

# Metric Entropy-Free Sample Complexity Bounds for Sample Average Approximation in Convex Stochastic Programming\*

Hongcheng Liu<sup>1</sup>      Jindong Tong<sup>2</sup>

Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

<sup>1</sup>liu.h@ufl.edu    <sup>2</sup>jindongtong@ufl.edu

This paper studies sample average approximation (SAA) in solving convex or strongly convex stochastic programming (SP) problems. Under some common regularity conditions, we show — perhaps for the first time — that SAA’s sample complexity can be completely free from any quantification of metric entropy (such as the logarithm of the covering number), leading to a significantly more efficient rate with dimensionality  $d$  than most existing results. From the newly established complexity bounds, an important revelation is that SAA and the canonical stochastic mirror descent (SMD) method, two mainstream solution approaches to SP, entail almost identical rates of sample efficiency, rectifying a persistent theoretical discrepancy of SAA from SMD by the order of  $O(d)$ . Furthermore, this paper explores non-Lipschitzian scenarios where SAA maintains provable efficacy but the corresponding results for SMD remain mostly unexplored, indicating the potential of SAA’s better applicability in some irregular settings.

*Key words:* Sample average approximation, heavy-tailed-ness, stochastic programming, dimensionality

**1. Introduction.** This paper is focused on a convex or strongly convex stochastic programming (SP) problem of the following form:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)], \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$  is a non-empty convex feasible region with integer  $d$  being the number of decision variables (a.k.a., dimensionality),  $\xi$  is a random vector of problem parameters whose probability distribution  $\mathbb{P}$  is supported on  $\Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ , and the cost function  $f: \mathcal{X} \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  is deterministic and measurable. Throughout this paper, we assume that  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  is everywhere differentiable for every  $\xi \in \Theta$ , the expectation  $\mathbb{E}[f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)] = \int_{\Theta} f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) d\mathbb{P}(\xi)$  is well defined for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $F$  admits a finite minimizer  $\mathbf{x}^*$  on  $\mathcal{X}$  with a finite optimal cost.

\*This paper is an extended version of the conference paper *Liu, H., Tong, J. (2024) New Sample Complexity Bounds for Sample Average Approximation in Heavy-Tailed Stochastic Programming*, in Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML), Vienna, Austria. PMLR 235, 2024.

The SP problem above has been widely applied and much discussed (e.g., by Shapiro et al. 2021, Birge 1997, Birge and Louveaux 2011, Ruszczyński and Shapiro 2003, Lan 2020, to name only a few). Particularly, it has extensive connections with many statistical and machine learning problems (as per, e.g., Bartlett et al. 2006, Liu et al. 2019). Indeed, the suboptimality gap in solving (1) can often be interpreted as the excess risk, an important metric of generalizability, when the SP problem is constructed for fitting/training a statistical or machine learning model.

This paper revisits one of the most traditional but popular solution methods for the SP called *sample average approximation* (SAA). Following its literature (Dupacová and Wets 1988, Ruszczyński and Shapiro 2003, Kleywegt et al. 2002, Shapiro et al. 2021, Oliveira and Thompson 2023, King and Wets 1991, among many others), we particularly focus on both the canonical formulation of SAA and one of its simple, regularized variations:

- (i) In particular, the canonical SAA is as below:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_N(\mathbf{x}) := N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N f(\mathbf{x}, \xi_j), \quad (2)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} := (\xi_j : j = 1, \dots, N)$  is an i.i.d. random sample of  $\xi$ . Our analysis on this formulation is centered around its effectiveness for strongly convex SP problems.

- (ii) On top of (2), we also consider the SAA variation that incorporates a Tikhonov-like regularization in the following:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}) := F_N(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}), \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda_0 \geq 0$  is a tuning parameter, and  $V_{q'} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ , given a user's choice of  $q'$ -norm (with  $q' \in (1, 2]$ ), is defined as

$$V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2, \quad (4)$$

for any initial guess  $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathcal{X}$  (though many of our results can be easily extended to the case with  $\mathbf{x}^0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ). Particularly in the case of  $q' = 2$  and  $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ , we have  $V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}) = 0.5\|\mathbf{x}\|_2^2$ , which becomes the canonical Tikhonov regularization (Golub et al. 1999) commonly employed in ridge regression (Hoerl and Kennard 1970). The same type of regularization approach has been discussed in the SAA theories for (general) convex SP, among others, by Hu et al. (2020), Feldman and Vondrak (2019), Shalev-Shwartz et al. (2010, 2009) and Lei and Ying (2020). Similarly in this paper, we also study SAA (3) in convex SP problems.

Throughout this paper, we refer to both formulations (2) and (3) as SAA; or, if there is ambiguity, “SAA (2)” and “SAA (3)”, respectively. Both versions of SAA avoid the multi-dimensional integral

involved in (1) and thus render the SP problem to be solvable as a “deterministic” nonlinear program (Shapiro et al. 2021), often leading to a substantial improvement in tractability.

Hereafter, consistent with the literature (e.g., Shapiro 1993), we refer to the vector-valued random variable,

$$\hat{\mathbf{x}} := \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}) \in \mathcal{X}, \quad (5)$$

with  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}} : \Theta^N \rightarrow \mathcal{X}$  being a deterministic and measurable function such that  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_N(\mathbf{x})$  (or  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x})$ ) given sample  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}$ , as an optimal solution to SAA (2) (or SAA (3), resp.). Sufficient conditions for the measurability of  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$  has been discussed (e.g., by Shapiro et al. 2021, Rockafellar and Wets 2009, Krätschmer 2023). Meanwhile, the quality of solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in approximating the solution to the genuine SP problem has also been much studied (e.g., by Artstein and Wets 1995, Dupacová and Wets 1988, King and Rockafellar 1993, King and Wets 1991, Pflug 1995, 1999, 2003, Shapiro 1989, 1993, 2003, Shapiro et al. 2021, Liu et al. 2016, 2022). Following many works in this body of literature, this current paper is focused on SAA’s (non-asymptotic) sample complexity; namely, how large the sample size  $N$  should be in order to ensure that  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  approximates the optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  to (1), meeting the user-prescribed thresholds for accuracy and probability. Although this is a well-visited topic, existing sample complexity bounds commonly carry an undesirable term of metric entropy, such as the example below.

**Typical non-asymptotic sample complexity under light-tailed-ness (when results, e.g., by Shapiro et al. 2021, Shapiro 2003, Shapiro and Nemirovski 2005, are applied to our settings):** *Under the Lipschitz assumption that, for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$  and every  $\xi \in \Theta$ ,*

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{y}, \xi)| \leq M(\xi) \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q, \quad (6)$$

where  $M : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is some deterministic and measurable function and  $\|\cdot\|_q$  is the  $q$ -norm ( $q \geq 1$ ), the optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (2) satisfies the following: For any given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ :

$$\text{Prob}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq O\left(\frac{\varphi^2 \mathcal{D}_q^2}{\epsilon^2} \left[\Gamma_\epsilon(\mathcal{X}) + \ln \frac{1}{\beta}\right]\right), \quad (7)$$

Here,  $\Gamma_\epsilon(\mathcal{X})$  is the logarithm of the covering number of the feasible region — one common form of the said metric entropy,  $\mathcal{D}_q$  is the  $q$ -norm diameter of the feasible region, and  $\varphi$  is the parameter related to the sub-Gaussian distribution assumed for  $M(\xi)$ .

Other than the logarithm of covering number above, in some other concurrent works, metric entropy may be calculated in different ways, including the “generic chaining”-based complexity

measures as in the analysis by Oliveira and Thompson (2023). Regardless of how the metric entropy is quantified, it generally causes the sample complexity bounds to exhibit an elevated dependence on problem dimensionality  $d$ . For example, because the covering number grows exponentially with  $d$  in general, the logarithm of covering number  $\Gamma_\epsilon(\mathcal{X})$  is then polynomial in  $d$ , leading to the following more explicit representation of the complexity rate than (7):

$$O\left(\frac{\varphi^2 \mathcal{D}_q^2}{\epsilon^2} \left[ d \cdot \ln\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_q \varphi}{\epsilon}\right) + \ln\frac{1}{\beta} \right]\right). \quad (8)$$

Changing ways to account for the metric entropy, such as via the said “generic chaining”-based argument, does not avoid the aforementioned polynomial growth rate with  $d$ , except for few scenarios under special structural assumptions (e.g., when the feasible region is a simplex).

