

On robust recovery of signals from indirect observations

Yannis Bekri* Anatoli Juditsky † Arkadi Nemirovski ‡

Abstract

We consider an *uncertain linear inverse problem* as follows. Given observation $\omega = Ax_* + \zeta$ where $A \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times p}$ and $\zeta \in \mathbf{R}^m$ is observation noise, we want to recover unknown signal x_* , known to belong to a convex set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$. As opposed to the “standard” setting of such problem, we suppose that the model noise ζ is “corrupted”—contains an uncertain (deterministic dense or singular) component. Specifically, we assume that ζ decomposes into $\zeta = N\nu_* + \xi$ where ξ is the random noise and $N\nu_*$ is the “adversarial contamination” with known $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that $\nu_* \in \mathcal{N}$ and $N \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$. We consider two “uncertainty setups” in which \mathcal{N} is either a convex bounded set or is the set of sparse vectors (with at most s nonvanishing entries). We analyse the performance of “uncertainty-immunized” *polyhedral estimates*—a particular class of nonlinear estimates as introduced in [15, 16]—and show how “presumably good” estimates of the sort may be constructed in the situation where the signal set is an *ellitope* (essentially, a symmetric convex set delimited by quadratic surfaces) by means of efficient convex optimization routines.

1 Situation and goals

1.1 Introduction

Since the term was coined in the 1950’s, the problem of robust estimation has received much attention in the classical statistical literature.¹ In this paper our focus is on robust estimation of a signal from indirect linear observations. Specifically, suppose that our objective is to recover a linear image $w_* = Bx_*$ of unknown signal x_* , known to belong to a given convex set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbf{R}^p$, given $B \in \mathbf{R}^{q \times p}$, $A \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times p}$, and a noisy observation

$$\omega = Ax_* + \eta_* + \xi \in \mathbf{R}^m \tag{1}$$

of x_* , perturbed by a mixed—random-and-deterministic noise $\xi + \eta_*$; here ξ is the random noise component, while η_* is the “adversarial” deterministic noise. Recently, this problem attracted much interest in the context of robust recovery of sparse (with at most $s \ll p$ nonvanishing entries) signal x_* . In particular, robust sparse regression with an emphasis on contaminated design was investigated in [4, 1, 7, 21, 6, 25]; methods based on penalizing the vector of outliers were studied in [10], see also [3, 26].

*LJK, Université Grenoble Alpes, 700 Avenue Centrale, 38401 Domaine Universitaire de Saint-Martin-d’Hères, France yannisbekri@hotmail.com

†LJK, Université Grenoble Alpes, 700 Avenue Centrale, 38401 Domaine Universitaire de Saint-Martin-d’Hères, France anatoli.juditsky@univ-grenoble-alpes.fr

‡Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia 30332, USA, nemirovs@isye.gatech.edu
This work was supported by Multidisciplinary Institute in Artificial intelligence MIAI @ Grenoble Alpes (ANR-19-P3IA-0003).

¹It is impossible to give an overview of the existing literature on robust estimation, and we do not try to do it here; for the “classical” framework one may refer to early references in [28], the foundational manuscript [12], or a recent survey [29].

In this paper, our emphasis is on specific assumptions about the structure of the signal x_* to be recovered and on the contamination η_* . Namely, we assume that the set \mathcal{X} of signals is an *elliptope*—a convex compact symmetric w.r.t. the origin subset of \mathbf{R}^p delimited by quadratic surfaces.² Our interest for elliptopes is motivated by the fact that these signal sets are well suited for the problem of estimating unknown signal x_* from observation (1) in the Gaussian no-nuisance case ($\eta_* = 0$, $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$). Specifically, let us consider linear estimate $\hat{w}_{\text{lin}}(\omega) = G_{\text{lin}}^T \omega$ and *polyhedral estimate* $\hat{w}_{\text{poly}}(\omega) = B\hat{x}_{\text{poly}}(\omega)$ where

$$\hat{x}_{\text{poly}}(\omega) \in \underset{x \in \mathcal{X}}{\text{Argmin}} \|G_{\text{poly}}^T(Ax - \omega)\|_{\infty}$$

of w_* . Let \mathcal{X} be an elliptope, and let the estimation error be measured in a co-elliptopic norm $\|\cdot\|$ (i.e., such that the unit ball \mathcal{B}_* of the norm $\|\cdot\|_*$ conjugate to $\|\cdot\|$ is an elliptope). In this situation, one can point out (cf. [13, 15, 16]) efficiently computable *contrast matrices* $G_{\text{lin}} \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times q}$ and $G_{\text{poly}} \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$ such that estimates $\hat{w}_{\text{lin}}(\cdot)$ and $\hat{w}_{\text{poly}}(\cdot)$ attain nearly minimax-optimal performance.

We suppose that the adversarial perturbation η_* has a special structure: we are given a “nuisance set” $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ such that $\nu_* \in \mathcal{N}$ and a $m \times n$ matrix N such that $\eta_* = N\nu_*$. We consider two types of assumptions about \mathcal{N} : \mathcal{N} is either 1) a (nonempty) compact convex set, or, more conventionally, 2) \mathcal{N} is the set of sparse disturbances (with at most $s \leq n$ nonvanishing components). Our focus is on the design and performance analysis of the polyhedral estimate $\hat{w}(\omega)$ of $w_* = Bx_*$ in the presence of the contaminating signal, and solving the problem in the first case leads to a “presumably good” solution for the second.

We would like to emphasize the principal feature of the approach we promote: in this paper, A , B , and N are “general” matrices of appropriate dimensions, while \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{N} are rather general sets. As a consequence, we adopt here an “operational” approach³ initiated in [8] and further developed in [18, 14, 15, 16], within which both the estimates and their risks are yielded by efficient computation, rather than by an explicit analytical analysis, seemingly impossible under the circumstances. The word “efficient” in the above is essential, and is also responsible for principal limitations of the results to follow. First of all, it imposes restrictions on the structure of the set of signals of interest and on the norm quantifying the estimation error. As it is shown in [16], the maximum of a quadratic form over an elliptope admits a “reasonably tight” efficiently computable upper bound, leading to tight bounds on the risk of linear and polyhedral estimates when the signal set is an elliptope. Furthermore, while in the case of convex compact set \mathcal{N} of contaminations, constructing risk bounds for the polyhedral estimate $\hat{w}_G(\omega)$ associated with a *given* contrast matrix G is possible under rather weak assumptions about the nuisance set \mathcal{N} (essentially, the computational tractability of this set is sufficient), the fundamental problem of *contrast synthesis*—minimizing these bounds over contrast matrices—allows for efficiently computable solution only when \mathcal{N} is either an elliptope itself, or is a “co-elliptope” (the polar of an elliptope).

To complete this section, we would like to mention another line of research on the problem of estimating signal x_* from observation (1) under purely deterministic disturbance (case of $\xi = 0$), the standard problem of optimal recovery [22, 23] and guaranteed estimation under uncertain-but-bounded perturbation [5, 9, 11, 19, 20, 24, 27]. The present work may be seen as an attempt to extend the corresponding framework to the case in which both deterministic and random observation noises are present.

²See [16, Section 4.2.1] or Section 1.3 below; as of now, an instructive example of elliptope is an intersection of finite family of ellipsoids/elliptic cylinders with common center.

³As opposed to the classical “descriptive” approach to solving the estimation problem in question via deriving and optimizing w.r.t. estimate parameters closed form analytical expressions for the risk of a candidate estimate.

Organization of the paper. We introduce the exact statement of the the estimation problem to be considered and the entities which are relevant for the analysis to follow in Section 1.2. Analysis and design of the polyhedral estimate in the case of uncertain-but-bounded contamination are presented in Section 2. Then in Section 3 we describe the application of the proposed framework to the case of (unbounded) singular contamination using the sparse model of the nuisance vector. Finally, we recall some results on ℓ_1 recovery used in the paper in appendix A.

Proofs of the results are kept short, they directly follow the corresponding statements.

1.2 The problem

The estimation problem we are interested in is as follows:

Recall that we are given observation (cf. (1))

$$\omega = Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi \in \mathbf{R}^m \quad (2)$$

where

- $N \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$, $A \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times p}$ are given matrices,
- $\nu_* \in \mathbf{R}^n$ is unknown *nuisance signal*, $\nu_* \in \mathcal{N}$, a known subset of \mathbf{R}^n ,
- x_* is unknown signal of interest known to belong to a given convex compact set $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbf{R}^p$ symmetric w.r.t. the origin,
- $\xi \sim P_\xi$ is a random observation noise.

Given ω , *our objective* is to recover the linear image $w_* = Bx_*$ of x_* , B being a given $q \times p$ matrix.

Given $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, we quantify the quality of the recovery $\widehat{w}(\cdot)$ by its ϵ -risk⁴

$$\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\widehat{w}] = \inf \left\{ \rho : \text{Prob}_{\xi \sim P_\xi} \{ \xi : \|Bx_* - \widehat{w}(Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi)\| > \rho \} \leq \epsilon \forall (\nu_* \in \mathcal{N} \text{ and } x_* \in \mathcal{X}) \right\}$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is a given norm.

Observation noise assumption. In the sequel, we assume that the observation noise ξ is sub-Gaussian with parameters $(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$, that is,

$$\mathbf{E} \left\{ e^{h^T \xi} \right\} \leq \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \sigma^2 \|h\|_2^2 \right).$$

1.3 Ellitopes

Risk analysis of a candidate polyhedral estimate heavily depends on the geometries of the signal set \mathcal{X} and norm $\|\cdot\|$. In the sequel, we restrict ourselves to the case where \mathcal{X} and the *polar* \mathcal{B}_* of the unit ball of $\|\cdot\|$ are *ellitopes*.

