arXiv:2602.20698v2 [cs.LG] 4 Nov 2026

High-Dimensional Robust Mean Estimation from Doubly Corrupted and Heterogeneous Batches

Maryam Aliakbarpour* Vladimir Braverman† Yuhan Liu‡ Junze Yin§

Abstract

Modern data systems often require aggregating information from multiple sources: some might be entirely untrustworthy, while the remaining presumably reliable sources may still suffer from a small amount of corruption. We study robust mean estimation under this practical scenario, which is formulated through the *double corruption model*: samples are divided among N users, each with n samples. ε fraction of the users could be arbitrarily corrupted, while each of the remaining "good" users still have α-fraction ($\alpha > 0$) of corrupted samples. The goal is to estimate the unknown mean μ with small ℓ_2 error. This is a challenging scenario because we must handle two types of adversarial corruption: user-level corruption and sample-level corruption. When the unknown distribution has covariance matrix bounded by the identity matrix, we design a sum-of-squares (SoS) algorithm that achieves an ℓ_2 error of $\sqrt{\alpha}$ with probability at least $2/3$ as long as the total number of samples $nN = \widetilde{\Omega}(d/\alpha)$. The estimation error and sample complexity are min-max optimal under the mild condition. For comparison, treating all nN samples as $(\varepsilon+\alpha)$-corrupted and applying standard robust mean estimation only achieves an error of $\sqrt{\varepsilon+\alpha}$. Thus, our new algorithm removes the adverse effect of untrustworthy users and achieves the optimal error as if only sample-level corruption is present. Also, our SoS algorithm extends to the heterogeneous setting where each user's local mean could be additionally shifted by $\sqrt{\beta}$ in ℓ_2 distance. We show that an error of $O(\sqrt{\alpha+\beta})$ can be achieved with probability at least $2/3$ when $nN = \widetilde{\Omega}(d/(\alpha+\beta))$.

*maryama@rice.edu. Department of Computer Science, Ken Kennedy Institute, Rice University.
†vova@cs.jhu.edu. Johns Hopkins University.
‡yuhan-liu@rice.edu. Rice University.
§jy158@rice.edu. Rice University.

1 Introduction

Modern data analysis increasingly relies on information aggregated from decentralized and heterogeneous sources [VHJ22, KLS21, YFD+23, LKSJ21]. In such settings, data may be collected by different institutions, devices, or individuals under varying measurement procedures, demographic compositions, and environmental conditions. Consequently, the classical assumption that all samples are i.i.d. draws from a single target distribution is often too restrictive [FASS21, SHK+22, SKK21]. At the same time, pooling data across sources can make it possible to solve statistical tasks that would be impossible for any individual source. This raises a fundamental question: how should one use data from sources that may differ from the target distribution and may not all be trustworthy?

We study this question in the context of perhaps the most fundamental task in high-dimensional statistics: estimating the mean μ of a target distribution over $\mathbb{R}^d$. The data are distributed among N users, each holding a batch of n samples. We work in the spirit of the *untrusted batch model* [QV18], in which an ε-fraction of users may be completely adversarial. The remaining users are not assumed to draw their data perfectly i.i.d. from the target distribution. Instead, each good user is required only to be *relevant* to the target in a quantitative sense.

There are two natural and complementary ways in which a relevant source may deviate from the target. First, a source may be off *everywhere, but only mildly*: for example, a hospital may serve a slightly different population, a sensor may have a small calibration bias, or data may be collected during a different season. We model this deviation as heterogeneous mean shift: user i draws samples from a distribution P_i with mean μ_i satisfying $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$. Second, a source may be off *rarely, but arbitrarily*: most records are drawn from the appropriate population, but a small fraction may be corrupted by logging errors, sensor failures, or malicious manipulation. We model this deviation as sample-level strong contamination: after observing the clean samples, an adversary may replace an α-fraction of the samples inside each good user's batch by arbitrary or even adversarially chosen points.

Our main contribution is a polynomial-time sum-of-squares (SoS) algorithm for robust mean estimation in this doubly corrupted and heterogeneous batch model. Informally, up to logarithmic factors, our estimator achieves the nearly optimal rate

$$\widetilde{\Theta}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{Nn}} + \sqrt{\alpha+\beta}\right).$$

This rate has a natural interpretation. The terms α and β represent inherent statistical difficulty among the relevant sources. In contrast, the effect of fully adversarial users is reduced by the batch size: averaging n clean samples in a good batch decreases the covariance scale by a factor of $1/n$, so the user-level corruption contributes only $\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$ rather than $\sqrt{\varepsilon}$.

1.1 Problem Setup

We start by introducing the double corruption model, which applies to a setting where a group of N users, holding n data points each, collectively performs an estimation task. The term *double corruption* refers to the two levels at which strong contamination may occur: an ε-fraction of entire user batches may be corrupted, and within every remaining batch an α-fraction of individual samples may also be corrupted.

Definition 1.1 ((ε,α)-double corruption)**.** *Let $\varepsilon, \alpha \in [0,1]$ be corruption parameters. Given N users where user i has data points $z_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $j \in [n]$, an adversary may examine the entire dataset and make the following changes:*

1. *choose a set of users* $\mathcal{B} \subseteq [N]$ *with* $|\mathcal{B}| \le \varepsilon N$*;*

2. *for every user* $i \in \mathcal{B}$*, replace all data points* $z_{i,j}$ *arbitrarily;*

3. *for every user* $i \notin \mathcal{B}$*, replace at most* αn *points in the multiset* $\{z_{i,j} : j \in [n]\}$ *arbitrarily.*

Our formulation is inspired by the strong contamination model [DK23], but introduces an additional level of adversarial corruption at the user level. We study robust mean estimation under this new model of corruption.

Problem 1 (Robust mean estimation under double corruption)**.** *Let* $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$[1]*. There are* N *users. User* i *has* n *i.i.d. samples* $\{z_{i,j} : j \in [n]\}$ *from a distribution* P *with mean* $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *and covariance* $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$*. The samples are* (ε, α)*-double corrupted. The goal is to estimate* μ *in* ℓ_2 *distance.*

Special cases Before discussing the full model, it is helpful to isolate the roles of the two parameters ε, α. For simplicity, consider a high constant success probability (say at least 2/3).

First, without corruption, i.e. $\varepsilon = \alpha = 0$, standard statistics show that an ℓ_2 error of $\Theta(\sqrt{d/Nn})$ is optimal. Second, when $\varepsilon = 0, \alpha > 0$, all Nn samples can be viewed as α-contaminated, and thus we can directly use standard robust mean estimation algorithms [DKK+19, LRV16, DKP20] which achieve an error of $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ using $Nn = O(d/\alpha)$ [PP25] samples[2]. Third, when $\varepsilon > 0, \alpha = 0$, the empirical mean of each user has covariance bounded by $\mathbb{I}_d/n$ instead of $\mathbb{I}_d$. Thus, we can scale all samples by $\sqrt{n}$ and apply standard robust mean estimation, which gives an error of $\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$ with $N = O(d/\varepsilon)$.

Difficulty of double corruption While the special cases above have simple solutions, combining user-level corruption with sample-level corruption creates a new difficulty. If we ignore the batch structure, then the total fraction of corrupted samples is at most $\varepsilon + \alpha$, and a standard robust mean estimator gives error $O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon + \alpha}\right)$ by $Nn = O\left(d/(\varepsilon + \alpha)\right)$ samples. It is sample-efficient but loses the $1/\sqrt{n}$ gain that should be possible for user-level corruption.

A second attempt is to robustly estimate a mean separately within each user and then aggregate these estimates. This can remove the dependence on ε and achieve error $O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$, but it requires every user to have enough samples for high-dimensional robust mean estimation, namely $n = \Omega\left(d/\alpha\right)$. This is much stronger than the optimal total-sample requirement $Nn = O\left(d/\alpha\right)$, and is incompatible with the important regime $1 \le n \le d$. Thus, neither approach simultaneously achieves the right error and the right sample complexity. This motivates the question:

Question 1.2. *Under the double corruption model, can we design a robust mean estimation algorithm that is both accurate and sample-efficient, suppressing the contribution of* ε *by the batch size while using only near-linear total samples in* d*?*

Answering this question already requires ideas beyond a black-box application of existing robust mean estimation algorithms.

[1] When $\varepsilon \in [0.5, 1)$, it is impossible to perform robust mean estimation with a single output in general. One may instead ask for list-decodable mean estimation, where the goal is to output a short list of candidates containing at least one accurate estimate [CSV17]; see Section 1.3.

[2] [DKK+19, DKP20] proved a sample complexity of $O(d \log(d)/\alpha)$, and [PP25] removed the $\log(d)$ factor.

Heterogeneous data Different sources of data may have distinct data distributions in practice. We further combine data heterogeneity with the double corruption model, therefore introducing the most general problem formulation studied in this work.

Problem 2 (Robust mean estimation under double corruption and heterogeneous data)**.** *Let $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$ and $\beta \geq 0$. There are N users. User i has n i.i.d. samples $\{z_{i,j} : j \in [n]\}$ from a distribution P_i with mean $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance $\Sigma_i \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$. We assume that there exists a target mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that, for every $i \in [N]$, $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$. The samples are then (ε, α)-double corrupted by an adversary. The goal is to estimate μ in ℓ_2 distance.*




Figure 1: A visualization of Problem 2. There are $N = 4$ batches, each containing $n = 350$ samples. The batches are 1/4-strongly contaminated. In each uncorrupted batch, the samples are 1/7-strongly contaminated. The heterogeneous batch means are within distance $\sqrt{\beta}$ of the target mean μ. Blue points are clean samples, and yellow points are corrupted samples.

It is worth noting that the two notions of relevance—the β-mean shift and the α-fraction corruption—are not interchangeable in high dimensions. In a bounded domain, moving the mean may require changing the entire probability mass of P. Conversely, replacing even a single sample in a batch can move the empirical mean of that batch by an arbitrarily large amount, which cannot be captured by any bounded-magnitude mean shift. Our model therefore allows both types of deviation simultaneously. Together with an ε-fraction of fully adversarial users, this yields a two-level relevance model that is robust to corrupted batches: as long as a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of the users are both α- and β-relevant to the target distribution, the model permits arbitrary deviations among the remaining users.

Without double corruption, $\varepsilon = \alpha = 0$, the empirical mean estimator achieves $\sqrt{\beta + \frac{d}{Nn}}$ error. However, because of the inherent difficulty of the double-corruption model and the fundamentally different nature of these two types of local perturbation, it is unclear how to handle them simultaneously.

Relation to existing corruption models Our formulation appears related to a line of work on the untrusted batch model for discrete distribution learning [QV18, CLM20, JO20b], where an ε-

fraction of the batches may be arbitrary, while each uncorrupted batch is drawn from a distribution that is close to the target distribution in total variation distance.

For discrete distributions, sample corruption and total-variation perturbation are closely related: changing a distribution by at most α in total variation can be viewed, under an appropriate coupling, as changing an α-fraction of the samples in expectation. These changes occur randomly according to some potentially worst-case distribution within total variation distance α of the target. This formulation is particularly convenient for distribution learning, because the empirical distribution of each batch changes by approximately α in total variation distance. In our model, however, the changes are made adversarially. Even a single corrupted sample can move the empirical mean of a batch arbitrarily far. This is the key distinction between our work and [QV18, CLM20, JO20b].

1.2 Main Results

Our theorem answers Question 1.2 and extends it to the full heterogeneous model in Problem 2.

Theorem 1.3. *Let $\delta \in (0, 1/10)$ and $c_1, c_2 > 0$ be sufficiently small. Given $\varepsilon, \alpha \in (0, c_1)$, $\beta \in [0, c_2)$, and n samples from each of $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ users satisfying $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha+\beta+\varepsilon/n} \log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$, there exists an algorithm with running time $(Nnd + d^2)^{O(1)}$ that solves Problem 2. With probability at least $1 - \delta$, the algorithm outputs $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying*

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right).$$

Equivalently, the ordinary statistical term $\sqrt{d/(Nn)}$ is dominated under the stated sample size. In the non-vacuous sample-corruption regime $\alpha n \geq 1$, the user-level term satisfies $\varepsilon/n \leq O(\alpha)$ for constant ε, and the error simplifies to $O\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}\right)$. Thus the fully corrupted users have no asymptotic effect beyond what is already forced by the sample-level corruption and heterogeneity.

We complement the upper bound with a matching information-theoretic lower bound. Under the mild condition $\alpha n \geq 4 \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)$ needed in the lower-bound construction, all estimators incur error at least $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta + \varepsilon/n}\right)$. In this lower-bound regime, the error rate in Theorem 1.3 is minimax optimal up to universal constants, and the sample complexity is near-optimal up to logarithmic factors. Under the upper-bound sample-size requirement and $\alpha n \geq 1$, the corruption and heterogeneity terms reduce to $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}\right)$, matching the simplified upper bound.

Algorithmic ideas The algorithm is based on a constant-degree SoS relaxation that searches simultaneously over two hidden objects: a large set of reliable users and, inside each selected user, a large subset of samples that agrees with the observations. The sample-level constraints provide a crude refinement that removes enough individual outliers to control the aggregate sample covariance. The user-level constraints then operate on cleaned batch means and enforce a sharper covariance bound at scale $1/n$ (plus a carefully chosen slack term). This coupling lets the algorithm combine the two advantages that the naive approaches could only obtain separately: near-linear total sample complexity and the $1/\sqrt{n}$ suppression of user-level corruption.

Extending the double-corruption algorithm to heterogeneous means requires additional care. The sample-level truncation must be performed around each user's local mean rather than around the target mean, while the user-level refinement must still aggregate toward a common target μ. We introduce relaxed selection parameters that balance the sample-level corruption α, the heterogeneity β, and the fraction of fully corrupted users ε. The resulting SoS system remains satisfiable with near-optimal sample complexity, and its identifiability proof yields the rate in Theorem 1.3. A detailed technical overview is given in Section 2.

Remark 1.4. *Our sample complexity is nearly optimal and has a logarithmic factor on the failure probability. In classical robust mean estimation and in recent one-level local/global corruption models, one can often obtain a sub-Gaussian dependence where the logarithmic term appears additively [DKP20, PP25]. Extending such rates to the present two-level corruption model is nontrivial. We specify obstacles in Section D.5.*

Remark 1.5. *Our running time is polynomial in N, n, and d, and is comparable to standard SoS algorithms for robust mean estimation [HL18, KSS18]. As in prior SoS work, we do not optimize the polynomial degree, and improving the running time is an interesting direction for future work. The main advantage of SoS over more computationally efficient approaches such as filtering is that it handles the sample-level and user-level corruptions jointly. In contrast, a naive sequential filtering approach may fail because the sample-level filter must make its decisions without knowing which users will later be identified as corrupted. In Section D.6, we construct two candidate clean distributions whose means differ by $\Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ but which, after corrupting an ε-fraction of users, induce exactly the same pooled sample distribution. Hence, any filtering algorithm that ignores the batch structure cannot distinguish which candidate is the true clean distribution and may discard $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ genuinely clean samples in one of the two instances. These deletions are irreversible: even if a subsequent user-level filter perfectly identifies all corrupted users, it cannot recover the clean samples discarded in the first stage. This motivates our joint SoS formulation, which selects the sample-level and user-level refinements simultaneously. We specify obstacles in Section D.6.*

1.3 Related Work

Robust statistics Robust mean estimation is a long-standing topic in statistics, dating back to [Hub64]. The Tukey median [Tuk60] achieves the optimal error for mean estimation but is computationally inefficient in high dimensions. The works of [DKK+19, LRV16] resolved this computational inefficiency and inspired many subsequent works on efficient and robust learning algorithms in various settings of practical interest. [CDG19, DKP20, DKPP22] improved the computational efficiency, sample complexity, and memory efficiency, achieving nearly-linear time, nearly sub-Gaussian rates, and near-optimal memory, respectively. Other works have studied robust estimation under heterogeneous corruption rates across samples [CLC25], sparse mean estimation [DKK+22], and high-dimensional robust mean estimation via gradient descent [CDGS20]. The SoS method [Nes00, Las01] has proven to be a powerful tool for robust statistics [KS17, HKP+17, KSS18]. It provides a unified framework to design efficient algorithms as opposed to relying on problem-specific heuristics. For many robust estimation problems, optimal or best-known time and sample complexity can often be achieved using the SoS approach [BDH+20, KMZ22, HLZ20, Hop20, DHPT25].

Another line of work combines strong contamination model with local perturbation. It was first studied by [ZJT20], and in this setting, [LL23] focused on covariance estimation and linear regression. However, these works studied the statistical aspect instead of giving a computational efficient algorithm. [NGS24] designed efficient algorithm for robust mean estimation in this strong contamination and perturbation setting. [PP25] strengthened this by considering a stronger directional local-perturbation model.

Learning from multiple (corrupted) sources and tasks With no corruption, a line of work studies learning from many related sources or tasks when each source provides only a small number of samples. [AS20] studied distribution testing from multiple sources with few samples per source. [ABB+24] developed a sample- and task-complexity theory for meta- and multitask learning with very few samples per task. [ABS+25] further studied privacy notions for personalized learning.

Another line of work studies learning from corrupted batches. [QV18] studied robust density estimation from corrupted batches for discrete distributions under TV distance. Subsequent works [CLM20, JO20b] further improved the computational and sample complexities. In addition to density estimation for discrete distributions, [JO20a, JO21] studied robust density estimation for structured continuous distributions and under $\mathcal{A}_k$ distance, which is always upper bounded by TV distance. [JO20a] also designed algorithms for piecewise interval classification. [JSK+24] analyzed linear regression in the presence of heterogeneous batches.

List decodable mean estimation When the strong contamination parameter becomes $\alpha \geq 1/2$, the clean samples form only a minority of the observed dataset. In this regime, the adversary may create several plausible clusters, and it is information-theoretically impossible to determine which cluster corresponds to the clean distribution without additional information. This motivates the list-decodable learning framework, where the goal is to output a short list of candidate estimates such that at least one element of the list is close to the true mean. This problem was formally introduced and analyzed by [CSV17]. Subsequent works improved the statistical guarantees and computational efficiency of list-decodable mean estimation and related mixture-learning problems [DKS18, CMY20, DKK+21, DKK20]. Other variants, such as list-decodable sparse mean estimation, have also been studied [ZS22]. Recently, [CCKL26] studied high-accuracy list-decodable mean estimation, where one can trade a larger list size for better accuracy.

2 Technical Overview

In this section, we present the main technical ideas in proving our main result Theorem 1.3. In Section 2.1, we briefly review the key insight for standard robust mean estimation and the sum-of-squares algorithm. Then, in Section 2.2, we present the algorithm for the double corruption model ($\varepsilon > 0, \alpha > 0, \beta = 0$), which contains the key insight on how to handle two layers of corruption and resolves Question 1.2. In Section 2.3, we extend our solution to the general case where all of $\varepsilon, \alpha, \beta$ can be larger than zero.

Notation We define $[N] := \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+$ as the set of positive integers. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $\|x\|_2 := \sqrt{\sum_{i\in[d]} x_i^2}$ for its ℓ_2 norm. For all vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\langle x, y\rangle := \sum_{i\in[d]} x_i \cdot y_i$ as the inner product of x and y. We let $\mathrm{tr}\,[A] := \sum_{i\in[d]} A_{i,i}$ be the trace of $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$. For matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, we write $A \succeq B$ to denote that $A - B$ is positive semidefinite, namely for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $x^\top (A - B)\, x \geq 0$. For a random variable $X \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{E}[X] \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the expectation and $\mathrm{Cov}[X] := \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ denotes the covariance matrix. The identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{I}_d$.

2.1 Background: Sum-of-Squares for Robust Mean Estimation

We first revisit the key insights for standard robust mean estimation [HL18, KSS18], which are necessary to explain the technical ideas in our algorithm. Let $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be ε_0-corrupted samples from a distribution with $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$. The main structural insight is that the empirical covariance of a set of samples provides a verifiable certificate on whether it is a "good" set whose empirical mean is an accurate estimate of the true mean. Roughly speaking, with high probability, there exists a set of samples with size at least $(1 - \Theta(\varepsilon_0))n$ that has empirical covariance bounded by $O(\mathbb{I}_d)$, and with high probability, for all sets with the above property, the empirical mean over the set is $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon_0})$ close to the true mean μ (even though it may contain corrupted samples).

For a more detailed explanation, please refer to [DK23, Chapter 2]. The main challenge is then to design an efficient algorithm that can find such a subset, without doing a brute-force search. The sum-of-squares method [Nes00, Las01] provides one such approach, and has been widely used in robust statistics [KS17, KSS18, DHPT25]. We encode the search for such a candidate set through polynomial constraints, which is expressed in terms of SoS variables $\{\mathsf{Y}_j\}_{j=1}^n$, $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^n$, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, and $\overline{\mathsf{Y}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathsf{Y}_j$, for all $j \in [n]$,

$$W_j^2 = W_j, \tag{1}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n W_j \geq (1-2\varepsilon_0)n, \tag{2}$$

$$W_j(\mathsf{Y}_j - x_j) = 0, \tag{3}$$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (\mathsf{Y}_j - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_j - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top = 3\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top. \tag{4}$$

Eq. (1) makes W_j an indicator variable, representing whether or not the j-th sample is selected. Eq. (2) ensures at least $(1-2\varepsilon_0)$-fraction of the observed samples is selected. The variable Y_j represents what we believe to be the value of the clean samples. Eq. (3) enforces $\mathsf{Y}_j = x_j$ whenever $W_j = 1$. Finally, (4) imposes the empirical covariance bound $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (\mathsf{Y}_j - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_j - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top \preceq 3\mathbb{I}_d$.

A brute-force search over all choices of W_j is exponential. The SoS instead returns a *pseudoexpectation operator* $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$, which is a linear operator that takes as input a polynomial in the SoS variables and outputs a real number. The operator $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfies the constraints, in the sense that when applied to both sides of Eqs. (1)-(4), the equations/inequalities are still valid. The algorithm then outputs $\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}\right]$ as the estimate of the mean. To prove the correctness of the algorithm involves two main steps,

1. **Satisfiability**: there exists an assignment of variables such that all constraints (1)-(4) are satisfied with high probability, implying the existence of a pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ that satisfies the constraints.

2. **Identifiability**: any pseudoexpectation operator $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ that satisfies (1)-(4) gives an accurate estimate of the mean.

For more details, please refer to Section B.

2.2 Double Corruption Without Heterogeneity: Solving Question 1.2

We now consider the double-corruption setting with $\alpha, \varepsilon > 0$ and $\beta = 0$.

The main challenge comes from the corruption in each user: with the observed sample $x_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the observed batch mean $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n x_{i,j}$ can be shifted by an arbitrary amount, and thus applying standard robust mean estimation over the batch means does not lead to any meaningful result. On the other hand, recall from Section 1.1, applying robust mean estimation over Nn samples with corruption level $\varepsilon + \alpha$ ignores the batch structure, and thus only achieves an error of $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon + \alpha})$.

To resolve this dilemma, we design a two-level polynomial system which consists of **crude sample-level refinement** and **user-level refinement**. The crude refinement step performs an initial filter on the bad samples, in a way similar to applying standard robust mean estimation to all Nn samples with corruption level $\varepsilon + \alpha$. After this step, the empirical mean of good users over the remaining samples would not shift arbitrarily, making it possible to further refine the estimate by leveraging the concentration afforded by the batch structure.

Polynomial system design: Two-level refinement With SoS variables $\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\{\mathsf{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\{W_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \{0,1\}$, $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \{0,1\}$, and $B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, we define $\mathsf{Z}_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$, $\overline{\mathsf{Z}} = \frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$, and $\overline{\mathsf{Y}} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathsf{Y}_i$. We introduce a novel SoS system that combines two levels of refinement, for all $i \in [N]$ and $j \in [n]$,

Crude sample-level refinement.

$$W_{i,j}^2 = W_{i,j}, \tag{5}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n U_i W_{i,j} \geq (1-4\alpha)n\sum_{i=1}^N U_i, \tag{6}$$

$$W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - x_{i,j}) = 0, \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n (\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Z}})(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Z}})^\top = O(1)\mathbb{I}_d - B_1B_1^\top.$$

User-level refinement.

$$U_i^2 = U_i, \tag{8}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N U_i \geq (1-2\varepsilon)N, \tag{9}$$

$$U_i(\mathsf{Y}_i - \mathsf{Z}_i) = 0, \tag{10}$$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathsf{Y}_i-\overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_i-\overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top = O\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d - B_2B_2^\top.$$

Crude sample-level refinement is similar to the structure of Eq. (1)–(4). It is applied to the sample-level variables inside selected users. For each user i, we introduce variables $\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}\}_{j\in[n]}$ and indicators $\{W_{i,j}\}_{j\in[n]}$. The variables $W_{i,j}$ play the same role as the one-level indicators W_j, and the variables $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ play the role of the one-level candidate cleaned samples Y_j from Section 2.1. The user indicator U_i links the sample-level and user-level refinements. The global cardinality constraint Eq. (6) requires that, across all selected users, at least a $(1-4\alpha)$-fraction of their samples be certified. Thus, sufficiently many candidate samples $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ are constrained to agree with the observations $x_{i,j}$ (Eq. (7)). This refinement controls the total surviving sample-level corruptions, but by itself it does not fully exploit the $1/n$ variance reduction from averaging within each batch.

