

A fast and slightly robust covariance estimator

John Duchi^{1,2} Saminul Haque³ Rohith Kuditipudi³

Departments of ¹Statistics, ²Electrical Engineering, and ³Computer Science
Stanford University

February 2025

Abstract

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ from a distribution P with mean zero and covariance Σ . Given a dataset \mathcal{X} such that $d_{\text{ham}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) \leq \varepsilon n$, we are interested in finding an efficient estimator $\widehat{\Sigma}$ that achieves $\mathbf{err}(\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma) := \|\Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} \widehat{\Sigma} \Sigma^{-\frac{1}{2}} - I\| \leq 1/2$. We focus on the low contamination regime $\varepsilon = o(1/\sqrt{d})$. In this regime, prior work required either $\Omega(d^{3/2})$ samples or runtime that is exponential in d . We present an algorithm that, for subgaussian data, has near-linear sample complexity $n = \widetilde{\Omega}(d)$ and runtime $O((n+d)^{\omega+\frac{1}{2}})$, where ω is the matrix multiplication exponent. We also show that this algorithm works for heavy-tailed data with near-linear sample complexity, but in a smaller regime of ε . Concurrent to our work, Diakonikolas et al. [2024] give Sum-of-Squares estimators that achieve similar sample complexity but with large polynomial runtime.

1 Introduction

1.1 Problem formulation

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P$ for a distribution P over \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero and covariance $\Sigma = \mathbb{E}_P[(Z - \mu)(Z - \mu)^T]$, and let the observations $\mathcal{X} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^n$ satisfy $d_{\text{ham}}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Z}) \leq \varepsilon n$ almost surely, i.e., \mathcal{X} is an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} . Defining the relative operator error

$$d_{\text{psd}}(A, B) := \begin{cases} \|A^{\dagger/2}(B - A)A^{\dagger/2}\|_{\text{op}} & \text{if } \text{Col}(B) \subseteq \text{Col}(A) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

we design an efficient algorithm **ALG** to compute an estimate $\widehat{\Sigma} = \mathbf{ALG}(\mathcal{X})$ that minimizes

$$\mathbf{err}(\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma) := d_{\text{psd}}(\widehat{\Sigma}, \Sigma). \quad (1)$$

We apply this algorithm to the following two families of distributions.

Definition 1.1 (Hypercontractive subgaussian). *A distribution P over \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero and covariance Σ is σ^2 -hypercontractive subgaussian if for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P}[\exp(Z \cdot v)] \leq e^{\sigma^2 v^T \Sigma v / 2}.$$

Theorem 1 (Informal). *Let $n = \widetilde{\Omega}(d)$ and $\varepsilon = \widetilde{O}(d^{-1/2})$. Let P satisfy Definition 1.1 with $\sigma = O(1)$. Then $\mathbf{err}(\mathbf{ALG}(\mathcal{X}), \Sigma) \leq 1/2$ with probability at least $3/4$.*

Definition 1.2 (Moment bounded). *A distribution P over \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero and covariance Σ is k -th moment bounded by m_k if for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$*

$$\mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P}[|Z \cdot v|^k]^{1/k} \leq m_k (v^T \Sigma v)^{1/2}.$$

Theorem 2 (Informal). *Let $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d)$ and $\varepsilon = \tilde{O}\left(d^{-(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{k})}\right)$. Let P satisfy Definition 1.2 with $k \geq 4$ and $m_k = O(1)$. Then $\mathbf{err}(\mathbf{ALG}(\mathcal{X}), \Sigma) \leq 1/2$ with probability at least $3/4$.*

Prior to our work, the best known polynomial time estimators required $n = \Omega(\varepsilon d^2)$ even for subgaussian data [Diakonikolas and Kane, 2022, Kothari et al., 2018]. Yet, information-theoretically only d samples are necessary so long as ε is a sufficiently small constant. For contamination rates $\varepsilon \ll d^{-1/2}$ (depending on the degree to which P concentrates), our algorithm achieves this optimal sample complexity up to polylogarithmic factors in d . Its runtime is $(n + d)^{\omega+1/2}$ assuming ω is the matrix multiplication exponent. Thus, we substantially improve upon the sample complexity of existing polynomial time algorithms in the small contamination regime where $d^{-1} < \varepsilon \ll d^{-1/2}$.

In recent work concurrent to ours, Diakonikolas et al. [2024] construct a family of estimators based on the Sum-of-Squares (SoS) hierarchy that achieve sample complexity $n = \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^2 d^{1+\gamma})$ and runtime $(n + d)^{O(1/\gamma)}$ assuming P is hypercontractive subgaussian. In the regime where $\varepsilon \ll d^{-1/2}$, their results imply a polynomial time SoS estimator with sample complexity $n = \tilde{O}(d)$ like ours. However, the runtime of this estimator is substantially worse than what we achieve. We defer a full discussion of related work to Section 1.2.

We describe our estimator in Algorithm 1 (ALG) and give a high-level overview of its design in Section 2. In Section 3, we define properties of a dataset \mathcal{Z} that collectively determine the degree to which \mathcal{Z} is a *good* dataset (Definition 3.4). In Section 3, we prove ALG robustly estimates of \mathcal{Z} from observations \mathcal{X} that are an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} so long as \mathcal{Z} is good. Then, we give bounds for n and ε under which i.i.d. samples from subgaussian and moment bounded distributions are good with high probability in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. These bounds establish the robustness and sample complexity of ALG for these classes of distributions, thus formalizing Theorems 1 and 2.

1.2 Related work

Despite the study of robust statistical estimation dating back to more than a half-century ago [Tukey, 1960, Huber, 1964], only in the last decade have researchers developed computationally efficient algorithms with optimal or near-optimal sample complexity. Originating from the work of Diakonikolas et al. [2016] and Lai et al. [2016], we now have polynomial time algorithms for robustly estimating the mean of an isotropic distribution to within small ℓ_2 error from $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d)$ observations and robustly estimating the covariance of a fourth moment bounded distribution to within small relative Frobenius error from $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d^2)$ observations, even when a constant fraction of these observations are contaminated. In many cases, the runtimes of these algorithms are not just polynomial but in fact quite fast [Cheng et al., 2019, 2020, Dong et al., 2019, Depersin and Lecué, 2019, Li and Ye, 2020] (see the book of Diakonikolas and Kane [2022] for a more thorough survey).

For anisotropic distributions, though it is information theoretically possible to robustly estimate the covariance of a moment bounded distribution to within small relative operator error (1) from $n = \Omega(d)$ observations [Mendelson and Zhivotovskiy, 2018, Lugosi and Mendelson, 2020], prior to our work all known polynomial time estimators required $n = \Omega(\varepsilon d^2)$ observations. Thus, even for $\varepsilon = \omega(d^{-1})$, robustly estimating of the mean of a bounded covariance distribution to within small covariance-normalized error required either $\exp(d)$ runtime or $n = \omega(d)$ observations. For $\varepsilon \gg d^{-1/2}$ and subgaussian data, the existence of a polynomial time sample efficient estimator remains an open question; for moment bounded distributions, the existence of a polynomial time estimator with sub-quadratic sample complexity $n = o(d^2)$

remains open.

Independently and concurrently to our work, Diakonikolas et al. [2024] derive SoS certificates of operator norm resilience: i.e., SoS proofs of the stability of a dataset’s covariance in operator norm with respect to removing any ε fraction of the data. They are then able to convert these certificates into robust covariance estimators using standard techniques (see e.g., Kothari et al. [2018]). Their estimators make trade-offs between n , ε and runtime; in particular, on subgaussian data for $n = \tilde{\Omega}(\varepsilon^2 d^2)$ they achieve small relative operator error in quasipolynomial time. They also mention a folklore polynomial time SoS certificate with sample complexity $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d)$ for $\varepsilon \ll d^{-1/2}$. In comparison, our estimator fails catastrophically for $\varepsilon = \Omega(d^{-1/2})$ but otherwise achieves the optimal sample complexity with much faster runtime. Our estimator also works on moment bounded distributions (albeit for smaller ε).

1.3 Notation

Semidefinite matrices and norms For a positive semidefinite (PSD) matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$, we let $\text{Col}(A)$ denote its column space, A^\dagger its pseudoinverse, and $A^{\dagger/2}$ the square-root of the pseudoinverse.

Define the extended-value inner product corresponding to $A \succeq 0$ between $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by

$$\langle u, v \rangle_A := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} v^T (A + tI)^{-1} u = \begin{cases} v^T A^\dagger u & u, v \in \text{Col}(A) \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and the extended-value Mahalanobis norm $\|\cdot\|_A$ by $\|v\|_A^2 = \langle v, v \rangle_A$. This norm has the monotonicity property that if $A \preceq B$, then $\|v\|_A \geq \|v\|_B$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. When A is non-singular, we have $\|v\|_A^2 = v^T A^{-1} v$ and $\langle u, v \rangle_A = u^T A^{-1} v$. We abuse notation throughout the paper to equate $\|v\|_A^2 = v^T A^\dagger v$ and $\langle u, v \rangle_A = u^T A^\dagger v$ in general. Also, for $A, B \succeq 0$ we use $A^\dagger \preceq B^\dagger$ to denote $\|v\|_A \leq \|v\|_B$ for all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Otherwise (e.g., in the context of a generic matrix multiplication operation), we use A^\dagger to denote the usual pseudoinverse.

We use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote both the ℓ_2 norm of a vector and the operator norm of a matrix.

Sets and Covariances For a dataset $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, let $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n z_i z_i^T$. For $S \subseteq [n]$, let \mathcal{Z}_S denote the sub-dataset $\{z_i \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\} \mid i \in [n]\}$. Notice that \mathcal{Z}_S is still a dataset of size n rather than size $|S|$, so $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_S) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S} z_i z_i^T$. Finally, we use $\mathbb{H}_1^n = \{1, \dots, n/2\}$ and $\mathbb{H}_2^n = \{n/2 + 1, \dots, n\}$ to denote the two halves of $[n]$.

2 Algorithm description

We describe our estimator **ALG** in Algorithm 1 and presently give an overview of its design. Recall the input \mathcal{X} to **ALG** is an ε -contamination of $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\} \stackrel{\text{i.i.d.}}{\sim} P$. Let $G, B \subseteq [n]$ denote the “good” and “bad” subsets of \mathcal{X} , i.e., $G = \{i \in [n] \mid x_i = z_i\}$ and $B = [n] \setminus G$. We can decompose $\Sigma(\mathcal{X})$ into its good and bad components so that $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}) = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G) + \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_B)$. The goal of **ALG** will be to remove elements from $R \subseteq [n]$ until $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R})$ is small, at which point (so long as we do not remove too many good data) the remaining covariance $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R \cap G})$ will be close to $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)$ and therefore a good estimate of the uncontaminated covariance $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$.

Suppose $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R})$ is not small relative to $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)$ in the current iteration of **ALG**, i.e., there exists a “bad direction” $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that $v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^{\dagger/2} v = \Omega(1)$, and let $B_v = \{i \in B \cap R \mid v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^{\dagger/2} x_i \geq C/\sqrt{\varepsilon}\}$. Then for sufficiently small constant C it will be

Algorithm 1: Robust covariance estimation (ALG)

Input: Dataset $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, contamination fraction ε , norm threshold t_{norm} , inner product threshold t_{inner}
Output: Estimated covariance matrix Σ_{ALG}

- 1 $R \leftarrow [n]$
- 2 **while** *true* **do**
- 3 $R_1 \leftarrow R \cap \mathbb{H}_1^n$
- 4 $R_2 \leftarrow R \cap \mathbb{H}_2^n$
- 5 **while** $\exists \ell, \ell' \in \{1, 2\}, i \in R_\ell$ s.t. $x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}})^\dagger x_i > t_{\text{norm}}^2$ **do**
- 6 Remove i from R_ℓ
- 7 **end**
- 8 $S_1 \leftarrow \text{ComputeS}(\mathcal{X}_{R_1}, \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2}), t_{\text{inner}})$
- 9 $S_2 \leftarrow \text{ComputeS}(\mathcal{X}_{R_2}, \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_1}), t_{\text{inner}})$
- 10 $R \leftarrow R_1 \cup R_2$
- 11 $S \leftarrow S_1 \cup S_2$
- 12 **if** $\|\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}{4e \log(t_{\text{norm}})}$ **then**
- 13 **return** $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)$
- 14 **end**
- 15 $v_S \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 v$
- 16 **for** $i \in [n]$ **do**
- 17 $w_i \leftarrow (x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 v_S)^2 \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\}$
- 18 **end**
- 19 $w_{\max} \leftarrow \max_{i \in [n]} w_i$
- 20 $\xi \sim \text{Unif}([0, 1])$
- 21 Remove i from R if $\frac{w_i}{w_{\max}} \geq \xi$
- 22 **end**

the case that $v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B_v \cap R}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)^\dagger/2 v = \Omega(1)$. This implies so long as we can reliably identify elements in B_v and include these elements in S , then ALG will not terminate while there remain bad directions. The main idea of ALG is that we can identify elements in B_v based on the fact that the corresponding points should have large inner products with each other. In particular, in each iteration of ALG we will add elements to S whose covariance normalized inner products with at least one other remaining element in R is $\Omega(1/\varepsilon)$.

There are two technical challenges that arise in this process. The first challenge arises in proving points in B_v have high inner product with each other; in particular, the contribution to the inner product from the direction v can be masked by the remaining $d - 1$ orthogonal directions. We show via a simple geometric argument (Lemma B.2) that enough contaminated points will have $\Omega(1/\varepsilon)$ covariance normalized inner product with some other contaminated point to ensure that $v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap S}) v = \Omega(v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R) v)$.

The second challenge is to show that $v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) v$ is small. In particular, while the inner products among uncontaminated data with respect to the uncontaminated sample covariance should be $o(1/\varepsilon)$ for $\varepsilon \ll 1/\sqrt{d}$, the contamination can cause the inner product of many uncontaminated points to exceed $1/\varepsilon$, in which case ALG will include these points in S . We are able to bound (Lemma 4.3) the number of uncontaminated points included in S by $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 d)n$, which suffices to ensure $v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) v \leq v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap S}) v$ since our assumptions on P imply that

Algorithm 2: Find large inner product pairs (ComputeS)

Input: Dataset $y_1, \dots, y_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$, PSD matrix A , inner product threshold t_{inner}
Output: Set S of points with large inner products

- 1 $S \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 **while** $\exists i, j \notin S$ such that $|y_i^T A^\dagger y_j| > t_{\text{inner}}$ **do**
- 3 Add i and j to S
- 4 **end**
- 5 **return** S

any $o(n)$ -size subset of G will have $o(1)$ relative operator norm with respect to $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_R)$. This means we will filter more contaminated points than uncontaminated points (in expectation) until ALG terminates, at which point there will be no directions in which the contaminated data skews the covariance by too much.

3 Properties of a good dataset

We presently introduce the properties we need the uncontaminated dataset to satisfy for ALG to work well. The first property we require is that all points have bounded Mahalanobis norm with respect to the covariance over the subset H of the uncontaminated dataset, so that the uncontaminated data will not be filtered in Line 5 of ALG.

Definition 3.1 (Bounded norm). *A dataset $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ is b_{norm} -norm bounded if for all $i \in [n]$ and $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$ we have $z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)^\dagger z_i \leq b_{\text{norm}}^2$.*

The second property we require is that most inner products between uncontaminated points be bounded with respect to uncontaminated covariance over H , in order to bound the number of uncontaminated elements that ALG includes in S (Line 11).

