

# Connections between Semiparametrics and Robustness

Helmut Rieder

University of Bayreuth, Germany

Tsinghua University, Beijing, 23 and 28 May 2013

## Topics

- 1) Robust influence curves for models with  $\infty$ -dim. nuisance parameter; e.g., semiparametric regression (Cox), mixture models (Neyman–Scott).
- 2) Adaptiveness (Stein's necessary condition) of robust estimators w.r.t. a finite-dim. nuisance parameter; e.g., location, linear regression, and ARMA.
- 3) Semiparametric treatment of gross error deviations from an ideal model as an  $\infty$ -dim. nuisance parameter, by projection on balls; for testing, an asymptotic version of the Huber–Strassen maximin result is thus obtained.
- 4) Uniform and nonuniform asymptotic normality of robust and adaptive estimators, respectively, in regression and time series models.
- 5) Fragility of optimal one-sided tests and confidence limits obtained for convex tangent cones, by projection on cones, as opposed to stability of corresponding procedures, even two-sided, for linear tangent spaces.
- 6) Control of the unknown neighborhood radius, a nuisance parameter in robustness.

**Model**  $\mathcal{Q} = \{ Q_{\theta, \nu} \}$  with parameter of interest  $\theta \in \Theta$  open  $\subset$  some  $\mathbb{R}^k$ , and nuisance parameter  $\nu \in H_\theta$ . **Differentiability** at any fixed  $(\theta_0, \nu_0)$

$$dQ_{\theta_0+ta, \nu_t^g} \approx (1 + t(a'\Lambda + g))dQ_{\theta_0, \nu_0} \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0 \quad (1)$$

in direction  $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ , along paths  $t \mapsto \nu_t^g$ . **Tangents**  $g \in L_2(Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0})$ ,  $g \perp 1$ ,

$$\partial_1 \mathcal{Q} = \{ a'\Lambda \mid a \in \mathbb{R}^k \}, \quad \partial_2 \mathcal{Q} \text{ a cone}, \quad \partial \mathcal{Q} = \partial_1 \mathcal{Q} + \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}$$

**Fisher information** of  $Q_{\nu_0}$  ( $\nu$  fixed to  $\nu_0$ ) about  $\theta$  at  $\theta_0$ :  $\mathcal{I} = \text{Cov } \Lambda$

**Influence curves** at  $Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0}$ :

Bickel (1982), Bickel et al. (1993), v.d.Vaart (1998)  
Rieder (1994), Shen (1995)

$$\psi \in L_2^k, \quad \mathbb{E} \psi = 0, \quad \mathbb{E} \psi \Lambda' = \mathbb{I}_k, \quad \mathbb{E} \psi g = 0 \quad \forall g \in \partial_2 \mathcal{Q} \quad (2)$$

**F-consistent diff. functionals:**  $T(Q_{\theta_0+ta, \nu_t^g}) - \theta_0 \approx \mathbb{E} \psi(a'\Lambda + g) t = ta$

**AL estimators:**  $n^{1/2}(S_n - \theta_0) \approx n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(x_i)$  in  $Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0}^{(n)}$ -probability, such that

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n - \theta_0) \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(a, \text{Cov } \psi) \quad \text{in law under } Q_n^{(n)}(a, g)$$

where  $Q_n(a, g) = Q_{\theta_0+s_n a, \nu_{s_n}^g}$ , at scale  $s_n = 1/\sqrt{n}$ ,  $n =$  sample size.

Let  $\Pi, \Pi_2$  denote the (coordinatewise) orthogonal projections from  $L_2^k(Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0})$  on the closed linear spans  $cl \text{ lin } \partial Q = \partial_1 Q + cl \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q$  and  $cl \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q$ , respectively. **Unique projection on  $cl \text{ lin } \partial Q$**  of all ICs:

$$\Pi(\psi) = \psi_{\text{eff}} := \mathcal{J}^{-1} \bar{\Lambda} \quad \forall \psi \text{ IC} \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{\Lambda} := \Lambda - \Pi_2(\Lambda)$  (model  $Q$ ).  $\psi_{\text{class}} := \mathcal{I}^{-1} \Lambda$  (model  $Q_{\nu_0}$ ).

Fisher informations of  $Q$  and  $Q_{\nu_0}$  for  $\theta$  at  $(\theta_0, \nu_0)$  and  $\theta_0$ , respectively:

$$\mathcal{J} = \text{Cov } \bar{\Lambda} = \mathcal{I} - \text{Cov } \Pi_2(\Lambda) \leq \mathcal{I} = \text{Cov } \Lambda \quad (4)$$

**Asymptotic covariance bound** for AL estimators with IC  $\psi$ :

$$\text{Cov } \psi \geq \mathcal{J}^{-1} = \text{Cov } \psi_{\text{eff}}, \quad \text{attained iff } \psi = \psi_{\text{eff}} \quad (5)$$

**Information bounds:**  $\mathcal{J}^{-1}$  (model  $Q$ )  $\geq \mathcal{I}^{-1}$  (model  $Q_{\nu_0}$ ).

**Classical adaptivity** (necessary condition):

Stein (1956)

$$\mathcal{J}^{-1} = \mathcal{I}^{-1} \iff \Lambda \perp \partial_2 Q \iff \psi_{\text{eff}} = \psi_{\text{class}} \quad (6)$$

ICs exist iff  $\mathcal{J} > 0$  iff  $a' \Lambda \notin cl \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^k, a \neq 0$ . Shen (1995), Rieder (2000)

**Bounded ICs exist** iff  $a' \Lambda \notin L_1\text{-closure } cl_1 \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q \quad \forall a \in \mathbb{R}^k, a \neq 0$ .

**1.3 Semiparametric Regression:**  $P_{\theta,\nu} = Q^{(W_{\theta,\nu}, Z)}$  = law of observations  $(W_{\theta,\nu}, Z)$ , where  $Z$  is some  $k$ -dim. covariate and  $W_{\theta,\nu}$  are the responses. Optimally bounded ICs at  $(\theta, \nu)$  are of (sufficient) form

$$\varrho = (A\Lambda - \xi - a) \min\left\{1, \frac{b}{|A\Lambda - \xi - a|}\right\} \quad (7)$$

for some  $b \in (0, \infty)$ ,  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ ,  $\xi \in c\ell \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q$ , and some  $a$ .

If the joint law of  $(W_{\theta,\nu}, Z)$  is distorted (errors-in-variables):  $a \in \mathbb{R}^k$ .

If only the conditional laws  $Q^{W_{\theta,\nu}|Z=z}(dw)$  may be distorted and the marginal  $Q^Z(dz)$  is kept ideal (error-free-variables), then  $a : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ , such that  $E(\varrho|Z) = 0$ .

**Remark** Actually, condition  $\varrho \perp \partial_2 Q$  (infinite-dim.) allows only approximations of the optimal  $\rho$ : Assuming a CONS  $g_1, g_2, \dots$  of  $c\ell \text{ lin } \partial_2 Q$ , one can prove the existence of  $A_m \in \mathbb{R}^{k \times k}$ ,  $\xi_m \in \text{lin}\{g_1, \dots, g_m\}$ , and  $a_m$ , such that the IC  $\varrho_m$  of form (7)—now  $\perp \partial_2 Q$  weakened to  $\varrho_m \perp g_1, \dots, g_m$ —tend in  $L_2(P)$  to the optimal  $\varrho$  (not necessarily of form (7)).

Shen (1995), Ruckdeschel, Hable, Rieder (2010)

**Cox regression:** Response variables  $W_{\theta,\nu} = (T_{\theta,\nu} \wedge C, \mathbf{1}_{\{T_{\theta,\nu} \leq C\}})$  from survival times  $T_{\theta,\nu}$  and a bounded censoring time  $C$ ;  $T_{\theta,\nu}$  and  $C$  stoch. independent given  $Z$ .

The cumulative hazard function of  $T_{\theta,\nu} | Z$  assumed of form  $e^{\theta'Z} \nu$  for some  $\theta \in \mathbb{R}^k$  and unknown, abs. continuous baseline hazard function  $\nu$ .

Then the parametric scores function  $\Lambda$  at  $(\theta, \nu)$  is

$$\Lambda((y, \delta), z) = \delta z - z e^{\theta'z} \nu(y) \quad (8)$$

and  $\partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = B L_2(\nu)$  for the operator  $B$  defined by

$$B\zeta: ((y, \delta), z) \mapsto \delta \zeta(y) - e^{\theta'z} \int_{[0,y]} \zeta d\nu, \quad \zeta \in L_2(\nu) \quad (9)$$

The projection on  $\text{cl } \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}$  equals  $\Pi_2 = B(B^*B)^{-1}B^*$ ,  $B^*$  the adjoint, where  $(B^*B)^{-1}B^*(y) = \mathbb{E}(Z|Y = y, \delta = 1)$ . Estimation of  $\theta$ , since

$\Pi_2(\Lambda) \neq 0$ , is not adaptive w.r.t.  $\nu$ .

Bickel, Klaassen et al. (1993), van der Vart (1998)

**Remark** To the IC  $\varrho$  of form (7), a robust version of the Cox PLE is constructed, using the order statistics to  $T_{\theta,\nu} \wedge C$ , as an M-estimator with the random weights  $\min\{1, \frac{b}{|A\Lambda - \xi - a|}\}$  evaluated at a starting estimate  $(\tilde{\theta}, \tilde{\nu})$ , and a weighted Breslow estimate of  $\nu$  employing the same weights.

Ruckdeschel, Hable, Rieder (2010)

**1.4 Exponential mixture models:**  $Q_{\theta, \nu}(dx) = \int M_{\theta, u}(dx) \nu(du)$ , each  $M_{\theta, u}(dx)$  a pm with  $\mu$ -density  $f(x, \theta, u) = \exp\{u' T_{\theta}(x) + S_{\theta}(x) - b(\theta, u)\}$  and distribution  $\nu(du)$  of the incidental parameter. Setting  $\dot{\cdot} = \partial/\partial\theta$ ,

$$\Lambda(X, \theta, \nu) = \dot{T}(X, \theta)' E(U|T) + \dot{S}(X, \theta) - E(\dot{b}(\theta, U)|T) \quad (10)$$

$$\partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = \{ w(X) \in L_2 \mid E w(X) = 0, w(X) \text{ is } \sigma(T)\text{-measurable} \} \quad (11)$$

$$\Pi_2: h(X) \mapsto E(h(X)|T(X, \theta)) - E h(X) \quad (12)$$

where  $\partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = c\ell \text{ lin } \partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = c\ell_1 \text{ lin } \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}$ .

Bickel, Klaassen et al. (1993)

Optimally robust IC of necessary and sufficient form (7): Shen (1995), Fischer (2006)

$$\varrho = \Gamma \min\left\{1, \frac{b}{|\Gamma|}\right\}, \quad \Gamma = A\Lambda - \xi - a, \quad \Lambda = \Lambda(X, \theta,)$$

with  $\xi \in L_2(T(X, \theta))$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  determined such that  $E(\varrho|T) = 0$ .

**Special case:**  $T(X, \theta) = T(X)$  and  $S(X, \theta) = \theta' S(x)$ . Then

$$\Lambda = S - E(\dot{b}|T), \quad \bar{\Lambda} = S - E(S|T) \quad (13)$$

The conditional density of  $X$  on  $T = t$  w.r.t.  $\mu(dx|T = t)$  not depending on  $\nu$ ,  $\Lambda$  and  $\bar{\Lambda}$  do not depend on  $\nu$ : **classical adaptivity**. More generally,  $\xi \in L_2(T(X))$  and  $a \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $E(\varrho|T) = 0$  do not depend on  $\nu$ : **robust adaptivity** (§2).