The second component is the *user-level refinement*. We introduce variables Y_i for the cleaned user-level means and select at least a $(1-2\varepsilon)$-fraction of users through the indicators U_i. Eq. (10) couples two levels: for every selected user i ($U_i = 1$), the user-level point Y_i must equal the cleaned batch mean Z_i. $1/n$ is the variance reduction term from averaging n clean samples, while the additional $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$ is the key new parameter, which we will specify below. In short, it is chosen to balance the two requirements: it is large enough to improve **satisfiability**, but small enough that the **identifiability** error remains $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. The algorithm computes a constant degree pseudoexpectation satisfying this two-level system and outputs $\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\,[\mathsf{Y}]$.

Satisfiability: the double truncation structure and parameter τ Now, we discuss that, with high probability, there exists an assignment to all SoS variables satisfying crude sample-level refinement and user-level refinement simultaneously.

The *crude sample-level refinement* follows the same idea as Section 2.1. Note that even when we have only clean samples, statistically far samples can cause the empirical covariance to deviate

drastically, so the constraint may fail to be satisfied even by an all-clean sample set. To avoid this issue, we consider a truncated version of the samples. Starting from the clean samples $z_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we truncate them $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ by replacing $z_{i,j}$ by μ whenever $\|z_{i,j} - \mu\|_2$ is larger than $2\sqrt{\frac{d}{\alpha}}$. This changes only an $O(\alpha)$-fraction of samples, makes the empirical covariance bounded by $O(\mathbb{I}_d)$, and shifts the mean by only $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. This gives a feasible assignment for the crude sample-level refinement by assigning the truncated samples $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ to the SoS variables $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$. We assign $W_{i,j} = 1$ only when $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} = x_{i,j}$. Since the adversary also changes at most an α-fraction of samples inside each good batch ($U_i = 1$), the observed samples differ from this truncated sample set on only $O(\alpha)$-fraction. Thus, Eq. (6) can be satisfied.

Next, we define $z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, and $\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}[z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}]$[3]. We need to further truncate z_i^{tr}'s so that we can show the satisfiability of the *user-level refinement* constraints. As each z_i^{tr} is an average of n truncated samples, we note that $\mathrm{Cov}\left[z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] \preceq (1/n)\mathbb{I}_d$. Our approach is to define the second truncation, namely $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, similar to before: when $\left\|z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2$ is larger than $2\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}$, we replace with μ^{tr}. Unfortunately, using the naive bound on $\left\|z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2$ as before requires $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log(d/\delta)\right)$ to ensure

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top \preceq O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$. This is much larger than the desired sample complexity $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log(d/\delta)\right)$ as $\alpha \geq 1/n > \varepsilon/n$. To improve the sample complexity, we revisit our first truncation step and observe that the truncation-induced mean shift is $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. On the other hand, the purpose of our empirical covariance bound $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\mathbb{I}_d$ is to ensure that the batch-level strong contamination parameter ε has less influence on the error $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right)$. If we must include an $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ term in our error guarantee, then it is acceptable to slightly weaken the empirical covariance bound to $O\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)$, where $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$, in exchange for improved sample complexity. This relaxation gives us our desired sample complexity $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log(d/\delta)\right)$. Below, we explain why this choice of τ does not influence the error $O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$.

Identifiability: controlling two sources of error The identifiability proof shows that every feasible pseudoexpectation must output a mean $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]$ close to the true mean μ. The proof is algebraic in nature, but its main idea can be understood as separately controlling the two ways in which the SoS solution may differ from the double-truncated clean reference $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_i z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$.

First, the user-level refinement controls the effect of fully corrupted users and unselected users. Indeed, after the second truncation, the clean user-level reference samples have empirical covariance at scale $1/n + \tau$, with $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$. Following the standard SoS approach, we can get

$$O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\varepsilon\tau}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right),$$

so τ does not introduce any error larger than the unavoidable $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ term.

Second, the crude sample-level refinement controls the additional error caused by sample-level corruptions that survive inside selected users. This is the main technical obstacle that does not appear in prior one-level SoS analyses. In those settings, the identifiability argument only needs to control the effect of selected versus unselected samples, or corrupted versus uncorrupted samples. Here, however, the difficulty comes from a two-level interaction: sample-level corrupted samples

[3]Note that in this case β is equal to 0, hence all users have the same mean.

may remain inside batches that are selected at the user level. Such errors cannot be controlled by a purely user-level covariance argument, because even one corrupted sample inside a selected batch can arbitrarily shift the cleaned batch mean Z_i. The global sample-count constraint (Eq. (6)) ensures that, across all users selected at the user level, only an $O(\alpha)$-fraction of sample–user pairs can remain uncertified or disagree with the truncated clean references. After a degree-6 SoS Cauchy–Schwarz step, the contribution of these surviving corrupted samples is bounded by a product of two factors: one factor counts the surviving corrupted sample mass and is $O(\alpha)$, while the other factor is controlled by the sample-level covariance constraint together with bridge relations between $\overline{\mathsf{Z}}$, $\overline{\mathsf{Y}}$, and the double-truncated reference mean. This yields an additional $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ error.

Combining the user-level and sample-level bounds gives $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right)$. Finally, we decompose the error to the true mean $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \mu\right\|_2$:

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 + \left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right\|_2.$$

The first term is controlled by the two refinement arguments above. The second term is the statistical fluctuation of the empirical mean from the true mean, which is $O(\sqrt{d\log(1/\delta)/(Nn)})$. The third term is the truncation bias, which is $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ from the satisfiability analysis. Hence, under the target sample complexity $nN \geq \widetilde{\Omega}(d/\alpha)$ and $\alpha n \geq 1$, the final error guarantee becomes $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. For more details, please refer to Section D.

2.3 Extending Our Double Corruption Techniques to Heterogeneous Setting

We now consider the full setting $\alpha, \varepsilon, \beta > 0$. Besides the double corruption from Section 2.2, the clean samples of user i are drawn from a distribution P_i with mean μ_i, where $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$.

In this setting, we use a similar *crude sample-level refinement* and *user-level refinement* structure as in Section 2.2 with three major updates. First, since each batch i has a slightly different mean μ_i, truncating around μ might not effectively remove the samples that cause large empirical covariance. In this situation, the empirical mean of n clean samples from the batch i satisfy $\mathbb{E}[z_{i,j}] = \mu_i$. Thus, to get the desired empirical covariance bounds for crude sample-level and user-level refinements, we now truncate each sample $z_{i,j}$ around μ_i, denoted as $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Similarly, for the second truncation step, we truncate $z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ around $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathbb{E}\left[z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$.

Second, with a small constant $c_\rho > 0$, we introduce more parameters $\eta := \max\{\alpha, \beta\}, \rho := \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\eta\}, c_\rho\}, \tau := \frac{\eta}{\rho}$ to improve the sample complexity, without hurting the error. The goal of η, ρ is to relax the polynomial system by allowing it to select fewer $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ (with $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} = x_{i,j}$, Eq. (7)) through $W_{i,j}$ and fewer Y_i (with $\mathsf{Y}_i = \mathsf{Z}_i$, Eq. (10)) through U_i. Specifically, we respectively replace Eq. (6) and Eq. (9) by

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^n U_i W_{i,j} \geq (1-4\eta)n \sum_{i=1}^N U_i, \text{ and,}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^N U_i \geq (1-2\rho)N,$$

where η, ρ are taken to be larger than the corresponding values α, ε in Eq. (6) and Eq. (9). Therefore, with these weaker requirements, we could truncate more samples $z_{i,j}$ (and empirical mean of the samples after the first truncation z_i^{tr}) around their respective means and assign them to $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ and

Y_i. This will remove more "extreme" $z_{i,j}$ and z_i^{tr} and make them more likely to satisfy the bounded covariance requirements. In addition, we let $\tau = \frac{\eta}{\rho}$ be the empirical covariance bound relaxation parameter in user-level refinement to make empirical covariance bound even easier to be satisfied. The errors caused by the mean shift are $O\left(\sqrt{\eta}\right)$ and $O\left(\sqrt{\rho/n}\right)$, both of which, by their definition, are upper bounded by $O\left(\sqrt{\alpha+\beta}\right)$.

Third, regarding the identifiability error, we combine the same procedure from Section 2.2 with the polynomial-constraint updates discussed above. We first bound the ℓ_2 error between the output of our algorithm $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]$ and the doubly truncated empirical mean $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$:

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 &\le O\left(\sqrt{\rho(1/n+\beta+\tau)} + \sqrt{\eta}\right) \\ &= O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon/n} + \sqrt{\eta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

The statistical fluctuation $\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\|_2$ and the second truncation bias $\|\overline{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2$ are bounded by $O(\sqrt{d\log(1/\delta)/(nN)})$ and $O(\sqrt{\eta})$, respectively. Finally, the heterogeneity enters through

$$\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\|_2 \le \|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\|_2 + \|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha+\beta})$$

Averaging over i gives $\|\overline{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha+\beta})$.

For more details, please refer to Section E. In addition, in Section C, we provide a warm-up in which we use SoS to analyze heterogeneity with one level of strong contamination ($\varepsilon, \beta > 0$ and $\alpha = 0$).

Acknowledgment

Maryam Aliakbarpour is affiliated with the Ken Kennedy Institute at Rice University.

Roadmap The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. In Section A, we present the technical preliminaries. In Section B, we revisit the SoS for the standard robust mean estimation $\varepsilon = 0, \alpha > 0, \beta = 0$. In Section C, we study a special case of $\varepsilon > 0, \alpha = 0, \beta > 0$ (heterogeneous and batch corruption) as a warm-up. In Section D, we provide a complete proof to the double corruption model (Question 1.2). Section E contains the proof for our main Problem 2. Finally, in Section F, we formally prove our lower bound result.

A Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce the technical preliminaries. In Section A.1, we give a brief overview of the sum-of-squares proof system. In Section A.2, we introduce the mathematical properties of pseudo-expectation. In Section A.3, we present the probabilistic and algebraic tools used in this paper.

Notation We define $[N] := \{1, 2, \ldots, N\}$ and $\mathbb{Z}_+$ as the set of positive integers. For all set A, we denote $\overline{A}$ as its complement. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we write $\|x\|_2 := \sqrt{\sum_{i\in[d]} x_i^2}$ for its ℓ_2 norm. For all vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we denote $\langle x, y\rangle := \sum_{i\in[d]} x_i \cdot y_i$ as the inner product of x and y. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, $\|A\|_2 := \sup_{\|x\|_2=1} \|Ax\|_2$ denotes its spectral norm, and $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\sum_{i,j} A_{i,j}^2}$ denotes its Frobenius norm. We use $\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ as a matrix with all 0 entries. We let $\mathrm{tr}\,[A] := \sum_{i\in[d]} A_{i,i}$ be the trace of A. For matrices $A, B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, we write $A \succeq B$ to denote that $A - B$ is positive semidefinite, namely for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we have $x^\top (A - B)\, x \geq 0$. For an arbitrary matrix $C \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times d}$, we let $C^\top$ be its transpose. For a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \Pr)$, Ω is the sample space, $\mathcal{F}$ is the σ-algebra of events, and $\Pr : \mathcal{F} \to [0, 1]$ is the probability measure. For a random variable $X : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mathbb{E}[X] \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denotes the expectation and $\mathrm{Cov}[X] := \mathbb{E}[(X - \mathbb{E}[X])(X - \mathbb{E}[X])^\top] \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ denotes the covariance matrix. For a random variable $Y : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}$, we let $\mathrm{Var}[Y] := \mathbb{E}[(Y - \mathbb{E}[Y])^2] \in \mathbb{R}$ to denote its variance. For all $A \in \mathcal{F}$, we define the indicator function $\mathbb{1}_{\{A\}} : \Omega \to \{0, 1\}$ as $\mathbb{1}_{\{A\}}(\omega) := 1$ if $\omega \in A$ and $\mathbb{1}_{\{A\}}(\omega) := 0$ if $\omega \notin A$, for all $\omega \in \Omega$. The identity matrix in $\mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ is denoted by $\mathbb{I}_d$. We use $\mathsf{B} \left|\frac{x}{k}\right. \{p(x) \geq q(x)\}$ to represent that there exists a degree-k sum-of-squares proof that the polynomial inequality $p(x) \geq q(x)$ holds, with variable x, by assuming the polynomial constraints in the set B. We define $\mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ as the polynomial ring over the real variables $x_1, \ldots, x_d \in \mathbb{R}$.

A.1 Sum-of-Squares (SoS)

Our algorithm relies on the sum-of-squares algorithm [Nes00, Las01]. We describe the results needed for our algorithm and refer the readers to [HKP+17, KSS18, BDH+20] for more detailed exposition of the method. The formal definition of the sum-of-squares (SoS) proof is as follows:

Definition A.1 (Sum-of-squares (SoS) proof)**.** *Polynomials p, q in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, we say that $p \geq q$ has a degree-k sum-of-squares proof if there exists polynomials $s_1, \ldots, s_t$ with degree at most $k/2$ such that*

$$p - q = \sum_{i=1}^{t} s_i^2.$$

We denote this as $\left|\frac{x}{k}\right. \{p \geq q\}$. Given a set of polynomial constraints $\mathcal{A} = \{f_i = 0\}_{i\in[m]} \cup \{g_j \geq 0\}_{j\in[n]}$, we say that there exists a degree-k proof of $p \geq q$ modulo $\mathcal{A}$ if there exists polynomials

a_i, b_j, s_t *such that* $\deg(a_i f_i) \le k$, $\deg(b_j^2 g_j) \le k$, *and* $\deg(s_t^2) \le k$ *for all* i, j, t, *and*

$$p - q = \sum_t s_t^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m a_i f_i + \sum_{j=1}^n b_j^2 g_j.$$

This can be denoted as $\mathcal{A} \left|\frac{x}{k}\right. \{p \ge q\}$.

Pseudo-distribution is a generalization of probability distributions in that their "probability" weight can be negative and "expectations" are only guaranteed to be non-negative for square polynomials of finite degree.

Definition A.2. *Let* $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ *be a finite set of vectors. A level-*ℓ *(or degree-*ℓ*) pseudo-distribution over* $\mathcal{X}$ *has a "mass function"* $D(x)$ *such that for all polynomial* f *such that* $\deg(f) \le \ell/2$.

$$\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} D(x) = 1, \quad \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} D(x) f(x)^2 \ge 0,$$

and we define the pseudo-expectation for $f(x)$ *as*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_D [f(x)] := \sum_x D(x) f(x).$$

This relaxation is crucial for the Sum-of-Squares framework: rather than searching over discrete or combinatorial objects directly, we optimize over pseudo-expectations that behave like expectations on all low-degree polynomials. In particular, any feasible SoS solution corresponds to a pseudo-distribution whose pseudo-expectation operator satisfies basic probabilistic inequalities (such as Cauchy–Schwarz) up to the prescribed degree.

Definition A.3 (Polynomial constraints and satisfiability)**.** *Given a set of polynomial constraints* $\mathcal{A} = \{f_1 \ge 0, \dots f_m \ge 0\}$, *we say that* D *satisfies* $\mathcal{A}$ *at degree* r *if for every* $S \subseteq [m]$ *and every sum-of-squares polynomial* h *with* $\deg(h) = \sum_{i \in S} \max\{\deg(f_i), r\}$,

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}_D \left[h(x) \prod_{i \in S} f_i(x) \right] \ge 0.$$

We say that D *satisfies* $\mathcal{A}$ *approximately at degree* r *if the above inequalities are satisfied up to an error of* $2^{-d\ell} \|h\|_2 \prod_{i \in S} \|f_i\|_2$, *where* $\|\cdot\|_2$ *is the 2-norm of the coefficients of each monomial.*

The following inference rules are helpful to establish new sum-of-square proofs.

Fact A.4 (SoS Cauchy-Schwarz, Claim 2.6 in [Sch22])**.** *Let* a, b *be vector-valued polynomials of degree at most* k. *Then for any* $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\vdash_{2k} \left\{ \langle a, b \rangle \le \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \|a\|_2^2 + \frac{1}{2\varepsilon} \|b\|_2^2 \right\}$$

and

$$\vdash_{4k} \left\{ \langle a, b \rangle^2 \le \|a\|_2^2 \|b\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Fact A.5 (SoS operator norm, Claim 2.7 in [Sch22])**.** *Let* $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $M \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, *and* $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times k}$. *Then*

$$\{M = \lambda I - BB^\top\} \vdash_k \{y^\top M y \le \lambda \|y\|_2^2\},$$

for

$$k \ge \deg\left(y^\top M y + y^\top B B^\top y\right).$$

Fact A.6. *Let $x, y, z \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have*

$$\vdash_2 \left\{3\left(x^2+y^2+z^2\right) \geq (x+y+z)^2\right\}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} 3\left(x^2+y^2+z^2\right) - (x+y+z)^2 &= 3x^2+3y^2+3z^2-x^2-y^2-z^2-2xy-2xz-2yz \\ &= 2x^2+2y^2+2z^2-2xy-2xz-2yz \\ &= (x-y)^2+(x-z)^2+(y-z)^2, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof by Definition A.1. □

A.2 Pseudo-Expectation Properties

We discuss some useful properties of *pseudo-expectation* operators.

Fact A.7 (Linearity of Pseudoexpectation)**.** *For any polynomials f, g and scalars $a, b \in \mathbb{R}$, the pseudoexpectation operator $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ is linear:*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[af+bg] = a\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[f] + b\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[g].$$

In addition, we can use Cauchy Schwarz inequality in pseudoexpectation.

Fact A.8 (Cauchy Schwarz for Pseudoexpectation, Fact 3.10 in [BK20])**.** *Let f, g be polynomials of degree at most d. Then, we have*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[fg\right] \leq \sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[f^2\right]}\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[g^2\right]}.$$

Fact A.9. *We have the following facts:*

- ***Part 1.*** *If $X, \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right] \in \mathbb{R}$, then we can get*

$$0 \leq \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left(X - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right]\right)^2\right] = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X^2\right] - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right]^2.$$

- ***Part 2.*** *If $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ denotes the tuple of indeterminates, where each $x_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right] = \left(\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[x_1\right], \ldots, \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[x_d\right]\right)$, then we can get*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|X - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right]\right\|_2^2\right] = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|X\|_2^2\right] - \left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right]\right\|_2^2.$$

- ***Part 3.*** *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be a given vector. If $X = (x_1, \ldots, x_d)$ denotes the tuple of indeterminates, where each $x_i \in \mathbb{R}[x_1, \ldots, x_d]$ and $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X\right] = \left(\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[x_1\right], \ldots, \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[x_d\right]\right)$, then we can get*

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|x - X\|_2^2\right] \geq \left\|x - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2$$

Proof. **Proof of Part 1.** First, we consider the case where $X, \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X] \in \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)^2\right] &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X^2+\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]^2-2X\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right]\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X^2\right]+\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]^2-2\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X^2\right]-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from the linearity of pseudo-expectation (see Fact A.7).

Proof of Part 2. Second, we consider the case where $X, \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X] \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that

$$\left(\left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)\left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)^\top\right)_{i,i} = \left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)_i \cdot \left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)_i = \left(X_i-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X_i]\right)^2 \tag{11}$$

Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2\right] &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\langle X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X], X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\rangle\right]\\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left[\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)\left(X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right)^\top\right]\right]\\ &= \sum_{i=1}^d\left(\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[X_i^2\right]-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X_i]^2\right)\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\sum_{i=1}^d X_i^2\right]-\sum_{i=1}^d\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X_i]^2\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|X\|_2^2\right]-\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where third step follows from **Part 1** and Eq. (11), the fourth step follows from linearity (see Fact A.7), and the last step follows from the definition of the ℓ_2 norm.

Proof of Part 3. Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|x-X\|_2^2\right] &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|X\|_2^2+\|x\|_2^2-2\langle x,X\rangle\right]\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|X\|_2^2\right]+\|x\|_2^2-2\left\langle x,\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\rangle\\ &= \left(\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\|X\|_2^2\right]-\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2\right)+\left(\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2+\|x\|_2^2-2\left\langle x,\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\rangle\right)\\ &= \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|X-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2\right]+\left\|x-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2\\ &\geq \left\|x-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X]\right\|_2^2,\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from the linearity of the pseudo-expectation (see Fact A.7), the fourth step follows from **Part 2** of Fact A.9, and the last step follows from the definition of pseudo-expectation that $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[X^2] \geq 0$. □

A.3 Probabilistic and Algebraic Tools

In this section, we present basic probabilistic and algebraic tools.

Fact A.10 (Union Bound)**.** *Let $A_1, A_2, \ldots, A_m$ be events in a probability space. Then*

$$\Pr\left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{m} A_i\right] \leq \sum_{i=1}^{m} \Pr[A_i].$$

Fact A.11 (Markov's Inequality)**.** *Let X be a non-negative random variable and let $a > 0$. Then*

$$\Pr[X \geq a] \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[X]}{a}.$$

Fact A.12 (Multiplicative Chernoff Bound)**.** *Let $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ be independent random variables taking values in $[0, 1]$, and let $X = \sum_{i=1}^{n} X_i$ with $\mu = \mathbb{E}[X]$. Then for all $\Delta > 0$, the following holds:*

$$\Pr[X \geq (1+\Delta)\mu] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta^2 \mu}{3}\right) \quad \textit{for } 0 < \Delta \leq 1,$$
$$\Pr[X \geq (1+\Delta)\mu] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta \mu}{3}\right) \quad \textit{for } \Delta > 1.$$

Fact A.13. *Let $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then*

$$\left\|uu^\top\right\|_2 = \|u\|_2^2.$$

Proof. If $u = \mathbf{0}_d$, then $uu^\top = 0$, so $\left\|uu^\top\right\|_2 = 0 = \|u\|_2^2$. Thus, assume $u \neq \mathbf{0}_d$. For all $v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|v\|_2 = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|uu^\top v\right\|_2 &= \left\|u(u^\top v)\right\|_2 \\
&= |u^\top v| \cdot \|u\|_2 \\
&\leq \|u\|_2 \|v\|_2 \|u\|_2 \\
&= \|u\|_2^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Therefore,

$$\left\|uu^\top\right\|_2 \leq \|u\|_2^2.$$

On the other hand, taking $v = u/\|u\|_2$, we have $\|v\|_2 = 1$ and

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|uu^\top v\right\|_2 &= \left\|uu^\top \frac{u}{\|u\|_2}\right\|_2 \\
&= \|u \cdot \|u\|_2\|_2 \\
&= \|u\|_2^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\left\|uu^\top\right\|_2 = \sup_{\|v\|_2=1} \left\|uu^\top v\right\|_2 \geq \|u\|_2^2.$$

Combining the two inequalities completes the proof. □

Fact A.14 (Theorem 5 in [MMKP25]). *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_m$ be independent mean-zero random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Suppose that $\|X_i\|_2 \le c$ almost surely for every $i \in [m]$. Then, for every $\delta \in (0,1)$, with probability at least $1-\delta$,*

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1}^m X_i \right\|_2 \le \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}\left[\|X_i\|_2^2\right]} \left(1 + \sqrt{2\log(1/\delta)}\right) + \frac{4c}{3}\log(1/\delta).$$

Fact A.15 (Matrix Chernoff Inequality, Theorem 3.12 from [DK23]). *Let $R > 0$. Let $\{X_k\}$ be a sequence of independent random $d \times d$ symmetric matrices with*

$$0 \preceq X_k \preceq R \cdot \mathbb{I}_d$$

almost surely. Let $\lambda_{\max} = \|\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_k X_k\right]\|_2$. Then, for any $\Delta > 0$, we have that

$$\Pr\left[\left\|\sum_k X_k\right\|_2 > (1+\Delta)\lambda_{\max}\right] \le d\left(\frac{e^{\Delta}}{(1+\Delta)^{1+\Delta}}\right)^{\lambda_{\max}/R}.$$

Fact A.16. *Let $X_1, \ldots, X_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be i.i.d. random variables satisfying $\mathbb{E}[X_i] = \mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathrm{Cov}[X_i] = \Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$, for all $i \in [n]$. Let $\overline{X} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i$. Then, we can get*

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left[\overline{X}\right] = \frac{1}{n}\Sigma.$$

Proof. We can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{Cov}\left[\overline{X}\right] &= \mathrm{Cov}\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\mathrm{Cov}\left[\sum_{i=1}^n X_i\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathrm{Cov}\left[X_i\right] \\
&= \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^n \Sigma \\
&= \frac{n}{n^2}\Sigma \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\Sigma.
\end{aligned}$$

□

Fact A.17. *Let $v_1, \ldots, v_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be deterministic vectors with empirical mean $\overline{v} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N v_i$, and fix any $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then, we have*

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (v_i - \overline{v})(v_i - \overline{v})^\top \preceq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (v_i - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top.$$

Proof. We have

$$(v_i - \overline{v})(v_i - \overline{v})^\top = (v_i - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top - (v_i - \mu)(\overline{v} - \mu)^\top - (\overline{v} - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top + (\overline{v} - \mu)(\overline{v} - \mu)^\top.$$

Averaging over $i = 1, \ldots, N$ and using

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \mu) = \overline{v} - \mu,$$

we get

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \overline{v})(v_i - \overline{v})^\top = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top - (\overline{v} - \mu)(\overline{v} - \mu)^\top.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \overline{v})(v_i - \overline{v})^\top - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top = & -(\overline{v} - \mu)(\overline{v} - \mu)^\top \\ & \preceq 0,\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \overline{v})(v_i - \overline{v})^\top \preceq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(v_i - \mu)(v_i - \mu)^\top. \qquad \square$$

B Background and Refinements to Robust Mean Estimation Via SoS

Before delving into our main results, we revisit the standard robust mean estimation problem.

