

Outlier-Bias Removal with Alpha Divergence: A Robust Non-Convex Estimator for Linear Regression

Ilyes Hammouda¹, Mohamed Ndaoud², and Abd-Krim Seghouane³

Abstract

Convex and penalized robust methods often suffer from bias induced by large outliers, limiting their effectiveness in adversarial or heavy-tailed settings. In this study, we propose a novel approach that eliminates this bias (when possible) by leveraging a non-convex M -estimator based on the alpha divergence. We address the problem of estimating the parameters vector in high dimensional linear regression, even when a subset of the data has been deliberately corrupted by an adversary with full knowledge of the dataset and its underlying distribution.

Our primary contribution is to demonstrate that the objective function, although non-convex, exhibits convexity within a carefully chosen basin of attraction, enabling robust and unbiased estimation. Additionally, we establish three key theoretical guarantees for the estimator: (a) a deviation bound that is minimax optimal up to a logarithmic factor, (b) an improved unbiased bound when the outliers are large and (c) asymptotic normality as the sample size increases. Finally, we validate the theoretical findings through empirical comparisons with state-of-the-art estimators on both synthetic and real-world datasets, highlighting the proposed method’s superior robustness, efficiency, and ability to mitigate outlier-induced bias.

Keywords: robustness, α -divergence, minimax theory, non-convex methods.

1 Introduction

In the field of statistical modeling and machine learning, robustness to outliers is a critical attribute for practical applications. In general, outliers refer to one or more observations that are markedly different from the bulk of the data and a routine data set may contain 1% to 10% (or more) outliers [Rousseeuw et al. \(1986\)](#). Linear regression, as one of the cornerstone methodologies, remains ubiquitous in fields, ranging from economics—where it is applied to understand market trends and forecast outcomes [Hellwig \(2014\)](#)—to sociology, where meta-analysis is used to explore power dynamics and societal heterogeneity [Tong and Guo \(2022\)](#). Despite their growing importance, traditional methods for leveraging big databases for predictions and identifying causal relationships often lack the robustness required to handle the complexity and variability when observations are corrupted by outliers. The family of Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) estimators is well-suited for dense linear regression problems, offering optimal performance under ideal conditions. However, these estimators are unreliable and exhibit significant sensitivity to anomalous data or heavy-tailed error distributions. As demonstrated by [Rousseeuw and Leroy \(1987\)](#), the presence of even a single

¹Department of Statistics, CREST ENSAE, ilyes.hammouda@ensae.fr

²Department of Decisions Sciences, ESSEC Business School, ndaoud@essec.edu

³School of Mathematics and Statistics, The University of Melbourne, abd-krim.seghouane@unimelb.edu.au




Figure 1: The quadratic norm of the bias of Huber’s estimator.

outlier with arbitrarily large values can cause the mean squared error of OLS estimators to escalate dramatically, severely undermining their reliability and robustness. Some studies [Weisberg and Cook \(1982\)](#) propose the use of data management techniques to address outliers. These methods involve applying tests and diagnostics to identify and remove contaminated observations. They are simple and effective when there is only a single outlier. However, these methods can fail when there are multiple outliers. The main challenge in this case is to counter the masking and swamping effects [Hadi and Simonoff \(1993\)](#). Additionally, they are largely based on heuristics, with a lack of established theoretical results.

Thus, the study of M -estimators with inherent robust properties is essential for addressing challenges in statistical estimation, particularly in the presence of outliers. Prior works have demonstrated that the Huber estimator exhibits interesting robustness properties in handling outliers [Dalalyan and Thompson \(2019\)](#); [Sasai and Fujisawa \(2020\)](#); [Minsker et al. \(2024\)](#), and asymptotically converges to a normal distribution under the presence of heavy-tailed noise [Minsker \(2019\)](#). However, its performance significantly degrades when both the observations and the design matrix are corrupted. More importantly, as a penalized convex estimator, it is well known that the Huber estimator suffers from an inherent bias especially in the presence of large outliers, as highlighted in [Figure 1](#).

This paper introduces a novel estimator based on a non-convex loss function derived from the α -divergence assuming a Gaussian nominal model. Methods based on α -divergence, which can be seen as a generalization of traditional divergence measures, have emerged as a versatile tool for enhancing robustness in Bayesian settings ([Hernandez-Lobato et al. \(2016\)](#), [Li and Gal \(2017\)](#)). We therefore provide theoretical guarantees that this estimator achieves minimax optimality, up to a logarithmic factor, in scenarios where the data is perturbed by heavy-tailed noise and contaminated with outliers. Moreover, the results of simulation studies indicate that, in certain cases, the proposed estimator outperforms the Huber estimator, thereby demonstrating its potential to reduce the estimation bias that is otherwise unavoidable with the Huber estimator.




Figure 2: Comparison between Huber and α -divergence loss functions.

1.1 Alpha Divergence as a loss function

Generally, divergence measures are used to indicate the extent to which two points are distinguished within a signal space. In the statistical framework, this concept is employed to quantify the dissimilarity between two probability distributions within a probability space. In this field of research, the most known divergence metrics belong to the f -divergence class, which was introduced in [Csiszár \(1967\)](#) and [Ali and Silvey \(1966\)](#). This class of statistical distances is obtained by computing the weighted average of the odds ratio of two probability distributions, P and Q , using a convex function, f . One of the most widely used divergence metrics of this class is the Kullback–Leibler divergence (KL-divergence) [Kullback and Leibler \(1951\)](#). Nevertheless, this latter is highly susceptible to the influence of outliers or deviation from the hypothesis. Consequently, metrics surpassing the KL divergence from this perspective have been proposed in the literature. Among these is the α -divergence family, which offers interesting properties well suited to the presence of outliers in the signal. This class of metrics was initially employed in [Chernoff \(1952\)](#) to assess classification error, and by [Rényi \(1961\)](#) to generalize the concept of entropy. More recently [Iqbal and Seghouane \(2019\)](#) presented an approach based on α -divergence for robust dictionary learning. In this article, we study the performance of the following loss function:

$$l_\tau(x) = \frac{1}{\tau} \left(1 - \exp\left(\frac{-\tau x^2}{2}\right) \right), \quad (1)$$

for a given threshold parameter $\tau > 0$.

Figure 2 provides a comparison between the proposed α -divergence based loss function and the widely studied Huber loss function, commonly used in the field of robust statistics [Huber \(1992\)](#), [Huber and Ronchetti \(2011\)](#). Both functions behave like a U-shaped curve near the origin, with a characteristic flattening beyond a certain threshold as the values deviate further from the center. This shape makes both functions particularly robust to the presence of outliers, as contaminated observations tend to fall within the flattened regions, thereby minimizing their influence on the performance of the estimator. Moreover, the comparison in Figure 2 suggests that the loss function described in (1) may offer increased stability and a larger breakdown point compared to the Huber-based function, especially in the presence of highly corrupted data. These insights will be further explored through simulations in Section 3.

Figure 2 suggests that a parallel can be established between the two methods mentioned above and the ℓ_1 vs ℓ_0 penalty used in high dimensional sparse linear regression. Indeed, the Huber-based loss function can be compared to the soft-thresholding operator, while the α -divergence-based function can be seen as a hard-thresholding competitor. That being said, it is worth noticing that, unlike the Huber loss, the α -divergence based loss is non-convex which makes its practical use more challenging. We will address the issue of practicability in this paper, showing that the estimator based on alpha-divergence is very attractive from a practical perspective as well.

