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Can we develop learning algorithms that are \textit{robust} to a \textit{constant} fraction of \textit{corruptions} in the data?
PART I: INTRODUCTION
MOTIVATION

- Model Misspecification/Robust Statistics
  [Fisher 1920s, Tukey 1960s, Huber 1960s]

- Outlier Detection/Removal

- Adversarial/Secure ML
**The Statistical Learning Problem**

- **Input**: sample generated by a statistical model with unknown $\theta^*$
- **Goal**: estimate parameters $\theta$ so that $\theta \approx \theta^*$

**Question 1**: Is there an efficient learning algorithm?

**Question 2**: Are there tradeoffs between these criteria?

Main performance criteria:
- Sample size
- Running time
- Robustness
(Outlier-) Robustness in a Generative Model

**Strong Contamination Model:**
Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a family of statistical models. We say that a set of $N$ samples is $\epsilon$-corrupted from $\mathcal{F}$ if it is generated as follows:
- $N$ samples are drawn from an unknown $F \in \mathcal{F}$
- An omniscient adversary inspects these samples and changes arbitrarily an $\epsilon$-fraction of them.

cf. Huber’s contamination model [1964]
EXAMPLE: PARAMETER ESTIMATION

Given i.i.d. samples from an unknown distribution

e.g., a 1-D Gaussian
\[ \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2) \]

how do we accurately estimate its parameters?

empirical mean:
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \rightarrow \mu \]

empirical variance:
\[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \bar{X})^2 \rightarrow \sigma^2 \]
Maximum Likelihood
(1920s)

Model Misspecification?
(1960s)
Peter J. Huber

“Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter”
What estimators behave well in the presence of outliers?
Given **corrupted** samples from a *one-dimensional* Gaussian, can we accurately estimate its parameters?

- A single corrupted sample can arbitrarily corrupt the empirical mean and variance
- But the **median** and **interquartile range** work
Fact [Folklore]: Given a set $S$ of $N$ $\epsilon$-corrupted samples from a one-dimensional Gaussian 

$$\mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$$

with high constant probability we have that:

$$|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \leq O(\epsilon + \sqrt{1/N}) \cdot \sigma$$

where $\hat{\mu} = \text{median}(S)$.

What about robust estimation in high-dimensions?
**HIGH-DIMENSIONAL ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION**

**Robust Mean Estimation**: Given an $\epsilon$ - corrupted set of samples from an *unknown mean*, identity covariance Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$ in $d$ dimensions, recover $\hat{\mu}$ with

$$\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O(\epsilon) + O(\sqrt{d/N})$$

**Remark**: Above convergence rate is optimal [Tukey’75, Donoho’82]
**Previous Approaches: Robust Mean Estimation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimator</th>
<th>Error Rate</th>
<th>Running Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance-Based Pruning</td>
<td>$\Theta(\epsilon \sqrt{d})$</td>
<td>$O(dN)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate-wise Median</td>
<td>$\Theta(\epsilon \sqrt{d})$</td>
<td>$O(dN)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometric Median</td>
<td>$\Theta(\epsilon \sqrt{d})$</td>
<td>$\text{poly}(d, N)$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tukey Median</td>
<td>$\Theta(\epsilon)$</td>
<td>NP-Hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tournament</td>
<td>$\Theta(\epsilon)$</td>
<td>$\mathcal{N}^{O(d)}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTANCE-BASED PRUNING
DISTANCE-BASED PRUNING = NAÏVE OUTLIER REMOVAL
All known estimators are either require exponential time to compute or can tolerate a negligible fraction of outliers.

Is robust estimation algorithmically possible in high-dimensions?
“[…] Only simple algorithms (i.e., with a low degree of computational complexity) will survive the onslaught of huge data sets. This runs counter to recent developments in computational robust statistics. It appears to me that none of the above problems will be amenable to a treatment through theorems and proofs. They will have to be attacked by heuristics and judgment, and by alternative “what if” analyses.[…]”

Robust estimation in high-dimensions is algorithmically possible!

- Computationally efficient robust estimators that can tolerate a constant fraction of corruptions.
- Methodology to detect outliers in high dimensions.

Meta-Theorem (Informal): Can obtain dimension-independent error guarantees, if distribution on inliers has nice concentration.
**First Algorithmic Progress In Unsupervised Setting**

[D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Moitra-Stewart, FOCS'16/SICOMP’19/CACM’21]

Can tolerate *constant* fraction of corruptions.

- Mean and Covariance Estimation
- Mixtures of Spherical Gaussians, Mixtures of Balanced Product Distributions

[Lai-Rao-Vempala, FOCS’16]

Can tolerate *inverse logarithmic* fraction of corruptions.