Shen (1995), Fischer (2006)

**1.4 Finite Dimensional Case:** In case  $\nu \in H_\theta \subset$  some  $\mathbb{R}^m$ , differentiability (1) is assumed with

$$\partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = \{ b' \Delta \mid b \in \mathbb{R}^m \} \quad (14)$$

for some nuisance scores  $\Delta \in L_2^m(Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0})$ ,  $E \Delta = 0$ ,  $\mathcal{D} := \text{Cov} \Delta > 0$ . Fisher information at  $(\theta_0, \nu_0)$  for the full parameter  $(\theta, \nu)$  is

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{Cov} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \\ \Delta \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I} & \mathcal{C} \\ \mathcal{C}' & \mathcal{D} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{C} = E \Lambda \Delta' \quad (15)$$

where  $\det \mathcal{H} = \det \mathcal{D} \det \mathcal{J}$ ,  $\mathcal{J} = \mathcal{I} - \mathcal{C} \mathcal{D}^{-1} \mathcal{C}'$ , and  $\Pi_2 \Lambda = \mathcal{C} \mathcal{D}^{-1} \Delta$ . Then

$$\psi_{\text{eff}} = \mathcal{J}^{-1}(\Lambda - \mathcal{C} \mathcal{D}^{-1} \Delta) \quad (16)$$

Neyman (1951):  $C(\alpha)$ -tests

and  $\psi_{\text{eff}} =$  first  $k$  coordinates of  $\mathcal{H}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda \\ \Delta \end{pmatrix} = \psi_{\text{class}}^{\text{full}}$  for the full parameter.

**Adaptivity**  $\iff \mathcal{C} = E \Lambda \Delta' = 0$  (symmetric in main/nuisance parameter).



**Minmax MSE problems** for AL estimators in robust neighborhood models:

$$\text{MSE}_*(\psi, r) = \text{E} |\psi|^2 + r^2 \omega_*^2(\psi) = \min !$$

that, in addition to the asymptotic variance  $\text{Cov} \psi$ , involve the maximum asymptotic biases  $\omega_*$  generated by shrinking  $r/\sqrt{n}$ -neighborhoods about  $Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0}$ ,  $\omega_* = \text{sup-norm and variants}$ , e.g., integral of sectionwise supnorms, Rieder (1994) and refer to the following two sets of ICs, respectively:

1. model  $Q_{\nu_0}$  (no nuisance  $\nu$ ):  $\psi \in L_2^k(Q_{\theta_0, \nu_0})$ ,  $\text{E} \psi = 0$ ,  $\text{E} \psi \Lambda' = \mathbb{I}_k$
2. model  $Q$  (with nuisance  $\nu$ ): in addition,  $\text{E} \psi g = 0 \quad \forall g \in \partial_2 Q$

Due to strict convexity, the minimizers  $\varrho_1$  and  $\varrho_2$ , respectively, are unique, and  $\min \text{MSE}_1 \leq \min \text{MSE}_2$ . **Robust adaptivity** (extending classical):

$$\min \text{MSE}_1 = \min \text{MSE}_2 \iff \varrho_1 = \varrho_2 \iff \varrho_1 \perp \partial_2 Q \quad (17)$$

**Nonadaptivity** (quantitative):  $\frac{\min \text{MSE}_2}{\min \text{MSE}_1} - 1$ .

## 2.2 Symmetric Location

Beran (1974), Stone (1975)

$$Q_{\theta, f}(dx) = f(x - \theta) \lambda(dx), \quad \theta \in \mathbb{R} \quad (18)$$

$f$  symmetric,  $\mathcal{I}_f^{\text{loc}} = \int (\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}})^2 f d\lambda < \infty$ ,  $\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} = -\dot{f}/f$ ,  $dF = f d\lambda$ .

For  $\theta_0 = 0$ ,  $f = f_0$  fixed,  $\partial_2 \mathcal{Q} = \{g \in L_2(F) \mid \mathbb{E} g = 0, g \text{ symmetric}\}$ .

By symmetry,  $\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} = -\dot{f}/f$  (odd)  $\perp$   $g$  (symmetric) in  $L_2(F)$ :  $\implies$

$\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} \notin c\ell_1 \text{ lin } \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}$  and **classical adaptivity** holds.

Robust ICs, for known  $\nu_0 = f$ ,

Huber (1981), Hampel et al. (1985), Rieder (1994)

$$\varrho(x) = A \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(x) \min\{1, c |\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(x)|^{-1}\}$$

are all odd (like  $\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}$ ), hence  $\varrho \perp \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}$ :  $\implies$  **robust adaptivity**

**Remark** Adaptive constructions that not only achieve asymptotic linearity with the robust IC in the ideal model but uniform asymptotic normality over shrinking neighborhoods not yet solved completely.

Shen (1994), Stabla (2005)

## 2.3 Regression and Scale

Kohl (2005)

$$Q_{\theta, \sigma}(dx, dy) = \frac{1}{\sigma} f\left(\frac{y - x'\theta}{\sigma}\right) \lambda(dy) K(dx) \quad (19)$$

Assumptions:  $F$  symmetric, finite Fisher information of location  $\mathcal{I}_f^{\text{loc}}$  and scale  $\mathcal{I}_f^{\text{sc}} = \int (\Lambda_f^{\text{sc}})^2 dF$ , where  $\Lambda_f^{\text{sc}}(u) = u\Lambda^{\text{loc}}(u) - 1$ ;  $\int xx' K(dx) > 0$ .

Classical adaptivity holds (i.e., w.r.t.  $\sigma$  and w.r.t.  $\theta$ )—due to symmetry of  $F$ —and extends to robust adaptivity w.r.t.  $\sigma$  and w.r.t.  $\theta$ , in connection with the bias terms

$$\omega_{c,0}(\psi) = \omega_{c,1}(\psi) = \sup_{x,u} |\psi(x, u)| \quad (20)$$

$$\omega_{c,2}^2(\psi) = \int \sup_u |\psi(x, u)|^2 K(dx) \quad (21)$$

These biases are generated by contamination neighborhoods (Tukey,  $* = c$ ), which are unconditional ( $t = 0$ ), or errors-in-variables, or are average conditional, error-free-variables, ( $t = \alpha = 1$ ), respectively by average square conditional neighborhoods ( $t = \alpha = 2$ ,  $* = c$ ).

Bickel (1984), Rieder (1987)

## Robust ICs for regression and scale $F$ symmetric, $t = 0$ and $t = \alpha = 1$

$\theta$  main,  $\sigma$  nuisance:

$$\varrho_{rg}(x, u) = A_{rg} x \Lambda_f^{loc}(u) w_{rg}(x, u) \quad (22)$$

$$w_{rg}(x, u) = \min\{1, b_{rg} |A_{rg} x \Lambda_f^{loc}(u)|^{-1}\} \quad (23)$$

$$A_{rg}^{-1} = E x x' \Lambda_f^{loc}(u)^2 w_{rg}(x, u) \quad (24)$$

$$r^2 b_{rg} = E(|A_{rg} x \Lambda_f^{loc}(u)| - b_{rg})_+ \quad (25)$$

$\sigma$  main,  $\theta$  nuisance:

$$\varrho_{sc}(u) = A_{sc} (\Lambda_f^{sc}(u) - z_{sc}) w_{sc}(u) \quad (26)$$

$$w_{sc}(u) = \min\{1, c_{sc} |\Lambda_f^{sc}(u) - z_{sc}|^{-1}\} \quad (27)$$

$$z_{sc} = E \Lambda_f^{sc} w_{sc} / E w_{sc} \quad (28)$$

$$A_{sc}^{-1} = E (\Lambda_f^{sc} - z_{sc})^2 w_{sc} \quad (29)$$

$$r^2 c_{sc} = E(|\Lambda_f^{sc} - z_{sc}| - c_{sc})_+ \quad (30)$$

Full parameter  $(\theta, \sigma)$ :  $\varrho = \begin{pmatrix} \varrho_{rg} \\ \varrho_{sc} \end{pmatrix}$ , but weights  $w_{rg}$ ,  $w_{sc}$  both replaced by

$$w(x, u) = \min\{1, b \left[ |A_{rg} x|^2 (\Lambda_f^{loc}(u))^2 + A_{sc}^2 (\Lambda_f^{sc}(u) - z_{sc})^2 \right]^{-1/2}\} \quad (31)$$

where  $r^2 b = E\left( \left[ |A_{rg} x|^2 (\Lambda_f^{loc}(u))^2 + A_{sc}^2 (\Lambda_f^{sc}(u) - z_{sc})^2 \right]^{1/2} - b \right)_+ \quad (32)$

Especially, if  $F = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , then  $|\varrho_{rg}(x, u)| \sim 1/u$  ( $x$  fixed,  $|u| \rightarrow \infty$ ).

## Regression with intercept as nuisance parameter

$$Q_{\theta, \mu}(dx, dy) = f(y - \mu - x'\theta) \lambda(dy) K(dx) \quad (33)$$

Assumptions:  $F$  symmetric,  $\mathcal{I}_f^{\text{loc}} < \infty$ ,  $\int xx' K(dx) > 0$ ,  $\int x K(dx) = 0$ .

Classical adaptivity, even if  $K$  is asymmetric.

Robust adaptivity for average square conditional neighborhoods

$t = \alpha = 2$ ,  $* = c$ , even if  $K$  is asymmetric.

Robust adaptivity for unconditional neighborhoods  $* = c$ ,  $t = 0$  and average conditional neighborhoods  $* = c$ ,  $t = \alpha = 1$ , if  $K$  symmetric.

For asymmetric  $K$ ,  $* = c$ ,  $t = 0$  or  $t = \alpha = 1$ , no robust adaptivity, since

$$\mathbb{E} \varrho_{\text{rg}} \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} = A_{\text{rg}} \mathbb{E} x \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)^2 \min\{1, b_{\text{rg}} |A_{\text{rg}} \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)|^{-1}\} \neq 0 \quad (34)$$

For a 2-point asymmetric  $K$ , nonadaptivity may be up to 300% Kohl (2005)

Robust ICs in model  $\mathcal{Q}$  are of form (15), (16), (18) with  $A_{\text{rg}x}$  replaced by  $A_{\text{rg}x} + A_{\mu}$ , and (17) by

$$A_{\text{rg}} \mathbb{E} xx' \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)^2 w = \mathbb{I}_k - A_{\mu} \mathbb{E} x' \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)^2 w \quad (35)$$

$$A_{\mu} \mathbb{E} \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)^2 w = -A_{\text{rg}} \mathbb{E} x \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(u)^2 w \quad (36)$$

**2.3 ARMA(p, q):**  $\phi(\mathbf{B})(\mathbf{X}_t - \mu) = \xi(\mathbf{B})\mathbf{V}_t \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad B$  backshift

Innovations  $V_t$  i.i.d.  $\sim F$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} < \infty$ ,  $\int u F(du) = 0$ ,  $\int u^2 F(du) < \infty$ .

Stationarity and invertibility assumption:  $\phi(z)\xi(z) \neq 0 \quad \forall |z| \leq 1$ ,

$\phi, \xi$  relatively prime ( $\Rightarrow$  positive Fisher information),  $\phi_p \xi_q \neq 0$ .

