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Abstract
Utility-Based Shortfall Risk (UBSR) is a risk metric that is increasingly popular in financial applications, owing to certain desirable properties that it enjoys. We consider the problem of estimating UBSR in a recursive setting, where samples from the underlying loss distribution are available one-at-a-time. We cast the UBSR estimation problem as a root finding problem, and propose stochastic approximation-based estimations schemes. We derive non-asymptotic bounds on the estimation error in the number of samples. We also consider the problem of UBSR optimization within a parameterized class of random variables. We propose a stochastic gradient descent based algorithm for UBSR optimization, and derive non-asymptotic bounds on its convergence.

1 Introduction

In several financial applications, it is necessary to understand risk sensitivity while maximizing the returns. Several risk measures have been studied in the literature, e.g., mean-variance, Value at Risk (VaR), Conditional Value at Risk (CVaR), distorted risk measure, and prospect theory. In [2], the authors consider four properties as desirable for a risk measure, namely positive homogeneity, translation invariance, sub-additivity, and monotonicity. They define a risk measure as being coherent if it possesses the aforementioned properties. In a related development, in [19], the authors chose to relax the sub-additivity and positive homogeneity requirements of a coherent risk measure, and instead impose a convexity condition on the underlying risk measure. Such a relaxation is justified in practical contexts where the risk is a non-linear function of the underlying random variable (e.g., a financial position).

CVaR is a popular risk measure that come under the umbrella of coherent risk measures. Utility-based shortfall risk (UBSR) [19] is a risk measure that is closely related to CVaR, and one that belongs to the class of convex risk measures. UBSR as a risk measure is preferable over CVaR for two reasons: (i) Unlike CVaR, UBSR is invariant under randomization; and (ii) UBSR involves a utility function that can be chosen to encode the risk associated with each value the r.v. X takes, while CVaR is concerned primarily with values of X beyond a certain quantile.

In real-world scenarios, the distribution of the underlying r.v. is seldom available in a closed form. Instead, one can obtain samples, which are used to estimate the chosen risk measure. Risk estimation has received a lot of attention in the recent past, cf. [25, 14, 31, 41, 17, 7, 36, 35, 43, 11, 29, 27], with CVaR being the dominant choice for the risk measure.

In this paper, we focus on recursive estimation of UBSR, in a setting where data arrives in an online fashion. Estimation of UBSR has immediate applications in financial portfolio optimization, cf. [24]. Stochastic approximation [38, 9] is a procedure that is well-suited for the purpose of online estimation. In the context of UBSR estimation, our main contribution is the non-asymptotic analysis of a stochastic approximation-based estimation scheme. We cast the estimation of UBSR as a stochastic root finding problem, and derive ‘finite-sample’ bounds for this scheme. Our analysis assumes that the underlying objective satisfies a monotonicity condition. If the monotonicity parameter is known and is used in setting the step-size, the algorithm results in an $O(1/n)$ rate of error decay. We also develop another variant that employs a universal step-size, and results in a $O(1/n^\alpha)$ rate, where $0 < \alpha < 1$. These non-asymptotic results are obtained under similar technical assumptions as in [17, 24] — specifically, a finite second
moment condition on the loss distribution. If the loss distribution is sub-Gaussian, we also obtain a ‘high probability’ result for the concentration of the approximation error.

Moving beyond UBSR estimation, we also consider the problem of optimizing UBSR within a parameterized class of random variables. The motivation for this problem lies in understanding the risk sensitivity in a portfolio management application [39, 24]. Specifically, an investor could choose to distribute his/her capital among different assets, and the decision parameter governing the capital distribution is to be optimized to decide the best allocation. The utility function that goes into the definition of UBSR would encode the investor’s risk preference, and the goal is to find the best decision parameter to minimize risk, as quantified by UBSR.

For the problem of UBSR optimization, we propose a stochastic gradient algorithm, and derive non-asymptotic bounds on its performance. Stochastic gradient (SG) methods have a long history, and non-asymptotic analysis of such schemes has garnered a lot of attention over the last decade, see [10] for a survey. Unlike in a classic SG setting, the UBSR optimization problem involves biased function measurements, which presents some technical challenges. Specifically, the UBSR estimation scheme is biased, in the sense that the estimation error does not have zero expectation. This is unlike in the classical SG settings, where the estimation error is assumed to be zero mean. In our setting, even though the estimation error is not zero-mean, the error can be reduced by increasing the batch size used for estimation. For the purpose of gradient estimation, we leverage the UBSR sensitivity formula derived in [24], and use a natural estimator of this quantity based on i.i.d. samples. By controlling the batch size, we are able to derive an $O(1/n)$ rate for the SG algorithm to optimize the UBSR.

**Related work.** Stochastic approximation has been explored in the context of CVaR estimation in [5, 6]. Recursive estimation of quantiles, variances and medians has been considered earlier in [12, 13, 23]. UBSR was introduced in [19], and non-recursive estimation schemes for UBSR were proposed in [24]. A paper closely related to our work from UBSR estimation viewpoint is [17], which uses a recursive estimation technique. The authors establish asymptotic convergence of their algorithm, and a ‘central limit theorem’ showing the asymptotic Gaussianity of the scaled estimation error. In contrast, we establish non-asymptotic, i.e., finite-sample bounds for the performance of our recursive estimation method, under similar technical assumptions as [17, 24]. [16, 4] consider finite-sample analysis of zeroth order stochastic approximation, but they assume zero-mean noise on the function measurements, which is not the case for UBSR optimization considered here. Other related papers include [8, 32] which consider stochastic approximation of an abstract objective function where the function measurements are biased, and the bias can be controlled through a batch size. In a recent paper [34], the authors use the estimation scheme from [24] to establish concentration inequalities for UBSR estimation.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we define the notion of UBSR for a general random variable, and formulate the estimation as well as optimization problems under a UBSR objective. In Section 3, we describe the stochastic approximation-based scheme for estimating the UBSR of a random variable, and present concentration bounds for this estimation scheme. In Section 4, we present a stochastic gradient algorithm for optimizing the UBSR in a parameterized class of random variables, and present a non-asymptotic bound that quantifies the convergence rate of this algorithm. We provide proofs of convergence for all the proposed algorithms in the supplementary material. Finally, in Section 5, we provide our concluding remarks.

## 2 Problem Formulation

Let $X$ be a random variable, and $\ell(\cdot)$ be a convex loss function. Let $\lambda$ be a pre-specified “risk-level” parameter that lies in the interior of the range of $\ell$. We first define an acceptance set as follows:

$$
\mathcal{A} := \{X \in \mathcal{X} : E[\ell(-X)] \leq \lambda\}, \quad (1)
$$

where $\mathcal{X}$ represents the set of random variables $X$ with $E[\ell(-X)] < \infty$. Note that the acceptance set is defined over the space of bounded random variables in $[19]$. We work with a more general definition of the acceptance set that includes unbounded random variables.

