

Robustified Empirical Risk Minimization with Law-Invariant, Coherent Risk Measures

Peter Coppens and Panagiotis Patrinos[†]

Abstract—In this work we consider law-invariant, coherent risk measures as a proxy-cost for data-driven expected risk minimization. We show how such risks serve as point-wise high-confidence upper bounds of the expected risk. The confidence level can be determined tightly for any number of samples. Conversely we also illustrate how to calibrate risk measures to act as a high-confidence upper bound with some user specified confidence. Numerical experiments then illustrate how the resulting proxy-cost both generalizes better and is less sensitive to tuning parameters compared to the usual empirical risk minimization approach.

I. INTRODUCTION

In this work, the problem under investigation is *expected risk minimization*

$$\underset{\theta \in \Theta}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)]. \quad (1)$$

Here $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta}$ and $\xi: \Omega \rightarrow \Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{n_\xi}$ a random vector defined on sample space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Problems like (1) are omnipresent in machine-learning and statistics [1], [2].

In practice the expectation in (1) cannot be evaluated exactly. Instead a sample $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^n$ is available. Let $\ell_i(\theta) = \ell(\theta, \xi_i)$ and $L(\theta) = (\ell_1(\theta), \dots, \ell_n(\theta))$. We then solve

$$\underset{\theta \in \Theta}{\text{minimize}} \underset{\mu \in \mathcal{A}}{\text{maximize}} \quad \langle \mu, L(\theta) \rangle, \quad (2)$$

for some convex, non-empty and closed *ambiguity set* $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ of probability vectors. The usual *empirical risk minimization* or *sample average approach* (SAA) amounts to $\mathcal{A} = \{\mathbb{1}_n/n\}$. We denote the value of the maximization in (2) as $\rho[L(\theta)]$ and refer to it as a *risk measure* [3, §6.3], [4]. When \mathcal{A} is permutation invariant (i.e. for any $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$ and permutation π , $\pi\mu \in \mathcal{A}$) we show

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\rho[L(\theta)] := \max_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, L(\theta) \rangle \geq \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)] \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

for all $\theta \in \Theta$ when $\ell_n(\theta)$ is replaced by $\bar{\ell}(\theta)$ which upper bounds $\ell(\theta, \xi)$ with probability one. The value of $1 - \varepsilon$ is given by the volume of a so-called *distortion set*, which is related to ρ through a modified convex conjugate. Whenever ρ satisfies (3) we say it is ε -*calibrated*. Note that (3) defines two problems: (i) an analysis problem, where given some ρ a

ε should be determined; (ii) a synthesis/calibration problem where we want to determine some (parametric) ρ such that (3) holds for some user provided ε . We solve both problems in this work and it turns out that calibrated risk measures solving (ii) serve as good proxy costs for (1).

Solving (2) instead of a sample average is nothing new and several sets \mathcal{A} have been considered under the framework of *distributionally robust optimization* (DRO) [4]. Specifically \mathcal{A} can be based on moments as in [5], divergence from the empirical distribution as in [6], Wasserstein distance [7] or other statistical hypothesis tests [8]. See [9], [10] for recent surveys. There are however some issues with classical DRO. Sets often depend on some parameters (e.g. some radius). These are sometimes determined using concentration inequalities [5] or using inexact asymptotic bounds [6] to make sure the true distribution is contained within \mathcal{A} with high confidence. This can often be conservative in the case of concentration inequalities, either due to loose constants in the concentration inequalities or due to the shape of the ambiguity set. So instead one often resorts to either bootstrapping or cross validation (cf. [7]), which can be computationally expensive and lack statistical guarantees for finite samples, similarly to the asymptotic bounds.

Recently, in the asymptotic setting, this conservativeness has been tackled by looking at *cost-aware* bounds like (3) [11], [12] with good results. They also discuss the gap between (3) and the usual uniform bounds (i.e. $\mathbb{P}[\rho[L(\theta)] \geq \mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)], \forall \theta] \geq 1 - \varepsilon'$) provided by DRO. The finite sample case has not been considered much. We take the first steps in that direction in this work.

To summarize, our approach is novel as follows:

- 1) Our scheme provides *cost-aware*, point-wise statistical guarantees as in (3) for any number of samples;
- 2) The bounds are tight for any distribution, replacing the involved analytical derivations of concentration inequalities with efficient numerical procedures;
- 3) The framework applies to many risks from literature, including distortion [13] and ϕ -divergence risks [6];
- 4) We present the *distortion representation* of risks.

The resulting scheme also outperforms SAA in both regression and classification as illustrated in §V, while being less sensitive to tuning parameters.

We exploit results from convex duality [14], order statistics [15], [16], Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics [17], majorization [18], [19] and isotonic regression [20].

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. In §II we derive mean bounds linked to law-invariant coherent risk measures through the distortion representation in §III. The problem of

[†]P. Coppens and P. Patrinos are with the Department of Electrical Engineering (ESAT-STADIUS), KU Leuven, Kasteelpark Arenberg 10, 3001 Leuven, Belgium. Email: peter.coppens@kuleuven.be, panos.patrinos@kuleuven.be

This work was supported by: the Research Foundation Flanders (FWO) PhD grant 11E5520N and research projects G0A0920N, G086518N and G086318N; Research Council KU Leuven C1 project No. C14/18/068; Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique - FNRS and the FWO - Vlaanderen under EOS project no 30468160 (SeLMA); EU's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme: Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant No. 953348.

calibrating risk measures given ε is answered in §IV and in §V numerical case studies are presented, showing the performance of these calibrated risks.

Notation: Let \mathbb{R} denote the reals and $\overline{\mathbb{R}}$ the extended reals. For some convex function $\phi: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ let $\partial\phi$ denote the subgradient, ϕ^* the convex conjugate and $\text{dom}\phi$ its domain. For a set \mathcal{X} let $\iota_{\mathcal{X}}(x) = 0$ if $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $+\infty$ otherwise be the indicator function of \mathcal{X} and $\text{ri}\mathcal{X}$ the relative interior. For integers a, b let $[a, b] = \{a, \dots, b\}$ and $[b] = \{1, \dots, b\}$. Let $[x]_+ = \max(0, x)$. For real vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ we use $\langle x, y \rangle$ to denote the Euclidean inner product and $\mathbb{1}_n \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is the vector of all ones. For a cone \mathcal{K} let $\mathcal{K}^* := \{y: \langle x, y \rangle \geq 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{K}\}$ denote its dual and $\mathcal{K}^\circ := -\mathcal{K}^*$ its polar cone. Let Π^n denote the permutations of $[n]$ (i.e. all bijections $[n] \rightarrow [n]$). We write $\pi x = (x_{\pi(1)}, \dots, x_{\pi(n)})$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and similarly for sets $\pi\mathcal{X} = \{\pi x: x \in \mathcal{X}\}$. Similarly let $\Pi^n y = \{\pi y: \pi \in \Pi^n\}$ denote the orbit of y under Π^n . Let $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n := \{x: x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n\}$ denote the monotone cone and $(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ its polar (cf. [Lem. A.1](#)). Let $\Delta^n := \{\mu: \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1, \mu_i \geq 0, i \in [n]\}$ denote the probability simplex. For a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $x_{(1)} \leq x_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq x_{(n)}$ be the increasing permutation of the elements of x with $x_\uparrow = (x_{(1)}, x_{(2)}, \dots, x_{(n)})$. For $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $x \prec y$ denote that y majorizes x [18]. For sets let $A + B := \{a + b: a \in A, b \in B\}$ denote the Minkowski sum and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $x + B = \{x\} + B$. For random variables X, Y we write $X \cong Y$ to say X is identically distributed to Y . Let $\text{esssup}[X]$ denote the essential supremum. Let $X \cong \mathcal{U}(\ell, u)$ imply X is uniformly distributed over $[\ell, u]$ and $X \cong \mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ denote X is normally distributed with mean μ and covariance Σ .

II. STATISTICAL FRAMEWORK

In this section we find upper bounds for $\mathbb{E}[\ell(\theta, \xi)]$ that hold point-wise over θ . These are related to classical results in order statistics. The bounds are presented to highlight the connection with the *distortion representation* of law-invariant, coherent risk measures described in the next section. To simplify the notation, we focus on scalar random variables $Z: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined on some abstract probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$. Specifically, we fix the value of θ and take $Z = \ell(\theta, \xi)$. Then consider an i.i.d. sample $(Z_i)_{i=1}^{n-1} = (\ell(\theta, \xi_i))_{i=1}^{n-1}$ and some upper bound $\text{esssup}[Z] \leq Z_n < +\infty$ – one could take $Z_n = \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \ell(\theta, \xi)$ – with order statistic $Z_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq Z_{(n-1)} \leq \text{esssup}[Z] \leq Z_{(n)}$. We assume throughout that the expectation $\mathbb{E}[Z]$ is well defined.

Throughout the section we assume that Z is a continuous random variable for clarity of the exposition. The final theorem however holds for any random variable. For continuous Z we have the following [15, Thm. 8.7.4].

Proposition II.1. *Let $Z_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq Z_{(n-1)}$ be the order statistics of an i.i.d. sample from a continuous random variable Z . Moreover let $Z_{(0)} = -\infty$ and $Z_{(n)} \geq \text{esssup}[Z]$. Then the random vector of so-called coverages:*

$$W := (F(Z_{(i)}) - F(Z_{(i-1)}))_{i=1}^n$$

is uniformly distributed over Δ^n with $F(z) = \mathbb{P}[Z \leq z]$.

We exploit this property by writing the expectation of Z in terms of these coverages using the law of total expectation

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] = \int_{-\infty}^{Z_{(n)}} Z dF(Z) = \sum_{i=1}^n \int_{Z_{(i-1)}}^{Z_{(i)}} Z dF(Z).$$

The equality holds for any realization of the data. For each term $\int_{Z_{(i-1)}}^{Z_{(i)}} Z dF(Z) \leq Z_{(i)} \int_{Z_{(i-1)}}^{Z_{(i)}} dF(Z) = Z_{(i)} W_i$. Hence

$$\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq \sum_{i=1}^n Z_{(i)} W_i = \langle W, \hat{Z}_\uparrow \rangle, \quad (4)$$

for any realization of the data. Computing the value of W when only Z_1, \dots, Z_n is known is not possible in practice. Instead consider some set \mathcal{D} such that

$$\mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}] = 1 - \varepsilon \quad (5)$$

and take the supremum over its elements in (4).

Such a confidence level is similar to that of ambiguity sets in classical data-driven DRO. There $\mathbb{P}[\mu_\star \in \mathcal{A}] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$, which places randomness inside the data-driven \mathcal{A} , while the true distribution μ_\star of ξ in (1) is fixed and unknown. Instead in (5) \mathcal{D} is fixed and W acts as the random variable, with known distribution by [Prop. II.1](#). Thus calibrating \mathcal{D} is easier compared to calibrating \mathcal{A} , which requires conservative concentration inequalities.

We summarize this discussion in a theorem.

Theorem II.2. *Given an i.i.d. sample $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ from some random variable Z and some $Z_n \geq \text{esssup}[Z] < +\infty$, let $\hat{Z} = (Z_1, \dots, Z_n) \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Consider some non-empty $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\mathcal{D} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \mathcal{D}$. Then*

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \mu, \hat{Z}_\uparrow \rangle \geq \mathbb{E}[Z] \right] \geq \mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}], \quad (6)$$

for W uniformly distributed over the simplex Δ^n .

