

# Universal Robust Regression via Maximum Mean Discrepancy

Pierre Alquier<sup>(1)</sup>, Mathieu Gerber<sup>(2)</sup>

(1) RIKEN AIP, Tokyo, Japan

(2) School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, UK

Many modern datasets are collected automatically and are thus easily contaminated by outliers. This led to a regain of interest in robust estimation, including new notions of robustness such as robustness to adversarial contamination of the data. However, most robust estimation methods are designed for a specific model. Notably, many methods were proposed recently to obtain robust estimators in linear models (or generalized linear models), and a few were developed for very specific settings, for example beta regression or sample selection models. In this paper we develop a new approach for robust estimation in arbitrary regression models, based on Maximum Mean Discrepancy minimization. We build two estimators. Both are proven to be robust to Huber-type contamination. One of them satisfies a strong non-asymptotic error bound and is also robust to adversarial contamination, at the cost of being more computationally expensive.

## 1. Introduction

Robustness is a fundamental problem in statistics, which aims at using statistical procedures that remain stable in presence of outliers. Historically, outliers were mistakes in data collection, or observations of individuals belonging to a different population than the population of interest. Robustness became even more important in the modern context where automatically collected datasets are often heterogeneous. Moreover, some strategic datasets are susceptible of malevolent manipulations.

In the statistical literature, the development of robust estimation methods for regression models generally focusses on the construction of  $Z$ -estimators [13, Chapter 5] for which each individual observation can only have a bounded impact on the estimating equations, and which therefore have a bounded influence function [31, 32]. This strategy has been successfully applied for the robust estimation of the regression coefficients in generalized linear models [38, 10, 11] as well as e.g. robust inference in the negative binomial regression model with unknown overdispersion parameter [1] or in the Heckman

sample selection model [57]. Based on other approaches, robust estimators for mixtures of linear regression models (see e.g. [5]), for the Beta regression model with unknown precision parameter [28] or for robust linear least square regression [4] have been developed.

In the past ten years there was a renewed interest for robust methods in the machine learning community. Catoni developed a loss function whose minimization leads to robust estimators of the expectation of a random variable [12], a technique which was then adapted to many situations including linear regression [13]. More generally, Lipschitz loss functions such as the absolute loss, or Huber’s loss [33], lead to robustness of the empirical risk minimization procedure, a fact that was used in [17, 2, 18, 34] to study robust procedures of classification and regression. The Median-of-Means approach of [47, 21] was also adapted to regression [44, 39, 45, 20] and classification [41]. Minimax rates for regression in terms of the sample size and the contamination rate were derived in [22, 19].

In the discussion by Sture Holm in [9], as well as in [48], minimum distance estimation is identified as a way to obtain robust estimators. Building on this idea, [7] introduced a density power divergence minimization approach for robust inference in parametric models for i.i.d. observations. This procedure is extended to regression models in [26] but suffers from two limitations. Firstly, the optimization of the objective function is, in general, a computationally challenging problem. Secondly, there is no general result which guarantees that the resulting  $M$ -estimator is robust. Its influence function is however known to be bounded for the Gaussian linear regression model [26], for the Poisson and Logistic regression models [27] and for the Beta regression model with unknown precision parameter [26].

In this paper we introduce a new minimum distance estimation strategy for parameter inference in regression models which (a) is proven to be robust to outliers under general conditions on the statistical model and (b) only requires to be able to sample from the model and to compute the gradient of its log-likelihood function to be applicable. In this sense, the approach proposed in this work defines a *universal robust regression method*.

More specifically, following an idea recently introduced in [6], the minimum distance estimation procedure presented in this paper relies on the Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD) distance. The MMD metric already turned out to be very useful in statistics and machine learning problems, e.g. for two sample test [51, 29], change-point detection [3], goodness-of-fit tests [35], or training GANs [43, 24]. The robustness of minimum MMD estimation with bounded kernels when the distribution of the data is completely specified is studied in [6, 1], see also [2] for a Bayesian type estimator. (Note that unbounded kernels are used in [42], but the “automatic” robustness induced by bounded kernels is then lost, and the authors have to use a Median-of-Mean procedure to robustify their MMD estimator.) The main novelty in this paper is to extend the MMD method of [6, 1] to the regression setting, where we only want to estimate the distribution  $Y|X$ , and not the distribution of the pair  $(Y, X)$ . This step turns out to be non-trivial, especially in the random design case.

We prove that the proposed estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  of the model parameter is (i) universally consistent, in the sense that it will always converge to the best approximation of the truth in the model, without *any* assumption on the distribution generating the observations, and (ii) robust to adversarial contaminations. However, the computation time of  $\hat{\theta}_n$

is quadratic with respect to the sample size  $n$  and, for this reason, we introduce an alternative estimator  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  which, as argued below, is expected to have a similar behaviour as  $\hat{\theta}_n$  in practice. The computation time of  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  is linear in  $n$  and we establish that this estimator is itself robust to outliers, in the sense that its influence function is bounded.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we define the two estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ , and discuss algorithms to compute them. In Section 3 we provide their theoretical analysis, both in the deterministic and random design case for  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and in the random design case only for  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ . In the random design case, our theoretical result for  $\hat{\theta}_n$  requires assumptions on the reproducing kernel that are quite involved. Section 4 provides examples of kernel satisfying these assumptions while Section 5 is devoted to the simulation study. Section 6 concludes, and all the proofs are gathered in the Appendix B.

## 2. MMD-based regression

### 2.1. Set-up and first assumptions

Let  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  be two topological spaces, equipped respectively with the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra  $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$  and  $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$ , and let  $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Z}} = \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  be the set of probability distributions on  $(\mathcal{Z}, \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Z}})$ . All the random variables considered in this work are assumed to be defined on the same probability space  $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ .

Let  $\{P_{\lambda}, \lambda \in \Lambda\}$  be a set of probability distributions on  $\mathcal{Y}$ ,  $\Theta$  be a Polish space and  $g : \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Lambda$  be such that the mapping  $x \mapsto P_{g(\theta, x)}(A)$  is  $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -measurable for all  $A \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and all  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Then, given an  $\mathcal{Z}$ -valued random variable  $(Y, X)$ , with  $Y$  taking values in  $\mathcal{Y}$ , we consider the statistical model  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \theta \in \Theta\}$  for the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given  $X$ . For example, the Gaussian linear regression model with known variance is obtained by taking  $P_{\lambda} = \mathcal{N}_1(\lambda, \sigma^2)$  and  $g(\theta, x) = \theta^{\top} x$ , the logistic regression model by taking  $P_{\lambda} = \mathcal{B}er(\lambda)$  and  $g(\theta, x) = 1/(1 + \exp(-\theta^{\top} x))$ , and the Poisson regression model by taking  $P_{\lambda} = \mathcal{P}ois(\lambda)$  and  $g(\theta, x) = \exp(\theta^{\top} x)$ . Other classical examples include binomial, exponential, gamma and inverse-Gaussian regression models.

Finally, we let  $D_n = \{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be a set of  $n$  random variables taking values in  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Throughout this paper we assume that a realization of  $D_n$  is used to fit the regression model  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  and, for that reason, in what follows we will refer to  $D_n$  as the observations.

### 2.2. Background on RKHS and first assumptions

We let  $k : \mathcal{Z}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be a kernel on  $\mathcal{Z}$  (i.e.  $k$  is symmetric and positive semi-definite) and denote by  $(\mathcal{H}, \langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})$  the reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) over  $\mathcal{Z}$  having  $k$  as reproducing kernel (see [46] for a comprehensive introduction to RKHS). We assume throughout this work that the following condition on  $k$  holds:

**Assumption 1.** *The kernel  $k$  is  $\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Z}}$ -measurable and such that  $|k| \leq 1$ .*

Under Assumption 1, for any probability distribution  $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  the quantity  $\mu(P) := \mathbb{E}_{Z \sim P}[k(Z, \cdot)]$  is well defined in  $\mathcal{H}$ . If in addition  $k$  is such that the mapping  $P \mapsto \mu(P)$  is one-to-one,  $k$  is said to be characteristic. In this case the MMD, that is the mapping  $\mathbb{D}_k : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})^2 \rightarrow [0, 2]$  defined by

$$\mathbb{D}_k(P, Q) = \|\mu(P) - \mu(Q)\|_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})^2,$$

is a metric on  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ . We stress that none of the results presented in this work requires  $k$  to be characteristic. However, it is only under this assumption on  $k$  that they provide useful and interpretable convergence guarantees for the proposed estimators.

Next, we let  $k_X$  be a kernel on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $k_Y$  be a kernel on  $\mathcal{Y}$  and we denote by  $k_X \otimes k_Y$  the product kernel on  $\mathcal{Z}$  such that  $k_X \otimes k_Y((x, y), (x', y')) = k_X(x, x')k_Y(y, y')$  for all  $(x, y), (x', y') \in \mathcal{Z}$ . With this notation in place we can state a second assumption on  $k$  that will be required for some of the results presented below.

**Assumption 2.** *There is a continuous kernel  $k_X$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  and a kernel  $k_Y$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  such that  $|k_X| \leq 1$ ,  $|k_Y| \leq 1$  and  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$ .*

From Theorems 3-4 in [10] it follows that, under Assumption 2,  $k$  is characteristic if  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  are continuous, translation invariant, characteristic and bounded. When  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  examples of such kernels  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  include the Gaussian kernel, the exponential kernel and the Matérn kernels.

### 2.3. Definition of the estimators $\hat{\theta}_n$ and $\tilde{\theta}_n$

Let  $\hat{P}^n = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_i, Y_i)}$  be the empirical distribution of the observations and, for every  $\theta \in \Theta$ , let  $\hat{P}_\theta^n$  be the (random) probability distribution on  $\mathcal{Z}$  defined by

$$\hat{P}_\theta^n(A \times B) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i}(A) P_{g(\theta, X_i)}(B), \quad A \times B \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{X}} \otimes \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}. \quad (1)$$

In other words, if  $(X, Y) \sim \hat{P}_\theta^n$  then  $X$  is uniformly distributed on the set  $\{X_1, \dots, X_n\}$  and  $Y|(X = x) \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}$ .

The first estimator introduced in this work,  $\hat{\theta}_n$ , is defined through the minimization of the MMD distance between the probability distributions  $\hat{P}_\theta^n$  and  $\hat{P}^n$ , that is<sup>1</sup>

$$\hat{\theta}_n(D_n) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k^2(\hat{P}_\theta^n, \hat{P}^n) = \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \hat{F}_n(\theta), \quad \hat{F}_n(\theta) := \sum_{i,j=1}^n \hat{\ell}(\theta, X_i, X_j, Y_j) \quad (2)$$

where, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $(x, x') \in \mathcal{X}^2$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,

$$\hat{\ell}(\theta, x, x', y) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}, Y' \sim P_{g(\theta, x')}} [k((x, Y), (x', Y')) - 2k((x, Y), (x', y))]. \quad (3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>When such a minimizer does not exist, we can use an  $\epsilon$ -minimizer instead and that follows can be trivially adapted. In addition, we implicitly assume that  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  are measurable, for all  $n \geq 1$ .

Remark that the number of terms in the definition of the function  $\hat{F}_n$  to minimize is  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ . Although below we propose an approach that makes possible to efficiently compute  $\hat{\theta}_n$  for moderate values of  $n$  (i.e. for  $n$  equals to a few thousands), this feature of  $\hat{F}_n$  limits the applicability of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  in large datasets. For large scale problems we propose the alternative estimator  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ , defined by

$$\tilde{\theta}_n(D_n) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \tilde{F}_n(\theta), \quad \tilde{F}_n(\theta) := \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) \quad (4)$$

where, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,

$$\tilde{\ell}(\theta, x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{g(\theta, x)}} [k_Y(Y, Y') - 2k_Y(Y, y)]. \quad (5)$$

The function  $\tilde{F}_n$  defined in (4) has the advantage to involve only  $n$  terms but, on the other hand,  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  cannot be interpreted as the minimizer of a measure of discrepancy between  $\hat{P}_\theta^n$  and  $\hat{P}^n$ . For this reason, our general theory for  $\hat{\theta}_n$  does not apply to this estimator. Although theoretical results regarding the robustness properties of  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  are provided in the next section, they are weaker than those obtained for  $\hat{\theta}_n$ .

Henceforth we use the shorthand  $\hat{\theta}_n = \hat{\theta}_n(D_n)$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n = \tilde{\theta}_n(D_n)$ , which is standard in statistics.

## 2.4. Link between the two estimators

Assume that  $k = k_{\gamma_X} \otimes k_Y$ , with  $k_{\gamma_X}$  a strictly positive kernel on  $\mathcal{X}$  such that  $k_{\gamma_X}(x, x) = 1$ , and let  $\ell(\theta, x, x', y) = \hat{\ell}(\theta, x, x', y)/k_{\gamma_X}(x, x')$  if  $k_{\gamma_X}(x, x') \neq 0$  and  $\ell(\theta, x, x', y) = 0$  otherwise. Remark that under the above assumption on  $k$  the quantity  $\ell(\theta, x, x', y)$  does not depend on  $k_{\gamma_X}$  and is such that  $\ell(\theta, x, x, y) = \tilde{\ell}(\theta, x, y)$ . Therefore, letting

$$h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n) = 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n k_{\gamma_X}(X_i, X_j) \ell(\theta, X_i, X_j, Y_j), \quad (6)$$

it follows that the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  are such that

$$\hat{\theta}_n \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) + h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n) \right\}, \quad \tilde{\theta}_n \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i).$$

Consequently, using  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  in place of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  amounts to discarding, in the definition of this latter estimator, the term  $h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n)$  whose computation requires  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  operations.

For standard choices of  $k_{\gamma_X}$  we have  $\lim_{\gamma_X \rightarrow 0} k_{\gamma_X}(x, x') = 0$  for all  $x' \neq x$ . This property holds e.g. if  $k_{\gamma_X}$  is the exponential or the Gaussian kernel with bandwidth parameter  $\gamma_X > 0$ , or if  $k_{\gamma_X}$  is the kernel defined in Section 4 (with  $\gamma_X > 0$  as in that section). In this case, assuming that the  $X_i$ 's are  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. distinct, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  we have  $\lim_{\gamma_X \rightarrow 0} h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n) = 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. Consequently, under suitable continuity assumptions,  $\hat{\theta}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_n$  as  $\gamma_X \rightarrow 0$ ,  $\mathbb{P}$ -a.s. For this reason, and as illustrated in Section 5, for a small value of  $\gamma_X$  we expect the two estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  to have a very similar behaviour in practice.

## 2.5. Computation of the two estimators

Computing the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  (resp.  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ ) requires to optimize the function  $\hat{F}_n$  (resp.  $\tilde{F}_n$ ), which is defined through an expectation. In some models, the expectation appearing in (3) (resp. in (5)) can be computed explicitly, in which case the function  $\hat{F}_n$  (resp.  $\tilde{F}_n$ ) has a known expression and standard optimization algorithms can be used to optimize it. This is for example the case in logistic or multinomial regression, since for these two models the expectation in (3) (and in (5)) is a finite sum.

In general, the functions  $\hat{F}_n$  and  $\tilde{F}_n$  are however intractable, and as a general strategy for computing  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  we propose the use of a stochastic gradient algorithm. As shown in the Appendix A, under suitable regularity conditions we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\theta} \hat{\ell}(\theta, x, x', y) \\ &= 2\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}, Y' \sim P_{g(\theta, x')}} \left[ \left( k((x, Y), (x', Y')) - k((x, Y), (x', y)) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(Y) \right] \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, x, y) = 2\mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{g(\theta, x)}} \left[ \left( k_Y(Y, Y') - k_Y(Y, y) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(Y) \right].$$

In the general case, we can easily compute an unbiased estimate of  $\nabla \hat{F}_n(\theta)$  and of  $\nabla \tilde{F}_n(\theta)$  under the mild conditions that (i) we can sample from  $P_{\lambda}$  for all  $\lambda \in \Lambda$  and (ii) that we can compute the gradient of the log-likelihood function of a single observation. The stability of this procedure obviously depends on the model, but it holds generally at least for compact parameter spaces  $\Theta$ , as discussed in Appendix A

In both cases, it is important to stress that the functions  $\hat{F}_n$  and  $\tilde{F}_n$  being typically non-convex and multi-modal (in particular in the presence of outliers), the starting value of the stochastic gradient algorithm must be chosen with care. When the maximum likelihood estimator of the model parameter can be efficiently computed we recommend to use its value to initialize the optimization procedure. Otherwise, the (gradient-free) algorithm introduced in [25], designed to compute the global optimum of a function defined through an expectation, can be used to find a good starting value for the stochastic gradient algorithm.

It is important to mention at this stage that the computation of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  can be greatly facilitated by taking  $k = k_{\gamma_X} \otimes k_Y$  for some small  $\gamma_X > 0$ , with  $k_{\gamma_X}$  as in Section 2.4. Indeed, for such a kernel  $k$  it often true that with high probability we have  $k_{\gamma_X}(X_i, X_j) \approx 0$  for all  $i \neq j$ , and thus that  $h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n) \approx 0$  (with  $h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, D_n)$  as defined in (6)). In this case, we can efficiently compute  $\hat{\theta}_n$  with a stochastic gradient algorithm whose cost per iteration is linear in the sample size  $n$ , as explained in Appendix A.2.

## 3. Theoretical analysis

### 3.1. Set-up and summary of the main results

In this section we introduce theoretical results concerning the robustness of the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  when outliers are present in the dataset used by the statistician to fit the

regression model. To this aim, we need to interpret  $D_n$  as a contaminated version of a dataset  $D_n^0 := \{(X_i^0, Y_i^0)\}_{i=1}^n$ , and below we consider two contamination models, namely the Huber contamination model [33] and the adversarial contamination model, defined in Definition 1 and in Definition 2, respectively. The various possible contamination models are discussed in Section 2 in [8].

**Definition 1.** *We say that the observed dataset  $D_n$  is an  $\epsilon$ -adversarial contamination of  $D_n^0$  if there exists a set  $I \subset \{1, \dots, n\}$  such that  $|I|/n \leq \epsilon$  and such that  $(X_i, Y_i) = (X_i^0, Y_i^0)$  for all  $i \notin I$ .*

**Definition 2.** *We say that the observed dataset  $D_n$  is an  $(\epsilon, Q)$ -Huber contamination of  $D_n^0$  if there exists a  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  such that  $(X_i, Y_i) \sim \epsilon Q + (1 - \epsilon)\delta_{(X_i^0, Y_i^0)}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .*

Below we derive non-asymptotic bounds for  $\hat{\theta}_n$  under both the fixed design and the random design scenarios, which prove the robustness of this estimator to adversarial contaminations of the data. For  $\hat{\theta}_n$ , we derive an asymptotic result in the random design case which establishes the robustness of this estimator to Huber contaminations of the sample.

We recall the reader that results in the fixed design case only provide guarantees on the estimation of the distribution of  $Y$  when  $X$  is equal to one of the observed  $X_i$ 's, while in practice regression is often used for out-of-sample predictions. In this case, and assuming that the pairs  $(Y_i^0, X_i^0)$ 's are i.i.d, this means that we want guarantees on the estimation of the distribution of  $Y$  when  $X$  is drawn from the same (unknown) distribution as the observed  $X_i$ 's, and independently from them. This is precisely what theoretical results in the random design case provide.

