for the event $\left\{\|x\|_2^2 - D \leq -\kappa\sqrt{D}\right\}$

Sketch of proof. The square of a standard normal variable is sub-exponential of parameters (2, 4) (see Lemma 23), Thus the sum of D of them is sub-exponential of parameters $(2\sqrt{D}, 4)$. The result follows from the sub-exponential tail bound. \square

C.4 An isotropic unit vector is almost orthogonal to any fixed vector

In this section, we prove that the norm of μ is small. Essentially, the intuition behind this is that $\mathbf{u}(g)$ is unlikely to point towards its expected value μ , because high-dimensional isotropic vectors are nearly orthogonal.

To precisely derive the result, let us first identify the following high-probability events.

Lemma 9. *Let $\kappa \in [0, \sqrt{D}]$. With probability at least $1 - e^{-\kappa^2/8}$, we have $\|x\|_2^2 \geq D - \kappa\sqrt{D}$.*

Proof. This follows from Lemma 8 and $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$. \square

Lemma 10. *Let $\kappa \geq 1$ and u any unit vector. Then with probability at least $1 - \frac{2}{\kappa\sqrt{\tau}}e^{-\kappa^2/2}$, we have $|u^T x| \leq \kappa$.*

Proof. $u^T x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, u^T I u) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Lemma 7 yields the result. \square

The two previous well-known facts allow to derive the following key lemma.

Lemma 11. Consider a fixed unit vector $u \in \mathbb{S}^{D-1}$ and assume v is a random vector uniformly distributed over \mathbb{S}^{D-1} . Let S be a random variable, which may depend on v , and with values in $[-\Delta, \Delta]$. For $D \geq 1024$, we have $\mathbb{E}[Su^T v] \leq 12\Delta/\sqrt{D}$.

Proof. Note that v can be written $x/\|x\|_2$ for $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$. For $\kappa \in [1, \sqrt{D}]$, define

$$\mathcal{E}_\kappa \triangleq \left\{ \|x\|_2^2 \geq D - \kappa\sqrt{D} \right\} \cap \left\{ |x^T u| \leq \kappa \right\}. \quad (24)$$

Combining the two previous lemma yields $\mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_\kappa] \leq e^{-\kappa^2/8} + \frac{2}{\kappa\sqrt{\tau}}e^{-\kappa^2/2}$. Now define $K \triangleq \lfloor \sqrt{D}/4 \rfloor$. For $\kappa \in [1, K]$, we then have $D - \kappa\sqrt{D} \geq 3D/4$. Note moreover that $K^2 \geq (\frac{\sqrt{D}}{4} - 1)^2 \geq \frac{D}{16} - \frac{\sqrt{D}}{2} \geq \frac{D}{16} \left(1 - \frac{8}{\sqrt{D}}\right) \geq \frac{D}{32}$, using $D \geq 256$. For $D \geq 1024$, we also have $e^{-D/256} \leq 0.587/\sqrt{D}$. Moreover, note that $D - \sqrt{D} \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}})D \geq (1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1024}})D = \frac{31}{32}D$. We now have the following union bound:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|Su^T v|}{\Delta} \right] = \sum_{\kappa=1}^K \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|Sx^T u|}{\Delta \|x\|_2} \middle| \mathcal{E}_\kappa - \mathcal{E}_{\kappa-1} \right] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_\kappa - \mathcal{E}_{\kappa-1}] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{|Sx^T u|}{\Delta \|x\|_2} \middle| -\mathcal{E}_K \right] \mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_K] \quad (25)$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\frac{1}{\sqrt{D - \sqrt{D}}}}_{\kappa=1} + \sum_{\kappa=2}^K \left(\frac{\kappa}{\sqrt{D - \kappa\sqrt{D}}} \right) \mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_{\kappa-1}] + \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[|u(x)^T u| \mid -\mathcal{E}_K]}_{\leq 1} \mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_K] \quad (26)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{31D}} + \sqrt{\frac{8}{7D}} \sum_{\kappa=2}^K \kappa \left(e^{-\frac{(\kappa-1)^2}{8}} + \frac{2}{(\kappa-1)\sqrt{\tau}} e^{-\frac{(\kappa-1)^2}{2}} \right) + e^{-\frac{K^2}{8}} + \frac{2}{K\sqrt{\tau}} e^{-\frac{K^2}{2}} \quad (27)$$