Proof. Proof deferred to §B. □

Using the notation from the introduction, take $\hat{Z} = L(\theta)$ and reflect on the similarity of the sup to (2). The difference is that $L(\theta)$ is ordered, which leads to the *distortion representation* of risk measures studied in the next section. Invariance $\mathcal{D} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \mathcal{D}$ enables non-continuous random variables Z . Interestingly the distortion representation derived below automatically satisfies this property.

III. DISTORTION REPRESENTATION

The notion of law-invariant, coherent risk measures has been studied in depth before (see [3, §6.3.5], [21], [13] and references within). They are usually motivated through an axiomatic framework. Our interest originates from the fact that they are a class of risk measures that satisfy a representation like the supremum in (6).

In our setting risk measures are defined by considering a finite sample space $\Omega^n = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$ with distribution $\mathbb{1}_n/n = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$ and σ -algebra \mathcal{F} . Then any random variable $X: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is uniquely characterized by some vector in $x = (X(\omega_i))_{i=1}^n \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Its components will later

encode the samples, similarly to $L(\theta)$ in (2). The underlying distribution encodes the fact that the samples are exchangeable and has the consequence that identically distributed random variables are characterized as permutations (cf. §C)

Lemma III.1. Consider two random variables $X, Y: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ their vector characterization. Then

$$X \cong Y \iff \exists \pi \in \Pi^n: x = \pi(y),$$

We consider coherent risks, which can be represented as support functions [4]

Proposition III.2. For a $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{A} := \text{dom } \rho^*$ be the ambiguity set. Then ρ is coherent iff

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X \rangle \quad (7)$$

for some non-empty, closed and convex $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \Delta^n$. Moreover ρ is also law-invariant (i.e. $\rho(X) = \rho(Y)$ if $X \cong Y$) iff $\pi \mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$.

We provide a motivation for Prop. III.2 in terms of the usual definition of a coherent risk measure in §C.

We refer to (7) as the *ambiguity representation* and define an analogous *distortion representation* using the domain of the *ordered convex conjugate*:

$$\rho^\diamond(\mu) := \sup_{X \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n} \{ \langle \mu, X \rangle - \rho(X) \}, \quad (8)$$

which differs from ρ^* as the supremum is taken over \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n .

Theorem III.3. For a law-invariant, coherent risk $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\mathcal{D} := \text{dom } \rho^\diamond$ denote the distortion set. Then

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \mu, X_\uparrow \rangle \quad (9)$$

for \mathcal{D} closed, convex, (i) $\mathbb{1}_n/n \in \mathcal{D}$, (ii) $\mathcal{D} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \mathcal{D}$, (iii) $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$ and (iv) any μ s.t. $\pi(\mu) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi_n$ is nonnegative.

Moreover, letting \mathcal{A} be as in Prop. III.2,

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{D}). \quad (10)$$

Proof. We only derive a valid \mathcal{D} such that (9) holds, as this is the main property we require further on. From (7):

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X \rangle = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X_\uparrow \rangle = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ} \langle \mu, X_\uparrow \rangle.$$

The second and third equality follow from permutation invariance and the definition of the polar cone respectively. So $\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ is valid. The remainder is shown in §C. \square

The full derivation of (10) in §C makes extensive use of the link between Π^n , \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n and vector majorization [18].

A visualization of (10) is provided in Fig. 1. We highlight the link with the supremum in (6). In fact, when $\mathcal{D} = \text{dom } \rho^\diamond$ it cannot be further increased in size. Any set \mathcal{D}' satisfying (9) would have to be a subset of \mathcal{D} . So $\mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}]$ cannot be increased further for the given risk measure. Moreover \mathcal{D} is invariant under addition with $(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ as required by (6).

We conclude this section with:




Fig. 1: Graphical depiction of Prop. C.4 for $n = 3$. The intersection with the simplex Δ^n is shown.

Theorem III.4. A law-invariant, coherent risk $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is ε -calibrated as in (3) with $\varepsilon = \mathbb{P}[W \notin \mathcal{D} = \mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ]$ for W uniformly distributed over Δ^n .

Proof. This follows by combining (9) with Thm. II.2. \square

Thm. III.4 is considered the main contribution of this work. In the next section we show how it can be used to calibrate several existing risk measures at a specified level ε .

Remark III.5. In Thm. III.4 it is assumed that $L(\theta)$ includes some $\bar{\ell}(\theta) \geq \text{esssup}_{\xi \in \Xi} \ell(\xi, \theta)$. In practice, this value can be difficult to compute. So in practice we often replace it with an additional sample.

IV. CALIBRATING RISK FUNCTIONALS

Previously, we showed that law-invariant, coherent risk measures ρ are ε -calibrated with $\varepsilon = \mathbb{P}[W \notin \mathcal{D}]$. For certain risk measures, numerical procedures that compute $\mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}]$ are available. These are *distortion risks*, the distortion set of which is *simple* as specified below. We then introduce a modified CV@R risk of this type. Its single parameter is calibrated such that $\mathbb{P}[W \notin \mathcal{D}] \leq \varepsilon$ for some ε .

Another wide class of law-invariant, coherent risk measures are the ϕ -divergences. For these, exact numerical procedures are unavailable. Instead, efficient sampling procedures to calibrate the ϕ -divergence at some level ε are derived.

The proofs in this section are deferred to §D. Since our contribution is focused on calibration, we omit details related to solving (2) and refer to §E instead. Optimizing distortion risk measures [13], [22] and ϕ -divergences [6], [23] has been studied extensively in literature after all.

A. Distortion risk

We consider *simple* distortion sets, which are generated by one vector. That is $\mathcal{D} = \mu_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ with $\mu_\uparrow \in \Delta^n \cap \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n$. Fig. 1 depicts one such set. Simple distortion sets correspond to *distortion risk measures* (also called *spectral risk measures* [3, §6.3.4], [24, §2.4.2]) which are law-invariant, coherent and *comonotonic* [13, Def. 4.1].

Proposition IV.1. For simple distortion sets $\mathcal{D} = \mu_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ with $\mu \in \Delta^n$, the associated risk measure ρ given by (9) is a distortion risk measure [13, Def. 4.5] and

$$\rho(X) = \langle \mu_\uparrow, X_\uparrow \rangle. \quad (11)$$

The coverage probability of simple distortion sets is expressed in terms of order statistics.

Corollary IV.2. For simple distortion sets $\mathcal{D} = \mu_{\uparrow} + (\mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^n)^{\circ}$ with $\mu \in \Delta^n$, the coverage probability

$$\mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}] = \mathbb{P} \left[\sum_{i=1}^k \mu_{(i)} \leq U_{(k)}, \forall k \in [n-1] \right], \quad (12)$$

where $U_{(1)} \leq U_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq U_{(n-1)}$ are order statistics associated with the uniform distribution over $[0, 1]$.

Remark IV.3. Bounds like the one in [Cor. IV.2](#) have been extensively studied due to the link with the *uniform empirical process* and Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics [[25](#), [§1](#)]. An efficient method for the computation of (12) is given in [[17](#)].

We now present an example of a distortion risk that can be calibrated efficiently.

Example IV.4. For $\gamma \in [0, 1]$, consider the following:

$$\overline{\text{CV@R}}_n^{\gamma}[X] = \left(\frac{d}{n-1} - \gamma \right) X_{(d)} + \sum_{i=d+1}^{n-1} \frac{X_{(i)}}{n-1} + \gamma X_{(n)}, \quad (13)$$

which is a *distortion risk* with $d = \lceil (n-1)\gamma \rceil$ and $\gamma \geq 1/(n-1)$. It is a known bound for the mean [[26](#)], relating directly to a one-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov bound. In [§D](#) we also establish a novel link with the conditional value-at-risk, explaining the notation $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$.

The exact method described in [Rem. IV.3](#) is applicable to (13) and enables computing ε for a given γ . This dependency is monotone, with $\gamma = 0, 1$ giving $\varepsilon = 1, 0$ respectively. So scalar root finders¹ can find γ for a given value of ε .

Alternatively, asymptotic bounds for (12) exist in literature. For sufficiently large n [[15](#), [Thm. 11.6.2](#)]

$$\varepsilon = e^{-2(n-1)\gamma^2} \Leftrightarrow \gamma = \sqrt{\frac{\log(1/\varepsilon)}{2n-2}}. \quad (14)$$

B. ϕ -divergence risk

The ϕ -divergence [[6](#)] between $\mu, \nu \in \Delta^n$ is defined as

$$I_{\phi}(\mu, \nu) = \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \phi(\mu_i/\nu_i) \quad (15)$$

where $\phi(t)$ is convex for $t \geq 0$, $0\phi(a/0) := a \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \phi(t)/t$, $0\phi(0/0) := 0$ and $\phi(1) = 0$. A (centered) ϕ -divergence ambiguity set is then

$$\mathcal{A}_{\alpha}^n := \left\{ \mu : I_{\phi}^n(\mu) := I_{\phi}(\mu, \mathbb{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha \right\}, \quad (16)$$

with $\mathbb{1}_n/n := (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$. The distortion set associated with it is $\mathcal{D}_{\alpha}^n := \mathcal{A}_{\alpha}^n + (\mathbb{R}_{\uparrow}^n)^{\circ}$, by [Prop. C.4](#). The set \mathcal{A}_{α}^n is clearly permutation invariant, since (15) is when $\nu = \mathbb{1}_n/n$.

Calibration of the ϕ -divergence risk corresponds to solving

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha : \mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}_{\alpha}^n] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right\}. \quad (17)$$

Unlike in the previous section, the probability cannot be evaluated exactly. Instead we compute a sample approximation to (17) as follows:

Theorem IV.5. Let $\{W^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^m$ be an i.i.d. sample uniformly from Δ^n and $\alpha_i := (I_{\phi}^n)^{\circ}(W^{(i)})$ for $i \in [m]$ with associated order statistics $\alpha_{(1)} \leq \dots \leq \alpha_{(m)}$. Then, for some $\varepsilon \in [0, 1]$ and some $u \in [n]$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[\mathbb{P} \left[(I_{\phi}^n)^{\circ}(W) \leq \alpha_{(u)} \mid W^{(i)} \right] \geq 1 - \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta$$

with $\beta = I_{1-\varepsilon}(u, m-u+1)$ the regularized incomplete beta function (i.e. the cdf of a beta distribution) at level $1 - \varepsilon$.

In practice, sample m values of α_i and sort them. For given β and ε , take $u \in [n]$ such that $\beta = I_{1-\varepsilon}(u, m-u+1)$ or increase m if no such u exists. Then [Thm. IV.5](#) says ρ with radius $\alpha_{(u)}$ is ε -calibrated with probability at least $1 - \beta$.

Remark IV.6. Note that (17) can be viewed as a chance-constrained program. So instead of relying on classical bounds from order statistics as we did in the proof of [Thm. II.2](#) in [§D](#), we could use [[27](#), [Thm. 3.7](#)]. We evaluate $(I_{\phi}^n)^{\circ}(W)$ with a modified *pool adjacent violators (PAV)* algorithm, which has worst-case computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(n)$ [[20](#)]. Details are provided in [Rem. D.3](#).

V. CASE STUDIES

To illustrate the validity and potential of our method we provide several simple case studies. These are convex for maximum interpretability, as in the non-convex case the presence of local optima might affect the performance in unexpected ways. Nonetheless our method is also applicable in non-convex settings, where stochastic gradient descent methods are applicable (cf. [[22](#)] for simple distortions and [[23](#)] for divergences). Such cases are deferred to future work. Solution of (2) for the convex case is detailed in [§E](#).