Definition 3.2 (Bounded inner products). *A dataset $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ is $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded if for $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$ there exists $T \subseteq [n] \setminus H$ satisfying $|T| \geq n - |H| - m_{\text{inner}}$ and $|z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)^\dagger z_j| \leq b_{\text{inner}}$ for all distinct $i, j \in T$.*

The final property we require is that all sufficiently small subsets of the data have a covariance that is bounded above proportionally to the sample covariance. This will ensure that no small subset has a large effect on the sample covariance in relative operator norm.

Definition 3.3 (Operator norm resilience). *A dataset $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient if for $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$ we have $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \preceq \frac{3}{4} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$ and for all $T \subseteq H$ with $|T| \leq m_{\text{op}}$ we have $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_T) \preceq \alpha_{\text{op}} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)$.*

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient. Let $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$. Then for all $T \subseteq H$ such that $|T| \geq |H| - m_{\text{op}}$, we have*

$$(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}) \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_T) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \quad \text{and} \quad \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)^\dagger \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_T)^\dagger \preceq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)^\dagger.$$

Proof This follows immediately from the definition of operator norm resilience. \square

With these properties in hand, we define the notion of a good dataset.

Definition 3.4 (Good dataset). A dataset \mathcal{Z} is $(b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good if it is

1. b_{norm} -norm bounded;
2. $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded; and
3. $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient.

4 Analysis of ALG for contaminated good data

Theorem 3. Let $C > 0$ and $\varepsilon, n, b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}}, t_{\text{inner}}, t_{\text{norm}}$ satisfy

1. $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4(1+C)}$,
2. $t_{\text{norm}} \geq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$,
3. $t_{\text{inner}} \geq \max\{2b_{\text{inner}}, \frac{8\varepsilon\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\}$,
4. $n \geq \frac{12\varepsilon t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}$,
5. $m_{\text{op}} \geq \max\{1 + C, 1 + \frac{72(1+C)t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}\} \varepsilon n + 4m_{\text{inner}}$.

Let \mathcal{Z} be a $(b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good dataset and let \mathcal{X} be an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} . Then ALG terminates in T iterations with $\mathbb{E}[T] \leq 2\varepsilon n$ and returns Σ_{ALG} satisfying

$$(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma_{\text{ALG}} \preceq \frac{1 + \alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$$

with probability at least $1 - C^{-1}$.

We presently prove Theorem 3. The bulk of the proof analyzes a single iteration of the outer while-loop (Section 4.1); in particular, we will show that every iteration this loop will either terminate with the desired utility or will remove more contaminated than uncontaminated elements in expectation. We will then prove the main result from the single-iteration result by applying a standard martingale argument (see, e.g., Diaconikolas and Kane [2022, Theorem 2.17]) to bound the number of removed good elements over all iterations (Section 4.2).

4.1 Analysis of one iteration

In this section, we analyze a single iteration of the outer while loop of ALG (Lines 2-22). We show in Proposition 1 that assuming not too many uncontaminated points have already been removed in previous iterations, the algorithm will either terminate and output an estimate of the sample covariance with the desired error or will remove on average more contaminated points than uncontaminated points.

Before proceeding, we introduce some notation to track the state of ALG over an iteration. Let R^{start} be the state of R at the start of the iteration of the outer while loop (i.e., before Line 3 of ALG executes) and let R^{end} be the state of R at the end of the iteration (i.e., after Line 21 of ALG executes). Likewise, let R^{norm} be the state of R after the norm filtering (Lines 5-7 of ALG) completes execution. For all of these states of R , we subscript by $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ to denote the half of R corresponding to \mathbb{H}_ℓ^n ; e.g., $R_1^{\text{start}} = R^{\text{start}} \cap \mathbb{H}_1^n$. Finally, we use $G, B \subseteq n$ to track the indices of uncontaminated and contaminated data, i.e., $G = \{i \in [n] \mid x_i = z_i\}$ and $B = [n] \setminus G$.

Proposition 1. *Let \mathcal{Z} and \mathcal{X} satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3. Suppose $|G \setminus R^{\text{start}}| \leq C\epsilon n$. Then almost surely either*

1. *ALG terminates with output Σ_{ALG} satisfying $(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma_{\text{ALG}} \preceq \frac{1 + \alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - 8\epsilon t_{\text{inner}}} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$; or*
2. $\mathbb{E} [|B \cap (R^{\text{start}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})| \mid R^{\text{start}}] > \mathbb{E} [|G \cap (R^{\text{start}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})| \mid R^{\text{start}}]$.

We defer the proof of Proposition 1 to Appendix B.1. In the remainder of this section, we will state the key helper lemmas we require and give a sketch of the proof. Every iteration of ALG begins with a norm-filtering step (Lines 5-7). The first key lemma analyzes the state of ALG after executing this norm-filtering step.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $|G \setminus R^{\text{start}}| \leq m_{\text{op}}$. Then*

1. $G \cap R^{\text{start}} = G \cap R^{\text{norm}}$;
2. *The norm filter terminates in at most $|B \cap R^{\text{start}}| + 1$ iterations; and*
3. *For $i \in R^{\text{norm}}$ and $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, we have $x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_\ell^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger x_i \leq t_{\text{norm}}^2$.*

Proof Proceeding with the first claim, for $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ we have

$$|G \cap R_\ell^{\text{start}}| = |\mathbb{H}_\ell^n| - |\mathbb{H}_\ell^n \cap (G \setminus R^{\text{start}})| \geq |\mathbb{H}_\ell^n| - m_{\text{op}}.$$

Thus, for all $i \in G \cap R^{\text{start}}$

$$x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_\ell^{\text{start}}})^\dagger x_i \leq x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_\ell^{\text{start}}})^\dagger x_i \leq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{H_\ell})^\dagger x_i \leq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} b_{\text{norm}}^2,$$

where the second inequality follows from Lemma 3.1. It follows immediately from the assumption $t_{\text{norm}} \geq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$ that no uncontaminated elements are filtered the first iteration of the norm-filtering step. Repeating this argument for all the other iterations, we conclude that no uncontaminated elements are filtered throughout. This implies the first claim of the lemma, provided the norm-filtering step terminates.

We now bound the number of iterations before the norm-filtering step terminates. Note that for all but the final iteration of the norm-filtering step, ALG removes at least one element. Our previous observation implies that this element must be from $B \cap R^{\text{start}}$, from which it follows that the norm-filtering step runs for at most $|B \cap R^{\text{start}}| + 1$ iterations. This completes the proof of the first claim and hence proves the second claim as well.

The final claim follows by the termination condition of the norm-filtering step. \square

After the norm-filtering step, ALG computes S_1 and S_2 by calls to `ComputeS`, with both sets comprised of pairs of points with large covariance-normalized inner product (see Line 2 of `ComputeS`). We require that S_1 and S_2 satisfy two key properties. The first property is that $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell})$ upper bounds $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R_\ell^{\text{norm}}})$ in directions where $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R_\ell^{\text{norm}}})$ is large. We capture this property in Lemma 4.2 and prove it in Appendix B.2. The second property is that ALG does not add too many uncontaminated points to $S = S_1 \cup S_2$. We capture this property in Lemma 4.3 and prove it in Appendix B.3.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\ell, \ell' \in \{1, 2\}$ for $\ell \neq \ell'$. Let $m \geq \frac{12\epsilon t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{t_{\text{inner}}}$. Then for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $T \subseteq R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}$ such that $|T| \leq m$ we have*

$$u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) u \leq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}} \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}) u, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) u \right\}.$$

Lemma 4.3. *Suppose $t_{\text{inner}} \geq 2b_{\text{inner}}$, $t_{\text{norm}} \geq b_{\text{norm}}$, and $|G \cap R^{\text{norm}}| \geq n - \min\{m_{\text{op}}, \frac{n}{4}\}$. Then we have*

$$|G \cap S| \leq 4m_{\text{inner}} + |B \cap R^{\text{norm}}| + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}(n - |G \cap R^{\text{norm}}|).$$

We now briefly sketch the proof of Proposition 1, deferring the full proof to Appendix B.1. We use Lemma 4.2 to certify that $\|\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R^{\text{norm}}})\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2}\|$ is small if the condition in Line 12 is satisfied, in which case ALG terminates with output $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})$ satisfying the first claim of the proposition. If ALG does not terminate, Lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 in combination with the operator norm resilience of \mathcal{Z} ensure that the cumulative weight ALG assigns to uncontaminated points in S is smaller than the cumulative weight ALG assigns to the contaminated points in S (Line 17). This implies that Line 21 of ALG will filter more contaminated points than uncontaminated in expectation, thus proving the second claim of the proposition.

4.2 Proof of Theorem 3

Define G and B as in the previous section. Let R_t denote the state of R after the t -th iteration of the outer while loop (and $R_0 = [n]$). Let $M_t = |G \setminus R_t| + |R_t \setminus G|$ equal the number removed uncontaminated points plus the number of remaining contaminated points up to the t -th iteration. Clearly $M_t \geq 0$ for all t and $M_0 = |B| \leq \varepsilon n$. Let $T = \inf\{t \mid M_t > C\varepsilon n \text{ or ALG terminates at iteration } t\}$ and define $N_t = M_{t \wedge T}$.

We first show $\{N_t\}$ is a supermartingale; i.e., that $\mathbb{E}[N_t \mid N_0, \dots, N_{t-1}] \leq N_{t-1}$ for all $t \geq 0$. Observe that the event $\{T \leq t-1\}$ and the random variables N_1, \dots, N_{t-1} are all (R_1, \dots, R_{t-1}) -measurable. We now condition on R_1, \dots, R_{t-1} . If $T \leq t-1$, then clearly $N_t = N_{t-1}$, so there is nothing else to show. Otherwise, we know that ALG has not terminated before the t -th iteration and also that $M_{t-1} \leq C\varepsilon n$, which implies $|G \setminus R_{t-1}| \leq C\varepsilon n$. Observe that the change from M_{t-1} to M_t is equal to the difference in how many uncontaminated versus contaminated points were removed at the t -th iteration. More precisely, because B and G partition $[n]$ and because $R_t \subseteq R_{t-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_t - M_{t-1} &= |G \setminus R_t| + |R_t \setminus G| - (|G \setminus R_{t-1}| + |R_{t-1} \setminus G|) \\ &= |G \cap (R_{t-1} \setminus R_t)| - |B \cap (R_{t-1} \setminus R_t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Because $|G \setminus R_{t-1}| \leq C\varepsilon n$ and M_t is conditionally independent of R_1, \dots, R_{t-2} given R_{t-1} , the second claim of Proposition 1 gives that $\mathbb{E}[M_t - M_{t-1} \mid \xi_1, \dots, \xi_{t-1}] < 0$. Then because $T > t-1$ in this case, we know that $N_{t-1} = M_{t-1}$ and $N_t = M_t$. Recalling that N_1, \dots, N_{t-1} are measurable with respect to R_1, \dots, R_{t-1} , this proves that $\{N_t\}$ is a supermartingale.

Now because $\{N_t\}$ is a non-negative supermartingale with $N_0 \leq \varepsilon n$ almost surely, we have by Ville's inequality that with probability at least $1 - C^{-1}$, $\max_t N_t \leq C\varepsilon n$. This implies that with probability at least $1 - C^{-1}$, it holds that $|G \setminus R_t| \leq C\varepsilon n$ for all t until ALG terminates. This means that the preconditions for Proposition 1 hold until the ALG terminates, at which point the first claim of Proposition 1 gives the desired claim that the output Σ_{ALG} satisfies

$$(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma_{\text{ALG}} \preceq \frac{1 + \alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}).$$

Finally, each iteration of ALG removes at least one point from R . Combined with the martingale analysis above, it follows for each iteration that ALG removes at least one bad point with probability at least $1/2$. Thus, the expected number of iterations before ALG terminates is at most $2|B| \leq 2\varepsilon n$.

5 Performance of ALG for hypercontractive subgaussians

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ where P is σ^2 -subgaussian (i.e., satisfies Definition A.1), and let \mathcal{X} be an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} . The following lemma gives the parameters for which the dataset \mathcal{Z} is good. We defer the proof to Appendix C.1.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\delta > 0$, $n \gtrsim \max\{\sigma^4 d + \log(1/\delta), \sigma^2(d + \log(n/\delta))\}$, and $m_{\text{op}} \leq n$. Then there exists $b_{\text{norm}}, b_{\text{inner}}, \alpha_{\text{op}}$ satisfying*

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\text{norm}}^2 &= O(\sigma^2 \cdot (d + \log(n/\delta))) \\ b_{\text{inner}} &= \sigma \sqrt{2 \log(n^2/\delta)} b_{\text{norm}} \\ \alpha_{\text{op}} &= 4 \left(1 + 2\sigma^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{2m_{\text{op}}} \right) \right) \cdot \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n} + O \left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

such that with probability at least $1 - 7\delta$, \mathcal{Z} is $(b_{\text{norm}}, 0, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good.

Applying Theorem 3 with the parameters from Lemma 5.1 gives the following performance guarantees of ALG on hypercontractive subgaussian data in Corollary 5.1.

Corollary 5.1. *Let $C > 0$ be a constant. Suppose $\log(n/\delta) \lesssim d$, $n \gtrsim \sigma^4 d$, and $\varepsilon \lesssim \frac{\log n}{\sigma^2 \sqrt{d}}$. Then there exists $t_{\text{norm}} \asymp \sigma \sqrt{d}$ and $t_{\text{inner}} \asymp \sigma^2 \log(n) \sqrt{d} \max \left\{ 1, \frac{1}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}} \right\}$ such that with probability at least $1 - 7\delta - C$, $\Sigma_{\text{ALG}} = \text{ALG}(\mathcal{X}; \varepsilon, t_{\text{norm}}, t_{\text{inner}})$ satisfies*

$$\text{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})) = O(\sigma^2 \log n) \cdot (\varepsilon \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{d/n}).$$

Corollary 5.1 bounds the error of ALG with respect to the uncontaminated sample covariance $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$. One can combine this result with the concentration of the uncontaminated sample covariance to the true population covariance (see Lemma A.3) to obtain a formal version of Theorem 1. We defer the proof of Corollary 5.1 to Appendix C.2.

6 Performance of ALG for moment bounded data

In the previous section, we were able to show that the uncontaminated data \mathcal{Z} is good for parameters that imply a near-linear sample complexity in d . This is no longer the case when \mathcal{Z} is drawn i.i.d. from a moment-bounded distribution; in particular, the heavy-tailed nature of these distributions means \mathcal{Z} will not be b_{norm} -norm bounded unless b_{norm} is polynomially larger than d . In order then to achieve the near-linear sample complexity, we must consider a clipped version of the distribution.

Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{Z_1, \dots, Z_n\} \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ where P has k -th moment bounded by m_k (i.e., satisfies Definition 1.2), and let \mathcal{X} be an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} . Let $b_{\text{clip}} > 0$ be a threshold and define $\bar{z} = z \mathbf{1} \{ \|z\|_{\Sigma} \leq b_{\text{clip}} \}$. Let $\bar{Z} \sim \bar{P}$ for $Z \sim P$ with $\bar{\Sigma} = \mathbb{E}[\bar{Z} \bar{Z}^T]$, and let $\bar{\mathcal{Z}} = \{\bar{Z}_1, \dots, \bar{Z}_n\}$. Then by Lemma A.9 we have

$$d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq m_k^k \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}} \right)^{k-2}, \quad (2)$$

and by Lemma A.11 we have

$$d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \bar{\Sigma}) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}}\right). \quad (3)$$

Together, the above two displays imply that $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$ will be close to Σ for $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim \sqrt{d} m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}}$ and $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)$. If \mathcal{X} was (hypothetically) an ε -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ instead of \mathcal{Z} , we could then take the same approach as in the previous section by applying ALG directly on \mathcal{X} to achieve the guarantee of Theorem 2. Instead, we apply a separate preprocessing step (Algorithm 3, or **Preprocess**) to \mathcal{X} before calling ALG. Specifically, we pick an initial norm threshold $t_{\text{clip}} \leq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} b_{\text{clip}}$ and then apply ALG to $\mathcal{Y} = \text{Preprocess}(\mathcal{X}, t_{\text{clip}})$.

Algorithm 3: Preprocess step (**Preprocess**)

Input: Dataset $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, norm threshold t_{norm}
Output: Dataset $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$
1 for $i = 1$ **to** n **do**
2 | $y_i \leftarrow x_i \mathbf{1}\{x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger x_i \leq t_{\text{norm}}^2\}$
3 end
4 return $\{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$

The main technical challenge that arises with this approach is controlling the influence of the contaminated points on the preprocessing step. If we set t_{norm} too large, then the contaminated points can conspire to prevent the preprocessing step from removing many uncontaminated points whose norm with respect to Σ is larger than b_{clip} , in which case the remaining uncontaminated data may no longer be norm bounded (with suitable parameters); but if we set t_{norm} too small then we risk removing too many uncontaminated points, in which case the remaining uncontaminated data may no longer be inner product bounded.

We show in Lemma 6.1 that for $t_{\text{clip}} \asymp b_{\text{clip}}$ the preprocessing step removes all but ε -fraction of points whose norm with respect to Σ is larger than b_{clip} . We then show in Lemma 6.2 that not only is $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ itself good, but moreover all sufficiently large subsets of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ are also good. We defer the proofs of these lemmas to Appendices D.2 and D.3, respectively.

Lemma 6.1. *Let $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}} \sqrt{d}$, $n \gtrsim \max\{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta), m_k^4(d + \log(1/\delta))\}$, and $\varepsilon \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}}$. Let $\mathcal{Y} = \text{Preprocess}(\mathcal{X}, b_{\text{clip}}/\sqrt{8})$. Then with probability at least*

$$1 - C_k m_k^k n^{1-k/2} - 2\delta - \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n\right)\right),$$

there exists $T \subseteq [n]$ satisfying $|T| \leq 2\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n$ and \mathcal{Y} is a $\left(\frac{9n\varepsilon}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right)$ -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus T}$.

Lemma 6.2. *Let $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}} \sqrt{d}$ and*

$$n \gtrsim \max\{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta), m_k^4(d + \log(1/\delta))\}.$$

Let m_{op} and m_{inner} satisfy $m_{\text{op}} \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}} n$. Then there exists

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\text{norm}} &= O(b_{\text{clip}}) \\ b_{\text{inner}} &= O(m_k n^{1/k} b_{\text{clip}}) \\ \alpha_{\text{op}} &= O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n}\right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

such that with probability at least $1 - O(\delta + n^{-\Omega(km_{\text{inner}})})$ it holds for all $|F| \leq \min\{m_{\text{op}}, m_{\text{inner}}\}$ that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}$ is $(b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good.

Together, Lemmas 6.1 and 6.2 imply there exists t_{clip} such that the remaining uncontaminated data after the preprocessing step is good for parameters that imply the result of Theorem 2. We formalize this claim in Corollary 6.1, which gives the main performance guarantee of our estimator on moment-bounded data. We defer its proof to Appendix D.4.

Corollary 6.1. Suppose $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}} \sqrt{d}$, $n \gtrsim \max\{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta), m_k^4 (d + \log(1/\delta))\}$, and $\varepsilon \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}}$. Let $\mathcal{Y} = \text{Preprocess}(\mathcal{X}, b_{\text{clip}}/\sqrt{8})$. For any $\gamma > 0$ satisfying

$$\max\left\{\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k, \frac{\varepsilon n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right\} \lesssim \gamma \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}},$$

there exist parameters t_{norm} and t_{inner} such that with probability at least

$$1 - C_k m_k^k n^{1-\frac{k}{2}} - \exp(-\Omega(\gamma n)) - O(\delta + n^{-\Omega(km_{\text{inner}})}),$$

the output $\Sigma_{\text{ALG}} = \text{ALG}(\mathcal{Y}, \frac{9n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2} \varepsilon, t_{\text{norm}}, t_{\text{inner}})$ satisfies

$$\text{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})) \lesssim \log b_{\text{clip}} \sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{m_k \varepsilon n^{1+\frac{1}{k}}}{b_{\text{clip}}} + m_k^2 \gamma^{1-\frac{2}{k}} \log b_{\text{clip}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 n^2}{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \gamma}.$$

Corollary 6.1 bounds the error of our estimator with respect to the sample covariance of the clipped data. Bounding the error with respect to Σ then follows from combining the result of the corollary with the displays (2) and (3). For $m_k = O(1)$ and $n = \tilde{\Omega}(d)$, taking $b_{\text{clip}} = \tilde{\Omega}(\sqrt{d})$ and $\gamma = \tilde{O}(1)$ gives the result of Theorem 2.

References

- Y. Cheng, I. Diakonikolas, R. Ge, and D. Woodruff. Faster algorithms for high-dimensional robust covariance estimation. *arXiv:1906.04661 [cs.LG]*, 2019.
- Y. Cheng, I. Diakonikolas, R. Ge, and M. Soltanolkotabi. High-dimensional robust mean estimation via gradient descent. *arXiv:2005.01378 [cs.LG]*, 2020.
- J. Depersin and G. Lecué. Robust subgaussian estimation of a mean vector in nearly linear time. *arXiv:1906.03058 [math.ST]*, 2019.

- I. Diakonikolas and D. M. Kane. *Algorithmic High-dimensional Robust Statistics*. Cambridge University Press, 2022.
- I. Diakonikolas, G. Kamath, D. M. Kane, J. Li, A. Moitra, and A. Stewart. Robust estimators in high dimensions without the computational intractability. *arXiv:1604.06443 [cs.DS]*, 2016.
- I. Diakonikolas, S. B. Hopkins, A. Pensia, and S. Tiegel. SoS certificates for sparse singular values and their applications: Robust statistics, subspace distortion, and more. *arXiv:2412.21203 [cs.DS]*, 2024.
- Y. Dong, S. B. Hopkins, and J. Li. Quantum entropy scoring for fast robust mean estimation and improved outlier detection. *arXiv:1906.11366 [cs.DS]*, 2019.
- P. J. Huber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. *Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73–101, 1964.
- P. K. Kothari, J. Steinhardt, and D. Steurer. Robust moment estimation and improved clustering via sum of squares. In *Proceedings of the Fiftieth Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing*, 2018.
- K. A. Lai, A. B. Rao, and S. Vempala. Agnostic estimation of mean and covariance. *arXiv:1604.06968 [cs.DS]*, 2016.
- J. Li and G. Ye. Robust gaussian covariance estimation in nearly-matrix multiplication time. *arXiv:2006.13312 [cs.DS]*, 2020.
- G. Lugosi and S. Mendelson. Multivariate mean estimation with direction-dependent accuracy. *arXiv:2010.11921 [math.ST]*, 2020.
- S. Mendelson and N. Zhivotovskiy. Robust covariance estimation under $L_4 - L_2$ norm equivalence. *arXiv:1809.10462 [math.ST]*, 2018.
- R. I. Oliveira and Z. F. Rico. Improved covariance estimation: optimal robustness and sub-Gaussian guarantees under heavy tails. *arXiv:2209.13485 [math.ST]*, 2022.
- T. Tao. *Topics in Random Matrix Theory*, volume 132 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, 2012.
- J. W. Tukey. A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. In *Contributions to Probability and Statistics: Essays in Honor of Harold Hotelling*, volume 2 of *Stanford Studies in Mathematics and Statistics*. Stanford University Press, 1960.
- R. Vershynin. Introduction to the non-asymptotic analysis of random matrices. In *Compressed Sensing: Theory and Applications*, chapter 5, pages 210–268. Cambridge University Press, 2012.

A Helper Lemmas

A.1 Basic Lemmas

Lemma A.1 (Properties of d_{psd}). *Let A, B be p.s.d. matrices such that $d_{\text{psd}}(A, B) \leq c < 1$. Then,*

$$\left\| B^{1/2} A^{\dagger/2} \right\| \leq \sqrt{1+c} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{psd}}(B, A) \leq \frac{c}{1-c}$$

Proof First, suppose for contradiction that $\text{Col}(A) \neq \text{Col}(B)$. Then because $\text{Col}(B) \subseteq \text{Col}(A)$, we can pick a normal vector $v \in \text{Col}(A)$ that is orthogonal to $\text{Col}(B)$ and moreover, there exists a unique vector $u \in \text{Col}(A)$ such that $A^{\dagger/2}u = v$. Then we have that

$$u^T A^{\dagger/2} (B - A) A^{\dagger/2} u = v^T B v - u^T A^{\dagger/2} A A^{\dagger/2} u = u^T u,$$

which implies that $\|A^{\dagger/2}(B - A)A^{\dagger/2}\| \geq 1$, contradicting our assumption $d_{\text{psd}}(A, B) < 1$. Thus, $\text{Col}(A) = \text{Col}(B)$ and so by restricting to vectors in $\text{Col}(A)$, we can assume without loss of generality that A, B are both invertible. Then, because $\|A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2} - I\| = d_{\text{psd}}(A, B) \leq c$, we know that the spectrum of $A^{-1/2}BA^{-1/2}$ is contained in $[1 - c, 1 + c]$. Because for any matrix M , the singular values of MM^T are the square of the singular values of M , we have that the spectrum of $B^{1/2}A^{-1/2}$ is contained in $[\sqrt{1-c}, \sqrt{1+c}]$, proving the first claim. We then have that inverse $A^{1/2}B^{-1/2}$ has spectrum contained in $[1/\sqrt{1+c}, 1/\sqrt{1-c}]$, which implies the spectrum of $B^{-1/2}(A - B)B^{-1/2}$ is contained in $[\frac{1}{1+c} - 1, \frac{1}{1-c} - 1]$, proving the second claim. \square

A.2 Subgaussian concentration lemmas

Throughout this section, we let $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ for a σ^2 -hypercontractive subgaussian distribution P over \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero and covariance Σ (Definition 1.1).

Definition A.1 (Subgaussian random variable). *A random variable Y in \mathbb{R} is σ^2 -subgaussian if for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)}] \leq e^{\frac{\sigma^2 \lambda^2}{2}}$.*

Note for $Z \sim P$ and any $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ that $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z$ is σ^2 -subgaussian.

Definition A.2 (Sub-exponential random variable). *A random variable Y in \mathbb{R} is ν -sub-exponential if for all $\lambda \in [-1/\nu, 1/\nu]$, $\mathbb{E}[e^{\lambda(Y - \mathbb{E}Y)}] \leq e^{\nu^2 \lambda^2}$.*

Lemma A.2 (Tail bounds of subgaussians [Vershynin, 2012, Lemma 5.5]). *Let $c > 0$ be a sufficiently small constant. Let Y be a mean zero σ^2 -subgaussian random variable in \mathbb{R} . Then, for all $t \geq 0$, $\mathbb{P}(|Y| > t) \leq \exp(1 - c \frac{t^2}{\sigma^2})$.*

Lemma A.3 (Concentration of empirical covariance [Vershynin, 2012, Theorem 5.39]). *Let $\delta > 0$ and suppose $n \gtrsim \sigma^4 d + \log(1/\delta)$. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Z_i^T, \Sigma \right) = O \left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

Proof The result follows almost immediately from applying Vershynin [2012, Theorem 5.39] to the random variables $\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_1, \dots, \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_n$. \square

Lemma A.4 (Bernstein-type inequality [Vershynin, 2012, Proposition 5.16]). *Let $c > 0$ be a sufficiently small universal constant. Let Y_1, \dots, Y_n be independent ν -sub-exponential random variables. Then for any vector $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and every $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n a_i Y_i \right| \geq t \right) \leq 2 \exp \left[-c \min \left\{ \frac{t^2}{\nu^2 \|a\|_2^2}, \frac{t}{\nu \|a\|_\infty} \right\} \right].$$

Lemma A.5 (Square of subgaussian is sub-exponential [Vershynin, 2012, Lemma 5.14]). *If Y is σ^2 -subgaussian, then Y^2 is $2\sigma^2$ -sub-exponential.*

Lemma A.6 (Subgaussian ℓ_2 -norm boundedness). *Let $\delta > 0$. With probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|Z_i\|_\Sigma^2 \leq \sigma^2 \cdot O(d + \log(n/\delta)).$$

Proof We first observe that $\|Z_i\|_\Sigma = \|\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i\|$. Recalling that $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i$ is σ^2 -subgaussian for any $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have by a standard packing argument (see, e.g., Vershynin [2012, Chapter 5]) and Lemma A.2 that $\mathbb{P}(\|\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i\| > t) \leq 4^d \exp(1 - ct^2/\sigma^2)$. Picking $t^2 \gtrsim \sigma(d + \log(n/\delta))$, we have by a union bound over $i \in [n]$ that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\sup_{i \in [n]} \|Z_i\|_\Sigma^2 \leq t^2$, proving the claim. \square

A.3 Moment bounded concentration lemmas

Throughout this section, we let $Z_1, \dots, Z_n \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P$ for a distribution P over \mathbb{R}^d with mean zero, covariance Σ , and k -th moments bounded by m_k (Definition 1.2).

Definition A.3 (Moment bounded random variable). *A random variable $Y \in \mathbb{R}$ has k -th moments bounded by m_k if $\mathbb{E}[|Y|^k]^{1/k} \leq m_k$.*

Note for $Z \sim P$ and any $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ that $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z$ has k -th moments bounded by m_k .