1.2 Robust linear regression

In what follows, we assume that the data is generated according to the following mean shift linear regression model:

$$\mathbf{Y} = \mathbf{X}\beta^* + \theta + \xi, \quad (2)$$

Where $\mathbf{Y} := (y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n)^T \in \mathbf{R}^n$, $\mathbf{X} := [X_1; X_2; \dots; X_n]^T \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$, $\beta^* := (\beta_1, \beta_2, \dots, \beta_p)^T \in \mathbf{R}^p$, $\theta := (\theta_1, \theta_2, \dots, \theta_n)^T \in \mathbf{R}^n$ and $\xi := (\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n)^T \in \mathbf{R}^n$. We suppose that the n -data points $(X_1, y_1), \dots, (X_n, y_n)$, are independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.). Each observation $y_i \in \mathbf{R}$ is a measure of an unknown vector $\beta^* \in \mathbf{R}^p$. The regression vectors $(X_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbf{R}^p$ are with covariance matrix equal to the identity. These observations are also affected by a noise term $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^n \in \mathbf{R}$ whose inputs are assumed to be i.i.d., of unit variance, and independent of the regression vectors X_i . Finally, we consider that the measurements $(y_i)_{i=1}^n$ are contaminated by an adversarial noise term, modeled in equation (2) by the term θ_i . This term is generated by an adversary with access to the data $((y_i, X_i, \xi_i)_{i=1}^n)$, to the vector, as well as to the joint distribution of all the variables in the model.

This paper focuses on the case of dense linear regression, where the dimension n is assumed to be significantly larger than p , and the vector β^* has no particular structure. Moreover, we assume that the noise terms $(\xi_i)_{i=1}^n$ follow a heavy-tailed distribution. We aim to study the statistical properties of the following estimator

$$\hat{\beta} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\tau} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-\tau (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2}{2} \right) \right). \quad (3)$$

1.3 Contributions

Section 2 is devoted to the theoretical properties of the α -divergence robust estimator. Our contribution is threefold:

- In Section 2.1, we provide a comprehensive analysis of the α -divergence loss landscape and discuss the inherent robustness properties of the objective function. Our key finding is that the objective function is strictly convex, with high probability, over a suitably chosen basin of attraction. This result emphasizes the practicality of our procedure, since most popular known robust estimators such as the Huber estimator or the LAD estimator fall in a convex set over which our loss function is convex. This, in turns, bypasses quite nicely the non-convexity limitation of the latter.

- Next, we derive, in Section 2.2, a non-asymptotic result indicating that the convergence rate of the estimator is of the order $\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \frac{o}{n}\right)$ when the noise is sub-Gaussian, up to a logarithmic factor, and $\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\sigma}{n}}\right)$, when the noise only has finite variance. As a consequence the estimator based on α -divergence is minimax optimal. Additionally, we establish a second non-asymptotic result showing that our method can enjoy bias-free deviations when the outliers are large enough enhancing the superiority of this method over Huber’s estimator.
- Lastly, we prove, in Section 2.3 that asymptotically, the estimator converges to a normal distribution, under minimal assumptions, showing the efficiency of our procedure.

Our theoretical findings are corroborated by numerical experiments in Section 3 where we present the results of simulations performed on both synthetic and real-world data.

1.4 Notations

Absolute constants independent of any problem parameters will be denoted by symbols such as C , as well as c . By convention, capital C will represent “a sufficiently large absolute constant”, whereas lowercase c will indicate “a sufficiently small absolute constant”.

We note \mathbf{I}_p the identity matrix of size $p \times p$. For vectors u, v in \mathbf{R}^p , the ℓ_2 - norm is defined as follows: $\|u\|^2 := \sum_{i=1}^n u_i^2$ and the corresponding scalar product $\langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n u_i v_i$. In the case of a matrix $A \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$ we note the l_∞ as follows: $\|A\|_\infty := \sup_{\|x\| \leq 1} \|Ax\|$. Furthermore, the Moore–Penrose inverse of A , denoted by A^\dagger is defined such that A^\dagger satisfies the following property: For all y in the span of the columns of A , we have that $\mathbf{A}A^\dagger y = y$. The singular values of A are noted as follows $(s_i(A))_{i \in [1, n]}$, such that $s_1(A) \geq \dots \geq s_n(A)$. Finally $(\lambda_i(A))_{i \in [1, n]}$ are the eigenvalues of the matrix A , also ordered in descending order. Finally, O will refer to the support of the vector θ defined in (2), ie the subset of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ for which $\theta_i \neq 0$. We use o to refer to $|O| = \text{Card}(O)$. In this work, we will also use notations $\left(\xrightarrow{d}\right)$ to denote convergence in distribution, $\left(\xrightarrow{a.s.}\right)$ for almost surely convergence and $\left(\xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}}\right)$ for convergence in probability.

2 On the theoretical properties of the α -divergence estimator

In this section, we study the statistical properties of the estimator defined in (3). To do so, we first announce few assumptions that will be useful to establish our results.

Assumption 1. *We suppose that the outliers vector θ is o -sparse i.e. $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}(\theta_i \neq 0) \leq o$.*

Assumption 2. *For $i = 1, \dots, n$, we suppose that X_1, \dots, X_n are centered, isotropic and 1-sub-Gaussian. Thus $\mathbf{E}(X_1 X_1^\top) = \mathbf{I}_p$. We say that a random vector $X \in \mathbf{R}^p$ is 1-sub-Gaussian if and only if for all $u \in \mathbf{R}^p$ we have that $\mathbf{E}(\exp(\langle u, X \rangle)) \leq \exp(\|u\|^2/2)$.*

Assumption 3. *The noise components $(\xi_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are i.i.d. centered with unit variance. We assume that the distribution of the noise P_ξ belongs to a set $\mathcal{P}_{\ell, a}$ for some $\ell \geq 2$ where:*

$$\mathcal{P}_{\ell, a} = \{P_\xi \text{ such that } \mathbf{E}(|\xi|^\ell) \leq a^\ell\}.$$

When $\ell = \infty$, we assume instead that $\mathbf{P}(|\xi| \geq t) \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2a^2}\right)$. We also suppose that we know ℓ or its lower bound and that a is bounded by a sufficiently large constant.




Figure 3: Landscape of the empirical α -divergence loss.

Remark 1. Assumption 3 was used recently in [Minsker et al. \(2024\)](#) and is well-suited for handling heavy-tailed noise. Observe that the class $\mathcal{P}_{2,1}$ is simply the class of centered noise with finite variance.

In what follows, we define the augmented set of outliers:

$$O' := \left\{ i : (Y_i - X_i^T \beta^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau} \right\} \cup O, \quad (4)$$

where τ is the same temperature parameter used in the α -divergence loss. The set O' includes the original corrupted samples and the samples with large noise values, that we shall treat as outliers. We denote by $o' := |O'|$.

Recall that we are given n observations $(y_1, X_1), \dots, (y_n, X_n)$ generated according to the following model:

$$y_i = X_i^T \beta^* + \theta_i + \xi_i, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, n, \quad (5)$$

where we now consider that assumptions 1, 2 and 3 are satisfied. We remind the reader that we are interested in studying the performance of the following estimator of β^* :

$$\hat{\beta} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\tau} \left(1 - \exp \left(\frac{-\tau (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2}{2} \right) \right). \quad (6)$$

2.1 On the loss landscape

To get a better understanding of the properties of the α -divergence estimator we need to analyze first its loss landscape. It is clear that the loss function, to be minimized, is a sum of non-convex terms, which introduces significant optimization challenges. Figure 3 shows that the optimization process can be trapped in local minima, potentially yielding poor estimates. To address this, we demonstrate that, with high probability, the objective function is strictly convex within a well-defined basin of attraction.

Theorem 1. Let the function $f(\beta)$ be defined as follows:

$$f(\beta) := \frac{1}{\tau n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left(1 - \exp \left(-\frac{\tau}{2} (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2 \right) \right), \quad (7)$$

where $\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p$ is a parameter vector, and observations $(y_1, X_1), \dots, (y_n, X_n)$ satisfy assumptions 1-3. Then the function f is strictly convex with probability at least $1 - 2 \exp(-Dn/C^2)$, on the set \mathcal{O}_τ where the constant D satisfies the inequality:

$$p + 2o' \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{2o'} \right) \right) < \frac{Dn}{C^2}, \quad (8)$$

for a sufficiently large C . The set \mathcal{O}_τ , is defined as:

$$\mathcal{O}_\tau := \left\{ \beta \in \mathbf{R}^p, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1} \left\{ \exp \left(\frac{-\tau (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2}{2} \right) \geq \exp(-\frac{1}{4}) \right\} \geq D \right\}. \quad (9)$$

Remark 2. The condition imposed on D (and equivalently on C) is required in order to ensure that the number of unperturbed (or clean) observations exceeds the number of outliers.