Throughout this section we will consider the following risk measures: (SAA) takes $\rho(X) = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i/n$; ($\overline{\text{CV@R}}$) takes $\rho = \overline{\text{CV@R}}_n^{\gamma}$ with γ determined such that ρ is ε -calibrated using [Rem. IV.3](#) and [[17](#)] or using (14) when $n \geq 100$; (TV) and (KL) take ρ as a *total-variation* and a *Kullback-Leibler* ϕ -divergence risk respectively and both are ε -calibrated as in [Thm. IV.5](#) with $\beta = 0.005$ and $m = 10\,000$.

A. Newsvendor

We begin with a toy problem to illustrate the behavior of our method in low-sample settings. Let $\xi: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be beta distributed with parameters $\alpha = 0.1$, $\beta = 0.2$, scaled by a factor $\overline{D} := 100$. Consider a newsvendor problem [[3](#), [§1.2.1](#)]:

$$\operatorname{minimize}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} \mathbb{E} \left[\underbrace{cx + b[\xi - x]_+ + h[x - \xi]_+}_{\ell(\theta, \xi)} \right],$$

with $b = 14$, $h = 2$ and $c = 1$. For samples $\{\xi_i\}_{i=1}^{n-1}$ with $n = 20$ let $\ell_i(\theta) = \ell(\theta, \xi_i)$ for $i \in [n-1]$, $\ell_n(\theta) = \max\{(c-b)\theta + b\overline{D}, (c+h)\theta\}$ a robust upper bound and $L(\theta) = (\ell_i(\theta))_{i=1}^n$. We then solve (2) for the risk measures specified above. Note that $\rho(L(\theta)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \ell_i(\theta)/(n-1)$ for the sample average (SAA) has no robust term.

The risks are calibrated at $\varepsilon = 0.2$. Their performance is compared over 200 sampled data sets in [Fig. 2](#). The left plot shows the actual expected cost for the minimizers of (2) The blue dashed line is the true optimum of [§V-A](#). See [[3](#), [§1.2.1](#)]

¹We use `brentq` as implemented in `scipy 1.10.0`




Fig. 2: Box plots showing news vendor expected cost (left); and difference predicted cost and expected cost (right). The colored area is the *inter-quartile range (IQR)*, while the whiskers show the range of samples truncated to 1.5 times the IQR. Outliers are depicted as diamonds. The red dashed lines depict the robust performance. The blue dashed line is the optimal cost.

for details on how to compute these values. Note how the SAA performs decently in the median, but has significantly more variance. The outliers above 240 were omitted, the largest of which was 428.2. Moreover, the right plot depicts the difference between the predicted cost, i.e. the optimum value of (2), and the true cost. The SAA often underestimates its true cost, while our methods overestimate it. The dashed red line depicts the behavior when taking $\mathcal{A} = \Delta^n$ in (2) (cf. [3, Eq. 1.9]). As we almost never perform worse than this robust method, this shows that our methods learn from data without being overly sensitive to the sample.

In large sample cases we can use [Rem. III.5](#). In combination with some regularization, this significantly boosts the performance of our method, as shown in the next examples.

B. Regression

Let $T_k : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ denote the Chebychev polynomials of the first kind for $k \geq 0$ and $f_d(x) = (T_k(x))_{k=0}^d \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}$ a feature vector. Consider a lasso regression problem:

$$\underset{\theta \in \mathbb{R}^{d+1}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \mathbb{E} [(\langle f_d(X), \theta \rangle - Y)^2] + \lambda \|\theta\|_1. \quad (18)$$

Assuming access to samples $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, we replace the expectation as in (2) with the risks described above, where $L(\theta) = ((\langle f_d(X_i), \theta \rangle - Y_i)^2)_{i=1}^n$. Note that we do not include a robust term, approximating it with the largest sample as discussed in [Rem. III.5](#).

For the parameters $\theta_* = (0, 0, 0.2, 0.5, 1.0)$ the data is generated as $Y_i = \langle f_d(X_i), \theta_* \rangle + E_i$ with $X_i \cong \mathcal{U}(-1, 1)$ and $E_i \cong \mathcal{U}(-0.2, 0.2)$ for $i \in [n]$. We over-parametrize the problem, taking $d = 20$, to illustrate the regularizing effect of our method. A fit is plotted for $\lambda = 0.2$ and $n = 50$ in [Fig. 3](#). Note how the risk measures all perform similarly, while SAA has a worse fit.

The methods are evaluated quantitatively by sampling an additional 100 000 data points and computing a sample approximation of the cost of (18). The resulting performance is compared for several tunings in [Tbl. I](#), where any parameters not mentioned are kept as specified above. It is of note that our methods are significantly less sensitive to tuning parameters compared to the SAA. In fact, our methods outperform SAA for all tunings investigated.




Fig. 3: Regression using $n = 50$ samples with $d = 20$ and $\lambda = 0.2$ for different risk measures.

ε	d	λ	SAA	TV	$\overline{\text{CV@R}}$	KL
0.05	10	0.001	0.019 (03)	0.018 (02)	0.018 (02)	0.018 (02)
		0.01	0.018 (05)	0.017 (04)	0.017 (04)	0.017 (04)
		0.05	0.023 (05)	0.017 (05)	0.017 (05)	0.018 (05)
	20	0.001	0.023 (03)	0.023 (04)	0.023 (04)	0.023 (03)
		0.01	0.019 (05)	0.019 (04)	0.019 (04)	0.019 (04)
		0.05	0.024 (05)	0.018 (05)	0.018 (05)	0.018 (05)
0.2	10	0.001	0.019 (03)	0.019 (02)	0.019 (02)	0.018 (02)
		0.01	0.018 (05)	0.017 (04)	0.017 (04)	0.017 (04)
		0.05	0.023 (05)	0.018 (05)	0.018 (05)	0.018 (05)
	20	0.001	0.023 (03)	0.040 (06)	0.041 (06)	0.047 (06)
		0.01	0.023 (03)	0.023 (03)	0.023 (03)	0.023 (03)
		0.05	0.024 (05)	0.018 (04)	0.018 (04)	0.018 (04)
		0.2	0.073 (13)	0.040 (06)	0.041 (06)	0.047 (06)

TABLE I: Regression generalization performance for various tuning parameters. Values are reported as *mean (standard deviation $\cdot 10^3$)* computed over 10 training sets. The same 10 sets were used for every selection of parameters and method. Note that ε does not affect SAA.

C. Support Vector Machines

Consider a classification problem with $X \cong \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ normally distributed and $Y = 1$ if $X_1 X_2 \geq 0$ and $Y = -1$ otherwise. A *Support Vector Machine (SVM)* solves:

$$\underset{(f, b) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \lambda \mathbb{E} [1 - Y(f(X) - b)]_+$$

with $\lambda > 0$ and \mathcal{H} some *reproducing kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS)* [28, Def. 2.9]. The resulting classifier is then given by $\text{sign}(f(X) - b)$. Henceforth \mathcal{H} is the RKHS associated with the *radial basis function* kernel [28, §2.3] with some standard deviation σ . Solving the primal problem is difficult for two reasons: (i) the true expectation is often unknown; (ii) optimizing over the infinite dimensional \mathcal{H} is intractable in general. We resolve (i) by replacing the expectation with a risk measure ρ , calibrated as in §IV and (ii) through the usual duality trick [28, §7.4]. Details are deferred to §F.

For three risks of the ones described above – SAA, TV and $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$ – the associated ambiguity set is polyhedral and the dual problem is a QP. The sample average – C-SVC in [28, §7.5] – is the usual choice. We illustrate how our calibrated risks perform better.

First observe [Fig. 4](#), where the three classifiers produced by the three risk measures above are depicted. Note how both TV and $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$ perform similarly and both visibly better




Fig. 4: SVM classifiers trained using $n = 250$ samples with $\sigma = 0.25$ and $\lambda = 10^4$ for different risks. The red and blue markers are samples for $Y = 1$ and -1 respectively. The line is the decision boundary and the color axis depicts $f(X) - b$.

ε	σ	λ	SAA	TV	$\overline{CV@R}$
0.05	0.05	10^4	0.438 (0.048)	0.140 (0.137)	0.135 (0.082)
		10^6	0.168 (0.056)	0.025 (0.011)	0.027 (0.013)
		10^8	0.044 (0.012)	0.015 (0.005)	0.018 (0.005)
	0.25	10^4	0.085 (0.033)	0.023 (0.008)	0.020 (0.010)
		10^6	0.033 (0.011)	0.016 (0.006)	0.015 (0.006)
		10^8	0.020 (0.010)	0.020 (0.009)	0.021 (0.009)
	0.5	10^4	0.047 (0.018)	0.020 (0.010)	0.020 (0.008)
		10^6	0.025 (0.009)	0.022 (0.011)	0.022 (0.011)
		10^8	0.028 (0.013)	0.029 (0.013)	0.027 (0.013)
0.2	0.05	10^4	0.438 (0.048)	0.208 (0.113)	0.207 (0.118)
		10^6	0.168 (0.056)	0.036 (0.019)	0.043 (0.023)
		10^8	0.044 (0.012)	0.016 (0.007)	0.018 (0.007)
	0.25	10^4	0.085 (0.033)	0.032 (0.017)	0.024 (0.014)
		10^6	0.033 (0.011)	0.015 (0.006)	0.015 (0.006)
		10^8	0.020 (0.010)	0.022 (0.010)	0.020 (0.009)
	0.5	10^4	0.047 (0.018)	0.024 (0.008)	0.021 (0.009)
		10^6	0.025 (0.009)	0.021 (0.011)	0.020 (0.010)
		10^8	0.028 (0.013)	0.028 (0.013)	0.028 (0.013)

TABLE II: SVM misclassification rates for various tuning parameters. Values are reported as *mean (standard deviation)* computed over 10 training sets. The same 10 sets were used for every selection of parameters and method. Note that ε does not affect SAA.

than the usual SAA. Quantitative performance is compared through the fraction of incorrectly labeled samples in a test set of 10^5 samples, which we refer to as the misclassification rate. The performance is compared for several tunings in [Tbl. II](#), where any parameters not mentioned are kept as specified above. It is of note that our methods are significantly less sensitive to tuning parameters compared to the SAA.

We can also examine the effect of varying the sample count n . For each such value we train the classifiers, again using the parameters used to produce [Fig. 4](#), for 30 training sets. The resulting misclassification rates are depicted in [Fig. 5](#). Again note that $\overline{CV@R}$ and TV both outperform SAA.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding Machine Learning*. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [2] V. Vapnik, *Statistical Learning Theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.
- [3] A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński, *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory, Third Edition*. SIAM, 2021.
- [4] A. Pichler and A. Shapiro, “Mathematical Foundations of Distributionally Robust Multistage Optimization,” 2021, arXiv: [2101.02498](#).
- [5] E. Delage and Y. Ye, “Distributionally Robust Optimization Under Moment Uncertainty with Application to Data-Driven Problems,” *Operations Research*, vol. 58, no. 3, pp. 595–612, 2010.




Fig. 5: SVM misclassification rates for varying sample counts n . The center line depicts the mean, while the colored region depicts the empirical 0.2-confidence interval.