$$\leq \sqrt{\frac{32}{31D}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \sqrt{\frac{8}{7}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1) e^{-\frac{k^2}{8}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \sqrt{\frac{8}{7\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-\frac{k^2}{2}} + e^{-\frac{D}{256}} + \frac{2\sqrt{32}}{\sqrt{\tau D}} e^{-\frac{D}{64}} \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{D}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{32}{31}} + \sqrt{\frac{8}{7}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1) e^{-\frac{k^2}{8}} + \sqrt{\frac{8}{7\tau}} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-\frac{k^2}{2}} + 0.587 + \frac{8\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{\tau}} e^{-16} \right), \quad (29)$$

We now use $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} (k+1) e^{-k^2/8} \leq 6$ (Lemma 4) and $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k+1}{k} e^{-k^2/2} \leq 1.44$ (Lemma 5), which eventually yields the bound. This then implies $\mathbb{E}[Su^T v] \leq \mathbb{E}[|Su^T v|] \leq 12\Delta/\sqrt{D}$. \square

C.5 The norms of the expected normalized/clipped gradient are small

We now derive the main results of this section, which bound the expected norms of normalized and clipped gradients.

Lemma 12. Assume $D \geq 1024$. Then $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]\|_2 \leq 12/\sqrt{D}$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 11 with $u \triangleq \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)])$, $v = \mathbf{u}(x)$, $S = S(x, \xi)$ and $\Delta = 1$. Recall that $\mathbf{u}(g) = Sv$. We then have

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]\|_2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]) = \mathbb{E}[Sv]^T u = \mathbb{E}[Su^T v] \leq 12/\sqrt{D} \quad (30)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 13. Assume $D \geq 1024$. Then $\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]\|_2 \leq 12\Delta/\sqrt{D}$.

Proof. We apply Lemma 11 with $u \triangleq \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)])$, $v = \mathbf{u}(x)$ and $S = S_\Delta(x, \xi)$. Recall that $\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) = Sv$. We then have

$$\|\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]\|_2 = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]) = \mathbb{E}[Sv]^T u = \mathbb{E}[Su^T v] \leq 12\Delta/\sqrt{D} \quad (31)$$

This concludes the proof. \square

D Isotropic unit/clipped vectors are sub-Gaussian

In this section we show that isotropic unit vectors are sub-Gaussian, which will allow us to derive a concentration bound on the deviation to the expectation.

D.1 Preliminaries on sub-Gaussian variables

Definition 4. A random zero-mean variable X is sub-Gaussian of parameter σ if

$$\forall \lambda \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbb{E} [e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{\lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2}. \quad (32)$$

Lemma 14 (Adapted from [Ver18], Proposition 2.5.2). Suppose X is a random zero-mean variable that verifies $\mathbb{P}[|X| \geq t] \leq 3e^{-t^2/c^2}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Then X is sub-Gaussian of parameter $14c$.

Proof. For any $p \geq 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[|X|^p \geq s] ds \stackrel{t=s^{1/p}}{=} \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[|X| \geq t] p t^{p-1} dt \quad (33)$$

$$\leq 3p \int_0^\infty e^{-t^2/c^2} t^{p-1} dt \stackrel{u=t^2/c^2}{=} 3p \int_0^\infty e^{-u} c^{p-1} u^{\frac{p-1}{2}} \frac{c^2 du}{c\sqrt{u}} \quad (34)$$

$$\leq 3pc^p \int_0^\infty e^{-u} u^{\frac{p}{2}-1} du = 3pc^p \Gamma(p/2), \quad (35)$$

where Γ is the classical gamma function. It is well-known that for $t \geq 1/2$, it verifies $\Gamma(t) \leq 3t^t$. Thus $\mathbb{E}[|X|^p] \leq 9pc^p (p/2)^{p/2}$.

