

Wasserstein Generative Regression

Shanshan Song^{*†} Tong Wang^{*‡} Guohao Shen[§] Yuanyuan Lin^{¶**} Jian Huang^{‖**}

June 28, 2023

Abstract

In this paper, we propose a new and unified approach for nonparametric regression and conditional distribution learning. Our approach simultaneously estimates a regression function and a conditional generator using a generative learning framework, where a conditional generator is a function that can generate samples from a conditional distribution. The main idea is to estimate a conditional generator that satisfies the constraint that it produces a good regression function estimator. We use deep neural networks to model the conditional generator. Our approach can handle problems with multivariate outcomes and covariates, and can be used to construct prediction intervals. We provide theoretical guarantees by deriving non-asymptotic error bounds and the distributional consistency of our approach under suitable assumptions. We also perform numerical experiments with simulated and real data to demonstrate the effectiveness and superiority of our approach over some existing approaches in various scenarios.

keywords: Conditional distribution, deep neural networks, generative learning, nonparametric regression, non-asymptotic error bounds.

1 Introduction

Regression models and conditional distributions play a key role in a variety of prediction and inference problems in statistics. There is a vast literature on nonparametric methods for regression analysis and conditional density estimation. Most existing methods use smoothing and basis expansion techniques, including kernel smoothing, local polynomials, and splines (Silverman, 1986; Scott, 1992; Fan and Gijbels, 1996; Györfi et al., 2002; Wasserman, 2006; Tsybakov, 2008). However, the existing nonparametric regression and conditional density

*Shangshan Song and Tong Wang contributed equally to this work.

[†]Department of Statistics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

[‡]Department of Statistics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

[§]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China

[¶]Department of Statistics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR, China

[‖]Department of Applied Mathematics, The Hong Kong Polytechnic University, Hong Kong SAR, China

**Corresponding authors, Yuanyuan Lin, email: ylin@sta.cuhk.edu.hk; Jian Huang, email: j.huang@polyu.edu.hk

estimation methods suffer from the “curse of dimensionality”, that is, their performance deteriorates dramatically as the dimensionality of data increases. Indeed, most existing methods can only effectively handle up to a few predictors. Moreover, most existing methods only consider the case when the response is a scalar, but are not applicable to the settings with a high-dimensional response vector.

To circumvent the curse of dimensionality, many researchers have proposed and studied non- and semi-parametric models that impose certain structural constraints that reduce the model dimensionality. Some notable examples include the single index model (Ichimura, 1993; Hardle et al., 1993), the generalized additive model (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1986; Stone, 1986), and the projection pursuit model (Friedman and Stuetzle, 1981), among others. However, these methods make strong assumptions about the model structure, which may not hold in reality. Moreover, these methods aim at estimating the regression function, but do not learn the conditional distribution. Therefore, they can only provide point prediction, not interval prediction with a measure of uncertainty.

In recent years, there have been many important developments in *deep generative learning* (Salakhutdinov, 2015), in which deep neural networks are used to approximate high-dimensional functions, such as generator and discriminator functions. In particular, for learning distributions of high-dimensional data arising in image analysis and natural language processing, the generative adversarial networks (GANs) (Goodfellow et al., 2014; Arjovsky et al., 2017) have proven to be effective and achieved impressive success (Reed et al., 2016; Zhu et al., 2017). Instead of estimating the functional form of a density function, GANs start from a known reference distribution and learn a map that pushes the reference distribution to the data distribution. GANs have also been extended to learn conditional distributions (Mirza and Osindero, 2014; Kovachki et al., 2021; Zhou et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2021).

One of the main challenges in nonparametric regression is to estimate a function that can accurately capture the relationship between covariate and response variables. GANs can learn complex distributions. However, to the best of our knowledge, there have not been systematic studies on how GANs can be used for nonparametric regression, despite their successes in distribution learning. Furthermore, conditional GANs, which are a natural extension of GANs for learning conditional distributions, do not automatically guarantee a good estimation of a regression function.

We propose a new and unified approach for nonparametric regression and conditional distribution estimation. Our approach estimates the regression function and a conditional generator at the same time using a generative learning method. A conditional generator is a function that transforms a random vector from a known reference distribution to the response variable space, which can be used to sample from a conditional distribution. Thus, when a conditional generator is estimated, it can be used to explore the target conditional distribution. Theoretically, the regression function is the expectation of the conditional generator with respect to the reference distribution. However, empirically such an expectation may not produce a good estimator of the regression function.

Our main idea is to constrain the conditional generator to produce samples that minimize the quadratic loss of the regression function, which is computed as the expectation of the conditional generator. Specifically, in the objective function for estimating the conditional generator based on distribution matching using the Wasserstein distance, we incorporate a

quadratic loss term to control the error of the estimated regression function. We use deep neural networks to approximate the conditional generator, which can capture the complex structure of the data distribution. In principle, other approximation methods such as splines can also be used. However, deep neural network approximation has the important advantage of being able to adapting to the latent structure of the data distribution. For simplicity, we call our method Wasserstein generative regression (WGR).

The proposed method has several attractive properties. First, it is applicable to problems with a high-dimensional response variable, while the existing methods typically only consider the case of a scalar response. Second, the proposed method allows continuous, discrete and mixed types of predictors and responses, while the smoothing and basis expansion methods are mainly applicable to continuous-type variables. Third, since the proposed method learns a conditional distribution generator, it can be used for constructing prediction intervals. In comparison, the existing nonparametric regression can only give point prediction. Finally, the proposed method is able to adapt to the latent data structure in a data-driven manner and thus can mitigate the curse of dimensionality, under the assumption the data distribution is supported on an approximate low-dimensional set.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we describe the proposed WGR method. We present the implementation details in Section 3. In Section 4 we establish non-asymptotic error bounds for the proposed estimator and show that it is consistent. In Section 5 we conduct numerical experiments, including simulation studies and real data analysis, to evaluate the performance of the proposed method. Technical proofs and additional numerical experiments are given in Appendix.

2 Method

Consider a pair of random vectors $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, where X is a vector of predictors and Y is a vector of response variables. Suppose $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ with $d, q \geq 1$. We allow either or both of X and Y to be high-dimensional. The predictor X or the response Y can contain both continuous and categorical components. Our goal is to learn the conditional distribution of Y given $X = x$ and estimate the regression function $\mathbb{E}(Y|X = x)$ in a unified framework.

We describe the proposed WGR method in detail below, which has three main ingredients, a conditional distribution generator, a quadratic loss for regression, and the Wasserstein metric for distribution matching.

2.1 Conditional generator

The theoretical foundation of WGR is the noise outsourcing lemma (Kallenberg, 2002). This lemma states that, if \mathcal{Y} is a standard Borel space (Preston, 2009), there exist a Borel-measurable function $g^* : \mathcal{X} \times \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and a random variable $\eta \sim \text{Uniform}[0, 1]$ such that η is independent of X and

$$(X, Y) = (X, g^*(X, \eta)) \quad \text{almost surely.} \quad (1)$$

We note that the condition that \mathcal{Y} being a standard Borel space is satisfied in all the applications we are interested in. In (1), for simplicity, η is taken to be a uniform random variable. In general, we can take η to be a random vector from a given reference distribution P_η that is easy to sample from. For example, we can take P_η to be the standard multivariate normal $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_m)$ with $m \geq 1$, which allows us to control the noise level more easily in practice.

We call the function g^* in (1) a conditional generator, since if g^* satisfies (1), it also satisfies

$$g^*(\eta, x) \sim P_{Y|X=x}, \eta \sim P_\eta, x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (2)$$

So for a given x , to sample from the conditional distribution $P_{Y|X=x}$, we can first generate $\eta \sim P_\eta$, then calculate $g^*(\eta, x)$, which gives a sample from $P_{Y|X=x}$. In addition, we can calculate any moments of $P_{Y|X=x}$ via $g^*(\cdot, x)$. In particular, we have

$$\mathbb{E}(Y|X = x) = \mathbb{E}_\eta[g^*(\eta, x)], x \in \mathcal{X}.$$

In summary, we can determine the usual regression function (the conditional mean) and sample from the conditional distribution as follows:

- Regression function or conditional mean: $\mathbb{E}(Y|X = x) = \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(x; \eta), x \in \mathcal{X}$,
- Conditional distribution: $g^*(x; \eta) \sim P_{Y|X=x}, x \in \mathcal{X}, \eta \sim P_\eta$.

Hence, the conditional generator provides a basis for a unified framework for nonparametric regression and conditional distribution learning.

2.2 Objective function

Let $P_{X,g}$ denote the joint distribution of $(X, g(X, \eta))$, which is the generated distribution based on a conditional generator $g(x, \eta), \eta \sim P_\eta, x \in \mathcal{X}$. One possible way to measure the quality of a conditional generator g is to compare the generated distribution $P_{X,g}$ with the data distribution $P_{X,Y}$. A good conditional generator g should ensure that the generated distribution is close to the data distribution in some sense. For example, one can use a distance metric such as the Wasserstein distance or a divergence measure such as the Kullback-Leibler divergence to quantify the discrepancy between the two distributions.

Let \mathbb{D} be a divergence measure for the difference between $P_{X,g}$ and $P_{X,Y}$. Then, we formulate an objective function that combines this divergence measure with the least squares loss to minimize the distribution mismatch and the prediction error simultaneously. The objective function is

$$\lambda_w \mathbb{D}(P_{X,g} \| P_{X,Y}) + \lambda_\ell \mathbb{E} \| Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) \|^2. \quad (3)$$

Here, both λ_ℓ and λ_w are tuning parameters weighing two losses, which are assumed to be nonnegative and $\lambda_\ell + \lambda_w = 1$. The objective function (3) combines two types of losses: the first one evaluates how closely the generated distribution $P_{X,g}$ resembles the data distribution $P_{X,Y}$; the second one is a criterion quantifying how well the regression function fits the data. Intuitively, the objective function (3) tries to learn the conditional distribution of Y given X with the regularization that the conditional mean is well estimated.

We take \mathbb{D} to be the *1-Wasserstein* distance. A computationally convenient form of the 1-Wasserstein distance between $P_{X,g}$ and $P_{X,Y}$ is the Monge-Rubinstein dual (Villani, 2009):

$$\mathbb{D}_W(P_{X,g}, P_{X,Y}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Lip}}^1} \{ \mathbb{E}_{(X,\eta)} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)} f(X, Y) \}, \quad (4)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Lip}}^1 = \{f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, |f(u) - f(v)| \leq \|u - v\|_2, \forall u, v \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}\}$ is a 1-Lipschitz class of functions on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. The Lipschitz function f in (4) is often called a critic or a discriminator.

Then, based on (3), the population objective function for the proposed Wasserstein generative regression (WGR) is:

$$L(g) = \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{Lip}}^1} L_W(g, f) + \lambda_\ell L_{\text{LS}}(g), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} L_W(g, f) &= \mathbb{E}_{(X,\eta)} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)} f(X, Y), \\ L_{\text{LS}}(g) &= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta)\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose we have a random sample $\{(X_i, Y_i), i = 1, 2, \dots, n\}$ from $P_{X,Y}$, where $n \geq 1$ is the sample size. Let $\{\eta_i, i = 1, \dots, n\}$ and $\{\eta_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ with $J \geq 1$ be random variables generated independently from P_η . We parameterize the generator function g and the discriminator f by neural network functions g_θ and f_ϕ with parameters (weights and biases) θ and ϕ , respectively. That is, we use neural network functions to approximate the generator and critic functions and optimize the objective function given below over the neural networks to obtain an estimator of g . In addition, since $\mathbb{E}_\eta g_\theta(X_i, \eta)$ generally does not have a close form expression, we approximate it by the sample average $J^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^J g_\theta(X_i, \eta_{ij})$. Then, the empirical objective function for estimating (θ, ϕ) is

$$\widehat{L}(g_\theta, f_\phi) = \lambda_w \widehat{L}_W(g_\theta, f_\phi) + \lambda_\ell \widehat{L}_{\text{LS}}(g_\theta), \quad (6)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{L}_W(g_\theta, f_\phi) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{f_\phi(X_i, g_\theta(X_i, \eta_i)) - f_\phi(X_i, Y_i)\}, \\ \widehat{L}_{\text{LS}}(g_\theta) &= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_\theta(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Let $(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi})$ be a solution to the minimax problem

$$(\hat{\theta}, \hat{\phi}) = \arg \min_{\theta} \max_{\phi} \widehat{L}(g_\theta, f_\phi). \quad (7)$$

Then, the estimated conditional generator is $\hat{g}(x, \eta) = g_{\hat{\theta}}(x, \eta)$ and the estimated regression function is obtained by taking the expectation of $\hat{g}(x, \eta)$ with respect to η , that is, $\hat{g}(x) = \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(x, \eta)$. Since there is no analytical expression for the expectation $\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(x, \eta)$, we

approximate it using an empirical average based on a random sample $\{\eta'_1, \dots, \eta'_K\}$, $K \geq 1$, from P_η ,

$$\hat{g}(x) \approx \frac{1}{K} \sum_{k=1}^K \hat{g}(x, \eta'_k),$$

which gives the estimated regression function.

We note that for a given $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\{\hat{g}(x, \eta'_k), k = 1, \dots, K\}$ are approximately distributed as $P_{Y|X=x}$. We can use $\{\hat{g}(x, \eta'_k), k = 1, \dots, K\}$ to explore any aspects of $P_{Y|X=x}$ that we are interested in such as its higher moments and quantiles.

3 Implementation

In this section, we present the details for implementing WGR. We first describe the neural networks used in the approximation of g and f . We then present the computational algorithm we implemented in detail.

3.1 ReLU Feedforward Neural Networks

We first give a brief description of feedforward neural networks (FNN) with rectified linear unit (ReLU) activation function. The ReLU function is denoted by $\sigma(x) := \max(x, 0)$, and it is defined for each component of x if x is a vector. A neural network can be expressed as a composite function $\zeta(x) = \mathcal{L}_H \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_{H-1} \circ \sigma \circ \dots \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_1 \circ \sigma \circ \mathcal{L}_0(x)$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^{p_0}$, where $\mathcal{L}_i(x) = W_i x + b_i$ with a weight matrix $W_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{i+1} \times p_i}$ and bias vector $b_i \in \mathbb{R}^{p_{i+1}}$ in the i -th linear transformation, and p_i is the width of the i -th layer, $i = 0, 1, \dots, H$. The width and depth of the network are described by $W = \max\{p_1, \dots, p_H\}$ and H , respectively. To ease the presentation, we use $\mathcal{NN}(p_0, p_{H+1}, W, H)$ to denote the neural networks with input dimension p_0 , output dimension p_{H+1} , width at most W and depth at most H .

