

# Stability and Sample Complexity of Divergence Regularized Optimal Transport \*

Erhan Bayraktar<sup>†</sup>    Stephan Eckstein<sup>‡</sup>    Xin Zhang<sup>§</sup>

December 2, 2022

## Abstract

We study stability and sample complexity properties of divergence regularized optimal transport (DOT). First, we obtain quantitative stability results for optimizers of (DOT) measured in Wasserstein distance, which are applicable to a wide class of divergences and simultaneously improve known results for entropic optimal transport. Second, we study the case of sample complexity, where the (DOT) problem is approximated using empirical measures of the marginals. We show that divergence regularization can improve the corresponding convergence rate compared to unregularized optimal transport. To this end, we prove upper bounds which exploit both the regularity of cost function and divergence functional, as well as the intrinsic dimension of the marginals. Along the way, we establish regularity properties of dual optimizers of (DOT), as well as general limit theorems for empirical measures with suitable classes of test functions.

*Keywords* Entropic Optimal Transport;  $f$ -Divergence; Regularization; Intrinsic Dimension

*AMS 2010 Subject Classification* 90C25; 49N05

## 1 Introduction

Regularization of optimal transport problems introduces various benefits, mainly in terms of computational tractability (see, e.g., [2, 12, 32, 40]). The most well-known regularization method is the entropic one, leading to the so-called entropic optimal transport (EOT) problem, allowing for the use of

---

\*The authors thank Daniel Bartl and Benoît Kloeckner for helpful comments.

<sup>†</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Michigan, erhan@umich.edu. This paper is supported in part by the National Science Foundation under DMS-2106556, and in part by the Susan M. Smith Professorship .

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Mathematics, ETH Zurich, seckstein@ethz.ch.

<sup>§</sup>Department of Mathematics, University of Vienna, xin.zhang@univie.ac.at.

Sinkhorn’s algorithm [12, 24, 46]. Beyond its computational aspects, (EOT) enjoys other beneficial properties compared to unregularized OT, such as stability of optimizers with respect to perturbations of marginals or cost function (see, e.g., [6, 13, 19, 26, 28, 38]), and improved estimation rates when only finitely many sample points for each marginal are known (see, e.g., [25, 29, 36, 42]). While different aspects, like numerical stability and sparseness of optimal couplings, motivate the use of other divergences aside from the entropic one (see, e.g., [3, 16, 20, 34, 45]), similar results regarding stability and sample complexity have not yet been established beyond the entropic case. This paper aims to fill this gap.

## 1.1 Overview of the Main Results

The divergence regularized optimal transport (DOT) problem takes the form

$$\text{OT}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int c \, d\pi + \varepsilon D_\varphi(\pi, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2),$$

where  $\mu_1, \mu_2$  are the marginals,  $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  is the set of couplings between  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ ,  $c$  is the cost function,  $D_\varphi$  is the divergence functional and  $\varepsilon > 0$  is the regularization parameter; the precise notation is detailed in Section 2. While we keep the exposition simple in the introduction, all results will also apply to the version of (DOT) with multiple marginals  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N$ .

### 1.1.1 Quantitative Stability of Optimizers

We first discuss the quantitative stability results for  $\text{OT}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ . While continuity of the optimal values, i.e., of the mapping  $(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mapsto \text{OT}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  is already treated in [19], this paper establishes continuity of the mapping

$$(\mu_1, \mu_2) \mapsto \pi^* := \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int c \, d\pi + \varepsilon D_\varphi(\pi, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2). \quad (1.1)$$

The main result in this regard is given in Theorem 3.4, whereby differences in both marginals and optimizers are measured in a Wasserstein distance. Assuming weakened versions of Lipschitzianity for  $c$  (see Definition 2.5) and strong convexity for  $\varphi$  (see Definition 3.1), Theorem 3.4 shows that the mapping in (1.1) is Hölder continuous of order  $\frac{1}{2p}$  when measuring distances in the  $p$ -th Wasserstein distance and restricting to marginals with uniformly bounded  $2p$ -th moments. The method of proof follows the line of [19, Theorem 3.11], where a similar result for (EOT) is established. There are, however, some notable differences. The proof of [19, Theorem 3.11] relies on the

Pythagorean theorem for relative entropy (c.f. [11]) and a subsequent application of a generalized Pinsker inequality [4]. While tools for the latter step are available also for non-entropic divergences (e.g., [1]), there is no suitable counterpart for the Pythagorean theorem for general divergences. In the entropic case, combining these tools establishes a strong convexity property for the functional

$$\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2) \ni \pi \mapsto \int c d\pi + \varepsilon D_\varphi(\pi, \mu_1 \otimes \mu_2)$$

around its optimizer. We circumvent the use of a Pythagorean-like theorem and directly establish a strong convexity property for this functional in Lemma 3.3 for a general class of divergences. Interestingly, the resulting estimate in Theorem 3.4 requires weaker moment assumptions than [19, Theorem 3.11], even though it is also applicable to the (EOT) problem. The reason is that the generalized Pinsker inequality [4] used within [19, Theorem 3.11] requires exponential moments, and is applicable to general measures. Lemma 3.3 on the other hand is more specifically tailored to optimizers of (DOT) problems, where non-exponential moments are sufficient.

### 1.1.2 Sample Complexity

While the problem of sample complexity can be regarded as a particular case of stability with respect to the marginals, the general treatment of the previous section falls short of obtaining the strongest possible results in this case. Indeed, while the previous section is only based on Lipschitz properties of the cost function, the study of sample complexity allows us to exploit differentiability properties of both divergence and cost function.

To clarify the problem, *sample complexity* refers to the estimation of (DOT) knowing only empirical measures  $\hat{\mu}_1^n, \hat{\mu}_2^n$  using  $n$  sample points of the marginals. This means, we want to bound the expected difference

$$\Delta^n := \mathbb{E} [|\text{OT}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\mu_1, \mu_2) - \text{OT}_\varphi^\varepsilon(\hat{\mu}_1^n, \hat{\mu}_2^n)|],$$

where the expectation is taken over independent sample points used for  $\hat{\mu}_1^n$  and  $\hat{\mu}_2^n$ . The main result in this regard is given in Theorem 5.3, showing

$$\Delta^n \lesssim n^{-s/d_\mu},$$

where  $s$  is the order of differentiability of the cost  $c$  and the convex conjugate of  $\varphi$ , and  $d_\mu > 2s$  is the intrinsic dimension of  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$ . The form of intrinsic dimension used (see Definition 4.1) is based on covering numbers

and is in particular upper bounded by the entropic dimension of the support of the marginals, while also allowing for non-compact support.

To explain the idea of the proof of Theorem 5.3 and the relation to the literature, let us focus on compactly supported measures  $\mu_1$  and  $\mu_2$  on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . It is known that for unregularized OT ( $\varepsilon = 0$ ),  $\Delta^n$  is of order  $n^{-1/d}$  and thus a victim of the curse of dimensionality (see, e.g., [23]). On the other hand, for (EOT) with suitably regular cost function,  $\Delta^n$  is of order  $n^{-1/2}$  (see [25, 36]) and thus avoids the curse of dimensionality. The basic reason for this improved rate of convergence of (EOT) compared to (OT) is that densities of optimizers are very regular for (EOT). In other words, the dual potentials for (EOT) are infinitely often differentiable. Thus, to bound  $\Delta^n$  in the entropic case, one only has to test the difference between  $(\hat{\mu}_1^n, \hat{\mu}_2^n)$  and  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  using very regular functions. Since it is known that regularity acts as a counterforce to dimensionality (c.f. [30]), the curse of dimensionality can thus be avoided for (EOT).

The proof of Theorem 5.3 follows the idea used in [36] for (EOT) by establishing regularity properties of optimal dual potentials in Proposition 5.1. This regularity mainly depends on two things, the regularity of the cost function  $c$ , and the regularity of the convex conjugate of  $\varphi$ , which we denote by  $\psi$ . Proposition 5.1 shows that if  $c$  and  $\psi$  are  $s$ -times continuously differentiable, then the optimal dual potentials are  $(s-1)$ -times continuously differentiable. The reason we lose one order is that the defining equations for the dual potentials (the analogue to the Schrödinger equations for (EOT), established in Lemma 2.3), already use the first order derivative of  $c$  and  $\psi$ . While differentiability of order  $(s-1)$  would only lead to a rate of order  $n^{-(s-1)/d}$  in Theorem 5.3, we additionally impose a Lipschitz condition on the order  $s$  derivative of  $\psi$ , which transfers to the order  $(s-1)$  derivative of the optimal dual potentials.