Lemma A.7. *Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \in \mathbb{R}$ be independent random variables with mean zero and k -th moment bounded by m_k . Then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \geq \alpha \right) \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{ek}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\alpha \sqrt{n}} \right)^k.$$

Proof We adapt an argument from Tao [2012, Section 2.1] for bounding the deviation of the mean of k -moment bounded random variables.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \geq \alpha \right) &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right|^k \geq (n\alpha)^k \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{(n\alpha)^k} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right|^k \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Expanding the term in the expectation, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \right|^k \right] = \sum_{1 \leq i_1, \dots, i_k \leq n} \mathbb{E}[Y_{i_1} \dots Y_{i_k}].$$

Notice that for any choice of i_1, \dots, i_k such that any specific value occurs exactly once, the expectation is 0 by independence and the mean zero assumption. For other choices of i_1, \dots, i_k , the expectation is bounded by m_k^k by independence and Jensen's inequality. Thus, we count the number of ways to choose i_1, \dots, i_k such that no value appears exactly once. For such i_1, \dots, i_k , note that only at most $k/2$ distinct values can occur. Let N_r be the number of ways to assign i_1, \dots, i_k such that exactly $k/2 - r$ values appear. Then, following Tao [2012, Section 2.1], $N_r \leq \binom{n}{\frac{k}{2}-r} \left(\frac{k}{2} - r\right)^k \leq (en)^{\frac{k}{2}-r} \left(\frac{k}{2}\right)^{k/2+r}$, by Stirling's formula.. Thus the total number of assignments is bounded by

$$\sum_{r=0}^{k/2} N_r \leq \left(\frac{ekn}{2}\right)^{k/2} \sum_{r=0}^{k/2} \left(\frac{k}{2en}\right)^r \leq \left(\frac{ekn}{2}\right)^{k/2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - \frac{k}{2en}}\right) \leq 2 \left(\frac{ekn}{2}\right)^{k/2}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i \geq \alpha\right) \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{ek}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\alpha\sqrt{n}}\right)^k.$$

□

Lemma A.8. *Suppose $k \geq 2$. Then for $Z \sim P$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_{\Sigma}^k] \leq m_k^k d^{k/2} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{P}(\|Z\|_{\Sigma} > M) \leq \left(\frac{m_k \sqrt{d}}{M}\right)^k.$$

Proof The last claim follows from the first and Markov's inequality, and so we turn to proving the first claim. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_{\Sigma}^k] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^d (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot e_j)^2\right)^{k/2}\right] \\ &= d^{k/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot e_j)^2\right)^{k/2}\right] \\ &\leq d^{k/2} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d |\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot e_j|^k\right] \\ &\leq m_k^k d^{k/2}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality is from Jensen's inequality and the assumption that $k \geq 2$ and the second inequality follows from the moment boundedness assumption. □

Lemma A.9. *Let $Z \sim P$ and $t > 0$. Let $\bar{Z} = Z \mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_{\Sigma} \leq t\}$ and let $\bar{\mu} = \mathbb{E}[\bar{Z}]$ and $\bar{\Sigma} = \mathbb{E}[\bar{Z}\bar{Z}^T]$. Then,*

$$\|\bar{\mu}\|_{\Sigma} \leq m_k^k \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{t}\right)^{k-1} \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq m_k^k \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{t}\right)^{k-2}.$$

Proof To bound $\|\bar{\mu}\|_\Sigma$, recall that P has mean zero and so

$$\begin{aligned}\|\bar{\mu}\|_\Sigma &= \|\mathbb{E}[Z - Z\mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_\Sigma \leq t\}]\|_\Sigma \\ &= \|\mathbb{E}[Z\mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_\Sigma > t\}]\|_\Sigma \\ &= \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} \mathbb{E}[Z\mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_\Sigma > t\}] \cdot v).\end{aligned}$$

For every $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have by Hölder's inequality and Lemma A.8 that

$$\mathbb{E}[(\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot v) \mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_\Sigma > t\}] \leq \mathbb{E}[|\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot v|^k]^{\frac{1}{k}} \mathbb{P}(\|Z\|_\Sigma > t)^{1-\frac{1}{k}} \leq m_k^k \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{t}\right)^{k-1}.$$

We now turn to the covariance. Trivially, we have $\text{Col}(\bar{\Sigma}) \subseteq \text{Col}(\Sigma)$ and so $d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) < \infty$. Thus, it suffices to bound $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} (\Sigma - \bar{\Sigma}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v$ for each $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \text{Col}(\Sigma)$. To this end, we have by Hölder's inequality that

$$\begin{aligned}v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} (\Sigma - \bar{\Sigma}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v &= \mathbb{E}[(\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot v)^2 - (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z} \cdot v)^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot v)^2 \mathbf{1}\{\|Z\|_\Sigma > t\}] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[|v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z|^k]^{\frac{2}{k}} \mathbb{P}(\|Z\|_\Sigma > t)^{1-\frac{2}{k}}.\end{aligned}$$

The moment boundedness assumption gives $\mathbb{E}[|v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z|^k] \leq m_k^k$ and Lemma A.8 gives $\mathbb{P}(\|Z\|_\Sigma > t) \leq \left(\frac{m_k \sqrt{d}}{t}\right)^k$, proving the claim. \square

Lemma A.10 (Large points have large sample covariance norms). *Let C_k be a sufficiently large constant that depends only on k . Let $t > 0$ and $n \geq 2t^2$. With probability at least $1 - C_k m_k^k n^{1-k/2}$, we have for all $i \in [n]$ that if $\|Z_i\|_\Sigma > 2t$, then $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i > t^2$.*

Proof Almost surely $\text{span}(\mathcal{Z}) \subseteq \text{Col}(\Sigma)$, so we can assume both $Z_i^T \Sigma^\dagger Z_i$ and $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i$ are finite. We show for each $i \in [n]$ that $\|Z_i\|_\Sigma > 2t$ implies $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i > t^2$ with probability at least $1 - C_k m_k^k n^{-k/2}$. The desired claim then follows via a union bound over $i \in [n]$.

Applying the Sherman-Morrison formula gives

$$\begin{aligned}Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i &= Z_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) + \frac{1}{n} Z_i Z_i^T \right)^\dagger Z_i \\ &= Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i - \frac{(Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i)^2}{n + Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i} \\ &= \frac{n}{n + Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i} \cdot Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i.\end{aligned}$$

The final quantity is increasing in $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i$, so if $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i > 2t^2$ then

$$Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i > \frac{2t^2 n}{n + 2t^2} \geq t^2.$$

Thus, it suffices to show that $\|Z_i\|_\Sigma > 2t$ implies $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i > 2t^2$ with probability at least $1 - C_k m_k^k n^{-k/2}$. To this end, we have by Cauchy-Schwarz that

$$\|Z_i\|_\Sigma^4 = (Z_i^T \Sigma^\dagger Z_i)^2 = (Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger)^2 \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^2 \Sigma^\dagger Z_i^2 \leq (Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^\dagger Z_i) \cdot (Z_i^T \Sigma^\dagger \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) \Sigma^\dagger Z_i),$$

which implies for $V_i = \frac{\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i}{\|Z_i\|_{\Sigma}}$ that

$$Z_i^T \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^{\dagger} Z_i \geq \|Z_i\|_{\Sigma}^2 (V_i^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} V_i)^{-1}.$$

Because V_i and \mathcal{Z}_{-i} are independent, we can fix $V_i = v$ and show a high probability upper bound on $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v$ over the distribution of \mathcal{Z}_{-i} . Expanding gives

$$v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j \neq i} (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_j \cdot v)^2,$$

where by Lemma A.7 we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j \neq i} (\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_j \cdot v)^2 - 1 \geq \alpha \right) \leq 2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{ek}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\alpha \sqrt{n-1}} \right)^k.$$

Thus, with probability at least $1 - C_k m_k n^{-k/2}$ over the randomness of \mathcal{Z}_{-i} , we have that $v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i}) \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v \leq 2$. Therefore, with at least that same probability we have

$$Z_i^T \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^{\dagger} Z_i \geq \|Z_i\|_{\Sigma}^2 / 2,$$

from which it follows that $\|Z_i\|_{\Sigma} > 2t$ implies $Z_i^T \Sigma (\mathcal{Z}_{-i})^{\dagger} Z_i > (2t)^2 / 2 \geq 2t^2$. \square

Lemma A.11 (Sample covariance of bounded random variables). *Let $Y_1, \dots, Y_n \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} P$ such that $\mathbb{E}[Y_1 Y_1^T] = \Sigma$ and $\|Y_1\|_{\Sigma} \leq M$ almost surely. Then with probability at least $1 - \delta$ we have*

$$d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Y_i Y_i^T, \Sigma \right) = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{M^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

Proof This follows immediately from applying Vershynin [2012, Theorem 5.41] on the whitened data $\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Y_i$. Note that in our setting $\mathbb{E}[\Sigma^{\dagger/2} Y_1]$ need not be 0, but Vershynin [2012, Theorem 5.41] only states their concentration result for isotropic random variables. This is not a problem because the proof of Vershynin [2012, Theorem 5.41] does not rely on the mean being zero, it only requires that the second moment be the identity. \square

Lemma A.12 (Oliveira and Rico [2022, Proposition 3.4]). *Suppose Y_1, \dots, Y_n are i.i.d. non-negative real random variables with $\mathbb{E}[Y_1^q] < \infty$ for $q \geq 2$ and let W_1, \dots, W_n be an η -contamination of Y_1, \dots, Y_n . Let $c > 0$ be a universal constant, let $\alpha \in (0, 1)$. For $k = \lfloor \eta n \rfloor + \lceil c \eta n + \log(2/\alpha) \rceil$, let $T_k = \inf_{S \subseteq [n], |S|=k} \sum_{i \in S} \frac{W_i}{n-k}$. If $k < n$, then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|T_k - \mathbb{E}[Y_1]| \leq C \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[Y_1^2] \log(2/\alpha)}{n}} + C_c \mathbb{E}[Y_1^q]^{\frac{1}{q}} \eta^{1-\frac{1}{q}} \right) \geq 1 - \alpha,$$

for universal constants $C, C_c > 0$ where C_c only depends on c .

B Proofs for Section 4.1

B.1 Proof of Proposition 1

Rather than using Lemma 4.2 directly, we will instead use the following corollary, which converts the bound in Lemma 4.2 from being in terms of R_ℓ^{norm} and S_ℓ to being in terms of R^{norm} and S .

Corollary B.1 (Corollary of Lemma 4.2). *Suppose $m \geq \frac{12et_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{t_{\text{inner}}}$. For all $T \subseteq R^{\text{norm}}$ such that $|T| \leq m$ and all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned} & v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{8m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}, 32e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot v^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Corollary B.1 For $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$, applying Lemma 4.2 to the subset $T \cap R_\ell^{\text{norm}}$ gives for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$

$$\begin{aligned} u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{T \cap R_\ell^{\text{norm}}}) u & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}} \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_\ell^{\text{norm}}}) u, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) u \right\} \\ & \leq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}} \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) u, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) u \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is because $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_\ell^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})$ and $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S)$.

Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) u & = u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{T \cap R_1^{\text{norm}}}) u + u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{T \cap R_2^{\text{norm}}}) u \\ & \leq 2 \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}} \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) u, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) u \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the desired claim follows by letting $u = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v$. \square

We now prove Proposition 1.

First consider the case that $\|\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2}\| \leq \frac{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}{4e \log(t_{\text{norm}})}$. By Line 12, ALG immediately terminates and outputs $\Sigma_{\text{ALG}} = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})$. Thus, we need to show that in this case, $(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}) \cdot \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq \frac{1 + \alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}} \cdot \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$. Because we assumed $n \geq \frac{12et_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}$, we can apply Corollary B.1 with $m = \varepsilon n$ and $T = B \cap R^{\text{norm}}$ to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R^{\text{norm}}}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\| \\ & \leq \max \left\{ 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}, 32e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\| \right\} \\ & \leq 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then, because $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{B \cap R^{\text{norm}}}) = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}})$, we have $d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}}), \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})) \leq 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}$, which implies $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq (1 - 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}})^{-1} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}})$. We also have $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})$ because $G \cap R^{\text{norm}} \subseteq R^{\text{norm}}$. Furthermore, Lemma 4.1 gives that $|G \cap R^{\text{norm}}| = |G \cap R^{\text{start}}| \geq (1 - (1 + C)\varepsilon)n \geq n - m_{\text{op}}$, and so operator-norm resilience gives by Lemma 3.1 that $(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq (1 + \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$. Combining all these bounds yields,

$$(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}}) \preceq \frac{1 + \alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - 8\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}),$$

which proves the desired claim for this case.

Now consider the case that $\|\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S)\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2}\| > \frac{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}{4e \log(t_{\text{norm}})}$. In this case, **ALG** does not terminate at the current iteration, and so we need to show that **ALG** will remove more points from B than from G on average. Observe that **ALG** only removes points in the norm filter of Line 6 and the randomized filter of Line 21. Moreover, Lemma 4.1 gives that the norm filter only removes points in B . Thus, it suffices to show that the randomized filter will on average remove more points from B than from G ; i.e., that $\mathbb{E}[|B \cap (R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})|] > \mathbb{E}[|G \cap (R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})|]$. Because B and G partition $[n]$, this claim is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{E}[|G \cap (R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})|] < \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{E}[|R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}}|].$$

To prove this, we first observe that after the if-statement check in Line 12 fails, **ALG** computes $v_S \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ such that

$$v_S^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S = \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\| > \frac{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}{4e \log(t_{\text{norm}})}.$$

Then, **ALG** filters each point $i \in R^{\text{norm}}$ with probability $\frac{1}{w_{\text{max}}}(x_i \cdot \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S)^2 \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\}$. By linearity of expectation, we thus have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}}|] &= \frac{1}{w_{\text{max}}} \sum_{i \in R^{\text{norm}}} (x_i \cdot \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S)^2 \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\} \\ &= \frac{1}{w_{\text{max}}} \sum_{i \in S} v_S^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} x_i x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S \\ &= \frac{n}{w_{\text{max}}} \cdot v_S^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S \\ &> \frac{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}{4e \log(t_{\text{norm}})} \cdot \frac{n}{w_{\text{max}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

On the other hand, we can bound the expected number of good points removed by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|G \cap (R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})|] &= \frac{1}{w_{\text{max}}} \sum_{i \in G \cap R^{\text{norm}}} (x_i \cdot \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S)^2 \mathbf{1}\{i \in S\} \\ &= \frac{n}{w_{\text{max}}} \cdot v_S^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} v_S \\ &\leq \frac{n}{w_{\text{max}}} \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\|. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

To bound $\left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\|$, we begin by bounding the number of good points added to S . First note that $|(G \cap R^{\text{norm}})| = n - |B| - |G \setminus R^{\text{start}}| \geq n - (1 + C)\varepsilon n$. Then because $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4(1+C)}$ and $m_{\text{op}} \geq (1 + C)\varepsilon n$, we may apply Lemma 4.3 to obtain

$$|G \cap S| \leq 4m_{\text{inner}} + |B \cap R^{\text{norm}}| + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}(n - |G \cap R^{\text{norm}}|).$$

Because we also assume that $m_{\text{op}} \geq 4m_{\text{inner}} + \left(1 + \frac{72(1+C)t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}\right)\varepsilon n$, the above display implies $|G \cap S| \leq m_{\text{op}}$. Thus, $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilience implies $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \preceq \alpha_{\text{op}} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$ and so

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\| &\leq \alpha_{\text{op}} \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger/2} \right\| \\ &= \alpha_{\text{op}} \left\| \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^{1/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^{\dagger} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^{1/2} \right\|. \end{aligned}$$

Then observe that $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger = \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger \preceq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger$, where the last bound is by Lemma 3.1. This implies $\|\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger / 2 \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap S}) \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger / 2\| \leq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}}$. Plugging this into (5), we have that $\mathbb{E}[|G \cap (R^{\text{norm}} \setminus R^{\text{end}})|] \leq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{n}{w_{\text{max}}}$. Because we assume $t_{\text{inner}} \geq \frac{8e\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, the desired claim follows by combining this with (4).

