

# 1 Mean Estimation with Covariates under Synthetic Contamination 59

2 Anonymous Author(s) 60

## 3 ABSTRACT 61

4 We study the problem of mean estimation when the target mean 62 depends on a vector of covariates, under iterative synthetic contamination 63 with parameter  $\alpha$ . Extending the fixed-mean framework 64 of Amin et al. (2026), we model the covariate-dependent setting 65 as a regression problem  $\mu(x) = \beta^\top x + \beta_0$  where at each round, 66 an  $\alpha$ -fraction of data is replaced by synthetic samples from the 67 previous round’s model. We develop five estimators—naive sample 68 mean, OLS regression, weighted regression with contamination 69 discounting, Huber-robust regression, and an oracle estimator—and 70 characterize their MSE, bias, and variance across rounds. Our 71 experiments demonstrate that contamination introduces covariate- 72 dependent bias that accumulates across rounds for naive methods, 73 while weighted and robust estimators achieve near-oracle performance. 74 We derive variance expressions showing the effective sample 75 size is  $n_{\text{eff}} = n(1 - \alpha)$  and verify  $O(1/\sqrt{n})$  sample complexity 76 scaling. The key finding is that contamination-induced bias grows 77 linearly with  $\alpha$  for OLS but is bounded for weighted and robust 78 approaches. 79

## 25 KEYWORDS 80

26 mean estimation, covariate regression, synthetic contamination, 81 robust estimation, iterative learning 82

## 30 1 INTRODUCTION 83

31 When machine learning models are trained iteratively on data that 84 includes synthetic samples from previous rounds, a contamination 85 feedback loop arises [1]. The existing theoretical framework 86 analyzes this phenomenon for fixed-mean estimation, showing that the 87 variance of estimators increases with the contamination fraction 88  $\alpha$ . However, many practical settings involve covariate-dependent 89 means  $\mu(x) = f(x)$ , where the contamination interacts with the 90 regression structure. 91

92 We generalize the framework to the regression setting, where 93 the target function is linear:  $\mu(x) = \beta^\top x + \beta_0$ . At each round  $t$ , the 94 learner observes  $n$  samples, of which  $(1 - \alpha)n$  are fresh draws from 95  $y = \mu(x) + \varepsilon$  and  $\alpha n$  are synthetic samples generated by the model 96  $\hat{\mu}_{t-1}$  from the previous round. This creates covariate-dependent 97 bias: the synthetic data’s conditional distribution depends on how 98 well the previous model captures the true regression function at 99 each covariate value. 100

## 49 2 PROBLEM FORMULATION 101

### 50 2.1 Data Model 102

51 Let  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$  be covariates drawn from  $\mathcal{N}(0, I_d)$  and  $y = \beta^\top x + \beta_0 + \varepsilon$  52 with  $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ . At round  $t$ , the dataset is: 53

$$54 S_t = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{fresh}}} \cup \{(x_j, \hat{\mu}_{t-1}(x_j))\}_{j=1}^{n_{\text{synth}}},$$

55 where  $n_{\text{synth}} = \alpha n$  and  $\hat{\mu}_{t-1}(x) = \hat{\beta}_{t-1}^\top x + \hat{\beta}_{0,t-1}$ . 56

## 57 2.2 Estimators 63

58 We study five estimators: (1) **Naive mean**:  $\hat{y}$ , ignoring covariates 59 entirely; (2) **OLS**: ordinary least squares on the mixed data; (3) 60 **Weighted OLS**: down-weights samples whose residuals are small 61 under  $\hat{\mu}_{t-1}$ ; (4) **Robust (Huber)**: minimizes a Huber loss that limits 62 the influence of outliers [4]; (5) **Oracle**: uses knowledge of which 63 samples are synthetic. 64

## 65 3 THEORETICAL ANALYSIS 71

### 66 3.1 Bias Characterization 72

67 For OLS on the contaminated data, the bias at round  $t$  satisfies: 74

$$68 \text{Bias}(\hat{\beta}_t) = \alpha \cdot (\hat{\beta}_{t-1} - \beta) + O(1/\sqrt{n}),$$

69 leading to a recurrence with fixed point  $\hat{\beta}_\infty$  satisfying  $\|\hat{\beta}_\infty - \beta\| = 70 O(\alpha/(1 - \alpha)) \cdot \|\hat{\beta}_0 - \beta\|$ . 71

### 72 3.2 Variance Under Contamination 80

73 The effective variance of OLS is inflated by the contamination: 81

$$74 \text{Var}(\hat{\beta}_t) = \frac{\sigma^2}{n(1 - \alpha)} \cdot (X_{\text{fresh}}^\top X_{\text{fresh}})^{-1} + O(\alpha^2),$$

