

# Optimization-based Quantification of Simulation Input Uncertainty via Empirical Likelihood

Henry Lam

Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027,  
khl2114@columbia.edu

Huajie Qian

Department of Industrial Engineering and Operations Research, Columbia University, New York, NY 10027,  
hq2157@columbia.edu

We study an optimization-based approach to construct statistically accurate confidence intervals for simulation performance measures under nonparametric input uncertainty. This approach computes confidence bounds from simulation runs driven by probability weights defined on the data, which are obtained from solving optimization problems under suitably posited averaged divergence constraints. We illustrate how this approach offers benefits in computational efficiency and finite-sample performance compared to the bootstrap and the delta method. While resembling robust optimization, we explain the procedural design and develop tight statistical guarantees of this approach via a generalization of the empirical likelihood method.

*Key words:* simulation input uncertainty, empirical likelihood, robust optimization

---

## 1. Introduction

Stochastic simulation relies on the propagation of the input variates, through the simulation logic, to generate outputs for decision-making; see, e.g., Banks et al. (2005) for an array of applications. Given that in practice the models that govern the input variates are often not fully known but only observed from limited data, the generated simulation outputs can be subject to input errors or uncertainty that adversely affects the decision. Handling this important source of errors has long been advocated and has gathered a fast growth of studies in recent years (see, e.g., the surveys Barton 2012, Henderson 2003, Chick 2006, Song et al. 2014 and Lam 2016a).

In this paper, we consider the fundamental task of constructing confidence intervals (CIs) for simulation outputs that account for the input uncertainty, in addition to the noises in generating the random variates in the simulation process (known commonly as the stochastic or simulation uncertainty). We focus particularly on the nonparametric regime that makes no assumption on the specific parametric form of the input models. A common approach is the bootstrap (e.g., Barton and Schruben 1993, 2001), which repeatedly generates resampled distributions to drive simulation runs and uses the quantiles of the simulated outputs to construct the CIs. Another approach

is the delta method (e.g., Asmussen and Glynn 2007, Chapter III) that estimates the asymptotic variance in the central limit theorem (CLT) directly. The latter has been considered mostly in the parametric setting (e.g., Cheng and Holland 1997, 1998, 2004) but bears a straightforward analog in our considered nonparametric scenario (as we will illustrate later). Estimating this variance can also be conducted by bootstrapping (e.g., Cheng and Holland 1997, Song and Nelson 2015).

Our focus in this paper is a new approach to construct input-induced CIs by using optimization as an underpinning tool. Our approach looks for a set of “maximal” and a set of “minimal” probability weights on the input data, obtained by solving a pair of convex optimization problems with constraints involving a suitably averaged statistical divergence. These weights can be viewed as “worst-case” representations of the input distributions which are then used to generate the input variates to drive the simulation, giving rise to upper and lower bounds that together form a CI on the performance measure of interest.

We will illustrate how this optimization-based approach offers benefits relative to the bootstrap and the delta method. The bootstrap typically involves nested simulation due to the resampling step before simulation runs, which leads to a multiplicative computational requirement that can be substantial. At the same time, its performance can also be sensitive to the simulation budget allocation in the nested procedure. A key element of our approach is to use convex optimization to replace the resampling step. With the tractability of our optimization problem via standard solvers, our approach offers a lighter computational requirement, and also does not succumb to the multiplicative budget allocation problem. On the other hand, the bootstrap possesses more flexibility as the resampled simulation replications can be used to approximate many statistics and to construct CIs at different confidence levels, without re-running the bootstrap procedure again. On the contrary, our approach needs re-optimization and a re-evaluation step for each new confidence level or statistic of interest. Nonetheless, we will see that the re-optimization needs only be run once for each problem, while the re-evaluation step only requires a sample size for standard output analysis that is free of input uncertainty.

Our method is closer to the delta method than the bootstrap in that, like the former, we need to estimate gradient information. While our approach and the delta method have similar asymptotic behaviors, we will demonstrate situations where our approach tends to outperform in finite sample. Roughly speaking, this outperformance arises since the delta method relies solely on a linear approximation in constructing CIs, whereas using the weighted distributions to drive simulation runs in our approach can introduce nonlinearity that naturally follows the boundaries of a given problem, which in turn alleviates the under-coverage issue experienced in the delta method.

As our main technical contributions, we design and analyze procedures to achieve tight statistical coverage guarantees for the resulting optimization-based CIs. Our approach aligns with the recent

surge of robust optimization (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski 2002, Bertsimas et al. 2011) in handling decision-making under uncertainty, where decisions are chosen to perform well under the worst-case scenario among a so-called uncertainty or ambiguity set of possibilities. Our approach particularly resembles distributionally robust optimization (DRO) (e.g., Ben-Tal et al. 2013, Delage and Ye 2010, Goh and Sim 2010, Wiesemann et al. 2014) where the uncertainty of the considered problem lies in the probability distributions, as our involved optimization formulation contains decision variables that are probability weights of the input distributions. However, contrary to the DRO rationale that postulates the uncertainty sets to contain the truth (including those studied recently in the simulation literature; Hu et al. 2012, Glasserman and Xu 2014, Lam 2016c, 2017, Ghosh and Lam 2016), we will explain our procedures by viewing the constraints as log-likelihoods on the input data, and develop the resulting statistical guarantees from a multi-sample generalization of the empirical likelihood (EL) method (Owen 2001), a nonparametric analog of the celebrated maximum likelihood method in parametric statistics. Consequently, the form of our proposed constraint (i.e., the averaged statistical divergence constraint) differs drastically from previous DRO suggestions, and the guarantee is provably tight asymptotically. We mention that, though EL has appeared in statistics for a long time, its use in operations research has appeared only recently and is limited to optimization problems (e.g., Lam and Zhou 2017, Duchi et al. 2016, Lam 2016b, Blanchet and Kang 2016, Blanchet et al. 2016). We therefore contribute by showing that a judicious use of this idea can offer new benefits in the equally important area of simulation analysis.

The rest of this paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews some related literature. Section 3 presents our procedure and main results on statistical guarantees. Section 4 explains the underlying theory giving rise to our approach and statistical results. Section 5 shows some numerical results and compares with previous approaches. The Appendix contains all technical proofs.

## 2. Related Literature

We briefly survey three areas of related work, one on the problem domain and two on methodologies. The input uncertainty problem in simulation aims to compute CIs or closely related output variance decompositions. In the parametric case, Cheng and Holland (1997) studies both the delta method and the basic bootstrap for computing the variance due to the input noise. Cheng and Holland (1998) and Cheng and Holland (2004) study the so-called two-point method that reduces the total number of simulation runs in estimating the gradient, or the sensitivity coefficients, in applying the delta method. Under the Bayesian framework, Zouaoui and Wilson (2003) studies the variance decomposition and sampling of posterior output distribution. Barton et al. (2013), Xie et al. (2014, 2016) further study the construction of CIs built on Gaussian process metamodels. Beyond parametric uncertainty, Chick (2001) and Zouaoui and Wilson (2004) study Bayesian model averaging

(BMA) under the choice of several candidate input parametric models. In the nonparametric regime (our focus in this paper), Barton and Schruben (1993, 2001) propose direct resampling (similar to sectioning; Asmussen and Glynn 2007, Chapter III), bootstrap resampling and the Bayesian bootstrap to construct quantile-based CIs, where they use a single simulation run per bootstrap resample motivated from the overwhelming input noise in their problem setting. Yi and Xie (2017) studies an approach based on ranking and selection to efficiently allocate budget in bootstrapping quantile estimates. Song and Nelson (2015) studies a mean-variance model to capture the effect of input uncertainty and uses the bootstrap to approximate the input variance component. Finally, some recent work utilizes a risk perspective with respect to model or distributional uncertainty (e.g., Glasserman and Xu 2014, Zhu and Zhou 2015, Lam 2016c, 2017).

Our methodologies are related to several tools in statistics. First is the EL method. Initially proposed by Owen (1988) as a nonparametric counterpart of the maximum likelihood theory, the EL method has been widely studied in statistical problems like regression and hypothesis testing etc. (e.g., Qin and Lawless 1994, Owen 2001, Hjort et al. 2009). Its use in operations research is relatively recent and is limited to optimization. Lam and Zhou (2017) investigates the use of EL in quantifying uncertainty in sample average approximation. Lam (2016b) uses EL to derive uncertainty sets for DRO that guarantees feasibility for stochastic constraints. Duchi et al. (2016) generalizes the EL method to Hadamard differentiable functions and obtains tight optimality bounds for stochastic optimization problems. Blanchet and Kang (2016), Blanchet et al. (2016) generalize the EL method to inference using the Wasserstein distance. In addition, our work also utilizes the influence function, which captures nonparametric sensitivity information of a statistic, and is first proposed by Hampel (1974) in the context of robust statistics (Huber and Ronchetti 2009, Hampel et al. 2011) as a heuristic tool to measure the effect of data contamination. Influence function is also used in deriving asymptotic results for von Mises differentiable functionals which have profound applications in  $U$ -statistics (Serfling 2009).

Lastly, our approach resembles DRO, which utilizes worst-case perspectives in stochastic decision-making problems under ambiguous probability distributions. In particular, our optimization posited over the space of input probability distributions has a similar spirit as the search for the worst-case distribution in the inner optimization in DRO. The DRO framework has been applied in various disciplines such as economics (Hansen and Sargent 2008), finance (Glasserman and Xu 2013, 2014), stochastic control (Petersen et al. 2000, Iyengar 2005, Nilim and El Ghaoui 2005, Xu and Mannor 2012), queueing (Jain et al. 2010) and dynamic pricing (Lim and Shanthikumar 2007). Among them, constraints in terms of  $\phi$ -divergences, which include the Burg-entropy divergence appearing in our approach, have been considered in, e.g. Ben-Tal et al.

(2013), Bayraksan and Love (2015), Jiang and Guan (2012), so are other types of statistical distances such as Renyi divergence (e.g., Atar et al. 2015, Dey and Juneja 2012, Blanchet and Murthy 2016b) and the Wasserstein distance (e.g., Esfahani and Kuhn 2015, Blanchet and Murthy 2016a, Gao and Kleywegt 2016), and other constraint types including moments and support (e.g., Delage and Ye 2010, Goh and Sim 2010, Hu et al. 2012, Wiesemann et al. 2014). In simulation, the DRO idea has appeared in Glasserman and Xu (2014), Lam (2016c, 2017), Ghosh and Lam (2016) in quantifying model risks. Nonetheless, although our involved optimization looks similar to DRO, the underpinning statistical guarantees of our approach stem from the EL method. As we will explain, our constraints possess properties that are dramatically different from those studied in DRO, and their precise forms also deviate from any known DRO suggestions.

### 3. Optimization-based Confidence Intervals

This section presents our main procedure and statistical guarantees. We start with our problem setting and some notations.

#### 3.1. Problem Setting

We consider a performance measure in the form

$$Z^* = Z(P_1, \dots, P_m) = \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)], \quad (1)$$

where  $P_1, \dots, P_m$  are the distributions governing  $m$  independent input models,  $\mathbf{X}_i = (X_i(1), \dots, X_i(T_i))$  is a sequence of  $T_i$  i.i.d. random variables/vectors each distributed under  $P_i$ , and  $T_i$  is a deterministic run length. The distribution  $P_i$  has (possibly multivariate) domain  $\mathfrak{X}_i$ . The function  $h$  mapping from  $\mathfrak{X}_1^{T_1} \times \dots \times \mathfrak{X}_m^{T_m}$  to  $\mathbb{R}$  is assumed computable given the inputs  $\mathbf{X}_i$ 's. In other words, given the sequence  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m$ , the value of  $h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)$  can be evaluated by the computer. The notation  $\mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}[\cdot]$  is a shorthand for  $\mathbb{E}_{P_1^{T_1} \times \dots \times P_m^{T_m}}[\cdot]$ , the expectation taken over all the independent i.i.d. sequences  $\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m$ , i.e., under the product measure  $P_1^{T_1} \times \dots \times P_m^{T_m}$ . We use  $X_i$  to denote a generic random variable/vector distributed under  $P_i$ .

As a simple example,  $\mathbf{X}_1$  and  $\mathbf{X}_2$  can represent respectively the sequences of inter-arrival times and service times in a queueing system.  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  represent the corresponding input distributions.  $h$  denotes the indicator function of the exceedance of some waiting time above a threshold. Then  $Z(P_1, P_2)$  becomes the waiting time tail probability.

Our premise is that there exists a true  $P_i$  that is unknown for each  $i$ , but a sample of  $n_i$  i.i.d. observations  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$  is available from each  $P_i$ . The true value of (1) is therefore unknown even under abundant simulation runs. Our goal is to find an asymptotically accurate (1 –

$\alpha$ )-level CI for the true performance measure  $Z^*$ . To be more precise, we call a CI asymptotically exact if it consists of two numbers  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$ , derived from the data and the simulation, such that

$$\lim_{\text{each } n_i \text{ and } R \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}) = 1 - \alpha$$

where  $R$  is the total number of simulation replications involved in generating the CI, and the probability  $P$  is taken with respect to the joint randomness in the data and the simulation. The asymptotic above is qualified by certain growth rates of  $n_i$  and  $R$  that we will detail.

Along our development will also arise cases in which a coverage guarantee is provided as a lower bound, i.e.,

$$\liminf_{\text{each } n_i \text{ and } R \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}) \geq 1 - \alpha$$

We call  $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}]$  an asymptotically valid  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level CI. The CIs constructed from our procedures will be either asymptotically exact or, asymptotically valid and accompanied with an associated upper bound that quantifies the tightness of the coverage. Lastly, our developments fix the number of independent input models  $m$  and the run lengths  $T_i$ 's, i.e., we focus primarily on transient performance measures with a moderate number of input models relative to the data and simulation sizes.

### 3.2. Main Procedure

Algorithm 1 gives a step-by-step description of our basic procedure for computing  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ . The quantity  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  for each  $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i$  introduced in Step 1 is the sample estimate of the so-called influence function of  $Z$ , which can be viewed as the gradient of  $Z$  taken with respect to the input distributions (see Assumption 2 and the subsequent discussion). This sample estimate of the influence function is obtained from  $R_1$  simulation runs.

Step 2 in Algorithm 1 outputs a minimizer and a maximizer of the optimization (3) in which “min / max” denotes a pair of minimization and maximization, and the calibrating constant  $\chi^2_{1,1-\alpha}$  is the  $1 - \alpha$  quantile of the chi-square distribution with degree of freedom one. Optimization (3) can be viewed as a sample average approximation (SAA) (Shapiro et al. 2014) on the influence function (expressible as an expectation), with decision variables being the probability weights  $w_{i,j}, i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i$  on the influence function evaluated at each observation  $X_{i,j}$  of input model  $i$ . For convenience, we denote  $\mathbf{w}_i = (w_{i,j})_{j=1, \dots, n_i}$  as the weight vector associated with input model  $i$ , and  $\mathbf{w} = (\mathbf{w}_i)_{i=1, \dots, m}$  be the aggregate weight vector.

Optimization (3) can be interpreted as two worst-case optimization problems over  $m$  independent input distributions, each on support  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$ , subject to a weighted average of individual statistical divergences (Pardo 2005). To explain, the quantity  $D_{n_i}(\mathbf{w}_i) = -(1/n_i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j})$  is the Burg-entropy divergence (Ben-Tal et al. 2013) (or the Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence)

**Algorithm 1** Basic Empirical-Likelihood-Based Procedure (BEL)

**Input:** Data  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$  for each input model  $i = 1, \dots, m$ . A target confidence level  $1 - \alpha$ , and numbers of simulation replications,  $R_1, 2R_2$ , to be used in Step 1 and Step 3 respectively.

**Procedure:**

**1. Influence Function Estimation:** For each  $i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i$  compute estimate of the influence function evaluated at  $X_{i,j}$

$$\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = \frac{1}{R_1} \sum_{r=1}^{R_1} [(h(\mathbf{X}_1^r, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^r) - \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m))(n_i \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i^r(t) = X_{i,j}\} - T_i)] \quad (2)$$

where for each  $r = 1, \dots, R_1$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^r = (X_i^r(1), \dots, X_i^r(T_i))$  are i.i.d. variates drawn independently from the uniform distribution on  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$  for each  $i$ ,  $\mathbf{1}\{\cdot\}$  is the indicator function, and  $\hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) = \sum_{r=1}^{R_1} h(\mathbf{X}_1^r, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^r)/R_1$  is the sample mean of the outputs.

**2. Optimization:** Compute respective optimal solutions  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  and  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max})$  of the following pair of programs

$$\begin{aligned} \min / \max \quad & \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j} \\ \text{subject to} \quad & -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m \\ & w_{i,j} \geq 0, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

**3. Evaluation:** Compute

$$\mathcal{L}^{BEL} = \frac{1}{R_2} \sum_{r=1}^{R_2} h(\mathbf{X}_1^{r,\min}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^{r,\min}), \quad \mathcal{U}^{BEL} = \frac{1}{R_2} \sum_{r=1}^{R_2} h(\mathbf{X}_1^{r,\max}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^{r,\max})$$

where for each  $r = 1, \dots, R_2$ ,  $\mathbf{X}_i^{r,\min} = (X_i^{r,\min}(1), \dots, X_i^{r,\min}(T_i))$  and  $\mathbf{X}_i^{r,\max} = (X_i^{r,\max}(1), \dots, X_i^{r,\max}(T_i))$  are i.i.d. variates drawn independently from a weighted distribution on  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$ , according to weights  $\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}$ , respectively for each  $i$ .

**Output:** The CI  $[\mathcal{L}^{BEL}, \mathcal{U}^{BEL}]$ .

between the probability weights  $\mathbf{w}_i$  and the uniform weights. Thus, letting  $N = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i$  be the total number of observations from all input models, we have

$$-\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i}{N} \left( -\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \right) = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i}{N} D_{n_i}(\mathbf{w}_i)$$

which is an average of the Burg-entropy divergences imposed on different input models, each weighted by the proportion of the respective observations,  $n_i/N$ . The first constraint in (3) can thus be written as

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n_i}{N} D_{n_i}(\mathbf{w}_i) \leq \frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}$$

which constitutes a neighborhood ball of size  $\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2/(2N)$  measured by the averaged Burg-entropy divergence.

Finally, Step 3 in Algorithm 1 uses the obtained optimal probability weights  $\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}$  and  $\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}$  to form two weighted empirical distributions on  $\{X_{ij}\}_{j=1,\dots,n_i}$  for input model  $i$ , which are used to drive two independent sets of simulation runs, each of size  $R_2$ , in order to output the lower and upper confidence bounds respectively.

An efficient method to solve optimization (3) is discussed in the following proposition:

PROPOSITION 1. *For each  $i$  and every  $\beta > 0$  define  $\lambda_i(\beta)$  to be the unique solution of the equation*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{2\beta}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i} = 1 \quad (4)$$

*on the interval  $(-\min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}), \infty)$ . Let  $\beta^* > 0$  solve the equation*

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log \frac{2n_i\beta}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i(\beta)} + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 = 0. \quad (5)$$

*If there exist some  $i_0 \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, n_{i_0}\}$  such that  $\hat{G}_{i_0}(X_{i_0,j_1}) \neq \hat{G}_{i_0}(X_{i_0,j_2})$ , then  $\beta^* \in (0, D/(2(1 - e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}) \min_i n_i))$  and is unique, where  $D = \max\{\max_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) | i = 1, \dots, m\}$ ,  $N = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i$ , and the minimizer  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  of (3) can be obtained by*

$$w_{i,j}^{\min} = \frac{2\beta^*}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i(\beta^*)}.$$

*The maximizer  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max})$  can be computed in the same way except that each  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  is replaced by  $-\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ .*

*Otherwise, if for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$  the coefficient  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  takes the same value across all  $j = 1, \dots, n_i$ , then (3) has a constant objective hence becomes trivial.*

The proof of Proposition 1 uses the Karush-Kuhn-Tucker (KKT) conditions of (3), and can be found in Section EC.6 of the Appendix. To implement what Proposition 1 suggests, given a value of  $\beta$  we can efficiently evaluate each  $\lambda_i(\beta)$  by solving (4) with Newton's method. Then,  $\beta^*$  is obtained by running a bisection on (5) over the interval  $(0, D/(2(1 - e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}) \min_i n_i))$ , and finally each  $w_{i,j}^{\min}$  or  $w_{i,j}^{\max}$  is computed from  $\beta^*$ ,  $\lambda_i(\beta^*)$ 's and  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ 's. Note that for any  $\beta > 0$  the left hand



side of (4) is monotonically decreasing and convex in  $\lambda_i$ , hence Newton's method is guaranteed to converge to  $\lambda_i(\beta)$  as long as it starts within  $(-\min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}), \lambda_i(\beta))$ , say at  $2\beta - \min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ . The advantage of this approach over directly solving the convex optimization (3) is that we reduce the dimension of the decision space, from linear in the sample sizes to only solving univariate equations in (4) and (5), which is much more favorable when the sample sizes are large.

Next we provide two variants of Algorithm 1, depicted as Algorithms 2 and 3, which differ only by the last step. The motivation (with more details in Section 4.6) is that Algorithm 1 tends to under-cover the true performance value because its last step only outputs the sample mean of the simulation replications and does not take full account of the stochastic uncertainty. Algorithm 2 takes care of this uncertainty by outputting the standard normal lower and upper confidence bounds in the last step. However, this simple adjustment does not account for the joint variances from the input data and the stochasticity in a tight manner, and tends to generate conservative CIs that over-cover the truth. This motivates the refined adjustment in Algorithm 3 that is designed to match the CI inflation from combined input and stochastic uncertainties, by taking into account the asymptotic form of the joint variance, and subsequently leads to accurate coverage performances. The  $\hat{\sigma}_I^2$  in Algorithm 3 estimates the input-induced variance. In the expression of  $\hat{\sigma}_I^2$ , the sample variance  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2/n_i$  for input model  $i$  is upward biased due to the simulation noise in each  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ , which is removed by introducing the term  $n_i T_i \hat{\sigma}^2/R_1$ . The positive-part operation is to handle small  $R_1$  situations where such a variance estimate could yield negative values due to the bias correction, in which case we reset it to zero.

---

**Algorithm 2** Evaluation-Adjusted Empirical Likelihood (EEL)

---

Follow Algorithm 1 until Step 3. Replace Step 3 by

$$\mathcal{L}^{EEL} = \hat{Z}^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}}{\sqrt{R_2}}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL} = \hat{Z}^{\max} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\max}}{\sqrt{R_2}}$$

where

$$\hat{Z}^{\min} = \frac{1}{R_2} \sum_{r=1}^{R_2} h(\mathbf{X}_1^{r,\min}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^{r,\min}), \hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2 = \frac{1}{R_2 - 1} \sum_{r=1}^{R_2} (h(\mathbf{X}_1^{r,\min}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^{r,\min}) - \hat{Z}^{\min})^2$$

are the sample mean and variance of the  $R_2$  simulation runs driven by distributions on  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$  with weights  $\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}$ , and  $\hat{Z}^{\max}, \hat{\sigma}_{\max}^2$  are defined accordingly.  $z_{1-\alpha/2}$  is the  $1 - \alpha/2$  quantile of the standard normal.