Using the acceptance set, the utility-based shortfall risk (UBSR) $SR_\lambda(X)$ is defined by

$$
SR_\lambda(X) := \inf\{t \in \mathcal{R} : t + X \in \mathcal{A}\}, \quad (2)
$$

For notational convenience, we have made the dependence of UBSR $SR_\lambda(X)$ on the loss function $\ell$ implicit. Intuitively, if $X$ represents a financial position, then $SR_\lambda(X)$ denotes the minimum cash that has to be added to $X$ so that it falls into the acceptable set $\mathcal{A}$. 
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For a given loss function, we set the utility function as $u(x) = -\ell(-x)$. Further, defining the utility of $X$ to be $U(X) := E[u(X)]$, we can conclude from (1) that the position $X$ is acceptable if $U(X)$ is at least $-\lambda$.

UBSR is a particular example of a convex risk measure [19], which is a generalization of a coherent risk measure [2]. In particular, a coherent risk measure satisfies sub-additivity and positive-homogeneity, and these two properties readily imply convexity. As a risk measure, UBSR is preferable over the popular Value-at-Risk (VaR), owing to the fact that UBSR is convex. Another closely related risk measure is CVaR (Conditional Value at Risk), which is a coherent risk measure. UBSR has a few advantages over CVaR, namely (i) Unlike CVaR, UBSR is invariant under randomization; and (ii) convex. Another closely related risk measure is CVaR (Conditional Value at Risk), which is a coherent risk measure.

Under the above assumption, it can be shown using convexity and monotonicity of the loss function $\ell(\cdot)$ that $SR_{\ell,\lambda}(X)$ is finite, and also the unique root of the function $g$, i.e., the solution $t^*$ that satisfies $g(t^*) = 0$ coincides with $SR_{\ell,\lambda}(X)$. Thus, the problem of UBSR estimation, i.e., estimating $SR_{\ell,\lambda}(X)$ of a r.v. $X$, can be cast as a root finding problem. We consider a setting where the expectation in the definition of $g(\cdot)$ cannot be explicitly evaluated. Instead, we have access to samples from the distribution of $X$, and we use a stochastic root-finding scheme for the UBSR estimation.

Next, we define the the problem of UBSR optimization. Suppose that $X$ belongs to a parameterized family of distributions $\{X(\theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$, where $\Theta$ is a compact and convex subset of $\mathbb{R}$. The SR optimization problem for this prametized class is given as

$$\text{Find } \theta^* \in \arg\min_{\theta \in \Theta} SR_{\lambda}(X(\theta)).$$

For the sake of simplicity, we focus on the case of a scalar parameter $\theta$. Extending to a vector parameter is straightforward. Again, assuming that we have access to samples from the distribution of $X$, we use a stochastic gradient descent technique for SR optimization.

### 3 UBSR estimation

We consider a setting where the expectation in the definition of the function $g$ cannot be explicitly evaluated. Instead, we assume that have access to samples from the distribution of $X$ in an online fashion, and the goal is to have a recursive estimation scheme for UBSR.

Stochastic approximation [9] is a class of algorithms for solving stochastic root-finding problems. UBSR estimation is a root-finding problem since one has to find a $t^*$ satisfying $g(t^*) = 0$, or $E[\ell(-X-t^*)] = \lambda$. For this problem, [17] proposed a stochastic approximation scheme, and performed an asymptotic convergence analysis. In this paper, we focus on UBSR estimation from a non-asymptotic viewpoint.

We propose a method to incrementally estimate UBSR using each additional sample. Specifically, we use the following update iteration:

$$t_n = \Gamma(t_{n-1} + a_n (\hat{g}(t_{n-1}))),$$

where $\hat{g}(t) = \ell(x_n - t_{n-1}) - \lambda$ is an estimate of $g(t)$ using an i.i.d. sequence $\{\xi_i\}$ from the distribution of $-X$, and $\Gamma$ is a projection operator defined by $\Gamma(x) = \min(\max(t_1, x), t_n)$. Such a projection operator has been used in the context of UBSR estimation earlier, cf. [17].
Theorem 2. Assume (A1)-(A5). Setting the step size \( a_k = \frac{c}{k} \), with \( \frac{1}{2} < \mu_1 c < 1 \), we have

\[
E[|t_n - SR_\lambda(X)|^2] \leq \frac{(t_0 - SR_\lambda(X))^2}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \frac{\sigma^2 2^{2\mu_1 c} c^2}{(2\mu_1 c - 1)n^2}.
\]

Proof. See Appendix A.1.

Remark 1. The first term on the RHS in the bound above concerns the initial error, i.e., the rate at which the algorithm ‘forgets’ the starting point \( t_0 \). The second term relates to the noise variance in UBSR estimation. From the bound above, together with the fact that \( \frac{1}{2} < \mu_1 c \), it is apparent that the initial error is forgotten faster than the error due to the noise. On a different note, from the bound in (6), it is apparent that \( E[|t_n - SR_\lambda(X)|] \) scales linearly with the reciprocal of the monotonicity parameter \( \mu_1 \), since \( c\mu_1 \) is a constant.

Remark 2. In [17], the authors establish that \( n^{1/2}(t_n - SR_\lambda(X)) \) is asymptotically normal, say \( N(0, \zeta^2) \) for a step-size choice that requires the knowledge of \( g'(t_0) \). Under mild regularity conditions (cf. [21]), the asymptotic normality result implies \( nE(t_n - SR_\lambda(X))^2 \) converges to a constant that depends on \( \zeta^2 \). The result derived in Theorem 1 holds for all \( n \), and matches the \( O(1/n) \) bound from the asymptotic normality result of [17].

Next, we present a high probability bound for the SR estimation algorithm in (5), under the following additional assumptions:

(A4). The loss function \( l \) is Lipschitz with constant \( L_1 \).

(A5). The r.v. \( X \) is \( \nu^2 \)-sub-Gaussian, i.e. \( E\left[\exp\left(\frac{X^2}{2\nu^2}\right)\right] \leq 2 \).

The sub-Gaussianity condition above is equivalent to the following tail bound [42]:

\[
P(|X| > \epsilon) \leq 2 \exp\left(\frac{\epsilon^2}{2\nu^2}\right), \text{ for any } \epsilon > 0.
\]

Theorem 2. Assume (A1) (A5) Setting the step size \( a_k = \frac{c}{k} \), with \( \frac{1}{2} < \mu_1 c < 1 \) and \( cL_1^2 < \mu_1 \). Then, for any \( \delta \in (0, 1) \), we have the following bound w.p. at least \( 1 - \delta \):

\[
|t_n - SR_\lambda(X)| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\delta)}{C_1 n}} + \frac{E[|t_0 - SR_\lambda(X)|]}{n^{\mu_1 c}} + \frac{\sigma^2 2^{2\mu_1 c}}{\sqrt{(2\mu_1 c - 1)n}},
\]

where

\[
C_1 = \frac{(2\mu_1 c - 1)}{2^{2\mu_1 c + \nu^2} L_1^2 \nu^2}.
\]
Case II: Assume (A1)-(A5). Set the step size \( g \) the knowledge of Remark 5.

Remark 4. The final result on UBSR estimation is a high probability bound for a universal stepsize choice.

A few remarks are in order.

**Remark 5.** The authors in \([17]\) analyze a iterate-averaged variant of the SR estimation algorithm \((5)\), while assuming the knowledge of \( g'(SR_\lambda(X)) \) for setting the step-size constant \( c \). The rate they derive under this assumption is \( O(1/n) \) asymptotically. In comparison, our analysis is for a universal step-size, and we obtain a non-asymptotic bound of \( O(1/n^\alpha) \), for \( \alpha \in (0,1) \). In practice, the knowledge of \( g'(SR_\lambda(X)) \) is seldom available, motivating the universal step-size choice. The rate we derive in this case is comparable to the one obtained in \([18]\) for general stochastic approximation schemes.

