

Quantifying Distributional Model Risk in Marginal Problems via Optimal Transport*

Yanqin Fan,[†] Hyeonseok Park,[‡] and Gaoqian Xu[§]

July 4, 2023

Abstract

This paper studies distributional model risk in marginal problems, where each marginal measure is assumed to lie in a Wasserstein ball centered at a fixed reference measure with a given radius. Theoretically, we establish several fundamental results including strong duality, finiteness of the proposed Wasserstein distributional model risk, and the existence of an optimizer at each radius. In addition, we show continuity of the Wasserstein distributional model risk as a function of the radius. Using strong duality, we extend the well-known Makarov bounds for the distribution function of the sum of two random variables with given marginals to Wasserstein distributionally robust Markarov bounds. Practically, we illustrate our results on four distinct applications when the sample information comes from multiple data sources and only some marginal reference measures are identified. They are: partial identification of treatment effects; externally valid treatment choice via robust welfare functions; Wasserstein distributionally robust estimation under data combination; and evaluation of the worst aggregate risk measures.

*We acknowledge valuable feedback from participants of Optimization-Conscious Econometrics Conference II at the University of Chicago, KI+Scale MoDL Retreat at the University of Washington, and Econometrics and Optimal Transport Workshop at the University of Washington. Fan acknowledges support from NSF Infrastructure grant (PIHOT) DMS-2133244.

[†]Department of Economics, University of Washington. Email: fany88@uw.edu

[‡]Institute for Advanced Economic Research, Dongbei University of Finance and Economics. Email: hynskpark21@dufe.edu.cn

[§]Department of Economics, University of Washington. Email: gx8@uw.edu

1 Introduction

Distributionally robust optimization (DRO) has emerged as a powerful tool for hedging against model misspecification and distributional shifts. It minimizes *distributional model risk* (DMR) defined as the worst risk over a class of distributions lying in a *distributional uncertainty set*, see Blanchet and Murthy (2019). Among many different choices of uncertainty sets, Wasserstein DRO (W-DRO) with distributional uncertainty sets based on optimal transport costs has gained much popularity, see Kuhn et al. (2019) and Blanchet et al. (2021) for recent reviews. W-DRO has found successful applications in robust decision making in all disciplines including economics, finance, machine learning, and operations research. Its success is largely credited to the strong duality and other nice properties of the Wasserstein DMR (W-DMR). The objective of this paper is to propose and study W-DMR in *marginal problems where only some marginal measures of a reference measure are given*, see e.g., Kelllerer (1984), Rachev and Rüschendorf (1998), Villani (2009), and Villani (2021), and Rüschendorf (1991).

In practice, *marginal problems* arise from either the lack of complete data or an incomplete model. In insurance and risk management, computing model-free measures of aggregate risks such as Value-at-Risk and Expected Short-Fall is of utmost importance and routinely done. When the exact dependence structure between individual risks is lacking, researchers and policy makers rely on the worst risk measures defined as the maximum value of aggregate risk measures over all joint measures of the individual risks with some fixed marginal measures, see Embrechts and Puccetti (2010) and Embrechts et al. (2013); In causal inference, distributional treatment effects such as the variance and the proportion of participants who benefit from the treatment depend on the joint distribution of the potential outcomes. Even with ideal randomized experiments such as double-blind clinical trials, the joint distribution of potential outcomes is not identified and as a result, only the lower and upper bounds on distributional treatment effects are identified from the sample information, see Fan and Wu (2009), Fan and Park (2010) and Fan and Park (2012), Fan et al. (2017), Ridder and Moffitt (2007), Firpo and Ridder (2019); In algorithmic fairness when the sensitive group variable is not observed in the main data set, assessment of unfairness measures must be done using multiple data sets, see Kallus et al. (2022). Abstracting away from estimation, all these problems involve optimizing the expected value of a functional of multiple random variables with fixed marginals and thus belong to the class of marginal problems for which optimal transport related tools are important.¹

¹When the marginals are univariate, optimal transport problem can be conveniently expressed in terms of copulas. Fan and Park (2010), Fan and Park (2012), Fan and Wu (2009), Fan et al. (2017), Ridder and Moffitt (2007), and Firpo and Ridder (2019) explicitly use copula tools.

The marginal measures in the afore-mentioned applications and general marginal problems are typically empirical measures computed from multiple data sets such as in the evaluation of worst aggregate risk measures or identified under specific assumptions such as randomization or strong ignorability in causal inference. Developing a unified framework for hedging against model misspecification and/or distributional shifts in marginal measures motivates the current paper.

Theoretically, this paper makes several contributions to the literature on distributional robustness and the literature on marginal problems. First, it introduces *Wasserstein distributional model risk in marginal problems* (W-DMR-MP), where each marginal measure is assumed to lie in a Wasserstein ball centered at a fixed reference measure with a given radius. We focus on the important case with two marginals and consider both non-overlapping and overlapping marginals. For *non-overlapping marginal measures*, when the radius is zero, the W-DMR-MP reduces to the marginal problems or optimal transport problems studied in Kellerer (1984), Rachev and Rüschendorf (1998), Villani (2009), and Villani (2021). For *overlapping marginals*, when the radius is zero, the W-DMR-MP reduces to the overlapping marginals problem studied in Rüschendorf (1991); Second, we establish strong duality for our W-DMR with both non-overlapping and overlapping marginals under similar conditions to those for W-DMR, see Zhang et al. (2022), Blanchet and Murthy (2019), and Gao and Kleywegt (2022). As a first application of our strong duality result for non-overlapping marginals, we extend the well-known Markov bounds for the distribution function of the sum of two random variables to Wasserstein distributionally robust Markov bounds; Third, we prove finiteness of the W-DMR-MP and existence of an optimizer at each radius. Based on both results, we show that the identified set of the expected value of a smooth functional of random variables with fixed marginals is a closed interval; Fourth, we show continuity of the W-DMR in marginal problems as a function of the radius. Together these results extend those for W-DMR in Blanchet and Murthy (2019), Zhang et al. (2022), and Yue et al. (2022); Lastly, we extend our formulations and theory to W-DMR with multi-marginals. On a technical note, our proofs build on existing work on W-DMR such as Blanchet and Murthy (2019), Zhang et al. (2022), and Yue et al. (2022). However, an additional challenge due to the presence of multiple marginal measures in our Wasserstein uncertain sets is the verification of the existence of a joint measure with overlapping marginals. We make use of existing results for a given consistent product marginal system in Vorob'ev (1962), Kellerer (1964), and Shortt (1983) to address this issue.

Practically, we demonstrate the flexibility and broad applicability of our W-DMR-MP via four distinct applications when the sample information comes from multiple data sources. First, we consider partial identification of treatment effects when the marginal measures of the potential outcomes lie in their respective

Wasserstein balls centered at the measures identified under strong ignorability. The validity of strong ignorability is often questionable when unobservable confounders may be present. We apply our W-DMR-MP to establishing the identified sets of treatment effects which can be used to conducting sensitivity analysis to the selection-on-observables assumption. For average treatment effects, we show that when the cost functions are separable, incorporating covariate information does not help shrink the identified set; on the other hand, for non-separable cost functions such as the Mahalanobis distance, incorporating covariate information may help shrink the identified set; Second, in causal inference when the optimal treatment choice is to be applied to a target population different from the training population, Adjaho and Christensen (2023) introduces robust welfare functions defined by W-DMR to study externally valid treatment choice. The W-DMR-MP we propose allows us to dispense with the assumption of a *known dependence structure* for the reference measure in Adjaho and Christensen (2023). When shifts in the covariate distribution are allowed, we show that our robust welfare function is upper bounded by the worst robust welfare function of Adjaho and Christensen (2023); Third, one important application of W-DMR is in distributionally robust estimation and classification. However as Awasthi et al. (2022) points out,² some sensitive variables may not be observed in the same data set as the response variable rendering W-DRO inapplicable. We apply W-DMR-MP to distributionally robust estimation under data combination;³ Fourth, applying our W-DMR-MP to the evaluation of the worst aggregate risk measures allows us to dispense with the known marginals assumption in Embrechts and Puccetti (2010) and Embrechts et al. (2013).

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 reviews the W-DMR and strong duality, introduces our W-DMR-MP, and then presents four motivating examples. Section 3 establishes strong duality and Wasserstein distributionally robust Markov bounds. Section 4 studies finiteness of W-DMR-MP and existence of optimal solutions. Moreover, we show that the identified set of the expected value of a smooth functional of random variables with fixed marginals is a closed interval. Section 5 establishes continuity of W-DMR-MP as a function of the radius. Section 6 revisits the motivating examples in Section 2. Section 7 extends our W-DMR-MP to more than two marginals. The last section offers some concluding remarks. Technical proofs are relegated to a series of appendices.

We close this section by introducing the notation used in the rest of this paper. For two sets A and B , the relative complement is denoted by $A \setminus B$. Let $\overline{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty, \infty\}$, $[d] = \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$, $\mathbb{R}_+^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i \geq 0, \forall i \in [d]\}$, and $\mathbb{R}_{++}^d = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : x_i > 0, \forall i \in [d]\}$. For any real numbers $x, y \in \mathbb{R}$, we define $x \wedge y :=$

²See Graham et al. (2016) and Chen et al. (2008) for general data combination problems.

³Section 2.3.3 provides a detailed comparison of our set up and Awasthi et al. (2022).

$\min\{x, y\}$ and $x \vee y := \max\{x, y\}$. The Euclidean inner product of x and y in \mathbb{R}^d is denoted by $\langle x, y \rangle$. For any real matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, let A^\top denote the transpose of W . For an extended real function f on \mathcal{X} , the positive part f^+ and the negative part f^- are defined as $f^+(x) = \max\{f(x), 0\}$ and $f^-(x) = \max\{-f(x), 0\}$, respectively.

For any Polish space \mathcal{S} , let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$ be the associated Borel σ -algebra and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ be the collection of probability measures on \mathcal{S} . Given a Polish probability space $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}, \nu)$, let $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}^\nu$ denote the ν -completion of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$. Given a probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ and a map $T : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$, let $T\#\mu$ denote the push forward of \mathbb{P} by T , i.e., $(T\#\mathbb{P})(A) = \mathbb{P}(T^{-1}(A))$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, where $T^{-1}(A) = \{\omega \in \Omega : T(\omega) \in A\}$. The law of a random variable $S : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is denoted by $\text{Law}(S)$ which is the same as $S\#\mathbb{P}$. For any $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$, let $\Pi(\mu, \nu)$ denote the set of all couplings (or joint measures) with marginals μ and ν .

For any $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}^\nu$ -measurable function f , let $\int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\nu$ denote the integral of f in the completion of $(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}, \nu)$. For a random element $S : \Omega \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ with $\text{Law}(S) = \nu$, we write $\mathbb{E}_\nu[f(S)] = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\nu$. Given $p \in (0, \infty)$ and a Borel measure ν on \mathcal{S} , let $L^p(\nu) := L^p(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}, \nu)$ denote the set of all the $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}^\nu$ -measurable functions $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $\|f\|_{L^p(\nu)} := (\int_{\mathcal{S}} |f|^p d\nu)^{1/p} < \infty$.

2 W-DMR and Motivating Examples

In this section, we first review W-DMR and then introduce W-DMR in marginal problems. Lastly, we present four motivating examples of marginal problems which will be used to illustrate our results in the rest of this paper.

2.1 A Review of W-DMR and Strong Duality

W-DMR is defined as the worst model risk over a class of distributions lying in a Wasserstein uncertainty set composed of all probability measures that are a fixed Wasserstein distance away from a given reference measure, see Blanchet and Murthy (2019).

Before presenting W-DMR, we review some basic definitions. Let \mathcal{X} be a Polish (metric) space with a metric \mathbf{d} .

Definition 2.1 (Optimal transport cost). *Let $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be given probability measures. The optimal transport cost between μ and ν associated with a cost function $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is defined as*

$$\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \nu) = \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} c d\pi.$$

When the cost function c is lower-semicontinuous, there exists an optimal coupling corresponding to $\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \nu)$. In other words, there exists $\pi^* \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)$ such that $\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \nu) = \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} c d\pi^*$ (Ref. Villani, 2009, Theorem 4.1).

Definition 2.2 (Wasserstein distance). *Let $p \in [1, \infty)$. The Wasserstein distance of order p between any two measures μ and ν on Polish metric space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ is defined by*

$$\mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \nu) = \left[\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu, \nu)} \int_{\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}^p d\pi \right]^{1/p}.$$

Throughout this paper, we make the following assumption on the cost function c .

Assumption 2.1. *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be a Borel space associated to \mathcal{X} . The cost function $c : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ is measurable and satisfies $c(x, y) = 0$ if and only if $x = y$.*

Assumption 2.1 implies that for $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$, $\mu = \nu$ if and only if $\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \nu) = 0$. When c is the metric \mathbf{d} on \mathcal{X} , $\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \nu)$ coincides with the Wasserstein distance of order 1 (Kantorovich-Rubinstein distance) between μ and ν defined in Definition 2.2.

For a given function $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, Blanchet and Murthy (2019) define W-DMR as

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{DMR}}(\delta) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_{\text{DMR}}(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\gamma, \quad \delta \geq 0,$$

where $\Sigma_{\text{DMR}}(\delta)$ is the Wasserstein uncertainty set⁴ centered at a reference measure $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ with radius $\delta \geq 0$, i.e.,

$$\Sigma_{\text{DMR}}(\delta) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \gamma) \leq \delta\}.$$

Assumption 2.1 allows the cost function c to be asymmetric and take value ∞ , where the latter corresponds to the case that there is no distributional shift in some marginal measure of μ .

Remark 2.1. *Under Assumption 2.1, $\Sigma_{\text{DMR}}(0) = \{\mu\}$ and*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{DMR}}(0) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu.$$

⁴By convention, we call all uncertainty sets based on optimal transport costs as Wasserstein uncertainty sets.

It is well-known that under mild conditions, strong duality holds for $\mathcal{I}_{\text{DMR}}(\delta)$ when $\delta > 0$ (c.f., Blanchet and Murthy (2019), Gao and Kleywegt (2022), and Zhang et al. (2022)). To be self-contained, we restate the strong duality result in Zhang et al. (2022) for Polish space below.⁵

Theorem 2.1 (Zhang et al. (2022, Theorem 1)). *Let $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}}, \mu)$ be a probability space. Let $\delta \in (0, \infty)$ and $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function such that $\int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\mu > -\infty$. Suppose the cost function satisfies Assumption 2.1. Then, for any $\delta > 0$,*

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{DMR}}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left\{ \lambda \delta + \int_{\mathcal{X}} \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} [f(x') - \lambda c(x, x')] d\mu(x) \right\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\lambda c(x, x')$ is defined to be ∞ when $\lambda = 0$ and $c(x, x') = \infty$.

In the rest of this paper, we keep the convention that for any cost function c , $\lambda c(x, y) = \infty$ when $\lambda = 0$ and $c(x, y) = \infty$.

2.2 W-DMR in Marginal Problems

2.2.1 Non-overlapping Marginals

Let $\mathcal{V} := \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ be the product space of two Polish spaces \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 . Let μ_1 and μ_2 be Borel probability measures on \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 respectively. Following Rüschendorf (1991) (see also Embrechts and Puccetti (2010)), we call the Fréchet class of all probability measures on \mathcal{V} having marginals μ_1 and μ_2 the Fréchet class with non-overlapping marginals denoted as $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{V}; \mu_1, \mu_2) := \mathcal{F}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. Note that $\mathcal{F}(\mu_1, \mu_2) = \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$.

Let $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption 2.2. *The function $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable such that $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma_0 > -\infty$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$.*

The marginal problem associated with μ_1 and μ_2 is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_{\text{M}}(\mu_1, \mu_2) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma.$$

It is essentially an optimal transport problem, where the sup operation is replaced with the inf operation, see Kellerer (1984), Rachev and Rüschendorf (1998), Villani (2009), and Villani (2021) or Appendix A.2 for a review of strong duality for $\mathcal{I}_{\text{M}}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$.

⁵The strong duality result in Zhang et al. (2022) allows for general space \mathcal{X} .

The W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals we propose extends the marginal problem by allowing each marginal measure of γ to lie in a fixed Wasserstein distance away from a reference measure. Specifically, for any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$, let γ_1 and γ_2 denote the projection of γ on \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 , respectively. The W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad (2.2)$$

where $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is the uncertainty set given by

$$\Sigma_D(\delta) := \Sigma_D(\mu_1, \mu_2, \delta) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}) : \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) \leq \delta_1, \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) \leq \delta_2\},$$

in which \mathbf{K}_1 and \mathbf{K}_2 are optimal transport costs associated with cost functions c_1 and c_2 , respectively, and $\delta := (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is the radius of the uncertainty set. Obviously $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is non-empty for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Remark 2.2. (i) Under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2, it holds that $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) > -\infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, see Lemma B.1 (i); (ii) Under Assumption 2.1, the uncertainty set $\Sigma_D(0) = \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and thus $\mathcal{I}_D(0) = \mathcal{I}_M(\mu_1, \mu_2)$.

2.2.2 Overlapping Marginals

Let $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$ be the product space of three Polish spaces \mathcal{Y}_1 , \mathcal{Y}_2 , and \mathcal{X} . Let $\mathcal{S}_1 := \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 := \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$. Let $\mu_{13} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1)$ and $\mu_{23} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_2)$ be such that the projection of μ_{13} and the projection of μ_{23} on \mathcal{X} are the same. Following Rüschendorf (1991) (see also Embrechts and Puccetti (2010)), we call the Fréchet class of all probability measures on \mathcal{S} having marginals μ_{13} and μ_{23} the Fréchet class with overlapping marginals and denote it as $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_{13}, \mu_{23}) := \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$. Unlike the non-overlapping case, $\mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$ is different from the class of couplings $\Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$.

Let $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption 2.3. The function $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is measurable such that $\int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\nu_0 > -\infty$ for some $\nu_0 \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$.

Rüschendorf (1991) studies the following marginal problem with overlapping marginals:

$$\mathcal{I}_M(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}) := \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma.$$

As shown in Rüschendorf (1991), the marginal problem with overlapping marginals can be computed via the marginal problem with non-overlapping marginals through the following relation:

$$\mathcal{I}(0) = \int_{\mathcal{X}} \left[\sup_{\gamma(\cdot|x) \in \Pi(\mu_{1|3}, \mu_{2|3})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2} f(y_1, y_2, x) d\gamma(y_1, y_2|x) \right] d\gamma_X(x),$$

where for each fixed $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $\mu_{\ell|3}(\cdot|x)$ denote the conditional measure of Y_ℓ given $X = x$, and the inner optimization problem is a marginal problem with non-overlapping marginals.

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$, let γ_{13} and γ_{23} denote the projections of γ on $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$, respectively. The W-DMR with overlapping marginals is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma, \quad \delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\Sigma(\delta)$ is the uncertainty set given by

$$\Sigma(\delta) := \Sigma(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}, \delta) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_{13}, \gamma_{13}) \leq \delta_1, \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_{23}, \gamma_{23}) \leq \delta_2\}$$

in which $\delta := (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ is the radius of the uncertainty set, and \mathbf{K}_1 and \mathbf{K}_2 are optimal transport costs associated with c_1 and c_2 . We note that $\Sigma(\delta)$ is non-empty for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Remark 2.3. (i) Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 imply that $\mathcal{I}(\delta) > -\infty$ for all $\delta \geq 0$, see Lemma B.1 (ii); (ii) When $\delta = 0$, the uncertainty set $\Sigma(0) = \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$ and $\mathcal{I}(0) = \mathcal{I}_M(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$.

2.3 Motivating Examples

In this section, we present four distinct examples to demonstrate the wide applicability of the W-DMR in marginal problems. The first example is concerned with partial identification of treatment effect parameters when commonly used assumptions in the literature for point identification fail; the second example is concerned with distributionally robust optimal treatment choice; the third one is an application of W-DMR-MP in distributionally robust estimation under data combination; and the last one concerns measures of aggregate risk.

For the first two examples, we adopt the potential outcomes framework for a binary treatment. Let $D \in \{0, 1\}$ represent an individual's treatment status, and $Y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \subset \mathbb{R}$ and $Y_2 \in \mathcal{Y}_2 \subset \mathbb{R}$ denote the potential outcomes under treatments $D = 0$ and $D = 1$, respectively. Let the observed outcome be

$$Y = DY_2 + (1 - D)Y_1.$$

To focus on introducing the main ideas, we adopt the selection-on-observables framework stated in Assumption 2.4 below.

Assumption 2.4.

(i) **Conditional Independence:** *The potential outcomes are independent of treatment assignment conditional on covariate $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^q$ for $q \geq 1$, i.e.,*

$$(Y_1, Y_2) \perp\!\!\!\perp D \mid X;$$

(ii) **Common Support:** *For all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, $0 < p(x) < 1$, where $p(x) := \mathbb{P}(D = 1 \mid X = x)$.*

Suppose a random sample on (Y, X, D) is available. Then under Assumption 2.4, the marginal conditional distribution functions of Y_1, Y_2 given $X = x$ are point identified:

$$F_{Y_1|X}(y|x) = \mathbb{P}(Y_1 \leq y \mid X = x) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid X = x, D = 0)$$

and

$$F_{Y_2|X}(y|x) = \mathbb{P}(Y_2 \leq y \mid X = x) = \mathbb{P}(Y \leq y \mid X = x, D = 1).$$

As a result, the probability measures μ_{13} of (Y_1, X) and μ_{23} of (Y_2, X) are identified as well.

2.3.1 Partial Identification of Treatment Effects

Assumption 2.4 is commonly used to identify treatment effect parameters and optimal treatment choice. However the validity of Assumption 2.4 may be questionable when there are unobserved confounders. W-DMR-MP presents a viable approach to studying sensitivity of causal inference to deviations from Assumption 2.4 by varying the marginal measures of a joint measure of (Y_1, Y_2, X) in Wasserstein uncertainty sets centered at reference measures consistent with Assumption 2.4. Specifically, let f be a measurable function of Y_1, Y_2 . Consider treatment effects of the form: $\theta_o := \mathbb{E}_o[f(Y_1, Y_2)]$, where \mathbb{E}_o denotes expectation with respect to the true measure. It includes the average treatment effect (ATE) for which $f(Y_1, Y_2) = Y_2 - Y_1$ and the distributional treatment effect such as $\mathbb{P}_o(Y_2 - Y_1 \geq 0)$, where \mathbb{P}_o denotes the probability computed under the true measure.

Consider the identified set for θ_o defined as

$$\Theta(\delta) := \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(y_1, y_2, x) : \gamma \in \Sigma(\delta) \right\},$$

where

$$\Sigma(\delta) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_{13}, \gamma_{13}) \leq \delta_1, \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_{23}, \gamma_{23}) \leq \delta_2\},$$

in which μ_{13} and μ_{23} are the identified measures of (Y_1, X) and (Y_2, X) under Assumption 2.4. Under mild conditions, we show in Proposition 4.1 that the identified set $\Theta(\delta)$ is a closed interval given by

$$\Theta(\delta) = \left[\min_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(s), \max_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(s) \right],$$

where the lower and upper limits of the interval are characterized by the W-DMR-MP.⁶ When $\delta = 0$, Fan et al. (2017) establish a characterization of $\Theta(0)$ via marginal problems with overlapping marginals.

The identified set $\Theta(\delta)$ can be used to conduct sensitivity analysis to deviations from Assumption 2.4. We note that sensitivity analysis to other commonly used assumptions such as the threshold-crossing model can be done by taking the reference measures as the measures identified under these alternative assumptions, see Fan and Wu (2009).

2.3.2 Robust Welfare Function

In empirical welfare maximization (EWM), an optimal choice/policy is chosen to maximize the expected welfare estimated from a training data set and then applied to a target population, see Kitagawa and Tetenov (2018). EWM assumes that the target population and the training data set come from the same underlying probability measure. This may not be valid in important applications. Motivated by designing externally valid treatment policy, Adjaho and Christensen (2023) introduces a robust welfare function which allows the target population to differ from the training population. In this paper, we revisit Adjaho and Christensen (2023)'s robust welfare function and propose a new one based on W-DMR with overlapping marginals.

Adjaho and Christensen (2023) adopts the following definition of a robust welfare function:

$$\text{RW}_0(d) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma_0(\delta_0)} \mathbb{E}_{\gamma}[Y_1(1 - d(X)) + Y_2d(X)],$$

where $d : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a measurable policy function, i.e., $d(X)$ is 0 or 1 depending on X and $\Sigma_0(\delta_0)$ is the Wasserstein uncertainty set centered at a joint measure μ for (Y_1, Y_2, X) consistent with Assumption 2.4, i.e.,

$$\Sigma_0(\delta_0) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \gamma) \leq \delta_0\},$$

⁶Since $\inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(s)$ can be rewritten as $-\sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} [-f(y_1, y_2)] d\gamma(s)$, we also refer to the lower limit as W-DMR-MP.

where $\mathbf{K}_c(\mu, \gamma)$ is the optimal transport cost with cost function $c : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$.

Noting that Assumption 2.4 only identifies the marginal measures μ_{13}, μ_{23} of the reference measure μ in $\Sigma_0(\delta_0)$, we define a new robust welfare function as

$$\text{RW}(d) := \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[Y_1(1 - d(X)) + Y_2 d(X)],$$

where $\Sigma(\delta) = \Sigma(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}, \delta)$ is the uncertainty set for W-DMR with overlapping marginals.