Theorem 1 indicates that the α -divergence loss function is strictly convex on a well defined set \mathcal{O}_τ . Examining the second-order derivative of the function f defined in (7), weights of the form $w_i(\beta) := \exp \left(\frac{-\tau (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2}{2} \right)$ emerge, each corresponding to an individual observation. Consequently, the basin of attraction \mathcal{O}_τ is characterized by the vectors for which the weights w_i exhibit a degree of uniformity, thereby minimizing the influence of a limited set of points that may be considered outliers. The only issue with the set \mathcal{O}_τ is that it is not necessarily convex and hence minimizing over it does not necessarily lead to a global minimum. The next Proposition will address this issue by restricting our attention to a subset that is convex.

Proposition 1. Let $c > 0$ be a sufficiently small constant and $\ell \geq 2$. Consider the convex set :

$$\mathcal{J}_c := \{ \beta \in \mathbf{R}^p : \|\beta - \beta^*\| \leq c \}.$$

If $n \geq C_1(o + \log(1/\delta) + p)$ then $\mathcal{J}_c \subset \mathcal{O}_\tau$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for the choice $\tau = C_2 \left(\frac{o + \log(1/\delta)}{n} \right)^{2/\ell}$ where C_1, C_2 are large constants.

Combining the results of both Theorem 1 and Proposition 1, we have established that the α -divergence loss function is strictly convex on the convex set \mathcal{J}_c . Consequently, this ensures that the optimization procedure employed to solve (6) will display stable behavior and is guaranteed to converge, provided an appropriately chosen initialization, specifically if an initialization vector, within \mathcal{J}_c , is chosen.

Remark 3. Most of the popular robust estimators belong to the set \mathcal{J}_c . For instance, the Least Absolute Deviation (LAD) estimator, defined as

$$\hat{\beta}_{LAD} := \arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - X_i^T \beta|,$$

was analyzed in [Pensia et al. \(2024\)](#). The authors of the latter show that, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-cn)$, the LAD estimator satisfies

$$\|\hat{\beta}_{LAD} - \beta^*\| \leq c,$$

for some $c > 0$. In practice, it is easy to find vectors in \mathcal{J}_c .

In order to identify an effective estimator that can address the optimization problem based on α -divergence, we will employ a two-stage procedure. Initially, we compute the LAD estimator as a convex estimator. In the second part of the procedure, we solve the problem defined in (6) using gradient descent that we initialize with the LAD estimator. Our methodology yields a good estimator of β^* with almost optimal non-asymptotic and optimal asymptotic guarantees, as will be stated later.

```

Data:  $((X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)), \tau, \beta_0, c$ 
while  $\text{median}(|Y_i - X_i^\top \beta_{k-1}|)_{i=1, \dots, n} \geq c$  do
    Compute a step towards the solution of the Least absolute deviation (LAD)
    estimator
     $\beta_k \leftarrow$  one step towards the solution of the problem  $\arg \min_{\beta \in \mathbf{R}^p} \sum_{i=1}^n |Y_i - X_i^\top \beta|$ ,
    taking as initialization  $\beta_{k-1}$ 
     $\beta_{LAD} \leftarrow \beta_k$ 
end
Compute the solution of (3) using  $\beta_{LAD}$  as initialization
 $\hat{\beta} \leftarrow$  The solution of (3) where  $\beta_{LAD}$  is considered as the initialization for the optimization
procedure.
return  $\hat{\beta}$ 

```

Algorithm 1: Robust M -estimation based on α -divergence.

2.2 Non-asymptotic optimality

A two-stage procedure will be examined in this section, as outlined in Algorithm 1. From now on $\hat{\beta}$ will denote the output of Algorithm 1. In practice, a quasi-Newton method is employed to solve the optimization problems of interest, specifically the ‘‘Limited Memory Algorithm for Bound Constrained Optimisation’’ (L-BFGS), which is a limited-memory method adapted to non-linear optimization problems with simple constraints on the variables. Despite its design for constrained optimization problems, this algorithm is also highly effective for unconstrained problems. This is due to the fact that it does not necessitate explicit information about the Hessian matrix, which can be challenging or expensive to compute in the case of high-dimensional problems [Byrd et al. \(1995\)](#). Furthermore, this method incorporates a memory-limited quasi-Newton update step to approximate the Hessian matrix, thereby ensuring that the memory requirement is linear in n [Zhu et al. \(1997\)](#). The use of this approach for the calculation of the estimator is noteworthy, as it incorporates second-order information via the estimation of the Hessian, thereby enhancing the estimator’s robustness to outliers. Additionally, the least absolute deviation estimator (LAD) is employed in the initial phase of the algorithm, as outlined in Algorithm 1. We recall the reader that well-known estimators, such as Huber and LAD, fall within the specified basin of attraction defined in \mathcal{J}_c , thereby ensuring the convergence of the second phase of the algorithm to a global minimum.

Theorem 2. Let τ be chosen such that $n \geq C(o' + p)$. If assumptions 1,2,3 hold, then any solution $\hat{\beta}$ of (6) that belongs to \mathcal{O}_τ , satisfies the following deviation bound. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, we have that

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq C_1 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{2o'}{n} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{en}{2o'}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right),$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is an absolute constant.

The bound derived in Theorem 2 highlights an important trade-off when selecting the parameter τ . Specifically, τ should be chosen to be small enough (and hence o' large enough) to facilitate effective data filtration, which means that the ‘outliers’ set should primarily capture genuinely contaminated observations while minimizing the inclusion of clean data. However, if τ is too small, the resulting bound may become excessively large, undermining the estimator’s performance. In practice, this hyperparameter is typically determined by cross-validation. The next proposition provides the optimal choice of τ in theory.

Proposition 2. Let $n \geq C_1(o + \log(1/\delta) + p)$. Setting $\tau = C \left(\frac{o + \log(1/\delta)}{n} \right)^{2/\ell}$, and using assumptions 1,2,3, then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, Algorithm 1 converges to a unique $\hat{\beta}$ and we get that

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq C_1 \left(\left(\frac{o}{n} \right)^{1-1/\ell} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{en}{2o}\right)} + \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n} \log\left(\frac{en}{2\log(1/\delta)}\right)} \right).$$

The bound in Proposition 2 can be interpreted as follows. The term $\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}$ corresponds to the parametric rate for estimating a vector of dimension p given n observations. The term $\sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}}$ corresponds to sub-Gaussian deviations in order to get a bound with probability $1 - \delta$. Finally, the term $\left(\frac{o}{n}\right)^{1-1/\ell} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{en}{2o}\right)}$ corresponds to the contamination term. This measures the impact of outliers on the estimation error, capturing how their presence affects the algorithm’s robustness. This contamination term is minimax optimal up to a logarithmic factor as proved in Minsker et al. (2024). The extra logarithmic factor results from the assumption that the outliers are generated by an adversary who has access to the entire dataset and to the joint distribution of all variables under model (2). Hence Proposition 2 shows that the α -divergence estimator is a sub-Gaussian estimator and moreover is minimax optimal. It now remains to show that our estimator is superior compared to other robust methods such that Huber’s estimator for instance. The next Theorem claims that, given large outliers, the α -divergence estimator gets rid of the outlier contribution.

Theorem 3. Let $n \geq C_1(o + \log(1/\delta) + p)$. Setting $\tau = C \frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}$ and using the same assumptions in Theorem 2, where we assume further that $\sqrt{\tau} \min_{i \in \mathcal{O}} |\theta_i| \geq C_1(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log(n)} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, we get that

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq C_2 \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

The condition $\sqrt{\tau} \min_{i \in \mathcal{O}} |\theta_i| \geq C_1(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log(n)} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)})$ in Theorem 3 is not necessary and can be relaxed, but it gives a practical illustration where the α -divergence estimator is able to estimate the regression vector β^* without the outlier contribution whenever these are too large. To some extent, our procedure adapts to cases where outliers are too large and removes the corresponding bias whenever possible.




Figure 4: Comparison of the speed of convergence between Huber and α -divergence algorithms.