The final result on UBSR estimation is a high probability bound for a universal stepsize choice.

**Theorem 4.** Assume \((A1)/(A5)\) Set the step size \( a_k = \frac{C}{n^\alpha} \) with \( \alpha \in (0,1) \), and choose an \( n_0 \) such that \( L_1^2 a_{n_0} < \mu_1 \). Then, for any \( \delta \in (0,1) \), and for any \( n \geq n_0 \), we have the following bound w.p. at least \( 1 - \delta \):

\[
|t_n - SR_\lambda(X)| \leq C_2 \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c n^{1-\alpha}}{2(1-\alpha)} \right) + \frac{C_3}{n^{\alpha/2}}
\]
where $C_2 = 8L_1\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)(1+c^2L_1^2)\nu/s + \log(1/\delta)}$, and $C_3 = 8L_1\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)(1+c^2L_1^2)\nu/s}$. In the above, $\mu_1, \sigma^2, L_1$, and $\nu$ are specified in (A2), (A3), (A4), and (A5) respectively, while the constant $C(n_0)$ is as defined in Theorem 3.

Proof. See Appendix A.4.

In the result above, we have chosen the stepsize to be $c/k^{1/2}$ as choosing $c/k$ does not guarantee a $O(1/n)$ rate (see Remark 3).

## 4 UBSR Optimization

Recall that the UBSR optimization problem:

$$\text{Find } \theta^* \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} SR_\lambda(X(\theta)).$$

(9)

In this section, we devise a stochastic gradient algorithm that aims to solve the problem (9) using a gradient descent scheme with the following update iteration:

$$\theta_{k+1} = \theta_k - \alpha_k h_k'(\theta_k),$$

(10)

where $\alpha_k$ is a step-size parameter that satisfies standard stochastic approximation conditions, and $h_k'(\theta_k)$ is an estimate of $\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta}$. We operate in a risk-sensitive learning framework, i.e., we do not have direct access to UBSR $SR_\lambda(\theta)$ and its derivative $\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta}$, for any $\theta$. Instead, we can obtain samples of the underlying r.v. corresponding to any parameter $\theta$, and use these samples to form the estimate $h_k'(\theta)$. In the section below, we describe the derivation estimation scheme, and subsequently present non-asymptotic bounds for the iterate governed by (10).

### 4.1 Estimation of UBSR derivative

We begin by presenting the expression for the derivative of $SR_\lambda(X(\theta))$ w.r.t. $\theta$, derived in [24]: Letting $\xi = -X$,

$$\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} = \frac{A(\theta)}{B(\theta)},$$

(11)

where $A(\theta) \triangleq E[\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)]$, and $B(\theta) \triangleq E[\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)]$. The expression above is derived by first interchanging the differentiation and integration operators in $\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta}$, and then invoking the implicit function theorem. The assumptions needed to justify these steps are given below.

We now present a scheme for estimating the UBSR derivative $\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta}$, for a given $\theta$. Suppose we are given samples $\{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_m\}$ from the distribution of $-X(\theta)$ for a given parameter $\theta$. Using these samples, we form a biased estimator $h_m'(\theta)$ of UBSR derivative as follows:

$$h_m'(\theta) = \frac{A_m}{B_m}, \text{ where } A_m(\theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i(\theta) - m(\theta) \xi_i'(\theta), \text{ and } B_m(\theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i(\theta) - m(\theta),$$

(12)

and $m(\theta)$ is estimate of $SR_\lambda(\theta)$, which is obtained by running (5) for $m$ iterations. Notice that the estimate defined above is a ratio of estimates for the quantities $A(\theta)$ and $B(\theta)$, which are used in the expression (11) for $\frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta}$. Notice that $A_m(\theta)$ and $B_m(\theta)$ are not unbiased estimates of $A(\theta)$ and $B(\theta)$, since the UBSR estimate $m(\theta)$ is biased. Hence, it is apparent that $h_m'(\theta)$ is a biased estimate of the UBSR derivative. An interesting question is if the estimate $h_m'(\theta)$ is consistent, and we answer this in the affirmative in Lemma 1.
**Assumptions.** We make the following assumptions for analyzing the consistency property of the UBSR derivative estimate (12). Recall that $\xi = -X$.

(A7). $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} E(\xi(\theta)^2) \leq M_1$.

(A8). [(A1) and (A2)] hold for every $\theta \in \Theta$.

(A9). The partial derivatives $\partial_l(\xi(\theta - t(\theta))) / \partial \theta$, $\partial_l(\xi(\theta - t(\theta))) / \partial t$ exist, and there exists $\beta_1, \beta_2 > 0$ such that

$$E \left[ (l'(\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)) \xi''(\theta))^2 \right] \leq \beta_1 < \infty,$$

$$E \left[ (l'(\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)))^2 \right] \leq \beta_2 < \infty, \forall \theta \in \Theta.$$

(A10). The loss function $l(\cdot)$ satisfies

$$|l'(\xi(\theta) - t)| \leq L_1, |l''(\xi(\theta) - t)| \leq L_2,$$

for any $(\theta, t) \in \Theta \times [t_1, t_u]$.

(A11). The loss function $l(\cdot)$ is twice differentiable, and for any $\theta \in \Theta$, $l'(\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)) > \eta$.

(A12). $\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} |l'(\theta)| \leq M_2$, and $l'$ is $L_3$-Lipschitz for all $\theta \in \Theta$.

We now discuss the motivation behind the assumptions listed above. First, a higher moment bound is usually necessary for ensuring asymptotic consistency of a sample-based estimate, and the bounded second moment requirement in (A7) encompasses a large class of unbounded r.v.s, while ensuring an $O(1/\sqrt{m})$ bound on the estimation error of $h'_m(\cdot)$ even in the non-asymptotic regime, i.e., for all $m \geq 1$. Assumption (A8) ensures that the scheme in (5) can be invoked to form the UBSR estimate $t_m$, in the derivative estimate (12). The second moment bounds in Assumption (A9) are necessary for obtaining a convergence rate result for the estimator (12), and a similar assumption has been made in [24] in the context of an asymptotic normality result. The Lipschitz conditions in (A10) are necessary for the interchange of expectation and differentiation operators in arriving at the expression (11) for UBSR derivative, see also [24]. From the condition in (A11) and the definition of $B_m$, it is apparent that $B_m(\theta) > \eta$. Finally, the conditions in (A11) and (A12) in conjunction with (A10) ensure that the function $l'(\xi(\theta) - SR_\lambda(\theta)) |l'(\theta)$ is Lipschitz, and this in turn enables the derivation of a convergence rate result for the estimate (12).

We now present a rate result for the UBSR derivative estimate (12).