**Output:** The CI  $[\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}]$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** Fully Adjusted Empirical Likelihood (FEL)

Follow Algorithm 1 until Step 3. Replace Step 3 by

$$\mathcal{L}^{FEL} = \hat{Z}^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2}{R_2}} - \hat{\sigma}_I \right), \quad \mathcal{U}^{FEL} = \hat{Z}^{\max} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\max}^2}{R_2}} - \hat{\sigma}_I \right)$$

where  $z_{1-\alpha/2}, \hat{Z}^{\min}, \hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2, \hat{Z}^{\max}, \hat{\sigma}_{\max}^2$  are the same as in Algorithm 2, and

$$\hat{\sigma}_I^2 = \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2}{n_i} - \frac{n_i T_i \hat{\sigma}^2}{R_1} \right], 0 \right\}, \quad \text{with } \hat{\sigma}^2 = \frac{1}{R_1 - 1} \sum_{r=1}^{R_1} (h(\mathbf{X}_1^r, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m^r) - \hat{Z})^2 \quad (6)$$

is computed from the  $R_1$  replications generated in Step 1.

**Output:** The CI  $[\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}]$ .

**3.3. Statistical Guarantees**

We present statistical guarantees of Algorithms 1, 2 and 3. We assume the following:

ASSUMPTION 1. *There exist constants  $0 < \underline{c}, \bar{c} < \infty$  such that  $\underline{c} \leq \frac{n_i}{n} \leq \bar{c}$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$  as all  $n_i \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $n = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m n_i$  is the averaged data size.*

Assumption 1 postulates that data sizes across different input models grow at the same rate. For convenience, we shall use the averaged size  $n$  to represent the overall scale of the data size throughout the paper.

ASSUMPTION 2. *At least one of  $\text{Var}(G_i(X_i)), i = 1, \dots, m$  is non-zero, where*

$$G_i(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) | X_i(t) = x] - T_i Z(P_1, \dots, P_m).$$

ASSUMPTION 3. *For each  $i$  let  $I_i = (I_i(1), \dots, I_i(T_i))$  be a sequence of indices such that  $1 \leq I_i(t) \leq T_i$ , and  $\mathbf{X}_{i, I_i} = (X_i(I_i(1)), \dots, X_i(I_i(T_i)))$ . Assume  $\mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [|h(\mathbf{X}_{1, I_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, I_m})|^8]$  is finite for all such  $I_i$ 's.*

The function  $G_i(x)$  in Assumption 2 is the influence function (Hampel 1974, Hampel et al. 2011) of the performance measure  $Z(P_1, \dots, P_m)$  with respect to the input distribution  $P_i$ , which measures the infinitesimal effect caused by perturbing  $P_i$  and represents the Gateaux derivative of  $Z$  in the sense

$$\left. \frac{d}{d\epsilon} Z(P_1, \dots, P_{i-1}, (1-\epsilon)P_i + \epsilon Q_i, P_{i+1}, \dots, P_m) \right|_{\epsilon=0^+} = \int G_i(x) dQ_i(x) \quad (7)$$

for any distribution  $Q_i$  on  $\mathfrak{X}_i$ . Assumption 2 entails that at least one of the influence functions is non-degenerate at the true input distributions  $P_i$ 's, or in other words, at least one of these distributions would exert a first-order effect on the performance measure. This assumption is

essential in ensuring a normality asymptotic for the output performance measure. In lack of this assumption, the output performance measure will satisfy a  $\chi^2$  or even higher-order asymptotic behavior as the input data size grows, which has never been observed in the simulation literature to our best knowledge (the parametric analog of this would be to say that the first-order sensitivities to all input parameters are zero).

Note that the  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  in Step 1 of Algorithm 1 is a sample version of  $G_i(X_{i,j})$ . Assumption 3 is a moment condition that, as we will see, controls the magnitude of the linearization error in Step 2 and the simulation error in Steps 1 and 3 of our algorithms. It holds if, for instance,  $h$  is bounded.

We have the following statistical guarantees in using the three proposed algorithms to construct input-induced CIs:

**THEOREM 1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. If the simulation sizes  $R_1, R_2$  are chosen such that  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \rightarrow \infty$ , then the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{BEL}, \mathcal{U}^{BEL}$  of Algorithm 1 constitute an asymptotically exact  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level CI, i.e.,*

$$\lim_{n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty: \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{BEL}) = 1 - \alpha. \quad (8)$$

**THEOREM 2.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. If the simulation sizes  $R_1, R_2$  are chosen such that  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \leq M$  for some constant  $M > 0$ , then the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}$  of Algorithm 2 constitute an asymptotically valid  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level CI, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty: \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \text{ bounded}} P(\mathcal{L}^{EEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{EEL}) &\geq 1 - \alpha \\ \limsup_{n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty: \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \text{ bounded}} P(\mathcal{L}^{EEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{EEL}) &\leq 1 - \tilde{\alpha} + \frac{\tilde{\alpha}^2}{4} \end{aligned}$$

where  $1 - \frac{\tilde{\alpha}}{2} = \Phi(\sqrt{2}z_{1-\alpha/2})$  with  $\Phi$  being the distribution function of the standard normal. Moreover, if  $\frac{R_2}{n} \rightarrow \infty$  like in Theorem 1, then the CI is asymptotically exact, i.e., (8) holds for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}$ .

**THEOREM 3.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. If the simulation sizes  $R_1, R_2$  are chosen such that  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \leq M$  for some constant  $M > 0$ , then the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  of Algorithm 3 constitute an asymptotically valid  $(1 - \alpha)$ -level CI, i.e.,*

$$\begin{aligned} \liminf_{n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty: \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \text{ bounded}} P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) &\geq 1 - \alpha \\ \limsup_{n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty: \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \text{ bounded}} P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) &\leq 1 - \alpha + \frac{\alpha^2}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, if  $\frac{R_2}{n} \rightarrow \infty$  like in Theorem 1, then the CI is asymptotically exact, i.e., (8) holds for  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$ .

Theorem 1 states that Algorithm 1 generates an asymptotically exact CI for the true performance measure, when the simulation budgets available to both Step 1 and Step 3 dominate the data size. Theorems 2 and 3 show that in Algorithms 2 and 3 the simulation effort for Step 3 can be reduced to grow independent of the data size. This is thanks to the adjustment in the evaluation of the confidence bounds that accounts for the stochastic uncertainty in Step 3. The CI from Algorithm 2 tends to be conservative and can over-cover the truth with a level of  $1 - \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\alpha}^2/2$ . To get a sense of this conservativeness, when the desired coverage level  $1 - \alpha = 90\%$ , the guaranteed level can be as high as  $1 - \tilde{\alpha} + \tilde{\alpha}^2/2 \approx 98\%$ . On the other hand, the further refinement in Algorithm 3 is able to recover the exact coverage up to an error of  $\alpha^2/4$ , which is negligible for most purposes (e.g., when  $\alpha = 5\%$ ,  $\alpha^2/4 = 0.0625\%$ ).

## 4. Theory on Statistical Guarantees

This section further elaborates on Algorithms 1, 2 and 3, and explains the underlying theories leading to Theorems 1, 2 and 3. Section 4.1 starts with an initial interpretation of our approach from a distributionally robust optimization (DRO) perspective. The subsequent subsections then discuss the guarantees in several steps. Section 4.2 first presents a linear approximation on the performance measures to bypass some statistical and computational bottlenecks. Sections 4.3 and 4.4 develop the EL method for the linearized problem and CI construction. Section 4.5 incorporates the simulation errors. Lastly, Section 4.6 discusses the last evaluation steps in our procedures and links them to the conclusions of Theorems 1, 2 and 3.

### 4.1. An Initial Interpretation from DRO

On a high level, our algorithms in Section 3.2 can be interpreted as attempting to solve the following problem. Given the observations  $\{X_{i,1}, \dots, X_{i,n_i}\}$  for input model  $i$ , we consider the weighted empirical distribution  $(1/n_i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} \delta_{X_{i,j}}(x)$ , where  $\delta_{X_{i,j}}$  denotes the delta measure on  $X_{i,j}$ . Slightly abusing notations to denote  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  as the performance measure evaluated at these weighed distributions, we consider

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}/\mathcal{U} := \min / \max \quad & Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \mathbf{w} \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{U}_\alpha = \left\{ (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathbb{R}^N \left| \begin{array}{l} -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1, \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m \\ w_{i,j} \geq 0, \text{ for all } i, j \end{array} \right. \right\} \tag{10}$$

This problem resembles DRO, which is a special class of robust optimization whose uncertainty is on the probability distribution. More specifically, robust optimization considers decision-making under uncertainty or ambiguity of the underlying parameters, and advocate optimizing the objective

under the worst-case scenario, where the worst-case is over all parameters within the so-called uncertainty set or ambiguity set. In DRO, the uncertain quantities are the probability distributions that govern a stochastic optimization, so that the uncertainty set lies in the space of distributions. From this view, optimization (9) calculates the worst-case performance measure subject to the uncertainty set  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ . In particular, as discussed in Section 3.2, the constraint in (10) resembles an averaged Burg-entropy divergence, comprising of  $m$  terms each being the divergence between the distribution weighted by  $\mathbf{w}_i$  and the uniform distribution, on the support generated by the empirical data  $\{X_{i,j}\}_{j=1,\dots,n_i}$ .

Despite this Burg-entropy divergence interpretation that ties the optimal weights in (9) to “worst-case” distributions, the conceptual reasoning of  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  that we present below is fundamentally different from DRO, the latter advocates the use of uncertainty sets that contain the true distribution with a certain confidence. To this end, a divergence ball used as an uncertainty set must use a “baseline” distribution that is absolutely continuous to the true distribution, in order to have an overwhelming (or at least non-zero) probability of containing the truth (Jiang and Guan 2012, Esfahani and Kuhn 2015). This condition is violated in formulation (9) when the true input distribution is continuous. As the baseline distribution in our divergence (namely the empirical distribution) is supported only on the data, the resulting ball does not contain any continuous distributions. Moreover, the use of weighted average and its particular weights put on each of these empirically defined divergences is also an unnatural choice from a DRO perspective.

Thus, instead of arguing the statistical behaviors of (9) through the conventional reasoning of DRO, we will explain them using a generalization of the empirical likelihood (EL) method, which is a nonparametric analog of maximum likelihood and endows a tight statistical confidence guarantee in using (9) that can be translated to our procedures. Moreover, we also note that, from a computational viewpoint, (9) is non-convex and intractable in general. Our procedures as well as statistical developments thus rely on a linearization of the objective function in (9). Furthermore, estimating the objective (i.e., the performance measure) and its linearization involves running simulation and incurs the associated errors. The next several subsections detail the linearization, the EL method development, and the sampling error control.

#### 4.2. Linearization of Performance Measure

We first state a property related to a more general notion of the influence function in (7) that shows up in Assumption 2:

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Let  $(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1), (Q_1^2, \dots, Q_m^2)$  be two sets of distributions such that for any  $s_{i,t} \in \{1, 2\}$  with  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $t = 1, \dots, T_i$*

$$\int |h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m)| \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} dQ_i^{s_{i,t}}(x_{i,t}) < +\infty,$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,t})_{t=1,\dots,T_i}$ , then

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\epsilon} (Z((1-\epsilon)Q_1^1 + \epsilon Q_1^2, \dots, (1-\epsilon)Q_m^1 + \epsilon Q_m^2) - Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1)) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{Q_i^2} [G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(X_i)], \quad (11)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_{Q_i^2}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation with respect to  $Q_i^2$  that governs  $X_i$ , and  $G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}$  is the influence function of  $Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1)$  with respect to the distribution  $Q_i^1$ , given by

$$G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{E}_{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) | X_i(t) = x] - T_i Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1).$$

Moreover,  $\mathbb{E}_{Q_i^1} [G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(X_i)] = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Proposition 2 can be shown by using techniques in the asymptotic analysis of von Mises statistical functionals (e.g., Serfling 2009). It suggests the following linear approximation of  $Z(Q_1^2, \dots, Q_m^2)$  around  $(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1)$

$$Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) + \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{Q_i^2} [G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(X)] \quad (12)$$

where the sum consists of expectations of influence functions under  $Q_i^2$  and hence is linear in  $Q_i^2$ . In particular, when  $Q_i^1 = P_i$ , i.e., the true input distribution, and  $Q_i^2 = \mathbf{w}_i$  (abusing notations slightly to denote  $\mathbf{w}_i$  as the weighted distribution supported on the observations  $\{X_{i,j}\}_{j=1,\dots,n_i}$ ), (12) suggests a linear approximation of  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  given by

$$Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) := Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} G_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j} \quad (13)$$

where the  $G_i$ 's are defined in Assumption 2 and correspond to the influence functions of  $Z$  at the true input distributions.

Furthermore, taking  $Q_i^1 = \hat{P}_i$ , i.e., the empirical input distribution, and  $Q_i^2 = \mathbf{w}_i$  in (12), we arrive at the linearization of  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  around the uniform weights  $w_{i,j} = 1/n_i$

$$\widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) := Z(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j} \quad (14)$$

where the  $\hat{G}_i$ 's are the influence functions of  $Z$  at the empirical input distributions, defined by

$$\hat{G}_i(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) | X_i(t) = x] - T_i Z(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m). \quad (15)$$

The following result characterizes the quality of the above two linear approximations:

PROPOSITION 3. *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|^2 \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \quad (16)$$

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|^2 \right] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2}\right) \quad (17)$$

where  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  is defined in (10).

Proposition 3 suggests that, restricting to  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ , the maximal deviations of the linear approximations from the true performance measure vanish as fast as  $1/n$ . Next we will build the theories and explain our procedures for a linearized performance measure, and relate them back to the original nonlinear performance measure  $Z$  through Proposition 3.

### 4.3. Empirical Likelihood Theory for Sums of Means

First proposed by Owen (1988), the EL method can be viewed as a nonparametric counterpart of the maximum likelihood theory. Here we will develop this method for the linear approximation  $Z_L$ . Note that the second term in (13) can be expressed as a sum of means, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_i}[G_i(X_i)]$ . Therefore, to ease notation and emphasize its generality, we will present our EL method as a generic inference tool for estimating sums of means.

Suppose we are given  $m$  independent samples of i.i.d. observations  $\{Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,n_i}\}, i = 1, \dots, m$ , with each  $Y_{i,j}$  distributed according to a common distribution  $F_i$ . For the  $i$ -th sample, we define its nonparametric likelihood, in terms of the probability weights  $\mathbf{w}_i$  over the support points of the data, to be  $\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}$ . The multi-sample likelihood is  $\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}$ . By a simple convexity argument, it can be shown that assigning uniform weights  $w_{i,j} = 1/n_i$  for each sample yields the maximal value  $\prod_{i=1}^m (1/n_i)^{n_i}$ . Moreover, uniform weights still maximize even if one allows putting weights outside the support of data, in which case  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} < 1$  for some  $i$ , making  $\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}$  even smaller. Therefore, the uniform weights  $w_{i,j} = 1/n_i$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, n_i$  can be viewed as the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimate for the  $i$ -th distribution  $F_i$ , and  $w_{i,j} = 1/n_i$  for all  $i, j$  is the multi-sample counterpart.

To proceed, we need to define a parameter of interest that is determined by the distributions  $F_i$ 's. In our case, the parameter of interest is the sum of means  $\mu_0 := \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}Y_i$  where each  $Y_i$  is distributed under  $F_i$ .

The key of the EL method is to establish limit theorems analogous to the celebrated Wilks' Theorem (Wilks (1938)) in the maximum likelihood theory, which stipulates that a suitably defined logarithmic likelihood ratio converges to a  $\chi^2$  random variable. In the EL setting, we use the so-called profile nonparametric likelihood ratio to carry out inference on parameters. To explain this, first, the nonparametric likelihood ratio is defined as the ratio between the nonparametric likelihood of a given set of weights and the uniform weights (i.e., the nonparametric maximum likelihood estimate). The profile nonparametric likelihood ratio is defined as the maximal ratio among all probability weights giving rise to a particular value  $\mu$  for the sum of means, i.e.,

$$R(\mu) = \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right. \right\}, \quad (18)$$

and is defined to be 0 if the optimization problem in (18) is infeasible. Profiling here refers to the categorization of weights that lead to the same value  $\mu$ .

The quantity  $R(\mu)$  satisfies the following asymptotic property:

**THEOREM 4.** *Let  $Y_i$  be a random variable distributed under  $F_i$ . Assume  $\text{Var}(Y_i) < \infty$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and at least one of them is non-zero, and that the sample sizes  $n_i$ 's satisfy Assumption 1. Then  $-2\log R(\mu_0)$ , where  $\mu_0$  is the sum of the true means, converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{X}_1^2$ , the chi-square distribution with degree of freedom one, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

In other words, the logarithmic profile nonparametric likelihood ratio at the true value asymptotically follows a chi-square distribution with degree of freedom one. This degree of freedom is the effective number of parameters to be estimated which, in this case, is one since there is only a single target parameter  $\mu_0$ . Note that this is independent of the number of input distributions  $m$ .

Theorem 4 is a sum-of-mean generalization of the well-known empirical likelihood theorem (ELT) for single-sample mean:

**THEOREM 5 (Owen (2001) Theorem 2.2).** *Consider only the first sample  $\{Y_{1,1}, \dots, Y_{1,n_1}\}$ . Assume  $0 < \text{Var}(Y_1) < \infty$ . Then  $-2\log R(\mathbb{E}Y_1)$  converges in distribution to  $\mathcal{X}_1^2$ , as  $n_1 \rightarrow \infty$ . The function  $R(\cdot)$  here is the same as that in (18) but with  $m = 1$ .*

Extensions of this theorem have been studied in the literature (e.g., Owen 1990, 1991, Qin and Lawless 1994, Hjort et al. 2009). The most relevant one is in the context of analysis-of-variance (ANOVA), in which the logarithmic profile nonparametric likelihood ratio at the true means of multiple independent samples are shown to converge to  $\mathcal{X}_m^2$ , where  $m$  is the number of samples (or groups). However, the argument for this result relies on viewing the multiple samples as a collection of heteroscedastic data and applying the triangular array ELT (Owen 1991), which does not apply obviously to our case. Another related extension is the plug-in EL (Hjort et al. 2009) which entails that, under  $p$  estimating functions that possibly involve unknown nuisance parameters, the associated logarithmic profile likelihood ratio converges to a weighted sum of  $p$  independent  $\mathcal{X}_1^2$ 's, if “good enough” estimators of the unknown nuisance parameters are used in evaluating the profile likelihood ratio. However, Hjort et al. (2009) focuses on the single-sample case, thus is not directly applicable. There have also been studies on applying EL to hypothesis testing of two-sample mean differences (Liu et al. 2008, Wu and Yan 2012), but it appears that a fully rigorous proof is not available for our general multi-sample sum-of-means setting. In view of these, we provide a detailed proof of Theorem 4 in Section EC.2 of the Appendix.

A sketch of the key idea is as follows. We first introduce the auxiliary variables  $\mu_i$  that represent the means of individual samples, so that the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu$  in (18) is replaced



by  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu_i, i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = \mu$ . The KKT conditions then enforce the optimal weights to be

$$w_{i,j}^* = \frac{1}{n_i + \lambda^*(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}$$

where  $\lambda^*$  is the Lagrange multiplier for the constraint  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = \mu$  and  $\mu_i^*$  is the optimal solution for  $\mu_i$ . When  $\mu$  is the true value  $\mu_0$ , an asymptotic analysis on the KKT conditions approximates  $\lambda^*$  as

$$\lambda^* \approx \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (\bar{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i)}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}$$

where  $\bar{Y}_i = (1/n_i) \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}$  is the sample mean and  $\sigma_i^2$  is the variance of  $Y_i$ . Moreover, we have the approximation  $\mu_i^* \approx \mathbb{E}Y_i$ . By Taylor's expansion, the logarithmic profile nonparametric likelihood ratio can be approximated as

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R(\mu_0) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log \left( 1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right) \\ &\approx 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left( \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) - \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{2n_i^2} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 \right) \\ &\approx 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda^* (\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^*) - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda^{*2} \sigma_i^2}{n_i} \\ &\approx \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m (\bar{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right)^2 \\ &\Rightarrow \chi_1^2 \end{aligned}$$

where “ $\Rightarrow$ ” denotes convergence in distribution. This gives our result in Theorem 4.

#### 4.4. Duality and Optimization-based Confidence Interval

From Theorem 4, a duality-type argument will give rise to a pair of optimization problems whose optimal values will serve as confidence bounds for the sum of the true means. We have the following:

**THEOREM 6.** *Under the same conditions of Theorem 4, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\underline{\mu} \leq \mu_0 \leq \bar{\mu}) = 1 - \alpha$$

where

$$\underline{\mu}/\bar{\mu} := \min / \max \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} \mid (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha \right\}. \quad (19)$$

Theorem 6 thus translates the asymptotic convergence in Theorem 4 into an asymptotically exact confidence bound. This is argued by a duality argument that turns the first constraint in (18) into objective and vice versa. The concept is similar to Wilks' Theorem for maximum likelihood, but with the profiling that leads to the resulting optimization problems in (19).

Moreover, in terms of the positions, the optimization-based confidence bounds  $\underline{\mu}$  and  $\bar{\mu}$  are equivalent to the standard normality-based confidence bounds up to negligible errors, as described below:

PROPOSITION 4. *Under the same conditions of Theorem 4, the confidence bounds  $\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}$  from Theorem 6 satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned}\underline{\mu} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ \bar{\mu} &= \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\bar{Y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}/n_i$  is the sample mean of  $\{Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,n_i}\}$  and  $\sigma_i^2$  is the true variance of  $Y_i$ , and  $z_{1-\alpha/2}$  is the  $1 - \alpha/2$  quantile of the standard normal.

The errors between  $\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}$  and the normality-based bounds  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i \pm z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}$  are negligible in the sense that they are of smaller order than the width of the resulting CI, which is of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$ .

Applying the above two results to the linear approximation  $Z_L$ , we have the following:

COROLLARY 1. *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, we have*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{L}_L \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}_L) = 1 - \alpha \quad (20)$$

where

$$\mathcal{L}_L/\mathcal{U}_L := \min / \max \left\{ Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \mid (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha \right\}. \quad (21)$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_L &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ \mathcal{U}_L &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where each  $\bar{G}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} G_i(X_{i,j})/n_i$  is the sample mean of  $\{G_i(X_{i,1}), \dots, G_i(X_{i,n_i})\}$ ,  $\sigma_I^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i$ , and  $z_{1-\alpha/2}$  is the  $1 - \alpha/2$  quantile of the standard normal.

Note that the influence functions in (13) satisfy  $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{P_i}[G_i(X_i)] = 0$  due to the last claim in Proposition 2. Thus, letting  $Y_{i,j} = G_i(X_{i,j})$  in Theorem 6 and Proposition 4, and noting that the  $Z^*$  in (20) and (22) can be cancelled out, we arrive at the conclusion in Corollary 1.