Problem 3 (Robust Mean Estimation)**.** *Let $\alpha \in (0, 0.5)$ and let P be a distribution over $\mathbb{R}^d$ with mean μ and covariance $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$. First, n clean samples are drawn i.i.d. from P. Then an adversary inspects these samples and replaces at most an α-fraction of them by arbitrary points. Given only the final, possibly corrupted, samples, the goal is to estimate μ in ℓ_2 distance.*

Overview of SoS-Based Robust Mean Estimation The main idea behind high-dimensional robust mean estimation is the following. If one can identify a large collection of points with sufficiently small empirical covariance, then the empirical mean of this collection cannot be pulled too far in any direction. This collection does not need to be perfectly clean: it may contain some corrupted points, as long as these points are not harmful enough to significantly increase the empirical covariance. This gives a *verifiable criterion*: instead of knowing which samples are clean, it is enough to find a large set of samples satisfying a low-covariance condition.

A brute-force search over all large subsets is computationally infeasible: checking all subsets of size $(1-\alpha)n$ requires time at least $\binom{n}{(1-\alpha)n}$, which is exponential in n. The Sum-of-Squares (SoS) framework provides a polynomial-time relaxation of this subset-selection problem. It introduces formal variables representing a candidate cleaned dataset and imposes polynomial constraints requiring that many candidate points agree with the observed data and that the candidate dataset has small empirical covariance.

Given observed, possibly corrupted samples $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the standard SoS relaxation can be written using variables $\{\widetilde{Y}_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}$, $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$. Here $\widetilde{Y}_j$ represents a candidate cleaned version of the observed sample x_j, and W_j is a Boolean selection variable indicating whether the candidate cleaned sample is required to agree with the observed sample. The polynomial constraints are

$$W_j^2 = W_j, \qquad \forall j \in [n], \tag{12}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^n W_j \geq (1-\alpha)n, \tag{13}$$

$$W_j(\widetilde{Y}_j - x_j) = 0, \qquad \forall j \in [n], \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (\widetilde{Y}_j - \widetilde{Y})(\widetilde{Y}_j - \widetilde{Y})^\top = C\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top, \tag{15}$$

where $\widetilde{Y} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \widetilde{Y}_j$. The first constraint forces each W_j to be Boolean, and the second constraint requires that at least $(1-\alpha)n$ candidate points agree with the observed data. The third constraint says that whenever $W_j = 1$, the cleaned sample must agree with the observed sample, i.e. $\widetilde{Y}_j = x_j$. The final constraint encodes the requirement that the candidate cleaned dataset has empirical covariance at most $C\mathbb{I}_d$. This relaxation leads to two basic questions:

1. With high probability over the clean samples, does there exist an assignment to the variables $\{\widetilde{Y}_j\}_{j=1}^n$, $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^n$, and B satisfying all of the polynomial constraints?

2. If a pseudoexpectation satisfies these polynomial constraints, why must the resulting estimate $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\widetilde{Y}]$ be close to the true mean μ?

The SoS analysis has two corresponding parts. The first part is *satisfiability*: one shows that, with high probability over the clean samples, there exists an assignment to the SoS variables satisfying all polynomial constraints. The second part is *identifiability*: one shows that any pseudoexpectation satisfying the polynomial constraints produces a mean estimate close to the clean empirical mean.

Prior Work and Our Refinements The SoS-based analysis of robust mean estimation in Problem 3 can be traced back to [HL18, KSS18]. These works develop SoS relaxations for robust mean and moment estimation under bounded covariance assumptions, as well as under stronger certifiably bounded higher-moment assumptions. The higher-moment assumptions rule out the most problematic heavy tails and imply that, with high probability, the uncorrupted empirical distribution satisfies the required low-degree empirical moment constraints. Thus, in those settings, the clean empirical distribution itself provides a feasible assignment to the polynomial constraints, establishing satisfiability.

More concretely, if z_j denotes the realized value of the clean sample Z_j, then the standard non-truncated satisfiability proof assigns z_j to $\widetilde{Y}_j$ for all $j \in [n]$, and sets $W_j = 1$ on a large subset of uncorrupted indices. For such indices, $x_j = z_j$, and therefore $\widetilde{Y}_j = x_j$. Hence the agreement constraint $W_j(\widetilde{Y}_j - x_j) = 0$ is satisfied. The remaining covariance constraint is satisfied provided the raw clean empirical distribution has sufficiently small empirical covariance.

We revisit the bounded-covariance setting while allowing arbitrary distributions satisfying only $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$, including distributions that may not satisfy any bounded higher-moment condition. For

such heavy-tailed distributions, the raw clean samples need not directly satisfy the empirical covariance constraint. We therefore use a truncation argument [DK23] to construct a large well-behaved clean set whose empirical covariance is bounded while changing the mean by only the target error.

Specifically, we show the following:

- With high probability, truncation changes at most an α-fraction of the clean samples. Equivalently, the realized truncated samples $\{Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$ differ from the realized clean samples $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^n$ on at most αn indices (Claim B.2).
- The truncation shifts the population mean by at most the target error: if $\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}]$, then $\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ (Claim B.3).
- The realized truncated samples satisfy the empirical covariance constraint required by the polynomial system (Claim B.4).

Proving these claims is the goal of Section B.1.

Consequently, the observed samples $\{x_j\}_{j\in[n]}$ can be viewed as a 2α-strong contamination of the realized truncated clean samples: an α-fraction of indices may differ due to the adversary, and another α-fraction may differ due to truncation. Therefore, in Section B.2, we modify the polynomial constraints accordingly. For example, the constraint $\sum_{j=1}^n W_j \ge (1-\alpha)n$ is replaced by $\sum_{j=1}^n W_j \ge (1-2\alpha)n$. Moreover, the SoS variables should be interpreted as candidate cleaned *truncated* samples. Thus, in our polynomial system, we reserve the variables $\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ for candidate cleaned truncated samples. In the satisfiability proof, these variables are assigned by the realized truncated samples: $Y_j = Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$, for all $j \in [n]$. Thus, $\widetilde{Y}_j$ denotes the non-truncated candidate cleaned sample in the standard SoS relaxation, whereas Y_j denotes the truncated candidate cleaned sample used in our analysis.

The identifiability part builds upon [HL18, KSS18]: any pseudoexpectation satisfying the polynomial constraints must output a mean close to the mean of the feasible clean object. In the non-truncated setting, this feasible object is the raw clean empirical distribution. In our setting, it is the truncated clean empirical distribution. It remains to relate the empirical mean of the truncated clean samples back to the original population mean μ. Under $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$, the clean empirical mean has squared error at most d/n in expectation. Since truncation makes the relevant random variables bounded, we can further use a concentration inequality [MMKP25] to obtain the desired high-probability, nearly optimal sample-complexity guarantee. This step is carried out in Section B.3.

Combining the truncation-based satisfiability argument (Lemma B.6), the SoS identifiability argument (Lemma B.7), and the concentration of the truncated empirical mean (Lemma B.7), we obtain the following result:

Theorem B.1 (SoS robust mean estimation under bounded covariance)**.** *Let $c \in (0, 0.5)$ be a universal constant. Let $\alpha \in (0, c)$. Under the setup of Problem 3, there exists a polynomial-time algorithm (Algorithm 1) that outputs $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O(\sqrt{\alpha})$ with probability at least $1-\delta$, provided $n = \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\frac{d}{\delta}\right)$. The error rate is minimax optimal, and the sample complexity is nearly optimal up to logarithmic factors.*

B.1 Background and Refinements to Truncation and Satisfiability Tools

In this section, we adapt the truncation argument from [DK23]. Specifically, in Claim B.2, Claim B.3, and Claim B.4, we show that modifying at most an α-fraction of the clean samples

by truncation is sufficient to ensure the desired bounded empirical covariance condition, while changing the population mean by only the target error.

We first explain the random variables used in the truncation argument. The vectors Z_j are the clean samples that would have been observed without adversarial corruption. They are not available to the algorithm, but they exist in the probabilistic model and are used only in the analysis. Since bounded covariance does not imply that the empirical covariance of the raw clean samples is bounded with high probability, we introduce truncated clean samples Z_j^{tr}. These truncated samples differ from Z_j on only a small fraction of indices (Claim B.2), their mean remains close to μ (Claim B.3), and their empirical covariance is bounded with high probability (Claim B.4).

Claim B.2 (Few samples are modified by truncation)**.** *Let $\gamma > 0$ be the scaling factor of the covariance bound*[4]*. Let $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be i.i.d. random vectors with common mean $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Z_j]$ and covariance $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_j] \preceq \gamma \mathbb{I}_d$. Define*

$$Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} := \begin{cases} Z_j, & \|Z_j - \mu\|_2 \le 2\sqrt{\gamma d/\alpha}, \\ \mu, & \textit{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \ge \alpha\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right).$$

Proof. Note that since $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Z_j]$, we have

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_j\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_j - \mu\right)\left(Z_j - \mu\right)^\top\right] \preceq \gamma \mathbb{I}_d, \tag{16}$$

so we can further get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\|Z_j - \mu\|_2^2\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\langle Z_j - \mu, Z_j - \mu\rangle\right] \\ &= \mathrm{tr}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_j - \mu\right)\left(Z_j - \mu\right)^\top\right]\right] \\ &\le \mathrm{tr}\left[\gamma \mathbb{I}_d\right] \\ &= \gamma d, \end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of the ℓ_2 norm and the third step follows from Eq. (16). Therefore, we can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} \neq Z_j\right] &= \Pr\left[\|Z_j - \mu\|_2^2 > 4\frac{\gamma d}{\alpha}\right] \\ &\le \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\|Z_j - \mu\|_2^2\right]}{4\gamma d/\alpha} \\ &\le \frac{\alpha}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of Z_j^{tr}, the second step follows from the Markov inequality (see Fact A.11), and the third step follows from Eq. (17). For all $j \in [n]$, $\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}$ are

[4] In the setting of Problem 3, we choose $\gamma = 1$.

i.i.d. Bernoulli with $\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{4}$. Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right] \leq \frac{\alpha}{4} n. \tag{18}$$

If $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right] = 0$, then the proof is immediate. If $\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right] \neq 0$, then we define

$$\Delta := \frac{\alpha n}{\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right]} - 1.$$

Using the multiplicative Chernoff bound (see Fact A.12), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left[\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \geq \alpha\right] &= \Pr\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \geq n\alpha\right] \\
&= \Pr\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \geq (1+\Delta)\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right]\right] \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta\,\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right]}{3}\right) \\
&= \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n - \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_j \neq Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}\right]}{3}\right) \\
&\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second and the last steps follow from Eq. (18). □

Claim B.3 (The truncation-induced mean shift is small)**.** *Under the notation of Claim B.2, let* $\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}]$. *Then, we have*

$$\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\gamma\alpha}).$$

Proof. Let $F_j := \{Z_j = Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}$. On F_j, truncation does not change the sample, while on $\overline{F}_j$ we have $Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mu$. We define $b := \mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu$. Since $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Z_j]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
b &= \mathbb{E}\left[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] - \mathbb{E}\left[Z_j\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - Z_j\right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\overline{F}_j\}}(\mu - Z_j)\right].
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|b\|_2^4 &= \langle b, b\rangle^2 \\
&= \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{1}_{\{\overline{F}_j\}}\langle \mu - Z_j, b\rangle\right]\right)^2 \\
&\leq \Pr[\overline{F}_j] \cdot \mathbb{E}\left[\langle Z_j - \mu, b\rangle^2\right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \frac{\alpha}{4} \cdot b^\top \operatorname{Cov}[Z_j] b$$
$$\leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{4} \|b\|_2^2 .$$

where the third step follows from Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, the fourth step follows from $\Pr[\overline{F}_j] \leq \alpha/4$ (proof of Claim B.2), and the last step follows from $\operatorname{Cov}[Z_j] \preceq \gamma \mathbb{I}_d$. If $b = \mathbf{0}_d$, then the proof is done. Otherwise, dividing both sides by $\|b\|_2^2$ gives $\|b\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\gamma\alpha}{4}$. Thus,

$$\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 = \|b\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\gamma\alpha} = O(\sqrt{\gamma\alpha}). \qquad \square$$

Claim B.4 (Empirical covariance of the truncated variables)**.** *Let $Z_1, \ldots, Z_n$ be i.i.d. random vectors in $\mathbb{R}^d$ with mean $\mathbb{E}[Z_j] = \mu$ and covariance $\operatorname{Cov}[Z_j] \preceq \gamma \mathbb{I}_d$, for all $j \in [n]$. Let $Z_1^{\mathrm{tr}}, \ldots, Z_n^{\mathrm{tr}}$ be the truncated variables from Claim B.2. Let $\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Then, with probability at least $1 - d\exp(-\Omega(n\alpha/d))$,*

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}})(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}})^\top \preceq C\gamma \mathbb{I}_d$$

for a sufficiently large universal constant $C > 0$.

Proof. We define

$$M_j := \frac{1}{n}(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top .$$

We can get

$$\begin{aligned}
\|M_j\|_2 &= \left\| \frac{1}{n}(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top \right\| \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\left\|(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top\right\|_2 \\
&= \frac{1}{n}\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \frac{4\gamma d}{\alpha n},
\end{aligned}$$

where the third step follows from Fact A.13 and the last step follows from Claim B.2. Hence, we can see that for all $j \in [n]$, with $R = O\left(\frac{\gamma d}{\alpha n}\right)$,

$$\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \preceq M_j \preceq R\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Since truncation is performed around μ, we have

$$Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu = (Z_j - \mu)\mathbb{1}_{\left\{\|Z_j - \mu\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\gamma d/\alpha}\right\}}.$$

Therefore, for every fixed $u \in \mathbb{R}^d$,

$$\langle Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu, u\rangle^2 = \mathbb{1}_{\left\{\|Z_j - \mu\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\gamma d/\alpha}\right\}}\langle Z_j - \mu, u\rangle^2 \leq \langle Z_j - \mu, u\rangle^2.$$

Taking expectation gives

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\langle Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu, u\rangle^2\right] \leq \mathbb{E}\left[\langle Z_j - \mu, u\rangle^2\right].$$

Moreover, since $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_j] \preceq \gamma \mathbb{I}_d$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}[Z_j]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\langle Z_j - \mu, u\rangle^2\right] = u^\top \mathrm{Cov}[Z_j] u \le \gamma \|u\|_2^2.$$

Moreover, using the covariance bound of the truncated variables, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\max} &:= \left\| \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{j=1}^n M_j\right] \right\|_2 \\
&= \left\| \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top\right] \right\|_2 \\
&\le \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\| \mathbb{E}\left[(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top\right] \right\|_2 \\
&\le \gamma.
\end{aligned}$$

If $\lambda_{\max} = 0$, the proof is done. Otherwise, choose $\Delta = C\gamma/\lambda_{\max} - 1$ for a sufficiently large universal constant C, so that $\Delta > 0$ and $(1+\Delta)\lambda_{\max} = C\gamma$. Applying the matrix Chernoff inequality (Fact A.15) gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr\left[\left\|\sum_{j=1}^n M_j\right\|_2 > C\gamma\right] &\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\Delta\lambda_{\max}}{R}\right)\right) \\
&\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\gamma}{R}\right)\right) \\
&\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{d}\right)\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where the second step follows from $\Delta\lambda_{\max} = C\gamma - \lambda_{\max}$ and $\lambda_{\max} \le \gamma$, so we have $\Delta\lambda_{\max} \ge (C-1)\gamma = \Omega(\gamma)$. Combining with Fact A.17, we have, with probability at least $1 - d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{d}\right)\right)$,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}})(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}})^\top \preceq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top \preceq C\gamma\mathbb{I}_d,$$

which completes the proof. □

B.2 Refinements to SoS Variables and Polynomial Constraints

We combine the truncation argument from the previous section (Section B.1) with the SoS polynomial constraints (Eqs. (12), (13), (14), and (15)) to formalize the refined polynomial system. Since the observed samples $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ can be viewed as a 2α-strong contamination of the truncated clean samples $\{Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$, the SoS relaxation should only require agreement with a $(1-2\alpha)$-fraction of the observed points. Moreover, in the satisfiability proof, the candidate cleaned variables Y_j will be assigned by the truncated clean samples Z_j^{tr}, rather than by the raw clean samples Z_j.

Definition B.5 (Polynomial system C)**.** *Let $C > 0$ be a sufficiently large universal constant. Given observed samples $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, the polynomial system C consists of the following constraints over variables $\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^n$, $\{W_j\}_{j=1}^n$, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$:*

$$W_j^2 = W_j, \qquad \forall j \in [n], \tag{19}$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_j \geq (1-2\alpha)n, \tag{20}$$

$$W_j(Y_j - x_j) = 0, \qquad \forall j \in [n], \tag{21}$$

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_j - \overline{Y})(Y_j - \overline{Y})^\top = C\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top. \tag{22}$$

The constraint $W_j^2 = W_j$ makes W_j a Boolean variable. The cardinality constraint says that the candidate set retains at least $(1-2\alpha)n$ points. The agreement constraint says that if $W_j = 1$, then the candidate cleaned point Y_j must agree with the observed point x_j. The covariance constraint says that the candidate cleaned points have empirical covariance at most $C\mathbb{I}_d$; the slack matrix B converts this semidefinite inequality into polynomial equalities.

Algorithm 1 SoS for robust mean estimation (Problem 3).

1: **Input**: observed samples $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$, corruption parameter α, and polynomial system C (Definition B.5).
2: Compute a pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying C.
3: **Output**: $\widehat{\mu} = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

We now formally show that our refined polynomial system (polynomial system C, Definition B.5) is satisfiable for all arbitrary distribution P with $\mathrm{Cov}\,[P] \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$.

Lemma B.6 (Satisfiability of C)**.** *Under the setup of Problem 3, with probability at least $1-\delta$, there exists an assignment to the variables*

$$\{Y_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \{W_j\}_{j=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$$

such that all constraints in C are satisfied, as long as

$$n \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\frac{d}{\delta}\right).$$

Proof. Let $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the clean samples drawn before the adversary acts, and let $\{Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$ be their truncated versions. We denote their realized values by $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^n$ and $\{z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$, respectively.

By Claim B.2, with probability at least $1-\exp(-\alpha n/4)$, at most αn clean samples are modified by truncation. Since at most αn samples are corrupted by the adversary, at least $(1-2\alpha)n$ indices satisfy both $x_j = z_j$ and $z_j = z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Let $S := \{j \in [n] : x_j = z_j = z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}$. On this event, we have $|S| \geq (1-2\alpha)n$. Choose any subset $T \subseteq S$ with

$$|T| = (1-2\alpha)n.$$

We now define an assignment to the variables of C. For every $j \in [n]$, set $Y_j = z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$, and set $W_j = \mathbb{1}_{\{j\in T\}}$. Then $W_j^2 = W_j$ for every $j \in [n]$, and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_j = |T| = (1-2\alpha)n.$$

Thus, the Boolean constraint and the cardinality constraint are satisfied. Next, we verify the agreement constraint. If $W_j = 0$, then $W_j(Y_j - x_j) = 0$ holds trivially. If $W_j = 1$, then $j \in T \subseteq S$, so $x_j = z_j = z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} = Y_j$. Hence,

$$W_j(Y_j - x_j) = 0$$

for every $j \in [n]$. It remains to verify the covariance constraint. By Claim B.4, with probability at least $1 - d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{d}\right)\right)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})^\top \preceq C\mathbb{I}_d,$$

where $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Since $Y_j = z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$ for every $j \in [n]$, we have $\overline{Y} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Y_j = \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_j - \overline{Y})(Y_j - \overline{Y})^\top \preceq C\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Taking the constant C in Definition B.5 to be sufficiently large, there exists a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_j - \overline{Y})(Y_j - \overline{Y})^\top = C\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top.$$

For example, B can be chosen so that $BB^\top = C\mathbb{I}_d - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(Y_j - \overline{Y})(Y_j - \overline{Y})^\top$. Thus, the covariance constraint is satisfied. Combining the two high-probability events by a union bound, the polynomial system C is satisfiable with probability at least

$$1 - \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right) - d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{d}\right)\right).$$

Proof of sample complexity. It remains to check the sample complexity. If $n \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\frac{d}{\delta}\right)$, then

$$d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{n\alpha}{d}\right)\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Moreover, by increasing the universal constant in the sample complexity bound if necessary, we also have

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}.$$

Hence the total failure probability is at most δ. Therefore, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, there exists an assignment satisfying all constraints in C. □

B.3 Background and Refinements to Identifiability of the SoS Relaxation

We now prove identifiability for the refined polynomial system C. The argument follows the standard SoS identifiability framework for robust mean estimation [Sch22], but with one key refinement: the reference clean object is no longer the raw clean empirical distribution. Instead, because we first truncate the clean samples to handle heavy tails, the SoS solution is compared to the empirical mean of the truncated clean samples $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. We first show, using the agreement and covariance constraints of C, that any feasible pseudoexpectation must satisfy $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. We then use the truncation guarantees from Section B.1 to relate $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ back to the true population mean μ. We further use a recent vector Bernstein inequality from [MMKP25] (Fact A.14) to bound the deviation between the empirical truncated mean and the population truncated mean. This allows us to obtain the desired high-probability guarantee directly, and may save a $\log(1/\delta)$ factor in the sample complexity compared with first proving a constant-probability bound and then applying confidence amplification [HS16].