**Lemma 1.** Assume [(A7)-(A12)] Then, for all $m \geq 1$, the UBSR derivative estimator (12) satisfies

$$E \left| h'_m(\theta) - \frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} \right| \leq C_4 \sqrt{m}, \text{ and } E \left| h'_m(\theta) - \frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} \right|^2 \leq C_5,$$

where $C_4 = \sqrt{2L_3L_4 + M_2} \lambda_1 \eta$, and $C_5 = \frac{2\beta_2(\theta)\beta_1 + 2\beta_3(\theta)\bar{\beta}}{\rho_{1,\eta}}$. Here the constants $\beta_1, \beta_2, L_1, L_2, L_3, M_1, M_2$ are as specified in assumptions [(A7)-(A12)] above.

**Proof.** The proof uses a connection between empirical and true mean of a r.v. to the 1-Wasserstein distance between empirical and true distribution functions. Specifically, for a given $t \in [t_1, t_u]$, define

$$f_m(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} l'(\xi_i(\theta) - t), \text{ and } f(t) = E[l'(\xi(\theta) - t)].$$

Let $F$ denote the cumulative distribution function of $\xi$, and $F_n$ denote the empirical distribution function, i.e., $F_n(x) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} I[\xi - t \leq x]$, for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$. Then, we have

$$f_m(t) = \int l' dF_m, \text{ and } f(t) = \int l' dF.$$

Using the fact that $l'$ is $L_2$ Lipschitz from (A10), we obtain

$$|f_m(t) - f(t)| \leq L_2 W_1(F_n, F),$$

(13)
Applying Theorem 3.1 of [28] with $p = 1, q = 2, d = 1$ there and using (A7) we obtain

$$EW_1(F_n, F) \leq \frac{\zeta M_1}{\sqrt{m}},$$

leading to $E|f_m(t) - f(t)| \leq \frac{L_2\zeta M_1}{\sqrt{m}}$.

In the above, $\zeta$ is a universal constant.

Along similar lines, we can infer -

$$E \left| \tilde{f}_m(t) - \tilde{f}(t) \right| \leq \frac{(L_1L_3 + M_2L_2)\zeta M_1}{\sqrt{m}},$$

(14)

where $\tilde{f}_m(t) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i'(\xi(t) - t) \xi'(\theta)$, and $\tilde{f}(t) = E|v'(\xi(t) - t)\xi'(\theta)|$.

In the above, $\zeta$ is a universal constant.

Under assumptions similar to those listed above, the authors in [28] establish an asymptotic consistency as well as normality results. In contrast, we establish a result in the non-asymptotic regime, with an $O(\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}})$ that matches the aforementioned asymptotic rate.

4.2 Non-asymptotic bounds for UBSR optimization

In addition to the assumptions used for analyzing the convergence rate of UBSR derivative estimate (12), we require the following assumption for the non-asymptotic analysis of the stochastic gradient algorithm (10) for UBSR optimization:

(A13). For any $\theta \in \Theta$, the function $h(\theta) = SR_\lambda(\theta)$ satisfies $h''(\theta) > \mu_2$, for some $\mu_2 > 0$.

The assumption above implies that the UBSR objective $SR_\lambda(\theta)$ is a strongly convex function.

We now present a non-asymptotic bound for the last iterate $\theta_n$ of the algorithm (10) with gradient estimates formed using (12). The batch size $m$ used for gradient estimation is kept constant in each iteration $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Using the results from Lemma 1 in conjunction with (A13) we present a bound on the error $E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2]$ in the optimization parameter in the theorem below.

Theorem 5. Assume (A7) (A13). Let $\theta^*$ denote the minimum of $SR_\lambda(\cdot)$. Set $a_k = c/k$ in (10), with $\mu_2c > \frac{1}{2}$. For each iteration of (10), let $m$ denote the batch size used for computing the estimate (12) corresponding to the parameter $\theta_k$, $k = 1, \ldots, n$. Then, for all $n \geq 1$, we have

$$E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \frac{3\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|^2}{n^{2\mu_2c}} + \frac{C_6}{n} + \frac{C_7}{m},$$

(15)

where $C_6 = \frac{3\zeta c_2^{2\mu_2c}c_2^2}{(2\mu_2c - 1)^2},$ and $C_7 = \frac{3\zeta c_2^{2\mu_2c}c_2^2}{(2\mu_2c)^2},$ with $C_4$ and $C_5$ as defined in Lemma 1.

The batch size could be chosen as a function of the horizon $n$. Results in a similar spirit, i.e., where a stochastic gradient algorithm is run for $n$ iterations, and the parameters such as step-size and batch size are set as a function of $n$ are common in the literature, cf. [22,4].
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The first term in (15) represents the initial error, and it is forgotten at a rate faster than $O(1/n)$ since $\mu_2 c > 1/2$. The overall rate for the algorithm would depend on the choice of the batch size $m$, and it is apparent that the error $E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2]$ does not vanish with a constant batch size. As in the case of Theorem 1, we observe that the error $E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|]$ has an inverse dependence on the strong convexity parameter $\mu_2$.

We now present a straightforward corollary of the result in Theorem 5 with a batch size that ensures the error in the parameter vanishes asymptotically.

**Corollary 6.** Under conditions of Theorem 5 with $m = \rho^\rho$ for some $\rho \in (0, 1]$, we have

$$E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2] \leq \frac{3\|\theta_0 - \theta^*\|^2}{n^{2\mu_2 c}} + \frac{C_6}{n} + \frac{C_7}{n^\rho} = O\left(\frac{1}{n^\rho}\right),$$

A few remarks are in order.

**Remark 6.** From the result in the corollary above, it is easy to see that the optimal choice of batch size is $m = \Theta(n)$, and this in turn ensures an $O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ rate of convergence for the stochastic gradient algorithm [14] with a biased derivative estimation scheme in a slightly different context, the authors in [3] show that an increasing batch size is necessary for the error of gradient descent type algorithm to vanish. Finally, the $O(1/n)$ bound in Theorem 5 which is for a setting where gradient estimates are biased, matches the minimax complexity result for strongly convex optimization with a stochastic first order oracle, cf. [11].

**Remark 7.** In the result above, we have bounded the error $E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2]$ in the optimization parameter. Using (A13) and $m = \Theta(n)$, we can also bound the optimization error $E[SR_\lambda(\theta_n)] - SR_\lambda(\theta^*)$ using Corollary 6 as follows:

$$E[SR_\lambda(\theta_n)] - SR_\lambda(\theta^*) \leq \frac{1}{\mu_2} E[\|\theta_n - \theta^*\|^2] = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right).$$

**Remark 8.** To understand the deviation from the non-asymptotic analysis of a regular stochastic gradient algorithm (cf. [30]), we provide a brief sketch of the proof of Theorem 5.

Letting $M_k = \int h''(m\theta_k + (1 - m)\theta^*)dm$, and $z_n = \theta_n - \theta^*$, we have

$$z_k = z_{k-1}(1 - a_k M_{k-1}) - a_k \varepsilon_{k-1}, \text{ where } \varepsilon_k = \left(h'_m(\theta_k) - h'(\theta_k)\right).$$

Unlike the setting of [30], the noise in derivative estimate $\varepsilon_k$ is biased, i.e., $E[\varepsilon_k] \neq 0$. Now, unrolling the recursion above and taking expectations, we obtain

$$E[\|z_n\|^2] \leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] \prod_{k=1}^n (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 + 3E\left[\sum_{k=1}^n a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^n (1 - a_j M_{j-1})^2\right]$$

$$\leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] n^{-2\mu_2 c} + 3 \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{c^2}{k^2} E[\varepsilon_{k-1}^2] (\mathcal{P}_{k+1:n})^2 + 3 \sum_{k \neq l} a_k a_l E[\varepsilon_{l-1}^2] E[\varepsilon_{k-1}^2] \mathcal{P}_{k+1:n} \mathcal{P}_{l+1:n},$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{i:j} = \prod_{k=i}^j (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2$. In the above, we used strong convexity to bound the first term in (16). Term (II) in (17) is extra when compared to the analysis in the unbiased case. The rest of proof uses the bounds obtained in Lemma 4 to bound terms (I) and (II) on the RHS of (17).