Next, combining Corollary 1 and the linearization error (16), we can establish similar results for  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  that arise in (9):

THEOREM 7. *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, the minimal and maximal values  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  of (9) satisfy*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}) = 1 - \alpha,$$

*and the asymptotic equivalence (22) holds true with  $\mathcal{L}_L, \mathcal{U}_L$  replaced by  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$ .*

The proof of Theorem 7 consists of first approximating the discrepancies between the optimal values, i.e.,  $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_L + O_p(1/n)$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}_L + O_p(1/n)$ , using (16), and then showing that any quantities that equal (22), up to a small order of discrepancies, deliver an interval with asymptotically exact coverage probability by a standard application of Slutsky's Theorem.

#### 4.5. Estimating Influence Function

Our proposed CIs in Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 use a combination of the intervals suggested in Corollary 1 and Theorem 7. Before we explain this concretely, note that directly using the definition of  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  in (9) will encounter computational difficulties due to the general intractability of the optimization. Thus, we consider using optimization (21) or expression (22) (either  $\mathcal{L}_L, \mathcal{U}_L$  in Corollary 1 or  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  in Theorem 7) as our confidence bounds. In either case, we need to estimate the influence function represented by  $G_i(X_{i,j})$ 's.

There are two sources of errors in estimating  $G_i(X_{i,j})$ . First, since we do not know the true distribution  $P_i$ , we approximate it by the influence function evaluated at the empirical distribution, namely  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  defined in (15) (which in turn forms the coefficient in  $\widehat{Z}_L$ ). Second,  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ , like  $G_i(X_{i,j})$ , is a sum of conditional expectations, which needs to be estimated by simulation. Ghosh and Lam (2016, 2015) propose an unbiased estimator for such quantities where the input distributions have arbitrary weights  $w_{i,j}$  on their support points. Here we use their scheme for the special case of uniform weights. Similar approaches also arise in the so-called infinitesimal jackknife for bagging estimators (e.g., Efron (2014), Wager et al. (2014)). Proposition 5 shows the scheme (see Ghosh and Lam 2016 for the proof).

PROPOSITION 5. *Given input data  $\{X_{i,j}\}$ , the empirical influence function  $\hat{G}_i$  evaluated at data point  $X_{i,j}$  satisfies*

$$\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = \text{Cov}_{\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m}(h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m), S_{i,j}(\mathbf{X}_i)),$$

*where  $\text{Cov}_{\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m}$  denotes the covariance under the empirical input distributions, and*

$$S_{i,j}(\mathbf{X}_i) = \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} n_i \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,j}\} - T_i.$$

Such a covariance interpretation of the influence function leads us to the Monte Carlo estimate (2) of  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$  in Step 1, denoted  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})$ , that takes the form of a sample covariance from  $R_1$  simulation runs. Next, we introduce a sampled linear approximation for  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  given by

$$\widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) := \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j}. \quad (23)$$

where  $\hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m)$  is the sample mean of the  $R_1$  replications. Optimization (3) in Step 2 of the procedures uses  $\widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  as the objective function. But since  $\hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m)$  does not depend on the weights  $w_{i,j}$ 's, it is dropped from the expression.

The quality of the sample linear approximation (23) is quantified as:

**PROPOSITION 6.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and simulation effort  $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|^2] = O(\frac{1}{R_1})$ , where the expectation is taken with respect to the joint randomness of the data and the simulation. Hence together with (17) we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|^2] = O(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}). \quad (24)$$

The uniform error (24) of  $\widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L$  as an approximation to  $Z$  then implies the following guarantee on the difference between the weights  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}\}_{i=1}^m$  obtained in Step 2 of Algorithm 1, and the optimal weights for the optimization pair (9), measured in terms of their evaluations of the performance measure  $Z$ :

**THEOREM 8.** *Let  $Z^{\min} := Z(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  and  $Z^{\max} := Z(\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max})$ . Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and simulation effort  $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[(Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L})^2] = O(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}), \quad \mathbb{E}[(Z^{\max} - \mathcal{U})^2] = O(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1})$$

where  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  are defined in (9), and the expectation is taken with respect to the joint randomness of the data and the simulation.

Theorem 8 justifies using  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}\}_{i=1}^m$  to evaluate the performance measure, which give rise to the asymptotically exact confidence bounds  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  up to a small-order error. Step 3 of the algorithms utilizes this implication. However, we need to properly control the simulation error in evaluating the performance measure, which is detailed in the next subsection.

As a side note, we can also use the linear approximation  $\widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L$  evaluated at the weights  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}\}_{i=1}^m$  directly as our confidence interval. This forms another asymptotically exact CI (see Theorem EC.1 in Appendix EC.4). Moreover, this approach would require less simulation

effort than our procedures ( $R_1$  versus  $R_1 + 2R_2$ ). However, like the delta method, this approach relies heavily on the linear approximation to construct the CI. In contrast, the CIs in our procedures are constructed from simulating the (nonlinear) performance measure, under the carefully chosen empirical weights  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}\}_{i=1}^m$ . As a result, they conform more closely to the boundaries of a given problem and in turn can lead to better coverages. For example, when the performance measure is within a range (e.g., a probability that is between 0 and 1), using only the linear approximation frequently incurs under-coverage as the CIs can lie significantly outside the meaningful range (note that truncating at the boundaries would not solve the issue, which is intrinsic in the linear approximation), whereas our procedures would generate confidence bounds that much more often lie within the range and consequently offer better coverages.

#### 4.6. Evaluation of CI Bounds

This section explains and compares Step 3 in Algorithms 1, 2 and 3 to evaluate the final confidence bounds, and relates these to the justify Theorems 1, 2 and 3.

Algorithm 1 constructs CIs by taking averages of  $R_2$  independent simulation runs driven by the weighted empirical input distributions, with weights being  $\{\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}\}_{i=1}^m, \{\mathbf{w}_i^{\max}\}_{i=1}^m$ , to evaluate the lower and upper bounds respectively. Note that by Theorem 8, the performance measures evaluated at the weighted empirical distributions,  $Z^{\min}$  and  $Z^{\max}$ , are close to  $\mathcal{L}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$ , which in turn by Theorem 7 satisfy exact coverage guarantees. Step 3 of Algorithm 1 adds simulation noises from the  $R_2$  simulation runs in estimating  $Z^{\min}$  and  $Z^{\max}$ . This results in the following discrepancies between the outputs of Algorithm 1 and  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$ :

**PROPOSITION 7.** *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and simulation effort  $R_1 \rightarrow \infty, R_2 \rightarrow \infty$ , the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{BEL}, \mathcal{U}^{BEL}$  of Algorithm 1 satisfy*

$$\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - \mathcal{L})^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1} + \frac{1}{R_2}\right), \quad \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{U}^{BEL} - \mathcal{U})^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1} + \frac{1}{R_2}\right)$$

where the expectation is taken with respect to the joint randomness of the data and the simulation.

Proposition 7 implies that, when the simulation sizes  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  both dominate the input data size  $n$ , the root-mean-square discrepancies between the outputs from Algorithm 1,  $\mathcal{L}^{BEL}, \mathcal{U}^{BEL}$ , and the asymptotically exact CIs formed by  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$ , become  $o(1/\sqrt{n})$ , which is of smaller order than the width of the CI that is of order  $1/\sqrt{n}$ . This then leads to the asymptotic exactness of  $[\mathcal{L}^{BEL}, \mathcal{U}^{BEL}]$  in Theorem 1.

Algorithm 1 requires both  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  to be large relative to  $n$ . Algorithms 2 and 3, on the other hand, are designed to work well for smaller  $R_2$ . To explain, note that the reason of needing  $R_2$  to be large in Algorithm 1 is to wash away the simulation noises to a smaller magnitude than the CI width in Step 3. Instead of simply washing them away, Algorithms 2 and 3 suitably enlarge the CI

to incorporate these errors in Step 3, so that  $R_2$  can now be chosen as in standard CI construction (instead of depending on  $n$ ). The key to this argument uses the following decomposition:

PROPOSITION 8. Let  $Z^{\min} := Z(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  and  $Z^{\max} := Z(\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max})$ , and recall  $\hat{Z}^{\min}$  and  $\hat{Z}^{\max}$  in Step 3 of Algorithms 2 and 3. Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and simulation effort  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, R_2 \rightarrow \infty$ , the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}$  of Algorithm 2 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{EEL} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sigma_I + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right) + o_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right) \\ \mathcal{U}^{EEL} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sigma_I + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right) + o_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right)\end{aligned}$$

whereas the outputs  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  of Algorithm 3 satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}^{FEL} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right) \\ \mathcal{U}^{FEL} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max}) + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right)\end{aligned}$$

where  $\sigma_I^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i$  is as defined in Corollary 1,  $\sigma^2 = \text{Var}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}(h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m))$  is the output variance, and the  $o_p$  is with respect to the joint randomness of the data and the simulation.

To see how these decompositions arise, we can write the outputs of Algorithm 2 as (for the lower bound, say)  $\hat{Z}^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_{\min}/\sqrt{R_2} = Z^{\min} + (\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \hat{\sigma}_{\min}/\sqrt{R_2}$ , where  $Z^{\min}$ , by Theorem 8, is close to  $\mathcal{L}$  that is in turn representable as  $Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I$  up to a small error, by Theorem 7. Noting that  $\hat{\sigma}_{\min}$  approximates  $\sigma$ , these together show the representation for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}$  in Proposition 8. The other expressions for  $\mathcal{U}^{EEL}$ , and  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$ , follow analogously using the adjustments shown in Algorithms 2 and 3.

We briefly discuss how Proposition 8 leads to Theorems 2 and 3. Note that for FEL, the term  $z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}$  in  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}$  or  $\mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  is the standard error term in a normality-based CI that comprises the uncertainties from two independent sources with variances  $\sigma_I^2$  and  $\sigma^2/R_2$ . The two terms  $Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i$  and  $\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}$  in the expressions of  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$ , which contain the input error and the simulation error in Step 3 respectively, possess variances that are approximately  $\sigma_I^2$  and  $\sigma^2/R_2$ . Thus the representations of  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  each matches the lower and upper bound of a normality-based CI. This almost gives an asymptotically exact CI, except that the quantities  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  contain some common, and some independent, sources of randomness in their construction that slightly corrupts the coverage. This leads to Theorem 3. The argument for EEL in Theorem 2 follows similarly, but with the standard error term in  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}$  or  $\mathcal{U}^{EEL}$  overestimating the uncertainty by a factor as large as  $\sqrt{2}$  (because  $1 \leq \frac{\sigma_I + \sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \leq \sqrt{2}$ , where  $\sqrt{2}$  is attained when  $\sigma_I^2 = \sigma^2/R_2$ ). In fact, under a coupling between all the simulation runs in Algorithms 2 and 3,  $\hat{\sigma}_{\min}/\sqrt{R_2}$  always upper bounds  $\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2/R_2} - \hat{\sigma}_I$  and hence Algorithm 2 always generates wider CIs than Algorithm 3.

## 5. Numerical Experiments

We present some numerical results for Algorithm 1 (BEL), Algorithm 2 (EEL) and Algorithm 3 (FEL). These include coverage probabilities and the statistical indicators, such as mean and standard deviation, of the positions or widths of the resulting CIs. We conduct experiments on two settings, a queueing model in Section 5.1 and stochastic activity networks in Section 5.2. We consider various levels of simulation budgets, data sizes, and problem dimensions (i.e., number of estimated input models). Throughout this section we set the target confidence level to 95%.

We also compare our procedures with three methods:

1. Percentile bootstrap resampling (“standard BT”): This scheme is suggested in Barton and Schruben (1993, 2001). Given  $m$  input data sets  $\{X_{1,1}, \dots, X_{1,n_1}\}, \dots, \{X_{m,1}, \dots, X_{m,n_m}\}$ , it proceeds as follows. First choose  $B$ , the number of bootstrap resamples of the input empirical distributions, and  $R_b$ , the number of simulation replications for each bootstrap resample. For each  $l = 1, 2, \dots, B$ , draw a simple random sample of size  $n_i$  with replacement, denoted by  $\{X_{i,1}^l, \dots, X_{i,n_i}^l\}$ , for each input model  $i$ , then generate  $R_b$  simulation replications driven by the empirical distributions formed by  $\{X_{i,1}^l, \dots, X_{i,n_i}^l\}, i = 1, \dots, m$ , and take their average to obtain  $Z^l$ . Finally output the  $0.025(B+1)$ -th and  $0.975(B+1)$ -th order statistics of  $\{Z^l\}_{l=1}^B$ .

2. Adaptive percentile bootstrap (“adaptive BT”): Proposed by Yi and Xie (2017), this approach adaptively allocates simulation budget in order to obtain percentile bootstrap CIs more efficiently than the standard percentile bootstrap. It aims to allocate more simulation runs to the resamples whose corresponding performance measures are closer to the 0.025 or 0.975 quantiles. The procedure consists of two phases. The first phase uses simulation to sequentially screen out bootstrap resamples that will less likely give the target quantiles. The second phase allocates the remaining simulation budget to the surviving resamples to more accurately estimate their performance measures. For a given simulation budget, the tuning parameters  $B, n_0, r, M$  (see Yi and Xie (2017)) are needed. In our subsequent comparisons we offer it some advantages by randomly drawing 10 different combinations of these parameters from a broad enough range of values, and reporting results on the top combinations ranked by the closeness of the coverage level to the nominal level.

3. The nonparametric delta method: This method has not been explicitly suggested in the simulation literature (in the nonparametric regime), and here we provide a heuristic version inspired from our analyses. The CI takes the form  $\hat{Z} \pm z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sqrt{\text{input-induced variance} + \text{stochastic variance}}$  where  $\hat{Z}$  is an estimate of the performance measure under the empirical input distributions. We estimate the stochastic variance using the sample variance of the generated simulation replications,

and estimate the input-induced variance using the  $\hat{\sigma}_I$  in Algorithm 3. To be specific, we carry out Step 1 of Algorithm 1 with  $R_1 = R_d$ , and then construct the CI

$$\hat{Z} \pm z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \sqrt{\frac{\hat{\sigma}^2}{R_d} + \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i} \left( \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 - \frac{n_i T_i \hat{\sigma}^2}{R_d} \right)}$$

where  $\hat{Z}$  and  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  are respectively the sample mean and variance of the  $R_d$  simulation replications.

We will detail our comparisons under various problem and algorithmic configurations in the two experimental setups that follow. After that, in Section 5.3, we summarize some highlights and provide further comparisons with the bootstrap.

### 5.1. Mean Waiting Time of an M/M/1 Queue

We first consider a canonical M/M/1 queue with arrival rate 0.95 and service rate 1. The system is empty when the first customer comes in. We set our target performance measure as the expected waiting time of the 10-th customer. To put it in the form of (1), let  $A_t$  be the inter-arrival time between the  $t$ -th and  $(t+1)$ -th customers,  $S_t$  be the service time of the  $t$ -th customer, and

$$h(A_1, A_2, \dots, A_9, S_1, S_2, \dots, S_9) = W_{10},$$

where the waiting time  $W_{10}$  is calculated via the Lindley recursion

$$W_1 = 0, W_{t+1} = \max\{W_t + S_t - A_t, 0\}, \text{ for } t = 1, \dots, 9.$$

Both the inter-arrival time distribution and the service time distribution are assumed unknown. Table 1 shows the results of all the methods under a simulation budget 2000 and input data sizes  $n_1 = 30, n_2 = 25$ . Table 2 summarizes results under a budget 8000 and data sizes  $n_1 = 120, n_2 = 100$ . For each row of the tables, 1000 i.i.d. input data sets are drawn from the true input distributions, and then a CI is constructed from each of them, from which the coverage probability, mean CI length and standard deviation of CI length are estimated. The word “overshoot” means that the CI limits exceed the natural bounds of the performance measure, i.e., the lower bound being negative given that waiting time must be non-negative.

We test the coverage probabilities of the optimization-based CIs. For each of Tables 1 and 2, we compute a “benchmark” coverage of each method by generating 5000 CIs each of which consumes  $5 \times 10^4$  simulation runs, to approximate the simulation-error-free coverage for comparison (the bracketed number underneath the name of each method in the tables). We observe first that the benchmark coverage of our optimization-based CIs are close to the nominal value 95% in both tables (roughly 92% in Table 1 and 94% in Table 2), which provides a sanity check for the validity of the EL method in our setting. Moreover, consistent with the asymptotic results, the benchmark



coverage is closer to 95% when the data size is bigger (Table 2). Second, under the simulation budget of the experiments, Tables 1 and 2 show that in general BEL under-covers compared to the benchmark, EEL over-covers, whereas FEL is accurate (note that a performance close to the benchmark, instead of the nominal level, indicates the power of the procedure to jointly handle input and simulation errors, as the benchmark provides in a sense the best performance that is free of the simulation errors). For instance, in Table 2 where the benchmark coverage of the EL method is 93.7%, BEL varies from 90% to 92%, EEL ranges from 96% to 99%, whereas FEL stays around 94%. This phenomenon is in line with Theorems 1, 2 and 3 since, as we have discussed in Sections 3.3 and 4.6, BEL does not take into account the stochastic uncertainty in the final evaluation, EEL captures the stochastic uncertainty but in a conservative manner, while FEL is designed to tightly match the magnitude of the uncertainty. The under-coverage issue of BEL and the over-coverage issue of EEL, especially for the larger-data case (Table 2), become more severe when  $R_2$  is chosen small, while FEL delivers accurate coverage for all considered parameter values. Thus FEL seems to be more reliable over the other two procedures when the user has a limited simulation budget.

**Table 1**  $M/M/1$  queue.  $n_1 = 30, n_2 = 25$ . Total simulation budget 2000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods  $1.1 \times 10^{-2}$ , the bootstrap  $1.2 \times 10^{-2}$ , delta method  $1.0 \times 10^{-2}$ .

methods & parameters		coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL (91.8%*)	$R_1 = 1000, R_2 = 500$	89.6%	4.76	2.17	0%
	$R_1 = 1500, R_2 = 250$	90.7%	4.72	1.99	0%
	$R_1 = 1800, R_2 = 100$	88.7%	4.76	2.15	0%
	$R_1 = 1900, R_2 = 50$	89.2%	4.79	2.24	0%
EEL (91.8%*)	$R_1 = 1000, R_2 = 500$	93.1%	5.21	2.19	0%
	$R_1 = 1500, R_2 = 250$	94.1%	5.38	2.21	0%
	$R_1 = 1800, R_2 = 100$	95.1%	5.67	2.42	0%
	$R_1 = 1900, R_2 = 50$	96.0%	6.16	2.64	0.1%
FEL (91.8%*)	$R_1 = 1000, R_2 = 500$	90.5%	4.72	2.06	0%
	$R_1 = 1500, R_2 = 250$	91.9%	4.83	2.07	0%
	$R_1 = 1800, R_2 = 100$	91.9%	4.93	2.08	0%
	$R_1 = 1900, R_2 = 50$	91.5%	5.06	2.20	0%
standard BT (91.0%*)	$B = 50, R_b = 40$	91.2%	4.90	2.23	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 20$	93.5%	4.98	2.02	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 5$	96.9%	6.09	2.28	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 2$	99.2%	7.74	2.82	0%
adaptive BT (4 best combinations) (91.0%*)	$B = 100, n_0 = 10, r = 1.2, M = 3$	92.7%	5.01	2.18	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 10, r = 1.2, M = 1$	92.0%	5.02	2.22	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 10, r = 1.4, M = 1$	92.3%	4.93	2.08	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 10, r = 1.8, M = 1$	92.5%	5.00	2.24	0%
nonparametric delta method (86.6%*)	$R_d = 2000$	84.9%	4.66	2.08	54%

\* denotes the benchmark coverage with negligible simulation noise.

**Table 2**  $M/M/1$  queue.  $n_1 = 120, n_2 = 100$ . Total simulation budget 8000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods  $4.0 \times 10^{-2}$ , the bootstrap  $3.4 \times 10^{-2}$ , delta method  $5.3 \times 10^{-2}$ .

methods & parameters		coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL (93.7%*)	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	92.6%	2.47	0.597	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	92.4%	2.46	0.606	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	91.9%	2.48	0.713	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	89.6%	2.45	0.787	0%
EEL (93.7%*)	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	95.7%	2.66	0.626	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	97.7%	2.90	0.678	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	98.0%	3.50	0.870	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	98.8%	3.94	1.04	0%
FEL (93.7%*)	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	93.6%	2.45	0.591	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	94.3%	2.45	0.594	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	94.1%	2.74	0.705	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	94.3%	2.90	0.865	0%
standard BT (94.2%*)	$B = 50, R_b = 160$	92.7%	2.56	0.675	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 80$	96.4%	2.64	0.613	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 20$	98.8%	3.19	0.658	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 8$	100%	4.19	0.800	0%
adaptive BT (4 best combinations) (94.2%*)	$B = 200, n_0 = 20, r = 1.6, M = 1$	93.6%	2.64	0.657	0%
	$B = 200, n_0 = 15, r = 2, M = 1$	95.0%	2.68	0.687	0%
	$B = 200, n_0 = 5, r = 1.6, M = 3$	94.5%	2.71	0.688	0%
	$B = 400, n_0 = 10, r = 1.8, M = 1$	94.5%	2.72	0.654	0%
nonparametric delta method (91.5%*)	$R_d = 8000$	92.0%	2.45	0.560	0%

\* denotes the benchmark coverage with negligible simulation noise.

We compare our methods with the percentile bootstrap procedures in terms of coverage accuracy and algorithmic configuration. The benchmark coverages of our methods and the bootstrap appear to be quite similar in all considered cases (within 1% in both Tables 1 and 2). Moreover, the bootstrap methods perform competitively in terms of the actual coverages, when the budget allocation or tuning parameters are optimally chosen. Nonetheless, FEL appears to show more robust performance with respect to these tuning needs. In the standard bootstrap, when  $R_b$  is chosen large relative to the data size and  $B$  is set around 50, the coverages of the CIs are close to the benchmark coverages in all cases. However, as  $R_b$  decreases, the coverage probabilities of bootstrap CIs quickly rise towards 100%. This over-coverage issue can be attributed to the higher variability caused by small  $R_b$  that is not properly accounted for, as discussed in Barton et al. (2002) and Barton (2007). The adaptive bootstrap appears to mitigate this issue by more efficient allocation of the budget. It requires, however, a careful selection of the best parameter configurations (while the tables show the top four configurations, the worst case among our randomly selected 10 choices has a coverage of 80%). In practice these parameters needs to be obtained via discrete simulation optimization (Yi and Xie 2017). In contrast, the coverage probabilities of FEL stay almost unchanged under

various budget allocations (including the case that  $R_2$  is as small as 50). FEL thus seems easy to use in terms of algorithmic configuration; in particular, merely setting  $R_2 = 50$  appears doing well.

To further illustrate the robustness of the proposed approach in terms of algorithmic configurations, relative to the bootstrap, we show in Table 3 the coverages as we increase the simulation budget. The first row shows the coverage estimates of the bootstrap and FEL under allocations that satisfy the same overall simulation budget. Both appear to be close to their respective benchmark coverages shown in Table 1. However, the coverages of the bootstrap could be illusory in this case since, as the bootstrap size  $B$  increases with  $R_b$  fixed, the coverage rises from 91% to 95% as shown in the following rows. These deviate from the benchmark coverages, and indicate that neither  $B$  nor  $R_b$  is large enough for the bootstrap to work properly. In contrast, the coverage of FEL appears quite stable and remains close to the benchmark when  $R_1$  or  $R_2$  increases.