2.3 Asymptotic efficiency

After claiming that the α -divergence estimator is non-asymptotically minimax optimal, the objective of this section is to show that our estimator is also asymptotically efficient. Since we now consider the case where n tends to infinity, it is no longer appropriate to assume the presence of outliers in the observations. Consequently, we set $\theta = 0$ in model (2). The following Theorem establishes the asymptotic efficiency of the estimator given by Algorithm 1 for a suitably chosen τ_n .

Theorem 4. *Let the parameter τ_n in the definition of estimator (3) be chosen as $\tau_n := \frac{u_n}{n}$, where u_n is a sequence that slowly goes to infinity as n increases. Under this choice of τ_n , the estimator given by Algorithm 1 satisfies the following asymptotic normality result:*

$$\sqrt{n}(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p).$$

3 Numerical experiments

In this section, we present the empirical results obtained using the methodology outlined in this article. We begin by discussing the results of experiments conducted on simulated data and then present results derived from a real-world dataset.

3.1 Simulated data

The experiments were conducted on simulated data generated according to the model described in (2). To incorporate heavy-tailed noise into the data, we modeled ξ as a centered Pareto-distributed random variable.

First, we compare the convergence speed of our method with that of the well-known Huber-based algorithm in Figure 4. For both algorithms, we initialize the optimization procedure within the basin of attraction and then perform gradient descent, comparing at each iteration the deviation between




Figure 5: Distribution of the MSE of Huber and α -divergence estimators under corruption.

the true β^* and its estimator. While the Huber algorithm demonstrates a slightly faster convergence, our approach yields an estimator with a lower ℓ_2 error within a small number of iterations.

In the following experiment, illustrated in Figure 5, we compare the distribution of the Mean Squared Error (MSE) produced by our method and the Huber estimator. Specifically, we apply Algorithm 1 to estimate β^* over 10,000 experiments, each using a distinct dataset $((X_1, y_1), \dots, (X_n, y_n))$ generated according to model (2).

In all experiments, we use the L-BFGS algorithm to solve the optimization problems. We observe that our method highly reduces the estimation bias present in the Huber-based estimator, thereby improving the overall estimator performance. Additionally, despite our approach consisting of a two-step procedure, the average number of iterations required for convergence is comparable between the two estimators.

The final experiment on simulated data was designed to evaluate the breakdown point of the Huber-based algorithm and our proposed approach. As demonstrated in Figure 6, our method exhibits greater stability compared to the Huber-based counterpart. Specifically, the deviation between the true β^* and its estimator using our method increases at a slower rate than that of the




Figure 6: Effect of growing outlier proportion on the MSE for Huber and α -divergence estimators.

Huber-based estimator as the proportion of outliers grows. This experiment highlights thus the enhanced robustness of our estimator in comparison to other classical approaches, for instance, the Huber-based one.

3.2 Real-world dataset

To evaluate the performance of our method on real-world data, we utilized the Ames Housing Dataset [De Cock \(2011\)](#). This dataset comprises approximately 79 features of residential properties, designed for predicting house sale prices in Ames, Iowa, USA. As noted in [De Cock \(2011\)](#), five of the 2930 observations are identified as outliers: three represent partial sales that are unlikely to reflect actual market values, while the other two correspond to unusually large properties with prices that are relatively appropriate. To assess the robustness of our approach on this dataset and compare its performance with other classical robust estimators, we introduced additional contamination in the training set. Specifically, we injected heavy-tailed noise, modeled as Pareto noise, and randomly selected 10% of the observations to which we added outliers. The results of this experiment, illustrated in [Figure 7](#), indicate that our method achieves lower variance compared to classical methods. Furthermore, our approach mitigates the estimation bias observed in the Huber-based estimator, as discussed previously.




Figure 7: Distribution of the residuals of three estimators on a real-world dataset.

Funding

The work of Mohamed Ndaoud was supported by a Chair of Excellence in Data Science granted by the CY Initiative.

Bibliography

Ali, S. M. and S. D. Silvey (1966). A general class of coefficients of divergence of one distribution from another. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 28(1), 131–142.

- Byrd, R. H., P. Lu, J. Nocedal, and C. Zhu (1995). A limited memory algorithm for bound constrained optimization. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing* 16(5), 1190–1208.
- Chernoff, H. (1952). A measure of asymptotic efficiency for tests of a hypothesis based on the sum of observations. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 493–507.
- Csiszár, I. (1967). On information-type measure of difference of probability distributions and indirect observations. *Studia Sci. Math. Hungar.* 2, 299–318.
- Dalalyan, A. and P. Thompson (2019). Outlier-robust estimation of a sparse linear model using ℓ_1 -penalized huber’s m -estimator. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32.
- De Cock, D. (2011). Ames, iowa: Alternative to the boston housing data as an end of semester regression project. *Journal of Statistics Education* 19(3).
- Hadi, A. S. and J. S. Simonoff (1993). Procedures for the identification of multiple outliers in linear models. *Journal of the American statistical association* 88(424), 1264–1272.
- Hellwig, Z. (2014). *Linear Regression and its application to economics*. Elsevier.
- Hernandez-Lobato, J., Y. Li, M. Rowland, T. Bui, D. Hernández-Lobato, and R. Turner (2016). Black-box alpha divergence minimization. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1511–1520. PMLR.
- Huber, P. J. (1992). Robust estimation of a location parameter. In *Breakthroughs in statistics: Methodology and distribution*, pp. 492–518. Springer.
- Huber, P. J. and E. M. Ronchetti (2011). *Robust statistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Iqbal, A. and A.-K. Seghouane (2019). An α -divergence-based approach for robust dictionary learning. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 28(11), 5729–5739.
- Kullback, S. and R. A. Leibler (1951). On information and sufficiency. *The annals of mathematical statistics* 22(1), 79–86.
- Li, Y. and Y. Gal (2017). Dropout inference in bayesian neural networks with alpha-divergences. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 2052–2061. PMLR.
- Minsker, S. (2019). Distributed statistical estimation and rates of convergence in normal approximation. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 13(2), 5213 – 5252.
- Minsker, S., M. Ndaoud, and L. Wang (2024). Robust and tuning-free sparse linear regression via square-root slope. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science* 6(2), 428–453.
- Pensia, A., V. Jog, and P.-L. Loh (2024). Robust regression with covariate filtering: Heavy tails and adversarial contamination. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* (just-accepted), 1–40.
- Rényi, A. (1961). On measures of entropy and information. In *Proceedings of the fourth Berkeley symposium on mathematical statistics and probability, volume 1: contributions to the theory of statistics*, Volume 4, pp. 547–562. University of California Press.

- Rousseeuw, P. and A. Leroy (1987, 01). Robust regression & outlier detection, john wiley & sons. *Journal of Educational Statistics* 13, 358–364.
- Rousseeuw, P. J., F. R. Hampel, E. M. Ronchetti, and W. A. Stahel (1986). Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions.
- Sasai, T. and H. Fujisawa (2020). Robust estimation with lasso when outputs are adversarially contaminated. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.05990*.
- Tong, G. and G. Guo (2022). Meta-analysis in sociological research: Power and heterogeneity. *Sociological Methods & Research* 51(2), 566–604.
- Vershynin, R. (2018). *High-Dimensional Probability: An Introduction with Applications in Data Science*. Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Weisberg, S. and R. Cook (1982). *Residuals and Influence in Regression*. Chapman & Hall.
- Zhu, C., R. H. Byrd, P. Lu, and J. Nocedal (1997). Algorithm 778: L-bfgs-b: Fortran subroutines for large-scale bound-constrained optimization. *ACM Trans. Math. Softw.* 23, 550–560.

Online Supplementary Material for “Outlier-Bias Removal with Alpha Divergence: A Robust Non-Convex Estimator for Linear Regression”

A Technical results

In this section, we state the concentration inequalities and technical Lemmas that will be used in the proofs that follow.

Theorem 5 (Vershynin (2018)). *Let $X \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$ be a random matrix whose rows $(X_i)_{i \leq n}$ are independent K_i -sub-Gaussian random variables in \mathbf{R}^p . There exists a sufficiently large constant $C_K > 0$, depending only on the parameter $K = \max_i K_i$, such that for all $t \geq 1$, with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} X X^T - \frac{1}{n} \mathbf{E}(X X^T) \right\|_{op} \leq \frac{C_K}{n} \left\| \mathbf{E}(X X^T) \right\|_{op} \left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} + \frac{p}{n} + \frac{t}{n} \right).$$

This inequality is sharp when X is isotropic, i.e when $\mathbf{E}[X_i X_i^T] = \mathbf{I}_p$, for all $0 \leq i \leq n$.