2.3.3 W-DRO Under Data Combination

An important application of W-DMR is W-DRO. Let $f : \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a loss function with an unknown parameter $\theta \in \Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^q$. W-DRO under data combination is defined as

$$\min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2, x; \theta) d\gamma(y_1, y_2, x), \quad (2.4)$$

where $\Sigma(\delta)$ is the uncertainty set for the overlapping case. For each $\theta \in \Theta$, the inner optimization is a W-DMR with overlapping marginals. In practice, we need to choose the reference measures μ_{13} and μ_{23} based on the sample information. Focusing on logit model, where $\mathcal{Y}_1 = \{+1, -1\}$ is the space for the dependent variable, and \mathcal{Y}_2 and \mathcal{X} are feature spaces/covariate space, and

$$f(y_1, y_2, x; \theta) = \log(1 + \exp(-y_1 \langle \theta, (y_2, x) \rangle)),$$

Awasthi et al. (2022) proposes a method dubbed ‘Robust Data Join’ in which the empirical measures constructed from the two data sets are used as reference measures. Specifically, let $\hat{\mu}_{13}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{23}$ denote empirical measures based on two separate data sets. The uncertainty set in Awasthi et al. (2022) takes the following form:

$$\Sigma_{\text{RDJ}}(\delta) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_1(\hat{\mu}_{13}, \gamma_{13}) \leq \delta_1, \mathbf{K}_2(\hat{\mu}_{23}, \gamma_{23}) \leq \delta_2\},$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_1((y_1, x), (y'_1, x')) &= \|x - x'\|_p + \kappa_1 |y_1 - y'_1| \quad \text{and} \\ c_2((y_2, x), (y_2, x')) &= \|x - x'\|_p + \kappa_2 \|y_2 - y'_2\|_{p'} \end{aligned}$$

with $\kappa_1 \geq 1$, $\kappa_2 \geq 1$, $p \geq 1$, and $p' \geq 1$.

Note that Awasthi et al. (2022)’s ‘Robust Data Join’ is different from our W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals because the measure of interest $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ has overlapping marginals. It is also different from our W-DMR with overlapping marginals because the reference measures $\hat{\mu}_{13}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{23}$ may not have overlapping marginals. Unlike the uncertainty set for W-DMR, $\Sigma_{\text{RDJ}}(\delta)$ is empty when $\delta = 0$.

2.3.4 Risk aggregation

Let S_1, S_2 be random variables representing individual risks defined on Polish spaces $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2$, respectively. Let μ_1, μ_2 be probability measures of S_1, S_2 . Let $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ and $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a risk aggregating function. Applying W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals to the risk aggregation function g , we can compute the worst aggregate risk when the joint measure of the individual risks varies in the uncertainty set $\Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)$. This is different from the set-up in Eckstein et al. (2020), where the following robust risk aggregation problem is studied:

$$\mathcal{I}_{\Pi}(\delta_0) := \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_{\Pi}(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma,$$

where

$$\Sigma_{\Pi}(\delta_0) := \{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2) : \mathbf{K}_c(\gamma, \mu) \leq \delta_0\},$$

in which \mathbf{K}_c is the optimal transport cost associated with a cost function $c : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$. Since $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\Pi}(\delta_0)$ is a coupling of (μ_1, μ_2) , we have that $\Sigma_{\Pi}(\delta_0) \subset \Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(0)$ and thus $\mathcal{I}_{\Pi}(\delta_0) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{D}}(0)$.

3 Strong Duality and Distributionally Robust Makarov Bounds

In this section, we establish strong duality for our W-DMR-MP and apply it to develop Wasserstein distributionally robust Makarov bounds.

3.1 Non-overlapping Marginals

For a measurable function $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we define the function $g_{\lambda} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ as

$$g_{\lambda}(v) := \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}} \varphi_{\lambda}(v, v'), \quad (2.1)$$

where $\varphi_{\lambda} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ is given by

$$\varphi_{\lambda}(v, v') = g(s'_1, s'_2) - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, s'_1) - \lambda_2 c_2(s_2, s'_2),$$

with $v := (s_1, s_2)$ and $v' := (s'_1, s'_2)$. Similarly, define $g_{\lambda_1, 1} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ and $g_{\lambda_2, 2} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\}$ as

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\lambda_1, 1}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1} \{g(s'_1, s_2) - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, s'_1)\} \quad \text{and} \\ g_{\lambda_2, 2}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2} \{g(s_1, s'_2) - \lambda_2 c_2(s_2, s'_2)\}. \end{aligned}$$

The dual problem $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ corresponding to the primal problem $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}_D(\delta) = \begin{cases} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2, \\ \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{ \lambda_1 \delta_1 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda_1, 1} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta_1 > 0 \text{ and } \delta_2 = 0, \\ \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{ \lambda_2 \delta_2 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda_2, 2} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta_1 = 0 \text{ and } \delta_2 > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Then, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \{0\}$.*

Unlike the dual for W-DMR, the dual for W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals in Theorem 3.1 involves a marginal problem with non-overlapping marginals μ_1, μ_2 due to the lack of knowledge on the dependence of the joint measure μ . Computational algorithms developed for optimal transport can be used to solve the marginal problem, see Peyré and Cuturi (2018). For empirical measures μ_1, μ_2 , the marginal problem is a discrete optimal transport problem and there are efficient algorithms to compute it, see Peyré and Cuturi (2018). For general measures μ_1, μ_2 , strong duality may be employed in the numerical computation of the marginal problem. For instance, consider the case when $\delta > 0$. When $g_{\lambda}(v)$ is Borel measurable, several strong duality results are available, see e.g., Villani (2009) and Villani (2021). For a general function g and cost functions c_1, c_2 , $g_{\lambda}(v)$ is not guaranteed to be Borel measurable. However, for Polish spaces, the set $\{v \in \mathcal{V} : g_{\lambda}(v) \geq u\}$ is an analytic set for all $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ (and g_{λ} is universally measurable), since g, c_1 and c_2 are Borel measurable (see Blanchet and Murthy (2019, p. 580) and Bertsekas and Shreve (1978, Lemma 7.22, Lemma 7.30 (i) and Proposition 7.47)). This allows us to apply strong duality for the marginal problem in Kellerer (1984) restated in Theorem A.1 to the marginal problem involving $g_{\lambda}(v)$, see corollary A.1 in Appendix A.2.

Without additional assumptions on the function g and the cost functions, the dual $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ in Theorem 3.1 for interior points $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ and the dual for boundary points may not be the same. To illustrate, plugging in $\delta_2 = 0$ in the dual form for interior points in Theorem 3.1, we obtain

$$\inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda} d\varpi \right].$$

It is different from the dual $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta_1, 0)$ for $\delta_1 > 0$, since

$$\inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda} d\varpi \neq \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda_1, 1} d\varpi.$$

When the function g and the cost functions satisfy assumptions in Theorem 5.1, the dual $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ in Theorem 3.1 for interior points $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ and the dual for boundary points are the same so that

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda} d\varpi \right]$$

for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Remark 3.1. For Polish spaces, Theorem 3.1 generalizes the strong duality in Zhang et al. (2022) restated in Theorem 2.1. Our proof is based on that in Zhang et al. (2022). However, due to the presence of two marginal measures in the uncertainty set $\Sigma_D(\delta)$, we need to verify the existence of a joint measure when some of its overlapping marginal measures are fixed, and we rely on existing results for a given consistent product marginal system studied in Vorob'ev (1962), Kellerer (1964), and Shortt (1983), see Appendix A.3 for a detailed review.

Remark 3.2. Similar to Sinha et al. (2017) for W -DMR in marginal problems, we can define an alternative W -DMR through linear penalty terms, i.e.,

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) : \mathbf{K}_{\ell}(\mu_{\ell}, \gamma_{\ell}) < \infty \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2 \right\}$$

with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. The proof of Theorem 3.1 implies that the dual form of this problem is $\sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int g_{\lambda} d\varpi$ under the condition in Theorem 3.1.

3.2 Overlapping Marginals

Let $\phi_{\lambda} : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{-\infty\}$ be

$$\phi_{\lambda}(v, s') := f(s') - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, s'_1) - \lambda_2 c_2(s_2, s'_2),$$

where $v = (s_1, s_2)$, $s' = (y'_0, y'_1, x')$, $s'_\ell = (y'_\ell, x')$ and $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell)$. Define the function $f_{\lambda} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ associated with f as

$$f_{\lambda}(v) := \sup_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \phi_{\lambda}(v, s').$$

Similarly, we define $f_{\lambda,1} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and $f_{\lambda,2} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{y'_1 \in \mathcal{Y}_1} \{f(y'_1, y_2, x_2) - \lambda_1 c_1((y_1, x_1), (y'_1, x_2))\} \text{ and} \\ f_{\lambda,2}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{y'_2 \in \mathcal{Y}_2} \{f(y_1, y'_2, x_1) - \lambda_2 c_2((y_2, x_2), (y'_2, x_1))\}, \end{aligned}$$

in which $s_1 = (y_1, x_1)$ and $s_2 = (y_2, x_2)$. The dual problem $\mathcal{J}(\delta)$ corresponding to the primal problem $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta) = \begin{cases} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2, \\ \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{ \lambda_1 \delta_1 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda_1, 1} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta_1 > 0 \text{ and } \delta_2 = 0, \\ \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \{ \lambda_2 \delta_2 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda_2, 2} d\varpi \} & \text{if } \delta_1 = 0 \text{ and } \delta_2 > 0. \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

Theorem 3.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Then, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{J}(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \{0\}$.*

An interesting feature of the dual for overlapping marginals is that it involves marginal problems with non-overlapping marginals, i.e., $\sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda}(v) d\varpi(v)$, although the uncertainty set in the primal problem involves overlapping marginals. Compared with the non-overlapping marginals case, overlapping marginals in the uncertainty set make the relevant consistent product marginal system in the verification of the existence of a joint measure more complicated, see the proof of Lemma C.5. Nonetheless, the non-overlapping marginals in the dual allow us to apply Theorem A.1 to the marginal problem involving f_{λ} , $f_{\lambda,1}$ and $f_{\lambda,2}$, see corollary A.2 in Appendix A.2.

Under the assumptions in Theorem 5.2, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda} d\varpi \right]$$

for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Remark 3.3. *Similar to the non-overlapping case, we can define an alternative W-DMR with overlapping marginals through linear penalty terms, i.e.,*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} g d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_{13}, \gamma_{13}) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_{23}, \gamma_{23}) : \mathbf{K}_{\ell}(\mu_{\ell 3}, \gamma_{\ell 3}) < \infty \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2 \right\},$$

with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$. The proof of Theorem 3.2 implies that the dual form of this problem is $\sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda} d\varpi$ under the conditions in Theorem 3.2.

3.3 Wasserstein Distributionally Robust Makarov Bounds

Let $\mathcal{S}_1 = \mathbb{R}$, $\mathcal{S}_2 = \mathbb{R}$, $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1)$, and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_2)$. Further, let $Z = S_1 + S_2$, where S_1, S_2 are random variables whose probability measures are μ_1, μ_2 respectively. For a given $z \in \mathbb{R}$, let $F_Z(z) = \mathbb{E}_o[g(S_1, S_2)]$, where $g(s_1, s_2) = \mathbb{1}\{s_1 + s_2 \leq z\}$.

Sharp bounds on the quantile function $F_Z^{-1}(\cdot)$ are established in Makarov (1982) and referred to as the Makarov bounds. Inverting the Makarov bounds lead to sharp bounds on the distribution function $F_Z(z)$, see Rüschendorf (1982) and Frank et al. (1987). They are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[g(S_1, S_2)] &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \max \{ \mu_1(x) + \mu_2(z - x) - 1, 0 \} \quad \text{and} \\ \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[g(S_1, S_2)] &= 1 + \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}} \min \{ \mu_1(x) + \mu_2(z - x) - 1, 0 \}. \end{aligned}$$

Since the quantile bounds first established in Makarov (1982) and the above distribution bounds are equivalent, we also refer to the latter as Makarov bounds. Makarov bounds have been successfully applied in distinct areas. For example, the upper bound on the quantile of Z is known as the worst VaR of Z , see Embrechts et al. (2003), Embrechts et al. (2005); Makarov bounds are also used to study partial identification of distributional treatment effects when the treatment assignment mechanism identifies the marginal measures of the potential outcomes such as in Assumption 2.4, see Fan and Park (2009), Fan and Park (2010), and Fan and Park (2012), Fan and Wu (2009), Fan et al. (2017), Ridder and Moffitt (2007), and Firpo and Ridder (2019).

Applying Theorem 3.2, we extend Makarov bounds to allow for possible misspecification of the marginal measures and call the resulting bounds Wasserstein distributionally robust Makarov bounds.

Corollary 3.1 (Wasserstein distributionally robust Makarov bounds). *Suppose that $g(s_1, s_2) = \mathbf{1}(s_1 + s_2 \leq z)$ and $c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = |s_\ell - s'_\ell|^2$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. For all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[g(S_1, S_2)] \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left[\int_{\{s_1 + s_2 > z\}} \left[1 - \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 (s_1 + s_2 - z)^2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right]^+ d\varpi(s_1, s_2) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \mathbb{E}_\varpi \left[\mathbf{1} \{S_1 + S_2 \leq z\} \right] \right] \right); \\ & \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[g(S_1, S_2)] \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[- \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \inf_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left\{ - \int_{\{s_1 + s_2 \leq z\}} \left[1 - \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 (s_1 + s_2 - z)^2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right]^+ d\varpi(s_1, s_2) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. + \mathbb{E}_\varpi \left[\mathbf{1} \{S_1 + S_2 \leq z\} \right] \right\} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We note that $g_\lambda(v)$ is bounded and continuous in v , and convex in λ , and $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ is compact. Applying Fan (1953, Theorem 2)'s minimax theorem, we can interchange the order of inf and sup in the dual in the above corollary and get

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma[g(S_1, S_2)] \\ = & \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left[\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left(\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\{s_1 + s_2 > z\}} \left[1 - \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 (s_1 + s_2 - z)^2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right]^+ d\varpi(s_1, s_2) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \mathbb{E}_\varpi \left[\mathbb{1} \{S_1 + S_2 \leq z\} \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

This expression is very insightful, where the inner infimum term characterizes possible deviations of the true marginal measures from the reference measures.

4 Finiteness of the W-DMR-MP and Existence of Optimizers

In this section, we assume that all the reference measures belong to appropriate Wasserstein spaces and prove finiteness of the W-DMR-MP and existence of an optimizer.

Definition 4.1 (Wasserstein space). *The Wasserstein space of order $p \geq 1$ on a Polish space \mathcal{X} with metric \mathbf{d} is defined as*

$$\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X}) = \left\{ \mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \int_{\mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}(x_0, x)^p d\mu(x) < \infty \right\},$$

where $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$ is arbitrary.

Assumption 4.1.

- (i) *In the non-overlapping case, we assume that $\mu_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{p_1}(\mathcal{S}_1)$ and $\mu_2 \in \mathcal{P}_{p_2}(\mathcal{S}_2)$ for some $p_1 \geq 1$ and $p_2 \geq 1$;*
- (ii) *In the overlapping case, we assume that $\mu_{13} \in \mathcal{P}_{p_1}(\mathcal{S}_1)$ and $\mu_{23} \in \mathcal{P}_{p_2}(\mathcal{S}_2)$ for some $p_1 \geq 1$ and $p_2 \geq 1$.*

Assumption 4.2. *The cost function $c_\ell : \mathcal{S}_\ell \times \mathcal{S}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is of the form $c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}(s_\ell, s'_\ell)^{p_\ell}$, where $(\mathcal{S}_\ell, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell})$ is a Polish space and $p_\ell \geq 1$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.*

4.1 Finiteness of the W-DMR-MP

For non-overlapping case, we establish the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 4.1 (i) and 4.2 hold. Then for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) < \infty$ if and only if there exist $v^* := (s_1^*, s_2^*) \in \mathcal{V}$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that for all $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$,*

$$g(s_1, s_2) \leq M [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p_2}], \quad (4.1)$$

where p_1 and p_2 are defined in Assumption 4.1 (i).

The inequality in Equation (4.1) is a growth condition on the function g . It extends the growth condition in Yue et al. (2022) for W-DMR to our W-DMR with non-overlapping marginals.

For the overlapping case, the following result holds.

Theorem 4.2. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.3, 4.1 (ii) and 4.2 hold. Then for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) < \infty$ if and only if there exist $(s_1^*, s_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$f(s) \leq M [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p_2}], \quad (4.2)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$, where $s := (y_1, y_2, x)$, $s_\ell := (y_\ell, x)$ and $s_\ell^* := (y_\ell^*, x^*)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, and p_1 and p_2 are defined in Assumption 4.1 (ii).

The growth condition (4.2) on the function f extends the growth condition in Yue et al. (2022) for W-DMR. When

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}((y_\ell, x), (y'_\ell, x')) = \mathbf{d}_{y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) + \mathbf{d}_X(x, x'),$$

condition (4.2) is satisfied if and only if there exist $s^* := (y_1^*, y_2^*, x^*)$ and a constant $M > 0$ such that

$$f(s) \leq M [1 + \mathbf{d}_{y_1}(y_1, y_1^*)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{y_2}(y_2, y_2^*)^{p_2} + \mathbf{d}_X(x, x^*)^{p_1 \wedge p_2}],$$

for all $s = (y_1, y_2, x) \in \mathcal{S}$.

Remark 4.1. *The conditions in Theorems 4.1 and 4.2 are sufficient conditions for $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ to be finite for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ including boundary points because $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ are non-decreasing.*

4.2 Existence of Optimizers

Definition 4.2. A metric space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d})$ is said to be proper if for any $r > 0$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{X}$, the closed ball $\overline{B}(x_0, r) := \{x \in \mathcal{X} : \mathbf{d}(x, x_0) \leq r\}$ is compact.

Examples of proper metric spaces include finite dimensional Banach spaces and complete Riemannian manifolds, see Yue et al. (2022).

Assumption 4.3. $(\mathcal{S}_1, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1})$ and $(\mathcal{S}_2, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2})$ are proper.

Assumptions 4.1 to 4.3 imply that $\Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)$ and $\Sigma(\delta)$ are weakly compact, see Propositions C.1 and C.2 in Appendix C. Given weak compactness of the uncertainty sets $\Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)$ and $\Sigma(\delta)$, it is sufficient to show that the mapping: $\gamma \rightarrow \int g d\gamma$ is upper semi-continuous over $\gamma \in \Sigma_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)$ for the non-overlapping case, and the mapping: $\gamma \rightarrow \int f d\gamma$ is upper semi-continuous over $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)$ for the overlapping case. In Theorems 4.3 and 4.4 below, we provide conditions for g and f ensuring upper semi-continuity of each map and thus the existence of optimal solutions for $\mathcal{I}_{\mathbb{D}}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$.

Theorem 4.3. Suppose that Assumptions 2.2, 4.1 (i), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Further, assume that g is upper-semicontinuous, and there exist a constant $M > 0$, $v^* := (s_1^*, s_2^*) \in \mathcal{V}$ and $p'_\ell \in (0, p_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, such that

$$g(v) \leq M \left[1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p'_2} \right], \quad (4.3)$$

for all $v := (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$. Then an optimal solution of (2.2) exists for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Theorem 4.4. Suppose that Assumptions 2.3, 4.1 (ii), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Further, assume that f is upper-semicontinuous, and there exist $(s_1^*, s_2^*) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$, a constant $M > 0$, $p'_\ell \in (0, p_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, such that

$$f(s) \leq M \left[1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p'_2} \right], \quad (4.4)$$

for all $s \in \mathcal{S}$ where $s := (y_1, y_2, x)$, $s_\ell := (y_\ell, x)$ and $s_\ell^* := (y_\ell^*, x_\ell^*)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Then an optimal solution of (2.3) exists for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

4.3 Characterization of Identified Sets

In some applications, such as the partial identification of treatment effects introduced in Section 2.3.1, the identified sets of $\theta_{\mathbb{D}o} := \mathbb{E}_o[g(S_1, S_2)]$ and $\theta_o := \mathbb{E}_o[f(S)]$ are of interest, where S is a random variable whose probability measure belongs to

$\Sigma(\delta)$, and S_1 and S_2 are random variables whose joint probability measure belongs to $\Sigma_D(\delta)$. They are:

$$\Theta_D(\delta) := \left\{ \int_{S_1 \times S_2} g d\gamma : \gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta) \right\} \quad \text{and} \quad \Theta(\delta) := \left\{ \int_S f d\gamma : \gamma \in \Sigma(\delta) \right\}.$$

By applying finiteness and existence results, we show below that under mild conditions, the identified sets $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$ are both closed intervals.

Proposition 4.1.

(i) Suppose Assumptions 4.1 (i), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. In addition, g is continuous, and $|g|$ satisfies Condition (4.3). Then, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have

$$\Theta_D(\delta) = \left[\min_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{S_1 \times S_2} g d\gamma, \max_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{S_1 \times S_2} g d\gamma \right],$$

where both the lower and upper bounds are finite.

(ii) Suppose Assumptions 4.1 (ii), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. In addition, f is continuous and $|f|$ satisfies Condition (4.4). Then for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have

$$\Theta(\delta) = \left[\min_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_S f d\gamma, \max_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_S f d\gamma \right],$$

where both the lower and upper bounds are finite.

The strong duality in Section 3 can be used to evaluate the lower and upper bounds.

5 Continuity of the DMR-MP Functions

In this section, we establish continuity of the W-DMR-MP functions $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ under similar conditions to those in Zhang et al. (2022). Compared with Zhang et al. (2022), our analysis is more involved, because the boundary in our case includes not only the origin $(0, 0)$ but also $(\delta_1, 0)$ and $(0, \delta_2)$ for all $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$.

5.1 Non-overlapping Marginals

Lemma B.1 (i) implies that under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is a concave function for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and hence is continuous on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 . We provide the main assumption for the continuity of $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 in this subsection.

Assumption 5.1. Let $\Psi : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be a continuous, non-decreasing, and concave function with $\Psi(0,0) = 0$. Suppose the function $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies

$$g(v) - g(v') \leq \Psi(c_1(s_1, s'_1), c_2(s_2, s'_2)), \quad (5.1)$$

for all $v = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$ and $v' = (s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{V}$.

The function Ψ in Assumption 5.1 plays the role of the modulus of continuity of g . To illustrate, consider the following example.

Example 5.1. Suppose assumption 4.2 holds, i.e., $c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}(s_\ell, s'_\ell)^{p_\ell}$ for some $p_\ell \geq 1$, $\ell = 1, 2$.

(i) Define a product metric $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}$ on $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ as

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}((s_1, s_2), (s'_1, s'_2)) = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1) + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2).$$

Let $\Psi(x, y) = x^{1/p_1} + y^{1/p_2}$. Then, $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}((s_1, s_2), (s'_1, s'_2)) = \Psi(c_1(s_1, s'_1), c_2(s_2, s'_2))$. On the metric space $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}})$, the function g is continuous and has $\omega : x \mapsto x$ as modulus of continuity. Moreover, Assumption 5.1 implies the growth condition in (4.3).

(ii) Suppose $p_1 = p_2$. Define a product metric $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}$ on $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ as

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}((s_1, s_2), (s'_1, s'_2)) = [\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^p + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^p]^{1/p}.$$

Let $\Psi(x, y) = (x+y)^{1/p}$. Then, $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}((s_1, s_2), (s'_1, s'_2)) = \Psi(c_1(s_1, s'_1), c_2(s_2, s'_2))$. On the metric space $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}})$, the function g is continuous and has $\omega : x \mapsto x$ as modulus of continuity. Assumption 5.1 also implies the growth condition in (4.3).

(iii) Suppose $p_1 \neq p_2$. Define a product metric $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}$ on $\mathcal{V} = \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ as

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}((s_1, s_2), (s'_1, s'_2)) = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1) \vee \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2).$$

Then, Assumption 5.1 implies

$$g(v) - g(v') \leq \Psi(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}(v, v'), \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}(v, v')) = \omega(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}}(v, v')).$$

where $\omega : x \mapsto \Psi(x, x)$ is a concave function. On the metric space $(\mathcal{V}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{V}})$, the function g is continuous and has $\omega : x \mapsto \Psi(x, x)$ as modulus of continuity.

Theorem 5.1. Suppose Assumptions 2.1, 2.2 and 5.1 hold and $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then, the function $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

Two implications follow. First, under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(0) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g d\gamma.$$

Continuity facilitates sensitivity analysis as δ approaches zero; Second, under the assumptions in Theorem 5.1, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} g_\lambda d\varpi \right]$$

for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. As a result, the dual $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ in (3.1) is continuous for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

5.2 Overlapping Marginals

Lemma B.1 (ii) implies that under Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3, $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is a concave function for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and hence is continuous on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 . We provide the main assumption for the continuity of $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 below.

To simplify the technical analysis, we maintain Assumption 4.2 in this section. Since the metrics in \mathcal{Y}_1 and \mathcal{Y}_2 are not specified, we introduce an auxiliary function ρ_ℓ from $\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{Y}_\ell$ to \mathbb{R}_+ induced by the cost function c_ℓ , $\ell = 1, 2$.

Assumption 5.2. *For $\ell = 1, 2$, there exists a function ρ_ℓ from $\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{Y}_\ell$ to \mathbb{R}_+ such that*

- (i) ρ_ℓ is symmetric, i.e., $\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \rho_\ell(y'_\ell, y_\ell)$ for all $y_\ell, y'_\ell \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$;
- (ii) there is $q_\ell \in [1, p_\ell]$ such that $\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) \leq \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}(s_\ell, s'_\ell)^{q_\ell}$ for all $s_\ell \equiv (y_\ell, x) \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ and $s'_\ell \equiv (y'_\ell, x') \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$;
- (iii) there is a constant $N > 0$ such that $\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) \leq N [\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y_\ell^*) + \rho_\ell(y_\ell^*, y'_\ell)]$ for all $y_\ell, y'_\ell, y_\ell^* \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell$.

We now introduce the main assumption on f .

Assumption 5.3. *For $\ell = 1, 2$, let $\Psi_\ell : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be continuous, non-decreasing, and concave satisfying $\Psi_\ell(0, 0) = 0$. Suppose for all $s = (y_1, y_2, x)$ and $s' = (y'_1, y'_2, x')$, it holds that*

$$f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') \leq \Psi_1(c_1(s_1, s'_1), \rho_2(y_2, y'_2)),$$

and

$$f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') \leq \Psi_2(\rho_1(y_1, y'_1), c_2(s_2, s'_2)).$$

Like Assumption 5.1, Assumption 5.3 depends on the cost functions c_1, c_2 . It also depends on the auxiliary functions ρ_1, ρ_2 . The functions Ψ_1, Ψ_2 play the role of the modulus of continuity.