Lemma B.7 (Identifiability of C)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 3, if*

$$n \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\frac{d}{\delta}\right),$$

then, with probability at least $1-\delta$, every pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying the SoS constraints C yields

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[Y\right]-\mu\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right).$$

Moreover, such a pseudoexpectation can be computed in time

$$\left(nd+d^2\right)^{O(1)}.$$

Proof. Let $\{Z_j\}_{j=1}^n$ be the clean samples before adversarial corruption. Let $\{Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$ be the truncated clean samples, and we denote their realized truncated values by $\{z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$. Define $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. For each $j\in[n]$, we define the indicator $A_j := \mathbb{1}_{\{x_j=z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}$. On the high-probability event from Claim B.2 and the strong contamination model, the observed samples $\{x_j\}_{j=1}^n$ differ from the truncated clean samples $\{z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{j=1}^n$ on at most a 2α-fraction of indices. Hence,

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-A_j)\leq 2\alpha.$$

Moreover, by Claim B.4, with probability at least $1-d\exp(-\Omega(n\alpha/d))$,

$$\Sigma_{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}-\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}-\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})^\top \preceq C\mathbb{I}_d.$$

We first prove that the SoS output is close to $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Define $b := \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\overline{Y}$ and $\rho := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-W_jA_j)$. Using the cardinality constraint $\sum_{j=1}^n W_j = (1-2\alpha)n$ and the bound $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-A_j)\leq 2\alpha$, we have

$$\mathsf{C}\Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n,W_1,\ldots,W_n,B}{2}}\left\{\begin{aligned}\rho &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-W_j)+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n W_j(1-A_j)\\ &\leq 2\alpha+\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-A_j)\\ &\leq 4\alpha.\end{aligned}\right\}$$

Here we use that $W_j\in\{0,1\}$ has a degree-2 SoS proof from $W_j^2=W_j$. Since $\alpha<0.1$, this also implies $1-\rho\geq 1-4\alpha=\Omega(1)$. Now observe that whenever $W_jA_j=1$, we have both $W_j=1$ and $x_j=z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. By the agreement constraint $W_j(Y_j-x_j)=0$, this implies $Y_j=x_j=z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Thus, for all $j\in[n]$,

$$\mathsf{C}\Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n,W_1,\ldots,W_n,B}{2}}\left\{W_jA_j(Y_j-z_j^{\mathrm{tr}})=0\right\}.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathsf{C}\Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n,W_1,\ldots,W_n,B}{2}}\left\{\begin{aligned}b &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}-Y_j)\\ &= \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n(1-W_jA_j)(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}-Y_j).\end{aligned}\right\}$$

Using $z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - Y_j = (z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}) - (Y_j - \overline{Y}) + b$, we get

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{2}} \left\{ (1-\rho)b = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}) - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)(Y_j - \overline{Y}). \right\}$$

Taking inner product with $b = \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}$ and applying SoS Cauchy–Schwarz (Fact A.4) gives

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ \begin{aligned} \langle (1-\rho)b, b\rangle^2 = (1-\rho)^2 \|b\|_2^4 & \\ \leq 2\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)\left\langle z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}, b\right\rangle\right)^2 & \\ + 2\left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)\left\langle Y_j - \overline{Y}, b\right\rangle\right)^2 . & \end{aligned} \right\}$$

We bound the two terms separately. For the first term, recall that $\rho = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)$ and $\Sigma_{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})(z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}})^\top$, so another application of Cauchy–Schwarz gives

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ \begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)\left\langle z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}, b\right\rangle\right)^2 &\leq \rho \cdot \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}, b\right\rangle^2 \\ &= \rho \cdot b^\top \Sigma_{\mathrm{tr}} b \\ &\leq C\rho \|b\|_2^2 , \end{aligned} \right\}$$

where the first step follows from $(1-W_jA_j)^2 = 1+W_j^2A_j^2-2W_jA_j = 1+W_jA_j-2W_jA_j = 1-W_jA_j$, as $W_j, A_j \in \{0,1\}$. For the second term, the covariance constraint in C implies, by combining the polynomial constraint Eq. (22) with Fact A.5, that

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{4}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle Y_j - \overline{Y}, b\right\rangle^2 \leq C\|b\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Hence, again by SoS Cauchy–Schwarz,

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ \begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n (1 - W_j A_j)\left\langle Y_j - \overline{Y}, b\right\rangle\right)^2 &\leq \rho \cdot \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle Y_j - \overline{Y}, b\right\rangle^2 \\ &\leq C\rho \|b\|_2^2 . \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Combining the two bounds on the right-hand side, we get

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ (1-\rho)^2 \|b\|_2^4 \leq 4C\rho \|b\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Since $\rho \leq 4\alpha$, this implies

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ (1-\rho)^2 \|b\|_2^4 \leq 16C\alpha \|b\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Moreover, since $\alpha < 0.1$, we have $1 - \rho \geq 1 - 4\alpha \geq 0.6$. Thus,

$$\mathsf{C} \Big|^{\frac{Y_1,\dots,Y_n,W_1,\dots,W_n,B}{6}} \left\{ \|b\|_2^4 \leq O(\alpha) \|b\|_2^2 \right\}.$$

Since $b = \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}$, this is exactly

$$\mathsf{C}\left|\frac{Y_1,\ldots,Y_n,W_1,\ldots,W_n,B}{6}\right\rangle \left\{\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^4 \le O(\alpha)\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^2\right\}.$$

Applying the pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ to both sides gives

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^4\right] \le O(\alpha)\,\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^2\right].$$

On the other hand, by **Part 1** of Fact A.9, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^2\right]^2 \le \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^4\right].$$

Combining the previous two inequalities yields

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^2\right] \le O(\alpha).$$

By **Part 3** of Fact A.9

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Y}\right\|_2^2\right] \ge \left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}]\right\|_2^2,$$

we conclude that

$$\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}]\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

It remains to relate $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ to the true mean μ. Recall that

$$\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}[Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}}].$$

By Claim B.3, the truncation-induced population mean shift satisfies

$$\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

Thus, it remains to control the concentration of the empirical mean $\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ around μ^{tr}. We apply Fact A.14 to the independent mean-zero random vectors, for all $j \in [n]$,

$$X_j := \frac{1}{n}\left(Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right).$$

Then, $\sum_{j=1}^n X_j = \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}$. We first bound the variance term:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2^2\right] &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2^2\right] \\ &\le \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|Z_j - \mu\right\|_2^2\right] \\ &\le d.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|X_j\right\|_2^2\right] = \frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2^2\right] \le \frac{d}{n}.$$

Since $\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le 2\sqrt{d/\alpha}$ by the definition of truncation (Claim B.2), and $\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha})$, we have

$$\left\|Z_j^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{d/\alpha}\right).$$

Hence $\|X_j\|_2 \le O\left(\frac{1}{n}\sqrt{\frac{d}{\alpha}}\right)$. Applying Fact A.14, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \le \sqrt{\frac{d}{n}}\left(1+\sqrt{2\log(1/\delta)}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n}\sqrt{\frac{d}{\alpha}}\log(1/\delta)\right).$$

Therefore, as long as $n \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\frac{d}{\delta}\right)$, the right-hand side is at most $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. Hence, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

Combining this concentration bound with the truncation-induced mean shift, we obtain

$$\left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le \left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

Finally, by the triangle inequality,

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \mu\right\|_2 \le \left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 + \left\|\overline{z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

Proof of running time. The running time follows from the standard SoS SDP algorithm. The polynomial system C has $nd + n + d^2$ variables and constant degree. Hence a constant-degree pseudoexpectation satisfying C can be found in time $(nd+d^2)^{O(1)}$. This completes the proof. □

C Warm-Up: Learning from Corrupted Batches With Heterogeneous Distributions

In this section, we study the mean-shift model. There are N users, each contributing a batch of n data points. At least a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of the users are good. Each good user i draws its clean samples from a distribution P_i whose mean μ_i is close to the target mean μ, while the remaining users may be fully adversarial.

Problem 4 (Mean shift)**.** *Consider parameters $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$, $\beta > 0$, a target mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and N users, each providing a batch of n data points in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We are guaranteed that at least a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of these users are good; each good user $i \in \mathcal{G}$ provides n i.i.d. samples drawn from an unknown distribution P_i with mean μ_i and covariance $\Sigma_i \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$. The relevance of a good user's data is quantified by its proximity to the target: $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$. The remaining ε-fraction of users are adversarial and may contribute entirely arbitrary batches. Our goal is to robustly estimate the true mean μ in ℓ_2 distance.*

Equivalently, the N users are subject to ε-strong contamination at the user level. One may imagine that all users first draw their clean batches from their respective distributions P_i, and then an adversary inspects all the data and replaces the entire batches of an ε-fraction of users by arbitrary data. The algorithm only observes the final, possibly corrupted, batches.

Theorem C.1. *Let $c \in (0, 0.5)$ be a universal constant. Given $\varepsilon \in (0, c)$, $\beta \ge 0$, and $n = o(d)$ samples from each of $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ users satisfying*

$$nN \ge \min\left\{\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right), \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)\right\}.$$

Then there exists a polynomial-time algorithm that solves Problem 4. With probability at least $1-\delta$, the algorithm outputs $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ satisfying

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

Remark C.2. *For simplicity of presentation, we assume $\beta \in (0, c)$ for a sufficiently small universal constant $c > 0$. This is without loss of generality up to a rescaling argument: if necessary, we may multiply all samples by a common scalar factor so that the rescaled heterogeneity parameter is smaller than c, run the algorithm on the rescaled instance, and then rescale the output back to the original scale.*

Algorithm 2 SoS for solving mean shift (Problem 4).

1: **Input**: n samples from each user, $\beta \in (0, 0.1)$, $\varepsilon \in (0, 0.1)$, polynomial system A (Definition C.3).
2: Compute a pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying the constraints of the polynomial system A.
3: **Output:** $\widehat{\mu} = \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\,[Z] \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The recent work [PP25] studies robust estimation under combined global and local corruptions using stability-based algorithms. Their framework gives better running time and sub-Gaussian sample-complexity rates for Problem 4 compared with our SoS method. However, our goal is not to improve upon [PP25]. Instead, our contribution is different. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first SoS formulation for the untrusted-batch mean-shift problem studied here. The SoS perspective is important for two reasons. First, it provides a modular polynomial system whose satisfiability and identifiability can be analyzed separately. Second, this section serves as a building block for the more complicated two-level heterogeneous corruption model (Problem 2), where user-level corruption, sample-level corruption, and heterogeneous user means must be handled simultaneously. The stability-based techniques of [PP25], while has better running time and sample complexity, cannot be directly applied to the more complicated problem that we aim to study. We will specify the reason in Section E.

Recall the standard SoS robust mean estimation principle discussed in Section B: if one can identify a large truncated set of points whose empirical covariance is small, and whose truncation does not significantly shift the mean, then the empirical mean of this truncated set serves as a stable proxy for the original clean mean. In the present mean-shift model, we apply this principle at the user level. Instead of working with individual samples, we work with the empirical mean of each user's batch. For a good user, this empirical mean has covariance smaller by a factor of $1/n$. Although its expectation may be shifted from the target mean μ by as much as $\sqrt{\beta}$, the resulting covariance scale is still only $\frac{1}{n} + \beta$. Thus, the natural goal is to find a large collection of user-level empirical means whose empirical covariance is bounded at this scale.

To implement this idea, we introduce a polynomial system A (Definition C.3). Let $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the observed empirical mean of user i, obtained by averaging the n submitted samples. For each clean user, let $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the clean user-level empirical mean before user-level corruption, and let $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the truncated version of Z_i used in the satisfiability proof. In the SoS relaxation, we introduce variables $Y_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$, representing candidate cleaned user-level empirical means, and Boolean variables $W_i \in \{0, 1\}$, certifying whether Y_i agrees with the observed empirical mean x_i. We write $\overline{Y} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N Y_i$. In the satisfiability, we can treat Y_i to be the realized truncated clean empirical mean Z_i^{tr} to show that there exists a solution to our polynomial system.

Definition C.3 (Polynomial system A)**.** *Let $C_A > 0$ be a sufficiently large universal constant. Let $\varepsilon' := \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}, \frac{1}{10}\}$. The polynomial system A consists of the following constraints over variables $\{W_i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\{Y_i\}_{i=1}^N$, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ (a matrix of "slack" variable):*

$$W_i(Y_i - x_i) = 0, \qquad \forall i \in [N],$$

$$W_i^2 = W_i, \qquad \forall i \in [N],$$
$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} W_i = (1-2\varepsilon')N,$$
$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Y_i - \overline{Y})(Y_i - \overline{Y})^\top = C_A\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top.$$

The main technical point is that we do not force the SoS system to retain a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of users. Instead, we use the relaxed retention parameter

$$\varepsilon' := \min\left\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}, \frac{1}{10}\right\}.$$

This relaxation allows fewer Y_i to satisfy $W_i(Y_i - x_i) = 0$, allowing us to replace more extreme samples $z_{i,j}$ to μ_i via truncation. This makes the empirical covariance bound $O\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d$ easier to be satisfied. Therefore, this is the key device that gives the desired sample complexity. If the target error is dominated by $\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$, then $\varepsilon' \approx \varepsilon$, and the system behaves like the usual user-level robust mean estimation relaxation. If the target error is dominated by $\sqrt{\beta}$, then we may allow the SoS system to discard up to an $O(n\beta)$-fraction of user-level empirical means without worsening the final error. This additional slack makes the truncation and covariance concentration step succeed under

$$nN \geq \min\left\{\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right), \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)\right\},$$

rather than under the worse sample complexity obtained by taking the maximum of the two requirements.

For the SoS algorithm to work, we prove two statements.

1. **Satisfiability.** With probability at least $1-\delta/2$, there exists an assignment to all variables satisfying the polynomial system A. The witness is obtained by setting $Y_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and selecting a large set of indices on which the observed empirical means agree with the truncated clean empirical means. We show that the user-level truncation argument with the relaxed parameter ε', together with a covariance bound at scale $\frac{1}{n}+\beta$ despite the fact that the clean user means μ_i need not be identical. See Lemma C.4 in Section C.1.

2. **Identifiability.** With probability at least $1-\delta/2$, every pseudoexpectation satisfying A yields an accurate estimate of the true mean μ. We show that the SoS proof remains valid even after relaxing the retained fraction from $(1-\varepsilon)$ to $(1-2\varepsilon')$. The resulting SoS error term is

$$O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon'\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)}\right),$$

which is still bounded by

$$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

The remaining terms are controlled by the fluctuation of the truncated user-level empirical means, the truncation bias, and the allowed heterogeneity $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$. See Lemma C.10 in Section C.2.

By assuming that satisfiability (Lemma C.4) and identifiability (Lemma C.10) hold, we prove Theorem C.1.

Proof of Theorem C.1. We apply Lemma C.4 and Lemma C.10 with failure probability $\delta/2$. Since

$$\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta/2}\right) = O\left(\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

the assumed sample complexity still implies the hypotheses of both lemmas.

By Lemma C.4, with probability at least $1-\delta/2$, the polynomial system A is satisfiable. Hence the SoS relaxation has a feasible pseudoexpectation. By Lemma C.10, with probability at least $1-\delta/2$, every pseudoexpectation satisfying A yields

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[Y] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

Therefore, by a union bound, with probability at least $1-\delta$, both events hold simultaneously. □

C.1 Satisfiability

Lemma C.4 (Satisfiability of A)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 4, with probability at least* $1-\delta$*, there exists an assignment to the variables*

$$\{W_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad \{Y_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$$

such that all constraints in A *are satisfied, as long as*

$$nN \geq \min\left\{\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right), \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)\right\}.$$

Overview Now, we give a proof overview, and then give a formal proof. Recall that in the standard SoS-based robust mean estimation (as discussed in Section B), the clean samples may be heavy-tailed under only a bounded covariance assumption, so their empirical covariance may not be bounded with high probability. The standard way is to truncate the clean random variables: after modifying only a small fraction of them, the truncated variables are bounded enough for matrix concentration, while the observed corrupted samples can still be viewed as a slightly more corrupted version of the truncated clean samples.

In our setting, the objects entering the polynomial system A are not individual samples, but user-level empirical means. For each good user i, let Z_i be the empirical mean of its n clean samples. Since Z_i is centered at μ_i and satisfies $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_i] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$, we truncate Z_i around μ_i, obtaining Z_i^{tr}. The shift from μ_i to the global mean μ is then handled separately using $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$. Thus the natural covariance scale is $\frac{1}{n} + \beta$.

We set the truncation parameter to be $\rho = \varepsilon'$. With high probability, truncation modifies at most $\varepsilon' N$ clean user-level empirical means (Claim C.6). Since the adversary corrupts at most $\varepsilon N \leq \varepsilon' N$ users, the observed empirical means $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and the truncated clean empirical means $\{Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{i=1}^N$ agree on at least $(1-2\varepsilon')N$ indices. The ℓ_2 distance of the truncated mean $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$ and the user mean μ_i can always be bounded by $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right)$, for all $i \in [N]$ (Claim C.7), meaning that this truncation will not negatively influence our error guarantee $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right)$.

On this high-probability event, we construct a feasible assignment as follows. Set $Y_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ for every i. Then choose $(1-2\varepsilon')N$ indices where $x_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and set $W_i = 1$ on these indices and $W_i = 0$

on the remaining indices. This immediately satisfies the agreement constraint $W_i(Y_i - x_i) = 0$, the Boolean constraint $W_i^2 = W_i$, and the cardinality constraint $\sum_i W_i = (1 - 2\varepsilon')N$.

It remains to verify the covariance constraint. By the truncation construction and matrix Chernoff, with high probability,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top \preceq C_A\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

where the universal constant C_A absorbs the losses from truncation and concentration. Since centering at the empirical average can only decrease empirical covariance, and since $Y_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Y_i - \overline{Y})(Y_i - \overline{Y})^\top \preceq C_A\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Therefore the covariance constraint in A is satisfied (Claim C.9) by choosing a slack matrix B such that

$$C_A\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d - \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Y_i - \overline{Y})(Y_i - \overline{Y})^\top = BB^\top.$$

Thus all constraints in A are satisfiable with high probability. The sample complexity follows from the matrix Chernoff bound applied to the truncated variables, with the choice $\varepsilon' = \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}, 1/10\}$.

To prove satisfiability, we need to show that the aggregated empirical covariance of the truncated user-level empirical means is bounded with high probability:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)^\top \preceq C_A\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d. \tag{23}$$

Formal proof We now present the formal proof.

Remark C.5. *Claim B.2 and Claim B.3 are stated for i.i.d. samples with a common mean. In this section, the user-level random variables Z_i need not have the same mean: each Z_i has mean μ_i, and the means satisfy $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$. Nevertheless, the proofs of Claim C.6 and Claim C.7 are essentially identical to those of Claim B.2 and Claim B.3, respectively. The only changes are that the covariance scale is now $\gamma = 1/n$, and the truncation parameter ε is replaced by ρ. Indeed, both arguments are pointwise in the underlying mean: for each user i, truncation is performed around its own mean μ_i. We will include the short proof verification under Claim C.6 and Claim C.7 for completeness.*

Claim C.6. *Let $\rho \in (0, 1)$ be a truncation parameter and $\gamma > 0$[5]. For each user $i \in [N]$, let $Z_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be an independent random vector with mean $\mu_i := \mathbb{E}[Z_i]$ and covariance $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_i] \preceq \gamma\mathbb{I}_d$. We define the truncated random variable*

$$Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \begin{cases} Z_i, & \|Z_i - \mu_i\|_2 \le 2\sqrt{\frac{\gamma d}{\rho}}, \\ \mu_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then, we have

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i \neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \ge \rho\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{\rho N}{4}\right).$$

[5]In this section, we choose $\gamma = \frac{1}{n}$.

Proof. For each $i \in [N]$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|Z_i - \mu_i\|_2^2\right] = \operatorname{tr}\left[\operatorname{Cov}[Z_i]\right] \le \gamma d.$$

Therefore, by Markov's inequality,

$$\Pr[Z_i \neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}] = \Pr\left[\|Z_i - \mu_i\|_2^2 > 4\frac{\gamma d}{\rho}\right] \le \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|Z_i - \mu_i\|_2^2]}{4d\gamma/\rho} \le \frac{\rho}{4}.$$

The indicators

$$\mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i \neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}, \qquad i \in [N],$$

are independent Bernoulli random variables with expectations at most $\rho/4$. Applying the multiplicative Chernoff bound gives

$$\Pr\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_i \neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \ge \rho\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{\rho N}{4}\right). \qquad \square$$

To proceed, we need to ensure that the truncation step—used to bound the covariance—does not alter the mean by too much. The following claim quantifies this effect, showing that the difference between the original and truncated means is small and scales as $O\left(\sqrt{\rho/n}\right)$.

Claim C.7. *Under the same notation as in Claim C.6, for each user $i \in [N]$, let $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$. Then, we have*

$$\left\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\gamma\rho}\right).$$

Proof. The proof is the same as Claim B.3. $\square$

Having established in Claim C.7 that the means of the truncated and original variables are close, we now extend this result to show that the empirical covariance of the truncated variables remains well-behaved.

Remark C.8. *The genuinely different part is the empirical covariance bound. In Claim B.4, all truncated variables have a common reference mean μ, and the goal is to show that their empirical covariance is bounded by a constant multiple of $\mathbb{I}_d$. In the present mean-shift setting, however, the truncated user-level variables may have different means μ_i^{tr}, and these means are only known to be close to the target mean μ. Thus, the empirical second moment around μ contains two contributions: the within-user fluctuation, of order $1/n$, and the between-user mean shift, of order β (together with the smaller truncation-induced shift ρ/n). Consequently, Claim C.9 must prove the stronger bound*

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

rather than merely a constant covariance bound.

Claim C.9. *Let $Z_1^{\mathrm{tr}}, \ldots, Z_N^{\mathrm{tr}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be independent truncated random vectors defined as in Claim C.6 with truncation parameter ρ. For each $i \in [N]$, let $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$. Suppose that for all $i \in [N]$, $\operatorname{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$ and $\left\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \le O\left(\beta + \rho/n\right)$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$,*

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

where

$$\delta = \begin{cases} d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\rho N}{d}\right)\right), & \beta n \le 1, \\ d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\beta n \rho N}{d}\right)\right), & 1 < \beta n \le \frac{d}{\rho}. \end{cases}$$

Proof. We define

$$M_k := \frac{1}{N}(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top. \tag{24}$$

By the definition of Z_k^{tr}, Claim C.6, and Claim C.7, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le & \left\|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_k\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu_k - \mu\right\|_2 \\ & \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{k\in[N]} \|M_k\|_2 = & \max_{k\in[N]} \left\|\frac{1}{N}(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top\right\|_2 \\ = & \frac{1}{N}\max_{k\in[N]} \left\|(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu)^\top\right\|_2 \\ = & \frac{1}{N}\max_{k\in[N]} \left\|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \\ \le & O\left(\frac{d}{\rho n N} + \frac{\beta}{N}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (24), the third step follows from Fact A.13, and the last step follows from Eq. (25). This implies that

$$\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \preceq M_k \preceq R \cdot \mathbb{I}_d, \qquad R = O\left(\frac{d}{\rho n N} + \frac{\beta}{N}\right).$$

Additionally, by Fact A.16, we have

$$\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Also, Claim C.7 and the assumption $\|\mu_k - \mu\|_2^2 \le \beta$ imply

$$\left\|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \le O\left(\beta + \rho/n\right),$$

and hence

$$\left(\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)\left(\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)^\top \preceq O\left(\beta + \rho/n\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)^\top\right] = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)^\top\right]$$

$$= \frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)^\top\right]+\left(\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)\left(\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)^\top\right)$$
$$\preceq O\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

where we used $\rho \le 1$ in the last line. Thus

$$\lambda_{\max} := \left\|\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N} M_k\right]\right\|_2 \le C_0\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)$$

for a universal constant $C_0 > 0$. Let $L := \frac{1}{n}+\beta$. Choose a sufficiently large universal constant $C_1 > C_0$. Applying the matrix Chernoff inequality with threshold $C_1 L$ gives

$$\Pr\left[\left\|\sum_k M_k\right\|_2 > C_1 L\right] \le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{L}{R}\right)\right)$$
$$\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{N\left(1+\beta n\right)}{\frac{d}{\rho}+\beta n}\right)\right). \tag{26}$$

It remains to simplify the exponent. We consider the two regimes that are needed later, namely $\beta n \le 1$ and $1 < \beta n \le d/\rho$.

Case 1 ($\beta n \le 1$). Suppose $\beta n \le 1$. Then Eq. (26) gives

$$d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{N\left(1+\beta n\right)}{\frac{d}{\rho}+\beta n}\right)\right) \le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{N}{d/\rho}\right)\right)$$
$$= d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\rho N}{d}\right)\right).$$

Case 2 ($1 < \beta n \le \frac{d}{\rho}$). Suppose $1 < \beta n \le \frac{d}{\rho}$. Then Eq. (26) gives

$$d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{N\left(1+\beta n\right)}{\frac{d}{\rho}+\beta n}\right)\right) \le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\beta n N}{d/\rho}\right)\right)$$
$$= d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\beta\rho n N}{d}\right)\right).$$

Finally, choosing $C \ge C_1$ gives

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d$$

with probability at least $1-\delta$, for δ as stated. □

Now, we combine everything together to prove Lemma C.4.

Proof of Lemma C.4. We apply Claims C.6, C.7, and C.9 with truncation parameter $\rho = \varepsilon'$.

By Claim C.6, with probability at least $1-\exp(-\Omega(\varepsilon' N))$, at most $\varepsilon' N$ clean empirical means are modified by truncation. Since at most $\varepsilon N \le \varepsilon' N$ users are corrupted at the user level, at least

$(1-2\varepsilon')N$ indices satisfy $x_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$, after the clean empirical means are sampled and truncated. Throughout the rest of this proof, we treat $\{Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{i=1}^N$ as fixed realized vectors.

At least $(1-2\varepsilon')N$ indices satisfy $x_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$. On this event, set $Y_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$, for all $i \in [N]$. Let $S = \{i \in [N] : x_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}$. Choose any subset $T \subseteq S$ with $|T| = (1-2\varepsilon')N$, and set $W_i = \mathbb{1}_{\{i\in T\}}$. Therefore, the constraints

$$W_i(Y_i - x_i) = 0, \qquad W_i^2 = W_i, \qquad \sum_{i=1}^N W_i = (1-2\varepsilon')N$$

all hold. It remains to verify the covariance constraint. By Claim C.9, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Combining this with Fact A.17, applied to the fixed vectors $\{Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{i=1}^N$, gives

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d,$$

where

$$\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}.$$

Since $Y_i = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ for every i, we have $\overline{Y} = \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \overline{Y}\right)\left(Y_i - \overline{Y}\right)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Taking C_A in Definition C.3 to be a sufficiently large universal constant, there exists a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Y_i - \overline{Y}\right)\left(Y_i - \overline{Y}\right)^\top = C_A\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top.$$

Thus the polynomial system A is satisfiable on this high-probability event.

Proof of sample complexity. We now set $\rho = \varepsilon'$ in the failure probabilities of Claim C.9. If $\beta n \le 1$, then

$$\delta = d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\varepsilon' N}{d}\right)\right).$$

Thus it is enough that

$$N \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right).$$

Since

$$\varepsilon' = \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}, 1/10\},$$

this requirement is implied, up to universal constants, by

$$nN \ge \min\left\{\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right), \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)\right\}.$$

If $1 < \beta n \le d/\varepsilon'$, then

$$\delta = d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\beta n \varepsilon' N}{d}\right)\right).$$

In this regime, $\beta n > 1$, so $\varepsilon' = 1/10$. Hence it suffices that

$$nN \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right).$$

Combining the two regimes gives the claimed sample-complexity condition. □

C.2 Identifiability

Lemma C.10 (Identifiability of A)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 4, if*

$$nN \ge \min\left\{\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right), \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\beta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)\right\},$$

then, with probability at least $1-\delta$, every pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying the SoS constraints A *yields*

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

Moreover, such a pseudoexpectation can be computed in time

$$O(Nnd) + (Nd + d^2)^{O(1)}.$$

Overview Now, we give a proof overview, and then, we will present the formal proof. Our goal is to show that every feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying A yields a mean estimate close to the true mean μ, namely

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

With $\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$, we decompose the error as the sum of $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2$, $\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\right\|_2$, $\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right)\right\|_2$, and $\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(\mu_i - \mu\right)\right\|_2$. We bound these four terms separately.