By definition [13, 16], a *basic ellitope* in \mathbf{R}^n is a set of the form

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \exists z \in \mathbf{R}^k, t \in \mathcal{T} : z^T T_\ell z \leq t_\ell, \ell \leq L\}, \quad (3)$$

where $T_\ell \in \mathbf{S}^k$, $T_\ell \succeq 0$, $\sum_\ell T_\ell \succ 0$, and $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbf{R}_+^L$ is a convex compact set with a nonempty interior which is monotone: whenever $0 \leq t' \leq t \in \mathcal{T}$ one has $t' \in \mathcal{T}$. An ellitope an image of a basic ellitope under a linear mapping. We refer to L as *ellitopic dimension* of \mathcal{X} .

Clearly, every ellitope is a convex compact set symmetric w.r.t. the origin; a *basic ellitope*, in addition, has a nonempty interior.

⁴The ϵ -risk of an estimate depends, aside of ϵ and the estimate, on the “parameters” $\|\cdot\|$, \mathcal{X} , \mathcal{N} ; these entities will always be specified by the context, allowing to omit mentioning them in the notation $\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\cdot]$.

Examples.

A. Bounded intersection \mathcal{X} of L centered at the origin ellipsoids/elliptic cylinders $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : x^T T_\ell x \leq 1\} [T_\ell \succeq 0]$ is a basic ellitope:

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \exists t \in \mathcal{T} := [0, 1]^L : x^T T_\ell x \leq t_\ell, \ell \leq L\}$$

In particular, the unit box $\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \|x\|_\infty \leq 1\}$ is a basic ellitope.

B. A $\|\cdot\|_p$ -ball in \mathbf{R}^n with $p \in [2, \infty]$ is a basic ellitope:

$$\{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \|x\|_p \leq 1\} = \{x : \exists t \in \mathcal{T} = \{t \in \mathbf{R}_+^n, \|t\|_{p/2} \leq 1\} : \underbrace{x_\ell^2}_{x^T T_\ell x} \leq t_\ell, \ell \leq n\}.$$

Ellitopes admit fully algorithmic “calculus:” this family is closed with respect to basic operations preserving convexity and symmetry w.r.t. the origin, e.g., taking finite intersections, linear images, inverse images under linear embedding, direct products, arithmetic summation (for details, see [16, Section 4.6]).

Main assumption. We assume from now on that the signal set \mathcal{X} and the polar \mathcal{B}_* of the unit ball of the norm $\|\cdot\|$ are *basic ellitopes*:⁵

$$\mathcal{X} = \{x \in \mathbf{R}^n : \exists t \in \mathcal{T} : x^T T_k x \leq t_k, k \leq K\} \tag{4a}$$

$$\mathcal{B}_* = \{y \in \mathbf{R}^q : \exists s \in \mathcal{S} : y^T S_\ell y \leq s_\ell, \ell \leq L\} \tag{4b}$$

where $\mathcal{T} \subset \mathbf{R}_+^K$, $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbf{R}_+^L$ are monotone convex compact sets with nonempty interiors, $T_k \succ 0, \sum_k T_k \succ 0, S_\ell \succeq 0, \sum_\ell S_\ell \succ 0$.

Notation. In the sequel,

- $\mathfrak{n}[G]$ is the maximum of Euclidean norms of the columns of a matrix G , and $\mathfrak{m}[G]$ is the maximum of magnitudes of entries in G

2 Uncertain-but-bounded nuisance

In this section, we consider the case of *uncertain-but-bounded* nuisance, specifically, assume that $\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbf{R}^n$ is a convex compact set symmetric w.r.t. the origin and specify $\pi(\cdot)$ as the semi-norm on \mathbf{R}^m given by

$$\pi(h) = \sup_u \{(Nu)^T h : u \in \mathcal{N}\}.$$

2.1 Bounding the ϵ -risk of polyhedral estimate

In this section, a polyhedral estimate is specified by $m \times I$ contrast matrix G and is as follows: given observation ω (see (2)), we find an optimal solution $\hat{x}_G(\omega)$ to the (clearly solvable) optimization problem

$$\min_{x, \nu} \{\|G^T(Ax + N\nu - \omega)\|_\infty : x \in \mathcal{X}, \nu \in \mathcal{N}\}. \tag{5}$$

Given a $m \times I$ matrix $G = [g_1, \dots, g_I]$, let $\Xi_\epsilon[G]$ be the set of all realizations of ξ such that

$$|[g_i^T \xi]_i| \leq \underbrace{\sigma \sqrt{2 \ln [2I/\epsilon]}}_{=: \mathcal{K}(\epsilon)} \|g_i\|_2, \quad \forall i \leq I. \tag{6}$$

⁵The results to follow straightforwardly extend to the case when \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{B}_* are ellitopes; we assume them to be basic just to save notation.

Note that

$$\text{Prob}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{S}\mathcal{G}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)} \{ \xi \notin \Xi_\epsilon(G) \} \leq \epsilon. \quad (7)$$

Indeed, we have $\mathbf{E}_\xi \left\{ e^{\gamma g^T \xi} \right\} \leq e^{\frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \|g\|_2^2 \sigma^2}$, implying that for all $a \geq 0$,

$$\text{Prob}\{g^T \xi > a\} \leq \inf_{\gamma > 0} \exp \left\{ \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \|g\|_2^2 \sigma^2 - \gamma a \right\} = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} a^2 \sigma^2 \|g\|_2^2 \right\},$$

so that

$$\text{Prob} \left\{ \exists i \leq I : |g_i^T \xi| > \varkappa(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2 \right\} \leq 2I \exp \left\{ -\frac{\varkappa^2(\epsilon)}{2\sigma^2} \right\} \leq \epsilon.$$

Proposition 2.1 *Given $m \times I$ contrast matrix $G = [g_1, \dots, g_I]$, consider the optimization problem*

$$\text{Opt}[G] = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma} \left\{ \overbrace{\phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4\psi^2[G] \sum_i \gamma_i}^{=: f_G(\lambda, \mu, \gamma)} : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \right. \quad (8)$$

$$\left. \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell & \frac{1}{2} B \\ \hline \frac{1}{2} B^T & \sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T \left[\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T \right] A \end{array} \right] \succeq 0 \right\}$$

where

$$\psi[G] = \max_i \pi(g_i) + \varkappa(\epsilon) n[G]$$

and from now on for a nonempty compact set $\mathcal{Z} \subset \mathbf{R}^N$

$$\phi_{\mathcal{Z}}(\zeta) := \max_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \zeta^T z$$

is the support function of \mathcal{Z} . Let (λ, μ, γ) be a feasible solution to the problem in (8). Then

$$\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\widehat{w}_G] \leq f_G(\lambda, \mu, \gamma),$$

i.e., the ϵ -risk of the estimate \widehat{w}_G is upper bounded with $f_G(\lambda, \mu, \gamma)$.

Proof. Let us fix $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon[G]$, $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$, and $\eta_* \in \mathcal{N}$. Let also $\widehat{x} = \widehat{x}_G(\omega)$ be the x -component of some optimal solution $[\widehat{x}; \widehat{\nu}]$, $\widehat{\nu} \in \mathcal{N}$, to (5) and, finally, let $\Delta = \widehat{x} - x_*$. Observe that $[x, \nu] = [x_*, \nu_*]$ is feasible for (5) and $\|G^T [Ax_* + N\nu_* - \omega]\|_\infty = \|G^T \xi\|_\infty \leq \varkappa(\epsilon) n[G]$, implying that $\|G^T [A\widehat{x} + N\widehat{\nu} - \omega]\|_\infty \leq \varkappa(\epsilon) n[G]$ as well. Therefore

$$\|G^T A\Delta\|_\infty \leq 2\varkappa(\epsilon) n[G] + \|G^T N[\widehat{\nu} - \nu_*]\|_\infty.$$

Taking into account that $\widehat{\nu}, \nu_* \in \mathcal{N}$, we have $\|G^T N[\widehat{\nu} - \nu_*]\|_\infty \leq 2 \max_i \pi(g_i)$, and we arrive at

$$|g_i^T A\Delta| \leq 2\psi[G], \quad i = 1, \dots, I. \quad (9)$$

Now, we have $\Delta \in 2\mathcal{X}$, that is, for some $t \in \mathcal{T}$ and all k it holds $\Delta^T T_k \Delta \leq 4t_k$, and let $v \in \mathcal{B}_*$, so that for some $s \in \mathcal{S}$ for all ℓ it holds $v^T S_\ell v \leq s_\ell$. By the semidefinite constraint of (8) we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^T B\Delta &\leq v^T \left[\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell \right] v + \Delta^T \left[\sum_k \mu_k T_k \right] \Delta + [A\Delta]^T \sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T A\Delta \\ &\leq \sum_\ell \lambda_\ell s_\ell + 4 \sum_k \mu_k t_k + \sum_i \gamma_i (g_i^T A\Delta)^2 \leq \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + \sum_i \gamma_i (g_i^T A\Delta)^2 \\ &\leq \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4\psi^2[G] \sum_i \gamma_i. \end{aligned}$$

Maximizing the left hand side of the resulting inequality over $v \in \mathcal{B}_*$, we arrive at $\|B\Delta\| \leq f_G(\lambda, \mu, \gamma)$. \square

Note that the optimization problem in the right hand side of (8) is an explicit convex optimization problem, so that $\text{Opt}[G]$ is efficiently computable, provided that ϕ_S, ϕ_T and π are so. Thus, Proposition 2.1 provides us with “presumably good” efficiently computable upper bound on the ϵ -risk of polyhedral estimate stemming from a given contrast matrix G and as such gives us a computation-friendly tool to *analyse* the performance of a polyhedral estimate. Unfortunately, this tool does not allow to *design* a “presumably good” estimate, since an attempt to make G a variable, rather than a parameter, in the right hand side problem in (8) results in a nonconvex, and thus difficult to solve, optimization problem. We now look at two situations in which this difficulty can be overcome.