### 4.3 A comparison to optimization with an inexact gradient oracle

In this section, we compare our contributions in the context of UBSR optimization to previous works that consider stochastic gradient algorithms with inputs from an inexact gradient oracle. A few recent works on this topic are [8, 32, 16, 26, 15].
For invoking the results from either [8] or [32], we require non-asymptotic bounds for UBSR estimation, which we derive in our paper. In particular, these references consider an abstract optimization setting where the objective function measurements are biased, and the bias can be controlled through a batch size parameter. The bounds in Section 3 would enable UBSR optimization through a stochastic gradient scheme, and the results from these two references would apply. The gradient estimation scheme in the aforementioned references is based on the idea of simultaneous perturbation (or in simpler terms, finite differencing), and this estimation scheme is black-box in nature, i.e., does not use the form/structure of the objective function. In contrast, we use the form of the UBSR objective, which in turn leads to an expression for its derivative. Using this expression, we form an estimate of UBSR derivative from i.i.d. samples, and then analyze the statistical properties of the ‘direct’ estimator in Lemma 1. Thus, the bounds we derive in Theorem 5 are specialized to the UBSR optimization problem, leading to precise constants. Finally, in [32], the authors only provide asymptotic rate results in the form of central limit theorems, while we study the UBSR optimization problem from a non-asymptotic viewpoint. The bounds we derive contain precise guidelines for choosing step-size and batch size parameters, which aid practical implementations.

Next, the stochastic optimization framework considered in [4] is not directly applicable for UBSR optimization, as they assume that the objective function measurements have zero-mean noise, while UBSR estimation results in a noise component with a positive mean. The latter can be controlled using the batch size used for estimation. In [26], the authors derive non-asymptotic bound of the order $O(\log n/\sqrt{n})$ using a stochastic gradient algorithm for a biased stochastic optimization problem. However, their framework does not feature a batch size parameter, and their result require the existence of a Lyapunov function. Finally, in [15], the author considers a biased gradient oracle, and provides an $O(1/n)$ bound. However, their results are not directly applicable for UBSR optimization, as they consider a deterministic bias parameter, and their result do not feature a tunable batch-size parameter.

5 Concluding Remarks

We considered the problem of estimating Utility Based Shortfall Risk (UBSR) in an online setting, when samples from the underlying loss distribution are available one sample at a time. We cast the UBSR estimation problem as a stochastic approximation based root finding scheme. We derived non-asymptotic convergence guarantees for different step sizes, under a mild technical condition of a finite second moment. We also derived ‘high probability’ bounds for the concentration of the estimation error, when the loss distribution is sub-Gaussian.

Finally we considered the UBSR optimization problem, when the loss distribution belongs to a parameterized family. We proposed a stochastic gradient descent scheme, and derived non-asymptotic convergence guarantees under finite second moments. We faced the challenge of working with biased gradient estimates, which we addressed using batching. More broadly, the techniques developed in this work are applicable in a variety of settings, to characterize the finite sample performance of stochastic approximation and SGD algorithms.

As future work, it would be interesting to explore UBSR optimization in a risk-sensitive reinforcement learning setting. An orthogonal direction of future research is to extend the UBSR optimization algorithm to a vector parameter context, using a gradient estimation scheme based on finite differences, and the simultaneous perturbation method.
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A Proofs for SR estimation

A.1 Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Using the definition of the variable $z_{n+1}$, the update rule (5), and the fact that $t^* := SR_\lambda(X)$ lies within the projected region $[t_i, t_n]$, we obtain

$$z_n = t_n - t^*$$
$$= T(t_{n-1} + a_n (g(t_{n-1}) + \varepsilon_{n-1})) - T(t^*)$$
$$= T(t_{n-1} + a_n (g(t_{n-1}) + \varepsilon_{n-1})) - t^*.$$  \hfill (18)

For any $k \geq 1$, define

$$J_k = \int_0^1 g'(mt_k + (1 - m)t^*)dm. \hfill (19)$$

Using (A2) we obtain $J_k \leq -\mu_1$, for all $k \geq 1$. Using $J_n$ we can express $g(t_n)$ as,

$$g(t_n) = \int_0^1 g'(mt_n + (1 - m)t^*)dm(t_n - t^*) = J_n z_n.$$  

Squaring on both sides of (18), and using the fact that projection is non-expansive, we obtain

$$z_n^2 \leq [z_{n-1} + a_n (g(t_{n-1}) + \varepsilon_{n-1})]^2$$
$$\leq [z_{n-1} + a_n (J_{n-1}z_{n-1} + \varepsilon_{n-1})]^2$$
$$\leq [z_{n-1}(1 + a_n J_{n-1}) + a_n \varepsilon_{n-1}]^2$$
$$\leq z_{n-1}^2(1 + a_n J_{n-1})^2 + a_n^2 \varepsilon_{n-1}^2 + 2z_{n-1}(1 + a_n J_{n-1})a_n \varepsilon_{n-1}.$$  

Taking expectation $E[z_{n+1}|\mathcal{F}_n]$, where $\mathcal{F}_n$ is the sigma field generated by $\{t_k, k \leq n\}$, and using $E[\varepsilon_n] = 0$, we obtain

$$E[z_n^2] \leq (1 + a_n J_{n-1})^2 E[z_{n-1}^2] + a_n^2 E[\varepsilon_{n-1}^2] + 2z_{n-1}(1 + a_n J_{n-1})a_n E[\varepsilon_{n-1}]$$
$$\leq (1 + a_n J_{n-1})^2 E[z_{n-1}^2] + a_n^2 E[\varepsilon_{n-1}^2].$$

Using (A2) we have

$$E[z_n^2] \leq (1 + a_n J_{n-1})^2 E[z_{n-1}^2] + a_n^2 \sigma^2$$
$$\leq E[z_0^2] \prod_{k=1}^n (1 + a_k J_{k-1})^2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n (1 + a_j J_{j-1})^2. \hfill (20)$$

Since $\frac{1}{2} < \mu_1 < 1$, we have $(1 + a_k J_k)^2 \leq (1 - \mu_1 c)^2 \leq e^{-2\mu_1 c}$. Hence, we obtain

$$E[z_n^2] \leq E[z_0^2] \prod_{k=1}^n (1 + a_k \mu_1)^2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^n (1 - a_j \mu_1)^2$$
$$\leq E[z_0^2] e^{-2\mu_1 c \sum_{k=1}^n a_k} + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^n [a_k^2 e^{-2\mu_1 c \sum_{j=k+1}^n a_k}]$$
$$\leq E[z_0^2] e^{-2\mu_1 c \log(n)} + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^n [a_k^2 e^{-2\mu_1 c \log(n/k+1)}]$$
$$\leq \frac{E[z_0^2]}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^2 \left(\frac{n}{k+1}\right)^{-2\mu_1 c}.$$
We have used the following inequality to upper bound the sum in (21):

\[
\frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \sigma^2 n^{-2\mu_1 c} \sum_{k=1}^n \frac{c^2}{k^2} (k+1)^{2\mu_1 c} \leq E[z_n^2] + \sigma^2 \frac{n^{2\mu_1 c}}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} \sum_{k=1}^n c^2 \frac{1}{(2\mu_1 c - 1) n}.
\] (21)