The first term measures how far an arbitrary feasible pseudo-solution can be from the truncated clean empirical mean. This is exactly the role of our improved SoS robust mean estimation lemma (Lemma B.7). Since the observed empirical means and the truncated clean empirical means differ on at most a $2\varepsilon'$-fraction of indices, and since both collections satisfy the covariance constraint at scale $\frac{1}{n} + \beta$, Lemma B.7 gives

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon'\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)}\right).$$

By the definition $\varepsilon' = \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}, 1/10\}$, this term is bounded by $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right)$.

The second term is the fluctuation of the truncated user-level empirical means around their own expectations. Since each user-level empirical mean has covariance at scale $\frac{1}{n}$, standard concentration gives, with high probability, $\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{nN}}\right)$. Under the assumed sample complexity, this term is dominated by

$$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

The third term is the bias introduced by truncation. From our satisfiability proof (Claim C.9), we have already shown that for each i, $\left\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}\right)$. Therefore,

$$\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right)\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

The fourth term comes from the allowed user-level mean shift. Since every good user satisfies $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$, we have

$$\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i - \mu\right)\right\|_2 \le \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}.$$

Combining the four bounds gives our desired error bound $\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\beta}\right)$. This establishes identifiability: any feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying A must output a mean close to the true mean. Finally, the running time follows from the standard constant-degree SoS optimization guarantee applied to the variables $\{W_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and the slack matrix B.

Formal proof Now, we present the formal proof.

Proof of Lemma C.10. **Proof of Correctness.** Condition on a realization of the truncated random variables Z_i^{tr}, and define

$$\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}.$$

By Lemma B.7, applied to the polynomial system A, the SoS algorithm outputs $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{Y}]$ satisfying

$$\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\overline{Y}\right]\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon'\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta\right)}\right). \tag{27}$$

C_A in Definition C.3 only affect the universal constant hidden in the $O(\cdot)$ notation. It remains to bound $\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2$. We decompose

$$\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le \left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\right\|_2 + \left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right)\right\|_2 + \left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i - \mu\right)\right\|_2. \tag{28}$$

For the first term of Eq. (28), we define $U_i := Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $X_i := \frac{1}{N}U_i$. Then $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are independent mean-zero random vectors, and

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right).$$

Since $\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|U_i\|_2^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\left\|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2^2\right]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \mathbb{E}\left[\operatorname{tr}\left[\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)^\top\right]\right] \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)^\top\right]\right] \\
&= \operatorname{tr}\left[\operatorname{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]\right] \\
&\leq \frac{d}{n}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\|X_i\|_2^2\right] &= \frac{1}{N^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\|U_i\|_2^2\right] \\
&\leq \frac{d}{nN}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Moreover, by Claim C.6 and Claim C.7,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\|U_i\|_2 &= \|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 \\
&\leq \|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\|_2 + \|\mu_i - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 \\
&\leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}}\right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, for all $i \in [N]$, we have

$$
\|X_i\|_2 \leq O\left(\frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}}\right).
$$

Applying Fact A.14, with probability at least $1-\delta$, we have

$$
\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{nN}} + \frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}}\log(1/\delta)\right).
$$

After setting $\rho = \varepsilon'$, our sample-complexity condition $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right) > \log(1/\delta)/\rho$. Hence $\frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}}\log(1/\delta)$ is absorbed by $\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{nN}}$, and therefore

$$
\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right)\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{nN}}\right). \tag{29}
$$

For the second term of Eq. (28), Claim C.7, applied with $\rho = \varepsilon'$, gives

$$
\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\right)\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}\right). \tag{30}
$$

For the third term of Eq. (28), the heterogeneity assumption gives

$$
\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\mu_i - \mu\right)\right\|_2 \leq \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}. \tag{31}
$$

Combining Eq. (28), Eq. (29), Eq. (30), and Eq. (31), we obtain

$$\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{nN}}+\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

Again, by our sample complexity condition $nN \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon'/n}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{nN}} &\le \sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{\frac{d}{\varepsilon'/n}\log\left(d/\delta\right)}}\\ &\le \sqrt{\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\varepsilon'/n}}}\\ &= \sqrt{\varepsilon'/n},\end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|\mu-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[Y\right]\right\|_2 \le\ & \left\|\mu-\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2+\left\|\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[Y\right]\right\|_2\\ &\le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right)+O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon'\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)}\right)\\ &\le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right).\end{aligned}$$

In the last line we used $\varepsilon' \le 1/10$, so $\sqrt{\varepsilon'\beta} \le O(\sqrt{\beta})$. Moreover,

$$\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon'}{n}} \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right),$$

because $\varepsilon' \le \max\{\varepsilon, n\beta\}$. Hence, we have

$$\left\|\mu-\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[Y\right]\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\beta}\right),$$

which completes the correctness proof.

Proof of running time. Regarding the running time, it takes $O(Nnd)$ time to compute the empirical mean $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of each user $i \in [N]$, each of which is computed by averaging n samples. We then solve the SoS relaxation associated with the polynomial system A in Definition C.3. By [Sch22], if a polynomial system has at most q variables and a polynomial axioms, then a degree-k SoS relaxation can be solved in time $(qa)^{O(k)}$.

We now count these quantities for A. The variables are $Y_1,\dots,Y_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $W_1,\dots,W_N \in \mathbb{R}$, and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$. Thus, the number of scalar variables is $q = Nd+N+d^2$.

The scalar polynomial axioms are as follows. The constraint $W_i(Y_i-x_i)=0$ contributes $O(Nd)$ scalar equality constraints, the Boolean constraints $W_i^2=W_i$ contribute $O(N)$ scalar equality constraints, the cardinality constraint $\sum_{i=1}^N W_i = (1-2\varepsilon')N$ contributes one scalar equality constraint,

and the matrix constraint $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Y_i-\overline{Y})(Y_i-\overline{Y})^\top = C_A\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta\right)\mathbb{I}_d - BB^\top$ contributes at most $O(d^2)$ scalar equality constraints. Therefore the total number of scalar polynomial axioms is at most $a = O(Nd+d^2)$.

Our SoS degree $k = 6$ used in the algorithm is a fixed constant. Hence the SoS step runs in time

$$(qa)^{O(k)} = (Nd+d^2)^{O(1)}$$

Combining everything together, the total running time is

$$O(Nnd) + (Nd+d^2)^{O(1)}.$$

Thus, Algorithm 2 runs in polynomial time. □

D Learning From Doubly Corrupted Batches

In this section, we focus on the adversarial model, where the goal is again to estimate an underlying mean parameter from data contributed by N users, each of whom provides a batch of n samples. At least a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of the users are considered "good". For each good user, the clean samples are drawn i.i.d. from the target distribution, but an α-fraction of the samples in that user's batch may be adversarially corrupted. The remaining ε-fraction of users may be entirely adversarial and may provide arbitrary batches.

Problem 5 (Adversarial)**.** *Consider parameters $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$, a target distribution P over $\mathbb{R}^d$ with mean μ and covariance $\Sigma \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$, and N users, each providing a batch of n data points in $\mathbb{R}^d$. We are guaranteed that at least a $(1-\varepsilon)$-fraction of these users are good; each good user $i \in \mathcal{G}$ draws n i.i.d. samples from P. Then an α-fraction of the n samples are replaced by arbitrary, adversarially chosen points. This is in addition to the entirely adversarial datasets of the remaining ε-fraction of users. Our goal is to robustly estimate the true mean μ in ℓ_2 distance.*

Equivalently, the observed data are generated through a two-level strong contamination process. One may imagine that all samples of all good users are first drawn independently from the target distribution P with mean μ and covariance bounded by $\mathbb{I}_d$. Then an adversary inspects the entire collection of samples. The adversary may replace the entire batches of an ε-fraction of users, and, for every remaining good user, may additionally replace up to an α-fraction of that user's samples by arbitrary points. We can only observe the final, possibly corrupted, batches.

Given these observed batches as input, we design a novel SoS-based algorithm solving Problem 5. We show that the algorithm runs in polynomial time and achieves the optimal ℓ_2-error rate $O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$ when $\alpha n \geq 4\log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)$.

Theorem D.1. *Let $c \in (0, 0.5)$ be a universal constant. Given $\varepsilon \in (0, c)$, $\alpha \in (0, c)$, and $n = o(d)$ samples from each of $N \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ users satisfying*

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha+\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right),$$

there exists an algorithm with running time

$$(Nnd+d^2)^{O(1)}$$

that solves Problem 5. The algorithm outputs $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ *satisfying*

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right)$$

with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We first explain the main idea before stating the two key lemmas used in the proof. A naive approach is to ignore the two-level structure of the corruption and treat all Nn samples as jointly $(\varepsilon + \alpha)$-corrupted. This would allow one to apply a standard robust mean estimation algorithm (Theorem B.1), but it would only give the weaker error $O(\sqrt{\varepsilon + \alpha})$. This approach is suboptimal because it does not use the fact that most users are only partially corrupted: for a good user, only an α-fraction of its samples are corrupted, while only an ε-fraction of users are completely unreliable.

Our algorithm exploits this hierarchical structure and seeks "good" samples from "good" users. At the sample level, we first seek a large set of samples whose empirical covariance is bounded. This step removes gross outliers caused by sample-level corruption. At the user level, we then aggregate the cleaned user-level means and enforce a second bounded-covariance condition across users. The second step is crucial because, after removing the sample-level corruptions, the cleaned mean of a good user's batch has covariance on the order of $1/n$. Thus the effect of the ε-fraction of entirely corrupted users is reduced by the batch size, leading to the term $\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$, while the within-user corruption contributes the term $\sqrt{\alpha}$.

To solve this problem, we use an SoS-based algorithm. Instead of directly formalizing the problem as a combinatorial two-level subset-selection problem, we propose a system of polynomial constraints (which will be defined in Definition D.2) whose purpose is to encode both sample-level and user-level refinement. The polynomial system introduces SoS indeterminates representing candidate cleaned samples and candidate cleaned user-level means. In the satisfiability proof, these variables are assigned by truncated clean random variables. We need to show:

1. **Satisfiability** (Lemma D.3): With probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, there exists an assignment of all the SoS indeterminates such that all constraints are satisfied.

2. **Identifiability** (Lemma D.4): With probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, any feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying the constraints yields an accurate estimate $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the true mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

Organization of the Remainder of This Section In the remainder of this section, we make this outline formal. In Section D.2, we define the SoS variables and polynomial constraints, state the two key lemmas—satisfiability (Lemma D.3) and identifiability (Lemma D.4)—and provide high-level proof overviews for both. Assuming these two lemmas, we then prove the main result of this section (Theorem D.1). In Sections D.3 and D.4, we prove satisfiability (Lemma D.3) and identifiability (Lemma D.4), respectively.

D.1 Notation

Let $\{x_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the observed samples after the two-level corruption process. Lowercase symbols such as $x_{i,j}$ denote samples. For each user i and sample index j, let $Z_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the clean sample random variable before any sample-level or user-level corruption, and let $z_{i,j}$ denote its realized value. The clean user-level empirical mean random variable is $Z_i := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n Z_{i,j}$. $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ denotes the truncated version of the clean sample random variable $Z_{i,j}$. We write $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} :=$

$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ for the empirical mean of the sample-level truncated random variables. If a second truncation is applied at the user level, we denote the resulting random variable by $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, so $\overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Lowercase symbols such as $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, z_i^{tr}, and $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ denote the corresponding realized values.

Let $\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the SoS variables representing candidate cleaned samples, and define the SoS user-level empirical mean $\mathsf{Z}_i := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$. Let $\{\mathsf{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be the SoS variables representing candidate cleaned user-level means. The variables $W_{i,j}$ and U_i are also SoS indeterminates: $W_{i,j}$ indicates whether sample (i,j) is selected as clean, and U_i indicates whether user i is selected as globally uncorrupted. The SoS variables $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$, Z_i, and Y_i are assigned by the corresponding truncated clean random variables.

D.2 Algorithmic Design and Proof Overview

In Section D.2.1, we define the SoS variables and polynomial constraints. In Section D.2.2, we state the satisfiability result (Lemma D.3) and give a proof overview. In Section D.2.3, we state the identifiability result (Lemma D.4) and give a proof overview. Finally, in Section D.2.4, we combine these results to prove Theorem D.1.

D.2.1 SoS Variables and Polynomial Constraints

Our algorithm is based on the following two-level polynomial system.

Definition D.2 (Polynomial system B)**.** *Let the notation be defined as in Section D.1. Let $\tau := \alpha/\varepsilon$. Let $C_3, C_4 > 0$ be sufficiently large universal constants. The polynomial system B consists of the following constraints over SoS indeterminates*

$$\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \{\mathsf{Z}_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \{\mathsf{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \subset \mathbb{R}^d,$$
$$\{W_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad \{U_i\}_{i=1}^{N} \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}.$$

Crude sample-level refinement:

$$\mathsf{Z}_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{32}$$

$$\overline{\mathsf{Z}} = \frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, \tag{33}$$

$$W_{i,j}^2 = W_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i \in [N],\ j \in [n], \tag{34}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i W_{i,j} = (1 - \Theta(\alpha))n\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i, \tag{35}$$

$$W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - x_{i,j}) = 0, \qquad \forall i \in [N],\ j \in [n], \tag{36}$$

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})^\top = C_3\mathbb{I}_d - B_1 B_1^\top, \tag{37}$$

User-level refinement:

$$U_i^2 = U_i, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{38}$$

$$\overline{\mathsf{Y}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathsf{Y}_i, \tag{39}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i = (1-\Theta(\varepsilon))N, \tag{40}$$

$$U_i(\mathsf{Y}_i - \mathsf{Z}_i) = 0, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{41}$$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top = C_4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d - B_2 B_2^\top. \tag{42}$$

Generally speaking, the crude sample-level refinement removes sample-level outliers within selected users. The variable $W_{i,j}$ indicates whether sample (i,j) is selected as clean. The agreement constraint Eq. (36) says that, if $W_{i,j}=1$, then the candidate cleaned sample $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ must agree with the observed sample $x_{i,j}$. The global cardinality constraint Eq. (35) says that, among all samples belonging to users selected at the user level, the system certifies a $(1-\Theta(\alpha))$-fraction of sample–user pairs. The $\Theta(\alpha)$ loss accounts for both the samples changed by the adversary and the clean samples modified by the sample-level truncation. Importantly, this constraint controls the number of certified samples globally across the selected users; it does not require every selected user to certify the same fraction of its samples. The sample-level covariance constraint Eq. (37) encodes the spectral bound

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})^\top \preceq C_3\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Here $C_3 > 0$ is a sufficiently large universal constant. It absorbs the constant slack coming from the matrix Chernoff bound in the satisfiability proof.

The user-level refinement works with the cleaned user-level means Y_i. The constraint Eq. (41) says that, for a selected user, the cleaned user-level mean Y_i must agree with the average Z_i of its candidate cleaned samples. The constraint Eq. (40) forces the system to select a large collection of users. The $\Theta(\varepsilon)$ loss accounts for both the ε-fraction of entirely adversarial users and the additional $O(\varepsilon)$-fraction of users that may be removed by the user-level truncation. Finally, the user-level covariance constraint Eq. (42) encodes the spectral bound

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top \preceq C_4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Here $C_4 > 0$ is a sufficiently large universal constant. The term $1/n$ reflects the variance reduction from averaging n samples within each user, while the slack parameter $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$ is chosen so that the matrix Chernoff failure probability is small under the desired sample complexity, without changing the final error rate.

Algorithm 3 SoS for solving adversarial (Problem 5).

1: **Input**: n samples from each user, $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{18}\right)$, $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{90}\right)$ satisfying $\varepsilon + 5\alpha < \frac{1}{18}$, and polynomial system B (crude and user-level refinement, see the full definition in Definition D.2).
2: Compute a pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying the constraints of the polynomial system B.
3: **Output:** $\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\overline{Y}\right] \in \mathbb{R}^d$.

The SoS algorithm (Algorithm 3) is now simple: compute a pseudoexpectation satisfying B, and output $\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}\right]$. To prove correctness, sample complexity, and running time, we analyze the satisfiability and identifiability of the polynomial system B.

D.2.2 Proof Overview of Satisfiability

Lemma D.3 (Satisfiability of B)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 5, with probability at least* $1-\delta$*, there exists an assignment to the variables*

$$\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \{\mathsf{Z}_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d, \qquad \{\mathsf{Y}_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}^d,$$

$$\{W_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]} \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad \{U_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset \mathbb{R}, \qquad B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$$

such that all constraints in B *are satisfied, as long as*

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

The formal proof is deferred to Section D.3. We construct a feasible assignment using suitable truncated clean random variables. We first truncate $Z_{i,j}$ around the true mean μ, obtaining $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. This sample-level truncation is just like the truncation step in Section B.1, where we modify only a small fraction of the clean samples to ensure the satisfiability of **crude sample-level refinement** in Definition D.2.

The technical novelty here is our second truncation step. We form the truncated empirical mean $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Since Z_i^{tr} is an average of n bounded-covariance random variables, its covariance is at scale $1/n$. To ensure the satisfiability of **user-level refinement** in Definition D.2, we apply a second truncation step. Namely, we truncate Z_i^{tr} around its expectation, obtaining $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. However, this second truncation step cannot be immediately derived from our prior approach, such as Claim B.4 under Section B.1. To be more specific, using Claim B.4, we can get with probability at least $1 - d\exp(-\Omega(N\varepsilon/d))$,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top \preceq C\frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Although it helps with satisfying Eq. (42) by assigning $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ to the SoS variable Y_i, we need too many samples to ensure $d\exp(-\Omega(N\varepsilon/d)) \leq \delta$: $N \geq \Omega\left(d/\varepsilon\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)$. Thus, the total sample complexity is

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon/n}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)$$

Our target accuracy is $\|\widehat{\mu}-\mu\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$. Therefore, this sample complexity is sub-optimal as $\alpha \geq \frac{\varepsilon}{n}$. To ensure optimal sample complexity up to logarithmic factors, we make some compromise to the tightness of the bound:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \overline{Z}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top \preceq C_4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d.$$

The choice $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$ makes the matrix Chernoff failure probability small under the desired total sample complexity $nN \geq \Omega((d/\alpha)\log(d/\delta))$, and it will not negatively influence the accuracy $\|\widehat{\mu}-\mu\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$ (which will be informally explained in Section D.2.3 and formally proved in Section D.4).

D.2.3 Proof Overview of Identifiability

Lemma D.4 (Identifiability of B)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 5, if*

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

then, with probability at least $1-\delta$*, every pseudoexpectation* $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ *satisfying the SoS constraints* B *yields*

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]-\mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right).$$

Moreover, such a pseudoexpectation can be computed in polynomial time.

The full proof is given in Section D.4. Now, we give a proof overview. Our goal is to show that every feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying B yields a mean estimate close to the true mean μ, namely

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]-\mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\alpha}\right).$$

Let

$$\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}, \qquad \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}.$$

Here $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ is the realized value of the twice-truncated user-level random variable $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. We first prove that $\overline{\mathsf{Y}}$ is close to $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ in the SoS sense. The distance is decomposed according to whether a user is both selected by the SoS solution and belongs to the deterministic reference set of good, untruncated users. Let $\mathcal{I}_i$ be the deterministic indicator that user i is genuinely good and satisfies $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Then we decompose $\overline{\mathsf{Y}} - \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ into two contributions:

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N (1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)(\mathsf{Y}_i - \widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}) \qquad \text{and} \qquad \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N U_i\mathcal{I}_i(\mathsf{Y}_i - \widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}).$$

The first term corresponds to users that are either not certified by the SoS solution or are not truly good. This term is controlled by the user-level bounded covariance constraint. Since at most an ε-fraction of users are bad, and since the selected user-level means have empirical covariance at scale $\frac{1}{n}+\tau$, the SoS Cauchy–Schwarz inequality gives a contribution of order

$$O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\alpha}\right),$$

where we used $\tau = \alpha/\varepsilon$.

The second term is the main new difficulty compared with the bounded mean-shift model. Even if a user is good, an α-fraction of its samples may still be corrupted. Therefore Y_i need not agree with the clean empirical mean $\widetilde{\mu}_i$ sample by sample. The sample-level constraints are designed precisely to control this contribution. The global sample-count constraint, together with the global bound on the number of disagreements between $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $x_{i,j}$ among reference users, implies that the total surviving bad mass is $O(\alpha)$.

Moreover, the agreement constraint Eq. (36) implies that whenever $W_{i,j}=1$ and $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} = x_{i,j}$, we have $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} = z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Thus, the discrepancy $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ can be nonzero only on pairs that are either not selected by $W_{i,j}$ or for which the observed sample disagrees with the truncated clean reference.

Applying the SoS Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, this second contribution is bounded by the product of two factors. The first factor is the surviving bad mass, which is at most $O(\alpha)$. The second factor is controlled using the sample-level bounded covariance constraint Eq. (37) together with the user-level covariance constraint and the concentration of the clean empirical averages. This yields a contribution of order $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$.

Combining these two bounds gives

$$\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}} - \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right)$$

in the SoS proof system. Finally, the twice-truncated empirical mean $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ is close to the true mean μ by the two truncation-bias bounds and vector Bernstein applied to the bounded variables $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Under the assumed sample complexity $nN \geq \Omega((d/\alpha)\log(d/\delta))$, this gives

$$\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\|_2 = O(\sqrt{\alpha}).$$

Therefore,

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right).$$

This establishes identifiability: any feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying B must output a mean close to the true mean. Finally, the running time follows from the standard constant-degree SoS optimization guarantee applied to the variables

$$\{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, W_{i,j}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]}, \qquad \{\mathsf{Y}_i, \mathsf{Z}_i, U_i\}_{i=1}^N, \qquad B_1, B_2.$$

D.2.4 Proof of Theorem D.1

By assuming that satisfiability (Lemma D.3) and identifiability (Lemma D.4) hold, we prove Theorem D.1.

Proof of Theorem D.1. We apply Lemma D.3 and Lemma D.4 with failure probability $\delta/2$. Since

$$\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta/2}\right) = O\left(\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

the assumed sample complexity still implies the hypotheses of both lemmas.

By Lemma D.3, with probability at least $1-\delta/2$, the polynomial system B is satisfiable. Hence the SoS relaxation has a feasible pseudoexpectation. By Lemma D.4, with probability at least $1-\delta/2$, every pseudoexpectation satisfying B yields

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}] - \mu\right\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right).$$

Therefore, by a union bound, with probability at least $1-\delta$, both events hold simultaneously. The algorithm outputs

$$\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}],$$

and hence satisfies the desired error guarantee. Under the parameter regime of Problem 5, the term $\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}$ is dominated by $\sqrt{\alpha}$, so the bound becomes $O(\sqrt{\alpha})$. □

D.3 Satisfiability

In this section, we give a formal proof for Lemma D.3, showing that our polynomial system B is satisfiable. We prove this under Lemma D.5 (the satisfiability of **crude sample-level refinement** in polynomial system B) and Lemma D.6 (the satisfiability of **user-level refinement** in polynomial system B).

Lemma D.5. *Let the notation be defined as in Section D.1. Let $\delta \in (0, 0.1)$ be the failure probability. Then, with at least $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)$ total number of samples, we can find a truncated random variable $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

1. $\frac{1}{nN}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{Z_{i,j}\neq Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\}} < \alpha$,
2. *with $\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$ and $\mu = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{i,j}\right]$, we have $\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right)$, and*
3. *the sample-level covariance constraint Eq. (37) holds if $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$ and Z_i are assigned the realized values of $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and Z_i^{tr}, respectively.*

Proof. We define

$$Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \begin{cases} Z_{i,j}, & \text{if } \left\|Z_{i,j} - \mu\right\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{\alpha}}, \\ \mu, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

Parts 1–3 respectively follow from Claim B.2, Claim B.3, and Claim B.4 by setting $\gamma = 1$, ε to be α, Z_j to be $Z_{i,j}$, Z_j^{tr} to be $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, and n to be nN. □

Lemma D.6. *Let the notation be defined as in Lemma D.5. Then, with at least $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\left(d/\delta\right)\right)$ total number of samples, we can find a truncated random variable $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that*

1. $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\}} < \varepsilon$,
2. *with $\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\right]$ and $\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right]$, we have $\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\varepsilon/n}\right)$, and*
3. *the user-level covariance constraint Eq. (42) holds if Y_i is assigned the realized value of $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$.*

Proof. We further make use of the sample-level truncated random variables $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ from Lemma D.5 (see Eq. (43)). For each user $i \in [N]$, we define

$$Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right].$$

We then define the user-level truncated random variable

$$Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \begin{cases} Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, & \text{if } \left\|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}, \\ \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

and write

$$\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right].$$

Part 1 and **Part 2** respectively follow from Claim B.2 and Claim B.3 by setting $\gamma = 1/n^6$, Z_j to be Z_i^{tr}, Z_j^{tr} to be $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, and n to be N. Below, we give a proof for **Part 3**.