- [6] A. Ben-Tal, D. Den Hertog, A. De Waegenaere, B. Melenberg, and G. Rennen, “Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities,” *Management Science*, vol. 59, no. 2, pp. 341–357, 2013.
- [7] P. Mohajerin Esfahani and D. Kuhn, “Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 171, no. 1-2, pp. 115–166, 2018.
- [8] D. Bertsimas, V. Gupta, and N. Kallus, “Data-driven robust optimization,” *Mathematical Programming*, vol. 167, no. 2, pp. 235–292, 2018.
- [9] F. Lin, X. Fang, and Z. Gao, “Distributionally Robust Optimization: A review on theory and applications,” *Numerical Algebra, Control & Optimization*, vol. 12, no. 1, p. 159, 2022.
- [10] H. Rahimian and S. Mehrotra, “Distributionally Robust Optimization: A Review,” 2019, arXiv: [1908.05659](#).
- [11] J. C. Duchi, P. W. Glynn, and H. Namkoong, “Statistics of robust optimization: A generalized empirical likelihood approach,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 946–969, 2021.
- [12] H. Lam, “Recovering best statistical guarantees via the empirical divergence-based distributionally robust optimization,” *Operations Research*, vol. 67, no. 4, pp. 1090–1105, 2019.
- [13] D. Bertsimas and D. B. Brown, “Constructing Uncertainty Sets for Robust Linear Optimization,” *Operations Research*, vol. 57, no. 6, pp. 1483–1495, 2009.
- [14] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J. B. Wets, *Variational Analysis*, vol. 317. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 1998.
- [15] S. S. Wilks, *Mathematical Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.
- [16] H. A. David and H. N. Nagaraja, *Order Statistics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 2003.
- [17] A. Moscovich, “Fast calculation of p-values for one-sided Kolmogorov-Smirnov type statistics,” 2020, arXiv: [2009.04954](#).
- [18] A. W. Marshall, I. Olkin, and B. C. Arnold, *Inequalities: Theory of Majorization and Its Applications*. Springer New York, 2011.
- [19] A. Steinerman, “G-Majorization, group-induced cone orderings, and reflection groups,” *Linear Algebra and its Applications*, vol. 127, pp. 107–119, 1990.
- [20] M. J. Best, N. Chakravarti, and V. A. Ubhaya, “Minimizing Separable Convex Functions Subject to Simple Chain Constraints,” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 658–672, 2000.
- [21] A. Shapiro, “On kusuoka representation of law invariant risk measures,” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 142–152, 2013.
- [22] R. Mehta, V. Roulet, K. Pillutla, L. Liu, and Z. Harchaoui, “Stochastic Optimization for Spectral Risk Measures,” 2022, arXiv: [2212.05149](#).
- [23] É. Chouzenoux, H. Gérard, and J.-C. Pesquet, “General risk measures for robust machine learning,” *Foundations of Data Science*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 249–269, 2019.
- [24] G. C. Pflug and W. Römisch, *Modeling, Measuring and Managing Risk*. World Scientific, 2007.
- [25] G. R. Shorack and J. A. Wellner, *Empirical Processes with Applications to Statistics*. SIAM, 2009.
- [26] T. W. Anderson, “Confidence limits for the expected value of an arbitrary bounded random variable with a continuous distribution function,” tech. rep., Stanford University, 1969.
- [27] M. C. Campi and S. Garatti, *Introduction to the Scenario Approach*. SIAM, 2018.
- [28] B. Schölkopf, A. J. Smola, F. Bach, et al., *Learning with kernels: support vector machines, regularization, optimization, and beyond*. MIT press, 2002.

- [29] R. E. Barlow and H. D. Brunk, "The Isotonic Regression Problem and its Dual," *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 67, no. 337, pp. 140–147, 1972.
- [30] S. Boyd, S. P. Boyd, and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*. Cambridge university press, 2004.
- [31] A. Ruszczyński and A. Shapiro, "Optimization of convex risk functions," *Mathematics of Operations Research*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 433–452, 2006.
- [32] J. F. Bonnans and A. Shapiro, *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems*. Springer New York, 2000.
- [33] H. H. Bauschke and P. L. Combettes, *Convex Analysis and Monotone Operator Theory in Hilbert Spaces*. Springer New York, 2011.
- [34] R. T. Rockafellar and S. Uryasev, "Optimization of conditional value-at-risk," *The Journal of Risk*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 21–41, 2000.
- [35] A. Beck, *First-Order Methods in Optimization*. SIAM, 2017.
- [36] L. A. E. William Q. Meeker, Gerald J. Hahn, *Statistical Intervals: A Guide for Practitioners and Researchers*. Wiley, 2ed. ed., 2017.
- [37] M. Schuurmans and P. Patrinos, "A general framework for learning-based distributionally robust mpc of markov jump systems," *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, pp. 1–16, 2023.

APPENDIX A MONOTONE CONE

Let $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : x_1 \leq x_2 \leq \dots \leq x_n\}$ denote the monotone cone. This cone and its dual have a history in isotonic regression [29] and majorization [19].

We first derive the polar of \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n .

Lemma A.1. *Let \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n be the monotone cone. Then*

$$(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \sum_{i=1}^k x_i \geq 0, \forall k \in [n-1], \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = 0 \right\}.$$

Proof. The monotone cone is polyhedral with $\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n = \{x : Mx \leq 0\}$ for $M \in \mathbb{R}^{(n-1) \times n}$ with $Mx = (x_1 - x_2, x_2 - x_3, \dots, x_{n-1} - x_n)$. The definition of the polar cone is thus

$$(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \langle x, y \rangle \leq 0, \forall x \text{ s.t. } Mx \leq 0\}.$$

By Farkas' lemma [30, p. 263] we have either $Mx \leq 0$ and $\langle x, y \rangle > 0$ or $M^\top \lambda = y$ and $\lambda \geq 0$. So

$$(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ = \{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : y = M^\top \lambda, \lambda \geq 0\}.$$

Note that $\langle \lambda, Mx \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \lambda_i (x_i - x_{i+1}) = \sum_{j=1}^n x_j (\lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1}) = \langle M^\top \lambda, x \rangle$, where $\lambda_0 = \lambda_n = 0$. Thus $y \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ iff $y = M^\top \lambda$ for $\lambda \geq 0$. Here $y = M^\top \lambda$ holds iff

$$\begin{aligned} y_j &= \lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1}, & \forall j \in [n]. \\ \Leftrightarrow \sum_{j=1}^k y_j &= \sum_{j=1}^k \lambda_j - \lambda_{j-1} = \lambda_k, & \forall k \in [n]. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lambda \geq 0$ we have $\sum_{j=1}^k y_j = \lambda_k \geq 0$ for $k \in [n-1]$ and $\sum_{j=1}^n y_j = \lambda_n = 0$. \square

We relate $(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ to majorization.

Lemma A.2. *Consider $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$x_\uparrow \in y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ \quad \text{iff} \quad x \prec y,$$

where $x \prec y$ denotes that x is majorized by y .

Proof. The definition of majorization [18, Def. 1.A.1] is:

$$x \prec y \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n x_{(i)} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n y_{(i)} \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n x_i = \sum_{i=1}^n y_i.$$

This is clearly equivalent to **Lemma A.1** applied to $x_\uparrow - y_\uparrow$. \square

Majorization is related to the convex hull of the orbit under Π^n . Specifically [18, Cor. 2.B.3]:

$$x \prec y \Leftrightarrow x \in \text{co}(\Pi^n y). \quad (19)$$

This has the following useful consequence.

Lemma A.3. *Consider $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then*

$$\text{co}(\Pi^n y) = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ).$$

Proof. The result is a specialization of [19, Lem. 4.2]. Take $x \in \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$. Then $x \prec y$ by (19) and $x_\uparrow - y_\uparrow \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ by **Lem. A.2**. Using the definition of the polar cone this gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle x_\uparrow - y_\uparrow, u_\uparrow \rangle &\leq 0, & \forall u_\uparrow \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n \\ \Leftrightarrow \langle x_\uparrow, u_\uparrow \rangle &\leq \langle y_\uparrow, u_\uparrow \rangle, & \forall u_\uparrow \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n \\ \Rightarrow \langle x, u_\uparrow \rangle &\leq \langle y, u_\uparrow \rangle, & \forall u_\uparrow \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n, \\ \Leftrightarrow x - y &\in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ, \end{aligned}$$

where we used $\langle x, u_\uparrow \rangle \leq \langle x_\uparrow, u_\uparrow \rangle$ [18, Prop. 6.A.3] for the third implication and the definition of the polar cone again for the fourth. Thus we have shown that $x \in y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. As we could have taken any $x \in \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$ we thus showed $\text{co}(\Pi^n y) \subseteq y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. We can take permutations of both sides without affecting the result (since permutations are invertible). Moreover $\pi \text{co}(\Pi^n y) = \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$. Thus $\text{co}(\Pi^n y) \subseteq \pi(y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$ and $\text{co}(\Pi^n y) \subseteq \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$.

For the converse let $x \in \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$. So $x_\uparrow \in y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. By **Lem. A.2** we have $x \prec y$. Applying (19) then implies $x \in \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$. Therefore $\bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ) \subseteq \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$, completing the proof. \square

We can generalize the above to apply to convex, permutation invariant sets.

Proposition A.4. *Consider some convex permutation invariant $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ (i.e. $x \in \mathcal{A}$ implies $\pi x \in \mathcal{A}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$). Then*

$$\mathcal{A} = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ).$$

Proof. Let $x \in \mathcal{A}$. By **Lem. A.3** we have $\pi(x) \in x_\uparrow + \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. Noting that $x_\uparrow \in \mathcal{A}$ by permutation invariance gives $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{A} + \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. Thus $x \in \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$ and $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$.

For the converse let $x \in \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ)$. Then $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. Specifically $x_\uparrow \in \mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$, which implies $\exists y \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $x_\uparrow \in y + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. Note that $y \in y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ by **Lem. A.3**. That is $\exists s \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ such that $y = y_\uparrow + s$ and $x_\uparrow \in y + s + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. Since $(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ is a convex cone, $s + s' \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ for $s, s' \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. Thus $x_\uparrow \in y_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$, which by **Lem. A.2** implies $x \prec y$ or $x \in \text{co}(\Pi^n y)$ (19). From $y \in \mathcal{A}$ and permutation invariance $\Pi^n y \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Moreover, by convexity, $\text{co}(\Pi^n y) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. Thus $x \in \mathcal{A}$ and $\bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{A} + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ) \subseteq \mathcal{A}$. \square

We finish with a characterization of the convex hull of the permutations of some vector as a polyhedral set.

Proposition A.5. Consider a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ with d distinct elements, which we store in $\bar{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Let $c \in \mathbb{N}^d$ denote the number of copies of each component of \bar{x} in x . Then

$$\text{co}(\Pi^n x) = \{S\bar{x}: S\mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_n, \mathbf{1}_n^\top S = c^\top, S \geq 0\}.$$

Proof. Since the doubly stochastic matrices are the convex hull of the permutation matrices [18, 2.A.2], the convex hull of all permutations of x is

$$\text{co}(\Pi^n x) = \{Hx: H\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n, \mathbf{1}_n^\top H = \mathbf{1}_n, H \geq 0\}.$$

Consider

$$C^\top := \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \dots & 1 & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & 1 & \dots & 1 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n},$$

where row i contains c_i repetitions of 1 for each $i \in [d]$ such that $x = C\bar{x}$. The pseudo-inverse C^\dagger is given as

$$C^\dagger := \begin{bmatrix} 1/c_1 & \dots & 1/c_1 & & & \\ & & & \ddots & & \\ & & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & & 1/c_d & \dots & 1/c_d \end{bmatrix} \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}.$$

So $\bar{x} = C^\dagger x$ and $C^\dagger C = I_d$.