2.2 Synthesis of “presumably good” contrast matrices

We consider here two types of assumptions about the set \mathcal{N} of nuisances which allow for a computationally efficient design of “presumably good” contrast matrices. Namely,

- 1) “elliptic case:” \mathcal{N} is a basic ellitope
- 2) “co-elliptic case:” the set $N\mathcal{N} = \{N\nu : \nu \in \mathcal{N}\}$ is the *polar* of an ellitope

$$\mathcal{N}_* = \{w \in \mathbf{R}^m : \exists \bar{r} \in \bar{\mathcal{R}} : w^T \bar{R}_j w \leq \bar{r}_j, j \leq \bar{J}\}$$

$$\left[\bar{R}_j \succeq 0, \sum_j \bar{R}_j \succ 0, \bar{\mathcal{R}} \subset \mathbf{R}_+^{\bar{J}}, \text{int}\bar{\mathcal{R}} \neq \emptyset, \text{ is a monotone convex compact} \right]$$

Note that \mathcal{N}_* is exactly the unit ball of the norm $\pi(g) = \max_{\nu \in \mathcal{N}} g^T N\nu$.

2.2.1 Elliptic case

Immediate observation is that *the elliptic case can be immediately reduced to the no-nuisance case*. Indeed, when \mathcal{N} is an ellitope, so is the direct product $\bar{\mathcal{X}} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{N}$. Thus, setting $\bar{A}[x; \nu] = Ax + N\nu$, $\bar{B}[x; \nu] = Bx$, observation (2) becomes

$$\omega = \bar{A}\bar{x}_* + \xi, \quad [\bar{x}_* = [x_*; \nu_*] \in \bar{\mathcal{X}}]$$

and our objective is to recover from this observation the linear image $w_* = \bar{B}\bar{x}_*$ of the new signal \bar{x}_* . Design of presumably good (and near-minimax-optimal when $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$) polyhedral estimates in this setting is considered in [16]. It makes sense to sketch the construction here, since it explains the idea which will be used through the rest of the paper.

Thus, consider the case when $\mathcal{N} = \{0\}$, and let the signal set and the norm $\|\cdot\|$ still be given by (4). In this situation problem (8) becomes

$$\text{Opt}[G] = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma} \left\{ \phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + 4\mathcal{K}^2(\epsilon)n^2[G] \sum_i \gamma_i : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \right. \quad (10)$$

$$\left. \left[\frac{\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell}{\frac{1}{2}B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2}B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T [\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T] A} \right] \succeq 0 \right\}$$

Note that when $\theta > 0$, we have $\text{Opt}[G] = \text{Opt}[\theta G]$. Indeed, (λ, μ, γ) is a feasible solution to the problem specifying $\text{Opt}[G]$ if and only if $(\lambda, \mu, \theta^2 \gamma)$ is a feasible solution to the problem specifying $\text{Opt}[\theta G]$, and the values of the respective objectives at these solutions are the same. It

follows that as far as optimization of $\text{Opt}[G]$ in G is concerned, we lose nothing when restricting ourselves to contrast matrices G with $\varkappa(\epsilon)n[G] = 1$. In other words, setting

$$\theta(g) = \varkappa(\epsilon)\|g\|_2 \quad (11)$$

and augmenting variables λ, μ , and γ in (10) by variables $g_i, \theta(g_i) \leq 1, i = 1, \dots, I$ (recall that we want to make G variable rather than parameter and to minimize $\text{Opt}[G]$ over G), we arrive at the problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt} = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma, \{g_i\}, \rho} & \left\{ \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4\rho : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \right. \\ & \left. \theta(g_i) \leq 1, \sum_i \gamma_i \leq \rho, \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \sum_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} S_{\ell} & \frac{1}{2}B \\ \hline \frac{1}{2}B^T & \sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T \left[\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T \right] A \end{array} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Now, aggregating variables γ, g_1, \dots, g_I into the matrix $\Theta = \sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T$ and denoting by \mathfrak{T} the set of the pairs $(\Theta \in \mathbf{S}_+^m, \rho)$ for which there exists decomposition $\Theta = \sum_{i \leq I} \gamma_i g_i g_i^T$ with $\theta(g_i) \leq 1$ and $\gamma_i \geq 0, \sum_i \gamma_i \leq \rho$, (12) can be rewritten as the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt} = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \Theta, \rho} & \left\{ \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4\rho : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \right. \\ & \left. (\Theta, \rho) \in \mathfrak{T}, \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \sum_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} S_{\ell} & \frac{1}{2}B \\ \hline \frac{1}{2}B^T & \sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T \Theta A \end{array} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Observe that when $I \geq m$, \mathfrak{T} is a simple convex cone:

$$\mathfrak{T} = \{(\Theta, \rho) : \Theta \succeq 0, \rho \geq \varkappa^2(\epsilon)\text{Tr}(\Theta)\},$$

so that (13) is an explicit (and clearly solvable) convex optimization program. To convert an optimal solution $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \Theta^*, \rho^*)$ to (13) into an optimal solution to (12), it suffices to subject Θ^* to the eigenvalue decomposition $\Theta^* = \sum_{i=1}^I v_i e_i e_i^T$ with $\|e_i\|_2 = 1$ and $v_i \geq 0, i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and $e_i = 0, v_i = 0, i \in \{m, \dots, I\}$, and set $g_i^* = \varkappa^{-1}(\epsilon)e_i, \gamma_i^* = \varkappa^2(\epsilon)v_i$, thus arriving at an optimal solution $(\lambda^*, \mu^*, \{g_i^*, \gamma_i^*\}_{i \leq I}, \rho^*)$ to problem (12).

It is worth mentioning, that the obtained estimate is nearly-optimal under the circumstances: the bound Opt for the ϵ -risk of the estimate \widehat{w}_{G^*} with contrast matrix $G^* = [g_1^*, \dots, g_m^*]$ differs from the corresponding minimax risk by a factor which is logarithmic in elliptic dimensions K and L of ellitopes \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{B}_* (cf., e.g., [16, Proposition 5.10]).

2.2.2 Co-elliptic case

The just outlined approach to reducing the nonconvex problem (12) responsible for the design of the best, in terms of $\text{Opt}[G]$, contrast matrix G to an explicit convex optimization problem heavily utilizes the fact that the unit ball of the norm $\theta(\cdot)$ (cf. (11)) is a simple ellitope—a multiple of the unit Euclidean ball; this was the reason for \mathfrak{T} to be a computationally tractable convex cone. Our future developments are built on the fact that when the unit ball of $\theta(\cdot)$ is a basic ellitope, something similar takes place: the associated set \mathfrak{T} , while not necessarily convex and computationally tractable, can be tightly approximated by a computationally tractable convex cone. The underlying result (it, up to notation, is [17, Proposition 3.2]) is as follows:

Proposition 2.2 *Let $I \geq m$, and let $\mathcal{W} \subset \mathbf{R}^m$ be a basic ellitope:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} = \{w \in \mathbf{R}^m : \exists r \in \mathcal{R} : w^T R_j w \leq r_j, j \leq J\} \\ \left[R_j \succeq 0, \sum_j R_j \succ 0, \mathcal{R} \subset \mathbf{R}_+^J, \text{int}\mathcal{R} \neq \emptyset, \text{ is a monotone convex compact} \right] \end{aligned}$$

Let us associate with \mathcal{W} the closed convex cone⁶

$$\mathbf{K} = \{(\Theta, \rho) : \exists r \in \mathcal{R} : \text{Tr}(\Theta R_j) \leq \rho r_j, 1 \leq j \leq J, \Theta \succeq 0, \rho \geq 0\}.$$

Whenever a matrix $\Theta \in \mathbf{S}_+^m$ is representable as $\sum_i \gamma_i w_i w_i^T$ with $\gamma_i \geq 0$ and $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$, one has $(\Theta, \sum_{i=1}^I \gamma_i) \in \mathbf{K}$, and nearly vice versa: whenever $(\Theta, \rho) \in \mathbf{K}$, one can find efficiently (via a randomized algorithm) vectors $w_i \in \mathcal{W}$, and reals $\gamma_i \geq 0$, $i \leq I$, such that $\Theta = \sum_i \gamma_i w_i w_i^T$ and and

$$\sum_i \gamma_i \leq 2\sqrt{2} \ln(4m^2 J) \rho.$$

We are now ready to outline a ‘‘presumably good’’ contrast design in the co-elliptic case. Let us put $R_j = \frac{1}{4} \bar{R}_j$, $j \leq \bar{J}$, and $R_{\bar{J}+1} = \frac{\varkappa^2(\epsilon)}{4} I_m$ and consider the ellitope

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} &= 2 \left[\mathcal{N}_* \cap \{w : \varkappa(\epsilon) \|w\|_2 \leq 1\} \right] \\ &= \{w \in \mathbf{R}^m : \exists r \in \mathcal{R} = \bar{\mathcal{R}} \times [0, 1] : w^T R_j w \leq r_j, j \leq J = \bar{J} + 1\}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

and let $\theta(\cdot)$ be the norm on \mathbf{R}^n with the unit ball \mathcal{W} . Note that $\theta(\cdot) = 2 \max[\pi(\cdot), \varkappa(\epsilon) \|\cdot\|_2]$, so that for every $G = [g_1, \dots, g_I]$, the quantity $\psi[G]$, see (8), is upper-bounded by $\max_i \theta(g_i)$, and this bound is tight within the factor 2. Consequently, Proposition 2.1 states that the ϵ -risk of the polyhedral estimate with contrast matrix G is upper-bounded by the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\text{Opt}}[G] &= \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma} \left\{ \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4 \left[\max_i \theta(g_i) \right]^2 \sum_i \gamma_i : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left[\frac{\sum_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} S_{\ell}}{\frac{1}{2} B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2} B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T \left[\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T \right] A} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

and $\text{Opt}[G] \leq \overline{\text{Opt}}[G] \leq 2\text{Opt}[G]$. As in the previous section, the problem of minimizing $\overline{\text{Opt}}[G]$ over G can be reformulated in the form (13). A computationally efficient way to get a tight approximation to the optimal solution of the latter problem is given by the following result.