Example 5.2 (p_j -product metric). Let $(\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}), (\mathcal{Y}_2, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_2})$, and $(\mathcal{X}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be Polish (metric) spaces. For $p_\ell \geq 1$, define the p_ℓ -product metric on \mathcal{S}_ℓ as

$$\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = [\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell)^{p_\ell} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x')^{p_\ell}]^{1/p_\ell}.$$

Let

$$\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) := \inf_{x_\ell, x'_\ell \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x'_\ell))^{p_\ell}.$$

It is easy to show that $\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell)^{p_\ell}$ and Assumption 5.2 is satisfied with $N = 2^{p_\ell}$. Moreover, Assumption 5.3 reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') &\leq \Psi_1(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(y_2, y'_2)^{p_2}) \quad \text{and} \\ f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') &\leq \Psi_2(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(y_1, y'_1)^{p_1}, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2}). \end{aligned}$$

When $p_1 = p_2 = p$, Assumption 5.3 may be reduced to a simpler form. To see this, define two functions ψ_1 and ψ_2 from \mathbb{R}^3 to \mathbb{R}^2 as $\psi_1 : (z_1, z_2, z) \mapsto (z_1 + z, z_2)$ and $\psi_2 : (z_1, z_2, z) \mapsto (z_1, z_2 + z)$. We can see that

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_1(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^p, \rho_2(y_1, y'_1)^p) &= \Psi_1 \circ \psi_1(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(y_1, y'_1)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(y_2, y'_2)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x')^p), \\ \Psi_2(\rho_1(y_1, y'_1)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^p) &= \Psi_2 \circ \psi_2(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(y_1, y'_1)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(y_2, y'_2)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x')^p). \end{aligned}$$

Since ψ_j is linear, $\Phi_j = \Psi_j \circ \psi_j$ is still continuous, non-decreasing and concave. Assumption 5.3 is reduced to the following condition:

$$f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') \leq \Phi_j(\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(y_1, y'_1)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(y_2, y'_2)^p, \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{X}}(x, x')^p)$$

for all $(y_1, y_2, x) \in \mathcal{S}$ and $(y'_1, y'_2, x') \in \mathcal{S}$.

Theorem 5.2. Suppose Assumptions 2.3, 4.1 (ii), 4.2, 5.2 and 5.3 hold, and $\mathcal{I}(\delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta > 0$. Then the function $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

Like the non-overlapping case, two implications follow. First, under Assumption 2.1 and Assumption 2.2,

$$\mathcal{I}(0) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma.$$

Continuity facilitates sensitivity analysis as δ approaches zero; Second, under the assumptions in Theorem 5.2, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda d\varpi \right]$$

for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. As a result, the dual $\mathcal{J}(\delta)$ in (3.2) is continuous for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

6 Motivating Examples Revisited

In this section, we apply the results in Sections 3-5 to the examples introduced in Section 2.

6.1 Partial Identification of Treatment Effects

In addition to characterizing $\Theta(\delta)$ introduced in Section 2, we also study the identified set for $\theta_{D_o} = \mathbb{E}_o[f(Y_1, Y_2)]$ without using the covariate information:

$$\Theta_D(\delta) := \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(y_1, y_2) : \gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta) \right\},$$

where

$$\Sigma_D(\delta) = \{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2) : \mathbf{K}_{Y_1}(\mu_{Y_1}, \gamma_1) \leq \delta_1, \mathbf{K}_{Y_2}(\mu_{Y_2}, \gamma_2) \leq \delta_2 \}$$

in which \mathbf{K}_{Y_1} and \mathbf{K}_{Y_2} are the optimal transport costs associated with cost functions c_{Y_1} and c_{Y_2} , respectively.

6.1.1 Characterization of the Identified Sets

When f is continuous and conditions in Proposition 4.1 are satisfied, the identified sets $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$ are both closed intervals with upper limits given by W-DMR for non-overlapping and overlapping marginals respectively. This allows us to apply our duality results in Section 3 to evaluate and compare $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$.

Let $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ denote the upper bounds of $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$, respectively, where

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(y_1, y_2) \text{ and } \mathcal{I}(\delta) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(y_1, y_2) d\gamma(y_1, y_2, x).$$

Proposition 4.1 establishes robust versions of existing results on the identified sets of treatment effects under Assumption 2.4, see Fan et al. (2017). Sensitivity to deviations from Assumption 2.4 can be examined via $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$ by varying δ . For example, when f satisfies assumptions in Theorems 5.1 and 5.2, $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ are continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 . As a result,

$$\lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(0) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{\delta \rightarrow 0} \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(0).$$

For a general function f , the lower and upper limits of the identified sets $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$ need to be computed numerically. When f is additively separable, we show that duality results in Section 3 simplify the evaluation of $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$. Since the lower bounds of $\Theta_D(\delta)$ and $\Theta(\delta)$ can be computed in a similar way by applying duality to $-f(y_1, y_2)$, we omit details for the lower bounds.

Assumption 6.1. Let $f : (y_1, y_2, x) \mapsto f_1(y_1) + f_2(y_2)$ from \mathcal{S} to \mathbb{R} , where $f_\ell \in L^1(\mu_{\ell 3})$ for $\ell = 1, 2$.

To avoid tedious notation, we also treat f as a function from $\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2$ to \mathbb{R} . Under Assumptions 2.1 and 6.1, it is easy to show that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) &= \sup_{\gamma_1: \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(\mu_{\mathcal{Y}_1}, \gamma_1) \leq \delta_1} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} f_1 d\gamma_1 + \sup_{\gamma_2: \mathbf{K}_{\mathcal{Y}_2}(\mu_{\mathcal{Y}_2}, \gamma_2) \leq \delta_2} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_2} f_2 d\gamma_2 \\ &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \geq 0} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} (f_1)_{\lambda_1} d\mu_1 \right] + \inf_{\lambda_2 \geq 0} \left[\lambda_2 \delta_2 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_2} (f_2)_{\lambda_2} d\mu_2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where $(f_\ell)_{\lambda_\ell} : \mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$(f_\ell)_{\lambda_\ell}(y_\ell) = \sup_{y'_\ell \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell} \{f_\ell(y'_\ell) - \lambda_\ell c_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell)\}.$$

That is, when f is an additively separable function, the W-DMR for non-overlapping marginals is the sum of two W-DMRs associated with the marginals regardless of the cost functions.

Depending on the cost functions, the W-DMR for overlapping marginals may be different from the sum of two W-DMRs associated with the marginals.

Definition 6.1 (Ref. Chen et al. (2022)). We say that a function $f : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is separable if each x and y can be optimized regardless of the other variable. In other words,

$$\operatorname{argmin}_{x,y} f(x, y) = (\operatorname{argmin}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f(x, y'), \operatorname{argmin}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} f(x', y))$$

for any $x' \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Assumption 6.2. For $\ell = 1, 2$, the cost function $c_\ell((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x'_\ell))$ is separable with respect to (y_ℓ, y'_ℓ) and (x_ℓ, x'_ℓ) .

Example 6.1. Let $a_\ell : \mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ and $b_\ell : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ satisfy Assumption 2.1. Let $s = (y, x)$ and $s' = (y', x')$. Then $c(s, s') = a(y, y') + b(x, x')$ is separable with respect to (x, x') and (y, y') . Also, both $c(s, s') = (a(y, y') + 1)(b(x, x') + 1) - 1$ and $c(s, s') = [a(y, y')^p + b(x, x')^p]^{1/p}$ for $p \geq 1$ are separable with respect to (x, x') and (y, y') even though they are not additively separable.

Proposition 6.1. For $\ell = 1, 2$, let $c_\ell : (\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}) \times (\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denote the cost function for $\Theta(\delta)$. Suppose that c_ℓ satisfies Assumption 2.1 and the marginal measure of $\mu_{\ell 3}$ on \mathcal{Y}_ℓ coincides with μ_ℓ , i.e., $\mu_{\ell 3} = \operatorname{Law}(Y_\ell, X)$ with $\mu_\ell = \operatorname{Law}(Y_\ell)$. Under Assumptions 6.1 and 6.2, one has $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$, where $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is based on the cost function $c_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}$ on $\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{Y}_\ell$ given by

$$c_{\mathcal{Y}_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \inf_{x_\ell, x'_\ell \in \mathcal{X}} c_\ell((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x'_\ell)).$$

It is easy to verify that $c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = 0$ if and only if $y_\ell = y'_\ell$.

This proposition implies that for separable cost functions, the W-DMR for overlapping marginals equals the W-DMR for non-overlapping marginals with cost function $c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell)$. As a result, the covariate information does not help shrink the identified set.

6.1.2 Average Treatment Effect

Suppose $f(y_1, y_2) = y_2 - y_1$ and $c_\ell((y, x), (y_\ell, x_\ell)) = |y - y'_\ell|^2 + \|x_\ell - x'_\ell\|^2$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Let $\tau_{ATE} = \mathbb{E}[Y_2 - Y_1]$. Then Proposition 6.1 implies that the upper bound on τ_{ATE} is given by

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \sqrt{\delta_1} + \sqrt{\delta_2}.$$

In the rest of this section, we demonstrate that when Assumption 6.2 is violated, the W-DMR for overlapping marginals may be smaller than the W-DMR for non-overlapping marginals and, as a result, $\Theta(\delta)$ is a proper subset of $\Theta_D(\delta)$.

Consider the squared Mahalanobis distance with respect to a positive definite matrix. That is,

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = (s_\ell - s'_\ell)^\top V_\ell^{-1} (s_\ell - s'_\ell),$$

where $V_\ell = \begin{pmatrix} V_{\ell,YY} & V_{\ell,YX} \\ V_{\ell,XY} & V_{\ell,XX} \end{pmatrix}$ is a positive definite matrix. It is easy to show that

$$c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \min_{x_\ell, x'_\ell \in \mathcal{X}'_\ell} c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = (y_\ell - y'_\ell)^\top V_{\ell,YY}^{-1} (y_\ell - y'_\ell),$$

where $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell)$ and $s'_\ell = (y'_\ell, x'_\ell)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let \mathcal{I} be the primal of the overlapping W-DMR problem under*

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = (s_\ell - s'_\ell)^\top V_\ell^{-1} (s_\ell - s'_\ell).$$

Let \mathcal{I}_D be the primal of the non-overlapping W-DMR problem under $c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell)$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}\|X\|_2^2 < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}|Y_1|^2 < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}|Y_2|^2 < \infty$. Then, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) \leq \mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ for all $\delta > 0$.

Proposition 6.3. *Suppose that all the conditions in Proposition 6.2 hold. Then,*

(i) *for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + V_{1,YY}^{1/2} \delta_1^{1/2} + V_{2,YY}^{1/2} \delta_2^{1/2}, \\ \mathcal{I}(\delta) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \lambda_1 \delta_1 + \lambda_2 \delta_2 + \frac{1}{4\lambda_1} (V_1/V_{1,XX}) + \frac{1}{4\lambda_2} (V_2/V_{2,XX}) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} V_o^\top (\lambda_1 V_{1,XX}^{-1} + \lambda_2 V_{2,XX}^{-1})^{-1} V_o \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX} := V_{\ell,YY} - V_{\ell,YX}V_{\ell,XX}^{-1}V_{\ell,XY}$ is the Schur complement of $V_{\ell,XX}$ in V_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$, and $V_o = V_{2,XX}^{-1}V_{2,XY} - V_{1,XX}^{-1}V_{0,XY}$;

(ii) $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ if and only if $V_{1,XY} = V_{2,XY} = 0$;

(iii) $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ are continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

Proposition 6.2 and Proposition 6.3 imply that for non-separable Mahalanobis cost functions, the information in covariates may help shrink the identified set since $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) < \mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for some δ under mild conditions. Proposition 6.3 also implies that (i) $\mathcal{I}(0) = \mathcal{I}_D(0) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$; (ii) $\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0)$ and $\mathcal{I}(0, \delta_2) = \mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2)$ for all $\delta_1 \geq 0$ and $\delta_2 \geq 0$.

6.2 Comparison of Robust Welfare Functions

Recall that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}_0(d) &:= \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma_0(\delta)} \mathbb{E}[Y_1(1 - d(X)) + Y_2d(X)] \quad \text{and} \\ \text{RW}(d) &:= \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \mathbb{E}[Y_1(1 - d(X)) + Y_2d(X)], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_0(\delta_0) &= \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}(\mu, \gamma) \leq \delta_0\} \quad \text{and} \\ \Sigma(\delta) &= \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell,3}, \gamma_{\ell,3}) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell = 1, 2\}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following cost function c_ℓ for $\ell = 1, 2$:

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) + b(x, x'),$$

where $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell)$, $s'_\ell = (y'_\ell, x'_\ell)$, and $c_{Y_1}(y_1, y'_1)$ and $c_{Y_2}(y_2, y'_2)$ are cost functions for Y_1 and Y_2 , respectively, and $b(x, x')$ is some function on the space \mathcal{X} satisfying Assumption 2.1. When $b(x, x') = \infty \mathbf{1}\{x \neq x'\}$, $\mathbb{P}(X = X') = 1$ for any probability measure in uncertainty set.

Adjaho and Christensen (2023) establishes strong duality for $\text{RW}_0(d)$ under several cost functions. For comparison purposes, we restate the following Proposition in Adjaho and Christensen (2023) which allows distributional shifts in covariate X .

Proposition 6.4. (Proposition 4.1 in Adjaho and Christensen (2023)) *Suppose Y_1 and Y_2 are unbounded and $\mathbb{E}\|X\|_2^2$ is finite. Let the cost function $c : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ be given by*

$$c(s, s') = |y_1 - y'_1| + |y_2 - y'_2| + \|x' - x\|_2,$$

for $s = (y_1, y_2, x)$ and $s' = (y'_1, y'_2, x')$. Then

$$\text{RW}_0(d) = \sup_{\eta \geq 1} \{ \mathbb{E}_\mu [\max\{Y_2 + \eta h_1(X), Y_1 + \eta h_0(X)\}] - \eta \delta_0 \}, \quad \text{where}$$

$$h_0(x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}: d(u)=0} \|x - u\|_2 \quad \text{and} \quad h_1(x) = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{X}: d(u)=1} \|x - u\|_2.$$

This proposition implies that $\text{RW}_0(d)$ depends on the choice of the reference measure μ . Since only the marginals μ_{13} and μ_{23} are identified under Assumption 2.4, Adjaho and Christensen (2023) suggest three possible choices for μ by imposing specific dependence structures on μ :

- Y_1 and Y_2 are perfectly positively dependent conditional on $X = x$;
- Y_1 and Y_2 are conditionally independent given $X = x$;
- Y_1 and Y_2 are perfectly negatively dependent conditional on $X = x$.

Section 4.3.1 in Adjaho and Christensen (2023) shows that their robust welfare function $\text{RW}_0(d)$ is minimized when Y_1 and Y_2 are perfectly negatively dependent conditional on $X = x$.

The following proposition evaluates $\text{RW}(d)$ via the duality result in Section 3 and compares it with $\text{RW}_0(d)$.

Proposition 6.5. *Consider*

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = |y_\ell - y'_\ell| + \|x_\ell - x'_\ell\|_2.$$

Assume that Y is unbounded and $\mathbb{E}|Y_1|$, $\mathbb{E}|Y_2|$, and $\mathbb{E}\|X\|_2^2$ are finite. Then,

- (i) the robust welfare function $\text{RW}(d)$ based on $\Sigma(\delta)$ has the following dual reformulation:

$$\text{RW}(d) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2)\} d\pi(v) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right],$$

where $v = (y_1, x_1, y_2, x_2)$, and

$$\varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2) = \min_{x': d(x')=0} \left(\lambda_1 \|x_1 - x'\|_2 + \lambda_2 \|x_2 - x'\|_2 \right),$$

$$\varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2) = \min_{x': d(x')=1} \left(\lambda_1 \|x_1 - x'\|_2 + \lambda_2 \|x_2 - x'\|_2 \right);$$

- (ii) When $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = \delta_2$, $\text{RW}(d) \leq \text{RW}_0^*(d)$, where $\text{RW}_0^*(d)$ is the robust welfare function $\text{RW}_0(d)$ based on the reference measure $\pi^* = \int \max\{\mu_{1|3} + \mu_{2|3} - 1, 0\} d\mu_3$.

Part (ii) of the above proposition implies that $\text{RW}(d) \leq \text{RW}_0(d)$ for any reference measure $\mu \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$.

6.3 W-DRO for Logit Model Under Data Combination

We revisit the logit model in Section 2.3.3 and make the following assumption.

Assumption 6.3. (i) Let (Y_1, Y_2, X) follow some unknown measure μ . Let D denote a binary random variable independent of (Y_1, Y_2, X) such that we observe (Y_1, X) when $D = 0$, and (Y_2, X) when $D = 1$; (ii) Let $\{Y_{1i}, X_{1i}\}_{i=1}^{n_1}$ be the data set from (Y_1, X) , and $\{Y_{2i}, X_{2i}\}_{i=1}^{n_2}$ be the data set from (Y_2, X) .

Under this assumption, $X|D = 1$ has the same distribution as $X|D = 0$ and the empirical distributions of the two data sets are consistent estimators of the population reference measures for (Y_1, X) and (Y_2, X) .

Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Then Theorem 3.2 implies that for all $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\theta, \lambda} d\varpi \right],$$

where

$$f_{\theta, \lambda}(v) = \sup_{y'_1, y'_2, x'} [f(y'_1, y'_2, y; \theta) - \lambda_1 c_1((y_1, x_1), (y'_1, x')) - \lambda_2 c_2((y_2, x_2, y'_2, x'))]$$

with $v = (y_1, x_1, y_2, x_2)$.

Let $\hat{\mu}_{13}$ and $\hat{\mu}_{23}$ denote the empirical measures based on the two data sets. The dual form of $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ can be estimated by

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta) := \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\hat{\mu}_{13}, \hat{\mu}_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\theta, \lambda} d\varpi \right].$$

A direct consequence of Kellerer (1984, Proposition 2.1) is that

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2, \{\varphi_i\}_{i=1}^{n_1}, \{\varphi_j\}_{j=1}^{n_2}} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \frac{1}{n_1} \sum_{i=1}^{n_1} \varphi_i + \frac{1}{n_2} \sum_{j=1}^{n_2} \varphi_j \right]$$

such that $f_{\theta, \lambda}(s_{1i}, s_{2j}) \leq \varphi_i + \varphi_j$ for any $i \in [n_1]$ and $j \in [n_2]$,

where the last expression reduces to the dual in Awasthi et al. (2022) for the cost functions

$$c_1((y_1, x), (y'_1, x')) = \|x - x'\|_p + \kappa_1 |y_1 - y'_1| \quad \text{and}$$

$$c_2((y_2, x), (y_2, x')) = \|x - x'\|_p + \kappa_2 \|y_2 - y'_2\|_{p'}.$$

7 W-DMR with Multi-marginals

Sections 2-6 present a detailed study of W-DMR with two marginals. In this section, we briefly introduce W-DMR with more than two marginals or multi-marginals and discuss strong duality for non-overlapping and overlapping marginals.⁷ Applications include extension of risk aggregation in Section 2.3.4 to any finite number of individual risks and robust treatment choice in Section 2.3.4 to multi-valued treatment.

7.1 Non-overlapping Marginals

Let $\mathcal{V} := \prod_{\ell \in [L]} \mathcal{S}_\ell$ for Polish spaces \mathcal{S}_ℓ for $\ell \in [L]$, and μ_ℓ be a probability measure on $(\mathcal{S}_\ell, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell})$. Let $\Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)$ be the set of all possible couplings of μ_1, \dots, μ_L . Further, let $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption 7.1. *The function $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma_0 > -\infty$ for some $\gamma_0 \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$.*

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$, let γ_ℓ denote the projection of γ on \mathcal{S}_ℓ for $\ell \in [L]$. The W-DMR with non-overlapping multi-marginals is formulated as

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma,$$

where $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is the uncertainty set defined as

$$\Sigma_D(\delta) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V}) : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell \in [L]\}$$

in which $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ is the radius of the uncertainty set.

For a generic vector $v \in \mathbb{R}^L$ and $A \subset [L]$, we write $v_A = (v_{A,1}, \dots, v_{A,L}) \in \mathbb{R}^L$ as follows:

$$v_{A,\ell} = \begin{cases} v_\ell & \text{if } \ell \in A, \\ 0 & \text{if } \ell \notin A. \end{cases}$$

We also define $\tilde{c}_\ell : \mathcal{S}_\ell \times \mathcal{S}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{\infty\}$ as:

$$\tilde{c}_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = \begin{cases} c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) & \text{if } \ell \in A, \\ \infty \mathbf{1}\{s_\ell \neq s'_\ell\} & \text{if } \ell \notin A. \end{cases}$$

⁷For multi-marginals, the collection of given marginals can be more complicated than the non-overlapping and overlapping marginals (see Rüschendorf (1991), Embrechts and Puccetti (2010) and Doan et al. (2015)), we leave a complete treatment of the W-DMR with multi-marginals in future work.

For a function $g : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$, we define the function $g_{\lambda, A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ as

$$g_{\lambda, A}(v) = \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}} \left\{ g(v') - \sum_{\ell=1}^L \lambda_\ell \tilde{c}_\ell \{s_\ell, s'_\ell\} \right\}$$

with $v := (s_1, \dots, s_L)$ and $v' := (s'_1, \dots, s'_L)$.

Theorem 7.1 (Non-overlapping case). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 7.1 hold. Then, for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$ and $A \subset [L]$, we have*

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_A) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta_A \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda, A} d\pi \right].$$

In practice, the dual in Theorem 7.1 involves the computation of the multi-marginal problem, $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi$, see Pass (2010), Pass (2012), Pass (2015), Lindheim (2022), Nenna and Pass (2022), and Mehta et al. (2023) for detailed studies of properties and computation of multi-marginal problems for specific functions g_λ . For general possibly non Borel-measurable g_λ , the strong duality in Kellerer (1984) could be applied. The established result is stated in Corollary A.3 in Appendix A.2.

7.2 Overlapping Marginals

Let $\mathcal{S} := \left(\prod_{\ell \in [L]} \mathcal{Y}_\ell \right) \times \mathcal{X}$, where \mathcal{Y}_ℓ for $\ell \in [L]$ and \mathcal{X} are Polish spaces. Let $\mathcal{S}_\ell := \mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}$ for $\ell \in [L]$. Let $\mu_{\ell, L+1} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [L]$ be such that the projections of $\mu_{\ell, L+1}$ on \mathcal{X} are the same for $\ell \in [L]$. We call the Fréchet class of all probability measures on \mathcal{S} having marginals $(\mu_{\ell, L+1})_{\ell \in [L]}$ the Fréchet class with overlapping marginals and denote it as $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_{\ell, L+1})_{\ell \in [L]}) := \mathcal{F}((\mu_{\ell, L+1})_{\ell \in [L]})$. This class is the star-like system of marginals in Rüschendorf (1991) and Embrechts and Puccetti (2010), see also Doan et al. (2015).

Moreover, let $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a measurable function satisfying the following assumption.

Assumption 7.2. *The function $f : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a measurable function such that $\int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\nu_0 > -\infty$ for some $\nu_0 \in \Pi(\mu_{1, L+1}, \dots, \mu_{L, L+1}) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$.*

For any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$, let $\gamma_{\ell, L+1}$ denote the projection of γ on $\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}$ for $\ell \in [L]$. Similar to the two marginals case, the W-DMR with overlapping multi-marginals is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma,$$

where $\Sigma(\delta)$ is the uncertainty set defined as

$$\Sigma(\delta) = \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell,L+1}, \gamma_{\ell,L+1}) \leq \delta_\ell \text{ for } \ell \in [L]\},$$

in which $\delta = (\delta_1, \dots, \delta_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$ is the radius of the uncertainty set.

For a function $f : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\lambda := (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_L) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$, and $A \subset [L]$, we define the function $f_{\lambda,A} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ as follows:

$$f_{\lambda,A}(v) = \sup_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ f(s') - \sum_{\ell=1}^L \lambda_\ell \tilde{c}_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) \right\},$$

where $v = (s_1, \dots, s_L)$, $s' = (y'_1, \dots, y'_L, x')$, $s'_\ell = (y'_\ell, x')$ and $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell)$, and

$$\tilde{c}_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = \begin{cases} c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) & \text{if } \ell \in A, \\ \infty \mathbf{1}\{s_\ell \neq s'_\ell\} & \text{if } \ell \notin A. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 7.2 (Overlapping case). *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1 and 7.2 hold. Then, for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$ and $A \subset [L]$, we have*

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta_A) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta_A \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{1,L+1}, \dots, \mu_{L,L+1})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda,A} d\pi \right].$$

Similar to the nonoverlapping case, strong duality holds for the inner multi-marginal problem under additional conditions. The result is stated in corollary A.4 of Appendix A.2.