**Influence**  $\psi(x_{\leq t})$  of observation  $x_t$  **given the past**  $x_{<t} := (x_{t-1}, x_{t-2}, \dots)$ .

Influence curves  $\psi(x_{\leq t})$  of AL estimators as in (2), but  $\mathbf{E}(\psi(x_{\leq t}) | x_{<t}) = 0$   
(stationary, ergodic martingale differences). Jeganathan (1982), Staab (1984), Rieder (2003)

Differentiability (1) now refers to transition densities of the ideal model  $\mathcal{P}$ .

Joint law of  $x_{\leq n}$ :  $Q^{(n)}(dx_{\leq n}) = \prod_{j=1}^n Q^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j}) Q^{(n,0)}(dx_{\leq 0})$

**Neighborhoods** ( $* = c, t = \varepsilon$ ) of radius  $r_n = r s_n = r n^{-1/2}$  about the  
ideal **transition distributions**  $P^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j})$  with **contamination curve**  $\varepsilon$ :

$$Q^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j}) = \quad (37)$$

$$(1 - r_n \varepsilon(x_{<j})) P^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j}) + r_n \varepsilon(x_{<j}) M^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j})$$

where  $M^{(n,j|<j)}(dx_j | x_{<j})$  any kernel, initial distribution (of  $x_{\leq 0}$ ) left ideal.

$$\alpha = 1: \mathbf{E} \varepsilon \leq 1, \quad \alpha = 2: \mathbf{E} \varepsilon^2 \leq 1$$

Bickel (1984), Rieder (1987) for regression

Bias terms for  $* = c$  and  $t = \varepsilon$ , respectively  $t = \alpha = 1, 2$ :

$$\omega_{c,\varepsilon}(\psi) = \mathbb{E} \varepsilon(x_{\leq 0}) \sup_{x_1} |\psi(x_1, x_{\leq 0})| \quad (38)$$

$$\omega_{c,1}(\psi) = \|\psi\|_{\infty}, \quad \omega_{c,2}^2(\psi) = \mathbb{E} \sup_{x_1} |\psi(x_1, x_{\leq 0})|^2 \quad (39)$$

Transition scores:  $\Lambda_1 = \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1)(H'_1, \tau)'$  where  $\tau = \phi(1)/\xi(1)$  and

$$H'_1 = (-B\phi^{-1}(B), \dots, -B^p\phi^{-1}(B); B\xi^{-1}(B), \dots, B^q\xi^{-1}(B))V_1 \quad (40)$$

Denoting  $\mathcal{K} = \text{Cov} H_1$ , Fisher information is:  $\mathcal{I} = \mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} \text{diag}(\mathcal{K}, \tau^2)$

$\implies$  **classical adaptivity** (w.r.t.  $\mu$  and w.r.t.  $(\phi, \xi)$ )

Analogy to regression with intercept on identifying  $H_1$  as regressor.

Robust ICs are of regression type form (15), (16), (18), (28), (29).

In the model with parameter  $(\phi, \xi, \mu = 0)$ :

$$\varrho_{c,\alpha} = AH_1(\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1) - \vartheta_{\alpha}) w_{\alpha}, \quad w_{\alpha} = \min\left\{1, \frac{\beta_{\alpha}}{|\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1) - \vartheta_{\alpha}|}\right\} \quad (41)$$

$\alpha = 1$ :  $\beta_1 = b/|AH_1|$ ,  $\vartheta_1 = \vartheta_1(H_1)$  **Hampel-type**

$\alpha = 2$ :  $\beta_2 = \text{constant}$ ,  $\vartheta_2 = \text{constant}$  **Huber-type**

## Robust Adaptivity for ARMA

1) Estimation of  $(\phi, \xi)$ , nuisance parameter  $\mu$ :

**Robust adaptivity** in case  $\alpha = 2$ , in case  $\alpha = 1$  if  $F$  is symmetric.

In fact,  $E H_1 = 0$ , and  $H_1, \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1)$  are stochastically independent, so

$$E A H_1 (\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} - \vartheta_2)^2 \min\left\{1, \frac{\beta_2}{|\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} - \vartheta_2|}\right\} = 0 \quad (\alpha = 2)$$

But

$$E A H_1 (\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} - \vartheta_1)^2 \min\left\{1, \frac{b/|AH|}{|\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}} - \vartheta_1(H)|}\right\} = 0 \quad (\alpha = 1)$$

where  $\vartheta_1(H_1) = \vartheta_1(-H_1)$ , requires  $\mathcal{L}_F(H_1)$ , resp.  $F$ , to be symmetric.

**Nonadaptivity** for AR(1), MA(1) with asymmetric  $F = \text{Gumbel}(\gamma, 1)$ ,

$\gamma = -\text{di}\Gamma(1)$  ( $\Rightarrow \int v dF(v) = 0$ ), at most 3%! Kohl (2005)

2) Estimation of  $\mu$  with nuisance parameter  $(\phi, \xi)$ :

**Robust adaptivity** for  $\alpha = 1, 2$

robust IC:  $\varrho_{c,12} = A \Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1) \min\{1, \beta_{12} |\Lambda_f^{\text{loc}}(V_1)|^{-1}\} \quad \alpha = 1, 2$



$$\mathbf{2.5 ARCH}(p): \quad X_t = \sigma(1 + a_1 X_{t-1}^2 + \dots + a_p X_{t-p}^2)^{1/2} V_t \quad t \in \mathbb{Z}$$

Innovations  $V_t$  i.i.d.  $\sim F$ ,  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{sc}} < \infty$ ,  $\int v dF(v) = 0$ ,  $\int v^2 dF(v) = 1$

Stationarity, ergodicity:  $\mathbb{E} \log V_t^2 + \log \sigma^2 + \log \max_j a_j < 0$

Estimation of  $a$ , nuisance parameter  $\sigma$ :

**No adaptivity**—neither classical nor robust ( $* = c$ ,  $\alpha = 1$ ).

ARCH(1) with  $F = \text{logNormal}(\delta, \gamma)$  with  $\delta = -e^{\gamma^2/2}$  ( $\Rightarrow \int v dF(v) = 0$ ):

**Nonadaptivity** increases with  $r \in [0, \infty)$ .

Kohl (2005), MonteCarlo

$$a_1 = 1, \gamma = .5: \quad .3 \uparrow .4, \quad a_1 = 10, \gamma = .5: \quad 25 \uparrow 160.$$

**Conclusion** *Classical adaptivity extends to robust adaptivity for neighborhoods  $* = c$ ,  $\alpha = 2$ , for neighborhoods  $* = c$ ,  $t = 0$ ,  $\alpha = 1$  some additional symmetry of the ideal model may be needed.*

**Neighborhood model**  $\mathcal{Q} = \{Q \mid Q \in U_*(P_\theta, r), \theta \in \Theta\}$  of neighborhoods about the elements of an ideal model  $\mathcal{P} = \{P_\theta \mid \theta \in \Theta\}$ . Writing

$$Q_{\theta, \nu} = P_\theta + \nu, \quad \nu := Q - P_\theta \quad \text{for } Q \in U_*(P_\theta, r) \quad (42)$$

puts  $\mathcal{Q}$  into semiparametric model form: main parameter  $\theta$ , nuisance parameter  $\nu = Q - P_\theta \in H_\theta := U_*(P_\theta, r) - P_\theta$ ; in particular,  $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{Q}_{\nu_0=0}$ .

**Remark** We assume a true  $\theta$  (idealistic approach), so the law  $Q$  may be referred to this  $\theta$ . Conversely, given  $Q$ , the inclusion  $Q \in U_*(P_\theta, r)$  may not define  $\theta$  uniquely.

**Neighborhoods**  $U_c(\theta, r) = \{(1-r)P + rM \mid M \text{ any probability}\}$  (convex contamination) and balls  $U_*(\theta, r) = \{Q \mid d_*(Q, P_\theta) \leq r\}$  in the Hellinger and total variation metrics, which are defined by

$$\sqrt{2} d_h^2(Q, P) = \|\sqrt{dQ} - \sqrt{dP}\|_2, \quad 2 d_v(Q, P) = \|dQ - dP\|_1 \quad (43)$$

**3.1 Proposition 1** Fix  $\theta_0, \nu_0 = 0$ . Then  $\partial_2 \mathcal{Q}_* = rG_*$  for  $* = h, v, c$ , where  $G_* =$  all functions  $g \in L_2(P_{\theta_0})$ ,  $\mathbb{E} g = 0$ , such that, respectively,

$$(h) \quad \mathbb{E} g^2 \leq 8 \quad (v) \quad \mathbb{E} |g| \leq 2 \quad (c) \quad g \geq -1 \quad (44)$$

In particular, if  $r > 0$ :  $\text{cl lin } \partial_2 \mathcal{Q}_* = L_2(P_{\theta_0})$ , so  $\Pi_2(\Lambda) = \Lambda$  and  $\bar{\Lambda} = 0$ .

We therefore dispense with the linear span and define the **sp-robust IC**

$$\tilde{\varrho}_* := \mathcal{C}^{-1}\tilde{\Lambda}, \quad \tilde{\Lambda} = \Lambda - \tilde{\Pi}_2(\Lambda), \quad \mathcal{C} = \mathbb{E}\tilde{\Lambda}\Lambda' \quad (45)$$

in analogy to  $\psi_{\text{eff}}$ , but employing nonlinear projection  $\tilde{\Pi}_2: L_2^k \rightarrow (rG_*)^k$  onto closed convex sets; the radius  $r$  is assumed so small that  $\det \mathcal{C} \neq 0$ .

**3.2 Lemma 1** *Let  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \hat{\mathcal{G}}, \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  be some nonempty closed convex: subset, cone, and linear subspace, respectively, of some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$ . Then, for any  $\kappa \in \mathcal{H}$ , the unique best approximations  $\tilde{\kappa} \in \tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \hat{\kappa} \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}, \bar{\kappa} \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  of  $\kappa$  are characterized by*

$$\langle \kappa - \tilde{\kappa} | g \rangle \leq \langle \kappa - \tilde{\kappa} | \tilde{\kappa} \rangle, \quad \langle \kappa - \hat{\kappa} | g \rangle \leq \langle \kappa - \hat{\kappa} | \hat{\kappa} \rangle = 0, \quad \langle \kappa - \bar{\kappa} | g \rangle = 0 \quad (46)$$

for all  $g$  in  $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}, \hat{\mathcal{G}},$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{G}},$  respectively.

**3.2 Theorem 2** (h) *If  $8r^2 < \min_{j=1, \dots, k} \mathcal{I}_{j,j}$  then  $\tilde{\varrho}_h = \mathcal{I}^{-1}\Lambda$ .*

(v) *If  $2r < \min_{j=1, \dots, k} \mathbb{E}|\Lambda_j|$  then*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{(v)} = v_j' \vee \Lambda_j \wedge v_j'' \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{E}(v_j' - \Lambda_j)_+ = r = \mathbb{E}(\Lambda_j - v_j'')_+ \quad (47)$$

(c) *If  $r < -\max_{j=1, \dots, k} \inf_{P_{\theta_0}} \Lambda_j$  then*

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{(c)} = (\Lambda_j + r) \wedge u_j \quad \text{where} \quad \mathbb{E}((\Lambda_j + r) \wedge u_j) = 0 \quad (48)$$

**Hellinger balls** Since  $\text{MSE}_h(\psi, r) = \text{tr Cov } \psi + 8r^2 \max_{\psi} \text{Cov } \psi$  and  $\text{Cov } \psi \geq \mathcal{I}^{-1} \forall \text{ICs in model } \mathcal{P}$ , the robust IC is  $\varrho_h = \mathcal{I}^{-1}\Lambda$  for all  $r \geq 0$ . Thus  $\tilde{\varrho}_h = \varrho_h$  whenever  $\tilde{\varrho}_h$  is defined.