Take H doubly stochastic. Then $v = HCC^\dagger x = HC\bar{x} \in \text{co}(\Pi^n x)$ and $S = HC$ satisfies the conditions above. Specifically $HC^\top \mathbf{1}_d = H\mathbf{1}_n = \mathbf{1}_n$ and $\mathbf{1}_n^\top HC^\top = \mathbf{1}_n^\top C^\top = \mathbf{1}_d^\top$ and $HC^\top \geq 0$. Let \mathcal{R} denote the right-most set in the proposition. We have shown $v \in \mathcal{R}$ or $\text{co}(\Pi^n x) \subseteq \mathcal{R}$. For the reverse implication take some $v \in \mathcal{R}$. So $v = Sy = SC^\dagger Cy = SC^\dagger x$. It is easy to verify that SC^\dagger is doubly stochastic. Thus $v \in \text{co}(\Pi^n x)$. \square

APPENDIX B STATISTICAL FRAMEWORK

Proof of Thm. II.2: For continuous Z , (6) follows directly from (4) and Prop. II.1. Conditioned on the event that the coverages W , as defined in Prop. II.1 lie within \mathcal{D} , the supremum upper bounds the right-hand side of (4) and hence $\mathbb{E}[Z]$. As W is uniformly distributed by Prop. II.1 this event has probability $\mathbb{P}[W \in \mathcal{D}]$, confirming the stated result.

For discontinuous Z the proof is more involved. Now Prop. II.1 no longer holds, implying that W defined there is not uniformly distributed over Δ^n . Let $F(z) = \mathbb{P}[Z \leq z]$ denote the cdf and $F(z-) = \mathbb{P}[Z < z]$. For the sample $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$ let

$$\tilde{F}_i = (1 - U_i) \cdot F(Z_{i-}) + U_i \cdot F(Z_i),$$

with the auxiliary random variables $U_i \cong \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ for $i \in [n]$. Then $\tilde{F}_i \cong \mathcal{U}(0, 1)$ by [24, Prop. 1.3]. Therefore

$$\tilde{W} = \left(\tilde{F}_{(i)} - \tilde{F}_{(i-1)} \right)_{i=1}^n.$$

is uniformly distributed over Δ^n (cf. [16, §6.4]). We show that $\tilde{W} \in \mathcal{D}$ implies $W = (F(Z_{(i)}) - F(Z_{(i-1)}))_{i=1}^n \in \mathcal{D}$. Then the stated result follows from similar arguments as for the continuous case.

Since $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D} + (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$ and we assume $\tilde{W} \in \mathcal{D}$, we should show $W \in \tilde{W} + (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$, or equivalently $W - \tilde{W} \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$. We assumed that $Z_{(n)} \geq \text{esssup}[Z]$ and $Z_{(0)} = -\infty$.

So $F(Z_{(n)}) = \tilde{F}_{(n)} = 1$ and $F(Z_{(0)}) = \tilde{F}_{(0)} = 0$. Thus $\sum_{i=1}^n W_i = \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{W}_i = 1$. Therefore, by Lem. A.1, $W - \tilde{W} \in (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$ holds iff, for all $k \in [n-1]$

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{i=1}^k W_i - \tilde{W}_i \geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & F(Z_{(k)}) - F(Z_{(0)}) - (\tilde{F}_{(k)} - \tilde{F}_{(0)}) \geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & F(Z_{(k)}) - \tilde{F}_{(k)} \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The second \Leftrightarrow follows from $F(Z_{(0)}) = \tilde{F}_{(0)} = 0$. Note that

$$\tilde{F}_{(k)} = (1 - U_{\pi(k)}) \cdot F(Z_{\pi(k)-}) + U_{\pi(k)} \cdot F(Z_{\pi(k)}),$$

where π is the permutation such that $\tilde{F}_{\pi(k)} = \tilde{F}_{(k)}$. For $i, j \in [n]$, $Z_j \geq Z_i$ implies $F(Z_{j-}) \geq F(Z_{i-})$ and $F(Z_j) \geq F(Z_i)$ by monotonicity of the cdf. Therefore $Z_{\pi(k)} = Z_{(k)}$. Thus (20) is equivalent to

$$(1 - U_{\pi(k)}) \cdot (F(Z_{(k)}) - F(Z_{(k)-})) \geq 0,$$

which holds since $F(Z_{(k)}) \geq F(Z_{(k)-})$. By the earlier arguments, this completes the proof. \square

APPENDIX C DISTORTION REPRESENTATION

This section contains the proofs associated with §III.

Proof of Lem. III.1: We will need to use the vector and function characterization of random variables simultaneously throughout this proof. So to avoid the abuse of notation used throughout the rest of the paper we use capital letters when $X: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is implied and $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ for the vector representation with

$$x_i = X(\omega_i), \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

The random variables $X, Y: \Omega^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are identically distributed when $\mathbb{P}[X \in \mathcal{X}] = \mathbb{P}[Y \in \mathcal{X}]$ for every measurable set $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{B}$, with \mathcal{B} the Borel sigma algebra over the reals. Using the vector representation $\mathbb{P}[X \in \mathcal{X}] = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i)$. Thus $X \cong Y$ holds iff

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i), \quad \forall \mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (21)$$

To show \Leftarrow observe that (21) is permutation invariant. So $\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(y_{\pi(i)}) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i)$ for all $\mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{F}$.

To show \Rightarrow let m denote the number of distinct elements of x , the values of which we define as $\{z_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Then let $\mathcal{C}_j = \{i: x_i = z_j\}$ for $j \in [m]$. We have

$$\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^m |\mathcal{C}_j| \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(z_j) = \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{X}}(y_i), \quad \forall \mathcal{X} \in \mathcal{B}$$

since $X \cong Y$ by assumption. For any $j \in [m]$ let $\mathcal{X} = \{z_j\}$ and $\mathcal{D}_j = \{i: y_i = z_j\}$. Then the above implies that $|\mathcal{D}_j| = |\mathcal{C}_j|$ for all $j \in [m]$. Take $\pi: [n] \rightarrow [n]$ any of the bijections such that $\pi(\mathcal{D}_j) = \mathcal{C}_j$. Then $y_{\pi(i)} = z_j = x_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{D}_j$ and all $j \in [m]$. Thus $x = \pi y$, proving the claimed result. \square

We next state the usual definition of law-invariant, coherent risk measures:

Definition C.1 (coherent risk). Consider a $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ that is proper ² and lsc. Assume (for $X, Y \in \mathbb{R}^n$):

A1. convex: $\rho(\alpha X + (1 - \alpha)Y) \leq \alpha\rho(X) + (1 - \alpha)\rho(Y)$, $\forall \alpha \in [0, 1]$;

A2. monotone: if $Y \geq X$, then $\rho(Y) \geq \rho(X)$;

A3. translation equivariance: $\rho(X+a) = \rho(X)+a$, $\forall a \in \mathbb{R}$;

A4. pos. homogeneity: if $t > 0$, then $\rho(tX) = t\rho(X)$.

Then ρ is a coherent risk measure. Consider also

A5. law invariance: if $X \cong Y$, then $\rho(Y) = \rho(X)$.

The first four assumptions were considered in [31, §1], while A5 is considered in [13, Def. 4.4]. By Lem. III.1 it implies that $\rho(X) = \rho(\pi X)$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$.

The convex conjugate $\rho^*: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ of a risk measure is given as

$$\rho^*(\mu) = \sup_{X \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\langle \mu, X \rangle - \rho(X)\}. \quad (22)$$

Its domain is affected by the assumptions in Def. C.1.

Proposition C.2. Suppose that $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is proper, lsc., and convex. Then, $\rho = \rho^{**}$ with $\mathcal{A} := \text{dom}(\rho^*)$ a non-empty and convex set. Moreover

(i) A2 holds iff $\mu \geq 0$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$;

(ii) A3 holds iff $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{A}$;

(iii) A4 holds iff \mathcal{A} is closed and

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X \rangle, \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

(iv) A5 holds iff $\rho^*(\pi\mu) = \rho^*(\mu)$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$.

We assumed the underlying measure of the random variables is $\mathbb{1}_n/n = (1/n, \dots, 1/n)$ for (iv).

Proof. By [32, Prop. 2.112] ρ^* is proper and convex. Hence its domain must be non-empty and convex. Now (i)–(iii) follows from [31, Thm. 2.2].

By Lem. III.1, A5 holds iff $\rho(\pi X) = X$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. We first show that A5 implies $\rho^*(\pi\mu) = \rho^*(\mu)$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. First note that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_X \{\langle \mu, X \rangle - \rho(X)\} &= \sup_X \{\langle \mu, \pi(X) \rangle - \rho(\pi(X))\} \\ &= \sup_X \{\langle \pi^{-1}(\mu), X \rangle - \rho(X)\} \end{aligned}$$

Since $\{\pi^{-1}: \pi \in \Pi^n\} = \Pi^n$ we have shown $\rho^*(\pi\mu) = \rho^*(\mu)$ for all $\mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. For the reverse implication we can apply the same reasoning and using that $\rho = \rho^{**}$. Note that this result specializes [21, Prop. 2]. \square

To find the equivalent of Prop. C.2 for the ordered conjugate ρ° , we begin by relating ρ° to ρ^* in terms of an infimal convolution. Then we relate their domains.

Lemma C.3. Given some proper, convex, lsc. and law-invariant risk measure $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. Then

$$\rho^\circ = (\rho + \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n})^* = \rho^* \square \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ}.$$

²That is $\rho(X) > -\infty$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and the domain $\text{dom}(\rho) := \{X \in \mathbb{R}^n: \rho(X) < +\infty\}$ is nonempty.

Proof. The first equality holds by definition of the conjugate and the indicator. Plugging in the associated definitions and changing signs makes the second equality equivalent to

$$\inf_x \rho(x) + (\iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) - \langle x, y \rangle) = -\inf_u \rho^*(u) + \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}(y - u).$$

Letting $f(x) = \rho(x)$ and $g(x) = \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}(x) - \langle x, y \rangle$. Note that $f^* = \rho^*$ and $g^*(u) = \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}(y + u)$. Thus we require

$$\inf_x f(x) + g(x) = -\inf_u f^*(u) + g^*(-u),$$

which by [33, Fact. 15.25], since g is polyhedral, requires $\text{dom } g \cap \text{ri dom } f \neq \emptyset$.

By properness, $\text{dom } \rho \neq \emptyset$, which by convexity of ρ and [33, Fact. 6.14(i)] implies $\text{ri dom } \rho \neq \emptyset$. Moreover, by permutation invariance $x \in \text{dom } \rho$ implies $\pi x \in \text{dom } \rho$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$ since $\rho(\pi(x)) = \rho(x) < \infty$. Thus $\pi \text{ dom } \rho = \text{dom } \rho$. Moreover, by [14, Prop. 2.44] and linearity of permutations we have $\text{ri}(\text{dom } \rho) = \text{ri}(\pi \text{ dom } \rho) = \pi \text{ ri}(\text{dom } \rho)$. Thus $\text{dom } g \cap \text{ri dom } f = \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap \text{ri}(\text{dom } \rho) \neq \emptyset$.

Finally note that $\iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^n}^* = \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ}$ by [14, Ex. 11.4]. \square

Proposition C.4. Let $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be lsc., convex and law-invariant risk measure. Then

$$\text{dom}(\rho^\circ) = \text{dom}(\rho^*) + (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$$

$$\text{dom}(\rho^*) = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\text{dom}(\rho^\circ)).$$

Proof. The first result follows from Lem. C.3 and [14, Ex. 1.28]. The second result follows from Prop. A.4. \square

The equivalence derived through Prop. C.4 enables us to re-derive many of the statements in Prop. C.2 for ρ° .