Theorem 2.1 *Let $I \geq m$, and let*

$$\mathbf{K} = \{(\Theta, \rho) : \exists r \in \mathcal{R} : \text{Tr}(\Theta R_j) \leq \rho r_j, 1 \leq j \leq J, \Theta \succeq 0, \rho \geq 0\}$$

(see (14)). Consider the convex optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt}_* &= \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma, \Theta, \rho} \left\{ \phi_{\mathcal{S}}(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + 4 \underbrace{[2\sqrt{2} \ln(4m^2 J)]}_{=: \alpha} \rho : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \right. \\ &\quad \left. (\Theta, \rho) \in \mathbf{K}, \left[\frac{\sum_{\ell} \lambda_{\ell} S_{\ell}}{\frac{1}{2} B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2} B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T \Theta A} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

One can convert, in a computationally efficient way, the Θ -component Θ^* of an optimal solution to this (clearly solvable) problem into the contrast matrix G^* such that

$$\overline{\text{Opt}}[G^*] \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \min_G \overline{\text{Opt}}[G] \leq 2\sqrt{\alpha} \min_G \text{Opt}[G].$$

In particular, the ϵ -risk of the polyhedral estimate with contrast matrix G^* (this risk is upper-bounded by $\overline{\text{Opt}}[G^*]$) does not exceed $2\alpha \min_G \text{Opt}[G]$.

⁶This indeed is closed convex cone—the conic hull of the convex compact set $\{\Theta \succeq 0 : \exists r \in \mathcal{R} : \text{Tr}(\Theta R_j) \leq r_j, 1 \leq j \leq J\} \times \{1\}$.

Proof. When repeating the reasoning in the previous section, we conclude that $\overline{\text{Opt}} := \inf_G \overline{\text{Opt}}[G]$ is equal to

$$\inf_{g_1, \dots, g_I} \left\{ \overline{\text{Opt}}([g_1, \dots, g_I]) : \max_i \theta(g_i) = 1 \right\}.$$

The latter inf isw clearly is attained at certain collection g_1^+, \dots, g_I^+ with $\max_i \theta(g_i^+) = 1$. Let $G^+ = [g_1^+, \dots, g_I^+]$, let $\lambda^+, \mu^+, \gamma_i^+, i \leq I$, be an optimal solution to the problem in the right-hand side of (15) associated with $g_i = g_i^+, i \leq I$, and let $\Theta^+ = \sum_i \gamma_i^+ [g_i^+] [g_i^+]^T$ and $\rho^+ = \sum_i \gamma_i^+$. We clearly have

$$\overline{\text{Opt}} = \overline{\text{Opt}}[G^+] = \phi_S(\lambda^+) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\rho^+.$$

Besides this, we are in the case where $\theta(g) \leq 1$ is equivalent to $g \in \mathcal{W}$, and therefore, by the first claim in Proposition 2.2, $(\Theta^+, \rho^+) \in \mathbf{K}$, implying that $(\lambda^+, \mu^+, \Theta^+, \rho^+)$ is a feasible solution to the optimization problem in (16). Due to the structure of the latter problem, for $\kappa > 0$ the collection $(\kappa^{-1}\lambda^+, \kappa\mu^+, \kappa\Theta^+, \kappa\rho^+)$ is feasible for (16) with the corresponding value of the objective $\kappa^{-1}\phi_S(\lambda^+) + \kappa[4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\alpha\rho^+]$. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt}_* &\leq \inf_{\kappa > 0} [\kappa^{-1}\phi_S(\lambda^+) + \kappa[4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\alpha\rho^+]] \\ &= 2(\phi_S(\lambda^+) \underbrace{[4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\alpha\rho^+]^{1/2}}_{\leq \alpha[4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\rho^+]}) \leq 2\sqrt{\phi_S(\lambda^+) [4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\rho^+]} \sqrt{\alpha} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\alpha} [\phi_S(\lambda^+) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu^+) + 4\rho^+] = \sqrt{\alpha} \overline{\text{Opt}}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, let $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}, \bar{\Theta}, \bar{\rho}$ be an optimal solution to (16). As $(\bar{\Theta}, \bar{\rho}) \in \mathbf{K}$, the second claim in Proposition 2.2 states that there exists (and can be efficiently found) decomposition $\bar{\Theta} = \sum_i \bar{\gamma}_i [\bar{g}_i] [\bar{g}_i]^T$ with $\bar{g}_i \in \mathcal{W}$ (i.e., $\theta(\bar{g}_i) \leq 1$), $i \leq I$, $\bar{\gamma}_i \geq 0$, and $\sum_i \bar{\gamma}_i \leq \alpha\bar{\rho}$. The ϵ -risk of the polyhedral estimate with the contrast matrix $\bar{G} = [\bar{g}_1, \dots, \bar{g}_I]$ is then upper-bounded by $\overline{\text{Opt}}[\bar{G}]$. However, $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}$, and $\{\bar{\gamma}_i\}$ form a feasible solution to the problem specifying $\overline{\text{Opt}}[\bar{G}]$, and the value of the objective at this solution is upper bounded with

$$\phi_S(\bar{\lambda}) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{\mu}) + 4[\max_i \theta(\bar{g}_i)] \sum_i \bar{\gamma}_i \leq \phi_S(\bar{\lambda}) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\bar{\mu}) + 4\alpha\bar{\rho} = \text{Opt}_*.$$

Thus, the ϵ -risk of the polyhedral estimate with contrast matrix \bar{G} does not exceed

$$\text{Opt}_* \leq \sqrt{\alpha} \overline{\text{Opt}} \leq 2\sqrt{\alpha} \min_G \text{Opt}[G]. \quad \square$$

3 Observations with outliers

In this section, we consider the estimation problem posed in section 1.2 in the situation where the nuisance ν_* in (2) is sparse—has at most a given number s of nonzero entries.

Estimate construction. Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ be a given reliability tolerance. In this section, we are interested in polyhedral estimate specified by two contrast matrices $H = [h_1, \dots, h_n] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$ and $G = [g_1, \dots, g_I] \in \mathbf{R}^{n \times I}$. Given observation ω (see (2)) we solve the optimization problem

$$\min_{\nu, x} \left\{ \|\nu\|_1 : x \in \mathcal{X}, \begin{cases} |h_k^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2, & k = 1, \dots, n, \\ |g_i^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2, & i = 1, \dots, I, \end{cases} \right\} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) = \sigma \sqrt{2 \ln[2(n+I)/\epsilon]}.$$

Let $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{x}) = (\hat{\nu}(\omega), \hat{x}(\omega))$ be an optimal solution to the problem, when the problem is feasible, otherwise we put $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{x}) = (0, 0)$. Vector

$$\hat{w}_{G,H}(\omega) = B\hat{x}(\omega)$$

is the estimate of $w_* = Bx_*$ we intend to use.

3.1 Risk analysis

Let us denote $\Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ the set of realizations of ξ such that

$$|h_k^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \quad |g_i^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, I, \quad \forall \xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H). \quad (18)$$

For the same reasons as in (7), one has

$$\text{Prob}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{SG}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)}(\Xi_\epsilon(G, H)) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Let us now fix $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$, s -sparse ν_* , and $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, so that our observation is $\omega = Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi$.

A. By (18) we have $|h_k^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2$ and $|g_i^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2$ for all $k \leq n$ and $i \leq I$, while (17) becomes the problem

$$\min_{\nu, x} \left\{ \|\nu\|_1 : x \in \mathcal{X}, \begin{array}{l} |h_k^T [N[\nu - \nu_*] + A[x - x_*] - \xi]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \\ |g_i^T [N[\nu - \nu_*] + A[x - x_*] - \xi]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, I. \end{array} \right\} \quad (19)$$

We conclude that $(\nu, x) = (\nu_*; x_*)$ is a feasible solution to (17). Thus, we are in the case where $\hat{\nu}, \hat{x}$ are feasible for (19), and

$$\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq \|\nu_*\|_1.$$

B. Assume from now on that $(H, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ satisfies Condition $Q_\infty(s, \kappa)$ of Section A with $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$, that is,

$$\|w\|_\infty \leq \|H^T N w\|_\infty + \frac{\kappa}{s} \|w\|_1 \quad \forall w \in \mathbf{R}^n. \quad (20)$$

Since $\hat{\nu}$ and \hat{x} are feasible for (19), we have

$$|h_k^T [N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*] + A[\hat{x} - x_*] - \xi]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2, \quad \forall k \leq n.$$

Invoking (18) and the fact that $A[\hat{x} - x_*] \in 2A\mathcal{X}$ (since \mathcal{X} is symmetric w.r.t. the origin), we conclude that

$$\|H^T N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*]\|_\infty \leq \max_k \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_k^T A x| \right],$$

and besides this, ν_* is s -sparse and $\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq \|\nu_*\|_1$. Now Proposition A.1 with ν_* in the role of ν implies that

$$\|\hat{\nu} - \nu_*\|_q \leq \frac{(2s)^{\frac{1}{q}}}{1-2\kappa} \max_k \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_k^T A x| \right], \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty, \quad (21)$$

in particular, that

$$\|\hat{\nu} - \nu_*\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{1-2\kappa} \max_k \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_k^T A x| \right] =: \rho_H, \quad (22a)$$

$$\|\hat{\nu} - \nu_*\|_1 \leq \frac{2s}{1-2\kappa} \max_k \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_k^T A x| \right] = 2s\rho_H. \quad (22b)$$

In addition, [16, Proposition 1.3.4] states that the set \mathcal{H} of the pairs (H, κ) with $m \times n$ matrices H satisfying Condition $Q_\infty(s, \kappa)$ is the computationally tractable convex set

$$\mathcal{H} = \{(H, \kappa) \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n} \times \mathbf{R} : |[I_n - N^T H]_{ij}| \leq s^{-1} \kappa, 1 \leq i, j \leq n\}. \quad (23)$$