In what follows we let  $(P_{Y|x}^0)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  be a regular conditional probability<sup>2</sup> of  $Y$  given  $X$ , so  $Y_i^0 | (X_i^0 = x) \sim P_{Y|x}^0$  for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and all  $i = 1, \dots, n$ .

## 3.2. Non-asymptotic bounds for the estimator $\hat{\theta}_n$

### 3.2.1. Fixed design case

In the fixed design case the  $X_i^0$ 's are deterministic and therefore it does not really make sense to assume that they can be manipulated by an adversary. For this reason, in this subsection we assume that the contamination of the sample occurs only on the  $Y_i^0$ 's, so that  $X_i = X_i^0$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ .

Then, letting

$$\bar{P}_n^0(A \times B) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0}(A) P_{Y|X_i^0}^0(B), \quad \forall (A \times B) \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{Z}},$$

we set up our objective as the reconstruction of  $\bar{P}_n^0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  by a distribution in the set  $\{\hat{P}_\theta^n, \theta \in \Theta\}$ .

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume throughout this work that  $(P_{Y|x}^0)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  exists, which is for instance the case if  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are two Polish spaces.

The following lemma gives a non-asymptotic bound on the performances of the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  for this task, under an adversarial contamination of the sample.

**Lemma 1.** *Assume that  $D_n$  is an  $\epsilon$ -adversarial contamination of  $D_n^0$  such that  $X_i = X_i^0$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Then, under Assumption 1,*

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0)] \leq 4\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^n, \bar{P}_n^0) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and, for all  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) < 4\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^n, \bar{P}_n^0) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(2 + \sqrt{2\log(1/\eta)})\right\} \geq 1 - \eta. \quad (7)$$

**Remark 1.** *Lemma 1 does not require any assumption on the distribution of the data  $\{(X_i^0, Y_i^0)\}_{i=1}^n$ .*

In statistical theory we often assume that the ‘‘truth is in the model’’, that is, that there is a  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  such that  $\hat{P}_{\theta_0}^n = \bar{P}_n^0$ . In this case, Lemma 1 shows that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \hat{P}_{\theta_0}^n)] \leq 4\epsilon + 2/\sqrt{n} \quad (8)$$

while, in the non-contaminated case where  $D_n = D_n^0$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0)] \leq 2/\sqrt{n}. \quad (9)$$

In words, when computed from the uncontaminated dataset  $D_n^0$  the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is consistent for estimating  $\theta_0$  (with respect to the MMD distance) and, provided that  $\epsilon$  is small, an  $\epsilon$ -adversarial contamination of the sample will have only a negligible impact on the estimated parameter value. Similar consequences can be derived from the inequality in probability given in (7).

Lemma 1 implies the convergence of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  with respect to the MMD distance. However, under additional assumptions, it is possible to relate this form of convergence to the convergence with respect to a more usual criterion.

**Theorem 1.** *Under the assumptions of Lemma 1, let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a semi-norm on  $\Theta$  and  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$ . Assume that there exist a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$  and a constant  $\mu > 0$  such that  $\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^n, \hat{P}_{\theta_0}^n) \geq \mu\|\theta - \theta_0\|$  for all  $\theta \in U$ . Let  $\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^n, \hat{P}_{\theta_0}^n) \in (0, 2]$  and assume that  $\epsilon \in [0, \alpha/32)$  and that  $P_{Y^0|X_i^0} = P_{g(\theta_0, X_i^0)}$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$  (well-specified model). Then,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq 4\epsilon/\mu\right) = 1$$

and, for all  $n \geq 64/\alpha^2$  and all  $\eta \in [2e^{-n\alpha^2/38}, 1)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| < \frac{4\epsilon}{\mu} + \frac{1}{\mu\sqrt{n}}(2 + \sqrt{2\log(2/\eta)})\right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$



### 3.2.2. Random design case

We assume now that the pairs  $(Y_i^0, X_i^0)$ 's are i.i.d. from some probability distribution  $P^0 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ . Let  $P_X^0$  be the marginal distribution of the  $X_i^0$ 's and, for every  $\theta \in \Theta$ , let  $P_\theta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  be defined by

$$P_\theta(A \times B) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbf{1}_A(X) P_{g(\theta, X)}(B)], \quad A \times B \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Z}}.$$

Then, we set up our objective as the reconstruction of  $P^0$  by a distribution in  $\{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$ , and our natural candidate is  $P_{\hat{\theta}_n}$ . Since the approximating set  $\{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$  is unknown (because it depends on  $P_X^0$ ) achieving this objective requires more care than in the fixed design setting. Notably, the results presented below are limited to the case where  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$  and impose some conditions on the RKHSs  $\mathcal{H}_X$  and  $\mathcal{H}_Y$ .

**Assumption 3.**  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  for some integer  $d$ . Moreover,  $\mathcal{X}$  is path-wise connected and such that  $\Lambda_d(\mathcal{X}) > 0$ , with  $\Lambda_d$  the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . (Remark that these latter two conditions impose no loss of generality as we can just replace  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  by any set that contains  $\mathcal{X}$  and that satisfies them.)

**Assumption 4.** Either the function  $f = 0$  is the only constant function in  $\mathcal{H}_X$ , either both  $\mathcal{H}_X$  and  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  contain non-zero constant functions.

**Assumption 5.** For all  $f \in \mathcal{H}_Y$  and  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,  $g \in \mathcal{H}_X$  where  $g(x) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}} [f(Y)]$ .

Under the assumption that  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$ , Assumption 4 holds when  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  are such that  $\inf_{(x, x') \in \mathcal{X}^2} k_X(x, x') > 0$  and  $\inf_{(y, y') \in \mathcal{X}^2} k_Y(y, y') > 0$ . Assumption 5 is harder to fulfil but we provide in Section 4 a class of characteristic kernels  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$  that verify this assumption (as well as Assumption 4).

**Lemma 2.** Assume that  $D_n$  is an  $\epsilon$ -adversarial contamination of  $D_n^0$ . Then, under Assumptions 1-5, there exists a constant  $C_{k_X} \in (0, \infty)$  that depends only on  $k_X$  such that

$$\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(P_{\hat{\theta}_n}, P^0)] \leq 8\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + (\sqrt{2}C_{k_X} + 3)/\sqrt{n}$$

and such that, for all  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\hat{\theta}_n}, P^0) < 8\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{(3 + C_{k_X})(1 + \sqrt{2 \log(4/\eta)})}{\sqrt{n}} \right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$

From Lemma 2 we can readily obtain the random design counterpart of the inequalities (8)-(9), obtained in the fixed design setting, to prove the consistency of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  in the well-specified case and in the absence of contamination.

The following theorem is the main result of this subsection.

**Theorem 2.** Assume that there is a unique  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  such that  $\mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, P^0) = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0)$  and that there exist a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$  and a constant  $\mu > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) \geq \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, P^0) + \mu \|\theta - \theta_0\|, \quad \forall \theta \in U. \quad (10)$$

Let  $\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) - \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, P^0) \in (0, 2]$  and assume that  $D_n$  is an  $\epsilon$ -adversarial contamination of  $D_n^0$  for some  $\epsilon \in [0, \alpha/64)$ . Assume also that Assumptions 1-5 hold and let  $C_{k_X} \in (0, \infty)$  be as in Lemma 2. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| \leq 8\epsilon/\mu\right) = 1$$

and there exist constants  $(C_1, C_2) \in (0, \infty)^2$ , that depend only on  $\alpha$  and on  $C_{k_X}$ , such that for all  $n \geq C_1$  and all  $\eta \in [8e^{-C_2 n}, 1)$  we have

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\hat{\theta}_n - \theta_0\| < \frac{8\epsilon}{\mu} + \frac{(C_{k_X} + 3)}{\mu\sqrt{n}}\left(1 + \sqrt{2\log(8/\eta)}\right)\right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$

**Remark 2.** If  $P^0 = P_{\theta_0}$  for some  $\theta_0 \in \Theta$  (i.e. if the model is well-specified) then a sufficient condition for  $\theta_0$  to be the unique global minimizer of the mapping  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0)$  is that  $k$  is characteristic and the model  $\{P_\theta, \theta \in \Theta\}$  is identifiable, in the sense that  $\theta_1 \neq \theta_2 \Rightarrow P_{\theta_1} \neq P_{\theta_2}$ .

In Theorem 2 the distribution  $P_{\theta_0}$  should be interpreted as the best approximation of  $P^0$  in the sense of the MMD distance  $\mathbb{D}_k$  and thus, if the model contains  $P^0$ , we have  $P_{\theta_0} = P^0$  in the theorem. If a small fraction  $\epsilon$  of the data is corrupted then the theorem ensures that  $\hat{\theta}_n$  still estimates well  $\theta_0$ . In particular, the first part of Theorem 2 implies that the influence function of the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is bounded. It is also worth noting that since Theorem 2 imposes no conditions on  $\Theta$ , taking  $\epsilon = 0$  in this result establishes the almost sure convergence of  $\hat{\theta}_n$  towards  $\theta_0$  for non-compact parameter spaces. This is an important difference with the popular maximum likelihood estimator which, typically, requires  $\Theta$  to be compact in order to converge with probability one to  $\theta_0$ .

Condition (10) of Theorem 2 requires that the function  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) - \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, P^0)$  is strongly convex in a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\theta_0$ , a condition which is rather weak, as shown in the next proposition.

**Proposition 1.** Assume that  $\theta_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, \tilde{P}^0)$  is unique and that the function  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, \tilde{P}^0)$  is twice continuously differentiable at  $\theta_0$ . Then, condition (10) of Theorem 2 holds.

### 3.3. Asymptotic guarantees for the estimator $\tilde{\theta}_n$

For this estimator we set up our objective as the reconstruction of the regular conditional probability  $(P_{Y|x}^0)_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  by a distribution in the set  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ . As in Section 3.2.2, in what follows we denote by  $P^0$  the distribution of the  $(X_i^0, Y_i^0)$ 's. In addition, for  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  we let  $Q_X$  and  $(Q_{Y|x})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  be the distribution of  $X$  and the regular probability of  $Y$  given  $X$  when  $(X, Y) \sim Q$ , respectively.

It is direct to see that  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  is an  $M$ -estimator, and therefore sufficient conditions on  $k_Y$  and on the statistical model to ensure that  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  converges to some value  $\tilde{\theta}_0 \in \Theta$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  can be obtained from the general theory on  $M$ -estimators ([13], Chapter 5). The focus of the present paper being on robust estimation, the following proposition only establishes this result under the strong assumption that  $\Theta$  is a compact set.

**Proposition 2.** Let  $k_Y$  satisfy  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ ,  $D_n = D_n^0$  for all  $n$ , and assume that the following conditions hold:

- $\Theta$  is compact,
- the mapping  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{g(\theta, x)}} [k_Y(Y, Y') - 2k_Y(Y, y)]$  is continuous on  $\Theta$  for all  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ ,
- the mapping  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X_1)}, P_{Y|X_1}^0)^2]$  has a unique global minimum at  $\tilde{\theta}_0 \in \Theta$ .

Then,  $\tilde{\theta}_n \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_0$  in  $\mathbb{P}$ -probability.

**Remark 3.** If the model is well-specified, that is if  $(P_{Y|x}^0)_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \in \{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ , then a sufficient condition for  $\tilde{\theta}_0$  to be well-defined is that  $k_Y$  is a characteristic kernel and the model  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \theta \in \Theta\}$  is identifiable, in the sense that  $\mathbb{P}(\theta_1 \neq \theta_2 \Rightarrow P_{g(\theta_1, X)} \neq P_{g(\theta_2, X)}) = 1$ .

**Remark 4.** Using the general theory on  $M$ -estimators ([13], Chapter 5) one can obtain sufficient conditions on  $k_Y$  and on the statistical model which ensure that  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  is  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent and asymptotically Gaussian.

**Remark 5.** Unless the model is well-specified, the parameter value  $\tilde{\theta}_0$  defined in Proposition 2 may be different from the parameter value  $\theta_0$  the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  converges to (see Theorem 2).

Recalling that for  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  we focus on Huber's type contaminations of the sample, in Proposition 2 there is no loss of generality to assume that  $D_n = D_n^0$  for all  $n$  (no contamination). Indeed, in the random design setting, under an  $(\epsilon, Q)$ -Huber contamination of the sample we have that  $(X_i, Y_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \tilde{P}^0 := \epsilon Q + (1 - \epsilon)P^0$  and thus, since Proposition 2 requires no assumption on  $P^0$ , it results remains valid if  $P^0$  is replaced by  $\tilde{P}^0$ .

The following theorem provides an asymptotic guarantee regarding the robustness of  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  to Huber type contamination of the data. Notably, a direct implication of this theorem is that the influence function of  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  is bounded.

**Theorem 3.** Let  $k_Y$  satisfy  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ ,  $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$  and assume that following two conditions hold:

- the mapping  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X_1^0)}, P_{Y|X_1^0}^0)^2]$  has a unique global minimum at  $\tilde{\theta}_0$ ,
- there exist a neighbourhood  $U$  of  $\tilde{\theta}_0$  and a constant  $\mu > 0$  such that, for all  $\theta \in U$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \geq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] + \mu \|\theta - \tilde{\theta}_0\|. \quad (11)$$

Let

$$\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \in (0, 4]$$

and assume that  $\epsilon \in [0, \alpha/(52 + \alpha))$ . Then, for all

$$\tilde{\theta}_{Q,\epsilon} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{X_1 \sim \epsilon Q_X + (1-\epsilon)P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X_1)}, \epsilon Q_{Y|X_1} + (1-\epsilon)P_{Y|X_1}^0)^2]$$

we have  $\|\tilde{\theta}_{Q,\epsilon} - \tilde{\theta}_0\| \leq 52\epsilon/(\mu - \epsilon\mu)$ .

Following similar steps as in the proof of Proposition 1 it is easily checked that condition (11) holds when the function  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2]$  has  $\tilde{\theta}_0$  as unique global minimizer and is twice continuously differentiable around this parameter value.

## 4. A class of characteristic kernels satisfying the assumptions of Lemma 2

Let  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  be such that  $\psi(0) = 1/2$  and  $\psi(v) = 1/2 + (\sqrt{v^2 + 1} - 2)/v$  for all  $v \neq 0$ . For any  $d \in \mathbb{N}$  we let  $\psi_{(d)}(v) = (\psi(v_1), \dots, \psi(v_d))$ , noting that  $\psi_{(d)} : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow (0, 1)^d$  is a  $C^1$ -diffeomorphism. Then, we let  $k_{\alpha, \gamma_X}$  be the kernel on  $\mathcal{X}$  defined by  $k_{\alpha, \gamma_X}(x, x') = K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}(\|\psi_{(d)}(x) - \psi_{(d)}(x')\|)$ , with  $K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}$  the Matérn kernel with smoothness parameter  $\alpha > 0$  and bandwidth parameter  $\gamma_X > 0$ . We refer the reader to Example 2.2 in [7] for the definition  $K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}$  and note that  $K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}$  reduces to the exponential kernel when  $\alpha = 1/2$ , i.e.  $K_{1/2, \gamma_X}(\|x - x'\|) = \exp(-\|x - x'\|/\gamma_X)$ .

The following proposition shows that the class of kernels  $\{k_{\alpha, \gamma_X}, (\alpha, \gamma_X) \in (0, \infty)^2\}$  can be used to construct a characteristic kernel  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  that verifies Assumptions 1, 2 and 4.

**Proposition 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k_X = ck_{\frac{m}{2}, \gamma_X}$  for some constants  $(m, \gamma_X, c) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, \infty)^2$  such that  $|k_X| \leq 1$ , and let  $k_Y = \beta K + (1-\beta)$  for some  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  and for some continuous translation invariant characteristic kernel  $K$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$  satisfying  $|K| \leq 1$ . Then, the kernel  $k := k_X \otimes k_Y$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is characteristic and Assumptions 1, 2 and 4 hold.*

The next result notably implies that, under some regularity conditions on the model  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ , the kernel  $k$  defined in Proposition 3 satisfies Assumption 5.

**Theorem 4.** *Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k_X = ck_{\frac{m}{2}, \gamma_X}$  for some constants  $(m, \gamma_X, c) \in \mathbb{N} \times (0, \infty)^2$  such that  $|k_X| \leq 1$ , let  $k_Y$  be a continuous kernel on  $\mathcal{Y}$  satisfying  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ , and let  $s = (d + m)/2$  if  $(d + m)$  is even and  $s = (d + m + 1)/2$  if  $(d + m)$  is odd. Let  $A_s = \{a \in \mathbb{N}_0^d : \sum_{i=1}^d a_i \leq s\}$  and assume that each distribution  $P_\lambda$  has a density  $p_\lambda$  with respect to a measure  $\mu$ .*

*For all  $(\theta, x, y, a) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \times A_s$  let  $I_a = \{\lambda \in A_s : \lambda_i \leq a_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}$  and*

$$h_{a, \theta}(y, x) = \left( \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + x_i^2)^{\lambda_i + 1} \right) \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \left| \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i}}{\partial x_1^{\lambda_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\lambda_d}} p_{g(\theta, x)}(y) \right|,$$

*with the convention  $h_{a, \theta}(y, x) = p_{g(\theta, x)}(y)$  when  $a = (0, \dots, 0)$ .*

*Assume that the following conditions hold for all  $(\theta, a) \in \Theta \times A_s$ :*

(C1)  $\int_{\mathcal{X}} h_{a,\theta}(y, x)^2 \Lambda_d(dx) < \infty$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,

(C2)  $\int_{\mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}} h_{a,\theta}(y, x)^2 \Lambda_d \otimes \mu(d(x, y)) < \infty$ ,

(C3) one of the following two conditions hold:

a) The set  $\mathcal{Y}$  is countable,

b) (i) For some  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  there exist separable sets  $\{\mathcal{Y}_m\}_{m=1}^M$  such that  $\cup_{m=1}^M \mathcal{Y}_m = \mathcal{Y}$  and such that, for all  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,  $\mathcal{Y}_m \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and the function  $y \mapsto \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d a_i}}{\partial x_1^{a_1} \dots \partial x_d^{a_d}} P_{g(\theta, x)}(y)$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}_m$ , for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

(ii)  $\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |h_{a,\theta}(y, x)| < \infty$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

Then, Assumption 5 is satisfied.

**Remark 1.** If the measurable space  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{X}}, \Lambda_d)$  is complete then part (ii) of Condition (C3)b) can be omitted. We conjecture that under additional technical assumptions on  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mu)$  Condition (C1) may be omitted too.

**Remark 2.** It is worth noting that the estimator  $\hat{\theta}_n$  does not depend on the constants  $c$  and  $\beta$  appearing in the definition of  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$ . Thus, in practice we can always set  $c = \beta = 1$ .

**Remark 3.** Other  $C^1$ -diffeomorphisms  $\psi : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow (0, 1)$  than the one considered above can be used in the definition of  $k_{\alpha, \gamma_X}$ , such as the logistic function or the (rescaled) arctan function. However, other choices for the mapping  $\psi$  may require stronger assumptions on the model for the conclusion of Theorem 4 to hold.