We now specify the function classes below:

- For the generator network class \mathcal{G} : Let $\mathcal{G} \equiv \mathcal{NN}(d + m, q, W_{\mathcal{G}}, H_{\mathcal{G}})$ be a class of ReLU-activated FNNs, $g_\theta : \mathbb{R}^{d+m} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^q$, with parameter θ , width $W_{\mathcal{G}}$, and depth $H_{\mathcal{G}}$.
- For the discriminator network class \mathcal{D} : Let $\mathcal{D} \equiv \mathcal{NN}(d + q, 1, W_{\mathcal{D}}, H_{\mathcal{D}}) \cap \text{Lip}(\Omega; K_{\mathcal{D}})$ be a class of ReLU-activated FNNs, $f_\phi : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, with parameter ϕ , width $W_{\mathcal{D}}$, and depth $H_{\mathcal{D}}$, where for some $K_{\mathcal{D}} > 0$, $\text{Lip}(\Omega; K_{\mathcal{D}})$ is a class of Lipschitz functions defined below.

For any function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the Lipschitz constant of f is denoted by

$$\text{Lip}(f) = \sup_{x, y \in \Omega, x \neq y} \frac{|f(x) - f(y)|}{\|x - y\|}.$$

For a given $0 < K < \infty$, denote $\text{Lip}(\Omega; K)$ as the set of all functions $f : \Omega \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with $\text{Lip}(f) \leq K$. And let $\text{Lip}(\Omega; K, C) := \{f \in \text{Lip}(\Omega; K) : \|f\|_\infty \leq C\}$, where $\|f\|_\infty = \sup_{x \in \Omega} \|f(x)\|_\infty$ and C is a positive constant. Hence, $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Lip}}^1$ defined in (4) is $\text{Lip}(\mathbb{R}^{d+q}; 1)$.

Algorithm 1 WGR Algorithm

- 1: **Require:** (a) Labeled data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$; (b) Minibatch size $v \leq \min(n, N)$; (c) J , the size of noise vector η to compute the conditional expectation; λ , the gradient penalty parameter.
- 2: **for** number of training iterations **do**
- 3: Sample i.i.d. $\{\eta_{ij}, i = 1, 2, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ from the standard multivariate normal distribution.
- 4: With fixed $\theta^{(v)}$, update the discriminator f_ϕ by ascending its stochastic gradient:

$$\nabla_\phi \frac{\lambda_w}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ f_\phi(X_i, g_\theta(X_i, \eta_{i0})) - f_\phi(X_i, Y_i) - \lambda \left(\|\nabla_{(x,y)} f_\phi(X_i, Y_i)\|_2 - 1 \right)^2 \right\} \quad (8)$$

where the resulting parameter is denoted by $\phi^{(v+1)}$.

- 5: With fixed $\phi^{(v+1)}$, update the generator g_θ by descending its stochastic gradient:

$$\nabla_\theta \left[\frac{\lambda_l}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{\tilde{n}} \left\{ Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_\theta(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\}^2 + \frac{\lambda_w}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f_\phi(X_i, g_\theta(X_i, \eta_{i0})) \right],$$

where the resulting parameter is denoted by $\theta^{(v+1)}$.

- 6: **end for**
-

3.2 Computation

We now describe the implementation of WGR. For training the conditional distribution generator g_θ and the discriminator f_ϕ , we use the leaky rectified linear unit (leaky ReLU) as the activation function in g_θ and f_ϕ . The training algorithm is presented in Algorithm 1. We have implemented it in Pytorch.

To constrain the discriminator f_ϕ to the class of 1-Lipschitz functions, a gradient penalty is used in (8), which is a slightly modified version of the algorithm proposed by (Gulrajani et al., 2017). The difference is that we evaluate the gradients at the sample points in the penalty, instead of using generated intermediate points. Another approach that we have tried to enforce the Lipschitz constraint is the clipping method (Arjovsky et al., 2017), which also produces acceptable results, but seems to be less stable than the penalty method described in Algorithm 1. We use traversal to select the tuning parameters λ_l and λ_w that control the trade-off between label and word embeddings. The constraints are that λ_l and λ_w must add up to 1 and have one decimal place each. In Section 5, we demonstrate the effectiveness of this algorithm in various numerical experiments. However, we do not have a theoretical analysis of its convergence behavior and we leave this as an open problem for future research.

4 Error analysis and convergence

In this section, we first develop an error decomposition, which decomposes the estimation errors into approximation errors and stochastic errors of the generator and discriminator. We then derive non-asymptotic error bounds for WGR based on this error decomposition.

4.1 Error decomposition

We present a high-level description of the error decomposition for WGR. For the estimator \hat{g} define in (7), the estimation error consists of two parts: the L_2 -based excess risk $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2$, and the integral probability metric (Müller, 1997) $d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y})$ defined as

$$d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}_{(X, \eta)} f(X, \hat{g}(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}_{X, Y} f(X, Y)\},$$

where $\mathcal{F}_B^1 = \{f : \mathbb{R}^{d+q} \mapsto \mathbb{R}, |f(z_1) - f(z_2)| \leq \|z_1 - z_2\|, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d+q}, \|f\|_\infty \leq B\}$ is the bounded 1-Lipschitz function class. Clearly, if $P_{X, Y}$ has a bounded support, $d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}$ is the 1-Wasserstein distance. A function class \mathcal{F} is called symmetric if $f \in \mathcal{F}$ implies $-f \in \mathcal{F}$.

We introduce a new error decomposition method in Lemma 1, which decomposes the estimation error into approximation error and stochastic error of the generator and discriminator.

Lemma 1. *Assume that the discriminator network class \mathcal{D} is symmetric and the probability measures of (X, Y) and $(X, g(X, \eta))$ are supported on a compact set $\Omega \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+q}$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Then, for the WGR estimator defined in (7),*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_\ell \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\ & \leq \lambda_\ell \mathcal{E}_1 + 4\lambda_\ell \mathcal{E}_2 + 2\mathcal{E}_3 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_4 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{(X_i, Y_i, \eta_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{\eta_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq J}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \|Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij})\|^2 - \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right| \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{E}_3 := \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\lambda_\ell \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{\mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y)\} \right],$$

$$\mathcal{E}_4 := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \inf_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \|h - f\|_\infty,$$

$$\mathcal{E}_5 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right],$$

$$\mathcal{E}_6 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}, g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, g(X_i, \eta_i)) \right\} \right].$$

According to their definitions, $\mathcal{E}_1, \mathcal{E}_2, \mathcal{E}_5$ and \mathcal{E}_6 are stochastic errors; \mathcal{E}_3 and \mathcal{E}_4 are approximation errors. Lemma 1 provides a general error decomposition method, which covers the error decomposition inequality in Jiao et al. (2023) for the traditional nonparametric regression as a special case (corresponding to the case that $\lambda_\ell = 1, \lambda_w = 0$ and $J = \infty$). It can also be utilized for the error analysis for the conditional WGAN (corresponding to the case that $\lambda_\ell = 0, \lambda_w = 1$). Moreover, when $\lambda_\ell = 0$ and $\lambda_w = 1$, our error decomposition

result in (9) is in line with that in Lemma 9 in Huang et al. (2022) for the general GANs. The main difference is that the upper bound of \mathcal{E}_6 in (9) depends on the sample size n , while it is determined by the sample size of the generated noise η in Huang et al. (2022). This is the key difference in the theoretical analysis between conditional WGAN and general WGAN.

4.2 Non-asymptotic error bounds

More notations are needed. For $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, its $\ell_1, \ell_2, \ell_\infty$ -norm is defined as $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{k=1}^d |x_k|$, $\|x\|_2 = (\sum_{k=1}^d |x_k|^2)^{1/2}$ and $\|x\|_\infty = \max_{1 \leq k \leq d} |x_k|$, respectively. Let \mathbb{N} be the set of positive integers and $\mathbb{N}_0 := \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. The maximum and minimum of A and B are denoted by $A \vee B$ and $A \wedge B$. Let $\lfloor A \rfloor$ be the largest integer strictly smaller than A and $\lceil A \rceil$ be the smallest integer strictly larger than A . For any $\beta > 0$ and a set $\Gamma \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{m+d}$, the Hölder class of functions $\mathcal{H}^\beta(\Gamma, B_1)$ with a constant $0 < B_1 < \infty$ is defined as

$$\mathcal{H}^\beta(\Gamma, B_1) = \left\{ f : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \max_{\|\alpha\|_1 \leq \lfloor \beta \rfloor} \|D^\alpha f\|_\infty \leq B_1, \max_{\|\alpha\|_1 = \lfloor \beta \rfloor} \sup_{x, y \in \Gamma, x \neq y} \frac{|\partial^\alpha f(x) - \partial^\alpha f(y)|}{\|x - y\|^r} \leq B_1 \right\},$$

where $\partial^\alpha = \partial^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial^{\alpha_{m+d}}$ with $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{m+d})^\top \in \mathbb{N}_0^{m+d}$.

The following assumptions are needed.

Condition 1. *The probability measures of (X, Y) and $(X, g(X, \eta))$ are supported on a compact set $\Omega_X \times \Omega_Y \subseteq [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+q}$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, where $0 < B_0 < \infty$ is a constant.*

Condition 2. *The probability measure of η is supported on $\Omega_\eta \subseteq [-B_0, B_0]^m$.*

Condition 3. *For $g^* = (g_1^*, \dots, g_q^*)^\top$, $g_k^* \in \mathcal{H}^\beta(\Omega_\eta \times \Omega_X, B_1)$, $k = 1, \dots, q$, where $\beta > 0$ and $0 < B_1 < \infty$.*

Condition 4. *For any $x \in \Omega_X$, there exists a vector $\eta_x \in \Omega_\eta$ such that for any $g, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$,*

$$\|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(x, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta \tilde{g}(x, \eta)\|_1 \leq \|g(x, \eta_x) - \tilde{g}(x, \eta_x)\|_1.$$

Let $W, \bar{W}, \bar{H} \in \mathbb{N}$, which may depend on n . We also make the following assumptions on the network classes \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{G} .

ND 1. *The discriminator ReLU network class $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{NN}(d+q, 1, W_{\mathcal{D}}, H_{\mathcal{D}}) \cap \text{Lip}([-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}; K_{\mathcal{D}})$ has width $W_{\mathcal{D}} = W^{d+q} \{9(W+1) + 5(d+q) - 1\}$, depth $H_{\mathcal{D}} = 3 + 14(d+q)(d+q-1)$ and Lipschitz constant $K_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 54B^2 2^{d+q} (d+q)^{1/2} W^2$.*

NG 1. *The generator ReLU network class $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{NN}(m+d, q, W_{\mathcal{G}}, H_{\mathcal{G}})$ has width $W_{\mathcal{G}} = 38q(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2 3^{(m+d)} (m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1} \bar{W} \lceil \log_2(8\bar{W}) \rceil$ and depth $H_{\mathcal{G}} = 21(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2 \bar{H} \lceil \log_2(8\bar{H}) \rceil + 2(m+d)$.*

Conditions 1-3 require that $P_{X,Y}$, $P_{X,g}$ and P_η have a bounded support. Condition 3 is a smoothness condition for g^* in (1). Condition 4 is a technical condition. The upper bound of the Lipschitz constant in **ND 1** is needed to achieve small approximation error. More

details can be found in Lemma 6 in the Appendix. To lighten the notations, we define the following two quantities:

$$a := \frac{\beta}{2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}},$$

$$b := \frac{3(m+d)}{2[2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}]}.$$

Theorem 1. *Suppose that Conditions 1 - 4 hold and the network parameters of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{G} satisfy **ND 1** and **NG 1** with $W = \lceil n^a \rceil$, $\bar{W} = \lceil n^b / \log^2 n \rceil$ and $\bar{H} = \lceil \log n \rceil$. Then, for $J \gtrsim n$ and given weights λ_l and λ_w satisfying $0 < \lambda_l, \lambda_w < 1$ and $\lambda_l + \lambda_w = 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}_X \|\mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \leq C_1 n^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 1},$$

where C_1 is a positive constant independent of n and J .

Theorem 1 establishes a non-asymptotic upper bound for the excess risk of WGR using deep neural networks. The convergence rates in Theorem 1 is slightly slower than $O(n^{-\frac{2\beta}{2\beta+d}} \log^c n)$, the rate in deep least squares nonparametric regression as in Jiao et al. (2023). This is because in nonparametric regression, there is no distributional matching constraint, thus the noise vector η is not involved and a faster convergence rate can be achieved. In our proposed framework, we are not only interested in estimating the mean regression function, but also the conditional generator, which involves the noise vector from a reference distribution. This increases the dimensionality of the problem and results in a slower convergence rate.

We next establish a non-asymptotic error bound for the integral probability metric $d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y})$.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that those conditions of Theorem 1 hold. Then, for $J \gtrsim n$ and given weights λ_l and λ_w satisfying $0 \leq \lambda_l < 1, 0 < \lambda_w \leq 1$ and $\lambda_l + \lambda_w = 1$, we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y}) \right\} \leq C_2 n^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 1},$$

where C_2 is a positive constant independent of n and J .

The non-asymptotic error bounds in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2 are established for fixed positive weights λ_l and λ_w . In this case, we obtain the same convergence rate of the excess risk $\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2$ and the integral probability metric $d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y})$. Note that the conditional GAN is involved in our proposed procedure, thus the joint stochastic error of the discriminator and generator is affected by the dimension of the noise vector η , leading to a slower convergence rate compared with the one in Theorem 5 in Huang et al. (2022) for GAN estimators.

Next, we present a non-asymptotic error bound for varying weights λ_l and λ_w , which can diverge with the sample size n .

Theorem 3. *Suppose that Conditions 1 - 4 hold and the network parameters of \mathcal{D} and \mathcal{G} satisfy **ND 1** and **NG 1** with $W = \lceil n^a \rceil$, $\bar{W} = \lceil n^b / \log^2 n \rceil$ and $\bar{H} = \lceil \log n \rceil$. Then, for $\lambda_l >$*

$0, \lambda_w > 0$ satisfying $\lambda_l + \lambda_w = 1$ and $\lambda_w = O(n^{-1/(d+q+2)})$, when $2\beta(d+q+1) \geq 3(m+d) + \beta$ and $J \gtrsim n^{\{3(m+d)+6\beta\}/\{4\beta(d+q+2)\}}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 \right\} \leq C_3 n^{-\frac{3}{2(d+q+2)}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 2},$$

where C_3 is a positive constant independent of n and J . Moreover, as $n \rightarrow \infty$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \rightarrow 0.$$

When $\lambda_w = O(n^{-1/(d+q+2)})$, Theorem 3 gives an improved non-asymptotic error bound of the proposed estimator, and it also implies that our estimated distribution $P_{X, \hat{g}}$ converges weakly to $P_{X, Y}$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

5 Numerical studies

In this section, a number of experiments including simulation studies and real data examples are conducted to assess the performance of the proposed method. We implement WGR in Pytorch, and use the stochastic gradient descent algorithm RMSprop in the training process.

For comparison, we also compute the nonparametric least squares regression using neural networks (NLS) and conditional Wasserstein GAN (cWGAN) (Arjovsky et al., 2017; Liu et al., 2021). Aside from the results presented in this section, additional numerical results are provided in the supplementary materials, including the experiments with data generated from other models, experiments investigating the effects of the noise dimension m and the size J , and neural networks with different architectures.