Proposition C.5. Suppose that $\rho: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ is lsc., law-invariant and convex. Then $\mathcal{D} := \text{dom}(\rho^\circ)$ is a convex set such that $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \neq \emptyset$. Moreover

(i) If $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$ then $\mu + (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ \subseteq \mathcal{D}$;

(ii) A2 holds iff any μ s.t. $\pi(\mu) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all permutations $\pi \in \Pi^n$ is nonnegative.

(iii) A3 holds iff $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$ for any $\mu \in \mathcal{D}$;

(iv) A4 holds iff \mathcal{D} is closed and

$$\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{D}} \langle \mu, X \rangle, \quad \forall X \in \mathbb{R}^n$$

Proof. By Prop. C.2 we have convexity of $\text{dom } \rho^*$. This implies convexity of ρ° (Minkowski sum of convex sets). Next assume $x \in \text{dom } \rho^*$ then, by Prop. C.4, $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. Thus $x \uparrow \in \mathcal{D}$. So $\text{dom } \rho^* \neq \emptyset$, which holds by Prop. C.2, implies $\mathcal{D} \cap \mathbb{R}_+^n \neq \emptyset$.

(i) holds by Prop. C.4. To show (ii) we use Prop. C.4 and specifically $\text{dom } \rho^* = \bigcap_{\pi \in \Pi^n} \pi(\mathcal{D})$. So $x \in \text{dom } \rho^*$ iff $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$. Note that A2 holds iff $x \geq 0$ for all $x \in \text{dom } \rho^*$. So A2 holds iff every x such that $\pi(x) \in \mathcal{D}$ for all $\pi \in \Pi^n$ is nonnegative, proving (ii).

Let $\bar{\rho} = \rho + \iota_{\mathbb{R}^n}$ as in Lem. C.3. Then $\mathcal{D} = \text{dom}(\bar{\rho}^*)$. By permutation invariance $\bar{\rho}(X \uparrow) = \rho(X \uparrow) = \rho(X)$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$. We can then prove (iii) by noting that $(X+a) \uparrow = X \uparrow + a$. Hence A3 holds for $\bar{\rho}$ iff it holds for $\rho(X) = \bar{\rho}(X \uparrow)$.

Thus we can apply [Prop. C.2\(ii\)](#) to $\bar{\rho}$ in order to link [A3](#) with $\text{dom}(\rho^\circ) = \text{dom}(\bar{\rho}^*)$. For (iv) we use a similar argument noting that $(\alpha X)_\uparrow = \alpha X_\uparrow$ for all $X \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and all $\alpha \geq 0$ and apply [Prop. C.2\(iii\)](#). The only property of ρ that does not transfer to $\bar{\rho}$ is monotonicity. So (ii) is more complex. \square

We can now prove the main theorem of [§III](#).

Proof of [Thm. III.3](#): We need to show that [Prop. C.5](#) implies the properties of \mathcal{D} as stated in the theorem. [Prop. C.5](#) directly implies the following properties: convexity, closedness, (ii), (iii) and (iv) as well as (9). The one remaining property is (i). Note that, for any $\mu \in \text{dom } \rho^*$ we have $\text{co}(\Pi^n \mu) \subseteq \text{dom } \rho^*$ by permutation invariance (so $\mu_\uparrow \in \text{dom } \rho^*$). Then [Prop. C.4](#) and [Lem. A.3](#) imply $\text{co}(\Pi^n \mu) \subseteq \text{dom } \rho^\circ$. Take $E \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ a matrix of all ones. Then $E\mu/n \in \text{co}(\Pi^n \mu)$. Since $\sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i = 1$ by (iii) we have $E\mu/n = \mathbf{1}_n/n$. So if $\mathbf{1}_n/n \notin \text{dom } \rho^*$ then $\text{dom } \rho^*$ is empty by contradiction. Thus \mathcal{D} contains $\mathbf{1}_n/n$ since otherwise $\text{dom } \rho^* = \emptyset$. Finally, (10) rephrases [Prop. C.4](#). \square

APPENDIX D CALIBRATING RISK FUNCTIONALS

A. Distortion Risks

Proof of [Prop. IV.1](#): Note that $\langle \mu_\uparrow + s, X_\uparrow \rangle \leq \langle \mu_\uparrow, X_\uparrow \rangle$ for all $s \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ since it is the polar cone of \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n . Hence the supremum in (9) is achieved at μ_\uparrow . The characterization of ρ as a distortion risk measure then follows from [[13](#), [Thm. 4.2](#)] – where their risk measures are defined as $X \mapsto \rho(-X)$, where ρ follows our convention (cf. [[13](#), [Thm. 2.1](#)]). \square

Proof of [Cor. IV.2](#): We have $W \in \mu_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ iff. $W - \mu_\uparrow \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$. This holds iff, $\forall k \in [n-1]$ (cf. [Lem. A.1](#))

$$\sum_{i=1}^k W_i - \mu_{(i)} \geq 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \sum_{i=1}^k W_i \geq \sum_{i=1}^k \mu_{(i)}.$$

The fact that $\sum_{i=1}^k W_i \cong U_{(k)}$ follows from [[16](#), §6.4]. \square

B. Details for [Ex. IV.4](#)

We first characterize the conditional value-at-risk in terms of order statistics as a *distortion risk* below.

Lemma D.1. Consider $\text{CV@R}_n^\gamma: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\text{CV@R}_n^\gamma[X] = \inf_{\tau} \left\{ \tau + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)n} \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i - \tau]_+ \right\}, \quad (23)$$

for $\gamma \in [0, 1]$. Then

$$(1-\gamma)\text{CV@R}_n^\gamma[X] = \left(\frac{d}{n} - \gamma \right) X_{(d)} + \sum_{i=d+1}^n \frac{X_{(i)}}{n},$$

with $d := \lceil n\gamma \rceil$. So CV@R_n^γ is a distortion risk.

Proof. Consider the minimizers in the definition of CV@R :

$$\underset{\tau}{\operatorname{argmin}} \left\{ \tau + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)n} \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i - \tau]_+ \right\}.$$

By [[34](#), [Thm. 1](#)], this set is a closed bounded interval with the left endpoint being

$$\begin{aligned} \text{V@R}_n^\gamma[X] &:= \inf_x \{x: F_n(x) \geq \gamma\} \\ &= \inf_x \left\{ x: \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbf{1}_{(-\infty, x]}(X_i) \geq \gamma n \right\} = X_{(d)}, \end{aligned}$$

with F_n the empirical cdf, the definition of which we plugged in for the second equality. For the third equality note that the left-hand side counts the number of values X_i smaller than or equal to x . Assume

$$X_{(d-k-1)} < X_{(d-k)} = X_{(d-k+1)} = \dots = X_{(d)}, \quad (24)$$

for $k \geq 0$. Then clearly there are at least $d = \lceil n\gamma \rceil > n\gamma$ values smaller than or equal to $X_{(d-k)}$. For any $z < X_{(d-k)}$ there are at most $d-k-1$ samples values than or equal. Hence $\text{V@R}_n^\gamma[X] = X_{(d-k)} = X_{(d)}$.

Plugging into the cost of (23) gives

$$\begin{aligned} X_{(d)} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)n} \sum_{i=1}^n [X_i - X_{(d)}]_+ \\ = X_{(d)} + \frac{1}{(1-\gamma)n} \sum_{i=d+1}^n (X_{(i)} - X_{(d)}), \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where we used $X_{(i)} \leq X_{(d)}$ for $i \leq d$. The stated result follows from some basic algebraic manipulation. Finally note that $d/n - \gamma = (\lceil n\gamma \rceil - n\gamma)/n \leq 1/n$. So the monotonicity constraint on μ in [Prop. IV.1](#) is also satisfied. \square

We can then rewrite (13) as

$$\overline{\text{CV@R}}_n^\gamma[X] := (1-\gamma)\text{CV@R}_{n-1}^\gamma[(X_{(i)})_{i=1}^{n-1}] + \gamma X_{(n)}.$$

The associated simple distortion set in [Prop. IV.1](#) has

$$\mu = \left(0, \dots, 0, \frac{\lceil (n-1)\gamma \rceil}{n-1} - \gamma, \frac{1}{n-1}, \dots, \frac{1}{n-1}, \gamma \right), \quad (26)$$

So we need $\gamma \geq 1/(n-1)$ for $\mu \in \Delta^n \cap \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n$ to hold. The advantage of $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$ as a well-calibrated risk measure over CV@R is that additional weight is placed on the largest sample. This often makes the mean bound associated with $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$ less conservative compared to CV@R for the same confidence level. \square

C. ϕ -divergence risk

We first require the following lemma, that enables checking whether a vector lies in the distortion set associated with some ϕ -divergence risk measure.

Lemma D.2. Consider a ϕ -distortion set $\mathcal{D}_\alpha^n := \mathcal{A}_\alpha^n + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ with \mathcal{A}_α^n as in (16). Then $\mu \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha^n$ if and only if

$$(I_\phi^*)^\circ(\mu) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i \cdot \lambda_i - \frac{1}{n} \phi^*(\lambda_i) \right\} \leq \alpha. \quad (27)$$

Proof. By construction of $\mathcal{D}_\alpha^n = \mathcal{A}_\alpha^n + (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ we have $\mu \in \mathcal{D}_\alpha^n$ iff there is some $s \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ$ such that $\mu - s \in \mathcal{A}_\alpha^n$ or

$$\begin{aligned} \exists s \in (\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ: I_\phi^m(\mu - s) \leq \alpha \\ \Leftrightarrow \inf_s \left\{ I_\phi^m(\mu - s) + \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_\uparrow^n)^\circ}(s) \right\} \leq \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

The infimum equals $I_\phi^n \square \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ}$ by definition. Applying [14, Thm. 11.23], using $\Delta^n \subseteq \text{dom } I_\phi^n$ and $\Delta^n \cap \text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ \neq \emptyset$, gives $I_\phi^n \square \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ} = (I_\phi^{n*} + \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ})^* = (I_\phi^{n*} + \iota_{(\mathbb{R}_+^n)})^* = (I_\phi^{n*})^\diamond$, where we used [14, Ex. 11.4] for the second equality. For the equality in (27) we apply the tricks for the convex conjugate of a separable sum and the conjugate of $\alpha f(x/\alpha)$ listed in [35, App. B, Table 3]. \square

Remark D.3. To compute the supremum in (27) we specialize³ the pool adjacent violators (PAV) algorithm from [20]. This requires a partition of $[n]$ given as \mathcal{J} consisting of blocks $[p, q] \subseteq [n]$ with $p \leq q$. Let $[p, q]^+$ denote the block starting with $q+1$ and $[p, q]^-$ the one ending at $p-1$. If no $[p, q]^+$ or $[p, q]^-$ exists then the output is \emptyset . For example let

$$\mathcal{J} = \{[1, 5], [6, 8], [9, 10]\}.$$

Then $[6, 8]^+ = [9, 10]$, $[6, 8]^- = [1, 5]$ and $[1, 5]^- = \emptyset$.

For $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^n$ let $\lambda_{[p, q]} = (\lambda_p, \dots, \lambda_q)$ and $\bar{\mu}_{[p, q]} = \sum_{i=p}^q \mu_i$. Using this notation Alg. 1 computes the argmax of (27). We give expressions for $\partial\phi$ for some ϕ -divergences in Tbl. III. The steps 6 and 9 simply perform a merge operation. Say the current partition is as above and $[p, q] = [6, 8]$. Then $\mathcal{J} = \{[1, 5], [6, 10]\}$ and $[p, q] = [6, 10]$ after step 6.