B.2 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Lemma B.1 (Anti-concentration). *Let X be a non-negative random variable with $\mathbb{E}[X] = \mu$. Then for all $\gamma > 0$, there exists $t \geq \mu/2$ such that*

$$\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) \geq \frac{\gamma\mu}{2} t^{-(1+\gamma)}.$$

Proof Suppose for contradiction that for some $\gamma > 0$ and all $t \geq \mu/2$ that $\mathbb{P}(X \geq t) < \frac{\gamma\mu}{2} t^{-(1+\gamma)}$. Then

$$\mu = \mathbb{E}[X] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(X \geq t) dt < \frac{\mu}{2} + \int_{\mu/2}^\infty \frac{\gamma\mu}{2} t^{-(1+\gamma)} dt \implies \frac{1}{\gamma} < \int_{\mu/2}^\infty t^{-(1+\gamma)} dt.$$

However, the right-hand side is less than $1/\gamma$, yielding a contradiction. \square

Lemma B.2 (Bounded number of negatively correlated points). *Let $v_1, \dots, v_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that for all distinct $i, j \in [k]$, $\|v_i\|^2 \leq M^2$ and $v_i^T v_j \leq -b$. Then $k \leq \frac{M^2}{b} + 1$.*

Proof Observe that

$$0 \leq \left\| \sum_{i=1}^k v_i \right\|^2 = \sum_{i=1}^k \|v_i\|^2 + \sum_{i \neq j} v_i^T v_j \leq kM^2 - k(k-1)b.$$

Rearranging yields the result. \square

Lemma B.3 (Restatement of Lemma 4.2). *Let $\ell, \ell' \in \{1, 2\}$ for $\ell \neq \ell'$. Let $m \geq \frac{12et_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{t_{\text{inner}}}$. Then for all $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $T \subseteq R_\ell^{\text{norm}}$ such that $|T| \leq m$ we have*

$$u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) u \leq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}} \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}) u, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot u^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) u \right\}.$$

Proof The second claim of Lemma 4.1 implies for all $i \in R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}$ that $x_i \in \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}))$. Then because $T, S_\ell \subseteq R_\ell^{\text{norm}}$, we see that $\text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T)), \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell})) \subseteq \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}))$. This implies that it suffices to prove the claim for only $u \in \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}))$.

Now, let $A = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}})^\dagger / 2$ for convenience. Rescaling $u \in \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}))$ by A , it suffices to show for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_{\ell'}^{\text{norm}}}))$ that

$$v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) A v \leq \max \left\{ \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}, 16e \log(t_{\text{norm}}) \cdot v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) A v \right\}. \quad (6)$$

Again for convenience, let $\beta = v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) A v$. Equation (6) is immediate for $\beta \leq \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}$, so suppose $\beta > \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}$. Let $I \sim \text{Uni}(T)$. Then $\mathbb{E}[x_I x_I^T] = \frac{n}{|T|} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T)$, which implies

$$\mathbb{E}[(x_I \cdot Av)^2] = \frac{n}{|T|} \cdot v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) A v = \frac{n\beta}{|T|}.$$

Because $T \subseteq R^{\text{norm}}$, from Lemma 4.1 we have for all $i \in T$ that

$$(x_i \cdot Av)^2 \leq x_i^T A^2 x_i \leq t_{\text{norm}}^2. \quad (7)$$

Lemma B.1 implies for all $\gamma > 0$ there exists $t \geq \frac{n\beta}{2|T|}$ such that

$$\mathbb{P}((x_I \cdot Av)^2 \geq t) \geq \frac{\gamma n \beta}{2|T|} t^{-(1+\gamma)} \geq t_{\text{norm}}^{-2\gamma} \frac{\gamma n \beta}{2|T|t},$$

where the second inequality follows because (7) implies $t \leq t_{\text{norm}}^2$. Picking $\gamma = \frac{1}{2} \log^{-1}(t_{\text{norm}})$ yields $\mathbb{P}((x_I \cdot Av)^2 \geq t) \geq \frac{\gamma n \beta}{2et|T|}$, which implies

$$|\{i \in T \mid x_i \cdot Av \geq \sqrt{t}\}| \geq \frac{\gamma \beta n}{4et} \quad \text{or} \quad |\{i \in T \mid -x_i \cdot Av \geq \sqrt{t}\}| \geq \frac{\gamma \beta n}{4et}.$$

We will prove the claim assuming the first case, as the second case is symmetric.

Let $T' = \{i \in T \mid x_i \cdot Av \geq \sqrt{t}\}$. Then we have that

$$v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) Av = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S_\ell} (x_i \cdot Av)^2 \geq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in T' \cap S_\ell} (x_i \cdot Av)^2 \geq \frac{t}{n} |T' \cap S_\ell|. \quad (8)$$

We proceed to lower bound $|T' \cap S_\ell|$ in terms of β . Notice that for all $i, j \in T'$, we have $(x_i \cdot Av)(x_j \cdot Av) \geq t$. For distinct $i, j \in T' \setminus S_\ell$, the fact that S_ℓ contains neither i nor j implies $|x_i^T A^2 x_j| \leq t_{\text{inner}}$. Now observe the following identity that holds for all $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$:

$$x^T A^2 y = (x \cdot Av)(y \cdot Av) + (Ax - (x \cdot Av)v) \cdot (Ay - (y \cdot Av)v).$$

Defining $y_i := (Ax_i - (x_i \cdot Av)v)$ for $i \in [n]$, we have for all distinct $i, j \in T' \setminus S_\ell$ that

$$(x_i \cdot Av)(x_j \cdot Av) + y_i \cdot y_j = x_i^T A^2 x_j \leq |x_i^T A^2 x_j| \leq t_{\text{inner}}.$$

Combining this with the fact that $(x_i \cdot Av)(x_j \cdot Av) \geq t$, we thus see that $-y_i \cdot y_j \geq t - t_{\text{inner}}$. Because we assumed $|T| \leq m$ and $\beta > \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}$, we have that $t \geq \frac{n\beta}{2|T|} \geq 2t_{\text{inner}}$, and so $-y_i \cdot y_j \geq t/2$. Also, the norm-filter step guarantees from Lemma 4.1 that gives that $\|y_i\|^2 \leq \|Ax_i\|^2 \leq t_{\text{norm}}^2$ for all $i \in T'$. Thus, applying Lemma B.2 to $\{y_i \mid i \in T' \setminus S_\ell\}$ gives us $|T' \setminus S_\ell| \leq \frac{2t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t} + 1 \leq \frac{3t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t}$. This implies

$$|T' \cap S_\ell| = |T'| - |T' \setminus S_\ell| \geq \frac{1}{t} \left(\frac{\gamma \beta n}{4e} - 3t_{\text{norm}}^2 \right) \geq \frac{\gamma \beta n}{8et},$$

where the last inequality is by $\beta > \frac{4m}{n} t_{\text{inner}}$ and $m \geq \frac{12et_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{t_{\text{inner}}}$. Combining this with (8), we have $v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{S_\ell}) Av \geq \frac{\gamma \beta}{8e} = \frac{1}{16e \log(t_{\text{norm}})} v^T A \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_T) Av$, which is precisely what we wanted to show in (6). \square

B.3 Proof of Lemma 4.3

Recall that in our notation, for an arbitrary dataset $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m y_i y_i^T$ and for $T \subseteq [m]$, we denote $\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} y_i y_i^T$.

Lemma B.4. Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $i \in [m]$, $y_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger y_i \leq M^2$. Also let $\gamma, b > 0$, $T \subseteq [m]$ and $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that $\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) \preceq \frac{\gamma m}{k} \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)$ and for all $j \in [k]$, $w_j^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) w_j \geq b$. Then $k \leq \frac{\gamma M^2}{b} (m - |T|)$.

Proof

Let $J \sim \text{Uni}([k])$ so that we have $\mathbb{E}[w_J w_J^T] = \Sigma(\mathcal{W})$. Then because $w_J^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) w_J \geq b$ almost surely, we have that

$$b \leq \mathbb{E}[w_J^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) w_J] = \text{tr}((\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) \Sigma(\mathcal{W})).$$

Notice $\text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{W})) \subseteq \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)) \subseteq \text{Col}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}))$, so that $\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) \preceq \frac{\gamma m}{k} \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)$ implies

$$\text{tr}((\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) \Sigma(\mathcal{W})) \leq \frac{\gamma m}{k} \text{tr}((\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)).$$

To bound the trace, we first have

$$\text{tr}((\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)) = \text{tr}(I - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)) = \text{tr}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}) - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T))).$$

Then because $\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}) - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [m] \setminus T} y_i y_i^T$, we have

$$\text{tr}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}) - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T))) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in [m] \setminus T} y_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger y_i \leq \frac{M^2 (m - |T|)}{m}.$$

Combining all of the above displays and rearranging proves the claim. \square

Lemma B.5 (Restatement of Lemma 4.3). Suppose $t_{\text{inner}} \geq 2b_{\text{inner}}$, $t_{\text{norm}} \geq b_{\text{norm}}$, and $|G \cap R^{\text{norm}}| \geq n - \min\{m_{\text{op}}, \frac{n}{4}\}$. Then we have

$$|G \cap S| \leq 4m_{\text{inner}} + |B \cap R^{\text{norm}}| + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (n - |G \cap R^{\text{norm}}|).$$

Proof Throughout this proof, we denote R^{norm} as R for ease of notation.

Now S is a union of S_1 and S_2 , where $S_1 = \text{ComputeS}(\mathcal{X}_{R_1}, \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2}), t_{\text{inner}})$ and $S_2 = \text{ComputeS}(\mathcal{X}_{R_2}, \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_1}), t_{\text{inner}})$. We note that $S_1 \subseteq R_1$ and $S_2 \subseteq R_2$. For $S_1 \subseteq R_1$, this is because S_1 is constructed from pairs $i, j \in [n]$ for which the corresponding entries in \mathcal{X}_{R_1} have $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})$ -normalized inner product exceeding t_{inner} . However, for $i \in R_1$, the i th entry of \mathcal{X}_{R_1} is 0, and so has an inner product of 0 with all other entries of \mathcal{X}_{R_1} . A symmetric argument applies for $S_2 \subseteq R_2$.

Thus, we have that \mathbb{H}_1^n and \mathbb{H}_2^n partition $[n]$, R_1 and R_2 partition R , and S_1 and S_2 partition S . It therefore suffices to show that

$$\begin{aligned} |G \cap S_1| &\leq 2m_{\text{inner}} + |B \cap R_1| + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|), \text{ and} \\ |G \cap S_2| &\leq 2m_{\text{inner}} + |B \cap R_2| + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_1^n| - |G \cap R_1|). \end{aligned}$$

We will only show the first inequality, as the argument for the second inequality is symmetric.

Because $S_1 = \text{ComputeS}(\mathcal{X}_{R_1}, \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2}), t_{\text{inner}})$ is constructed by adding pairs of indices $i, j \in R_1$, we can, for every $i \in S_1$, define $j(i) \in S_1$ to be the other index that i was added to S_1 alongside. Because the condition in Line 2 of `ComputeS` prevents a point from being added

to S_1 more than once, we have that the choice of $j(i)$ is unique for each $i \in S_1$ and that $j(i) \neq j(i')$ for distinct $i, i' \in S_1$.

To bound $|G \cap S_1|$, first observe that for each $i \in G \cap S_1$, either $j(i) \in B \cap S_1$ or $j(i) \in G \cap S_1$. By injectivity of $j(\cdot)$, there are at most $|B \cap S_1|$ points $i \in G \cap S_1$ are such that $j(i) \in B \cap S_1$. Moreover, because $S_1 \subseteq R_1$, we have $|B \cap S_1| \leq |B \cap R_1|$. Therefore, all we need to show is

$$|\{i \in G \cap S_1 \mid j(i) \in G \cap S_1\}| \leq 2m_{\text{inner}} + \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|).$$

Now consider the set $Q = \{i \in G \cap S_1 \mid j(i) \in G \cap S_1, |x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger x_{j(i)}| > b_{\text{inner}}\}$. Because \mathcal{Z} is $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded, there exists a set T with $|T| \geq n - |\mathbb{H}_2^n| - m_{\text{inner}}$ such that $|z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger z_j| \leq b_{\text{inner}}$ for all distinct $i, j \in T$. By inclusion-exclusion, we have that $|Q \cap T| \geq |Q| - m_{\text{inner}}$. Thus, if $|Q| \geq 2m_{\text{inner}} + 1$, we have by Pigeonhole Principle that for some $i \in Q$, both $i \in T$ and $j(i) \in T$. This contradicts the definition of Q and so we have $|Q| \leq 2m_{\text{inner}}$. Thus, it only remains to show

$$|\{i \in G \cap S_1 \mid j(i) \in G \cap S_1, |x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger x_{j(i)}| \leq b_{\text{inner}}\}| \leq \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|).$$

Let $i \in G \cap S_1$ such that $j = j(i) \in G \cap S_1$ and $|x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger x_{j(i)}| \leq b_{\text{inner}}$. We may upper bound $|x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger x_j|$ as

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger x_j| &\leq \left| x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger x_j \right| + \left| x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_j \right| \\ &\quad + \left| x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_j \right|. \end{aligned}$$

The first term is bounded by b_{inner} by assumption. Now notice that $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2}) = \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R_2}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})$ and $\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2}) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})$, and so by applying Cauchy-Schwarz,

$$\begin{aligned} |x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger x_j| &\leq b_{\text{inner}} + \sqrt{x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_i} \sqrt{x_j^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_j} \\ &\quad + \sqrt{x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_i} \sqrt{x_j^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_j}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining this with the facts that $|x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger x_j| > t_{\text{inner}}$ and $b_{\text{inner}} \leq \frac{1}{2}t_{\text{inner}}$, we must have that

1. $x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_i \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}$; or
2. $x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_i \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}$; or
3. $x_j^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_j \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}$; or
4. $x_j^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_j \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}$.

Now define the sets

$$\begin{aligned} Q &:= \{i \in G \cap R_1 \mid x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger \right) x_i \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}\}, \\ Q' &:= \{i \in G \cap R_1 \mid x_i^T \left(\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger \right) x_i \geq \frac{1}{4}t_{\text{inner}}\}. \end{aligned}$$

We have shown that for $i \in G \cap S_1$ such that $j(i) \in G \cap S_1$, either $i \in Q \cup Q'$ or $j(i) \in Q \cup Q'$. Because $j(\cdot)$ is injective, this allows to conclude that $|G \cap S_1| \leq 2|Q \cup Q'| \leq 2|Q| + 2|Q'|$. Before bounding $|Q|$ and $|Q'|$, we first note that by assumption on $|G \cap R|$, we have

$$|\mathbb{H}_2^n \setminus (G \cap R_2)| \leq |[n] \setminus (G \cap R)| \leq \min\{m_{\text{op}}, \frac{n}{4}\}.$$

Then because \mathcal{Z} is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient, we have by Lemma 3.1 that $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n}) \preceq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R_2})$.

Now to bound $|Q|$, we will apply Lemma B.4 to

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{z_i \mid i \in \mathbb{H}_2^n\}, \quad \mathcal{W} = \{x_i \mid i \in Q\}, \quad \text{and} \quad T = G \cap R_2.$$

To do so, we first need to find the values of M, C, b with which we can apply the lemma. Because \mathcal{Z} is b_{norm} -norm bounded, we have for all $i \in \mathbb{H}_2^n$ that

$$z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger z_i = \frac{|\mathbb{H}_2^n|}{n} z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger z_i \leq \frac{1}{2} b_{\text{norm}}^2,$$

so we may take $M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$. By definition of Q , we have for $i \in Q$ that

$$x_i^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) x_i = \frac{|\mathbb{H}_2^n|}{n} x_i^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})^\dagger) x_i \geq \frac{1}{8} t_{\text{inner}},$$

so we may take $b = \frac{1}{8} t_{\text{inner}}$. Finally, to find γ , we first note that because \mathcal{Z} is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient, we have that $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq \frac{3}{4} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$. Since $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}) = \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) + \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})$, this implies that $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq 3\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n})$. Thus, because $Q \subseteq \mathbb{H}_1^n$, we have

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) = \frac{n}{|Q|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_Q) \preceq \frac{n}{|Q|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq \frac{3n}{|Q|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n}) \preceq \frac{3n}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})|Q|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R_2}) = \frac{3|\mathbb{H}_2^n|}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})|Q|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T),$$

and so we may take $\gamma = 3(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1}$. Applying Lemma B.4 with these quantities, we can conclude that $|Q| \leq \frac{3}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{b_{\text{norm}}^2}{2} \cdot \frac{8}{t_{\text{inner}}} \cdot (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|) \leq \frac{12t_{\text{norm}}^2}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|)$.