Now let $\nu \geq 0$. The Taylor expansion of the exponential function yields

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\nu^2 X^2}] = \mathbb{E}\left[1 + \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{(\nu^2 X^2)^q}{q!}\right] = 1 + \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{\nu^{2q}}{q!} \mathbb{E}[|X|^{2q}] \leq 1 + \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \frac{\nu^{2q}}{(q/e)^q} (18qc^{2q}q^q), \quad (36)$$

using Stirling approximation $q! \geq (q/e)^q$. We now use the bound $18q \leq e^{2.5q}$ for $q \geq 1$, which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\nu^2 X^2}] \leq 1 + \sum_{q=1}^{\infty} \nu^{2q} (e^{3.5q} c^{2q}) \leq \sum_{q=0}^{\infty} (36\nu^2 c^2)^q = \frac{1}{1 - 6^2 \nu^2 c^2}, \quad (37)$$

for $\nu < 1/6c$. We now use the bound $\frac{1}{1-t} \leq e^{2t}$ for $t \in [0, 1/2]$. Thus,

$$\forall \nu \in \left[0, \frac{1}{6c\sqrt{2}}\right], \mathbb{E}[e^{\nu^2 X^2}] \leq \exp(72\nu^2 c^2). \quad (38)$$

Now consider $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. We now use the inequality $e^t \leq t + e^{t^2}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\lambda X + e^{\lambda^2 X^2}\right] = \lambda \underbrace{\mathbb{E}[X]}_{=0} + \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda^2 X^2}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda^2 X^2}]. \quad (39)$$

Now, for $|\lambda| \leq \frac{1}{6c\sqrt{2}}$, the previous bound implies $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{72\lambda^2 c^2} \leq e^{90\lambda^2 c^2}$.

For $|\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{6c\sqrt{2}}$, we use the inequality $2\lambda t \leq \alpha\lambda^2 + \frac{1}{\alpha}t^2$ (for all λ, t and $\alpha > 0$) with $\alpha = 36c^2$, yielding $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{18c^2\lambda^2} \mathbb{E}[e^{X^2/72c^2}]$. Now note that we can apply Equation (38) for $\nu = 1/6c\sqrt{2}$ (and thus $\nu^2 = 1/72c^2$), which gives $\mathbb{E}[e^{X^2/72c^2}] \leq e$. For $|\lambda| \geq \frac{1}{6c\sqrt{2}}$, we have $e \leq e^{72c^2\lambda^2}$, which then implies $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{(18+72)c^2\lambda^2} = e^{90c^2\lambda^2}$.

Overall we thus have the sub-Gaussian bound, for $\sigma^2 = 180c^2$. The bound $\sqrt{180} \leq 14$ allows to conclude. \square

Lemma 15. *If X and Y are independent sub-Gaussians of parameters σ_X and σ_Y , then $X + Y$ is sub-Gaussian of parameter $\sqrt{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2}$.*

Proof. Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. Then $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(X+Y)}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X} e^{\lambda Y}] = \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda Y}] \leq e^{\lambda^2 \sigma_X^2 / 2} e^{\lambda^2 \sigma_Y^2 / 2} = e^{\lambda^2 (\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2) / 2}$ \square

Lemma 16 ([Wai19], Exercise 2.4). *If X has zero mean and verifies $a \leq X \leq b$. Then X is sub-Gaussian with parameter $\frac{b-a}{2}$.*

Proof. We refer to [Wai19], Exercise 2.4, as obtaining the tight parameter is technical and not very interesting for our purpose. \square

Theorem 2 (Hoeffding [Wai19]). *Suppose X is a zero-mean sub-Gaussian variable of parameter σ . Then*

$$\forall t \geq 0, \mathbb{P}[X \geq t] \leq e^{-t^2 / 2\sigma^2}. \quad (40)$$

Proof. This follows from the classical Chernoff bound. Namely, for $\lambda \geq 0$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq t] \leq e^{-\lambda t} \mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda X}] \leq e^{-\lambda t} e^{\lambda^2 \sigma^2 / 2}. \quad (41)$$

We conclude with the special case $\lambda = t / \sigma^2$. \square

D.2 Bounding the tail distribution

Lemma 17. *For any unit vector u and $\kappa \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}[|\mathbf{u}(g)^T u| \geq \kappa] \leq 3e^{-\kappa^2 D / 4}$.*

Proof. Note that the lemma is trivially true for $\kappa \leq \sqrt{2/D}$, as the right-hand side is then at least $3e^{-1/2} \geq 1$. Without loss of generality, we now assume $\kappa \geq \sqrt{2/D}$.

We can write $\mathbf{u}(g) = \chi \frac{x}{\|x\|_2}$, with $x \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$ and $\chi \in \{-1, +1\}$, whose distribution depends on x .