The following corollary summarizes the conclusions of Proposition 3 and of Theorem 4 for some popular regression models.

**Corollary 1.** Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  be as in Proposition 3 and as in Theorem 4, and let  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$ . Then  $k$  is characteristic and Assumptions 1-5 are satisfied for:

1. The Gaussian linear regression model with unknown variance (see Section 5.2),
2. For the mixture of Gaussian linear regression models with unknown variances and unknown mixture weights; that is for  $P_{g(\theta, x)} = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m \mathcal{N}_1(\beta_m^\top x, \sigma_m^2)$  with  $M \in \mathbb{N}$  known and with  $\theta = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_M, \sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_M, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M) \in \Theta$  where

$$\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{Md} \times (0, \infty)^M \times \left\{ (a_1, \dots, a_M) \in [0, 1]^M : \sum_{m=1}^M a_m = 1 \right\}.$$

3. For the Poisson linear regression model; that is for  $P_{g(\theta, x)} = \text{Pois}(\exp(\theta^\top x))$  with  $\theta \in \Theta := \mathbb{R}^d$ .
4. For the Logistic regression model; that is for  $P_{g(\theta, x)} = \text{Ber}(1/(1 + \exp(\theta^\top x)))$  with  $\theta \in \Theta := \mathbb{R}^d$ .
5. For the Heckman sample selection model (see Section 5.3).
6. For the Gamma regression model with unknown shape parameter (see Section 5.4).

## 5. Numerical experiments

### 5.1. Set-up

All the results presented in this section are obtained with the kernel  $k = k_Y \otimes k_X$ , where  $k_Y$  is the exponential kernel with parameter  $\gamma_Y = 1$ , that is with  $k_Y(y, y') = \exp(-\|y - y'\|)$ , and where  $k_X = c k_{\frac{m}{2}, \gamma_X}$  with  $c = m = 1$  and  $\gamma_X = 0.01$ .

For each experiment the observations used to fit the model are obtained from an uncontaminated dataset  $d_N^0 = \{(x_i^0, y_i^0)\}_{i=1}^N$  that we contaminate as follows. We choose an  $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$  and randomly select a set  $I \subset \{1, \dots, N\}$  such that  $|I| = \lfloor \epsilon N \rfloor$ . For all  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  we then let  $(x_i, y_i) = (x_i^0, y_i^0)$  if  $i \notin I$  and  $(x_i, y_i) = (x_i^c, y_i^c)$  for some  $(x_i^c, y_i^c) \in \mathcal{Z}$  if  $i \in I$ . The way we generate the  $(x_i^c, y_i^c)$ 's will vary from one example to the next and will therefore be specified in due course. Finally, for  $n \leq N$  we let  $d_n := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  be the sample available to estimate the model parameters.

Below the value of the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  are obtained using AdaGrad [23], an adaptive stochastic gradient algorithm, and the strategy exposed in Appendix A for computing the former estimator is implemented. As suggested in Section 2.5, the algorithms that compute  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$  use the maximum likelihood estimator as starting value.

### 5.2. Gaussian linear regression

We let  $d = 8$  and, for every  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , we let  $P_{g(\theta, x)} = \mathcal{N}_1(\beta^\top x, \sigma^2)$  with  $\theta = (\beta, \sigma) \in \Theta := \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty)$ . For this example the dataset  $d_N^0$  is constructed by simulating independent observations using

$$Y_i^0 = \beta_0^\top X_i^0 + \epsilon_i, \quad (X_i^0, \epsilon_i) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(0, I_d) \otimes \text{Laplace}(0, \sigma_0)$$

with  $\beta_0 = (4, 4, 3, 3, 2, 2, 1, 1)$  and  $\sigma_0 = 1$ . The model  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}, \theta \in \Theta\}$  is therefore misspecified and, in what follows, we focus on the estimation of  $\beta_0$ .

We let  $N = 5000$  and for  $n \leq N$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  the contaminated dataset  $d_n$  is generated as explained in Section 5.1, where two types of outliers  $(x_i^c, y_i^c)$  are considered for this example. More precisely, we say that the outliers are of type X when  $y_i^c = y_i$  and  $x_i^c$  is such that  $x_{ij}^c = x_{ij}$  for all  $j > 1$  and such that  $x_{i1}^c$  is a random draw from the from the  $\mathcal{N}(5, 1)$  distribution, and of type Y when  $y_i^c$  is a random draw from the  $\mathcal{N}(10, 1)$  distribution and  $x_i^c = x_i$ .

In Table 1 we report, for different values of  $n \leq N$  and of  $\epsilon \in [0, 0.03]$ , the root mean squared error (RMSE) for the estimation of  $\beta_0$  obtained for four estimators, namely the ordinary least square estimator  $\beta_{\text{ols}, n}$ , the least absolute deviation estimator  $\beta_{\text{lad}, n}$ , the robust estimator of  $\beta$  in linear Gaussian regression models proposed by [37] (computed using the R package `robustbase`), and the two proposed estimators  $\hat{\beta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_n$ .

When the sample is not contaminated (i.e. when  $d_n = d_n^0$ ) we observe that the OLS estimator is the best estimator. However, this estimator is extremely sensitive to the presence of outliers (of both types), a fact that is already well documented in the literature, see for example Chapter 1 in [50]. The estimator  $\beta_{\text{lad}, n}$  is robust to outliers but its RMSE is almost always higher than the one obtained with the two MMD based

$\tau$	type	$n$	$\beta_{\text{ols},n}$	$\beta_{\text{lad},n}$	$\beta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\beta}_n$	$\tilde{\beta}_n$
0		100	0.372	0.353	0.350	0.355	0.334
		1 000	0.116	0.092	0.104	0.108	0.107
		5 000	0.053	0.039	0.046	0.049	0.047
1	Y	100	0.464	0.339	0.385	0.350	0.342
		1 000	0.181	0.094	0.106	0.105	0.097
		5 000	0.103	0.043	0.049	0.054	0.051
2	Y	100	0.647	0.351	0.359	0.337	0.333
		1 000	0.241	0.097	0.110	0.114	0.115
		5 000	0.175	0.039	0.047	0.051	0.052
3	Y	100	0.724	0.331	0.343	0.329	0.320
		1 000	0.309	0.100	0.108	0.113	0.110
		5 000	0.250	0.043	0.048	0.053	0.055
1	X	100	0.870	0.356	0.374	0.342	0.338
		1 000	0.836	0.111	0.105	0.104	0.096
		5 000	0.818	0.065	0.049	0.054	0.052
2	X	100	1.575	0.400	0.347	0.337	0.331
		1 000	1.467	0.160	0.110	0.112	0.115
		5 000	1.401	0.119	0.046	0.051	0.052
3	X	100	1.838	0.442	0.344	0.331	0.323
		1 000	1.805	0.216	0.108	0.113	0.109
		5 000	1.771	0.183	0.048	0.054	0.056

Table 1.: Results for the Gaussian linear regression model. For each experimental setting we report the RMSE over 25 replications.

estimators  $\hat{\beta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_n$ , especially in the case of outliers of type X. We also observe that  $\hat{\beta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_n$  are robust to the two considered types of outliers, as predicted by our theory, and have a performance which is almost identical to that of the robust estimator  $\beta_{\text{rob},n}$  proposed [37], which is the one which tends to have the lowest RMSE in Table 1.

### 5.3. Heckman sample selection model

Let  $\Lambda = \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$  and, for every  $\lambda = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma, \rho) \in \Lambda$ , let  $P_\lambda$  be the distribution of  $(Z_1, Z_2)$  where

$$Z_2 = \mathbf{1}_{(0, \infty)}(Z_2^*), \quad Z_1 = Z_2 Z_1^*, \quad \begin{pmatrix} Z_1^* \\ Z_2^* \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \rho\sigma \\ \rho\sigma & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Letting  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$  and

$$g(\theta, x) = (\beta^\top x, \gamma^\top x, \sigma, \rho), \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \quad \forall \theta = (\beta, \gamma, \sigma, \rho) \in \Theta,$$

the Heckman sample selection model is defined by  $\{(P_{g(\theta, x)})_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}, \theta \in \Theta\}$ .

For this model, in addition to the two MMD based estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ , results are presented for  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$ , the maximum likelihood estimator of  $\theta$  (computed using the R package `sampleSelection` [53]) and for  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$ , the robust two-step estimator of  $\theta$  proposed by [57] (computed using the R package `ssmrob` [56]). We stress that the estimator  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  is designed specifically for robust estimation in Heckman sample selection models.

$\epsilon$	$n$	$\theta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\theta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\bar{\theta}_n$
0%	100	1.504	1.737	2.132	2.012
	1 000	0.565	0.608	0.733	0.735
	5 000	0.210	0.296	0.290	0.289
1%	100	1.767	2.020	2.017	1.802
	1 000	1.325	1.164	0.706	0.695
	5 000	1.293	1.083	0.283	0.283
2%	100	2.218	4.131	2.238	2.186
	1 000	1.766	1.551	0.683	0.681
	5 000	1.936	1.669	0.252	0.257
3%	100	2.657	3.048	1.786	1.755
	1 000	2.496	2.253	0.631	0.642
	5 000	2.404	2.142	0.243	0.242

$\epsilon$	$n$	$\beta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\beta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\beta}_n$	$\bar{\beta}_n$
0%	100	1.451	1.696	2.0638	1.944
	1 000	0.536	0.574	0.705	0.708
	5 000	0.202	0.238	0.273	0.269
1%	100	1.598	1.731	1.947	1.727
	1 000	1.009	0.584	0.675	0.669
	5 000	0.878	0.273	0.267	0.266
2%	100	1.958	3.684	2.189	2.147
	1 000	1.312	0.638	0.654	0.651
	5 000	1.389	0.341	0.239	0.241
3%	100	2.200	1.989	1.732	1.697
	1 000	1.861	0.707	0.604	0.611
	5 000	1.762	0.418	0.231	0.230

Table 2.: Results for the Heckman sample selection model (synthetic data). The left table is for the estimation of  $\theta = (\beta, \gamma, \sigma, \rho)$  while right table is for he estimation of  $\beta$  only. For each experimental setting, we report the RMSE over 25 replications.

### 5.3.1. Synthetic data

For this example we let  $d = 8$ ,

$$\Theta = \left\{ (\beta, \gamma, \sigma, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1) \text{ such that } \beta_{d-i+1} = \gamma_i = 0, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d/2\} \right\}$$

and construct the dataset  $d_N^0$  by simulating  $N = 5\,000$  independent observations using

$$Y_i^0 | X_i^0 \sim P_{g(\theta_0, X_i^0)}, \quad X_i^0 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(0, I_d)$$

where  $\theta_0 = (\beta_0, \gamma_0, \sigma_0, \rho_0)$  with

$$\beta_0 = (4, 3, 2, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0), \quad \gamma_0 = (0, 0, 0, 0, 4, 3, 2, 1), \quad \sigma_0 = 1.5, \quad \rho_0 = 0.5.$$

Remark that the model we consider here assumes that the outcome equation depends only on the first  $d/2$  components of  $X_i^0$  while the selection equation depends only on the last  $d/2$  components of  $X_i^0$ , so that the total number of parameter to estimate is  $d + 2 = 10$ .

For  $n \leq N$  and  $\epsilon > 0$  the contaminated dataset  $d_n$  is constructed as explained in Section 5.1, with  $y_i^c = y_i$  and  $x_i^c$  such that  $x_{ij}^c = x_{ij}$  for all  $j > 1$  and such that  $x_{i1}^c$  is a random draw from the from the  $\mathcal{N}_1(5, 1)$  distribution.

Table 2 shows, for different values of  $n \leq N$  and of  $\epsilon \in [0, 0.03]$ , the RMSE obtained with the different estimator for the estimation of  $\theta_0$  as well as for the estimation of  $\beta_0$ , which is often the main parameter of interest in this model. We observe that the maximum likelihood estimator is the best estimator when there are no outliers, as expected from the asymptotic theory. On the other hand, this estimator is sensitive to the presence of outliers. The robust estimator  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  of [57] improves upon  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$  when the sample is contaminated. However, for all the considered values of  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $n$ , this estimator is dominated by  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and by  $\bar{\theta}_n$ . When restricting our attention to the estimation of  $\beta$ , we



	$\epsilon = 0\%$				$\epsilon = 1\%$				$\epsilon = 3\%$			
	$\theta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\theta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\tilde{\theta}_n$	$\theta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\theta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\tilde{\theta}_n$	$\theta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\theta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\tilde{\theta}_n$
$\beta_1$	5.037	5.401	5.157	5.111	5.445	5.441	5.183	5.090	5.726	-0.735	5.028	5.085
$\beta_2$	0.212	0.201	0.200	0.212	0.180	0.190	0.198	0.213	0.172	0.120	0.207	0.214
$\beta_3$	0.350	0.255	0.436	0.318	0.250	0.244	0.439	0.320	0.193	0.665	0.442	0.319
$\beta_4$	0.019	0.013	0.025	0.027	0.013	0.015	0.024	0.026	0.006	0.064	0.030	0.027
$\beta_5$	-0.220	-0.155	-0.193	-0.210	-0.129	-0.131	-0.188	-0.200	-0.096	-0.388	-0.193	-0.212
$\beta_6$	0.541	0.481	0.590	0.526	0.489	0.474	0.590	0.517	0.475	0.753	0.596	0.519
$\beta_7$	-0.029	-0.067	-0.084	-0.084	-0.056	-0.064	-0.081	-0.075	-0.090	0.177	-0.075	-0.078
$\gamma_1$	-0.724	-0.749	-1.067	-0.827	-0.613	-0.735	-1.015	-0.825	-0.508	5.441	-0.631	-0.819
$\gamma_2$	0.098	0.105	0.147	0.116	0.109	0.120	0.154	0.125	0.106	0.190	0.124	0.120
$\gamma_3$	0.644	0.687	0.661	0.736	0.584	0.665	0.657	0.752	0.505	0.244	0.650	0.742
$\gamma_4$	0.070	0.070	0.085	0.071	0.060	0.064	0.080	0.069	0.053	0.015	0.060	0.068
$\gamma_5$	-0.373	-0.398	-0.447	-0.415	-0.344	-0.388	-0.453	-0.417	-0.302	-0.131	-0.465	-0.412
$\gamma_6$	0.795	0.834	1.148	0.906	0.559	0.753	1.162	0.888	0.344	0.474	1.152	0.869
$\gamma_7$	0.182	0.183	0.146	0.212	0.179	0.177	0.144	0.214	0.144	-0.064	0.140	0.207
$\sigma$	1.271	1.318	1.237	1.217	1.351	1.357	1.243	1.229	1.454	1.357	1.251	1.242
$\rho$	-0.124	-0.051	-0.172	-0.315	-0.520	-0.047	-0.184	-0.307	-0.720	-0.047	-0.157	-0.308

Table 3.: Estimated value of  $\theta$  in the Heckman sample selection model for the 2001 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey dataset.

observe in Table 2 that  $\beta_{\text{rob},n}$  dominates the two proposed estimator when  $\epsilon = 0.01$  and  $n \in \{100, 1000\}$  and when  $\epsilon = 0.02$  and  $n = 1000$ . For all the other 18 pairs  $(\epsilon, n)$  with  $\epsilon > 0$  studied in Table 2, the MMD based estimators  $\hat{\beta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\beta}_n$  outperform  $\beta_{\text{rob},n}$ .

### 5.3.2. Real data

We now consider the same dataset, and model, than the one used in [57, Table 4] (and available from the R package `ssmrob`). The dataset contains  $N = 3328$  observations  $d_N^0 := \{(y_{1i}^0, y_{2i}^0, x_i^0)\}_{i=1}^N$ , extracted from the 2001 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey, and the Heckman sample selection model is used to regress  $y_{i1}^0$ , the log ambulatory expenses for the  $i$ -th individual, on the vector  $x_i^0$  containing  $d = 7$  covariates (including an intercept). Both the selection and the outcome equation is assumed to depend on all the components of  $x_i^0$ , so that  $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^d \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$  and the number of parameter to estimate is  $2d + 2 = 16$ . We let  $n = N$  and, for a given  $\epsilon > 0$ , we contaminate the dataset  $d_N^0$ , where  $y_{2i}^0 = \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(y_{1i}^0)$ , by applying the approach described in Section 5.1 with  $(y_{1i}^c, y_{2i}^c, x_i^c) = (y_{1i}^0, 1 - y_{2i}^0, x_i^0)$ . Below we denote by  $d_{n,\epsilon}$  the resulting contaminated version of  $d_n^0$ .

The estimated parameters values, obtained for  $\epsilon \in \{0, 0.01, 0.03\}$  and the four considered estimators, are presented in Table 3. For  $\epsilon = 0$ , the results obtained for  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$  and for  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  reproduce those given in [57], and the two MMD based estimators provide similar estimated values of the model parameters. In order to assess the sensibility of the different estimators to a contamination of the data, in Table 4 we give the value of  $\Delta_{\epsilon,n}(\theta_n) := \|\theta_n(d_{n,\epsilon}) - \theta_n(d_n^0)\|$  for  $\theta_n \in \{\theta_{\text{mle},n}, \theta_{\text{rob},n}, \hat{\theta}_n, \tilde{\theta}_n\}$ . As expected, the maximum likelihood estimator is very sensitive to the presence of outliers and  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  improves upon  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$ . The most striking feature of Table 4 is the remarkable performance of  $\hat{\theta}_n$ .

$\epsilon$	$\theta_{\text{mle},n}$	$\theta_{\text{rob},n}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\tilde{\theta}_n$
1%	0.651	0.107	0.063	0.040
3%	1.090	0.468	0.458	0.055

Table 4.: Value of  $\Delta_{\tau,n}(\theta_n)$  for the Heckman sample selection model for the 2001 Medical Expenditure Panel Survey dataset, with  $\theta_n \in \{\theta_{\text{mle},n}, \theta_{\text{rob},n}, \hat{\theta}_n, \tilde{\theta}_n\}$ .

Notably, the value  $\Delta_{\epsilon,n}(\tilde{\theta}_n)$  is about 2.675 times smaller than that of  $\Delta_{\epsilon,n}(\theta_{\text{rob},n})$  when  $\epsilon = 0.01$ , and about 8.5 times smaller when  $\epsilon = 0.03$ . Finally, we observe that the impact of the contamination of the data on  $\hat{\theta}_n$  is similar to that on  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$ . We however recall the reader that  $\hat{\theta}_n$  depends on a parameter  $\gamma_X > 0$  which is kept constant throughout this Section 5, and thus which is not optimized (in any sense) to the particular problem at hand.