To bound $|Q'|$, we will similarly apply Lemma B.4 to

$$\mathcal{Y} = \{x_i \mid i \in R_2\}, \quad \mathcal{W} = \{x_i \mid i \in Q'\}, \quad \text{and} \quad T = G \cap R_2.$$

Again, we need to find the values of M, C, b with which we can apply Lemma B.4 to these datasets. For M , we have by Lemma 4.1 that for all $i \in R_2$,

$$x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger x_i = \frac{|R_2|}{n} x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger x_i \leq \frac{1}{2} t_{\text{norm}}^2,$$

so we may take $M = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} t_{\text{norm}}$. By definition of Q' , we have for $i \in Q'$ that

$$x_i^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) x_i = \frac{|R_2|}{n} x_i^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2})^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{R_2})^\dagger) x_i \geq \frac{|R_2|}{4n} t_{\text{inner}}.$$

Now note that

$$|R_2| \geq |G \cap R_2| = |\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |\mathbb{H}_2^n \setminus (G \cap R_2)| \geq \frac{n}{2} - \min\left\{m_{\text{op}}, \frac{n}{4}\right\} \geq \frac{n}{4},$$

so we may take $b = \frac{1}{16}t_{\text{inner}}$. Finally, to find γ , by the same argument as when we computed γ for $|Q|$, we have that

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) \preceq \frac{3n}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})|Q'|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{G \cap R_2}) = \frac{3n}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})|Q'|} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{G \cap R_2}) = \frac{3|R_2|}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})|Q'|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T),$$

and so we may take $\gamma = 3(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1}$. Applying Lemma B.4 with these quantities, we can conclude that $|Q'| \leq \frac{3}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2}{2} \cdot \frac{16}{t_{\text{inner}}} \cdot (|R_2| - |G \cap R_2|) \leq \frac{24t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|)$. Putting it all together, we have $2|Q| + 2|Q'| \leq \frac{72t_{\text{norm}}^2}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})t_{\text{inner}}} (|\mathbb{H}_2^n| - |G \cap R_2|)$, proving the claim. \square

C Proofs for Section 5

C.1 Proof of Lemma 5.1

We split the proof into two lemmas. Lemma C.1 shows that b_{norm} -norm and $(0, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product boundedness hold with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$. Lemma C.2 shows that $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilience with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$. A union bound then proves the claim.

Lemma C.1 (Norm and inner product boundedness). *Suppose $n \gtrsim \max\{\sigma^4 d + \log(1/\delta), \sigma^2(d + \log(n/\delta))\}$. Then there exists b_{norm} and b_{inner} satisfying*

$$b_{\text{norm}}^2 = O(\sigma^2 \cdot (d + \log(n/\delta))) \quad \text{and} \quad b_{\text{inner}} = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log(n^2/\delta)} b_{\text{norm}}$$

such that with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$, \mathcal{Z} is b_{norm} -norm bounded and $(0, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded.

Proof Expanding out the definitions of norm and inner product boundedness, we need to show that there exists $b_{\text{norm}}, b_{\text{inner}}$ satisfying $b_{\text{norm}}^2 = O(\sigma^2 \cdot (d + \log(n/\delta)))$ and $b_{\text{inner}} = \sigma \sqrt{2 \log(n^2/\delta)} b_{\text{norm}}$ such that with probability at least $1 - 3\delta$,

$$\max_{\ell \in \{1, 2\}} \sup_{i \in [n]} Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_i \leq b_{\text{norm}}^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \max_{\ell \in \{1, 2\}} \sup_{\substack{i, j \in [n] \setminus \mathbb{H}_\ell^n \\ i \neq j}} |Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j| \leq b_{\text{inner}}.$$

We begin by using independence and subgaussianity to bound the inner products between distinct points in terms of the norms of the points. For $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and distinct $i, j \in [n] \setminus \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$, notice that \mathcal{Z}_{-i} determines $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j$. Therefore, fixing \mathcal{Z}_{-i} , we have over the randomness of Z_i that $Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j$ is subgaussian with variance proxy $\sigma^2 \|\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j\|^2$. A subgaussian tail bound (Lemma A.2) gives that with probability at least $1 - \beta$ over the randomness of Z_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j| &\leq \sigma \sqrt{\log(e/\beta)} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j\| \\ &\leq \sigma \sqrt{1 + \log(1/\beta)} \|\Sigma^{1/2} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger\| \|\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger\| Z_j. \end{aligned}$$

Taking $\beta = \frac{\delta}{n^2}$ and a union bound, we have that the above holds simultaneously for all $\ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and all distinct pairs $i, j \in [n] \setminus \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$.

Now suppose we further condition on the events that

$$\max_{\ell \in \{1, 2\}} d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n}), \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$\sup_{i \in [n]} \|Z_i\|_{\Sigma}^2 \leq \sigma^2 \cdot O(d + \log(n/\delta)) = \frac{1}{2} b_{\text{norm}}^2,$$

both of which happen with probability at least $1 - \delta$ by Lemmas A.3 and A.6, respectively. We will now show that both of the desired claims hold.

First note that $d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n}), \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ implies $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n}) \succeq \frac{1}{2}\Sigma$. This then implies both

$$\|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger\Sigma^{1/2}\| \leq 2 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^{\dagger/2}\| \leq \sqrt{2}.$$

Then the first claim follows immediately by Cauchy-Schwarz because

$$\max_{\ell \in \{1,2\}} \sup_{i \in [n]} Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_i \leq \max_{\ell \in \{1,2\}} \sup_{i \in [n]} \|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger\Sigma^{1/2}\| \left\| \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i \right\|^2 \leq b_{\text{norm}}^2.$$

The second claim also follows immediately because for all $\ell \in \{1,2\}$ and distinct pairs $i, j \in [n] \setminus \mathbb{H}_\ell^n$, our earlier bound gives

$$\begin{aligned} |Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^\dagger Z_j| &\leq \sigma \sqrt{1 + \log(n^2/\delta)} \|\Sigma^{1/2}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^{\dagger/2}\| \|\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_{\mathbb{H}_\ell^n})^{\dagger/2} Z_j\| \\ &\leq \sigma \sqrt{2(1 + \log(n^2/\delta))} b_{\text{norm}}. \end{aligned}$$

This proves the claim. \square

We adapt the following argument for operator norm resilience of subgaussian data from Diaconikolas and Kane [2022, Proposition 3.3].

Lemma C.2 (Subgaussian operator norm resilience). *Let $n \gtrsim \sigma^4 d + \log(1/\delta)$ and $m_{\text{op}} \leq n$. Then there exists α_{op} satisfying*

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} = 2 \left(1 + 2\sigma^2 \log \left(\frac{n}{2m_{\text{op}}} \right) \right) \cdot \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n} + O \left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

such that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, \mathcal{Z} is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient.

Proof Let $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$ and for ease of notation, let $m = |H| = \frac{n}{2}$. We will show the required properties for H hold with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, so that the claim follows by a union bound over H .

We first show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \preceq \frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$. Because $n \geq m \gtrsim \sigma^4 d + \log(4/\delta)$, we have by Lemma A.3 that probability $1 - \delta$,

$$d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Z_i Z_i^T, \Sigma \right) \leq c \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Z_i^T, \Sigma \right) \leq c,$$

where $c > 0$ is a small constant we will set later. This implies $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Z_i Z_i^T \preceq (1+c)\Sigma$ and $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Z_i^T \succeq (1-c)\Sigma$ so that

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in S} Z_i Z_i^T \preceq \frac{(1+c)}{(1-c)n} \sum_{i=1}^n Z_i Z_i^T \implies 2\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \preceq \frac{1+c}{1-c}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}).$$

Picking $c = \frac{1}{5}$, we obtain $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) \preceq \frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\mathcal{Z})$, proving the first requirement.

Now we show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in T} Z_i Z_i^T \preceq \alpha_{\text{op}} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H)$$

for all $T \subseteq H$ such that $|T| \leq m_{\text{op}}$.

By $d_{\text{psd}}(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Z_i Z_i^T, \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{5}$, we know that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Z_i Z_i^T \succeq \frac{1}{2}\Sigma$. Noting that $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_H) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i \in H} Z_i Z_i^T$, it thus suffices to show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} Z_i Z_i^T \preceq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{2} \Sigma$$

for all $T \subseteq H$ such that $|T| \leq m_{\text{op}}$. Equivalently, we want to show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \text{Col}(\Sigma)$ that

$$\sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i)^2 = \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} Z_i Z_i^T \right] \Sigma^{\dagger/2} v \leq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{2}.$$

Let \mathcal{V} be a $\frac{1}{4}$ -net of $\mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \text{Col}(\Sigma)$, which we can take such that $|\mathcal{V}| \leq 9^d$ by Vershynin [2012, Lemma 5.2]. Then Vershynin [2012, Lemma 5.4] gives that

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i)^2 \leq 2 \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i)^2.$$

For each $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we will show that

$$\sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i)^2 \leq (1 + 2\sigma^2 \log(m/m_{\text{op}})) \cdot \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} + O\left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - 9^{-d}\delta$, so that the claim follows by a union bound over all $v \in \mathcal{V}$.

For a fixed $v \in \mathcal{V}$, let $Y_i = (v^T \Sigma^{\dagger/2} Z_i)^2$. We then have that Y_1, \dots, Y_n are i.i.d. σ^2 -sub-exponential random variables. Let $M > 0$ be a threshold we specify later. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} Y_i &\leq \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i \leq M\} + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\} \\ &\leq \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} \cdot M + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in S} Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\}. \end{aligned}$$

We now bound $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\}$ with high probability. Let $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\}]$. Be-

cause Y_i is σ^2 -sub-exponential, we first have that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu &= \mathbb{E}[Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\}] \\
&= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\} > t) dt \\
&= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}(Y_i > \max\{t, M\}) dt \\
&\leq \int_0^\infty \exp(-\max\{t, M\}/\sigma^2) dt. \\
&= \int_0^M \exp(-M/\sigma^2) dt + \int_M^\infty \exp(-t/\sigma^2) dt \\
&= (M + 1) \exp(-M/\sigma^2).
\end{aligned}$$

Then because $Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\}$ is also σ^2 -subexponential, we have by a Bernstein-type inequality (Lemma A.4) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in H} [Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\} - \mu] \geq t\right) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{i \in H} [Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\} - \mu] \geq tn\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-c \min\left\{\frac{(mt)^2}{\sigma^4 m}, \frac{mt}{\sigma^2}\right\}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

Picking

$$t \gtrsim \sigma^2 \left[\sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}} + \frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m} \right] \asymp \sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}},$$

we have $\mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} [Y_i \mathbf{1}\{Y_i > M\} - \mu] \geq t\right) \leq 9^{-d\delta}$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - 9^{-d\delta}$,

$$\sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} Y_i \leq \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} \cdot M + (M + 1) \exp(-M/\sigma^2) + O\left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}}\right).$$

By picking $M = \sigma^2 \log(m/m_{\text{op}})$, we prove the claim. \square

C.2 Proof of Corollary 5.1

For $m_{\text{inner}} = 0$ and any $m_{\text{op}} \leq n$, Lemma 5.1 gives that there exists $b_{\text{norm}}, b_{\text{inner}}, \alpha_{\text{op}}$ satisfying

$$\begin{aligned}
b_{\text{norm}}^2 &= \sigma^2 \cdot O(d + \log(n/\delta)) \\
b_{\text{inner}} &= 2\sigma \sqrt{2 \log(n^2/\delta)} b_{\text{norm}} \\
\alpha_{\text{op}} &= 2(1 + 2\sigma^2 \log(n/2m_{\text{op}})) \cdot \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n} + O\left(\sigma^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

such that with probability at least $1 - 7\delta$, the uncontaminated dataset \mathcal{Z} is $(b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good. To apply Theorem 3 with $C > 0$, we need $t_{\text{inner}}, t_{\text{norm}}$ to satisfy

1. $\varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{4(1+C)}$,

2. $t_{\text{norm}} \geq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$,
3. $t_{\text{inner}} \geq \max\left\{2b_{\text{inner}}, \frac{8\varepsilon\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right\}$,
4. $n \geq \frac{12\varepsilon t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}}$,
5. $m_{\text{op}} \geq \max\left\{1 + C, 1 + \frac{72(1+C)t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}\right\}\varepsilon n + 4m_{\text{inner}}$.

Picking $t_{\text{norm}} = (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$, we then need to pick t_{inner} satisfying

$$t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \max\left\{b_{\text{inner}}, \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\varepsilon}, \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon n}, \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2 \varepsilon n}{m_{\text{op}}}\right\}. \quad (9)$$

Because $\log(n/\delta) \lesssim d$ and $n \gtrsim \sigma^4 d$, we have that for a sufficiently small constant $c > 0$ and $m_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{cn}{\sigma^2 \log \sigma^2}$, the choice of α_{op} satisfies

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} = \sigma^2 \cdot O\left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n} \log\left(\frac{n}{m_{\text{op}}}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}\right) \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

This then implies $t_{\text{norm}} \asymp \sigma\sqrt{d}$ and we can simplify (9)

$$t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \max\left\{\sigma^2 \sqrt{d \log(n/\delta)}, \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(\sigma^2 d)}{\varepsilon}, \frac{\sigma^2 d \log(\sigma^2 d)}{\varepsilon n}, \frac{\sigma^2 \varepsilon d n}{m_{\text{op}}}\right\}.$$

Notice that we require $t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{\varepsilon}$, so that Theorem 3 gives an error bound of

$$\text{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})) \lesssim \alpha_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon t_{\text{inner}} \lesssim \varepsilon t_{\text{inner}}.$$

with probability at least $1 - C$.

Because $\varepsilon \lesssim \frac{\log n}{(\sigma^2 \log \sigma^2) \sqrt{d}}$, we can pick $m_{\text{op}} \asymp \frac{\varepsilon \sqrt{d}}{\log n} n$ satisfying $m_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{cn}{\sigma^2 \log \sigma^2}$. This yields

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} \lesssim \sigma^2 \sqrt{d} \left(\varepsilon + \sqrt{1/n}\right)$$

and allows us to choose

$$\begin{aligned} t_{\text{inner}} &\asymp \sigma^2 \max\left\{\sqrt{d \log(n/\delta)}, \left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}}\right) \sqrt{d} \log n, \frac{d \log n}{\varepsilon n}, \sqrt{d} \log n\right\} \\ &\asymp \sigma^2 \log(n) \sqrt{d} \max\left\{1, \frac{1}{\varepsilon \sqrt{n}}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

This then gives the error

$$\text{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})) \lesssim \varepsilon t_{\text{inner}} \lesssim \sigma^2 \log(n) \cdot (\varepsilon \sqrt{d} + \sqrt{d/n}),$$

proving the claim.