C. Since $\hat{\nu}$ and \hat{x} are feasible for (19), we have

$$|g_i^T (N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*] + A[\hat{x} - x_*] - \xi)| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, I,$$

while $|g_i^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2 \forall i$ due to $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$. We conclude that

$$|g_i^T A[\hat{x} - x_*]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2 + |g_i^T N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*]|, \quad i \leq I. \quad (24)$$

Let $\|z\|_{k,1}$, $z \in \mathbf{R}^n$, be the sum of $\min[k, n]$ largest magnitudes of entries in z ; note that $\|\cdot\|_k$ is the norm conjugate to the norm with the unit ball $\{u : \|u\|_\infty \leq 1, \|u\|_1 \leq k\}$. Consequently, (22) implies that

$$|g_i^T N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*]| \leq \rho_H \|N^T g_i\|_{2s,1}, \quad (25)$$

and therefore (24) implies that

$$|g_i^T A[\hat{x} - x_*]| \leq \psi_H[G], \quad \psi_H[G] = \max_i [\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2 + \rho_H \|N^T g_i\|_{2s,1}]. \quad (26)$$

Applying the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, with (26) in the role of (9), we arrive at the following result:

Proposition 3.1 *In the situation of this section given $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$ and $m \times n$ matrix H satisfying $(H, \kappa) \in \mathcal{H}$, see (23), consider optimization problem (cf. (8))*

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt}[G, H] = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma} \left\{ \overbrace{\phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + \psi_H^2[G] \sum_i \gamma_i}^{=: f_{G,H}(\lambda, \mu, \gamma)} : \right. \\ \left. \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \left[\frac{\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell}{\frac{1}{2} B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2} B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T [\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T] A} \right] \succeq 0. \right\} \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

Let (λ, μ, γ) be a feasible solution to (27). Then

$$\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\hat{w}_{G,H}] \leq f_{G,H}(\lambda, \mu, \gamma).$$

3.2 Synthesis of contrast matrices

Our present objective is to design contrast matrices H and G with small value of the bound $\text{Opt}[G, H]$ for the ϵ -risk of the estimate $\hat{w}_{G,H}$.

D. Building the contrast matrix $H \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$ is straightforward: the risk bound $\text{Opt}[G, H]$, depends on $H = [h_1, \dots, h_n]$ solely through the quantity

$$\rho_H = \frac{1}{1 - 2\kappa} \max_{k \leq n} \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|h_k^T A x\|_\infty \right].$$

and is smaller the smaller is ρ_H . For a fixed $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$, a presumably good choice of $H = [h_1, \dots, h_n]$ is then given by optimal solutions to n optimization problems

$$h_k = \underset{h}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h\|_2 + 2 \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|h^T A x\|_\infty : h \in \mathbf{R}^m, \|\text{Col}_i[I_n - N^T h]\|_\infty \leq s^{-1} \kappa \right\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n,$$

which, when recalling what \mathcal{X} is, by conic duality, are equivalent to the problems

$$\begin{aligned} h_k = \underset{h, v, \chi}{\text{argmin}} \left\{ \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h\|_2 + v + \phi_T(\chi) : h \in \mathbf{R}^m, \chi \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. \left[\frac{v}{A^T h} \middle| \frac{h^T A}{\sum_k \chi_k T_k} \right] \succeq 0, \|\text{Col}_i[I_n - N^T h]\|_\infty \leq s^{-1} \kappa \right\}, \quad 1 \leq k \leq n. \end{aligned}$$

E. Construction of G is less straightforward. We proceed as follows. Let $G = [G_1, G_2]$ where $G_2, G_1 \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times m}$ (so that $I = 2m$).

E.1 As $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, problem (19) is feasible, whence $(\hat{x}, \hat{\nu})$ is its feasible solution. For a column g of G , by the constraints of the problem, we have

$$|g^T A[\hat{x} - x_*]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g\|_2 + |g^T N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g\|_2 + 2s\rho_H \|N^T g\|_\infty, \quad (28)$$

(we have used (24) and (25)), implying that

$$(g^T A[\hat{x} - x_*])^2 \leq 2(\bar{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) \|g\|_2^2 + 4s^2 \rho_H^2 \|N^T g\|_\infty^2), \quad i = 1, \dots, m. \quad (29)$$

Note that the set

$$\mathcal{M} = \{g \in \mathbf{R}^m : 2\bar{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) \|g\|_2^2 + 8s^2 \rho_H^2 \|N^T g\|_\infty^2 \leq 1\}$$

is an ellitope: when denoting $N = [n_1, \dots, n_n]$ we have

$$\mathcal{M} = \left\{ g \in \mathbf{R}^m : \exists r \in [0, 1]^n : g^T \underbrace{(2\bar{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) I_m + 8s^2 \rho_H^2 n_j n_j^T)}_{M_j} g \leq r_j, j = 1, \dots, n \right\}.$$

E.2 Next, observe that when $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, by (21) one has

$$\|\hat{\nu} - \nu_*\|_2 \leq \frac{\sqrt{2s}}{1-2\kappa} \max_{k \leq n} \left[\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2 + \max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_k^T A x| \right] = \sqrt{2s} \rho_H.$$

Then by (28), for a column g of G it holds

$$\begin{aligned} (g^T A[\hat{x} - x_*])^2 &\leq (\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g\|_2 + |g^T N[\hat{\nu} - \nu_*]|)^2 \leq \left(\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g\|_2 + \sqrt{2s} \rho_H \|N^T g\|_2 \right)^2 \\ &\leq g^T (2\bar{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) I_m + 4s\rho_H^2 N N^T) g. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Now, let us put

$$Q = (2\bar{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) I_m + 4s\rho_H^2 N N^T)^{-1/2}, \quad (31)$$

and consider the optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Opt} = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho} &\left\{ f_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \Theta_1 \succeq 0, \Theta_2 \succeq 0, \right. \\ &\left. \text{Tr}(M_j \Theta_1) \leq \rho, j = 1, \dots, n, \left[\frac{\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell}{\frac{1}{2} B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2} B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T (\Theta_1 + Q \Theta_2 Q^T) A} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where

$$f_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) = \phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + \text{Tr}(\Theta_2) + 2\sqrt{2} \ln(4m^2 n) \rho. \quad (33)$$

Note that the constraints on Θ_1 and ρ of the problem (32) say exactly that (Θ_1, ρ) belongs to the cone \mathbf{K} associated, as explained in Proposition 2.2, with the ellitope \mathcal{M} in the role of \mathcal{W} .

Theorem 3.1 *Given a feasible solution $(\lambda, \mu, \tau, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$ to (32), (33), let us build $m \times m$ contrast matrices G_1, G_2 as follows.*

- *To build G_1 , we apply the second part of Proposition 2.2 to $\Theta_1, \rho, \mathcal{M}$ in the roles of $\Theta, \rho, \mathcal{W}$, to get, in a computationally efficient way, a decomposition $\Theta_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T$ with $g_{1,i} \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\gamma_i \geq 0, \sum_i \gamma_i \leq 2\sqrt{s} \ln(4m^2 n) \rho$. We set $G_1 = [g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{1,m}]$.*

- To build G_2 , we subject Θ_2 to eigenvalue decomposition $\Theta_2 = \Gamma \text{Diag}\{\chi\} \Gamma^T$ and set $G_2 = [g_{2,1}, \dots, g_{2,m}] = Q\Gamma$.

Note that $\Theta_1 + Q\Theta_2Q = \sum_i \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T + \sum_i \chi_i g_{2,i} g_{2,i}^T$.

For the resulting polyhedral estimate $\widehat{w}_{G,H}$ and for all $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$, s -sparse ν_* and $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ it holds

$$\|\widehat{w}_{G,H}(Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi) - Bx_*\| \leq f_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) \quad (34)$$

implying that the ϵ -risk of the estimate is upper-bounded by $f_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho)$ (due to $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$).

Proof. Let us fix $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$, s -sparse ν_* , $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, and let $w = Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi$. By **A**, problem (17) is feasible, so that $(\widehat{x}, \widehat{\nu}) = (\widehat{x}(\omega), \widehat{\nu}(\omega))$ is its optimal solution, and $\widehat{w} = B\widehat{x}$ is the estimate $\widehat{w}_{G,H}(\omega)$. Let $\Delta = \widehat{x} - x_*$ and e_1, \dots, e_m be the columns of the orthonormal matrix Γ . By construction of G_2 , we have for all $j \leq m$ (see (30))

$$(g_{2,j}^T A\Delta)^2 \leq g_{2,j}^T (2\overline{\alpha}^2(\epsilon)I_m + 4s\rho_H^2 NN^T) g_{2,j} = e_j^T [Q(2\overline{\alpha}^2(\epsilon)I_m + 4s\rho_H^2 NN^T)Q] e_j = e_j^T e_j = 1.$$

Furthermore, due to $g_{1,i} \in \mathcal{M}$ one has (see (29))

$$(g_{1,i}^T A\Delta)^2 \leq 2\overline{\alpha}^2(\epsilon) \|g\|_2^2 + 8s^2 \rho_H^2 \|N^T g\|_\infty^2 \leq 1 \quad \forall i \leq m.$$

Now, by the semidefinite constraint of (32) and due to $\Theta_1 + Q\Theta_2Q = \sum_i \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T + \sum_i \chi_i g_{2,i} g_{2,i}^T$, for every $v \in \mathcal{B}_*$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^T B\Delta &\leq v^T \left[\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell \right] v + \Delta^T \left[\sum_k \mu_k T_k \right] \Delta + [A\Delta]^T \left[\sum_i \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T + \sum_i \chi_i g_{2,i} g_{2,i}^T \right] A\Delta \\ &\leq \phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + \sum_i \chi_i (g_{1,i}^T A\Delta)^2 + \sum_j \gamma_j (g_{2,j}^T A\Delta)^2 \\ &\quad [\text{as } [v^T S_1 v; \dots; v^T S_L v] \in \mathcal{S} \text{ due to } v \in \mathcal{B}_* \text{ and } [\Delta^T T_1 \Delta; \dots; \Delta^T T_L \Delta] \in 4\mathcal{T} \text{ due to } \Delta \in 2\mathcal{X}] \\ &\leq \phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + \sum_i \chi_i + \sum_j \gamma_j \leq f_H(\lambda, \mu, \tau, \Theta_1, \Theta_2) \end{aligned}$$

due to $\sum_i \gamma_i \leq 2\sqrt{2} \ln(4m^2 n) \rho$ and $\sum_i \chi_i = \text{Tr}(\Theta_2)$. Taking the supremum over $v \in \mathcal{B}_*$ in the resulting inequality, we arrive at (34). \square