To establish Theorem 5.3 using the results given by Proposition 5.1, Lemma 5.2 shows that it suffices to control differences between  $(\mu_1, \mu_2)$  and  $(\hat{\mu}_1^n, \hat{\mu}_2^n)$  with respect to suitably regular test functions as obtained by Proposition 5.1. While general results (see, e.g., [30, Theorem 1.4]) would directly lead to the rate  $n^{-(s-1)/d}$ , we establish more specific results in Theorem 4.2 aimed at exploiting the particular regularity structure of optimal dual potentials, as well as the intrinsic dimension of the marginals. If  $C_1^{s-1,1}$  is the class of  $(s-1)$ -times continuously differentiable functions where the order  $(s-1)$  derivative is 1 Lipschitz and the infinity-norms of all derivatives are bounded by 1, and  $d_\mu > 2s$  is the intrinsic dimension of  $\mu_1$ , then Theorem

4.2 shows that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int f d\mu_1 - \int f d\hat{\mu}_1^n \right] \lesssim n^{-s/d_\mu}.$$

Convergence rates of empirical measures defined through testing against regular functions were also obtained in [25, 30, 36] by analyzing the space of test functions using reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and Rademacher complexity, wavelet decompositions, and covering numbers, respectively. Our results additionally incorporate the information of intrinsic dimension of measures (as, e.g., used in [15, 50]), and our proof relies on the chaining method and Taylor expansion of test functions. The particular structure using just  $(s - 1)$  order derivatives with additional Lipschitz continuity for the highest order is specifically tailored to the regularity of the dual potentials as obtained by Proposition 5.1.

## 1.2 Related Literature

Recent literature has caught up on establishing properties for arbitrary (DOT) problems aside from (EOT). One large topic are approximation properties as  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ . While convergence for (EOT) has initially been studied in [5, 31] and explicit rates for discrete problems are long known (see [9, 49]), by now general rates of convergence (see [7, 8, 39]), convergence of optimizers (see [37, 41]) and second order expansions around  $\varepsilon = 0$  (see [10, 27]) have been established. While the initial method used in [5] to show convergence to the unregularized problem for  $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$  transfers to general (DOT) problems (see also [17, Proposition 2.8]), rates of convergence have only recently been established in [18]. Related convergence results for general (DOT) problems have also been established in [33], where the focus is on absolutely continuous marginals.

A different string of literature focuses on computational aspects of (DOT) problems. Benefits of more general versions of (DOT) compared to (EOT) have been utilized for instance by [3, 16, 20, 34, 45]. Recent works have also established both theoretical and computational tractability of a generalized version of Sinkhorn’s algorithm (see [14, 47]), while [34] suggests the use of different algorithms to solve the (DOT) problem with quadratic divergence.

## 1.3 Structure of the Paper

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 details the notation and states preliminary results for (DOT) problems, and defines nec-

essary concepts that will be used in the later sections. Section 3 gives the results related to the quantitative stability of the (DOT) problem. Section 4 gives results for the rate of convergence of empirical measures, exploiting regularity of the test functions and the intrinsic dimension of the measure. Finally, based on the results in Section 4, Section 5 establishes the sample complexity when approximating (DOT) using empirical measures of the marginals.

## 2 Notation and Preliminaries

We first detail all used notation in Section 2.1, before giving preliminary results in Section 2.2. Section 2.2 recalls existence of primal and dual optimizers in Lemmas 2.1 and 2.3, and gives necessary definitions which will be used in Section 3.

### 2.1 Notation

For a polish space  $(Y, d_Y)$ , we denote by  $\mathcal{P}(Y)$  the set of Borel probability measures on  $Y$ , by  $\mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  for  $p \in [1, \infty)$  the subset of measures  $\mu$  with finite  $p$ -th moment, i.e., which satisfy  $\int d_Y(y, \hat{y})^p \mu(dy) < \infty$  for some  $\hat{y} \in Y$ . For  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance  $W_p(\mu, \nu)$  between  $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}_p(Y)$  is defined via

$$W_p(\mu, \nu)^p = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int d_Y(x, y)^p \pi(dx, dy).$$

If  $Y = \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ , we denote by  $C^s(Y)$  the set of functions  $f : Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  which are  $s$  times continuously differentiable, where we use the notation  $D^\alpha f = \frac{\partial f}{\partial_1^{\alpha_1} \partial_2^{\alpha_2} \dots \partial_d^{\alpha_d}}$  for  $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$  with  $|\alpha| := \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i \leq s$ . By  $C^{s,1}(Y) \subseteq C^s(Y)$  we denote the subset of functions  $f$  where  $D^\alpha f$  is Lipschitz for  $|\alpha| = s$ , and by  $C_K^{s,1}(Y) \subseteq C^{s,1}(Y)$  the subset of functions where  $\|D^\alpha f\|_\infty \leq K$  for  $|\alpha| \leq s$  and  $D^\alpha f$  is  $K$ -Lipschitz for  $|\alpha| = s$ . For a Taylor formula in several variables, we will follow [22], and in particular use the notation  $x^\alpha = x_1^{\alpha_1} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ .

For  $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  a strictly convex, lower bounded function with  $\varphi(1) = 0$  and  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \varphi(x)/x = \infty$ , we will always denote by  $\psi(y) := \sup_{x \geq 0} (xy - \varphi(x))$  its convex dual pair, and refer to  $(\varphi, \psi)$  as convex conjugates. The  $\varphi$ -divergence  $D_\varphi(Q, P)$  between probabilities  $Q, P$  on a common space is defined by

$$D_\varphi(Q, P) := \int \varphi\left(\frac{dQ}{dP}\right) dP \quad \text{for } Q \ll P$$

and  $D_\varphi(Q, P) := \infty$  for  $Q \not\ll P$ . The  $D_\varphi$ -regularized transport problem  $\text{OT}_\varphi$  is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) &:= \int c d\pi + D_\varphi(\pi, P), \quad P := \mu_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mu_N, \\ \text{OT}_\varphi(\mu) &:= \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu)} \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$ ,  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}(X_i)$  for polish spaces  $(X_i, d_{X_i})$ ,  $X = \prod_{i=1}^N X_i$ ,  $\Pi(\mu)$  is the set of probability measures on  $X$  with  $i$ -th marginal  $\mu_i$ , and  $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is a measurable cost function. We also denote  $X^{-i} = \prod_{j=1, j \neq i}^N X_j$  and  $P^{-i} = \otimes_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \mu_j$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . While usually, the problem includes an additional parameter,  $\varepsilon$ , as a multiplier for  $D_\varphi$ , we disregard  $\varepsilon$  here, noting that scaling of the cost function  $c$  by a factor  $\frac{1}{\varepsilon}$  leads to the equivalent problem with  $\varepsilon = 1$ . We will always assume that for some  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}_p(X_i)$ , and if  $p < \infty$ , then  $c$  has growth of order  $p$  (i.e.,  $|c(x)| \leq 1 + d_X(x_0, x)^p$  for some  $x_0 \in X$ ), or if  $p = \infty$ , then  $c$  is bounded. For the definition of the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance on  $X$ , we will use the particular product metric  $d_{X,p}(x, y) := (\sum_{i=1}^N d_{X_i}(x_i, y_i)^p)^{1/p}$ . The distance between two tuples of marginals will often be quantified by

$$W_p(\mu; \tilde{\mu}) := \left( \sum_{i=1}^N W_p(\mu_i, \tilde{\mu}_i)^p \right)^{1/p}.$$

We denote by  $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$  the total variation norm between signed measures (normalized to one for probability measures), and for two probability measures  $\pi, \tilde{\pi}$  and a non-negative measurable function  $\rho$  on the same space, we use the shorthand  $\rho(\pi - \tilde{\pi})$  for the signed measure  $\rho\pi - \rho\tilde{\pi}$ , where  $\rho\pi$  is the measure with Radon-Nikodym density  $\rho$  with respect to  $\pi$ .

## 2.2 Preliminaries

Throughout the paper, unless otherwise specified, let  $(\varphi, \psi)$  be convex conjugates,  $p \in [1, \infty]$ ,  $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}_p(X_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$  and assume  $c : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is continuous with growth of order  $p$ . Note that this implies that  $\int |c| dP < \infty$  and thus  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu)$  takes a finite value.

We first recall primal attainment and duality for  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu)$ .

**Lemma 2.1** (Existence of primal optimizers and duality). *There exists  $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu)$  such that*

$$\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu) = \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*).$$

For  $\psi(y) := \sup_{x \geq 0}(xy - \varphi(x))$ , we have the dual formulation

$$\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) = \sup_{h = \oplus_{i=1}^N h_i} \int h - \psi(h - c) dP,$$

where the supremum is taken over measurable functions  $h : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  of the form  $h(x) = \sum_{i=1}^N h_i(x_i)$ .

*Proof.* Primal attainment is a direct consequence of the compactness of  $\Pi(\boldsymbol{\mu})$ , continuity of  $c$  and weak lower-semicontinuity of  $\pi \mapsto D_\varphi(\pi, P)$ .

Regarding duality we refer to [16, Theorem 2.2], where we note that therein,  $h_i$  are restricted to be continuous, but the weak duality

$$\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) \geq \sup_{h = \oplus_{i=1}^N h_i} \int h - \psi(h - c) dP,$$

follows easily by using  $\psi(h - c) \geq \frac{d\pi^*}{dP}(h - c) - \varphi(\frac{d\pi^*}{dP})$ .  $\square$

Similar to the Schrödinger equations for entropic OT, we will require dual attainment and corresponding first order optimality conditions for  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ . In general,  $\psi$  is non-decreasing and bounded from below as the convex conjugate of  $\varphi$ . The following condition is both a regularity condition, and also a stronger version than superlinearity at infinity for  $\psi$ , i.e., we don't just need that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\psi(x)}{x} = \infty$ , but we require that  $\psi(x)/x \gtrsim x$  for large enough  $x$ .