#### 5.4. Gamma regression model

We finally consider the Gamma regression model  $\{(P_{g(\theta,x)})_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d}, \theta \in \Theta\}$  obtained by taking  $\Lambda = (0, \infty)^2$ ,  $P_\lambda = \text{Gamma}(\lambda_1, \lambda_1/\lambda_2)$  for all for  $\lambda \in \Lambda$ ,  $\Theta = (0, \infty) \times \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $g : \Theta \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \Lambda$  defined by

$$g(\theta, x) = (\nu, \nu \exp(x^\top \beta)), \quad \theta = (\nu, \beta) \in \Theta.$$

For this example we let  $d = 8$  and the dataset  $d_N^0$  is obtained by simulating  $N = 5000$  independent observations using  $Y_i^0 | X_i^0 \sim P_{g(\theta_0, X_i^0)}$  and  $X_i^0 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}_d(0, I_d)$ , with  $\theta_0 = (1, \dots, 1)$ . Then, for every  $n \leq N$  and  $\epsilon \in [0, 0.03]$ , the contaminated dataset  $d_n$  is constructed as described in Section 5.1, with  $y_i^c = y_i$  and  $x_i^c$  such that  $x_{ij}^c = x_{ij}$  for all  $j > 1$  and such that  $x_{i1}^c$  is a random draw from the from  $\mathcal{N}_1(-0.5, 1)$  distribution.

Table 5 presents the RMSE for the estimation of  $\theta_0$  and of  $\beta_0$  obtained with  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ . Results are also given for  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$ , the maximum likelihood estimator of  $\theta$ , and for  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$ , the estimator proposed by [10, 11] for robust inference in generalized linear model (computed using the R package `robustbase`). We observe from this table that, as expected,  $\theta_{\text{mle},n}$  is not robust to the presence of outliers, while the two proposed MMD based estimators are. The RMSEs obtained with the estimator  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  proposed by [10, 11] is however slightly smaller than the ones obtained with  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ .

We stress that, in some sense, the better performance of  $\theta_{\text{rob},n}$  is reassuring, since this estimator is precisely designed for robust inference in generalized linear model and, in particular, has been motivated in [11] for robust inference in Gamma regression models. By contrast, the applicability of the estimators  $\hat{\theta}_n$  and  $\tilde{\theta}_n$ , and their theoretical guarantee derived in Section 3 regarding their robustness, hold for a much broader class of regression models.

$\epsilon$	$n$	$\theta_{\text{mle}}$	$\theta_{\text{rob}}$	$\hat{\theta}_n$	$\tilde{\theta}_n$
0%	100	0.478	0.425	0.501	0.498
	1 000	0.123	0.120	0.142	0.144
	5 000	0.055	0.053	0.067	0.069
1%	100	0.394	0.398	0.521	0.521
	1 000	0.250	0.108	0.149	0.148
	5 000	0.350	0.049	0.071	0.070
2%	100	0.395	0.381	0.539	0.545
	1 000	0.353	0.113	0.146	0.145
	5 000	0.551	0.056	0.073	0.073
3%	100	0.441	0.407	0.471	0.475
	1 000	0.349	0.119	0.157	0.158
	5 000	0.631	0.069	0.076	0.078

$\epsilon$	$n$	$\beta_{\text{mle}}$	$\beta_{\text{rob}}$	$\hat{\beta}_n$	$\tilde{\beta}_n$
0%	100	0.308	0.306	0.444	0.443
	1 000	0.087	0.093	0.132	0.133
	5 000	0.041	0.043	0.061	0.063
1%	100	0.297	0.313	0.473	0.475
	1 000	0.114	0.098	0.132	0.133
	5 000	0.070	0.042	0.061	0.059
2%	100	0.302	0.301	0.490	0.493
	1 000	0.120	0.094	0.127	0.127
	5 000	0.105	0.046	0.066	0.067
3%	100	0.296	0.296	0.403	0.406
	1 000	0.119	0.091	0.138	0.136
	5 000	0.129	0.044	0.067	0.069

Table 5.: Results for the Gamma regression model. For each experimental setting, we report the mean square error over 25 replications.

## 6. Conclusion

We introduced a new family of parametric regression estimators based on MMD minimization. These estimators are universally  $\sqrt{n}$ -consistent and have strong robustness properties. Moreover, these estimators can be computed using a (stochastic) gradient algorithm whose cost per iteration is linear in the sample size  $n$ . Test on simulated data confirmed the good behaviour of these estimators in a wide range of regression models. Some questions remain open, including the dependence of the rate of convergence with respect to the dimension of the parameter space  $\Theta$ .

## Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the Heilbronn Institute for Mathematical Research who funded a two weeks visit for P. A. to the University of Bristol, during which this work was started.

## References

- [1] W. E. Aeberhard, E. Cantoni, and S. Heritier. Robust inference in the negative binomial regression model with an application to falls data. *TBiometrics*, 70(4):920–931, 2014.
- [2] P. Alquier, V. Cottet, and G. Lecué. Estimation bounds and sharp oracle inequalities of regularized procedures with Lipschitz loss functions. *The Annals of Statistics*, 47(4):2117–2144, 2019.
- [3] S. Arlot, A. Celisse, and Z. Harchaoui. A kernel multiple change-point algorithm via model selection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.3878*, 2012.
- [4] J.-Y. Audibert and O. Catoni. Robust linear least squares regression. *The Annals of Statistics*, 39(5):2766–2794, 2011.

- [5] X. Bai, W. Yao, J. E. Boyer. Robust fitting of mixture regression models. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 56(7), 2347–2359, 2019.
- [6] A. Barp, F.-X. Briol, A. B. Duncan, M. Girolami, and L. Mackey. Minimum Stein discrepancy estimators. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.08283*, 2019.
- [7] A. Basu, I.-R. Harris, N. L. Hjort, and M. C. Jones. Robust and efficient estimation by minimising a density power divergence. *Biometrika*, 85(3):549–559, 1998.
- [8] A.-H. Bateni and A. S. Dalalyan. Confidence regions and minimax rates in outlier-robust estimation on the probability simplex. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14(2), 2653–2677, 2020.
- [9] P. J. Bickel. Another look at robustness: a review of reviews and some new developments (with discussion and reply). *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, pages 145–168, 1976.
- [10] E. Cantoni and E. Ronchetti. Robust inference for generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 96:1022–1030, 2001.
- [11] E. Cantoni and E. Ronchetti. A robust approach for skewed and heavy-tailed outcomes in the analysis of health care expenditures. *Journal of Health Economics*, 25(2):198–213, 2006.
- [12] O. Catoni. Challenging the empirical mean and empirical variance: a deviation study. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, 48:1148–1185, 2012.
- [13] O. Catoni and I. Giullini. Dimension-free PAC-Bayesian bounds for matrices, vectors, and linear least squares regression. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1712.02747*, 2017.
- [14] M. Chen, C. Gao and Z. Ren. Robust covariance and scatter matrix estimation under Huber’s contamination model. *The Annals of Statistics*, 46(5):1932–1960, 2018.
- [15] B.-E. Chérif-Abdellatif and P. Alquier. Finite sample properties of parametric MMD estimation: robustness to misspecification and dependence. *Bernoulli*, 28(1):181–213, 2022.
- [16] B.-E. Chérif-Abdellatif and P. Alquier. MMD-Bayes: Robust Bayesian estimation via maximum mean discrepancy. *2nd Symposium on Advances in Approximate Bayesian Inference*, 2019.
- [17] G. Chinot, G. Lecué and M. Lerasle. Statistical learning with Lipschitz and convex loss functions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.01090*, 2018.
- [18] G. Chinot, G. Lecué, and M. Lerasle. Robust high dimensional learning for Lipschitz and convex losses. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.04281*, 2019.
- [19] A. Dalalyan and P. Thompson. Outlier-robust estimation of a sparse linear model using  $\ell_1$ -penalized Huber’s M-estimator. *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [20] J. Depersin. *A spectral algorithm for robust regression with subgaussian rates*. ArXiv preprint arXiv:2007.06072, 2020.
- [21] L. Devroye, M. Lerasle, G. Lugosi, and R. I. Oliveira. Sub-Gaussian mean estimators. *The Annals of Statistics*, 44(6):2695–2725, 2016.
- [22] I. Diakonikolas, W. Kong and A. Stewart. Efficient algorithms and lower bounds for robust linear regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.00040*, 2018.
- [23] J. Duchi, H. Elad and Y. Singer. Adaptive subgradient methods for online learning and stochastic optimization. *Journal of machine learning research*, 12(7), 2011.

- [24] G. K. Dziugaite, D. M. Roy, and Z. Ghahramani. Training generative neural networks via maximum mean discrepancy optimization. *UAI*, 2015.
- [25] M. Gerber and R. Douc. A Global Stochastic Optimization Particle Filter Algorithm. *Biometrika (to appear)*, 2022.
- [26] A. Ghosh and A. Basu. Robust estimation for independent non-homogeneous observations using density power divergence with applications to linear regression. *Electronic Journal of statistics*, 7:2420–2456, 2013.
- [27] A. Ghosh and A. Basu. Robust estimation in generalized linear models: the density power divergence approach. *Test*, 25(2):269–290, 2016.
- [28] A. Ghosh. Robust inference under the beta regression model with application to health care studies. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 28(3):871–888, 2019.
- [29] A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola. A kernel two-sample test. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Mar):723–773, 2012.
- [30] P. Gupta and G. O. Bhattacharjee. An efficient algorithm for random sampling without replacement. In *International Conference on Foundations of Software Technology and Theoretical Computer Science*, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pages 435–442, 1984.
- [31] F. R. Hampel. The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *Journal of the american statistical association*, 69(346):383–393, 1974.
- [32] F. R. Hampel, E. M. Ronchetti, P. J. Rousseeuw and W. A. Stahel. The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *Robust statistics: the approach based on influence functions*, Vol. 196. John Wiley & Sons, 2011.
- [33] P. J. Hüber. Robust estimation of a location parameter. *The annals of mathematical statistics*, 35(1):73-101, 1964.
- [34] M. J. Holland. PAC-Bayes under potentially heavy tails. *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [35] W. Jitkrittum, W. Xu, Z. Szabó, K. Fukumizu, and A. Gretton. A linear-time kernel goodness-of-fit test. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 262–271, 2017.
- [36] M. Kanagawa, P. Hennig, D. Sejdinovic, and B. K. Sriperumbudur. Gaussian processes and kernel methods: A review on connections and equivalences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02582*, 2018.
- [37] M. Koller and W.A. Stahel. Sharpening wald-type inference in robust regression for small samples. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 55(8):2504-2515, 2011.
- [38] H. R. Künsch, L. A. Stefanski and R. J. Carroll. Conditionally unbiased bounded-influence estimation in general regression models, with applications to generalized linear models. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 84(406):460–466, 1989.
- [39] G. Lecué and M. Lerasle. Learning from MOM’s principles: Le Cam’s approach. *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 129(11), 4385-4410, 2019.
- [40] G. Lecué and M. Lerasle. Robust machine learning by median-of-means: theory and practice. *The Annals of Statistics*, 48(2), 906-931, 2020.
- [41] G. Lecué, M. Lerasle and Mathieu, T. Robust classification via MOM minimization. *Machine Learning*, 109(8), 1635-1665, 2020.

- [42] M. Lerasle, Z. Szabó, T. Mathieu and G. Lecué. MONK: Outlier-Robust Mean Embedding Estimation by Median-of-Means. *ICML*, 2019.
- [43] Y. Li, K. Swersky, and R. Zemel. Generative moment matching networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1718–1727, 2015.
- [44] G. Lugosi and S. Mendelson. Risk minimization by median-of-means tournaments. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1608.00757*, 2016.
- [45] G. Lugosi and S. Mendelson. Regularization, sparse recovery, and median-of-means tournaments. *Bernoulli*, 25(3):2075–2106, 2019.
- [46] K. Muandet, K. Fukumizu, B. Sriperumbudur, and B. Schölkopf. Kernel mean embedding of distributions: A review and beyond. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning*, 10(1-2):1–141, 2017.
- [47] A. Nemirovski and B. Yudin. Problem complexity and method efficiency in optimization. A Wiley-Interscience Publication. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York. Translated from the Russian and with a preface by E. R. Dawson, Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics.
- [48] W. C. Parr and W. R. Schucany. Minimum distance and robust estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 75(371):616–624, 1980.
- [49] M. Schlather, R. Furrer, M. Kroll and B. D. Ripley R Package “RandomFieldsUtils”, 2019. <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/RandomFieldsUtils/RandomFieldsUtils.pdf>
- [50] P. J. Rousseeuw and A. M. Leroy. *Robust regression and outlier detection*. John Wiley & sons, 1987.
- [51] A. Smola, A. Gretton, L. Song and B. Schölkopf. A hilbert space embedding for distributions. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 13–31. Springer, 2007.
- [52] Z. Szabó and B. K. Sriperumbudur. Characteristic and universal tensor product kernels. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1):8724–8752, 2018.
- [53] O. Toomet and A. Henningsen. Sample selection models in R: Package sampleSelection. *Journal of statistical software*, 27(7):1–23, 2008.
- [54] A. B. Tsybakov,. Optimal rates of aggregation. In *Learning theory and kernel machines* (pp. 303-313). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003.
- [55] A. W. Van der Vaart. Asymptotic statistics. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- [56] M. Zhelonkin, M. G. Genton and E. Ronchetti. Robust estimation and inference in sample selection models. *R package version 3*, 2013.
- [57] M. Zhelonkin, M. G. Genton and E. Ronchetti. Robust inference in sample selection models. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B: Statistical Methodology*, 2016.

## A. Computation of the estimators

### A.1. Gradient of the loss

**Proposition 4.** Assume that each  $P_\lambda$  has a density  $p_\lambda$  with respect to a measure  $\mu$  such that  $\lambda \mapsto p_\lambda$  is differentiable, and that  $\theta \mapsto g(\theta, x)$  is differentiable for any  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

1. Assume that there is a function  $\hat{b} : \mathcal{Y}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \hat{b}(y, y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') < \infty$$

and such that, for all  $(\theta, x, x', y, y')$ ,

$$|k((x, y), (x', y')) \nabla_{\theta} p_{g(\theta, x)}(y) p_{g(\theta', x')}(y')| \leq \hat{b}(y, y').$$

Then, for all  $(\theta, x, x', y)$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \nabla_{\theta} \hat{\ell}(\theta, x, x', y) \\ &= 2 \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}, Y' \sim P_{g(\theta, x')}} \left[ \left( k((x, Y), (x', Y')) - k((x, Y), (x', y)) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(Y) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

2. Assume that there exists a function  $\tilde{b} : \mathcal{Y}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \tilde{b}(y, y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') < \infty$$

and such that, for all  $(\theta, x, y, y')$ ,

$$|k(y, y') \nabla_{\theta} [p_{g(\theta, x)}(y) p_{g(\theta', x)}(y')]| \leq \tilde{b}(y, y').$$

Then, for all  $(\theta, x, y)$  we have

$$\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, x, y) = 2 \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{g(\theta, x)}} \left[ \left( k_Y(Y, Y') - k_Y(Y, y) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(Y) \right].$$

**Remark 4.** We need more assumption to ensure stability and convergence of the stochastic gradient algorithm. See for example Proposition 5.2 in [1] (and the references therein), where the authors require the existence of the variance of

$$\hat{L}(\theta, x, x', U, U', y) := 2 \left( k((x, Y), (x', Y')) - k((x, Y), (x', y)) \right) \nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(Y)$$

when  $U \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}$  and  $U' \sim P_{g(\theta, x')}$ . However, under Assumption 1, it boils down to the corresponding assumption on  $\nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(U)$ . For example, if there is  $v > 0$  such that for any  $(x, \theta)$ ,  $\mathbb{E}_{U \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}} [\|\nabla_{\theta} \log p_{g(\theta, x)}(U)\|^2] \leq v$ , then

$$\text{Var}(\hat{L}(\theta, x, x', U, U', y)) \leq 16v, \quad \forall (\theta, x, x', y).$$

*Proof of Proposition 4.* We start by the proof of point 2. By definition,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) &= \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, X_i)}, Y' \sim P_{g(\theta, X_i)}} [k_Y(Y, Y') - 2k_Y(Y, Y_i)] \\ &= \iint [k_Y(y, y') - 2k_Y(y, Y_i)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\ &= \iint k_Y(y, y') p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\ &\quad - 2 \int k_Y(y, Y_i) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) \mu(dy), \end{aligned}$$

so

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) &= \nabla_{\theta} \iint k_Y(y, y') p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\
&\quad - \nabla_{\theta} \int k_Y(y, Y_i) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) \mu(dy) \\
&= \iint k_Y(y, y') \nabla_{\theta} [p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y')] \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\
&\quad - 2 \int k_Y(y, Y_i) \nabla_{\theta} [p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] \mu(dy)
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where the inversion of  $\int$  and  $\nabla$  is justified thanks to the existence of the function  $\tilde{b}$ . Remark that

$$\nabla_{\theta} [p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] = \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}$$

and that

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\theta} [p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y')] &= \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') + \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y')] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y').
\end{aligned}$$

Plugging this into (12) gives:

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) &= \iint k_Y(y, y') \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\
&\quad + \iint k_Y(y, y') \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y')] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y') \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\
&\quad - 2 \int k_Y(y, Y_i) \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) \mu(dy) \\
&= 2 \iint k_Y(y, y') \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) \mu(dy) \mu(dy') \\
&\quad - 2 \sum_{i=1}^n \int k_Y(y, Y_i) \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y)] p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(y) \mu(dy)
\end{aligned}$$

by symmetry, and thus,

$$\nabla_{\theta} \tilde{\ell}(\theta, X_i, Y_i) = \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, X_i)}, Y' \sim P_{g(\theta, X_i)}} \left\{ [k_Y(Y, Y') - k_Y(Y, Y_i)] \nabla_{\theta} [\log p_{g(\theta, X_i)}(Y)] \right\}.$$

The proof of point 1, from the expression in (2), is exactly similar.  $\square$

## A.2. A closer look at the computation of $\hat{\theta}_n$

Let  $k = k_{\gamma_X} \otimes k_Y$  with  $k_{\gamma_X}$  as in Section 2.4 and let  $L(\theta, x, x', y)$  be a random variable such that  $\mathbb{E}[L(\theta, x, x', y)] = \nabla_{\Theta} \ell(\theta, x, x', y)$ , with  $\ell(\theta, x, x', y)$  as defined in Section 2.4. Then, given  $n$  observations  $d_n := \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$  in  $\mathcal{Z}$ , the random variable

$$H_n(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n) := 2 \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \sum_{j=i+1}^n k_{\gamma_X}(x_i, x_j) L(\theta, x_i, x_j, y_j)$$

is such that  $\mathbb{E}[H_n(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)] = \nabla_{\theta} h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)$ , with  $h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)$  as defined in (6).