We have used the following inequality to upper bound the sum in (21):

\[
\frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \sigma^2 n^{-2\mu_1 c} \sum_{k=1}^n k^{2\mu_1 c-2} \leq \int_0^{n+1} k^{2\mu_1 c-2} dk \leq \frac{(n+1)^{2\mu_1 c-1}}{n^{2\mu_1 c} (2\mu_1 c - 1)} \leq \frac{2^{2\mu_1 c}}{(2\mu_1 c - 1) n}. \] (22)

Thus,

\[
E[z_n^2] \leq E[z_n^2] + \sigma^2 2^{2\mu_1 c} \frac{1}{(2\mu_1 c - 1) n}.
\]

Hence proved.

**A.2 Proof of Theorem 2**

*Proof.* We use the technique from [20], and tailor the analysis to the SR estimation problem, instead of a general stochastic approximation scheme in [20]. Moreover, unlike the bounds in the aforementioned reference, we make all the constants explicit.

The centered form of the iterate \( z_n = t_n - t^* \), with \( t^* := SR_{\lambda}(X) \), can be written as a telescoping sum as follows:

\[
|z_n| - E[|z_n|] = \sum_{k=1}^n g_k - g_{k-1} = \sum_{k=1}^n D_k,
\]

where \( g_k = E[|z_k||F_k], D_k = g_k - g_{k-1} \) and \( F_k = \sigma(t_1, \ldots, t_k) \).

Let \( t_{j,k}^i(t) \) denote the iterate at time instant \( j \), given that \( t_i = t \). Using this notation, we have

\[
E[|t_{j+1}^i(t) - t_{j+1}^i(t')|^2] 
\leq E[|t_j^i(t) - t_j^i(t')| + a_j(\hat{g}(t_{j+1}^i(t)) - \hat{g}(t_{j+1}^i(t')))|^2] 
\leq E[|t_j^i(t) - t_j^i(t')|^2] + 2a_j E[|t_{j+1}^i(t) - t_{j+1}^i(t')|E[|\hat{g}(t_{j+1}^i(t)) - \hat{g}(t_{j+1}^i(t'))|^2] 
\leq (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_j^2) E[|t_j^i(t) - t_j^i(t')|^2].
\]

Unrolling the recursion above, we obtain

\[
E[|t_n^i(t) - t_n^i(t')|^2] \leq |t - t'|^2 \prod_{j=1}^n (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_j^2),
\]

leading to

\[
E[|t_n - t^*||t_i = t] - E[|t_n - t^*||t_i = t'] \leq E[|t_n^i(t) - t_n^i(t')|]
\leq |t - t'|^2 \prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_j^2))^{1/2}
\leq a_i |\hat{g} - \hat{g}'| (\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_j^2))^{1/2}
\leq L_i |\hat{g} - \hat{g}'|.
\]
where $L_i = a_i(\prod_{j=1}^{n-1} (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2))^{1/2}$, $t = t_{i-1} + a_i \hat{g}$, and $t' = t_{i-1} + a_i \hat{g}'$. Now,

$$
\mathbb{P}(|z_n| - E[|z_n|] > \varepsilon) = \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{k=1}^{n} D_k > \varepsilon\right)
\leq \exp(-\lambda \varepsilon)(E[\exp(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n} D_k)])
\leq \exp(-\lambda \varepsilon)E[\exp(\lambda \sum_{k=1}^{n-1} D_k)]E[\exp(\lambda D_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}].
$$

(23)

It can be shown that an $L$-Lipschitz function $f$ of a $\nu^2$-sub-Gaussian r.v $Z$ is $4L^2\nu^2$-sub-Gaussian, i.e.,

$$
E[\exp(\lambda (f(Z)])] \leq \exp\left(2\lambda^2 L^2 \nu^2\right).
$$

Using [AS] and the fact that $l$ is $L_1$ Lipschitz, we have $\hat{g}$ is $4L_1^2\nu^2$-sub-Gaussian. Next, $D_n$ is a $L_n$-Lipschitz function of $\hat{g}$, implying $D_n$ is $16L_n^2L_1^2\nu^2$-sub-Gaussian. Using the bound above in (23), we obtain

$$
E[\exp(\lambda D_n)|\mathcal{F}_{n-1}] \leq \exp\left(8\lambda^2 L_n^2 L_1^2 \nu^2\right).
$$

Plugging this bound into (23), followed by an optimization over $\lambda$, we obtain

$$
\mathbb{P}(|z_n| - E[|z_n|] > \varepsilon) \leq \exp(-\lambda \varepsilon)\exp(8\lambda^2 L_n^2 \nu^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{\varepsilon^2}{64L_n^2 \nu^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2}\right).
$$

(24)

We now specialize the bound in (24) using $a_k = c/k$, with $0 < \mu_1 c < 1/2$. In particular, we first compute $\sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2$ for this stepsize choice, and subsequently derive the high probability bound.

$$
\sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \prod_{j=k}^{n-1} (1 - 2\mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2)
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \prod_{j=k}^{n} (1 - a_j(2\mu_1 - a_j L_1^2))
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \exp(-\mu_1 \sum_{j=k}^{n} a_j)
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \exp\left(-\mu_1 c \log\left(\frac{n}{k+1}\right)\right)
\leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{c^2 (k + 1)^{\mu_1 c}}{k^2 n}.
$$

Using the bound on $\sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2$ in (24), we obtain

$$
\mathbb{P}(|z_n| - E[|z_n|] > \varepsilon) \leq \exp\left(-\hat{c} n \varepsilon^2\right),
$$

(25)

where $\hat{c} = \frac{24\mu_1 c^2}{2\mu_1 c - 1}$. Using the bound on $E[|z_n|]$ from Theorem in (39), we have

$$
\mathbb{P}\left(|z_n| - E[z_n| \leq \sqrt{\frac{\log (1/\delta)}{\hat{c} n}} + \frac{E[|t_1 - t'|]}{n^{\mu_1 c}} + \frac{c\sigma 2^\mu_1 c}{\sqrt{(2\mu_1 c - 1)n}}\right) \geq 1 - \delta.
$$

(26)

Hence proved.
A.3 Proof of Theorem 3

Proof. The passage leading up to (20) holds for any choice of stepsize, and does not require \( \frac{1}{2} < \mu_1 c < 1 \). Using (20) as the starting point, we have

\[
E[z_n^2] \leq E[z_0^2] \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k |J_{k-1}|)^2 + \sigma^2 \sum_{k=1}^{n} [a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2].
\]

We split the terms on the RHS above into two regimes: \( k < n_0 \) and \( k \geq n_0 \). From (A6) we have \( |J_k| < B \). We shall now simplify (27) under two different stepsize choices.