Now denote $\mathcal{E} \triangleq \left\{ \|x\|_2 \geq \sqrt{\frac{D}{2}} \right\}$. Note that \mathcal{E} holds if and only if $\|x\|_2^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}D$. For \mathcal{E} to fail, we must have $\|x\|_2^2 < \frac{1}{2}D$, which requires $\|x\|_2^2 - D < -\frac{1}{2}D$. By Lemma 8 (with $\kappa = \sqrt{D}/2$), we know that $\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \geq 1 - e^{-D/32}$.

Consider any unit vector u .

$$\mathbb{P}[|\mathbf{u}(g)^T u| \geq \kappa] \leq \mathbb{P}[|x^T u| \geq \kappa \|x\|_2 \text{ and } \mathcal{E}] + \mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}] \quad (42)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P}\left[|x^T u| \geq \kappa \sqrt{\frac{D}{2}}\right] + e^{-D/32} \leq 2e^{-\kappa^2 D / 4} + e^{-D/32}, \quad (43)$$

using $x^T u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ and Lemma 7 (with $\kappa \geq \sqrt{2/D}$). Now, if $\kappa \leq 1$, then $e^{-\kappa^2 D / 4} \geq e^{-D/4} \geq e^{-D/32}$, and we thus have the bound $\mathbb{P}[|\mathbf{u}(g)^T u| \geq \kappa] \leq 3e^{-\kappa^2 D / 4}$. For $\kappa \geq 1$, we trivially have the same bound, since $|\mathbf{u}(g)^T u|$ is necessarily at most 1 (scalar product of unit vectors). \square

Lemma 18. *For any unit vector u and $\kappa \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}[|\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T u| \geq \kappa \Delta] \leq 3e^{-\kappa^2 D / 4}$.*

Proof. Note that $|\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T u| \leq \Delta |\mathbf{u}(g)^T u|$. It then suffices to apply Lemma 17. \square

Lemma 19. *Let u and v be unit vectors respectively orthogonal to $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]$. Then $\mathbf{u}(g)^T u$ and $\frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T v$ are both zero-mean sub-Gaussian variables with parameter $28/\sqrt{D}$.*

Proof. $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)^T u] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]^T u = 0$, thus $\mathbf{u}(g)^T u$ has zero mean. Similarly $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T v] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]^T v = 0$, thus $\frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T v = 0$. By Lemma 17 and Lemma 14 (with $c = 2/\sqrt{D}$), we know that $\mathbf{u}(g)^T u$ is sub-Gaussian with parameter $14 \cdot 2/\sqrt{D}$, and so is $\frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)^T v$ (using Lemma 18). \square

Lemma 20. $(\mathbf{u}(g) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)])^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)])$ and $\frac{1}{\Delta}(\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)])^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)])$ are zero-mean sub-Gaussian variables with parameter 1.

Proof. Denote $\mu \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]$. $\mathbb{E}[(\mathbf{u}(g) - \mu)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu)] = (\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)] - \mu)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu) = 0$, thus $(\mathbf{u}(g) - \mu)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu)$ has mean zero. Moreover $(\mathbf{u}(g) - \mu)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu) = \mathbf{u}(g)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu) - \|\mu\|_2 \in [-1 - \|\mu\|_2, 1 - \|\mu\|_2]$. By Lemma 16, it is thus sub-Gaussian of parameter 1. A similar argument applies to $\frac{1}{\Delta}(\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)])^T \mathbf{u}(\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)])$. \square

D.3 A concentration bound on the sum of normalized honest gradients

Lemma 21. Let $\kappa \geq 0$. With probability at least $1 - 2De^{-\kappa^2/1568}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h) - H\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)] \right\|_2 \leq \kappa\sqrt{2H} \quad (44)$$

Proof. Consider an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{D-1}$ of the hyperplane μ^\perp orthogonal to $\mu \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]$. From Lemma 19, along each coordinate $i \in [D-1]$, $\mathbf{u}(g_h)^T \mathbf{e}_i$ is sub-Gaussian of parameter $28/\sqrt{D}$. Since these terms are independent, by Lemma 15, we know that $X_i \triangleq \sum_h \mathbf{u}(g_h)^T \mathbf{e}_i$ is sub-Gaussian of parameter $28\sqrt{H/D}$. By Theorem 2 (with $t = \kappa\sqrt{H/D}$), we know that $|X_i| \leq \kappa\sqrt{H/D}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2 \cdot 28^2}$.