Next, for an integer  $M_1 \in \{1, \dots, (n-1)n/2 - 1\}$  we let

$$\mathcal{S}_{M_1} \subset \mathcal{S} := \{(i, j) : 1 \leq i < j \leq n\}$$

be such that the set  $\{k_{\gamma_X}(x_i, x_j)\}_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_{M_1}}$  contains the  $M_1$  largest elements of the set  $\{k_{\gamma_X}(x_i, x_j)\}_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}}$ , and for an integer  $M_2 \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $M_1 + M_2 \leq (n-1)n/2$  we let  $\{(I_m, J_m)\}_{m=1}^{M_2}$  be a simple random sample obtained without replacement from the set  $\mathcal{S} \setminus \mathcal{S}_{M_1}$ . Then, the random variable

$$\begin{aligned} H_n^{(M_1, M_2)}(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n) &:= 2 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mathcal{S}_{M_1}} k_{\gamma_X}(x_i, x_j) L(\theta, x_i, x_j, y_j) \\ &\quad + \frac{(n-1)n - 2M_1}{M_2} \sum_{m=1}^{M_2} k_{\gamma_X}(x_{I_m}, x_{J_m}) L(\theta, x_{I_m}, x_{J_m}, y_{J_m}) \end{aligned}$$

is such that  $\mathbb{E}[H_n^{(M_1, M_2)}(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)] = h_n(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)$ , and thus

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^N L(\theta, x_i, y_i) + H_n^{(M_1, M_2)}(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n) \right] = \nabla_{\theta} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \hat{\ell}(\theta, X_i, X_j, Y_j). \quad (13)$$

This approach for computing an unbiased estimate of  $\nabla_{\theta} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \hat{\ell}(\theta, X_i, X_j, Y_j)$  involves the construction of the sets  $\mathcal{S}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{M_1}$ , which requires  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$  operations. However, once these two sets are obtained, obtaining a realization of  $G_n(\theta, d_n) := \sum_{i=1}^N L(\theta, x_i, y_i) + H_n^{(M_1, M_2)}(\gamma_X, \theta, d_n)$  for a given  $\theta$  can be done in only  $\mathcal{O}(n + M_1 + M_2 \log(M_2))$  operations using e.g. the simple random sampling without replacement method proposed by [30].

For this procedure to work well in practice the parameters  $M_1$  and  $M_2$  must be such that the variance of  $G_n(\theta, d_n)$  is small. When a small value for  $\gamma_X$  is chosen it is often true that  $k_{\gamma_X}(x_i, x_j) \approx 0$  for most pairs  $(i, j) \in \mathcal{S}$ . When this happens, taking  $M_1 = \mathcal{O}(n)$  and  $M_2$  such that  $M_2 \log(M_2) = \mathcal{O}(n)$  allows to efficiently compute  $\hat{\theta}_n$  using a stochastic gradient algorithm whose cost per iteration is linear in the sample size  $n$ . However, the memory requirement the approach we just described is  $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$ , which limits its applicability to moderate values of  $n$  (to  $n$  equals to a few thousands, say).

## B. Proofs

### B.1. Preliminary lemmas on minimum-MMD estimation

The following lemma is adapted from Lemma 5 in [2]. While the proof is quite similar, the statement is more general.

**Lemma 3.** *Let  $\mathcal{S}$  be a set (equipped with a  $\sigma$ -algebra). Let  $K$  be any symmetric function  $\mathcal{S}^2 \rightarrow [-1, 1]$  that can be written  $K(s, s') = \langle \varphi(s), \varphi(s') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$  for some Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}$  and some function  $\varphi$  (note that we do not assume that  $K$  is a characteristic kernel). Let  $S_1, \dots, S_n$  be independent random variables on  $\mathcal{S}$  with respective distributions  $Q_1, \dots, Q_n$ . Define  $\bar{Q} = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n Q_i$  and  $\hat{Q} = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{S_i}$ . We define, for any  $Q$  and  $Q'$  probability distributions on  $\mathcal{S}$ ,*

$$\mathbb{D}_K^2(Q, Q') = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q, S' \sim Q} [K(Z, Z')] - 2\mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q, S' \sim Q'} [K(Z, Z')] + \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q', S' \sim Q'} [K(Z, Z')]$$

(which is indeed a metric if  $K$  is a characteristic kernel). We have:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_K(\bar{Q}, \hat{Q}) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_K^2(\bar{Q}, \hat{Q}) \right] \leq \frac{1}{n}.$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* Jensen's inequality gives  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_K(\bar{Q}, \hat{Q})] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_K^2(\bar{Q}, \hat{Q})]}$ . Put  $m_i = \mathbb{E}_{S \sim Q_i}[\varphi(S)]$ , then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_K^2(\bar{Q}, \hat{Q}) \right] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n [\varphi(S_i) - m_i] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\varphi(S_i) - m_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] + \frac{1}{n(n-1)} \sum_{i \neq j} \mathbb{E} [\langle \varphi(S_i) - m_i, \varphi(S_j) - m_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}] \\ &= \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\varphi(S_i)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] - \|m_i\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right) + 0 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left[ \|\varphi(S_i)\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 \right] = \frac{1}{n^2} \sum_{i=1}^n K(S_i, S_i) \leq \frac{1}{n}. \quad \square \end{aligned}$$

Our proof strategy to study  $\hat{\theta}_n(D_n)$  actually relies on the fact that despite contamination, the performance of  $\hat{\theta}_n(D_n)$  remains close to the one of  $\hat{\theta}_n(D_n)$ . The following lemma will help to formalize this claim.

**Lemma 4.** *Let  $\hat{P}^{n,0} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{(X_i^0, Y_i^0)}$  be the non-contaminated empirical distribution and  $\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0} P_{g(\theta, X_i^0)}$  be the uncontaminated counterpart of  $\hat{P}_\theta^n$ . Then, for any probability distribution  $Q$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , we have*

$$\left| \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}^{n,0}, Q \right) - \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}^n, Q \right) \right| < 2\epsilon \quad (14)$$

and

$$\left| \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, Q \right) - \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}_\theta^n, Q \right) \right| < 2\epsilon. \quad (15)$$

*Proof of Lemma 3.* For the first inequality (14),

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}^{n,0}, Q \right) - \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}^n, Q \right) \right| &\leq \mathbb{D}_k \left( \hat{P}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^n \right) \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[ k((X_i^0, Y_i^0), \cdot) - k((X_i, Y_i), \cdot) \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \left[ k((X_i^0, Y_i^0), \cdot) - k((X_i, Y_i), \cdot) \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I} \left\| \left[ k((X_i^0, Y_i^0), \cdot) - k((X_i, Y_i), \cdot) \right] \right\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i \in I} 2 = \frac{2|I|}{n} < 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The proof of (4) is exactly the same.  $\square$

## B.2. Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof of Lemma 1.* Thanks to (14) of Lemma 4 we have, for any fixed  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,

$$\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \hat{P}^n) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \quad (\text{triangle inequality})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \hat{P}^n) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) + 2\epsilon \text{ where we used (14) with } Q = \bar{P}_n^0 \\
&\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}}^n, \hat{P}^n) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) + 2\epsilon \text{ (by definition of } \hat{\theta}_n) \\
&\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}}^n, \hat{P}^{n,0}) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) + 4\epsilon \text{ by (14) with } Q = \hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}}^n \\
&\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) + 2\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) + 4\epsilon \text{ (triangle inequality)}. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

Taking the expectation in (16) gives:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \right] \leq 4\epsilon + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) \right]. \tag{17}$$

We can control the expectation in the right-hand side by an application of Lemma 3, where  $S_i = (X_i^0, Y_i^0) \sim Q_i := \delta_{X_i^0} P_{Y|X_i^0}^0$  that are indeed independent, and where  $K = k$ . The lemma gives:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{18}$$

We take the infimum with respect to  $\theta$  to obtain:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \right] \leq 4\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\theta}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}. \tag{19}$$

In order to prove (7), take any  $z'_i \in \mathcal{Z}$  and define

$$\hat{P}_{(i)}^{n,0} = \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{j \neq i} \delta_{(X_j^0, Y_j^0)} + \delta_{z'_i} \right).$$

We note that:

$$\left| \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) - \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{(i)}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) \right| \leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \hat{P}_{(i)}^{n,0}) \leq \frac{2}{n}.$$

This allows to use the McDiarmind's bounded difference inequality [8], which gives:

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^n, \bar{P}_n^0) \right] \geq t \right\} \leq \exp \left( -\frac{nt^2}{2} \right), \quad \forall t > 0. \tag{20}$$

Put  $\eta = \exp(-nt^2/2)$  to get

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) - \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, \bar{P}_n^0) \right] \geq \sqrt{\frac{2 \log(1/\eta)}{n}} \right\} \leq \eta,$$

which, together with (17)-(18), gives the statement of the theorem.  $\square$

## B.3. Proof of Lemma 2

### B.3.1. Preliminary results

We start with a result that will be an essential tool in the proof of Lemma 2. Essentially, it quantifies how well  $\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0} = (1/n) \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0} P_{g(\hat{\theta}_n, X_i^0)}$  approximates  $P^0$ . Usually, in regression literature, we focus mostly on the estimation of the distribution of  $Y|X$  rather than on the estimation of the distribution of the pair  $(X, Y)$ . Still, we believe that this result has in interpretation on its own, so we state it as a theorem.

**Theorem 5.** *Under Assumption 1 we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \right] \leq 8\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}}$$

and, for any  $\eta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \leq 8\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\eta)} \right) \right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$

*Proof of Theorem 5.* The proof is quite similar to the proof of Lemma 1, but requires some adaptations, in particular in the application of Lemma 3.

First,

$$\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^n) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^n, P^0). \quad (21)$$

Let us deal with the first term of this upper bound in a first time. Here, we will use both (14) and (15) of Lemma 4. We have:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^n) &\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^n) + 2\epsilon \text{ thanks to (14)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, \hat{P}^n) + 4\epsilon \text{ thanks to (15)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n(D_n^0)}^n, \hat{P}^n) + 4\epsilon \text{ (definition of } \hat{\theta}_n) \\ &\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n(D_n^0)}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^n) + 6\epsilon \text{ thanks to (15)} \\ &\leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n(D_n^0)}^{n,0}, \hat{P}^{n,0}) + 8\epsilon \text{ thanks to (14)} \\ &= \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, \hat{P}^{n,0}) + 8\epsilon \text{ (definition of } \hat{\theta}_n). \end{aligned}$$

Plugging this in (21) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) &\leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, \hat{P}^{n,0}) + \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) + 8\epsilon \\ &\leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P^0) + 2\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) + 8\epsilon \\ &\leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P_\theta) + \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) \right] + 2\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) + 8\epsilon \quad (22) \end{aligned}$$

and so, taking expectations on both sides,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \right] &\leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P_\theta) \right] + \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) \right\} \\ &\quad + 2\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) \right] + 8\epsilon. \quad (23) \end{aligned}$$

We tackle the term  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P_\theta) \right]$ . Letting  $\Phi$  denote the function such that  $k((x, y), (x', y')) = \langle \Phi(x, y), \Phi(x', y') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P_\theta) &= \sqrt{\mathbb{D}_k^2(\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, P_\theta)} \\ &= \left( \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}, (X', Y') \sim \hat{P}_\theta^{n,0}} \langle \Phi(X, Y), \Phi(X', Y') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - 2\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)\sim\hat{P}_\theta^{n,0},(X',Y')\sim P_\theta} \langle \Phi(X,Y), \Phi(X',Y') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
& + \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)\sim P_\theta,(X',Y')\sim P_\theta} \langle \Phi(X,Y), \Phi(X',Y') \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = \left( \mathbb{E}_{X\sim\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\delta_{X_i^0},X'\sim\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\delta_{X_i^0}} \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim P_{g(\theta,X)}}[\Phi(X,Y)], \mathbb{E}_{Y'\sim P_{g(\theta,X')}}[\Phi(X',Y')] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right. \\
& - 2\mathbb{E}_{X\sim\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\delta_{X_i^0},X'\sim P_X^0} \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim P_{g(\theta,X)}}[\Phi(X,Y)], \mathbb{E}_{Y'\sim P_{g(\theta,X')}}[\Phi(X',Y')] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\
& \left. + \mathbb{E}_{X\sim P_X^0,X'\sim P_X^0} \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim P_{g(\theta,X)}}[\Phi(X,Y)], \mathbb{E}_{Y'\sim P_{g(\theta,X')}}[\Phi(X',Y')] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\
& = \sqrt{\mathbb{D}_{\bar{k}}^2 \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0}, P_X^0 \right)} = \mathbb{D}_{\bar{k}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0}, P_X^0 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the function  $\bar{k}$  is given by:

$$\bar{k}(x, x') = \left\langle \mathbb{E}_{Y\sim P_{g(\theta,x)}}[\Phi(x, Y)], \mathbb{E}_{Y'\sim P_{g(\theta,x')}}[\Phi(x', Y')] \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}}.$$

Note that  $-1 \leq \bar{k} \leq 1$  so we can apply Lemma 3 to  $S_i = X_i^0 \sim Q_i = P_X^0$  and  $K = \bar{k}$  to get:

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_{\bar{k}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0}, P_X^0 \right) \right] \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}.$$

Combining this last result with (23), and applying Lemma 3 with  $S_i = (X_i^0, Y_i^0) \sim Q_i = P^0$  and  $K = k$  that gives  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0)] \leq 1/\sqrt{n}$ , we finally obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \right] & \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \left\{ \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) \right\} + \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}} + 8\epsilon \\
& = \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} + 8\epsilon,
\end{aligned}$$

that is the first inequality of the theorem.

In order to prove the second inequality let  $\theta_0 \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0)$ . Then (22) implies

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \\
& \leq \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{n,0}, P_{\theta_0}) + \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, P^0) + 2\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) + 8\epsilon \\
& = \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_0}^{n,0}, P_{\theta_0}) + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + 2\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) + 8\epsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

McDiarmid's bounded difference inequality leads to

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) - \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0)] \geq t \right\} \leq \exp \left( -\frac{nt^2}{2} \right)$$

and to

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) - \mathbb{E} \left( \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}^{n,0}, P^0) \right) \geq t \right\} \leq \exp \left( -\frac{nt^2}{2} \right).$$

By a union bound, the probability that one of the two events hold is smaller or equal to  $2 \exp(-nt^2/2)$ , which leads to

$$\mathbb{P} \left\{ \mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}, P^0) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} \left( 1 + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\eta)} \right) + 8\epsilon \right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$

This ends the proof.  $\square$

**Lemma 5.** *Assume that  $k_X$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X}^2$  and that Assumption 3 is satisfied. Then, there exists a  $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  such that*

$$\{f \in \mathcal{H}_X : \text{Cov}_{X \sim P_X}(f(X), g(X)) = 0, \forall g \in \mathcal{X}\} \subseteq \text{span}(1). \quad (24)$$

*Proof of Lemma 5.* From Theorem 2.17 in [9]: as  $k_X$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X}^2$ , any function  $f \in \mathcal{H}_X$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Let  $P_X$  denote the  $\mathcal{N}_d(0, I_d)$  distribution, truncated on  $\mathcal{X}$  if  $\mathcal{X} \neq \mathbb{R}^d$ . Assume that there exists a non-constant function  $f \in \mathcal{H}_X$  such that

$$\text{Cov}_{X \sim P_X}(f(X), g(X)) = 0, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_X.$$

Then,  $\text{Var}_{X \sim P_X}(f(X)) = 0$  and, since  $P_X$  admits a strictly positive density  $p_X$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ ,  $f$  is constant almost surely. However, as  $f$  is assumed to be continuous, and  $\mathcal{X}$  is path-wise connected, the function  $f$  is constant.  $\square$

As explained above, Theorem 5 states how far  $\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0}$  is from  $P^0$ . However, we want to prove Lemma 2 that gives a bound on the distance between  $P_{\hat{\theta}_n}$  and  $P^0$ . In order to highlight the difference, let us introduce  $\hat{P}_X^{n,0} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{X_i^0}$ , and remark that we can write  $\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^{n,0} = \hat{P}_X^{n,0} P_{g(\hat{\theta}_n, \cdot)}$  and  $P_{\hat{\theta}_n} = P_X^0 P_{g(\hat{\theta}_n, \cdot)}$ . The following lemma is the key point to derive Lemma 2 from Theorem 5 as it can be used to get an upper bound on the distance between  $\hat{P}_X^n P_{g(\theta, \cdot)}$  and  $P_X^0 P_{g(\theta, \cdot)}$ , for any  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

**Lemma 6.** *Let us consider a regular conditional probability  $(P_{Y|x})_{x \in \mathcal{X}}$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$ , and assume that*

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{H}_Y, f(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|\cdot}}[g(Y)] \in \mathcal{H}_X. \quad (25)$$

*Under Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 4, let  $c_\star$  be the largest constant  $c \in [0, \infty)$  such that  $k_X - c$  is a semi-definite positive kernel on  $\mathcal{X}$ . Then, there exists a constant  $C_{k_X} < \infty$ , that depends only on  $k_X$ , such that, for any probability distributions  $P'_X, P''_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ ,*

$$\mathbb{D}_k(P', P'') \leq C_{k_X} \max \left[ \mathbb{D}_{k_X}(P'_X, P''_X), \mathbb{D}_{k_X(k_X - c_\star)}(P'_X, P''_X) \right]$$

*where  $P' = P'_X P_{Y|\cdot}$  and  $P'' = P''_X P_{Y|\cdot}$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 6.* Let  $k_{\star, X} = k_X - c_\star$  and let  $\mathcal{H}_{\star, X}$  denote the RKHS with reproducing kernel  $k_{\star, X}$ . Let  $c'_\star$  be the largest constant  $c \geq 0$  such that  $k_Y - c$  is a (symmetric, semi-definite positive) kernel, and similarly we introduce the notations  $k_{\star, Y} = k_Y - c'_\star$  and  $\mathcal{H}_{\star, Y}$ . From Theorem 3.11 in [9], 0 is the only constant function in  $\mathcal{H}_{\star, X}$ , and the only constant function in  $\mathcal{H}_{\star, Y}$ . Also, (25) and Assumption 4 imply that  $c_\star > 0 \Leftrightarrow c'_\star > 0$ .

For any  $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$  and  $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  let us introduce the covariance operators  $\mathcal{C}_P : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_X$  and  $\mathcal{C}_P : \mathcal{H}_{\star, X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{\star, X}$  satisfying, for any  $f \in \mathcal{H}_X, g \in \mathcal{H}_Y$  and  $f_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{\star, X}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle f(X), \mathcal{C}_P g(Y) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_X} &= \text{Cov}_{(X,Y) \sim P}(f_1(X), g(Y)), \\ \langle f_1(X), \mathcal{C}_P f_2(X) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_X} &= \text{Cov}_{X \sim P_X}(f_1(X), f_2(X)). \end{aligned}$$

The boundedness of  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$  (in Assumption 2) implies that  $\mathcal{C}_P$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{P_X}$  exist, are unique, and that they are bounded, linear operators (see Section 3 in [6]). Finally, we let

$$\mu(P_{Y|x}) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|x}}[k_Y(Y, \cdot)] \in \mathcal{H}_Y.$$

Let  $\mathcal{A}_{k_X} := \{P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \text{ such that (24) holds}\}$ . As Assumption 3 holds and  $k_X$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{X}$  (thanks to Assumption 2), we can apply Lemma 5 which ensures that the set  $\mathcal{A}_{k_X}$  is not empty. Let  $P_X^* \in \mathcal{A}_{k_X}$  and  $P^* = P_X^* P_{Y|\cdot}$ . Since  $P_X^* \in \mathcal{A}_{k_X}$  and, as we have seen above, 0 is the only constant function in  $\mathcal{H}_{*,X}$ , it follows that  $\text{Ker}(\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}) = \{0\}$  and therefore the linear operator  $\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}$  is bijective and bounded. Consequently, by the bounded inverse theorem, it has a linear and bounded inverse  $\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1} : \mathcal{H}_{*,X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$ .