Algorithm 1: The PAV algorithm for computing (27)

```

1 initialization:
2 initialize the partition  $\mathcal{J} \leftarrow \{[i, i]\}_{i=1}^n$ 
3 let  $\lambda_{[i, i]}^* \in \partial\phi(n\bar{\mu}_{[i, i]})$  and  $[p, q] \leftarrow [1, 1]$ .
4 while  $[p, q]^+ \neq \emptyset$  do
5   if  $\lambda_{[p, q]}^* > \lambda_{[p, q]^+}^*$  then
6      $J \leftarrow (J \setminus \{[p, q], [p, q]^+\}) \cup ([p, q] \cup [p, q]^+)$ 
7     and  $[p, q] \leftarrow [p, q] \cup [p, q]^+$ .
8     let  $\lambda_{[p, q]}^* \in \partial\phi(n\bar{\mu}_{[p, q]}/(q-p))$ .
9   else
10     $J \leftarrow (J \setminus \{[p, q]^-, [p, q]\}) \cup ([p, q]^- \cup [p, q])$ 
11    and  $[p, q] \leftarrow [p, q]^- \cup [p, q]$ .
12    let  $\lambda_{[p, q]}^* \in \partial\phi(n\bar{\mu}_{[p, q]}/(q-p))$ .
13  end
14 end
15 return:  $\lambda^*$ .
```

Using Lem. D.2 to efficiently check containment in \mathcal{D}_α^n we can compute the data-driven approximation of (17) given in Thm. IV.5.

Proof of Thm. IV.5: By Lem. D.2, (17) is equivalent to

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha : \mathbb{P} \left[(I_\phi^{n*})^\diamond(W) \leq \alpha \right] \geq 1 - \epsilon \right\}.$$

³All that was required to specialize the algorithm of [20] is to note that

$$\operatorname{argmax}_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=p}^q \left(\frac{1}{n} \right) \phi^*(\lambda) - \mu_i \cdot \lambda = \partial\phi \left(\frac{n\bar{\mu}_{[p, q]}}{q-p} \right),$$

which follows from simple algebra and [14, Prop. 11.3].

So, letting F_ϕ denote the cdf of the scalar random variable $(I_\phi^{n*})^\diamond(W)$ then we can express this as $\alpha = F_\phi^{-1}(1 - \epsilon)$. The result then follows from a one-sided data-driven bound of a quantile stated in [36, §G.2.1]. \square

APPENDIX E TRACTABLE REFORMULATIONS

We review tractable reformulations of the risk measures presented in this work. We also highlight dedicated algorithms from literature, whenever they exist.

A. Conic representable ambiguity

We begin by considering the general class of conic representable risk measures [37].

Theorem E.1. For matrices $E \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times n}$ and $F \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times r}$ and some cone \mathcal{K} . Let

$$\mathcal{A} = \{ \mu \in \Delta^n : \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^r : E\mu + F\nu \preceq_{\mathcal{K}} b \}, \quad (28)$$

denote the ambiguity set with $\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X \rangle$ (cf. (7)). If \mathcal{K} is polyhedral (i.e. it is represented by an intersection of halfplanes) or $\text{ri } \mathcal{A} \neq \emptyset$, then

$$\rho(X) = \min_{(\lambda, \tau) \in \mathcal{K}^* \times \mathbb{R}} \tau + \langle b, \lambda \rangle \quad (29)$$

s. t. $E^\top \lambda + \tau \geq X, F^\top \lambda \geq 0.$

Proof. First note that (29) is the Lagrangian dual associated with $\rho(X) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{A}} \langle \mu, X \rangle$. Specifically, we can rewrite the supremum in standard dual form as

$$\rho(X) = \left\{ \max_y \langle (X, 0), y \rangle : \begin{bmatrix} E & F \\ -\mathbf{1}_n^\top & 0 \\ \mathbf{1}_n^\top & 0 \end{bmatrix} y \preceq_{\mathcal{G}^*} \begin{bmatrix} b \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\},$$

with $\mathcal{G}^* = \mathcal{K} \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \{0\}$ and $y = (\mu, \nu)$. Its dual is given as $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{K}^* \times \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}$. The primal is [30, Ex. 5.12]

$$\rho(X) = \min_{x \in \mathcal{G}} \langle (b, 0, 1), x \rangle \quad (30)$$

s. t. $\begin{bmatrix} E^\top & -\mathbf{1}_n & \mathbf{1}_n \\ F^\top & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} x = \begin{bmatrix} b \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}.$

If we partition $x = (\lambda, \beta, \tau)$ and eliminate β from the above problem then (29) is recovered. The conditions on \mathcal{K} and $\text{ri } \mathcal{A}$ follow from the discussion at the start of [30, §5.2.3]. \square

Remark E.2. Consider (2) with $L(\theta) : \mathbb{R}^{n_\theta} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ convex. Then the dual problem for $\rho[L(\theta)]$ in (29) has the constraint

$$E^\top \lambda + \tau \geq L(\theta),$$

which is clearly convex. The constraint can be made conic through application of an epigraph trick on $L(\theta)$.

Besides the classical positive orthant \mathbb{R}_+^n , which is self dual, we will need two more cones below. The exponential cone in \mathbb{R}^3 and its dual are:

$$\mathcal{E}^3 := \{x : x_1 \leq x_2 \log(\frac{x_3}{x_2}), x_2 > 0\},$$

$$(\mathcal{E}^3)^* = \{y : y_1 < 0, y_3 > 0, -y_1 \log(\frac{-y_1}{y_3}) + y_1 - y_2 \leq 0\}.$$

The second-order cone is self dual and is given as:

$$\mathcal{Q}^n := \{x = (t, z) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1} : t \geq \|z\|_2\}.$$

Divergence	$\phi(t)$	$\phi^*(\lambda)$	$\partial\phi(t)$
Kullback-Leibler	$t \log t - t + 1$	$e^\lambda - 1$	$\log(t)$
Burg Entropy	$t - \log t - 1$	$-\log(1 - \lambda), \lambda < 1$	$1 - t^{-1}$
Hellinger distance	$(\sqrt{t} - 1)^2$	$\lambda/(1 - \lambda), \lambda < 1$	$1 - 1/\sqrt{t}$
χ^2-distance	$(t - 1)^2/t$	$2 - 2\sqrt{1 - \lambda}, \lambda < 1$	$1 - t^{-2}$
Variation distance	$ t - 1 $	$\max(-1, \lambda), \lambda < 1$	$\begin{cases} -1, & t < 1 \\ [-1, 1], & t = 1 \\ 1, & 1 < t \end{cases}$

TABLE III: Some ϕ -divergences, their conjugates and subgradients required for PAV.

B. Distortion risk

Optimizing distortion risks has been considered in literature before and dedicated algorithms were developed [22]. For purpose of generality we provide a reformulation in terms of [Thm. E.1](#).

Proposition E.3. *Let ρ be a distortion risk with $\mathcal{D} := \text{dom } \rho^\diamond = \mu_\uparrow + (\mathbb{R}_+^n)^\circ$ for some $\mu \in \Delta^n$. Then the ambiguity set $\mathcal{A} := \text{dom } \rho^*$ is given as:*

$$\mathcal{A} = \{S\bar{\mu} : S\mathbf{1}_d = \mathbf{1}_n, \mathbf{1}_n^\top S = c, S \geq 0\},$$

with $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ containing the $d \leq n$ unique elements of μ and $c \in \mathbb{R}^d$ the number of copies of each element of $\bar{\mu}$ in μ . Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(X) &= \min_{y, w} \mathbf{1}_n^\top y + c^\top w \\ \text{s. t. } & y_i + w_j \geq X_i \bar{\mu}_j, (i, j) \in [n] \times [d]. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Proof. This follows from [Prop. C.4](#) and [Prop. A.5](#). For the final result, first note that \mathcal{A} can be written as in [Thm. E.1](#) with constraints $I_n \mu - (\bar{\mu}^\top \otimes I_n) \nu = 0$, $(\mathbf{1}_d^\top \otimes I_n) \nu = \mathbf{1}_n$, $(I_d \otimes \mathbf{1}_n^\top) \nu = \mathbf{1}_d$ and $\nu = \text{vec}(S) \geq 0$, with \otimes the Kronecker product and vec the vectorization operation. Dualizing and simplifying gives the required result. Note that the associated cones are all polyhedral. Hence [Thm. E.1](#) is applicable. \square

A similar characterization was provided in [13, Thm. 4.3], which did not exploit sparsity of μ as we do. Note how for $\overline{\text{CV@R}}$ we have $d = 4$ for any value of n . This fixed sparsity means that the number of constraints and variables in (31) grow linearly with n . Without exploiting sparsity, the growth would be quadratic.

C. ϕ -divergences

Optimization of ϕ -divergence based risk measures has been considered in [6] and [23]. Specifically [23, Prop. 9]:

$$\rho(X) = \min_{(\lambda, \mu) \in \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R}} \lambda \alpha + \mu + \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda \phi^* \left(\frac{X_i - \mu}{\lambda} \right).$$

This formulation is especially useful as it supports stochastic gradient descent algorithms [23].

To support reformulating $\rho(X)$ as a conic program in the convex case, we also characterize the ambiguity sets associated with the ϕ -divergences listed in [Tbl. III](#) in terms of conic constraints. The associated risk measure can be minimized through application of [Thm. E.1](#). For all, except the Burg Entropy and χ^2 -distance we follow [37, App. A].

KL-divergence:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha &\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log(n\mu_i) \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} \log(\mu_i n)/n \leq \nu_i, & \forall i \in [n] \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \leq \alpha, \end{cases} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} (-\nu_i, 1/n, \mu_i) \in \mathcal{E}^3, & \forall i \in [n] \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \leq \alpha. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Burg Entropy:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha &\Leftrightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (n\mu_i - \log(n\mu_i) - 1) \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow -\frac{1}{n} \log(n\mu_i) \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} -\log(\mu_i n)/n \leq \nu_i, & \forall i \in [n] \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \leq \alpha, \end{cases} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} (-\nu_i, 1/n, \mu_i) \in \mathcal{E}^3, & \forall i \in [n] \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \leq \alpha. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

Hellinger Distance: Using the fact that

$$I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) = \sum_{i=1}^n \left(\sqrt{\mu_i} - \sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \right)^2 = 2 \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\frac{\mu_i}{n}} \right),$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\mu_i/n} \geq 1 - \alpha/2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} 1 - \alpha/2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{1/n} \nu_i, & \forall i \in [n] \\ \nu_i^2 \leq \mu_i. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The second constraint can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_i^2 \leq \mu_i &\Leftrightarrow 4\nu_i^2 \leq (\mu_i + 1 + \mu_i - 1)(\mu_i + 1 - (\mu_i - 1)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow 4\nu_i^2 \leq (\mu_i + 1)^2 - (\mu_i - 1)^2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \|(2\nu_i, \mu_i - 1)\|_2 \leq \mu_i + 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\mu_i + 1, 2\nu_i, \mu_i - 1) \in \mathcal{Q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

χ^2 Distance: Using the fact that

$$I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(n\mu_i - 1)^2}{n\mu_i} = \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i - \frac{1}{n})^2 / \mu_i,$$

we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n (\mu_i^2 - 2\frac{\mu_i}{n} + \frac{1}{n^2}) / \mu_i \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_i - \frac{2}{n} + \frac{1}{\mu_i n^2} \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\mu_i n^2} \leq \alpha + 1 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n : \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i/n^2 \leq \alpha + 1, & \forall i \in [n] \\ 1/\mu_i \leq \nu_i. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