3.3 An alternative

In the sequel, we consider the estimate described in the beginning of Section 3, the only difference being in the sizes of contrast matrices G and H : now $H = [h_1, \dots, h_M] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times M}$, and $G = [g_1, \dots, g_{2m}]$. Thus, in our present setting, given observation ω , we solve the optimization problem

$$\min_{\nu, x} \left\{ \|\nu\|_1 : x \in \mathcal{X}, \begin{array}{l} |h_k^T(N\nu + Ax - \omega)| \leq \overline{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|h_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, M, \\ |g_i^T(N\nu + Ax - \omega)| \leq \overline{\alpha}(\epsilon) \|g_{2,i}\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2m, \end{array} \right\} \quad (35)$$

with

$$\overline{\alpha}(\epsilon) = \sigma \sqrt{2 \ln[(2M + 4m)/\epsilon]}$$

and specify $\widehat{x}(\omega), \widehat{\nu}(\omega)$ as an optimal solution to the problem when the problem is feasible, otherwise set $(\widehat{x}(\omega), \widehat{\nu}(\omega)) = (0, 0)$, and take $\widehat{w}_{G,H}(\omega) = B\widehat{x}(\omega)$ as the estimate of Bx_* .

3.3.1 Risk analysis

The above problem can be rewritten equivalently as

$$\min_{\nu, x} \left\{ \|\nu\|_1 : x \in \mathcal{X}, \begin{cases} |h_k^T(N[\nu - \nu_*] + A[x - x_*] - \xi)| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2, & k = 1, \dots, M, \\ |g_i^T(N[\nu - \nu_*] + A[x - x_*] - \xi)| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|g_i\|_2, & i = 1, \dots, 2m, \end{cases} \right\} \quad (36)$$

and when setting

$$\Xi_\epsilon(G, H) := \left\{ \xi \in \mathbf{R}^m : \begin{cases} |h_k^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2, & k = 1, \dots, M, \\ |g_i^T \xi| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|g_i\|_2, & i = 1, \dots, 2m, \end{cases} \right\} \quad (37)$$

we have

$$\text{Prob}_{\xi \sim \mathcal{SG}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)}(\Xi_\epsilon(G, H)) \geq 1 - \epsilon.$$

Let us fix $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ and set $\omega = Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi$. As $(\hat{\nu}, \hat{x})$ is a feasible for (36), $\hat{x} := \hat{x}(\omega)$, $\hat{\nu} := \hat{\nu}(\omega)$ is feasible as well, $\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq \|\nu_*\|_1$. Thus, same as in the proof of Proposition A.1, for $z = \hat{\nu} - \nu_*$ it holds

$$\|z\|_1 \leq 2\|z\|_{s,1}$$

implying that

$$\|z\|_1 \leq 2s\|z\|_\infty, \quad \|z\|_2 \leq \sqrt{2s}\|z\|_\infty. \quad (38)$$

Now denote $\Delta = \hat{x} - x_*$, and consider n pairs of convex optimization problems

$$\text{Opt}_2[i] = \max_{v, t, w} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \sqrt{w_i t} : v \in 2\mathcal{X}, \quad \|w\|_\infty \leq w_i, \quad \|w\|_1 \leq t, \quad t \leq 2sw_i, \quad (a) \\ |h_k^T(Nw + Av)| \leq 2\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, M \quad (b) \end{array} \right\} \quad (P_2[i])$$

$$\text{Opt}_\infty[i] = \max_{v, w} \left\{ w_i : v \in 2\mathcal{X}, \quad \|w\|_\infty \leq w_i, \quad \|w\|_1 \leq 2sw_i, \right. \\ \left. |h_k^T(Nw + Av)| \leq 2\bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, M. \right\} \quad (P_\infty[i])$$

Observe that

(!) A feasible solution (v, t, w) to $(P_2[i])$ satisfies $\|w\|_\infty \leq w_i$ and $\|w\|_1 \leq t$, whence

$$\|w\|_2 \leq \sqrt{w_i t} \leq \text{Opt}_2[i].$$

Now, let $\iota = \iota_z$ be the index of the largest in magnitude entry in z . Taking into account that $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ and recalling that $\Delta \in 2\mathcal{X}$, we conclude that when $z_\iota \geq 0$, $(v, t, w) = (\Delta, \|z\|_1, z)$ is feasible for $(P_2[\iota])$ and $(v, w) = (\Delta, z)$ is feasible for $(P_\infty[\iota])$, while when $z_\iota < 0$ the same holds true for $(v, t, w) = (-\Delta, \|z\|_1, -z)$ and $(v, w) = (-\Delta, -z)$. Indeed in the first case $v = \Delta \in \mathcal{X}$, $|h_k^T[A\hat{x} + N\hat{\nu} - \omega]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2$ and $|h_k^T[Ax_* + N\nu_* - \omega]| \leq \bar{\alpha}(\epsilon)\|h_k\|_2$ as both pairs $(\hat{x}, \hat{\nu})$ and (x_*, ν_*) are feasible for (35), implying $(P_2[i].b)$. Note that we are in the case of $z_\iota = \|z\|_\infty$, that is, $(P_2[i].a)$ holds true for $w = z$ due to (38). Thus, $(\Delta, \|z\|_1, z)$ indeed is feasible for $(P_2[i])$. As a byproduct of our reasoning, (Δ, z) is feasible for $(P_\infty[i])$. In the second case, the reasoning is completely similar.

Next, setting

$$\text{Opt}_2 = \max_i \text{Opt}_2[i], \quad \text{Opt}_\infty = \max_i \text{Opt}_\infty[i],$$

and recalling that $(\Delta, \|z\|_1, z)$ or $(-\Delta, \|z\|_1, -z)$ is feasible for some of problems $(P_2[i])$, and (Δ, z) or $(-\Delta, -z)$ is feasible for some of the problems $(P_\infty[i])$ and invoking (!), we get for all $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$

$$\|z\|_\infty \leq \text{Opt}_\infty, \quad \|z\|_2 \leq \text{Opt}_2, \quad \|z\|_1 \leq 2s\text{Opt}_\infty.$$

Consequently, for all $g \in \mathbf{R}^m$

$$\begin{aligned} |g^T Nz| &\leq \max_z \{g^T Nz : \|z\|_\infty \leq \text{Opt}_\infty, \|z\|_2 \leq \text{Opt}_2, \|z\|_1 \leq 2s\text{Opt}_\infty\} \\ &= \min_{u, v, w} \underbrace{\{\|u\|_1 \text{Opt}_\infty + \|v\|_2 \text{Opt}_2 + 2s\|w\|_\infty \text{Opt}_\infty, u + v + w = N^T g\}}_{=:\bar{\pi}(N^T g)}. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

Now, recalling that $\widehat{x}, \widehat{\nu}$ is feasible for (36) and that $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, we conclude that

$$|g_i^T A \Delta| \leq |g_i^T N z| + |g_i^T \xi| + \overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g\|_2,$$

whence

$$|g_i^T A \Delta| \leq \overline{\pi}(N^T g_i) + 2\overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2, \quad i \leq 2m. \quad (40)$$

Applying the same argument as in the proof of Proposition 2.1, with (40) in the role of (9), we arrive at the following result:

Proposition 3.2 *In the situation of this section, consider optimization problem (cf. (27))*

$$\text{Opt}[G, H] = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma} \left\{ \overbrace{\phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_{\mathcal{T}}(\mu) + \sum_i \gamma_i [\overline{\pi}(N^T g_i) + 2\overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2]^2}^{=: \bar{f}_{G, H}(\lambda, \mu, \gamma)} : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \right. \\ \left. \left[\frac{\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell}{\frac{1}{2} B^T} \mid \frac{\frac{1}{2} B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T [\sum_i \gamma_i g_i g_i^T] A} \right] \succeq 0. \right\} \quad (41)$$

Let (λ, μ, γ) be a feasible solution to (41). Then

$$\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\widehat{w}_{G, H} | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{N}] \leq \bar{f}_{G, H}(\lambda, \mu, \gamma).$$

3.3.2 Contrast matrix synthesis

We continue our analysis of the estimate $\widehat{w}_{G, H}$ in the situation when the observation is $\omega = Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi$ with $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$, see (37). By (39), for $z = \widehat{\nu} - \nu_*$ and all $g \in \mathbf{R}^m$ we have

$$|g^T N z| \leq \min \left\{ \|N^T g\|_2 \text{Opt}_2, \sqrt{2s} \|N^T g\|_2 \text{Opt}_\infty, 2s \|N^T g\|_\infty \text{Opt}_\infty \right\}$$

what implies (cf. (40)) that for all $i \leq 2m$

$$|g_i^T A \Delta| \leq 2\overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g_i\|_2 + \min \left\{ \|N^T g_i\|_2 \text{Opt}_2, \sqrt{2s} \|N^T g_i\|_2 \text{Opt}_\infty, 2s \|N^T g_i\|_\infty \text{Opt}_\infty \right\}. \quad (42)$$

Note that the right-hand side in (42) is nonconvex in g , making our design techniques unapplicable. To circumvent this difficulty, we intend to utilize the following important feature of polyhedral estimates: one may easily “aggregate” several estimates of this type to yield an estimate with the risk which is nearly as small as the smallest of the risks of the estimates combined.