7.3 Treatment Choice for Multi-valued Treatment

We apply strong duality to multi-valued treatment in Kido (2022). Let $d : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [L]$ be a policy function or treatment rule on \mathcal{X} and $Y_\ell \in \mathbb{R}$ denote the potential outcome under the treatment ℓ for $\ell \in [L]$. Consider the policy function defined as

$$Y(d) := \sum_{\ell=1}^L Y_\ell \times \mathbf{1}\{d(X) = \ell\}.$$

Kido (2022) introduces the following robust welfare function.

$$\text{RW}_C(d) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_M(\delta_0)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L Y_\ell \mathbf{1}\{d(X) = \ell\} \right],$$

where the uncertainty set $\Sigma_M(\delta_0)$ is based on the conditional distribution of $(Y_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]}$ given X :

$$\Sigma_M(\delta_0) := \left\{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}(\mu_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_L)|X=x}, \gamma_{(Y_1, \dots, Y_L)|X=x}) \leq \delta_0 \text{ for all } x, \mu_X = \gamma_X \right\},$$

in which the cost function c associated with \mathbf{K} is

$$c((y_1, \dots, y_L), (y'_1, \dots, y'_L)) = \sum_{\ell=1}^L |y_\ell - y'_\ell|.$$

Note that the uncertainty set $\Sigma_M(\delta_0)$ does not allow any potential shift⁸ in X . When Y_1, \dots, Y_L are unbounded, Kido (2022) shows that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}_C(d) &= \sum_{\ell=1}^L \mathbb{E}_{(Y_\ell, X) \sim \mu_{\ell, L+1}} [(Y_\ell - \delta_0) I(D(X) = \ell)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_X \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L (\mathbb{E}[Y_\ell | X] - \delta_0) I(D(X) = \ell) \right]. \end{aligned}$$

We apply W-DMR for overlapping marginals with the following cost function:

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = |y_\ell - y'_\ell| + \|x_\ell - x'_\ell\|_2,$$

and define a robust welfare function as

$$\text{RW}(d) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \mathbb{E}_\gamma \left[\sum_{\ell=1}^L Y_\ell I(d(X) = \ell) \right].$$

Proposition 7.1. *For $\ell \in [L]$, let*

$$c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = |y_\ell - y'_\ell| + \|x_\ell - x'_\ell\|_2.$$

Assume that Y_ℓ is unbounded, $\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_2^2] < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[|Y_\ell|] < \infty$. Then

$$\text{RW}(d) = \sup_{\lambda \geq 1} \left\{ \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{1, L+1}, \dots, \mu_{L, L+1})} \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \min_{\ell \in [L]} \{y_\ell + \phi_{\lambda, \ell}(x_1, \dots, x_L)\} d\pi(s) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right\},$$

where

$$\phi_{\lambda, \ell}(x_1, \dots, x_L) = \min_{x', d(x') = \ell} \sum_{\ell=1}^L \lambda_\ell \|x_\ell - x'_\ell\|_2.$$

Proposition 7.1 is an extension of Proposition 6.5.

⁸Kido (2022) mentions the possibility of allowing for covariate shift by incorporating uncertainty sets in (e.g., Mo et al., 2020; Zhao et al., 2019) for the distribution of the covariate in future work.

8 Concluding Remarks

In this paper, we have introduced W-DMR in marginal problems for both non-overlapping and overlapping marginals and established fundamental results including strong duality, finiteness of the proposed W-DMR, and existence of an optimizer at each radius. We have also shown continuity of the W-DMR-MP as a function of the radius. Applicability of the proposed W-DMR in marginal problems and established properties is demonstrated via distinct applications when the sample information comes from multiple data sources and only some marginal reference measures are identified. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this paper is the first systematic study of W-DMR in marginal problems. Many open questions remain including the structure of optimizers of W-DMR for both non-overlapping and overlapping marginals, efficient numerical algorithms, and estimation and inference in each motivating example. Another useful extension is to consider objective functions that are nonlinear in the joint probability measure such as the Value-at-Risk of a linear portfolio of risks in Puccetti and Rüschendorf (2012) and robust spectral measures of risk in Ghossoub et al. (2023) and Ennaji et al. (2022).

References

- Adjaho, C. and Christensen, T. (2023). *Externally Valid Policy Choice*. arXiv:2205.05561 [econ, stat].
- Aliprantis, C. D. and Border, K. C. (2006). *Infinite Dimensional Analysis: a Hitchhiker's Guide*. 3rd ed. Infinite dimensional analysis. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg.
- Awasthi, P., Jung, C., and Morgenstern, J. (2022). *Distributionally Robust Data Join*. arXiv:2202.05797 [cs].
- Beiglböck, M. and Schachermayer, W. (2011). “Duality for Borel measurable cost functions”. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 363.08, pp. 4203–4203.
- Bertsekas, D. P. and Shreve, S. E. (1978). *Stochastic optimal control. The Discrete-Time Case (Optimization and Neural Computation Series)*. Athena Scientific.
- Blanchet, J. and Murthy, K. (2019). “Quantifying Distributional Model Risk via Optimal Transport”. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 44.2, pp. 565–600.
- Blanchet, J., Murthy, K., and Nguyen, V. A. (2021). “Statistical Analysis of Wasserstein Distributionally Robust Estimators”. In: *Tutorials in Operations Research: Emerging Optimization Methods and Modeling Techniques with Applications*. Ed. by J. G. Carlsson, D. Shier, and H. J. Greenberg. INFORMS, pp. 227–254.
- Chen, M., Du, W., Tang, Y., Jin, Y., and Yen, G. G. (2022). “A Decomposition Method for Both Additively and Non-additively Separable Problems”. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, pp. 1–1.
- Chen, X., Hong, H., and Tarozzi, A. (2008). “Semiparametric efficiency in GMM models with auxiliary data”. *The Annals of Statistics* 36.2.
- Doan, X. V., Li, X., and Natarajan, K. (2015). “Robustness to Dependency in Portfolio Optimization Using Overlapping Marginals”. en. *Operations Research* 63.6, pp. 1468–1488.
- Dudley, R. M. (2014). *Uniform central limit theorems*. Second edition. Cambridge studies in advanced mathematics. Cambridge University Press.
- Eckstein, S., Kupper, M., and Pohl, M. (2020). “Robust risk aggregation with neural networks”. *Mathematical Finance* 30.4, pp. 1229–1272.
- Embrechts, P., Höing, A., and Juri, A. (2003). “Using copulae to bound the Value-at-Risk for functions of dependent risks”. *Finance and Stochastics* 7.2, pp. 145–167.
- Embrechts, P., Höing, A., and Puccetti, G. (2005). “Worst VaR scenarios”. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* 37.1, pp. 115–134.

- Embrechts, P. and Puccetti, G. (2010). “Bounds for the sum of dependent risks having overlapping marginals”. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 101.1, pp. 177–190.
- Embrechts, P., Puccetti, G., and Rüschendorf, L. (2013). “Model uncertainty and VaR aggregation”. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 37.8, pp. 2750–2764.
- Ennaji, H., Mérigot, Q., Nenna, L., and Pass, B. (2022). *Robust risk management via multi-marginal optimal transport*. arXiv: 2211.07694 [math.OC].
- Fan, K. (1953). “Minimax Theorems”. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 39.1, pp. 42–47.
- Fan, Y., Guerre, E., and Zhu, D. (2017). “Partial identification of functionals of the joint distribution of “potential outcomes””. *Journal of Econometrics* 197.1, pp. 42–59.
- Fan, Y. and Henry, M. (2023). “Vector copulas”. en. *Journal of Econometrics* 234.1, pp. 128–150.
- Fan, Y. and Park, S. S. (2009). “Partial identification of the distribution of treatment effects and its confidence sets”. In: *Advances in Econometrics*. Ed. by Q. Li and J. S. Racine. Vol. 25. Emerald Group Publishing Limited, pp. 3–70.
- (2010). “Sharp bounds on the distribution of treatment Effects and their statistical inference”. *Econometric Theory* 26.3, pp. 931–951.
- (2012). “Confidence intervals for the quantile of treatment effects in randomized experiments”. *Journal of Econometrics* 167.2, pp. 330–344.
- Fan, Y. and Wu, J. (2009). “Partial identification of the distribution of treatment effects in switching regime models and its confidence sets”. *Review of Economic Studies* 77.3, pp. 1002–1041.
- Firpo, S. and Ridder, G. (2019). “Partial identification of the treatment effect distribution and its functionals”. *Journal of Econometrics* 213.1, pp. 210–234.
- Frank, M. J., Nelsen, R. B., and Schweizer, B. (1987). “Best-possible bounds for the distribution of a sum — a problem of Kolmogorov”. *Probability Theory and Related Fields* 74.2, pp. 199–211.
- Gao, R. and Kleywegt, A. (2022). “Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with wasserstein distance”. *Mathematics of Operations Research*.
- Ghossoub, M., Hall, J., and Saunders, D. (2023). “Maximum Spectral Measures of Risk with Given Risk Factor Marginal Distributions”. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 48.2, pp. 1158–1182.
- Graham, B. S., Xavier Pinto, C. C. de, and Egel, D. (2016). “Efficient estimation of data combination models by the method of auxiliary-to-study tilting (AST)”. *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics* 34.2, pp. 288–301.
- Joe, H. (1997). *Multivariate Models and Multivariate Dependence Concepts*. en. 0th ed. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

- Kallus, N., Mao, X., and Zhou, A. (2022). “Assessing algorithmic fairness with unobserved protected class using data combination”. *Management Science* 68.3, pp. 1959–1981.
- Kellerer, H. G. (1964). “Verteilungsfunktionen mit gegebenen marginalverteilungen”. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und verwandte Gebiete*.
- Kellerer, H. G. (1984). “Duality theorems for marginal problems”. *Zeitschrift für Wahrscheinlichkeitstheorie und Verwandte Gebiete* 67.4, pp. 399–432.
- Kido, D. (2022). *Distributionally robust policy learning with wasserstein distance*. arXiv: 2205.04637 [econ.EM].
- Kitagawa, T. and Tetenov, A. (2018). “Who Should Be Treated? Empirical Welfare Maximization Methods for Treatment Choice”. *Econometrica* 86.2, pp. 591–616.
- Kuhn, D., Esfahani, P. M., Nguyen, V. A., and Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, S. (2019). “Wasserstein Distributionally Robust Optimization: Theory and Applications in Machine Learning”. en. In: *Operations Research & Management Science in the Age of Analytics*. Ed. by S. Netessine, D. Shier, and H. J. Greenberg. INFORMS, pp. 130–166.
- Lindheim, J. von (2022). *Approximative Algorithms for Multi-Marginal Optimal Transport and Free-Support Wasserstein Barycenters*. arXiv:2202.00954 [cs, math].
- Makarov, G. D. (1982). “Estimates for the Distribution Function of a Sum of Two Random Variables When the Marginal Distributions are Fixed”. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 26.4, pp. 803–806.
- Mehta, R., Kline, J., Lokhande, V. S., Fung, G., and Singh, V. (2023). “Efficient discrete multi marginal optimal transport regularization”. In: *The eleventh international conference on learning representations*.
- Mo, W., Qi, Z., and Liu, Y. (2020). “Learning optimal distributionally robust individualized treatment rules”. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 116.534, pp. 659–674.
- Nenna, L. and Pass, B. (2022). *An ODE characterisation of multi-marginal optimal transport*. arXiv:2212.12492 [cs, math].
- Pass, B. (2010). *Uniqueness and Monge solutions in the multi-marginal optimal transportation problem*. arXiv:1007.0424 [math].
- (2012). *Multi-marginal optimal transport and multi-agent matching problems: uniqueness and structure of solutions*. arXiv:1210.7372 [math].
- (2015). “Multi-marginal optimal transport: Theory and applications”. *ESAIM: Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Analysis* 49.6, pp. 1771–1790.
- Peyré, G. and Cuturi, M. (2018). *Computational optimal transport*. arXiv: 1803.00567 [stat.ML].
- Puccetti, G. and Rüschendorf, L. (2012). “Bounds for joint portfolios of dependent risks”. *Statistics & Risk Modeling* 29.2, pp. 107–132.

- Rachev, S. T. and Rüschendorf, L. (1998). *Mass transportation problems: Volume I: theory*. Vol. 1. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Ridder, G. and Moffitt, R. (2007). “Chapter 75 the econometrics of data combination”. In: *Handbook of econometrics*. Elsevier, pp. 5469–5547.
- Rüschendorf, L. (1982). “Random variables with maximum sums”. *Advances in Applied Probability* 14.3, pp. 623–632.
- (1991). “Bounds for distributions with multivariate marginals”. In: *Stochastic orders and decision under risk*. Institute of Mathematical Statistics, pp. 285–310.
- Santambrogio, F. (2015). *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*. Springer International Publishing.
- Shortt, R. M. (1983). “Combinatorial methods in the study of marginal problems over separable spaces”. *Journal of mathematical analysis and applications*.
- Sinha, A., Namkoong, H., Volpi, R., and Duchi, J. (2017). *Certifying some distributional robustness with principled adversarial training*. arXiv: 1710.10571 [stat.ML].
- Van Der Vaart, A. W. and Wellner, J. A. (1996). *Weak Convergence and Empirical Processes*. Springer Series in Statistics. New York, NY: Springer New York.
- Villani, C. (2009). *Optimal transport: old and new*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- (2021). *Topics in optimal transportation*. American Mathematical Soc.
- Vorob’ev, N. N. (1962). “Consistent families of measures and their extensions”. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*.
- Yue, M.-C., Kuhn, D., and Wiesemann, W. (2022). “On linear optimization over Wasserstein balls”. *Mathematical Programming*.
- Zhang, L., Yang, J., and Gao, R. (2022). *A simple duality proof for wasserstein distributionally robust optimization*. arXiv:2205.00362 [math.OC].
- Zhao, Y.-Q., Zeng, D., Tangen, C. M., and Leblanc, M. L. (2019). “Robustifying trial-derived optimal treatment rules for a target population”. *Electronic Journal of Statistics* 13.1.

A Appendix A: Preliminaries

In this appendix, we provide a self-contained review of interchangeability principle, strong duality for marginal problems, and probability measures given marginals.

Additional notations used in the appendices are collected here. For any set A , we denote by 2^A the power set of A . Suppose $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ and $g : \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}$, let $g \circ f$ denote the composite of f and g , i.e., a map $x \mapsto g(f(x))$ that maps \mathcal{X} into \mathcal{Z} . Given a Polish measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$. For any Borel measure μ on \mathcal{X} , let $\text{Supp}(\mu)$ denote the smallest closed set $A \subset \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mu(A) = 1$. For $j \in [n]$, let \mathcal{X}_j be a Polish space equipped with Borel σ -algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}_j}$. Let $\mathcal{S} := \prod_{j \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_j$. For any subset $K \subset [n]$, we write $\mathcal{S}_K := \prod_{j \in K} \mathcal{X}_j$ and the projection map proj_K from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S}_K as $\text{proj}_K : (x_j)_{j \in [n]} \mapsto (x_j)_{j \in K}$. Given $\mu_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}_j)$ for $j \in [n]$, let $\Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_n)$ denote the set of probability measures μ on \mathcal{S} such that $\text{proj}_{\{j\}} \# \mu = \mu_j$. Finally, let $\mathcal{N}(\mu, \Sigma)$ denote the multivariate normal distribution with mean μ and covariance matrix Σ .

A.1 Interchangeability Principle

Let $(\mathcal{T}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}, \mu)$ be a probability space, $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$ be a sample space and $\varphi : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be a measurable function. We denote by $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mu}$ the μ -completion of $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$. Let $\Gamma(\mu, \varphi)$ denote the set of probability measures π on $(\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}} \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$ such that $\pi(A \times \mathcal{X}) = \mu(A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}$ and $\int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi d\pi$ is well defined. If there is no such π , the natural convention is to take $\Gamma(\mu, \varphi) = \emptyset$.

Definition A.1. *A measurable function $\varphi : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to μ if the function $t \mapsto \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x)$ is $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{T}}^{\mu}$ -measurable and satisfies*

$$\int_{\mathcal{T}} \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) \right] d\mu(t) = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \varphi)} \int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) d\pi(t, x).$$

The interchangeability principle allows us to interchange the supremum and integral operators. It is a weak condition. As explained in Example 2 in Zhang et al. (2022), this condition is satisfied when the space is Polish and φ is measurable.

We extend the interchangeability principle with respect to a measure to a class of measures in the definition below.

Definition A.2. *Let \mathcal{G} be a set of probability measures on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}})$. A measurable function $\varphi : \mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to \mathcal{G} if φ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to μ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}$.*

Lemma A.1. *Suppose that φ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to \mathcal{G} . Let $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi) := \cup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \Gamma(\mu, \varphi)$. Then,*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi)} \int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) d\pi(t, x) = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) \right] d\mu(t) \right\}.$$

Proof. With the convention, we write $\sup A = -\infty$ if $A = \emptyset$. It is easy to see that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mathcal{G}, \varphi)} \int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi d\pi &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \varphi)} \int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) d\pi(t, x) \right] \\ &= \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \left[\sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\mu, \varphi)} \int_{\mathcal{T} \times \mathcal{X}} \varphi d\pi \right] = \sup_{\mu \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{T}} \left[\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) \right] d\mu(t) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.2 Strong Duality for Marginal Problems

The strong duality results for marginal problems are well-established in the literature, see Kellerer (1984), Villani (2009), Villani (2021), and Beiglböck and Schachermayer (2011). Here, we present a strong duality result based on Kellerer (1984).

Theorem A.1. *Given probability measures μ_ℓ on Polish space \mathcal{X}_ℓ equipped with Borel algebra $\mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}_\ell}$ for $\ell \in [L]$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \prod_{\ell \in [L]} \mathcal{X}_\ell$ and $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ be an extended real-valued function. Consider the following marginal problem:*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f(x) d\pi(x).$$

Suppose $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x) \geq u\}$ is analytic for all $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and there exist $f_\ell < \infty$, $f_\ell \in L^1(\mu_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [L]$ such that $f(x) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^L f_\ell(x_\ell)$ for all $x := (x_1, \dots, x_L) \in \mathcal{X}$. Let Φ_f be the set of all measurable functions $(\phi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]}$, where $\phi_\ell \in L^1(\mu_\ell)$ and $\phi_\ell > -\infty$ for all $\ell \in [L]$ such that

$$\sum_{\ell=1}^L \phi_\ell(x_\ell) \geq f(x), \quad \forall x = (x_1, \dots, x_L) \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Then,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)} \int_{\mathcal{X}} f d\pi = \inf_{(\phi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in \Phi_f} \left\{ \sum_{\ell=1}^L \int_{\mathcal{X}_\ell} \phi_\ell d\mu_\ell \right\}.$$

Proof. This theorem is a direct application of Kellerer (1984, Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.14) to Polish spaces. Since $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x) \geq u\}$ is analytic for every $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{X} is a Polish space, it is a $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$ -Suslin set, where $\mathfrak{F}_{\mathcal{X}}$ is the collection of closed sets of \mathcal{X} . Therefore, conditions in Kellerer (1984, Proposition 2.3 and Theorem 2.14) are satisfied with the outer integral in the primal problem.

Since $\{x \in \mathcal{X} : f(x) \geq u\}$ is analytic for every $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$ and \mathcal{X} is Polish space, f is universally measurable, see Aliprantis and Border (2006, Theorem 12.41) and Bertsekas and Shreve (1978). For each $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)$, there exists a Borel measurable function f^* such that $f^* = f$, π -almost surely. As a result, we can replace the outer integral by the integral with respect to π -completion using Lemma 1.2.1 of Van Der Vaart and Wellner (1996). \square

For the function φ defined in Appendix A.1, Bertsekas and Shreve (1978, Proposition 7.47) implies that the set $\{t \in \mathcal{T} : \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \varphi(t, x) \geq u\}$ is analytic for all $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. In our context, the functions $f_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $g_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ may not be Borel measurable; however, $\{f_\lambda \geq u\}$ and $\{g_\lambda \geq u\}$ are both analytic for all $u \in \overline{\mathbb{R}}$. In the following corollaries, we apply Theorem A.1 to the inner marginal problems in $\mathcal{J}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{J}(\delta)$, where we use the convention that the infimum over an empty set is defined as ∞ .

Corollary A.1. *In addition to conditions in Theorem 3.1, assume that there exist some measurable functions $a_1 \in L^1(\mu_1)$ and $a_2 \in L^1(\mu_2)$ such that $a_1 < \infty$, $a_2 < \infty$, and*

$$g(s_1, s_2) \geq a_1(s_1) + a_2(s_2), \quad \forall (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Then, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_D(\delta) = \left. \begin{aligned} & \inf_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \\ (\psi, \phi) \in L^1(\mu_1) \times L^1(\mu_2)}} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} \psi d\mu_1 + \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \phi d\mu_2 : \psi, \phi > -\infty \right. \\ & \left. \psi(s_1) + \phi(s_2) \geq g_\lambda(s_1, s_2), \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Corollary A.2. *In addition to conditions in Theorem 3.2, assume that for each λ , there exist some measurable functions $a_{\lambda,1} \in L^1(\mu_1)$ and $a_{\lambda,2} \in L^1(\mu_2)$ such that $a_{\lambda,1} < \infty$, $a_{\lambda,2} < \infty$, and*

$$f_\lambda(s_1, s_2) \geq a_{\lambda,1}(s_1) + a_{\lambda,2}(s_2), \quad \forall (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2.$$

Then, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta) = \inf_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \\ (\psi, \phi) \in L^1(\mu_{13}) \times L^1(\mu_{23})}} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{S}_1} \psi d\mu_{13} + \int_{\mathcal{S}_2} \phi d\mu_{23} : \psi, \phi > -\infty \right. \\ \left. \psi(s_1) + \phi(s_2) \geq f_\lambda(s_1, s_2) \quad \forall (s_1, s_2) \right\}.$$

Corollary A.3. *In addition to conditions in Theorem 7.1, assume that there exist some measurable functions $a_\ell \in L^1(\mu_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [L]$ such that $a_\ell < \infty$, and*

$$g(s) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^L a_\ell(s_\ell), \quad \forall s = (s_1, \dots, s_L) \in \prod_{\ell \in [L]} \mathcal{S}_\ell.$$

Then, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{+++}^L$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^L, \psi_\ell > -\infty \\ (\psi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in \prod_{\ell \in [L]} L^1(\mu_\ell)}} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \int \psi_\ell d\mu_\ell : \sum_{\ell=1}^L \psi_\ell(s_\ell) \geq g_{\lambda, [L]}(s), \forall s \right\}.$$

Corollary A.4. *In addition to conditions in Theorem 7.2, assume that for each λ , there exist some measurable functions $a_{\lambda, \ell} \in L^1(\mu_\ell)$ for $\ell \in [L]$ such that $a_{\lambda, \ell} < \infty$, and*

$$f_{\lambda, [L]}(s) \geq \sum_{\ell=1}^L a_{\lambda, \ell}(s_\ell), \quad \forall s = (s_1, \dots, s_L) \in \prod_{\ell \in [L]} \mathcal{S}_\ell.$$

Then, for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{+++}^L$, we have

$$\mathcal{J}(\delta) = \inf_{\substack{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^L, \psi_\ell > -\infty \\ (\psi_\ell)_{\ell \in [L]} \in \prod_{\ell \in [L]} L^1(\mu_\ell)}} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sum_{\ell=1}^L \int_{\mathcal{S}_\ell} \psi_\ell d\mu_{\ell, L+1} : \sum_{\ell=1}^L \psi_\ell(s_\ell) \geq f_{\lambda, [L]}(s), \forall s \right\}.$$

A.3 Probability Measures with Given Marginals

The existence of probability measures with given marginals was studied by Vorob'ev (1962), Kellerer (1964), and Shortt (1983). If the indices of the marginals are overlapping, then there may not be a probability measure compatible with the given marginals. In this section, we review a sufficient condition for the existence of such a measure.

We first define a *consistent product marginal system* (CPMS) by following Shortt (1983, p. 466). Let $\mathcal{S} = \prod_{j \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_j$. Given a finite index collection $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ with $K_j \subset [n]$ and probability measure μ_j on $\mathcal{S}_j := \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$ for $j \in [N]$. A *product marginal system* $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ consists of a product space \mathcal{S} and probability measures $(\mu_j)_{j=1}^N$.

Definition A.3 (Consistent product marginal system (CPMS)). *The product marginal system $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ is said to be consistent if for any $K_i, K_j \subset [n]$ with $K_i \cap K_j \neq \emptyset$, the projections of μ_i and μ_j on $\mathcal{S}_{K_i \cap K_j}$ are the same, i.e.,*

$$\left(\text{proj}_{K_i \cap K_j} \circ \text{proj}_{K_i}^{-1} \right) \# \mu_i = \left(\text{proj}_{K_i \cap K_j} \circ \text{proj}_{K_j}^{-1} \right) \# \mu_j.$$

A CPMS is not necessarily nonempty. To illustrate this, we consider the following examples.

Example A.1. Let $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$, $K_j = \{j\}$ for $j \in [2]$. Given probability measures μ_j on $\mathcal{S}_j := \mathcal{X}_j$ for $j \in [2]$, the CPMS $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_1, \mu_2)$ is given by

$$\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_1, \mu_2) = \left\{ \pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2) : \pi \circ \text{proj}_{\{j\}}^{-1} = \mu_j, \forall j = 1, 2 \right\}.$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_1, \mu_2)$ is identical to $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and is nonempty.

Example A.2. Let $\mathcal{X}_j = \mathbb{R}$ for $j \in [4]$. Let $K_j = \{j, j+1\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{X}_j \times \mathcal{X}_{j+1}$ for $j \in [3]$. To make the example more concrete, let $\mu_j = \mathcal{N}(0, I_2)$ for all $j \in [3]$. We note that

$$\left(\text{proj}_{K_j \cap K_{j+1}} \circ \text{proj}_{K_j}^{-1} \right) \# \mu_j = \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \forall j \in [3].$$

Moreover, it is easy to verify $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^3)$ is consistent and nonempty, since $\mathcal{N}(0, I_3)$ is an element of $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^3)$.

Example A.3. Let $\mathcal{X}_j = \mathbb{R}$ for $j \in [3]$, $K_1 = \{1, 2\}$, $K_2 = \{2, 3\}$, $K_3 = \{1, 3\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_j := \mathcal{S}_{K_j}$ for $j \in [3]$. We define

$$\mu_1 = \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 4 \end{bmatrix}\right), \quad \mu_2 = \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} 4 & -2 \\ -2 & 4 \end{bmatrix}\right), \quad \mu_3 = \mathcal{N}\left(0, \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -2 \\ -2 & 4 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

It is easy to verify $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^3)$ is consistent but is an empty set. Suppose $\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^3)$, then the covariance matrix of π is

$$\Sigma = \begin{bmatrix} 2 & -1 & -2 \\ -1 & 4 & -2 \\ -2 & -2 & 4 \end{bmatrix}.$$

However, Σ is not positive semi-definite so can not be a covariance matrix.