The second constraint can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} 1/\mu_i \leq \nu_i &\Leftrightarrow 4 \leq (\mu_i + \nu_i + \mu_i - \nu_i)(\mu_i + \nu_i - (\mu_i - \nu_i)) \\ &\Leftrightarrow 4 \leq (\mu_i + \nu_i)^2 - (\mu_i - \nu_i)^2 \\ &\Leftrightarrow \|(2, \mu_i - \nu_i)\| \leq \mu_i + \nu_i \\ &\Leftrightarrow (\mu_i + \nu_i, 2, \mu_i - \nu_i) \in \mathcal{Q}^2. \end{aligned}$$

Total variation:

$$\begin{aligned} I_\phi(\mu, \mathbf{1}_n/n) \leq \alpha &\Leftrightarrow \|\mu - \mathbf{1}_n/n\|_1 \leq \alpha \\ &\Leftrightarrow \exists \nu \in \mathbb{R}^n: \begin{cases} -\nu_i \leq \mu_i - 1/n \leq \nu_i, \forall i \in [n] \\ \sum_{i=1}^n \nu_i \leq \alpha. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX F SUPPORT VECTOR MACHINES

Let \mathcal{H} be some *reproducing kernel Hilbert Space (RKHS)* [28, Def. 2.9] with reproducing kernel $\kappa: \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. Here $\langle f, g \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ denotes the inner product associated with \mathcal{H} and $\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 = \langle f, f \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$ for $f, g \in \mathcal{H}$. The *primal problem* for learning a support vector machine is usually given in terms of the *hinge loss*:

$$\underset{(f,b) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \lambda \mathbb{E} [1 - Y(f(X) - b)]_+.$$

with $\lambda > 0$, $X: \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ and $Y: \Omega \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$. Using the reproducing property of κ (cf. [28, Def. 2.9.1]) we have $f(X) = \langle \kappa(X, \cdot), f \rangle$. Given a sample $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, let $\hat{Y} = \text{diag}(Y_1, \dots, Y_n) \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ and $\hat{K}: \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^n$ a linear operator such that $(\hat{K}f)_i = \langle \kappa(X_i, \cdot), f \rangle$. As discussed in **Rem. III.5** we do not include a data-point modeling the esssup of the random loss. Instead the largest sample will act as a replacement.

We then replace the expectation with a point-wise upper bound in the form of a law-invariant coherent risk measure ρ , generated by one of the procedures in §IV. The robustified, data-driven problem then becomes

$$\underset{(f,b) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \lambda \rho \left[\mathbf{1}_n - \hat{Y} (\hat{K}f - b \mathbf{1}_n) \right]_+ \quad (32)$$

Proposition F.1. *Consider (32) for coherent risk measure ρ with $\mathcal{A} := \text{dom}(\rho)$. Then the value of (32) equals*

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \times \mathbb{R}_+^n}{\text{maximize}} \quad \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^n \alpha_i \alpha_j Y_i Y_j \kappa(X_i, X_j) \\ \text{subj. to} \quad &\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i Y_i = 0, \quad \frac{\alpha + \beta}{\lambda} \in \mathcal{A}. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Moreover, let α^*, β^* denote the optimizers and $\mathcal{J} := \{j \in [n]: \alpha_j > 0, \beta_j > 0\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} f^* &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^* Y_i \kappa(X_i, \cdot) \\ b^* &= \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^* Y_i \kappa(X_i, X_j) - Y_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \text{ when } \mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset \end{aligned}$$

are the optimizers⁴ of (32) when $\mathcal{J} \neq \emptyset$. When $\mathcal{J} = \emptyset$, then b^* can be determined by solving (32), keeping $f = f^*$ fixed.

Proof. We write (32) with slack variables first

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{(f,b,s) \in \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 + \lambda \rho(s) \\ \text{subj. to} \quad &\hat{Y} (\hat{K}f - \mathbf{1}_n b) - \mathbf{1}_n + s \geq 0 \\ &s \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

The next step is to apply Lagrangian duality over Hilbert spaces as presented in [33, Prop. 19.18]. We first bring the problem in the standard form:

$$\underset{x \in \mathcal{G}}{\text{minimize}} \quad h(x) + g(Lx),$$

with $\mathcal{G} := \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$ a Hilbert space, elements of which we partition as $x = (f, b, s)$. Let $L: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{2n}$ denote the linear operator defined as

$$Lx = \left(\hat{Y} \hat{K}f - \hat{Y} \mathbf{1}_n b + s, s \right). \quad (34)$$

Its adjoint – defined implicitly as $L^*: \mathbb{R}^{2n} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}$ such that $\langle Lx, v \rangle = \langle x, L^*v \rangle$ – is given as

$$L^*v = (\hat{K}^* \hat{Y} \alpha, -\mathbf{1}_n^T \hat{Y} \alpha, \alpha + \beta),$$

for $v = (\alpha, \beta)$ and $\hat{K}^* \hat{Y} \alpha = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i Y_i \kappa(X_i, \cdot)$. The functions $h: \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $g: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ are given as

$$\begin{aligned} h(x) &:= \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2/2 + \lambda \rho(s) \\ g(Lx) &:= \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^{2n}}(Lx - \delta), \end{aligned}$$

with $\delta = (\mathbf{1}_n, 0) \in \mathbb{R}^{2n}$.

First we prove that strong duality holds, a sufficient condition for which is $\text{int}(\text{dom } g) \cap L \text{dom } h$ (cf. [33, Thm. 15.23, Prop. 6.19(vii)]). Note that $\text{dom } g = \mathbb{R}_+^{2n} + \delta$ and $\text{dom } h = \mathcal{H} \times \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R}^n$, keeping in mind that $\text{dom } \rho = \mathbb{R}^n$ since ρ is coherent. Note that $0 \in \mathcal{H}$ and $0 \in \mathbb{R}$ and that $L(0, 0, s) = (s, s)$. So $\mathcal{D} = \{(s, s): s \in \mathbb{R}^n\} \subset L \text{dom } h$. Hence $\text{int}(\text{dom } g) \cap L \text{dom } h \supset (\text{int}(\mathbb{R}_+^{2n}) + \delta) \cap \mathcal{D} \neq \emptyset$.

Consider the convex conjugates h^* and g^* . Then

$$h^*(\bar{x}) = \|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2/2 + \iota_{\{0\}}(\bar{b}) + \lambda \rho^*(\bar{s}/\lambda),$$

where we used the definition of the convex conjugate, the partitioning $\bar{x} = (\bar{f}, \bar{b}, \bar{s}) \in \mathcal{G}$, [33, Prop. 13.16, Prop. 13.20(i)] and separability of h . Coherence of ρ (specifically (7)) implies $\rho^* = \iota_{\mathcal{A}}$. Also, again letting $v = (\alpha, \beta)$,

$$g^*(v) = \iota_{\mathbb{R}_+^{2n}}(v) + \mathbf{1}_n^T \alpha$$

by [33, Prop. 13.20(ii)]. The dual problem, the value of which equals minus the primal by strong duality, is then given as [33, Prop. 19.18]:

$$\begin{aligned} &\underset{(\alpha, \beta) \in \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathbb{R}^n}{\text{minimize}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{K}^* \hat{Y} \alpha\|_{\mathcal{H}}^2 - \mathbf{1}_n^T \alpha \\ \text{subj. to} \quad &\mathbf{1}_n^T \hat{Y} \alpha = 0, \quad (\alpha + \beta)/\lambda \in \mathcal{A}, \quad (\alpha, \beta) \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

⁴In practice, we pick b^* as the average of the values over all $j \in \mathcal{J}$.

where we already integrated the indicator functions in the constraints. After adding the minus sign, this is equivalent to the problem in the theorem.

We next compute the subgradients. Note that,

$$\partial h^*(\bar{x}) = \{\bar{f}\} \times (\mathbb{R} \cap \{\bar{b}\}^\perp) \times \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{A}}(\bar{s}/\lambda)/\lambda, \quad (35)$$

with $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{C}}$ denotes the *normal cone* for set \mathcal{C} [33, Def. 6.37] and $\mathcal{C}^\perp = \{u: \langle x, u \rangle = 0, \forall x \in \mathcal{C}\}$ denotes the *orthogonal complement* of \mathcal{C} . The first term follows from differentiability. The second term follows from [33, Ex. 16.12, Ex. 6.39] which states $\partial \iota_{\{0\}}(\bar{b}) = \mathcal{N}_{\{0\}}(\bar{b}) = \mathbb{R}^n \cap \{\bar{b}\}^\perp$. The third follows from applying [33, Ex. 16.12, Cor. 16.42] to $\iota_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \lambda^{-1} I_n$. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \partial g^*(v) &= \mathbb{R}_+^n \cap \{v\}^\perp + \delta \\ &= \{u + \delta: u \geq 0, u^\top v = 0\}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where we apply [33, Cor. 16.38], differentiability of the second term and again [33, Ex. 16.12, Ex. 6.39] to deal with the indicator.

By [33, Prop. 19.17(v), Prop. 19.18(v)] the optimizers $v^* = (\alpha^*, \beta^*)$ and $x^* = (f^*, b^*, s^*)$ must satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} L^* \alpha^* &\in \partial h(x^*) & \text{and} & & -\alpha^* &\in \partial g(Lx^*) \\ \Leftrightarrow x^* &\in \partial h^*(L^* \alpha^*) & \text{and} & & Lx^* &\in \partial g^*(-\alpha^*), \end{aligned}$$

where we used [33, Cor. 16.24] to express the optimality conditions in terms of the subgradients of the conjugates. Plugging in the subgradient determined in (35) gives

$$f^* = \hat{K}^* \hat{Y} \alpha^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^* Y_i \kappa(X_i, \cdot).$$

Comparing with [28, Eq. 7.25] shows that this is the usual SVM solution. For the threshold b^* we use (36), giving

$$\begin{aligned} Lx^* &\in \partial g^*(-\alpha^*) \\ \Leftrightarrow \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^* (Y_i (f^*(X_i) - b^*) - 1 + s_i^*) + \sum_{i=1}^n \beta_i^* s_i^* &= 0, \\ Y_i (f^*(X_i) - b^*) - 1 + s_i &\geq 0, \quad \forall i \in [n], \\ s^* &\geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

Let $\mathcal{J} = \{j \in [n]: \alpha_j^* > 0, \beta_j^* > 0\}$. From the above conditions we have $s_j^* = 0$ for all $j \in \mathcal{J}$. Similarly we require

$$Y_j (f^*(X_j) - b^*) - 1 = 0, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

Using $Y_j \in \{-1, 1\}$ to multiply both sides with Y_j and the characterization of f^* above results in

$$b^* = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i^* Y_i \kappa(X_i, X_j) - Y_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}.$$

We can again compare with the classical SVM setting (cf. [28, Eq. 47.32] and the discussion at [28, p. 206]), seeing that the condition is similar. When $\mathcal{J} = \emptyset$, we cannot generate trivial constraints on b^* . In that case, we note the f^* is still a valid minimizer, thus b^* must minimize (32) for $f = f^*$. \square

For distortion risks as in Prop. IV.1 we can characterize the ambiguity set efficiently in terms of a polyhedral set by Prop. E.3. So for any distortion risk (33) is a quadratic program. For divergence-based risk measures the ambiguity set is convex so we can implement it directly. It is polyhedral only for the total variation in Tbl. III.