5.1 Simulation Studies

We conduct simulation studies to evaluate the performance of WGR with univariate or multi-dimensional response Y . We use five different models to generate data for our analysis. Each model has its own parameters and assumptions, which are summarized in Table 1. The table also shows the sample size and the architectures of the neural networks used in the analysis. We compare the performance of WGR with other existing methods under these models.

Model 1. *A nonlinear regression model with an additive error term:*

$$Y = X_1^2 + \exp(X_2 + X_3/3) + \sin(X_4 + X_5) + \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$.

Model 2. *A nonlinear regression model with additive heteroscedastic error:*

$$Y = X_1^2 + \exp(X_2 + X_3/3) + X_4 - X_5 + (0.5 + X_2^2/2 + X_5^2/2)\varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$.

Table 1: Description of simulation settings.

Data structure		
Model	M1, M2	M3, M4, M5
Response (Y)	$Y \in \mathbb{R}$	$Y \in \mathbb{Y}^2$
Covariate (X)	$N(0, I_5); N(0, I_{100})$	$N(0, 1)$
Noise (η)	$N(0, I_3)$	$N(0, I_{10})$
Sample size		
J	200	50
Training	5000	40000
Validation	1000	2000
Testing	1000	10000
Network architecture		
Generator network	(32, 16)	(512, 512, 512)
Discriminator network f_ϕ	(32, 16)	(512, 512, 512)

Notes: In Model 1 and Model 2, $X \sim N(0, I_5)$ is the intrinsic dimensional case, and $X \sim N(0, I_{100})$ is the high dimensional case under sparsity assumption. J is the size of the random noise sample. The networks used in the simulation are fully-connected feedforward neural networks with widths specified above.

Model 3. *A Gaussian mixture model:*

$$Y_1 = X + \varepsilon_1, \quad Y_2 = X + \varepsilon_2,$$

where $\varepsilon_i \sim I_{\{U_i < 1/3\}}N(-2, 0.25^2) + I_{\{1/3 < U_i < 2/3\}}N(0, 0.25^2) + I_{\{U_i > 2/3\}}N(2, 0.25^2)$, $i = 1, 2$, and $U_1 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, $U_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$.

Model 4. *Involute model:*

$$Y_1 = 2X + U \sin(2U) + \varepsilon_1, \quad Y_2 = 2X + U \cos(2U) + \varepsilon_2,$$

where $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 2\pi)$, $\varepsilon_1 \sim N(0, 0.4^2)$, $\varepsilon_2 \sim N(0, 0.4^2)$.

Model 5. *Octagon Gaussian mixture:*

$$Y_1 = X + \varepsilon_1, \quad Y_2 = X + \varepsilon_2,$$

where $\varepsilon_1 \sim I_{\{U_1 \in (i-1, i)\}}N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$, $\varepsilon_2 \sim I_{\{U_2 \in (i-1, i)\}}N(\boldsymbol{\mu}_i, \boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i = (3 \cos \frac{\pi i}{4}, 3 \sin \frac{\pi i}{4})$, $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2 \frac{\pi i}{4} + 0.16^2 \sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{4} & (1 - 0.16^2) \sin \frac{\pi i}{4} \cos \frac{\pi i}{4} \\ (1 - 0.16^2) \sin \frac{\pi i}{4} \cos \frac{\pi i}{4} & \sin^2 \frac{\pi i}{4} + 0.16^2 \cos^2 \frac{\pi i}{4} \end{pmatrix}$, $U_1 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 8)$, $U_2 \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 8)$, $i = 1, \dots, 8$.

In the validation and testing stages, for each realization of X , we generate $J = 500$ i.i.d. noise samples $\{\eta_j, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ from the standard normal distribution and compute $\{\hat{g}_\theta(X, \eta_j), j = 1, \dots, J\}$. To evaluate the predictive power of the WGR estimator \hat{g}_θ , we use the L_1 and L_2 errors defined as

$$L_1 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_\theta(X_i, \eta_{ij})\|, \quad L_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}_\theta(X_i, \eta_{ij})\|^2. \quad (10)$$

In addition, we can use the estimated conditional generator to obtain the estimated τ -th conditional quantile for a given $X = X_i$, denoted by $\hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(\tau|X = X_i)$, via Monte Carlo. Also, we can calculate the estimated conditional mean by $\hat{E}(Y|X = X_i) = (1/J) \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij})$ and the estimated conditional standard deviation by $\hat{SD}(Y|X = X_i) = [(1/J) \sum_{j=1}^J \{g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) - \hat{E}(Y|X = X_i)\}^2]^{1/2}$. Hence, we can compute the mean squared error (MSE) of the estimated conditional mean, standard deviation and the estimated τ -th quantile, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MSE}(\text{mean}) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \{\hat{E}(Y|X = X_i) - E(Y|X = X_i)\}^2, \\ \text{MSE}(\text{sd}) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \{\hat{SD}(Y|X = X_i) - SD(Y|X = X_i)\}^2, \\ \text{MSE}(\tau) &= \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \{\hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(\tau|X = X_i) - F_{Y|X}^{-1}(\tau|X = X_i)\}^2, \end{aligned}$$

where K is the size of the validation or testing set. We consider $\tau = 0.05, 0.25, 0.50, 0.75, 0.95$.




Figure 1: Comparison of conditional density estimation. The abbreviations represent the same as in Table 2. The conditional density functions are estimated using 5000 samples, which are generated by the conditional samplers from the methods given the randomly selected value of X .

We repeat the simulations 10 times. For each evaluation criterion, the simulation standard errors are computed and provided in parentheses. Table 2 summarizes the average L_1 error, L_2 error, $\text{MSE}(\text{mean})$ and $\text{MSE}(\text{sd})$. Table 3 reports the average $\text{MSE}(\tau)$ for different τ . In Figure 1, we visualize the quality of the conditional samples and the conditional density estimation given a random realization of X .

It can be seen that, for Models 1 and 2, the three methods are comparable in terms of L_1 and L_2 errors. But for the conditional mean, conditional standard deviation, and conditional

Table 2: Comparison of WGR with NLS and cWGAN for Models 1 and 2

Model	d	Method	L_1	L_2	Mean	Sd
M1	5	NLS	0.83(0.02)	1.08(0.05)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.00(0.02)	1.97(0.25)	0.98(0.25)	0.09(0.03)
		WGR	0.82 (0.02)	1.07 (0.05)	0.06 (0.01)	0.04 (0.01)
	100	NLS	1.17(0.03)	2.52(0.15)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.17(0.04)	2.65(0.41)	1.67(0.39)	0.81(0.02)
		WGR	1.15 (0.04)	2.40 (0.24)	1.64 (0.25)	0.16 (0.04)
M2	5	NLS	1.24(0.04)	2.45 (0.38)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.32(0.05)	4.11(0.44)	0.85(0.24)	0.37(0.10)
		WGR	1.23 (0.04)	3.41(0.38)	0.19 (0.10)	0.22 (0.04)
	100	NLS	1.63(0.05)	5.37(0.47)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.64(0.06)	5.34(0.46)	2.20(0.22)	1.11(0.08)
		WGR	1.61 (0.06)	5.27 (0.45)	2.06 (0.24)	0.30 (0.03)

Notes: d is the dimension of covariate X . The corresponding standard errors are given in parentheses. The smallest L_1 and L_2 error, and the smallest MSEs are in boldface. NLS represents the nonparametric least squares regression, cWGAN represents the conditional WGAN, WGR is our proposed Wasserstein generative regression method.

Table 3: MSE of the estimated conditional quantile at different quantile levels

Model	τ	$X \sim N(0, I_5)$		$X \sim N(0, I_{100})$	
		cWGAN	WGR	cWGAN	WGR
M1	0.05	1.22(0.23)	0.29 (0.07)	3.18(0.71)	1.84 (0.23)
	0.25	1.04(0.25)	0.10 (0.01)	1.83(0.22)	1.69 (0.20)
	0.50	0.99(0.26)	0.09 (0.02)	1.75(0.16)	1.66 (0.16)
	0.75	1.03(0.24)	0.10 (0.03)	1.89(0.21)	1.88 (0.13)
	0.95	1.34(0.21)	0.23 (0.06)	3.61(0.39)	2.41 (0.14)
M2	0.05	1.86(0.21)	0.77 (0.09)	4.99(0.51)	3.42 (1.07)
	0.25	0.94(0.26)	0.31 (0.06)	2.63(0.24)	2.26 (0.28)
	0.50	0.85(0.26)	0.19 (0.04)	2.21(0.22)	2.19 (0.22)
	0.75	1.00(0.21)	0.27 (0.05)	2.79(0.36)	2.57 (0.27)
	0.95	2.59(0.52)	0.81 (0.15)	5.41(0.65)	3.49 (0.47)

Notes: The notations are the same as in Table 2. The corresponding standard errors are given in parentheses. The smallest MSEs are in boldface.

Table 4: Summary of datasets and noise dimension and size

	CT slides	UJIndoorLoc	MNIST	STL10
Dimension of X	383	520	588	36477
Dimension of Y	1	6	144	12675
Training size	40000	14948	20000	10000
Validation size	3500	1100	1000	1000
Testing size	10000	5000	10000	2000
Dimension of η	50	50	100	12675
Size of η (J)	200	200	1	1

Notes: The noise vector η is sampled from the multivariate standard normal distribution. J is the size of the noise vector generated in each iteration.

quantile estimation, WGR has smaller MSEs values compared with cWGAN, indicating that WGR works better in distributional matching.

For Models 3-5, Figure 1 shows the kernel-smoothing conditional density estimates for a randomly selected value of X based on 5,000 samples generated using the estimated conditional generator. It can be seen that WGR can better estimate the underlying conditional distributions for these models.

5.2 Real data examples

We demonstrate the effectiveness of WGR on four datasets: CT slides (Graf et al., 2011), UJIndoorLoc (Torres-Sospedra et al., 2014), MNIST (LeCun et al., 2010), and STL10 (Coates et al., 2011). The results from the STL10 dataset are given in the Appendix. Table 4 gives a summary of the dimensions and training sizes of these datasets and the noise vectors used in the analysis.

5.2.1 The CT slices dataset

We evaluate the methods on the CT slices dataset (Graf et al., 2011) and compare their prediction accuracy. This dataset can be found at the UCI machine learning repository (<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/Relative+location+of+CT+slices+on+axial+axis>). The dataset contains 53,500 CT images from 74 patients (43 male, 31 female) with different anatomical landmarks annotated on the axial axis of the human body. Each CT image is represented by two histograms in polar space: one for the bone structures and another for the air inclusions inside the body. The covariate vector consists of 383 variables: 239 for the bone histogram and 145 for the air histogram. The response variable is the relative location of the image on the axial axis, which ranges from 0 to 180, where 0 indicates the top of the head and 180 indicates the soles of the feet.

The sample size of this dataset is 53,500. We use 40,000 observations for training, 3,500 observations for validation, and 10,000 observations for testing. Both the generator network and the critic network have two hidden layers with widths 128 and 64, respectively. The LeakyReLU activation function is used in both networks. The noise vector η is generated from $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{50})$. The number of the noise vectors J is set to be 200.

Table 5: Summary statistics for CT test data

Method	L1	L2	PI	CP
NLS	0.40	0.51	-	-
cWGAN	0.95	2.30	1.54	0.48
WGR	0.36	0.48	2.80	0.96

For evaluation, besides the L_1 and L_2 errors in (10), we also compute the average length of the estimated 95% prediction interval (PI) and the corresponding coverage probability (CP), defined as

$$\text{PI} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \{\hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(0.975|X_i) - \hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(0.025|X_i)\},$$

$$\text{CP} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K I\{Y_i \in [\hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(0.025|X_i), \hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(0.975|X_i)]\},$$

where $\hat{F}_{Y|X}^{-1}(\tau|X_i)$ is the estimated τ -th conditional quantile for a given $X = X_i$, and K is the sample size of the validation or testing set. The numerical results are summarized in Table 5.

Figure 2 shows the prediction intervals for 200 test samples, which are sorted in ascending order according to the value of Y . We randomly select 200 samples from the test dataset and estimate the conditional prediction interval based on 10,000 observations. The prediction intervals are sorted in ascending order according to the value of Y and are shown in Figure 2. In addition, we display the estimated conditional density functions for 10 test samples in Figure 2. The conditional density function is estimated using kernel smoothing based on 10,000 values calculated from the conditional generator.




Figure 2: The prediction intervals for the testing dataset and the estimated conditional density functions of 10 randomly selected samples. In the left two panels, the blue line represents the truth, the orange and the green lines represent the 2.5% and the 97.5% quantiles, respectively. In the right two panels, each color represents an observation from the test dataset.

As shown in Table 5, WGR and NLS have similar performance in terms of L_1 and L_2 errors, and both methods are superior to cWGAN. Furthermore, the CP of WGR is close to the nominal level of 95% and much higher than cWGAN. In addition, Figure 2 illustrates that the conditional distributions estimated by cWGAN are more peaked than those of our proposed method, and this accounts for why the prediction interval obtained by cWGAN covers fewer points than WGR.

5.2.2 The UJIndoorLoc dataset

We present an analysis of the UJIndoor dataset (Torres-Sospedra et al., 2014), a multi-building multi-floor indoor localization database that relies on WLAN/WiFi fingerprinting. The dataset can be downloaded from the UCI machine learning repository (<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/datasets/UJIIndoorLoc>). This dataset contains 21,048 observations, which are divided into three parts: 14948 for training, 1100 for validation, and 5000 for testing. Each observation has 529 attributes. The attributes include the WiFi fingerprint, which is composed of 520 intensity values of different detected Wireless Access Points (WAPs), ranging from -104dBm (very weak signal) to 0dBm (strong signal), and 100 for non-detected WAPs. The attributes also include the location information, which consists of six variables: *longitude*, *latitude*, *floor*, *building ID*, *space ID*, and *relative position*. The first two variables are continuous, while the others are categorical with at least two levels. We apply standardization to the data before training. Our goal is to predict the location information from the WiFi fingerprint using different machine learning methods and compare their performance.

The neural networks used are two-layer fully connected feedforward networks with 256 and 128 nodes, respectively. The LeakyReLU activation function is used in both the condi-

Table 6: Analysis results of the UJIndoorLoc testing dataset

Method		LNG	LAT	Floor	B-ID	S-ID	RP
NLS	L_1	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.05	0.16	0.34
	L_2	0.06	0.10	0.05	0.12	0.21	0.58
	PI	-	-	-	-	-	-
	CP	-	-	-	-	-	-
cWGAN	L_1	0.14	0.17	0.23	0.12	0.29	0.23
	L_2	0.04	0.07	0.11	0.04	0.36	0.11
	PI	0.24	0.26	0.31	0.22	0.61	1.06
	CP	0.55	0.50	0.44	0.53	0.68	0.49
WGR	L_1	0.08	0.10	0.18	0.05	0.20	0.41
	L_2	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.01	0.16	0.51
	PI	0.24	0.27	0.37	0.24	0.74	2.29
	CP	0.75	0.71	0.60	0.89	0.84	0.58

Notes: WGR is the proposed method. LNG is Longitude, LAT is latitude, B-ID is building ID, S-ID is space ID, RP is relative position.

tional generator and critic networks. The noise vector η is generated from $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_{50})$. And we use $J = 200$.