Noting that  $\mathcal{H}_{*,\mathcal{X}} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{X}}$  ([9], Theorem 5.4), we now define the linear operator

$$\mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}} = \mathcal{C}_{P^*} \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}$$

and show that, under the assumptions of the lemma,

$$\mu(P_{Y|x}) = c'_* + \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)), \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (26)$$

As mentioned above, if  $c_* = 0$  then  $c'_* = 0$  and, in this case, (26) holds thanks to (25) and Theorem 4 in [11].

We now consider the case  $c_* > 0$ , so that  $c'_* > 0$ . Then ([9], Theorems 5.4),  $\mathcal{H}_Y = \{h + c, h \in \mathcal{H}_{*,Y}, c \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_Y}^2 = \min \{ \|h\|_{\mathcal{H}_{*,Y}}^2 + c^2/c_*^2 : h + c = g, h \in \mathcal{H}_{*,Y}, c \in \mathbb{R} \}, \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_Y.$$

Notice that we therefore have  $\langle g, c \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y} = 0$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{*,Y}$  and all  $c \in \mathbb{R}$ . Now, let  $f \in \mathcal{H}_Y$  and  $c \in \mathbb{R}$  be such that  $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|x}}[f(Y) - c] \in \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$ . Notice that such a constant  $c$  exists by Assumption 5 and because of the above decomposition  $\mathcal{H}_Y = \{h + c, h \in \mathcal{H}_{*,Y}, c \in \mathbb{R}\}$ . Then, following the computations in the proof of Corollary 3 of [6] and Theorem 4 of [11], for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|x}}[f(Y) - c] = \langle f(Y) - c, \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y} = \langle f, \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y}.$$

Hence, noting that  $\langle a, c'_* \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y} = a$  for all  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ , it follows that for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|x}}[f(Y)] &= \langle f, \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y} + c \\ &= \langle (f - c) + c, c'_* + \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y} \\ &= \langle f, c'_* + \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(k_{*,X}(x, \cdot)) \rangle_{\mathcal{H}_Y}, \end{aligned}$$

which concludes to show (26).

We now let  $\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|x}} : \mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{*,X} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  be the (unique) linear operator on  $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$  such that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|x}}(f_1 \otimes f_2) = f_1 \otimes \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|x}}(f_2), \quad f_1 \in \mathcal{H}_X, f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$$

and let  $\|T\|_0$  be the operator norm of a linear operator  $T$ .

Then, recalling that  $\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}$  is bounded and that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_{*,X}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_X}$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$ , for all  $f_1 \in \mathcal{H}_X$  and  $f_2 \in \mathcal{H}_{*,X}$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|x}}(f_1 \otimes f_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}} &= \|f_1 \otimes \mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}(f_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \|f_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_X} \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}(f_2)\|_{\mathcal{H}_Y} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \|f_1\|_{\mathcal{H}_X} \|f_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_X} \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0 \\
&= \|f_1 \otimes f_2\|_{\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_X} \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0
\end{aligned}$$

and therefore

$$\|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_Y|X}\|_0 \leq \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0. \quad (27)$$

Next, remark that for every  $f \in \mathcal{H}_X$  the linear operator  $(f \otimes \cdot) : \mathcal{H}_Y \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is bounded. Indeed,

$$\|f \otimes g\|_{\mathcal{H}} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_X} \|g\|_{\mathcal{H}_Y}, \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{H}_X, \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_Y$$

showing that

$$\|f \otimes \cdot\|_0 \leq \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}_X}. \quad (28)$$

Recall now that if  $T : A \rightarrow B$  is linear and bounded and  $Z$  is a random variable taking values in a Hilbert space  $A$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\|Z\|_A] < \infty$  then  $\mathbb{E}[T(Z)] = T(\mathbb{E}[Z])$  ([5] Proposition 1.6).

Let  $\tilde{\mu}(P_X) = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_{\star, X}(X, \cdot)]$  be the embedding of  $P_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  in  $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_X$ . Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu(P') &:= \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim P'} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_Y(Y, \cdot)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|X}} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_Y(Y, \cdot)] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} \left[ k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|X}} [k_Y(Y, \cdot)] \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} \left[ k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes \mu(P_{Y|\cdot}) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} \left[ k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star + \mathcal{C}_{P_{Y|X}}(k_{\star, X}(X, \cdot)) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star] + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} \left[ \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}}(k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_{\star, X}(X, \cdot)) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star] + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_{\star, X}(X, \cdot)] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star] + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}} \tilde{\mu}(P'_X)
\end{aligned}$$

where the interchanges between expectation and tensor product in the third and sixth equalities are justified by (28) and (27), respectively, while the fifth equality holds by (26).

Similarly, we have

$$\mu(P'') := \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim P''} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes k_Y(Y, \cdot)] = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P''_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star] + \tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}} \tilde{\mu}(P''_X)$$

and thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{D}_k(P', P'') &= \|\mu(P') - \mu(P'')\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\leq \|\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P'_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P''_X} [k_X(X, \cdot) \otimes c'_\star]\|_{\mathcal{H}} + \|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}}(\tilde{\mu}(P'_X) - \tilde{\mu}(P''_X))\|_{\mathcal{H}} \\
&\leq c'_\star \mathbb{D}_{k_X}(P'_X, P''_X) + \|\tilde{\mathcal{C}}_{P_{Y|X}}\|_0 \|\tilde{\mu}(P'_X) - \tilde{\mu}(P''_X)\|_{\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\star, X}} \\
&\leq c'_\star \mathbb{D}_{k_X}(P'_X, P''_X) + \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0 \mathbb{D}_{k_X k_{\star, X}}(P'_X, P''_X) \\
&\leq (c'_\star + \|\mathcal{C}_{P^*} \circ \mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0) \max\left(\mathbb{D}_{k_X}(P'_X, P''_X), \mathbb{D}_{k_X k_{\star, X}}(P'_X, P''_X)\right) \\
&\leq (c'_\star + 2\|\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_0) \max\left(\mathbb{D}_{k_X}(P'_X, P''_X), \mathbb{D}_{k_X k_{\star, X}}(P'_X, P''_X)\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality uses the fact that, as  $k_Y$  is bounded by 1,  $\|\mathcal{C}_{P^*}\|_0 \leq 2$ .



Since  $P_X^* \in \mathcal{A}_{k_X}$  is arbitrary, this shows the result of the lemma with

$$C_{k_X, k_Y} = c'_* + 2 \inf_{P_X^* \in \mathcal{A}_{k_X}} \|\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_o$$

which depends on  $k_X$  and  $k_Y$ . In order to make the statement simpler, we can remark that  $c'_* \leq 1$  (indeed:  $k_Y(y, y) \leq 1$ , so  $k_Y(y, y) - 1 \leq 0$  which prevents  $k_Y - 1$  to be a positive semi-definite kernel). So the result of the lemma also holds with

$$C_{k_X} = 1 + 2 \inf_{P_X^* \in \mathcal{A}_{k_X}} \|\mathcal{C}_{P_X^*}^{-1}\|_o. \quad \square$$

### B.3.2. Proof of the lemma

*Proof of Lemma 2.* Let  $c_* \geq 0$  be as in Lemma 6 and, for short,

$$D(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0) = \max\left(\mathbb{D}_{k_X}(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0), \mathbb{D}_{k_X(k_X - c_*)}(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)\right).$$

Lemma 6 applied to  $P_X' = \hat{P}_X^{n,0}$  and  $P_X'' = P_X^0$  yields

$$\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, P_{\hat{\theta}_n}) \leq C_{k_X} D(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0) \quad (29)$$

(note that (25) in the lemma is satisfied thanks to Assumption 5) and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, P_{\hat{\theta}_n})\right] &\leq C_{k_X} \mathbb{E}\left[D(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)\right] \leq C_{k_X} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[D^2(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)^2\right]} \\ &\leq C_{k_X} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_{k_X}^2(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_{k_X(k_X - c_*)}^2(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)\right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Each of the terms under the radical above can be bounded thanks to Lemma 3: first, with  $Z_i = X_i \sim Q_i = P_X^0$  and  $K = k_X$ , then, still with  $Z_i = X_i \sim Q_i = P_X^0$  but with  $K = k_X(k_X - c_*)$ . We obtain:

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}^n, P_{\hat{\theta}_n})\right] \leq \frac{\sqrt{2}C_{k_X}}{\sqrt{n}}. \quad (30)$$

Now:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_k(P_{\hat{\theta}_n}, P^0)\right] &\leq \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_k(P_{\hat{\theta}_n}, \hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n})\right] + \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}, P^0)\right] \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}C_{k_X}}{\sqrt{n}} + \left(\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + 8\epsilon + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

where we used (30) to upper bound the first term, and Theorem 5 for the second term. This ends the proof of the bound in expectation.

Let us now prove the inequality in probability. Let  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  and use once again the bounded difference inequality to get

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0) - \mathbb{E}\left[D(\hat{P}_X^{n,0}, P_X^0)\right] \leq \sqrt{\frac{2\log(2/\eta)}{n}}\right\} \geq 1 - \frac{\eta}{2}$$

while, by Theorem 5,

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\hat{\theta}_n}, P^0) \leq 8\epsilon + \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} \left(1 + \sqrt{2\log(4/\eta)}\right)\right\} \leq 1 - \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

Together with (29), and using a union bound, we obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\mathbb{D}_k(\hat{P}_{\check{\theta}_n}, P^0) \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, P^0) + \frac{3(1 + \sqrt{2 \log(4/\eta)}) + C_{k_X}(\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\eta)})}{\sqrt{n}}\right\} \geq 1 - \eta.$$

We simplify the expression by noting that  $\sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2 \log(2)} < 1 + \sqrt{2 \log(4)}$ .  $\square$

## B.4. Proof of Theorem 1 and Theorem 2

### B.4.1. Preliminary result

**Lemma 7.** *Let  $\|\cdot\|$  be a semi-norm on  $\Theta$ . Let  $M : \Theta \rightarrow [0, 2]$  be such that there exists a unique  $\theta_\star \in \Theta$  verifying  $\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} M(\theta) = M(\theta_\star)$  and such that there exists a neighborhood  $U$  of  $\theta_\star$  and a constant  $\mu > 0$  for which*

$$M(\theta) - M(\theta_\star) \geq \mu \|\theta - \theta_\star\|, \quad \forall \theta \in U.$$

*Let  $(\check{\theta}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  be a sequence of random variables taking values in  $\Theta$  and such that there exist a strictly increasing function  $h_1 : (0, \infty) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$  with  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} h_1(x) = \infty$ , a continuous and strictly decreasing function  $h_2 : (0, 1) \rightarrow (0, \infty)$ , and a constant  $x \geq 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{M(\check{\theta}_n) < M(\theta_\star) + x + \frac{h_2(\eta)}{h_1(n)}\right\} \geq 1 - \eta, \quad \forall \eta \in (0, 1), \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (31)$$

*Then for any  $t > 0$ ,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq x/\mu + t\right\} \leq 2h_2^{-1}[(\mu t) \wedge (\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)],$$

*and*

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| < \frac{x}{\mu} + \frac{h_2(\frac{\eta}{2})}{\mu h_1(n)}\right\} \geq 1 - \eta, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad \forall \eta \in [2h_2^{-1}((\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)), 1)$$

*where  $\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} M(\theta) - M(\theta_\star) \in (0, 2]$ .*

Note that it would also be possible to get a result on  $\mathbb{E}[\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\|]$ , but at the price of the additional assumption that the parameter space  $\Theta$  is bounded:  $\sup_{(\theta, \theta') \in \Theta^2} \|\theta - \theta'\|_\Theta < \infty$ .

*Proof of Lemma 7.* Note that (31) is equivalent to

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{M(\check{\theta}_n) - M(\theta_\star) - x > t\right\} \leq h_2^{-1}(th_1(n)), \quad \forall t > 0, \quad \forall n \geq 1. \quad (32)$$

Remind that  $\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} M(\theta) - M(\theta_\star)$ . It is immediate to see that  $\alpha \leq 2$ . Moreover,  $\alpha > 0$ , otherwise,  $U^c$  being a closed set, there would be a  $\theta' \in U^c$  such that  $M(\theta') - M(\theta_\star) = 0$ .

Now, for any  $t > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq t + x/\mu\right\} \\ &= \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq t + x/\mu, \check{\theta}_n \in U\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq t + x/\mu, \check{\theta}_n \notin U\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{M(\check{\theta}) - M(\theta_\star) \geq \mu t + x, \check{\theta}_n \in U\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{\check{\theta}_n \notin U\right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}\left\{M(\check{\theta}) - M(\theta_\star) - x \geq \mu t\right\} + \mathbb{P}\left\{M(\check{\theta}) - M(\theta_\star) \geq \alpha\right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq h_2^{-1}(\mu t h_1(n)) + h_2^{-1}((\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n))$$

where we used (32) for the last inequality. As  $h_2^{-1}$  is strictly decreasing, we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq t + x/\mu\} \leq 2h_2^{-1}[(\mu t) \wedge (\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)]. \quad (33)$$

Fix  $\eta \in [2h_2^{-1}((\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)), 1)$  as in the statement of the lemma, and note that

$$2h_2^{-1}[(\mu t) \wedge (\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)] = \eta \Leftrightarrow t = \frac{h_2(\frac{\eta}{2})}{\mu h_1(n)}.$$

Plugging these values in (33), we obtain:

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| < \frac{x}{\mu} + \frac{h_2(\frac{\eta}{2})}{\mu h_1(n)}\right\} \geq 1 - \eta. \quad \square$$

We are now ready to prove the Theorems 1 and 2.

#### B.4.2. Proof of the corollary and of the theorem

*Proof of Theorem 1.* From Lemma (1), (31) in Lemma 7 holds with  $\theta_\star = \theta_0$ ,  $x = 4\epsilon$ ,  $h_1(n) = \sqrt{n}$ ,  $h_2(\eta) = 2 + \sqrt{2 \log(1/\eta)}$  and  $\check{\theta}_n = \hat{\theta}_n$ . Apply Lemma 7 to get:

$$\sum_{n \geq 1} \mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \geq \frac{4\epsilon}{\mu} + t\right\} \leq 2 \sum_{n \geq 1} \exp\left[-\frac{[(\mu t) \wedge (\alpha - x)_+ \sqrt{n} - 2]^2}{2}\right] < \infty, \quad \forall t > 0$$

showing that  $\mathbb{P}(\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| \leq 4\epsilon/\mu) = 1$ . Lemma 7 also states

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\|\check{\theta}_n - \theta_\star\| < \frac{h_2(\frac{\eta}{2})}{\mu h_1(n)}\right\} \geq 1 - \eta, \quad \forall n \geq 1, \quad \forall \eta \in [2h_2^{-1}((\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)), 1).$$

Note that

$$\frac{h_2(\frac{\eta}{2})}{\mu h_1(n)} = \frac{1}{\mu \sqrt{n}} \left(2 + \sqrt{2 \log(2/\eta)}\right)$$

and  $2h_2^{-1}((\alpha - x)_+ h_1(n)) = 2 \exp(-((\alpha - x)_+ \sqrt{n} - 2)^2/2)$ . For the sake of simplicity, we only consider  $n \geq 16/(\alpha - x)_+^2$ , in this case, we have  $(\alpha - x)_+ \sqrt{n} - 2 \geq (\alpha - x)_+ \sqrt{n}/2$  and thus the result holds in particular for any  $\eta \in [2 \exp(-n(\alpha - x)_+^2/8), 1)$ . Finally, remind that  $x = 4\epsilon < \alpha/8$  so it holds in particular for  $n \geq 64/\alpha^2$  and  $\eta \in [2 \exp(-n\alpha^2/32), 1)$ .  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 2.* From Lemma 2, (31) in Lemma 7 holds with  $h_1(n) = \sqrt{n}$ ,  $h_2(\eta) = (C_{k_X} + 3)(1 + \sqrt{2 \log(4/\eta)})$  and  $\check{\theta}_n = \hat{\theta}_n$ . Then, the result is proved following the computations done in the proof of Theorem 1.  $\square$

#### B.5. Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof of Proposition 1.* Let  $f : \Theta \rightarrow [0, 4]$  be defined by

$$f(\theta) = (\mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, \tilde{P}^0) - \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, \tilde{P}^0))^2, \quad \theta \in \Theta$$

and let  $U$  be an open set containing  $\theta_0$  such that  $f$  is twice continuously differentiable on  $U$ . Let  $H_\theta$  be the Hessian matrix of  $f$  evaluated at  $\theta \in U$ .

Then, using Taylor's theorem, for every  $\theta \in U$  we have, for some  $\tau \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} f(\theta) &= f(\theta_0) + (\theta - \theta_0)^\top \nabla f(\theta_0) + \frac{1}{2}(\theta - \theta_0)^\top H_{\theta_0 + \tau(\theta - \theta_0)}(\theta - \theta_0) \\ &= (\theta - \theta_0)^\top H_{\theta_0 + \tau(\theta - \theta_0)}(\theta - \theta_0) \\ &\geq \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \frac{\lambda_{\min}(H_{\theta_0 + \tau(\theta - \theta_0)})}{2} \\ &\geq \|\theta - \theta_0\|^2 \frac{\inf_{\theta \in U, \tau \in [0, 1]} \lambda_{\min}(H_{\theta_0 + \tau(\theta - \theta_0)})}{2} \end{aligned}$$

where for every  $\theta \in U$  we denote by  $\lambda_{\min}(H_\theta)$  the minimum eigenvalue of  $H_\theta$ . Under the assumptions of the proposition, we can take  $U$  sufficiently small so that  $c := \inf_{\theta \in U, \tau \in [0, 1]} \lambda_{\min}(H_{\theta_0 + \tau(\theta - \theta_0)}) > 0$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{D}_k(P_\theta, \tilde{P}^0) - \mathbb{D}_k(P_{\theta_0}, \tilde{P}^0) = \sqrt{f(\theta)} \geq \sqrt{c/2} \|\theta - \theta_0\|$$

showing that (10) holds for  $\mu = \sqrt{c/2}$ .  $\square$

## B.6. Proof of Proposition 2 and of Theorem 3

### B.6.1. Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof of Proposition 2.* For all  $(\theta, x, y) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ , let

$$m_\theta(x, y) = \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{g(\theta, x)}} [k_Y(Y, Y') - 2k_Y(Y, y)] + \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{Y, Y' \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{Y|X}^0} [k_Y(Y, Y')] \right]$$

and remark that

$$\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim P^0} [m_\theta(X, Y)] = \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2], \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

Under the assumptions of the theorem, the mapping  $\theta \mapsto m_\theta(x, y)$  is continuous on the compact set  $\Theta$  and is such that  $|m_\theta(x, y)| \leq 4$  for all  $(\theta, x, y) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Then (see e.g. [13], page 46)

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_\theta(X_i, Y_i) - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \right| \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{in } \mathbb{P}\text{-probability}$$

and therefore, noting that  $\tilde{\theta}_n \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta \in \Theta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n m_\theta(X_i, Y_i)$ , the result follows by Theorem 5.7 in [13].  $\square$

### B.6.2. Proof of Theorem 3

*Proof of Theorem 3.* Let  $\epsilon \in [0, 1)$  and, for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , let  $\tilde{P}_{Y|x}^0 = (1 - \epsilon)P_{Y|x}^0 + \epsilon Q_{Y|x}$  and  $\tilde{P}_X^0 = (1 - \epsilon)P_X^0 + \epsilon Q_X$  where  $Q_X$  denotes the distribution of  $X$  under  $Q$ .