Now consider $X_\mu \triangleq \sum_h (\mathbf{u}(g_h) - \mu)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu)$. This is the sum of H independent variables, each of which is sub-Gaussian of parameter 1. Thus X_μ is sub-Gaussian of parameter \sqrt{H} . By Theorem 2 (with $t = \kappa\sqrt{H}$), we have $|X_\mu| \leq \kappa\sqrt{H}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2 \cdot 28^2}$.

Taking the intersection of all these events imply that, with probability at least $1 - 2De^{-\kappa^2/1568}$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h) - H\mu \right\|_2^2 = X_\mu^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{D-1} X_i^2 \leq \kappa^2 H + (D-1)\kappa^2 \frac{H}{D} \leq 2\kappa^2 H. \quad (45)$$

Taking the square root concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 22. Let $\kappa \geq 0$. With probability at least $1 - 2De^{-\kappa^2/1568}$,

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) - H\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)] \right\|_2 \leq \kappa\Delta\sqrt{2H} \quad (46)$$

Proof. Consider an orthonormal basis $\mathbf{e}_1, \dots, \mathbf{e}_{D-1}$ of the hyperplane μ_Δ^\perp orthogonal to $\mu_\Delta \triangleq \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g)]$. From Lemma 19, along each coordinate $i \in [D-1]$, $\frac{1}{\Delta}\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h)^T \mathbf{e}_i$ is sub-Gaussian of parameter $28/\sqrt{D}$. Since these terms are independent, by Lemma 15, we know that $X_i \triangleq \sum_h \frac{1}{\Delta}\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h)^T \mathbf{e}_i$ is sub-Gaussian of parameter $28\sqrt{H/D}$. By Theorem 2 (with $t = \kappa\sqrt{H/D}$), we know that $|X_i| \leq \kappa\sqrt{H/D}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2 \cdot 28^2}$.

Now consider $X_\mu \triangleq \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_h (\mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) - \mu_\Delta)^T \mathbf{u}(\mu_\Delta)$. This is the sum of H independent variables, each of which is sub-Gaussian of parameter 1. Thus X_μ is sub-Gaussian of parameter \sqrt{H} . By Theorem 2 (with $t = \kappa\sqrt{H}$), we have $|X_\mu| \leq \kappa\sqrt{H}$ with probability at least $1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2} \geq 1 - 2e^{-\kappa^2/2 \cdot 28^2}$.

Taking the intersection of all these events imply that, with probability at least $1 - 2De^{-\kappa^2/1568}$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \frac{1}{\Delta} \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h) - H\frac{\mu_\Delta}{\Delta} \right\|_2^2 = X_\mu^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{D-1} X_i^2 \leq \kappa^2 H + (D-1)\kappa^2 \frac{H}{D} \leq 2\kappa^2 H. \quad (47)$$

Taking the square root, and multiplying by Δ , concludes the proof. \square

E Proof of arbitrary model manipulation (Theorem 1)

In this section, we prove Theorem 1. By Lemma 2, it suffices to prove that the sum $\sum \mathbf{u}(g_h)$ of normalized honest gradients has a norm bounded by P , and that $\sum \mathbf{u}_\Delta(g_h)$ has a norm bounded by ΔP .

Proof. Consider the event of Lemma 21 with $\kappa = 56\sqrt{\ln D}$. Then with probability at least $1 - 2De^{-2\ln D} = 1 - 2/D \geq 1 - \delta$, we have

$$\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h) \right\|_2 \leq \left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h) - H\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)] \right\|_2 + \|H\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{u}(g)]\|_2 \quad (48)$$

$$\leq 56\sqrt{2H \ln D} + \frac{12H}{\sqrt{D}}, \quad (49)$$

using Lemma 12. Assuming $H \geq 6272D \ln D = 2 \cdot 56^2 D \ln D$ implies $56\sqrt{H \ln D} \leq H/\sqrt{D}$. Thus $\left\| \sum_{h \in [H]} \mathbf{u}(g_h) \right\|_2 \leq 13H/\sqrt{D} \leq P$. By Lemma 2, we know that α can be made a stationary point. The case of \mathbf{u}_Δ is dealt with similarly. \square

F On isotropically random subspaces (Proposition 2)

The proof of Proposition 2 leverages well-known concentration bounds on sub-exponential distributions.