The influence of metric entropy such as in (7) (and thus in (8)) seems particularly overt when SAA is compared with the stochastic mirror descent (SMD) methods (aka, the stochastic approximation or the stochastic first-order methods) as discussed, e.g., by Nemirovski et al. (2009), Ghadimi and Lan (2013), and Lan (2020). SMD is a mainstream alternative to SAA in solving an SP problem. Under comparable, and sometimes weaker, assumptions than those of SAA, SMD can often achieve metric entropy-free sample complexity rates. As a consequence, comparisons between the current theories for both methods would suggest a significant performance gap in sample efficiency — SMD would be substantially more efficient than SAA by a margin of order  $O(d)$ . With such a stark contrast, one would expect SMD to exhibit a significantly better solution quality than SAA in practice, when both methods are operating under the same sample size constraints. Yet, this theoretical discrepancy, though being persistent in the literature, seems to have never been confirmed in empirical studies. On the contrary, in many reported experiments (such as those by Nemirovski et al. 2009), SAA achieves comparable, if not better, solution accuracy than SMD, given the same sample size. The aforementioned inconsistency between the theoretical predictions and numerical results underscores a critical literature gap, to which this paper seeks to respond by focusing on a directly related research question:

**The open question of our focus:** *Does SAA, or its simple variations, admit sample complexity bounds that are completely free from any quantification of metric entropy?*

Our answer to this question is affirmative, as demonstrated by the following three sets of results:

- (a) We show, perhaps for the first time, that SAA’s sample complexity matches exactly with that of the canonical SMD (Nemirovski et al. 2009, Ghadimi and Lan 2013, Lan 2020), under comparable assumptions commonly imposed for the latter. More specifically, when the variance

of  $\nabla f(\cdot, \xi)$  is bounded by  $\sigma_p^2$  — thus the underlying randomness is heavy-tailed — and the population-level objective function  $F$  comprises of an  $\mathcal{L}$ -smooth term and an  $\mathcal{M}$ -Lipschitz term, we prove in Theorems 1 and 2 of Section 3.1 that, for any given  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] &\leq \epsilon, \\ \text{if } N \geq &\begin{cases} O\left(\max\left\{\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\mu}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\mu \cdot \epsilon}\right\}\right) & \text{for SAA (2) in } \mu\text{-strongly convex SP;} \\ O\left(\frac{V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)}{q'-1} \cdot \max\left\{\frac{\mathcal{L}}{\epsilon}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\epsilon^2}\right\}\right) & \text{for SAA (3) in convex SP,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where we recall the definition of  $V_{q'}$  in (4). This set of results provide perhaps the first theoretical explanation on the comparable empirical performance between SAA and SMD. Furthermore, (9) also exhibits advantages when compared with the existing SAA's sample complexity benchmark by Oliveira and Thompson (2023). In particular, with the aforementioned assumption on the bounded-ness of variance, our results apply to the “most heavy-tailed” scenario considered by Oliveira and Thompson (2023). In this scenario, as explained in Remark 7 later, (9) significantly improves over the said benchmark in terms of the rate with dimensionality  $d$  and, for some cases, additionally in terms of the rates with  $\epsilon$  and/or  $\mathcal{M}$ .

- (b) In Theorem 3 of Section 3.2, under comparable conditions as in the typical non-asymptotic results for SAA, we prove what seems to be the first, large deviations-type sample complexity bound completely free from any metric entropy terms in the light-tailed settings: Suppose that (6) holds and  $M(\xi)$  therein is sub-Gaussian with a parameter  $\varphi > 0$ . For any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , the solution  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (3) satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] &\geq 1 - \beta, \\ \text{if } N \geq &O\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}^2 \cdot \varphi^2}{(q'-1) \cdot \epsilon^2} \cdot \min\left\{\ln^3 \frac{\Phi}{\beta}, \ln\left(d\Phi \ln \frac{e}{\beta}\right) \cdot \ln^2 \frac{\Phi}{\beta}\right\}\right), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where  $\Phi := O\left(\frac{\varphi \mathcal{D}_{q'}}{(q'-1) \cdot \epsilon}\right)$  and  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}$  is the  $q'$ -norm diameter of the feasible region for the same  $q' : q' \leq q$  (with  $q$  defined in (6)) as a hyper-parameter of SAA (3). Compared to the typical SAA results, such as those in (7) and (8), the avoidance of metric entropy in (10) leads to a significantly better growth rate with problem dimensionality  $d$ . Also, in comparison with the existing large deviations bounds for canonical SMD as discussed by Nemirovski et al. (2009), Eq. (10) presents an almost identical rate up to some (poly-)logarithmic terms. (More detailed discussions are provided in Remark 9 later). Our results in Proposition 1 and Theorem 3 (both in Section 3.2) further extend (10) to metric entropy-free bounds for both the sub-exponential settings (where the tails of the underlying distribution vanishes no slower than those of an exponential random variable) and the heavy-tailed settings (namely, when the  $p$ th central

moment of  $M(\xi)$  is bounded for any given  $p > 2$ ). These results complement our findings for the case of bounded variance (and thus  $p = 2$ ) in (a) above.

- (c) In Theorems 4 and 5 of Section 3.3, We additionally identify cases where SAA's theoretical efficacy may even outperform those of SMD. In particular, we consider a non-Lipschitzian scenario where neither  $F$  nor  $\nabla F$  admits a known upper bound on the Lipschitz constant. In this case, except for some recent SAA results by Milz (2023) that apply to a special case of our discussion, whether SMD or SAA can still be effective seems largely unknown from the literature thus far. In response, we show that, for any  $\vartheta > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , when the  $\mu$ -strong convexity holds w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm ( $q \geq 1$ ) and the  $p$ th central moment of  $\nabla f(\cdot, \xi)$  is bounded by  $\psi_p$  (for some  $p < \infty$  such that  $1 \leq p \leq q/(q-1)$ ), the optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (2) satisfies that

$$\text{Prob} [\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*\|_q^2 \leq \vartheta] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq O\left(\frac{p \cdot \psi_p^2}{\mu^2 \cdot \vartheta} \cdot \beta^{-2/p}\right). \quad (11)$$

Such a complexity bound does not depend on any Lipschitz constant. Meanwhile, in the convex case, for any given  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\vartheta > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , the optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (3) with hyper-parameter  $q' > 1$  satisfies that

$$\text{Prob} [\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_\epsilon^*\|_{q'}^2 \leq \vartheta] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq O\left(\frac{p \cdot \psi_p^2 \cdot [V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)]^2}{(q' - 1)^2 \cdot \epsilon^2 \cdot \vartheta} \cdot \beta^{-\frac{2}{p}}\right), \quad (12)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_\epsilon^*$  is some  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solution to the genuine SP problem (1). Here, (12) provides the sample requirement for  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to reside in the  $\vartheta$ -neighborhood of an  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solution with probability at least  $1 - \beta$  and is, again, invariant to any Lipschitz constant.

We would like to re-iterate that all our results share the advantage of being independent from any form of metric entropy, implying a new level of SAA's innate, SMD-comparable dimension-insensitivity that, to our knowledge, has not been uncovered thus far. While Guigues et al. (2017) have shown that SAA's polynomial dependence on  $d$  is unavoidable in general, their lower sample complexity bound is not at odds with our findings. Indeed, a closer examination would reveal that quantities such as  $\sigma_p$ ,  $\varphi$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\psi_p$  may all depend on  $d$  (implicitly) at some polynomial growth rate in less favorable scenarios. Nonetheless, our results also point to important special cases, such as illustrated in Remark 8 below, where  $d$  is allowed to be larger than  $N$  (sometimes substantially).

**1.1. Organizations** The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 summarizes related works. Our main theorems are presented in Section 3 and their proofs are provided in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper. Appendix A discusses some preliminary properties about  $V_{q'}$  as a component of SAA (3). Some useful lemmata are presented in Section B.

**1.2. Notations** Denote by  $\mathbb{R}$  the collection of all real numbers, and by  $\mathbb{R}_+$  and  $\mathbb{R}_{++}$  those of the non-negative and strictly positive real numbers, respectively.  $\mathbf{0}$  is the all-zero vector of some proper dimension. We at times use  $(x_i)$  or  $(x_i : i = 1, \dots, d)$  to denote a vector  $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d)^\top \in \mathbb{R}^d$  for convenience. For a function  $g$ , denote by  $\nabla g$  the gradient and by  $\nabla_i g$  its  $i$ th element. For any vector  $\mathbf{v} = (v_i : i = 1, \dots, d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ , denote by  $\|\cdot\|_p := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d |v_i|^p\right)^{1/p}$  the  $p$ -norm ( $p \geq 1$ ). Meanwhile, we define the  $L^p$ -norm of a random vector  $\boldsymbol{\zeta} = (\zeta_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  to be  $\|\boldsymbol{\zeta}\|_{L^p} := \left(\sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}_{\zeta_i} \left[|\zeta_i|^p\right]\right)^{1/p}$ . For any random variable/vector  $y$ , we also denote by  $\mathbb{E}_y[\cdot]$  the expectation of “.” over  $y$ , except that  $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$  denotes the expectation over all the randomness in “.”. Finally, “w.r.t.” and “a.s.” are short-hands for “with respect to” and “almost surely”, respectively.

**2. Related works.** There is a rich body of literature on (2) and (3). Asymptotic analysis of SAA has been provided by, e.g., Artstein and Wets (1995), Dupacová and Wets (1988), King and Rockafellar (1993), King and Wets (1991), Pflug (1995, 1999, 2003), and Shapiro (1989). Meanwhile, non-asymptotic (finite-sample) complexity bounds are also made available by works of, e.g., Shapiro (2003), Shapiro and Nemirovski (2005) and Shapiro et al. (2021) in light-tailed settings and the work of, e.g., Oliveira and Thompson (2023) in heavy-tailed settings. However, to our knowledge, the state-of-the-art sample complexity results in both light-tailed or heavy-tailed scenarios carry metric entropy terms that measure the complexity of the feasible region, such as  $\Gamma_\epsilon(\mathcal{X})$  in (7). These terms typically grow rapidly with  $d$ , elevating the dependence of SAA’s predicted sample requirement on the problem dimensionality.