Then, for all  $\theta \in \Theta$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0) + \mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{Y|X}^0, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0))^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0) + 2\epsilon)^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0)^2) + 8\epsilon + 4\epsilon^2] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0)^2) + 12\epsilon] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \tilde{P}_X^0} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0)^2) + 12\epsilon] \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where the third inequality the fact uses the that, since  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ ,  $\mathbb{P}(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0) \leq 2) = 1$ , the penultimate inequality holds since  $\epsilon < 1$  and the last inequality holds since  $\mathbb{E}_{X \sim Q_X} [(\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0)^2)] \geq 0$  for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ .

Then, applying (34) with  $\theta = \tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon}$  yields

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon}, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \tilde{P}_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0)^2] + 12\epsilon \\
& \leq \frac{1}{1 - \epsilon} \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim \tilde{P}_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] + \frac{12\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} + 12\epsilon \\
& \leq \inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] + \frac{24\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} + \frac{12\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} + 16\epsilon \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] + \frac{52\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$

where the second inequality follows by swapping  $\tilde{P}_{Y|X}^0$  and  $P_{Y|X}^0$  in (34) and the third one uses the fact that, since  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ ,

$$\mathbb{E}_{X \sim Q_X} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \leq 4, \quad \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

By assumption,  $\tilde{\theta}_0$  is the unique minimizer of the function  $\theta \mapsto \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2]$  and therefore (see the proof of Lemma 7)

$$\alpha = \inf_{\theta \in U^c} \left( \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \right) > 0.$$

Together with (35), this shows that if

$$\frac{52\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} < \alpha \Leftrightarrow \epsilon < \frac{\alpha}{52 + \alpha}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon}, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \\
& < \inf_{\theta \in U^c} \left( \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\theta, X)}, \tilde{P}^0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, \tilde{P}^0)^2] \right)
\end{aligned}$$

implying that  $\tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon} \in U$ . Consequently, using again (35),

$$\frac{52\epsilon}{1 - \epsilon} \geq \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon}, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] - \mathbb{E}_{X \sim P_X^0} [\mathbb{D}_{k_Y}(P_{g(\tilde{\theta}_0, X)}, P_{Y|X}^0)^2] \geq \mu \|\tilde{\theta}_{Q, \epsilon} - \theta_0\|$$

and the result follows.  $\square$

## B.7. Proof of Proposition 3

### B.7.1. A preliminary lemma

We start with a lemma showing that, under mild conditions on  $k_Y$ , the kernel  $k_{\alpha, \gamma_x}$  on  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ , defined in Section 4, is such that the kernel  $k_{\alpha, \gamma_x} \otimes k_Y$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is characteristic.

**Lemma 8.** Let  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ ,  $k_X = k_{\alpha, \gamma_x}$  for some  $\alpha, \gamma_x > 0$  and let  $k_Y$  be defined by

$$k_Y(y, y') = \beta K(y, y') + (1 - \beta), \quad (y, y') \in \mathcal{Y}$$

for some  $\beta \in (0, 1]$  and for some continuous, bounded and translation invariant characteristic kernel  $K$  on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Then, the kernel  $k = k_X \otimes k_Y$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is characteristic.

*Proof of Lemma 8.* Let  $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Z})$ ,  $\psi_Z : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow (0, 1)^d \times \mathcal{Y}$  be defined by  $\psi_Z((x, y)) = (\psi(x), y)$ ,  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{Z}$ , and let  $P_{\psi_Z}, Q_{\psi_Z} \in \mathcal{P}((0, 1)^d \times \mathcal{Y})$  be such that

$$P_{\psi_Z}(A) = P(\psi_Z^{-1}(A)), \quad Q_{\psi_Z}(A) = P(\psi_Z^{-1}(A)), \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}((0, 1)^d) \times \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$$

with  $\mathcal{B}((0, 1)^d)$  the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $(0, 1)^d$ .

Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{D}_k(P, Q) &= \mathbb{E}_{Z_1, Z_2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P} [k(Z_1, Z_2)] + \mathbb{E}_{Z'_1, Z'_2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} Q} [k(Z'_1, Z'_2)] - 2\mathbb{E}_{Z_1 \sim P, Z'_1 \sim Q} [k(Z_1, Z'_1)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}_1, \tilde{Z}_2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{\psi_Z}} [k(\psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}_1), \psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}_2))] + \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}'_1, \tilde{Z}'_2 \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} Q_{\psi_Z}} [k(\psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}'_1), \psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}'_2))] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{Z}_1 \sim P_{\psi_Z}, \tilde{Z}'_1 \sim Q_{\psi_Z}} [k(\psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}_1), \psi^{-1}(\tilde{Z}'_1))] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{X}_1, Y_1), (\tilde{X}_2, Y_2) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} P_{\psi_Z}} [K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}(\|\tilde{X}_1 - \tilde{X}_2\|)k_Y(Y_1, Y_2)] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{X}'_1, Y'_1), (\tilde{X}'_2, Y'_2) \stackrel{\text{iid}}{\sim} Q_{\psi_Z}} [K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}(\|\tilde{X}'_1 - \tilde{X}'_2\|)k_Y(Y'_1, Y'_2)] \\ &\quad - 2\mathbb{E}_{(\tilde{X}_1, Y_1) \sim P_{\psi_Z}, (\tilde{X}'_1, Y'_1) \sim Q_{\psi_Z}} [K_{\alpha, \gamma_X}(\|\tilde{X}_1 - \tilde{X}'_1\|)k_Y(Y_1, Y'_1)] \\ &= \mathbb{D}_{K_{\alpha, \gamma_X} \otimes k_Y}(P_{\psi_Z}, Q_{\psi_Z}). \end{aligned}$$

Under the assumptions of the lemma,  $k_Y$  is continuous, bounded, translation invariant and characteristic on  $\mathcal{Y}$  while the Matérn kernel is continuous, bounded, translation invariant and characteristic on  $\mathbb{R}^d$  [12]. Therefore from Theorems 3-4 in [10], the kernel  $K_{\alpha, \gamma_X} \otimes k_Y$  is characteristic on  $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathcal{Y}$  and thus

$$\mathbb{D}_k(P, Q) = \mathbb{D}_{K_{\alpha, \gamma_X} \otimes k_Y}(P_{\psi_Z}, Q_{\psi_Z}) = 0 \Leftrightarrow P_{\psi_Z} = Q_{\psi_Z}.$$

Together with the fact that  $P_{\psi_Z} = Q_{\psi_Z} \Leftrightarrow P = Q$ , this shows that  $\mathbb{D}_k(P, Q) = 0 \Leftrightarrow P = Q$ . Hence  $k$  is characteristic and the proof is complete.  $\square$

### B.7.2. Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof of Proposition 3.* Remark first that to prove the result it is enough to consider the case where  $(m + d)$  is even. Indeed, if  $(m + d)$  is odd then in what follows we can replace  $\mathcal{X}$  by  $\tilde{\mathcal{X}} = \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ , the function  $g : \Theta \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Lambda$  by the function  $\tilde{g} : \Theta \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\tilde{g}(\theta, (x, x')) = g(\theta, x)$  for all  $(\theta, x, x') \in \Theta \times \tilde{\mathcal{X}}$ , and  $d$  by  $\tilde{d} = d + 1$ .

Assumptions 1-2 are trivially verified while  $k$  is characteristic by Lemma 8, and thus to complete the proof of the theorem it remains to show that Assumption 4 holds. To this aim let  $k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d}$  be the restriction of  $K_{m/2, \gamma_x}$  to  $(0, 1)^d$ , and note that, because the set  $(0, 1)^d$  has Lipschitz boundary and  $m + d$  is even, the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d})$  is norm-equivalent to the Sobolev space  $W_2^s((0, 1)^d)$  ([7], Example 2.6). Then, since  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$  it follows that  $\mathcal{H}_X = \mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d}) = W_2^s((0, 1)^d)$  and thus the non-zero constant functions belong to  $\mathcal{H}_X$ . On the other hand, the definition of  $k_Y$  ensures that non-zero constant functions also belong to  $\mathcal{H}_Y$  ([9], Theorem 3.11) and thus Assumption 4 holds. The proof of the theorem is complete.  $\square$

## B.8. Proof of Theorem 4

### B.8.1. General sufficient conditions for Assumption 5

Let  $k_S$  be a kernel on some set  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(k_S)$  the RKHS over  $\mathcal{S}$  with reproducing kernel  $k_S$ ,  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and let us consider a regular conditional probability  $(P_{Y|s})_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$  on  $\mathcal{W}$ .

Then, the following result provides simple sufficient conditions to ensure that

$$\forall g \in \mathcal{H}_Y, \quad f(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|\cdot}}[g(Y)] \in \mathcal{H}(k_S). \quad (36)$$

**Theorem 6.** *Let  $k_S$  be a kernel on some set  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(k_S)$  be the RKHS over  $\mathcal{S}$  with reproducing kernel  $k_S$ ,  $\mathcal{W} \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and let us consider a regular conditional probability  $(P_{Y|s})_{s \in \mathcal{S}}$  on  $\mathcal{W}$  such that, for all  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ ,  $P_{Y|s} \ll dy$  for some  $\sigma$ -finite measure  $dy$  on  $(\mathcal{Y}, \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}})$ . For every  $s \in \mathcal{S}$ , let  $p(\cdot|s)$  be the Radon-Nikodym derivative of  $P_{Y|s}$  w.r.t. to  $dy$  and assume that the following conditions hold:*

1.  $p(y|\cdot) \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{W}$ ,
2. The function  $\mathcal{W} \ni y \mapsto p(y|\cdot)$  is Borel measurable,
3. For all  $y' \in \mathcal{W}$  the set  $\{k_Y(y', y)p(y|\cdot), y \in \mathcal{W}\}$  is separable,
4.  $\int_{\mathcal{W}} \|p(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_S)} dy < \infty$ .

Assume also that  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ . Then,  $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|\cdot}}[g(Y)] \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$  for all  $g \in \mathcal{H}_Y$ .

Remark that if  $\mathcal{W}$  is a finite set then Conditions 2 and 3 of the theorem always hold while Condition 4 is implied by Condition 1. Hence, in this case, assuming Conditions 1-4 reduces to assuming Condition 1, which is both sufficient and necessary for (36) to hold when  $\mathcal{W}$  is a finite set. When  $\mathcal{W}$  is not finite the additional Conditions 2-4 are used to show that, for all  $g \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$ , the function  $y \mapsto g(y)p(y|\cdot)$  is Bochner integrable and thus that  $\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|\cdot}}[g(Y)]$  is a well-defined function on  $\mathcal{S}$ .

To Prove Theorem 6 we first show the following preliminary result.

**Lemma 9.** *Let  $k_S$  be a kernel on some set  $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $\mathcal{H}(k_S)$  be the RKHS over  $\mathcal{S}$  with reproducing kernel  $k_S$ ,  $dy$  be a measure on  $(\mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \mathcal{Y})$  and  $f : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be such that*

1.  $f(\cdot, y) \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,
2. The function  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto f(\cdot, y)$  is Borel measurable,
3. The set  $\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$  is separable,
4.  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_S)} dy < \infty$ .

Assume also that  $|k_Y| \leq 1$ . Then,  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(\cdot, y) dy \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$ .

*Proof of Lemma 9.* Since the set  $\{f(\cdot, y) : y \in \mathcal{Y}\}$  is separable and the mapping  $y \mapsto f(\cdot, y)$  is Borel measurable the function  $y \mapsto f(\cdot, y)$  is strongly measurable. Therefore, there exist ([3], Proposition E.2) a sequence  $(\{E_{i,n}\}_{i=1}^n)_{n \geq 1}$  and a sequence  $(\{f_{i,n}\}_{i=1}^n)_{n \geq 1}$  such that

- $E_{i,n} \in \mathfrak{S}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and  $f_{i,n} \in \mathcal{H}(k_S)$  for all  $n \geq i \geq 1$ ,
- $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{E_{i,n}}(y) f_{i,n} - f(y, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_S)} = 0$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ,
- $\|\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{E_{i,n}}(y) f_{i,n}\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_S)} \leq \|f(y, \cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_S)}$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ .

For every  $n \geq 1$  let  $f_n : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined by

$$f_n(s, y) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{E_{i,n}}(y) f_{i,n}(s), \quad (s, y) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}.$$

Then, under the assumptions of the lemma we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_n(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy < \infty, \quad \forall n \geq 1,$$

and thus, for all  $n \geq 1$ , the simple function  $y \mapsto f_n(\cdot, y)$  is Bochner integrable. Consequently, for all  $n \geq 1$  the function

$$\tilde{f}_n := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f_n(\cdot, y) dy = \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \int_{E_{i,n}} dy \right) f_{i,n}$$

is well-defined. Notice that  $\tilde{f}_n \in \mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  for all  $n \geq 1$ .

To proceed further remark that, since  $|k_{\mathcal{Y}}| \leq 1$  by assumption,

$$|f_n(s, y)| \leq \|f_n(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}, \quad \forall (s, y) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$$

while  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy < \infty$  by assumption. Therefore, by the dominated convergence theorem, and using the fact that the convergence in  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}$  norm implies the point-wise convergence,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}_n(s) = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(s, y) dy, \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}. \quad (37)$$

Therefore, recalling that  $\tilde{f}_n \in \mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  for all  $n \geq 1$ , to complete the proof it remains to show that the sequence  $(\tilde{f}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is Cauchy w.r.t. the  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}$  norm.

To this aim remark that, since

$$\|f_n(\cdot, y) - f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} \leq 2\|f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}, \quad \forall n \geq 1$$

while, by assumption,  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy < \infty$ , the dominated convergence theorem implies that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_n(\cdot, y) - f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy = 0. \quad (38)$$

On the other hand, for every  $n > m \geq 1$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_n - \tilde{f}_m\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} &= \left\| \int_{\mathcal{Y}} (f_n(\cdot, y) - f_m(\cdot, y)) dy \right\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_n(\cdot, y) - f_m(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_n(\cdot, y) - f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy + \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_m(\cdot, y) - f(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the first inequality holds by ([3], Proposition E.5). Together, (38) and (39) show that the sequence  $(\tilde{f}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is indeed Cauchy w.r.t. the  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}$  norm, and the proof of the lemma is complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 6.* Let  $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  so that  $g = \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_i k_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_i, \cdot)$  for a sequence  $(y_i)_{i \geq 1}$  in  $\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Y}}$  and a sequence  $(a_i)_{i \geq 1}$  in  $\mathbb{R}$ . For all  $n \geq 1$  let  $g_n = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i k_{\mathcal{Y}}(y_i, \cdot)$  and  $f_n : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be defined



by  $f_n(s, y) = g_n(y)p(y|s)\mathbb{1}_W(y)$ ,  $(s, y) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . We first show that, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f_n$  verifies the assumptions of Lemma 9.

By Conditions 1 and 3 of the theorem, it readily follows that  $f_n$  verifies Conditions 1 and 3 of Lemma 9, for all  $n \geq 1$ . To show that this is also the case for Condition 2 of Lemma 9 let  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}))$  be the Borel  $\sigma$ -algebra on  $\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  and assume first that  $\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  contains the non-zero constant functions. Let  $n \geq 1$  and note that, under the assumptions of the lemma, the functions  $y \mapsto p(y|\cdot)$  and  $y \mapsto \mathbb{1}_W(y)g_n(y)$  are  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}))$ -measurable, and thus the function  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto f_n(\cdot, y)$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}))$ -measurable since the product of two Borel measurable functions is a Borel measurable function. Assume now that  $\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  does not contain the non-zero constant functions. Then, as shown above, the function  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto f_n(\cdot, y)$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}} + 1))$ -measurable, meaning that

$$\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f_n(\cdot|y) \in A\} \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}} + 1)). \quad (40)$$

Recalling that  $\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}} + 1) = \{f + c, f \in \mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}), c \in \mathbb{R}\}$  and that  $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}+1)} = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}$  for all  $f \in \mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$  ([9], Theorem 5.4), it follows that  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})) \subset \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}} + 1))$  which, together with (40), implies that

$$\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f_n(\cdot|y) \in A\} \in \mathfrak{G}_{\mathcal{Y}}, \quad \forall A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})).$$

This shows that the function  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto f_n(\cdot, y)$  is  $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}}))$ -measurable, and thus, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f_n$  satisfies Condition 2 of Lemma 9.

Lastly, using the fact that  $|k_{\mathcal{Y}}| \leq 1$  and Condition 4 of the theorem, for all  $n \geq 1$  we have

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|f_n(\cdot, y)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \leq \left( \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |g_n(y)| \right) \int_{\mathcal{W}} \|p(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \leq \|g_n\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Y}}} \int_{\mathcal{W}} \|p(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy < \infty$$

and thus, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f_n$  verifies Condition 4 of Lemma 9, which concludes to show that, for all  $n \geq 1$ ,  $f_n$  verifies all the assumptions of Lemma 9.

Therefore, by Lemma 9, the function  $\tilde{f}_n := \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f_n(\cdot, y) dy$  exists and belongs to  $\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$ , for all  $n \geq 1$ . In addition, for all  $n > m \geq 1$  we have (see [3], Proposition E.5, for the first inequality)

$$\begin{aligned} \|\tilde{f}_n - \tilde{f}_m\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} &= \left\| \int_{\mathcal{W}} (g_n - g_m)(y)p(y|\cdot) dy \right\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} \\ &\leq \int_{\mathcal{W}} |g_n(y) - g_m(y)| \|p(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy \\ &\leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |g_n(y) - g_m(y)| \int_{\mathcal{W}} \|p(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})} dy, \end{aligned}$$

where, since  $|k_{\mathcal{Y}}| \leq 1$  by assumption,

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left( \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |g_n(y) - g_m(y)| \right) \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \|g_n - g_m\|_{\mathcal{H}_{\mathcal{Y}}} = 0. \quad (41)$$

Consequently, the sequence  $(\tilde{f}_n)_{n \geq 1}$  is Cauchy w.r.t. the  $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})}$  norm, and therefore converges point-wise to a function  $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{H}(k_{\mathcal{S}})$ . Thus, to complete the proof it remains to show that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{f}_n(s) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|s}}[g(Y)], \quad \forall s \in \mathcal{S}.$$

Since for every  $n \geq 1$  and  $s \in \mathcal{S}$  we have

$$|\tilde{f}_n(s) - \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|s}}[g(Y)]| \leq \int_{\mathcal{W}} |g_n(y) - g(y)| p(y|s) dy \leq \sup_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |g_n(y) - g(y)|,$$

it follows, by (41), that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} |\tilde{f}_n(s) - \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{Y|s}}[g(Y)]| = 0$ , and the proof of the theorem is complete.  $\square$

### B.8.2. A technical lemma

**Lemma 10.** *Assume that each  $P_\lambda$  has a density  $p_\lambda$  with respect to a measure  $\mu$  and that for every  $(\theta, y) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{Y}$  all the partial derivative of order  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  of the function  $\mathcal{X} \ni x \mapsto p_{g(\theta, x)}(y)$  exist. For every  $(\theta, u, y) \in \Theta \times (0, 1)^d \times \mathcal{Y}$  and  $a \in A_s$  let*

$$\tilde{h}_{a, \theta}(y, u) := \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d a_i}}{\partial u_1^{a_1} \dots \partial u_d^{a_d}} p_{g(\theta, \psi_{(d)}^{-1}(u))}(y).$$

Then, there exists a constant  $C_s < \infty$  such that, for all  $(u, y, a) \in (0, 1)^d \times \mathcal{Y} \times A_s$ , we have

$$|h_{a, \theta}(y, u)| \leq C_s \left( \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + \psi^{-1}(u_i)^2)^{\lambda_i + 1} \right) \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \left| \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i}}{\partial x_1^{\lambda_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\lambda_d}} p_{g(\theta, \psi_{(d)}^{-1}(u))}(y) \right|$$

where  $I_a = \{\lambda \in A_s : \lambda_i \leq a_i, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, d\}\}$ .