**Definition 2.2** (Dual regularity of  $\varphi$ ). We say  $\varphi$  is dual regular, if  $\psi \in C^1$  and there exists  $C > 0$  such that  $\psi'(x) \geq |x|$  for  $x \geq C$ .

**Lemma 2.3** (Existence of dual optimizers). Assume  $(\varphi, \psi)$  is dual regular. Then there exists  $h^* = \oplus_{i=1}^N h_i^*$  satisfying

$$\sup_{h = \oplus_{i=1}^N h_i} \int h - \psi(h - c) dP = \int h^* - \psi(h^* - c) dP.$$

Further, using the notation  $x^{-i} = (x_j)_{j \neq i}$  and  $P^{-i} = \otimes_{j \neq i} \mu_j$  for  $x \in X$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ , there exists an optimizer  $h^*$  satisfying

$$1 = \int \psi'(h^*(x) - c(x)) P^{-i}(dx^{-i})$$

for all  $x_i \in X_i$  and  $i = 1, \dots, N$ .



*Proof.* Regarding existence, first note that for any feasible dual function  $h$ , there exists  $K \in \mathbb{R}$  such that  $\int \psi'(h - c - K) dP = 1$ , which follows since  $\psi$  is bounded from below, non-decreasing and superlinear at infinity. Choosing such  $K$ , we find that  $(h - K)$  has better dual objective value than  $h$ . Indeed, by the convexity of  $\psi$ , we have  $\psi(h - c) \geq \psi(h - c - K) + \psi'(h - c - K)K$  and thus

$$\int h - K - \psi(h - c - K) dP \geq \int h - K - \psi(h - c) + K dP = \int h - \psi(h - c) dP.$$

Now, we take a maximizing sequence  $(h^n)_n$  and by the above, w.l.o.g.  $\int \psi'(h^n - c) dP = 1$ . We will show that the sequence  $(h^n - c)_n$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^1(P)$ . To this end, for  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  let  $x^+ := \max\{x, 0\}$ ,  $x^- := -\min\{x, 0\}$ . First,  $\int \psi'(h^n - c) dP = 1$  implies, by the assumption that  $(\varphi, \psi)$  is dual regular and since  $\psi'$  is bounded below, that  $\int (h^n - c)^+ dP \leq C$  uniformly across  $h^n$ . Indeed, take  $C > 0$  such that  $\psi' \geq -C$  and  $\psi(x)/x \geq x$  for  $x \geq C$ . Then

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int \psi'(h^n - c) dP = \int_{h^n - c \leq C} \psi'(h^n - c) dP + \int_{h^n - c \geq C} \psi'(h^n - c) dP \\ &\geq -2C + \int (h^n - c)^+ dP \end{aligned}$$

Thus, using  $x = x^+ - x^-$ , lower boundedness of  $\psi$  and the fact that the dual objective values  $V^n$  under  $h^n$  are converging and thus uniformly bounded, we see that

$$\begin{aligned} &\int (h^n - c)^- dP \\ &= - \int (h^n - \psi(h^n - c)) dP + \int (h^n - c)^+ dP - \int \psi(h^n - c) dP + \int c dP \\ &\leq |V^n| + \int (h^n - c)^+ dP - \int \psi(h^n - c) dP + \int c dP \end{aligned}$$

is uniformly bounded as well and thus the sequence  $(h^n - c)_n$  is uniformly bounded in  $L^1(P)$ . By Komlós Lemma the sequence  $(\tilde{h}^n - c) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h^i - c$  converges in  $L^1(P)$  to some  $h^* - c$ , where we note that  $\tilde{h}^n$  is by convexity of  $\psi$  still a maximizing sequence, and thus  $h^*$  is a maximizer. Hereby,  $h^*$  can be verified to almost surely be of the form  $h^* = \oplus_{i=1}^N h_i^*$  by taking an almost surely convergent subsequence of  $\tilde{h}^n$ .

Regarding first order conditions, fix  $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ . By taking continuous and bounded test functions  $h_i$  and considering optimality of the map

$$t \mapsto \int h^* + th_i - \psi(h^* + th_i - c) dP,$$

which, after differentiating under the integral sign (which is justified, e.g., by [21, Theorem 2.27]), leads to the first order condition

$$\int h_i - \psi'(h^* - c)h_i dP = 0$$

and since  $h_i$  is arbitrary thus

$$1 = \int \psi'(h^* - c) dP^{-i}$$

$\mu_i$ -almost surely. Further, since this will neither change the objective value nor the other equations for  $j \neq i$ , we can simply define  $h_i$  to satisfy this equation pointwise, which yields the claim.  $\square$

For the quantitative stability results for  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ , we will require the concept of a shadow, c.f. [19, Definition 3.1 and Lemma 3.2].<sup>1</sup>

**Definition 2.4** (Shadow). Let  $\mu_i, \tilde{\mu}_i \in \mathcal{P}_p(X_i)$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . For  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$ , we define its *shadow*  $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\tilde{\mu}_1, \dots, \tilde{\mu}_N)$  as the second marginal of

$$\pi \otimes K \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X),$$

where  $K$  is the stochastic kernel given as the point-wise product measure

$$K(x) = K_1(x_1) \otimes K_2(x_2) \otimes \dots \otimes K_N(x_N),$$

where  $\theta_i = \mu_i \otimes K_i \in \Pi(\mu_i, \tilde{\mu}_i)$  are  $W_p(\mu_i, \tilde{\mu}_i)$  optimizers.

We also use a condition on cost functions  $c$  which generalizes Lipschitz continuity, and holds for instance also for  $c(x) = \|x_2 - x_1\|^p$  for  $x \in \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d$ , c.f. [19, Lemma 3.5, Example 3.6].

**Definition 2.5** (Weakened Lipschitz condition of  $c$ ). For  $L > 0$ , we say that  $c$  satisfies  $(A_L)$  for marginals  $\boldsymbol{\mu}, \tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}} \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ , if

$$\left| \int c d(\pi - \tilde{\pi}) \right| \leq LW_p(\pi, \tilde{\pi}) \tag{A_L}$$

for all  $\pi \in \Pi(\boldsymbol{\mu}), \tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\tilde{\boldsymbol{\mu}})$ .

Using the concept of the shadow, the stability of the value of  $\text{OT}_\varphi$  was shown in [19].

---

<sup>1</sup>We refer to it as "the" shadow, even though the given construction is not always unique. Whenever we refer to the shadow of a measure, any shadow will do.

**Lemma 2.6** (Continuity of  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ ). *Assume  $c$  satisfies  $(A_L)$  for marginals  $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ . Then*

$$|\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu})| \leq LW_p(\mu, \tilde{\mu})$$

*Proof.* See [19, Theorem 3.6]. □

### 3 Quantitative Stability of Regularized Optimal Transport

For the quantitative stability result for the optimizers of  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu)$ , we will rely on the respective quantitative stability of the optimal values given in Lemma 2.6.

Recall that a strongly convex function  $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R})$  with parameter  $m > 0$  satisfies  $\varphi''(x) \geq m$ , or equivalently  $\frac{1}{\varphi''(x)} \leq \frac{1}{m}$ . This assumption is too strong for our purposes, since it is not satisfied, e.g., for  $\varphi(x) = x \log x$ . For the purposes of our paper, a weaker strong convexity assumption is sufficient, which is given in the following definition.

**Definition 3.1** (Strong convexity assumption for  $\varphi$ ). For  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$ , we say  $\varphi$  is  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convex, if  $\varphi \in C^2(\mathbb{R}_+)$  and

$$\frac{1}{\varphi''(x)} \leq \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 x$$

for all  $x \in (0, \infty)$ .

**Example 3.2.** We showcase relevant instances of divergence functions  $\varphi$  which are both dual regular (c.f. Definition 2.2) and also  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convex for some  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0$  (c.f. Definition 3.1).

First, clearly, the entropic case is covered, i.e.,  $\varphi_{\text{ent}}(x) := x \log x$  is both dual regular and  $(0, 1)$ -convex.

Second, divergences of power form satisfy the constraints as long as the power is equal to or below 2. We consider  $\alpha$ -divergences, which clearly includes the popular  $\chi^2$ -divergence for  $\alpha = 2$ . Let  $\alpha \in (1, 2]$  and  $\varphi_\alpha(x) := \frac{x^\alpha - \alpha(x-1) - 1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}$ . That  $\varphi_\alpha$  is dual regular can be obtained from the fact that the convex conjugate  $\psi(y)$  equals, up to scaling and shifting, the function  $y_+^\beta$ , where  $\frac{1}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\beta} = 1$  and thus  $\beta \geq 2$ . Hence, both  $\psi \in C^1$ , and further  $\psi(x)/x \gtrsim x$  for large  $x$  follows. Regarding  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convexity,  $\varphi_\alpha$  has second order derivative  $\varphi_\alpha''(x) = x^{\alpha-2}$ . Therefore by Young's inequality

$$\frac{1}{\varphi_\alpha''(x)} = x^{2-\alpha} \leq (\alpha - 1) + (2 - \alpha)x,$$

and thus  $\varphi_\alpha$  is  $(\alpha - 1, 2 - \alpha)$ -convex.