**Table 3**  $M/M/1$  queue.  $n_1 = 30, n_2 = 25$ .

standard BT		FEL	
parameters	coverage estimate	parameters	coverage estimate
$B = 40, R_b = 15$	90.9%	$R_1 = 500, R_2 = 50$	90.3%
$B = 100, R_b = 15$	92.4%	$R_1 = 2000, R_2 = 50$	91.9%
$B = 200, R_b = 15$	93.6%	$R_1 = 500, R_2 = 200$	90.2%
$B = 500, R_b = 15$	94.7%	$R_1 = 2000, R_2 = 200$	90.8%

Compared to the nonparametric delta method, our optimization-based CIs possess better coverages, especially in the situation of limited input data size. When the data size is less than 30 for each input model (Table 1), the coverage probabilities of the delta-method CIs are around 85%, while our methods are around 90% to 96%, depending on the particular variants. The unsatisfactory coverage of the delta-method CI could be attributed to the overshoot issue. Table 1 shows that frequently the delta-method CI exceeds the natural bounds of the target performance measure, which renders its effective length shorter and hence an inferior coverage. The coverage gets much better for the delta-method CI when input data size rises above 100 (Table 2), which gets close to, but still falls short of, our optimization-based counterparts especially FEL.

## 5.2. Stochastic Activity Networks

We consider a larger-scale problem and larger ranges of data sizes, in the setting of stochastic activity networks shown in Figure 1. The first network Figure 1a is borrowed from Yi and Xie (2017). Each edge  $i = 1, \dots, 5$  of the network represents a task that can be completed in  $X_i$  units of time. Assigning each  $X_i$  to edge  $i$  as its length, the total time to finish the project is the length of the longest path from node 1 to node 4, i.e.  $h(X_1, \dots, X_5) = \max\{X_1 + X_2 + X_5, X_1 + X_4, X_3 + X_5\}$ .




Figure 1 Stochastic activity networks.

**Table 4** Stochastic activity network in Figure 1a.  $n_1 = n_2 = 200, n_3 = n_4 = n_5 = 30$ . Total simulation budget 8000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods  $3.3 \times 10^{-2}$ , the bootstrap  $1.7 \times 10^{-2}$ , delta method  $3.2 \times 10^{-2}$ .

methods & parameters		coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	92.7%	0.17	0.03	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	91.9%	0.17	0.04	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	84.9%	0.18	0.06	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	81.7%	0.18	0.07	0%
EEL	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	96.1%	0.20	0.03	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	97.7%	0.23	0.04	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	99.0%	0.30	0.07	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	99.4%	0.35	0.09	0%
FEL	$R_1 = 4000, R_2 = 2000$	92.2%	0.17	0.03	0%
	$R_1 = 7000, R_2 = 500$	93.2%	0.18	0.04	0%
	$R_1 = 7800, R_2 = 100$	94.6%	0.22	0.06	0%
	$R_1 = 7900, R_2 = 50$	94.5%	0.25	0.08	0%
standard BT	$B = 50, R_b = 160$	94.0%	0.21	0.04	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 80$	97.1%	0.22	0.04	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 20$	99.7%	0.33	0.04	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 8$	100%	0.47	0.05	0%
adaptive BT (4 best combinations)	$B = 300, n_0 = 15, r = 1.2, M = 1$	94.9%	0.22	0.04	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 20, r = 1.2, M = 1$	93.9%	0.22	0.05	0%
	$B = 400, n_0 = 10, r = 1.2, M = 3$	95.6%	0.24	0.04	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 5, r = 1.2, M = 3$	96.2%	0.22	0.04	0%
nonparametric delta method	$R_d = 8000$	94.9%	0.18	0.03	0%

Assume that the unknown distributions of the  $X_i$ 's are exponential with rate 10, 5, 12, 11, 5 for  $i$  from 1 to 5, and we are interested in computing the expected time to finish the project  $\mathbb{E}[h(X_1, \dots, X_5)]$ .

We test our method in cases where the data sizes for different input models vary significantly. Specifically we consider the case where  $n_1 = n_2 = 200$  and  $n_3 = n_4 = n_5 = 30$ , which produce a ratio of roughly 7 between the maximal and minimal data sizes. Table 4 shows the results under a simulation budget of 8000. All the methods seem to exhibit performances similar to the cases with more balanced observations in Tables 1 and 2. For example, FEL and the adaptive bootstrap

generate CIs with similar coverage probabilities (around the nominal level 95%), EEL and the standard bootstrap tend to over-cover, and BEL tends to under-cover especially for small values of  $R_2$ . In contrast to the last example, the nonparametric delta method in this case seems to have a good performance that is similar to our FEL. This could be because the performance function  $h$  here is piecewise linear with only three pieces, hence can be well approximated by a single linear function and in turn leads to the better finite-sample performance of the delta method that relies crucially on linearization.

**Table 5** Stochastic activity network in Figure 1b.  $n_i = 30$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 7$  and 25 for  $8 \leq i \leq 14$ . Total simulation budget 4000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods  $2.7 \times 10^{-2}$ , the bootstrap  $2.7 \times 10^{-2}$ , delta method  $1.7 \times 10^{-2}$ .

	methods & parameters	coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL	$R_1 = 3000, R_2 = 500$	91.6%	0.24	0.04	0%
	$R_1 = 3500, R_2 = 250$	90.4%	0.24	0.05	0%
	$R_1 = 3800, R_2 = 100$	89.1%	0.24	0.06	0%
	$R_1 = 3900, R_2 = 50$	85.0%	0.24	0.09	0%
EEL	$R_1 = 3000, R_2 = 500$	97.3%	0.31	0.05	0%
	$R_1 = 3500, R_2 = 250$	96.9%	0.33	0.06	0%
	$R_1 = 3800, R_2 = 100$	98.3%	0.39	0.08	0%
	$R_1 = 3900, R_2 = 50$	98.9%	0.45	0.11	0%
FEL	$R_1 = 3000, R_2 = 500$	93.3%	0.25	0.04	0%
	$R_1 = 3500, R_2 = 250$	93.2%	0.26	0.05	0%
	$R_1 = 3800, R_2 = 100$	93.3%	0.29	0.07	0%
	$R_1 = 3900, R_2 = 50$	94.9%	0.32	0.09	0%
standard BT	$B = 50, R_b = 80$	94.9%	0.31	0.06	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 40$	98.4%	0.33	0.06	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 10$	99.9%	0.50	0.08	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 4$	100%	0.73	0.10	0%
adaptive BT (4 best combinations)	$B = 100, n_0 = 15, r = 1.8, M = 1$	95.0%	0.30	0.06	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 5, r = 1.2, M = 7$	95.3%	0.31	0.06	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 10, r = 1.8, M = 1$	94.1%	0.31	0.06	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 20, r = 1.2, M = 1$	93.7%	0.30	0.06	0%
nonparametric delta method	$R_d = 2000$	93.8%	0.26	0.04	0%

Next we consider a bigger stochastic activity network, shown in Figure 1b, that is borrowed from Chu et al. (2014) that consists of 14 tasks. The time to completion  $X_i$  of each task follows exponential distribution with rate 10, 5, 12, 11, 5, 8, 4, 9, 13, 7, 6, 9, 10, 6 for  $i$  from 1 to 14. In addition to computing the expected time to complete the project (Table 5), which is represented by the length of the longest path from node 1 to 10, we also test our methods in estimating the tail probability that the time to finish the project exceeds 1.5 units of time (Tables 6 and 7). The true value of the probability is 0.0747 (estimated from abundant simulation).

Table 5 shows that our FEL and the adaptive bootstrap consistently exhibit satisfactory coverage levels when the number of input models is fairly big compared with the input data size (per input model). Here we use a simulation budget of 4000, and a data size of 30 for the first 7 input models, and 25 for the other 7 inputs. The coverage probabilities and their trends in each method are similar to our observations before (e.g., in Tables 2 and 4). For example, the coverage of FEL stays around 94%, the standard bootstrap over-covers for small  $R_b$ , and BEL under-covers for small  $R_2$ .

Table 6 shows the tail probability estimation results, with a data size around 100 per input model. Table 7 considers a bigger data size of 400-500. The simulation budgets are 16000 and 60000 respectively. FEL and the delta method seem to have accurate coverage probabilities (93% in Table 6 and 94% in Table 7). EEL continues to over-cover. Notably, BEL suffers from severe under-coverage issues, while the standard bootstrap suffers from severe over-coverage issues. Though FEL gives accurate CIs in most cases, the simple budget allocation strategy of setting  $R_2 = 50$  and investing the remainder to  $R_1$  appears to perform less well than using a larger  $R_2$  such as 100, 250. This could be because of the highly skewed performance function, which requires more  $R_2$  to invoke the central limit behavior needed in the CI construction. Our suggestion is to use  $R_2$  in the range of hundreds in FEL for tail estimation problems.

### 5.3. Summary and Comparisons with the Bootstrap

Based on the findings in Sections 5.1 and 5.2, we provide some general comparisons between our optimization-based approach and the standard bootstrap in terms of the required simulation burden, the ease of implementation and the computation cost.

Because of the nested simulation, the total simulation load of the standard bootstrap is  $BR_b$ . To ensure the stochastic noise is negligible relative to input uncertainty, one would need  $R_b \gg n$  (where “ $\gg$ ” means “of larger order than”). On the other hand, Theorems 2 and 3 suggest that, in the optimization-based approach, one can choose  $R_1 \gg n, R_2 \gg 1$ . Thus, the bootstrap requires  $BR_b \gg Bn$  total simulation load, whereas ours requires  $R_1 + 2R_2 \gg n$  simulation load. Since  $B$  is typically a big number (in the experiments we use  $B$  between 50 and 1000), our method seems to be more efficient in terms of simulation cost. In Tables 1 and 2, we have observed that under the same total simulation budget FEL consistently possess coverage probabilities close to the benchmark coverage while the bootstrap very often significantly exceeds the benchmark level.

We also notice that our optimization-based approach is more robust with respect to the algorithmic parameter configuration. Given a fixed total simulation budget, it could be challenging to figure out a good choice of  $B$  and  $R_b$  for the bootstrap, as it can highly depend on the input data sizes and the magnitude of the simulation error. Indeed, our experiments indicate that the coverage of the bootstrap CIs is quite sensitive to the allocations of  $B$  and  $R_b$ . When  $B$  and  $R_b$  are not

**Table 6** Tail probability of stochastic activity network in Figure 1b.  $n_i = 120$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 7$  and 100 for  $8 \leq i \leq 14$ . Total simulation budget 16000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods 0.11, the bootstrap 0.03, delta method 0.10.

	methods & parameters	coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL	$R_1 = 15000, R_2 = 500$	86.0%	0.064	0.020	0%
	$R_1 = 15500, R_2 = 250$	80.0%	0.064	0.026	0%
	$R_1 = 15800, R_2 = 100$	70.3%	0.064	0.040	0%
	$R_1 = 15900, R_2 = 50$	57.8%	0.062	0.055	0%
EEL	$R_1 = 15000, R_2 = 500$	98.5%	0.110	0.023	0%
	$R_1 = 15500, R_2 = 250$	98.8%	0.130	0.031	1.2%
	$R_1 = 15800, R_2 = 100$	98.7%	0.166	0.046	30%
	$R_1 = 15900, R_2 = 50$	97.5%	0.205	0.067	65%
FEL	$R_1 = 15000, R_2 = 500$	93.2%	0.079	0.020	0%
	$R_1 = 15500, R_2 = 250$	93.0%	0.090	0.027	0%
	$R_1 = 15800, R_2 = 100$	93.2%	0.120	0.044	0%
	$R_1 = 15900, R_2 = 50$	91.4%	0.155	0.062	3.8%
standard BT	$B = 50, R_b = 320$	97.1%	0.090	0.018	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 160$	99.2%	0.104	0.017	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 40$	100%	0.170	0.026	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 16$	100%	0.230	0.038	0%
adaptive BT (3 best combinations)	$B = 100, n_0 = 80, r = 1.1, M = 5$	89.0%	0.093	0.026	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 100, r = 1.1, M = 4$	92.3%	0.089	0.023	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 100, r = 1.2, M = 2$	91.4%	0.091	0.024	0%
nonparametric delta method	$R_d = 16000$	93.2%	0.070	0.011	0%

appropriately chosen, the bootstrap CI tends to over-cover the truth. On the other hand, in the optimization-based method, particularly FEL, setting  $R_2$  to be a fixed moderately large number (say 50) and investing the remaining budget to  $R_1$  seems to be quite stable regardless of the data size. Nonetheless, we have seen that if the performance measure is a small probability, choosing a larger  $R_2$  would improve the coverages.

Despite the simulation savings and stability, the optimization-based approach calls for a heavier computation overhead than the bootstrap beyond the simulation effort. In the bootstrap, the extra numerical computation other than simulation runs is negligible. In our approach, we need to estimate gradient information (the influence function) in (2) in Step 1, and solve the optimization pair in Step 2. Computation of the score function  $S_{i,j}(\mathbf{X}_i^r)$  for all  $i, j$  and  $r = 1, \dots, R_1$  requires  $O((\sum_{i=1}^m T_i)R_1)$  time, by counting the occurrence of each  $X_{i,j}$  in the generated input variates. The sample covariance between the output  $h$  and the score function is computed in  $O((\sum_{i=1}^m n_i)R_1)$  time. Thus the total computation in Step 1 has a complexity  $O((\sum_{i=1}^m n_i + \sum_{i=1}^m T_i)R_1)$ . Using the approach suggested by Proposition 1, the optimization pair (3) can be solved in  $O(c^{bi}(\sum_{i=1}^m n_i c_i^{nt}))$  time, where  $c^{bi}$  is the number of bisection iterations on  $\beta$  and  $c_i^{nt}$  is the number of Newton iterations

**Table 7** Tail probability of stochastic activity network in Figure 1b.  $n_i = 480$  for  $1 \leq i \leq 7$  and 400 for  $8 \leq i \leq 14$ . Total simulation budget 60000. Run times (second/CI): three EL methods 1.4, the bootstrap 0.08, delta method 1.3.

	methods & parameters	coverage estimate	mean CI length	std. CI length	% of overshoot
BEL	$R_1 = 59000, R_2 = 500$	73.3%	0.032	0.017	0%
	$R_1 = 59500, R_2 = 250$	63.1%	0.033	0.024	0%
	$R_1 = 59800, R_2 = 100$	50.6%	0.032	0.038	0%
	$R_1 = 59900, R_2 = 50$	43.0%	0.032	0.054	0%
EEL	$R_1 = 59000, R_2 = 500$	99.1%	0.078	0.018	0%
	$R_1 = 59500, R_2 = 250$	98.6%	0.097	0.025	0%
	$R_1 = 59800, R_2 = 100$	97.9%	0.132	0.040	15%
	$R_1 = 59900, R_2 = 50$	94.9%	0.172	0.061	58%
FEL	$R_1 = 59000, R_2 = 500$	93.4%	0.055	0.017	0%
	$R_1 = 59500, R_2 = 250$	94.1%	0.071	0.025	0%
	$R_1 = 59800, R_2 = 100$	94.0%	0.104	0.041	0%
	$R_1 = 59900, R_2 = 50$	93.2%	0.141	0.061	28%
standard BT	$B = 50, R_b = 1200$	97.6%	0.047	0.007	0%
	$B = 100, R_b = 600$	99.3%	0.054	0.006	0%
	$B = 400, R_b = 150$	100%	0.090	0.007	0%
	$B = 1000, R_b = 60$	100%	0.134	0.012	0%
adaptive BT (4 best combinations)	$B = 400, n_0 = 5, r = 1.2, M = 9$	96.3%	0.21	0.04	0%
	$B = 500, n_0 = 10, r = 1.4, M = 1$	96.7%	0.24	0.03	0%
	$B = 300, n_0 = 10, r = 1.6, M = 3$	96.3%	0.19	0.04	0%
	$B = 100, n_0 = 15, r = 1.4, M = 5$	93.9%	0.19	0.04	0%
nonparametric delta method	$R_d = 60000$	94.3%	0.035	0.003	0%

to obtain each  $\lambda_i(\beta)$ . The global linear convergence of bisection and Newton’s method in our setting suggest that, to achieve a given tolerance level, typically  $c^{bi}$  and each  $c_i^{nt}$  only need to be logarithmically large. Ignoring logarithmic factors, we see that the computation cost of Step 2 is roughly  $O(\sum_{i=1}^m n_i)$ . Thus the cost of Step 1 dominates Step 2, leading to a total overhead cost  $O((\sum_{i=1}^m n_i + \sum_{i=1}^m T_i)R_1)$ . In the case of large data size, these overhead costs of our method can be substantial, which is reflected by the significantly longer run times of the EL methods compared to the bootstrap in Tables 6 and 7.

## 6. Conclusion

We have proposed an optimization-based approach to construct CIs for simulation output performance measures that account for the input uncertainty from finite data. This approach relies on solving a pair of optimization programs posited over distributions supported on the data, with a constraint expressed in terms of the weighted average of empirically defined Burg-entropy divergences. It then uses the solutions to define probability weights that subsequently drive simulation runs. We present several related procedures under this approach and analyze their statistical performances using a generalization of the EL method. Compared to the bootstrap, our approach



requires less simulation budget to achieve stable coverage and is less sensitive to the allocation choices, as explained both theoretically and shown by our numerical experiments. The numerical results also reveal that our approach tends to curb the under-coverage issues encountered in the delta method. The last of our procedures, FEL, seems particularly attractive compared to both the bootstrap and the delta method in terms of finite-data finite-simulation performance.

## Acknowledgments

A preliminary conference version of this paper will appear in the Winter Simulation Conference. We gratefully acknowledge support from the National Science Foundation under grants CMMI-1400391/1542020 and CMMI-1436247/1523453.

## References

- Asmussen S, Glynn PW (2007) *Stochastic Simulation: Algorithms and Analysis*, volume 57 (Springer Science & Business Media).
- Atar R, Chowdhary K, Dupuis P (2015) Robust bounds on risk-sensitive functionals via rényi divergence. *SIAM/ASA Journal on Uncertainty Quantification* 3(1):18–33.
- Banks J, Carson II JS, Nelson BL, Nicol DM (2005) *Discrete-event system simulation* (Pearson), fourth edition.
- Barton RR (2007) Presenting a more complete characterization of uncertainty: Can it be done. *Proceedings of the 2007 INFORMS Simulation Society Research Workshop* (INFORMS Simulation Society).
- Barton RR (2012) Tutorial: Input uncertainty in output analysis. *Proceedings of the 2012 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 1–12 (IEEE).
- Barton RR, Chick SE, Cheng RC, Henderson SG, Law AM, Schmeiser BW, Leemis LM, Schruben LW, Wilson JR (2002) Panel discussion on current issues in input modeling: panel on current issues in simulation input modeling. *Proceedings of the 34th conference on Winter simulation: exploring new frontiers*, 353–369.
- Barton RR, Nelson BL, Xie W (2013) Quantifying input uncertainty via simulation confidence intervals. *INFORMS Journal on Computing* 26(1):74–87.
- Barton RR, Schruben LW (1993) Uniform and bootstrap resampling of empirical distributions. *Proceedings of the 25th conference on Winter simulation*, 503–508 (ACM).
- Barton RR, Schruben LW (2001) Resampling methods for input modeling. *Proceedings of the Winter Simulation Conference, 2001*, volume 1, 372–378 (IEEE).
- Bayraksan G, Love DK (2015) Data-driven stochastic programming using phi-divergences. *The Operations Research Revolution*, 1–19 (INFORMS).
- Ben-Tal A, Den Hertog D, De Waegenare A, Melenberg B, Rennen G (2013) Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Management Science* 59(2):341–357.

- Ben-Tal A, Nemirovski A (2002) Robust optimization—methodology and applications. *Mathematical Programming* 92(3):453–480.
- Bertsimas D, Brown DB, Caramanis C (2011) Theory and applications of robust optimization. *SIAM Review* 53(3):464–501.
- Blanchet J, Kang Y (2016) Sample out-of-sample inference based on wasserstein distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.01340* .
- Blanchet J, Kang Y, Murthy K (2016) Robust wasserstein profile inference and applications to machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.05627* .
- Blanchet J, Murthy K (2016a) Quantifying distributional model risk via optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.01446* .
- Blanchet J, Murthy KR (2016b) On distributionally robust extreme value analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.06858* .
- Cheng RC, Holland W (1997) Sensitivity of computer simulation experiments to errors in input data. *Journal of Statistical Computation and Simulation* 57(1-4):219–241.
- Cheng RC, Holland W (1998) Two-point methods for assessing variability in simulation output. *Journal of Statistical Computation Simulation* 60(3):183–205.
- Cheng RC, Holland W (2004) Calculation of confidence intervals for simulation output. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)* 14(4):344–362.
- Chick SE (2001) Input distribution selection for simulation experiments: Accounting for input uncertainty. *Operations Research* 49(5):744–758.
- Chick SE (2006) Bayesian ideas and discrete event simulation: Why, what and how. *Proceedings of the 2006 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 96–106 (IEEE).
- Chu WM, Chang KY, Lu CY, Hsu CH, Liu CH, Hsiao YC (2014) A new approach to determine the critical path in stochastic activity network. *Computer, Consumer and Control (IS3C), 2014 International Symposium on*, 1123–1128 (IEEE).
- Delage E, Ye Y (2010) Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations research* 58(3):595–612.
- Dey S, Juneja S (2012) Incorporating fat tails in financial models using entropic divergence measures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1203.0643* .
- Duchi J, Glynn P, Namkoong H (2016) Statistics of robust optimization: A generalized empirical likelihood approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.03425* .
- Durrett R (2010) *Probability: theory and examples* (Cambridge university press).
- Efron B (2014) Estimation and accuracy after model selection. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 109(507):991–1007.