Here is how it works in the present setting. We split the $m \times 2m$ contrast G into two $m \times m$ blocks $G_\chi = [g_{\chi, 1}, \dots, g_{\chi, m}]$, $\chi = 1, 2$, and design the blocks utilizing the respective inequalities inherited from (42), specifically, the inequalities

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{1,i}^T A \Delta| &\leq 2\overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g_{1,i}\|_2 + 2s \|N^T g_{1,i}\|_\infty \text{Opt}_\infty \\ |g_{2,i}^T A \Delta| &\leq 2\overline{\mathfrak{x}}(\epsilon) \|g_{2,i}\|_2 + \|N^T g_{2,i}\|_2 \underbrace{\min\{\text{Opt}_2, \sqrt{2s} \text{Opt}_\infty\}}_{=: \varrho_{2, H}} \end{aligned}$$

where $\Delta = \widehat{x} - x_*$. We weaken these inequalities to

$$\begin{aligned} |g_{1,i}^T A \Delta|^2 &\leq \pi_1^2(g_{1,i}), \quad \pi_1(g) = \sqrt{8\overline{\mathfrak{x}}^2(\epsilon) \|g\|_2^2 + 8s^2 \|N^T g\|_\infty^2}, \\ |g_{2,i}^T A \Delta|^2 &\leq \pi_2^2(g_{2,i}), \quad \pi_2(g) = \sqrt{8\overline{\mathfrak{x}}^2(\epsilon) \|g\|_2^2 + 2\varrho_{2, H}^2 \|N^T g\|_2^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Notice that norms π_χ , $\chi = 1, 2$, are ellipotic, so we can use in our present situation the techniques from Section 3.2, thus arriving at an analogue of Theorem 3.1. To this end, denote by $\mathbf{n}_1, \dots, \mathbf{n}_n$ the columns of N and set

$$\overline{M}_j = 8\overline{\varkappa}^2(\epsilon)I_m + 8s^2\mathbf{n}_j\mathbf{n}_j^T, \quad j \leq m, \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{Q} = (8\overline{\varkappa}^2(\epsilon)I_m + 2\varrho_{2,H}^2NN^Tg)^{-1/2}.$$

Next, observe that the unit ball of $\pi_1(\cdot)$ is the ellitope

$$\overline{M} = \{w \in \mathbf{R}^m : \exists r \in [0, 1]^M : w^T \overline{M}_j w \leq \rho_j, \quad j = 1, \dots, M\}$$

and the unit ball of π_2 is the ellipsoid $w^T \overline{Q}^{-2} w \leq 1$, and consider the optimization problem

$$\text{Opt} = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho} \left\{ \overline{f}_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \Theta_1 \succeq 0, \Theta_2 \succeq 0, \right. \\ \left. \text{Tr}(\overline{M}_j \Theta_1) \leq \rho, \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad \left[\frac{\sum_\ell \lambda_\ell S_\ell}{\frac{1}{2}B^T} \middle| \frac{\frac{1}{2}B}{\sum_k \mu_k T_k + A^T(\Theta_1 + Q\Theta_2 Q^T)A} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \quad (43)$$

where

$$\overline{f}_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) = \phi_S(\lambda) + 4\phi_T(\mu) + \text{Tr}(\Theta_2) + 2\sqrt{2} \ln(4m^2n)\rho. \quad (44)$$

Note that the constraints on Θ_1 and ρ in this problem say exactly that (Θ_1, ρ) belongs to the cone \mathbf{K} associated, according to Proposition 2.2, with the ellitope \overline{M} in the role of \mathcal{W} .

Theorem 3.2 *Given a feasible solution $(\lambda, \mu, \tau, \Theta_1, \Theta_2)$ to (43), (44), let us build $m \times m$ contrast matrices G_1, G_2 as follows.*

- To build G_1 , we apply the second part of Proposition 2.2 to $(\Theta_1, \rho, \overline{M})$ in the role of $(\Theta, \rho, \mathcal{W})$, to get, in a computationally efficient way, a decomposition $\Theta_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T$ with $g_{1,i} \in \overline{M}$ and $\gamma_i \geq 0$, $\sum_i \gamma_i \leq 2\sqrt{s} \ln(4m^2n)\rho$. We set $G_1 = [g_{1,1}, \dots, g_{1,m}]$.
- To build G_2 , we subject Θ_2 to the eigenvalue decomposition $\Theta_2 = \Gamma \text{Diag}\{\chi\} \Gamma^T$ and set $G_2 = [g_{2,1}, \dots, g_{2,m}] = Q\Gamma$.

Note that $\Theta_1 + Q\Theta_2 Q = \sum_i \gamma_i g_{1,i} g_{1,i}^T + \sum_i \chi_i g_{2,i} g_{2,i}^T$.

For the resulting polyhedral estimate $\widehat{w}_{G,H}$ and for all $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$, s -sparse ν_* and $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ if holds

$$\|\widehat{w}_{G,H}(Ax_* + N\nu_* + \xi) - Bx_*\| \leq \overline{f}_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho) \quad (45)$$

implying that the ϵ -risk of the estimate is upper-bounded by $f_H(\lambda, \mu, \Theta_1, \Theta_2, \rho)$ (as $\xi \in \Xi_\epsilon(G, H)$ with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$).

Proof of the theorem follows that of Theorem 3.1 and is omitted.

3.4 Putting things together

Finally, we can “aggregate” polyhedral estimates from Sections 3.2 and 3.3 in the following construction (cf. [16, Section 5.1.6]):

Let us put

$$\overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) = \sigma(2 \ln[(2n + 2M + 8m)/\epsilon])^{1/2},$$

and let $\widetilde{H} = [\widetilde{h}_1, \dots, \widetilde{h}_n] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times n}$, $\widetilde{G} = [\widetilde{g}_1, \dots, \widetilde{g}_{2m}] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times 2m}$ and $\overline{H} = [\overline{h}_1, \dots, \overline{h}_M] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times M}$, $\overline{G} = [\overline{g}_1, \dots, \overline{g}_{2m}] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times 2m}$ be the contrast matrices specified according to

the synthesis recipes of Sections 3.2 and 3.3, respectively. We define the aggregated estimate the \widehat{w} as $\widehat{w}(\omega) = B\widehat{x}(\omega)$ where $\widehat{x}(\omega)$ is the x -component of

$$(\widehat{x}(\omega), \widehat{\nu}(\omega)) \in \underset{x, \nu}{\text{Argmin}} \left\{ \|\nu\|_1 : x \in \mathcal{X}, \right. \\ \left. \begin{array}{l} |\widetilde{h}_k^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]| \leq \overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) \|\widetilde{h}_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, n, \\ |\overline{h}_k^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]| \leq \overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) \|\overline{h}_k\|_2, \quad k = 1, \dots, M, \\ |\widetilde{g}_i^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]|_\infty \leq \overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) \|\widetilde{g}_i\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2m, \\ |\overline{g}_i^T [N\nu + Ax - \omega]|_\infty \leq \overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) \|\overline{g}_i\|_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, 2m, \end{array} \right\}$$

when the problem is feasible, and $\widehat{x}(\omega) = 0$ otherwise.

Let us denote $G = [\widetilde{G}, \overline{G}] \in \mathbf{R}^{m \times 4m}$, let also $(\widetilde{\lambda}, \widetilde{\mu}, \widetilde{\gamma})$ be a feasible solution to the problem (27) with $H = \widetilde{H}$, and let $(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{\mu}, \overline{\gamma})$ be a feasible solution to the problem (41) with $H = \overline{H}$. Let $f_{G,H}$ and $\overline{f}_{G,H}$ be specified in (27) and (41) respectively. From Propositions 3.1, 3.2 it immediately follows that for every s -sparse ν_* and every $x_* \in \mathcal{X}$ the error bound

$$\text{Risk}_\epsilon[\widehat{w}(\cdot) | \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{N}] \leq \min[f_{G, \widetilde{H}}(\widetilde{\lambda}, \widetilde{\mu}, \widetilde{\gamma}), \overline{f}_{G, \overline{H}}(\overline{\lambda}, \overline{\mu}, \overline{\gamma})] \quad (46)$$

holds true.

Note that the resulting estimate can be efficiently optimized w.r.t. all parameters involved, except for \overline{H} , by specifying

- \widetilde{H} as (near) minimizer of $\rho[H]$ over $H \in \mathcal{H}$ (23),
- \widetilde{G} as a result of the decomposition of the (Θ_1, Θ_2) -component of a (near-) optimal solution to the problem (32), (33) (see Theorem 3.1) associated with \widetilde{H} ,
- \overline{G} as a result of the decomposition of the (Θ_1, Θ_2) -component of a (near-) optimal solution to the problem (43), (44) (see Theorem 3.2) associated with \overline{H} .

3.5 Numerical illustration

In our illustration,

- $m = n = 256$, $q = p = 32$, $N = I_n$, $B = I_p$, A is $n \times p$ matrix with $A^T A = I_p$;
- \mathcal{X} is the restriction on the p -point equidistant grid on the segment $\Delta = [0, 2\pi]$ of functions f satisfying $|f(0)| \leq 1$, $|f'(0)| \leq 1$, $|f''(t)| \leq 1$, $t \in \Delta$;
- the norm $\|\cdot\|$ quantifying the recovery error is the standard Euclidean norm on \mathbf{R}^p ;
- $\xi \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2 I_m)$ with $\sigma = 0.1$, $\epsilon = 0.05$, and $s = 8$.