D Proofs for Section 6

D.1 Useful properties of \bar{P}

Here we establish some properties of \bar{P} that will be useful in proofs for moment bounded data. By Lemma A.9, we know that

$$d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq m_k^k \left(\frac{\sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}} \right)^{k-2}.$$

Then, if $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}} \sqrt{d}$, we have that $d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{3}$. Because $\|\bar{Z}\|_{\Sigma} \leq b_{\text{clip}}$ almost surely, we have by Lemma A.1 that

$$\|\bar{Z}\|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \leq \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \Sigma^{1/2} \right\| \|\bar{Z}\|_{\Sigma} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} b_{\text{clip}}, \quad (10)$$

almost surely. Also, by moment-boundedness, we have for all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z} \cdot v\|^k] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} Z \cdot v\|^k] \leq m_k (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \Sigma \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} v)^{1/2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} m_k. \quad (11)$$

D.2 Proof of Lemma 6.1

We begin with a deterministic lemma about **Preprocess**. Showing the preconditions of the lemma hold with high probability, we will have proven Lemma 6.1. Before stating and proving that lemma, we first recall the following lemma that we used to prove Lemma 4.3.

Lemma D.1 (Restatement of Lemma B.4). *Let $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ such that for all $i \in [m]$, $y_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger y_i \leq M^2$. Also let $\gamma, b > 0$, $T \subseteq [m]$ and $\mathcal{W} = \{w_1, \dots, w_k\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be such that $\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) \preceq \frac{\gamma m}{k} \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)$ and for all $j \in [k]$, $w_j^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{Y}_T)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{Y})^\dagger) w_j \geq b$. Then $k \leq \frac{\gamma M^2}{b} (m - |T|)$.*

Lemma D.2. *Let Σ be a PSD matrix and let $t_{\text{clip}}, b_{\text{clip}} > 0$ such that $t_{\text{clip}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} b_{\text{clip}}$. Let $\mathcal{Z} = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ such that*

$$\inf\{z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger z_i \mid i \in [n], \|z_i\|_{\Sigma} > b_{\text{clip}}\} > \frac{1}{4} b_{\text{clip}}^2.$$

Let $\bar{\mathcal{Z}} = \{\bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n\}$, where $\bar{z}_i = z_i \mathbf{1}\{\|z_i\|_{\Sigma} \leq b_{\text{clip}}\}$, and suppose that $d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}$. Let $m = |\{i \in [n] \mid \|z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq t_{\text{clip}}/\sqrt{8}\}|$ and suppose that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m + \varepsilon n, \frac{1}{2})$ -operator norm resilient. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} and let $\mathcal{Y} = \text{Preprocess}(\mathcal{X}, t_{\text{clip}})$. Then there exists $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| \leq m$ such that \mathcal{Y} is a $\left(1 + \frac{8n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right) \varepsilon$ -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus T}$.

Proof Let $G = \{i \in [n] \mid z_i = x_i\}$ and $\bar{G} = \{i \in [n] \mid \bar{z}_i = x_i\}$. Note that $|G| \geq (1 - \varepsilon)n$ because \mathcal{X} is an ε -contamination of \mathcal{Z} . Moreover, because \mathcal{Z} and $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ only differ on points where $\|z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq b_{\text{clip}} \geq t_{\text{norm}}/\sqrt{2}$, we also have that $|\bar{G}| \geq n - (m + \varepsilon n)$.

Now define the set

$$T = \{i \in [n] \mid z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \geq t_{\text{clip}}^2 \text{ or } \|z_i\|_{\Sigma} > b_{\text{clip}}\}.$$

We first show that $|T| \leq m$. For $i \in [n]$ such that $z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \geq t_{\text{clip}}^2$,

$$t_{\text{clip}}^2 \leq z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \leq z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \cap \bar{G}})^\dagger z_i = z_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \cap \bar{G}})^\dagger z_i \leq 2z_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n})^\dagger z_i,$$

where the last inequality is by $(m + \varepsilon n, \frac{1}{2})$ -operator norm resilience of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$. Operator norm resilience also gives that $z_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}^n})^\dagger z_i \leq 2z_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})^\dagger z_i \leq 4z_i^T \Sigma^\dagger z_i$, which altogether imply that $\|z_i\|_\Sigma \geq t_{\text{clip}}/\sqrt{8}$. Because we also assume that $b_{\text{clip}} \geq \sqrt{8}t_{\text{clip}}$, we have that $T \subseteq \{i \in [n] \mid \|z_i\|_\Sigma \geq t_{\text{clip}}/\sqrt{2}\}$, which implies that $|T| \leq m$.

Thus, all we need to show now is that $\mathcal{Y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ is a $\left(\frac{9n\varepsilon}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right)$ -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n]\setminus T}$. Note for any $i \in [n]$,

$$y_i = x_i \mathbf{1} \left\{ x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger x_i \leq t_{\text{clip}}^2 \right\} \\ \bar{z}_i \mathbf{1} \{i \notin T\} = z_i \mathbf{1} \left\{ z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \leq t_{\text{clip}}^2 \text{ and } \|z_i\|_\Sigma \leq b_{\text{clip}} \right\},$$

where the first line is by construction of **Preprocess**. Then for any $i \in [n]$ such that $y_i \neq \bar{z}_i \mathbf{1} \{i \notin T\}$, we must have that

1. $x_i \neq z_i$ (in which case $i \notin G$), or
2. $x_i = z_i$ and $z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \leq t_{\text{clip}}^2$ and $\|z_i\|_\Sigma > b_{\text{clip}}$.

The first case only occurs for at most εn indices $i \in [n]$, and so letting S denote the set of indices for which the second case holds, we turn to bounding $|S|$.

First note that $S \subseteq G$, so that $\Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_S) = \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_S) \preceq \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)$. Now, we have by assumption that for all $i \in [n]$ satisfying $\|z_i\|_\Sigma > b_{\text{clip}}$, it holds that

$$\frac{1}{4}b_{\text{clip}}^2 < z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger z_i \leq z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_G)^\dagger z_i = z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)^\dagger z_i.$$

Because we also assume that $t_{\text{clip}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}b_{\text{clip}}$, we therefore have for $i \in S$ that

$$z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger z_i \leq t_{\text{clip}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{8}b_{\text{clip}}^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)^\dagger z_i,$$

and so

$$z_i^T (\Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)^\dagger - \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger) z_i \geq \frac{1}{2}z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G)^\dagger z_i \geq \frac{1}{8}b_{\text{clip}}^2.$$

We now wish to apply Lemma D.1 with $\mathcal{Y} = \mathcal{X}$, $\mathcal{W} = \{z_i \mid i \in S\}$, and $T = G$. The above argument implies that we can take $b = \frac{1}{8}b_{\text{clip}}^2$. We can also take $M^2 = n$ because for all $i \in [n]$, $x_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{X})^\dagger x_i \leq x_i^T \left(\frac{1}{n}x_i x_i^T\right)^\dagger x_i \leq n$. Finally we can also take $\gamma = 1$ because

$$\Sigma(\mathcal{W}) = \frac{n}{|S|} \Sigma(\mathcal{Z}_S) \preceq \frac{n}{|S|} \Sigma(\mathcal{X}_G).$$

Thus, applying Lemma D.1, we conclude that $|S| \leq \frac{8n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}(n - |G|) \leq \left(\frac{8n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right)\varepsilon n$.

Putting it all together, we have proven that \mathcal{Y} is a $\left(1 + \frac{8n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}\right)\varepsilon$ -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n]\setminus T}$. \square

Proof of Lemma 6.1 The claim immediately follows from applying Lemma D.2 with $t_{\text{clip}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}b_{\text{clip}}$ provided that the preconditions of the lemma hold with the desired probability. That is, we need to show that with our desired probability, it holds that

$$1. \inf\{Z_i^T \Sigma(\mathcal{Z})^\dagger Z_i \mid i \in [n], \|Z_i\|_\Sigma > b_{\text{clip}}\} > \frac{1}{4}b_{\text{clip}}^2;$$

2. $d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}$;
3. $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m + \varepsilon n, \frac{1}{2})$ -operator norm resilient, where $m = |\{i \in [n] \mid \|Z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq b_{\text{clip}}/8\}|$.

By Lemma A.10, the first event happens with probability at least $1 - C_k m_k n^{1-k/2}$.

For the second event, we recall some useful properties we established in Section D.1. In particular, because $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}}$, we have that $d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{3}$ and $\|\bar{\mathcal{Z}}\|_{\bar{\Sigma}}$ almost surely for $\bar{\mathcal{Z}} \sim \bar{P}$. This latter property implies by Lemma A.11 that $d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \bar{\Sigma}) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{n}}\right)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Because we also assume that $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)$, we can combine these errors to conclude that $d_{\text{psd}}(\bar{\Sigma}, \Sigma) \leq \frac{1}{2}$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

For the last event, we begin with a high probability upper bound on $m = |\{i \in [n] \mid \|Z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq b_{\text{clip}}/8\}|$. Note that m is binomially-distributed with n draws and probability $\mathbb{P}(\|Z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq b_{\text{clip}}/8)$. By Lemma A.8, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}(\|Z_i\|_{\Sigma} \geq b_{\text{clip}}/8) \leq \left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k.$$

Thus, a binomial tail bound yields that with probability at least $1 - \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n\right)\right)$, we have $m \leq 2\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n$. We therefore need to show that with high probability, $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \frac{1}{2})$ -operator norm resilient for $m_{\text{op}} = 2\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n + \varepsilon n$. We have from Lemma D.3 that for $m_{\text{op}} \leq n$, there exists

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{\max\{m_{\text{op}}, d + \log(1/\delta)\}}{n}\right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}}\right)$$

such that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Because $k \geq 4$ and $n \gtrsim \max\{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta), m_k^4 (d + \log(1/\delta))\}$, we can choose $\alpha_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$ so long as

$$m_k^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{n}\right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}} = m_k^2 \left(2 \left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k + \varepsilon\right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}}$$

is bounded above by a small constant. This follows because $\varepsilon \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}}$ and $b_{\text{clip}} \gtrsim m_k^{\frac{k}{k-2}} \sqrt{d}$.

Combining all the failure probabilities, the claim follows. \square

D.3 Proof of Lemma 6.2

We separately prove operator norm resilience and inner product resilience in the next two lemmas, and then put it all together afterwards to prove this lemma.

Lemma D.3 (Heavy-tailed operator norm resilience). *Suppose $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)$ and $m_{\text{op}} \leq n$. There exists*

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{\max\{m_{\text{op}}, d + \log(1/\delta)\}}{n} \right)^{1 - \frac{2}{k}} \right).$$

such that with probability at least $1 - 4\delta$, $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient.

Proof Let $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$. For ease of notation, let $m = |H| = \frac{n}{2}$. We will prove the desired properties for H hold with probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, so that the claim follows by a union bound over H .

For a large constant $C > 0$, we may assume without loss of generality that $m_{\text{op}} \geq C(d + \log(1/\delta))$. This is because the claim for $m_{\text{op}} < C(d + \log(1/\delta))$ is weaker than the claim for $m_{\text{op}} = C(d + \log(1/\delta))$, possibly up to constant factors.

We first show that $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H) \preceq \frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$. By Lemma A.11 and (10), we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$ that

$$d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \bar{\Sigma}) = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{n}} \right) \quad \text{and} \quad d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{n}{m} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H), \bar{\Sigma} \right) = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{m}} \right).$$

Because $n \geq m \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)$, we have that $\max\{d_{\text{psd}}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}), \bar{\Sigma}), d_{\text{psd}}(\frac{n}{m}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H), \bar{\Sigma})\} \leq c$ for a small constant $c > 0$. This rearranges to imply $\frac{n}{m}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H) \preceq \frac{1+c}{1-c}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$. Because $m = \frac{n}{2}$, we can obtain the desired $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_S) \preceq \frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$ by picking $c = \frac{1}{5}$. This establishes the first requirement for $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilience.

We now show the second requirement; that is, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have for all $T \subseteq H$ with $|T| = m_{\text{op}}$ that $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}) \preceq \alpha_{\text{op}} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)$. Because we are under the event that $d_{\text{psd}}(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T, \bar{\Sigma}) \leq c$, we have that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T \succeq \frac{1}{2}\bar{\Sigma}$. Thus, it suffices to show that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all $T \subseteq H$ with $|T| = m_{\text{op}}$ that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T \succeq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{2}\bar{\Sigma}$. Equivalently, we show that for all such T and all $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1} \cap \text{Col}(\bar{\Sigma})$,

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 \leq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{2}.$$

Let \mathcal{V} be a $\frac{1}{4}$ -net of \mathbb{S}^{d-1} , which we can take such that $|\mathcal{V}| \leq 9^d$ by Vershynin [2012, Lemma 5.2]. Then Vershynin [2012, Lemma 5.4] gives that

$$\sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 \leq 2 \sup_{v \in \mathcal{V}} \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2.$$

For each $v \in \mathcal{V}$, we will bound

$$Y_v := \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2$$

with probability at least $1 - 9^{-d}\delta$, so that our desired claim will follow by a union bound over

all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_v &= \sup_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 \\
&= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 - \inf_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m-m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 \\
&= \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 - 1 \right] - \frac{m-m_{\text{op}}}{m} \left[\inf_{\substack{T \subseteq S \\ |T|=m-m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m-m_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 - 1 \right] + \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m}.
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i \in H} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 - 1 \right| &= \left| v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \left(\frac{n}{m} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_S) - \bar{\Sigma} \right) \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} v \right| \\
&\leq d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{n}{m} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H), \bar{\Sigma} \right) \\
&= O \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{m}} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

To bound the second term, we will use Oliveira and Rico [2022, Proposition 3.14], which we restate in Appendix A.3 as Lemma A.12 for convenience. This proposition gives subgaussian-like concentration for the truncated sample mean. We will apply Lemma A.12 with η such that

$$m_{\text{op}} = \lfloor \eta m \rfloor + \lceil c \eta m + \log(4 \cdot 9^d / \delta) \rceil.$$

Because $m_{\text{op}} \geq C(d + \log(4/\delta))$ for a sufficiently large constant C , this η will satisfy $\eta \asymp \frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m}$. Then by applying Lemma A.12 with this η , $q = \frac{k}{2}$, $\alpha = 9^{-d} \delta$, and $Y_i = W_i = (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2$, we have with probability at least $1 - \frac{9^{-d}}{2} \delta$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left| \inf_{\substack{T \subseteq H \\ |T|=m-m_{\text{op}}}} \frac{1}{m-m_{\text{op}}} \sum_{i \in T} (v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_i)^2 - 1 \right| \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{\mathbb{E}[(v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_1)^4] \log(4 \cdot 9^d / \delta)}{m}} + \mathbb{E}[|v^T \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_1|^{2k}]^{\frac{1}{k}} \eta^{1-\frac{2}{k}} \\
&\lesssim m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} \right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by the moment bound on \bar{P} from (11). Therefore we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_v &\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{m}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} \right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}} + \frac{m}{n} \\
&\lesssim \sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)}{m}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{m}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{op}}}{m} \right)^{1-\frac{2}{k}},
\end{aligned}$$

proving the claim. \square

Lemma D.4 (Heavy-tailed norm-boundedness). *Suppose $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)$. With probability at least $1 - 2\delta$, $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}b_{\text{clip}}$ -norm bounded.*

Proof Let $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$. By Lemma A.11 and (10), we have with probability at least $1 - \delta$,

$$d_{\text{psd}} \left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in H} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T, \bar{\Sigma} \right) \leq \frac{1}{3}.$$

Then by Lemma A.1, we have that $\|\bar{\Sigma}^{1/2}(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in H} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T)^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2}\| \leq \frac{3}{2}$. Observe that

$$\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H) = \frac{1}{2} \cdot \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i \in H} \bar{Z}_i \bar{Z}_i^T,$$

so that $\|\bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2}\| \leq 3$.