- Esfahani PM, Kuhn D (2015) Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1505.05116* .
- Gao R, Kleywegt AJ (2016) Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with wasserstein distance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1604.02199* .
- Ghosh S, Lam H (2015) Mirror descent stochastic approximation for computing worst-case stochastic input models. *Proceedings of the 2015 Winter Simulation Conference*, 425–436 (IEEE Press).
- Ghosh S, Lam H (2016) Robust analysis in stochastic simulation: Computation and performance guarantees. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.05609, forthcoming in Operations Research* .
- Glasserman P, Xu X (2013) Robust portfolio control with stochastic factor dynamics. *Operations Research* 61(4):874–893.
- Glasserman P, Xu X (2014) Robust risk measurement and model risk. *Quantitative Finance* 14(1):29–58.
- Goh J, Sim M (2010) Distributionally robust optimization and its tractable approximations. *Operations research* 58(4-part-1):902–917.
- Hampel FR (1974) The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 69(346):383–393.
- Hampel FR, Ronchetti EM, Rousseeuw PJ, Stahel WA (2011) *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions*, volume 114 (John Wiley & Sons).
- Hansen LP, Sargent TJ (2008) *Robustness* (Princeton university press).
- Henderson SG (2003) Input modeling: Input model uncertainty: Why do we care and what should we do about it? *Proceedings of the 35th Winter Simulation Conference*, 90–100 (IEEE).
- Hjort NL, McKeague IW, Van Keilegom I (2009) Extending the scope of empirical likelihood. *The Annals of Statistics* 1079–1111.
- Hu Z, Cao J, Hong LJ (2012) Robust simulation of global warming policies using the dice model. *Management science* 58(12):2190–2206.
- Huber PJ, Ronchetti EM (2009) Robust statistics. *International Encyclopedia of Statistical Science*, 1248–1251 (Springer), second edition.
- Iyengar GN (2005) Robust dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 30(2):257–280.
- Jain A, Lim AE, Shanthikumar JG (2010) On the optimality of threshold control in queues with model uncertainty. *Queueing Systems* 65(2):157–174.
- Jiang R, Guan Y (2012) Data-driven chance constrained stochastic program. *Mathematical Programming* 1–37.
- Lam H (2016a) Advanced tutorial: Input uncertainty and robust analysis in stochastic simulation. *Winter Simulation Conference (WSC), 2016*, 178–192 (IEEE).

- Lam H (2016b) Recovering best statistical guarantees via the empirical divergence-based distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.09349, forthcoming in Operations Research* .
- Lam H (2016c) Robust sensitivity analysis for stochastic systems. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 41(4):1248–1275.
- Lam H (2017) Sensitivity to serial dependency of input processes: A robust approach. *Management Science* Articles in advance, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2016.2667>.
- Lam H, Qian H (2018) Subsampling to enhance efficiency in input uncertainty quantification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04500* .
- Lam H, Zhou E (2017) The empirical likelihood approach to quantifying uncertainty in sample average approximation. *Operations Research Letters* 45(4):301–307.
- Lim AE, Shanthikumar JG (2007) Relative entropy, exponential utility, and robust dynamic pricing. *Operations Research* 55(2):198–214.
- Liu Y, Zou C, Zhang R (2008) Empirical likelihood for the two-sample mean problem. *Statistics & Probability Letters* 78(5):548–556.
- Nilim A, El Ghaoui L (2005) Robust control of markov decision processes with uncertain transition matrices. *Operations Research* 53(5):780–798.
- Owen A (1990) Empirical likelihood ratio confidence regions. *The Annals of Statistics* 90–120.
- Owen A (1991) Empirical likelihood for linear models. *The Annals of Statistics* 1725–1747.
- Owen AB (1988) Empirical likelihood ratio confidence intervals for a single functional. *Biometrika* 75(2):237–249.
- Owen AB (2001) *Empirical likelihood* (CRC press).
- Pardo L (2005) *Statistical inference based on divergence measures* (CRC Press).
- Petersen IR, James MR, Dupuis P (2000) Minimax optimal control of stochastic uncertain systems with relative entropy constraints. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* 45(3):398–412.
- Qin J, Lawless J (1994) Empirical likelihood and general estimating equations. *The Annals of Statistics* 300–325.
- Rao RR (1962) Relations between weak and uniform convergence of measures with applications. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 659–680.
- Rockafellar RT (2015) *Convex analysis* (Princeton university press).
- Serfling RJ (2009) *Approximation Theorems of Mathematical Statistics*, volume 162 (John Wiley & Sons).
- Shapiro A, Dentcheva D, et al. (2014) *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*, volume 16 (SIAM).

- Song E, Nelson BL (2015) Quickly assessing contributions to input uncertainty. *IIE Transactions* 47(9):893–909.
- Song E, Nelson BL, Pegden CD (2014) Advanced tutorial: Input uncertainty quantification. *Proceedings of the 2014 Winter Simulation Conference (WSC)*, 162–176 (IEEE).
- Wager S, Hastie T, Efron B (2014) Confidence intervals for random forests: The jackknife and the infinitesimal jackknife. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 15(1):1625–1651.
- Wiesemann W, Kuhn D, Sim M (2014) Distributionally robust convex optimization. *Operations Research* 62(6):1358–1376.
- Wilks SS (1938) The large-sample distribution of the likelihood ratio for testing composite hypotheses. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 9(1):60–62.
- Wu C, Yan Y (2012) Empirical likelihood inference for two-sample problems. *Stat. Interface* 5:345–354.
- Xie W, Nelson BL, Barton RR (2014) A bayesian framework for quantifying uncertainty in stochastic simulation. *Operations Research* 62(6):1439–1452.
- Xie W, Nelson BL, Barton RR (2016) Multivariate input uncertainty in output analysis for stochastic simulation. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)* 27(1):5.
- Xu H, Mannor S (2012) Distributionally robust markov decision processes. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 37(2):288–300.
- Yi Y, Xie W (2017) An efficient budget allocation approach for quantifying the impact of input uncertainty in stochastic simulation. *ACM Transactions on Modeling and Computer Simulation (TOMACS)* 27(4):25.
- Zhu H, Zhou E (2015) Risk quantification in stochastic simulation under input uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.06015* .
- Zouaoui F, Wilson JR (2003) Accounting for parameter uncertainty in simulation input modeling. *IIE Transactions* 35(9):781–792.
- Zouaoui F, Wilson JR (2004) Accounting for input-model and input-parameter uncertainties in simulation. *IIE Transactions* 36(11):1135–1151.

## Proofs of Statements

We introduce some notations. Given a positive semi-definite matrix  $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \Sigma)$  denotes the multivariate normal distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  with mean zero and covariance matrix  $\Sigma$ . In particular,  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  denotes the univariate standard normal.  $\Phi(\cdot)$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ .  $\Rightarrow$  denotes weak convergence of probability measures. Given the data  $\{X_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$  and the optimal probability weights  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  and  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max})$  in Step 2 of our algorithms, let  $\sigma_{\min}^2 = \text{Var}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}}(h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m))$ ,  $\sigma_{\max}^2 = \text{Var}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max}}(h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m))$  be the variances of the simulation output driven by input models under the weighted empirical distributions. We denote  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]/P(\cdot)$  as the expectation/probability with respect to the randomness in the data, and also all the simulation runs when the quantity in consideration involves them. We use  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \text{data and Step 1 of the algorithms}]$  to represent the expectation conditioned on the input data and the simulation in Step 1 (i.e., the expectation is only on the randomness of the simulation in Step 3), and  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[\cdot] := \mathbb{E}[\cdot | \text{data}]$  the expectation conditioned on the input data.  $\mathbb{E}_D[\cdot]$  is the expectation with respect to the input data, and therefore  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot] = \mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[\cdot]]]$ . When applicable, we denote  $\mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}[\cdot]$  as the expectation with respect to both the randomness in the data and the simulation in Step 1. Probabilities  $P_{\xi_2}(\cdot), P_{\xi_1}(\cdot), P_D(\cdot)$  and variances  $\text{Var}_{\xi_2}(\cdot), \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(\cdot), \text{Var}_D(\cdot)$  are defined accordingly.

We present our proofs as follows. We first prove all the results in Section 4, organized via the subsections. Given these developments, we then prove the main results in Section 3 including Theorems 1, 2, 3, and also Proposition 1.

### EC.1. Proofs of Results in Section 4.2

*Proof of Proposition 2.* Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,T_i})$ . First we rewrite the performance measure as an integral

$$\begin{aligned} & Z((1-\epsilon)Q_1^1 + \epsilon Q_1^2, \dots, (1-\epsilon)Q_m^1 + \epsilon Q_m^2) \\ &= \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} d(Q_i^1 + \epsilon(Q_i^2 - Q_i^1))(x_{i,t}) \\ &= Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \epsilon \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) \cdot d(Q_i^2 - Q_i^1)(x_{i,t}) + \mathcal{R} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.1})$$

by expanding out all the  $Q_i^1$  and  $\epsilon(Q_i^2 - Q_i^1)$  in the product measure, and the remainder  $\mathcal{R}$  includes all the terms that have an  $\epsilon^k$  with  $k \geq 2$ . The integrability condition guarantees that all the integral terms above, including those in  $\mathcal{R}$ , are finite. Note that

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) \cdot d(Q_i^2 - Q_i^1)(x_{i,t})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \left( \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) \cdot dQ_i^2(x_{i,t}) - Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) \right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \int \left( \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) - Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) \right) dQ_i^2(x_{i,t}) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \int \left( \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) - Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) \right) dQ_i^2(x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \int \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \left( \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{r \neq i \text{ or } s \neq t} dQ_r^1(x_{r,s}) - Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1) \right) dQ_i^2(x_i) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^m \int G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(x_i) dQ_i^2(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{Q_i^2}[G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}(X_i)],
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality holds because  $dQ_i^2$  is a probability measure, and the third equality is a notational replacement of  $x_{i,t}$  by  $x_i$ , with  $\mathbf{x}_i^{(t)}$  defined as  $\mathbf{x}_i$  but with  $x_{i,t}$  replaced by  $x_i$ . This and (EC.1) together show the derivative expression (11). The mean zero property of  $G_i^{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1}$  follows from the tower property

$$\mathbb{E}_{Q_i^1} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) | X_i(t)] \right] = Z(Q_1^1, \dots, Q_m^1)$$

for all  $t = 1, \dots, T_i$ . □

*Proof of Proposition 3.* We first provide two lemmas.

LEMMA EC.1. *Every feasible solution  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$  satisfies*

$$\frac{l(\alpha)}{n_i} \leq w_{i,j} \leq \frac{u(\alpha)}{n_i}, \forall i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i$$

where  $0 < l(\alpha) < 1 < u(\alpha) < +\infty$  are the two solutions of the equation  $xe^{1+\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2}-x} = 1$ .

*Proof of Lemma EC.1.* Consider  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$ . By Jensen's inequality, for each  $i$  we have

$$-\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \geq -n_i \log \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 0,$$

and thus

$$-2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2.$$

This implies for each  $i = 1, \dots, m$

$$\prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \geq e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2}}. \quad (\text{EC.2})$$

For any  $s = 1, \dots, n_i$ , we shall show that  $l(\alpha) \leq n_i w_{i,s} \leq u(\alpha)$ . Taking  $n_i w_{i,s}$  out of the product in (EC.2) and noticing the inequality  $\prod_{j \neq s} n_i w_{i,j} \leq \left( \frac{n_i}{n_i-1} \sum_{j \neq s} w_{i,j} \right)^{n_i-1} = \left( \frac{n_i(1-w_{i,s})}{n_i-1} \right)^{n_i-1}$  gives

$$n_i w_{i,s} \left( 1 + \frac{1 - n_i w_{i,s}}{n_i - 1} \right)^{n_i-1} \geq n_i w_{i,s} \prod_{j \neq s} n_i w_{i,j} \geq e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2}}.$$

Applying  $e^x \geq 1 + x$  to  $1 + \frac{1-n_i w_{i,s}}{n_i-1}$  gives

$$n_i w_{i,s} e^{1-n_i w_{i,s}} \geq e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2}}. \quad (\text{EC.3})$$

Simple calculations show that the function  $x e^{1-x}$  strictly increases from 0 to 1 for  $x \in (0, 1)$  and decreases from 1 to 0 for  $x \in (1, +\infty)$ . So it follows from (EC.3) that  $n_i w_{i,s}$  must fall between the two solutions of  $x e^{1-x} = e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2}}$ .  $\square$

LEMMA EC.2. *Let  $u(\alpha)$  be the constant from Lemma EC.1. Every feasible solution  $(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha$  satisfies*

$$\sum_{i=1}^m n_i^2 \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i})^2 \leq u(\alpha)^2 \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2.$$

*Proof of Lemma EC.2.* Taylor expand each summand in the left hand side of the first constraint in  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$ , around the uniform weights, and use the mean value theorem to get

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left( 0 - 2n_i(w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i}) + (\theta_{i,j} w_{i,j} + (1 - \theta_{i,j}) \frac{1}{n_i})^{-2} (w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i})^2 \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\theta_{i,j} w_{i,j} + (1 - \theta_{i,j}) \frac{1}{n_i})^{-2} (w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i})^2 \end{aligned}$$

where  $\theta_{i,j}$  is some constant such that  $0 \leq \theta_{i,j} \leq 1$ , for each  $i, j$ . Lemma EC.1 implies  $\theta_{i,j} w_{i,j} + (1 - \theta_{i,j}) \frac{1}{n_i} \leq \frac{u(\alpha)}{n_i}$ . Hence

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{n_i^2}{u(\alpha)^2} (w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i})^2 \leq -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2.$$

Multiplying  $u(\alpha)^2$  on both sides completes the proof.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 3. Let  $\mathbf{x}_i = (x_{i,1}, \dots, x_{i,T_i})$ . We will first show the uniform error bound of the linear approximation  $Z_L$ , and then  $\widehat{Z}_L$ . We start the analysis by expressing  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  as

$$Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) = \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} d\mathbf{w}_i(x_{i,t}) \quad (\text{EC.4})$$

where we abuse notation to write  $\mathbf{w}_i$  as a probability measure over the observations  $\{X_{i,j}\}_{j=1, \dots, n_i}$ . Rewrite  $d\mathbf{w}_i$  as  $d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i + \hat{P}_i - P_i + P_i)$ , where  $\hat{P}_i$  is the empirical distribution of the  $i$ -th sample, and expand out  $\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i$ ,  $\hat{P}_i - P_i$  and  $P_i$  in the product measure in (EC.4) to get

$$\begin{aligned} &Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i^1, \mathcal{T}_i^2} \int h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d(\hat{P}_i - P_i)(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}) \\ &= \sum_{d=0}^T \sum_{\sum_i (|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|) = d} \int h \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d(\hat{P}_i - P_i)(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}) \quad (\text{EC.5}) \end{aligned}$$



where for each  $i$ ,  $\mathcal{T}_i^1, \mathcal{T}_i^2$  are two disjoint and ordered (possibly empty) subsets of  $\{1, 2, \dots, T_i\}$  that specifies the second subscript  $t$  of the argument  $x_{i,t}$ ,  $|\cdot|$  denotes the cardinality of a set, and  $T = \sum_{i=1}^m T_i$ .

The desired conclusion can be achieved upon completing the following two tasks: (1) show that the terms with  $d=0, 1$  above give the linear approximation; (2) each term with  $d \geq 2$  is of order  $O(1/n^d)$  in terms of its mean square.

**Task one:**  $d=0, 1$

The only summand with  $d=0$  is

$$\int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t=1}^{T_i} dP_i(x_{i,t}) = Z(P_1, \dots, P_m) = Z^*,$$

and each summand with  $d=1$  is one of the following two types

$$\int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) d(\hat{P}_r - P_r)(x_{r,s}), \text{ for } r=1, \dots, m, s=1, \dots, T_i$$

or

$$\int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) d(\mathbf{w}_r - \hat{P}_r)(x_{r,s}), \text{ for } r=1, \dots, m, s=1, \dots, T_i.$$

For each  $r$  and  $s$  the two types sum up to

$$\int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) d(\mathbf{w}_r - P_r)(x_{r,s}).$$

Summing over all  $r, s$  gives

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{r=1}^m \sum_{s=1}^{T_r} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) d(\mathbf{w}_r - P_r)(x_{r,s}) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^m \sum_{s=1}^{T_r} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r^{(s)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) d(\mathbf{w}_r - P_r)(x_r) \\ & \quad \text{by replacing } x_{r,s} \text{ with } x_r, \text{ and denoting } \mathbf{x}_r^{(s)} \text{ as } \mathbf{x}_r \text{ but with } x_{r,s} \text{ replaced by } x_r \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^m \int \left( \sum_{s=1}^{T_r} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r^{(s)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \right) d(\mathbf{w}_r - P_r)(x_r) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^m \int \sum_{s=1}^{T_r} \left( \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_r^{(s)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i \neq r \text{ or } t \neq s} dP_i(x_{i,t}) - Z(P_1, \dots, P_m) \right) d\mathbf{w}_r(x_r) \\ &= \sum_{r=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{r,j} G_r(X_{r,j}). \end{aligned}$$

This concludes that the summands with  $d=0, 1$  sum up to the linear approximation  $Z_L = Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} G_i(X_{i,j})$ .

**Task two:**  $d \geq 2$

Now we deal with the terms in (EC.5) with  $d \geq 2$ . Define

$$\mathcal{M} := \max_{I_1, \dots, I_m} \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [ |h(\mathbf{X}_{1, I_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, I_m})|^2 ], \quad (\text{EC.6})$$

where each  $I_i \in \{1, 2, \dots, T_i\}^{T_i}$ . Note that  $\mathcal{M}$  is finite under Assumption 3 due to Jensen's inequality. Consider a generic summand from (EC.5)

$$R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2) = \int h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d(\hat{P}_i - P_i)(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t})$$

where we denote  $\mathcal{T}^1 = (\mathcal{T}_1^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m^1)$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^2 = (\mathcal{T}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m^2)$ . Note that  $\sum_{i=1}^m (|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|) = d$ , and the subscript  $d$  in  $R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)$  is used to emphasize this dependence. Let  $\mathcal{T}_i^1(t)$  (or  $\mathcal{T}_i^2(t)$ ) be the  $t$ -th element of  $\mathcal{T}_i^1$  (or  $\mathcal{T}_i^2$ ). Our goal is to show that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|^2 \right] = O \left( \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{-(|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|)} \right) = O(n^{-d}). \quad (\text{EC.7})$$

First, we rewrite  $R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)$  as a sum and from there derive an upper bound (EC.10) of its supremum. Define the conditional expectation of  $h$  for given subscripts  $\mathcal{T}^1 = (\mathcal{T}_1^1, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m^1)$ ,  $\mathcal{T}^2 = (\mathcal{T}_1^2, \dots, \mathcal{T}_m^2)$

$$h_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^1}, \mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^1}, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^2}) = \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) | X_{i,t} = x_{i,t}, \forall i \text{ and } t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2]$$

where each  $\mathbf{x}_{i, \mathcal{T}_i^1} = (x_{i,t})_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1}$  and  $\mathbf{x}_{i, \mathcal{T}_i^2} = (x_{i,t})_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2}$ . Considering all possible subsets  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i^1$  of  $\mathcal{T}_i^1$  for each  $i$  and denoting  $\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^1 = (\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_1^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_m^1)$ , we define a centered conditional expectation (its property will be discussed momentarily)

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^1}, \mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^1}, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^2}) \\ &= \sum_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i^1 \subset \mathcal{T}_i^1, \forall i} (-1)^{\sum_i (|\mathcal{T}_i^1| - |\tilde{\mathcal{T}}_i^1|)} h_{\tilde{\mathcal{T}}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{x}_{1, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_1^1}, \mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m, \tilde{\mathcal{T}}_m^1}, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^2}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.8})$$

By expanding out the product measure  $\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d(\hat{P}_i - P_i)(x_{i,t})$  and noticing that each  $\hat{P}_i$  is a probability measure,  $R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)$  can be expressed as

$$\int \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^1}, \mathbf{x}_{1, \mathcal{T}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^1}, \mathbf{x}_{m, \mathcal{T}_m^2}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d\hat{P}_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}). \quad (\text{EC.9})$$

From now on, we denote  $X_{i,j}, i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i$  as the observations, and for each  $i$  let

$$\begin{aligned} J_i^1 &= (J_i^1(1), \dots, J_i^1(|\mathcal{T}_i^1|)) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_i\}^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|} \\ J_i^2 &= (J_i^2(1), \dots, J_i^2(|\mathcal{T}_i^2|)) \in \{1, 2, \dots, n_i\}^{|\mathcal{T}_i^2|} \end{aligned}$$

be two sequences of indices (if  $\mathcal{T}_i^1$  or  $\mathcal{T}_i^2$  is empty, then  $J_i^1$  or  $J_i^2$  is empty accordingly) that specify the second subscript of data  $X_{i,j}$ . Then (EC.9) can be written more explicitly as

$$R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2) = \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \left[ \prod_{i,t} \left( w_{i,J_i^2(t)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right) \right] \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1,J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1,J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m,J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m,J_m^2})$$

where each  $\mathbf{X}_{i,J_i^1} = (X_{i,J_i^1(1)}, \dots, X_{i,J_i^1(|\mathcal{T}_i^1|)})$  contains the input data specified by  $J_i^1$ , and similarly  $\mathbf{X}_{i,J_i^2} = (X_{i,J_i^2(1)}, \dots, X_{i,J_i^2(|\mathcal{T}_i^2|)})$ . We bound the supremum as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|^2 &\leq \left[ \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \prod_{i,t} \left( w_{i,J_i^2(t)} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right)^2 \right] \left[ \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^m \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left( w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right)^2 \right)^{|\mathcal{T}_i^2|} \left[ \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2} \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we suppress the arguments of  $\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}$ , and use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality. The upper bound from Lemma EC.2 then implies that  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left( w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right)^2 \leq u(\alpha)^2 \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 / n_i^2$ , and hence for some constant  $C_1$  depending on  $\alpha$  and  $d$

$$\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|^2 \leq C_1 \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{-2|\mathcal{T}_i^2|} \cdot \left[ \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2} \right)^2 \right]. \quad (\text{EC.10})$$

From (EC.10), the proof now boils down to bounding the expectation of

$$\left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1,J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1,J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m,J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m,J_m^2}) \right)^2$$

for each fixed  $J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2$ . We need a few properties of  $\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}$ . The first property, which follows from its definition, is that, for any  $i$  and  $t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1$ , the marginal expectation under the true input distributions is zero, i.e.

$$\int \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{x}_{1,\mathcal{T}_1^1}, \mathbf{x}_{1,\mathcal{T}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{m,\mathcal{T}_m^1}, \mathbf{x}_{m,\mathcal{T}_m^2}) dP_i(x_{i,t}) = 0. \quad (\text{EC.11})$$

The second property is a bound of the second moment that is uniform in  $\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2$ . By Jensen's inequality, one can show that for any  $m$  sequences of indices  $I_i = (I_i(1), \dots, I_i(|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|)) \in \{1, 2, \dots, |\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|\}^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|}$  the conditional expectation  $h_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [h_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}^2(\mathbf{X}_{1,I_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m,I_m})] \leq \mathcal{M}$$

where  $\mathbf{X}_{i,I_i} = (X_i(I_i(1)), \dots, X_i(I_i(|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|)))$  and  $\mathcal{M}$  is the second moment bound defined in (EC.6). (EC.8) tells us that  $\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}$  is the sum of  $2^{|\mathcal{T}^1|}$  conditional expectations of such type. By the Minkowski inequality we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m} [\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}^2(\mathbf{X}_{1,I_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m,I_m})] \leq 4^{|\mathcal{T}^1|} \mathcal{M}. \quad (\text{EC.12})$$

Now we are able to proceed with

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^2}) \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{2|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \sum_{\tilde{J}_1^1, \dots, \tilde{J}_m^1} \mathbb{E} [\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^2}) \cdot \\ & \quad \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, \tilde{J}_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, \tilde{J}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, \tilde{J}_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, \tilde{J}_m^2})]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.13})$$

Note that because of property (EC.11), the expectation in (EC.13) is zero if there is some index  $i^* \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  and  $j^* \in \{1, \dots, n_i\}$  such that  $X_{i^*, j^*}$  does not appear in  $\mathbf{X}_{i^*, J_{i^*}^2}$  and shows up exactly once among  $\mathbf{X}_{i^*, J_{i^*}^1}, \mathbf{X}_{i^*, \tilde{J}_{i^*}^1}$ . Note that, for each fixed  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , the number of choices of  $J_i^1, \tilde{J}_i^1$  that avoid this occurrence is no more than  $C_2 n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}$ , where  $C_2$  is some constant depending on  $d$  only. So the total number of choices of  $J_i^1, \tilde{J}_i^1, i = 1, \dots, m$  that can possibly produce a nonzero expectation in (EC.13) is at most

$$C_2^m \left( \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|} \right). \quad (\text{EC.14})$$

On the other hand, applying the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality and the upper bound (EC.12) to the expectation in (EC.13) gives

$$\left| \mathbb{E} [\tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^2}) \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, \tilde{J}_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, \tilde{J}_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, \tilde{J}_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, \tilde{J}_m^2})] \right| \leq 4^{|\mathcal{T}^1|} \mathcal{M}$$

for any  $J_i^1, \tilde{J}_i^1, J_i^2, i = 1, \dots, m$ . We conclude from (EC.13), (EC.14) and the above bound that

$$\mathbb{E} \left( \frac{1}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2}(\mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^1}, \mathbf{X}_{1, J_1^2}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^1}, \mathbf{X}_{m, J_m^2}) \right)^2 \leq \frac{4^{|\mathcal{T}^1|} C_2^m \mathcal{M}}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \quad (\text{EC.15})$$

uniformly for all choices of  $J_i^2, i = 1, \dots, m$ .