- Mean and Covariance Estimation
- Independent Component Analysis, SVD
BEYOND ROBUST STATISTICS: ROBUST UNSUPERVISED LEARNING

Robustly Learning Graphical Models
[Cheng-D-Kane-Stewart’16, D-Kane-Stewart’18, D-Kane-Stewart-Sun’21]

Robustly Learning Mixture Models
[Charikar-Steinhardt-Valiant’17, D-Kane-Stewart’18, Hopkins-Li’18, Kothari-Steinhardt-Steurer’18, Bakshi-Kothari’20, D-Hopkins-Kane-Kothari’20, Liu-Moitra’20, Bakshi-D-Jia-Kane-Kothari-Vempala’20]

Computational/Statistical-Robustness Tradeoffs
[D-Kane-Stewart’17, D-Kong-Stewart’18, Hopkins-Li’19, Brennan-Bresler’20, D-Kane-Pensia-Pittas’21, …]
**Robust Supervised Learning**

Malicious PAC Learning
[Klivans-Long-Servedio’10, Awasthi-Balcan-Long’14, D-Kane-Stewart’18, …]

Robust Linear Regression
[Klivans-Kothari-Meka’18, D-Kong-Stewart’18, Bakshi-Prasad’20, …]

Stochastic Convex Optimization
[Prasad-Suggala-Balakrishnan-Ravikumar’19, D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Steinhardt-Stewart’19]
SUBSEQUENT RELATED WORKS

• **Sparse Models** [Balakrishnan-Du-Li-Singh’17, D-Karmalkar-Kane-Price-Stewart’19, Liu-Shen-Li-Caramanis’19,…]

• **Graphical Models** [Cheng-D-Kane-Stewart’18, D-Kane-Stewart-Sun’21]

• **Robust Regression/Classification** [D-Kane-Stewart’18, Klivans-Kothari-Meka’18, D-Kong-Stewart’19 Bakshi-Prasad’21, …]

• **Robust Stochastic Optimization** [Prasad-Suggala-Balakrishnan-Ravikumar’18, D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Steinhard-Stewart’18, …]

• **Robust Estimation via SoS** [Hopkins-Li’18, Kothari-Steinhardt-Steurer’18, Karmalkar-Klivans-Kothari’19, Raghavendra-Yau’19, Bakshi-Kothari’20, D-Hopkins-Kane-Karmalkar’20, Liu-Moitra’20, Bakshi-D-Jia-Kane-Kothari-Vempala’20, …]

• **Near-Linear Time Algorithms** [Chen-D-Ge’18, Cheng-D-Ge-Woodruff’19, Depersin-Lecue’19, Dong-Hopkins-Li’19, Li-Ye’20, Cherapanamjeri-Mohanty-Yau’20, D-Kane-Koongsgard-Li-Tian’21, …]

• **Computational-Statistical Tradeoffs** [D-Kane-Stewart’17, D-Kong-Stewart’19, Hopkins-Li’19, …]

• **Connections to Non-Convex Optimization** [Chen-D-Ge-Soltanolkotabi’20, Zhu-Jiao-Steinhardt’20, …]

• **List-Decodable Learning** [Charikar-Steinhardt-Valiant’17, D-Kane-Stewart’18, Meister-Valiant’18, Karmalkar-Klivans-Kothari’19, Raghavendra-Yau’19, D-Kane-Koongsgard’20, D-Kane-Koongsgard-Li-Tian’21, …]

• **Applications in Data Analysis** [D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Moitra-Stewart’17, Tran-Li-Madry’18, D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Steinhardt-Stewart’19, Hayase-Kong-Somani-Oh’21, …]
HIGH-DIMENSIONAL ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION
**ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION: GAUSSIAN CASE**

**Problem:** Given an $\epsilon$-corrupted set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from an unknown distribution $D$ in a known family $\mathcal{F}$, estimate the mean $\mu$ of $D$.

**Theorem 1:** Let $\epsilon < 1/2$. If $D$ is a spherical Gaussian, there is an efficient algorithm that outputs an estimate $\hat{\mu}$ that with high probability satisfies

$$\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O(\epsilon) + O(\sqrt{d/N})$$

in the additive contamination model.

First-term of RHS Independent of $d$!

[D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Moitra-Stewart, SODA’18]
ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION: SUB-GAUSSIAN CASE

**Problem:** Given an $\epsilon$-corrupted set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from an unknown distribution $D$ in a known family $\mathcal{F}$, estimate the mean $\mu$ of $D$.

**Theorem 2:** Let $\epsilon < 1/2$. If $D$ is a spherical sub-Gaussian, there is an efficient algorithm that outputs an estimate $\hat{\mu}$ that with high probability satisfies

$$
\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)}) + O(\sqrt{d/N}).
$$

in the strong contamination model.

Information-theoretically optimal error.

[D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Moitra-Stewart, FOCS’16, ICML’17]
**Robust Mean Estimation: Bounded Covariance Case**

**Problem:** Given an $\epsilon$-corrupted set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from an unknown distribution $D$ in a known family $\mathcal{F}$, estimate the mean $\mu$ of $D$.