**Lemma 3.3** (Strong convexity of  $\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu$  at optimizer). *Assume  $\varphi$  is  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convex,  $\pi^*$  is an optimizer of  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu)$ , and  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu)$ . Then, for any measurable  $\rho : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ ,*

$$\|\rho(\pi^* - \pi)\|_{TV}^2 \leq C \left( \int |\rho|^2 d(P + \pi^* + \pi) \right) (\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) - \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*)),$$

where  $C = 4 \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\}$ .

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) < +\infty$ . Since  $\pi^*$  is an optimizer, the function  $[0, 1] \ni t \mapsto \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu((1-t)\pi^* + t\pi)$  is increasing in  $t$ , and hence its first order derivative is non-negative at  $t = 0$ . Therefore we obtain that

$$\int c d(\pi - \pi^*) + \int \varphi'(\rho_{\pi^*})(\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*}) dP \geq 0, \quad (3.1)$$

where  $\rho_\pi := \frac{d\pi}{dP}$ ,  $\rho_{\pi^*} := \frac{d\pi^*}{dP}$ .

By the Taylor expansion of function  $\varphi$

$$\varphi(y) = \varphi(x) + (y-x)\varphi'(x) + (y-x)^2 \int_0^1 dt \int_0^t \varphi''(x + s(y-x)) ds,$$

we get that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) - \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*) &= \int c d(\pi - \pi^*) + \int \varphi(\rho_\pi) - \varphi(\rho_{\pi^*}) dP \\ &= \int c d(\pi - \pi^*) + \int \varphi'(\rho_{\pi^*})(\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*}) dP \\ &\quad + \int (\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*})^2 \int_0^1 dt \int_0^t \varphi''(\rho_{\pi^*} + s(\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*})) ds dP \\ &\geq \int \int_0^1 (\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*})^2 (1-t) \varphi''(\rho_{\pi^*} + t(\rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*})) dt dP, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to (3.1).

Denoting  $\Delta = \rho_\pi - \rho_{\pi^*}$ , by the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( \int \int_0^1 \Delta^2 (1-t) \varphi''(\rho_{\pi^*} + t\Delta) dt dP \right) \left( \int \int_0^1 \frac{(1-t)\rho^2}{\varphi''(\rho_{\pi^*} + t\Delta)} dt dP \right) \\ &\geq \left( \int \int_0^1 (1-t) |\rho \Delta| dt dP \right)^2 = \frac{1}{4} \|\rho(\pi - \pi^*)\|_{TV}^2. \end{aligned}$$

According to the  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convexity of  $\varphi$ , the second term on the left hand side is bounded from above by

$$\max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} \int |\rho(x)|^2 d(P + \pi^* + \pi).$$

Therefore we can bound the weighted total variation of  $\pi, \pi^*$  from above by

$$\frac{1}{4} \|\rho(\pi - \pi^*)\|_{TV}^2 \leq \max\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2\} (\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) - \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*)) \int |\rho(x)|^2 d(P + \pi^* + \pi),$$

which completes the proof.  $\square$

The following theorem provides a quantitative stability of optimizers for a large class of divergence regularizations. Furthermore, in the case of entropic regularization, it recovers [19, Theorem 3.11] under weaker moment assumptions.

**Theorem 3.4** (Quantitative stability of optimizers of  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ ). *Assume  $\varphi$  is  $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2)$ -convex and  $c$  satisfies  $(A_L)$  for marginals  $\mu, \tilde{\mu} \in \mathcal{P}_p(X)$ . Let  $\pi^*, \tilde{\pi}^*$  be optimizers of  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu), \text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu})$ , respectively, let  $q \in [1, p]$  and  $\Delta := W_p(\mu, \tilde{\mu})$ . Then*

$$W_q(\pi^*, \tilde{\pi}^*) \leq N^{(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})} \Delta + C(L\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2q}},$$

where  $C$  is a constant only depending on  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  and the  $2q$ -th moment of  $\mu$ .

*Proof.* Take  $\pi \in \Pi(\mu)$  to be a shadow of  $\tilde{\pi}^*$ . From [19, Lemma 3.2], we find

$$W_p(\tilde{\pi}^*, \pi) = W_p(\mu, \tilde{\mu}), \quad \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) \leq \text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu}) + L\Delta.$$

Thus, by Lemma 2.6,

$$\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) - \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*) \leq 2L\Delta.$$

Take  $\rho(x) = d_X(x_0, x)^q$  in Lemma 3.3, and use the following inequality from [48, Proposition 7.10]

$$W_q(\pi^*, \pi)^q \leq 2^{q-1} \|\rho(\pi^* - \pi)\|_{TV},$$

which yields that

$$W_q(\pi^*, \pi)^{2q} \leq \tilde{C} (\mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi) - \mathcal{F}_\varphi^\mu(\pi^*)) \leq \tilde{C} 2L\Delta,$$

where  $\tilde{C}$  is, in view of Lemma 3.3, a constant only depending on  $q, \lambda_1, \lambda_2$  and the  $2q$ -th moment of  $\mu$ . Now, by the triangle inequality, we conclude

$$W_q(\pi^*, \tilde{\pi}^*) \leq W_q(\tilde{\pi}^*, \pi) + W_q(\pi^*, \pi) \leq N^{(\frac{1}{q} - \frac{1}{p})} \Delta + C(L\Delta)^{\frac{1}{2q}},$$

where  $C = (\tilde{C} 2)^{1/2q}$  only depends on  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2$  and the  $2q$ -th moment of  $\mu$ .  $\square$

## 4 Intrinsic Dimension and Regularity of Test Functions

We have seen in Section 3, respectively Lemma 2.6, that quantitative stability estimates for (DOT) can be obtained using Lipschitz properties of the cost functions. However, for sample complexity, the literature on (EOT) [25, 36] has established that additional regularity properties can be exploited, and to an extent the same is true even for unregularized OT [35]. This section provides the specific tools for convergence rates of empirical measures with respect to test functions arising from dual optimal solutions for general (DOT) problems, allowing us to exploit regularity in the sample complexity of (DOT) as well in Section 5. The main result, Theorem 4.2, may be of interest on its own, as to the best of the authors' knowledge, it is the first result measuring empirical rates of convergence, both with higher order differentiability of test functions, and a concept of intrinsic dimension (see Definition 4.1).

We fix  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$  and for i.i.d. random variables  $Z_1, Z_2, \dots$  with  $Z_1 \sim \mu$ , we denote by  $\hat{\mu}^n := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i}$  for  $n \in \mathbb{N}$  the (random) empirical measures of  $\mu$ .

The following introduces the concept of intrinsic dimension used in this paper. Roughly speaking, the measure  $\mu$  has intrinsic dimension  $d_\mu$ , if most of its support can be covered as efficiently as a  $d_\mu$ -dimensional unit cube. The precise meaning of "most" in this context depends on the regularity  $s$  of the test functions that we use. The general concept is adapted from [15].

**Definition 4.1** (Intrinsic dimension). Let  $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ ,  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d_\mu \in (2s, \infty)$ . We say that  $\mu$  satisfies  $I(d_\mu, s)$ , if there exists  $K > 0$  such that for every  $\varepsilon > 0$ , there exists  $\Omega_\varepsilon \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  satisfying  $\mu(\Omega_\varepsilon^c) \leq \varepsilon^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)}$  and a partition  $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$  of  $\Omega_\varepsilon$  s.t.

$$D_{\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} := \sup_{A \in \mathcal{A}_\varepsilon} \sup_{x, y \in A} \|x - y\| \leq \varepsilon \text{ and } |\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon| \leq K \varepsilon^{-d_\mu},$$

where  $|\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon|$  denotes the number of sets in the partition  $\mathcal{A}_\varepsilon$ .

The following is the main result of this section.

**Theorem 4.2.** *Assume  $\mu$  satisfies  $I(d_\mu, s)$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d_\mu \in (2s, \infty)$ .*

*Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int f d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right] \lesssim n^{-s/d_\mu}.$$

The proof will be given at the end of the section, and we first state some preliminary results that will be used. The idea is based on the proof of [15, Theorem 3.2], which is to use a refinement of partitions of a suitable form, c.f. Lemma 4.4. While [15, Theorem 3.2] uses Lipschitz continuity to pass from one partition to the next coarser one, we will use a Taylor expansion to this end. Lemma 4.3 gives the basic result for how we deal with the sampling error. Lemmas 4.5 and 4.6 will inductively control the errors when passing from one partition to the next coarser one, while the proof collects the estimate for the finest partition and suitably balances the occurring parameters.