Sample complexities free from the said metric entropy terms have been made available for machine learning algorithms, e.g., by Bousquet and Elisseeff (2002), Shalev-Shwartz et al. (2010, 2009), Feldman and Vondrak (2018, 2019), Bousquet and Elisseeff (2002), Feldman and Vondrak (2018) and Klochkov and Zhivotovskiy (2021). Their results can also provide metric entropy-free complexity bounds for SAA under the stipulation of more critical conditions. More specifically, through the argument of uniform stability or its variations, it has been proven (e.g., by Bousquet and Elisseeff 2002, Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010, 2009, Hu et al. 2020) that an optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA satisfies the below:

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \epsilon, \text{ if } N \geq \begin{cases} O\left(\frac{M}{\mu\epsilon}\right) & \text{for SAA (2) in } \mu\text{-strongly convex SP;} \\ O\left(\frac{MV_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)}{\epsilon^2}\right) & \text{for SAA (3) in general convex SP,} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where  $V_{q'}(\cdot)$  is defined as in (4) with  $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ , when the following, what we call, *uniform Lipschitz condition* holds: For all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\xi \in \Theta$ , there exists some  $\xi$ -invariant constant  $M > 0$  such that, for some  $q \geq q'$ .

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{y}, \xi)| \leq M \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q. \quad (14)$$

Furthermore, high probability bounds that are logarithmic in  $1/\beta$  are also obtained under the same condition (e.g., by Feldman and Vondrak 2018, 2019, Bousquet and Elisseeff 2002, Feldman and Vondrak 2018, Klochkov and Zhivotovskiy 2021, when their results are applied to the analysis of (2) or (3)). Nonetheless, the uniform Lipschitz condition in (14) can be overly critical for many applications of the SP; because  $M$  is  $\xi$ -invariant, this quantity can be undesirably large and even unbounded under the more common conditions, such as (6), in the SAA literature. To see this, one may consider a simple stochastic linear program of  $\min\{\mathbb{E}[\alpha^\top \mathbf{x}] : \mathbf{x} \in [-1, 1]^d\}$ , where  $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^d$  is some Gaussian random vector. While many applications can be subsumed by simple variations of this SP problem, it hardly satisfies (14) for a finite  $M$ . In contrast, our results are based on more flexible conditions common to the SP literature.

Some recent works on SAA for high-dimensional SP study the implications of special problem structures in reducing the growth rate of the metric entropy terms w.r.t. their dependence on  $d$ . Along this direction, Liu et al. (2022, 2019) and Lee et al. (2023) study the implications of sparsity and low-rankness. Lam and Li (2022) consider the influence of low Vapnik-Chervonenkis (VC) dimensions. Bugg and Aswani (2021) investigate the dimension-independent budget constraints. As is also discussed by Oliveira and Thompson (2023), when the feasible region is (representable by) a simplex, the generic chaining-based metric entropy exhibits a logarithmic growth rate with  $d$ . Nonetheless, to our knowledge, those results may not apply beyond the corresponding special structural assumptions.

Birge (2023) shows that simple designs with sub-sample estimates can promote sample efficiency particularly in terms of the dependence on the number of random parameters. Yet, the current theories therein are mostly focused on some more special (but still widely applicable) SP problems.

This current paper frequently refers to the existing complexity bounds, e.g., by Shapiro et al. (2021), Shapiro (2003), Shapiro and Nemirovski (2005), and Oliveira and Thompson (2023) as benchmarks in order to explain the claimed advantages of our results. Yet, it is worth noting that those concurrent works apply to more general settings than this paper. For instance, the SAA theories by Shapiro et al. (2021) and Oliveira and Thompson (2023) can handle nonconvex problems. The findings by Oliveira and Thompson (2023) further admit stochasticity in the feasible region. The analyses by Shapiro et al. (2021), Shapiro (2003), Shapiro and Nemirovski (2005), and Oliveira and Thompson (2023) cover the scenarios where the SAA formulation is solved inexactly. Nonetheless, when applied to the settings of our consideration — the exact solutions to SAA for the convex SP problems with deterministic constraints — the results by Shapiro et al. (2021), Shapiro (2003), Shapiro and Nemirovski (2005), and Oliveira and Thompson (2023) are known to be the best available benchmarks. We would like to also argue that the SP problems considered herein are still flexible enough to cover a very wide spectrum of applications, the consideration of the exact



SAA solutions follows many previous discussions (such as by Shapiro 1993, Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010, Hu et al. 2020, Bugg and Aswani 2021), and our proof arguments, which seem to differentiate from most SAA literature, may be further extended to inexact SAA solutions, nonconvex problems, and scenarios with uncertain constraints.

**3. Main Results.** This section presents the formal statements of our three sets of results. First, Section 3.1 provides the sample complexity bounds that match with those of the canonical SMD under comparable assumptions. Second, Section 3.2 shows our large deviations-type, metric entropy-free bounds under the standard Lipschitz condition as in (6). Lastly, Section 3.3 discusses our findings in non-Lipschitzian settings. All our proofs are postponed till Section 4.

**3.1. SMD-comparable sample complexity of SAA.** We will start by introducing our assumptions. To that end, we first formalize the aforementioned structure of a composite objective function in the genuine SP problem (1):

ASSUMPTION 1. *Given  $q \geq 1$ , let  $\rho = q/(q - 1)$ . There exist two deterministic and everywhere differentiable functions, denoted by  $F_1 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  and  $F_2 : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = F_1(\mathbf{x}) + F_2(\mathbf{x}), \quad (15)$$

where  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  satisfy the below:

(a) For some  $\mathcal{L} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\|\nabla F_1(\mathbf{x}_1) - \nabla F_1(\mathbf{x}_2)\|_\rho \leq \mathcal{L} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_q, \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathcal{X}^2; \quad (16)$$

(b) For some  $\mathcal{M} \in \mathbb{R}_+$ ,

$$\|\nabla F_2(\mathbf{x})\|_\rho \leq \mathcal{M}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (17)$$

We sometimes refer to this condition as ‘‘Assumption 1 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm’’. Here, (16) means that the first component of the population-level objective function  $F_1$  is  $\mathcal{L}$ -smooth; that is, it admits an  $\mathcal{L}$ -Lipschitz continuous gradient. Meanwhile, (17) essentially imposes that the second component of the population-level objective function  $F_2$  is  $\mathcal{M}$ -Lipschitz continuous. Results that apply to such a composite objective function subsume the special cases of  $F$  being smooth (with  $F_2 = 0$ ) and  $F$  being Lipschitz (with  $F_1 = 0$ ). Conditions closely similar to, if not more critical than, Assumption 1 have been considered in much SP literature (such as Ghadimi and Lan 2012, 2013, Nemirovski et al. 2009, Rakhlin et al. 2011, Lan 2020).

Our assumption on the underlying randomness is the everywhere bounded-ness of the variance of  $\nabla f(\cdot, \xi)$ . We formalize this condition below:

ASSUMPTION 2. For a given  $p \geq 1$ , there exists a scalar  $\sigma_p \geq 1$  such that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p^2 \right] \leq \sigma_p^2 \text{ for every } \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (18)$$

Hereafter, this condition is sometimes called ‘‘Assumption 2 w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm’’, which is common in the SP literature, especially in the discussions of SMD (e.g., by Ghadimi and Lan 2013, 2016, Lan 2020). The stipulation of  $\sigma_p \geq 1$  is non-critical; it is only for the simplification of notations in our results.

We formalize our assumptions of strong convexity and convexity in Assumptions 3 and 4, respectively, in the following:

ASSUMPTION 3. The following inequality holds for every pair of solutions  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathcal{X}^2$  and almost every  $\xi \in \Theta$ :

$$f(\mathbf{x}_1, \xi) - f(\mathbf{x}_2, \xi) \geq \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_2, \xi), \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_q^2, \quad (19)$$

for some given  $\mu > 0$  and  $q \geq 1$ .

REMARK 1. We refer to the above as ‘‘Assumption 3 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm’’ or ‘‘ $\mu$ -strong convexity’’, which is common in the SAA literature (e.g., in Milz 2023, Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010). Some SP literature (e.g., by Ghadimi and Lan 2012) assumes a relatively more flexible version of strong convexity than Assumption 3 as in the following:

$$F(\mathbf{x}_1) - F(\mathbf{x}_2) \geq \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}_2), \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_q^2, \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathcal{X}^2. \quad (20)$$

This condition is considered mostly in the discussions of SMD. We argue that the seemingly higher stringency in Assumption 3 relative to (20) does not make the SP problem much easier. Indeed, lower complexity bounds for SMD (such as by Rakhlin et al. 2011, Agarwal et al. 2009) are derived based on the identification of adversarial problems that satisfy Assumption 3. Thus, when solving an SP problem that satisfies Assumption 3 instead of (20), the typical SMD schemes cannot achieve faster sample complexity rates in general.