Case I: \( a_k = \frac{c}{k} \)

Notice that

\[
\prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k |J_{k-1}|)^2 = \prod_{k=1}^{n_0} (1 + a_k^2 |J_{k-1}|^2 - 2a_k |J_{k-1}|) \prod_{k=n_0+1}^{n} (1 - a_k |J_{k-1}|)^2
\]

\[
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} e^{-2\mu_1 \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{n} a_k}
\]

\[
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} e^{-2\mu_1 c \log(n_0 + 1)}
\]

\[
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} (\frac{n_0 + 1}{n})^{2\mu_1 c}
\]

\[
\leq C(n_0) \frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}}
\]

where \( C(n_0) = (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} (n_0 + 1)^{2\mu_1 c} \).

We now handle the second term in (27) as follows:

\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} [a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2] = \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} [a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n_0} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2] + \sum_{k=n_0+1}^{n} [a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2]
\]

\[
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} (\frac{n_0 + 1}{n})^{2\mu_1 c} \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-2} a_k^2 + \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \frac{k+1}{n}^{2\mu_1 c}
\]

\[
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} (n_0 + 1)^{2\mu_1 c} \frac{1}{6 n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \frac{c^2}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} (k+1)^{2\mu_1 c}.
\]

In the above, we used \( \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k^2 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} < c^2 \frac{\pi^2}{6} \) to arrive at the inequality in (28).

We now simplify (28) based on the value of \( \mu_1 c \) in the following three cases:

Case a: \( \mu_1 c > 1/2 \)

Using the bound in (22), we have \( \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} (k+1)^{2\mu_1 c} \leq \frac{c^2 \log(n+1)}{n} \). Substituting this bound in (28), we obtain

\[
E[z_n^2] \leq C(n_0) \left( E[z_0^2] + \sigma^2 \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) \frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \frac{\sigma^2 c^2 2^{4\mu_1 c}}{(2\mu_1 c - 1) n}.
\]

Case b: \( \mu_1 c = 1/2 \)

In this case, we have

\[
\sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} (k+1)^{2\mu_1 c} \leq \frac{2}{n} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k} \leq 2c^2 \log(n+1) \frac{1}{n}.
\]

Substituting the bound derived above in (28), we obtain

\[
E[z_n^2] \leq C(n_0) \left( E[z_0^2] + \sigma^2 \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) \frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + 2\sigma^2 c^2 \log(n+1) \frac{1}{n}.
\]

(30)
Case c: \( \mu_1 c < 1/2 \)
In this case, we can infer that
\[
\frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} (k+1)^{2\mu_1 c} \leq \frac{2^{2\mu_1 c}}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{(1+2(1/2-\mu_1 c))} \leq \frac{2^{2\mu_1 c+1}c^2}{(1-2\mu_1 c)n^{2\mu_1 c}}.
\]
leading to the following overall bound:
\[
E[z_n^2] \leq C(n_0) \left( E[z_0^2] + \sigma^2 \frac{\pi^2}{6} \frac{1}{n^{2\mu_1 c}} + \sigma^2 \frac{2^{2\mu_1 c+1}c^2}{(1-2\mu_1 c)n^{2\mu_1 c}} \right).
\]
(31)
We now turn to analyzing the case when the stepsize \( a_k \) is larger than \( c/k \).

Case II: \( a_k = \frac{c}{k^\alpha} \) for \( \alpha \in (0, 1) \).
First, we bound a factor in the first term of (27) as follows:
\[
\prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k |J_{k-1}|)^2 = \prod_{k=1}^{n_0} (1 + a_k^2 |J_{k-1}|^2 - 2a_k J_k) \prod_{k=n_0+1}^{n} (1 - a_k |J_{k-1}|)^2 
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} e^{-2\mu_1} \sum_{k=1}^{n_0} a_k 
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} \exp(-2\mu_1 c(n^{1-\alpha} - n_0^{1-\alpha})) 
\leq (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} \exp(2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \exp(-2\mu_1 c n^{1-\alpha}) 
\leq C(n_0) \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) 
\]
(32)
where \( C(n_0) = (1 + c^2 B^2)^{n_0} \exp(2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \).
We now bound the second term in (27) by splitting the term around \( n_0 \) as follows:
\[
\sum_{k=1}^{n} [a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2] 
= \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} \left[ a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2 \right] + \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \left[ a_k^2 \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j |J_{j-1}|)^2 \right] 
\leq C(n_0) \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 + \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \exp(-2\mu_1 c(n^{1-\alpha} - k^{1-\alpha})) 
\leq C(n_0) c^2 n_0 \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) + c^2 \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} k^{-2\alpha} \exp(2\mu_1 ck^{1-\alpha}) 
\leq C(n_0) c^2 n_0 \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) + \frac{2(2\mu_1 c)^{\frac{n}{n_0}} c^2}{1 - \alpha} 
\]
(33)
In arriving at (34), we have bounded the sum \( c^2 \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} k^{-2\alpha} \exp(2\mu_1 ck^{1-\alpha}) \) in (33) by using arguments similar to those used in arriving at Eq. (79) in [37]. In particular, the latter bound uses Jensen’s inequality and the convexity of \( f(x) = x^{-2\alpha} \exp(x^{1-\alpha}) \).
Substituting the bounds in (33) and (34) in (27), we obtain
\[
E[z_n^2] \leq C(n_0) \left( E[z_0^2] + \sigma^2 c^2 n_0 \exp(-2\mu_1 cn^{1-\alpha}) \right. 
\left. + \frac{\sigma^2 2(2\mu_1 c)^{\frac{n}{n_0}} c^2}{(1 - \alpha)n^\alpha} \right). 
\]
(35)
Hence proved.
A.4 Proof of Theorem 4

Proof. Recall that $n_0$ is chosen such that for all $n \geq n_0$, we have $\frac{c}{n} L_1^2 < \mu_1$. Notice that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} L_k^2 + \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} L_k^2. \tag{36}$$

We simplify the first term on the RHS as follows:

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} L_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 \left( \prod_{j=k}^{n_0-1} (1 - 2 \mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2) \right)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 \left( \prod_{j=k}^{n_0-1} (1 - 2 \mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2) \right) \left( \prod_{j=n_0}^{n} (1 - 2 \mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2) \right)$$

$$\leq (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{n_0} \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{-k} \prod_{j=n_0}^{n} (1 - a_j (2 \mu_1 - a_j L_1^2))$$

$$\leq (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{n_0} \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 \exp(-\mu_1 \sum_{j=n_0}^{n} a_j)$$

$$\leq (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{n_0} \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c (n_0-\mu_0)^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right) \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} a_k^2 (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{-k}$$

$$\leq \frac{(1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{n_0+1} e^2}{c^2 L_1^2} \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c (n_1-\mu_0)^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right). \tag{37}$$

We now simplify the second term on the RHS of (36) as follows:

$$\sum_{k=n_0}^{n} L_k^2 = \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \left( \prod_{j=k}^{n} (1 - 2 \mu_1 a_j + a_j^2 L_1^2) \right)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \prod_{j=k}^{n} (1 - a_j (2 \mu_1 - a_j L_1^2))$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \exp(-\mu_1 \sum_{j=n_0}^{n} a_j)$$

$$\leq \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} a_k^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c (n_1-\mu_0-\mu_1 k^{1-\alpha})}{1-\alpha} \right)$$

$$\leq \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c n_0^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right) \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^{2\alpha}} \exp \left( \frac{\mu_1 c k^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right)$$

$$\leq 2 \frac{(\mu_1 c)^{1-\alpha} e^2}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{n^\alpha}. \tag{38}$$