We intend to apply the matrix Chernoff inequality (see Fact A.15). Thus, we define

$$M_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top. \tag{45}$$

By the definition of $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ (Eq. (44)), we know that for all $i \in [N]$,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 \leq & \left\|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 \\ \leq & O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}} + \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right) \\ \leq & O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{46}$$

where the first step follows from the triangle inequality, the second step follows from Eq. (44) and **Part 2**, and the last step follows from $\varepsilon < 1$ and $d > 1$. Additionally, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}\max_{i\in[N]}\left\|M_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 = & \max_{i\in[N]}\left\|\frac{1}{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top\right\|_2 \\ = & \frac{1}{N}\max_{i\in[N]}\left\|\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top\right\|_2 \\ = & \frac{1}{N}\max_{i\in[N]}\left\|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2 \\ \leq & O\left(\frac{d}{Nn\varepsilon}\right),\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (45), the third step follows from Fact A.13, and the last step follows from Eq. (46). This implies that $R = O\left(\frac{d}{Nn\varepsilon}\right)$ with $\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \preceq M_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} \preceq R \cdot \mathbb{I}_d$. Furthermore, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top\right] = & \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)^\top\right] \\ = & \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N \mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right] \\ \preceq & \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d,\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the linearity of expectation, the second step follows from the definition of covariance, and the last step follows from $\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$. Let

$$L := \frac{1}{n} + \tau.$$

[6] Since $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, we can see $\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$ by Fact A.16.

The preceding expectation bound gives

$$\left\| \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} M_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} \right] \right\|_2 \le \frac{1}{n} \le L.$$

Applying the matrix Chernoff inequality with a sufficiently large universal constant $C > 0$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr\left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)})(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)})^\top \not\preceq CL\mathbb{I}_d \right] &\le d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{L}{R} \right) \right) \\ &\le d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{Nn\varepsilon}{d} \left(\frac{1}{n} + \tau \right) \right) \right) \\ &\le d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{Nn\varepsilon\tau}{d} \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\varepsilon\tau = \alpha$, this failure probability is at most δ whenever

$$nN \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha} \log\left(d/\delta \right) \right).$$

Centering at the empirical mean can only decrease the empirical second-moment matrix. Thus, after increasing the universal constant in Eq. (42) if necessary, the user-level covariance constraint holds with probability at least $1 - \delta$. This establishes Part 3. □

Proof of Lemma D.3. Work on the intersection of the high-probability events in Lemmas D.5 and D.6. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq [N]$ be the users whose batches are not corrupted at the user level, and define

$$\mathcal{H} := \{ i \in \mathcal{G} : z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \}.$$

Since at most an ε-fraction of users are corrupted at the user level and at most an additional ε-fraction are modified by the second truncation, we have

$$|\mathcal{H}| \ge (1 - O(\varepsilon))N.$$

Choose a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ of cardinality

$$|\mathcal{S}| = (1 - \Theta(\varepsilon))N,$$

where the hidden constant is chosen sufficiently large. Set

$$U_i := \mathbb{1}_{\{i \in \mathcal{S}\}}, \qquad \mathsf{Z}_{i,j} := z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \qquad \mathsf{Z}_i := z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \qquad \mathsf{Y}_i := z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}.$$

Then Eqs. (32), (40), and (41) hold. Indeed, if $U_i = 1$, then $i \in \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, so $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$.

For each $i \in \mathcal{S}$, define

$$\mathcal{A}_i := \{ j \in [n] : z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} = x_{i,j} \}.$$

Because $i \in \mathcal{G}$, at most αn observations in batch i were modified by the sample-level adversary. Therefore,

$$|\mathcal{A}_i| \ge n - \alpha n - \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{ z_{i,j} \neq z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} \}}.$$

Summing over $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and using Part 1 of Lemma D.5,

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}} |\mathcal{A}_i| \geq n|\mathcal{S}| - \alpha n|\mathcal{S}| - \alpha N n$$
$$\geq (1 - \Theta(\alpha))n|\mathcal{S}|,$$

where the hidden constant is chosen sufficiently large and we used $|\mathcal{S}| = (1-\Theta(\varepsilon))N$. Select exactly $(1 - \Theta(\alpha))n|\mathcal{S}|$ pairs (i, j) with $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and $j \in \mathcal{A}_i$, and set $W_{i,j} = 1$ on these pairs and $W_{i,j} = 0$ elsewhere. Then Eqs. (34), (36), and (35) hold.

By Part 3 of Lemma D.5, the sample-level empirical covariance is bounded by $C_3\mathbb{I}_d$ after increasing C_3 if necessary. Centering at $\overline{\mathsf{Z}}$ can only decrease the empirical second-moment matrix, so Eq. (37) holds for a suitable positive-semidefinite slack matrix $B_1B_1^\top$. Likewise, Part 3 of Lemma D.6 and the same centering argument imply Eq. (42) for a suitable slack matrix $B_2B_2^\top$. Finally, Eqs. (33), (38), and (39) hold by construction. A union bound over the events in Lemmas D.5 and D.6 completes the proof. □

D.4 Identifiability

The goal of this section is to establish the identifiability of the true mean μ under the two-level corruption model captured by the polynomial system B. After showing in Section D.3 that the system is satisfiable with high probability, we now argue that any feasible pseudoexpectation consistent with the SoS constraints must correspond to an accurate estimate of μ.

At a high level, our proof proceeds in two stages. First, the global sample-count and agreement constraints ensure that, across the selected reference users, only an $O(\alpha)$-fraction of sample–user pairs can contribute discrepancies from the truncated clean reference values. The sample-level covariance constraint then controls the aggregate effect of these discrepancies.

Second, an ε-fraction of users may be entirely corrupted, but the remaining users have bounded deviations. Using the bounded-covariance conditions enforced by the SoS system, we show that the pseudoexpectation output $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]$ (and thus the estimator $\widehat{\mu}$) cannot deviate far from the mean of the clean users. The total deviation accumulates additively from the two levels of corruption: $\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}$ from user-level corruption and $\sqrt{\alpha}$ from the corruption of samples within each uncorrupted user.

Together, these steps show that any feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying the SoS constraints must yield a mean estimate $\widehat{\mu}$ satisfying

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right)$$

thereby establishing identifiability of μ under the hierarchical corruption model.

Proof of Lemma D.4. For every user $i \in [N]$, define the realized sample-level truncated empirical mean and the realized twice-truncated user-level empirical mean by

$$\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \tag{48}$$

$$\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}. \tag{49}$$

We also define their averages over users:

$$\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \tag{50}$$

$$\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}. \tag{51}$$

Here $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ is the realized value of $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, and $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ is the realized value of $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$.

We introduce a deterministic indicator

$$\mathcal{I}_i := \mathbb{1}_{\{\mathsf{GoodRef}_i\}}. \tag{52}$$

Here $\mathsf{GoodRef}_i$ is the deterministic event that user i is genuinely good and

$$z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, \qquad z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}.$$

Thus, $\mathcal{I}_i = 1$ means that user i is not corrupted at the user level and is not modified by the second truncation. By the batch-level corruption bound and the user-level truncation bound,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-\mathcal{I}_i) \le O(\varepsilon). \tag{53}$$

Moreover, among users with $\mathcal{I}_i = 1$, disagreement between $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $x_{i,j}$ can arise only from sample-level corruption or sample-level truncation. Therefore,

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right) \le O(\alpha). \tag{54}$$

By the definition of the ℓ_2 norm, we have

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{4}}\left\{\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4 = \left\langle\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\right\}$$

Next, by combining Eq. (39) and Eq. (51), we can get

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{4}}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\left\langle\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\\ =\left(\dfrac{1}{N}\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)\left\langle\mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right.\\ \left.+\ \dfrac{1}{N}\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left\langle\mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\end{array}\right\}$$

Applying the SoS inequality $(a+b)^2 \le 2a^2+2b^2$, which follows from

$$2a^2+2b^2-(a+b)^2 = (a-b)^2 \ge 0,$$

we obtain

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{4}}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4 \le 2\left(\dfrac{1}{N}\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)\left\langle\mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\\ \qquad\qquad +\ 2\left(\dfrac{1}{N}\displaystyle\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left\langle\mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\end{array}\right\} \tag{55}$$

Considering the first term of Eq. (55), we use the SoS Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (Fact A.4) to obtain

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}\left\{\begin{aligned}&\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\\ \leq&\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)^2\right)\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\right)\end{aligned}\right\}. \tag{56}$$

Regarding $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)^2$, we have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{2}\left\{\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)^2&=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)\\&=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\big(1-U_i+U_i(1-\mathcal{I}_i)\big)\\&\leq\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i)+\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-\mathcal{I}_i)\\&\leq O(\varepsilon).\end{aligned}\right\}, \tag{57}$$

where the first equality follows from $U_i^2=U_i$ and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_i$ is a deterministic indicator. The final inequality follows from Eq. (40) and Eq. (53). Furthermore, defining $b:=\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, we have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{4}\left\{\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},b\right\rangle^2\\=&\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}+b-b,b\right\rangle^2\\=&\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(\left\langle \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},b\right\rangle-\langle\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\mathsf{Y}_i,b\rangle+\|b\|_2^2\right)^2\\\leq&\frac{3}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},b\right\rangle^2+\langle\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\mathsf{Y}_i,b\rangle^2+\|b\|_2^4\\=&3\left(b^\top\Sigma_{\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}}b+b^\top\Sigma_{\mathsf{Y}}b+\|b\|_2^4\right)\end{aligned}\right\}, \tag{58}$$

where the second step follows from the linearity of inner product, the third step follows from Fact A.6, and the last step follows from the definition of the (empirical) covariance. In addition, by the user-level covariance bound for the twice-truncated reference means, the empirical covariance $\Sigma_{\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}}$ satisfies:

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{2}\left\{b^\top\Sigma_{\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}}b\leq\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\|b\|_2^2\right\} \tag{59}$$

hold with high probability. Similarly, by Eq. (42) and Fact A.5, we have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{2}\left\{b^\top\Sigma_{\mathsf{Y}}b\leq\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\|b\|_2^2\right\}. \tag{60}$$

Combining Eq. (58), Eq. (59), and Eq. (60), we have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}_{4}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},b\right\rangle^2\\ \leq 3\left(4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\end{array}\right\}. \tag{61}$$

We further combine Eq. (56), Eq. (57), and Eq. (61):

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}_{6}\left\{\begin{array}{l}2\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(1-U_i\mathcal{I}_i)\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\\ \leq O(\varepsilon)\left(\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right).\end{array}\right\}. \tag{62}$$

This completes the bound for the first term of Eq. (55). Now, we consider the second term of Eq. (55). We have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}_{4}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\\ =\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)\end{array}\right\}, \tag{63}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (49), Eq. (32), and the fact that $\mathcal{I}_i = 1$ implies $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Now, with any arbitrary i, j, we consider $\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle$. We give the following claim:

Claim D.7. *We define $A := \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Then, we have*

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}_{2}\left\{\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},A\right\rangle=\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\right\}}\right)\cdot\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},A\right\rangle\right\}.$$

Proof. It suffices to show

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}_{2}\left\{0=-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\left\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\right\}}\cdot\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},A\right\rangle\right\}. \tag{64}$$

If $\mathbb{1}_{\left\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\right\}} = 0$, then Eq. (64) holds. If $\mathbb{1}_{\left\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\right\}} = 1$, then we have $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} = x_{i,j}$. By our polynomial constraint (Eq. (36)), we have $W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-x_{i,j}) = 0$. Therefore, we have $W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}) = 0$. Taking inner product with A gives us $W_{i,j}\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},A\rangle = 0$. □

Therefore, combining Eq. (63) and Claim D.7, we have

$$
\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}
\left\{
\begin{aligned}
& \left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}, \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2 \\
\leq\ & \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n U_i\mathcal{I}_i\Big(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\Big)\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2 \\
=\ & \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \left(U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\right)^2\right) \\
& \cdot \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\right) \\
=\ & \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)^2\right) \\
& \cdot \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\right) \\
=\ & \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\right) \\
& \cdot \left(\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}, \overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2\right)
\end{aligned}
\right\}, \tag{65}
$$

where the second step follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see Fact A.4), the third step follows from $U_i = U_i^2$ (see Eq. (38)), the definition of the indicator function $\mathcal{I}_i$, and the last step follows from

$$
\begin{aligned}
\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)^2 &= 1+W_{i,j}^2\mathbb{1}^2_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}-2W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}} \\
&= 1+W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}-2W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}} \\
&= 1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}.
\end{aligned}
$$

Considering the first factor $\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)$ in Eq. (65), we have

$$
\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{2}}\left\{\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left(1-W_{i,j}\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i\mathcal{I}_i(1-W_{i,j})+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i\mathcal{I}_iW_{i,j}\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&\leq\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i(1-W_{i,j})+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\left(n\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i-\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_iW_{i,j}\right)+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\left(n\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i-(1-\Theta(\alpha))n\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\right)+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&=\Theta(\alpha)\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&=\Theta(\alpha)(1-\Theta(\varepsilon))+\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathcal{I}_i\left(1-\mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}=x_{i,j}\}}\right)\\
&\leq O(\alpha)+O(\alpha)\\
&=O(\alpha)
\end{aligned}\right\},
\tag{66}
$$

where the second step follows from $\mathcal{I}_i, U_i, W_{i,j}\in\{0,1\}$, the fourth step follows from $\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_iW_{i,j}=(1-\Theta(\alpha))n\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i$ (Eq. (35)), the sixth step follows from $\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i=(1-\Theta(\varepsilon))N$ (Eq. (40)), and the seventh step follows from Eq. (54).

Considering the second part $\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle^2$ of Eq. (65), we define $c:=$

$\overline{\mathsf{Y}} - \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ and have

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{4}}\left\{\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},c\right\rangle^2\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-c+c,c\right\rangle^2\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-c,c\right\rangle+\langle c,c\rangle\right)^2\\
&=\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle-\left\langle z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},c\right\rangle+\|c\|_2^2\right)^2\\
&\le\frac{3}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle^2+\frac{3}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},c\right\rangle^2+3\|c\|_2^4
\end{aligned}\right\},\tag{67}$$

where the second and the third step follow from the linearity of inner product and the last step follows from Fact A.6. In particular, considering the first term of Eq. (67), we have

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}\left\{\begin{aligned}
&\frac{3}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle^2\\
&\le\frac{6}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Z}},c\right\rangle^2+\frac{6}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle^2\\
&=6c^\top\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Z}}\right)\left(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-\overline{\mathsf{Z}}\right)^\top c+\frac{6}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle^2\\
&\le 12\|c\|_2^2+\frac{6}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}},c\right\rangle^2\\
&\le\ \|c\|_2^2\left(12+\frac{6}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\overline{\mathsf{Y}}\right\|_2^2\right)\\
&\le 12\|c\|_2^2\left(1+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\|c\|_2^2\right)
\end{aligned}\right\},\tag{68}$$

where the second step follows from the definition of the inner product, the third step follows from our polynomial constraint (see Eq. (37)) and Fact A.5, the fourth step follows from the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality (see Fact A.4), and the last step follows from the triangle inequality. Considering the second term of Eq. (67), we have

$$\mathsf{B}^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{2}}\left\{\begin{aligned}
&\frac{3}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},c\right\rangle^2=3c^\top\Sigma_z^{\mathrm{tr}}c\\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\le 6\|c\|_2^2
\end{aligned}\right\},\tag{69}$$

where Σ_z^{tr} denotes the empirical second-moment matrix of the realized sample-level truncated values $\{z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\}_{i\in[N],j\in[n]}$ centered at $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. This matrix is controlled by the sample-level truncation/concentration bounds, up to the harmless shift between $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Combining Eq. (67), Eq. (68), and Eq. (69), we can bound the second part of Eq. (65) as follows:

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}\left\{\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left\langle \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}-z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},c\right\rangle^2\le 12\left\|c\right\|_2^2\left(1.5+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+1.25\left\|c\right\|_2^2\right)\right\}. \tag{70}$$

Therefore, combining Eq. (66) and Eq. (70), we can bound the Eq. (65) as follows:

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}\left\{\begin{array}{l}2\left(\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}U_i\mathcal{I}_i\left\langle \mathsf{Y}_i-\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)},\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\rangle\right)^2\\ \le O(\alpha)\left\|c\right\|_2^2\left(1+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|c\right\|_2^2\right).\end{array}\right\}. \tag{71}$$

Combining the bounds of both terms (Eq. (62) and Eq. (71)) of Eq. (55) together, we have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}\left\{\begin{array}{l}\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\\ \le O(\varepsilon)\left(4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\\ +O(\alpha)\left(6\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+4\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+5\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\end{array}\right\}. \tag{72}$$

By Lemma B.7, by taking $\varepsilon+\alpha$ as the given level of corruption, we also have

$$\mathsf{B}\Big|^{\frac{\mathsf{Z}_{i,j},\mathsf{Y}_i,W_{i,j},U_i,B_1,B_2}{6}}\left\{\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\le O(\varepsilon+\alpha)\left(4\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\right\}. \tag{73}$$

Now, we consider the bound on the pseudoexpectation of Eq. (72):

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\\ &\le\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\begin{array}{l}O(\varepsilon)\left(4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\\ +O(\alpha)\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\left(6+4\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+5\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right)\end{array}\right]\\ &\le O(\varepsilon)\left(4\left(\frac{1}{n}+\tau\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\right)\\ &+O(\alpha)\left(6\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+4\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+5\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\right)\end{aligned} \tag{74}$$

where the second step follows from the linearity of pseudoexpectation (see Fact A.7). In particular, by Fact A.8, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]\le\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]}\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]} \tag{75}$$

Considering $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]$, by Eq. (73), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right] &\le \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\left(4\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2+\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\right]\\ &\le O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\left(4\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right)\right),\end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from Eq. (73) and the second step follows from the linearity of pseudo-expectation (see Fact A.7). This implies that

$$\left(1-O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\le O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right].$$

For sufficiently small universal $\varepsilon+\alpha$, we may absorb the left-hand factor and obtain Eq. (76) below.

Therefore, we can get

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]=O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]. \tag{76}$$

By **Part 1** of Fact A.9, we can get

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]^2\le\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]$$

so that combining with Eq. (76) gives us

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]\le O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right) \tag{77}$$

Furthermore, combining Eq. (77) with Eq. (76) again implies

$$\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Z}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]}\le\sqrt{O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\cdot O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)}=O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right). \tag{78}$$

Therefore, combining Eq. (74), Eq. (78), and Eq. (75), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\\ &\le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\varepsilon\tau+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\\ &\quad+O\left(\alpha\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\right)\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]}\\ &=O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+O\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\\ &\quad+O\left(\alpha\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\right)\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]},\end{aligned}$$

where the equality uses $\tau=\alpha/\varepsilon$. For sufficiently small universal $\varepsilon+\alpha$, the fourth-moment term on the right-hand side can be absorbed into the left-hand side. Consequently,

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]\le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]+O\left(\alpha\left(\varepsilon+\alpha\right)\right)\sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]}.$$

Let $b := O(\alpha(\varepsilon+\alpha))$, $c := O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]$, and $x := \sqrt{\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right]}$. To make $x^2 - bx - c \le 0$, we need

$$\frac{b-\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2} \le x \le \frac{b+\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}$$

so that

$$x^2 \le \max\left\{\left(\frac{b-\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\right)^2, \left(\frac{b+\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\right)^2\right\}.$$

By the definition of b, c, we know that $b, \sqrt{b^2+4c} \ge 0$, so

$$\max\left\{\left(\frac{b-\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\right)^2, \left(\frac{b+\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\right)^2\right\} = \left(\frac{b+\sqrt{b^2+4c}}{2}\right)^2.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right] &\le \left(\frac{O(\alpha(\varepsilon+\alpha)) + \sqrt{O(\alpha(\varepsilon+\alpha))^2 + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]}}{2}\right)^2 \\ &\le O\left(\alpha^2(\varepsilon+\alpha)^2\right) + O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right].\end{aligned}$$

Since, by **Part 1** of Fact A.9, we have

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^4\right] \ge \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]^2,$$

we can get

$$\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]^2 - O\left(\alpha^2(\varepsilon+\alpha)^2\right) - O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right] \le 0.$$

Similarly, we can get

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right] &\le \frac{O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right) + \sqrt{O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right)^2 + O\left(\alpha^2(\varepsilon+\alpha)^2\right)}}{2} \\ &= O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha+\varepsilon\alpha+\alpha^2\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right).\end{aligned}$$

In addition, by **Part 3** of Fact A.9, we have

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}\right]-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2 \le \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\left\|\overline{\mathsf{Y}}-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\right]$$

$$\leq O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\alpha\right). \tag{79}$$

It remains to compare the twice-truncated empirical mean $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ with the true mean μ. First, for each sample (i,j), we truncate the clean random variable $Z_{i,j}$ and obtain $Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$. Then, for each user i, we define

$$Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}},$$

and apply a second, user-level truncation to obtain $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Let

$$\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\right], \qquad \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \mathbb{E}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right],$$

and define the empirical average of the twice-truncated user-level variables by

$$\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}.$$

By the triangle inequality,

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu\right\|_2 \leq \left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 + \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right\|_2. \tag{80}$$

We first bound the empirical fluctuation term. Define

$$X_i := Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}, \qquad i\in[N].$$

Then $\mathbb{E}[X_i]=0$. Moreover, by the user-level truncation,

$$\|X_i\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}\right)$$

almost surely. Also, since $\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\|X_i\|_2^2\right] = \mathrm{tr}\left[\mathrm{Cov}\left[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right]\right] \leq \frac{d}{n}.$$

Applying Fact A.14 to $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^N$, with probability at least $1-\delta$, we get

$$\left\|\sum_{i=1}^{N}\left(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right)\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{Nd\log(1/\delta)}{n}}+\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}\log(1/\delta)\right).$$

Dividing both sides by N, we obtain

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d\log(1/\delta)}{Nn}}+\frac{1}{N}\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\varepsilon}}\log(1/\delta)\right).$$

Under the sample-complexity assumption

$$Nn \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right),$$

the empirical fluctuation term is bounded by

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right). \tag{81}$$

Next, by the truncation-bias bounds from Lemma D.5 and Lemma D.6, we have

$$\left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\alpha}\right), \qquad \left\|\mu^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right).$$

Combining these two bounds with Eq. (80) and Eq. (81), we get, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \alpha\right). \tag{82}$$

In the parameter regime of Problem 5, where $\alpha \gtrsim \varepsilon/n$, this gives

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \le O(\alpha).$$

Therefore, we can bound the output of the SoS algorithm with the true mean μ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\mathrm{Y}\right] - \mu\right\|_2^2 &= \left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\mathrm{Y}\right] - \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} + \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \\
&\le 2\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}\left[\mathrm{Y}\right] - \widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2 + 2\left\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right\|_2^2 \\
&\le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \alpha\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma D.4. □

D.5 Technical Difficulties of Obtaining Sub-Gaussian Rate for Double Truncation

A natural first attempt is to combine the double-corruption analysis from Section 2.2 with existing stability-based techniques for robust mean estimation under local and global corruptions [DKP20, NGS24, PP25]. These works obtain nearly sub-Gaussian sample complexity by proving that, with high probability, the clean samples contain a large stable subset; see, for example, [DKP20, Theorem 1.4 and Proposition 1.5] and [PP25, Theorem 3 and Proposition 8]. However, this stable-subset construction cannot be used as a black box in our double-truncation framework. Their argument is based on a data-dependent selection of a stable subset, while our SoS satisfiability proof uses a deterministic truncation: clean samples $z_{i,j}$ with large $\|z_{i,j} - \mu\|_2$ are replaced by μ. This deterministic operation preserves the product structure of the clean data. In particular, after the first truncation, the batch mean $z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ is still an average of independent truncated samples, so it has covariance at scale $1/n$. This property is essential for the second-level truncation. By contrast, if one applies a data-dependent stable-subset construction inside the first level, the resulting objects are no longer simple averages of independent truncated samples. Consequently, the second-level truncation argument from Section 2.2 cannot be applied directly.

A second attempt is to apply the stable-subset theorem separately inside each batch. This would preserve independence across batches and would allow us to run a second-level truncation on the resulting batch representatives. However, it would require each batch to contain enough samples to certify stability on its own, namely $n \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d+\log(N/\delta)}{\alpha}\right)$. This is incompatible with our

goal of handling the regime $n = o(d)$ and total sample complexity $nN \le \widetilde{O}\left(\frac{d}{\alpha}\right)$. Thus, proving a high-dimensional stable subset separately within every batch is too expensive.

A third attempt is to adapt the minimax-duality arguments from [DKP20, PP25] directly to our two-level truncation setting. This is where the main technical divergence occurs. With only one level of corruption, [DKP20, PP25] relax the subset selection to weights vector $w \in \Delta_{n,\alpha} := \left\{w \in \mathbb{R}^n : 0 \le w_j \le 1/((1-\alpha)n); \sum_{j\in[n]} w_j = 1\right\}$, so the covariance objective has the bilinear form

$$\min_{w\in\Delta_{n,\varepsilon}} \max_{M\in\mathcal{M}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i \langle M, (x_i-\mu)(x_i-\mu)^\top\rangle,$$

where $\mathcal{M} := \{M : M \succeq 0, \operatorname{tr}[M] = 1\}$. Because this objective is linear in w and linear in M, one can apply minimax duality to exchange the order of $\min_w$ and $\max_M$. This exchange is crucial: for each fixed M, one can remove the samples with large quadratic scores $(x_i-\mu)^\top M(x_i-\mu)$, and then argue that there exists a single large subset whose covariance is bounded in all directions.