Table 6 presents the analysis results and Figure 3 shows the prediction intervals for *building ID*, *space ID*, and *relative position* in the response vector, based on 200 samples randomly selected from the test dataset. Compared with cWGAN, the prediction intervals of WGR have a higher coverage probability with a comparable length.




Figure 3: Prediction intervals for *building ID*, *space ID*, and *relative position* in the UJIndoorLoc test dataset. The blue line represents the truth, the orange line represents the 2.5% quantile, and the green line represents the 97.5% quantile.

We remark that the prediction intervals in these two data examples do not account for the uncertainty in estimating the conditional generator. To achieve theoretically valid coverage

probability, one could use the conformal prediction framework (Papadopoulos et al., 2002; Vovk et al., 2005) to adjust the prediction intervals accordingly. However, this is problem is beyond the scope of the current paper and we leave it for future work.

5.2.3 MNIST handwritten digits dataset

We now demonstrate the performance of WGR on a high-dimensional problem, where both X and Y are high-dimensional. We use the MNIST dataset (LeCun et al., 2010) of handwritten digits that can be downloaded from <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>. The MNIST dataset consists of 28×28 matrices of gray-scale images with values ranging from 0 to 1. Each image has a corresponding label in $\{0, 1, \dots, 9\}$. We apply WGR to the task of reconstructing the central part of an image that is masked. We assume that the masked part is the response $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{14 \times 14}$ and the remaining part is the covariate X , which has a dimension of $28 \times 28 - 14 \times 14 = 588$.

To evaluate the quality of the reconstructed images, we randomly sampled two images per digit from the test set and compared the results of three different methods in Figure 4. The figure shows that WGR produces sharper and more faithful images than the other methods, as it preserves more details and reduces artifacts.




Figure 4: Reconstructed images in MNIST test data.

5.2.4 MNIST dataset: effects of sample sizes and network architectures.

We conduct experiments to investigate how the training sample sizes and the network architectures affect the quality of the generated images using the MNIST dataset. We apply WGR with training sample sizes $n = 2,000$ and $n = 20,000$. The validation sample size is 1,000

and the test sample size is 10,000. For the network architectures, we use a network with 2 CNN layers and a network with 3 fully-connected layers, respectively. Figure 5 displays the reconstructed images with the two different network architectures. WGR with CNN layers is more stable than NLS and cWGAN when the training sample size varies. Moreover, it can be observed that WGR tends to generate images with higher quality.




Figure 5: Reconstructed images in MNIST test data.

6 Conclusions

In this paper, we have proposed a generative regression approach, Wasserstein generative regression (WGR), for simultaneously estimating a regression function and a conditional generator. We have provided theoretical support for WGR by establishing its non-asymptotic error bounds and convergence properties. Our numerical experiments demonstrate that it works well in various situations from the standard generalized nonparametric regression problems to more complex image reconstruction tasks.

WGR can be viewed as a way of estimating a conditional generator with a data-dependent regularization on the first conditional moment. However, our framework is not limited to this problem and can be adapted to other estimation tasks by choosing different loss functions. For instance, we can estimate the conditional median function or the conditional quantile function by using other losses that are more suitable for these objectives. We can also impose regularization on higher conditional moments or other properties of the conditional distribution, depending on the research question.

Although we have established non-asymptotic error bounds and convergence properties of WGR, our analysis is only a first attempt to deal with a challenging technical problem that involves empirical processes on complex functional spaces and approximation properties of deep neural networks. Further work is needed to better understand the properties of generative regression methods, including the proposed WGR. For instance, it would be interesting to know if the error bounds we derived are optimal or if they can be improved. WGR is a nonparametric method. For statistical inference and model interpretation, it is desirable to incorporate a semiparametric structure (Bickel et al., 1998) or a variable selection and dimension reduction component in WGR (Chen et al., 2022; Huang et al., 2012).

Generative regression leverages the power of deep neural networks to model complex and high-dimensional conditional distributions. Unlike traditional regression methods that only output point estimates, generative regression can capture the uncertainty and variability of the data by generating samples from the learned distribution. This allows for more interpretable results in various statistical applications. Therefore, we expect generative learning to be a useful addition to the existing methods for prediction and inference in statistics.

References

- Anthony, M. and Bartlett, P. L. (1999). *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Arjovsky, M., Chintala, S., and Bottou, L. (2017). Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In Precup, D. and Teh, Y. W., editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223.
- Bartlett, P. L., Harvey, N., Liaw, C., and Mehrabian, A. (2019). Nearly-tight vc-dimension and pseudodimension bounds for piecewise linear neural networks. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(1):2285–2301.
- Bickel, P. J., Klaassen, C. A. J., Yaácov, R., and Wellner, J. A. (1998). *Efficient and Adaptive Estimation for Semiparametric Models*. Springer, New York.

- Chen, Y., Gao, Q., and Wang, X. (2022). Inferential Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B*, 84(1):83–113.
- Coates, A., Ng, A., and Lee, H. (2011). An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 215–223.
- Fan, J. and Gijbels, I. (1996). *Local polynomial modelling and its applications*. Monographs on statistics and applied probability series. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Friedman, J. H. and Stuetzle, W. (1981). Projection pursuit regression. *J. Amer. Statist. Assoc.*, 76(376):817–823.
- Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., and Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2672–2680.
- Graf, F., Kriegel, H.-P., Ólsterl, S., and Schubert, M. (2011). Position prediction in ct volume scans. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning. Workshop on Learning for Global Challenges*.
- Gulrajani, I., Ahmed, F., Arjovsky, M., Dumoulin, V., and Courville, A. C. (2017). Improved training of Wasserstein GANs. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, page 5769–5779.
- Györfi, L., Kohler, M., Krzyżak, A., and Walk, H. (2002). *A Distribution-Free Theory of Nonparametric Regression*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
- Hardle, W., Hall, P., and Ichimura, H. (1993). Optimal smoothing in single-index models. *Annals of Statistics*, 21(1):157–178.
- Hastie, T. and Tibshirani, R. (1986). Generalized additive models. *Statistical Science*, 1(3):297 – 310.
- Heusel, M., Ramsauer, H., Unterthiner, T., Nessler, B., and Hochreiter, S. (2017). Gans trained by a two time-scale update rule converge to a local nash equilibrium. In Guyon, I., Luxburg, U. V., Bengio, S., Wallach, H., Fergus, R., Vishwanathan, S., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Hon, S. and Yang, H. (2022). Simultaneous neural network approximation for smooth functions. *Neural Networks*, 154:152–164.
- Huang, J., Breheny, P., and Ma, S. (2012). A selective review of group selection in high-dimensional models. *Statistical Science*, 27(4):481 – 499.
- Huang, J., Jiao, Y., Li, Z., Liu, S., Wang, Y., and Yang, Y. (2022). An error analysis of generative adversarial networks for learning distributions. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(116):1–43.

- Ichimura, H. (1993). Semiparametric least squares (sls) and weighted sls estimation of single-index models. *Journal of Econometrics*, 58(1):71–120.
- Jiao, Y., Shen, G., Lin, Y., and Huang, J. (2023). Deep nonparametric regression on approximate manifolds: Nonasymptotic error bounds and polynomial prefactors. *Annals of Statistics*, 51(2):691–716.
- Kallenberg, O. (2002). *Foundations of Modern Probability*. Springer, New York.
- Kovachki, N., Baptista, R., Hosseini, B., and Marzouk, Y. (2021). Conditional sampling with monotone gans. *arXiv 2006.06755*.
- LeCun, Y., Cortes, C., and Burges, C. (2010). Mnist handwritten digit database. *AT&T Labs [Online]*. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist>, 2.
- Liu, S., Zhou, X., Jiao, Y., and Huang, J. (2021). Wasserstein generative learning of conditional distribution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.10039*.
- Mirza, M. and Osindero, S. (2014). Conditional generative adversarial nets. arxiv:1411.1784.
- Müller, A. (1997). Integral probability metrics and their generating classes of functions. *Advances in Applied Probability*, pages 429–443.
- Nakada, R. and Imaizumi, M. (2020). Adaptive approximation and generalization of deep neural network with intrinsic dimensionality. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(174):1–38.
- Papadopoulos, H., Proedrou, K., Vovk, V., and Gammerman, A. (2002). Inductive confidence machines for regression. In *Proceedings of 13th European Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 345–356. Springer.
- Preston, C. (2009). A note on standard Borel and related spaces. *Journal of Contemporary Mathematical Analysis*, 44:63–71.
- Reed, S., Akata, Z., Yan, X., Logeswaran, L., Schiele, B., and Lee, H. (2016). Generative adversarial text to image synthesis. In *ICML*.
- Salakhutdinov, R. (2015). Learning deep generative models. *Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application*, 2:361–385.
- Scott, D. W. (1992). *Multivariate Density Estimation: Theory, Practice and Visualization*. Wiley, New York.
- Silverman, B. W. (1986). *Density Estimation for Statistics and Data Analysis*. Chapman & Hall, London.
- Stone, C. J. (1986). The dimensionality reduction principle for generalized additive models. *Ann. Statist.*, 14(2):590–606.

- Torres-Sospedra, J., Montoliu, R., Martínez-Usó, A., Avariento, J. P., Arnau, T. J., Benedito-Bordonau, M., and Huerta, J. (2014). Ujiindoorloc: A new multi-building and multi-floor database for wlan fingerprint-based indoor localization problems. In *International Conference on Indoor Positioning and Indoor Navigation*, pages 261–270.
- Tsybakov, A. (2008). *Introduction to Nonparametric Estimation*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Villani, C. (2009). *Optimal Transport: Old and New*. Springer.
- Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., and Shafer, G. (2005). *Algorithmic Learning in a Random World*.
- Wasserman, L. (2006). *All of Nonparametric Statistics (Springer Texts in Statistics)*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- Zhou, X., Jiao, Y., Liu, J., and Huang, J. (2022). A deep generative approach to conditional sampling. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 0:1–12.
- Zhu, J.-Y., Park, T., Isola, P., and Efros, A. A. (2017). Unpaired image-to-image translation using cycle-consistent adversarial networks. In *ICCV*.

Appendices

In this appendix, we provide detailed proofs of the main theorems and additional numerical experiments, including simulation studies and real data examples.

Appendix A Proof of Lemma 1

We first recall the error decomposition. For the proposed estimator \hat{g} , the estimation errors can be decomposed as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\ & \leq \lambda_{\ell} \mathcal{E}_1 + 4\lambda_{\ell} \mathcal{E}_2 + 2\mathcal{E}_3 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_4 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{S} = \{(X_i, Y_i, \eta_i)\}_{1 \leq i \leq n} \cup \{\eta_{ij}\}_{1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq j \leq J}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_1 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{2}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_2 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2 - \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\| \right\}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_3 := \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \} \right], \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_4 := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \inf_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \|h - f\|_{\infty}, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_5 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right], \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$\mathcal{E}_6 := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}, g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, g(X_i, \eta_i)) \right\} \right]. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

We will prove Lemma 1 in several steps.

Step 1. To rewrite the estimation error. For the generalized nonparametric regression model $Y = g^*(X; \eta)$, since the proposed objective function is

$$L(g, f) = \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w \{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \},$$

we have $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(g^*, f) = \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2$. Then, we write the estimation error

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(g^*, f) \right\} \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} L(\hat{g}, f) \right\} + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(g^*, f) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.7}) \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. To bound the first term in (A.7). By Lemma 24 in Huang et al. (2022),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} L(\hat{g}, f) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y}) - d_{\mathcal{D}}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y}) \right\} \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \inf_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \|h - f\|_{\infty} = 2\mathcal{E}_4, \end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_4 is defined in (A.4).

Step 3. To bound the second term in (A.7). By the definition of $L(g, f)$ and g^* ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(g^*, f) \right\} \\ &= \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \right\} + \lambda_w \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [d_{\mathcal{D}}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y})]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

We decompose the second term in (A.8) as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} [d_{\mathcal{D}}(P_{X,\hat{g}}, P_{X,Y})] &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}, g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, g(X_i, \eta_i)) \right\} \right] \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, \hat{g}(X_i, \eta_i)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \\ &:= \mathcal{E}_5 + \mathcal{E}_6 + \Delta, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.9})$$

where \mathcal{E}_5 and \mathcal{E}_6 are defined in (A.5) and (A.6). Note that Δ in (A.9) is non-negative as \mathcal{D} is symmetric. To deal with Δ , we introduce a new estimator \bar{g} defined as

$$\bar{g} = \arg \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \} \right]. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

It then follows from the definition of \hat{g} that

$$\Delta \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{L}(\hat{g}, f) \right\} \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{L}(\bar{g}, f) \right\}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Then, similar to (A.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{L}(\bar{g}, f) \right\} &\leq \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{ \mathbb{E} f(X, \bar{g}(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) \} \\ &\quad + \lambda_{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \bar{g}(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.12})$$

To bound the last term in (A.12), we subtract $\mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2$ on both sides of (A.12). Then,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \bar{g}(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2 \right\} - \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \bar{g}(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2 \right\} - \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \bar{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\
& \quad + \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_\eta \bar{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \\
& \leq \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_\eta \bar{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_2 is defined in (A.2). Then, by the definition of \bar{g} ,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_\eta \bar{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \\
& \leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\lambda_l \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} \right] := \mathcal{E}_3,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_3 is defined in (A.3). Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{L}(\hat{g}, f) \right\} - \lambda_l \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \leq \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + \lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

Further, by the definition of $\hat{L}(g, f)$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \hat{L}(\hat{g}, f) \right\} + \lambda_l \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \\
& = - \lambda_l \mathbb{E}_S \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \hat{g}(X_i, \eta_{ij})\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \lambda_w \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, \hat{g}(X_i, \eta_i)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right. \\
& \quad \left. + \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 - \lambda_w \Delta + \lambda_l \mathbb{E}_S \{ \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \}. \quad (\text{A.14})
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (A.13) and (A.14), we have

$$\lambda_w \Delta \leq \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + \lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + 2\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 + \lambda_l \mathbb{E}_S \{ \mathbb{E}\|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \}.$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} L(\hat{g}, f) - \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} L(g^*, f) \right\} \\
& \leq \lambda_\ell \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \right\} + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + 2\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 \\
& \quad + \lambda_l \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\
& \leq 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + 2\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 + \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\
& := 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6 + 2\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + \mathcal{E}_3 + \lambda_l \mathcal{E}_1,
\end{aligned}$$

where \mathcal{E}_1 is given in (A.1).

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_\ell \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\
& \leq \lambda_l \mathcal{E}_1 + 4\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + 2\mathcal{E}_3 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_4 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof of Lemma 1 is complete.

Appendix B Proofs of the main theorems

Proof of Theorem 1.