Using (37) and (38) in (36), we obtain

$$\sum_{k=1}^{n} L_k^2 = \sum_{k=1}^{n_0-1} L_k^2 + \sum_{k=n_0}^{n} L_k^2$$

$$\leq (1 + c^2 L_1^2)^{n_0+1} e^2 \exp \left( -\frac{\mu_1 c (n_1-\mu_0)^{1-\alpha}}{1-\alpha} \right) + 2 \frac{(\mu_1 c)^{1-\alpha} e^2}{1-\alpha} \frac{1}{n^\alpha}.$$

Using the above bound in (24), we obtain

$$\Pr(|z_n| - E\|z_n\| > \varepsilon) \leq \exp \left( -\tilde{c} n \varepsilon^2 \right), \tag{39}$$
where \( C = \frac{(1-\alpha)}{2((1-\alpha) + \epsilon^2)} \). Finally, using the bound on \( E[|z_n|] \) from Theorem 1 in (39), we obtain

\[
P \left( |t_n - t^*| \leq C_2 \exp(-\frac{\mu_1 \alpha}{2(1-\alpha)} + C_3 \frac{1}{n^{\alpha/2}}) \right) \geq 1 - \delta,
\]

where \( C_2 \) and \( C_3 \) are as defined in the theorem statement. Hence proved.

\[\square\]

### B Proofs for SR optimization

#### B.1 Proof of Lemma 1

**Proof.** The proof of the first claim, i.e., \( E \left| h_m'(\theta) - \frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{\sqrt{m}} \) was provided in the main paper.

We prove the second claim in the statement of the lemma, i.e., \( E \left( h_m'(\theta) - \frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} \right)^2 \leq C_5 \). Notice that

\[
E \left[ \left| h_m'(\theta) - \frac{dSR_\lambda(\theta)}{d\theta} \right|^2 \right] = E \left[ \frac{A_m(\theta) - A(\theta)^2}{B_m(\theta)} \right]
\]

\[
= E \left[ \frac{B(\theta)A_m(\theta) - A(\theta)B(\theta) + A(\theta)B(\theta) - A(\theta)B_m(\theta)}{B_m(\theta)B} \right]^2
\]

\[
\leq 2B^2(\theta)E[|A_m(\theta) - A(\theta)|^2] + 2A^2(\theta)E[|B_m(\theta) - B(\theta)|^2]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{2\beta_2^2(|A_m^2(\theta)|)}{\mu^2} + 2\beta_2(\theta)E[|B_m(\theta)|^2]
\]

\[
\leq \frac{2\beta_2^2 + 2\beta_1 \beta_2}{\mu^2 \eta^2} = C_5,
\]

where the final inequality used (A9). Hence proved. \[\square\]

#### B.2 Proof of Theorem 5

**Proof.** We first rewrite the update rule (10) as follows:

\[
\theta_n = \theta_{n-1} - a_n h_m'(\theta_{n-1})
\]

\[
= \theta_{n-1} - a_n (h'(\theta_{n-1}) + \epsilon_{n-1})
\]

where \( \epsilon_{n-1} = h_m'(\theta_{n-1}) - h'(\theta_{n-1}) \).

Letting \( z_n = \theta_n - \theta^* \), we have

\[
z_n = z_{n-1} - a_n (h'(\theta_{n-1}) + \epsilon_{n-1})
\]

Let \( M_k = \frac{1}{\int_0^1 [h''(m\theta_k + (1-m)\theta^*)]dm} \). Then,

\[
h'(\theta_n) = \int_0^1 [h''(m\theta_k + (1-m)\theta^*)]dm(\theta_n - \theta^*) = M_n z_n, \text{ and}
\]

\[
z_n = z_{n-1} (1 - a_n M_{n-1}) - a_n \epsilon_{n-1}.
\]
Unrolling the equation above, we obtain

\[ z_n = z_0 \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k M_{k-1}) - \sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1}). \]

Taking expectations, using Jensen’s inequality together with the fact \( \|a - b\|^2 \leq 3 \|a\|^2 + 3 \|b\|^2 \), we obtain

\[
E[\|z_n\|^2] \leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 + 3E[\sum_{k=1}^{n} (a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1}))^2]
\leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 + 3E[\sum_{k=1}^{n} (a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1}))^2]
\leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 + 3E[\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1})^2]
\leq 3E[\|z_0\|^2] \prod_{k=1}^{n} (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 + 3E[\sum_{k=1}^{n} a_k \varepsilon_{k-1} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1})^2]
\]

where \( P_{kj} = \prod_{k=i}^{j} (1 - a_k M_{k-1})^2 \).

We now bound term (I) using Lemma 1 as follows:

\[
I = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} E[\varepsilon_{k-1}^2] (P_{k+1:n})^2
\leq C_5 \sum_{k=1}^{n} \frac{c^2}{k^2} \frac{k+1}{n} 2\mu_2c
\leq C_5 2^{2\mu_2c} \frac{c^2}{(2\mu_2c - 1) n}
\]

(42)

Next, using Lemma 1, we bound the term (II) on the RHS of (41) as follows:

\[
II = \sum_{k \neq l}^{n} a_k a_l E[|\varepsilon_{l-1}|] E[|\varepsilon_{k-1}|] P_{k+1:n} P_{l+1:n}
\leq \left( \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{m}} \right)^2 \sum_{k \neq l}^{n} a_k a_l P_{k+1:n} P_{l+1:n}
\leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \sum_{k \neq l}^{n} \frac{c^2}{kl} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1}) \prod_{j=l+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1})
\leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \sum_{k \neq l}^{n} \frac{c^2}{kl} \prod_{j=k+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1}) \prod_{j=l+1}^{n} (1 - a_j M_{j-1})
\leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \sum_{k=l+1}^{n} \frac{c^2}{kl} \frac{l+1}{n} \mu_2c \left( \frac{k+1}{n} \right)^{\mu_2c}
\]
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\[ \leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{c^2}{l} \left( \frac{l+1}{n} \right) \mu_2 c \sum_{k=l+1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \left( \frac{k+1}{n} \right) \mu_2 c \]

\[ \leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \frac{2^{2\mu_2 e}}{n^{2\mu_2 e}} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{c^2 \mu_2 e}{l} \sum_{k=l+1}^{n} \frac{1}{k} \mu_2 e \]

\[ \leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \frac{2^{2\mu_2 e}}{n^{2\mu_2 e}} \sum_{l=1}^{n} \frac{c^2 \mu_2 e}{l} \frac{(n+1)^{\mu_2 e} - (l+1)^{\mu_2 e}}{\mu_2 e} \]

\[ \leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \frac{2^{3\mu_2 e}}{\mu_2 c} \sum_{l=1}^{n} (\mu_2 e) \]

\[ \leq \frac{2C_4^2}{m} \frac{2^{4\mu_2 e}}{(\mu_2 c)^2}. \] (43)

The main claim follows by substituting the bounds obtained in (42) and (43) in (41). \qed