A sufficient condition for a CPMS to be non-empty is the decomposability of its index set. We restate the definition of decomposibility from Fan and Henry (2023, Definition 11), Joe (1997, Section 3.7), and Kellerer (1964).

Definition A.4 (Decomposability). *A collection $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ of subsets of $[n]$ is called decomposable if there is a permutation σ of $[N]$ such that*

$$\left(\bigcup_{j < m} K_{\sigma(j)} \right) \cap K_{\sigma(m)} \in \bigcup_{j < m} 2^{K_{\sigma(j)}}, \quad \forall m \in [N]. \quad (\text{DC})$$

For Euclidean spaces, Kellerer (1964) proves that a CPMS is nonempty if its index set is decomposable, while Shortt (1983) extends this result to separable spaces. Below, we present a statement of this result for Polish spaces and give a simple proof.

Proposition A.1. *Let $\mathcal{S} = \prod_{j \in [n]} \mathcal{X}_j$ where \mathcal{X}_j are Polish spaces with the Borel algebras. Suppose that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ is a CPMS and the associated index collection $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ with $K_i \subset [n]$ is decomposable. Then $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ is nonempty.*

The proof of Proposition A.1 below is based on two results. The first is Theorem 1.1.10 in Dudley (2014) restated in theorem A.2 and the second is lemma A.2, a direct consequence of Definition A.3.

Theorem A.2 (Vorob'ev-Berkes-Philip). *Let $\mathcal{Y}_1, \mathcal{Y}_2, \mathcal{X}$ be Polish spaces with Borel algebras and let $\mathcal{S} := \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$. Let μ_0 and μ_1 be Laws on $\mathcal{S}_1 := \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}_2 := \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$ respectively. Suppose $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_1, \mu_2)$ is a consistent product marginal system. Then $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; \mu_1, \mu_2)$ is nonempty.*

Lemma A.2. *Suppose that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ is a CPMS, $K_i, K_j \subset [n]$ and $K_i \cap K_j \neq \emptyset$. If $Q \subset K_i \cap K_j$ and $Q \neq \emptyset$, then the projections of μ_i and μ_j on \mathcal{S}_Q are the same, i.e.,*

$$(\text{proj}_Q \circ \text{proj}_{K_i}^{-1}) \# \mu_i = (\text{proj}_Q \circ \text{proj}_{K_j}^{-1}) \# \mu_j.$$

Moreover, for all $\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$,

$$\text{proj}_Q \# \pi = (\text{proj}_Q \circ \text{proj}_{K_j}^{-1}) \# \mu_j, \quad \forall j \in [N].$$

Proof of Proposition A.1. We give a proof by induction on N . Without loss of generality, assume that the permutation σ in Equation (DC) satisfies $\sigma(j) = j$ for $j \in [N]$. Proposition A.1 holds trivially when $N = 1$. When $N = 2$, it holds by Theorem A.2. Let $\mathcal{H}_{N-1} := \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathcal{S}_j$ and assume that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{N-1}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^{N-1}) \neq \emptyset$.

Then, there is a $\gamma \in \mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{N-1}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^{N-1})$. Let us verify that $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{N-1} \times \mathcal{S}_N; \gamma, \mu_N)$ is consistent.

Let $Q = \cup_{j=1}^{N-1} K_j$. Since $\{K_1, \dots, K_N\}$ is decomposable, $Q \cap K_N \in \cup_{j < N} 2^{K_j}$. As a result, we must have $(Q \cap K_N) \subset K_\ell$ for some $\ell \in [N-1]$ and hence $(Q \cap K_N) \subset (K_\ell \cap K_N)$. If $(Q \cap K_N) = \emptyset$, the proof is trivial. In the rest of the proof, we suppose $(Q \cap K_N) \neq \emptyset$. Since $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{S}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^N)$ is consistent, by Lemma A.2,

$$(\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_{K_N}^{-1}) \# \mu_N = (\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_{K_\ell}^{-1}) \# \mu_\ell.$$

Since $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{N-1}; (\mu_j)_{j=1}^{N-1})$ is consistent, Lemma A.2 also implies

$$(\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_Q^{-1}) \# \gamma = (\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_{K_\ell}^{-1}) \# \mu_\ell.$$

This shows

$$(\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_{K_N}^{-1}) \# \mu_N = (\text{proj}_{K_N \cap Q} \circ \text{proj}_Q^{-1}) \# \gamma,$$

and $\mathcal{F}(\mathcal{H}_{N-1} \times \mathcal{S}_N; \gamma, \mu_N)$ is consistent. The proof is complete by using Theorem A.2 again. □

B Appendix B: Technical Lemmas

Lemma B.1.

- (i) Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.2 hold. Then, the function $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is concave, non-decreasing in $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, and $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) > -\infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.
- (ii) Suppose Assumptions 2.1 and 2.3 hold. Then, the function $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is concave, non-decreasing in $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, and $\mathcal{I}(\delta) > -\infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Proof of Lemma B.1. We show the claims on $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ only since the proof for $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is almost identical to that for $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$. Note that $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is well-defined since Assumption 2.1 implies that $\Sigma(\delta)$ is non-empty.

Note that under Assumption 2.2, for any $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) \geq \mathcal{I}(0) \geq \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) d\nu(s) > -\infty \tag{B.1}$$

for some $\nu \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. The monotonicity of \mathcal{I} can be seen from the definition. We now show the concavity of \mathcal{I} . Fix $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, $\delta' = (\delta'_1, \delta'_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$

and $\lambda \in (0, 1)$. For any $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta), \gamma' \in \Sigma(\delta')$, consider the probability measure $\gamma'' = \lambda\gamma + (1-\lambda)\gamma'$. Since \mathbf{K}_ℓ is Optimal Transport cost, $\nu \mapsto \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \nu)$ is convex. So, we have for $\ell = 1, 2$,

$$\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma''_{\ell,3}) \leq \lambda \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) + (1-\lambda) \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma'_\ell) \leq \lambda \delta_\ell + (1-\lambda) \delta'_\ell.$$

This shows that $\gamma'' \in \Sigma(\lambda\delta + (1-\lambda)\delta')$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\lambda\delta + (1-\lambda)\delta') &= \sup_{\nu \in \Sigma(\lambda\delta + (1-\lambda)\delta')} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) d\nu(s) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma'' = \lambda \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma + (1-\lambda) \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma'. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)$ and $\gamma' \in \Sigma(\delta')$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\lambda\delta + (1-\lambda)\delta') &\geq \lambda \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) d\gamma(s) + (1-\lambda) \sup_{\gamma' \in \Sigma(\delta')} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) d\gamma'(s) \\ &\geq \lambda \mathcal{I}(\delta) + (1-\lambda) \mathcal{I}(\delta'). \end{aligned}$$

□

Lemma B.2. Let $\varphi : \mathbb{R}_+^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ be a concave and non-decreasing function. For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$, define

$$\varphi^*(\lambda) = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\varphi(x) - \langle \lambda, x \rangle\}.$$

Then for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, one has

$$\varphi(x) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle + \varphi^*(\lambda)\}.$$

Proof of Lemma B.2. If $\varphi(x_0) = \infty$ for some $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, then $\varphi(x) = \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. In fact, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$, there is $x_1 \in B(x, \delta)$ such that $x = tx_0 + (1-t)x_1$ for some $t \in (0, 1)$ and the concavity of φ implies

$$\varphi(x) = \varphi(tx_0 + (1-t)x_1) \geq t\varphi(x_0) + (1-t)\varphi(x_1) = \infty.$$

Now we assume $\varphi(x) < \infty$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^n$. Define a new function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ as

$$\psi(x) := \begin{cases} -\varphi(x) & x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \\ \infty & x \notin \mathbb{R}_+^n. \end{cases}$$

It is easy to see ψ is convex and the Legendre–Fenchel transform of ψ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^*(\lambda) &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \psi(x)\} = \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \psi(x)\} \\ &= \sup_{x \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\varphi(x) - \langle -\lambda, x \rangle\} = \begin{cases} \varphi^*(-\lambda) & -\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \\ \infty & -\lambda \notin \mathbb{R}_+^n \end{cases}.\end{aligned}$$

The Legendre–Fenchel transform of $\psi^*(\lambda)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^{**}(x) &= \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \psi^*(\lambda)\} = \sup_{-\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \psi^*(\lambda)\} \\ &= \sup_{-\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle - \varphi^*(-\lambda)\} = - \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^n} \{\langle \lambda, x \rangle + \varphi^*(\lambda)\}\end{aligned}$$

Since ψ^{**} is the double Legendre–Fenchel transform of ψ , then ψ^{**} is the lower-semicontinuous convex envelope of ψ from below. The convexity of ψ implies $\psi = \psi^{**}$ in the interior of $\{x : \psi(x) < \infty\}$ which is \mathbb{R}_{++}^n . The desired result follows. \square

Lemma B.3. *Let $K := \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$, where $K_1 = \{3, 4\}$, $K_2 = \{1, 3\}$, and $K_3 = \{2, 4\}$. Then K is decomposable.*

Proof of Lemma B.3. When $m = 1$, The condition (DC) holds obviously. When $m = 2$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < 2} K_\ell \right) \cap K_2 = K_1 \cap K_2 = \{3\} \in \bigcup_{\ell < 2} 2^{K_\ell} = 2^{K_1}.$$

When $m = 3$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < 3} K_\ell \right) \cap S_3 = (K_1 \cup K_2) \cap K_3 = \{4\} \in \bigcup_{\ell < 3} 2^{K_\ell} = 2^{K_1} \cup 2^{K_2}.$$

\square

Lemma B.4. *Let $K := \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ where $K_1 = \{3, 4, 5\}$, $K_2 = \{1, 3, 5\}$, and $K_3 = \{2, 4, 5\}$. Then K is decomposable.*

Proof of Lemma B.4. When $m = 1$, the condition (DC) holds trivially. When $m = 2$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < 2} K_\ell \right) \cap K_2 = K_1 \cap K_2 = \{3, 5\} \in \bigcup_{\ell < 2} 2^{K_\ell} = 2^{K_1}.$$

When $m = 3$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < 3} K_\ell \right) \cap K_3 = (K_1 \cup K_2) \cap K_3 = \{4, 5\} \in \bigcup_{\ell < 3} 2^{K_\ell} = 2^{K_1} \cup 2^{K_2}.$$

\square

Lemma B.5. Let $K := \{K_1, \dots, K_{L+1}\}$ where $K_1 = \{L+1, \dots, 2L\}$ and $K_\ell = \{\ell-1, L+\ell-1\}$ for $2 \leq \ell \leq L+1$. Then K is decomposable.

Proof of Lemma B.5. When $m = 1$, the condition (DC) holds trivially. When $1 < m \leq L+1$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < m} K_\ell \right) \cap K_m = \bigcup_{\ell < m} (K_\ell \cap K_m) = K_1 \cap K_m \in 2^{K_1} \subset \bigcup_{\ell < m} 2^{K_\ell}.$$

This shows that the condition (DC) holds. \square

Lemma B.6. Let $K := \{K_1, \dots, K_{L+1}\}$, where $K_1 = \{L+1, \dots, 2L+1\}$ and $K_{\ell+1} = \{\ell, L+\ell, 2L+1\}$ for $1 \leq \ell \leq L$. Then K is decomposable.

Proof of Lemma B.6. When $m = 1$, the condition (DC) holds trivially. When $1 < m \leq L+1$,

$$\left(\bigcup_{\ell < m} K_\ell \right) \cap K_m = \bigcup_{\ell < m} (K_\ell \cap K_m) = (K_1 \cap K_m) \in 2^{K_1} \subset \bigcup_{\ell < m} 2^{K_\ell}.$$

This shows that the condition (DC) holds. \square

C Appendix C: Proofs of Main Results

C.1 Proofs in Section 3

C.1.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

The expressions of $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0)$ and $\mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2)$ can be derived from $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ for $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ with appropriate modifications of the cost function. In particular, consider another cost function $\widehat{c}_2(s_2, s'_2) = \infty \mathbf{1}\{s_2 \neq s'_2\}$ and the optimal transport distance $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2$ associated with \widehat{c}_2 . Define an uncertainty set $\widehat{\Sigma}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ depending on \mathbf{K}_1 and $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2$ as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \left\{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) : \mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1, \mu_1) \leq \delta_1, \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2(\gamma_2, \mu_2) \leq \delta_2 \right\}.$$

Moreover, we define $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_D : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \sup_{\gamma \in \widehat{\Sigma}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g(s_1, s_2) d\gamma(s_1, s_2).$$

We note $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2(\mu, \nu) = 0$ if and only if $\mu = \nu$. For all $\delta_2 > 0$, $\widehat{\Sigma}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \Sigma_D(\delta_1, 0)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0)$. Using the dual reformulation of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}_D$ on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 , we have

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda(s_1, s_2) d\varpi(s_1, s_2) \right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1, s'_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2} \{g(s'_1, s'_2) - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, s'_1) - \lambda_2 \widehat{c}_2(s_2, s'_2)\} \\ &= \sup_{s'_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1} \{g(s'_1, s_2) - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, s'_1)\} = g_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $g_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2)$ is independent of λ_2 , letting $\lambda_2 = 0$ yields

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) = \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda,1}(v) d\varpi(v) \right].$$

Using the same reasoning, we can get the expression of $\mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2)$.

In the rest of the proof, we show the dual reformulation of \mathcal{I}_D on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 . Let \mathcal{P}_D denote the set of $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$ that satisfies $\mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) < \infty$, $\mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) < \infty$, and $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma > -\infty$. Taking the Legendre transform on \mathcal{I} yields that any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) &:= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle\} = \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell \in [2] \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})} \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell \in [2] \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \underbrace{\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) \right\}}_{:= I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma]} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

We note that the expression above also holds for $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. Let $\mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$ be the set of all probability measures π on $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ such that $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined and the first and second marginals are μ_1 and μ_2 .⁹ Lemma C.3 implies $\mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$. By Lemma C.4, we have for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \bar{\Gamma}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

⁹To be more precise, $\pi((A_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \times \mathcal{V}) = \mu_1(A_1)$ and $\pi((\mathcal{S}_1 \times A_2) \times \mathcal{V}) = \mu_2(A_2)$ for all sets $A_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_1}$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_2}$.

where we write $\bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)$ for simplicity. From Lemma B.1 (i), \mathcal{I}_D is bounded from below, non-decreasing, and concave. As a result, $\mathcal{I}_D < \infty$ or $\mathcal{I}_D = \infty$ on $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. In the first case, by Lemma B.2, for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \bar{\Gamma}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \right\}.$$

In the second case, by definition $\mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) = \infty$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and the above is also true. Moreover, Example 2 of Zhang et al. (2022) implies that φ_λ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$. So Lemma A.1 implies that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \bar{\Gamma}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda(v) d\gamma(v),$$

where $g_\lambda(v) = \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda(v, v')$. This shows for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\gamma \right\}.$$

Lemma C.1. *If $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Proof of Lemma C.1. Fix any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$. By the definition of \mathcal{P}_D , we have $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) < \infty$ and hence there is $\nu_\ell \in \Pi(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell)$ such that $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \geq \int_{\mathcal{S}_\ell \times \mathcal{S}_\ell} c_\ell d\nu_\ell - \epsilon/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)$. Let $K = \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ with $K_1 = \{1, 3\}$, $K_2 = \{2, 4\}$ and $K_3 = \{3, 4\}$. Since K is decomposable, then by Proposition A.1 there is a measure $\tilde{\pi}$ on $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ with marginals given by $\pi_{1,3} = \nu_1$, $\pi_{2,4} = \nu_2$ and $\pi_{3,4} = \gamma$. Moreover, we note $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) d\tilde{\pi} = \int_{\mathcal{S}_\ell \times \mathcal{S}_\ell} c_\ell d\nu_\ell \leq \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) + \epsilon/(\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) < \infty$. Now, we show the LHS is not bigger than the RHS. When $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] = \infty$, provided $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \in (0, \infty)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, we must have $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma = \infty$. Then, it is apparent that $\int \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} = \infty$ and hence $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \leq \int \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} + \epsilon$. When $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] < \infty$, then $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma < \infty$. Therefore, the integral given by

$$\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} = \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_1} \lambda_1 c_1 d\nu_1 - \int_{\mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{S}_2} \lambda_2 c_2 d\nu_2 < \infty,$$

is well-defined. The desired result follows from the estimate below

$$\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} \geq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) - \epsilon = I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] - \epsilon.$$

Therefore, we have $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \leq \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} + \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$ are arbitrary, we have

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Next, we prove that the reversed direction holds by showing that if $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$, then $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$. Fix $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$. When $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma = \infty$, $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] = \infty$ and then the proof is done. Next, when $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma < \infty$, for any $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$ such that $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined,

$$\begin{aligned} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] &= \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_1, \gamma_1) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_2, \gamma_2) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g(s'_1, s'_2) d\pi_{3,4} - \lambda_1 \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_1} c_1(s_1, s'_1) d\pi_{1,3} - \lambda_2 \int_{\mathcal{S}_2 \times \mathcal{S}_2} c_2(s_2, s'_2) d\pi_{2,4} \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi. \end{aligned}$$

With the convention that $\sup = -\infty$, if the integral $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is not well-defined for all $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$, then $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ holds trivially. Otherwise, taking the supremum over $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$ on the RHS of the inequality above yields $I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$. The desired result follows. \square

Lemma C.2. *If $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Proof of Lemma C.2. We divide the proof into the following two steps. The first step is to show that the LHS is less than or equal to the RHS. Fix any $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$. If $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma = \infty$, from the proof of Lemma C.1, we can see that $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} = \infty$ for some $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$ and the LHS is ∞ . So, the integral $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi}$ is well-defined and $\tilde{\pi} \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$. We must have $\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \infty$ and the statement of the lemma is true. Now suppose $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma < \infty$ holds. For any $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$, since $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi \geq 0$, the integral

$$\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi < \infty,$$

is well-defined. This shows $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$, and we have $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$. Taking the supremum over $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)$ yields

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \leq \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Thus, we showed that the inequality above holds for all $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D$ and this ends the first step.

The second step is to show that the LHS is greater than or equal to the RHS. Fix any $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$. It suffices to show

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \geq \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

When $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi > -\infty$, we have $\int(\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi > -\infty$ and hence $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi_{3,4} > -\infty$. It follows that $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \pi_{3,4})$ and

$$\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \leq \sup_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \sup_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi}.$$

When $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = -\infty$, the inequality (C.1) holds trivially. \square

Lemma C.3. *For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, one has*

$$\mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

Proof of Lemma C.3. We divide the proof into the following four cases. When $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 > 0$, the equality (1) follows from Lemmas C.1 and C.2. When $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$, we show that equality (1) holds. Let $A_\ell = \{(v, v') \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) < \infty\}$, and for simplicity, we write $g : (v, v') \mapsto g(v')$ and $c_\ell : (v, v') \mapsto c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. By the convention, $0c_\ell = 0$, π -a.s. if and only if $c_\ell < \infty$, π -a.s., it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g(v') d\pi(v, v') : \pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}, \pi(A_1 \cap A_2) = 1, \right\} \\ &\geq \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g d\pi : \pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}, \int c_\ell d\pi < \infty \text{ for } \ell = 1, 2 \right\} \\ &\geq \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma : \gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds since for all $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$ with $\int c_\ell d\pi < \infty$ for $\ell = 1, 2$, the marginal $\pi_{3,4} \in \mathcal{P}_D$, i.e. $\pi(\mathcal{V} \times \cdot) \in \mathcal{P}_D$. On the other hand, for any $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$ with $\pi(A_1 \cap A_2) = 1$, define a measure π_n on $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ as

$$\pi_n(\cdot) = \frac{\pi(\cdot \cap (A_{1n} \cap A_{2n}))}{\pi(A_{1n} \cap A_{2n})},$$

where $A_{\ell n} = \{(v, v') \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V} : c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell) < n\}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. Since $c_\ell < n$, π_n -a.s. for $\ell = 1, 2$, then the second marginal of π_n is in \mathcal{P}_D .¹⁰ By the monotone convergence theorem,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^+ \mathbb{1}_{A_{1n} \cap A_{2n}} d\pi = \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^+ d\pi, \text{ and } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^- \mathbb{1}_{A_{1n} \cap A_{2n}} d\pi = \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^- d\pi.$$

Moreover, since $\pi(A_{1n} \cap A_{2n}) \rightarrow 1$,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^+ d\pi_n = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^+ \mathbb{1}_{A_{1n} \cap A_{2n}} d\pi}{\pi(A_{1n} \cap A_{2n})} = \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^+ d\pi.$$

Similarly, $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^- d\pi_n = \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g^- d\pi$. Since $\int g d\pi$ is well-defined, we can exclude the case $\int g^+ d\pi = \int g^- d\pi = \infty$. Therefore,

$$\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g d\pi = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g d\pi_n \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma.$$

This shows $\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_D} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g d\pi$ and hence equality (1) holds for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$.

Next, we show that equality (C.1) when $\lambda_1 > 0, \lambda_2 = 0$. By definition, the integral $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined for all $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}$. If $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \infty$ for some $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}$, then $\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi \geq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \int g d\gamma$. Without loss of generality, assume $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi < \infty$ for all $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}$. It follows that

$$\lambda_1 \int c_1 d\pi \leq \int (g^- + \lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi < \infty,$$

and $\int c_1 d\pi < \infty$ and $\pi(A_1) = 1$. By convention, $0 \times c_2 = 0, \pi$ -a.s. if and only if $0 \times c_2 < \infty, \pi$ -a.s. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g(v') d\pi(v, v') : \pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}, \pi(A_2) = 1 \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g(v') d\pi(v, v') : \pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}, \pi(A_1 \cap A_2) = 1 \right\} \\ &\geq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, for any $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D, \lambda}$ with $\pi(A_2) = 1$, define a measure π'_n on $\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ as

$$\pi'_n(\cdot) = \frac{\pi(\cdot \cap (A_{1n}))}{\pi(A_{1n})}.$$

¹⁰To be more precise, the measure $\pi_n(\mathcal{V} \times \cdot)$ is in \mathcal{P}_D .

Using a similar argument as shown above, we can show $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} g d\pi \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma$ and hence equality (C.1) holds when $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 = 0$. In the same way, we can show that equality (C.1) when $\lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 > 0$. \square

Lemma C.4. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. If φ_λ is interchangeable with respect to $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, then*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Proof of Lemma C.4. For any $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$, it is obvious that $\pi_{1,2} \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ and hence $\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)$. This shows $\mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda} \subset \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)$ and the LHS is less than or equal to the RHS.

Next, we show the LHS is not less than the RHS. We adopt the convention that the supremum of an empty set is $-\infty$. If $\int \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is not well-defined for all $\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)$, then the proof is done trivially. Now let π be any measure in $\Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \varphi_\lambda)$ for which integral $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined. To finish the proof, it suffices to show

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda(v, v') d\pi(v, v') \geq \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda(v, v') d\pi(v, v'). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

When $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = -\infty$, inequality (C.3) holds trivially. Now suppose $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \infty$. Because $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$, we have $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g(v') d\pi(v, v') = \infty$ and is well-defined. We note $\varphi_\lambda = g^+ - g^- - (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2)$ and hence $\varphi_\lambda^+ = g^+$ and $\varphi_\lambda^- = g^- + (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2)$. Since $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined, then $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi \leq \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda^- d\pi < \infty$. This shows that $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$ and inequality (C.3) holds. Next, suppose $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi < \infty$. Given that the integral is well-defined, using the same reasoning as demonstrated above, we have $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} g(v') d\pi(v, v') < \infty$ and $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} (\lambda_1 c_1 + \lambda_2 c_2) d\pi < \infty$. So $\pi \in \mathcal{G}_{D,\lambda}$ and the proof is done. \square

C.1.2 Proof of Corollary 3.1

We provide only the derivation of the upper bound $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int \mathbf{1}(s_1 + s_2 \leq z) d\gamma(s_1, s_2)$. We can derive the expression of the lower bound $\inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int \mathbf{1}(s_1 + s_2 \leq z) d\gamma(s_1, s_2)$ by the similar reasoning and the following identity.

$$\inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int \mathbf{1}(s_1 + s_2 \leq z) d\gamma(s_1, s_2) = 1 - \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int \mathbf{1}(\{s_1 + s_2 > z\}) d\gamma(s_1, s_2).$$

When $\lambda_1 = 0$ or $\lambda_2 = 0$, $g_\lambda(s_1, s_2) = 0$ for all $(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$. When $\lambda_1 \neq 0$

and $\lambda_2 \neq 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} g_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_1, s'_2} [\mathbf{1}(s'_1 + s'_2 \leq z) - \lambda_1 |s_1 - s'_1|^2 - \lambda_2 |s_2 - s'_2|^2] \\ &= \left(1 - \inf_{s'_1 + s'_2 \leq z} [\lambda_1 |s_1 - s'_1|^2 + \lambda_2 |s_2 - s'_2|^2] \right)^+ \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_1 + s_2 \leq z \\ \left[1 - \frac{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 (s_1 + s_2 - z)^2}{\lambda_1 + \lambda_2} \right]^+ & \text{if } \{s_1 + s_2 > z\} \end{cases}. \end{aligned}$$

By some simple algebra, we have.