The following Lemma is easily derived from the Theorem stated above.

Lemma 1 (Vershynin (2018)). *Let $X \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times p}$ be a random matrix whose rows $(X_i)_{i \leq n}$ are independent K_i -sub-Gaussian random variables in \mathbf{R}^p . Let $s_1(X), \dots, s_n(X)$ be the singular values of X such that $s_1(X) \geq \dots \geq s_n(X)$. Thus, for all $\delta > 0$, there exists a sufficiently large constant $C_K > 0$ and a sufficiently small constant c_K , depending only on the parameter $K = \max_i K_i$, such that with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the following inequality holds:*

$$\sqrt{n} - C_K \sqrt{p} - \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c_K}} \leq s_n(X) \leq s_1(X) \leq \sqrt{n} + C_K \sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(2/\delta)}{c_K}}.$$

Theorem 6 (Vershynin (2018)). *Let X be an isotropic K -sub-Gaussian random vector, then :*

$$\mathbf{E}(\|X\|) \leq 4\sqrt{Kp}.$$

Moreover, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ for any $\delta \in (0, 1)$:

$$\|X\| \leq 4\sqrt{Kp} + 2\sqrt{K \log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)}.$$

Lemma 2 (Minsker et al. (2024)). *Let us define the notation $\xi_{(i)}$ as the i -th largest component, in absolute value, of the vector ξ . If the noise vector ξ satisfies Assumption 3 and $0 \leq n/1000$, then we have that*

$$\mathbf{P}\left(\sum_{i=0}^n |\xi_{(i)}|^2 \leq 2n\right) \geq 1 - 2e^{-c_0},$$

for an absolute constant $c > 0$.

Lemma 3 (Minsker et al. (2024)). For all $1 \leq i \leq n$, we define $\mu_i = \sqrt{\frac{C}{n}} \left(\frac{n}{i}\right)^{1/\ell}$ for $\ell \geq 2$ and $C \geq 80$. Then, for all $k \geq 1$, the following inequality holds :

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\max_{i \geq k} \frac{|\xi|_{(i)}}{\sqrt{n}\mu_i} \geq \frac{1}{20} \right) \leq 2e^{-k}.$$

Lemma 4. Let $\ell \geq 2$ and $\tau = C \left(\frac{o + \log(1/\delta)}{n}\right)^{2/\ell}$ for some $C > 0$ large enough. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, $o' \leq o + \log(1/\delta)$.

Proof. Notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} o' = |O'| &= \left| \left\{ i : (Y_i - X_i^T \beta^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau} \right\} \cup O \right| \\ &= |O| + \left| \left\{ i : (Y_i - X_i^T \beta^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau} \right\} \setminus O \right| \\ &\leq o + \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}} \leq \log(1/\delta) \right) &= 1 - \mathbf{P} \left(\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{|\xi|_{(i)}^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}} \geq \log(1/\delta) \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \mathbf{P} \left(|\xi|_{\log(1/\delta)} \geq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2\tau}} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - \delta. \end{aligned}$$

The final bound is obtained using Lemma 3. □

B Proof of Theorem 1

To establish the strong convexity of the objective function f , we analyze its second order derivative. First, we notice the following equivalence:

$$\mathcal{O}_\tau := \left\{ \beta \in \mathbf{R}^p, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{w_i(\beta) \geq \exp(-\frac{1}{4})\}} \geq D \right\} \Leftrightarrow \left\{ \beta \in \mathbf{R}^p, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \geq D \right\},$$

where the constant D satisfies the inequality:

$$o' \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{o'} \right) \right) < \frac{Dn}{C^2},$$

for a sufficiently large constant C . In fact, this basin of attraction ensures that a significant number of observations remain “uncorrupted”. Specifically, any vector β in \mathcal{O}_τ , can be seen as candidate estimator for β^* . This assumption is generally not hard to verify in practice. Writing down the second order derivative of f in (7), for $\beta \in \mathcal{O}_\tau$, we get the following:

$$\nabla^2 f(\beta) \geq \left(\frac{\exp(-1/4)}{2n} \min_{S:|S|\geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) - \frac{2 \exp(-3/2)}{n} \max_{U:|U|\leq 2o'} \lambda_{\max}(X_U X_U^T) \right) \mathbf{I}_p. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In fact:

$$\nabla^2 f(\beta) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\beta) X_i X_i^T - \frac{\tau}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T (Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2 w_i(\beta) \quad (\text{B.2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\beta) X_i X_i^T \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

$$+ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\beta) X_i X_i^T (1 - \tau(Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}\}} \quad (\text{B.4})$$

$$- \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T \underbrace{\tau(Y_i - X_i^T \beta)^2}_{\leq \frac{1}{2}} w_i(\beta) \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\geq \frac{\exp(-1/4)}{2n} X_I X_I^T - \frac{2 \exp(-3/2)}{n} X_{I^c} X_{I^c}^T, \quad \text{where } I := \left\{ i : \tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{\exp(-1/4)}{2n} \lambda_{\min}(X_I X_I^T) - \frac{2 \exp(-3/2)}{n} \lambda_{\max}(X_{I^c} X_{I^c}^T) \right) \mathbf{I}_p \quad (\text{B.7})$$

$$\geq \left(\frac{\exp(-1/4)}{2n} \min_{S:|S|\geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) - \frac{2 \exp(-3/2)}{n} \max_{U:|U|\leq 2o'} \lambda_{\max}(X_U X_U^T) \right) \mathbf{I}_p, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where we have used the following inequality in (B.6):

$$\forall x \in \mathbf{R}^+, (1-x)e^{-\frac{x}{2}} \geq -2 \exp(-3/2),$$

while inequality (B.8) is true since:

$$\beta \in \mathcal{O}_\tau \Rightarrow |I| = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\{\tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}} \geq Dn.$$

It remains to control the two empirical processes : $\min_{S:|S|\geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)$ and $\max_{U:|U|\leq 2o'} \lambda_{\max}(X_U X_U^T)$. We will use Theorem 5 to do so. Since $\mathbf{E}[X X^T] = \mathbf{I}_n$, we have that $\frac{1}{n} X X^T - \mathbf{E}[X X^T] = \frac{1}{n} X X^T - \mathbf{I}_n$ is symmetric. Using Theorem 5, we know that there exists a sufficiently large constant $C_K > 0$ such that with probability at least $1 - e^{-t}$:

$$\max_{i \leq n} \left| \lambda_i \left(\frac{1}{n} X X^T - \mathbf{I} \right) \right| \leq C_K \max \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right), \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{t}{n} \right) \right).$$

Thus with probability $1 - e^{-t}$ we have as well:

$$1 - C_K \max \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right), \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{t}{n} \right) \right) \leq \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\min}(X X^T) \leq \frac{1}{n} \lambda_{\max}(X X^T) \leq 1 + C_K \max \left(\left(\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \right), \left(\frac{p}{n} + \frac{t}{n} \right) \right).$$

Since we are treating the dense case, we have the following inequality $1 \gg \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} \geq \frac{p}{n}$. Moreover, as long as $t < n$, we have: $1 \gg \sqrt{\frac{t}{n}} \geq \frac{t}{n}$, as well. Consequently, this argument implies that with a probability of at least $1 - 2e^{-t}$, we have:

$$n - C_1 \left(\sqrt{pn} + \sqrt{nt} \right) \leq \lambda_{\min}(XX^T) \leq \lambda_{\max}(XX^T) \leq n + C_1 \left(\sqrt{np} + \sqrt{nt} \right).$$