**Lemma 4.3.** *Let  $g : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be measurable and bounded and  $\mathcal{A}$  be a partition such that  $\cup_{A \in \mathcal{A}} A \subset \Omega$ . Then*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int_A g d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right| \right] \leq \|g\|_\infty \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n} \right)^{1/2}.$$

*Proof.* Recall that  $\hat{\mu}^n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{Z_i}}{n}$ , and hence  $\int_A g d\hat{\mu}^n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n g_A(Z_i)}{n}$ , where  $g_A(x) := g(x)\mathbb{1}_A(x)$  and  $\{g_A(Z_i)\}_{i=1, \dots, n}$  are *i.i.d.* with expectation  $\int_A g d\mu$ . Therefore we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \left| \int_A g d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right|^2 \right] = \frac{\text{Var}(g_A(Z_1))}{n} \leq \frac{1}{n} \int_A g^2 d\mu.$$

Now by Cauchy-Schwartz or Jensen's inequality, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int_A g d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right| \right] &\leq \sqrt{|\mathcal{A}|} \sqrt{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} \left| \int_A g d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right|^2 \right]} \\ &\leq \sqrt{\frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n}} \int g^2 d\mu \leq \|g\|_\infty \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}|}{n} \right)^{1/2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

In the following, we will show that if we choose partitions  $\mathcal{A}_T, \mathcal{A}_{T-1}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_1$  for different levels of  $\varepsilon$ , namely,  $\varepsilon_t = 3^t \varepsilon$ , then the partitions may without loss of generality be taken as refinements of each other. In the remainder of this section, we always consider  $\mathcal{A}_T, \dots, \mathcal{A}_1$  to be as in the following lemma, where we abbreviate  $D_t := D_{\mathcal{A}_t}$ .

**Lemma 4.4** (Partitions can be chosen as refinements). *Assume  $\mu$  satisfies  $I(d_\mu, s)$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d_\mu \in (2s, \infty)$ . Then there exists a constant  $K > 0$  such that for all  $T \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\varepsilon > 0$  with  $\varepsilon 3^T \leq 1$ , there exists  $\bar{\Omega} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$  and refinements of partitions  $\mathcal{A}_T, \mathcal{A}_{T-1}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_1$  of  $\bar{\Omega}$  s.t.*

$$|\mathcal{A}_t| \leq K(\varepsilon 3^t)^{-d_\mu}, \quad |D_{\mathcal{A}_t}| \leq 3^t \varepsilon \quad \text{and} \quad \mu(\bar{\Omega}^c) \leq K(3^T \varepsilon)^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)}.$$

*Proof.* Aside from the last part of the claim, this result is given in [15, Proof of Theorem 3.2]. We shortly recap the construction. In what follows, the constant  $K$  may change from line to line. From Definition 4.1 (using  $\tilde{K}$  instead of  $K$  therein), we take a partition  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_t$  of  $\Omega_t$  satisfying  $|D_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_t}| \leq 3^{t-1} \varepsilon$ ,  $|\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_t| \leq \tilde{K}(\varepsilon 3^{t-1})^{-d_\mu} \leq K(\varepsilon 3^t)^{-d_\mu}$ , and  $\mu(\Omega_t^c) \leq (\varepsilon 3^{t-1})^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)}$ . Taking  $\bar{\Omega} := \cap_{t=1}^T \Omega_t$  satisfies the desired inequality with  $K = \frac{1}{3^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)} - 1}$  by the geometric series, since

$$\mu(\bar{\Omega}^c) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} (\varepsilon 3^t)^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)} \leq K(3^T \varepsilon)^{sd_\mu/(d_\mu-2s)}.$$

In what follows, consider all sets to be intersected with  $\bar{\Omega}$  (and if this leads to an empty set, disregard it). We take  $\mathcal{A}_1 := \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1$ . Using the notation  $\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_t = \{\tilde{A}_{t,1}, \dots, \tilde{A}_{t,n_t}\}$ , we proceed inductively to define  $\mathcal{A}_t = \{A_{t,1}, \dots, A_{t,n_t}\}$  as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} A_{t,1} &:= \cup \{A_{t-1,j} : A_{t-1,j} \cap \tilde{A}_{t,1} \neq \emptyset, j = 1, \dots, n_{t-1}\}, \\ A_{t,i} &:= \cup \{A_{t-1,j} : A_{t-1,j} \cap \tilde{A}_{t,i} \neq \emptyset \text{ and } A_{t-1,j} \cap A_{t,k} = \emptyset \\ &\quad \text{for all } k = 1, \dots, i-1, j = 1, \dots, n_{t-1}\}, \end{aligned}$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, n_t$ ,  $t = 2, \dots, T$ . The refinement property is clear by construction, and further  $D_{\mathcal{A}_1} = D_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_1}$  and  $D_{\mathcal{A}_t} \leq 2D_{\mathcal{A}_{t-1}} + D_{\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_t}$ , which inductively yields the claim.  $\square$

For the proof of the main theorem, we require the following notation. For  $\tilde{s} \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ,  $g \in L^\infty$ , and  $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , define

$$E_{\tilde{s},g,i} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{\tilde{s}-1,1}} \left| \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} \int_{A_i} f(x_{A_i}) g(x) (\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right| \right],$$

where  $x_{A_i}$  are some fixed elements in  $A_i$ . We further define

$$M_{i,g} := \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} \left| \int_{A_i} g d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right| \right],$$



and by  $g_Z$  for  $Z > 0$  we denote some generic function in  $L^\infty$  satisfying  $\|g_Z\|_\infty \leq Z\|g\|_\infty$ .

**Lemma 4.5.** *For any  $\tilde{s} \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ,  $g \in L^\infty$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$ , we have that*

$$E_{\tilde{s},g,i} \leq E_{\tilde{s},g,T} + \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \tilde{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} E_{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|,g_{D_{j+1}^{|\alpha|}},j+1} + \sum_{|\alpha|=\tilde{s}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{j+1}^{\tilde{s}} M_{j,g} \right]$$

*Proof.* For any  $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i$ , since  $\mathcal{A}_i$  is a refinement of  $\mathcal{A}_{i+1}$  there exists a unique  $A_{i+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}$  such that  $A_i \subset A_{i+1}$ . Then, for arbitrary  $f \in C_1^{\tilde{s}-1,1}$ , by the Taylor expansion in multi-index notation (following, e.g., [22])

$$f(x_{A_i}) = f(x_{A_{i+1}}) + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \tilde{s}-1} \frac{D^\alpha f(x_{A_{i+1}})}{\alpha!} (x_{A_i} - x_{A_{i+1}})^\alpha + R^f(x_{A_i}, x_{A_{i+1}}),$$

where

$$R^f(x_{A_i}, x_{A_{i+1}}) = \sum_{|\alpha|=\tilde{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \left( D^\alpha f(\xi_{A_i, A_{i+1}}) - D^\alpha f(x_{A_{i+1}}) \right) (x_{A_i} - x_{A_{i+1}})^\alpha$$

for  $\xi_{A_i, A_{i+1}} = x_{A_{i+1}} + c_{A_i, A_{i+1}}(x_{A_i} - x_{A_{i+1}})$  for some  $c_{A_i, A_{i+1}} \in (0, 1)$ . And thus, by 1-Lipschitz continuity of  $D^\alpha f$  for  $|\alpha| = \tilde{s} - 1$ , we obtain

$$|R^f(x_{A_i}, x_{A_{i+1}})| \leq \sum_{|\alpha|=\tilde{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{i+1}^{\tilde{s}}.$$

Define functions  $g^\alpha$  for each index  $\alpha$  via

$$g^\alpha(x) := \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in A_i\}} g(x) (x_{A_i} - x_{A_{i+1}})^\alpha,$$

whose sup norm is clearly bounded by  $D_{i+1}^{|\alpha|} \|g\|_\infty$ , and thus an element of  $g_{D_{i+1}^{|\alpha|}}$ . Now plugging the Taylor expansion into the definition of  $E_{\tilde{s},g,i}$ , we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} E_{\tilde{s},g,i} &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{\tilde{s}-1,1}} \left| \sum_{A_{i+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}} \int_{A_{i+1}} f(x_{A_{i+1}}) g(x) (\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right| \right] \\ &+ \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \tilde{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{\tilde{s}-1,1}} \left| \sum_{A_{i+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{i+1}} \int_{A_{i+1}} D^\alpha f(x_{A_{i+1}}) g^\alpha(x) (\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right| \right] \\ &+ \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{\tilde{s}-1,1}} \left| \sum_{A_i \in \mathcal{A}_i} \int_{A_i} R^f(x_{A_i}, x_{A_{i+1}}) g(x) (\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right| \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Now the first term on the right hand side is just  $E_{\bar{s},g,i+1}$ , and the last term is clearly bounded from above by  $\sum_{|\alpha|=\bar{s}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{i+1}^{\bar{s}} M_{i,g}$ . For each term in the second line corresponding an index  $\alpha$ , we have  $D^\alpha f \in C_1^{\bar{s}-|\alpha|-1,1}$  and  $g^\alpha(x)$  is an element of  $g_{D_{i+1}^{|\alpha|}}$ . Therefore we get the estimate

$$E_{\bar{s},g,i} \leq E_{\bar{s},g,i+1} + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \bar{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} E_{\bar{s}-|\alpha|,g_{D_{i+1}^{|\alpha|}},i+1} + \sum_{|\alpha|=\bar{s}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{i+1}^{\bar{s}} M_{i,g}.$$