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_1} [\mathbf{1}(s'_1 + s_2 \leq z) - \lambda_1 |s_1 - s'_1|^2] \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_1 + s_2 \leq z, \\ (1 - \lambda_1 |s_1 + s_2 - z|^2)^+ & \text{if } \{s_1 + s_2 > z\}, \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} g_{\lambda,2}(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{s'_2} [\mathbf{1}(s_1 + s'_2 \leq z) - \lambda_2 |s_2 - s'_2|^2] \\ &= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_1 + s_2 \leq z, \\ (1 - \lambda_2 |s_1 + s_2 - z|^2)^+ & \text{if } \{s_1 + s_2 > z\}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

By applying Theorem 3.1, we have that for each $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int g_\lambda(s_1, s_2) d\pi(s_1, s_2) \right].$$

However, in the rest of proof, we show for all $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right] = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right].$$

Define a function $F : \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2) \times \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$F : (\pi, \lambda) \mapsto -\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle - \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} g_\lambda d\pi.$$

We note that for any (s_1, s_2) , the function $\lambda \mapsto g_\lambda(s_1, s_2)$ is convex since it is the supremum of a set of affine functions in λ . As a result, $\lambda \mapsto -\int g_\lambda d\pi$ is concave for each fixed π . For any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, the function $\pi \mapsto F(\pi, \lambda)$ is continuous due to

continuous and bounded g_λ and Portmanteau's theorem. Moreover, it is easy to verify that $\pi \mapsto F(\pi, \lambda)$ is convex. By Fan (1953, Theorem 2)' minimax theorem, we have

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} F(\pi, \lambda) = \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} F(\pi, \lambda).$$

As a result, we have for all $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} -F(\pi, \lambda) = - \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} F(\pi, \lambda) \\ &= - \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \sup_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} F(\pi, \lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} -F(\pi, \lambda) \\ &= \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Using the same reasoning as above, the application of Fan (1953, Theorem 2) to $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0)$ yields

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda, 1} d\pi \right].$$

Since $g_\lambda \downarrow g_{\lambda, 1}$ as $\lambda_2 \uparrow \infty$, the monotone convergence theorem implies

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, (\delta_1, 0) \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right] &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right] \\ &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \lim_{\lambda_2 \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right] \\ &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda, 1} d\pi \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Taking the supremum over $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$ on both sides yields that for $\delta_1 > 0$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda, 1} d\pi \right] = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, (\delta_1, 0) \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right].$$

Similarly, we can show that for $\delta_2 > 0$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_2 \delta_2 + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_{\lambda, 2} d\pi \right] = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, (0, \delta_2) \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right].$$

In addition, when $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, we note $g_\lambda \downarrow g$ as $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \uparrow \infty$ and the monotone convergence theorem implies $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi = \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi$ and

$$\mathcal{I}_D(0) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi.$$

This completes the proof that for all $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right] = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi \right].$$

C.1.3 Proof of Theorem 3.2

The expressions of $\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0)$ and $\mathcal{I}(0, \delta_2)$ can be derived from $\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ for $\delta_1, \delta_2 > 0$ with appropriate modifications of the cost function. In particular, consider another cost function $\widehat{c}_2(s_2, s'_2) = \infty \mathbf{1}\{s_2 \neq s'_2\}$ and the optimal transport distance $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2$ associated with \widehat{c}_2 . Define an uncertainty set $\widehat{\Sigma}(\delta_1, \delta_2)$ depending on \mathbf{K}_1 and $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2$ as

$$\widehat{\Sigma}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \left\{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_{13}, \mu_{13}) \leq \delta_1, \widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2(\gamma_{23}, \mu_{23}) \leq \delta_2 \right\}.$$

Moreover, we define $\widehat{\mathcal{I}} : \mathbb{R}_+^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \sup_{\gamma \in \widehat{\Sigma}(\delta_1, \delta_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(v) d\gamma(v).$$

We note $\widehat{\mathbf{K}}_2(\mu, \nu) = 0$ if and only if $\mu = \nu$. So, for all $\delta_2 > 0$, $\widehat{\Sigma}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \Sigma(\delta_1, 0)$ and $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0)$. Using the dual reformulation of $\widehat{\mathcal{I}}$ on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 , we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0) = \widehat{\mathcal{I}}(\delta_1, \delta_2) = \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda(s_1, s_2) d\varpi(s_1, s_2) \right],$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} f_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{(y'_1, y'_2, x') \in \mathcal{S}} \{f(y'_1, y'_2, x') - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, (y'_1, x')) - \lambda_2 \widehat{c}_2(s_2, (y'_2, x'))\} \\ &= \sup_{s'_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1} \{f(y'_1, y_2, x_2) - \lambda_1 c_1(s_1, (y'_1, x_2))\} = f_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2). \end{aligned}$$

Since $f_{\lambda,1}(s_1, s_2)$ is independent of λ_2 , letting $\lambda_2 = 0$ yields

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0) = \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_{\lambda,1}(v) d\varpi(v) \right].$$

Using the same reasoning, we can get the expression of $\mathcal{I}(0, \delta_2)$.

In the rest of the proof, we show that the dual reformulation of \mathcal{I} on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 holds. Let $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$ denote the set of $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ such that $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell 3}, \gamma_{\ell 3}) < \infty$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and

$\int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma > -\infty$. Taking the Legendre transform on \mathcal{I} gives

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) &:= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{\mathcal{I}(\delta) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle\} = \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell 3}, \gamma_{\ell 3}) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell \in [2] \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle : \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell 3}, \gamma_{\ell 3}) \leq \delta_\ell, \forall \ell \in [2] \right\} \\
&= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} \underbrace{\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma - \lambda_1 \mathbf{K}_1(\mu_{13}, \gamma_{23}) - \lambda_2 \mathbf{K}_2(\mu_{23}, \gamma_{23}) \right\}}_{:= I_\lambda[\gamma]} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} I_\lambda[\gamma].
\end{aligned}$$

We note that the expression above still holds when $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. Recall the definition of the function $\phi_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let \mathcal{G}_λ denote the set of $\pi \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S})$ such that $\int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi$ is well-defined and the first and second marginals coincides with μ_{13} and μ_{23} respectively.¹¹ Lemma C.7 implies $\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi$. By Lemma C.8, we have for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}), \phi_\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \phi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Example 2 of Zhang et al. (2022) implies that $\phi_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the interchangeability principle with respect to $\Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$. As a result, Lemma A.1 implies that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda(v) d\gamma(v),$$

where $f_\lambda(v) = \sup_{s \in \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda(v, s)$.

From Lemma B.1 (i), \mathcal{I} is bounded from below, non-decreasing, and concave. As a result, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ or $\mathcal{I}(\delta) < \infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. In the first case, $\mathcal{I}^* = \infty$ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 by definition and hence we have $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \mathcal{I}^*(\lambda)\} = \infty$. For the second case, by Lemma B.2, for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \{\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \mathcal{I}^*(\lambda)\} = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda(v) d\gamma(v) \right\},$$

and the proof is complete.

¹¹To be more precise, $\pi((A_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \times \mathcal{S}) = \mu_{13}(A_1)$ and $\pi((\mathcal{S}_1 \times A_2) \times \mathcal{S}) = \mu_{23}(A_2)$ for all Borel sets $A_1 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_1}$ and $A_2 \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}_2}$.

Lemma C.5. *If $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} I_\lambda[\gamma] = \sup_{\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda(v, s') d\pi(v, s').$$

Proof of Lemma C.5. The proof is almost identical to that of Lemma C.1, so we only give the sketch. For notational convenience, we write $c_\ell : (s_1, s_2, y_1, y_2, x) \mapsto c_\ell(s_\ell, (y_\ell, x))$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ and $f : (s_1, s_2, s') \mapsto f(s')$.

Fix any $\epsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}$. Let $K = \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ with $K_1 = \{3, 4, 5\}$, $K_2 = \{1, 3, 5\}$ and $K_3 = \{2, 4, 5\}$ and we note that K is decomposable. By Proposition A.1, there is a $\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23}, \gamma)$ satisfying $I_\lambda[\gamma] \leq \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\tilde{\pi} + \epsilon$. Since $\epsilon > 0$ and $\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}$ are arbitrary, this shows LHS \leq RHS. The proof of LHS \geq RHS is identical to the proof of Lemma C.1. \square

Lemma C.6. *If $\lambda_1 > 0$ and $\lambda_2 > 0$, then*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2, \gamma)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi.$$

Proof of Lemma C.6. The proof is the same as that of Lemma C.2. \square

Lemma C.7. *For all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, one has $\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi$.*

Proof of Lemma C.7. The proof is almost the same as Lemma C.3 as long as we replace g with f , φ_λ with ϕ_λ , A_ℓ with B_ℓ , $A_{\ell n}$ with $B_{\ell n}$ and \mathcal{P}_D with $\bar{\mathcal{P}}$, where

$$B_\ell = \{((s_1, s_2), (y_1, y_2, x)) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} : c_\ell(s_\ell, (y_\ell, x)) < \infty\},$$

and

$$B_{\ell n} = \{((s_1, s_2), (y_1, y_2, x)) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} : c_\ell(s_\ell, (y_\ell, x)) < n\},$$

for $\ell = 1, 2$. \square

Lemma C.8. *Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. If $\phi_\lambda : \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is interchangeable with respect to $\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)$, then*

$$\sup_{\pi \in \mathcal{G}_\lambda} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2), \phi_\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda d\pi$$

Proof of Lemma C.8. The proof is the same as Lemma C.4. \square

C.2 Proofs in Section 4

C.2.1 Proof of Theorem 4.1

First, assuming that condition (4.1) does not hold, we show $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \infty$. Fix any $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and $v = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$. For any $B \geq \lambda_1 \vee \lambda_2$, there is $v' = (s'_1, s'_2) \in \mathcal{V}$ such that

$$g(s'_1, s'_2) > B [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2}],$$

and hence

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi_\lambda(v, v') &= g(s'_1, s'_2) - \lambda_1 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2} \\ &> B [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2}] - \lambda_1 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2} \\ &\geq B + (B - \lambda_1) \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} + (B - \lambda_2) \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2} \geq B. \end{aligned}$$

This shows that for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ and B large enough, we have $g_\lambda(v) = \sup_{v' \in \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda(v, v') \geq B$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$. Therefore, by Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) \geq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda(v) d\pi(v) \geq B,$$

for all B large enough. As a result, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \infty$.

Conversely, assuming that the growth condition (4.1) holds, we show $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) < \infty$. For all $\pi \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f(v) d\pi(v) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} M [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p_2}] d\pi(s_1, s_2) \\ &= M + M \mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\pi_1, \delta_{s_1^*})^{p_1} + M \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\pi_2, \delta_{s_2^*})^{p_2} \\ &\leq M + \sum_{j=1}^2 M \left[\mathbf{W}_{p_j}(\pi_j, \mu_j) + \mathbf{W}_{p_j}(\mu_j, \delta_{s_j^*}) \right]^{p_j} < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

where π_j denotes the marginal measure of π on \mathcal{S}_j and $\delta_{s_j^*}$ denotes the Dirac measure at $s_j^* \in \mathcal{S}_j$. The last step follows from $\mu_j \in \mathcal{P}_{p_j}(\mathcal{S}_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$ and $\pi \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$, i.e., $\mathbf{W}_{p_j}(\pi_j, \mu_j)^{p_j} \leq \delta_j$ for $j = 1, 2$.

C.2.2 Proof of Theorem 4.2

First, we assume condition (4.2) does not hold and aim to show $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \infty$. Fix any $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$. For any $v = (s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V}$ and $B \geq \lambda_1 \vee \lambda_2$, there exists $s' = (y'_1, y'_2, x')$ such that

$$f(s') \geq B [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2}].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\phi_\lambda(v, s') &= f(s') - \lambda_1 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} - \lambda_2 \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2} \\ &\geq B + (B - \lambda_1) \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s'_1)^{p_1} + (B - \lambda_2) \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s'_2)^{p_2} \geq B.\end{aligned}$$

As a result, $f_\lambda(v) = \sup_{s' \in \mathcal{S}} \phi_\lambda(v, s') \geq B$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$ and all B large enough. Since $B > 0$ is arbitrary, we must have $\sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda(v) d\varpi(v) = \infty$. By Theorem 3.2, we have $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \infty$.

Conversely, we show that the condition (4.2) implies $\mathcal{I}(\delta) < \infty$. For any $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{S}} f(s) d\gamma(s) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{S}} M [1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p_2}] d\gamma(s) \\ &\leq M + M \mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\delta_{s_1^*}, \gamma_{13})^{p_1} + M \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\delta_{s_2^*}, \gamma_{23})^{p_2} \\ &\leq M + \sum_{j=1}^2 M \left[\mathbf{W}_{p_j}(\delta_{s_j^*}, \mu_{j3}) + \mathbf{W}_{p_j}(\mu_{j3}, \gamma_{j3}) \right]^{p_j} < \infty,\end{aligned}$$

where γ_{j3} is the marginal measure of γ on $\mathcal{S}_j = \mathcal{Y}_j \times \mathcal{X}$ and $\delta_{s_j^*}$ is the Dirac measure concentrated at $\{s_j^*\}$. The last step follow $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)$ and $\mu_{j3} \in \mathcal{P}_{p_j}(\mathcal{S}_j)$ for $j = 1, 2$.

C.2.3 Proof of Theorem 4.3

In this section, we first prove the weak compactness of $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$ when \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 are both proper and $c_j = \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_j}^{p_j}$ for some $p_j \geq 1$. As a result, $\mathbf{K}_j = \mathbf{W}_{p_j}^{p_j}$ and the set $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ can be written as

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta) := \left\{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) : \mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\gamma_1, \mu_1) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_1}, \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\gamma_2, \mu_2) \leq \delta_2^{1/p_2} \right\}.$$

For any Polish metric space \mathcal{X} , let $B_{\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})}(\mu, \delta) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) : \mathbf{W}_p(\mu, \gamma) \leq \delta\}$ denote the ball centered at μ in Wasserstein space $\mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{X})$. When there is no ambiguity we will abbreviate this notation by referring to $B_p(\mu, \delta)$.

Proposition C.1. *Suppose Assumptions 4.1 (i), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Then, $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ is weakly compact.*

Proof of Proposition C.1. Theorem 1 of Yue et al. (2022) implies $B_p(\mu, \delta)$ weakly compact whenever μ has a finite p -th moment. As a result, the set $\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ can be written as

$$\Sigma_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta) = \Pi(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2), \quad \text{where } \mathcal{B}_1 = B_{p_1}(\mu_1, \delta_1^{1/p_1}) \text{ and } \mathcal{B}_2 = B_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_2^{1/p_2}).$$

Since \mathcal{B}_1 and \mathcal{B}_2 are weakly compact in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1)$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1)$, respectively, then they are uniformly tight by Prokhorov's theorem. By Lemma 4.4 of Villani (2009).

$\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is tight in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2)$. By Prokhorov's theorem again, $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ has a compact closure under the topology of weak convergence. To show the weakly compactness of $\Sigma_D(\delta)$, it suffices to show it is closed.

Let $\pi^n \in \Sigma_D(\delta) \equiv \Pi(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$ be a sequence converging weakly to $\pi^\infty \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2)$. We have

$$\mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\pi_1^n, \mu_1) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\pi_2^n, \mu_2) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_2}.$$

Let π_j^n denote the marginal distribution of π^n on \mathcal{S}_j . For any open U_1 in \mathcal{S}_1 , the Portmanteau theorem implies

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi_1^n(U_1) = \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \pi^n(U_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) \geq \pi^\infty(U_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2) = \pi_1^\infty(U_1).$$

This shows π_1^n weakly converges to π_1^∞ . Moreover, $\mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\pi_1^\infty, \mu_1) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_1}$ can be seen from weakly closedness of \mathcal{B}_1 . Using the identical argument, we can show π_2^n weakly converges to π_2^∞ and $\mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\pi_2^\infty, \mu_2) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_2}$. This shows $\pi^\infty \in \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\pi_2^\infty, \mu_2) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_2}$ and hence $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is weakly closed. \square

The weak compactness of $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ does not depend on the functional forms of metrics $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}$. Essentially, the topological properties of \mathcal{S}_1 and \mathcal{S}_2 , mainly properness, determines the weak compactness of $\Sigma_D(\delta)$.

Proof of Theorem 4.3. Since Proposition C.1 implies that $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ is weakly compact, by Weierstrass' theorem, it suffices to show $\pi \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi$ is weakly upper semi-continuous. Let $\{\pi^k\}_{k=1}^\infty$ be any sequence in $\Sigma_D(\delta)$ that weakly converges to $\pi^\infty \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$, we show $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^k \leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^\infty$. For any $\rho > 0$, define an auxiliary function $f_\rho : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as $g_\rho(v) = f(v) \wedge [M(1 + \rho^{p'_0} + \rho^{p'_1})]$. Let $A_1 = \{(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1) \geq \rho\}$ and $A_2 = \{(s_1, s_2) \in \mathcal{V} : \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2) \geq \rho\}$. It is easy to verify that for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$,

$$|g(v) - g_\rho(v)| \leq \begin{cases} M [\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p'_2}] & \text{if } v \in A_1 \cap A_2, \\ M \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} & \text{if } v \in A_1 \cap A_2^c, \\ M \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p'_2} & \text{if } v \in A_1^c \cap A_2, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

For any $\pi \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi \right| &\leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} |g - g_\rho| d\pi \\ &\leq \int_{A_1 \cap A_2} |g - g_\rho| d\pi + \int_{A_1 \cap A_2^c} |g - g_\rho| d\pi + \int_{A_1^c \cap A_2} |g - g_\rho| d\pi. \end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 1 in Yue et al. (2022), there exists $B > 0$ such that $W_{p_j}(\pi_j, \delta_{s_j^*})^{p_j} \leq B$ for $j = 1, 2$ and all $\pi \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$, where π_j is the marginal of π on \mathcal{S}_j and $\delta_{s_j^*}$ is a Dirac measure at $\{s_j^*\}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_1 \cap A_2^c} |g - g_\rho| d\pi &\leq M \int_{A_1 \cap A_2^c} \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} d\pi \leq M \rho^{p_1 - p'_1} \int_{A_1 \cap A_2^c} \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1, s_1^*)^{p_1} d\pi \\ &\leq M \rho^{p_1 - p'_1} W_{p_1}(\pi_1, \delta_{s_1^*})^{p_1} \leq B \rho^{p'_1 - p_1}. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show $\int_{A_1^c \cap A_2} |g - g_\rho| d\pi \leq B \rho^{p'_2 - p_2}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{A_1 \cap A_2} |g - g_\rho| d\pi &\leq \int_{A_1 \cap A_2} M \left[\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2, s_1^*)^{p'_2} \right] d\pi(s_1, s_2) \\ &\leq B(\rho^{p'_1 - p_1} + \rho^{p'_2 - p_2}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have for all $\pi \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$,

$$\left| \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi \right| \leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} |g - g_\rho| d\pi \leq 2B(\rho^{p'_1 - p_1} + \rho^{p'_2 - p_2}).$$

For any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a $\rho > 0$ large enough such that $4B(\rho^{p'_1 - p_1} + \rho^{p'_2 - p_2}) < \epsilon/2$. By Lemma 3 in Yue et al. (2022), we have $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^k \leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^\infty$ and hence there is a $k(\epsilon)$ large enough such

$$\int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^k - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^\infty < \frac{\epsilon}{2}, \quad \text{for all } k > k(\epsilon).$$

Consequently, for all $k > k(\epsilon)$, the following holds:

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^k - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^\infty &\leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} |g - g_\rho| d\pi^k + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^k - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^\infty + \int_{\mathcal{V}} |g_\rho - g| d\pi^\infty \\ &\leq 4B(\rho^{p'_1 - p_1} + \rho^{p'_2 - p_2}) + \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^k - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\rho d\pi^\infty < \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we must have $\limsup_{k \rightarrow \infty} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^k \leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\pi^\infty$. This completes the proof. \square

C.2.4 Proof of Theorem 4.4

Here, we will only show that $\Sigma(\delta)$ is weakly compact. This is because the upper semi-continuity of $\gamma \rightarrow \int f d\gamma$ over $\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)$ can be shown using the same argument for the proof of Theorem 4.3. We write

$$\Sigma(\delta) = \left\{ \gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \mathbf{W}_{p_1}(\gamma_1, \mu_1) \leq \delta_1^{1/p_1}, \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\gamma_2, \mu_2) \leq \delta_2^{1/p_2} \right\}.$$

Lemma C.9. For $j = 1, 2$, let \mathcal{G}_j be an uniformly tight subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_j)$. Then the following set

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}) : \gamma_{13} \in \mathcal{G}_1, \gamma_{23} \in \mathcal{G}_2\},$$

is tight in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$.

Proof of Lemma C.9. First, we assume there exist $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and $\nu \in \mathcal{G}_2$ such that $\mu(\mathcal{Y}_1 \times A) = \nu(\mathcal{Y}_2 \times A)$ for all $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{X}}$, i.e. μ and ν have same marginal distribution on \mathcal{X} . Otherwise, $\Gamma(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$ will be empty and hence the statement holds trivially.

Since \mathcal{G}_1 is uniformly tight, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there is a compact set $K_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{S}_1 \equiv \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mu(K_\epsilon^c) \leq \epsilon$ for all $\mu \in \mathcal{G}_1$. Similarly, there is a compact set $L_\epsilon \subset \mathcal{S}_2 \equiv \mathcal{Y}_2 \times \mathcal{X}$ such that $\nu(L_\epsilon^c) \leq \epsilon$ for all $\nu \in \mathcal{G}_2$. Moreover, define a mapping $\sigma : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$ as $\sigma : (y_1, y_2, x) \mapsto (y_1, x, y_2)$. Trivially, σ is a homeomorphism (a continuous mapping whose inverse is also continuous) from \mathcal{S} to \mathcal{S} . Let $E_\epsilon = \sigma^{-1}(K_\epsilon \times \mathcal{Y}_2)$ and $G_\epsilon = \mathcal{Y}_1 \times L_\epsilon$. Explicitly, $(y_1, y_2, x) \in E_\epsilon \Leftrightarrow (y_1, x) \in K_\epsilon$. Fix any $\gamma \in \Gamma(\mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{G}_2)$, let $S = (Y_1, Y_2, X)$ be a random variable with γ as its law, i.e. $\text{Law}(S) = \gamma$. We must have $\gamma_{j3} \in \mathcal{G}_j$ for $j = 1, 2$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[S \notin E_\epsilon \cap G_\epsilon] &\leq \mathbb{P}[S \notin E_\epsilon] + \mathbb{P}[S \notin G_\epsilon] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[(Y_1, Y_2, X) \notin E_\epsilon] + \mathbb{P}[(Y_1, Y_2, X) \notin G_\epsilon] \\ &= \mathbb{P}[(Y_1, X) \notin K_\epsilon] + \mathbb{P}[(Y_2, X) \notin L_\epsilon] \\ &\leq \gamma_{13}(K_\epsilon^c) + \gamma_{23}(L_\epsilon^c) \\ &\leq 2\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

The desired result follows from the compactness of $E_\epsilon \cap G_\epsilon$ in \mathcal{S} . To see this, we note $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}_1} : (y_1, x) \mapsto y_1$ is continuous from \mathcal{S}_1 to \mathcal{Y}_1 and hence $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(K_\epsilon)$ is compact. As a result, $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}_1}(K_\epsilon) \times L_\epsilon$ is compact. Since $E_\epsilon \cap G_\epsilon$ is a subset of a compact set and its compactness follows from the closedness of E_ϵ and G_ϵ . \square

Proposition C.2. Suppose Assumptions 4.1 (ii), 4.2 and 4.3 hold. Then, $\Sigma(\delta)$ is weakly compact.

Proof. By abuse of notations, let $\mathcal{B}_1 = B_{p_1}(\mu_{13}, \delta_1^{1/p_1})$ and $\mathcal{B}_2 = B_{p_2}(\mu_{23}, \delta_2^{1/p_2})$. We can rewrite $\Sigma(\delta) = \Gamma(\mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{B}_2)$. By Lemma C.9, $\Sigma(\delta)$ is tight and hence has a compact closure under weak topology. Using a similar argument in the proof of Proposition C.1, we can show $\Sigma(\delta)$ is weakly closed. Therefore, $\Sigma(\delta)$ is weakly compact in $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$. \square

C.2.5 Proof of Proposition 4.1

We focus on $\Theta(\delta)$ since the proof of $\Theta_D(\delta)$ is identical to that of $\Theta(\delta)$. The proof of Proposition 4.1 for $\Theta(\delta)$ follows from the following two lemmas.