**Remark** Despite  $\varrho_h = \psi_{\text{class}}$ , model  $\mathcal{P}$  is not adaptive w.r.t. Hellinger neighborhoods since  $\text{MSE}_h(\varrho_h, r) = \text{tr } \mathcal{I}^{-1} + 8r^2 \max_{\psi} \text{Cov } \psi > \text{MSE}_h(\varrho_h, 0)$  for  $r > 0$ .

**Contamination neighborhoods** Risk  $\text{MSE}_c(\psi, r) = \|\psi\|_2^2 + r^2 \|\psi\|_\infty^2$  is uniquely minimized by the robust IC  $\varrho_c$ ,

$$\varrho_c = (A\Lambda - a) \min\{1, b |A\Lambda - a|^{-1}\} \quad (49)$$

where

$$r^2 b = E(|A\Lambda - a| - b)_+ \quad (50)$$

Rieder (1994)

The sp-robust IC  $\tilde{\varrho}_c$  (exchanging linear combination and clipping) has the coordinates

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{c,j} = C_{j,1}^- (\Lambda_1 + r) \wedge u_1 + \dots + C_{j,k}^- (\Lambda_k + r) \wedge u_k \quad (51)$$

with upper clipping constants  $u_j$  from (48) and  $(C_{j,j}^-) = \mathcal{C}^{-1}$  from (45).

In general, due to only one-sided (upper) bounds:  $\text{MSE}_c(\tilde{\varrho}_c, r) = \infty!$

### Total variation balls—dimension $k = 1$

Robust IC minimizing  $\text{MSE}_v(\psi, r) = \|\psi\|_2^2 + r^2(\sup \psi - \inf \psi)^2$  is given by

$$\varrho_v = c' \vee A\Lambda \wedge c'' \quad (52)$$

where

$$r^2(c'' - c') = \text{E}(c' - A\Lambda)_+ = \text{E}(A\Lambda - c'')_+ \quad (53)$$

**3.3 Theorem 1** *The sp-robust IC  $\tilde{\varrho}_v$  for  $r < \text{E}\Lambda_+$  coincides with the robust IC  $\varrho_v$  for*

$$\tilde{r} = \sqrt{\frac{r}{v_r'' - v_r'}} \quad (54)$$

where

$$\text{E}(v_r' - \Lambda)_+ = r = \text{E}(\Lambda - v_r'')_+ \quad (55)$$

Rieder (2000)

**3.3 Example 2** In case  $P_\theta = \mathcal{N}(\theta, 1)$ ,  $\tilde{\varrho}_v$  turns out pessimistic since

$$\tilde{r}/r \geq 2.2 \quad \forall r < 1/\sqrt{2\pi}, \quad \text{and } \tilde{r}/r \uparrow \infty \text{ as } r \downarrow 0 \text{ or } \uparrow 1/\sqrt{2\pi}$$

MSE-evaluation desirable.

### Total variation balls—dimension $k > 1$

Robust IC minimizing  $\text{MSE}_v(\psi, r) = \|\psi\|_2^2 + r^2 \omega_{v;s}^2$  for  $s = 2, \infty$  with

$$\omega_{v;2}^2(\psi) = \sum_{j=1}^k (\sup \psi_j - \inf \psi_j)^2, \quad \text{respectively}$$

$$\omega_{v;\infty}^2(\psi) = \max_{j=1, \dots, k} (\sup \psi_j - \inf \psi_j)^2,$$

has coordinates of form  $\varrho_{v,j} = c'_j \vee A_j \Lambda \wedge c''_j$  where, for variant  $s = 2$ ,

$$r^2(c''_j - c'_j) = \text{E}(c'_j - A_j \Lambda)_+ = \text{E}(A_j \Lambda - c''_j)_+ \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, k$$

respectively, for variant  $s = \infty$ ,  $\forall j = 1, \dots, k$ ,

$$r^2(c''_j - c'_j) = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{E}(c'_i - A_i \Lambda)_+ = \sum_{i=1}^k \text{E}(A_i \Lambda - c''_i)_+$$

Sp-robust IC  $\tilde{\varrho}_v$  has the coordinates:

$$\tilde{\varrho}_{v,j} = C_{j,1}^- v'_1 \vee \Lambda_1 \wedge v''_1 + \dots + C_{j,k}^- v'_k \vee \Lambda_k \wedge v''_k \quad (56)$$

where  $\text{E}(v'_j - \Lambda_j)_+ = r = \text{E}(\Lambda_j - v''_j)_+$  and  $(C_{j,i}^-) = \mathcal{C}^{-1}$  from (45), (47).

Thus the order of clipping and linear combination is interchanged again.

$\tilde{\varrho}_v$  is suboptimal but still sensibly robust. A MSE-comparison desirable.

Dimension  $k = 1$ . Given any probability  $P$ , we consider local asymptotic alternatives along tangents  $g \in L_2(P)$ ,  $\int g dP = \mathbb{E} g = \langle g | 1 \rangle = 0$ ,

$$dP_{n,g} \approx (1 + s_n g) dP, \quad s_n = 1/\sqrt{n} \quad (57)$$

E.g., by  $P$ -densities:  $(\frac{1}{2} s g + (1 - \frac{1}{4} s^2 \|g\|^2)^{1/2})^2$ , or simply:  $1 + s g$ , if  $\|g\|_\infty < \infty$ .

Observations  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  i.i.d.  $\sim P_{n,g}$ .

Let  $G_0, G_1 \subset L_2 \cap \{\mathbb{E} = 0\}$ ,  $G_0 \cap G_1 = \emptyset$ . Fix any  $g := (g_0, g_1) \in G_0 \times G_1$ . The simple asymptotic testing problem  $H_{g_0}$  vs.  $K_{g_1}$  at level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is:

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \delta_n dP_{n,g_1}^n = \max! \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \delta_n dP_{n,g_0}^n \leq \alpha \quad (58)$$

Denoting  $g_{10} := g_1 - g_0$ , the **optimal test** is  $\delta_g = (\delta_{n,g})$ ,

$$\delta_{n,g} = \mathbf{1} \left( s_n \sum_{i=1}^n g_{10}(x_i) > \|g_{10}\| u_\alpha + \langle g_{10} | g_0 \rangle \right) \quad (59)$$

where  $\|\cdot\| = \|\cdot\|_2 = \langle \cdot | \cdot \rangle^{1/2}$ , and  $u_\alpha =$  standard normal upper  $\alpha$  point:  $\Phi(-u_\alpha) = \alpha$ .

$\delta_g$  achieves asymptotic size  $\alpha$  and power  $\Phi(-u_\alpha + \|g_{10}\|)$  under  $H_{g_0}, K_{g_1}$ .

The tests  $\delta_{n,g}$  are unique up to terms  $\rightarrow 0$  in  $P^n$ -probability.

The maxmin asymptotic testing problem  $H_{G_0}$  vs.  $K_{G_1}$  at level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is

$$\inf_{g_1 \in G_1} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \delta_n dP_{n, g_1}^n = \max! \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \sup_{g_0 \in G_0} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \delta_n dP_{n, g_0}^n \leq \alpha \quad (60)$$

Assume now  $G_0, G_1$  closed, convex. Pass to  $G_{10} := G_1 - G_0$ , which set is convex, but need not be closed if  $\dim L_2(P) > 1$ . We assume  $G_{10}$  closed and pick  $q_{10} := q_1 - q_0$  the unique minimum norm element of  $G_{10}$ .

### 3.4 Theorem 1 [saddle point for testing]

Then the maxmin asy. testing problem  $H_{G_0}$  vs.  $K_{G_1}$  at level  $\alpha$  has saddle point  $(q, \delta_q)$ , and the maxmin asy. power =  $\Phi(-u_\alpha + \|q_{10}\|)$ .

Any other pair  $g = (g_0, g_1)$  in  $G_0 \times G_1$  achieving  $g_{10} = q_{10}$  also provides a saddle point  $(g, \delta_g)$ , and necessarily  $\delta_g = \delta_q$ .

**Proof** Based on LAN, this is the **statistical equivalent** of the first characterization in (46) with  $\kappa = 0$ , for the minimum norm element of closed convex sets.

Given some scores  $\Lambda \in L_2(P_{\theta_0})$ ,  $\int \Lambda dP_{\theta_0} = 0$ , and  $\tau \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $\neq 0$ , enlarge the parametric alternatives  $dP_{\theta_0 + s_n \tau} \approx (1 + s_n \tau \Lambda) dP_{\theta_0}$  to  $P_{n, g}$ , by the nuisance parameter  $g \in G_0$ , respectively  $g \in \tau \Lambda + G_1$ . Then

$$q_{10} = \tau \Lambda - \tilde{\Pi}_2(\tau \Lambda | G_0 - G_1) \quad (61)$$



To test neighborhoods  $U_*(\theta_0, s_n r_0)$  and  $U_*(\theta_0 + s_n \tau, s_n r_1)$  about  $P = P_{\theta_0}$  and  $P_{\theta_0 + s_n \tau}$  of type  $*$  =  $h, v, c$  with possibly different radii  $s_n r_0$  and  $s_n r_1$ , respectively, employ the tangent balls  $G_*$  defined in (37) and put

$$G_{*,0} = r_0 G_*, \quad G_{*,1} = \tau \Lambda + r_1 G_* \quad (62)$$

Abbreviate  $H_* := H_{G_{*,0}}$  and  $K_* := K_{G_{*,1}}$ .