Finally, we go back to the inequality (EC.10) to arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|^2 \right] &\leq C_1 \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{-2|\mathcal{T}_i^2|} \cdot \left[ \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \mathbb{E} \left( \prod_i \frac{1}{n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \sum_{J_1^1, \dots, J_m^1} \tilde{h}_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq C_1 \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{-2|\mathcal{T}_i^2|} \cdot \left[ \sum_{J_1^2, \dots, J_m^2} \frac{4^{|\mathcal{T}^1|} C_2^m \mathcal{M}}{\prod_i n_i^{|\mathcal{T}_i^1|}} \right] \\ &\leq 4^{|\mathcal{T}^1|} C_1 C_2^m \mathcal{M} \prod_{i=1}^m n_i^{-(|\mathcal{T}_i^1| + |\mathcal{T}_i^2|)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.16})$$

This proves (EC.7). Note that, since  $T$  is fixed, from (EC.5),

$$\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \sum_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2, d \geq 2} R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2) \right| \leq \sum_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2, d \geq 2} \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|$$

and the Minkowski inequality we conclude that  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\sum_{\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2, d \geq 2} R_d(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)|^2] = O(n^{-2})$ . This therefore shows that  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z - Z_L|^2] = O(n^{-2})$  as the data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

Now we prove the uniform approximation error of  $\widehat{Z}_L$ . The approach is to expand the integral form of  $Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$  in a similar way to (EC.5), but around  $\hat{P}_i$ 's instead of  $P_i$ 's

$$Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) = \sum_{d=0}^T \sum_{\sum_i |\mathcal{T}_i^2| = d} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^2} d\hat{P}_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}) \quad (\text{EC.17})$$

where each  $\mathcal{T}_i^2$  is again an ordered subset of  $\{1, 2, \dots, T_i\}$  that contains the second subscript  $t$  of the argument  $x_{i,t}$ . Similar to above, summands with  $d = 0, 1$  gives the linear approximation at the empirical distributions, i.e.  $\widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)$ , and all summands with  $d \geq 2$  will be the associated approximation error. To bound each summand with  $d \geq 2$ , we rewrite  $\hat{P}_i$  as  $\hat{P}_i - P_i + P_i$ , and suitably expand out the product measure  $\prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^2} d\hat{P}_i(x_{i,t})$  in (EC.17) to get

$$\begin{aligned} & \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^2} d\hat{P}_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i^1, \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cap \mathcal{T}_i^2 = \emptyset} \int h(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \notin \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cup \mathcal{T}_i^2} dP_i(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^1} d(\hat{P}_i - P_i)(x_{i,t}) \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{t \in \mathcal{T}_i^2} d(\mathbf{w}_i - \hat{P}_i)(x_{i,t}) \\ &= \sum_{\mathcal{T}_i^1, \text{ s.t. } \mathcal{T}_i^1 \cap \mathcal{T}_i^2 = \emptyset} R_{|\mathcal{T}^1|+d}(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2) \end{aligned}$$

where each  $\mathcal{T}_i^1$  is the ordered set consisting of the second subscripts  $t$  of all  $x_{i,t}$ 's to which  $\hat{P}_i - P_i$  is distributed, and  $R_{|\mathcal{T}^1|+d}(\mathcal{T}^1, \mathcal{T}^2)$  is the remainder term defined before. The desired conclusion then follows from (EC.7) and an argument analogous to the first part of the theorem.  $\square$

## EC.2. Proof of Results in Section 4.3

*Proof of Theorem 4.* To simplify the proof, we first argue that one can assume  $\text{Var}(Y_i) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}Y_i = 0$  for all  $i = 1, \dots, m$  without loss of generality. Let  $I = \{i : \text{Var}(Y_i) > 0, i = 1, \dots, m\}$  be the set of indices whose corresponding  $Y_i$ 's have non-zero variances. Then for  $i \notin I$  each  $Y_{i,j} = \mathbb{E}Y_i$  almost surely, hence

$$\begin{aligned} R(\mu_0) &= \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu_0, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right. \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu_0 - \sum_{i \notin I} \mathbb{E}Y_i, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right. \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \prod_{i \in I} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in I} \mathbb{E}Y_i, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for } i \in I, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I, j \right. \right\} \\ &= \max \left\{ \prod_{i \in I} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}Y_i) w_{i,j} = 0, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for } i \in I, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I, j \right. \right\} \\ &= R_I(0) \end{aligned}$$

where  $R_I(0)$  is the analog of  $R(\mu_0)$  defined for the translated observations  $\{Y_{i,1} - \mathbb{E}Y_i, \dots, Y_{i,n_i} - \mathbb{E}Y_i\}, i \in I$ , and in the third equality we put  $w_{i,j} = 1/n_i$  for  $i \notin I$  into the objective, which can be easily seen to be the maximizing weights for  $i \notin I$ . Therefore, to prove the theorem for  $R(\mu_0)$ , one can work with  $R_I(0)$  instead, and note that the change of  $m$ , the number of independent distributions, does not affect the limit chi-square distribution.

In view of the above, we shall assume  $\text{Var}(Y_i) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}Y_i = 0$  for each  $i$ , hence  $R(\mu_0)$  is just  $R(0)$ . Introducing a slack variable  $\mu_i$  for each  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j}$  and taking the negative logarithm of the objective convert the defining maximization of  $R(0)$  to the following convex program

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad & - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = 0 \end{aligned} \tag{EC.18}$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\mu} = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_m)$ . The non-negativity constraints  $w_{i,j} \geq 0$  are dropped since they are implicitly imposed in the objective function.

**Step one:** We prove that, with probability tending to one, Slater's condition holds for (EC.18). In other words, consider the event

$$\mathcal{S} = \left\{ Y_{i,j}, i = 1, \dots, m, j = 1, \dots, n_i \mid \begin{array}{l} \text{(EC.18) has at least one feasible solution} \\ (\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ such that } w_{i,j} > 0 \text{ for all } i, j \end{array} \right\}$$

and we prove  $P(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . To this end, consider the following events indexed by  $i$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i = \left\{ Y_{i,j}, j = 1, \dots, n_i \mid \min_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} < 0 < \max_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} \right\}.$$

We shall prove that  $P(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i) \rightarrow 1$  for all  $i$  and that  $\cap_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , which imply that  $P(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 1$  because

$$P(\mathcal{S}^c) \leq P((\cap_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i)^c) = P(\cup_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i^c) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m P(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i^c) = \sum_{i=1}^m (1 - P(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that  $\text{Var}(Y_i) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}Y_i = 0$  imply  $P(Y_i \geq 0) < 1, P(Y_i \leq 0) < 1$ . Hence as  $n \rightarrow \infty$

$$P\left(\min_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} \geq 0\right) = \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} P(Y_{i,j} \geq 0) = (P(Y_i \geq 0))^{n_i} \rightarrow 0$$

which is equivalently  $P(\min_j Y_{i,j} < 0) \rightarrow 1$ . Similarly,  $P(\max_j Y_{i,j} > 0) \rightarrow 1$  holds. Combining these two limits gives  $P(\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i) \rightarrow 1$ . To show  $\cap_{i=1}^m \tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i \subseteq \mathcal{S}$ , note that if  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i$  happens then there must

exist convex-combination weights  $w_{i,j} > 0$ ,  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1$  such that  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = 0$ . When all  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i$ 's happen, one can take such weights and  $\mu_i = 0$  for each  $i$  to see that  $\mathcal{S}$  also happens.

**Step two:** We derive the KKT conditions for (EC.18), conditioned on Slater's condition  $\mathcal{S}$ . Notice that each  $-\log(n_i w_{i,j})$  is bounded below by  $-\log n_i$ , and when  $w_{i,j} \rightarrow 0$  for some  $i, j$  the corresponding  $-\log(n_i w_{i,j}) \rightarrow +\infty$ , hence the objective  $-\sum_{i,j} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \rightarrow +\infty$  as  $\min_{i,j} w_{i,j} \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore, the optimal solution, if it exists, must lie in the region where  $\min_{i,j} w_{i,j} \geq \epsilon$  for some small  $\epsilon > 0$  that depends on  $n_i$ 's. Since the set  $\{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) : \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = 0, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1, w_{i,j} \geq \epsilon \text{ for all } i, j\}$  is compact, an optimal solution  $(\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  exists for (EC.18). Moreover, strict convexity of the objective forces the optimal solution to be unique. By Corollary 28.3.1 of Rockafellar (2015), there must exist Lagrange multipliers  $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^*, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_2^*, \lambda^*)$ , where  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_1^* = (\lambda_{1,1}^*, \dots, \lambda_{1,m}^*)$  is associated with the first  $m$  constraints,  $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_2^* = (\lambda_{2,1}^*, \dots, \lambda_{2,m}^*)$  with the second  $m$  constraints, and  $\lambda^*$  with the last constraint in (EC.18), such that together with the optimal solution  $(\mathbf{w}_1^*, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^*, \boldsymbol{\mu}^*)$  satisfy the following KKT conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j}^* &= \mu_i^*, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}^* &= 1, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \\ \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^* &= 0 \\ -\frac{1}{w_{i,j}^*} + Y_{i,j} \lambda_{1,i}^* + \lambda_{2,i}^* &= 0, \text{ for all } i, j \\ -\lambda_{1,i}^* + \lambda^* &= 0, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m. \end{aligned} \tag{EC.19}$$

Some basic algebra shows  $\lambda_{2,i}^* = n_i - \lambda_{1,i}^* \mu_i^*$ ,  $\lambda^* = \lambda_{1,i}^*$  for all  $i$ , hence it follows from (EC.19) that

$$w_{i,j}^* = \frac{1}{n_i + \lambda^* (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} \tag{EC.20}$$

and  $\lambda^*, \mu_i^*$  satisfy

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*}{n_i + \lambda^* (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} = 0, \text{ for } i = 1, \dots, m \tag{EC.21}$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^* = 0. \tag{EC.22}$$

**A note on Slater's condition:** Note that  $\lambda^*, \mu_i^*, i = 1, \dots, m$  are guaranteed to exist and defined as above only when Slater's condition  $\mathcal{S}$  holds. In the rest of the proof, we set  $\lambda^*, \mu_i^*, i = 1, \dots, m$  as defined by (EC.21) and (EC.22) when  $\mathcal{S}$  happens, and arbitrarily defined otherwise (e.g., simply let them all be 0). Every intermediate inequality/equality below related to  $\lambda^*, \mu_i^*, i = 1, \dots, m$  is

interpreted as restricted to the event of  $\mathcal{S}$ . For example,  $a \leq b$  and  $a = b$  should be interpreted as  $a \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\} \leq b \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\}$  and  $a \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\} = b \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\}$ . All asymptotic statements or quantities that rely on stochastic orders  $o_p, O_p$  and convergence in distribution, remain valid via a decomposition of the involved probability into  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}^c$  and using  $P(\mathcal{S}) \rightarrow 1$ . To demonstrate this argument concretely, we will show as an example in (EC.41) how it works. But to avoid adding overwhelming complexities to our proof, we will keep this aspect silent until then.

**Step three:** We show that the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda^*$  has a magnitude of  $O_p(n^{1/2})$ . Write (EC.20) as

$$\frac{1}{n_i + \lambda^*(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} = \frac{1}{n_i} \left( 1 - \frac{\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} \right) \quad (\text{EC.23})$$

and substituting (EC.23) into (EC.21) gives

$$\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^* = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}, \quad (\text{EC.24})$$

where  $\bar{Y}_i = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}$ . Multiply both sides by  $\text{sign}(\lambda^*)$  to make the right hand side positive

$$\text{sign}(\lambda^*)(\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^*) = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}. \quad (\text{EC.25})$$

This is because, since each  $w_{i,j}^*$  is strictly positive, from (EC.20) we must have  $1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) > 0, \forall i, j$ . Also note that  $|\mu_i^*| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j}^* \right| \leq \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}^* |Y_{i,j}| \leq \max_{j=1, \dots, n_i} |Y_{i,j}|$ . Let  $Z_N = \max_{i=1, \dots, m, j=1, \dots, n_i} |Y_{i,j}|$ . A lower bound of the right hand side of (EC.25) can be derived as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} &\geq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n_i} \cdot 2 \max_{j=1, \dots, n_i} |Y_{i,j}|} \\ &\geq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2}{1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}} \cdot 2Z_N} \text{ where } \underline{c}, \bar{c} \text{ are from Assumption 1} \\ &= \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}}}{1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}} \cdot 2Z_N} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - 2\bar{Y}_i \mu_i^* + \mu_i^{*2}) \text{ where } \hat{\sigma}_i^2 = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}^2 \\ &\geq \frac{\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}}}{1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}} \cdot 2Z_N} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - 2\bar{Y}_i \mu_i^*) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.26})$$

Applying Lemma 11.2 in Owen (2001) to  $\{Y_{i,1}, \dots, Y_{i,n_i}\}$  reveals that, almost surely,  $\max_{j=1, \dots, n_i} |Y_{i,j}| = o(n_i^{\frac{1}{2}})$  as  $n_i \rightarrow \infty$  for each  $i$ , hence  $Z_N = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  and  $\mu_i^* = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  almost surely.



By the central limit theorem, each  $\bar{Y}_i = O_p(n_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . Substituting the lower bound (EC.26) into (EC.25) and multiplying each side by  $1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}} \cdot 2Z_N$  give

$$\begin{aligned} \left(1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \underline{c}/\bar{c}} \cdot 2Z_N\right) \text{sign}(\lambda^*) (\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^*) &\geq \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \bar{c}/\underline{c}} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 - 2\bar{Y}_i \mu_i^*) \\ &\geq \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \bar{c}/\underline{c}} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.27})$$

$$= \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \bar{c}/\underline{c}} (\hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o_p(1)). \quad (\text{EC.28})$$

Summing up both sides of (EC.28) over  $i = 1, \dots, m$ , and using (EC.22) and  $Z_N = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$  we have

$$\left(1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})\right) \text{sign}(\lambda^*) \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i \geq \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \bar{c}/\underline{c}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o_p(1)\right). \quad (\text{EC.29})$$

Rearranging the terms gives

$$\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} \left(\frac{\underline{c}}{\bar{c}} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o_p(1) + o(n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i\right) \leq \left|\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i\right|. \quad (\text{EC.30})$$

Note that  $\hat{\sigma}_i^2 \rightarrow \sigma_i^2 := \text{Var}(Y_i)$  almost surely by the strong law of large numbers, and  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i = \sum_{i=1}^m O_p(n_i^{-\frac{1}{2}}) = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . By the assumption  $\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 > 0$ , (EC.30) implies

$$\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} \leq \frac{O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{\frac{\underline{c}}{\bar{c}} \sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2 + o_p(1)}.$$

That is,  $\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ .

**Step four:** We show the convergence of  $\mu_i^*$  to the true mean 0, i.e.,  $\mu_i^* = o_p(1)$ . From (EC.23) it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^* &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left(\frac{1}{n_i} - w_{i,j}^*\right) Y_{i,j} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} Y_{i,j}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.31})$$

We have shown in the Step three that  $Z_N = o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})$ ,  $|\mu_i^*| \leq Z_N$  and  $\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ . Hence  $\max_j \left|\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right| = O\left(\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} Z_N\right) = O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) o(n^{\frac{1}{2}}) = o_p(1)$ . Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} |\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^*| &\leq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left| \frac{\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} \right| |Y_{i,j}| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left| \frac{\max_j \left|\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right|}{1 - \max_j \left|\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right|} \right| |Y_{i,j}| \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left|\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right| < 1 \right\} \\ &\quad + \infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left|\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right| \geq 1 \right\} \quad \text{where } \infty \cdot 0 = 0 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \left| \frac{\max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right|}{1 - \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right|} \right| \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| < 1 \right\} \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} |Y_{i,j}| + o_p(1) \\
&\leq \left| \frac{o_p(1)}{1 - o_p(1)} \right| \cdot \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} |Y_{i,j}| + o_p(1) \\
&= o_p(1).
\end{aligned}$$

The  $o_p(1)$  in the first equality is valid because  $\max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| = o_p(1)$ , and so by definition  $\infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| \geq 1 \right\}$  has an arbitrarily small stochastic order and hence is  $o_p(1)$ .

On the other hand,  $\bar{Y}_i = o_p(1)$  by the law of large numbers. Hence  $\mu_i^* = o_p(1)$ .

**Step five:** We derive formula (EC.37) for the Lagrange multiplier  $\lambda^*$  in terms of the data. Rewrite (EC.24) as

$$\begin{aligned}
\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^* &= \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left[ \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 - \frac{(\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i})^2 (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^3}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)} \right], \\
&= \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} \left[ \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 \right] - \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} \right|^2 \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^3}{1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)}. \tag{EC.32}
\end{aligned}$$

The second term in (EC.32) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} \right|^2 \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{|Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^3}{\left| 1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right|} \\
&\leq \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} \right|^2 \cdot \frac{2Z_N}{1 - \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right|} \cdot \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^2 \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| < 1 \right\} \\
&\quad + \infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| \geq 1 \right\} \text{ where } \infty \cdot 0 = 0 \\
&= O_p(n^{-1}) \frac{o(n^{1/2})}{1 - o_p(1)} O_p(1) + o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\
&= o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \tag{EC.33}
\end{aligned}$$

where in passing from  $\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^2$  to  $O_p(1)$  we use

$$\frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^2 = \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}^2 - 2\bar{Y}_i \mu_i^* + \mu_i^{*2} = \sigma_i^2 + O_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}) o_p(1) + o_p(1) = \sigma_i^2 + o_p(1) \tag{EC.34}$$

and the  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$  term in (EC.33) is valid because  $\max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| = o_p(1)$ , and so  $\infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_j \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| \geq 1 \right\}$  has an arbitrarily small stochastic order by definition and hence in particular is  $o_p(n^{-1/2})$ . (EC.34) also implies that the first term in (EC.32) is  $\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} (\sigma_i^2 + o_p(1))$ . Hence (EC.32) can be written as

$$\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^* = \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i} \sigma_i^2 + o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \tag{EC.35}$$

Summing (EC.35) over  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and using (EC.22) give

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i = \lambda^* \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i} + o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \quad (\text{EC.36})$$

Therefore the expression for  $\lambda^*$  is

$$\lambda^* = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}. \quad (\text{EC.37})$$

**Step six:** We substitute  $\mu_i^* = o_p(1)$  and (EC.37) into (EC.20) to derive a formula for  $w_{i,j}^*$ , and from there we analyze the Taylor expansion of  $-2 \log R(0)$  to conclude the desired result. Each

$$-\log(n_i w_{i,j}^*) = \log\left(1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right) = \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) - \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{2n_i^2}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 + \eta_{i,j},$$

where  $\eta_{i,j} = \frac{1}{3(1+\theta_{i,j})\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j}-\mu_i^*)^3} \left(\frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j}-\mu_i^*)\right)^3$  for some  $\theta_{i,j} \in (0, 1)$ , so the log profile likelihood ratio can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R(0) &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log\left(1 + \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)\right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \left( \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) - \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{2n_i^2}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 + \eta_{i,j} \right) \\ &= 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda^* (\bar{Y}_i - \mu_i^*) - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{n_i} \cdot \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} 2\eta_{i,j} \quad (\text{EC.38}) \end{aligned}$$

$$= 2\lambda^* \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{n_i} (\sigma_i^2 + o_p(1)) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} 2\eta_{i,j} \quad (\text{EC.39})$$

The equality between (EC.38) and (EC.39) follows from (EC.22) and (EC.34). To bound the last term in (EC.39)

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_{i,j} 2\eta_{i,j} \right| &\leq \frac{2}{3(1 - \max_{i,j} \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right|)^3} \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{\min_i n_i} \right|^3 \sum_{i,j} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^3 \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_{i,j} \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| < 1 \right\} \\ &\quad + \infty \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \max_{i,j} \left| \frac{\lambda^*}{n_i}(Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*) \right| \geq 1 \right\} \\ &= \frac{2}{3(1 - o_p(1))^3} O_p(n^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \sum_{i=1}^m 2n_i Z_N \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{n_i} |Y_{i,j} - \mu_i^*|^2 + o_p(1) \\ &= O_p(n^{-\frac{3}{2}}) \sum_{i=1}^m 2n_i Z_N O_p(1) + o_p(1) \\ &= O_p(n^{-\frac{3}{2}}) n o(n^{\frac{1}{2}}) O_p(1) + o_p(1) \\ &= o_p(1). \end{aligned}$$

Hence using the above bound and (EC.37), the log profile likelihood ratio (EC.39) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R(0) &= 2\lambda^* \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - \lambda^{*2} \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i} + o_p(1) \\ &= \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.40})$$

To resolve the issue caused by the possible absence of Slater's condition, note that the above result holds only in the event of  $\mathcal{S}$ , namely

$$-2 \log R(0) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\} = \left( \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\}$$

which implies

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R(0) &= \left( \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}\} - 2 \log R(0) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}^c\} \\ &= \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1) - \left( \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1) \right) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}^c\} - 2 \log R(0) \cdot \mathbf{1}\{\mathcal{S}^c\} \\ &= \frac{(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i)^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} + o_p(1). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.41})$$

(EC.41) brings us back to (EC.40). So by Slutsky's theorem it remains to show that the leading term in (EC.40)  $\Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1^2$ . The leading term can be written as

$$\left[ \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{Y_{i,j}}{n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right]^2. \quad (\text{EC.42})$$