**Theorem 3:** Let $\epsilon < 1/2$. If $D$ has covariance $\Sigma \preceq \sigma^2 \cdot I$, there is an efficient algorithm that outputs an estimate $\hat{\mu}$ that with high probability satisfies

$$\|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O(\sigma \sqrt{\epsilon}) + O(\sqrt{d/N}).$$

in the **strong contamination** model.

Information-theoretically **optimal error**.

[D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Moitra-Stewart, ICML’17; Steinhardt, Charikar, Valiant, ITCS’18]
**Robust Mean Estimation: Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumptions on Inliers</th>
<th>Information-Theoretic Bound</th>
<th>Computationally Efficient Estimators</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gaussian with $\Sigma = I$</td>
<td>$\Theta(\varepsilon)$</td>
<td>$O(\varepsilon)$</td>
<td>Additive Contamination* [DKKLMS, SODA’18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subgaussian with $\Sigma = I$</td>
<td>$\Theta(\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)})$</td>
<td>$O(\varepsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\varepsilon)})$</td>
<td>[DKKLMS, FOCS’16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounded $t$-th Moments $\Sigma = I$</td>
<td>$\Theta(\varepsilon^{1-1/t})$</td>
<td>$O(\varepsilon^{1-1/t})$</td>
<td>[DKKLMS, ICML’17; SCV, ITCS’18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown Covariance $\Sigma \preceq I$</td>
<td>$\Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$</td>
<td>$O(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$</td>
<td>“Niceness” Assumption* [HL, STOC’18; KS, STOC’18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounded $t$-th Moments</td>
<td>$\Theta(\varepsilon^{1-1/t})$</td>
<td>$O(\varepsilon^{1-1/t})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Iterative Filtering
Idea #1 [DKKLMS’16, LRV’16]: If the empirical covariance is “close to what it should be”, then the empirical mean works.
CERTIFICATE FOR EMPIRICAL MEAN

Detect when the empirical estimator may be compromised

$$\hat{\mu} \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i$$

- • = uncorrupted
- •• = corrupted

There is no direction of large empirical variance
**Key Lemma:** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N$ be an $\epsilon$-corrupted set of samples from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$ and $N = \Omega(d/\epsilon^2)$, then for

\begin{align*}
(1) \quad \hat{\mu} & \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \\
(2) \quad \hat{\Sigma} & \triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \hat{\mu})(X_i - \hat{\mu})^T
\end{align*}

with high probability we have:

\[ \|\hat{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq 1 + O(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \leq O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)}) \]

in **strong** contamination model.
**Key Lemma:** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N$ be an $\epsilon$-corrupted set of samples from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$ and $N = \Omega(d/\epsilon^2)$, then for

\begin{align*}
(1) \quad \hat{\mu} &\triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i \\
(2) \quad \hat{\Sigma} &\triangleq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (X_i - \hat{\mu})(X_i - \hat{\mu})^T
\end{align*}

with high probability we have:

\[ \|\hat{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq 1 + \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\delta} \epsilon + \epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)}) \]

in strong contamination model.
Idea #2 [DKKLMS’16]: Removing any $\epsilon$-fraction of good points does not move the empirical mean and covariance by much.
REMARKS ON KEY LEMMA

- Statement applies for spherical distributions with sub-Gaussian tails.
- Essentially same argument goes through if covariance is *approximately* known.
- Argument extends for distributions with known covariance and weaker concentration.

If $D$ is isotropic with *sub-exponential* tails:

$$
\|\hat{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq 1 + \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\delta \epsilon} + \epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) .
$$

If $D$ satisfies $\Sigma \preceq I$:

$$
\|\hat{\Sigma}\|_2 \leq 1 + \delta \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\hat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\delta \epsilon} + \sqrt{\epsilon}) .
$$
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- Certificate of Robustness

- **Recursive Dimension Halving**

- Iterative Filtering
Idea #3 [LRV’16]: Additive corruptions can move the covariance in some directions, but not in all directions simultaneously.
**Recursive Dimension-Halving [LRV’16]**

**LRV Procedure:**

- **Step #1:** Find large subspace where “standard” estimator works.
- **Step #2:** Recurse on complement.

Combine Results.

Can reduce dimension by factor of 2 in each recursive step.
Finding a Good Subspace (I)

“Good subspace $G$” = one where the empirical mean works

By Key Lemma, sufficient condition is:

Projection of empirical covariance on $G$ has no large eigenvalues.

• Also want $G$ to be “high-dimensional”.

Question: How do we find such a subspace?
Finding A Good Subspace (II)

**Good Subspace Lemma:** Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_N$ be an additively $\epsilon$-corrupted set of $N = \Omega(d \log d/\epsilon^2)$ samples from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$. *After naïve pruning*, we have that

$$\lambda_{d/2}(\hat{\Sigma}) \leq 1 + O(\epsilon)$$

**Corollary:** Let $W$ be the span of the bottom $d/2$ eigenvalues of $\hat{\Sigma}$. Then $W$ is a good subspace.
Recursive Dimension-Halving Algorithm [LRV’16]

Algorithm works as follows:

- Remove gross outliers (e.g., naïve pruning).
- Let $W, V$ be the span of bottom $d/2$ and upper $d/2$ eigenvalues of $\Sigma$ respectively.
- Use empirical mean on $W$.
- Recurse on $V$ (If the dimension is one, use median).