This inequality holds for any  $i \in \{1, \dots, T-1\}$ . Summing them up from  $i$  to  $T-1$ , we obtain our claimed result

$$E_{\bar{s},g,i} \leq E_{\bar{s},g,T} + \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} \left[ \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \bar{s}-1} \frac{1}{\alpha!} E_{\bar{s}-|\alpha|,g_{D_{j+1}^{|\alpha|}},j+1} + \sum_{|\alpha|=\bar{s}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{j+1}^{\bar{s}} M_{j,g} \right].$$

□

**Lemma 4.6.** *There exists a constant  $C$  independent of  $\varepsilon, n, T$  such that for  $\bar{s} \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ ,  $g \in L^\infty$  and  $i \in \{1, \dots, T\}$ , the following bound holds:*

$$E_{\bar{s},g,i} \leq C \|g\|_\infty \left( 3^{i(\bar{s}-\frac{d_\mu}{2})} \frac{\varepsilon^{\bar{s}-d_\mu/2}}{n^{1/2}} + ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{\bar{s}-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|A_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right).$$

*Proof.* Throughout the proof,  $C$  is a generic constant that may change its value from line to line, but will never depend on  $n, \varepsilon$  or  $T$ . For the proof, we first state some elementary properties:

- (i) By Lemma 4.3,  $E_{\bar{s},g,T} \leq \|g\|_\infty \left( \frac{|A_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2}$ , where we simply use that  $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ .
- (ii) By Lemma 4.3, for  $k < d_\mu/2$ ,

$$\sum_{j=i}^{T-1} D_{j+1}^k M_{j,g} \leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{k-d_\mu/2}}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} (3^{(k-d_\mu/2)j}) \leq C \frac{\varepsilon^{k-d_\mu/2}}{n^{1/2}} 3^{(k-d_\mu/2)i},$$

where we note that  $\sum_{j=i}^{T-1} q^j \leq \frac{1}{1-q} q^i \leq C q^i$  for  $q = 3^{k-d_\mu/2} < 1$ .

These properties together with Lemma 4.5 will be enough to yield the claim inductively over increasing  $\tilde{s}$ . Indeed, for  $\tilde{s} = 1$ , we simply have

$$E_{1,g,i} \leq E_{1,g,T} + \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} D_{j+1} M_{j,g},$$

where the bound for the right hand side follows from property (i) and (ii) directly.

For the induction step, assume  $\tilde{s} \geq 2$  and the claim is true for  $1, \dots, \tilde{s} - 1$ . We build on the lemma 4.5. The first term therein,  $E_{\tilde{s},g,T}$ , can be controlled by property (i) and is thus included in the inequality we want to show by possibly increasing  $C$  by 1. The term  $\sum_{|\alpha|=\tilde{s}} \frac{1}{\alpha!} D_{j+1}^{\tilde{s}} M_{j,g}$  can be treated via Property (ii). Finally, we only need to treat the terms for  $1 \leq |\alpha| \leq \tilde{s} - 1$  using the induction hypothesis. Using  $D_{j+1} \lesssim 3^j \varepsilon$ , we find that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} E_{s-|\alpha|,g_{D_{j+1}^{|\alpha|}},j+1} \\ & \leq C \|g\|_{\infty} \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} D_{j+1}^{|\alpha|} \left( 3^{j(\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})} \frac{\varepsilon^{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-d_{\mu}/2}}{n^{1/2}} + ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ & \leq C \|g\|_{\infty} \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{j|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{|\alpha|} \left( 3^{j(\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})} \frac{\varepsilon^{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-d_{\mu}/2}}{n^{1/2}} + ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) \\ & \leq C \|g\|_{\infty} \left( \frac{\varepsilon^{\tilde{s}-d_{\mu}/2}}{n^{1/2}} \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{j(\tilde{s}-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})} + \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{\tilde{s}-|\alpha|-1} + 1) \sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{j|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{|\alpha|} \right) \\ & \leq C \|g\|_{\infty} \left( \frac{\varepsilon^{\tilde{s}-d_{\mu}/2}}{n^{1/2}} 3^{i(\tilde{s}-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})} + \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{\tilde{s}-1} + 1) \right), \end{aligned}$$

where the final inequality follows from the fact that  $\sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{j(\tilde{s}-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})} \leq C 3^{i(\tilde{s}-\frac{d_{\mu}}{2})}$  and  $\sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{j|\alpha|} \varepsilon^{|\alpha|} \leq C (3^T \varepsilon)^{|\alpha|}$ . The induction and thus the proof are complete.  $\square$

*Proof of Theorem 4.2.* According to the definition of intrinsic dimension, we

have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int f(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int_{\bar{\Omega}} f(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int_{\bar{\Omega}^c} f(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n)(dx) \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the second term on the right hand side is simply bounded by  $2\mu(\bar{\Omega}^c)$  due to  $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1$ .

Recalling that  $\bar{\Omega} = \cup_{A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} A_1$ , for any  $x \in A_1$ , we take the Taylor expansion of  $f \in C_1^s$

$$f(x) = f(x_{A_1}) + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq s-1} \frac{D^\alpha f(x_{A_1})}{\alpha!} (x - x_{A_1})^\alpha + R^f(x, x_{A_1}),$$

where the last term is bounded by  $D_1^s$ . Now for each index  $\alpha$ , define  $g^\alpha(x) := \sum_{A_1 \in \mathcal{A}_1} \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in A_1\}} (x - x_{A_1})^\alpha$  where  $\|g^\alpha\|_\infty \leq D_1^{|\alpha|}$ . Then taking the supremum over all  $f$  in the equation above and taking expectation yield to that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int_{\bar{\Omega}} f d(\mu - \mu^n) \right] \leq E_{s,1,1} + \sum_{1 \leq |\alpha| \leq s-1} E_{s-|\alpha|,g^\alpha,1} + D_1^s.$$

Invoking Lemma 4.6 and that  $D_1 \leq 3\varepsilon$ , we obtain that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int_{\bar{\Omega}} f d(\mu - \mu^n) \right] \leq C \left( \varepsilon^s + \frac{\varepsilon^{s-d_\mu/2}}{n^{1/2}} + ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{s-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right),$$

and therefore

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}} \int f d(\mu - \mu^n) \right] \\ &\leq C \left( \varepsilon^s + \frac{\varepsilon^{s-d_\mu/2}}{n^{1/2}} + ((\varepsilon 3^T)^{s-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \right) + 2\mu(\bar{\Omega}^c). \end{aligned}$$

Then we choose  $T = \log_3(\varepsilon^{-2s/d_\mu})$  and  $\varepsilon = n^{-1/d_\mu}$ . The first two terms in the estimate are still of order  $n^{-s/d_\mu}$ , it only remains to deal with the last two terms including  $\mathcal{A}_T$  and  $\bar{\Omega}$ . Note again that  $\varepsilon 3^T \leq 1$ , which means  $((\varepsilon 3^T)^{s-1} + 1) \leq 2$ . Further,

$$|\mathcal{A}_T|/n \leq C(\varepsilon^{-2s/d_\mu} \varepsilon)^{-d_\mu} / (\varepsilon^{-d_\mu}) \leq C\varepsilon^{2s},$$

and thus

$$((\varepsilon 3^T)^{s-1} + 1) \left( \frac{|\mathcal{A}_T|}{n} \right)^{1/2} \leq C \varepsilon^s = C n^{-s/d_\mu}.$$

And finally,

$$2\mu(\bar{\Omega}^C) \leq C(3^T \varepsilon)^{(s d_\mu)/(d_\mu - 2s)} \leq C(\varepsilon^{1-2s/d_\mu})^{(s d_\mu)/(d_\mu - 2s)} = C \varepsilon^s = C n^{-s/d_\mu}.$$

The overall estimate is complete.  $\square$

**Remark 4.7.** While we exclude the case  $s = d_\mu/2$  in the above, the only point in Theorem 4.2 where the given argument fails is in Lemma 4.6 for  $\tilde{s} = s$ , where property (ii) for  $k = d_\mu/2$  cannot be treated via a geometric series, and instead one has to estimate the sum

$$\sum_{j=i}^{T-1} 3^{(k-d_\mu/2)j} \leq T.$$

Since  $T$  is eventually chosen to be logarithmic in  $n$ , we expect that the same method of proof for  $s = d_\mu/2$  will lead to an estimate of the form

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sup_{f \in C_1^{s-1,1}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \int f d(\mu - \hat{\mu}^n) \right] \lesssim \log(n)^\gamma n^{-1/2}$$

for some  $\gamma > 0$ .

## 5 Sample Complexity of Regularized Optimal Transport

Throughout this section, we make the standing assumption that each marginal  $\mu_i$  is supported on a compact subset  $X_i$  of  $\mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Further, we assume that  $\varphi$  is dual regular, and  $\psi$  is strictly convex beyond a (unique) point where it is 1, i.e.,

$$\exists x_0 \in \mathbb{R} : \psi'(x_0) = 1 \text{ and } \psi \text{ is strictly convex on } [x_0, \infty). \quad (5.1)$$

Notably, (5.1) is satisfied in many cases including entropic divergences and  $\alpha$ -divergences, c.f. [43, Theorem 11.13].

Our first result quantifies the regularity of the optimal dual potentials depending on the regularity of  $c$  and  $\psi$ .