Some results in this section (as well as in the latter part of this paper) consider the condition of convexity below:

ASSUMPTION 4. The following inequality holds for every  $(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) \in \mathcal{X}^2$  and all  $\xi \in \Theta$ :

$$f(\mathbf{x}_1, \xi) - f(\mathbf{x}_2, \xi) \geq \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_2, \xi), \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle.$$

We would like to compare the above with a counterpart assumption that the population-level objective  $F(\cdot)$  is convex, which is, again, a common condition in the literature on SMD (e.g., by

Nemirovski et al. 2009, Ghadimi and Lan 2013). Relative to this counterpart condition, the incremental stringency in Assumption 4 does not make the SP problems much easier; this is because, again, the adversarial problem instances used to prove lower performance limits for SMD in solving the convex SP problems (such as those constructed by Agarwal et al. 2009) often satisfy Assumption 4. From such analysis, one can see that switching from the assumption of  $F$  being convex into Assumption 4 does not allow SMD to achieve a better sample efficiency in general.

We are now ready to formalize the promised sample complexity bounds in both strongly convex and convex cases below.

**THEOREM 1.** *Suppose that Assumptions 1 and 3 hold both w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm for a given  $q \geq 1$ , and that Assumption 2 holds w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm for some  $p: 1 \leq p \leq \frac{q}{q-1}$ . Then any optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (2) satisfies the below for any given  $\epsilon > 0$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{if } N \geq C_1 \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\mu}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\mu\epsilon} \right\}; \quad (21)$$

and, meanwhile, for any given  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq C_1 \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\mu}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\mu\epsilon\beta} \right\}. \quad (22)$$

Here,  $C_1 > 0$  is some universal constant.

*Proof.* See Section 4.1.1.

**REMARK 2.** The theorem above confirms the promised sample complexity in (9) for SAA (2) when it is applied to the strongly convex SP problems. In comparison with the concurrent results on SMD, e.g., as discussed by Lan (2020), the rates in (21) and (22) are identical to the best known rates for the canonical SMD algorithms in terms of the sample size requirement  $N$  to achieve the same solution accuracy. Nonetheless, it is worth noting the presence of an accelerated SMD variation, called AC-SA (Lan 2012, Ghadimi and Lan 2012, Lan 2020), which provably achieves a better rate on  $\mathcal{L}$  with some careful choice of hyper-parameters.

**REMARK 3.** The formulation of SAA for solving a  $\mu$ -strongly convex SP problem does not require estimating the value of  $\mu$ , nor is it necessary to assess  $\sigma_p$ ,  $\mathcal{M}$ , or  $\mathcal{L}$ . This feature may sometimes lead to convenience in solving an SP problem.

Our next theorem is focused on convex SP. Before its statement, we first introduce some choice of hyper-parameters for the Tikhonov-like penalty in (3) given some  $q > 1$  and a user-specified accuracy threshold  $\epsilon > 0$ :

$$q' \in (1, 2]: q' \leq q; \quad R^* \geq \max\{1, V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)\}; \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}. \quad (23)$$

**THEOREM 2.** *Let  $q > 1$ . Suppose that the hyper-parameters  $q'$ ,  $R^*$ , and  $\lambda_0$  are specified as in (23). Assume that (i) Assumption 1 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm, (ii) Assumption 2 w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm for some  $p: 1 \leq p \leq \frac{q}{q-1}$ , and (iii) Assumption 4 hold. Any optimal solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  to SAA (3) satisfies the following inequalities: For any given  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ ,*

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_2 R^*}{q' - 1} \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\epsilon}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\epsilon^2} \right\}; \quad (24)$$

and, meanwhile, for any given  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ ,

$$\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_2 R^*}{q' - 1} \cdot \max \left\{ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{\epsilon}, \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{\beta \epsilon^2} \right\}. \quad (25)$$

Here,  $C_2 > 0$  is some universal constant.

*Proof.* See Section 4.1.2.

**REMARK 4.** Noting that  $R^*$  is comparable to  $V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ , we may then observe that Theorem 2 confirms the promised sample complexity in (9) for SAA (3) when it is applied to solving a convex SP problem. Similar to Remark 2 for the strongly convex case above, this theorem shows that the rate of SAA's sample complexity matches exactly with that of the canonical SMD methods as discussed by Nemirovski et al. (2009), Ghadimi and Lan (2013) and Lan (2020) in solving convex SP problems. Nonetheless, it is worth noting here that an accelerated variation of SMD, called AC-SA (Lan 2012), achieves a better rate on  $\mathcal{L}$  with some more careful design.

**REMARK 5.** The stipulation of  $q > 1$  (and thus not including the choice of  $q = 1$ ) is non-critical. Indeed, in the non-trivial case with  $d > 1$ , following the existing discussions of SMD in the 1-norm setting (Nemirovski et al. 2009), the case where Assumption 1 holds for  $q = 1$  can be subsumed by the consideration of the case with  $q = 1 + \frac{1}{\ln d} > 1$  by the fact that

$$\|\mathbf{v}\|_{1+\frac{1}{\ln d}} \leq \|\mathbf{v}\|_1 \leq e \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_{1+\frac{1}{\ln d}}, \quad (26)$$

where  $e$  is the base of natural logarithm.

A proper selection of  $\lambda_0$  for this theorem relies on  $R^*$ , an overestimate of  $V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ , which is equal to half of the squared  $q'$ -norm distance between the optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  and any user-specified initial guess  $\mathbf{x}^0$ . Assuming (straightforward variations of) the knowledge of such a distance is not uncommon in related literature (e.g., as in Loh and Wainwright 2011, Loh 2017, Liu et al. 2022). In practice, when little is known about the SP's problem structure, one may choose  $\mathbf{x}^0$  to be any feasible solution and specify  $R^*$  to be coarsely large; for instance, one may let  $R^*$  be half of the squared  $q'$ -norm diameter of  $\mathcal{X}$ , if it is bounded. Starting from this coarse selection, one may then perform some empirical hyper-parameter search for better values of  $R^*$  (and thus  $\lambda_0$ ) with the aid

of cross validation. Meanwhile, if some problem structure about the SP problem is known, one may incorporate such *a priori* knowledge into the construction of  $V_{q'}$ . For instance, if it is known that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  satisfies the weak sparsity condition (or the budget/capacity constraint) that  $\|\mathbf{x}^*\|_1 \leq r$  for some known  $r$  (Negahban et al. 2012, Bugg and Aswani 2021), then, in view of (26) above, we may construct the regularization term with  $q' = 1 + \frac{1}{\ln d}$  and  $\mathbf{x}^0 = \mathbf{0}$ . Correspondingly,  $R^* = \frac{1}{2} \cdot e^2 \cdot r^2$ .

REMARK 6. In the results of both Theorems 1 and 2, the complexity bounds are completely free from any metric entropy terms, leading to new complexity rates that are significantly better dependence on  $d$  than the complexity benchmark (8). Furthermore, while (8) is applicable to light-tailed SP problems, our results hold under heavy-tailed-ness with only a bounded second moment of the underlying randomness. To complement Theorems 1 and 2 above, we are to additionally discuss our metric entropy-free results specifically under light-tailed-ness and their comparison with (8) later in Section 3.2.

REMARK 7. In comparison with the state-of-the-art benchmark for the sample complexity bounds under heavy-tailed-ness by Oliveira and Thompson (2023), our results above are focused on the “most heavy-tailed” cases considered by the benchmark — only the second moment is assumed to be bounded. In this case, the said benchmark is summarized below: Let  $\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$  be the set of  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solutions; namely,

$$\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon} := \{\mathbf{x} : F(\mathbf{x}) \leq F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \epsilon\}. \quad (27)$$

Suppose that  $\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$  is bounded and

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{y}, \xi)| \leq M(\xi) \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}, \quad \xi \in \Theta, \quad (28)$$

then it holds that

$$\text{Prob}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta - 2\rho, \quad \text{if } N \geq O\left(\frac{\mathbf{M}_2 \cdot \left[\left(\gamma(\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon})\right)^2 + (\mathcal{D}^{*,\epsilon})^2 \cdot \ln \frac{1}{\beta}\right]}{\epsilon^2}\right), \quad (29)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}^{*,\epsilon}$  is the diameter of  $\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$  and  $\gamma(\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon})$  is a generic chaining-based metric entropy term that grows at the rate of  $O(\sqrt{d} \cdot \mathcal{D}^{*,\epsilon})$  in general — elevating the dependence on  $d$  in the sample complexity again. Meanwhile,  $\mathbf{M}_2$  is the second moment of  $M(\xi)$  and the probability term  $\rho$  is given as

$$\rho := \max \left\{ \mathbb{P} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \left( M(\xi_j) \right)^2 > 2\mathbf{M}_2 \right], \mathbb{P} \left[ N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N [f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_j) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)]^2 > 2v_{x^*} \right] \right\},$$

for  $v_{x^*}$  being the variance of  $f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)$ . To facilitate comparison between our results and (29), we consider some conversions of notations below. First, by definition, it is verifiable that  $\mathbf{M}_2 \approx$

$\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2]$ , which is comparable to  $\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2$  in general. Second, it is also worth noting that  $\mathcal{D}^{*,\epsilon}$  is generally comparable to  $\mathcal{D}_q$ , the  $q$ -norm diameter of the feasible region  $\mathcal{X}$ . Indeed, one may easily construct scenarios where the largest distance between any two  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solutions can be insignificantly different from the largest possible distance between any two feasible solutions. One such example is for the expected objective function to be close to a constant along the affine subspace that includes the pair of feasible solutions with the largest distance between them. Likewise, in general,  $M(\xi)$  has to be large enough to apply globally for all  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$ . Thus, (28) is also comparable to (6), which is verifiably more stringent than Assumption 1 for our results.