F.1 Sub-exponential distributions and bounds

Definition 5. A zero-mean random variable X with mean μ is sub-exponential with parameters (ν, b) if

$$\forall |\lambda| < 1/b, \quad \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(X-\mu)} \right] \leq e^{\nu^2 \lambda^2 / 2}. \quad (50)$$

Lemma 23 ([Wai19], Example 2.8). Let $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. Then Z^2 is sub-exponential with parameters $(\nu = 2, b = 4)$.

Proof. This follows from explicitly computing $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda(Z^2-1)} \right]$, and by bounding the result appropriately. \square

Lemma 24. Suppose $X, Y \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ are independent. Then XY is zero mean and sub-exponential of parameters $(2\sqrt{2}, 4)$.

Proof. We have $XY = A^2 - B^2$, where $A \triangleq \frac{X+Y}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $B \triangleq \frac{X-Y}{\sqrt{2}}$. Since (A, B) results from rotating (X, Y) by an eighth of a turn, given the rotational symmetry of $\mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$, it is known that (A, B) also follows the $\mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ distribution. In particular, A^2 and B^2 are each the square of a standard centered normal distribution, and they are independent. By Lemma 23, it follows that A^2 and B^2 each has zero mean, and is sub-exponential with parameters $(2, 4)$. Moreover, by Lemma 25, their difference is also zero mean and is sub-exponential, of parameters $(2\sqrt{2}, 4)$. \square

Lemma 25. Assume that for each $i \in [N]$, X_i is an independent zero-mean sub-exponential random variable with parameters (ν_i, b_i) . Then $\sum_{i \in [N]} X_i$ is zero-mean sub-exponential with parameters $(\sqrt{\sum \nu_i^2}, \max b_i)$.

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that each X_i has zero mean. Let $\lambda < 1/(\max b_i) = \min(1/b_i)$. Then

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda \sum X_i} \right] = \prod_{i \in [N]} \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\lambda X_i} \right] \leq \prod_{i \in [N]} e^{\nu_i^2 \lambda^2 / 2} = e^{(\sum \nu_i^2) \lambda^2 / 2}, \quad (51)$$

which is the conclusion of the lemma. \square

Theorem 3 ([Wai19], Proposition 2.9). *Suppose X is sub-exponential with mean μ and parameters (ν, b) . Then*

$$\mathbb{P}[X \geq \mu + t] \leq \begin{cases} e^{-t^2/2\nu^2}, & \text{if } 0 \leq t \leq \nu^2/b, \\ e^{-t/2b}, & \text{if } t > \nu^2/b, \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

Proof. This follows from the classical Chernoff bound. \square

F.2 Concentration bounds

We prove this slightly more general lemma, whose special case $\kappa = 8\sqrt{\ln(1+d)}$ yields Proposition 2.

Lemma 26. *Let u be a unit vector. Suppose V is an isotropically random d -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^D . Then, for all $\kappa \geq 1$, with high probability at least $1 - 3d^2e^{-\kappa^2/16}$, for all unit vectors $v \in V$, $|u^T v| \leq 6\kappa\sqrt{\frac{d}{D}}$.*

Proof. Note that the proposition is trivial for $\kappa \geq \frac{1}{6}\sqrt{\frac{D}{d}}$, as the right-hand side is 1, which is clearly an upper-bound on the scalar product of two unit vectors. Without loss of generality, in the sequel, we assume $1 \leq \kappa \leq \frac{1}{6}\sqrt{\frac{D}{d}} < \sqrt{D}$.

Define V to be the vector spanned by d independent vectors $w_1, \dots, w_d \sim \mathcal{N}(0, I_D)$. With probability 1, V has dimension d . Plus it is clearly isotropically drawn. Moreover, $(\frac{w_1}{\sqrt{D}}, \dots, \frac{w_d}{\sqrt{D}})$ is then a quasi-orthonormal basis of V . More precisely, define the following events:

$$\mathcal{E}_1 \triangleq \left\{ \forall i \in [d], \left| \|w_i\|_2^2 - D \right| \leq \kappa\sqrt{D} \right\}, \quad (53)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2 \triangleq \left\{ \forall i \neq j, |w_i^T w_j| \leq \kappa\sqrt{D} \right\}, \quad (54)$$

$$\mathcal{E}_3 \triangleq \left\{ \forall i \in [d], |w_i^T u| \leq \kappa \right\}. \quad (55)$$