**3.5 Theorem 1 [Hellinger balls,  $*$  =  $h$ ]** *Let  $8r^2 < \tau^2 \|\Lambda\|^2$ . Then the least favorable tangent pair  $q_h = (q_{h,0}, q_{h,1})$  in  $G_{h,0} \times G_{h,1}$  is unique,*

$$q_{h,0} = r_0 \gamma \Lambda, \quad q_{h,1} = \tau \Lambda - r_1 \gamma \Lambda \quad \text{where } \gamma = \sqrt{8} \|\Lambda\|^{-1} \quad (63)$$

The maxmin test  $\delta_{q_h} = (\delta_{n,q_h})$  for  $H_h$  vs.  $K_h$  is

$$\delta_{n,q_h} = \mathbf{1} \left( s_n \|\Lambda\|^{-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda(x_i) > u_\alpha + \sqrt{8} r_0 \right) \quad (64)$$

$$\text{Maxmin asymptotic power} = \Phi(-u_\alpha + \tau \|\Lambda\| - \sqrt{8} r).$$

**Remarks** a) Despite of classical test statistics, no adaptivity w.r.t. Hellinger balls.

b) No Huber–Strassen least favorable pairs  $dQ_1 = \pi dQ_0$  to compare with: Birgè (1980)

$$Q_0(\pi > t) \geq Q'(\pi > t), \quad Q_1(\pi > t) \leq Q''(\pi > t) \quad \forall Q' \in \mathcal{Q}_0, Q'' \in \mathcal{Q}_1, \forall t > 0 \quad (65)$$

**3.5 Theorem 2** [Total variation balls,  $* = v$ ] *Let  $2r < \tau \mathbb{E}|\Lambda|$ .*

a) *Then a least favorable tangent pair  $q_v = (q_{v,0}, q_{v,1})$  in  $G_{v,0} \times G_{v,1}$  is given by  $q_{v,0} = r_0 \tilde{g}_v$ ,  $q_{v,1} = \tau \Lambda - r_1 \tilde{g}_v$  for the tangent  $\tilde{g}_v$  defined by*

$$r \tilde{g}_v = \tau(\Lambda - v'')_+ - \tau(v' - \Lambda)_+ \quad (66)$$

*and  $v' < 0 < v''$  determined by  $\tau \mathbb{E}(v' - \Lambda)_+ = r = \tau \mathbb{E}(\Lambda - v'')_+$ .*

*A tangent pair  $g_{v,0} = r_0 g_0$ ,  $g_{v,1} = \tau \Lambda - g_1$  is least favorable iff*

$$r_0 g_0^+ + r_1 g_1^+ = \tau(\Lambda - v'')_+, \quad r_0 g_0^- + r_1 g_1^- = \tau(v' - \Lambda)_+ \quad (67)$$

*With  $\Lambda^{(v)} := v' \vee \Lambda \wedge v''$ , the maxmin test  $\delta_{q_v} = (\delta_{n,q_v})$  for  $H_v$  vs.  $K_v$  is*

$$\delta_{n,q_v} = \mathbf{1} \left( s_n \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda^{(v)}(x_i) > \|\Lambda^{(v)}\| u_\alpha + r_0(v'' - v') \right) \quad (68)$$

*Maxmin asy. power =  $\Phi(-u_\alpha + \tau \|\Lambda^{(v)}\|)$ .*

b)  $\delta_{q_v}$  *coincides with the robust asy. test based on least favorable probability pairs for  $U_v(P_{\theta_0}; r_0/\sqrt{n})$  vs.  $U_v(P_{\theta_0+\tau/\sqrt{n}}; r_1/\sqrt{n})$ , hence maximizes the asy. minimum power over  $U_v(P_{\theta_0+\tau/\sqrt{n}}; r_1/\sqrt{n})$  subject to asy. maximum size  $\leq \alpha$  over  $U_v(P_{\theta_0}; r_0/\sqrt{n})$ .*

**3.5 Theorem 3** [Contamination,  $* = c$ ] Let  $r_0 < \mathbb{E}(\tau\Lambda - (r_1 - r_0))_+$ .

a) The least favorable tangent pair  $q_c = (q_{c,0}, q_{c,1})$  in  $G_{c,0} \times G_{c,1}$  is unique,

$$q_{c,0} = \tau(\Lambda - c'')_+ - r_0, \quad q_{c,1} = \tau\Lambda + \tau(c' - \Lambda)_+ - r_1 \quad (69)$$

where  $c' < z := (r_1 - r_0)/\tau < c''$  are determined by  $\mathbb{E} q_{c,0} = \mathbb{E} q_{c,1} = 0$ .

Based on  $\Lambda^{(c)} := c' \vee \Lambda \wedge c'' - z$ , the maxmin test  $\delta_{q_c} = (\delta_{n,q_c})$  for  $H_c$  vs.  $K_c$  is

$$\delta_{n,q_c} = \mathbf{1} \left( s_n \sum_{i=1}^n \Lambda^{(c)}(x_i) > \|\Lambda^{(c)}\| u_\alpha + r_0(c'' - z) \right) \quad (70)$$

$$\text{Maxmin asy. power} = \Phi(-u_\alpha + \tau \|\Lambda^{(c)}\|).$$

b)  $\delta_{q_c}$  coincides with the robust asy. test based on least favorable probability pairs for  $U_c(P_{\theta_0}; r_0/\sqrt{n})$  vs.  $U_c(P_{\theta_0+\tau/\sqrt{n}}; r_1/\sqrt{n})$ , hence maximizes the asy. minimum power over  $U_c(P_{\theta_0+\tau/\sqrt{n}}; r_1/\sqrt{n})$  subject to asy. maximum size  $\leq \alpha$  over  $U_c(P_{\theta_0}; r_0/\sqrt{n})$ .

Huber (1964), (1968), Huber–Carol (1970), Huber–Strassen (1973), Rieder (1978), (2000)

## Summary

### ESTIMATION

Hellinger ( $* = h$ ): SpM (semiparametric method) yields the optimally robust IC.

Total variation ( $* = v$ ), parameter dim  $k = 1$ : SpM yields a suboptimal IC of optimally robust form (for a different radius).

Total variation ( $* = v$ ), parameter dim  $k > 1$ : SpM eases the problem by exchanging the order of clipping and linear combination of coordinates. The sp-robust IC thus obtained is reasonably robust under MSE.

Contamination ( $* = c$ ): SpM fails, yielding unbounded ICs,  $\text{MSE} = \infty$ .

### TESTING a one-dimensional parameter

Total variation, contamination ( $* = c, v$ ): SpM yields the optimally robust—maxmin—asymptotic tests of *Huber–Strassen* form.

Hellinger ( $* = h$ ): SpM yields a maxmin asymptotic test—although, at finite sample size, no Huber–Strassen pairs exist.

Adaptive constructions by Beran (1976), Kreiß (1987) for ARMA, and by Drost, Klaassen, Wercker (1997, 1998) for ARCH, GARCH, TAR, such that for all  $F, \theta$

$$\mathcal{L}_{F,\theta}\{(n\mathcal{I}_{F,\theta})^{1/2}(S_n - \theta)\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k) \quad (71)$$

Adaptation w.r.t. symmetric innovation distribution.

### Nonuniformity

Klaassen (1980)

*1-dim location,  $F$  symmetric,  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} < \infty$ ,  $S_n: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  translation equivariant, sample size  $n$  fixed. Then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0 \forall x > 0$*

$$\inf_{G \in B_c^{\text{s},i}(F, \varepsilon)} G^n\{|(n\mathcal{I}_G)^{1/2}S_n| \leq x\} = 0 < 2\Phi(x) - 1 \quad (72)$$

where  $B_c^{\text{s},i}(F, \varepsilon) = \{(1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon H \mid H \text{ symmetric, } \mathcal{I}_H^{\text{loc}} < \infty\}$

Extensions to other models? Practical use of adaptive estimators?

Robustness?

Bickel (1981), (1982), Huber (1996)

**Models** Location, scale (nonidentifiable), linear regression, ARMA having a finite Fisher information of the form

$$\mathcal{I}_{F,\theta} = \mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc/sc}} \sigma_F^2 \mathcal{K}_\theta \quad (73)$$

Factor  $\sigma_F^2 = \int v^2 F(dv)$ , where  $\mu_F = \int v F(dv) = 0$ , appears only in MA, AR, ARMA.

Huber (1981)

$$\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_c^1} \left( \int \dot{\varphi} dF \right)^2 / \int \varphi^2 dF \quad (74)$$

$\mathcal{C}_c^1$  := all continuously differentiable functions of compact support. Then:  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} < \infty$  iff  $dF = f d\lambda$ ,  $f$  abs. continuous and  $\int (\Lambda_F^{\text{loc}})^2 dF < \infty$ , in which case  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc}} = \int (\Lambda_F^{\text{loc}})^2 dF$ .

Ruckdeschel, Rieder (2010)

$$\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{sc}} := \sup_{\varphi \in \mathcal{C}_{1,c}} \left( \int v \dot{\varphi}(v) dF \right)^2 / \int \varphi^2 dF \quad (75)$$

$\mathcal{C}_{1,c}$  := all functions with continuous derivative of compact support. Then:  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{sc}} < \infty$  iff  $dF = f d\lambda$  on  $\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}$ ,  $v \mapsto v f(v)$  is abs. continuous and  $\int_{\neq 0} (\Lambda_F^{\text{sc}})^2 dF < \infty$  where  $\Lambda_F^{\text{sc}} = v \Lambda_F^{\text{loc}} - 1$ , in which case  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{sc}} = \int_{\neq 0} (\Lambda_F^{\text{sc}})^2 dF$ .

$\implies \mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc/sc}}$  is convex and weakly l.s.c. but not u.s.c. !

Kolmogorov metric = sup-norm distance between c.d.f.'s on  $\mathbb{R}^k$

### 4.3 Theorem 1 (location, scale, linear regression, MA)

Assume  $\mathcal{I}_F^{\text{loc/sc}} < \infty$ ,  $S_n: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$  any estimator,  $n$  fixed. Then  $\forall \varepsilon > 0$

$$\sup_{G \in B_c^{s,i}(F, \varepsilon)} d_\kappa \left( \mathcal{L}_{G, \theta} \left\{ (n \mathcal{I}_{G, \theta}^{1/2}(S_n - \theta)) \right\}, \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k) \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} - \kappa_n \quad (76)$$

where

$$\kappa_n := d_\kappa \left( \mathcal{L}_{F, \theta} \left\{ (n \mathcal{I}_{F, \theta}^{1/2}(S_n - \theta)) \right\}, \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k) \right) \quad (77)$$

and  $B_c^{s,i}(F, \varepsilon) =$  all  $(1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon H$  with  $H$  symmetric,  $\mathcal{I}_H^{\text{loc/sc}} < \infty$ , and, in case MA, in addition  $\mu_H = 0$ ,  $\sigma_H^2 \in (0, \infty)$ .

**Remarks** a) No equivariance, no symmetry assumptions.

b) Use  $G_m = (1 - \varepsilon_m)F + \varepsilon_m/2 (\mathcal{N}(-a, \sigma_m^2) + \mathcal{N}(a, \sigma_m^2))$  with  $\varepsilon_m, \sigma_m^2 \rightarrow 0$  such that  $\mathcal{I}_{G_m}^{\text{loc/sc}} \rightarrow \infty$  and, in case of MA,  $\sigma_{G_m}^2 \rightarrow \sigma_F^2$ . In these models, the joint law of observations is  $d_\nu$ -continuous in the innovation distribution. Pass to  $d_\kappa$ , which is scale invariant and metrizes weak convergence to  $\mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k)$ .

c)  $1 - 2^{-k} = d_\kappa(1_0, \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k))$

### 4.3 Theorem 2 (location, scale, linear regression, MA, AR, ARMA)

If  $\mathcal{L}_{F,\theta}\{(n\mathcal{I}_{F,\theta}^{1/2}(S_n - \theta))\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k)$  then, for any  $\varepsilon_n \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{G \in B_c^{s,i}(F, \varepsilon_n)} d_\kappa \left( \mathcal{L}_{G,\theta}\{(n\mathcal{I}_{G,\theta}^{1/2}(S_n - \theta))\}, \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{I}_k) \right) \geq 1 - \frac{1}{2^k} \quad (78)$$

where  $B_c^{s,i}(F, \varepsilon) =$  all  $(1 - \varepsilon)F + \varepsilon H$  with  $H$  symmetric,  $\mathcal{I}_H^{\text{loc/sc}} < \infty$ , and, in the cases MA, AR, ARMA, in addition  $\mu_H = 0$ ,  $\sigma_H^2 \in (0, \infty)$ . In the case of AR, ARMA, the functions  $S_n$  are required to be continuous.