*Proof of Lemma 10.* Let  $(\theta, y, u) \in \Theta \times \mathcal{Y} \times (0, 1)^d$  and  $a \in A_s$ . Then, it is easy to check that for some constant  $C'_a < \infty$  we have

$$|h_{a, \theta}(y, u)| \leq C'_a \left( \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \prod_{i=1}^d \frac{d^{\lambda_i} \psi^{-1}(u_i)}{du_i^{\lambda_i}} \right) \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \left| \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i}}{\partial x_1^{\lambda_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\lambda_d}} p_{g(\theta, \psi_{(d)}^{-1}(u))}(y) \right| \quad (42)$$

using the convention

$$\frac{d^{\lambda_i} \psi^{-1}(u_i)}{du_i^{\lambda_i}} = 1$$

when  $\lambda_i = 0$ . Thus, to prove the lemma we need to find an appropriate upper bound for the term in bracket in (42).

To this aim we remark that for every  $m \in \mathbb{N}$  there exists a constant  $\tilde{C}_m < \infty$  such that

$$\frac{d^m \psi^{-1}(u_1)}{du_1^m} \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_m}{u_1^{m+1} (1 - u_1)^{m+1}}, \quad \forall u_1 \in (0, 1). \quad (43)$$

Next, remark that for  $z \neq 0$  we have

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(z)(1 - \psi(z)) &= \left( \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2}{2z} \right) \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2}{2z} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{4} - \left( \frac{\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2}{2z} \right)^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} - \frac{4 + z^2 + 4 - 4\sqrt{4 + z^2}}{4z^2} \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2}{z^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Therefore, for some constant  $C < \infty$  we have

$$\frac{1}{\psi(z)(1 - \psi(z))} \leq 4 + z^2 C \Leftrightarrow C \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2} - \frac{4}{z^2} = \frac{z^2 - 4\sqrt{4 + z^2} + 8}{z^2(\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2)} =: g(z).$$

We note that  $\lim_{|z| \rightarrow \infty} g(z) = 0$  while, using l'hospital's rule,

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow 0} g(z) = \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{2z - 4z(4 + z^2)^{-1/2}}{2z(\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2) + z^3(4 + z^2)^{-1/2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{2 - 4(4 + z^2)^{-1/2}}{2(\sqrt{4 + z^2} - 2) + z^2(4 + z^2)^{-1/2}} \\
&= \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{4z(4 + z^2)^{-3/2}}{2z(4 + z^2)^{-1/2} + 2z(4 + z^2)^{-1/2} - z^3(4 + z^2)^{-3/2}} \\
&= \lim_{z \rightarrow 0} \frac{4(4 + z^2)^{-3/2}}{2(4 + z^2)^{-1/2} + 2(4 + z^2)^{-1/2} - z^2(4 + z^2)^{-3/2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Consequently, letting  $\tilde{C} = \sup_{z \in \mathbb{R}} g(z) < \infty$  and recalling that  $\psi(0) = 1/2$  (so that  $\psi(0)(1 - \psi(0)) = 1/4$ ), it follows that

$$\frac{1}{\psi(z)(1 - \psi(z))} \leq 4 + z^2 \tilde{C}, \quad \forall z \in \mathbb{R}. \quad (45)$$

Together with (43), this implies that

$$\frac{d^m \psi^{-1}(u_1)}{du_1^m} \leq \tilde{C}_m (4 + \psi^{-1}(u_1)^2 \tilde{C})^{m+1} \leq \tilde{C}_m^{2m+1} (1 + \psi^{-1}(u_1)^2)^{m+1} \quad \forall u_1 \in (0, 1)$$

where the second inequality assumes without loss of generality that  $\tilde{C}_m \geq \tilde{C} \geq 4$ . Together with (42), this shows that the result of the lemma holds for

$$C_s = \max\{\tilde{C}_m^{2m+1}, m \in \{1, \dots, s\}\} \times \max\{C'_a, a \in A_s\}.$$

The proof is complete.  $\square$

### B.8.3. Proof of Theorem 4

*Proof of Theorem 4.* As in the proof of Proposition 3, below we assume without loss of generality that  $(m + d)$  is even so that  $\mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0,1)^d})$  is norm-equivalent to the Sobolev space  $W_2^s((0, 1)^d)$ , where  $k_{m/2, (0,1)^d}$  denotes the restriction of  $K_{m/2, \gamma_x}$  to  $(0, 1)^d$ .

For every  $(u, \theta) \in (0, 1)^d \times \Theta$  let  $\tilde{g}(\theta, u) = g(\theta, \psi_{(d)}^{-1}(u))$ . Then, since  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^d$ , so that  $\mathcal{H}_X = \mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0,1)^d})$ , it follows that Assumption 5 holds if and only if

$$\mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{\tilde{g}(\theta, \cdot)}}[g(Y)] \in \mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0,1)^d}), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{H}_Y, \quad \theta \in \Theta. \quad (46)$$

For every  $(u, \theta) \in (0, 1)^d \times \Theta$  let  $\tilde{p}_\theta(\cdot | u) = p_{\tilde{g}(\theta, u)}$ . Notice that  $\tilde{p}_\theta(\cdot | u)$  is the density of  $P_{\tilde{g}(\theta, u)}$  w.r.t. the measure  $\mu$ .

We now fix  $\theta \in \Theta$  and show that the density  $p(\cdot | \cdot) := \tilde{p}_\theta(\cdot | \cdot)$  verifies Conditions 1-4 of Theorem 6, with  $\mathcal{S} = (0, 1)^d$ ,  $k_{\mathcal{S}} = k_{m/2, (0,1)^d}$ ,  $\mathcal{W} = \mathcal{Y}$  and with  $dy = \mu(dy)$ .

To this aim let  $(y, a) \in \mathcal{Y} \times A_s$  and

$$\tilde{h}_{a, \theta}(y, u) = \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d a_i}}{\partial u_1^{a_1} \dots \partial u_d^{a_d}} \tilde{p}_\theta(y | u), \quad \forall u \in (0, 1)^d.$$

Let  $|J(x)|$  be the Jacobian determinant of  $\psi_{(d)}$  evaluated at  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , and note that  $\sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |J(x)| < \infty$ . Then, by Lemma 10, there exists a constant  $C_s < \infty$  such that

$$\int_{(0,1)^d} \tilde{h}_{a, \theta}(y, u)^2 \Lambda_d(du) \leq C_s^2 \int_{(0,1)^d} h_{a, \theta}(y, \psi_{(d)}^{-1}(u))^2 \Lambda_d(du)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= C_s^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} |J(x)| h_{a,\theta}(y, x)^2 \Lambda_d(dx) \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |J(x)| C_s^2 \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} h_{a,\theta}(y, x)^2 \Lambda_d(dx) \\
&< \infty
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds under (C1). Therefore,  $\tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot) \in W_2^s((0, 1)^d) = \mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d})$  for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , showing that  $\tilde{p}_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$  verifies Condition 1 of Theorem 6. Following a similar argument, it is direct to see that under (C2) we have  $\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|\tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot)\|_{W_2^s((0, 1)^d)} \mu(dy) < \infty$ , and since  $\mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d})$  is norm-equivalent to  $W_2^s((0, 1)^d)$  it follows that

$$\int_{\mathcal{Y}} \|\tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot)\|_{\mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d})} \mu(dy) < \infty$$

as required by Condition 4 of Theorem 6.

Next, we note that if  $\mathcal{Y}$  is countable then Condition 2-3 of Theorem 6 trivially hold, and we now show that these two conditions are also verified under (C3)b).

We first note that, because each  $\mathcal{Y}_m$  is separable and  $\mathcal{Y} = \cup_{m=1}^M \mathcal{Y}_m$  with  $M$  finite, and recalling that a finite union of separable sets is separable, to show that Condition 3 of Theorem 6 holds it suffices to show that, for all  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$  and for every  $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ , the function

$$\mathcal{Y}_m \ni y \mapsto K_y(y', y) \tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot) \in \mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d}) \quad (47)$$

is continuous. Let  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ ,  $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$  and note that, since  $k_{\mathcal{Y}}$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$  by assumption while the RKHS  $\mathcal{H}(k_{m/2, (0, 1)^d})$  is norm-equivalent to  $W_2^s((0, 1)^d)$ , to show that the function defined in (47) is continuous it suffices to show that, for all  $a \in A_s$ , the function

$$\mathcal{Y}_m \ni y \mapsto \int_{(0, 1)^d} \tilde{h}_{a,\theta}(y, u)^2 \Lambda_d(du) \quad (48)$$

is continuous. Under (C3)b), part (i), for all  $u \in (0, 1)^d$  and all  $a \in A_s$  the function  $\mathcal{Y}_m \ni y \mapsto \tilde{h}_{a,\theta}(y, u)$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Moreover, by Lemma 10, for all  $(a, y) \in A_s \times \mathcal{Y}_m$  we have

$$\sup_{u \in (0, 1)^d} |\tilde{h}_{a,\theta}(y, u)| \leq C_s \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^d} |h_{a,\theta}(y, x)| < \infty$$

where the second inequality holds under (C3)b), part (iii). Then, for all  $a \in A_s$ , the continuity of the function defined in (48) follows from the dominated convergence theorem, which concludes to show that Condition 3 of Theorem 6 holds under (C3)b). Finally, noting that the continuity of the mapping  $\mathcal{Y}_m \ni y \mapsto \tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot)$  implies its Borel measurability, it follows that under (C3)b) the function  $\mathcal{Y}_m \ni y \mapsto \tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot)$  is Borel measurable for all  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , and thus that the mapping  $\mathcal{Y} \ni y \mapsto \tilde{p}_\theta(y|\cdot)$  is Borel measurable. This concludes to show that the density  $\tilde{p}_\theta(\cdot|\cdot)$  verifies the Conditions 1-4 of Theorem 6 under (C1)-(C3).

Finally, since we have  $|k_{\mathcal{Y}}| \leq 1$  by assumption, it follows that (46) holds by Theorem 6, implying that Assumption 5 is satisfied. The proof of the theorem is complete.  $\square$

## B.9. Sketch of the proof of Corollary 1

*Sketch of proof of Corollary 1.* Remark first that to prove the corollary we only need to show that Assumption 5 is verified for the considered models.

To this aim, we first note that the following two observations hold for all the considered models. Firstly, for every integers  $a = (a_1, \dots, a_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  the function

$$x \mapsto \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d a_i}}{\partial x_1^{a_1} \dots \partial x_d^{a_d}} p_{g(\theta, x)}(y)$$

is well defined and behaves as  $\exp(-c\|x\|)$  as  $\|x\| \rightarrow \infty$ , with  $c \in (0, \infty)$ . Secondly,  $\mathbb{E}[Y^p | X = x] < \infty$  for all  $p \geq 1$  and all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Then, using these two observations, it is readily checked that for the considered models the function  $h_{a, \theta} : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined by (using the shorthand  $I_a := \{i \in \{1, \dots, d\} : a_i \neq 0\}$ )

$$h_{a, \theta}(y, x) = \left( \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \prod_{i=1}^d (1 + x_i^2)^{\lambda_i + 1} \right) \max_{\lambda \in I_a} \left| \frac{\partial^{\sum_{i=1}^d \lambda_i}}{\partial x_1^{\lambda_1} \dots \partial x_d^{\lambda_d}} p_{g(\theta, x)}(y) \right|, \quad (y, x) \in \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{X}$$

verifies all the conditions of Theorem 4, for all  $a \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  and all  $\theta \in \Theta$ , and thus that Assumption 5 is satisfied by Theorem 4.

To prove the result for the Gaussian linear regression model let  $p_{g(\theta, x)}$  be the density of  $P_{g(\theta, x)}$  with respect to the Lebesgue measure on  $\mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{R}$ . Then, using the above two observations, it is easily checked that Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3)b) (with  $M = 1$ ) are verified and the result follows.

To prove the result for the Mixture model let  $f \in \mathcal{H}_Y$  and, for  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ , let  $h_m(x) = \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mathcal{N}_1(\beta_m^\top x, \sigma_m^2)}[f(Y)]$ . Then, for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have

$$h(x) := \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim P_{g(\theta, x)}}[f(Y)] = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim \mathcal{N}_1(\beta_m^\top x, \sigma_m^2)}[f(Y)] = \sum_{m=1}^M \alpha_m g h_m(x)$$

where, from the first part of the corollary,  $h_m \in \mathcal{H}_X$  for all  $m \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ . Hence,  $h \in \mathcal{H}_X$  and Assumption 5 holds.

To prove the result for the Poisson regression model let  $p_{g(\theta, x)}$  be the density of  $P_{g(\theta, x)}$  with respect to the counting measure on  $\mathcal{Y} := \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$ . Then, using the above two observations, it is easily checked that Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3)a) hold and the result follows.

To prove the result for the Logistic regression model let  $p_{g(\theta, x)}$  be the density of  $P_{g(\theta, x)}$  with respect to the counting measure on  $\mathcal{Y} := \{0, 1\}$ . Then, using the above two observations, it is easily checked that Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3)a) hold and the result follows.

We now prove the result for the Heckman sample selection model. To this aim, for  $\lambda = (\mu_1, \mu_2, \sigma, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}^2 \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$  we let  $P_\lambda$  be the distribution of  $(Y_1, Y_2)$ , where  $Y_{2i} = \mathbb{1}_{(0, \infty)}(Y_{2i}^*)$  and  $Y_{1i} = Y_{2i} Y_{1i}^*$  with

$$\begin{pmatrix} Y_{1i}^* \\ Y_{2i}^* \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N}_2 \left( \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 \\ \mu_2 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma^2 & \rho\sigma \\ \rho\sigma & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right).$$

Let  $\mu(d(y_1, y_2)) = (\Lambda_1(dy_1) + \delta_{\{0\}}(dy_1)) \otimes \delta_{\{0\}}(dy_2)$ . Then,

$$P_\lambda(d(y_1, y_2)) = p_\lambda(y_1, y_2) \mu(d(y_1, y_2))$$

where, denoting by  $\phi(\cdot; \mu, \sigma^2)$  the probability density function of the  $\mathcal{N}_1(\mu, \sigma^2)$  distribution w.r.t.  $\Lambda_1$ , the density  $p_\lambda$  is such that, for all  $(y_1, y_2) \in \mathcal{Y} := \mathbb{R} \times \{0, 1\}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} p_\lambda(y_1, y_2) &= \phi(y_1; \mu_1, \sigma^2) \Phi\left((\mu_2 + (\rho/\sigma)\mu_1)/\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}\right) \mathbb{1}_{\mathbb{R} \setminus \{0\}}(y_1) (1 - \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(y_2)) \\ &\quad + \Phi(-\mu_2) \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(y_1) \mathbb{1}_{\{0\}}(y_2). \end{aligned}$$

The Heckman sample selection model is then obtained by letting

$$g(\theta, x) = (\beta_1^\top x, \beta_2^\top x, \sigma, \rho), \quad \forall \theta = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \sigma, \rho) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d} \times (0, \infty) \times (-1, 1)$$

and, using the above two observations, it is easily checked that Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3)b), with  $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \mathbb{R} \times \{0\}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}_2 = \mathbb{R} \times \{1\}$  (so that  $M = 2$ ) hold. The result follows.

Finally, to prove the result for the Gamma regression model we let  $p_{g(\theta, x)}$  be the density of  $P_{g(\theta, x)}$  with respect to  $\Lambda_1$ ; that is

$$p_{g(\theta, x)}(y) = c(\nu)y^{\nu-1} \exp(-\nu\beta^\top x) \exp(-\nu y \exp(-\beta^\top x))$$

for all  $y \in \mathcal{Y} := (0, \infty)$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\theta = (\beta, \nu) \in \Theta := \mathcal{X} \times (0, \infty)$ . Then, using the above two observations it is easily checked that Conditions (C1), (C2) and (C3)b) (with  $M = 1$ ) hold, and the result follows. □

## References

- [1] B.-E. Chérif-Abdellatif and P. Alquier. Finite sample properties of parametric MMD estimation: robustness to misspecification and dependence. *Bernoulli*, 28(1):181–213, 2022.
- [2] B.-E. Chérif-Abdellatif and P. Alquier. MMD-Bayes: Robust Bayesian estimation via maximum mean discrepancy. *2nd Symposium on Advances in Approximate Bayesian Inference*, 2019.
- [3] D.L. Cohn. Measure theory. Boston, Mass.: Birkhäuser, 2013.
- [4] Constantine, G and Savits, T. A multivariate Faa di Bruno formula with applications. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 348(2): 503–520, 1996.
- [5] G. Da Prato and J. Zabczyk. *Stochastic equations in infinite dimensions*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [6] K. Fukumizu, F. R. Bach, and M. I. Jordan. Dimensionality reduction for supervised learning with reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5(Jan):73–99, 2004.
- [7] M. Kanagawa, P. Hennig, D. Sejdinovic, and B. K. Sriperumbudur. Gaussian processes and kernel methods: A review on connections and equivalences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1807.02582*, 2018.
- [8] C. McDiarmid. On the method of bounded differences. *Surveys in combinatorics*, 141(1):148–188, 1989.
- [9] V. I. Paulsen and M. Raghupathi. *An introduction to the theory of reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces*, volume 152. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [10] Z. Szabó and B. K. Sriperumbudur. Characteristic and universal tensor product kernels. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(1), 8724-8752, 2018.
- [11] L. Song, J. Huang, A. Smola and K. Fukumizu. Hilbert space embeddings of conditional distributions with applications to dynamical systems. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 961–968, 2009.

- [12] B. K. Sriperumbudur, A. Gretton, K. Fukumizu, B. Schölkopf and G. R. G. Lanckriet. Hilbert space embeddings and metrics on probability measures. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11, 1517–1561, 2010.
- [13] A. W. Van der Vaart. Asymptotic statistics. Cambridge university press, 2000.