**Proposition 5.1** (Regularity of optimal potentials). *Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and assume  $c \in C^s(X)$ ,  $\psi \in C^{s,1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Then there exists a dual optimizer  $h = \bigoplus_{i=1}^N h_i$  of  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  such that for all  $i = 1, \dots, N$ ,  $h_i \in C_K^{s-1,1}$ , where  $K$  depends only on  $\psi, c$  and the diameter of the space  $X$ .*

*Proof. Step 1:* By our standing assumption that  $\varphi$  is dual regular, we can take the dual optimizer  $h$  from Lemma 2.3. Let us prove that  $h_i$  is Lipschitz. Take two  $x_i, \tilde{x}_i$ , and assume without loss of generality that  $h_i(x_i) \leq h_i(\tilde{x}_i)$ . Due to the compactness of  $X$ , there exists a positive constant  $L$  such that  $|c(x_i, x^{-i}) - c(\tilde{x}_i, x^{-i})| \leq L|x - \tilde{x}|$ . Subsequently, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \int_{X^{-i}} \psi'(h_i(\tilde{x}_i) + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(\tilde{x}_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}) \\ &\leq \int_{X^{-i}} \psi'(h_i(x_i) + L|x_i - \tilde{x}_i| + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(\tilde{x}_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}). \end{aligned}$$

Since  $\psi'$  is increasing, we conclude that  $h_i(x_i) \leq h_i(\tilde{x}_i) \leq h_i(x_i) + L|x_i - \tilde{x}_i|$ , i.e.,  $h_i$  is  $L$ -Lipschitz.

*Step 2:* Second we prove that  $\sum_{i=1}^N \|h_i\|_\infty$  is bounded. For each  $i$ , let us denote the defining function of  $h_i$  by

$$F_i(x_i, y_i) = \int_{X^{-i}} \psi'(y_i + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}), \quad (5.2)$$

where  $h_i$  satisfies  $F_i(x_i, h_i(x_i)) = 1$  for all  $x_i \in X_i$ . Recall from (5.1) that  $x_0$  is the unique solution of  $\psi'(x_0) = 1$ . Due to the fact that  $\psi'$  is strictly increasing over  $[x_0, +\infty)$ , we deduce from  $1 = F_i(x_i, h_i(x_i))$  that

$$\begin{aligned} &\psi' \left( h_i(x_i) + \max_{x^{-i}} (h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \right) \\ &= \max_{x^{-i}} \psi' (h_i(x_i) + (h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i}))) \geq 1, \end{aligned}$$

and hence

$$h_i(x_i) + \max_{x^{-i}} (h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \geq x_0.$$

Similarly it can be shown that

$$h_i(x_i) + \min_{x^{-i}} (h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \leq x_0.$$

Without loss of generality, let us assume that  $h_i(0) = 0$  and thus  $\|h_i\|_\infty \leq L|X_i|$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, N-1$ . Taking  $i = N$ , the above two inequalities together imply that

$$|h_N(x_N)| \leq x_0 + \|c\|_\infty + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \|h_i\|_\infty,$$

and also

$$\sum_{i=1}^N \|h_i\|_\infty \leq x_0 + \|c\|_\infty + 2L \left( \sum_{i=1}^N |X_i| \right) =: C_0. \quad (5.3)$$

*Step 3:* We already proved that  $h_i \in C_K^{0,1}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, N$ . Supposing  $s \geq 2$  and that  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset C_K^{k,1}$  is true for  $k \geq 0$  with  $k \leq s-2$ , let us prove that  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^N \subset C_K^{k+1,1}$ .

Due to the compactness of  $X^{-i}$  and our assumption,  $F_i : X_i \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  defined in (5.2) is differentiable, and has first order derivatives

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial x_i}(x_i, y_i) = - \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(y_i + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \partial_{x_i} c(x_i, x^{-i}) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}), \quad (5.4)$$

$$\frac{\partial F_i}{\partial y_i}(x_i, y_i) = \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(y_i + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}). \quad (5.5)$$

The defining equation  $F_i(x_i, h_i(x_i)) = 1$  for  $h_i$  thus yields, according to the implicit function theorem (c.f. [44, Theorem 9.28]), that  $h_i$  is differentiable and we have

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{x_i} h_i(x_i) &= \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(h_i(x_i) + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}) \\ &= \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(h_i(x_i) + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \partial_{x_i} c(x_i, x^{-i}) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}). \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$f_i(x_i) := \partial_{x_i} F_i(x_i, h_i(x_i)) \quad (5.6)$$

$$= - \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(h_i(x_i) + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) \partial_{x_i} c(x_i, x^{-i}) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}),$$

$$g_i(x_i) := \partial_{y_i} F_i(x_i, h_i(x_i)) \quad (5.7)$$

$$= \int_{X^{-i}} \psi''(h_i(x_i) + h^{-i}(x^{-i}) - c(x_i, x^{-i})) P^{-i}(dx^{-i}),$$

and hence (5.4) can be rewritten as

$$f_i(x_i) + g_i(x_i)h_i^{(1)}(x_i) = 0. \quad (5.8)$$

Taking  $(k-1)$ -th derivative of (5.8) with respect to  $x_i$  yields that

$$f_i^{(k-1)}(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} g_i^{(j)}(x_i) h_i^{(k-j)}(x_i) + g_i(x_i)h_i^{(k)}(x_i) = 0.$$

Since  $\psi''$  is strictly positive over  $[x_0, \infty)$  and  $\|h\|_\infty$  is bounded,  $g_i(x_i)$  is bounded from below by a positive constant and thus

$$h_i^{(k)}(x_i) = -\frac{f_i^{(k-1)}(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \binom{k-1}{j} g_i^{(j)}(x_i) h_i^{(k-j)}(x_i)}{g_i(x_i)}. \quad (5.9)$$

From (5.6) and (5.7), it can be seen that  $f_i^{(k-1)}, g_i^{(k-1)}$  are differentiable, due to our induction hypothesis and the exchangeability of integral and derivative over compact sets. Therefore,  $h_i^{(k)}$  is differentiable by (5.9), the formula given by

$$h_i^{(k+1)}(x_i) = -\frac{f_i^{(k)}(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k}{j} g_i^{(j)}(x_i) h_i^{(k+1-j)}(x_i)}{g_i(x_i)}.$$

Also we note that  $f_i^{(k)}, g_i^{(k)}$  are Lipschitz due to the fact that  $\psi^{(j)}$  is Lipschitz for all  $j = 1, \dots, s$ . Then since  $g_i$  is uniformly bounded away from zero and from above, one can easily obtain the Lipschitz property of  $h_i^{(k+1)}$ . Indeed,  $h_i^{(k+1)}$  is differentiable almost everywhere, and is equal to

$$h_i^{(k+2)} = -\frac{f_i^{(k+1)}(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^{k+1} \binom{k+1}{j} g_i^{(j)}(x_i) h_i^{(k+2-j)}(x_i)}{g_i(x_i)},$$

where  $f_i^{(k+1)}$  and  $g_i^{(k+1)}$  are weak derivatives of Lipschitz functions  $f_i^{(k)}$  and  $g_i^{(k)}$ .

Noting that  $|f_i^{(k+1)}(x_i) + \sum_{j=1}^k \binom{k+1}{j} g_i^{(j)}(x_i) h_i^{(k+2-j)}(x_i)|$  is bounded only depending on  $\|\psi^{(j+2)}\|_\infty, \|c^{((j+1) \vee 0)}\|_\infty, \|h_i^{(j \vee 0)}\|_\infty, j = -2, \dots, k+1$ , together with the induction hypothesis we obtain  $h_i \in C_K^{k+1,1}$ .  $\square$

The lemma below follows the idea by [36].



**Lemma 5.2** (Dual continuity of  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ ). *Let  $s \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $h, \tilde{h}$  be dual optimizers for  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu})$  and  $\text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu}_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)$ , respectively. Assume  $K > 0$  such that  $(h - \psi(h - c)), (\tilde{h} - \psi(\tilde{h} - c)) \in C_K^{s-1,1}(X)$ . Then*

$$|\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu}_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)| \leq 3K \|\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1\|_{C_K^{s-1,1}(X_1)},$$

where  $\|\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1\|_{C_K^{s-1,1}(X_1)} := \sup_{f \in C_K^{s-1,1}(X_1)} \int f d(\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $a := \int (h - \psi(h - c)) dP^{-1} \in C_K^{s-1}(X_1)$  and  $b := \int (\tilde{h} - \psi(\tilde{h} - c)) dP^{-1} \in C_K^{s-1,1}(X_1)$ . We calculate

$$\begin{aligned} |\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\tilde{\mu}_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)| &= \left| \int a d\mu_1 - \int b d\tilde{\mu}_1 \right| \\ &\leq \left| \int a d(\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1) \right| + \left| \int (a - b) d\tilde{\mu}_1 \right| \leq \|\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1\|_{C_K^{s-1,1}} + \int (b - a) d\tilde{\mu}_1, \end{aligned}$$

where the final term can be estimated via

$$\int (b - a) d\tilde{\mu}_1 = \int (b - a) d(\tilde{\mu}_1 - \mu_1) + \int (b - a) d\mu_1 \leq 2\|\mu_1 - \tilde{\mu}_1\|_{C_K^{s-1,1}(X_1)},$$

since  $\int (b - a) d\mu_1 \leq 0$ . Putting two inequalities together yields the claim.  $\square$

The following theorem is a combination of Theorem 4.2, Proposition 5.1, and Lemma 5.2. We emphasize again that the compactness of space  $X$ , dual regularity of  $\varphi$  and (5.1) are standing assumptions.

