

## INTRODUCTION TO ROBUSTNESS: BREAKDOWN POINTS

Let  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$  and  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  be samples of real numbers. For  $j = 1, \dots, n$  let  $X \underset{j}{=} Z$  mean that  $X_i = Z_i$  except for at most  $j$  values of  $i$ . More specifically, for  $y = (y_1, \dots, y_j)$  let  $X \underset{j,y}{=} Z$  mean that for some integers  $i_r$  with  $1 \leq i_1 < i_2 < \dots < i_j \leq n$ ,  $Z_{i_r} = y_r$  for  $r = 1, \dots, j$  and  $Z_i = X_i$  if  $i \neq i_r$  for  $r = 1, \dots, j$ . The idea is that  $X_i$  are i.i.d. from a nice distribution like a normal and  $y_r$  are errors or “bad” data. So the sample  $Z$  contains  $n - j$  good data points and  $j$  errors. A robust statistical procedure will be one that doesn’t behave too badly if  $j$  is not too large compared to  $n$ .

“Breakdown point” is one of the main ideas in robustness. Let  $T = T(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  be a statistic taking values in a parameter space  $\Theta$ , a locally compact metric space. The main examples of parameter spaces to be considered here for real data are:

(a) The location parameter space of all  $\mu$  such that  $-\infty < \mu < \infty$  (the real line). Examples of statistics taking values in this space are the sample mean  $\bar{Z}$  and the sample median.

(b) The scale parameter space containing 0, of all  $\sigma$  such that  $0 \leq \sigma < \infty$ . Examples of statistics with values in  $[0, \infty)$  are (i) the sample standard deviation and (ii) the median of all  $|X_i - m|$  where  $m$  is the sample median. A variant of the scale parameter space is the open half-line  $0 < \sigma < \infty$ . Both examples (i) and (ii) can take the value 0 for some samples, so on such samples, these statistics are undefined if the scale parameter space is  $(0, \infty)$ .

(c) Often parameter spaces are considered, when location and scale are estimated simultaneously, of pairs  $(\mu, \sigma)$  where  $-\infty < \mu < \infty$  and  $0 \leq \sigma < \infty$  or alternately where  $0 < \sigma < \infty$ .

The closure of a set  $A \subset \Theta$  will be denoted  $\bar{A}$ . If  $\Theta$  is a Euclidean space or a closed subset of one, such as the closed half-line  $0 \leq \sigma < \infty$ , then a set  $A \subset \Theta$  has compact closure if and only if  $\sup\{|x| : x \in A\} < \infty$ . In the open half-line  $0 < \sigma < \infty$ , a subset  $A$  is compact if and only if it is bounded away from both 0 and  $+\infty$ , in other words for some  $\delta > 0$  and  $M < \infty$ ,  $\delta \leq \sigma \leq M$  for all  $\sigma \in A$ .

The *breakdown point* of  $T$  at  $X$  is defined as

$$\varepsilon^*(T, X) = \varepsilon^*(T; X_1, \dots, X_n) = \frac{1}{n} \max\{j : \overline{\{T(Z) : Z \underset{j}{=} X\}} \text{ is compact}\}.$$

In other words  $\varepsilon^*(T, X) = j/n$  for the largest  $j$  for which there is some compact set  $K \subset \Theta$  such that  $T(Z) \in K$  whenever  $Z \underset{j}{=} X$ . If  $\varepsilon^*(T, X)$  doesn’t depend on  $X$ , which is often the case, then let  $\varepsilon^*(T) := \varepsilon^*(T, X)$  for all  $X$ .

Some authors define the breakdown point instead in terms of the smallest number of replaced observations that can cause  $T(Z)$  not to remain in any compact set. Such a definition adds  $1/n$  to  $\varepsilon^*(T, X)$  and makes no difference asymptotically as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

If a fraction of the data less than or equal to the breakdown point is bad (subject to arbitrarily large errors), the statistic doesn’t change too much (it remains in a compact set), otherwise it can escape from all compact sets (in a Euclidean space, or by definition in other locally compact spaces, it can go to infinity). There are a number of definitions

of breakdown point. The one just given is called the “finite sample” breakdown point (Hampel et al., 1986, p. 98, for a real-valued statistic).

Since  $j$  in the definition is an integer, the possible values of the breakdown point for samples of size  $n$  are  $0, 1/n, 2/n, \dots, 1$ . A statistic with a breakdown point of 0 is (by definition) not robust. Larger values of the breakdown point indicate more robustness, up to breakdown point =  $1/2$  which is the maximum attainable in some problems.

**Examples.** (i) For the sample mean  $T = \bar{Z} = (Z_1 + \dots + Z_n)/n$ , the breakdown point is 0 for any  $Z_j$  since for  $j = 1$ , if we let  $y_1 \rightarrow \infty$  then  $\bar{Z} \rightarrow \infty$  (for  $n$  fixed).