For any fixed λ_l and λ_w satisfying $0 < \lambda_l, \lambda_w < 1$, it follows from Lemma 1 that

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\
& \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_l} (\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_1 + 4\lambda_l \mathcal{E}_2 + 2\mathcal{E}_3 + 2\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_4 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_5 + 3\lambda_w \mathcal{E}_6). \tag{A.15}
\end{aligned}$$

The upper bounds of the error terms in (A.15) are given in Lemmas 3 to 9 in Section C. Thus, under Conditions 1-4, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_S \{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \| \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta) \|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \} \\
& \leq \lambda_l C_1 (B_0 \vee 1)^2 q^2 \frac{H_G S_G \log S_G \log n}{n} \\
& \quad + 16 \lambda_l C_2 q B_0^2 \sqrt{\frac{H_G S_G \log S_G \log J}{J}} \\
& \quad + 2(K_{\mathcal{D}} \lambda_w + 2B_0 q^2 \lambda_l) 19 B_1 (\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2 (m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1/2 + (\beta \vee 1)/2} (\bar{W} \bar{H})^{-2\beta/(m+d)} \\
& \quad + 2 \lambda_w 2^{d+q} (d+q) B W^{-1} \\
& \quad + 3 \lambda_w C_3 \{ B + 2^{d+q} (d+q) B \} \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{D}} S_{\mathcal{D}} \log(S_{\mathcal{D}}) \log n}{n}} \\
& \quad + 3 \lambda_w C_4 B \{ B + 2^{d+q} (d+q) B \} \sqrt{\frac{(H_G + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1) S_{G, \mathcal{D}} \log(S_{G, \mathcal{D}}) \log n}{n}}, \tag{A.16}
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1, C_2, C_3, C_4 are positive constants independent of $n, J, \beta, B_0, B_1, B, S_{G, \mathcal{D}}$ is the size of the network in $\mathcal{NN}(m+d, 1, 2W_G + 2W_{\mathcal{D}} + 2d, H_G + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1)$, and the Lipschitz constant for the discriminator network class $K_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 54B2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2}W^2$.

To simplify (A.16), we let the network parameters W, \bar{W} and \hat{H} in the discriminator network class **ND** 1 and generator network class **NG** 1 be

$$W = \lceil n^a \rceil, \bar{W} = \lceil n^b / \log^2 n \rceil, \bar{H} = \lceil \log n \rceil,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \frac{\beta}{2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}}, \\
b &= \frac{3(m+d)}{2[2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}]}.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \| \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta) \|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\
& \leq C n^{-\frac{\beta}{2\beta + \{3(m+d)\} \vee \{2\beta(d+q+1)\}}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 1},
\end{aligned}$$

where C is independent of (n, J) . The proof of Theorem 1 is complete.

Proof of Theorem 2.

For any fixed λ_l and λ_w satisfying $0 < \lambda_l, \lambda_w < 1$,

$$\mathbb{E}_S \left\{ d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_w} \mathbb{E}_S \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \| \mathbb{E}_\eta \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta) \|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\}.$$

Thus, Theorem 2 can be proved using the results in the proof of Theorem 1. We omit the details here.

Proof of Theorem 3:

Following similar arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1, we know that the Lipschitz constant $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ in (A.16) satisfies $K_{\mathcal{D}} \leq 54B2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2}\lceil n^{2a} \rceil$. Thus, for any $\lambda_l, \lambda_w > 0$ satisfying $\lambda_l + \lambda_w = 1$ and $\lambda_w = O(n^{-\frac{1}{d+q+2}})$,

$$K_{\mathcal{D}}\lambda_w \leq C_1 54B2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2},$$

where C_1 is a positive constant independent of (n, J) . Therefore, for d, q, m satisfying $2\beta(d+q+1) \geq 3(m+d) + \beta$, $J \gtrsim n^{\{3(m+d)+6\beta\}/\{4\beta(d+q+2)\}}$, by (A.16),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_l} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\ & \leq C_3 n^{-\frac{3}{2(d+q+2)}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 2}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} & \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_w} \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \lambda_l \mathbb{E} \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g^*(X, \eta) \right\|^2 + \lambda_w d_{\mathcal{F}_B^1}(P_{X, \hat{g}}, P_{X, Y}) \right\} \\ & \leq C_3 n^{-\frac{1}{2(d+q+2)}} (\log n)^{\frac{2\beta}{m+d} \vee 2} \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

as $n \rightarrow \infty$, where C_3 is a positive constant independent of (n, J) .

Appendix C Supporting lemmas

In this section, we give some supporting lemmas that are used to establish the upper bound for the terms in the error decomposition and are needed in the proof of Theorems 1 - 3.

We bound \mathcal{E}_1 in Lemma 2.

Lemma 2. *Suppose Conditions 1 and 4 hold. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left\| Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta) \right\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X_i, \eta) \right\|^2 \right\} \\ & \leq C B_0 q \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{G}} S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}} \{\log B_0 + \log n\}}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where C is a positive constant, and $H_{\mathcal{G}}, S_{\mathcal{G}}$ are the width and depth of the network class \mathcal{G} respectively.

Proof. The proof will be done in two steps.

Step 1. Symmetrization. Let $\{X'_i, Y'_j\}_{i=1}^n$ be n i.i.d. copies of (X, Y) , independent of $\{X_i, Y_i\}_{i=1}^n$. And let $h_g(X, Y) := \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X, \eta)\|^2$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$. Then, by standard

symmetrization technique,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} h_g(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h_g(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, X'_i, Y'_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{h_g(X'_i, Y'_i) - h_g(X_i, Y_i)\} \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, X'_i, Y'_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \{h_g(X'_i, Y'_i) - h_g(X_i, Y_i)\} \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, X'_i, Y'_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \{h_g(X'_i, Y'_i) - h_g(X_i, Y_i)\} \right\} \right] \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{X'_i, Y'_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i h_g(X'_i, Y'_i) \right\} + \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i h_g(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \\
& = 2 \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i h_g(X_i, Y_i) \right\},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^J$ are independent uniform $\{\pm 1\}$ -valued Rademacher random variables. We use $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})$ to denote the Rademacher complexity for \mathcal{H} , that is

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i h_g(X_i, Y_i) \right].$$

Step 2. To bound the Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H})$. We define a function class $\mathcal{G}_{|\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n} = \{\mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_1, \eta), \dots, \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_n, \eta) : g \in \mathcal{G}\}$. Then, under Condition 1,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{H}) & \leq 4B_0 \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, Y_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \{Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta)\} \right] \\
& \leq 4B_0 \mathbb{E}_{\{Y_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i Y_i \right] + 4B_0 \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i, \epsilon_i\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \epsilon_i \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta) \right] \\
& \leq 32 \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\inf_{0 < \delta < B_0/2} \left\{ \delta + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\delta}^{B_0/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_{|\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty})} d\epsilon \right\} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is by Lemma 12 in Huang *et al.* (2022). By Condition 4, there exists a vector $\eta_x \in \Omega_{\eta}$ such that for any $g, \tilde{g} \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\|\mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(x, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \tilde{g}(x, \eta)\|_1 \leq \|g(x, \eta_x) - \tilde{g}(x, \eta)\|_1.$$

Thus,

$$\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_{\{|X_i\}_{i=1}^n\}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_{\{|X_i, \eta_{xi}\}_{i=1}^n\}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty).$$

Next, we consider to use $\text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G})$, the pseudo-dimension of \mathcal{G} , to bound $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_{\{(X_i, \eta_i)\}_{i=1}^n\}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$. When $n \geq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G})$, its upper bound can be directly obtained by Theorem 12.2 in Anthony and Bartlett (1999). When $n < \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G})$, $\mathcal{G}_{\{(X_i, \eta_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^n : \|x\|_\infty \leq B_2\}$ can be covered by at most $\lceil 2B_0/\epsilon \rceil^n$ balls with radius ϵ in the distance $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. Thus, for any n and $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{G}_{\{(X_i, \eta_i)\}_{i=1}^n\}}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}) \log \left[\frac{2eB_0n}{\epsilon} \right].$$

Since \mathcal{G} is a ReLU network class, according to Bartlett et al. (2019), its pseudo-dimension can be bounded by

$$H_{\mathcal{G}}S_{\mathcal{G}} \log(S_{\mathcal{G}}/H_{\mathcal{G}}) \lesssim \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}) \lesssim H_{\mathcal{G}}S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}}, \quad (\text{A.17})$$

where $H_{\mathcal{G}}, S_{\mathcal{G}}$ are the width and depth of the network class \mathcal{G} , respectively. As a result, \mathcal{E}_1 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \|Y - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X, \eta)\|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} \hat{g}(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \\ & \leq 32 \inf_{0 < \delta < B_2/2} \left(\delta + \frac{3\sqrt{H_{\mathcal{G}}S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G})}}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\delta}^{B_0/2} \sqrt{\log[2eB_2n/\epsilon]} d\epsilon \right) \\ & \leq 32 \inf_{0 < \delta < B_0/2} \left(\delta + \frac{3B_2}{2} \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{G}}S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) \log[2eB_0n/\delta]}{n}} \right) \\ & \leq CB_0 \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{G}}S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{G}) [\log n + \log B_0]}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we intend to bound \mathcal{E}_2 , the stochastic error for the generator. Under Condition 1, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$ and $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \left\| Y_i - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|^2 - \|Y_i - \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta)\|^2 \right\} \right\} \\ & \leq 4B_0 \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{S}} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\eta} g(X_i, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|_1 \right\} \right]. \quad (\text{A.18}) \end{aligned}$$

Then, we can establish the upper bound of (A.18) in the following lemma.

Lemma 3. *Assume Condition 1 hold. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\eta_{ij}\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X_i, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|_1 \right\} \right] \\ & \leq CqB_0 \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{G}} S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}} \{\log J + \log(B_0)\}}{J}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

Proof. Recall that $\eta \sim P_\eta$ and $\{\eta_{ij}, i = 1, \dots, n, j = 1, \dots, J\}$ is $n \times J$ i.i.d. copies of η , independent of $\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n$. The proof will be done in three steps.

Step 1: To decompose the network class \mathcal{G} . The network class \mathcal{G} can be decomposed into the product $\mathcal{G}_1 \otimes \mathcal{G}_2 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{G}_q$, where \mathcal{G}_k satisfies that for $g = (g_1, \dots, g_q)^\top \in \mathcal{G}$, $g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ for $k = 1, \dots, q$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\eta_{ij}\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\| \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X_i, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|_1 \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{X_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\eta_{ij}\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\| \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X_i, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X_i, \eta_{ij}) \right\|_1 \right\} \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_{\{X\} \cup \{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\| \mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g(X, \eta_j) \right\|_1 \right\} \\ & \leq \sum_{k=1}^q \mathbb{E}_{\{X\} \cup \{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \mathbb{E}_\eta g_k(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \\ & = \sum_{k=1}^q \mathbb{E}_X \left[\mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \mathbb{E}_\eta g_k(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \right]. \tag{A.19} \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: To bound $\mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \mathbb{E}_\eta g_k(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\}$. Let $\{\eta'_j\}_{j=1}^J$ be J i.i.d. copies of η , independent of $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J$ and X . It then follows from the standard

symmetrization technique that given X , for $k = 1, \dots, q$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \mathbb{E}_\eta g_k(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \\
& \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta'_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \{g_k(X, \eta_j) - g_k(X, \eta'_j)\} \right| \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j, \eta'_j, \epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j \{g_k(X, \eta_j) - g_k(X, \eta'_j)\} \right| \right] \\
& \leq 2 \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j, \epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \\
& = 2\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_k|X),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_k|X)$ is the conditional Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{G}_k given X .

Step 3: To bound the conditional Rademacher complexity $\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_k|X)$. For any $g_k, \tilde{g}_k \in \mathcal{G}_k$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| - \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j \tilde{g}_k(X, \eta_j) \right| & \leq \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j \{g_k(X, \eta_j) - \tilde{g}_k(X, \eta_j)\} \right| \\
& \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq J} |g_k(X, \eta_j) - \tilde{g}_k(X, \eta_j)|.
\end{aligned}$$

We use $e_{X,J}(g_k, \tilde{g}_k)$ to denote the distance between g_k and \tilde{g}_k with respect to $\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J$ and X defined as

$$e_{X,J}(g_k, \tilde{g}_k) = \|g_k - \tilde{g}_k\|_{L^\infty(\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J)}.$$

For any $\delta > 0$, we define $\mathcal{G}_{k,\delta}$ to be a covering set of \mathcal{G}_k with radius δ with respect to $e_{X,J}(\cdot)$ and $\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k, e_{X,J})$ to be the δ -covering number of \mathcal{G}_k with respect to the distance $e_{X,J}(\cdot)$. The, by the triangle inequality and Lemma B.4 in Zhou et al. (2022), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_k|X) & \leq \delta + \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j, \epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_{k,\delta}} \left| \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J \epsilon_j g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \\
& \leq \delta + \frac{C_1}{J} \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\left\{ \log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k, e_{X,J}) \right\}^{1/2} \left\{ \max_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_{k,\delta}} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k^2(X, \eta_j) \right\}^{1/2} \right] \\
& \leq \delta + \frac{C_1 B_0}{\sqrt{J}} \mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left[\left\{ \log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k, e_{X,J}) \right\}^{1/2} \right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_1 > 0$ is a constant and the third inequality holds since the probability measure of $(X, g(X, \eta))$ is supported on $\Omega \subseteq [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d+q}$ for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$. It follows from Theorem 12.2 in Anthony and Bartlett (1999) that for $J \geq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k)$,

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k, e_{X,J}) = \log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k|_{\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J}, \|\cdot\|_\infty) \leq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k) \log \left\{ \frac{2eJB_0}{\delta \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k)} \right\},$$

where $\mathcal{G}_k|_{\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J} = \{(g_k(\eta_1, X), \dots, g_k(X, \eta_j)) : g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k\}$ and $\mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k|_{\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J}, \|\cdot\|_\infty)$ is the δ -covering number of $\mathcal{G}_k|_{\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^J$ with respect to the distance $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. When $J < \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k)$, $\mathcal{G}_k|_{\{(X, \eta_j)\}_{j=1}^J} \subseteq \{x \in \mathbb{R}^J : \|x\|_\infty \leq B_0\}$ can be covered by at most $\lceil 2B_0/\delta \rceil^J$ balls with radius δ with respect to the distance $\|\cdot\|_\infty$. This means that for any J ,

$$\log \mathcal{N}(\delta, \mathcal{G}_k, e_{X,J}) \leq \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k) \log \left(\frac{2eJB_0}{\delta} \right).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathcal{R}(\mathcal{G}_k|X) \leq \delta + \frac{C_1 B_0}{\sqrt{J}} \log \left(\frac{2eJB_0}{\delta} \right) \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k).$$

Moreover, Bartlett et al. (2019) gives the following result for the pseudo-dimension of a ReLU network class:

$$\text{Pdim}(\mathcal{G}_k) \lesssim H_{\mathcal{G}} S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}},$$

where $H_{\mathcal{G}}, S_{\mathcal{G}}$ are the width and depth of the network class \mathcal{G} , respectively. By letting $\delta = 1/J$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\{\eta_j\}_{j=1}^J} \left\{ \sup_{g_k \in \mathcal{G}_k} \left| \mathbb{E}_\eta g_k(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{J} \sum_{j=1}^J g_k(X, \eta_j) \right| \right\} \lesssim B_0 \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{G}} S_{\mathcal{G}} \log S_{\mathcal{G}} \{\log J + \log(B_0)\}}{J}}.$$

Thus, we have proved Lemma 3 in view of (A.19). □

We next can bound \mathcal{E}_3 by combining Lemmas 4 and 5.