With the conversion of notations above, one may see that our complexity bounds as presented in Theorems 1 and 2 entail three potential advantages as summarized below:

- First, similar to Remark 6, the bounds provided in the said theorems also exhibit non-trivially better rates with dimensionality  $d$  than (29), now that, as mentioned above,  $[\gamma(\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon})]^2$  therein grows polynomially with  $d$  in general.
- Second, our results make use of the potential smoothness of the objective function to obtain sharper bounds. In the more adversarial case of  $\mathcal{L} = 0$ , our derived complexity grows linearly with  $\mathcal{M}^2$ , leading to comparable rates to (29). Nonetheless, when  $\mathcal{L}$  is more dominant than  $\mathcal{M}$ , our new complexity bounds become potentially more efficient. Particularly, in the more desirable case of  $\mathcal{M} = 0$  and  $\epsilon$  is reasonably small, the rates in (22) and (25) of our theorems above can be simplified into

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] &\geq 1 - \beta, \\ \text{if } N &\geq \begin{cases} O\left(\frac{\sigma_p^2}{\mu \cdot \epsilon \cdot \beta}\right) & \text{for SAA (2) in } \mu\text{-strongly convex SP;} \\ O\left(\frac{V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)}{q'-1} \frac{\sigma_p^2}{\epsilon^2 \cdot \beta}\right) & \text{for SAA (3) in convex SP,} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

showing a region of parameters to allow SAA's sample complexity to be free from the impact of Lipschitz constants of  $\nabla F_1$  and  $F_2$ .

- Third, our bounds in (22) and (25) provide explicit dependence on the significance level  $\beta$ , while, in contrast, (29) carries a more opaque quantity  $\rho$ .

**REMARK 8.** In some applications, the variance  $\sigma_p^2$  may also depend on dimensionality  $d$ . This dependence can be further explicated under the additional assumption that, for some  $\phi_p \geq 0$ , it holds that  $\|\nabla_i f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^p} \leq \phi_p$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and every  $i = 1, \dots, d$ . Intuitively, this additional assumption means that the component-wise  $p$ th central moment of  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$  is bounded by  $\phi_p^p$  everywhere. Because for  $p \geq 2$ , the function  $(\cdot)^{2/p}$  is concave in  $\cdot$ . Thus, one may easily see that the following should hold:

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p^2] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla_i f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x})|^p \right)^{2/p} \right]$$

$$\leq \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^d |\nabla_i f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x})|^p \right] \right)^{2/p} \leq d^{2/p} \cdot \phi_p^2.$$

Namely, in this case, one may let  $\sigma_p^2 := d^{2/p} \cdot \phi_p^2$  in our bounds, whose dependence on dimensionality reduces when  $p$  increases. Particularly, when it is admissible to let  $p \geq c \ln d$  for some constant  $c > 0$ , the quantity  $\sigma_p^2$  becomes dimension-free.

An important component of our proofs resorts to a seemingly novel argument based on the “average-replace-one (average-RO) stability” (Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010), which is related to the average stability (Rakhlin et al. 2005), uniform-RO stability (Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010), and uniform stability (Bousquet and Elisseeff 2002). While it is known that the average-RO stability can lead to error bounds for learning algorithms (Shalev-Shwartz et al. 2010), seldom is there a sample complexity bound for SAA based on such a stability type in comparable settings of our consideration. In contrast, as mentioned in Section 2, most existing SAA theories are based on either the “uniform convergence” theories, such as the  $\epsilon$ -net (Shapiro et al. 2021) or the generic chaining (Oliveira and Thompson 2023), or the variations of uniform (RO-) stability theories, such as by Feldman and Vondrak (2019), Shalev-Shwartz et al. (2010, 2009), and Klochkov and Zhivotovskiy (2021). Therefore, we think that our average-RO stability-based proof approach may also be of independent interest to some readers. One may see more discussions on how the average-RO stability is incorporated in our proofs from Remark 15 later in Section 4.1.

**3.2. Large deviations-type, metric entropy-free complexity bounds.** Eq. (22) and (25) in the previous subsection provide sample complexity bounds at the rate of  $O(1/\beta)$  in ensuring a significance level of  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ . While we expect this rate to be hardly improvable given only the assumption of a bounded variance, imposing stronger conditions such as the bounded-ness of higher moments should expectedly lead to a better dependence on  $\beta$ . In particular, when the underlying randomness is light-tailed, many concurrent results, such as in (7) and (8), are (poly-)logarithmic in  $1/\beta$  (although most of these results are polynomial in some metric entropy terms). It then prompts the question whether metric entropy-free bounds can also be derived while preserving a (poly-)logarithmic rate with  $1/\beta$  under similar conditions. Our affirmative answer to this question is presented in this subsection.

The assumptions of consideration include a formalized statement of the Lipschitz condition in (6) and that of the underlying randomness, both provided in the below:

ASSUMPTION 5. *Let  $M : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a deterministic and measurable function.*

(a) *Given  $q > 1$ , for any  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}) \in \mathcal{X}^2$  and every  $\xi \in \Theta$ ,*

$$|f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{y}, \xi)| \leq M(\xi) \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_q. \quad (31)$$

(b) It holds that  $\|M(\xi)\|_{L^p} \leq \psi_M$  for some  $\psi_M \in \mathbb{R}_+$  and  $p > 2$ .

Assumption 5.(a) is a very common condition in the SAA literature (Shapiro et al. 2021, Shapiro 2003, Shapiro and Nemirovski 2005). Compared to the uniform Lipschitz condition as in Eq. (14), Assumption 5.(a) does not impose that  $M(\xi)$  should be  $\xi$ -invariant and thus is more flexible. Meanwhile, Assumption 5.(b) means that  $M(\xi)$  should have a finite  $p$ th moment, though this random variable can still be heavy-tailed. A related condition is also imposed by Oliveira and Thompson (2023). The specification that  $q > 1$  (and thus excluding the case of  $q = 1$ ) is non-critical due to the same argument as in Remark 5.

For perhaps more interesting results of this section, we impose light-tailed counterparts to the above as stated in Assumptions 6 and 7 below:

ASSUMPTION 6. *Let  $M : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a deterministic and measurable function.*

(a) *Assumption 5.(a) holds; and*

(b) *For some  $\varphi \geq 1$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}[M(\xi) \geq t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\varphi}\right), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Assumption 6.(b) imposes subexponential tails, a common form of light-tailed-ness, for the underlying distribution and is comparable to, if not weaker than, the counterpart conditions imposed by Shapiro (2003), Shapiro and Nemirovski (2005) and Shapiro et al. (2021).

ASSUMPTION 7. *Let  $M : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  be a deterministic and measurable function.*

(a) *Assumption 5.(a) holds; and*

(b) *For some  $\varphi \geq 1$ , it holds that*

$$\mathbb{P}[M(\xi) \geq t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{\varphi^2}\right), \quad \forall t \geq 0.$$

Assumption 7.(b) imposes sub-Gaussian tails, which is another form of light-tailed-ness assumptions for the underlying distribution and is relatively stronger than Assumption 6.(b). This assumption is closely similar to the counterpart conditions imposed by Nemirovski et al. (2009) in establishing a large deviations bound for SMD.

We are now ready to formally state our sample complexity below, where we recall the notation that  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}$  is the  $q'$ -norm diameter of the feasible region.

PROPOSITION 1. *Let  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  be any fixed scalars. Suppose that (i)  $N \geq 3$ , (ii) Assumption 4 holds (namely,  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  is convex), and (iii)  $\mathcal{X}$  is bounded with  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}$  being its  $q'$ -norm diameter. Denote by  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  an optimal solution to SAA (3).*



(a) Under Assumption 5 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm, if the hyper-parameters of (3) are specified as

$$q' \in (1, 2] : q' \leq q, \quad R^* \geq \max\{1, \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2\}, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}, \quad (32)$$

then it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \left( C_3 \cdot \frac{\psi_M^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot B \cdot R^* \right)^{\frac{p}{p-2}} \cdot \beta^{-\frac{2}{p-2}} + \left( C_3 \cdot \frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}}{p-1} \cdot \frac{\psi_M}{\epsilon} \right)^{\frac{p}{p-1}} \beta, \quad (33)$$

where  $B := \frac{1}{q'-1} \ln N \cdot \ln \frac{N}{\beta}$  and  $C_3 > 0$  is some universal constant.