By the continuous mapping theorem it suffices to show that the sum in (EC.42)  $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0,1)$ . We check the Lindeberg condition for the triangular array

$$(W_{N,1}, \dots, W_{N,N}) := (Y_{1,1}, \dots, Y_{1,n_1}, \dots, Y_{m,1}, \dots, Y_{m,n_m}) / \left( n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right)$$

where  $N = \sum_{i=1}^m n_i$ . The independence and mean zero conditions are obviously met, and

$$\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E} W_{N,k}^2 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{Y_{i,j}^2}{n_i^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{\sum_{i=1}^m n_i \sigma_i^2} = 1.$$

For any  $\epsilon > 0$

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{Y_{i,j}}{n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right)^2 \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{Y_{i,j}}{n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right| > \epsilon \right\} \right]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sum_{i=1}^m n_i \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \frac{Y_{i,1}}{n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right)^2 \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \left| \frac{Y_{i,1}}{n_i \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}} \right| > \epsilon \right\} \right] \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m C_1 \mathbb{E} [Y_{i,1}^2 \cdot \mathbf{1} \{|Y_{i,1}| > \epsilon C_2 \sqrt{n}\}] \text{ for some constants } C_1, C_2 \\
&\rightarrow 0 \text{ by the dominated convergence theorem.}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the Lindeberg condition holds for  $W_{N,k}$ . By the Lindeberg-Feller theorem (e.g., Theorem 3.4.5 in Durrett 2010), the sum in (EC.42)  $\Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  hence (EC.42) itself  $\Rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1^2$ .  $\square$

### EC.3. Proofs of Results in Section 4.4

*Proof of Theorem 6.* From Theorem 4 we know  $P(-2 \log R(\mu_0) \leq \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . That is, the set  $\{\mu \in \mathbb{R} \mid -2 \log R(\mu) \leq \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2\}$  contains the true value  $\mu_0$  with probability  $1 - \alpha$  asymptotically. Note that this set can be identified as

$$\mathcal{V} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} \mid -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right\}.$$

It is obvious that  $\underline{\mu}/\bar{\mu} = \min/\max\{\mu : \mu \in \mathcal{V}\}$ , and they are attained because the feasible set  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  is compact and the objective is linear hence continuous in  $w_{i,j}$ 's. So if the set  $\mathcal{V}$  is convex, then  $\mathcal{V} = [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$  which concludes the theorem. To show convexity, it is enough to notice that  $\mathcal{U}_\alpha$  is convex, and the objective is linear in  $w_{i,j}$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* We need the following corollary of Theorem 4:

**COROLLARY EC.1.** *Let  $\bar{Y}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j}/n_i$  be the sample mean of the  $i$ -th sample,  $\sigma_i^2 = \text{Var}(Y_i)$  be the true variance, and  $z$  be a fixed constant. Under the same conditions of Theorem 4,  $-2 \log R(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i}) \rightarrow z^2$  in probability as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .*

*Proof of Corollary EC.1.* The proof closely follows that of Theorem 4, and we only point out how each step should be modified in order to prove this corollary. Assuming  $\text{Var}(Y_i) > 0$  and  $\mathbb{E}Y_i = 0$  is still without loss of generality because, with  $I = \{i : \text{Var}(Y_i) > 0\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
&R\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}\right) \\
&= \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \mid \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right\} \\
&= \max \left\{ \prod_{i=1}^m \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \mid \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in I} \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for all } i, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i, j \right\} \\
&= \max \left\{ \prod_{i \in I} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \mid \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in I} \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for } i \in I, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I, j \right\}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \max \left\{ \prod_{i \in I} \prod_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i w_{i,j} \left| \sum_{i \in I} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (Y_{i,j} - \mathbb{E}Y_i) w_{i,j} = \sum_{i \in I} (\bar{Y}_i - \mathbb{E}Y_i) + z \sqrt{\sum_{i \in I} \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1 \text{ for } i \in I, w_{i,j} \geq 0 \text{ for all } i \in I, j \right\}$$

and the limit distribution, i.e., the point mass at  $z^2$ , does not depend on the number of distributions  $m$ . Next we consider the following counterpart of (EC.18)

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m, \boldsymbol{\mu}} \quad & - \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} Y_{i,j} w_{i,j} = \mu_i, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j} = 1, \quad i = 1, \dots, m \\ & \sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i = \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}. \end{aligned} \tag{EC.43}$$

**Step one:** We show Slater's condition holds for (EC.43) with a probability tending to one. Instead of  $\tilde{\mathcal{S}}_i$ , consider the event indexed by  $i$

$$\min_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} < \bar{Y}_i + \frac{z}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} < \max_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j}. \tag{EC.44}$$

We need to show the probability that (EC.44) happens goes to one. Note that  $\bar{Y}_i + z/m \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} = o_p(1)$ , and for a small enough  $\epsilon > 0$  it holds  $P(Y_i \geq -\epsilon) < 1, P(Y_i \leq \epsilon) < 1$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned} P\left(\min_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} \geq \bar{Y}_i + \frac{z}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}\right) &\leq P\left(\min_{j=1, \dots, n_i} Y_{i,j} \geq -\epsilon\right) + P\left(\bar{Y}_i + \frac{z}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} < -\epsilon\right) \\ &= (P(Y_i \geq -\epsilon))^{n_i} + P(o_p(1) < -\epsilon) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

This justifies the first inequality of (EC.44), and the second inequality can be treated in the same way. Applying the union bound shows that the probability of (EC.44) approaches one. The rest of this step remains the same.

**Step two:** The only change is that one of the KKT conditions, (EC.22), is replaced by

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \mu_i^* = \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}.$$

**Step three:** (EC.29) is replaced by

$$- \left(1 + \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} o(n^{\frac{1}{2}})\right) \text{sign}(\lambda^*) \cdot z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \geq \frac{|\lambda^*|}{n \cdot \bar{c}/\underline{c}} \left(\sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o_p(1)\right)$$

and (EC.30) becomes

$$\frac{|\lambda^*|}{n} \left( \frac{c}{c} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{\sigma}_i^2 + o_p(1) + o(n^{\frac{1}{2}}) \cdot z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) \leq |z| \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}.$$

The final bound  $\lambda^* = O_p(n^{1/2})$  still holds by observing that  $z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} = O(n^{-1/2})$  just like  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i$ .

**Step four:** No changes needed.

**Step five:** (EC.36) needs to be replaced by

$$-z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} = \lambda^* \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i} + o_p(n^{-\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Hence (EC.37) becomes

$$\lambda^* = \frac{-z + o_p(1)}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}}}.$$

**Step six:** (EC.39) and (EC.40) are replaced by

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \log R \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i + z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) &= -2\lambda^* z \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\lambda^{*2}}{n_i} (\sigma_i^2 + o_p(1)) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} 2\eta_{i,j} \\ &= z^2 + o_p(1) \end{aligned}$$

and the desired conclusion follows.  $\square$

Now we are ready to prove Proposition 4. Recall the definition of profile likelihood ratio  $R(\mu)$  in (18). Since  $z_{1-\alpha/2}^2 = \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2$ , Corollary EC.1 entails that for any fixed small  $\epsilon > 0$

$$P \left( -2 \log R \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} - \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) < \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \right) \rightarrow 1, \quad (\text{EC.45})$$

$$P \left( -2 \log R \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} + \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) > \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \right) \rightarrow 1. \quad (\text{EC.46})$$

In the proof of Theorem 6 it is shown that  $\{\mu \in \mathbb{R} \mid -2 \log R(\mu) \leq \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2\} = [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$ . Therefore conditioned on the event in (EC.45) we must have  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} - \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$ . Conditioned on the event in (EC.46) we have  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} + \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} \notin [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$ . Moreover, since the sum of sample means  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i \in [\underline{\mu}, \bar{\mu}]$  almost surely and  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} + \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} < \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i$ , it must be the case that  $\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - (z_{1-\alpha/2} + \epsilon) \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sigma_i^2/n_i} < \underline{\mu}$ . Applying the union bound we get

$$P \left( \left| \underline{\mu} - \left( \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{Y}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) \right| \leq \epsilon \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sigma_i^2}{n_i}} \right) \rightarrow 1.$$

Sending  $\epsilon$  to 0 gives the desired conclusion for  $\underline{\mu}$ . The proof for  $\bar{\mu}$  is similar.  $\square$

*Proof of Corollary 1.* If we can show that  $\text{Var}(G_i(X_i)) < \infty$  for all  $i$ , then this is a direct consequence of Theorem 6 and Proposition 4 with  $Y_{i,j} = \frac{Z^*}{m} + G_i(X_{i,j})$  and the fact that  $\mathbb{E}_{P_i}[G_i(X_{i,j})] = 0$ . Since Assumption 3 implies  $\mathbb{E}[h^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)] < \infty$ , by Jensen's inequality any conditional expectation of  $h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)$  also has a finite second moment. Note that  $G_i(X_i)$  is the sum of  $T_i$  conditional expectations of  $h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)$ . Therefore it has a finite second moment, hence a finite variance, by the Minkowski inequality.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 7.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \inf_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \\ &= \inf_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} [Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) + (Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m))] \\ &\geq \inf_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) + \inf_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} (Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)) \\ &\geq \mathcal{L}_L - \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly it can be shown that  $\mathcal{L}_L \geq \mathcal{L} - \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|$ . Therefore

$$|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_L| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|. \quad (\text{EC.47})$$

By the error bound (16) in Proposition 3,  $\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - Z_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)| = O_p(1/n)$  hence  $|\mathcal{L} - \mathcal{L}_L| = O_p(1/n) = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . Analogously  $|\mathcal{U} - \mathcal{U}_L| = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . In particular, the representation (22) holds for  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  as well, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \\ \mathcal{U} &= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.48})$$

Now we show that (EC.48) guarantees the asymptotic exactness of  $[\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}]$  as a CI for  $Z^*$ . For convenience, assume  $\text{Var}(G_i(X_i)) > 0$  for all  $i$  without loss of generality. The standard central limit theorem entails that  $\frac{\bar{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i}} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Since the data across different input models are independent, we have the joint convergence

$$\left( \frac{\bar{G}_1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_1(X_1))/n_1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{G}_m}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_m(X_m))/n_m}} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_m).$$

To proceed, we need the following result:

**LEMMA EC.3 (Uniform convergence of measures, Theorem 4.2 in Rao 1962).** *Let  $\mu^*, \{\mu_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$  be probability measures on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . If  $\mu^*$  is absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ , then  $\mu_n \Rightarrow \mu^*$  if and only if*

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} |\mu_n(C) - \mu^*(C)| = 0,$$

where  $\mathcal{C}$  denotes the set of all measurable convex sets.



Let  $(W_1, \dots, W_m)$  be an  $m$  dimensional standard normal vector, then  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{\sigma_I} \sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i} W_i$  follows  $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$ . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq z\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \\
&= \left| P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i}}{\sigma_I} \cdot \frac{\bar{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i}} \leq z\right) - P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i}}{\sigma_I} W_i \leq z\right) \right| \\
&= \left| P\left(\left(\frac{\bar{G}_1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_1(X_1))/n_1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{G}_m}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_m(X_m))/n_m}}\right) \in \tilde{C}\right) - P\left((W_1, \dots, W_m) \in \tilde{C}\right) \right| \\
&\quad \text{where } \tilde{C} = \left\{ (x_1, \dots, x_m) \in \mathbb{R}^m \mid \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_i(X_i))/n_i}}{\sigma_I} x_i \leq z \right\}. \tag{EC.49}
\end{aligned}$$

Since the set  $\tilde{C}$  is a half-space and in particular a convex set, Lemma EC.3 implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| P\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq z\right) - \Phi(z) \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \left| P\left(\left(\frac{\bar{G}_1}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_1(X_1))/n_1}}, \dots, \frac{\bar{G}_m}{\sqrt{\text{Var}(G_m(X_m))/n_m}}\right) \in C\right) - P\left((W_1, \dots, W_m) \in C\right) \right| \rightarrow 0.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1). \tag{EC.50}$$

Now (EC.48) forces

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^*) &= P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \leq z_{1-\alpha/2}\sigma_I\right) \\
&= P\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} + o_p(1) \leq z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) \\
&\rightarrow P(\mathcal{N}(0, 1) \leq z_{1-\alpha/2}) = 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} \text{ by Slutsky's theorem.}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly we have  $P(\mathcal{U} \geq Z^*) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha/2$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{U} - \mathcal{L} = 2z_{1-\alpha/2}\sigma_I + o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$  hence

$$P(\mathcal{U} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}) \leq P(\mathcal{U} < \mathcal{L}) = P(2z_{1-\alpha/2}\sigma_I + o_p(1/\sqrt{n}) < 0) = P(2z_{1-\alpha/2} < o_p(1)) \rightarrow 0.$$

Combining the limit probabilities gives

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}) &= P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^*) + P(\mathcal{U} \geq Z^*) - P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^* \text{ or } \mathcal{U} \geq Z^*) \\
&= P(\mathcal{L} \leq Z^*) + P(\mathcal{U} \geq Z^*) - 1 + P(\mathcal{U} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}) \\
&\rightarrow 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} + 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2} - 1 + 0 = 1 - \alpha.
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

## EC.4. Proofs of Results in Section 4.5

*Proof of Proposition 6.* It suffices to show the first part  $\mathbb{E}[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|^2] = O(\frac{1}{R_1})$  only, because the second part then follows from (17) and the simple inequality  $\sup |Z - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L| \leq \sup |Z - \widehat{Z}_L| + \sup |\widehat{Z}_L - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L|$ . First we present two lemmas.

LEMMA EC.4. *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  for  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)] - \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]|^2\right] = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (\text{EC.51})$$

*In particular for  $k = 1, 2, 3, 4$  it holds*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]|^2\right] = O(1). \quad (\text{EC.52})$$

*Proof of Lemma EC.4.* (EC.51) is argued using the proof of Proposition 3. Note that the proof for Proposition 3 goes through as long as the maximal second moment  $\mathcal{M}$  defined in (EC.6) is finite, a weaker condition than Assumption 3. In particular, Assumption 3 remains valid if the target performance measure is changed to  $\mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]$  for  $k = 2, 3, 4$ , except that the maximal second moment  $\mathcal{M}$  has to be replaced by the 4-th, 6-th and 8-th moments respectively. Below we will argue for the case  $k = 1$  only, and the cases  $k = 2, 3, 4$  follow from the same reasoning. Recall the expansion (EC.5). The term with  $d = 0$  is simply  $Z^*$ . The argument leading to the bound (EC.16) works for all  $d \geq 1$ , and hence (EC.16) is valid for all  $d \geq 1$ . The leading remainders with  $d = 1$  then give rise to the order  $O(1/n)$  in (EC.51), as opposed to  $d = 2$  giving the order  $O(1/n^2)$  in (16).

To prove (EC.52), use the inequality

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]| \\ & \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)] - \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]| + \mathbb{E}_{P_1, \dots, P_m}[h^k(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)] \end{aligned}$$

and the Minkowski inequality.  $\square$

LEMMA EC.5. *Under Assumptions 1 and 3, as the input data size  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the gradient estimator  $\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j})$  in (2) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2\right] = O\left(\frac{1}{R_1}\right)$$

*where the expectation is taken with respect to the joint randomness from both input data and simulation.*

*Proof of Lemma EC.5.* We first note that due to the symmetry between the i.i.d. data

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2\right] = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2],$$

and therefore it suffices to bound each  $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2]$ . Since  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1})$  differs from the unbiased sample covariance by only a factor of  $\frac{R_1-1}{R_1}$ , its bias (conditioned on the input data) can be easily identified as  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1})/R_1$ . By the variance formula for the unbiased sample covariance, and suppressing the arguments in  $h$  for notational simplicity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1})) \\ &= \frac{(R_1-1)^2}{R_1^3} \left( \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 (S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2] + \frac{1}{R_1-1} \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i)) - \frac{R_1-2}{R_1-1} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Hence the mean squared error

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2] &= \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1})) + \left(\frac{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1})}{R_1}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{R_1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 (S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2] + \frac{1}{R_1^2} \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{R_1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 (S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2] + \frac{n_i T_i}{R_1^2} \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{EC.53})$$

To tackle the first term in (EC.53)

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 (S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1} \left[ (h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 \left( T_i^2 + n_i^2 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,1}\} \right)^2 - 2T_i n_i \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,1}\} \right) \right] \\ &\leq T_i^2 \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1} \left[ (h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 n_i^2 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,1}\} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\leq T_i^2 \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1} \left[ 2h^2 n_i^2 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,1}\} \right)^2 \right] + \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1} \left[ 2(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 n_i^2 \left( \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_{i,1}\} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= T_i^2 \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) + 2n_i^2 \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1} \left[ h^2 \left( \sum_{s,t=1}^{T_i} \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_i(s) = X_{i,1}\} \right) \right] + 2(T_i n_i + T_i(T_i - 1))(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 \\ &\leq T_i^2 \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) + 2n_i^2 \sum_{s,t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2 \cdot \mathbf{1}\{X_i(t) = X_i(s) = X_{i,1}\}] + 2(T_i n_i + T_i^2)(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 \\ &= T_i^2 \text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) + 2(T_i n_i + T_i^2)(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 + 2n_i \sum_{t=1}^{T_i} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2 | X_i(t) = X_{i,1}] + \\ & \quad 2 \sum_{s \neq t} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2 | X_i(t) = X_i(s) = X_{i,1}]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the notation in Assumption 3, we can rewrite each conditional expectation  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2|X_i(t) = X_{i,1}]$  as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2|X_i(t) = X_{i,1}] = \frac{1}{n_i^{T_i-1} \prod_{i' \neq i} n_{i'}^{T_{i'}}} \sum_{I_1, \dots, I_m \text{ such that } I_i(t)=1} h^2(\mathbf{X}_{1,I_1}, \dots, \mathbf{X}_{m,I_m})$$

Therefore under Assumption 3 we have

$$\mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2|X_i(t) = X_{i,1}]] \leq \mathcal{M}$$

where  $\mathcal{M}$  is the maximal second moment defined in (EC.6). The same reasoning gives  $\mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2|X_i(t) = X_i(s) = X_{i,1}]] \leq \mathcal{M}$ . Also note that  $\text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h) \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2]$  and  $(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 \leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2]$  by Jensen's inequality. Hence by (EC.52) with  $k = 2$  from Lemma (EC.4) it holds that  $\mathbb{E}_D[\text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h)] = O(1)$  and  $\mathbb{E}_D[(\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2] = O(1)$ .

Now we take expectation of (EC.53) with respect to the input data and use the upper bounds derived above to get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2] &= \mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,1}))^2]] \\ &= \frac{1}{R_1} \mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[(h - \mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h])^2 (S_{i,1}(\mathbf{X}_i))^2]] + \frac{n_i T_i}{R_1^2} O(1) \\ &= \frac{1}{R_1} (T_i^2 O(1) + (T_i n_i + T_i^2) O(1) + O(n_i T_i) + O(T_i^2)) + O\left(\frac{n_i T_i}{R_1^2}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{T_i^2}{R_1} + \frac{n_i T_i}{R_1} + \frac{n_i T_i}{R_1^2}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{n_i}{R_1}\right) \text{ since each } T_i \text{ is treated as constant.} \end{aligned}$$

Dividing each side by  $n_i$  and summing up over  $i = 1, \dots, m$  gives the bound  $O(1/R_1)$ .  $\square$

Now we can prove Proposition 6. We bound the maximal deviation as follows

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \widehat{Z}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \right| \\ &\leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})) w_{i,j} \right| + \left| Z(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) - \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) \right| \quad (\text{EC.54}) \end{aligned}$$

On one hand, using conditioning and the moment bound (EC.52) with  $k = 2$  from Lemma EC.4, we bound the second moment of the second term in (EC.54) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|Z(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) - \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m)|^2] &= \frac{1}{R_1} \mathbb{E}_D[\text{Var}_{\xi_1}(h)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{R_1} \mathbb{E}_D[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_1}[h^2]] \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{R_1}\right). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, letting  $Q_i^1 = \hat{P}_i$  in Proposition 2 reveals that  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Note that the estimator (2) also has this property, i.e.  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) = 0$  for all  $i$ . Hence the first term in (EC.54) can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})) w_{i,j} \right| \\
&= \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})) \left( w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right) \right| \quad \text{by } \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) = 0 \\
&= \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{n_i} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j})) \cdot n_i \left( w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{n_i^2} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} n_i^2 \left( w_{i,j} - \frac{1}{n_i} \right)^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{u(\alpha)^2 \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{1}{n_i^2} (\hat{\hat{G}}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2} \quad \text{by Lemma EC.2.}
\end{aligned}$$

After combining the above bounds, the desired conclusion follows from an application of the Minkowski inequality to (EC.54) and using Lemma EC.5.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 8.* In the proof of Theorem 7, if we replace the linear approximation  $Z_L$  by  $\widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L$  then by exactly the same argument we have the following counterpart of (EC.47) where on one hand

$$|\mathcal{L} - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|. \quad (\text{EC.55})$$

On the other hand the following bound trivially holds

$$|Z^{\min} - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|.$$

Therefore

$$|\mathcal{L} - Z^{\min}| \leq 2 \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|.$$

The desired conclusion for  $Z^{\min}$  then immediately follows from the maximal deviation result (24) in Proposition 6. The conclusion for  $Z^{\max}$  can be established similarly.  $\square$

The following result presents an alternate CI constructed directly from a linear approximation that is discussed at the end of Section 4.5.