**Remarks** a) Adaptive constructions  $S_n$  are smooth in the observations.  
 b) In AR, ARMA, i.e.  $\text{MA}(\infty)$ , the joint law of the observations is not  $d_\nu$ -continuous in the innovation distribution. Instead, we derive bounds in  $L_2$  which translate to Prokhorov distance  $d_\pi$  via

Strassen (1965)

$$d_\pi(\mathcal{L}(Y), \mathcal{L}(X)) \leq \sqrt{\|Y - X\|_2} \quad (79)$$

Invoke continuity of  $S_n$  and, again, switch to  $d_\kappa$ .

c) ARCH? GARCH?



Let  $(\mathcal{M}, d)$  be any metric space, balls  $B(F, r)$  (open/closed).  
For any given function  $\alpha: \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  consider

$$\beta(F, r) := \sup\{\alpha(G) \mid G \in B(F, r)\} \quad (80)$$

which, for fixed  $F$ , increases in  $r$ .

**4.4 Lemma 1** *The function  $\beta$  satisfies*

$$\beta(F, r - 0) \leq \liminf_{G \rightarrow F} \beta(G, r) \leq \limsup_{G \rightarrow F} \beta(G, r) \leq \beta(F, r + 0) \quad (81)$$

with “=” except for countably many values of  $r$ , depending on  $F$ .

Follows from  $B(F, r - \delta) \subset B(G, r) \subset B(F, r + \delta)$  if  $\delta = d(G, F)$ .

**Remarks** a) Robust risk (max Var, max MSE, min FisherInfo) continuous.

b) Weak dependence of robust estimators and minmaxrisk on the unknown radius  $r$  of neighborhoods as a nuisance parameter. Rieder, Ruckdeschel, Kohl (2008)

c) Based on uniform tightness of the empirical process, uniformly asymptotically normal constructions of robust estimators in the independent case,

$$\mathcal{L}_{Q_n^n} \{n^{1/2}(S_n - T(Q_n))\} \rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \text{Cov}_{\varrho\theta}) \quad (82)$$

for all sequences  $Q_n$  out of neighborhoods  $U_*(\theta, r_n)$  about  $P_\theta$ ,  $r_n = r n^{-1/2}$ ,  $0 < r < \infty$ .

d) Difficulties under dependence; need neighborhoods smaller than (2.30).

**Functional**  $T: \mathcal{P} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ , defined on a family  $\mathcal{P}$  of pm's on some sample space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{A})$ . Observations  $x_1, \dots, x_n$  i.i.d.  $\sim$  any  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ .

Want most accurate tests and confidence statements about  $T(P)$ .

Fix any  $P = P_0 \in \mathcal{P}$ . Local alternatives at  $P$  within  $\mathcal{P}$  are defined by

$$\sqrt{dP_{g,s}} = \left(1 + \frac{s}{2}g\right)\sqrt{dP} + o(s) \quad \text{as } s \downarrow 0 \quad (83)$$

**Tangent set**  $\mathcal{G}$  of all  $g \in L_2(P)$ ,  $g \perp 1$ ,  $P_{g,s} \in \mathcal{P}$  for small  $s > 0$ .

$\mathcal{G}$  is a cone, vertex at 0 (i.e.,  $\gamma g \in \mathcal{G}$  whenever  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\gamma \geq 0$ ), and will be assumed also convex (i.e.,  $\gamma_1 g_1 + \gamma_2 g_2 \in \mathcal{G}$  for all  $g_0, g_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ ,  $\gamma_0, \gamma_1 \geq 0$ ).

**Differentiability** of  $T$ : There is some  $\kappa \in L_2(P)$  such that for all  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ ,

$$T(P_{g,s}) = T(P) + s\langle \kappa | g \rangle + o(s) \quad \text{as } s \downarrow 0 \quad (84)$$

$\kappa$  is nonunique, but  $\bar{\kappa} =$  the orthoprojection of  $\kappa$  onto  $\text{cl lin } \mathcal{G}$  is unique.

In addition, let  $\hat{\kappa} =$  the (nonorthogonal) projection of  $\kappa$  onto  $\text{cl } \mathcal{G}$ .

**Literature** The \*-Theorem 25.20, for  $\mathcal{G}$  a cone, and LAM-Theorem 25.21, for  $\mathcal{G}$  a convex cone, by v.d.Vaart (1998) are both in terms of  $\bar{\kappa}$ , not  $\hat{\kappa}$ .

For  $\mathcal{G}$  a (closed) convex cone, Pfanzagl+Wefelmeyer (1982) state optimal 2-sided confidence bounds, and Janssen (1999) optimal 1-sided tests, in terms of  $\hat{\kappa}$ , but, in the proofs, assume  $-\mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{G}$ , whence  $\mathcal{G}$  linear, resp.  $\kappa - \hat{\kappa} \perp \mathcal{G}$ , whence  $\hat{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}$ .

**Characterizations** of  $\bar{\kappa} \in \text{cl lin } \mathcal{G}$  and  $\hat{\kappa} \in \text{cl } \mathcal{G}$  as in (46) by, respectively,

$$\kappa - \bar{\kappa} \perp \mathcal{G}; \text{ that is, } \langle \kappa | g \rangle = \langle \bar{\kappa} | g \rangle \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G} \quad (85)$$

$$\langle \kappa | \hat{\kappa} \rangle = \langle \hat{\kappa} | \hat{\kappa} \rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \kappa | g \rangle \leq \langle \hat{\kappa} | g \rangle \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G} \quad (86)$$

Bounds based on  $\hat{\kappa}$  are sharper since  $\|\hat{\kappa}\| < \|\bar{\kappa}\|$  unless  $\bar{\kappa} = \hat{\kappa}$ .

We shall assume either

- a)  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  a closed convex cone, vertex at 0,      OR
- b)  $\mathcal{G} = \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  a closed linear space.

For comparison, let  $P = P_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{P}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{P}}$ , where the smaller model  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$  has tangent set a closed convex cone  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , and the tangent set of the larger model  $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$  is the closed linear span  $\bar{\mathcal{G}} = \text{cl lin } \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  of  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ . We assume that

$$\bar{\kappa} \in \bar{\mathcal{G}} \setminus \hat{\mathcal{G}} \text{ (i.e. } \bar{\kappa} \neq \hat{\kappa} \text{) and } \hat{\kappa} \neq 0. \quad (87)$$

**5.1 Example 1** Let  $P = \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  and  $\kappa(x) = x$  the identity on the real line;  $\kappa$  may be interpreted the influence curve at  $P$  of the expectation functional as well as of the one-sample normal scores rank functional.

As tangent sets at  $P$ , consider  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ , the convex hull and linear span, respectively, of the two tangents  $g_1(x) = \text{sign}(x)$  and  $g_2(x) = \mu \text{sign}(x) \mathbf{1}_{(|x| \leq a)}$ , with  $a$  and  $\mu = \mu_a$  in  $(0, \infty)$  such that  $\|g_2\| = \|g_1\| = \|\kappa\| = 1$ .

By a minimization w.r.t.  $a \in (0, \infty)$ , it may be achieved that  $\|\hat{\kappa}\| = .85 \|\bar{\kappa}\|$ .

Given  $P \in \mathcal{P}$ , the  $n$  i.i.d. observations  $x_i \sim Q_n = P_{g,t/\sqrt{n}}$ ,  $n \geq 1$ , for any  $t \in (0, \infty)$ , any tangent  $g \in \mathcal{G}$  at  $P$ , **one-sided hypotheses about  $Q_n$**  are

$$J^0 : Q_n = P \iff g = 0 \quad \text{and, employing the functional } T,$$

$$J : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} (T(Q_n) - T(P)) = 0 \iff \langle \kappa | g \rangle = 0$$

$$H : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} (T(Q_n) - T(P)) \leq 0 \iff \langle \kappa | g \rangle \leq 0$$

$$K : \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sqrt{n} (T(Q_n) - T(P)) \geq c \iff \langle \kappa | g \rangle \geq c \in (0, \infty) \text{ fixed.}$$

In case  $P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{P}}$  and corresponding tangent sets  $\bar{\mathcal{G}} = cl \operatorname{lin} \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , the corresponding hypotheses obviously satisfy  $J^0 \subset \hat{J} \subset \bar{J}$ ,  $\hat{H} \subset \bar{H}$ ,  $\hat{K} \subset \bar{K}$ . Depending on the choice  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  or  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ , put  $\tilde{\kappa} = \hat{\kappa}$ , respectively  $\tilde{\kappa} = \bar{\kappa}$ .

We consider sequences  $\tau = (\tau_n)$  of tests  $\tau_n$  at sample size  $n$ .

**5.2 Theorem 1** [ $J^0$  vs.  $K$ ] *If  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \tau_n dP^n \leq \alpha$  then*

$$\inf_K \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \tau_n dQ_n^n \leq \Phi\left(-u_\alpha + \frac{c}{\|\tilde{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (88)$$

*The power bound is achieved uniquely—up to  $o_{P^n}(n^0)$ —by the tests*

$$\tilde{\tau}_n = 1\left\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\kappa}(x_i) > \|\tilde{\kappa}\| u_\alpha\right\} \quad (89)$$

[ $\bar{H}$  vs.  $\bar{K}$ ] *In case  $\mathcal{G} = \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  moreover  $\sup_{\bar{H}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \tilde{\tau}_n dQ_n^n \leq \alpha$*

**Proof** The closed convex set  $G_1 = \text{all } g_1 \in \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } \langle \kappa | g_1 \rangle \geq c$  has minimum norm element  $q_1 = \tilde{t}\tilde{\kappa}$  with  $\tilde{t} = c/\|\tilde{\kappa}\|^2$ . Thus 3.4 Theorem 1 provides the unique asymptotic maxmin test  $\tilde{\tau}$  for  $J^0$  vs.  $K$ . To enlarge the null  $J^0$  to  $J$  or  $H$ , set  $G_0 = \text{all } g_0 \in \mathcal{G} \text{ such that } \langle \kappa | g_0 \rangle = 0$ , respectively  $\leq 0$ .

In case  $\mathcal{G} = \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $q_1 = q_{10} = q_1 - q_0$ , with  $q_0 = 0$ , turns out of minimum norm also in  $\bar{G}_{10} = \bar{G}_1 - \bar{G}_0$ . This is true since  $c \leq \langle \bar{\kappa} | g_1 \rangle - \langle \bar{\kappa} | g_0 \rangle \implies \|q_{10}\|^2 \leq \langle q_{10} | g_{10} \rangle$  for all  $g_{10} \in \bar{G}_{10}$ , and thus (46). 3.4 Theorem 1 now applies again for  $\bar{H}$  vs.  $\bar{K}$ .

In case  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , minimization of the norm in  $\hat{G}_{10} = \hat{G}_1 - \hat{G}_0$  is **yet unsolved**.

For  $\bar{\mathcal{G}} = c\ell \text{ lin } \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  note that  $\hat{\kappa} \neq \bar{\kappa}$  iff  $\langle \kappa | g \rangle < \langle \hat{\kappa} | g \rangle$  for some  $g \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ .

**5.2 Theorem 2** In case  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  assume some  $g_0 \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  such that

$$\langle \kappa | g_0 \rangle \leq 0 < \langle \hat{\kappa} | g_0 \rangle \quad (90)$$

Then  $\sup_{\hat{J}} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int \hat{\tau}_n dQ_n = 1$  [level breakdown of  $\hat{\tau}$  on  $\hat{J}$ ]

**5.2 Example 3** In 5.1 Example 1, although  $\hat{\kappa} \neq \bar{\kappa}$ , condition (90) is not fulfilled.

But replace tangent  $g_2$  there by  $g_3(x) = \delta 1_{(0,a]}(x) - \eta 1_{(a,\infty)}(x) = -g_3(-x)$ ,  $x \geq 0$ , where the constants may be determined such that  $\|g_3\| = 1$ . Then  $g_3$  achieves (90).