Recall from (10) that $\|\bar{Z}_i\|_{\bar{\Sigma}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}b_{\text{clip}}$ almost surely, which implies

$$\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)^\dagger \bar{Z}_i \leq \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\| \|\bar{Z}_i\|_{\bar{\Sigma}}^2 \leq \frac{9}{2} b_{\text{clip}}^2,$$

proving the claim after a union bound over H . \square

Lemma D.5. *Suppose $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta_0)$ and that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient with probability at least $1 - \delta_0$. For $\gamma > 0$, let*

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\text{res}} &\leq m_{\text{op}} \\ b_{\text{inner}} &\geq \sqrt{6}(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} b_{\text{clip}} \cdot \gamma \\ \delta &\geq |H|^{m_{\text{res}}} (n - |H|)^{m_{\text{inner}}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\gamma} \right)^{km_{\text{inner}}}. \end{aligned}$$

Then with probability at least $1 - 4\delta_0 - 2\delta$, it holds for all $F \subseteq [n]$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$ that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}$ is $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded.

Proof We need to show that with probability at least $1 - 4\delta_0 - 2\delta$, for all $H \in \{\mathbb{H}_1^n, \mathbb{H}_2^n\}$ and for all $F \subseteq [n]$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$, there exists $T \subseteq [n] \setminus H$ satisfying $|T| \geq n - |H| - m_{\text{inner}}$ and $|z_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{H \setminus F})^\dagger z_j| \leq b_{\text{inner}}$ for all distinct $i, j \in T \setminus F$.

We prove the claim with half the failure probability for $H = \mathbb{H}_1^n$, so that a symmetric argument for $H = \mathbb{H}_2^n$ and a union bound will prove the desired claim. Note that we may take $F \subseteq H$ without loss of generality, as indices in $F \cap ([n] \setminus H)$ can be freely added to T , which only loosens the requirements for T .

We begin with the following supporting lemma that shows it is unlikely for too many disjoint pairs of indices to have a large inner product with respect to the sample covariance.

Lemma D.6. *Let $F \subseteq H$ and let $\mathcal{A} \subset \{(i, j) \in ([n] \setminus H)^2 \mid i \neq j\}$ such that every $i \in [n] \setminus H$ appears in at most one pair in \mathcal{A} . Let $A_{i,j}$ be the event that*

$$\left| \bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j \right| > \gamma \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\|. \quad (12)$$

Then $\mathbb{P}(\cap_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{A}} A_{i,j}) \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\gamma} \right)^{k|\mathcal{A}|}$.

Proof of Lemma D.6 We first individually bound $\mathbb{P}(A_{i,j} \mid \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{-j})$ for a each pair $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$. Then because $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_i$ is independent of \bar{Z}_j and also measurable with respect to $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{-j}$, we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left(|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| \geq \gamma \mid \bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{-j}\right) \leq \sup_{v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}} \mathbb{P}(|\bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_j \cdot v| \geq \gamma).$$

By the moment bound (11), we have for every $v \in \mathbb{S}^{d-1}$ that

$$\mathbb{P}(|\bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_j \cdot v| \geq \gamma) \leq \frac{1}{\gamma^k} \mathbb{E}[|\bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_j \cdot v|^k] \leq \left(\sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \cdot \frac{m_k}{\gamma}\right)^k.$$

From our assumptions that the pairs in \mathcal{A} are disjoint and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq ([n] \setminus F)^2$, we obtain for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$ and $(i', j') \in \mathcal{A} \setminus \{(i, j)\}$ that $A_{i', j'}$ is measurable with respect to $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{-j}$. The desired result then follows immediately. \square

Now for all $F \subseteq H$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$ and all $\mathcal{A} \subseteq ([n] \setminus H)^2$ of $\frac{m_{\text{inner}}}{2}$ disjoint pairs of indices, we apply Lemma D.6 with $T = H \setminus F$ and \mathcal{A} and take a union bound. As there are at most $|H|^{m_{\text{res}}}$ possible F and at most $(n - |H|)^{m_{\text{inner}}}$ possible \mathcal{A} , we have by our choice of δ that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, it holds for all F and \mathcal{A} that there exists $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$ for which

$$|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| \leq \gamma \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j \right\| \leq \gamma \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\| \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_j \right\|.$$

Now suppose that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilience with respect to H , which holds with probability at least $1 - \delta_0$. Then because we assume $m_{\text{res}} \leq m_{\text{op}}$, we have that $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}) \succeq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}) \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)$, and so $\left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\| \leq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} \left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\|$. By assumption on n and Lemma A.11, we have that $\left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_H)^\dagger \bar{\Sigma}^{1/2} \right\| \leq 2$ with probability at least $1 - \delta_0$.

Furthermore, by (10) we know that $\left\| \bar{\Sigma}^{\dagger/2} \bar{Z}_j \right\| \leq \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} b_{\text{clip}}$ by (10) almost surely.

Therefore, by our choice of b_{inner} , we have that with probability at least $1 - 2\delta_0 - \delta$, it holds for all $F \subseteq H$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$ and all $\mathcal{A} \subseteq ([n] \setminus H)^2$ of $\frac{m_{\text{inner}}}{2}$ disjoint pairs of indices that there exists $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$ for which $|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| \leq b_{\text{inner}}$. Denote this event as \mathcal{E} . We will now show that \mathcal{E} will not hold if there exists $F \subseteq H$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$ such that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}$ is not $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded with respect to H , proving the claim by contrapositive.

Suppose that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_F$ is not $(m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}})$ -inner product bounded for some $F \subseteq H$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$. Then for all $T \subseteq [n] \setminus H$ with $|T| \geq n - |H| - m_{\text{inner}}$, there exists distinct $i, j \in T$ for which $|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| > b_{\text{inner}}$. Now we iteratively construct a set \mathcal{A} . First initialize \mathcal{A} to \emptyset . Then, until \mathcal{A} consists of $\frac{m_{\text{inner}}}{2}$ pairs, iteratively find two distinct $i, j \in [n] \setminus H$ that don't appear in \mathcal{A} and satisfies $|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| > b_{\text{inner}}$ and add the pair (i, j) to \mathcal{A} . Note that finding such a pair is always possible, because while \mathcal{A} has less than $\frac{m_{\text{inner}}}{2}$ pairs, there are at least $n - |H| - m_{\text{inner}}$ indices from which to choose i and j , and so our assumption implies there is a pair (i, j) for which $|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| > b_{\text{inner}}$. This process results in \mathcal{A} being a set of $\frac{m_{\text{inner}}}{2}$ disjoint pairs of indices such that $|\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_j| > b_{\text{inner}}$ for all $(i, j) \in \mathcal{A}$. Thus, \mathcal{E} does not hold, as desired. \square

With these properties in hand, we now prove Lemma 6.2.

Proof of Lemma 6.2 Because $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(2d/\delta)$, we have from Lemmas D.3 that with probability at least $1 - O(\delta)$, $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -operator norm resilient where

$$\alpha_{\text{op}} = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \sqrt{\frac{d + \log(1/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \left(\frac{\max\{m_{\text{op}}, d + \log(1/\delta)\}}{n}\right)^{1 - \frac{2}{k}}\right).$$

Moreover, because $k \geq 4$ and $n \gtrsim \max\{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta), m_k^4(d + \log(1/\delta))\}$, this choice of α_{op} satisfies $\alpha_{\text{op}} \leq c$ for a small constant $c > 0$. Increasing n by a constant factor if necessary, we can also have with probability at least $1 - O(\delta)$ that $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq \frac{3}{5}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$ and $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_2^n}) \preceq \frac{3}{5}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$, rather than just $\frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})$. We also have by Lemma D.4 that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ is $O(b_{\text{clip}})$ -norm bounded with probability at least $1 - O(\delta)$.

Under these events, we first show that for all $F \subseteq [n]$ such that $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$, the dataset $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}$ is $O(b_{\text{clip}})$ -norm bounded and $(m_{\text{op}}, O(\alpha_{\text{op}}))$ -operator norm resilient. We will only show the required properties hold with respect to $H = \mathbb{H}_1^n$, as the case where $H = \mathbb{H}_2^n$ is symmetric.

For $O(b_{\text{clip}})$ -norm boundedness, we have for all $i \in [n]$ that

$$\bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \setminus F})^\dagger \bar{Z}_i \leq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-1} \bar{Z}_i^T \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n})^\dagger \bar{Z}_i = O(b_{\text{clip}}^2),$$

where the first inequality is because $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}} \leq m_{\text{op}}$ and $(m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -inner product resilience and the final bound is by $O(b_{\text{clip}})$ -norm boundedness.

For $(m_{\text{op}}, O(\alpha_{\text{op}}))$ -operator norm resilience, we first show that

$$\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \setminus F}) \preceq \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq \frac{3}{5}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}) \preceq \frac{3}{5(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}),$$

where the last inequality is by operator norm resilience. Because $\alpha_{\text{op}} \leq c$ for a sufficiently small constant c , we have that $\frac{3}{5(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})} \leq \frac{3}{4}$ and so $\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \setminus F}) \preceq \frac{3}{4}\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F})$. Now for any $T \subseteq \mathbb{H}_1^n$ such that $|T| \leq m_{\text{op}}$,

$$\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{T \setminus F}) \preceq \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_T) \preceq \alpha_{\text{op}} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n}) \preceq \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}}}{1 - \alpha_{\text{op}}} \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \setminus F}) \preceq O(\alpha_{\text{op}}) \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{\mathbb{H}_1^n \setminus F}).$$

Finally we establish the required inner product boundedness properties. By applying Lemma D.5 with $\gamma = \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}m_k \cdot \left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{1/k}$, we have that $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus F}$ is $(m_{\text{inner}}, O(m_k n^{1/k} b_{\text{clip}}))$ -inner product bounded for all $F \subseteq [n]$ satisfying $|F| \leq m_{\text{res}}$, simultaneously with probability at least

$$1 - O\left(\left(\frac{n}{2}\right)^{m_{\text{res}} + m_{\text{inner}} - km_{\text{inner}}}\right) = 1 - O\left(n^{-\Omega(km_{\text{inner}})}\right).$$

The last equality above is because we assume $m_{\text{res}} \leq m_{\text{inner}}$ and $k \geq 4$.

This proves the claim. \square

D.4 Proof of Corollary 6.1

Applying Lemma 6.1, we have with probability at least $1 - C_k m_k^k n^{1-k/2} - 2\delta - \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n\right)\right)$,

there exists $T \subseteq [n]$ with $|T| \leq 2\left(\frac{8m_k \sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n$ such that \mathcal{Y} is a ε' -contamination of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n] \setminus T}$.

Then because $\left(\frac{8m_k\sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k \lesssim \gamma \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}}$, we can apply Lemma 6.2 with $m_{\text{inner}} \geq 2\left(\frac{4m_k\sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k n$ and $m_{\text{op}} = \gamma n$ to get that there exists

$$\begin{aligned} b_{\text{norm}} &= O(b_{\text{clip}}) \\ b_{\text{inner}} &= O(m_k n^{1/k} b_{\text{clip}}) \\ \alpha_{\text{op}} &= O\left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \gamma^{1-\frac{2}{k}}\right). \end{aligned}$$

such that both $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$ and $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n]\setminus T}$ are $(b_{\text{norm}}, m_{\text{inner}}, b_{\text{inner}}, m_{\text{op}}, \alpha_{\text{op}})$ -good with probability at least $1 - O(\delta + n^{-\Omega(km_{\text{inner}})})$.

For ease of notation, let $\varepsilon' = \frac{9n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2} \varepsilon$. To apply Theorem 3 to $\Sigma_{\text{ALG}} = \text{ALG}(\mathcal{Y}, \varepsilon', t_{\text{inner}}, t_{\text{norm}})$, we need to choose the parameters $t_{\text{inner}}, t_{\text{norm}}$ so that

1. $\varepsilon' \leq \frac{1}{4(1+C)}$,
2. $t_{\text{norm}} \geq (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$,
3. $t_{\text{inner}} \geq \max\{2b_{\text{inner}}, \frac{8\varepsilon\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{1-\alpha_{\text{op}}} \cdot \frac{1}{\varepsilon'}\}$,
4. $n \geq \frac{12\varepsilon t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon' t_{\text{inner}}}$,
5. $m_{\text{op}} \geq \max\{1 + C, 1 + \frac{72(1+C)t_{\text{norm}}^2}{t_{\text{inner}}}\} \varepsilon' n + 4m_{\text{inner}}$.

Because $\gamma \gtrsim \left(\frac{8m_k\sqrt{d}}{b_{\text{clip}}}\right)^k$, we have that $m_{\text{op}} \geq 8m_{\text{inner}}$, so the fifth requirement above amounts to $\varepsilon' \lesssim \gamma$ (which is satisfied by assumption on γ) and $t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2 \varepsilon'}{\gamma}$.

Then picking $t_{\text{norm}} = (1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})^{-\frac{1}{2}} b_{\text{norm}}$, the only remaining parameter to choose is t_{inner} and we need it to satisfy

$$t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \max\left\{b_{\text{inner}}, \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}} \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{(1 - \alpha_{\text{op}})\varepsilon'}, \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2 \log(t_{\text{norm}})}{\varepsilon' n}, \frac{t_{\text{norm}}^2 \varepsilon'}{\gamma}\right\}. \quad (13)$$

Because $n \gtrsim b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)$ and $m_{\text{op}} \lesssim m_k^{-\frac{2k}{k-2}} n$, we have that $\alpha_{\text{op}} \leq \frac{1}{2}$. This means satisfies $t_{\text{norm}} \asymp b_{\text{clip}}$ and we can simplify (13) to get

$$t_{\text{inner}} \gtrsim \max\left\{m_k n^{1/k} b_{\text{clip}}, \frac{\alpha_{\text{op}} \log b_{\text{clip}}}{\varepsilon'}, \frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log b_{\text{clip}}}{\varepsilon' n}, \frac{\varepsilon' b_{\text{clip}}^2}{\gamma}\right\}.$$

With these parameters, we may apply Theorem 3 to obtain

$$\text{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n]\setminus T})) \lesssim \alpha_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon' t_{\text{inner}}.$$

Moreover, by operator norm resilience of $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}$,

$$\text{err}(\Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}_{[n]\setminus T}), \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})) = \alpha_{\text{op}}.$$

Putting everything together, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})) &\lesssim \alpha_{\text{op}} + \varepsilon' t_{\text{inner}} \\
&\lesssim m_k \varepsilon' n^{1/k} b_{\text{clip}} + \log b_{\text{clip}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + m_k^2 \gamma^{1-\frac{2}{k}} \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log b_{\text{clip}}}{n} + \frac{(\varepsilon')^2 b_{\text{clip}}^2}{\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that $\varepsilon' = \frac{9\varepsilon n}{b_{\text{clip}}^2}$ and ignoring lower-order terms, we finally have

$$\mathbf{err}(\Sigma_{\text{ALG}}, \Sigma(\bar{\mathcal{Z}})) \lesssim \log b_{\text{clip}} \sqrt{\frac{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \log(d/\delta)}{n}} + \frac{m_k \varepsilon n^{1+\frac{1}{k}}}{b_{\text{clip}}} + m_k^2 \gamma^{1-\frac{2}{k}} \log b_{\text{clip}} + \frac{\varepsilon^2 n^2}{b_{\text{clip}}^2 \gamma},$$

as desired.