Lemma 4. *Suppose Condition 1 holds. Then,*

$$\mathcal{E}_3 \leq (K_{\mathcal{D}} \lambda_w + 2B_0 q^2 \lambda_l) \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y)\}, \quad (\text{A.20})$$

where $K_{\mathcal{D}}$ is the Lipschitz constant defined in **ND 1**.

Proof. Let $Y = (Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(q)})^\top \in \mathbb{R}^q$. Under Condition 1, for any $g = (g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(q)})^\top \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 &\leq \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}(Y|X)\|_1^2 \\ &\leq 2B_0 q \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}(Y|X)\|_1 \\ &\leq 2B_0 q^2 \max_{k=1, \dots, q} \mathbb{E} |\mathbb{E}_\eta g^{(k)}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}(Y^{(k)}|X)|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $F_{g^{(k)}(X, \eta)|X}(\cdot)$ and $F_{Y^{(k)}|X}(\cdot)$ denote the conditional cumulative distribution of $g^{(k)}(X, \eta)$ and $Y^{(k)}$, respectively. For any $k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and $g = (g^{(1)}, \dots, g^{(q)})^\top \in \mathcal{G}$, by the definition of Wasserstein distance,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} |\mathbb{E}_\eta g^{(k)}(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}(Y^{(k)}|X)| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \mathcal{W}_1(P_{g^{(k)}(X, \eta)|X}, P_{Y^{(k)}|X}) \leq \mathcal{W}_1(P_{X, g(X, \eta)}, P_{X, Y}) = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E} f(X, Y)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last equality holds for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\mathcal{F}_B^1 = \{f : \mathbb{R}^{d+q} \mapsto \mathbb{R}, |f(z_1) - f(z_2)| \leq \|z_1 - z_2\|, z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{d+q}, \|f\|_\infty \leq B\}$. Hence, for any $g \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 \leq 2B_0q^2 \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\}. \quad (\text{A.21})$$

Under Conditions 1, **ND** 1 and **NG** 1,

$$\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} \leq K_{\mathcal{D}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\}.$$

Consequently, together with (A.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_3 &= \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\lambda_l \mathbb{E} \|\mathbb{E}_\eta g(X, \eta) - \mathbb{E}_\eta g^*(X, \eta)\|^2 + \lambda_w \sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} \right] \\ &\leq (K_{\mathcal{D}}\lambda_w + 2B_0q^2\lambda_l) \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 5. For $g^* = (g_1^*, \dots, g_q^*)^\top$, assume that $g_k^* \in \mathcal{H}^\beta([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d}, B_1)$, $k = 1, \dots, q$, and the network class \mathcal{G} satisfies **NG** 1. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} \\ &\leq 19B_1(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2(m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1/2 + (\beta \vee 1)/2} (\bar{W}\bar{H})^{-2\beta/(m+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By the definition of g^* in (1) and the Lipschitz continuity of $f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} &= \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, g^*(X, \eta))\} \\ &\leq \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \{\mathbb{E}\|g(X, \eta) - g^*(X, \eta)\|\} \\ &\leq \sqrt{m+d} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \|g - g^*\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d})}. \end{aligned}$$

For any $k \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ and $g_k^* \in \mathcal{H}^\beta([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d}, B_1)$, we define a new function

$$\tilde{g}_k^0(x) := g_k^*(2B_0x - B_0) \in \mathcal{H}^\beta([0, 1]^{m+d}, B_1).$$

Corollary 3.1 in Jiao et al. (2023) tells that there exists a ReLU network function $\tilde{\phi}_k$, satisfying **NG** 1, such that for any k ,

$$\|\tilde{\phi}_k - \tilde{g}_k^0\|_{L^\infty([0, 1]^{m+d})} \leq 19B_1(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2(m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + (\beta \vee 1)/2} (WH)^{-2\beta/(m+d)}.$$

Then, we define

$$\phi(x) := \left(\tilde{\phi}_1 \left(\frac{1}{2B_0}x - \frac{1}{2} \right), \dots, \tilde{\phi}_q \left(\frac{1}{2B_0}x - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right)^\top.$$

Hence, by Remark 14 in Nakada and Imaizumi (2020), $\phi \in \mathcal{G}$ with width $W_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $H_{\mathcal{G}}$ satisfying **NG** 1. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\phi - g^*\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d})} &\leq \max_{1 \leq k \leq q} \left\| \tilde{\phi}_k \left(\frac{1}{2B_0}x - \frac{1}{2} \right) - \tilde{g}_k^0 \left(\frac{1}{2B_0}x - \frac{1}{2} \right) \right\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d})} \\ &= \max_{1 \leq k \leq q} \|\tilde{\phi}_k - \tilde{g}_k^0\|_{L^\infty([0,1]^{m+d})} \\ &\leq 19B_1(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2(m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + (\beta \vee 1)/2} (WH)^{-2\beta/(m+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}_B^1} \{\mathbb{E}f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \mathbb{E}f(X, Y)\} &\leq \sqrt{m+d} \|\phi - g^*\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{m+d})} \\ &\leq 19B_1(\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1)^2(m+d)^{\lfloor \beta \rfloor + 1/2 + (\beta \vee 1)/2} (WH)^{-2\beta/(m+d)}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Next, we can bound \mathcal{E}_4 by Lemmas 6.

Lemma 6. *Suppose Condition 1 holds. Then, there exists a network function \tilde{f} satisfying the width and depth in **ND** 1 such that on the domain $[-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}$,*

$$\sup_{z \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} |\phi(z) - \tilde{f}(z)| \leq 2^{d+q}(d+q)BW^{-1}.$$

Proof. The proof is carried out in two steps. We begin with approximating f by a sum-product combination of univariate piecewise-linear functions. And then we use a neural network to approximate it.

Step 1: To approximate f by a piecewise-linear function. Let N be a positive integer. First, we find a grid of $(N+1)^{d+q}$ functions $\phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})$ such that

$$\sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}^{d+q}} \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \equiv 1, \quad \mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}.$$

To address this issue, for any $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_{d+q})^\top$, we define

$$\phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) = \prod_{k=1}^{d+q} \psi \left(3N \left(x_k - \frac{m_k}{N} \right) \right), \quad (\text{A.22})$$

where $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_{d+q}) \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}^{d+q}$ and

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & |x| > 2, \\ 2 - |x|, & 1 \geq |x| \leq 2, \\ 1, & |x| < 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.23})$$

Note that for arbitrary \mathbf{m} , $\text{supp } \phi_{\mathbf{m}} \subset \{\mathbf{x} : |x_k - m_k/N| \leq 1/N\}$. Then, we construct the function f_1 to approximate f defined as

$$f_1(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}^{d+q}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}),$$

where $a_{\mathbf{m}} = f(\mathbf{m}/N)$. Then, by the properties of $\phi_{\mathbf{m}}$ and the Lipschitz property of f , the approximation error can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \|f - f_1\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{d+q})} &= \left\| \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}^{d+q}} \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})(f(\mathbf{x}) - a_{\mathbf{m}}) \right\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{d+q})} \\ &\leq \sum_{\mathbf{m}: |x_k - m_k/N| \leq 1/N, \forall k} |f(\mathbf{x}) - a_{\mathbf{m}}| \\ &\leq 2^{d+q} \max_{\mathbf{m}: |x_k - m_k/N| \leq 1/N, \forall k} |f(\mathbf{x}) - a_{\mathbf{m}}| \\ &\leq 2^{d+q} \max_{\mathbf{m}: |x_k - m_k/N| \leq 1/N, \forall k} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{m}/N\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{2^{d+q} \sqrt{d+q}}{N}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2: To approximate f_1 by a neural network. First, we construct a ReLU activated ψ satisfying (A.23):

$$\psi(x) = \sigma(\sigma(x+2) - \sigma(x+1) + \sigma(2-x) - \sigma(1-x) - 1). \quad (\text{A.24})$$

According to Hon and Yang (2022), for an almost everywhere differentiable function $g : [0, 1]^{d+q} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, we can define its sobolev norm as

$$\|g\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} = \max_{\mathbf{n}: |\mathbf{n}|_1=1} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^{d+q}} |D^{\mathbf{n}}g(\mathbf{x})|,$$

where $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_{d+q}) \in \{0, 1\}^{d+q}$ and $D^{\mathbf{n}}g$ is the respective weak derivative. Then, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) &= \varphi(\psi(3Nx_1 - 3m_1), \dots, \psi(3Nx_{d+q} - 3m_{d+q})), \\ \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}^{d+q}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.25})$$

where φ is a ReLU neural network with width $9(N_1 + 1) + d + q - 1$ and depth $14(d+q)(d+q-1)L$, and $\|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} \leq 18$. By Lemma 7, we can implement \tilde{f} by a neural network satisfying **ND** 1. Then, the approximation error of f_1 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} |\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f_1(\mathbf{x})| &= \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} \left| \sum_{\mathbf{m}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \{\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})\} \right| \\ &\leq B(N+1)^{d+q} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} \max_{\mathbf{m}} |\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x})| \\ &\leq B(N+1)^{d+q} \|\varphi - t_1 t_2 \cdots t_{d+q}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} \\ &\leq B(N+1)^{d+q} 10(d+q-1)(N+1)^{-7(d+q)} \\ &= 10B(d+q-1)(N+1)^{-6(d+q)}, \end{aligned}$$

where the third inequality is by Lemma 3.5 in Hon and Yang (2022). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} |\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} |\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) - f_1(\mathbf{x})| + \|f - f_1\|_{L^\infty([-B_0, B_0]^{d+q})} \\ &\leq 2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2}N^{-1} + 10B(d+q-1)(N+1)^{-6(d+q)} \\ &\leq 2^{d+q}(d+q)BN^{-1}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma 7. *Suppose Condition 1 holds. Then, for the network function \tilde{f} defined in (A.25), its Lipschitz constant satisfies $\text{Lip}(\tilde{f}) \leq 54B2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2}N^2$.*

Proof. To bound the Lipschitz constant of \tilde{f} , we need to find a positive constant C such that

$$\max_{\mathbf{n}:|\mathbf{n}|_1=1} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [0,1]^{d+q}} |D^{\mathbf{n}}\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})| \leq C,$$

as it is a sufficient condition for $\text{Lip}(\tilde{f}) \leq \sqrt{d+q}C$. By the definitions of \tilde{f} and $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}$, we can decompose the first-order partial derivative of \tilde{f} over x_{k_0} as

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) \right| &= \left| \sum_{\mathbf{m} \in \{0,1,\dots,N\}^{d+q}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: \forall k, \\ x_k \in \{t: |t-m_k/N| \leq 1/N\}}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| + \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: \exists k_1, \\ x_{k_1} \notin \{t: |t-m_{k_1}/N| \leq 1/N\}}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: \forall k, \\ x_k \in \{t: |t-m_k/N| \leq 1/N\}}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| + \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: \exists k_1 \neq k_0, \\ x_{k_1} \notin \{t: |t-m_{k_1}/N| \leq 1/N\}}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \sum_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: x_{k_0} \notin \{t: |t-m_{k_0}/N| \leq 1/N\}, \\ \forall k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \in \{t: |t-m_{k_1}/N| \leq 1/N\}}} a_{\mathbf{m}} \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\ &:= E_1 + E_2 + E_3. \end{aligned}$$

We shall next bound E_1 , E_2 and E_3 , respectively. For E_1 , by the definition of $\tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}$ and the properties of φ ,

$$E_1 \leq 2^{d+q}B \max_{\substack{\mathbf{m}: \forall k, \\ x_k \in \{t: |t-m_k/N| \leq 1/N\}}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \leq 2^{d+q}B \cdot 3N \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} \leq 54B2^{d+q}N,$$

where the second inequality holds according to the chain derivative rule.

Next, we consider E_2 . By the definition of $\phi_{\mathbf{m}}$, for any $\mathbf{m} \in \{\mathbf{m} : \exists k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \notin \{t : |t - m_{k_1}/N| \leq 1/N\}\}$, we have $\partial\phi_{\mathbf{m}}/\partial x_{k_0} = 0$. Thus, similar to E_1 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
E_2 &\leq B \sum_{\mathbf{m}:\exists k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \notin \{t:|t-m_{k_1}/N|\leq 1/N\}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\
&\leq B(N+1)^{d+q} \max_{\mathbf{m}:\exists k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \notin \{t:|t-m_{k_1}/N|\leq 1/N\}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\
&= B(N+1)^{d+q} \cdot \max_{\mathbf{m}:\exists k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \notin \{t:|t-m_{k_1}/N|\leq 1/N\}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) - \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \phi_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\
&\leq B(N+1)^{d+q} \cdot 3N \|\varphi - t_1 t_2 \cdots t_{d+q}\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} \\
&\leq 30B(d+q-1)(N+1)^{-5(d+q)}.
\end{aligned}$$

Third, E_3 satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
E_3 &\leq B(N-1)2^{d+q-1} \max_{\mathbf{m}:x_{k_0} \notin \{t:|t-m_{k_0}/N|\leq 1/N\}, \forall k_1 \neq k_0, x_{k_1} \in \{t:|t-m_{k_1}/N|\leq 1/N\}} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial x_{k_0}} \tilde{f}_{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{x}) \right| \\
&\leq B(N-1)2^{d+q-1} \cdot 3N \|\varphi\|_{\mathcal{W}^{1,\infty}([0,1]^{d+q})} \\
&\leq 542^{d+q-1} B N^2.
\end{aligned}$$

As a result, we can bound the sobolev norm of \tilde{f} by

$$\max_{\mathbf{n}:|\mathbf{n}|=1} \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in [-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}} |D^{\mathbf{n}} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})| \leq 54B2^{d+q}N^2.$$

Therefore, on the domain $[-B_0, B_0]^{d+q}$, $\text{Lip}(\tilde{f}) \leq 54B2^{d+q}(d+q)^{1/2}N^2$. \square

In the following, we shall establish the bound of \mathcal{E}_5 in Lemma 8.

Lemma 8. *Suppose $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq B_2$ for a constant B_2 and the pseudo-dimension of \mathcal{D} satisfies $\text{Pdim}(\mathcal{D}) < \infty$, then*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \leq C B_2 \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{D}} S_{\mathcal{D}} \log(S_{\mathcal{D}}) [\log n + \log B_2]}{n}},$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant, $H_{\mathcal{D}}, S_{\mathcal{D}}$ are the width and depth of the network class \mathcal{D} , respectively.

Proof. Define $\mathcal{D}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} = \{(f(X_1, Y_1), \dots, f(X_n, Y_n)) : f \in \mathcal{D}\}$, where $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are n i.i.d. samples from $P_{X, Y}$. Let $\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{D}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty})$ be the ϵ -covering number of $\mathcal{D}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ with respect to the distance $\|\cdot\|_{\infty}$.