Lemma C.10. *Suppose that the Assumptions in Proposition 4.1 hold. Then, the linear functional $T : \Sigma(\delta) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $\pi \mapsto \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\pi$ is continuous.*

Proof. Since $\mu_{\ell 3}$ has finite p_ℓ -th moment, then for all $\pi \in \Sigma(\delta)$, $\pi_{\ell 3}$, i.e., the projection onto $\mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}$ also has finite p_ℓ -th moment. Define a function $h : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as

$$h(s) = M \left[1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_1}(s_1^*, s_1)^{p'_1} + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s_2^*, s_2)^{p'_2} \right],$$

where $s = (y_1, y_2, x)$, $s_1 = (y_1, x)$ and $s_2 = (y_2, x)$. We note $h \in L^1(\pi)$ for all $\pi \in \Sigma(\delta)$. Using the identical argument in the proof of Theorem 4.3, we can show that $\pi \mapsto \int f d\pi$ is upper semicontinuous on $\Sigma(\delta)$. By replacing f by $-f$, we can see that $\pi \mapsto \int (-f) d\pi$ is upper semicontinuous and hence $\pi \mapsto \int f d\pi$ is lower semicontinuous on $\Sigma(\delta)$. As a result, $\pi \mapsto \int f d\pi$ is continuous on $\Sigma(\delta)$. \square

Lemma C.11. *Suppose that Assumptions 4.1 (ii) and 4.2 hold. Then $\Sigma(\delta)$ is connected under weak topology.*

Proof. Fix any π and π' in $\Sigma(\delta)$. It suffices to show $\nu : t \mapsto t\pi + (1-t)\pi'$ is continuous from $[0, 1]$ into $\Sigma(\delta)$. We note $\Sigma(\delta) \subset \mathcal{P}_p(\mathcal{S})$ is metrizable under \mathbf{W}_p for $p = p_1 \wedge p_2$. Fix any $t_0 \in [0, 1]$. Let $t_1 \neq t_0$ be any point in $[0, 1]$ such that $\Delta = |t_1 - t_0| > 0$ is sufficiently small. Without loss of generality, we assume $t_0 < t_1$. For simplicity, we write $\gamma = t_0\pi + (1-t_1)\pi' \geq 0$. By the triangle inequality,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), \nu(t_1)) &= \mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), \gamma + \Delta\pi') \\ &\leq (1-\Delta)\mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), (1-\Delta)^{-1}\gamma) + \underbrace{\Delta\mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), \pi')}_{=O(\Delta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the following derivation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), (1-\Delta)^{-1}\gamma) &= \mathbf{W}_p\left(\nu(t_0), \underbrace{\frac{\nu(t_0) - \Delta\pi'}{1-\Delta}}_{=\rho_\Delta}\right) = \mathbf{W}_p((1-\Delta)\rho_\Delta + \Delta\pi', \rho_\Delta) \\ &\leq \Delta\mathbf{W}_p(\pi', \rho_\Delta) = \Delta\mathbf{W}_p\left(\pi', \frac{\nu(t_0) - \Delta\pi'}{1-\Delta}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \frac{\nu(t_0) - \Delta\pi'}{1-\Delta} = \nu(t_0)$ in weak topology induced by \mathbf{W}_p , then

$$\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \mathbf{W}_p\left(\pi', \frac{\nu(t_0) - \Delta\pi'}{1-\Delta}\right) = \mathbf{W}_p(\pi', \nu(t_0)) < \infty.$$

As a result,

$$\mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), (1-\Delta)^{-1}\gamma) \leq \Delta\mathbf{W}_p\left(\pi', \frac{\nu(t_0) - \Delta\pi'}{1-\Delta}\right) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \Delta \rightarrow 0,$$

and hence

$$\mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), \nu(t_1)) \rightarrow 0, \quad \text{as } \Delta \rightarrow 0.$$

Interchange the role of t_0 and t_1 , we can show the case when $\mathbf{W}_p(\nu(t_0), \nu(t_1)) \rightarrow 0$ as $\Delta = |t_1 - t_0| \rightarrow 0$. This shows $\nu : t \mapsto t\pi + (1-t)\pi'$ is continuous on $[0, 1]$. So $\Sigma(\delta)$ is path-connected and hence connected under weak topology. \square

C.3 Proofs in Section 5

C.3.1 Proof of Theorem 5.1

Note that the proof of Lemma B.2 implies that If $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is finite for some $\delta > 0$, then $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is finite for all $\delta > 0$ because \mathcal{I} is concave.

Lemma C.12. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 and 5.1 hold. Then for any $\delta = (\delta_1, \delta_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, we have*

$$0 \leq \mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) - \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0) \leq \Psi(\delta_1, \delta_2).$$

Moreover, \mathcal{I}_D is continuous on $(0, 0)$.

Proof. Fix any $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$ and any $\epsilon > 0$. We can construct random variables $\tilde{V} = (\tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2) \in \mathcal{V}$ with $\tilde{\gamma} = \text{Law}(\tilde{V})$ and write $\tilde{\gamma}_j = \text{Law}(\tilde{S}_j)$ for $j \in [2]$. Let $K = \{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ with $K_1 = \{1, 3\}$, $K_2 = \{2, 4\}$ and $K_3 = \{3, 4\}$. It is easy to see K is decomposable, and Proposition A.1 implies that there are random variables $(V, \tilde{V}) = (S_1, S_2, \tilde{S}_1, \tilde{S}_2) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}$ such that $\mu_1 = \text{Law}(S_1)$, $\mu_2 = \text{Law}(S_2)$ and $\mathbb{E} [c_j(S_j, \tilde{S}_j)] \leq \mathbf{K}_j(\mu_j, \tilde{\gamma}_j) + \epsilon \leq \delta_j + \epsilon$ for $j \in [2]$. Let π denote the law of (V, \tilde{V}) . Therefore, with $\gamma = \text{Law}(S_1, S_2) \in \Sigma_D(0)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\tilde{\gamma} - \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0) &\leq \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\tilde{\gamma} - \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma = \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} [g(v) - g(\tilde{v})] d\pi(v, \tilde{v}) \\ &= \mathbb{E} [g(V) - g(\tilde{V})] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi \left(c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1), c_2(S_2, \tilde{S}_2) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \Psi \left(\mathbb{E} [c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1)], \mathbb{E} [c_2(S_2, \tilde{S}_2)] \right) \\ &\leq \Psi(\delta_1 + \epsilon, \delta_2 + \epsilon). \end{aligned}$$

Since the measure $\tilde{\gamma} \in \Sigma_D(\delta)$ is arbitrary, we must have

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) - \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0) = \sup_{\tilde{\gamma} \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\tilde{\gamma} - \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0) \leq \Psi(\delta_1 + \epsilon, \delta_2 + \epsilon).$$

Since Ψ is continuous and $\epsilon > 0$ is arbitrary, then $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) - \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0) \leq \Psi(\delta_1, \delta_2)$. The monotonicity of \mathcal{I}_D implies $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, \delta_2) \geq \mathcal{I}_D(0, 0)$. In addition, the continuity of \mathcal{I}_D at $(0, 0)$ follows from the continuity of Ψ at $(0, 0)$ and letting $(\delta_1, \delta_2) \rightarrow (0, 0)$. \square

In fact, Lemma B.1 (i) and Proof of Lemma C.12 implies the effective domain of \mathcal{I}_D is either \mathbb{R}_+^2 or \emptyset because \mathcal{I}_D is non-decreasing and concave.

Lemma C.13. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.2 and 5.1 hold, and $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is finite for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. If $\eta_0 > \eta \geq 0$ and $\delta \geq 0$, one has*

$$0 \leq \mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) \leq \Psi(\eta_0 - \eta, 0).$$

and

$$0 \leq \mathcal{I}_D(\delta, \eta_0) - \mathcal{I}_D(\delta, \eta) \leq \Psi(0, \eta_0 - \eta).$$

Proof. We assume that for all $\eta, \delta \geq 0$, there exists $\gamma^{\eta, \delta} \in \Sigma_D(\eta, \delta)$ such that $\mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) = \int g d\gamma^{\eta, \delta}$. Otherwise, due to the continuity of Ψ on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , we can repeat the proof with ϵ -approximation optimizer and let $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. In addition, since $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, the $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) < \infty$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$.

Let $\gamma_\ell^{\eta, \delta}$ denote the marginal of $\gamma^{\eta, \delta}$ on \mathcal{S}_ℓ . Fix $\gamma^{\eta_0, \delta} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2)$. Define a probability measure γ_1^* on \mathcal{S}_1 as

$$\gamma_1^* = \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right) \gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta} + \left(\frac{\eta_0 - \eta}{\eta_0} \right) \mu_1.$$

By definition, $\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_1) \leq \eta_0$ and $\mathbf{K}_2(\gamma_2^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_2) \leq \delta$. By convexity of $\nu \mapsto \mathbf{K}_1(\nu, \mu_1)$, we have $\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1^*, \mu_1) \leq \eta$ and $\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1^*, \gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}) \leq \eta_0 - \eta$. Without loss of generality, suppose there is an optimal coupling $\nu \in \Pi(\gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}, \gamma_1^*)$ such that

$$\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}, \gamma_1^*) = \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_1} c_1 d\nu.$$

By gluing lemma, we can construct random variables $(S_1, S_2, \tilde{S}_1) \in \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{S}_1$ with a probability measure $\hat{\pi} \equiv \text{Law}(S_1, S_2, \tilde{S}_1)$ such that

$$\hat{\pi}_{1,2} = \text{Law}(S_1, S_2) = \gamma^{\eta_0, \delta}, \quad \hat{\pi}_{1,3} = \text{Law}(S_1, \tilde{S}_1) = \nu \in \Pi(\gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}, \gamma_1^*),$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_1, \gamma_1^{\eta_0, \delta}) = \mathbb{E} \left[c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1) \right] \leq \eta_0 - \eta.$$

Let $\gamma = \text{Law}(\tilde{S}_1, S_2) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$ and it is obvious that $\tilde{\gamma}_1 \in \Sigma_D(\eta, \delta)$. Next, consider the following derivation:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) &\leq \int g(v) d\gamma^{\eta_0, \delta}(v) - \int g(v) d\gamma(v) \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} [g(s_1, s_2) - g(\tilde{s}_1, s_2)] d\hat{\pi}(s_1, s_2, \tilde{s}_1) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[g(S_1, S_2) - g(\tilde{S}_1, S_2) \right] \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi \left(c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1), 0 \right) \right] \\ &\leq \Psi \left(\mathbb{E} \left[c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1) \right], 0 \right) \leq \Psi(\eta_0 - \eta, 0). \end{aligned}$$

Using the same argument, we can show $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta, \eta_0) - \mathcal{I}_D(\delta, \eta) \leq \Psi(0, \eta_0 - \eta)$. \square

Now we present the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. Since \mathcal{I}_D is concave on \mathbb{R}_+^2 , then \mathcal{I}_D is continuous on \mathbb{R}_{++}^2 . By Lemma C.12, \mathcal{I}_D is continuous at $(0, 0)$. Let $E_0 = \{(x, 0) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : x > 0\}$ and $E_1 = \{(0, y) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 : y > 0\}$. To complete the proof, it suffices to show \mathcal{I}_D is continuous at all $\delta \in E_0 \cup E_1$.

Fix any $(\eta, 0) \in E_0$. For any $\eta_0 \geq \eta$ and any $\delta > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, 0) &= \mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) + \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, 0) \\ &\leq \Psi(\eta_0 - \eta, 0) + \Psi(0, \delta) = \Psi(|\eta_0 - \eta|, 0) + \Psi(0, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, for any $\eta_0 < \eta$ and $\delta > 0$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, 0) \leq \Psi(|\eta_0 - \eta|, 0) + \Psi(0, \delta).$$

This shows for all η, η_0 and δ in $(0, \infty)$, one has

$$|\mathcal{I}_D(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}_D(\eta, 0)| \leq \Psi(|\eta_0 - \eta|, 0) + \Psi(0, \delta).$$

The continuity of \mathcal{I}_D at $(\eta, 0)$ follows from the continuity of Ψ at $(0, 0)$ and letting $(\eta_0, \delta) \rightarrow (\eta, 0)$. Since $(\eta, 0) \in E_0$ is arbitrary, \mathcal{I}_D is continuous at all $x \in E_0$. Using the same argument, we can show \mathcal{I}_D is continuous at all $x \in E_1$. The desired result follows. \square

C.3.2 Proof of Theorem 5.2

Note that the proof of Lemma B.2 implies that if $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is finite for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$, then $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is finite for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$ because $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ is concave. Based on this, we give the following lemma that is used to show the continuity of \mathcal{I} .

Lemma C.14. *Let $\delta \geq 0$, $\eta_0 > \eta \geq 0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{I}(\delta) < \infty$ for some $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. Under Assumptions 2.3, 4.1 (ii), 4.2, 5.2 and 5.3, there is a constant $M > 0$ such that*

$$\mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) \leq \Psi_1(\eta_0 - \eta, M(1 - \eta/\eta_0)),$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta, \eta_0) - \mathcal{I}(\delta, \eta) \leq \Psi_2(M(1 - \eta/\eta_0), \eta_0 - \eta).$$

Proof. For simplicity, assume that for any $\eta, \delta \geq 0$, one has $\gamma^{\eta, \delta} = \arg \max_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\eta, \delta)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma$, equivalently, $\mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) = \int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma^{\eta, \delta}$. Otherwise, due to the global continuity of Ψ_j , we can repeat the proof with an ϵ -approximation argument and let $\epsilon \downarrow 0$.

For fixed $\eta_0 > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, we have $\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_{1,3}^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_1) \leq \eta_0$ and $\mathbf{K}_2(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_2) \leq \delta$ by the definition of $\gamma^{\eta_0, \delta}$. Let $K_1 = \{1, 2, 3\}$, $K_2 = \{1, 3, 4, 6\}$ and $K_3 = \{5, 6\}$

and it is easy to verify the collection $\{K_1, K_2, K_3\}$ is decomposable. As a result, by Proposition A.1, we can construct random variables

$$(S, \tilde{S}) \equiv (Y_1, Y_2, X, \tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{X}) \in \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{S},$$

such that

$$\text{Law}(Y_1, Y_2, X) = \gamma^{\eta_0, \delta}, \quad \text{Law}(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{X}) = \mu_1, \quad \text{Law}(\tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{X}) = \mu_2,$$

and

$$\mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_{1,3}^{\eta_1, \delta}, \mu_1) = \mathbb{E} \left[c_1(S_1, \tilde{S}_1) \right] \leq \eta_0, \quad \text{where } S_1 = (Y_1, X) \text{ and } \tilde{S}_1 = (\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{X}).$$

Let ε be a Bernoulli random variable that is independent of (S, \tilde{S}) with $\mathbb{P}(\varepsilon = 1) = \eta/\eta_0$. Define new random variables:

$$\hat{S} \equiv (\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{X}) = \varepsilon(Y_1, Y_2, X) + (1 - \varepsilon)(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{X}),$$

and let $\hat{\gamma} = \text{Law}(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{X})$. For any measurable set $A \in \mathcal{B}_{\mathcal{S}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\gamma}(A) &= \mathbb{P}(\hat{S} \in A) = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{P}(\hat{S} \in A | \varepsilon) \right] \\ &= (\eta/\eta_0) \mathbb{P}(S \in A) + (1 - \eta/\eta_0) \mathbb{P}(\tilde{S} \in A). \end{aligned}$$

This shows

$$\hat{\gamma} = (\eta/\eta_0) \gamma^{\eta_0, \delta} + (1 - \eta/\eta_0) \tilde{\gamma}, \quad \text{where } \tilde{\gamma} = \text{Law}(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{X}).$$

Next, we verify $\hat{\gamma} \in \Sigma(\eta, \delta)$. Since $\nu \mapsto \mathbf{K}_1(\nu, \mu_1)$ is convex and $\tilde{\gamma}_{1,3} = \text{Law}(\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{X}) = \mu_1$, we have

$$\mathbf{K}_1(\hat{\gamma}_{1,3}, \mu_1) \leq \left(\frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right) \mathbf{K}_1(\gamma_{1,3}^{\eta_1, \delta}, \mu_1) + \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right) \mathbf{K}_1(\tilde{\gamma}_{1,3}, \mu_1) \leq \eta.$$

Similarly, we have $\mathbf{K}_2(\hat{\gamma}_{2,3}, \mu_2) \leq \delta$. As a result, we verify $\hat{\gamma} \in \Sigma(\eta, \delta)$. Next, it is easy to see

$$\mathbb{E} \left[c_1 \left((\hat{Y}_1, \hat{X}), (Y_1, X) \right) \right] \leq \left(1 - \frac{\eta}{\eta_0} \right) \mathbb{E} \left[c_1 \left((\tilde{Y}_1, \tilde{X}), (Y_1, X) \right) \right] \leq (\eta - \eta_0)$$

Since $\text{Law}(Y_2, X) = \gamma_2^{\eta_0, \delta}$, $\text{Law}(\tilde{Y}_2, \tilde{X}) = \mu_2$ and $\mathbf{K}_2(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_2) \leq \delta$, i.e. $\mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_0, \delta}, \mu_2) \leq \delta^{1/p_2}$, by triangle inequality, we have

$$\mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_1, \delta}, \delta_{s_2}) \leq \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_1, \delta}, \mu_2) + \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2}) \leq \delta^{1/p_2} + \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2}),$$

where δ_{s_2} denotes the dirac measure at $\{s_2\}$ and $s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$ is arbitrary. Further, Assumption 5.2 (ii) implies $\rho_2(y'_2, y_2) \leq 1 + \mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(s'_2, s_2)^{p_2}$ for all $s_2 = (y_2, x)$ and $s'_2 = (y'_2, x')$,

$$\mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, y_2)] - 1 \leq \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(S_2, s_2)^{p_2}] = \mathbf{W}_{p_2} \left(\gamma_{2,3}^{\eta_1, \delta}, \delta_{s_2} \right)^{p_2} \leq [\delta^{1/p_2} + \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2})]^{p_2},$$

and

$$\mathbb{E} [\rho_2(\tilde{Y}_2, y_2)] - 1 \leq \mathbb{E} [\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_2}(\tilde{S}_2, s_2)^{p_2}] = \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2})^{p_2}.$$

As a result, by Assumption 5.2 (iii),

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, \hat{Y}_2)] &= (\eta/\eta_0) \underbrace{\mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, Y_2) | \varepsilon = 0]}_{=0} + (1 - \eta/\eta_0) \mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, \tilde{Y}_2) | \varepsilon = 1] \\ &\leq (1 - \eta/\eta_0) \mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, \tilde{Y}_2)] \leq (1 - \eta/\eta_0) N \left(\mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, y_2)] + \mathbb{E} [\rho_2(y_2, \tilde{Y}_2)] \right) \\ &\leq M(1 - \eta/\eta_0), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M = N \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2})^{p_2} + N [\delta^{1/p_2} + \mathbf{W}_{p_2}(\mu_2, \delta_{s_2})]^{p_2} < \infty.$$

Therefore, by Assumption 5.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) &\leq \mathbb{E} [f(Y_1, Y_2, X)] - \mathbb{E} [f(\hat{Y}_1, \hat{Y}_2, \hat{X})] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\Psi \left(c_1 \left((Y_1, X), (\hat{Y}_1, \hat{X}) \right), \rho_2(Y_2, \hat{Y}_2) \right) \right] \\ &\leq \Psi \left(\mathbb{E} [c_1(S_1, \hat{S}_1)], \mathbb{E} [\rho_2(Y_2, \hat{Y}_2)] \right) \\ &\leq \Psi(\eta_0 - \eta, M(1 - \eta/\eta_0)). \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof can be completed using the same reasoning. □

Now, we give the proof of Theorem 5.2.

Proof of Theorem 5.2. If $\eta_0 > \eta \geq 0$, Lemma C.14 implies

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) &= \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) + \mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) \\ &\leq \Psi_1(\eta_0 - \eta, M(1 - \eta/\eta_0)) + \Psi_2(M\delta, \delta). \end{aligned}$$

If $\eta \geq \eta_0$, by monotonicity of $\eta \mapsto \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0)$ and Lemma C.14, we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) \leq \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, 0) \leq \Psi_2(M\delta, \delta),$$

and

$$\mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) \geq \mathcal{I}(\eta, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) \geq 0.$$

As a result, we must have for all η_0, η and δ in $[0, \infty)$,

$$0 \leq \mathcal{I}(\eta_0, \delta) - \mathcal{I}(\eta, 0) \leq \Psi_1(|\eta_0 - \eta|, M|1 - \eta/\eta_0|) + \Psi_2(M\delta, \delta).$$

The continuity of \mathcal{I} at $(\eta, 0)$ follows from the continuity of Ψ_1 and Ψ_2 , and letting $(\eta_0, \delta) \rightarrow (\eta, 0)$. Using a similar argument, we can show \mathcal{I} is continuous at $(0, \eta)$. \square

C.4 Proofs in Section 6

C.4.1 Proof of Proposition 6.1

By some simple algebra and Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D(\delta) &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{S}} [(f_1)_{\lambda_1}(y_1) + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}(y_2)] d\gamma(y_1, y_2) \right\} \\ &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \geq 0} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} (f_1)_{\lambda_1} d\mu_1 \right] + \inf_{\lambda_2 \geq 0} \left[\lambda_2 \delta_2 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_2} (f_2)_{\lambda_2} d\mu_2 \right], \end{aligned}$$

where the last step holds because $(f_\ell)_\lambda \geq f_\ell$ and the right-hand side is well-defined since $f_\ell \in L^1(\mu_\ell)$. Next, we show $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$. Theorem 3.2 implies

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi \right\},$$

where $(f_S)_\lambda : \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) = \sup_{(y'_1, y'_2, x') \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ f_1(y'_1) + f_2(y'_2) - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell c_\ell((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x')) \right\}.$$

In fact, Assumption 6.2 implies for all $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell) \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$ and $s'_\ell = (y'_\ell, x'_\ell) \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$, one has

$$c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \inf_{x_\ell, x'_\ell \in \mathcal{X}} c_\ell((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x'_\ell)) \leq c_\ell((y_\ell, x_\ell), (y'_\ell, x'_\ell)).$$

Recall $(f_S)_\lambda : (s_1, s_2) \mapsto (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2)$ is a function from $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell) \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$. As a result, for all $s_1 \in \mathcal{S}_1$ and $s_2 \in \mathcal{S}_2$

$$\begin{aligned} (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &\leq \sup_{(y'_1, y'_2, x') \in \mathcal{S}} \left\{ f_1(y'_1) + f_2(y'_2) - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell c_{Y_\ell}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) \right\} \\ &= (f_1)_{\lambda_1}(y_1) + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}(y_2). \end{aligned}$$

This shows for all $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \lambda_2) \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$, one has

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} (f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda} d\pi \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_1, \mu_2)} \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2} [(f_1)_{\lambda_1}(y_1) + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}(y_2)] d\gamma(y_1, y_2),$$

and hence $\mathcal{I}(\delta) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$. We end the proof by showing

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} (f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda} d\pi \geq \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} (f_1)_{\lambda_1} d\mu_1 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_2} (f_2)_{\lambda_2} d\mu_2.$$

It suffices to show that there is $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$ such that $(f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda}(s_1, s_2) \geq (f_1)_{\lambda_1}(y_1) + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}(y_2)$, π -a.e. In fact, we note that if $x_1 = x_2$, then $(f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda}((y_1, x_1), (y_2, x_2)) = (f_1)_{\lambda_1}(y_1) + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}(y_2)$ under Assumption 6.2. Consider a probability measure $\pi^* = \text{Law}(Y_1, X, Y_2, X)$ where $\mu_{\ell,3} = \text{Law}(Y_{\ell}, X)$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} (f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda} d\pi &\geq \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} (f_{\mathcal{S}})_{\lambda} d\pi^* = \int_{\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2} [(f_1)_{\lambda_1} + (f_2)_{\lambda_2}] d\pi^* \\ &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}_1} (f_1)_{\lambda_1} d\mu_1 + \int_{\mathcal{Y}_2} (f_2)_{\lambda_2} d\mu_2. \end{aligned}$$

C.4.2 Proof of Proposition 6.2

Since $c_{Y_{\ell}}(y_{\ell}, y'_{\ell}) = \inf_{x_{\ell}, x'_{\ell} \in \mathcal{X}_{\ell}} c_{\ell}(s_{\ell}, s'_{\ell})$, the proof of Proposition 6.1 implies $\mathcal{I}(\delta) \leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$.

C.4.3 Proof of Proposition 6.3 (i)

The proof consists of two steps. In Step 1, we derive the dual form of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. In Step 2, we derive the dual reformulations of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$.