By Lemma 8, using $\kappa < \sqrt{D}$, we know that \mathcal{E}_1 holds with probability at least $1 - de^{-\kappa^2/8}$. By combining Lemma 24, Lemma 25, we know that $w_i^T w_j$ is zero-mean and sub-exponential of parameters $(2\sqrt{2D}, 4)$. Thus by Theorem 3 (with $t = \kappa\sqrt{D} < D$), \mathcal{E}_2 holds with probability $1 - d^2e^{-\kappa^2/16}$. Finally, $w_i^T u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, u^T I u) = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$. By Lemma 7, \mathcal{E}_3 holds with probability at least $1 - \frac{d}{\kappa\sqrt{\tau}}e^{-\kappa^2/2} \geq 1 - de^{-\kappa^2/2}$, using $\kappa \geq 1$. Taking the intersection $\mathcal{E} = \mathcal{E}_1 \cap \mathcal{E}_2 \cap \mathcal{E}_3$ then yields

$$\mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}] \geq 1 - de^{-\kappa^2/8} - d^2e^{-\kappa^2/16} - de^{-\kappa^2/2} \quad (56)$$

$$\geq 1 - 3d^2e^{-\kappa^2/16}. \quad (57)$$

In the sequel, we work under this high-probability event.

Now consider any (not necessarily unit) vector $z \in V$. Then there exists unique values $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_d$ such that $z = \sum \lambda_i w_i$. But now, we have

$$|z^T u| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i w_i^T u \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^d |\lambda_i| |w_i^T u| \leq \kappa \|\lambda\|_1 \leq \kappa\sqrt{d} \|\lambda\|_2, \quad (58)$$

where we used the classical inequality $\|\cdot\|_1 \leq \sqrt{d}\|\cdot\|_2$ in \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, note that

$$\|z\|_2^2 = \left\| \sum \lambda_i w_i \right\|_2^2 = \sum_i \lambda_i^2 \|w_i\|_2^2 + 2 \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j w_i^T w_j \geq (D - \kappa\sqrt{D}) \|\lambda\|_2^2 - 2\kappa\sqrt{D} \sum_{i \neq j} \lambda_i \lambda_j \quad (59)$$

$$\geq (D - \kappa\sqrt{D}) \|\lambda\|_2^2 - 2\kappa\sqrt{D} \|\lambda\|_1^2 \geq (D - \kappa\sqrt{D}) \|\lambda\|_2^2 - 2\kappa\sqrt{dD} \|\lambda\|_2^2 \quad (60)$$

$$= \left(1 - \frac{(1 + 2\sqrt{d})\kappa}{\sqrt{D}} \right) D \|\lambda\|_2^2 \leq \left(1 - 3\kappa\sqrt{\frac{d}{D}} \right) D \|\lambda\|_2^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} D \|\lambda\|_2^2, \quad (61)$$

where the last line uses $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{6}\sqrt{\frac{D}{d}}$. Now denoting $v = z/\|z\|_2$ yields

$$|v^T u| \leq \frac{|z^T u|}{\|z\|_2} \leq \frac{\kappa\sqrt{d}\|\lambda\|_2}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{2}D\|\lambda\|_2^2}} = \sqrt{2}\kappa\sqrt{\frac{d}{D}} \leq 6\kappa\sqrt{\frac{d}{D}}, \quad (62)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

Lemma 27. *Let $d \geq 2$ and u be a unit vector. Suppose V is an isotropically random d -dimensional subspace of \mathbb{R}^D . Then, for all $\nu \geq 1$, with high probability at least $1 - 23e^{-4\nu^2}$, for all unit vectors $v \in V$, $|u^T v| \leq 48\nu\sqrt{\frac{d\ln(1+d)}{D}}$.*

Proof. Let $\nu \geq 1$. Define $\kappa \triangleq 8\nu\sqrt{\ln(1+d)}$. Then $\kappa \geq 8\sqrt{\ln(1+d)} \geq 1$, for $d \geq 2$.