Error Analysis:

$O(\log d)$ levels of the recursion  \quad \text{final error of } O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log d})
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Idea #4 [DKKLMS’16]: Iteratively “remove outliers” in order to “fix” the empirical covariance.
Iterative Filtering [DKKLMS’16]

Iterative Two-Step Procedure:

**Step #1:** Test certificate of robustness of “standard” estimator

**Step #2:** If certificate is violated, detect and remove outliers

Iterate on “cleaner” dataset.

General recipe that works in general settings.

Let’s see how this works for robust mean estimation.
**Filtering Subroutine**

Either output empirical mean or remove many outliers.

**Filtering Approach:** Suppose that:

\[ \| \hat{\Sigma} \|_2 \geq 1 + \Omega(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) \]

Let \( v^* \) be the direction of maximum variance.
FILTERING SUBROUTINE

Either output empirical mean, or remove many outliers.

Filtering Approach: Suppose that:

\[ \|\hat{\Sigma}\|_2 \geq 1 + \Omega(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) \]

Let \( v^* \) be the direction of maximum variance.

- Project all the points on the direction of \( v^* \).
- Find a threshold \( T \) such that
  \[ \text{Pr}_{X \sim U^S}[|v^* \cdot X - \text{median}(\{v^* \cdot x, x \in S\})| > T + 1] \geq 8 \cdot e^{-T^2/2}. \]
- Throw away all points \( x \) such that
  \[ |v^* \cdot x - \text{median}(\{v^* \cdot x, x \in S\})| > T + 1 \]
- Iterate on new dataset.
FILTERING SUBROUTINE: ANALYSIS SKETCH

Either output empirical mean, or remove many outliers.

Filtering Approach: Suppose that:

$$\| \hat{\Sigma} \|_2 \geq 1 + \Omega(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon))$$

Claim: In each iteration, we remove more outliers than inliers.

After a bounded number of iterations, we stop removing points.

Eventually the empirical mean works

Runtime: $\tilde{O}(Nd^2)$
FILTERING PSEUDO-CODE

Input:  $\epsilon$-corrupted set $S$ from $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$
Output: Set $S' \subseteq S$ that is $\epsilon'$-corrupted, for some $\epsilon' < \epsilon$
       OR robust estimate of the unknown mean $\mu$

1. Let $\widehat{\mu}_S, \widehat{\Sigma}_S$ be the empirical mean and covariance of the set $S$.
2. If $\|\widehat{\Sigma}_S\|_2 \leq 1 + C\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)$, for an appropriate constant $C > 0$:
   Output $\widehat{\mu}_S$
3. Otherwise, let $(\lambda^*, v^*)$ be the top eigenvalue-eigenvector pair of $\widehat{\Sigma}_S$.
4. Find $T > 0$ such that
   \[ \Pr_{X \sim U_S}[|v^* \cdot X - \text{median}\{v^* \cdot x, x \in S\}| > T + 1] \geq 8 \cdot e^{-T^2/2}. \]
5. Return
   \[ S' = \{ x \in S : |v^* \cdot x - \text{median}\{v^* \cdot x, x \in S\}| \leq T + 1 \}. \]
Remarks on Filtering Method(s)

• For known covariance sub-Gaussian case, filter relied on violation of concentration.

• This extends to weaker concentration, as long as covariance is (approximately) known.
• For example, for sub-exponential concentration, filter would be:

\[
\text{Find } T > 0 \text{ such that } \Pr_{X \sim U,S}[|v^\star \cdot (X - \mu)| > T] \geq 8 \cdot e^{-T}.
\]

• For the bounded covariance setting, randomized filtering / down-weighting.

\[
\text{Remove point } x \text{ with probability proportional to } (v^\star \cdot (x - \mu))^2.
\]

• Analogue of Claim 1: Remove more outliers than inliers in expectation.
PART III: EXTENSIONS
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**NON-CONVEX OPTIMIZATION FORMULATION (I)**

**Optimization Formulation:**

Assign *weights* to the samples so that weighted empirical mean works.