Step 1. We derive the expressions of $\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. First, recall $c_{Y_{\ell}}(y_{\ell}, y'_{\ell}) = V_{\ell, Y Y}^{-1}(y_{\ell} - y'_{\ell})^2$. Theorem 3.1 implies

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{Y_1}, \mu_{Y_2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\lambda}(y_1, y_2) d\varpi(y_1, y_2) \right],$$

where $(f_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\lambda} : (y_1, y_2) \mapsto (f_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\lambda}(y_1, y_2)$ from \mathbb{R}^2 to \mathbb{R} is given by

$$(f_{\mathcal{Y}})_{\lambda}(y_1, y_2) = y_2 - y_1 + \frac{V_{1, Y Y}}{4\lambda_1} + \frac{V_{2, Y Y}}{4\lambda_2}.$$

Since $V_{\ell, Y Y} > 0$ for $\ell \in [2]$, by some simple algebra, we have for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$

$$\mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{D}}(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + V_{1, Y Y}^{1/2} \delta_1^{1/2} + V_{2, Y Y}^{1/2} \delta_2^{1/2}$$

Next, we derive the expression of $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. Let $Q_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{(d+1) \times (d+1)}$ be the inverse of V_ℓ , i.e.,

$$Q_\ell = \begin{bmatrix} Q_{\ell,YY} & Q_{\ell,YX} \\ Q_{\ell,XY} & Q_{\ell,XX} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX})^{-1} & -(V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX})^{-1}V_{\ell,YX}V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} \\ -V_{\ell,XX}^{-1}V_{\ell,XY}(V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX})^{-1} & (V_\ell/V_{\ell,YY})^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX} = V_{\ell,YY} - V_{\ell,YX}V_{\ell,XX}^{-1}V_{\ell,XY}$ and $V_\ell/V_{\ell,YY} = V_{\ell,XX} - V_{\ell,XY}V_{\ell,YY}^{-1}V_{\ell,YX}$. Conversely,

$$\begin{bmatrix} V_{\ell,YY} & V_{\ell,YX} \\ V_{\ell,XY} & V_{\ell,XX} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} (Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,XX})^{-1} & -Q_{\ell,YY}^{-1}Q_{\ell,YX}(Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,YY})^{-1} \\ -(Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,YY})^{-1}Q_{\ell,XY}Q_{\ell,XX}^{-1} & (Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,YY})^{-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

where $Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,XX} = Q_{\ell,YY} - Q_{\ell,YX}Q_{\ell,XX}^{-1}Q_{\ell,XY}$ and $Q_\ell/Q_{\ell,YY} = Q_{\ell,XX} - Q_{\ell,XY}Q_{\ell,YY}^{-1}Q_{\ell,YX}$. Next, we evaluate the function $(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2)$ that appears in the dual reformulation. For simplicity, we write $a_1 = -1$ and $a_2 = 1$. Consider the following derivation:

$$\begin{aligned} (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &:= \sup_{y'_1, y'_2, x'} \left\{ y'_2 - y'_1 - \sum_{\ell=1,2} \lambda_\ell c_\ell((y'_\ell, x'), (y_\ell, x_\ell)) \right\} \\ &= \sup_{y'_1, y'_2, x'} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \left(a_\ell y_\ell - \lambda_\ell \begin{bmatrix} y'_\ell - y_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_\ell \begin{bmatrix} y'_\ell - y_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\} \\ &=_{(1)} y_2 - y_1 + \sup_{z'_1, z'_2, x'} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \left(a_\ell z'_\ell - \lambda_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\} \\ &= y_2 - y_1 + \sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \sup_{z'_\ell \in \mathbb{R}} \left(a_\ell z'_\ell - \lambda_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where equation (1) follows from the change of variables $z'_\ell = y'_\ell - y_\ell$. So, to evaluate $(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2)$, it suffices to maximize $(z'_1, z'_2, x') \mapsto \phi_1(z'_1, x'; x_1) + \phi_2(z'_2, x'; x_2)$ where

$$\phi_\ell(z'_\ell, x'; x_\ell) = a_\ell z'_\ell - \lambda_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_\ell \begin{bmatrix} z'_\ell \\ x' - x_\ell \end{bmatrix}.$$

We first consider $\sup_{z'_\ell \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_\ell(z'_\ell, x'; x_\ell)$. The first-order conditions imply that the optimal solution is

$$z'_\ell = (\lambda_\ell Q_{\ell,YY})^{-1} \left[\frac{a_\ell}{2} - \lambda_\ell Q_{\ell,YX}(x' - x_\ell) \right].$$

By some simple algebra, $\sup_{z'_\ell \in \mathbb{R}} \phi_\ell(z'_\ell, x', x_\ell) = \varphi_\ell(x' - x_\ell, \lambda)$ where $\varphi_\ell : \mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is given by

$$\varphi_\ell(x, \lambda) = \frac{Q_{\ell,YY}^{-1}}{4\lambda_\ell} + a_\ell x^\top V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} V_{\ell,XY} - \lambda_\ell x^\top V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} x.$$

As result,

$$(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) = \sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} [\varphi_1(x' - x_1, \lambda_1) + \varphi_2(x' - x_2, \lambda_2)].$$

Now, we consider the optimization above. The first-order conditions imply the optimal solution x' takes the form of $x' - x_\ell = B_\ell(x_2 - x_1) + b_\ell$ for some $B_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $b_\ell \in \mathbb{R}^d$ that depend on λ_ℓ . So, we have

$$\sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} [\varphi_1(x', x_1) + \varphi_2(x', x_2)] = b + B(x_1 - x_2) - (x_1 - x_2)^\top W(x_1 - x_2).$$

for some positive definite matrix $W \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $b \in \mathbb{R}$ that depend on $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, x_1$ and x_2 . Here, the constant b will be determined below. For any $\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi &= \frac{1}{4\lambda_1} Q_{1,YY}^{-1} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_2} Q_{2,YY}^{-1} + \underbrace{\int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} B(x_1 - x_2) d\pi}_{=0} \\ &+ \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} (x_1 - x_2)^\top W(x_1 - x_2) d\pi(s_1, s_2) + b \\ &= \frac{1}{4\lambda_1} Q_{1,YY}^{-1} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_2} Q_{2,YY}^{-1} - \int (x_1 - x_2)^\top W(x_1 - x_2) d\pi + b. \end{aligned}$$

Now, let us consider $\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int (f_S)_\lambda d\pi$. To maximize $\int (f_S)_\lambda d\pi$, it suffices to consider

$$\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d+1} \times \mathbb{R}^{d+1}} (x_1 - x_2)^\top W(x_1 - x_2) d\pi(s_1, s_2).$$

Since $(x_1 - x_2)^\top W(x_1 - x_2)$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, the probability measure $\pi = \text{Law}(Y_1, X, Y_2, X)$ with $\text{Law}(Y_\ell, X) = \mu_{\ell,3}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$ is a solution and the optimal value is 0. We denote by Π the set of all probability measures on $\mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_2$ that takes forms of $\pi = \text{Law}(Y_1, X, Y_2, X)$. As a consequence,

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+2}} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi = \frac{1}{4\lambda_1} Q_{1,YY}^{-1} + \frac{1}{4\lambda_2} Q_{2,YY}^{-1} + b$$

where $b = \frac{1}{4} V_o^\top (\lambda_1 V_{1,XX}^{-1} + \lambda_2 V_{2,XX}^{-1})^{-1} V_o$ with $V_o = V_{2,XX}^{-1} V_{2,XY} - V_{1,XX}^{-1} V_{1,XY}$. As a result, the dual reformulation of $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \lambda_1 \delta_1 + \lambda_2 \delta_2 + \frac{1}{4\lambda_1} (V_1/V_{1,XX}) + \frac{1}{4\lambda_2} (V_2/V_{2,XX}) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} V_o^\top (\lambda_1 V_{1,XX}^{-1} + \lambda_2 V_{2,XX}^{-1})^{-1} V_o \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Step 2. We derive the dual reformulation of $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ and $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^2 \setminus \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$. First, we note that $\mathcal{I}_D(0) = \mathcal{I}(0) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1]$. Theorem 3.1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\lambda_1 \delta_1 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{Y_1}, \mu_{Y_2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_Y)_{\lambda,1}(y_1, y_2) d\varpi(y_1, y_2) \right], \\ \mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2) &= \inf_{\lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\lambda_2 \delta_2 + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{Y_1}, \mu_{Y_2})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_Y)_{\lambda,2}(y_1, y_2) d\varpi(y_1, y_2) \right],\end{aligned}$$

where $(f_Y)_{\lambda,\ell}$, for $\ell = 1, 2$, is given by $(f_Y)_{\lambda,\ell} = y_2 - y_1 + (4\lambda_\ell)^{-1}V_{\ell,YY}$. Since $V_{\ell,YY} > 0$, by simple algebra, we have for all $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^2$,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + V_{1,YY}^{1/2} \delta_1^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + V_{2,YY}^{1/2} \delta_2^2.$$

Theorem 3.2 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0) &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_S)_{\lambda,1}(y_1, y_2) d\varpi(y_1, y_2) \right], \\ \mathcal{I}(0, \delta_2) &= \inf_{\lambda_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} (f_S)_{\lambda,2}(y_1, y_2) d\varpi(y_1, y_2) \right],\end{aligned}$$

where $(f_Y)_{\lambda,\ell}$, for $\ell = 1, 2$, is given by

$$\begin{aligned}(f_Y)_{\lambda,1} &= \sup_{y'_1} \left\{ y_2 - y'_1 - \lambda_1 \begin{bmatrix} y'_1 - y_1 \\ x_2 - x_1 \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_1 \begin{bmatrix} y'_1 - y_1 \\ x_2 - x_1 \end{bmatrix} \right\}, \\ (f_Y)_{\lambda,2} &= \sup_{y'_2} \left\{ y'_2 - y_1 - \lambda_2 \begin{bmatrix} y'_2 - y_2 \\ x_1 - x_2 \end{bmatrix}^\top Q_2 \begin{bmatrix} y'_2 - y_2 \\ x_1 - x_2 \end{bmatrix} \right\}.\end{aligned}$$

With similar calculation as in Step 1, the functions $(f_Y)_{\lambda,1}$ and $(f_Y)_{\lambda,2}$ can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}(f_Y)_{\lambda,1} &= y_2 - y_1 + \frac{V_1/V_{1,XX}}{4\lambda_1} - (x_2 - x_1)^\top V_{1,XX}^{-1} V_{1,XY} - \lambda_1 (x_2 - x_1)^\top V_{1,XX}^{-1} (x_2 - x_1), \\ (f_Y)_{\lambda,2} &= y_2 - y_1 + \frac{V_2/V_{2,XX}}{4\lambda_2} + (x_1 - x_2)^\top V_{2,XX}^{-1} V_{2,XY} - \lambda_2 (x_1 - x_2)^\top V_{2,XX}^{-1} (x_1 - x_2).\end{aligned}$$

With the same reasoning as in Step 1, we have

$$\sup_{\varpi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int (f_S)_{\lambda,\ell} d\varpi = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \frac{V_\ell/V_{\ell,XX}}{4\lambda_\ell}, \quad \text{for } \ell \in [2].$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}(\delta_1, 0) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + (V_1/V_{1,XX})^{1/2} \delta_1^{1/2} = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta_1, 0), \\ \mathcal{I}(0, \delta_2) &= \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + (V_2/V_{2,XX})^{1/2} \delta_2^{1/2} = \mathcal{I}_D(0, \delta_2).\end{aligned}$$

C.4.4 Proof of Proposition 6.3 (ii)

Recall the proof of Proposition 6.3 (i), we have

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left\{ \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \tilde{\Pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+2}} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi \right\}$$

where $\tilde{\Pi}$ is the set of all probability measures such that their supports $\text{Supp}(\pi)$ are in $\{(y_1, x_1, y_2, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+2} : x_1 = x_2\}$. By the definition of $\tilde{\Pi}$, to evaluate $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$, it suffices to restrict the domain of $(f_S)_\lambda$ on $\text{Supp}(\pi)$. For any $(s_1, s_2) \in \text{Supp}(\pi)$, we have $x_1 = x_2$

$$\begin{aligned} (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= (y_2 - y_1) + \sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} [\varphi_1(x' - x_1, \lambda_1) + \varphi_2(x' - x_2, \lambda_2)] \\ &= (y_2 - y_1) + \underbrace{\sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left\{ \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \frac{Q_{\ell, Y Y}^{-1}}{4\lambda_\ell} + x'^\top V_{\ell, X X}^{-1} V_{\ell, X Y} a_\ell - \lambda_\ell x'^\top V_{\ell, X X}^{-1} x' \right\}}_{=\mathcal{H}(\lambda, \delta)} \end{aligned}$$

As a consequence, $(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2)$ is independent of x_1 and x_2 for all $(s_1, s_2) \in \text{Supp}(\pi)$, and hence for all $\pi \in \tilde{\Pi}$, we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2d+2}} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \mathcal{R}(\lambda, \delta),$$

where $\mathcal{R}(\lambda, \delta) = \mathcal{H}(\lambda, \delta) + \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle$ and $\text{Law}(Y_\ell, X) = \mu_{\ell 3}$ for $\ell = 1, 2$. So, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{R}(\lambda, \delta)$. Moreover,

$$\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{R}_D(\lambda, \delta),$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}_D(\lambda, \delta) = \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \frac{V_{1, Y Y}}{4\lambda_1} + \frac{V_{2, Y Y}}{4\lambda_2}.$$

The rest of the proof is divided into the following two steps.

Step 1. We show that $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta)$ implies

$$\delta_1^{1/2} V_{1, Y Y}^{-1/2} V_{1, X Y} + \delta_2^{1/2} V_{2, Y Y}^{-1/2} V_{2, X Y} = 0. \quad (\text{C.4})$$

Since $Q_{\ell, Y Y} \geq V_{\ell, Y Y}^{-1}$ by definition, then $Q_{\ell, Y Y}^{-1} \leq V_{\ell, Y Y}$ and $\mathcal{R}(\lambda, \delta) \leq \mathcal{R}_D(\lambda, \delta)$. Let $\lambda_D^* = (\delta_1^{-1/2} V_{1, Y Y}^{1/2}, \delta_2^{-1/2} V_{2, Y Y}^{1/2})$. It is easy to see $\inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \mathcal{R}_D(\lambda, \delta) = \mathcal{R}_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta) \geq \mathcal{R}(\lambda_D^*, \delta)$ and hence

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \mathcal{R}(\lambda_D^*, \delta) \leq \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \mathcal{R}_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta).$$

Thus, $\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ implies $R_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta) = R(\lambda_D^*, \delta)$. In fact, we note that

$$R_D(\lambda, \delta) = \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_\ell) \right] \quad \text{and} \quad R_D(\lambda, \delta) = \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \sup_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_\ell).$$

Since $x' \mapsto \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_\ell)$ is strictly concave, it admits a unique maximizer and hence $R_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta) = R(\lambda_D^*, \delta)$ implies for $\ell = 1, 2$,

$$\arg \max_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_{D,\ell}^*) \right] = \arg \max_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_{D,\ell}^*).$$

The first-order conditions imply

$$\arg \max_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \left[\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_\ell) \right] = \left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} \right)^{-1} \left(\sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} a_\ell V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} V_{\ell,XY} \right),$$

and

$$\arg \max_{x' \in \mathbb{R}^d} \varphi_\ell(x', \lambda_\ell) = \frac{1}{2} a_\ell \lambda_{D,\ell}^* V_{2,XY}^{-1}, \quad \text{for } \ell = 1, 2.$$

So, recall $\lambda_{D,\ell}^* = \delta_\ell^{-1/2} V_{\ell,YY}^{1/2}$, $a_1 = -1$ and $a_2 = 1$, we have

$$\delta_1^{1/2} V_{1,YY}^{-1/2} V_{1,XY} + \delta_2^{1/2} V_{2,YY}^{-1/2} V_{2,XY} = 0.$$

Step 2. We show $\delta_1^{1/2} V_{1,YY}^{-1/2} V_{1,XY} + \delta_2^{1/2} V_{2,YY}^{-1/2} V_{2,XY} = 0$ implies $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta)$. We note $\lambda \mapsto R_D(\lambda, \delta)$ is convex since it is supremum of a set of affine functions. It can be written as

$$R_D(\lambda, \delta) = \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \frac{V_\ell / V_{\ell,XX}}{4\lambda_\ell} + \frac{1}{4} V_o^\top \underbrace{(\lambda_1 V_{1,XX}^{-1} + \lambda_2 V_{2,XX}^{-1})^{-1}}_{=\Lambda_\lambda} V_o$$

Taking derivatives with respect to λ_ℓ yields

$$\frac{\partial R_D(\lambda, \delta)}{\partial \lambda_\ell} = \delta_\ell - \frac{V_\ell / V_{\ell,XX}}{4\lambda_\ell^2} - \frac{1}{4} V_o^\top \Lambda_\lambda^{-1} V_{\ell,XX}^{-1} \Lambda_\lambda^{-1} V_o.$$

By some algebra and under $\delta_1^{1/2} V_{1,YY}^{-1/2} V_{1,XY} + \delta_2^{1/2} V_{2,YY}^{-1/2} V_{2,XY} = 0$, we can show

$$\frac{\partial R_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta)}{\partial \lambda_\ell} = 0.$$

As a result, $R_D(\lambda_D^*, \delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} R_D(\lambda, \delta) = R(\lambda_D^*, \delta) = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} R(\lambda, \delta)$ and

$$\mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathbb{E}[Y_2] - \mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} R_D(\lambda, \delta) = \mathcal{I}_D(\delta).$$

Step 3. We show that Equation (C.4) incorporates the case when $\delta_1 = 0$ or $\delta_2 = 0$. From Proposition 6.3 (ii), we know the following statements hold.

- When $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\delta_2 = 0$, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta)$ if and only if $V_{1,XY} = 0$.
- When $\delta_1 = 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta)$ if and only if $V_{2,XY} = 0$.
- When $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) = \mathcal{I}(\delta) = \mathcal{I}_{D,0}$.

We will see that Equation (C.4) incorporates all these cases.

- When $\delta_1 > 0$ and $\delta_2 = 0$, Equation (C.4) is equivalent to $V_{1,XY} = 0$.
- When $\delta_1 = 0$ and $\delta_2 > 0$, Equation (C.4) is equivalent to $V_{2,XY} = 0$.
- When $\delta_1 = \delta_2 = 0$, Equation (C.4) is satisfied always.

This completes the proof.

C.4.5 Proof of Proposition 6.3 (iii)

The continuity of \mathcal{I}_D can be seen from the Proposition 6.3 (i) or Theorem 5.1. Next, we show \mathcal{I} is continuous on \mathbb{R}_+^2 by verifying the conditions of Theorem 5.2. Obviously, $\mathbf{d}_{\mathcal{S}_\ell}(s_\ell, s'_\ell) = \sqrt{c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell)}$ defines a norm on $\mathcal{S}_\ell = \mathbb{R}^{q+1}$. Define a function $\rho_\ell : \mathcal{Y}_\ell \times \mathcal{Y}_\ell \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = (y_\ell - y'_\ell)^\top V_{\ell,YY}^{-1} (y_\ell - y'_\ell).$$

In fact, it is not difficult to see

$$\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \min_{(x_\ell, x'_\ell) \in \mathcal{X}_\ell \times \mathcal{X}_\ell} (s_\ell - s'_\ell)^\top V_\ell^{-1} (s_\ell - s'_\ell) \leq c_\ell(s_\ell, s'_\ell), \quad \forall s_\ell, s'_\ell \in \mathcal{S}_\ell.$$

Moreover, $\rho_\ell^{1/2}$ is a norm on \mathcal{Y}_ℓ and the triangle inequality implies

$$\rho_\ell^{1/2}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) \leq \rho_\ell^{1/2}(y_\ell, y_\ell^*) + \rho_\ell^{1/2}(y_\ell^*, y'_\ell), \quad \forall y_\ell, y'_\ell, y_\ell^* \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell.$$

As a result, we must have

$$\rho(y_\ell, y'_\ell) \leq 2 [\rho_\ell(y_\ell, y_\ell^*) + \rho_\ell(y_\ell^*, y'_\ell)], \quad \forall y_\ell, y'_\ell, y_\ell^* \in \mathcal{Y}_\ell.$$

We verified the functions ρ_1 and ρ_2 satisfy Assumption 5.2 with respect to Mahalanobis distances. Recall $f(y_1, y_2, x) = y_1 - y_2$ and define a concave function $\Psi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ as

$$\Psi : (a_1, a_2) \mapsto V_{1,YY}^{1/2} a_1^{1/2} + V_{2,YY}^{1/2} a_2^{1/2}.$$

Since $|y_\ell - y'_\ell|^2 = V_{\ell, Y_\ell} \rho_\ell(y_\ell, y'_\ell)$ and $\rho_\ell \leq c_\ell$, then

$$\begin{aligned} f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') &\leq |y_1 - y'_1| + |y_2 - y'_2| \\ &\leq \sum_{\ell=1}^2 V_{\ell, Y_\ell}^{1/2} \rho_\ell^{1/2}(y_\ell, y'_\ell) = \Psi(\rho_1(y_1, y'_1), \rho_2(y_2, y'_2)) \\ &\leq \Psi(c_1(s_1, s'_1), \rho_2(y_2, y'_2)). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can show

$$f(y_1, y_2, x) - f(y'_1, y'_2, x') \leq \Psi(\rho_1(y_1, y'_1), c_2(s_2, s'_2)).$$

Theorem 5.2 implies the continuity of \mathcal{I} on \mathbb{R}_+^2 .

C.5 Proofs in Section 6.2

C.5.1 Proof of Proposition 6.5

We prove Proposition 6.5 (i) using a technique similar to Adjaho and Christensen (2023). For any $s_\ell = (y_\ell, x_\ell) \in \mathcal{S}_\ell$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{(y'_1, y'_2) \in \mathcal{Y}_1 \times \mathcal{Y}_2} \left\{ -y'_2 d(x') - y'_1 [1 - d(x')] - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell [|y_\ell - y'_\ell| + \|x_\ell - x'\|_2] \right\} \\ &= \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ \left[\sup_{y'_2 \in \mathcal{Y}_2} \{-y'_2 d(x') - \lambda_2 |y_2 - y'_2|\} + \sup_{y'_1 \in \mathcal{Y}_1} \{-y'_1 (1 - d(x')) - \lambda_1 |y_1 - y'_1|\} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell \|x_\ell - x'\| \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

We note that

$$\sup_{y'_2 \in \mathcal{Y}_2} \{-y'_2 d(x') - \lambda_2 |y_2 - y'_2|\} = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda_2 < 1 \\ -y_2 d(x') & \text{if } \lambda_2 \geq 1 \end{cases},$$

and

$$\sup_{y'_1 \in \mathcal{Y}_1} \{-y'_1 (1 - d(x')) - \lambda_1 |y_1 - y'_1|\} = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{if } 0 \leq \lambda_1 < 1 \\ -y_1 (1 - d(x')) & \text{if } \lambda_1 \geq 1 \end{cases}.$$

Therefore, we have for $\lambda_1 \geq 1$ and $\lambda_2 \geq 1$

$$\begin{aligned} (f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) &= \sup_{x' \in \mathcal{X}} \left\{ -y_2 d(x') - y_1 (1 - d(x')) - \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell \|x_\ell - x'\| \right\} \\ &= -\min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda, 1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda, 0}(x_1, x_2)\}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\varphi_{\lambda,d}(x_1, x_2) = \min_{u \in \mathcal{X}: d(u)=d} \sum_{1 \leq \ell \leq 2} \lambda_\ell \|x_\ell - u\|_2,$$

for $d \in \{0, 1\}$. If $\lambda_1 < 1$ or $\lambda_2 < 1$, then $(f_S)_\lambda(s_1, s_2) = \infty$. As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}(d) &= \inf_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \mathbb{E}[Y_2 d(X) + Y_1(1 - d(X))] = - \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} (f_S)_\lambda d\pi \right] \\ &= - \inf_{\lambda \in [1, \infty)^2} \left[\langle \lambda, \delta \rangle + \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} -\min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2)\} d\pi(v) \right] \\ &= \sup_{\lambda \in [1, \infty)^2} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2)\} d\pi(v) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we show Proposition 6.5 (ii). Recall the set $\tilde{\Pi}$ defined in the proof of Proposition 6.3 (ii). Here, $\tilde{\Pi}$ is the set of all the probability measures concentrate on $\{(y_1, x_1, y_2, x_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{2d+2} : x_1 = x_2\}$. Consider the following derivation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}(d) &= \sup_{\lambda_0 \geq 1, \lambda_2 \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2)\} d\pi(v) - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\delta_0 \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\lambda_1 \geq 1, \lambda_2 \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \tilde{\Pi}} \int_{\mathcal{V}} \min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x_1, x_2), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x_1, x_2)\} d\pi(v) - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\delta_0 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Recall the functions h_0 and h_1 defined in Proposition 6.4, we notice that for all $(y_1, x_1, y_2, x_2) \in \tilde{\Pi}$,

$$\varphi_{\lambda,\ell}(x_1, x_2) = (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)h_\ell(x_1), \quad \forall \ell = 1, 2.$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{RW}(d) &\leq \sup_{\lambda_1 \geq 1, \lambda_2 \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \min\{y_2 + \varphi_{\lambda,1}(x), y_1 + \varphi_{\lambda,0}(x)\} d\pi(s) - (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2)\delta_0 \right] \\ &= \sup_{\eta \geq 2} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \min\{y_2 + \eta h_1(x), y_1 + \eta h_0(x)\} d\pi(s) - \eta\delta_0 \right] \\ &\leq \sup_{\eta \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \int_{\mathcal{S}} \min\{y_2 + \eta h_1(x), y_1 + \eta h_0(x)\} d\pi(s) - \eta\delta_0 \right] \\ &= {}_{(1)} \sup_{\eta \geq 1} \left[\inf_{\pi \in \mathcal{F}(\mu_{13}, \mu_{23})} \mathbb{E}_X [\mathbb{E}(\min\{Y_2 - Y_1 + \eta h_1(X), \eta h_0(X)\} | X)] + \mathbb{E}(Y_1) - \eta\delta_0 \right] \\ &= \sup_{\eta \geq 1} \left[\int_{\mathcal{S}} \min\{y_2 + \eta h_1(x), y_1 + \eta h_0(x)\} d\pi^*(s) - \eta\delta_0 \right] \\ &= \text{RW}_0(d) \end{aligned}$$

where equation (1) follows from Proposition 2.17 in Santambrogio (2015) and the concavity of $y \mapsto \min\{y + \eta h_1(x), \eta h_0(x)\}$ (see also Section 4.3.1 in Adjaho and Christensen (2023)).

C.6 Proofs in Section 7

We provide a brief sketch of proofs in Section 7.

C.6.1 Proof of Theorem 7.1

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.1, it is sufficient to derive the dual reformulation of $\mathcal{I}_D(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$. Let \mathcal{P}_D denote the set of $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{V})$ that satisfies $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) < \infty$ for all $\ell \in [L]$ and $\int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma > -\infty$. Taking the Legendre transform on \mathcal{I}_D yields that any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) &:= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \{\mathcal{I}_D(\delta) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle\} = \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma_D(\delta)} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} \underbrace{\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \lambda_\ell \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \right\}}_{:= I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma]} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma B.5 and the similar reasoning as the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can show

$$\mathcal{I}_D^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}_D} I_{D,\lambda}[\gamma] = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi, \varphi_\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi(\mu_1, \dots, \mu_L)} \int_{\mathcal{V}} g_\lambda d\pi.$$

The desired result follows from Lemma B.2.

C.6.2 Proof of Theorem 7.2

Similarly to the proof of Theorem 3.2, it is sufficient to derive the dual reformulation of $\mathcal{I}(\delta)$ for $\delta \in \mathbb{R}_{++}^L$. Let \mathcal{P} denote the set of $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{S})$ that satisfies $\mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_{\ell,L}, \gamma_{\ell,L}) < \infty$ for all $\ell \in [L]$ and $\int_{\mathcal{S}} f d\gamma > -\infty$. Taking the Legendre transform on \mathcal{I} yields that any $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) &:= \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \{\mathcal{I}(\delta) - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle\} = \sup_{\delta \in \mathbb{R}_+^L} \sup_{\gamma \in \Sigma(\delta)} \left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} f d\gamma - \langle \lambda, \delta \rangle \right\} \\ &= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} \underbrace{\left\{ \int_{\mathcal{V}} g d\gamma - \sum_{\ell \in [L]} \lambda_\ell \mathbf{K}_\ell(\mu_\ell, \gamma_\ell) \right\}}_{:= I_\lambda[\gamma]} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}} I_\lambda[\gamma]. \end{aligned}$$

For notational simplicity, we write $\Pi := \Pi(\mu_{1,L+1}, \dots, \mu_{L,L+1})$. Using Lemma B.6 and the similar reasoning as in the proof of Theorem 3.2, we can show

$$\mathcal{I}^*(\lambda) = \sup_{\gamma \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}} I_\lambda[\gamma] = \sup_{\pi \in \Gamma(\Pi, \phi_\lambda)} \int_{\mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{V}} \varphi_\lambda d\pi = \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \int_{\mathcal{V}} f_\lambda d\pi.$$

The desired result follows from Lemma B.2.

C.6.3 Proof of Proposition 7.1

The proof is identical to that of Proposition 6.5.