To extend the previous bound to control the maximum and the minimum we will use a union bound. Without loss of generality, we suppose that Dn is an integer. Otherwise, it is possible to replace Dn by its ceiling in the proof.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{P} \left(\min_{|S| \geq Dn} \frac{\lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)}{\left(|S| - C(\sqrt{|S|p} + \sqrt{|S|t}) \right)} \leq 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\exists S, |S| \geq Dn, \frac{\lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)}{\left(|S| - C(\sqrt{|S|p} + \sqrt{|S|t}) \right)} \leq 1 \right) \\ &= \mathbf{P} \left(\bigcup_{i=Dn}^n |S| = i, \frac{\lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)}{\left(|S| - C(\sqrt{|S|p} + \sqrt{|S|t}) \right)} \leq 1 \right) \\ &\leq \sum_{i=Dn}^n \binom{n}{i} \mathbf{P} \left(\lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) \leq i - C \left(\sqrt{pi} - \sqrt{ti} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since for every subset S with cardinality at least Dn , the matrix $X_S X_S^T$ is positive semi-definite, we know that $\lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) \geq 0$. Therefore, for the probability above to be well-defined, it is required that for every i satisfying $Dn \leq i \leq n$, the following inequality holds:

$$i - C \left(\sqrt{pi} - \sqrt{ti} \right) \geq 0.$$

It suffices to verify this condition for $i = Dn$, which leads to a first constraint on D and t :

$$t \leq \frac{Dn}{C_1^2}.$$

On the other hand, to control the growth of the binomial term resulting from the union bound, we impose a second condition on D :

$$2\sigma' \left(1 + \log \left(\frac{n}{2\sigma'} \right) \right) \leq t \leq \frac{Dn}{C_1^2},$$

which is equivalent to the condition (8). Finally, using $\sum_{i=k}^n \binom{n}{i} \leq \left(\frac{en}{n-k} \right)^{n-k}$ we get, moreover, that:

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\min_{|S| \geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) \leq Dn - C\sqrt{np} - \sqrt{t + \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right)} \right) \leq \exp(-c_1 t).$$

Following similar steps, we demonstrate that:

$$\mathbf{P} \left(\max_{|U| \leq 2\sigma'} \lambda_{\max}(X_U X_U^T) \geq 2\sigma' + C\sqrt{2\sigma'p} + \sqrt{t + \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right)} \right) \leq \exp(-c_1 t).$$

As a consequence, we have established that with high probability at least $1 - \exp(-Dn/C^2)$ that: $\min_{|S| \geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)$ is larger than $\frac{3Dn}{4} - C_1 \sqrt{\frac{3n}{4}p}$, and $\max_{|U| \leq 2o'} \lambda_{\max}(X_U X_U^T)$ is smaller than $2o' + \sqrt{nD/C^2} + C_1 \sqrt{\frac{Dn}{4}p}$, for a sufficiently large constant C_1 . Referring back to (B.1), when n is sufficiently large, the term $C_1 \sqrt{\frac{Dnp}{4}}$ is small compared to Dn . Moreover, the following inequality holds: $\frac{\exp(-1/4)D}{2} - \frac{4o' \exp(-3/2)}{n} > 0$, as long as $D > \frac{8o'}{n} \exp(-10/8)$. This condition is satisfied due to the condition (8). Thus, we have shown that the function f is strictly convex in the basin of attraction.

C Proof of proposition 1

Let $\hat{\beta}_c \in \mathcal{J}_c$, where $n - o' - \frac{4n}{5}c \geq Dn$. Notice first:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{\{(Y_i - X_i \hat{\beta}_c)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}} &= \mathbb{1}_{\{(\xi_i + X_i(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c))^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}} \\ &\geq \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 + (X_i(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c))^2 \leq \frac{1}{4\tau}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Let's fix τ and consider, for simplicity, two positive reals a and b . Then we have:

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{b \leq \frac{5}{4}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{b \geq \frac{5}{4}\}}. \quad (*)$$

Notice that : $\mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{b \leq \frac{5}{4}\}} = \mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\} \cap \{b \leq \frac{5}{4}\}}$. Then using a collectively exhaustive set of events we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \left\{ a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{5}{4} \right\} \right\} &= \left\{ \underbrace{\left\{ a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{5}{4} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{a}{2} \right\}}_{\subset \{a+b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau}\}} \right\} \cup \\ &\quad \left\{ \underbrace{\left\{ a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{5}{4} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \geq \frac{a}{2} \right\}}_{\subset \{a+b \leq \frac{15}{4}\}} \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus $\left\{ \left\{ a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{5}{4} \right\} \right\} \subset \left\{ a + b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau} \right\} \cup \left\{ a + b \leq \frac{15}{4} \right\}$. Now considering τ sufficiently small so that: $\frac{1}{4\tau} \geq \frac{15}{4}$, consequently $\left\{ a + b \leq \frac{15}{4} \right\} \subset \left\{ a + b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau} \right\}$. Finally, $\left\{ \left\{ a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau} \right\} \cap \left\{ b \leq \frac{5}{4} \right\} \right\} \subset \left\{ a + b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau} \right\} \Rightarrow \mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \mathbb{1}_{\{b \leq \frac{5}{4}\}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{a+b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau}\}}$. Thus:

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{a \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \leq \mathbb{1}_{\{a+b \leq \frac{1}{4\tau}\}} + \mathbb{1}_{\{b \geq \frac{5}{4}\}}. \quad (\text{C.9})$$

Using (C.9) with $a = \xi_i^2$ and $b = \left(X_i (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c) \right)^2$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{1}_{\{(Y_i - X_i \hat{\beta}_c)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2\tau}\}} &\geq \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} - \mathbb{1}_{\{(X_i(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c))^2 \geq \frac{5}{4}\}} \\ \Rightarrow |I(\hat{\beta}_c)| &\geq \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} - \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{(X_i(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c))^2 \geq \frac{5}{4}\}}. \end{aligned}$$

If $\tau = C_2 \left(\frac{o + \log(1/\delta)}{n} \right)^{2/\ell}$, then $\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_i^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} = \sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_{(i)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} = \sum_{i=0}^{o'} \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_{(i)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} + \sum_{i=o'}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_{(i)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \geq \sum_{i=o'}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{\xi_{(i)}^2 \leq \frac{1}{6\tau}\}} \geq n - o - \log(1/\delta)$ with probability $1 - \delta$, thanks to Lemma 4. To control the second term uniformly over β , we use the following argument: considering two real numbers having the same sign a and b , then we have: $\mathbb{1}_{\{a \geq b\}} \leq \frac{a}{b}$. Thus $\sum_{i=0}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{(X_i(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c))^2 \geq \frac{5}{4}\}} \leq \frac{4}{5} \left\| X(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c) \right\|_2^2$. Thus with high probability:

$$\begin{aligned} |I(\hat{\beta}_c)| &\geq n - o' - \frac{4}{5} \lambda_{\max}(XX^T) \|\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_{\text{plug-in}}\|_2^2 \\ &\geq n - o' - \frac{4}{5} \left(n + C(\sqrt{np} + \sqrt{tn}) \right) \|\beta^* - \hat{\beta}_c\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Since $(n + C(\sqrt{np} + \sqrt{tn})) \asymp n$ and $\|\hat{\beta}_c - \beta^*\|_2^2 \leq c$, where $n - o' - \frac{4n}{5}c \geq Dn$ by assumption. Thus $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\left\{ \exp\left(\frac{-\tau(Y_i - X_i^T \hat{\beta}_c)^2}{2} \right) \geq \exp(-\frac{1}{4}) \right\}} \geq Dn$. Consequently $\hat{\beta}_c \in \mathcal{O}_\tau$. Finally $\mathcal{J}_c \subset \mathcal{O}_\tau$ for

$$\tau = C_2 \left(\frac{o + \log(1/\delta)}{n} \right)^{2/\ell} \text{ with probability at least } 1 - \delta.$$

D Proof of Theorem 2

Going back to the model we are considering (2), if we assume that the noise has a heavy-tailed distribution, then it is possible for the noise to take large values. To deal with these large values, we treat them as outliers. Theorem 2 states that if the noise satisfies Assumption 3, then with high probability the number of large values taken by the noise is small. This implies that the large noise values can be treated as outliers without compromising the sparsity of θ , hence the use of the set \mathcal{O}' . Considering Lemma 2, we treat the o' largest noise components $(\xi_i)_n$, in absolute value, as outliers. We also know that $o' \geq o$. We denote the new $(n - o')$ -sparse noise vector by ξ . Yet we will consider the following event:

$$\Omega := \{ \text{Function } f \text{ is convex on the set } \mathcal{O}_\tau \}$$