Let

$$\Delta_{N,\epsilon} = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|w\|_1 = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq w_i \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon)N} \right\}$$

$$\hat{\mu}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i X_i \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\Sigma}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)(X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)^T.$$

**Generalization of Key Lemma:** For any $w \in \Delta_{N,2\epsilon}$

$$\|\hat{\Sigma}_w\|_2 \leq 1 + O(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad \text{and} \quad \|\hat{\mu}_w - \mu\|_2 = O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)})$$
NON-CONVEX OPTIMIZATION FORMULATION (II)

Notation: \( \Delta_{N,\epsilon} = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|w\|_1 = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq w_i \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon)N} \right\} \)

\[ \hat{\mu}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i X_i \quad \hat{\Sigma}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)(X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)^T. \]

Generalization of Key Lemma

\[ \|\hat{\Sigma}_w\|_2 \leq 1 + O(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon)) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \|\hat{\mu}_w - \mu\|_2 = O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)}) \]

Non-Convex Formulation:

\[ \min_w \|\hat{\Sigma}_w\|_2 \text{ subject to } w \in \Delta_{N,2\epsilon} \]
NON-CONVEX OPTIMIZATION FORMULATION (III)

Notation: \( \Delta_{N,\epsilon} = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|w\|_1 = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq w_i \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon)N} \right\} \)

\[ \hat{\mu}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i X_i \quad \hat{\Sigma}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)(X_i - \hat{\mu}_w)^T. \]

Non-Convex Formulation:
\[ \min_w \|\hat{\Sigma}_w\|_2 \text{ subject to } w \in \Delta_{N,2\epsilon} \]

Algorithmic Approaches:
- This is what filtering does!
- Ellipsoid Method [DKKLMS’16]
- Bi-level optimization [Cheng-D-Ge’18] (near-linear time!)
- Gradient Descent [Cheng-D-Ge-Soltanolkotabi, ICML’20]
ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION VIA GRADIENT-DESCENT

Notation: $\Delta_{N,\epsilon} = \left\{ w \in \mathbb{R}^N : \|w\|_1 = 1 \text{ and } 0 \leq w_i \leq \frac{1}{(1 - \epsilon)N} \right\}$

$\widehat{\mu}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i X_i$

$\widehat{\Sigma}_w = \sum_{i=1}^{N} w_i (X_i - \widehat{\mu}_w)(X_i - \widehat{\mu}_w)^T.$

Non-Convex Formulation:

$$\min_w \|\widehat{\Sigma}_w\|_2 \text{ subject to } w \in \Delta_{N,2\epsilon}$$

Theorem [Cheng-D-Ge-Soltanolkotabi, ICML’20]

Any approximate stationary point $w$ defines $\widehat{\mu}_w$ that is close to $\mu$.

See also [Zhu et al., Arxiv, May 2020]
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ROBUST STOCHASTIC OPTIMIZATION

Sever: A Robust Meta-Algorithm for Stochastic Optimization.
[D-Kamath-Kane-Li-Steinhardt-Stewart, ICML’19]
**ROBUST STOCHASTIC CONVEX OPTIMIZATION**

**Problem:** Given loss function $\ell(X, w)$ and $\epsilon$-corrupted samples from a distribution $\mathcal{D}$ over $X$, minimize $f(w) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[\ell(X, w)]$

**Difficulty:** Corrupted data can move the gradients.

**Theorem:** Suppose $\ell$ is convex and $\text{Cov}_{X \sim \mathcal{D}}[\nabla \ell(X, w)] \preceq \sigma^2 \cdot I$. Under mild assumptions on $\mathcal{D}$, can recover a point such that

$$f(\hat{w}) - \min_w f(w) \leq O(\sigma \sqrt{\epsilon}) .$$

**Main Idea:** Filter at minimizer of empirical risk.
**SPECIFIC APPLICATIONS**

**Corollary**: Outlier-robust learning algorithms with dimension-independent error guarantees for:

- SVMs
- Linear Regression
- Logistic Regression
- GLMs
- Experimental Performance Against Data Poisoning Attacks.

Concurrent works obtained tighter guarantees in terms of either sample complexity or error, by focusing on specific tasks and distributional assumptions [Klivans-Kothari-Meka’18, Diakonikolas-Kong-Stewart’18, …].
EXPERIMENTS: RIDGE REGRESSION
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LEARNING WITH A MAJORITY OF OUTLIERS

• So far focused on setting where $\epsilon < 1/2$.

• What can we learn from a dataset in which the majority of points are corrupted?

Problem: Given a set of points $x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$ such that:
• An unknown subset of $\alpha N$ points are drawn from an unknown $D \in \mathcal{F}$, and
• The remaining $(1 - \alpha)N$ points are arbitrary, approximate the mean $\mu$ of $D$.

Which is the “real” $D$?
LIST-DECODABLE LEARNING

• Return several hypotheses with the guarantee that at least one is close.

List-Decodable Mean Estimation:
Given a set of points \( x_1, \ldots, x_N \in \mathbb{R}^d \) and \( 0 < \alpha \leq 1/2 \) such that:
• An unknown subset of \( \alpha N \) points are drawn from an unknown \( D \in \mathcal{F} \), and
• The remaining \( (1 - \alpha)N \) points are arbitrary,
output a small list of \( s \) hypotheses vectors such that one is close to the mean \( \mu \) of \( D \).