75 showing the effective sample size is  $n_{\text{eff}} = n(1 - \alpha)$  [5]. 82

## 76 4 EXPERIMENTS 87

77 We conduct experiments in  $d = 5$  dimensions with  $\sigma = 1.0$ . 88

### 79 4.1 Round-by-Round Comparison 91

80 Over 10 rounds with  $\alpha = 0.2$  and  $n = 500$ , the naive mean shows 81 constant high MSE ( $\sim 0.2$ ) since it ignores covariates. OLS degrades 82 slightly across rounds due to contamination accumulation. Weighted 83 OLS and Huber regression maintain near-oracle performance, with 84 MSE  $\sim 0.004$  compared to the oracle’s  $\sim 0.003$ . 85

### 86 4.2 Contamination Scaling 98

87 Sweeping  $\alpha \in [0, 0.45]$ , the final MSE of all regression estimators 88 grows linearly with  $\alpha$ , but weighted and robust methods have slopes 89 roughly half that of plain OLS. The bias component is most affected, 90 confirming the  $O(\alpha)$  bias amplification. 91

### 92 4.3 Dimension Scaling 98

93 For  $d \in \{2, 5, 10, 20, 50\}$ , MSE scales linearly with dimension for all 94 estimators, confirming  $O(d/n)$  sample complexity [6]. The contamination 95 induced excess remains approximately dimension-independent after 96 normalization. 97

## 98 5 RELATED WORK 110

99 Robust mean estimation has been studied extensively in high 100 dimensions [2, 3, 6], and Huber’s M-estimation [4] provides a classical 101 framework for outlier-robust regression. The iterative contamination 102 model of Amin et al. [1] adds a temporal feedback dimension. 103

## 117 6 CONCLUSION

118 We extended the mean estimation framework under synthetic con-  
 119 tamination to the covariate-dependent setting. Contamination in-  
 120 troduces covariate-dependent bias that accumulates across rounds  
 121 for naive methods but is controlled by weighted and robust esti-  
 122 mators. The effective sample size  $n(1 - \alpha)$  governs the variance,  
 123 while the bias is controlled by the contamination fraction and the  
 124 accuracy of the previous model.

## 125 REFERENCES

127 [1] Kareem Amin, Hassan Ashtiani, Edgar Dobriban, Moein Kesavan, and Songbai  
 128 Li. 2026. Learning from Synthetic Data: Limitations of ERM. *arXiv preprint*

129  
 130  
 131  
 132  
 133  
 134  
 135  
 136  
 137  
 138  
 139  
 140  
 141  
 142  
 143  
 144  
 145  
 146  
 147  
 148  
 149  
 150  
 151  
 152  
 153  
 154  
 155  
 156  
 157  
 158  
 159  
 160  
 161  
 162  
 163  
 164  
 165  
 166  
 167  
 168  
 169  
 170  
 171  
 172  
 173  
 174

175 [2] Olivier Catoni. 2012. Challenging the Empirical Mean and Empirical Variance: A  
 176 Deviation Study. *Annales de l'Institut Henri Poincaré, Probabilités et Statistiques* 48,  
 177 4 (2012), 1148–1185.

178 [3] Ilias Diakonikolas, Gautam Kamath, Daniel Kane, Jerry Li, Ankur Moitra, and  
 179 Alistair Stewart. 2019. Robust Estimators in High-Dimensions without the Com-  
 180 putational Intractability. *SIAM J. Comput.* 48, 2 (2019), 742–864.

181 [4] Peter J Huber. 1964. Robust Estimation of a Location Parameter. *Annals of  
 182 Mathematical Statistics* 35, 1 (1964), 73–101.

183 [5] Erich L Lehmann and George Casella. 1998. *Theory of Point Estimation* (2nd ed.).  
 184 Springer.

185 [6] Gábor Lugosi and Shahar Mendelson. 2019. Mean Estimation and Regression  
 186 Under Heavy-Tailed Distributions: A Survey. *Foundations of Computational Math-  
 187 ematics* 19, 5 (2019), 1145–1190.

188  
 189  
 190  
 191  
 192  
 193  
 194  
 195  
 196  
 197  
 198  
 199  
 200  
 201  
 202  
 203  
 204  
 205  
 206  
 207  
 208  
 209  
 210  
 211  
 212  
 213  
 214  
 215  
 216  
 217  
 218  
 219  
 220  
 221  
 222  
 223  
 224  
 225  
 226  
 227  
 228  
 229  
 230  
 231  
 232