Thus Lemma 26 applies: with probability at least $p \triangleq 1 - 3d^2e^{-\kappa^2/16}$,

$$\forall \text{ unit } v \in V, \quad |u^T v| \leq 6\kappa\sqrt{\frac{d}{D}} = 48\nu\sqrt{\frac{d\ln(1+d)}{D}}. \quad (63)$$

Now using $1+d \geq 3 \geq e$ and $2-4\nu^2 \leq 2-4 = -2 < 0$, we have

$$p = 1 - 3d^2e^{-4\nu^2\ln(1+d)} = 1 - 3d^2(1+d)^{-4\nu^2} \quad (64)$$

$$\geq 1 - \frac{3d^2}{(1+d)^2}(1+d)^{2-4\nu^2} \geq 1 - 3e^{2-4\nu^2} \quad (65)$$

$$\geq 1 - (3e^2)e^{-4\nu^2} \geq 1 - 23e^{-4\nu^2}, \quad (66)$$

which concludes the proof. \square

F.3 Proof of Proposition 2

Let us first prove a bound on an infinite series.

Lemma 28. $\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} \leq 1.04$.

Proof. Note that $\frac{d}{dt}te^{-4t^2} = (1-8t^2)e^{-4t^2} \leq 0$ for $t \geq 1$. Thus, for $k \geq 2$ and $t \in [k-1, k]$, we have $ke^{-4k^2} \leq te^{-4t^2}$. Now consider $K \geq 2$. Then

$$\sum_{k=0}^{\infty}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} = \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty}e^{-4k^2} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty}ke^{-4k^2} \quad (67)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} + \sum_{k=K}^{\infty}e^{-4k} + \int_{K-1}^{\infty}te^{-4t^2}dt \quad (68)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} + \frac{e^{-4K}}{1-e^{-4}} - \frac{1}{8}\left[e^{-4t^2}\right]_{K-1}^{\infty} \quad (69)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=0}^{K-1}(1+k)e^{-4k^2} + \frac{e^{-4K}}{1-e^{-4}} + \frac{1}{8}e^{-4(K-1)^2}. \quad (70)$$

Using $K = 2$ yields the bound. \square

Finally we can conclude.

Proof of Proposition 2. Denote $\mu \triangleq \mathbb{E}[v]$, and $u \triangleq \mathbf{u}(\mu)$. Define $\mathcal{E}_0 = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{E}_\nu \triangleq \left\{ \forall z \in V, |u^T z| \leq 48\kappa \|z\|_2 \sqrt{\frac{d \ln(1+d)}{D}} \right\}$ for $\nu \in \mathbb{N} - \{0\}$. Like in Lemma 12, we bound $\|\mu\|_2$ by considering a partition into events \mathcal{E}_ν and applying Lemma 27, yielding

$$\|\mu\|_2 = u^T \mu = \mathbb{E}[u^T v] = \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{E}[u^T v | \mathcal{E}_\nu - \mathcal{E}_{\nu-1}] \mathbb{P}[\mathcal{E}_\nu - \mathcal{E}_{\nu-1}] \quad (71)$$

$$\leq \sum_{\nu=2}^{\infty} 48\nu \sqrt{\frac{d \ln(1+d)}{D}} \mathbb{P}[-\mathcal{E}_{\nu-1}] \quad (72)$$

$$\leq 48 \sqrt{\frac{d \ln(1+d)}{D}} \sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} 23\nu e^{-4(\nu-1)^2} \quad (73)$$

$$= 1104 \sqrt{\frac{d \ln(1+d)}{D}} \underbrace{\sum_{\nu=1}^{\infty} \nu e^{-4(\nu-1)^2}}_{\leq 1.04}, \quad (74)$$

using Lemma 28. The inequality $1104 \cdot 1.04 \leq 1150$ allows to conclude. \square

G Experimental details

The experiments were run on a machine with Nvidia GeForce GTX 970M with Cuda 13. The code is provided in the supplementary material, and can be straightforwardly reproduced, even on a CPU, by following the instructions from `README.md`.

In order to facilitate convergence, and since the optimization problem is strongly convex for linear models, in the synthetic part of the experiments, we consider a dynamic learning rate, where the learning rate is multiplied by an update term smaller than 1 (in our experiments, equal to 0.9), when, after 10 iterations, the norm of the estimated (robustified) gradient decreases.

The initial learning rate is fixed at 0.05, and its value at iteration t is given by $u_t 0.05 / \sqrt{t}$, where $u_t = 0.9^{k_t}$ with k_t being the number of the itmes that the learning rate gets a dynamic update because of a failure to decrease the norm of the gradient.

Our experiments all exhibit a convergence to a point, for which the norm of the estimated (robustified) gradient is very small.