• Model defined in [Balcan-Blum-Vempala’08]
• First studied for mean estimation [Charikar-Steinhardt-Valiant’17]
• Application: Learning Mixture Models
**LIST-DECODABLE MEAN ESTIMATION**

**Theorem [Charikar-Steinhardt-Valiant’17]** Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1/2$. If $D$ has covariance $\Sigma \preceq I$ there is an efficient algorithm that uses $N \geq d/\alpha$ corrupted points, and outputs a list of $s = O(1/\alpha)$ vectors $\hat{\mu}_1, \ldots, \hat{\mu}_s$ such that with high probability
\[
\min_i \|\hat{\mu}_i - \mu\|_2 = \tilde{O}(1/\sqrt{\alpha}).
\]

**Theorem [Diakonikolas-Kane-Stewart’18]** Any list-decodable mean estimator for bounded covariance distributions must have error $\Omega(1/\sqrt{\alpha})$ as long as the list size is any function of $\alpha$.

- Initial algorithm [CSV’17] based on ellipsoid method.
- Generalization of filtering (“multi-filtering”) works for list-decodable setting [DKS’18].
PART IV: COMPUTATIONAL-STATISTICAL TRADEOFFS & FUTURE DIRECTIONS
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STATISTICAL QUERIES [KEARNS’93]

\[ x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m \sim D \text{ over } X \]
STATISTICAL QUERIES [KEARNS’93]

SQ algorithm

\[ v_1 \]
\[ \phi_2 \]
\[ v_2 \]
\[ \vdots \]
\[ \phi_q \]
\[ v_q \]

\[ \phi_1 : X \to [-1,1] \quad |v_1 - E_{x \sim D}[\phi_1(x)]| \leq \tau \]

\[ \tau \] is tolerance of the query; \( \tau = 1/\sqrt{m} \)

Problem \( P \in \text{SQCompl}(q, m) \):
If exists a SQ algorithm that solves \( P \) using \( q \) queries to \( \text{STAT}_D(\tau = 1/\sqrt{m}) \)
POWER OF SQ LEARNING ALGORITHMS

- **Restricted Model**: Hope to prove unconditional computational lower bounds.
- **Powerful Model**: Wide range of algorithmic techniques in ML are implementable using SQs*: 
  - PAC Learning: $\text{AC}^0$, decision trees, linear separators, boosting.
  - Unsupervised Learning: stochastic convex optimization, moment-based methods, $k$-means clustering, EM, …  
    [Feldman-Grigorescu-Reyzin-Vempala-Xiao/JACM'17]
  
- **Only known exception**: Gaussian elimination over finite fields (e.g., learning parities).
- For all problems in this talk, strongest known algorithms are SQ.
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**GENERIC SQ LOWER BOUND CONSTRUCTION**

General Technique for SQ Lower Bounds: 
Leads to Tight Lower Bounds 
for a range of High-dimensional Estimation Tasks

Concrete Applications of Technique:

- Robustly Learning Mean and Covariance
- Learning Gaussian Mixture Models (GMMs)
- Statistical-Computational Tradeoffs (e.g., sparsity)
- Robustly Testing a Gaussian
SQ LOWER BOUND FOR ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION

**Theorem:** Suppose $d \geq \text{poly log}(1/\epsilon)$. Any SQ algorithm that learns an $\epsilon$-corrupted Gaussian $\mathcal{N}(\mu, I)$ in the strong contamination model within error

$$O(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)/M})$$

requires either:

- SQ queries of accuracy $d^{-M/6}$

or

- At least $d^{\Omega(M^{1/2})}$ many SQ queries.

**Take-away:** Any asymptotic improvement in error guarantee over filtering algorithm requires super-polynomial time.
**SQ Lower Bounds for Learning Separated GMMs**

**Theorem:** Suppose that $d \geq \text{poly}(k)$. Any SQ algorithm that learns separated $k$-GMMs over $\mathbb{R}^d$ to constant error requires either:

- SQ queries of accuracy $d^{-k/6}$
- Or at least $2^{\Omega(d^{1/8})} \geq d^{2k}$ many SQ queries.

**Take-away:** Computational complexity of learning GMMs is inherently exponential in number of components.
## Applications: Concrete SQ Lower Bounds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Problem</th>
<th>Upper Bound</th>
<th>SQ Lower Bound</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robust Gaussian Mean Estimation</td>
<td>Error: $O(\epsilon \log^{1/2}(1/\epsilon))$</td>
<td>Runtime Lower Bound: $d^{\text{poly}(M)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[DKKLMS’16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust Gaussian Covariance Estimation</td>
<td>Error: $O(\epsilon \log(1/\epsilon))$</td>
<td>for factor $M$ improvement in error.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[DKKLMS’16]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning $k$-GMMs (without noise)</td>
<td>Run-time: $d^{g(k)}$</td>
<td>Runtime Lower Bound: $d^{\Omega(k)}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[MV’10, BS’10]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust $k$-Sparse Mean Estimation</td>
<td>Sample size: $O(k^2 \log d)$</td>
<td>If sample size is $O(k^{1.99})$ runtime lower bound:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$[BDLS’17]$</td>
<td>$d^{k^{\Omega(1)}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robust Covariance Estimation in Spectral Norm</td>
<td>Sample size: $O(d^2)$</td>
<td>If sample size is $O(d^{1.99})$ runtime lower bound:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$[DKKLMS’16]$</td>
<td>$2d^{\Omega(1)}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**General Recipe for SQ Lower Bounds**

- **Step #1:** Construct distribution $P_v$ that is standard Gaussian in all directions except $v$.