In the above estimate we set $\overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) = \sqrt{2}\sigma \text{erfcinv}(\frac{\epsilon}{6n})$ where $\text{erfcinv}(\cdot)$ is the inverse complementary Gaussian error function, and $\overline{H} = I_n$. When processing problem (43), (44) numerically, Θ_1 was set to 0; the resulting problem can be rewritten as

$$\text{Opt} = \min_{\lambda, \mu, \gamma, \Theta} \left\{ \lambda + 4 \sum_{k=1}^n \mu_k + 4 \sum_{j=1}^n \gamma_j + \rho_2 \text{Tr}(\Theta) : \lambda \geq 0, \mu \geq 0, \gamma \geq 0, \Theta \succeq 0, \right. \\ \left. \left[\begin{array}{c|c} \lambda I_n & \frac{1}{2} B \\ \hline \frac{1}{2} B^T & A^T \Theta A + [T, \overline{A}]^T \text{Diag}\{\mu; \gamma\} [T, \overline{A}]^T \end{array} \right] \succeq 0 \right\} \quad (47)$$

where $\overline{A} = 2A/\rho_2$ with $\rho_2 = 2\overline{\varkappa}(\epsilon) + \varrho_{2, \overline{H}}$, the subsequent entries in Tz being z_1 , $[z_2 - z_1]/h$, $[z_{i-2} - 2z_{i-1} + z_i]/h^2$, $3 \leq i \leq n$, and $h = 2\pi/n$. Problem (47) was processed by the first order Composite Truncated Level method [2] in the same fashion as problem (14) in [2].

The results of our experiments are as follows:

- The upper bound, given by (46) for the estimate specified at the end of Section 3.4 is 36.95 (62% of $\max_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \|x\|_2$). Note that the upper bound, given by Theorem 3.1, on the risk of the estimate stemming from the optimal solution to (32), (33) is as large as 60.16.
- The recovery errors observed in experiments were much smaller than the risk bounds and were similar for both estimates mentioned in the previous item. Here is a sample of recoveries (\bar{s} is the actual number of outliers – of nonzero entries in ν – used in simulations):



Magenta: true signal Blue – recovery

A Error bound for ℓ_1 recovery

Condition $Q_\infty(s, \kappa)$

Given an $m \times n$ sensing matrix N , positive integer $s \leq n$, and $\kappa \in (0, 1/2)$, we say that $m \times p$ matrix H satisfy condition $Q_\infty(s, \kappa)$ if

$$\|w\|_\infty \leq \|H^T N w\|_\infty + \frac{\kappa}{s} \|w\|_1 \quad \forall w \in \mathbf{R}^n. \quad (48)$$

For $y \in \mathbf{R}^n$, let y^s stand for the vector obtained from y by zeroing out all but the s largest in magnitude entries.

Proposition A.1 Given N and integer $s > 0$, assume that H satisfies the condition $Q_\infty(s, \kappa)$ with $\kappa < \frac{1}{2}$. Then for all $\nu, \hat{\nu} \in \mathbf{R}^n$ such that $\|\hat{\nu}\|_1 \leq \|\nu\|_1$ it holds:

$$\|\hat{\nu} - \nu\|_q \leq \frac{(2s)^{\frac{1}{q}}}{1-2\kappa} \left[\|H^T N [\hat{\nu} - \nu]\|_\infty + \frac{\|\nu - \nu^s\|_1}{s} \right], \quad 1 \leq q \leq \infty. \quad (49)$$

Proof. Let us denote $\rho = \|H^T N [\hat{\nu} - \nu]\|_\infty$, and let $z = \hat{\nu} - \nu$.

1^o. Let $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$ of cardinality $\leq s$ and let \bar{I} be its complement in $\{1, \dots, n\}$. When denoting by x_I the vector obtained from a vector x by zeroing out the entries with indexes not belonging to I , we have

$$\|\widehat{\nu}_{\bar{I}}\|_1 = \|\widehat{\nu}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\nu}_I\|_1 \leq \|\nu\|_1 - \|\widehat{\nu}_I\|_1 = \|\nu_I\|_1 + \|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1 - \|\widehat{\nu}_I\|_1 \leq \|z_I\|_1 + \|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1,$$

and therefore

$$\|z_{\bar{I}}\|_1 \leq \|\widehat{\nu}_{\bar{I}}\|_1 + \|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1 \leq \|z_I\|_1 + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1.$$

It follows that

$$\|z\|_1 = \|z_I\|_1 + \|z_{\bar{I}}\|_1 \leq 2\|z_I\|_1 + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1. \quad (50)$$

Besides this, by definition of ρ we have

$$\|H^T N z\|_\infty \leq \rho. \quad (51)$$

2^o. Since H satisfies $\mathbf{Q}_\infty(s, \kappa)$, we have

$$\|z\|_{s,1} \leq s\|H^T N z\|_\infty + \kappa\|z\|_1$$

where $\|z\|_{s,1}$ is the ℓ_1 -norm of the s -dimensional vector composed of the s largest in magnitude entries of z . By (51) it follows that $\|z\|_{s,1} \leq s\rho + \kappa\|z\|_1$ which combines with the evident inequality $\|z_I\|_1 \leq \|z\|_{s,1}$ (recall that $\text{Card}(I) = s$) and with (50) to imply that

$$\|z\|_1 \leq 2\|z_I\|_1 + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1 \leq 2s\rho + 2\kappa\|z\|_1 + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1,$$

hence (recall that $\kappa \leq \frac{1}{2}$)

$$\|z\|_1 \leq \frac{2s\rho + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1}{1 - 2\kappa}. \quad (52)$$

On the other hand, since H satisfies $\mathbf{Q}_\infty(s, \kappa)$, we also have

$$\|z\|_\infty \leq \|H^T N z\|_\infty + \frac{\kappa}{s}\|z\|_1,$$

which combines with (52) and (51) to imply that

$$\|z\|_\infty \leq \rho + \frac{\kappa}{s} \frac{2s\rho + 2\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1}{1 - 2\kappa} = (1 - 2\kappa)^{-1} \left[\rho + \frac{\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1}{s} \right] \quad (53)$$

We conclude that for all $1 \leq q \leq \infty$,

$$\|z\|_p \leq \|z\|_\infty^{\frac{q-1}{q}} \|z\|_1^{\frac{1}{q}} \leq \frac{(2s)^{\frac{1}{q}}}{1-2\kappa} \left[\rho + \frac{\|\nu_{\bar{I}}\|_1}{s} \right]. \quad \square$$

References

- [1] S. Balakrishnan, S. S. Du, J. Li, and A. Singh. Computationally efficient robust sparse estimation in high dimensions. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 169–212. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Y. Bekri, A. Juditsky, and A. Nemirovski. First order algorithms for computing linear and polyhedral estimates. *Open Journal of Mathematical Optimization*, 5:1–15, 2024.
- [3] A. G. Bruce, D. L. Donoho, H.-Y. Gao, and R. D. Martin. Denoising and robust nonlinear wavelet analysis. In *Wavelet applications*, volume 2242, pages 325–336. SPIE, 1994.

- [4] Y. Chen, C. Caramanis, and S. Mannor. Robust sparse regression under adversarial corruption. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 774–782. PMLR, 2013.
- [5] F. L. Chernousko. *State estimation for dynamic systems*. CRC Press, 1993.
- [6] A. Dalalyan and P. Thompson. Outlier-robust estimation of a sparse linear model using ℓ_1 -penalized huber’s m -estimator. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [7] I. Diakonikolas, W. Kong, and A. Stewart. Efficient algorithms and lower bounds for robust linear regression. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2745–2754. SIAM, 2019.
- [8] D. L. Donoho. Statistical estimation and optimal recovery. *The Annals of Statistics*, 22(1):238–270, 1994.
- [9] E. Fogel and Y.-F. Huang. On the value of information in system identification—bounded noise case. *Automatica*, 18(2):229–238, 1982.
- [10] R. Foygel and L. Mackey. Corrupted sensing: Novel guarantees for separating structured signals. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 60(2):1223–1247, 2014.
- [11] O. Granichin and B. Polyak. *Randomized Algorithms of an Estimation and Optimization Under Almost Arbitrary Noises*. Nauka, 2003.
- [12] P. Huber. *Robust statistics*. Wiley New York, 1981.
- [13] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. Near-optimality of linear recovery from indirect observations. *Mathematical Statistics and Learning*, 1(2):171–225, 2018.
- [14] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. Near-optimality of linear recovery in Gaussian observation scheme under $\|\cdot\|_2^2$ -loss. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(4):1603–1629, 2018.
- [15] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. On polyhedral estimation of signals via indirect observations. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(1):458—502, 2020.
- [16] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. *Statistical Inference via Convex Optimization*. Princeton University Press, 2020.
- [17] A. Juditsky and A. Nemirovski. On design of polyhedral estimates in linear inverse problems. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 6(1):76–96, 2024.
- [18] A. B. Juditsky and A. S. Nemirovski. Nonparametric estimation by convex programming. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 2278–2300, 2009.
- [19] A. Kurzhanski. *Identification—a theory of guaranteed estimates*. Springer, 1989.
- [20] A. Kurzhanski and I. Vályi. *Ellipsoidal calculus for estimation and control*. Springer, 1997.
- [21] L. Liu, Y. Shen, T. Li, and C. Caramanis. High dimensional robust sparse regression. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 411–421. PMLR, 2020.
- [22] C. A. Micchelli and T. J. Rivlin. *A Survey of Optimal Recovery*, pages 1–54. Springer US, Boston, MA, 1977.

- [23] C. A. Micchelli and T. J. Rivlin. Lectures on optimal recovery. In P. R. Turner, editor, *Numerical Analysis Lancaster 1984*, pages 21–93. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1985.
- [24] M. Milanese and A. Vicino. Optimal estimation theory for dynamic systems with set membership uncertainty: An overview. *Automatica*, 27(6):997–1009, 1991.
- [25] S. Minsker, M. Ndaoud, and L. Wang. Robust and tuning-free sparse linear regression via square-root slope. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 6(2):428–453, 2024.
- [26] S. Sardy, P. Tseng, and A. Bruce. Robust wavelet denoising. *IEEE transactions on signal processing*, 49(6):1146–1152, 2001.
- [27] F. C. Schweppe. *Uncertain dynamic systems*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- [28] J. W. Tukey. A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. *Contributions to probability and statistics*, pages 448–485, 1960.
- [29] C. Yu and W. Yao. Robust linear regression: A review and comparison. *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation*, 46(8):6261–6282, 2017.