It follows from Lemma 12 in Huang et al. (2022) that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E}f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \\
&\leq 8 \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\inf_{0 < \delta < B_2/2} \left\{ \delta + \frac{3}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\delta}^{B_2/2} \sqrt{\mathcal{N}(\epsilon, \mathcal{D}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n}, \|\cdot\|_{\infty})} d\epsilon \right\} \right].
\end{aligned}$$

It follows from similar arguments as in the proof of Lemma 2 that \mathcal{E}_5 can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, Y) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, Y_i) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq C B_2 \sqrt{\frac{H_{\mathcal{D}} S_{\mathcal{D}} \log S_{\mathcal{D}}(\mathcal{D}) [\log n + \log B_2]}{n}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.26})$$

where C is a universal positive constant. \square

We will bound \mathcal{E}_6 in Lemma 9.

Lemma 9. *Suppose $\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}} \|f\|_{\infty} \leq B_2$ and the pseudo-dimension of \mathcal{G} and \mathcal{D} satisfies $Pdim(\mathcal{G}) < \infty, Pdim(\mathcal{D}) < \infty$. Let $(W_{\mathcal{G}}, H_{\mathcal{G}})$ be the width and depth of the network in \mathcal{G} and $(W_{\mathcal{D}}, H_{\mathcal{D}})$ be the width and depth of the network in \mathcal{D} . Let $S_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D}}$ denote the size of the network in $\mathcal{NN}(m+d, 1, 2W_{\mathcal{G}} + 2W_{\mathcal{D}} + 2d, H_{\mathcal{G}} + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1)$. Then,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}, g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, g(X_i, \eta_i)) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq C B_2 \sqrt{\frac{(H_{\mathcal{G}} + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1) S_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D}} \log(S_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D}}) [\log n + \log B_2]}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant.

Proof. Let $h(X, \eta) = f(X, g(X, \eta))$ and $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{NN}(m+d, 1, 2W_{\mathcal{G}} + 2W_{\mathcal{D}} + 2d, H_{\mathcal{G}} + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1) + 1$. Then, $\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}} \|h\|_{\infty} \leq B_2$. According to Remarks 13-14 in Nakada and Imaizumi (2020), we can show by a similar argument to the proof of Lemma 8 that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{D}, g \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} f(X, g(X, \eta)) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n f(X_i, g(X_i, \eta_{i0})) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n} \left[\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \mathbb{E} h(X, \eta) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_i, \eta_{i0}) \right\} \right] \\ & \leq C B_2 \sqrt{\frac{(H_{\mathcal{G}} + H_{\mathcal{D}} + 1) S_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D}} \log(S_{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{D}}) [\log n + \log B_2]}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

where $C > 0$ is a universal constant. \square

Appendix D Additional simulation results

In this section, we provide additional simulation results. Other than Models 1 and 2 considered in the main text, three additional models are used to show the performance of the proposed method.

Model 1. *A nonlinear model with an additive error term:*

$$Y = X_1^2 + \exp(X_2 + X_3/3) + \sin(X_4 + X_5) + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, 1).$$

Model 2. A model with an additive error term whose variance depends on the predictors:

$$Y = X_1^2 + \exp(X_2 + X_3/3) + X_4 - X_5 + (0.5 + X_2^2/2 + X_5^2/2) \times \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim N(0, 1)$$

Model 6. A nonlinear model with a heavy tail additive error term:

$$Y = X_1^2 + \exp(X_2 + X_3/3) + \sin(X_4 + X_5) + \varepsilon, \quad \varepsilon \sim t(3).$$

Model 7. A model with a multiplicative non-Gaussian error term:

$$Y = (5 + X_1^2/3 + X_2^2 + X_3^2 + X_4 + X_5) \times \exp(0.5\varepsilon),$$

where $\varepsilon \sim 0.5N(-2, 1) + 0.5N(2, 1)$.

Model 8. A mixture of two normal distributions:

$$Y = I_{\{U < 0.5\}}N(-X_1, 0.25^2) + I_{\{U > 0.5\}}N(X_1, 0.25^2),$$

where $U \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$ and is independent of X .

We use the same evaluation criteria in Section 5.1.

D.1 Simulation results for different methods for Models 1-2, 6-8

We compare the performance of the proposed method to the nonparametric least squares regression (NLS) and conditional WGAN (cWGAN). The numerical results are summarized in Tables A.1 and A.2. It can be seen that the proposed method has smaller MSEs for most cases, indicating that the proposed method can improve the distribution matching to some extent.

D.2 Simulation results with varying noise dimension

We check the performance of the proposed method with varying dimension of the noise η . Other than $m = 3$ considered in Section 5.1, we also try $m = 10$ and $m = 25$. The results are given in Tables A.3 and A.4. For larger m , there tends to be a smaller MSE of the estimated conditional quantiles, but it takes longer time to train. There is trade-off between performance and training time. We also observe that the performance of the proposed method is somewhat robust to the noise dimension m , as long as m takes reasonable values.

D.3 Simulation results for different values of J

We conduct simulation studies to check the performance of the proposed method for different J , the sample size of the generated noise vector η . The generator and discriminator networks have two fully-connected hidden layers. The LeakyReLU function is used as the active function. The noise vector η is generated from $N(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{I}_3)$. We take $J = 10, 50, 200, 500$, and report the results in Tables A.5 and A.6. It can be seen that the proposed method works comparably for different J .

Table A.1: The L_1 and L_2 errors, MSE of the estimated conditional mean and the estimated standard deviation by different methods.

X	Model	Method	L_1	L_2	Mean	SD
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	NLS	0.83(0.02)	1.08(0.05)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.00(0.02)	1.97(0.25)	0.98(0.25)	0.09(0.03)
		WGR	0.82 (0.02)	1.07 (0.05)	0.06 (0.01)	0.04 (0.01)
	M2	NLS	1.24(0.04)	2.45 (0.38)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.62(0.05)	4.11(0.44)	0.85(0.24)	0.37(0.10)
		WGR	1.23 (0.04)	3.41(0.38)	0.19 (0.10)	0.22 (0.04)
	M6	NLS	1.17(0.04)	3.05(0.70)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.31(0.03)	3.95(0.53)	2.92(0.46)	0.39(0.15)
		WGR	1.16 (0.05)	3.00 (0.71)	2.49 (0.14)	0.28 (0.14)
	M7	NLS	2.23 (0.09)	9.43 (1.09)	-	-
		cWGAN	2.31(0.09)	10.13(1.21)	0.91(0.12)	1.00(0.08)
		WGR	2.24(0.09)	9.47(1.08)	0.20 (0.03)	0.85 (0.09)
	M8	NLS	0.83 (0.02)	1.09(0.07)	-	-
		cWGAN	0.83 (0.03)	1.09(0.07)	0.01 (0.00)	0.53 (0.14)
		WGR	0.83 (0.02)	1.09 (0.07)	0.01 (0.00)	0.62(0.09)
	$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	NLS	1.17(0.03)	2.52(0.15)	-
cWGAN			1.17(0.04)	2.65(0.41)	1.67(0.39)	0.81(0.02)
WGR			1.15 (0.04)	2.40 (0.24)	1.64 (0.25)	0.16 (0.04)
M2		NLS	1.63(0.05)	5.37(0.47)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.64(0.06)	5.34(0.46)	2.20(0.22)	1.11(0.08)
		WGR	1.61 (0.06)	5.27 (0.45)	2.06 (0.24)	0.23 (0.03)
M6		NLS	1.58 (0.03)	5.09 (0.62)	-	-
		cWGAN	1.71(0.08)	6.01(0.80)	5.16(0.74)	1.19(0.45)
		WGR	1.62(0.06)	5.39(0.66)	4.20 (0.53)	0.47 (0.19)
M7		NLS	2.51(0.09)	11.52(1.17)	-	-
		cWGAN	2.51(0.09)	12.02(1.49)	2.88(0.29)	0.96(0.25)
		WGR	2.45 (0.11)	11.37 (1.30)	2.22 (0.17)	0.73 (0.06)
M8		NLS	0.85(0.02)	1.13(0.07)	-	-
		cWGAN	0.89(0.03)	1.29(0.10)	0.00 (0.00)	0.06 (0.00)
		WGR	0.83 (0.02)	1.09 (0.07)	0.19(0.05)	0.06 (0.30)

NOTE: The corresponding simulation standard errors are given in parentheses. WGR is the proposed method.

Table A.2: MSE of the estimated conditional quantiles by different methods.

X	Model	Method	$\tau = 0.05$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.95$
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	cWGAN	1.22(0.23)	1.04(0.25)	0.99(0.26)	1.03(0.24)	1.34(0.21)
		WGR	0.29 (0.07)	0.10 (0.01)	0.09 (0.02)	0.10 (0.03)	0.23 (0.06)
	M2	cWGAN	1.86(0.21)	0.94(0.26)	0.85(0.26)	1.00(0.21)	2.59(0.52)
		WGR	0.77 (0.09)	0.31 (0.06)	0.19 (0.04)	0.27 (0.05)	0.81 (0.15)
	M6	cWGAN	3.57(0.73)	3.29(0.58)	2.95(0.50)	3.01(0.46)	6.14(1.44)
		WGR	3.39 (0.48)	2.70 (0.24)	2.47 (0.12)	2.50 (0.21)	2.76 (0.50)
	M7	cWGAN	0.17 (0.03)	0.28 (0.05)	0.60(0.09)	1.99(0.21)	8.40(0.79)
		WGR	2.01(0.47)	0.41(0.10)	0.39 (0.06)	0.74 (0.11)	4.04 (0.40)
	M8	cWGAN	0.03 (0.02)	0.04(0.03)	0.36 (0.04)	0.04(0.03)	0.03(0.02)
		WGR	0.03 (0.01)	0.02 (0.01)	0.40(0.04)	0.02 (0.01)	0.03 (0.02)
$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	cWGAN	3.18(0.71)	1.83(0.22)	1.75(0.16)	1.89(0.21)	3.61(0.39)
		WGR	1.84 (0.23)	1.69 (0.20)	1.66 (0.16)	1.88 (0.13)	2.41 (0.14)
	M2	cWGAN	4.99(0.51)	2.63(0.24)	2.21(0.22)	2.79(0.36)	5.41(0.65)
		WGR	3.42 (1.07)	2.26 (0.28)	2.19 (0.22)	2.57 (0.27)	3.49 (0.47)
	M6	cWGAN	7.79(1.79)	5.95(1.09)	5.04(0.80)	6.15(0.88)	12.86(2.92)
		WGR	5.47 (0.76)	4.89 (0.67)	4.72 (0.79)	4.91 (0.78)	4.65 (0.71)
	M7	cWGAN	1.43 (0.24)	1.92(0.11)	2.65(0.17)	4.21(0.49)	10.38(1.89)
		WGR	1.88(0.186)	1.82 (0.13)	2.17 (0.17)	3.11 (0.23)	7.15 (0.59)
	M8	cWGAN	1.69(0.10)	1.06(0.08)	0.34 (0.04)	0.99(0.08)	1.59(0.10)
		WGR	0.64 (0.13)	0.64 (0.13)	0.56(0.10)	0.66 (0.11)	0.62 (0.10)

NOTE: The corresponding simulation standard errors are given in parentheses. WGR is the proposed method.

Table A.3: The L_1 and L_2 error, MSE of the estimated conditional mean and the estimated standard deviation for different m .

X	Model	m	L_1	L_2	Mean	SD	
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	3	0.83(0.02)	1.07(0.05)	0.06(0.01)	0.04(0.01)	
		10	0.83(0.02)	1.08(0.05)	0.06(0.01)	0.04(0.2)	
		25	0.83(0.03)	1.08(0.08)	0.06(0.01)	0.07(0.02)	
	M2	3	1.24(0.04)	3.42(0.38)	0.18(0.13)	0.25(0.08)	
		10	1.23(0.05)	3.38(0.39)	0.14(0.03)	0.14(0.03)	
		25	1.21(0.04)	3.21(0.28)	0.16(0.04)	0.20(0.05)	
	M6	3	1.16(0.05)	3.00(0.72)	2.49(0.14)	0.28(0.14)	
		10	1.16(0.05)	3.02(0.72)	2.36(0.16)	0.20(0.06)	
		25	1.18(0.07)	3.10(0.72)	2.37(0.17)	0.18(0.06)	
	M7	3	2.24(0.09)	9.47(1.08)	0.20(0.03)	0.85(0.09)	
		10	2.24(0.09)	9.43(1.09)	0.20(0.02)	0.80(0.15)	
		25	2.21(0.10)	9.21(1.22)	0.22(0.04)	0.77(0.07)	
	M8	3	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.01(0.01)	0.62(0.09)	
		10	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.63(0.10)	
		25	0.83(0.02)	1.08(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.56(0.13)	
	$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	3	1.15(0.04)	2.40(0.24)	1.64(0.25)	0.16(0.04)
			10	1.25(0.03)	2.83(0.21)	1.86(0.22)	0.17(0.05)
			25	1.18(0.04)	2.47(0.17)	1.44(0.13)	0.16(0.05)
		M2	3	1.62(0.05)	5.36(0.46)	2.11(0.22)	0.36(0.12)
			10	1.63(0.08)	5.40(0.57)	2.20(0.23)	0.38(0.12)
			25	1.62(0.06)	5.31(0.43)	2.17(0.19)	0.45(0.19)
		M6	3	1.62(0.06)	5.39(0.66)	4.20(0.53)	0.47(0.19)
			10	1.63(0.05)	5.34(0.56)	4.47(0.62)	0.65(0.18)
			25	1.58(0.03)	4.92(0.33)	4.20(0.39)	0.50(0.13)
M7		3	2.45(0.11)	11.37(1.30)	2.22(0.17)	0.73(0.06)	
		10	2.44(0.10)	11.14(1.08)	2.15(0.24)	0.80(0.15)	
		25	2.46(0.09)	11.26(1.20)	2.10(0.25)	0.73(0.06)	
M8		3	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.19(0.05)	0.30(0.16)	
		10	0.90(0.02)	1.34(0.06)	0.24(0.08)	0.34(0.12)	
		25	0.89(0.04)	1.27(0.11)	0.15(0.08)	0.40(0.13)	

NOTE: The corresponding standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table A.4: Mean squared prediction error (MSE) of the estimated conditional quantile for different values of m .