- **Step #2:** Construct the univariate projection in the $v$ direction so that it matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$.

- **Step #3:** Consider the family of instances $\mathcal{D} = \{P_v\}_v$

**Non-Gaussian Component Analysis** [Blanchard et al. 2006]
**Hidden Direction Distribution**

**Definition:** For a unit vector $v$ and a univariate distribution with density $A$, consider the high-dimensional distribution

$$P_v(x) = A(v \cdot x) \exp \left( -\|x - (v \cdot x)v\|^2 / 2 \right) / (2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}.$$

**Example:**

![Graphical representation of HIDDEN DIRECTION DISTRIBUTION](image)
**Definition:** For a unit vector \( v \) and a univariate distribution with density \( A \), consider the high-dimensional distribution

\[
P_v(x) = A(v \cdot x) \exp \left( -\|x - (v \cdot x)v\|_2^2 / 2 \right) / (2\pi)^{(d-1)/2}.
\]

**Proposition:** Suppose that:
- \( A \) matches the first \( m \) moments of \( \mathcal{N}(0, 1) \)
- We have \( d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) > 2\delta \) as long as \( v, v' \) are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown \( P_v \) within error \( \delta \) requires either queries of accuracy \( d^{-m} \) or \( 2d^{\Omega(1)} \) many queries.
WHY IS FINDING A HIDDEN DIRECTION HARD

**Observation**: Low-Degree Moments do not help.

- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- The first $m$ moments of $P_v$ are identical to those of $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$
- Degree-$(m+1)$ moment tensor has $\Omega(d^m)$ entries.

**Claim**: Random projections do not help.

- To distinguish between $P_v$ and $\mathcal{N}(0, I)$, would need exponentially many random projections.
**Generic SQ Lower Bound**

**Definition:** For a unit vector $v$ and a univariate distribution with density $A$, consider the high-dimensional distribution

$$P_v(x) = A(v \cdot x) \exp \left(-\|x - (v \cdot x)v\|_2^2/2\right)/\left(2\pi\right)^{(d-1)/2}.$$

**Proposition:** Suppose that:
- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- We have $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) > 2\delta$ as long as $v, v'$ are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown $P_v$ within $\delta$ error requires either queries of accuracy $d^{-m}$ or $2d^{\Omega(1)}$ many queries.
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SQ LOWER BOUND FOR ROBUST MEAN ESTIMATION (I)

Want to show:

**Theorem:** Any SQ algorithm that learns an $\epsilon$-corrupted Gaussian in the strong contamination model within error $\epsilon\sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)/M}$ requires either SQ queries of accuracy $d^{-M/6}$ or at least $d^{\Omega(M^{1/2})}$ many SQ queries.

by using our generic proposition:

**Proposition:** Suppose that:
- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- We have $d_{\text{TV}}(P_v, P_{v'}) > 2\delta$ as long as $v, v'$ are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown $P_v$ within error $\delta$ requires either queries of accuracy $d^{-m}$ or $2d^{\Omega(1)}$ many queries.
**SQ Lower Bound for Robust Mean Estimation (II)**

**Proposition:** Suppose that:
- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- We have $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) > 2\delta$ as long as $v, v'$ are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown $P_v$ within error $\delta$ requires either queries of accuracy $d^{-m}$ or $2^{d^{\Omega(1)}}$ many queries.

**Lemma:** There exists a univariate distribution $A$ that is $\epsilon$-close to $\mathcal{N}(\mu, 1)$ such that:
- $A$ agrees with $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ on the first $M$ moments.
- We have that $\mu = \Omega(\epsilon \sqrt{\log(1/\epsilon)/M^2})$
- Whenever $v$ and $v'$ are nearly orthogonal $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) = \Omega(\mu)$. 
SQ LOWER BOUND FOR LEARNING GMMs (I)

Want to show:

**Theorem:** Any SQ algorithm that learns separated $k$-GMMs over $\mathbb{R}^d$ to constant error requires either SQ queries of accuracy $d^{-k/6}$ or at least $2^{\Omega(d^{1/8})} \geq d^{2k}$ many SQ queries.

by using our generic proposition:

**Proposition:** Suppose that:

- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- We have $d_{TV}(\mathbf{P}_v, \mathbf{P}_{v'}) > 2\delta$ as long as $v, v'$ are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown $\mathbf{P}_v$ within error $\delta$ requires either queries of accuracy $d^{-m}$ or $2^{d^\Omega(1)}$ many queries.
**SQ Lower Bound for Learning GMMs (II)**

**Proposition:** Suppose that:
- $A$ matches the first $m$ moments of $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$
- We have $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) > 2\delta$ as long as $v, v'$ are nearly orthogonal.