**5.2 Remark 4** [ $\bar{\tau}$  for  $\hat{H}$  vs.  $\hat{K}$ ] In case  $\bar{\mathcal{G}} = c\ell \text{ lin } \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , since  $P \in \hat{H} \subset \bar{H}$ , the test  $\bar{\tau}$  achieves  $\sup_{\hat{H}} \text{asy.level of } \bar{\tau}_n = \alpha$  and, with  $\inf_{\hat{K}}$  attained at  $\hat{q}_1 = \hat{t}\hat{\kappa} \in \hat{K} \subset \bar{K}$ ,

$$\inf_{\hat{K}} \text{asy.power of } \bar{\tau}_n = \Phi\left(-u_\alpha + \frac{c}{\|\bar{\kappa}\|}\right) (\bar{\tau} \text{ best?}) < \Phi\left(-u_\alpha + \frac{c}{\|\hat{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (91)$$

Given  $P, \mathcal{G}, T$  differentiable under  $P_{n,g,t} := P_{g,t/\sqrt{n}}$ , as in (83), (84).

Consider estimator sequences  $S = (S_n)$  which, for certain tangents  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , asymptotically have median  $\geq T$  or  $\leq T$  such that, respectively,  $\forall t > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n,g,t}^n \{S_n < T(P_{n,g,t})\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (92)$$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n,g,t}^n \{S_n > T(P_{n,g,t})\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (93)$$

We assume  $\mathcal{G}$  closed, a) a convex cone  $\hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , or b) a linear space  $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ .

**5.3 Theorem 1** a)  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ : If (92) holds for  $g = \hat{\kappa}$ , then  $\forall c > 0$

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P^n \left\{ T(P) > S_n - \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq \Phi\left(\frac{c}{\|\hat{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (94)$$

The upper bound is attained by  $\hat{S}$   $\forall c > 0$ , iff

$$\sqrt{n} (\hat{S}_n - T(P))_+ = (n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \hat{\kappa}(x_i))_+ + o_{P^n}(n^0) \quad (95)$$

b)  $\mathcal{G} = \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ : Under (92) for  $g = \bar{\kappa}$  and (93) for  $g = -\bar{\kappa}$ , then  $\forall c', c'' > 0$ ,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} P^n \left\{ S_n - \frac{c''}{\sqrt{n}} < T(P) < S_n + \frac{c'}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \leq \Phi\left(\frac{c''}{\|\bar{\kappa}\|}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-c'}{\|\bar{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (96)$$

The upper bound is attained by  $\bar{S}$   $\forall c', c'' > 0$  iff

$$\sqrt{n} (\bar{S}_n - T(P)) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \bar{\kappa}(x_i) + o_{P^n}(n^0) \quad (97)$$

Estimators such that, with any  $\eta \in L_2(P)$ ,  $\eta \perp 1$ ,

$$\sqrt{n} (S_n - T(P)) = n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(x_i) + o_{P_n}(n^0) \quad (98)$$

for all tangents  $g \in \mathcal{G}$ , all  $t > 0$ , are asymptotically normal

$$\mathcal{L}^{P_{n,g,t}^n} \left\{ \sqrt{n} (S_n - T(P_{n,g,t})) \right\} \longrightarrow \mathcal{N}(t \langle \eta - \kappa | g \rangle, \|\eta\|^2) \quad (99)$$

**5.4 Corollary 2** [ $\mathcal{G} = \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ , stability of  $\bar{S}$ ]: *The estimator  $\bar{S}$  achieves*

$$P_{n,g,t}^n \left\{ \bar{S}_n - \frac{c''}{\sqrt{n}} < T(P_{n,g,t}) < \bar{S}_n + \frac{c'}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \longrightarrow \Phi\left(\frac{c''}{\|\bar{\kappa}\|}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{-c'}{\|\bar{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (100)$$

for all  $g \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ ,  $t > 0$ , and all  $c', c'' \geq 0$ ; in particular, is asy. median unbiased achieving  $\lim_n = \frac{1}{2}$  in (92), (93)  $\forall g \in \bar{\mathcal{G}}$ .

In case  $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}} \subset \bar{\mathcal{G}}$  and  $\hat{\kappa} \neq \bar{\kappa}$ ,  $\exists g_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  such that  $0 < \langle \kappa | g_1 \rangle < \langle \hat{\kappa} | g_1 \rangle$ . Consequently, no opt. estimator  $\hat{S}$  of form (95) may fulfill condition (93). Moreover, as lower confidence limit,  $\hat{S}$  **breaks down** under  $P_{n,g_1,t}$ .

**5.4 Proposition 3** [ $\mathcal{G} = \hat{\mathcal{G}}$ , positive asy. bias of  $\hat{S}$ ]:  $\exists g_1 \in \hat{\mathcal{G}}$  such that any optimal estimator  $\hat{S}$  of form (95) satisfies,  $\forall c \geq 0$ ,

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_{n,g_1,t}^n \left\{ T(P_{n,g_1,t}) \geq S_n - \frac{c}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} = 0 < \Phi\left(\frac{c}{\|\hat{\kappa}\|}\right) \quad (101)$$

in particular, violates (93) as  $\lim_t \lim_n P_{n,g_1,t}^n \left\{ \hat{S}_n > T(P_{n,g_1,t}) \right\} = 1 > \frac{1}{2}$ .

## Models:

Rieder, Kohl, Ruckdeschel (2008)

- Location:  $y = \theta + u$ ,  $u \sim \mathcal{N}_k(0, \mathbb{I}_k)$ ,  $P_0 = \mathcal{N}_k(0, \mathbb{I}_k) = P$
- Scale ( $k = 1$ ):  $y = \sigma u$ ,  $u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1) = P_1 = P$
- Regression ( $k \geq 1$ ):  $y = x\theta + u$ ;  $x, u$  sto. indep.

$$u \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad x \sim K(dx)$$

$$P = P_0(dx, du) = K(dx)\mathcal{N}(0, 1)(du)$$

For  $\alpha = 2$ , coincidence of results with 1-dim. location.

For  $\alpha = 1$ , assume  $K$  spherically (elliptically) symmetric.

- ARMA( $p, q$ )-models (with shift) are covered, setting  $K = \mathcal{L}(H)$ .  
Ideal innovations i.i.d.  $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ , then  $K$  multivariate normal.  
For  $\alpha = 2$ , coincidence of results with 1-dim. location.
- ARCH(1):  $y_t = \sqrt{1 + \theta y_{t-1}^2} u_t$ ,  $u_t$  i.i.d.  $\sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$   
For  $\alpha = 2$ , coincidence of results with 1-dim. scale.



## Neighborhoods About $P$ :

- (1-dim. location) symmetric contamination nbd of size  $s \in [0, 1)$  :

$$F = (1 - s)\mathcal{N}(0, 1) + sH, \quad H \text{ symmetric}$$

- $r/\sqrt{n}$  - nbds at sample size  $n$ :

$$Q_n = (1 - \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}})P + \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}}H$$

(location, unconditional regression; scale:  $H$  symmetric)

- conditional regression  $r/\sqrt{n}$ -nbds, with radius curve  $\varepsilon(x)$ :

$$Q_n(du | x) = (1 - \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon(x))\Phi(du) + \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon(x) H(du | x),$$

- in time series: contaminated transition probabilities

$$Q_n(dy_t | \bar{y}_{t-1}) \quad \text{where } \bar{y}_{t-1} := y_{t-1}, \dots, y_1$$

$$= (1 - \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon(\bar{y}_{t-1}))P(dy_t | \bar{y}_{t-1}) + \frac{r}{\sqrt{n}} \varepsilon(\bar{y}_{t-1}) H_n(dy_t | \bar{y}_{t-1})$$

- $\|\varepsilon\|_\alpha \leq 1$ :  $E\varepsilon \leq 1$  ( $\alpha = 1$ ),  $E\varepsilon^2 \leq 1$  ( $\alpha = 2$ ),  $\varepsilon \leq 1$  ( $\alpha = \infty$ )  
 $E$  is taken under the ideal measure  $P$ , resp. ideal regressor distr.

## Relative Maximum Risk Over Neighborhoods:

We use the estimate which is optimally robust for the neighborhood model of an assumed radius while this radius may not be true.

- relative Var (in Huber[64] model):

$$\text{(minmax) M-estimates of location, } \sum_{i=1}^n \psi(y_i - S_n) \approx 0$$

$$\text{relVar}(\psi_{s_0}, s) = \frac{\max \text{Var}(\psi_{s_0}, s)}{\max \text{Var}(\psi_s, s)}, \quad 0 \leq s < 1$$

- relative MSE ( $r/\sqrt{n}$  - neighborhoods, Ri[94]):

(minmax) asy. linear estimates with influence curves

$$\sqrt{n}(S_n - \theta) - n^{-1/2} \sum_{i=1}^n \eta(y_i) \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{in } P\text{-prob.}$$

$$\text{relMSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = \frac{\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r)}{\max \text{MSE}(\eta_r, r)}, \quad 0 \leq r < \infty$$

## Location (1-dim)

### Minimax asymptotic variance

- Minimax M-estimate for  $s \in [0, 1)$ :

$$\psi_s(u) = (-m_s) \vee u \wedge m_s, \quad \frac{s}{1-s} m_s = E(|u| - m_s)_+$$

- Maximal asymptotic variance of  $\psi_{s_0}$  under  $s$ :

$$\max \text{Var}(\psi_{s_0}, s) = \frac{(1-s) E \psi_{s_0}^2 + s m_0^2}{[(1-s) E \psi'_{m_0}]^2}$$

- Median ( $s = 1$ ):  $\psi_1(u) = \text{sign}(u) = \lim_{s \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{m_s} \psi_s(u)$ ,

$$\max \text{Var}(\psi_1, s) = \frac{\pi}{2(1-s)^2}, \quad \text{relVar}(\psi_1, s) \longrightarrow 1 \quad (s \rightarrow 1)$$

## Minimax asymptotic MSE

- Minimax IC for  $r \in [0, \infty)$ :  $\eta_r(u) = A_r u \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u|} \right\}$ ,  
 $1 = A_r \mathbb{E} u^2 \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u|} \right\}, \quad r^2 c_r = \mathbb{E} (|u| - c_r)_+$

- Median ( $r = \infty$ ):  $\eta_\infty(u) = b_{\min} \text{sign}(u)$ ,

- Minimal bias (of ALE):  $b_{\min} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}}$

- Maximal MSE of  $\eta_{r_0}$  under  $r$ :


$$\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = A_{r_0}^2 \mathbb{E} \min \{u^2, c_{r_0}^2\} + r^2 A_{r_0}^2 c_{r_0}^2$$

## Coincidence


$$\begin{aligned} (1-s) \max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) &= \max \text{Var}(\psi_{s_0}, s) \\ \implies \text{relVar}(\psi_{s_0}, s) &= \text{relMSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) \end{aligned}$$

where  $r$  and  $s$  correspond via  $s = r^2/(1+r^2)$ .


relVar, relMSE: 1-Dimensional Location (Var=1.050 at  $r, s = 0$ )



relVar, relMSE: 1-Dimensional Location (Var = 1.181 at  $r, s = 0$ )