In our two-level setting, the user-level covariance constraint is imposed on cleaned batch means. If we try to imitate the same argument, the natural object is $\mathsf{Z}_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} W_{i,j}(z_{i,j}-\mu_i)$, and the corresponding user-level quadratic form is $\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i\langle M, \mathsf{Z}_i\mathsf{Z}_i^\top\rangle$. Expanding this expression gives

$$\frac{1}{n^2}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j,k=1}^{n} U_i W_{i,j} W_{i,k}\langle z_{i,j}-\mu_i, M(z_{i,k}-\mu_i)\rangle.$$

Thus the objective contains cross terms $W_{i,j}W_{i,k}$. It is no longer bilinear in the selection variables and the dual matrix M. Consequently, the minimax-duality step used in the one-level arguments does not apply.

D.6 Technical Difficulties of Sequential Filtering

We give a simple example illustrating an obstruction to first applying a sample-level filtering algorithm and then filtering users. For simplicity, we work in one dimension and set the sample-level corruption rate to $\alpha = 0$. Let $\varepsilon < 1/2$, and define

$$p := \frac{\varepsilon}{2(1-\varepsilon)}, \qquad a := \frac{1}{\sqrt{p}} = \sqrt{\frac{2(1-\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon}}.$$

Consider the following two instances.

Instance $+$. The clean distribution is

$$P_+ = (1-p)\delta_0 + p\delta_a,$$

where δ_x denotes the point mass at x. Let K_+ denote the realized number of clean samples equal to $+a$. An ε-fraction of users are corrupted, and the adversary fills the corrupted batches with exactly K_+ copies of $-a$, placing all remaining corrupted samples at 0.

Instance $-$. The clean distribution is the reflection of P_+,

$$P_- = (1-p)\delta_0 + p\delta_{-a}.$$

Let K_- denote the realized number of clean samples equal to $-a$. An ε-fraction of users are corrupted, and the adversary fills the corrupted batches with exactly K_- copies of $+a$, placing all remaining corrupted samples at 0.

Both clean distributions satisfy the covariance assumption. Indeed,

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P_+}[X] = pa = \sqrt{p}, \qquad \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P_-}[X] = -\sqrt{p},$$

while

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P_\pm}[X^2] = pa^2 = 1.$$

Consequently,

$$\mathop{\mathrm{Var}}_{P_\pm}[X] = 1 - p \le 1.$$

Let $M := Nn$ denote the total number of samples. Since there are $(1-\varepsilon)M$ samples belonging to clean users,

$$K_\pm \sim \mathrm{Bin}\big((1-\varepsilon)M, p\big),$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[K_\pm] = (1-\varepsilon)Mp = \frac{\varepsilon M}{2}.$$

By a Chernoff bound, for any fixed $\delta \in (0,1)$,

$$\Pr\left[\left|K_\pm - \frac{\varepsilon M}{2}\right| \ge \delta\frac{\varepsilon M}{2}\right] \le 2\exp\left(-\Omega(\delta^2\varepsilon M)\right).$$

Hence, with high probability,

$$K_\pm = (1 \pm \delta)\frac{\varepsilon M}{2} < \varepsilon M,$$

so the corrupted users contain enough sample locations for the adversary to realize the construction.

Now suppose that the first-stage filtering algorithm ignores the user identities and only sees the pooled samples. Since K_+ and K_- have the same distribution, we may couple the two instances so that

$$K_+ = K_- =: K.$$

Conditioned on this realization, the pooled samples in *both* instances consist of exactly

$$K \text{ copies of } +a, \qquad K \text{ copies of } -a, \qquad M - 2K \text{ copies of } 0.$$

Thus, writing

$$q := \frac{K}{M},$$

the pooled empirical distribution in either instance is

$$\widehat{Q}_K = (1-2q)\delta_0 + q\delta_a + q\delta_{-a}.$$

In particular, a procedure that ignores the batch structure receives exactly the same pooled data in the two instances.

The pooled empirical distribution is symmetric around zero, so

$$\mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{\widehat{Q}_K}[X] = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\mathop{\mathrm{Var}}_{\widehat{Q}_K}[X] = 2qa^2.$$

Since, with high probability,

$$q = (1 \pm o(1))\frac{\varepsilon}{2}$$

and

$$a^2 = \frac{2(1-\varepsilon)}{\varepsilon},$$

we obtain

$$\operatorname*{Var}_{\widehat{Q}_K}[X] = 2(1-\varepsilon)(1 \pm o(1)).$$

Hence, for sufficiently small ε, the pooled empirical variance is close to 2, whereas the variance of either clean distribution is at most 1. A covariance-based sample-level filtering procedure must therefore modify the sample set before reaching a stopping condition with variance close to the clean covariance bound.

To see why this forces the filter to remove clean samples in one of the two instances, let ξ_+ and ξ_- denote the fractions of the total sample set removed from the atoms at $+a$ and $-a$, respectively, and let R denote the total fraction of samples retained by the filter. For any acceptable filtering procedure we have

$$R = 1 - O(\varepsilon).$$

The empirical variance of the retained distribution can be lower bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}(X) &= a^2\left(\frac{2q-\xi_+-\xi_-}{R} - \frac{(\xi_+-\xi_-)^2}{R^2}\right) \\
&\geq a^2\left(\frac{2q-\xi_+-\xi_-}{R} - \frac{(\xi_++\xi_-)^2}{R^2}\right) \\
&= a^2\left(\frac{2q-s}{R} - \frac{s^2}{R^2}\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $s := \xi_+ + \xi_-$, and the inequality follows from $|\xi_+ - \xi_-| \leq \xi_+ + \xi_-$. Suppose, towards a contradiction, that

$$\xi_+ + \xi_- = o(\varepsilon).$$

Since the filtering procedure retains $1 - O(\varepsilon)$ of the samples, we have $R = 1 - O(\varepsilon)$. Moreover, with high probability, $q = (1 \pm o(1))\varepsilon/2$. Therefore,

$$a^2\frac{2q-s}{R} = 2 - o(1),$$

while

$$a^2\frac{s^2}{R^2} = o(1).$$

Hence

$$\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}(X) \geq 2 - o(1).$$

Thus, for any fixed $\tau < 1$ and sufficiently small ε, the filter cannot reach the stopping condition $\widehat{\mathrm{Var}}(X) \leq 1 + \tau$ while removing only $o(\varepsilon)$ mass from the two extreme components. Consequently, it must remove

$$\xi_+ + \xi_- = \Omega(\varepsilon),$$

and hence at least one of the components at $+a$ or $-a$ loses $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ mass.

The crucial point is that the first-stage filtering procedure sees exactly the same pooled samples in the two instances and therefore cannot determine which extreme component is genuinely clean.

Thus, removing $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ mass from either extreme component necessarily removes $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ clean mass in one of the two instances. Thus, in at least one of the two instances, the sample-level filtering step necessarily discards too many clean samples.

Importantly, this error cannot be repaired by the subsequent user-level filtering step. Even if the second-stage filter performs optimally and perfectly identifies and removes all corrupted users, the clean samples discarded in the first stage are already lost. Since these samples lie at distance

$$a = \Theta(\varepsilon^{-1/2}),$$

removing $\Omega(\varepsilon)$ clean mass from the minority component changes the mean by at least

$$\Omega(\varepsilon) \cdot \Theta(\varepsilon^{-1/2}) = \Omega(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

Thus, even after all corrupted users are subsequently removed, the estimator still suffers $\Omega(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ error solely because the first-stage sample filter discarded too many clean samples.

Equivalently, the two possible clean means satisfy

$$\left| \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P_+}[X] - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{P_-}[X] \right| = 2\sqrt{p} = \Theta(\sqrt{\varepsilon}).$$

Therefore, a sample-level refinement chosen without using the user structure may irreversibly incur $\Omega(\sqrt{\varepsilon})$ error, despite there being no sample-level corruption at all. This illustrates the fundamental obstacle to sequential filtering: the sample-level filter must commit to a refinement before knowing which users are corrupted. Our SoS formulation instead solves jointly for the sample indicators $W_{i,j}$ and user indicators U_i, so that the sample-level and user-level refinements are chosen simultaneously.

E Learning From Doubly-Corrupted and Heterogeneous Batches

In this section we combine the two sources of statistical difficulty studied in the preceding sections. At the user level, an ε-fraction of batches may be fully adversarial. At the sample level, even inside an uncorrupted batch, an α-fraction of samples may be replaced by arbitrary points. Finally, the uncorrupted users may be heterogeneous: user i has mean μ_i, and these means are only assumed to lie within distance $\sqrt{\beta}$ of the target mean μ.

Problem 2 (Robust mean estimation under double corruption and heterogeneous data)**.** *Let $\alpha, \varepsilon \in (0, 0.5)$ and $\beta \geq 0$. There are N users. User i has n i.i.d. samples $\{z_{i,j} : j \in [n]\}$ from a distribution P_i with mean $\mu_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and covariance $\Sigma_i \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$. We assume that there exists a target mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that, for every $i \in [N]$, $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$. The samples are then (ε, α)-double corrupted by an adversary. The goal is to estimate μ in ℓ_2 distance.*

Definition E.1 (Polynomial system D)**.** *Let $C_D > 0$ be sufficiently large universal constants, and let $c_\rho > 0$ be a sufficiently small universal constant. Define*

$$\eta := \max\{\alpha, \beta\}, \qquad \rho := \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\eta\}, c_\rho\}, \qquad \tau := \frac{\eta}{\rho}.$$

For each $i \in [N]$ and $j \in [n]$, let $x_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the observed data point. The variable $W_{i,j} \in \{0, 1\}$ indicates whether the sample (i, j) is selected as an observed agreement, and the variable $U_i \in \{0, 1\}$

indicates whether user i is selected at the user level. The SoS variable $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the cleaned sample-level point, and

$$\mathsf{Z}_i := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}$$

represents the cleaned empirical mean of user i. The SoS variable $\mathsf{Y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ represents the cleaned user-level mean used for the final aggregation. Let $B_1, B_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ be matrix slack variables.

The polynomial system D consists of the following constraints:

Crude sample-level refinement:

$$\mathsf{Z}_i = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{83}$$

$$\overline{\mathsf{Z}} = \frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, \tag{84}$$

$$W_{i,j}^2 = W_{i,j}, \qquad \forall i \in [N],\ j \in [n], \tag{85}$$

$$W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - x_{i,j}) = 0, \qquad \forall i \in [N],\ j \in [n], \tag{86}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n} U_i W_{i,j} = (1 - \Theta(\eta))n\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i, \tag{87}$$

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - \overline{\mathsf{Z}})^\top = C_D\mathbb{I}_d - B_1B_1^\top. \tag{88}$$

User-level refinement:

$$U_i^2 = U_i, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{89}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} U_i = (1 - \Theta(\rho))N, \tag{90}$$

$$U_i(\mathsf{Y}_i - \mathsf{Z}_i) = 0, \qquad \forall i \in [N], \tag{91}$$

$$\overline{\mathsf{Y}} = \frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathsf{Y}_i, \tag{92}$$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})(\mathsf{Y}_i - \overline{\mathsf{Y}})^\top = C_D\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d - B_2B_2^\top. \tag{93}$$

E.1 Satisfiability

We prove that the polynomial system D is satisfiable with high probability. We view all users as initially clean: for each $i \in [N]$, the clean samples $Z_{i,1}, \ldots, Z_{i,n}$ are drawn independently from P_i, where $\mathbb{E}[Z_{i,j}] = \mu_i$, $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_{i,j}] \preceq \mathbb{I}_d$, and $\|\mu_i - \mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$. After these clean batches are generated, the adversary may replace an ε-fraction of entire batches and, in each remaining batch, may replace an α-fraction of samples.

Lemma E.2 (Satisfiability of D)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 2, with probability at least* $1-\delta$*, there exists an assignment to the SoS variables* $W_{i,j}, \mathsf{Z}_{i,j}, \mathsf{Y}_i, U_i, B_1, B_2$ *in Definition E.1 satisfying all constraints of* D*, as long as*

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Proof. We first define the two truncation steps, then construct a feasible assignment for the polynomial system.

Sample-level truncation. For every $i \in [N]$ and $j \in [n]$, we define

$$Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} := \begin{cases} Z_{i,j}, & \text{if } \|Z_{i,j}-\mu_i\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{d/\eta}, \\ \mu_i, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Let $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}]$. Applying Claim C.6 to the Nn clean sample-level variables, with covariance scale $\gamma = 1$ and truncation parameter η, gives with probability at least $1-\exp\left(-\frac{\eta N}{4}\right)$,

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{Z_{i,j}\neq Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\}} \leq \eta. \tag{94}$$

To ensure $\exp\left(-\frac{\eta N}{4}\right) \leq \delta/4$, we need $N \geq \frac{4}{\eta}\log(4/\delta)$. Since $n = o(d)$ and $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$, we can get

$$\begin{aligned} nN &\geq \Omega\left(\frac{n}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \frac{4n}{\eta}\log(4/\delta). \end{aligned}$$

By Claim C.7, we have for every $i \in [N]$,

$$\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_i\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\eta}). \tag{95}$$

Claim E.3 (Sample-level empirical covariance after truncation)**.** *With probability at least* $1-\delta/4$*,*

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^N\sum_{j=1}^n (Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu)(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu)^\top \preceq C\mathbb{I}_d$$

as long as

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Proof. For each $(i,j) \in [N]\times[n]$, define

$$M_{i,j} := \frac{1}{Nn}\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)^\top.$$

By the definition of the sample-level truncation,

$$\left\|Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i\right\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{\eta}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\left\|Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right\|_2 &\le \left\|Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i\right\|_2+\|\mu_i-\mu\|_2\\ &\le 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{\eta}}+\sqrt{\beta}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|M_{i,j}\|_2 \le O\left(\frac{d/\eta+\beta}{Nn}\right).$$

Thus

$$\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \preceq M_{i,j} \preceq R\mathbb{I}_d, \qquad R=O\left(\frac{d/\eta+\beta}{Nn}\right).$$

Next, since the truncation maps $Z_{i,j}$ either to itself or to its mean μ_i, it does not increase the second moment around μ_i. Thus

$$\mathrm{Cov}[Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}] \preceq \mathbb{E}\left[\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i\right)\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i\right)^\top\right] \preceq \mathrm{Cov}[Z_{i,j}] \preceq \mathbb{I}_d.$$

Moreover,

$$\left\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right\|_2^2 \le O(\eta+\beta) \le O(1),$$

where the first inequality uses the truncation mean-shift bound and $\|\mu_i-\mu\|_2 \le \sqrt{\beta}$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)^\top\right] \preceq C_0\mathbb{I}_d$$

for a universal constant $C_0>0$. Choose a sufficiently large universal constant $C_1>C_0$. Applying the matrix Chernoff inequality gives

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\left[\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\sum_{j=1}^{n}\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)\left(Z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu\right)^\top \succ C_1\mathbb{I}_d\right] &\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{1}{R}\right)\right)\\ &\le d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{Nn}{d/\eta+\beta}\right)\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since $\beta\le\eta$ and $\eta\in(0,1)$, we have $d/\eta+\beta\le O(d/\eta)$. Thus the failure probability is at most

$$d\exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{\eta Nn}{d}\right)\right).$$

This is at most $\delta/4$ as long as

$$nN \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right).$$ □

User-level truncation. Since $\mathrm{Cov}[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d$, define

$$Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \begin{cases} Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, & \text{if } \|Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 \le 2\sqrt{d/(n\rho)},\\ \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}, & \text{otherwise.}\end{cases}$$

Let $\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} := \mathbb{E}[Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}]$. Applying Claim C.6 with covariance scale $1/n$ and truncation parameter ρ, if $N\rho \geq \Omega(\log(1/\delta))$, then with probability at least $1 - \delta/4$,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{\left\{Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} \neq Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\}} \leq \rho. \tag{96}$$

Since $nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$ and $n = o(d)$, we can get $N \geq \Omega\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$. In addition, since $\rho = \min\{\max\{\varepsilon, n\eta\}, c_\rho\}$, we consider the cases when $\rho = c_\rho$ and $\rho = \max\{\varepsilon, n\eta\}$. First, suppose $\rho = c_\rho$. We can get $N\rho \geq c_\rho\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right) \geq \Omega(\log(1/\delta))$. Second, suppose $\rho = \max\{\varepsilon, n\eta\} \geq n\eta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} N\rho &\geq Nn\eta \\ &\geq \Omega\left(d\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right) \\ &\geq \Omega(\log(1/\delta)). \end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

Therefore, in all cases, we can get $N\rho \geq \Omega(\log(1/\delta))$ and apply Claim C.6. Moreover, by Claim C.7, we have for all $i \in [N]$,

$$\|\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}}\right). \tag{98}$$

Claim E.4. *With probability at least* $1 - \delta/4$,

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)(Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)^\top \preceq C\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau\right)\mathbb{I}_d$$

as long as

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right).$$

Proof. For each $k \in [N]$, define

$$M_k := \frac{1}{N}\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right)\left(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\right)^\top.$$

By the definition of the second truncation,

$$\left\|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\right\|_2 \leq 2\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\|_2 &\leq \|Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 + \|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_k\|_2 + \|\mu_k - \mu\|_2 \\ &\leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}} + \sqrt{\eta} + \sqrt{\beta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\|M_k\|_2 = \frac{1}{N}\left\|(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)^\top\right\|_2$$

$$= \frac{1}{N} \left\| Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu \right\|_2^2$$
$$\leq O\left(\frac{d}{n\rho N} + \frac{\eta + \beta}{N} \right)$$
$$\leq O\left(\frac{d}{n\rho N} + \frac{\beta + \tau}{N} \right),$$

where the last line uses $\eta \leq \tau$ since $\tau = \eta/\rho$ and $\rho \leq 1$. Thus

$$\mathbf{0}_{d\times d} \preceq M_k \preceq R\mathbb{I}_d, \qquad R = O\left(\frac{d}{n\rho N} + \frac{\beta + \tau}{N} \right).$$

Next, since the second truncation maps Z_k^{tr} to either itself or its mean μ_k^{tr}, it does not increase covariance. Hence

$$\mathrm{Cov}[Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}] \preceq \mathrm{Cov}[Z_k^{\mathrm{tr}}] \preceq \frac{1}{n}\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Since $\|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}}\|_2 \leq O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}}\right)$, $\|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr}} - \mu_k\|_2 \leq O(\sqrt{\eta})$, and $\|\mu_k - \mu\|_2 \leq \sqrt{\beta}$, we have

$$\|\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\|_2^2 \leq O\left(\frac{\rho}{n} + \eta + \beta \right) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau \right),$$

where we used $\rho \leq 1$, $\eta \leq \tau$, and $\eta \geq \beta$. Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} (Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)(Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)^\top \right] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\mathrm{Cov}[Z_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}] + (\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)(\mu_k^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu)^\top \right)$$
$$\preceq C_0 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau \right) \mathbb{I}_d$$

for a universal constant $C_0 > 0$. Thus

$$\lambda_{\max} := \left\| \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{k=1}^{N} M_k \right] \right\|_2 \leq C_0 \left(\frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau \right).$$

Let $L := \frac{1}{n} + \beta + \tau$. Choose a sufficiently large universal constant $C_1 > C_0$. By the matrix Chernoff inequality,

$$\Pr\left[\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{N} M_k \right\|_2 > C_1 L \right] \leq d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{L}{R} \right) \right)$$
$$\leq d \exp\left(-\Omega\left(\frac{N(1 + n(\beta + \tau))}{d/\rho + n(\beta + \tau)} \right) \right).$$

It remains to simplify the exponent. Let $s := \beta + \tau$. To make the failure probability upper bounded by δ, it suffices to make

$$\frac{N(1 + ns)}{d/\rho + ns} \geq C \log\left(\frac{d}{\delta} \right).$$

Equivalently, it is enough that

$$nN \geq C \log\left(\frac{d}{\delta} \right) \cdot \frac{n(d/\rho + ns)}{1 + ns}.$$

Since $s \geq \tau = \eta/\rho$, $1 + ns \geq n\tau = \frac{n\eta}{\rho}$. Thus, we have

$$\frac{nd/\rho}{1+ns} \leq \frac{d}{\eta}.$$

Also,

$$\frac{n^2 s}{1+ns} \leq n.$$

Therefore,

$$\frac{n(d/\rho + ns)}{1+ns} \leq \frac{d}{\eta} + n.$$

In the regime $n = o(d)$ and $\eta \in (0,1)$, we have $n \leq O(d/\eta)$. Hence

$$nN \geq \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$$

is sufficient to make the failure probability at most $\delta/4$. This completes the proof of the claim. □

Constructing a feasible assignment for the polynomial system D. Let $\mathcal{G}$ be the set of users not corrupted at the batch level, so $|\mathcal{G}| \geq (1-\varepsilon)N$. Define

$$\mathcal{H} := \{i \in \mathcal{G} : Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = Z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}\}.$$

On the event Eq. (96), and since $\varepsilon \leq \rho$,

$$|\mathcal{H}| \geq (1-\varepsilon-\rho)N \geq (1-2\rho)N.$$

Choose a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ satisfying

$$|\mathcal{S}| = (1 - \Theta(\rho))N.$$

We set $\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} = z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, $\mathsf{Z}_i = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, $\mathsf{Y}_i = z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, and $U_i = \mathbb{1}_{\{i\in\mathcal{S}\}}$. For $i \in \mathcal{S}$, let

$$A_i := \{j \in [n] : z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}} = x_{i,j}\}.$$

Since $i \in \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, at most αn observed samples in user i are sample-corrupted. Therefore

$$|A_i| \geq n - \alpha n - \sum_{j=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{z_{i,j} \neq z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}\}}.$$

Summing over $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and using Eq. (94),

$$\sum_{i\in\mathcal{S}} |A_i| \geq n|\mathcal{S}| - \alpha n|\mathcal{S}| - \eta N n \geq (1 - \Theta(\eta))n|\mathcal{S}|.$$

We may therefore choose exactly $(1-\Theta(\eta))n|\mathcal{S}|$ pairs (i,j) with $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and $j \in A_i$. Set $W_{i,j} = 1$ on these chosen pairs and $W_{i,j} = 0$ everywhere else. Then

$$W_{i,j}(\mathsf{Z}_{i,j} - x_{i,j}) = 0$$

for all i, j, and the global sample-count constraint Eq. (87) holds.

Moreover, if $U_i = 1$, then $i \in \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, so $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} = z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and hence

$$U_i(\mathsf{Y}_i - \mathsf{Z}_i) = 0.$$

It remains only to verify the two covariance constraints. By Claim E.3,

$$\frac{1}{Nn}\sum_{i,j}(z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu)(z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu)^\top \preceq C\mathbb{I}_d.$$

Centering at the empirical mean can only decrease the empirical second moment, so Eq. (88) holds after choosing C_D sufficiently large and taking B_1 to be a square root of the resulting positive semidefinite slack matrix. Similarly, Claim E.4 and the same centering argument imply Eq. (93), after increasing C_D if necessary and choosing B_2 as a square root of the corresponding slack matrix. A union bound over the four high-probability events completes the proof. □

E.2 Identifiability

After proving satisfiability of D, we show that any feasible pseudoexpectation satisfying D yields an accurate estimate of the true mean μ.

Lemma E.5 (Identifiability of D)**.** *Under the setting of Problem 2, suppose $\eta=\max\{\alpha,\beta\}<c$ and $\varepsilon<c$ for a sufficiently small universal constant $c>0$. Suppose $\alpha n\ge 1$ and $nN\ge\Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta}\log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$. Then, with probability at least $1-\delta$, every pseudoexpectation $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}$ satisfying D yields*

$$\|\widehat{\mu}-\mu\|_2\le O\left(\sqrt{\alpha+\beta}\right).$$

Proof. Let $z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$ and $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ denote the realized truncated samples from the satisfiability proof, and define $\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr}}:=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{j=1}^n z_{i,j}^{\mathrm{tr}}$, $\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}:=z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$, and $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}:=\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N\widetilde{\mu}_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$.