(b) Under Assumption 6 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm, given the same hyper-parameter choices for (3) as in (32), it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq C_4 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \frac{\ln N \cdot \ln^3(N/\beta)}{q' - 1}, \quad (34)$$

where  $C_4 > 0$  is some universal constant.

(c) Under Assumption 7 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm, given the same hyper-parameter choices for (3) as in (32), it holds that

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq C_5 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \frac{\ln N \cdot \ln^2(N/\beta)}{q' - 1}, \quad (35)$$

where  $C_5 > 0$  is some universal constant.

*Proof.* See Section 4.2.1.

The results in Proposition 1 are implicit; the sample requirement is that  $N$  should be greater than some poly-logarithmic function of  $N$  itself. While we would like to argue that these are informative enough to assess the sample efficiency of SAA, we present some more explicit complexity bounds in the theorem below.

**THEOREM 3.** *Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  be an optimal solution to SAA (3).*

(a). Under the same set of assumptions as in Proposition 1.(b), for some universal constant  $C_6 > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq C_6 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{(q' - 1) \cdot \epsilon^2} \cdot \ln^4 \left[ \frac{C_6 \varphi R^*}{(q' - 1) \cdot \epsilon \cdot \beta} \right], \quad (36)$$

given any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ .

(b). Under the same set of assumptions as in Proposition 1.(c), for some universal constant  $C_7 > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_7 \cdot R^* \cdot \varphi^2}{(q' - 1) \cdot \epsilon^2} \cdot \min \left\{ \ln^3 \frac{\Phi}{\beta}, \quad \ln \left( d\Phi \ln \frac{e}{\beta} \right) \cdot \ln^2 \frac{\Phi}{\beta} \right\}, \quad (37)$$

where  $\Phi := \frac{C_7 \varphi R^*}{(q' - 1) \cdot \epsilon}$  and  $e$  is the base of natural logarithm, given any  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* See proof in Section 4.2.2.

Both parts of Theorem 3 provide sample complexity bounds as further explications of Proposition 1. In particular, if we note that  $R^*$  can be comparable to  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}^2$ , Part (b) of this theorem confirms the promised complexity in (10).

Again, the sample complexity rates from Theorem 3 are completely free from any metric entropy terms. As a result, given light-tailed underlying distributions, our bounds are more appealing in terms of the dependence on dimensionality  $d$  as compared to the benchmark (8). In addition, barring some other (poly-)logarithmic terms, the said improvement w.r.t.  $d$  is achieved at some arguably small compromise: the logarithmic rate on  $1/\beta$  in (8) has now become poly-logarithmic. In further comparison with the results of Bugg and Aswani (2021) for high-dimensional SP problems under the structural assumption that the feasible region is representable by a simplex, our bounds seem to entail comparable insensitivity to  $d$  without any structural assumption alike.

REMARK 9. Under comparable sub-Gaussian assumptions as Part (b) of Theorem 3, large deviations bounds for canonical SMD (e.g., Eq (2.65) of Nemirovski et al. 2009) are available as the below, after some straightforward conversion of notations:

$$O\left(\frac{\mathcal{D}_q^2 \varphi^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \ln^2 \frac{1}{\beta}\right). \quad (38)$$

Up to some (poly-)logarithmic terms, the complexity bound in Part (b) of Theorem 3 is almost identical to (38). This is — in addition to what has been discussed as in Remarks 2 and 4 — yet another theoretical evidence that the solution accuracy of SAA is theoretically ensured to be comparable to canonical SMD under similar conditions.

In the heavy-tailed case under the conditions including (i) convexity, (ii) Assumption 5.(a), and (iii) the bounded-ness of the  $p'$ th central moment of  $[M(\xi)]^2$ , the state-of-the-art benchmark by Oliveira and Thompson (2023) is as the following: For a given  $p' \geq 2$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Prob}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \\ & \text{if } N \geq O\left(\frac{\mathbf{M}_2 \cdot \left(\left(\gamma(\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon})\right)^2 + (\mathcal{D}^{*,\epsilon})^2 \cdot \ln \frac{1}{\beta}\right)}{\epsilon^2} + p' \cdot \left(\frac{\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{p'}}{\mathbf{M}_2} + \frac{\widetilde{v}_{\mathbf{x}^*, p'}}{v_{\mathbf{x}^*}}\right) \cdot \beta^{-2/p'}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

where the notations follow the same as those for (29), except that  $\widetilde{\mathbf{M}}_{p'}$  and  $\widetilde{v}_{\mathbf{x}^*, p'}$  are the  $p'$ th central moments of  $[M(\xi)]^2$  and  $(f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) - F(\mathbf{x}^*))^2$ , respectively. Note that the case with a fixed  $p' \geq 2$  in (39) corresponds to our results with  $p := 2p' \geq 4$  in Assumption 5.(b). Under comparable assumptions, we first observe that Part (a) of Proposition 1 is, again, more advantageous in the

dependence on dimensionality  $d$  due to the avoidance of metric entropy terms such as  $(\gamma(\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}))^2$ , which is polynomial in  $d$  in general. Meanwhile, the comparison in terms of the dependence on  $\epsilon$  is more subtle, as discussed in the following:

It is worth noting that, when  $p = 2p' \geq 4$  is relatively small, the benchmark result in (39) presents more appealing dependence on  $\epsilon$  — with a rate of  $O(\epsilon^{-2})$  in (39) versus  $O(\epsilon^{-2-\frac{4}{p-2}}) = O(\epsilon^{-2-\frac{2}{p'-1}})$  in Proposition 1.(a). Yet, when  $p \geq c \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2$  for some universal constant  $c > 0$ , that is,  $p$  is larger than some relatively small threshold, the said two rates on  $\epsilon$  become comparable. We leave closing the remaining difference between those two results for  $p \in [4, c \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2)$  to future research.

REMARK 10. Our settings of discussion as stated in Section 1 assumes everywhere differentiability of  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  for every  $\xi \in \Theta$ . This assumption is non-critical and can be dropped with some further analysis. Specifically, for a given  $\xi \in \Theta$ , the Lipschitz continuity of  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  implies its almost everywhere differentiability. Furthermore, for any choice of  $\delta > 0$ , we may always associate  $f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$  with its “smoothed” approximation of  $f_\delta(\mathbf{x}, \xi) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}[f(\mathbf{x} + \delta \mathbf{u}, \xi)]$ , where the expectation in  $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{u}}$  is over  $\mathbf{u}$ , a standard Gaussian distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^d$ . According to Nesterov and Spokoiny (2017),  $f_\delta(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$  is everywhere differentiable, and, now that  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  is  $M(\xi)$ -Lipschitz,  $f_\delta(\mathbf{x}, \xi)$  is also  $M(\xi)$ -Lipschitz. Then the (unique) solution to SAA (3) can be viewed as the limiting solution to  $\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N f_\delta(\mathbf{x}, \xi_j) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})$  as  $\delta \rightarrow 0^+$ , allowing our results under differentiability of  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  to be directly applicable to the scenarios where  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  is  $M(\xi)$ -Lipschitz but not necessarily everywhere differentiable. A similar argument is discussed by Guigues et al. (2017) to justify a related differentiability condition for an analysis of the SAA’s confidence bounds.

**3.3. Sample complexity beyond Lipschitz conditions.** This section is focused on non-Lipschitzian scenarios where there is not necessarily a known upper bound on the (global) Lipschitz constant for either  $F$  or (any part of) its gradient  $\nabla F$ . Our assumptions are discussed as below.

ASSUMPTION 8. *There exists an optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  to (1) such that the following two conditions hold for some  $q \in [1, 2]$  and  $p \in [2, \infty) : p \leq q/(q-1)$ :*

(a) *Let  $\kappa : \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  be some deterministic and measurable function. There exists some  $\mu > 0$  such that, for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  and almost every  $\xi \in \Theta$ ,*

$$f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) - f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \geq \langle \nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi), \mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|_q^2 - \kappa(\xi),$$

*Furthermore,  $\mathbb{E}[\kappa(\xi)] = 0$ .*

(b) *There exists some  $\psi_p \geq 0$  such that  $\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p} \leq \psi_p$ .*

REMARK 11. Assumption 8.(a) non-trivially relaxes Assumption 3, while the latter is the same strong convexity assumption as in some SAA literature, e.g., by Milz (2023). (Additional discussions

on the applicability of Assumption 3 is in Remark 1). If we change  $\mathbf{x}^*$  into every  $\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}$  and impose that  $\kappa(\xi) = 0$  for almost every  $\xi$ , then Assumption 8.(a) is reduced to Assumption 3. Our assumption on the underlying randomness in Assumption 8.(b) is also flexible, as it only imposes the  $p$ th central moment of the gradient  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)$  — merely at one optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$  — to be finite.