1-dim. Location: relMSE, relVar vs.  $r$ , resp.  $s=r^2/(1+r^2)$



## Location ( $k$ -dim)

### Minimax asymptotic MSE

- Minimax IC for  $r \in [0, \infty)$ :  $\eta_r(u) = \alpha_r u \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u|} \right\}$ ,  
 $k = \alpha_r \mathbb{E} |u|^2 \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u|} \right\}$ ,  $r^2 c_r = \mathbb{E} (|u| - c_r)_+$
- min- $L_1$  ( $r = \infty$ ):  $\sum_{i=1}^n |u_i - \hat{\theta}|_2 = \min_{\theta} !$   $\eta_{\infty}(u) = b_{\min} \frac{u}{|u|}$
- Minimal bias (of ALE):

$$b_{\min} = \frac{k}{\mathbb{E} |\Lambda|} = \frac{k \Gamma(\frac{k}{2})}{\sqrt{2} \Gamma(\frac{k+1}{2})}, \quad \frac{b_{\min}}{\sqrt{k}} \rightarrow 1, \quad \frac{\mathbb{E} |\eta_{\infty}|^2}{k} \rightarrow 1$$


- Maximal MSE of  $\eta_{r_0}$  under  $r$ :  
 $\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = \alpha_{r_0}^2 \mathbb{E} \min \{ |u|^2, c_{r_0}^2 \} + r^2 \alpha_{r_0}^2 c_{r_0}^2$
- Relative MSE:  $\eta_{\infty}$  becomes radius-minimax

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r)}{\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{\infty}, r)} = 1$$

uniformly in  $0 \leq r_0, r \leq \text{any } r_1 < \infty$ .



reIMSE: 2-Dimensional Location



## Regression ( $k$ -dim)

### Minimax asymptotic MSE ( $* = c, \alpha = 1$ )

- Minimax IC for  $r \in [0, \infty)$ :  $\eta_r(x, u) = \alpha_r x u \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|xu|} \right\}$ ,  
 $k = \alpha_r E |x|^2 u^2 \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|xu|} \right\}$ ,  $r^2 c_r = E (|xu| - c_r)_+$

- weighted min- $L_1$  ( $r = \infty$ ):  $\eta_\infty(x, u) = b_{\min} \frac{x}{|x|} \text{sign}(u)$
- Minimal bias (of ALE):  $b_{\min} = \frac{k}{E|\Lambda|} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} \frac{k}{E|x|}$

- Maximal MSE of  $\eta_{r_0}$  under  $r$ :

$$\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = \alpha_{r_0}^2 E \min \{ |x|^2 u^2, c_{r_0}^2 \} + r^2 \alpha_{r_0}^2 c_{r_0}^2$$

- RelMSE same for all  $\theta$ , but depends on  $K(dx)$ .


### Convergence to 1-dim. location

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{relMSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = \text{relMSE}(\eta_{r_0}^{\text{loc}}, r)$$

uniformly for  $0 \leq r_0, r \leq \text{any } r_1 < \infty$ , as  $k \rightarrow \infty$ .

In case ( $* = c, \alpha = 2$ ) limit attained  $\forall k \geq 1$ .

relMSE: Regression ( $\ast=c$ ,  $\alpha=1$ ,  $K$  normal,  $\text{dim}=3$ )



## Scale (1-dim)

### Minimax asymptotic MSE for ( $* = c$ ) contamination balls

- Minimax IC for  $r \in [0, \infty)$ :  $\eta_r(u) = A_r(u^2 - \alpha_r^2) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u^2 - \alpha_r^2|} \right\}$

$$0 = E(u^2 - \alpha_r^2) \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u^2 - \alpha_r^2|} \right\},$$

$$A_r^{-1} = E(u^2 - \alpha_r^2)^2 \min \left\{ 1, \frac{c_r}{|u^2 - \alpha_r^2|} \right\},$$

$$r^2 c_r = E(|u^2 - \alpha_r^2| - c_r)_+$$

- MAD ( $r = \infty$ ):  $\eta_\infty(u) = b_{\min} \text{sign}(|u| - \alpha_\infty)$ ,  $\hat{\theta} = \alpha_\infty^{-1} \text{med}(|u_i|)$
- Minimal bias (of ALE):  $b_{\min} = (4\alpha_\infty \varphi(\alpha_\infty))^{-1} = 1.166$
- $0 < \alpha_r$  decreasing from  $\alpha_0 = 1$  to  $\alpha_\infty := \Phi^{-1}(3/4) = 0.674$
- clipping of  $|u|$  only from above for  $r \leq 0.92$ ;  
clipping of  $|u|$  from below and above iff  $r \geq 0.92$
- For  $r_0, r \in [0, \infty)$ , the maximal MSE is

$$\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = A_{r_0}^2 E \min \{|u^2 - \alpha_{r_0}^2|^2, c_{r_0}^2\} + r^2 A_{r_0}^2 c_{r_0}^2$$

## Minimax asymptotic MSE for $(* = v)$ contamination balls

- Minimax IC for  $r \in [0, \infty)$ :

$$\eta_r(u) = A_r \{ [g_r \vee u^2 \wedge (g_r + c_r)] - 1 \}$$

$$0 = E(g_r - u^2)_+ - E(u^2 - g_r - c_r)_+$$

$$1 = A_r E u^2 \{ [g_r \vee u^2 \wedge (g_r + c_r)] - 1 \}$$

$$r^2 c_r = E(g_r - u^2)_+$$

- MAD $_v$  ( $r = \infty$ ):

$$\eta_\infty(u) = \omega_v^{\min} \{ P(|u| < 1) 1(|u| > 1) - P(|u| > 1) 1(|u| < 1) \}$$


- Minimal bias (of ALE):

$$\omega_v^{\min} = (E \Lambda_+)^{-1} = \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} e \approx 2.066$$


- clipping of  $|u|$  always from above and below
- For  $r_0, r \in [0, \infty)$ , the maximal MSE is

$$\max \text{MSE}(\eta_{r_0}, r) = A_{r_0}^2 E \{ [g_{r_0} \vee u^2 \wedge (g_{r_0} + c_{r_0})] - 1 \}^2 + r^2 A_{r_0}^2 c_{r_0}^2$$


1-Dimensional Scale: IC-comparison for lower cases



1-Dimensional Scale: ICs for least fav.  $r=0.499$  (\*=c) resp.  $r=0.265$  (\*=v)




## 1-Dim. Scale: Minimax MSE






reIMSE: 1-Dimensional Scale (contamination)



reIMSE: 1-Dimensional Scale (total variation)



## Summary

1) Estimation of the unknown radius hardly pays, provided one employs the radius-minimax estimator. The increase of its risk with respect to the radius-optimal procedure is moderate to small.

In all our models, it is  $\leq 12.5\%$ , if the radius may be specified to belong to some interval  $[\frac{1}{3}r, 3r]$  for any  $r$ .

2) The minimax radii are small: 5–6% contamination, at sample size 100.

3) The radius-minimax estimator for completely unknown radius stays the same for a variety of convex risks which are homogeneous in bias and (square root) variance; e.g.,  $L_p$ -loss, confidence levels.

Ruckdeschel, Rieder (2004)

Rieder, Kohl Ruckdeschel (2008)

- Beran, R.J. (1974): Asymptotically efficient and adaptive rank estimates in location models. *Ann. Statist.* **2** 63–74.
- Beran, R.J. (1976): Adaptive estimates for autoregressive processes. *Ann. Inst. Statist. Math.* **11** 432–452.
- Bickel, P.J. (1982): On adaptive estimation. *Ann. Statist.* **10** 647–671.
- Bickel, P.J. et al. (1993): *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*. Springer, New York.
- Birgé, L. (1980): Approximation dans les espaces métrique et théorie de l'estimation. Ph.D. Thesis, University of Paris.
- Drost, F.C., Klaassen, C.A.J., Werker, B.J.M. (1997): Adaptive estimation in time-series models. *Ann. Statist.* **25** 786–817.
- Fischer, J. (2006): *Robuste Schätzung im semiparametrischen Mixture-Modell*. Diploma thesis, U Bayreuth.
- Hampel, F.R. et al. (1986): *Robust Statistics—The Approach Based on Influence Functions*. Wiley, New York.
- Huber, P.J. (1981): *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New York.
- Huber, P.J. and Strassen, V. (1973): Minimax tests and the Neyman–Pearson lemma for capacities. *Ann. Statist.* **1** 251–263.
- Huber–Carol, C. (1970): *Étude asymptotique de tests robustes*. Thèse de Doctorat, ETH Zürich.
- Kohl, M. (2005): *Numerical Contributions to the Asymptotic Theory of Robustness*. PhD thesis. University of Bayreuth.
- Kohl, M. and Ruckdeschel, P. (2008): ROptEst: Opt. robust estimation. *R ver. 0.6.3*. URL <http://robast.r-forge.r-project.org>
- Kreiss, J.-P. (1987): On adaptive estimation in stationary ARMA processes. *Ann. Statist.* **15** 112–133.
- Pfanzagl, J., Wefelmeyer, W. (1982): *Contributions to a General Asymptotic Statistical Theory*. Springer LN in Statistics #13.
- Rieder, H. (1977): Least favorable pairs for special capacities. *Ann. Statist.* **5** 909–921.
- Rieder, H. (1978): A robust asymptotic testing model. *Ann. Statist.* **6** 1080–1094.
- Rieder, H. (1994): *Robust Asymptotic Statistics*. Springer, New York.
- Rieder, H. (2000): Neighborhoods as nuisance parameters? Robustness vs. semiparametrics. Discussion Paper Nr. 25, SFB 373.
- Rieder, H. (2000): One-sided confidence about functionals over tangent cones. Discussion Paper Nr. 26, SFB 373.
- Rieder, H., Kohl, M. and Ruckdeschel, P. (2008): The cost of not knowing the radius. *Stat. Meth. & Appl.* **17** 13–40.
- Ruckdeschel, P. and Rieder, H. (2004): Optimal influence curves for general loss functions. *Statistics & Decisions* **22** 201223.
- Ruckdeschel, P. (2006): A motivation for  $1/\sqrt{n}$ -shrinking neighborhoods. *Metrika* **63** 295–307.
- Ruckdeschel, P., Hable, R., Rieder, H. (2010): Optimal robust ICs in semiparametric regression. *JSP1* **140** 226–245.
- Ruckdeschel, Kohl, Rieder (2010): Infinitesimally Robust estimation in general smooth models. *Stat. Meth. & Appl.* **19** 333–354.
- Ruckdeschel, P. and Rieder, H. (2010): Fisher information of scale. *Statistics and Probability Letters* **80** 1881–1885.
- Shen, L.Z. (1994): Optimal robust estimates for semiparametric symmetric location models. *Statistics & Decisions* **12** 113–124.
- Shen, L.Z. (1995): On optimal B-robust influence functions in semiparametric models. *Ann. Statist.* **23** 968–989.
- Stabla, Th. (2005): *Robuste adaptive Schätzung*. Diploma thesis, U Bayreuth.
- Stein, C. (1956): *Efficient nonparametric estimation and testing*. In: Proceedings of the Third Berkeley Symposium on Mathematical Statistics and Probability, 1954–1955, vol. I, 187–195. UC Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Stone, C. (1975): Adaptive maximum likelihood estimation for a location parameter. *Ann. Statist.* **3** 267–284.
- van der Vaart, A.W. (1998): *Asymptotic Statistics*. CUP, Cambridge.