We first compare $\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]$ to the fixed reference average $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$. Let $\mathcal{I}_i$ be the deterministic indicator of the event that user i is a good reference user: user i is not corrupted at the batch level, $z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}=z_i^{\mathrm{tr}}$, and the observed batch agrees with the sample-level truncation except on the sample-corruption and truncation indices. The proof of Lemma D.4 applies with the following substitutions: $\varepsilon\mapsto O(\rho)$, $\alpha\mapsto O(\eta)$, and $\frac{1}{n}+\tau\mapsto\frac{1}{n}+\beta+\tau$. We can get

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2^2\le O\left(\rho\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta+\tau\right)+\eta\right).$$

Recall that $\tau=\eta/\rho$ and $\rho=\min\{\max\{\varepsilon,n\eta\},c_\rho\}$. Therefore, we have

$$\rho\left(\frac{1}{n}+\beta+\tau\right)+\eta=\frac{\rho}{n}+\rho\beta+\eta+\eta\le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n}+\eta\right).$$

Consequently,

$$\left\|\widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}]-\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}\right\|_2\le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}+\sqrt{\eta}\right). \tag{99}$$

It remains to compare $\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ with μ. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu\|_2\le&\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)})\right\|_2+\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}-\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}})\right\|_2\\&+\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(\mu_i^{\mathrm{tr}}-\mu_i)\right\|_2+\left\|\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^N(\mu_i-\mu)\right\|_2.\end{aligned} \tag{100}$$

For the first term, the variables $Z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}$ are independent, mean zero, have covariance at most $n^{-1}\mathbb{I}_d$, and are bounded by $O(\sqrt{d/(n\rho)})$. Therefore Fact A.14 gives, with probability at least $1-\delta$,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (z_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu_i^{\mathrm{tr},(2)}) \right\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{d \log(1/\delta)}{nN}} + \frac{1}{N} \sqrt{\frac{d}{n\rho}} \log(1/\delta) \right) \le O(\sqrt{\eta}),$$

where the last inequality follows from $N\rho \ge \Omega(\log(1/\delta))$ (Eq. (97)) and $nN \ge \Omega\left(\frac{d}{\eta} \log\left(\frac{d}{\delta}\right)\right)$. The remaining three terms in Eq. (100) are bounded by $O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\rho}{n}}\right)$ (Eq. (98)), $O(\sqrt{\eta})$ (Eq. (95)), and $\sqrt{\beta}$ (Problem 2), respectively. Since

$$\frac{\rho}{n} \le O\left(\frac{\varepsilon}{n} + \eta\right),$$

we obtain

$$\|\widetilde{\mu}^{\mathrm{tr},(2)} - \mu\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\eta} + \sqrt{\beta} \right). \tag{101}$$

Combining Eqs. (99) and (101),

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\eta} + \sqrt{\beta} \right).$$

Finally, $\alpha n \ge 1$ and $\varepsilon < 1$ imply $\varepsilon/n \le \alpha$, while $\eta = \max\{\alpha, \beta\}$. Hence

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \le O\left(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta} \right).$$

□

Proof of Theorem 1.3. By Lemma E.2, with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, the polynomial system D is satisfiable. We run the standard constant-degree SoS SDP relaxation for D and output

$$\widehat{\mu} := \widetilde{\mathbb{E}}[\overline{\mathsf{Y}}].$$

By Lemma E.5, with probability at least $1 - \delta/2$, every feasible pseudoexpectation gives

$$\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \le O(\sqrt{\alpha + \beta}).$$

A union bound gives the desired success probability. The polynomial system has $Nnd + Nd + d^2 + Nn + N$ variables and constant degree, so the standard SoS SDP algorithm runs in time $(Nnd + d^2)^{O(1)}$. □

F Hardness

In this section, we present the proof of the lower bound of our main result.

F.1 Hardness of Problem 4

Theorem F.1. *Consider the model in Problem 4. Then there exists a choice of uncorrupted user distributions $\{\mathcal{D}_i\}$ and an ε-user adversary such that for any estimator $\widehat{\mu}$,*

$$\Pr\left[\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 \ge \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{nN}} + \sqrt{\beta} \right) \right] \ge \frac{1}{2}.$$

Proof. It follows from Lemma F.3. The $\Omega(\sqrt{\beta})$ lower bound is straightforward: suppose the true mean is μ, for all users, the adversary could simply change the mean to some μ' that is $\sqrt{\beta}$ apart, and no algorithms could tell whether the true mean is μ or μ'. □

F.2 Hardness of Problem 5

Theorem F.2. *Given $\varepsilon \in \left(0, \frac{1}{18}\right)$ and $\alpha \in \left(0, \frac{1}{90}\right)$ satisfying $\varepsilon + 5\alpha < \frac{1}{18}$ and $\alpha n \geq 4 \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right)$, and $n = o(d)$ samples from each of N users, there exists an instance of Problem 5, consisting of a choice of uncorrupted data distributions with mean $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and a choice of adversarial corruptions, such that for any estimator $\widehat{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\|\widehat{\mu} - \mu\|_2 = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{d}{nN}} + \sqrt{\alpha}\right)$.*

Proof. The $\Omega(\sqrt{\varepsilon/n})$ term follows from Lemma F.3, and the $\Omega(\sqrt{\alpha})$ term follows from Lemma F.4. The classical lower bound for mean estimation from Nn samples with bounded covariance gives $\Omega(\sqrt{d/(Nn)})$. Combining these three lower bounds completes the proof. □

F.2.1 The Case When $\alpha = 0$

Lemma F.3. *Consider Problem 5 with $\alpha = 0$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/18)$. Then there exist two hypotheses H_0, H_1 over $\mathbb{R}$ with $\mathrm{Var}[H_0], \mathrm{Var}[H_1] \leq 1$ such that $|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}| = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right)$. Moreover, for all estimator $\widetilde{\mu}$, at least one of the two hypotheses satisfies*

$$\Pr\left[|\widetilde{\mu} - \mu| \geq \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{n}}\right] \geq \frac{3}{4}.$$

Proof. We define $\varepsilon_0 := \frac{\varepsilon}{4n}$ and respectively define the hypotheses H_0 and H_1 on $\mathbb{R}$ as

$$\Pr_{X \sim H_0}[X = 0] = 1 - \varepsilon_0, \quad \Pr_{X \sim H_0}\left[X = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}}\right] = \varepsilon_0,$$

and

$$\Pr_{Y \sim H_1}[Y = 0] = 1.$$

We first compute their means and variances. For the means, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu_{H_0} &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X \sim H_0}[X] \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\varepsilon_0}} \cdot \varepsilon_0 \\
&= \sqrt{\varepsilon_0} \\
&= \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{4n}}.
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_{H_1} = 0.$$

For their variances, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathop{\mathrm{Var}}_{X \sim H_0}[X] &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X \sim H_0}\left[X^2\right] - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X \sim H_0}[X]^2 \\
&= \frac{\varepsilon_0}{\varepsilon_0} - \varepsilon_0 \\
&\leq 1,
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\operatorname*{Var}_{Y\sim H_1}[Y] = 0 < 1.$$

Therefore, we have

$$|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}| = \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{4n}}. \tag{102}$$

Now, for each user $i \in [N]$, let

$$I_i := \mathbb{1}_{\{\text{the } i\text{-th user's batch contains at least one nonzero sample}\}}.$$

For each user $i \in [N]$ and each sample index $j \in [n]$, let $X_{i,j}$ denote the j-th sample in the batch of user i. Under the hypothesis H_0, the random variables $X_{i,1}, \ldots, X_{i,n}$ are i.i.d. draws from H_0. Since

$$\{I_i = 1\} = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \{X_{i,j} \neq 0\},$$

by the union bound, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pr[I_i = 1] &= \Pr\left[\bigcup_{j=1}^{n} \{X_{i,j} \neq 0\}\right] \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Pr[X_{i,j} \neq 0] \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{n} \varepsilon_0 \\
&= n\varepsilon_0.
\end{aligned}$$

Since we have $\varepsilon_0 = \frac{\varepsilon}{4n}$, we can get

$$\Pr[I_i = 1] \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4}.$$

We define $M := \sum_{i=1}^{N} I_i$ to be the number of users whose batch contains at least one nonzero sample. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[M] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^{N} I_i\right] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \mathbb{E}[I_i] \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Pr[I_i = 1] \\
&\leq \frac{\varepsilon N}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence, applying Markov's inequality (Fact A.11), we have

$$\Pr[M > \varepsilon N] \le \frac{\mathbb{E}[M]}{\varepsilon N} \le \frac{1}{4}. \tag{103}$$

We note that on the event $\{M \le \varepsilon N\}$, the adversary has the power to corrupt all users whose batch has at least one nonzero sample. Replacing all samples in each such batch by 0, the adversary makes the entire observed dataset equal to the all-zero dataset, which we denote it by z. In H_1, the observed dataset is already all 0 without corruption. For all estimator $\widetilde{\mu}(z)$, by the triangle inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}| &= |\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z) + \widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_1}| \\ &\le |\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| + |\widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_1}|. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, it is impossible that both $|\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|$ and $|\widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_1}| < \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|$. Via De Morgan's Laws, we have either

$$|\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}| \tag{104}$$

or

$$|\widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_1}| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|. \tag{105}$$

Suppose that Eq. (104) holds. Then, under the hypothesis H_0, on the event $\{M \le \varepsilon N\}$ where the adversary makes the observed dataset equal to z, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr_{H_0}\left[|\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|\right] &\ge \Pr_{H_0}[\{M \le \varepsilon N\}] \\ &\ge \frac{3}{4}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the event $\{M \le \varepsilon N\}$ implies $|\mu_{H_0} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|$ and the second step follows from Eq. (103).

Suppose that Eq. (105) holds. Then, under the hypothesis H_1, the observed dataset is always equal to z, we have

$$\Pr_{H_1}\left[|\widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_1}| \ge \frac{1}{2}|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}|\right] = 1.$$

We complete the proof by $|\mu_{H_0} - \mu_{H_1}| = \sqrt{\frac{\varepsilon}{4n}}$ (Eq. (102)). □

F.2.2 The $\Omega(\sqrt{\alpha})$ Lower Bound

Lemma F.4. *Consider Problem 5 with $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/18)$ and $\alpha \in (0, 1/90)$. Suppose that*

$$\alpha n \ge 4 \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

Then, there exist two hypotheses H_2, H_3 on $\mathbb{R}$ such that $\mathrm{Var}[H_2] \le 1$, $\mathrm{Var}[H_3] \le 1$, and

$$|\mu_{H_2} - \mu_{H_3}| = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{\alpha},$$

and for every estimator $\widetilde{\mu}$, at least one of the two hypotheses satisfies

$$\Pr\left[|\widetilde{\mu} - \mu| \ge \frac{1}{4}\sqrt{\alpha}\right] \ge \frac{3}{4}.$$

Proof. We respectively define the hypotheses H_2 and H_3 on $\mathbb{R}$ as

$$\Pr_{X\sim H_2}[X=0] = 1-\frac{\alpha}{4}, \qquad \Pr_{X\sim H_2}\left[X=\frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right] = \frac{\alpha}{4},$$

and

$$\Pr_{Y\sim H_3}[Y=0] = 1.$$

Therefore, their means are

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_{H_2} &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X\sim H_2}[X] \\ &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{4}\right)\cdot\left(\frac{2}{\sqrt{\alpha}}\right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2},\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mu_{H_3} = 0.$$

Hence

$$|\mu_{H_2} - \mu_{H_3}| = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2}. \tag{106}$$

Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathop{\mathrm{Var}}_{X\sim H_2}[X] &= \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X\sim H_2}\left[X^2\right] - \mathop{\mathbb{E}}_{X\sim H_2}[X]^2 \\ &= \left(\frac{\alpha}{4}\right)\left(\frac{4}{\alpha}\right) - \frac{\alpha}{4} \\ &= 1-\frac{\alpha}{4} \\ &\le 1,\end{aligned}$$

while

$$\mathop{\mathrm{Var}}_{Y\sim H_3}[Y] = 0.$$

Thus, both H_2 and H_3 satisfy the bounded variance assumption.

Now, for each user $i\in[N]$, consider n i.i.d. samples $X_{i,1},\dots,X_{i,n}$ drawn from H_2, and define

$$T_i := \sum_{j=1}^{n} \mathbb{1}_{\{X_{i,j}\neq 0\}}.$$

Then

$$T_i \sim \mathrm{Bin}\left(n, \frac{\alpha}{4}\right),$$

and therefore

$$\mathbb{E}[T_i] = \frac{\alpha n}{4}. \tag{107}$$

Using the multiplicative Chernoff bound (Fact A.12) with $\delta = 3$, we have

$$\Pr\left[T_i \geq 4\,\mathbb{E}[T_i]\right] \leq \exp\left(-\,\mathbb{E}[T_i]\right).$$

Combining this with Eq. (107), we obtain

$$\Pr\left[T_i > \alpha n\right] \leq \Pr\left[T_i \geq \alpha n\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right). \tag{108}$$

We call user i an *overflow user* if

$$T_i > \alpha n.$$

Let

$$B_i := \mathbb{1}_{\{T_i > \alpha n\}}$$

and let

$$S := \sum_{i=1}^{N} B_i$$

denote the total number of overflow users.

By Eq. (108),

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}[S] &= \sum_{i=1}^{N} \Pr[T_i > \alpha n] \\ &\leq N \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We now use the user-level corruption budget. By Markov's inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\left[S > \varepsilon N\right] &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[S]}{\varepsilon N} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Since

$$\alpha n \geq 4 \log\left(\frac{4}{\varepsilon}\right),$$

we have

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\alpha n}{4}\right) \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{4},$$

and therefore

$$\Pr\left[S > \varepsilon N\right] \leq \frac{1}{4}.$$

Define the event

$$\mathcal{E} := \{S \leq \varepsilon N\}.$$

Then

$$\Pr_{H_2}\left[\mathcal{E}\right] \geq \frac{3}{4}. \tag{109}$$

We next describe the adversary under H_2 on the event $\mathcal{E}$.

For every non-overflow user i, namely every user satisfying

$$T_i \le \alpha n,$$

the sample-level adversary replaces all T_i nonzero samples by 0. This uses at most αn sample corruptions in that user's batch.

For every overflow user i, namely every user satisfying

$$T_i > \alpha n,$$

the adversary uses the user-level corruption budget and replaces the entire batch by zeros.

On the event $\mathcal{E}$, there are at most εN overflow users, so this uses at most the allowed ε-fraction of fully corrupted users. Hence the above is a valid double-corruption adversary.

After these modifications, every observed sample is equal to zero. Let z denote this all-zero dataset.

Under hypothesis H_3, the clean observed dataset is also always equal to z.

Let $\widetilde{\mu}(z)$ denote the output of an arbitrary estimator on z. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{2} &= |\mu_{H_2} - \mu_{H_3}| \\ &= |\mu_{H_2} - \widetilde{\mu}(z) + \widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_3}| \\ &\le |\mu_{H_2} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| + |\widetilde{\mu}(z) - \mu_{H_3}|,\end{aligned}$$

where the first equality follows from Eq. (106).

Therefore, it is impossible that both

$$|\mu_{H_2} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| < \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}$$

and

$$|\mu_{H_3} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| < \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}$$

hold simultaneously. Hence either

$$|\mu_{H_2} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| \ge \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}, \tag{110}$$

or

$$|\mu_{H_3} - \widetilde{\mu}(z)| \ge \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}. \tag{111}$$

Suppose Eq. (110) holds. Under hypothesis H_2, on the event $\mathcal{E}$, the adversary makes the observed dataset equal to z. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr_{H_2}\left[|\widetilde{\mu} - \mu_{H_2}| \ge \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}\right] &\ge \Pr_{H_2}[\mathcal{E}] \\ &\ge \frac{3}{4},\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality follows from Eq. (109).

Otherwise, Eq. (111) holds. Under hypothesis H_3, the observed dataset is always z, and hence

$$\Pr_{H_3}\left[|\widetilde{\mu} - \mu_{H_3}| \ge \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}}{4}\right] = 1.$$

This completes the proof. □

References

[ABB+24] Maryam Aliakbarpour, Konstantina Bairaktari, Gavin Brown, Adam Smith, Nathan Srebro, and Jonathan Ullman. Metalearning with very few samples per task. In *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 46–93. PMLR, 2024.

[ABS+25] Maryam Aliakbarpour, Konstantina Bairaktari, Adam Smith, Marika Swanberg, and Jonathan Ullman. Privacy in metalearning and multitask learning: Modeling and separations. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 4096–4104. PMLR, 2025.

[AS20] Maryam Aliakbarpour and Sandeep Silwal. Testing properties of multiple distributions with few samples. In *11th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2020)*, 2020.

[BDH+20] Ainesh Bakshi, Ilias Diakonikolas, Samuel B. Hopkins, Daniel Kane, Sushrut Karmalkar, and Pravesh K. Kothari. Outlier-robust clustering of gaussians and other non-spherical mixtures. In Sandy Irani, editor, *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020, Durham, NC, USA, November 16-19, 2020*, pages 149–159. IEEE, 2020.

[BK20] Ainesh Bakshi and Pravesh Kothari. Outlier-robust clustering of non-spherical mixtures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.02970*, 2020.

[CCKL26] Ziyun Chen, Spencer Compton, Daniel M Kane, and Jerry Li. High-accuracy list-decodable mean estimation. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 767–776, 2026.

[CDG19] Y. Cheng, I. Diakonikolas, and R. Ge. High-dimensional robust mean estimation in nearly-linear time. In *Proceedings of the 30th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, 2019.

[CDGS20] Yu Cheng, Ilias Diakonikolas, Rong Ge, and Mahdi Soltanolkotabi. High-dimensional robust mean estimation via gradient descent. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1768–1778. PMLR, 2020.

[CLC25] Syomantak Chaudhuri, Jerry Li, and Thomas A Courtade. Robust estimation under heterogeneous corruption rates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2508.15051*, 2025.

[CLM20] Sitan Chen, Jerry Li, and Ankur Moitra. Efficiently learning structured distributions from untrusted batches. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC 2020, page 960–973, New York, NY, USA, 2020. Association for Computing Machinery.

[CMY20] Yeshwanth Cherapanamjeri, Sidhanth Mohanty, and Morris Yau. List decodable mean estimation in nearly linear time. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 141–148. IEEE, 2020.

[CSV17] Moses Charikar, Jacob Steinhardt, and Gregory Valiant. Learning from untrusted data. In *Proceedings of the 49th annual ACM SIGACT symposium on theory of computing*, pages 47–60, 2017.

[DHPT25] Ilias Diakonikolas, Samuel B. Hopkins, Ankit Pensia, and Stefan Tiegel. Sos certifiability of subgaussian distributions and its algorithmic applications. In Michal Koucký and Nikhil Bansal, editors, *Proceedings of the 57th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2025, Prague, Czechia, June 23-27, 2025*, pages 1689–1700. ACM, 2025.

[DK23] Ilias Diakonikolas and Daniel M Kane. *Algorithmic high-dimensional robust statistics*. Cambridge university press, 2023.

[DKK+19] Ilias Diakonikolas, Gautam Kamath, Daniel Kane, Jerry Li, Ankur Moitra, and Alistair Stewart. Robust estimators in high-dimensions without the computational intractability. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 48(2):742–864, 2019.

[DKK20] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, and Daniel Kongsgaard. List-decodable mean estimation via iterative multi-filtering. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:9312–9323, 2020.

[DKK+21] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel Kane, Daniel Kongsgaard, Jerry Li, and Kevin Tian. List-decodable mean estimation in nearly-pca time. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:10195–10208, 2021.

[DKK+22] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, Sushrut Karmalkar, Ankit Pensia, and Thanasis Pittas. Robust sparse mean estimation via sum of squares. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4703–4763. PMLR, 2022.

[DKP20] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M. Kane, and Ankit Pensia. Outlier robust mean estimation with subgaussian rates via stability. In Hugo Larochelle, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, Raia Hadsell, Maria-Florina Balcan, and Hsuan-Tien Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 33: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2020, NeurIPS 2020, December 6-12, 2020, virtual*, 2020.

[DKPP22] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, Ankit Pensia, and Thanasis Pittas. Streaming algorithms for high-dimensional robust statistics. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 5061–5117. PMLR, 2022.

[DKS18] Ilias Diakonikolas, Daniel M Kane, and Alistair Stewart. List-decodable robust mean estimation and learning mixtures of spherical gaussians. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1047–1060, 2018.

[FASS21] Noam Finkelstein, Roy Adams, Suchi Saria, and Ilya Shpitser. Partial identifiability in discrete data with measurement error. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, pages 1798–1808. PMLR, 2021.

[HKP+17] Samuel B. Hopkins, Pravesh K. Kothari, Aaron Potechin, Prasad Raghavendra, Tselil Schramm, and David Steurer. The power of sum-of-squares for detecting hidden structures. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 720–731, 2017.

[HL18] Samuel B Hopkins and Jerry Li. Mixture models, robustness, and sum of squares proofs. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1021–1034, 2018.

[HLZ20] Sam Hopkins, Jerry Li, and Fred Zhang. Robust and heavy-tailed mean estimation made simple, via regret minimization. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M.F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 11902–11912. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.

[Hop20] Samuel B. Hopkins. Mean estimation with sub-gaussian rates in polynomial time. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2):pp. 1193–1213, 2020.

[HS16] Daniel Hsu and Sivan Sabato. Loss minimization and parameter estimation with heavy tails. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(18):1–40, 2016.

[Hub64] Peter J Huber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 35(1):73–101, 1964.

[JO20a] Ayush Jain and Alon Orlitsky. A general method for robust learning from batches. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:21775–21785, 2020.

[JO20b] Ayush Jain and Alon Orlitsky. Optimal robust learning of discrete distributions from batches. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4651–4660. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.

[JO21] Ayush Jain and Alon Orlitsky. Robust density estimation from batches: The best things in life are (nearly) free. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4698–4708. PMLR, 2021.

[JSK+24] Ayush Jain, Rajat Sen, Weihao Kong, Abhimanyu Das, and Alon Orlitsky. Linear regression using heterogeneous data batches. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 37:87061–87103, 2024.

[KLS21] Anastasiia Koloskova, Tao Lin, and Sebastian U Stich. An improved analysis of gradient tracking for decentralized machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11422–11435, 2021.

[KMZ22] Pravesh K. Kothari, Peter Manohar, and Brian Hu Zhang. Polynomial-time sum-of-squares can robustly estimate mean and covariance of gaussians optimally. In Sanjoy Dasgupta and Nika Haghtalab, editors, *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory, 29 March - 1 April 2022, Paris, France*, volume 167 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 638–667. PMLR, 2022.

[KS17] Pravesh K Kothari and David Steurer. Outlier-robust moment-estimation via sum-of-squares. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.11581*, 2017.

[KSS18] Pravesh K Kothari, Jacob Steinhardt, and David Steurer. Robust moment estimation and improved clustering via sum of squares. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1035–1046, 2018.

[Las01] Jean B Lasserre. New positive semidefinite relaxations for nonconvex quadratic programs. *Advances in Convex Analysis and Global Optimization: Honoring the Memory of C. Caratheodory (1873–1950)*, pages 319–331, 2001.

[LKSJ21] Tao Lin, Sai Praneeth Karimireddy, Sebastian Stich, and Martin Jaggi. Quasi-global momentum: Accelerating decentralized deep learning on heterogeneous data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 6654–6665. PMLR, 2021.

[LL23] Zheng Liu and Po-Ling Loh. Robust w-gan-based estimation under wasserstein contamination. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA*, 12(1):312–362, 2023.

[LRV16] Kevin A Lai, Anup B Rao, and Santosh Vempala. Agnostic estimation of mean and covariance. In *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 665–674. IEEE, 2016.

[MMKP25] Erfan Mirzaei, Andreas Maurer, Vladimir R Kostic, and Massimiliano Pontil. An empirical bernstein inequality for dependent data in hilbert spaces and applications. In *The 28th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, 2025.

[Nes00] Yurii Nesterov. Squared functional systems and optimization problems. In *High performance optimization*, pages 405–440. Springer, 2000.

[NGS24] Sloan Nietert, Ziv Goldfeld, and Soroosh Shafiee. Robust distribution learning with local and global adversarial corruptions. In *The Thirty Seventh Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4007–4008. PMLR, 2024.

[PP25] Thanasis Pittas and Ankit Pensia. Optimal robust estimation under local and global corruptions: Stronger adversary and smaller error. In *The Thirty Eighth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4596–4639. PMLR, 2025.

[QV18] Mingda Qiao and Gregory Valiant. Learning discrete distributions from untrusted batches. In Anna R. Karlin, editor, *9th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2018, January 11-14, 2018, Cambridge, MA, USA*, volume 94 of *LIPIcs*, pages 47:1–47:20. Schloss Dagstuhl - Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2018.

[Sch22] Tselil Schramm. The sum-of-squares "proofs to algorithms" paradigm (lecture 0). Course notes, STATS 314A: Advanced Statistical Theory, Stanford University, March 2022. Available at https://tselilschramm.org/sos-paradigm/notes22/00-proofs-to-algs.pdf.

[SHK+22] Jessica Schrouff, Natalie Harris, Sanmi Koyejo, Ibrahim M Alabdulmohsin, Eva Schnider, Krista Opsahl-Ong, Alexander Brown, Subhrajit Roy, Diana Mincu, Christina Chen, et al. Diagnosing failures of fairness transfer across distribution shift in real-world medical settings. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:19304–19318, 2022.

[SKK21] Tobias Sutter, Andreas Krause, and Daniel Kuhn. Robust generalization despite distribution shift via minimum discriminating information. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:29754–29767, 2021.

[Tuk60] John Wilder Tukey. A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. *Contributions to probability and statistics*, pages 448–485, 1960.

[VHJ22] Thijs Vogels, Hadrien Hendrikx, and Martin Jaggi. Beyond spectral gap: The role of the topology in decentralized learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:15039–15050, 2022.

[YFD+23] Mang Ye, Xiuwen Fang, Bo Du, Pong C Yuen, and Dacheng Tao. Heterogeneous federated learning: State-of-the-art and research challenges. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 56(3):1–44, 2023.

[ZJT20] Banghua Zhu, Jiantao Jiao, and David Tse. Deconstructing generative adversarial networks. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 66(11):7155–7179, 2020.

[ZS22] Shiwei Zeng and Jie Shen. List-decodable sparse mean estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24031–24045, 2022.