For part of our results in this section, we also consider a stronger version of Assumption 8.(b) as the below, where we recall the definition of the set of  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solutions  $\mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$  as in (27):

ASSUMPTION 9. *For given  $p \in [2, \infty)$  and  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a scalar  $\psi_p \in \mathbb{R}_+$  such that, for all  $\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$ :*

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon}, \xi) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon})\|_{L^p} \leq \psi_p. \quad (40)$$

Intuitively, this assumption means that the underlying randomness admits a bounded  $p$ th central moment for all the  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solutions.

We are now ready to present our results.

THEOREM 4. *Let  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  be any optimal solution to SAA (2). Suppose that Assumption 8 holds. There exists some universal constant  $C_8 > 0$  such that*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{x}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] \leq \vartheta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_8 p}{\mu^2} \cdot \frac{\psi_p^2}{\vartheta}; \quad \text{and} \quad (41)$$

$$\text{Prob} [\|\mathbf{x}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq \vartheta] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_8 p}{\mu^2} \cdot \frac{\psi_p^2}{\beta \vartheta}. \quad (42)$$

for any given  $\vartheta > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ .

Furthermore, if  $\kappa(\xi) = 0$  for almost every  $\xi \in \Theta$ , we then have

$$\text{Prob} [\|\mathbf{x}^* - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq \vartheta] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_8 p}{\mu^2} \cdot \frac{\psi_p^2}{\vartheta} \cdot \beta^{-\frac{2}{p}}, \quad (43)$$

for any given  $\vartheta > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ .

*Proof.* See Section 4.3.1.

REMARK 12. It is worth mentioning that our result here only ensures a controlled  $q$ -norm distance from the SAA solution to a genuine optimal solution  $\mathbf{x}^*$ . While it is unknown whether suboptimality gaps can also be controlled from our results, we argue that the said distance from  $\mathbf{x}^*$  is a reasonable metric of optimization performance and has been considered in related literature (e.g., by Milz 2023, Rakhlin et al. 2011).

Based on Theorem 4, one may further obtain the results for SAA (3) in solving a convex SP problem as below.

**THEOREM 5.** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$ . Denote by  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  an optimal solution to (3) with some  $q' \in (1, 2]$ . Let  $\lambda_0 := \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}$  for an arbitrary choice of  $R^* \geq \max\{1, \frac{1}{2} \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)\}$ . Under Assumption 4 and Assumption 9 w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm for some  $p < \infty$  such that  $2 \leq p \leq q'/(q' - 1)$ , there exists some  $\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon} \in \mathcal{X}^{*,\epsilon}$  that satisfies the following for any  $\vartheta > 0$  and  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ :*

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] \leq \vartheta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_9 \cdot p \cdot \psi_p^2 \cdot (R^*)^2}{(q' - 1)^2 \cdot \epsilon^2 \cdot \vartheta}; \quad \text{and} \quad (44)$$

$$\text{Prob} [\|\mathbf{x}^{*,\epsilon} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq \vartheta] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{C_9 \cdot p \cdot \psi_p^2 \cdot (R^*)^2}{(q' - 1)^2 \cdot \epsilon^2 \cdot \vartheta} \cdot \beta^{-\frac{2}{p}}, \quad (45)$$

where  $C_9 > 0$  is some universal constant.

*Proof.* See Section 4.3.2.

**REMARK 13.** Theorems 4 and 5 above provide formal statements of the promised sample complexity as in (11) and (12) of Section 1, respectively. Again, no metric entropy term is in presence.

Another potentially desirable feature of these complexity bounds is that they do not depend on any Lipschitz constants of  $F$  and  $f(\cdot, \xi)$ , nor those of their gradients. This result predicts SAA to be effective even if the Lipschitz constants are undesirably large and even potentially unbounded. In contrast, most existing SAA's sample complexity bounds, e.g., by Shapiro et al. (2021), Hu et al. (2020), Shalev-Shwartz et al. (2010), and Oliveira and Thompson (2023), grow polynomially with the some Lipschitz constants. To our knowledge, the only SAA result under similar conditions is provided by Milz (2023), whose findings imply the same error bound of Theorem 4 in the 2-norm setting. Nonetheless, our analysis in Theorem 4 presents an alternative proof and generalizes from the 2-norm setting to more general  $q$ -norm ( $1 \leq q \leq 2$ ) settings. Further, Theorem 5 applies to SP problems not necessarily strongly convex, which are not discussed by Milz (2023).

To our knowledge, there currently is little theory for SMD's effectiveness when none of the Lipschitz constants of  $F$ ,  $f(\cdot, \xi)$ , or their gradients is bounded. Comparing with SMD, our results show SAA's potential for better applicability to the SP problems in less desirable settings.

**REMARK 14.** It is also worth noting that both Theorems 4 and 5 explicate the evolution of the complexity rate w.r.t.  $\beta$ , as the underlying distribution gradually admits more and more bounded central moments (and thus the tail becomes lighter and lighter). Once it is admissible to let  $p \geq c \ln(1/\beta)$  for some constant  $c$ , the complexity then becomes logarithmic in  $1/\beta$ .

Similar to Remark 12, Theorem 5 does not provide a guarantee on the solution's suboptimality gap. Yet, such a guarantee is, as we suspect, hardly available due to the limited regularities in the non-Lipschitzian settings of consideration.

**4. Technical Proofs.** This section presents the technical proofs of our results, indexed as below: First, Section 4.1 shows the SMD-comparable complexity bounds from Section 3.1; then, Section 4.2 demonstrates the large deviations-type, metric entropy-free sample bounds from Section 3.2; and finally, Section 4.3 provides the proofs for the results in non-Lipschitzian settings in Section 3.3. All our proofs are aimed at demonstrating the promised complexity rates; we have not sought to optimize the constants.

**4.1. Proof of SMD-comparable complexity bounds in Section 3.1.** Sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 below provide proofs of Theorems 1 and 2, respectively.

**4.1.1. Proof of Theorem 1.** We first prove (21) through two steps.

**Step 1.** Observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})]. \quad (46)$$

Therefore, it suffices to establish an upper bound on  $\mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})]$ , which is the focus of Step 2 in this proof.

**Step 2.** With the observation from Step 1, we construct a sequence of alternative formulations of SAA (2) with  $F_N^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{N} \left( f(\mathbf{x}, \xi_j') + \sum_{\iota \neq j} f(\mathbf{x}, \xi_\iota) \right)$ , where  $\xi_j'$  is an i.i.d. copy of  $\xi$ , for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ . Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}^{(j)} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi_j', \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_N)$ . Correspondingly, we let  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} := \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}^{(j)})$  following the notation in (5). By definition, we then have

$$\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_N^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (47)$$

Below, we establish an overestimate on  $N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2]$ . This overestimate is to play a key role in bounding  $\mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})]$ .

To that end, we first observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ &= \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)}{N} + \sum_{\iota \neq j} \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_\iota) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_\iota)}{N} \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

$$= \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)}{N} - \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j') - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j')}{N} + F_N^{(j)}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_N^{(j)}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \quad (49)$$

$$\leq \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)}{N} - \frac{f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j') - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j')}{N} \quad (50)$$

Here, (48) and (49) are by the definitions of  $F_N$  and  $F_N^{(j)}$ . Meanwhile, (50) is due to the fact that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}$  minimizes  $F_N^{(j)}$ .

By Assumption 3, we have  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) \leq \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$  for almost every  $\xi_j \in \Theta$ , as well as  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi'_j) \leq \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle$  for almost every  $\xi'_j \in \Theta$ . Combining this with (50) leads to the below:

$$\begin{aligned}
& F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \\
& \leq \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle, \quad a.s. \\
& = \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle. \tag{51}
\end{aligned}$$

Since Assumption 1 leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
& \langle \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
& = \langle \nabla F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle \nabla F_2(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_2(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\
& \leq \mathcal{L} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q^2 + 2\mathcal{M} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q, \tag{52}
\end{aligned}$$

we may continue from the above to obtain, through Hölder's and Young's inequalities, for all  $\alpha > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) & \leq \frac{1}{2\alpha\mu N^2} \cdot \|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)})\|_p^2 + \frac{1}{2\alpha\mu N^2} \cdot \|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 \\
& \quad + \left( \frac{\mathcal{L}}{N} + \alpha\mu \right) \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 + \frac{16\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu N^2} + \frac{\mu}{16} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2, \quad a.s. \tag{53}
\end{aligned}$$

By strong convexity of  $F_N$  as in Assumption 3 as well as the fact that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  minimizes  $F_N$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , we have that

$$F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2, \quad a.s. \tag{54}$$

Combining (53) and (54), we immediately obtain the below after some re-organization and simplification:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left[ \left( \frac{7}{16} - \alpha \right) \cdot \mu - \frac{\mathcal{L}}{N} \right] \cdot \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 & \leq \frac{1}{2N^2\mu\alpha} \cdot \|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)})\|_p^2 \\
& \quad + \frac{1}{2N^2\mu\alpha} \cdot \|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 + \frac{16\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu N^2}, \quad a.s. \tag{55}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}$  and  $\xi_j$  are independent, so are  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $\xi'_j$ . We therefore have  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)})\|_p^2] \leq \sigma_p^2$  and  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2] \leq \sigma_p^2$  under Assumption 2. Further because we may let  $\alpha = 1/4$  and it is assumed that  $N \geq \frac{C_1\mathcal{L}}{\mu}$  (where we may as well let  $C_1 \geq 8$ ), we then have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] & \leq \left[ \left( \frac{7}{16} - \alpha \right) \cdot \mu - \frac{\mathcal{L}}{N} \right]^{-1} \cdot \left( \frac{\sigma_p^2}{N^2\mu\alpha} + \frac{16\mathcal{M}^2}{\mu N^2} \right) \leq \frac{64\sigma_p^2}{N^2\mu^2} + \frac{256\mathcal{M}^2}{N^2\mu^2}; \\
\implies N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] & \leq \frac{64\sigma_p^2}{N^2\mu^2} + \frac{256\mathcal{M}^2}{N^2\mu^2}. \tag{56}
\end{aligned}$$