(ii) Let  $T = Z_{(1)}$ , the smallest number in the sample. Then the breakdown point of  $T$  is again 0 for any  $Z_i$  since for  $j = 1$ , as  $y_1 \rightarrow -\infty$  we have  $Z_{(1)} \rightarrow -\infty$ . Likewise the maximum  $Z_{(n)}$  of the sample has breakdown point 0.

So the statistics  $\bar{Z}$ ,  $Z_{(1)}$ ,  $Z_{(n)}$  are not robust. Other order statistics have some robustness (for fixed finite  $n$ ):

**Theorem 1.** For sample size  $n$ , and each  $j = 1, \dots, n$ , the order statistic  $T = Z_{(j)}$  has breakdown point  $\varepsilon^*(T) = \frac{1}{n} \min(j - 1, n - j)$ .

**Proof.** At any sample  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ , we have  $\inf\{T(Z) : Z \underset{j}{=} X\} = -\infty$  (let  $y_1, \dots, y_j$  all go to  $-\infty$ ). Likewise  $\sup\{T(Z) : Z \underset{n-j+1}{=} X\} = +\infty$  (let  $y_1, \dots, y_{n-j+1} \rightarrow +\infty$ ). It follows that  $\varepsilon^*(T, X) \leq \frac{1}{n} \min(j - 1, n - j)$ .

If  $Z \underset{j-1}{=} X$  then the smallest possible value of  $Z_{(j)}$  occurs when  $y_i < X_k$  for all  $i$  and  $k$  and for at least one  $r$  such that  $X_r = X_{(1)}$ ,  $X_r$  is not replaced, so  $Z_{(j)} \geq X_{(1)}$ . Similarly, if  $Z \underset{n-j}{=} X$  the largest possible value of  $Z_{(j)}$  satisfies  $Z_{(j)} \leq X_{(n)}$ . So if  $k = \min(j - 1, n - j)$  and  $Z \underset{k}{=} X$ , then  $X_{(1)} \leq Z_{(j)} \leq X_{(n)}$  so  $Z_{(j)}$  is bounded and  $\varepsilon^*(T, X) = \frac{1}{n} \min(j - 1, n - j)$  as claimed. Since this is true for an arbitrary  $X$ , the theorem is proved.  $\square$

If  $j = 1$  or  $n$ , the breakdown point of  $X_{(j)}$  is 0 as noted in the Examples above. If  $n$  is odd, so  $n = 2k + 1$  for an integer  $k$ , then the sample median  $X_{(k+1)}$  has breakdown point  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2n} = \frac{k}{n}$ . If  $n = 2k$  for an integer  $k$ , then the two endpoints of the interval of medians,  $Z_{(k)}$  and  $Z_{(k+1)}$ , each have breakdown point  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n}$ . So any median has breakdown point at least  $\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{n} \rightarrow \frac{1}{2}$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . From Theorem 1, no other order statistic has any larger breakdown point than the median, so  $\varepsilon^*(X_{(j)}) < 1/2$  for all  $j$ . This is typical behavior for interesting estimators. But, larger breakdown points are possible. If  $T$  has bounded values, then it trivially has breakdown point 1 by our definition. Or, let  $T = \min_j |Z_j|$ . Then one can check that  $T$  has breakdown point  $1 - \frac{1}{n}$ .

For real-valued observations  $Z_1, \dots, Z_n$ , a real-valued statistic  $T = T(Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  will be called *equivariant for location* if for all real  $\theta$ , and letting  $Z = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n)$  and  $Z + \theta = (Z_1 + \theta, \dots, Z_n + \theta)$ ,

$$T(Z + \theta) = T(Z) + \theta$$

for all  $n$ -vectors  $Z$  of real numbers and all real  $\theta$ .

For example, the order statistics  $Z_{(j)}$  and the sample mean  $\bar{Z}$  are clearly equivariant for location.

**Theorem 2.** For any real-valued statistic  $T$  equivariant for location, the breakdown point is  $< 1/2$  at any  $X = (X_1, \dots, X_n)$ .

**Proof.** Let the breakdown point of  $T$  at  $X$  be  $j/n$ . Then there is an  $M < \infty$  such that

$$(3) \quad |T(Z)| \leq M \text{ whenever } Z =_j X.$$

Let  $\theta = 3M$ . Now  $Z = Y + \theta$  for some  $Y$  with  $Y =_j X$  if and only if  $Z =_j X + \theta$ . Then  $T(Z) = T(Y) + \theta$ . So

$$(4) \quad |T(Z) - \theta| \leq M \text{ whenever } Z =_j X + \theta, \text{ and then } 2M \leq T(Z) \leq 4M.$$

But if  $j \geq n/2$  there is a  $Z$  with  $Z =_j X$  and also  $Z =_j X + \theta$ . For such a  $Z$ , (3) and (4) give a contradiction, proving Theorem 2.  $\square$

## REFERENCES

- Frank R. Hampel, Peter J. Rousseeuw, Elvezio M. Ronchetti, and Werner A. Stahel (1986). *Robust Statistics: The Approach based on Influence Functions*. Wiley, New York.
- Peter J. Huber (1981) *Robust Statistics*. Wiley, New York.