Theorem 1 states that this event happens with probability at least $1 - \exp(-cn)$. We start by analyzing the first-order condition:

$$-\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i(Y_i - X_i^T \hat{\beta}) \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(Y_i - X_i^T \hat{\beta})^2 \right) = 0. \quad (*)$$

For the sake of simplicity, we adopt the following notation: $w_i(\hat{\beta}) := \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(Y_i - X_i^T \hat{\beta})^2\right)$. Returning to equation (*) and using (5) as well, we get that:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i (\theta_i + \xi_i) \\
\implies & \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) (\theta_i + \xi_i) \\
\implies & \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xi_i \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \theta_i \\
\implies & \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xi_i \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \theta_i \\
& \quad - \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*).
\end{aligned}$$

As mentioned in the assumptions in Section 2, we define the set of outliers as the elements O' such that

$$O' := \left\{ i : (Y_i - X_i^T \beta^*)^2 \geq \frac{1}{2\tau} \right\} \cup O.$$

The proof proceeds in three stages mainly. First, we control the left-hand term; second, we address the corrupted terms; and lastly, we handle the uncontaminated terms.

Left-hand term Let $\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{O}_\tau$:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) & \geq \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \mathbf{1}_{\{w_i(\hat{\beta}) \geq \exp(-1/4)\}} \\
& \geq \frac{\exp(-1/4)}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T X_I X_I^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*),
\end{aligned}$$

where $I := \{i : \tau(Y_i - X_i \beta)^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\}$. Thus:

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) & \geq \lambda_{\min}(X_I X_I^T) \frac{\exp(-1/4)}{n} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2^2 \\
& \geq \min_{|S| \geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) \frac{\exp(-1/4)}{n} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

We have shown the first part of the proof stated as follows:

$$\frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \geq \min_{|S| \geq \frac{3n}{4}} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) \frac{\exp(-1/4)}{n} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|_2^2. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Contaminated observations Notice first:

$$\forall i \in \text{outliers}, w_i(\hat{\beta}) = \exp\left(-\frac{\tau}{2}(X_i^T(\beta^* - \hat{\beta}) + \theta_i)^2\right).$$

Indeed, since we treat the o' largest realizations of the noise, in absolute value, as contaminated observations, this implies that the outlier vector is now at most o' -sparse. Consequently, for all i in the set of outliers, we have: $Y_i = X_i^T \beta^* + \theta_i$. Thus, we can bound the error due to the contaminated observations as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \theta_i - \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) = \\ & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) w_i(\hat{\beta}) (\theta_i + X_i^T (\beta^* - \hat{\beta})) \leq \\ & \frac{1}{n} \left\| X_O (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\| \left\| w(\hat{\beta}) \otimes [X_O (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}) + \theta] \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.11})$$

Here \otimes refers to the Hadamard product. On the one hand:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| w(\hat{\beta}) \otimes [X_O (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}) + \theta] \right\|^2 &= \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta})^2 (\theta_i + X_i^T (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}))^2 \\ &= \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} \exp(-\tau (X_i^T (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}) + \theta_i)^2) (\theta_i + X_i^T (\beta^* - \hat{\beta}))^2 \\ &\leq \frac{2o'}{\tau e}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.12})$$

To control the contaminated observations weighted by the exponential terms in the previous sum, we employed the following argument:

$$\forall x \in \mathbb{R}^+, x \exp(-x) \leq \frac{1}{e}.$$

On the other hand, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| X_O (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\| &\leq \|X_O\|_{op} \left\| (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\| \\ &\leq \max_{|O| \leq 2o'} \|X_O\|_{op} \left\| (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.13})$$

Now combining (D.11, D.12, D.13), we finally get :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \theta_i - \frac{1}{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)^T \sum_{i \in \text{outliers}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \leq \\ & \max_{|O| \leq 2o'} \sqrt{\frac{\lambda_{\max}(X_O X_O^T)}{n}} \sqrt{\frac{2o'}{\tau e n}} \left\| \hat{\beta} - \beta^* \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.14})$$

Clean observations For this part, we use again the following notation: $\tilde{X} := w(\hat{\beta}) \otimes \mathbf{X}$, where \otimes is the Hadamard (element-wise) product. Additionally, we define π as the orthogonal projector onto the column space of X .

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xi_i &= \left\langle \tilde{X}_C (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*), \xi \right\rangle \\ &\leq \left\| \tilde{X}_C (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \right\| \left\| \pi \xi \right\|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.15})$$

In fact:

$$|\langle \tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*), \xi \rangle| = |\langle \tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*), \pi \xi \rangle + \overbrace{\langle \tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*), \xi(\mathbf{I} - \pi) \rangle}^0| \leq \|\pi \xi\| \|\tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|.$$

Let's first address the term $\|\pi \xi\|$. Recall that we have the closed-form expression for π given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi \xi\|^2 &= \|X (X^T X)^\dagger X^T \xi\|^2 = \xi^T X (X^T X)^\dagger X^T \xi \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}((X X^T)^\dagger) \|\xi\|^2 \left\| \frac{X^T \xi}{\|\xi\|} \right\|^2 \\ &\stackrel{(P)}{\leq} \lambda_{\min}^{-1}(X^T X) \|\xi\|^2 \|u\|^2 (u \in \mathbf{R}^p, \text{ s.t. } u \in SG(I)) \\ &\stackrel{(1-\delta)}{\leq} \frac{2n \|u\|^2}{\lambda_{\min}(X^T X)} \\ &\stackrel{(1-2\delta)}{\leq} \frac{2n(4\sqrt{p} + 2\log(1/\delta))^2}{\lambda_{\min}(X^T X)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.16})$$

The second inequality holds with probability 1. Indeed: $X^T \xi = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \xi_i$. Since the random vectors $(X_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n}$ are i.i.d. and 1-sub-Gaussian, and ξ is independent of X , it follows that for each i , $\xi_i X_i$ can be viewed as a sub-Gaussian random vector (conditional on ξ) scaled by a constant. Therefore, we deduce that $X^T \xi \in SG(\|\xi\|_2^2)$. The last two inequalities are derived by applying Theorem 6 and Lemma 2. Finally, we use the properties of the operator norm to control the term $(\|\tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{X}_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|_2^2 &\leq \|X_C(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)\|^2 \\ &\leq \|X_C\|_{op}^2 \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2 \\ &\leq \lambda_{\max}(X X^T) \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D.17})$$

First inequality is true since: $\forall \beta \in \mathbf{R}^p$, $1 \leq i \leq n$ $w_i(\beta)^2 \leq 1$. Now combining the previous result with (D.15,D.16,D.17) we get:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in \text{clean}} w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \xi_i \leq \sqrt{2} \frac{s_{\max}(X)}{s_{\min}(X)} \left(4\sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + 2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)/n} \right). \quad (\text{D.18})$$