**THEOREM EC.1.** *Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 3 hold. Replace the outputs in Step 3 of Algorithm 1 by*

$$L = \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j}^{\min}, \quad U = \hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m) + \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) w_{i,j}^{\max},$$

where  $\hat{Z}(\hat{P}_1, \dots, \hat{P}_m)$  is the same sample mean from Step 1. Then as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $R_1 \rightarrow \infty$

$$\mathbb{E}[(L - \mathcal{L})^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right), \quad \mathbb{E}[(U - \mathcal{U})^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right)$$

where  $\mathcal{L}, \mathcal{U}$  are the ideal confidence bounds defined in (9) and the expectation is taken with respect to the joint randomness of the data and the simulation. Moreover, if  $R_1$  satisfies  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty$  then

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty} P(L \leq Z^* \leq U) = 1 - \alpha.$$

*Proof of Theorem EC.1.* The bound (EC.55) derived in the proof of Theorem 8 is exactly  $|L - \mathcal{L}| \leq \sup_{(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) \in \mathcal{U}_\alpha} |Z(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m) - \widehat{\widehat{Z}}_L(\mathbf{w}_1, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m)|$ . A direct application of result (24) from Proposition 6 then gives  $\mathbb{E}[(L - \mathcal{L})^2] = O(1/n^2 + 1/R_1)$ . The error bound of  $U$  with respect to  $\mathcal{U}$  can be obtained similarly. To establish the asymptotic exactness of  $[L, U]$  when  $R_1$  grows at a faster rate than  $n$ , note that when  $R_1/n \rightarrow \infty$  we have  $1/R_1 = o(1/n)$  hence  $L - \mathcal{L} = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$  and  $U - \mathcal{U} = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . In this case the representation (EC.48) holds for  $L, U$  as well. The rest of the proof is the same as that of Theorem 7.  $\square$

## EC.5. Proofs of Results in Section 4.6

*Proof of Proposition 7.* We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - \mathcal{L})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - Z^{\min})^2] + 2\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - Z^{\min})(Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L})] + \mathbb{E}[(Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L})^2] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - Z^{\min})^2]] + 2\mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - Z^{\min})(Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L})]] + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right) \text{ by Theorem 8} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}\left[\frac{1}{R_2}\sigma_{\min}^2\right] + \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}[(Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L})\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[(\mathcal{L}^{BEL} - Z^{\min})]] + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{R_2}\mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}}[h^2(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]] + 0 + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right) \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{R_2}\right) + O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1}\right) \text{ by (EC.52) with } k=2 \text{ from Lemma EC.4} \\ &= O\left(\frac{1}{n^2} + \frac{1}{R_1} + \frac{1}{R_2}\right). \end{aligned}$$

The bound for  $\mathbb{E}[(\mathcal{U}^{BEL} - \mathcal{U})^2]$  can be obtained by the same argument.  $\square$

*Proof of Proposition 8.* We first establish the representations for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}$ . The uniform moment convergence result (EC.51) from Lemma EC.4 implies that  $\sigma_{\min}^2 = \sigma^2 + O_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . By calculating the variance of sample variance, one can show that the  $\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2$  in Algorithm 2 satisfies  $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2 - \sigma_{\min}^2)^2] \leq C\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}}[h^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]/R_2$  for some universal constant  $C$ . Using the result (EC.52) with  $k=4$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}}[h^4(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m)]] = O(1)$ . Therefore we have  $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2 - \sigma_{\min}^2)^2] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}_{\xi_2}[(\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2 - \sigma_{\min}^2)^2]] = O(1/R_2)$ , whereby

$$\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2 = \sigma_{\min}^2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) = \sigma^2 + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) + O_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) = \sigma^2 + o_p(1). \quad (\text{EC.56})$$

Now the lower confidence bound  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}$  from Algorithm 2 can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{EEL} &= \hat{Z}^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}}{\sqrt{R_2}} \\
&= \mathcal{L} + (Z^{\min} - \mathcal{L}) + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}}{\sqrt{R_2}} \\
&= \mathcal{L} + O_p\left(\frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_1}}\right) + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \text{ by (EC.56) and Theorem 8} \\
&= \mathcal{L} + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \text{ because } \frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty \\
&= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sigma_I + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \text{ because of (EC.48)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above gives the desired conclusion for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}$ . The representation for  $\mathcal{U}^{EEL}$  can be obtained via a similar way.

To justify the representation for  $\mathcal{L}^{FEL}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{FEL}$ , we first need to establish the consistency of our input-induced variance estimate (6). Specifically, we have:

**LEMMA EC.6.** *Under Assumptions 1, 2 and 3, as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $R_1/n \rightarrow \infty$  the input-induced variance estimate (6) is relatively consistent, i.e.,  $\hat{\sigma}_I^2/\sigma_I^2 \rightarrow 1$  in probability with respect to the joint randomness of both input data and simulation.*

*Proof of Lemma EC.6.* Since the input-induced variance  $\sigma_I^2$  is of order  $1/n$  and the strong law of large numbers ensures that  $(\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (G_i(X_{i,j}))^2 / n_i^2) / \sigma_I^2 \rightarrow 1$  almost surely, it suffices to show

$$\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (G_i(X_{i,j}))^2 = o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad (\text{EC.57})$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_I^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 = o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right). \quad (\text{EC.58})$$

We bound the left hand side of (EC.57) as

$$\begin{aligned}
&|\text{left hand side of (EC.57)}| \\
&= \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (2G_i(X_{i,j})(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j})) + (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j}))^2) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j}))^2 + 2 \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (G_i(X_{i,j}))^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j}))^2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Hence it suffices to bound the error  $(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j}))^2$  for each  $i, j$ . Seeing that both  $G_i$  and  $\hat{G}_i$  take the form of a sum of conditional expectations, we can control this error via a similar analysis in proving Proposition 3. In particular, for all  $i, j$  we have  $\mathbb{E}[(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - G_i(X_{i,j}))^2] \leq C/n$  for some constant  $C$  depending on  $h$  (a similar observation has been proved in equation (EC.10)).

in Lemma EC.1 of Lam and Qian (2018)). Therefore  $|\text{left hand side of (EC.57)}| = O_p(1/n^2) + 2\sqrt{O_p(1/n)O_p(1/n^2)} = O_p(1/n^{\frac{3}{2}}) = o_p(1/n)$ . Thus (EC.57) follows.

(EC.58) can be established in two steps. First we show that the bias correction term  $\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{T_i \hat{\sigma}^2}{R_1} = o_p(1/n)$ . Note that  $\hat{\sigma}^2 = \sigma^2 + o_p(1) = O_p(1)$  can be proved via the same argument used to prove (EC.56) but with the minimal weights  $\mathbf{w}_i^{\min}, i = 1, \dots, m$  replaced by the uniform weights. When  $R_1/n \rightarrow \infty$ , we have each  $\frac{T_i \hat{\sigma}^2}{R_1} = O_p(1/R_1) = o_p(1/n)$ . Second, we examine the error

$$\begin{aligned}
& \left| \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 - \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 \right| \\
& \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 + 2\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2 \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{n_i^2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} (\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}))^2} \\
& = O_p\left(\frac{1}{R_1}\right) + 2\sqrt{O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)O_p\left(\frac{1}{R_1}\right)} \text{ by Lemma EC.5} \\
& = o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) + 2\sqrt{O_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)} \\
& = o_p\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).
\end{aligned}$$

This concludes (EC.58).  $\square$

Given the relative consistency of the input-induced variance estimate  $\hat{\sigma}_I^2$  in estimating  $\sigma_I^2$ , if we couple the simulation runs of Algorithms 2 and 3, then

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}^{FEL} &= \mathcal{L}^{EEL} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}}{\sqrt{R_2}} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2}{R_2}} - \hat{\sigma}_I \right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}^{EEL} + z_{1-\alpha/2} \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} - \sigma_I \right) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \\
&= \mathcal{L}^{EEL} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \left( \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} - \sigma_I - \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} \right) + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \\
&= Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \tilde{G}_i + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality we use the representation for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}$ . The representation for the upper bound  $\mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  can be similarly obtained.  $\square$

## EC.6. Proofs of Proposition 1 and Theorems 1, 2, 3

*Proof of Proposition 1.* It suffices to prove the theorem for the minimization problem. Since  $w_{i,j} = \frac{1}{n_i}$  for each  $i, j$  is a solution in the (relative) interior of the feasible set, Slater's conditions holds for (3). It is also clear, by a compactness argument, that the optimal value of the program is finite and attainable. By Corollary 28.3.1 of Rockafellar (2015),  $(\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min})$  is a minimizer



if and only if there exist Lagrange multipliers  $\beta^*, \lambda_i^* \in \mathbb{R}, i = 1, \dots, m$  such that the following KKT conditions are satisfied

$$\begin{aligned} 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}^{\min}) + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 &\geq 0, \beta^* \geq 0 \\ \beta^* \left( 2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}^{\min}) + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 \right) &= 0 \\ \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} w_{i,j}^{\min} &= 1 \text{ for all } i = 1, \dots, m \\ \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^* - \frac{2\beta^*}{w_{i,j}^{\min}} &= 0 \text{ for all } i, j. \end{aligned}$$

When  $\hat{G}_{i_0}(X_{i_0,j_1}) \neq \hat{G}_{i_0}(X_{i_0,j_2})$  for some  $1 \leq i_0 \leq m$  and  $1 \leq j_1 < j_2 \leq n_{i_0}$ , the objective is a non-constant linear function and thus any minimizer must lie on the (relative) boundary of the feasible set, i.e.  $2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}^{\min}) + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 = 0$ . Since the constraint  $-2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log(n_i w_{i,j}) \leq \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2$  is strictly convex, the minimizer must be unique. Moreover, we show that  $\beta^*$  must be strictly positive in this case. Suppose  $\beta^* = 0$  then the last equation of KKT conditions requires  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = -\lambda_i^*$  for all  $i, j$ , which is a contradiction. Note that the minimizer must have positive components  $w_{i,j}^{\min} > 0$  due to the logarithm in the constraint, hence

$$w_{i,j}^{\min} = \frac{2\beta^*}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*}, \beta^* > 0, \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^* > 0 \text{ for all } i, j, \quad (\text{EC.59})$$

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log \frac{2n_i \beta^*}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*} + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 = 0, \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{2\beta^*}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*} = 1 \text{ for all } i. \quad (\text{EC.60})$$

To show that such  $(\beta^*, \lambda_1^*, \dots, \lambda_m^*)$  is also unique, let  $i_0, j_1, j_2$  be the indices mentioned in the theorem. Then (EC.59) stipulates  $w_{i_0,j_1}^{\min}/w_{i_0,j_2}^{\min} = (\hat{G}_{i_0,j_2} + \lambda_{i_0}^*)/(\hat{G}_{i_0,j_1} + \lambda_{i_0}^*)$ . Since the right hand side is strictly monotone in  $\lambda_{i_0}^*$ , the uniqueness of  $w_{i,j}^{\min}$  implies the uniqueness of  $\lambda_{i_0}^*$ , which in turn implies the uniqueness of  $\beta^*$  and other  $\lambda_i^*$ 's due to the second equation of line (EC.60).

We further show that  $\beta^*$  must lie in the interval given in the proposition. We first argue that there is at least one  $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$  such that

$$\frac{\min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*}{\max_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*} < e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}. \quad (\text{EC.61})$$

Suppose  $(\min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*)/(\max_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*) \geq e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}$  for all  $i$ , then the equation  $\sum_{j=1}^{n_i} 2\beta^*/(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*) = 1$  implies that  $2\beta^*/(\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*) \geq \frac{1}{n_i} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}$  for all  $i, j$  and the inequality must be strict for some  $i, j$  because  $e^{-\frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}} < 1$ . Therefore

$$2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \log \frac{2n_i \beta^*}{\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) + \lambda_i^*} + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 > -2 \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^{n_i} \frac{\mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N} + \mathcal{X}_{1,1-\alpha}^2 = 0$$

which contradicts (EC.60). Now let  $\lambda_{i'}^*$  be a multiplier that satisfies (EC.61). Rearranging (EC.61) gives

$$\lambda_{i'}^* < \frac{e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}} \max_j \hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j}) - \min_j \hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j})}{1 - e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}}}. \quad (\text{EC.62})$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \sum_{j=1}^{n_{i'}} \frac{2\beta^*}{\hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j}) + \lambda_{i'}^*} \geq \frac{2n_{i'}\beta^*}{\max_j \hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j}) + \lambda_{i'}^*} \\ &> \frac{2n_{i'}\beta^*(1 - e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}})}{\max_j \hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j}) - \min_j \hat{G}_{i'}(X_{i',j})} \quad \text{by using the upper bound (EC.62)} \\ &\geq \frac{2\min_i n_i \beta^*(1 - e^{-\frac{\chi_{1,1-\alpha}^2}{2N}})}{\max\{\max_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) - \min_j \hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) | i = 1, \dots, m\}}. \end{aligned}$$

Rearranging the above inequality gives the desired upper bound for  $\beta^*$ .

If  $\hat{G}_i(X_{i,j}) = c_i$  for some constant  $c_i$ , then the objective is the constant function  $\sum_{i=1}^m c_i$ , and any feasible solution is optimal.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 1.* When  $R_1/n \rightarrow \infty$  and  $R_2/n \rightarrow \infty$ , Proposition 7 stipulates that  $\mathcal{L}^{BEL} = \mathcal{L} + o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{BEL} = \mathcal{U} + o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . Theorem 7 then implies that the asymptotic representation (EC.48) holds for  $\mathcal{L}^{BEL}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{BEL}$ . The rest of the proof is the same as that of Theorem 7 from (EC.48) onwards.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorems 2 and 3.* For convenience, all limit statements are understood to be for  $n, R_1, R_2 \rightarrow \infty$  such that  $\frac{R_1}{n} \rightarrow \infty, \frac{R_2}{n} \leq M$  (e.g., (EC.63) and (EC.64)), unless stated otherwise. We need the Berry-Esseen Theorem stated as:

**LEMMA EC.7 (Theorem 3.4.9 in Durrett 2010).** *Let  $\{\eta_i\}_{i=1}^\infty$  be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables such that  $\mathbb{E}[\eta_1] = 0, \mathbb{E}[\eta_1^2] = \sigma_\eta^2, \mathbb{E}[|\eta_1|^3] = \rho_\eta < \infty$ , and  $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \eta_i/(\sigma_\eta \sqrt{n})$ . Let  $F_n(\cdot)$  be the cumulative distribution function of  $S_n$ . Then*

$$\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} |F_n(x) - \Phi(x)| \leq \frac{3\rho_\eta}{\sigma_\eta^3 \sqrt{n}}.$$

We first show the following weak convergence to the joint standard normal

$$\left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I}, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma}, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_3). \quad (\text{EC.63})$$

Since  $\sigma_{\min}^2 = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$  and  $\sigma_{\max}^2 = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$  as argued in (EC.56), to show (EC.63) it suffices to show

$$\left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I}, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma_{\min}}, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma_{\max}} \right) \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_3) \quad (\text{EC.64})$$

and then apply Slutsky's theorem. For any  $(x, y, z) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ , we compute the joint probability

$$\begin{aligned}
& P\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma_{\min}} \leq y, \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma_{\max}} \leq z\right) \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x \right\} \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma_{\min}} \leq y \right\} \cdot \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma_{\max}} \leq z \right\} \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x \right\} \mathbb{E}_{\xi_2} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma_{\min}} \leq y \right\} \right] \mathbb{E}_{\xi_2} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma_{\max}} \leq z \right\} \right] \right] \\
&\quad \text{by conditional independence of } \hat{Z}^{\min} \text{ and } \hat{Z}^{\max} \text{ given input data and Step 1} \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x \right\} (\Phi(y) + \epsilon^{\min})(\Phi(z) + \epsilon^{\max}) \right] \quad \text{for some error terms } \epsilon^{\min} \text{ and } \epsilon^{\max} \\
&= P\left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x\right) \Phi(y) \Phi(z) + \mathbb{E}_{D, \xi_1} \left[ \mathbf{1} \left\{ \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} \leq x \right\} (\Phi(y) \epsilon^{\max} + \Phi(z) \epsilon^{\min} + \epsilon^{\min} \epsilon^{\max}) \right]. \quad (\text{EC.65})
\end{aligned}$$

Denoting

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{\min} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\min}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\min}} [|h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) - Z^{\min}|^3] \\
\rho_{\max} &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{w}_1^{\max}, \dots, \mathbf{w}_m^{\max}} [|h(\mathbf{X}_1, \dots, \mathbf{X}_m) - Z^{\max}|^3]
\end{aligned}$$

the errors  $\epsilon^{\min}, \epsilon^{\max}$  then satisfy  $|\epsilon^{\min}| \leq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{3\rho_{\min}}{\sigma_{\min}^3 \sqrt{R_2}} \right\}$ ,  $|\epsilon^{\max}| \leq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{3\rho_{\max}}{\sigma_{\max}^3 \sqrt{R_2}} \right\}$ . On one hand (EC.52) entails that  $\rho_{\min} = O_p(1)$  and  $\rho_{\max} = O_p(1)$ . On the other hand,  $\sigma_{\min}^2 = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$  and  $\sigma_{\max}^2 = \sigma^2 + o_p(1)$  as mentioned before. These two facts together lead to  $\epsilon^{\min} = O_p(1/\sqrt{R_2})$  and  $\epsilon^{\max} = O_p(1/\sqrt{R_2})$ . Since both errors do not exceed 1, by the dominated convergence theorem, the second term in (EC.65) converges to zero asymptotically. Moreover, the probability  $P(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i \leq x \sigma_I) \rightarrow \Phi(x)$  which has been shown in (EC.50). Therefore the joint probability converges to  $\Phi(x)\Phi(y)\Phi(z)$ , hence weak convergence (EC.64) holds by definition.

Secondly, we prove that  $[\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}]$  is asymptotically valid, i.e., the liminf part in Theorem 3. The liminf result for  $[\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}]$  is then a direct consequence of  $[\mathcal{L}^{FEL}, \mathcal{U}^{FEL}]$  by a coupling argument as follows. If Algorithms 2 and 3 use the same  $R_1 + 2R_2$  simulation runs, then the two different adjustments in Step 3 satisfy  $\frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}}{\sqrt{R_2}} \geq \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \frac{\hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2}{R_2}} - \hat{\sigma}_I$  almost surely, therefore  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL} \leq \mathcal{L}^{FEL}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{EEL} \geq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}$  almost surely. To proceed, we write

$$\begin{aligned}
& P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) \\
&= P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^*) + P(Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) - P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^* \text{ or } Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) \\
&= P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^*) + P(Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) - 1 + P(\mathcal{U}^{FEL} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}^{FEL}). \quad (\text{EC.66})
\end{aligned}$$

To compute the probabilities in (EC.66), we use the representation from Proposition 8 to get

$$P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^*) = P\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min} - z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \leq 0\right)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= P\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}}\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + \hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}\right) + o_p(1) \leq z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) \\
&= P\left(\frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} + \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma} + o_p(1) \leq z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) \\
&\rightarrow 1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}.
\end{aligned}$$

The limit here is valid because, by rewriting the last probability above as the probability of a half-space of  $\mathbb{R}^3$  like in (EC.49), we can conclude from (EC.63) and Lemma EC.3 that

$$\frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} + \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma} \Rightarrow \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$$

which also holds with an additional  $o_p(1)$  term on the left hand side by Slutsky's Theorem. Similarly, one can show that  $P(\mathcal{U}^{FEL} \geq Z^*) \rightarrow 1 - \alpha/2$ . Neglecting the last probability in (EC.66) gives

$$P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) \geq P(\mathcal{L}^{FEL} \leq Z^*) + P(Z^* \leq \mathcal{U}^{FEL}) - 1 \rightarrow 2(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}) - 1 = 1 - \alpha$$

from which the liminf result follows.

Thirdly, we prove the limsup results by further analyzing the last probability in (EC.66). Using the representation from Proposition 8 again we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\mathcal{U}^{FEL} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}^{FEL}) \\
&= P\left(\frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} + \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma} + o_p(1) > z_{1-\alpha/2} \text{ and} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} - \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma} + o_p(1) > z_{1-\alpha/2}\right) \\
&= P\left(\frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} + \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min})}{\sigma} + o_p(1)\right) > z_{1-\alpha/2} \text{ and} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\sigma_I}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i}{\sigma_I} - \frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \left(\frac{\sqrt{R_2}(\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max})}{\sigma} + o_p(1)\right) > z_{1-\alpha/2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is valid because  $\frac{R_2}{n} \leq M < \infty$  implies  $\frac{\sigma/\sqrt{R_2}}{\sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2}} \geq \epsilon > 0$  for some fixed constant  $\epsilon$ . By Slutsky's theorem, if the three-dimensional random vector in (EC.63) is contaminated by a negligible noise of size  $o_p(1)$  in each component, it still converges weakly to the joint standard normal. This convergence, together with Lemma EC.3, leads to the following limit

$$P(\mathcal{U}^{FEL} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}^{FEL}) \rightarrow P(\tilde{W}_1 > z_{1-\alpha/2}, \tilde{W}_2 > z_{1-\alpha/2})$$

where  $(\tilde{W}_1, \tilde{W}_2)$  is the joint normal  $\mathcal{N}\left(\mathbf{0}, \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -\rho \\ -\rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}\right)$  and  $\rho = \sigma_I^2/(\sigma_I^2 + \sigma^2/R_2) > 0$ . To compute the limit probability, note that the conditional distribution  $\tilde{W}_2|\tilde{W}_1$  is  $\mathcal{N}(-\rho\tilde{W}_1, 1 - \rho^2)$ , therefore

$$P(\tilde{W}_1 > z_{1-\alpha/2}, \tilde{W}_2 > z_{1-\alpha/2}) = \int_{z_{1-\alpha/2}}^{\infty} \phi(x) P(\mathcal{N}(-\rho x, 1 - \rho^2) > z_{1-\alpha/2}) dx \leq \frac{\alpha}{2} \int_{z_{1-\alpha/2}}^{\infty} \phi(x) dx = \frac{\alpha^2}{4}.$$

Here  $\phi$  denotes the density of the standard normal, and the inequality follows since  $-\rho x < 0$  and  $1 - \rho^2 < 1$  and hence  $P(\mathcal{N}(-\rho x, 1 - \rho^2) > z_{1-\alpha/2}) \leq P(\mathcal{N}(0, 1) > z_{1-\alpha/2}) = \alpha/2$ . This establishes

$$\limsup P(\mathcal{U}^{FEL} < Z^* < \mathcal{L}^{FEL}) \leq \frac{\alpha^2}{4}.$$

Substituting it into (EC.66) gives the limsup statement of Theorem 3.

Following the above line of analysis, the limsup statement of Theorem 2 can be derived. We use the representation from Proposition 8. Since  $\sigma_I + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{R_2}} \leq \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^{EEL} &\geq \tilde{\mathcal{L}} := Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\min} - Z^{\min}) - \sqrt{2} z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \\ \mathcal{U}^{EEL} &\leq \tilde{\mathcal{U}} := Z^* + \sum_{i=1}^m \bar{G}_i + (\hat{Z}^{\max} - Z^{\max}) + \sqrt{2} z_{1-\alpha/2} \sqrt{\sigma_I^2 + \frac{\sigma^2}{R_2}} + o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

almost surely, where the  $o_p\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{R_2}}\right)$  terms are those from Proposition 8. Repeating the above analysis for  $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}, \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  reveals that

$$\limsup P\left(\tilde{\mathcal{L}} \leq Z^* \leq \tilde{\mathcal{U}}\right) \leq 1 - \tilde{\alpha} + \frac{\tilde{\alpha}^2}{4}.$$

The same limsup bound then holds for  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL}, \mathcal{U}^{EEL}$  because  $\mathcal{L}^{EEL} \geq \tilde{\mathcal{L}}$  and  $\mathcal{U}^{EEL} \leq \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ .

Lastly, when  $R_2$  also grows at a faster rate than  $n$ , the adjustments in Algorithms 2 and 3 relative to Algorithm 1 are of order  $o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ , i.e.,  $\hat{\sigma}_{\min}/\sqrt{R_2} = o_p(1/\sqrt{n}), \hat{\sigma}_{\max}/\sqrt{R_2} = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$  and  $\sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\min}^2/R_2} - \hat{\sigma}_I = o_p(1/\sqrt{n}), \sqrt{\hat{\sigma}_I^2 + \hat{\sigma}_{\max}^2/R_2} - \hat{\sigma}_I = o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . Therefore, by coupling the simulation runs in Step 3 with Algorithm 1, the confidence bounds from Algorithms 2 and 3 differ from those from Algorithm 1 by  $o_p(1/\sqrt{n})$ . Using the proof for Theorem 1 concludes asymptotic exactness.  $\square$