X	Model	m	$\tau = 0.05$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.95$	
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	3	0.29(0.07)	0.10(0.01)	0.09(0.02)	0.10(0.03)	0.23(0.06)	
		10	0.18(0.04)	0.09(0.02)	0.08(0.01)	0.09(0.01)	0.16(0.05)	
		25	0.26(0.05)	0.10(0.02)	0.07(0.02)	0.11(0.10)	0.29(0.10)	
	M2	3	0.77(0.09)	0.31(0.06)	0.19(0.04)	0.27(0.05)	0.81(0.15)	
		10	0.49(0.11)	0.21(0.05)	0.15(0.03)	0.20(0.04)	0.54(0.12)	
		25	0.62(0.18)	0.24(0.07)	0.16(0.04)	0.23(0.04)	0.76(0.16)	
	M6	3	3.39(0.48)	2.70(0.24)	2.47(0.12)	2.50(0.21)	2.76(0.50)	
		10	2.74(0.26)	2.39(0.19)	2.39(0.20)	2.59(0.21)	3.07(0.45)	
		25	2.97(0.30)	2.46(0.20)	2.37(0.20)	2.55(0.21)	3.02(0.35)	
	M7	3	2.01(0.47)	0.40(0.10)	0.39(0.06)	0.74(0.11)	4.04(0.40)	
		10	1.51(0.66)	0.56(0.05)	0.31(0.05)	0.63(0.19)	4.73(0.68)	
		25	1.07(0.14)	0.50(0.11)	0.32(0.09)	0.57(0.10)	3.88(0.51)	
	M8	3	0.03(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	0.40(0.04)	0.02(0.01)	0.03(0.02)	
		10	0.02(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	0.41(0.05)	0.02(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	
		25	0.03(0.02)	0.02(0.02)	0.41(0.04)	0.02(0.02)	0.03(0.01)	
	$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	3	1.84(0.23)	1.69(0.20)	1.75(0.16)	1.88(0.13)	2.41(0.14)
			10	2.05(0.30)	1.91(0.25)	1.92(0.22)	2.02(0.23)	2.52(0.36)
			25	1.69(0.17)	1.42(0.15)	1.47(0.13)	1.65(0.12)	2.02(0.22)
		M2	3	3.42(1.07)	2.26(0.28)	2.19(0.22)	2.57(0.27)	3.49(0.47)
			10	3.07(0.67)	2.29(0.21)	2.33(0.26)	2.64(0.37)	3.55(0.44)
			25	3.58(1.15)	2.25(0.17)	2.34(0.17)	2.79(0.12)	3.54(0.26)
		M6	3	4.47(0.76)	4.89(0.67)	4.72(0.79)	4.91(0.78)	5.65(0.71)
			10	5.91(0.55)	4.68(0.55)	4.55(0.61)	4.94(0.68)	6.17(0.74)
			25	4.28(0.49)	4.08(0.36)	4.36(0.38)	4.71(0.57)	5.35(0.76)
M7		3	1.88(0.19)	1.82(0.13)	2.17(0.17)	3.11(0.23)	7.15(0.59)	
		10	1.91(0.29)	1.87(0.17)	2.16(0.21)	3.06(0.30)	7.22(0.91)	
		25	1.89(0.23)	1.79(0.18)	2.10(0.25)	3.00(0.37)	6.77(0.69)	
M8		3	0.64(0.13)	0.64(0.13)	0.56(0.10)	0.66(0.11)	0.62(0.10)	
		10	0.67(0.12)	0.62(0.10)	0.63(0.08)	0.64(0.12)	0.59(0.08)	
		25	0.69(0.17)	0.60(0.09)	0.52(0.10)	0.65(0.06)	0.67(0.09)	

NOTE: The corresponding simulation standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table A.5: The L_1 and L_2 error, MSE of the estimated conditional mean and the estimated standard deviation for different J .

X	Model	J	L_1	L_2	Mean	SD
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	10	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.04)	0.07(0.01)	0.10(0.03)
		50	0.82(0.02)	1.07(0.04)	0.06(0.02)	0.05(0.02)
		200	0.83(0.02)	1.07(0.05)	0.06(0.01)	0.04(0.01)
		500	0.82(0.02)	1.06(0.06)	0.05(0.01)	0.05(0.02)
	M2	10	1.24(0.04)	3.42(0.38)	0.18(0.13)	0.25(0.08)
		50	1.23(0.05)	3.42(0.40)	0.19(0.14)	0.26(0.09)
		200	1.23(0.04)	3.41(0.38)	0.19(0.10)	0.22(0.04)
		500	1.22(0.04)	3.40(0.38)	0.16(0.13)	0.22(0.03)
	M6	10	1.16(0.03)	2.86(0.30)	2.60(0.22)	0.35(0.13)
		50	1.16(0.04)	3.02(0.66)	2.51(0.15)	0.24(0.14)
		200	1.16(0.05)	3.00(0.72)	2.49(0.14)	0.28(0.14)
		500	1.16(0.05)	3.00(0.71)	2.49(0.14)	0.28(0.14)
	M7	10	2.23(0.09)	9.44(1.08)	0.21(0.03)	0.95(0.12)
		50	2.24(0.09)	9.42(1.10)	0.21(0.04)	0.77(0.15)
		200	2.24(0.09)	9.47(1.08)	0.20(0.03)	0.85(0.09)
		500	2.23(0.09)	9.40(1.07)	0.18(0.02)	0.86(0.09)
	M8	10	0.83(0.03)	1.09(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.59(0.15)
		50	0.83(0.02)	1.08(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.62(0.14)
		200	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.01(0.01)	0.62(0.09)
		500	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.00(0.00)	0.60(0.11)
$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	10	1.17(0.05)	2.40(0.21)	1.71(0.20)	0.20(0.13)
		50	1.15(0.03)	2.50(0.22)	1.65(0.22)	0.14(0.04)
		200	1.15(0.04)	2.40(0.24)	1.64(0.25)	0.16(0.04)
		500	1.20(0.03)	2.45(0.20)	1.74(0.18)	0.13(0.03)
	M2	10	1.62(0.05)	5.36(0.46)	2.11(0.22)	0.36(0.12)
		50	1.59(0.04)	5.23(0.54)	1.98(0.27)	0.37(0.10)
		200	1.61(0.06)	5.27(0.45)	2.06(0.24)	0.30(0.03)
		500	1.62(0.05)	5.39(0.48)	2.08(0.24)	0.30(0.05)
	M6	10	1.58(0.05)	5.14(0.54)	4.32(0.51)	0.43(0.17)
		50	1.57(0.05)	5.06(0.52)	4.18(0.59)	0.53(0.17)
		200	1.62(0.06)	5.39(0.66)	4.20(0.53)	0.47(0.19)
		500	1.57(0.05)	5.05(0.56)	4.14(0.50)	0.44(0.13)
	M7	10	2.44(0.11)	11.13(1.23)	2.03(0.15)	0.73(0.09)
		50	2.45(0.10)	11.23(1.28)	2.12(0.16)	0.68(0.05)
		200	2.45(0.11)	11.37(1.30)	2.22(0.17)	0.73(0.06)
		500	2.46(0.12)	11.75(1.61)	2.24(0.21)	0.78(0.10)
	M8	10	0.83(0.02)	1.15(0.06)	0.15(0.08)	0.25(0.15)
		50	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.06)	0.19(0.07)	0.28(0.12)
		200	0.83(0.02)	1.09(0.07)	0.19(0.05)	0.30(0.16)
		500	0.83(0.02)	1.10(0.07)	0.16(0.06)	0.32(0.16)

NOTE: The corresponding simulation standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table A.6: Mean squared prediction error (MSE) of the estimated conditional quantile for different J .

X	Model	J	$\tau = 0.05$	$\tau = 0.25$	$\tau = 0.50$	$\tau = 0.75$	$\tau = 0.95$
$N(0, I_d)$	M1	10	0.44(0.12)	0.12(0.03)	0.09(0.02)	0.15(0.05)	0.30(0.09)
		50	0.33(0.11)	0.09(0.02)	0.07(0.02)	0.11(0.03)	0.19(0.05)
		200	0.29(0.07)	0.10(0.01)	0.09(0.02)	0.10(0.03)	0.23(0.06)
		500	0.25(0.07)	0.09(0.02)	0.06(0.01)	0.09(0.02)	0.20(0.05)
	M2	10	1.19(0.36)	0.30(0.08)	0.25(0.03)	0.33(0.06)	0.72(0.19)
		50	1.01(0.29)	0.31(0.09)	0.24(0.04)	0.39(0.09)	0.87(0.29)
		200	0.77(0.09)	0.31(0.06)	0.19(0.04)	0.27(0.05)	0.81(0.15)
		500	0.73(0.14)	0.30(0.05)	0.20(0.04)	0.29(0.05)	0.78(0.14)
	M6	10	3.30(0.64)	2.75(0.39)	2.61(0.25)	2.61(0.22)	2.86(0.26)
		50	3.26(0.38)	2.70(0.29)	2.51(0.19)	2.51(0.19)	2.75(0.44)
		200	3.39(0.48)	2.70(0.24)	2.47(0.12)	2.50(0.21)	2.76(0.50)
		500	3.77(0.67)	2.89(0.36)	2.51(0.15)	2.54(0.20)	3.16(0.79)
	M7	10	3.10(0.56)	0.63(0.12)	0.42(0.08)	0.97(0.11)	3.83(0.44)
		50	1.77(0.49)	0.30(0.06)	0.37(0.06)	0.80(0.16)	4.34(0.96)
		200	2.01(0.47)	0.40(0.10)	0.39(0.06)	0.74(0.11)	4.04(0.40)
		500	2.80(0.63)	0.42(0.14)	0.42(0.06)	0.96(0.13)	3.99(0.68)
	M8	10	0.04(0.01)	0.03(0.01)	0.56(0.09)	0.05(0.01)	0.01(0.01)
		50	0.02(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	0.39(0.05)	0.02(0.01)	0.03(0.02)
		200	0.03(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	0.40(0.04)	0.02(0.01)	0.03(0.02)
		500	0.02(0.01)	0.02(0.01)	0.42(0.05)	0.04(0.01)	0.02(0.02)
$N(0, I_{100})$	M1	10	2.29(0.46)	1.81(0.25)	1.74(0.20)	1.91(0.21)	2.62(0.50)
		50	1.77(0.29)	1.74(0.46)	1.72(0.20)	1.86(0.17)	2.25(0.24)
		200	1.84(0.23)	1.69(0.20)	1.75(0.16)	1.88(0.13)	2.41(0.14)
		500	1.81(0.25)	1.73(0.21)	1.81(0.19)	1.95(0.15)	2.35(0.22)
	M2	10	2.80(0.40)	2.22(0.25)	2.20(0.22)	2.45(0.29)	3.24(0.48)
		50	2.55(0.33)	2.17(0.23)	2.11(0.22)	2.36(0.31)	3.12(0.43)
		200	3.42(1.07)	2.26(0.28)	2.19(0.22)	2.57(0.27)	3.49(0.47)
		500	2.52(0.45)	2.14(0.23)	2.18(0.23)	2.46(0.32)	3.40(0.49)
	M6	10	4.61(0.57)	4.42(0.57)	4.49(0.53)	4.72(0.56)	5.18(0.62)
		50	4.52(0.81)	4.27(0.64)	4.41(0.61)	4.80(0.63)	5.66(0.97)
		200	4.47(0.76)	4.89(0.67)	4.72(0.79)	4.91(0.78)	5.65(0.71)
		500	4.44(0.55)	4.24(0.51)	4.36(0.51)	4.65(0.59)	5.14(0.63)
	M7	10	1.78(0.16)	1.77(0.16)	2.01(0.15)	2.79(0.19)	6.74(0.77)
		50	1.72(0.19)	1.75(0.19)	2.09(0.21)	3.00(0.25)	6.77(0.52)
		200	1.88(0.19)	1.82(0.13)	2.17(0.17)	3.11(0.23)	7.15(0.59)
		500	2.07(0.18)	1.86(0.16)	2.16(0.17)	3.16(0.24)	7.23(0.70)
	M8	10	1.60(0.13)	1.04(0.10)	0.36(0.12)	1.07(0.11)	1.63(0.14)
		50	0.56(0.05)	0.66(0.10)	0.42(0.04)	0.64(0.09)	0.60(0.09)
		200	0.64(0.13)	0.64(0.13)	0.56(0.10)	0.66(0.11)	0.62(0.10)
		500	0.60(0.08)	0.72(0.09)	0.40(0.04)	0.65(0.08)	0.61(0.08)

NOTE: The corresponding standard errors are given in parentheses.

Table A.7: FID score of the three methods on the test dataset of color images.

Method	(S1)	(S2)	(S3)	(S4)
NLS	66.093	116.875	113.659	110.068
cWGAN	32.669	75.211	72.731	66.669
WGR	29.513	69.653	67.565	67.110

Appendix E Additional real data examples

E.1 Color image dataset: Cifar10 and STL10 dataset.

In this part, we apply the proposed method to two color image datasets: Cifar10 and STL10 dataset available at <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html> and <https://cs.stanford.edu/~acoates/stl10/>. The images in Cifar-10 dataset and STL10 dataset are stored in $32 \times 32 \times 3$ matrices and $96 \times 96 \times 3$ matrices, respectively, indicating that the information contained in images from Cifar-10 dataset is less and easier to reconstruct than those in STL10 dataset. Since the images are of different sizes, we resize all images into the size $128 \times 128 \times 3$, a commonly-used size for color image generation.

The Cifar-10 dataset contains 60000 colored images in 10 classes, with 6000 images per class. STL10 dataset contains 13000 labelled images belonging to 10 classes on average, and 100000 unlabelled images, which may be images of other types of animals or vehicles. For comparison, we consider several settings for training.

(S1): For Cifar-10 dataset, we randomly select 10000 images for training, 1000 images for validation, and 10000 images for testing.

(S2): For STL10 dataset, we only pick the unlabelled images from the dataset, and randomly select 80000 images for training, 1000 images for validation, and 2000 images for testing.

(S3): For STL10 dataset, we only pick the labelled images from the dataset, and randomly partition them into three parts: 10000 training images, 1000 validation images, and 2000 test images.

(S4): We use the same images as in setting (S3), but use the training images in each class to obtain different generators for different classes. In other words, 10 generators are obtained as there are 10 classes of labelled images in STL10 dataset.

We use the Fréchet inception distance (FID) score (Heusel et al., 2017) to measure the performance of our method and compare it with other methods. Table A.7 shows the FID scores for different settings. NLS has the highest FID scores in all settings, which means it has the worst image reconstruction quality. WGR has lower FID scores than cWGAN in setting (S1), (S2), and (S3), but similar FID scores in setting (S4). Setting (S4) is the easiest one, because it only requires learning the conditional distribution of one class, while other settings require learning a mixture conditional distribution of all classes. Our method achieves the lowest FID scores in all settings.

E.1.1 Image reconstruction: STL10 dataset

In this part, we apply WGR to the reconstruction task for color images. We use the STL10 dataset, which is available at <https://cs.stanford.edu/~acoates/stl10/>.




Figure A.1: Reconstructed images in STL10 test dataset.

We preprocess the STL10 dataset by resizing all the images to $128 \times 128 \times 3$, which is a standard size for color image generation tasks. We then simulate a missing data scenario by masking the central quarter part of each image. Our goal is to reconstruct the masked part of the image. Therefore, the covariates X have a dimension of $128 \times 128 \times 3 - 65 \times 65 \times 3 = 36477$ and the response Y has a dimension of $65 \times 65 \times 3 = 12675$.

Figure A.1 displays the reconstructed images from three different methods. The images produced by WGR are more faithful to the original, as they have higher clarity than NLS and higher accuracy than cWGAN. We use the FID score to measure the quality of reconstructed images numerically. The FID scores of NLS, cWGAN, and WGR are 113.66, 72.73, and 67.56 respectively. In this case, our method achieves the lowest FID score, which implies that it reconstructs images with better quality to a certain degree.