**Theorem 5.3** (Sample complexity of  $\text{OT}_\varphi$ ). *Assume  $\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N$  satisfy  $I(d_\mu, s)$  for some  $s \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $d_\mu \in (2s, \infty)$  and that  $c \in C^s(X)$ ,  $\psi \in C^{s,1}(\mathbb{R})$ . Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E} [|\text{OT}_\varphi(\boldsymbol{\mu}) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1^n, \dots, \hat{\mu}_N^n)|] \lesssim n^{-s/d_\mu}.$$

*Proof.* Note that our Proposition 5.1 holds for any  $(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N)$  with bounded support, and hence the assumption of Lemma 5.2 is always satisfied. Now the difference  $|\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_N)|$  is bounded from above by

$$\begin{aligned} &|\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N)| \\ &+ |\text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \mu_2, \dots, \mu_N) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2, \dots, \mu_N)| \\ &\quad \vdots \\ &+ |\text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{N-1}, \mu_N) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{N-1}, \hat{\mu}_N)|. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma 5.2 to every term in the above, we obtain that

$$|\text{OT}_\varphi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_N) - \text{OT}_\varphi(\hat{\mu}_1, \dots, \hat{\mu}_N)| \leq 3K \sum_{i=1}^N \|\mu_i - \hat{\mu}_i\|_{C_K^{s-1,1}(X_i)}.$$

Taking expectation on both sides and using Theorem 4.2, we conclude the result.  $\square$

## References

- [1] R. Agrawal and T. Horel. Optimal bounds between f-divergences and integral probability metrics. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 22(1):5662–5720, 2021.
- [2] J. Blanchet, A. Jambulapati, C. Kent, and A. Sidford. Towards optimal running times for optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.07717*, 2018.
- [3] M. Blondel, V. Seguy, and A. Rolet. Smooth and sparse optimal transport. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 880–889. PMLR, 2018.
- [4] F. Bolley and C. Villani. Weighted csiszár-kullback-pinsker inequalities and applications to transportation inequalities. In *Annales de la Faculté des sciences de Toulouse: Mathématiques*, volume 14, pages 331–352, 2005.
- [5] G. Carlier, V. Duval, G. Peyré, and B. Schmitzer. Convergence of entropic schemes for optimal transport and gradient flows. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 49(2):1385–1418, 2017.
- [6] G. Carlier and M. Laborde. A differential approach to the multi-marginal Schrödinger system. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 52(1):709–717, 2020.
- [7] G. Carlier, P. Pegon, and L. Tamanini. Convergence rate of general entropic optimal transport costs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03347*, 2022.
- [8] L. Chizat, P. Roussillon, F. Léger, F.-X. Vialard, and G. Peyré. Faster wasserstein distance estimation with the sinkhorn divergence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:2257–2269, 2020.
- [9] R. Cominetti and J. S. Martín. Asymptotic analysis of the exponential penalty trajectory in linear programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 67(1):169–187, 1994.
- [10] G. Conforti and L. Tamanini. A formula for the time derivative of the entropic cost and applications. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 280(11):108964, 2021.
- [11] I. Csiszár. I-divergence geometry of probability distributions and minimization problems. *The annals of probability*, pages 146–158, 1975.
- [12] M. Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- [13] G. Deligiannidis, V. De Bortoli, and A. Doucet. Quantitative uniform stability of the iterative proportional fitting procedure. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.08129*, 2021.
- [14] S. Di Marino and A. Gerolin. Optimal transport losses and sinkhorn algorithm with general convex regularization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.00976*, 2020.

- [15] R. M. Dudley. The speed of mean Glivenko-Cantelli convergence. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 40(1):40–50, 1969.
- [16] S. Eckstein and M. Kupper. Computation of optimal transport and related hedging problems via penalization and neural networks. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 83(2):639–667, 2021.
- [17] S. Eckstein, M. Kupper, and M. Pohl. Robust risk aggregation with neural networks. *Mathematical finance*, 30(4):1229–1272, 2020.
- [18] S. Eckstein and M. Nutz. Convergence rates for regularized optimal transport via quantization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.14391*, 2022.
- [19] S. Eckstein and M. Nutz. Quantitative stability of regularized optimal transport and convergence of sinkhorn’s algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 54(6):5922–5948, 2022.
- [20] M. Essid and J. Solomon. Quadratically regularized optimal transport on graphs. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(4):A1961–A1986, 2018.
- [21] G. B. Folland. *Real analysis: modern techniques and their applications*, volume 40. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.
- [22] G. B. Folland. Higher-order derivatives and Taylor’s formula in several variables. *Preprint*, pages 1–4, 2005.
- [23] N. Fournier and A. Guillin. On the rate of convergence in wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, 162(3):707–738, 2015.
- [24] J. Franklin and J. Lorenz. On the scaling of multidimensional matrices. *Linear Algebra and its applications*, 114:717–735, 1989.
- [25] A. Genevay, L. Chizat, F. Bach, M. Cuturi, and G. Peyré. Sample complexity of sinkhorn divergences. In *The 22nd international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1574–1583. PMLR, 2019.
- [26] P. Ghosal, M. Nutz, and E. Bernton. Stability of entropic optimal transport and schrödinger bridges. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 283(9):109622, 2022.
- [27] N. Gigli and L. Tamanini. Second order differentiation formula on  $\text{rd}^*(k, n)$  spaces. *Journal of the European Mathematical Society*, 23(5):1727–1795, 2021.
- [28] N. Keriven. Entropic optimal transport in random graphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.03949*, 2022.
- [29] M. Klatt, C. Taming, and A. Munk. Empirical regularized optimal transport: Statistical theory and applications. *SIAM Journal on Mathematics of Data Science*, 2(2):419–443, 2020.
- [30] B. Kloeckner. Empirical measures: regularity is a counter-curse to dimensionality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.04038*, 2018.
- [31] C. Léonard. From the schrödinger problem to the monge–kantorovich problem. *Journal of Functional Analysis*, 262(4):1879–1920, 2012.
- [32] T. Lin, N. Ho, and M. Jordan. On efficient optimal transport: An analysis of greedy and accelerated mirror descent algorithms. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3982–3991. PMLR, 2019.
- [33] D. Lorenz and H. Mahler. Orlicz space regularization of continuous optimal transport problems. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 85(2):1–33, 2022.
- [34] D. A. Lorenz, P. Manns, and C. Meyer. Quadratically regularized optimal

- transport. *Applied Mathematics & Optimization*, 83(3):1919–1949, 2021.
- [35] T. Manole and J. Niles-Weed. Sharp convergence rates for empirical optimal transport with smooth costs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.13181*, 2021.
  - [36] G. Mena and J. Niles-Weed. Statistical bounds for entropic optimal transport: sample complexity and the central limit theorem. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
  - [37] M. Nutz and J. Wiesel. Entropic optimal transport: Convergence of potentials. *Probability Theory and Related Fields*, pages 1–24, 2021.
  - [38] M. Nutz and J. Wiesel. Stability of Schrödinger potentials and convergence of sinkhorn’s algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.10059*, 2022.
  - [39] S. Pal. On the difference between entropic cost and the optimal transport cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.12206*, 2019.
  - [40] G. Peyré, M. Cuturi, et al. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
  - [41] A.-A. Pooladian and J. Niles-Weed. Entropic estimation of optimal transport maps. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.12004*, 2021.
  - [42] P. Rigollet and A. J. Stromme. On the sample complexity of entropic optimal transport. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.13472*, 2022.
  - [43] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational analysis*, volume 317. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
  - [44] W. Rudin. *Principles of mathematical analysis*. International Series in Pure and Applied Mathematics. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York-Auckland-Düsseldorf, third edition, 1976.
  - [45] V. Seguy, B. B. Damodaran, R. Flamary, N. Courty, A. Rolet, and M. Blondel. Large-scale optimal transport and mapping estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.02283*, 2017.
  - [46] R. Sinkhorn and P. Knopp. Concerning nonnegative matrices and doubly stochastic matrices. *Pacific Journal of Mathematics*, 21(2):343–348, 1967.
  - [47] D. Terjék and D. González-Sánchez. Optimal transport with  $f$ -divergence regularization and generalized sinkhorn algorithm. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 5135–5165. PMLR, 2022.
  - [48] C. Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58. American Mathematical Soc., 2021.
  - [49] J. Weed. An explicit analysis of the entropic penalty in linear programming. In *Conference On Learning Theory*, pages 1841–1855. PMLR, 2018.
  - [50] J. Weed and F. Bach. Sharp asymptotic and finite-sample rates of convergence of empirical measures in Wasserstein distance. *Bernoulli*, 25(4A):2620–2648, 2019.