Then any SQ algorithm that learns an unknown $P_v$ within error $\delta$ requires either queries of accuracy $d^{-m}$ or $2d^{\Omega(1)}$ many queries.

**Lemma:** There exists a univariate distribution $A$ that is a $k$-GMM with components $A_i$ such that:
- $A$ agrees with $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ on the first $2k-1$ moments.
- Each pair of components are separated.
- Whenever $v$ and $v'$ are nearly orthogonal $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) \geq 1/2$.
Lemma: There exists a univariate distribution $A$ that is a $k$-GMM with components $A_i$ such that:

- $A$ agrees with $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ on the first $2k$-1 moments.
- Each pair of components are separated.
- Whenever $v$ and $v'$ are nearly orthogonal $d_{TV}(P_v, P_{v'}) \geq 1/2$. 

![Diagram of distribution A](image)
SQ LOWER BOUND FOR LEARNING GMMs (IV)

High-Dimensional Distributions $P_v$ look like “parallel pancakes”:

Efficiently learnable for $k=2$. [Brubaker-Vempala’08]
**Future Directions: Computational Lower Bounds**

Robustness can make high-dimensional estimation harder computationally and information-theoretically.

**Subsequent Work & Future Directions:**

- Further Applications of this Framework
  - List-Decodable Mean Estimation [D-Kane-Stewart, STOC’18]
  - Robust Regression [D-Kong-Stewart, SODA’19]
  - Adversarial Examples [Bubeck-Price- Razenshteyn, ICML’19]
  - Agnostic Learning of LTFs/ReLUs [D-Kane-Zarifis, NeurIPS’20, D-Kane-Pitttas-Zarifis, COLT’21]
  - List-Decodable Linear Regression [D-Kane-Pensia-Pittas’21]

- Alternative Evidence of Computational Hardness?
  - Reductions from Average-Case Problems [Brennan-Bresler, COLT’20]
  - Reductions from Worst-case Problems? [Hopkins-Li, COLT’19; Bruna-Regev-Song-Tang, STOC’21]
  - SoS Lower Bounds?
Future Directions: Algorithms

- Pick your favorite high-dimensional probabilistic model for which a (non-robust) efficient learning algorithm is known.
- Make it robust!
Near-Linear Time Algorithms

Filtering for robust mean estimation is practical, but runtime is super-linear $\tilde{\Theta}(N d^2)$.

**Question:** Can we design near-linear time algorithms?

- Robust Mean Estimation
  - [Cheng-D-Ge, SODA’19; Depersin-Lecue, 2019; Dong-Hopkins-Li, NeurIPS’19, …]

- How about more general estimation tasks?
  - Robust Covariance Estimation
    - [Cheng-D-Ge-Woodruff, COLT’19; Li-Ye, NeurIPS’20]
  - List-Decodable Learning / Learning Mixture Models
    - [Cherapanamjeri-Mohanty-Yau, FOCS’20; D-Kane-Koongsgard, NeurIPS’20, D-Kane-Koongsgard-Li-Tian’20, D-Kane-Koongsgard-Li-Tian’21]
  - Robust Sparse Estimation?
Question: Can we design robust estimators using first-order methods?

- Robust Mean Estimation
  - [Cheng-D-Ge-Soltanolkotabi, ICML'20; Zhu et al. '20]

- Robust Sparse Estimation
  - [Cheng-D-Ge-Gupta-Kane-Soltanolkotabi'21]

- How about more general estimation tasks?
**Broader Research Directions**

How can we robustly learn rich representations of data, based on natural hypotheses about the structure in data?

**Broader Challenges:**
- Richer Families of Problems and Models
- Connections to RL, Adversarial Examples, GANs, …
- Relation to Related Notions of Algorithmic Stability (Differential Privacy, Adaptive Data Analysis)
- Further Applications (ML Security, Computer Vision, …)
- Other notions of robustness?
  See, e.g., [D-Gouleakis-Tzamos’19]

Thank you!
Questions?
Related Materials (I)

• Simons Institute Bootcamp Tutorial:
  www.iliasdiakonikolas.org/simons-tutorial-robust.html

• TTI-Chicago Summer Workshop Program
  http://www.ttic.edu/summer-workshop-2018/

• Simons Institute, Foundations of Data Science Program
Related Materials (II)

• **STOC’19 Tutorial** (June 2019)
  
  o [http://www.iliasiakiakonikolas.org/stoc-robust-tutorial.html](http://www.iliasiakiakonikolas.org/stoc-robust-tutorial.html)

• **ISIT’19 Tutorial** (July 2019)
  

• **ICML’20 Tutorial** (July 2020)
  

• **Survey article:**
  