Final bound We establish the following intermediate result by combining (D.10,D.14,D.18). If the following assumptions are verified (1-3), then with probability at least $1-\delta$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| &\leq e^{\frac{1}{4}} \left(\sqrt{\frac{2o'}{\tau e}} \left(\frac{\max_{|O| \leq 2o'} s_{\max}(X_O)}{\min_{|S| \geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)} \right) \right) + \\ &\quad \left(\sqrt{2n} \left(\frac{s_{\max}(X)}{\min_{|S| \geq Dn} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T) s_{\min}(X)} \right) (4\sqrt{p} + 2\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)}) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thanks to Lemma 1, we know that $s_{\max}(X)$ and $s_{\min}(X)$ are of the order of \sqrt{n} , respectively, with probability at least $1 - \exp(-cn)$. Furthermore, in the proof of Theorem 1, we demonstrated that $\min_{|S| \geq \frac{3n}{4}} \lambda_{\min}(X_S X_S^T)$ is of the order of $\frac{3n}{4} - \sqrt{\frac{3np}{4}}$. Therefore, it remains to control the term $\max_{|O| \leq 2o'} s_{\max}(X_O)$. To address this, as in the proof of Theorem 1, we apply a union bound.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{P} \left(\max_{|O| \leq 2\sigma'} \frac{s_{\max}(X_O)}{|O| + C\sqrt{p} + t} \geq 1 \right) &= \mathbf{P} \left(\exists O, |O| \leq 2\sigma', \frac{s_{\max}(X_O)}{|O| + C\sqrt{p} + t} \geq 1 \right) \\
&\leq \mathbf{P} \left(\bigcup_i^{2\sigma'} |O| = i, \frac{s_{\max}(X_O)}{|O| + c\sqrt{p} + t} \geq 1 \right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=0}^{2\sigma'} \binom{n}{i} \mathbf{P} (s_{\max}(X_O) \geq i + c\sqrt{p} + t) \\
&\leq e^{-ct} \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{2\sigma'} \binom{n}{i}}_{\leq \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'}\right)^{2\sigma'}} \\
&\leq \exp \left(-c \left(t^2 - \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right) \right) \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The previous result holds for all positive t . However, it is valid only if: $t^2 - \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right) > 0$. We therefore introduce the intermediate variable $u := t^2 - \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right)$. Furthermore, given that the vectors $(X_i)_{i=1, \dots, n}$ are 1-sub-Gaussian, the constants C and c can be taken as universal constants, which yields the following result: There exist two universal constants $C, c > 0$ such that with probability $1 - \exp(-cu)$:

$$\max_{|O| \leq 2\sigma'} s_{\max} \leq \sqrt{2\sigma'} + C\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{u + \frac{2\sigma'}{c} \log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right)}. \quad (\text{D.19})$$

Finally, with probability at least $1 - \delta$ there exists a universal constant sufficiently large C_1 such that:

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq C_1 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\tau}} \frac{2\sigma'}{n} \sqrt{\log \left(\frac{en}{2\sigma'} \right)} + \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right). \quad (\text{D.20})$$

E Proof of proposition 2

Using Proposition 1 and the strict convexity of f on \mathcal{J}_c proved in Theorem 1, we know that the solution of (6), initialized with the LAD estimator, is unique and belongs to \mathcal{O}_τ with probability $1 - \delta$. Moreover using Lemma 4, we know that $\sigma' \leq C(o + \log(1/\delta))$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$. Hence we can invoke the bound in Theorem 2 and replace τ by its value.

F Proof of Theorem 3

The proof of this theorem is largely analogous to that of Theorem 2. When the outliers become sufficiently large, we exploit the fact that the function:

$$\begin{aligned}
g : \mathbb{R}^+ &\longrightarrow \mathbb{R}^+ \\
x &\longmapsto x \exp(-x)
\end{aligned}$$

is decreasing on $[1, +\infty[$ to more effectively control the term (D.12). Notice first that for every observation i in the outliers set, for any $\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{J}_c$, we have the following:

$$\begin{aligned} |\theta_i + X_i^T(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)| &\geq |\theta_i| - |X_i^T(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)| \\ &\geq \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| - \max_{i \in [n]} \|X_i\| \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \\ &\geq \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| - \max_{i \in [n]} \|X_i\| \\ (\text{with probability } 1 - \delta) &\geq \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| - 4 \left(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log(n)} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right). \end{aligned}$$

The third inequality is obtained using the definition of being an element of the set \mathcal{J}_c for c small enough: $\hat{\beta} \in \mathcal{J}_c \Leftrightarrow \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq c \Rightarrow \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq 1$. The final inequality is obtained using Theorem 6 as well as a union bound. If we suppose in addition that $\min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| \geq 8 \left(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log(n)} + \sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} \right)$, we obtain the following bound:

$$|\theta_i + X_i^T(\hat{\beta} - \beta^*)| \leq \frac{\min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i|}{2}. \quad (\text{F.21})$$

Thus the bound of Theorem 2 becomes with probability $1 - \delta$:

$$\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq C_2 \left(\frac{o'}{n} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{en}{2o'}\right)} \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| \exp\left(\frac{-\tau \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i|^2}{8}\right) + \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{n}} \right).$$

Using that $\sqrt{\tau} \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| \geq C \left(\sqrt{p} + \sqrt{\log(n)} \right)$, we obtain:

$$\frac{o'}{n} \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{en}{2o'}\right)} \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i| \exp\left(\frac{-\tau \min_{i \in \text{outliers}} |\theta_i|^2}{8}\right) \leq C_3 \sqrt{\frac{p}{n}}. \quad (\text{F.22})$$

G Proof of Theorem 4

One potential choice for the sequence u_n in the definition of τ_n is $\log(n)$. Going back to the first-order condition of problem (3), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i X_i^T (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n w_i(\hat{\beta}) X_i \xi_i \\ \Leftrightarrow \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i X_i^T + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T \right) \sqrt{n} (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \xi_i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i \xi_i. \end{aligned}$$

First, since $w_i(\cdot)$ is bounded and $X_i X_i^T$ is definite positive, for all $0 \leq i \leq n$, and that $\mathbf{E} [X_1 X_1^T] = \mathbf{I}_p$, we establish, thanks to the law of large numbers:

$$\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^T \xrightarrow{a.s.} \mathbf{I}_p.$$

We aim to demonstrate that, for the choice of τ_n as established in the statement of the theorem and utilizing the bound obtained in Theorem 2, the term $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i X_i^\top$ tends to 0. To accomplish this, we employ a Taylor expansion of $w_i(\cdot)$ in a neighborhood of β^* . Since $w_i(\cdot)$ is differentiable in the vicinity of β^* for every $0 \leq i \leq n$, we can derive the following result:

$$w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1 = w_i(\beta^*) - 1 + \nabla w_i(\beta^*)^\top (\hat{\beta} - \beta^*) + R_i,$$

where R_i is the remainder term in the Taylor expansion, such that with probability $1 - 1/n$, for all $0 \leq i \leq n$, $R_i \leq \tau_n \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2$. Moreover, as established by Theorem 2, $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|$ converges to zero under the specified choice of τ_n given in the statement and taking, for instance, $\delta = \frac{1}{n}$ in Theorem 2.

Furthermore, for any $0 \leq i \leq n$, we have $\nabla w_i(\beta^*) = -\tau_n w_i(\beta^*) X_i^\top$. Recall that $w_i(\beta^*) = \exp(-\frac{\tau_n}{2} \xi_i^2)$. Since, by assumption, $(X_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$ and $(\xi_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$ are independent, and given that the function $\exp(-\frac{\tau_n}{2} x^2)$ is measurable, it follows that $(w_i(\beta^*))_{i \in [1, n]}$ and $(X_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$ are also independent. We get with probability, at least $1 - 1/n$, that

$$\max_i |w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1| \leq \tau_n (\log(n) + \sqrt{p} \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| + \|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\|^2).$$

It comes out that, with probability, at least $1 - 1/n$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i X_i^\top \right\| \leq C \tau_n \log(n),$$

since $\|\hat{\beta} - \beta^*\| \leq 1$. As a consequence, the term $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i X_i^\top$ tends to 0 in probability. We conclude that

$$\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i X_i^\top + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i X_i^\top \right) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \mathbf{I}_p. \quad (\text{G.23})$$

For the right-hand term, since the variables $(X_i \xi_i)_{i \in [1, n]}$ have zero expectation and finite covariance, we can apply the central limit theorem. Additionally, using the fact that $\mathbf{E}[X_1] = 0$ by assumption, we have:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \xi_i \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p).$$

To control the term $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i \xi_i$, we once again employ a Taylor expansion of $w_i(\cdot)$ around β^* . The remainder term are treated in a manner analogous to the one explained in the first part of the proof. We have, with probability at least $1 - 1/n$, that

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i \xi_i \right\| \leq \max_i |w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1| \|X \xi\| \leq C \tau_n \log(n) \sqrt{n(p + \log(n))}.$$

It comes out that $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i \xi_i \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} 0$. Applying Slutsky's Lemma, we get that

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i \xi_i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^n (w_i(\hat{\beta}) - 1) X_i \xi_i \xrightarrow{\mathbf{P}} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{I}_p). \quad (\text{G.24})$$

Finally, we conclude the proof by invoking Slutsky's Theorem one final time combining (G.23) and (G.24).