Because  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j)$  and  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)$  are identically distributed — so are  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)$  and  $f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi'_j)$  — we then obtain that  $\mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)]$  and that  $\mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] = \mathbb{E}[f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi'_j)]$ . Therefore,

$$\mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \tag{57}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi'_j)] + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle] + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle] \end{aligned} \tag{58}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{8}{N\mu} \|\nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 + \frac{8}{N\mu} \|\nabla F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla f(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)\|_p^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \mathcal{L} + \frac{N\mu}{16} \right) \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q^2 + 2\mathcal{M} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q \right] \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{16}{N\mu} \sigma_p^2 + \left( \mathcal{L} + \frac{17}{16} N\mu \right) \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q^2 + \frac{\mathcal{M}^2}{N\mu} \right] \tag{60}$$

$$\leq C \cdot \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{N\mu}, \tag{61}$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ . Here, (58) is based on the (strong) convexity of  $f(\cdot, \xi)$  for almost every  $\xi \in \Theta$  as per Assumption 3, (59) is by Assumption 1 (which leads to (52)) as well as Young's inequality, (60) is the result of invoking both Assumption 2 and Young's inequality, and (61) is obtained by employing (56) and the assumption that  $N \geq \frac{c_1 \mathcal{L}}{\mu}$ .

Eq. (61) above combined with (46) leads to  $\mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq C \cdot \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{N\mu}$ , which implies the desired result in (21) after some simple re-organization. Then (22) is an immediate result by Markov's inequality. Q.E.D.

**REMARK 15.** An important component of this proof is to establish an upper bound on  $N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2]$  as in (56) with  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}$  defined as in (47). This upper bound ensures that, if one data point is changed to a different i.i.d. copy of  $\xi$  in SAA, the output solution does not change much, on average, in terms of the squared distance w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm. This is the manifestation of



the innate average-RO stability of SAA when it is applied to solving a strongly convex SP problem. The concept of average-RO stability is introduced by Shalev-Shwartz et al. (2010). To our knowledge, our proof may be the first to use the average-RO stability to analyze the non-asymptotic sample complexity of SAA.

**4.1.2. Proof of Theorem 2.** The proof below follows that of Theorem 1 with some important modifications. First, SAA (3) can be considered as SAA (2) to the following new SP problem:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}).$$

We may repeat (46) to show that  $\mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})]$  with  $F_{\lambda_0, N}$  as defined in (3). Then, by the definition of  $F_{\lambda_0}$ , where  $\lambda_0 = 0.5\epsilon/R^* \leq 0.5\epsilon/V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)$ , an immediate result is that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \\ \implies & \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*)] \leq \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] + \frac{\epsilon}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (62)$$

Let  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1, N}^{(j)} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi'_j, \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_N)$  with  $\xi'_j$  being an i.i.d. copy of  $\xi$ , define  $f_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, \xi) := f(\cdot, \xi) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\cdot)$ , and denote that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} := \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1, N}^{(j)}) \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} N^{-1} \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \xi'_j) + \sum_{\iota \neq j} f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \xi_\iota) \right]$ . Under Assumption 4, we can follow the same argument for (51) in the proof of Theorem 1 to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{N} \cdot \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ & = \langle \nabla F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_1(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle + \langle \nabla F_2(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla F_2(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ & \quad + \langle \lambda_0 \nabla V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \lambda_0 \nabla V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \\ & \leq \mathcal{L} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 + 2\mathcal{M} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_q + \lambda_0 \cdot (\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}) \cdot \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'}, \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

where (64) is due to Assumption 1 and a property of  $V_{q'}(\cdot) = 0.5\|\cdot - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2$  (as shown in (134) of Appendix A); that is,  $\|\nabla V_{q'}(\cdot)\|_{p'} = \|\cdot - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}$  for  $p' = q'/(q' - 1)$ .

Note that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}$  and  $\xi_j$  are independent, so are  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  and  $\xi'_j$ . Assumption 2 then implies that  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)})\|_p^2 \right] \leq \sigma_p^2$  and  $\mathbb{E} \left[ \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi'_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 \right] \leq \sigma_p^2$ . Further noting that  $q' \leq q$ , we may then continue from (63) above to obtain, for any  $\alpha > 0$ :

$$\mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})]$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{2\alpha(q'-1)\lambda_0 N^2} \cdot \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)})\|_p^2 + \frac{1}{2\alpha(q'-1)\lambda_0 N^2} \cdot \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \left[ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{N} + \left( \frac{1}{16} + 2\alpha \right) \cdot \lambda_0 \cdot (q'-1) \right] \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'}^2 + \frac{16\mathcal{M}^2}{\lambda_0 \cdot (q'-1)N^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_0}{4\alpha N^2 \cdot (q'-1)} \cdot \mathbb{E} [(\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'})^2] \\
&\leq \frac{\sigma_p^2}{\alpha(q'-1)\lambda_0 N^2} + \left[ \frac{\mathcal{L}}{N} + \left( \frac{1}{16} + 2\alpha \right) \lambda_0 \cdot (q'-1) \right] \mathbb{E} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'}^2 + \frac{16\mathcal{M}^2}{\lambda_0 \cdot (q'-1)N^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{\lambda_0}{\alpha N^2 \cdot (q'-1)} \cdot \mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2], \tag{65}
\end{aligned}$$

where (65) invokes the aforementioned implications of Assumption 2, the relationship that  $\mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2] = \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2]$ , and the assumption that  $1 < q' \leq q$ . Note that  $V_{q'}(\cdot)$  is  $(q'-1)$ -strongly convex w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm (Ben-Tal et al. 2001) for  $q' \in (1, 2]$ . Thus, by Assumption 4,  $F_{\lambda_0, N}$  entails  $[(q'-1)\lambda_0]$ -strong convexity in the sense of Assumption 3. This strong convexity — when combined with the fact that  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  minimizes  $F_{\lambda_0, N}$  as well as the assumption that  $N \geq \frac{C_2 \mathcal{L}}{(q'-1)\lambda_0}$  — leads to, for some straightforward choice of  $\alpha$  and some universal constant  $\hat{C} > 0$ :

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'}^2] \leq \hat{C} \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)^2 \lambda_0^2 N^2} + \frac{\hat{C}}{N^2 (q'-1)^2} \mathbb{E} [\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2]. \tag{66}$$

We observe that  $f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j')$  and  $f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)$  are identically distributed, so are the pair of  $f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)$  and  $f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j')$ . Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \\
&= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j') - f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j') - f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j')] + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j)] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j') - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle] + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}} \rangle] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} [\langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}), \widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} \rangle] \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{8}{N(q'-1)\lambda_0} \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j') - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 + \frac{8}{N(q'-1)\lambda_0} \|\nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)\|_p^2 \right. \\
&\quad + 2\mathcal{M} \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_{q'} + \left( \frac{N(q'-1)\lambda_0}{16} + \mathcal{L} \right) \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_{q'}^2 \\
&\quad \left. + \lambda_0 \cdot (\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}) \cdot \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'} \right] \tag{67} \\
&\leq \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{8}{N(q'-1)\lambda_0} \|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j') - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p^2 + \frac{8}{N(q'-1)\lambda_0} \|\nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}) - \nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}, \xi_j)\|_p^2 \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{8\mathcal{M}^2}{N(q'-1)\lambda_0} + \left( \frac{N(q'-1)\lambda_0}{4} + \mathcal{L} \right) \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}\|_{q'}^2 \\
& + \frac{4\lambda_0}{N(q'-1)} \cdot (\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'} + \|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'})^2 \Big], \tag{68}
\end{aligned}$$

where (67) is due to (64), Young's inequality, and the assumption that  $q' \leq q$ . Recall that (i) it has been assumed that  $N \geq \frac{C_2\mathcal{L}}{(q'-1)\lambda_0}$ ; (ii)  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}^{(j)}$  and  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$  are identically distributed; and (iii) Assumption 2 holds. We then may continue from (66) and (68) above to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \\
& \leq \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} + \widehat{C}' \frac{\lambda_0}{N \cdot (q'-1)} \mathbb{E}[\|\widehat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2] \tag{69}
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} + 2\widehat{C}' \frac{\lambda_0}{N(q'-1)} \mathbb{E}[V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})], \tag{70}$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C}' > 0$ , where (69) holds as a result of (66), and (70) holds by the definition of  $V_{q'}$ . In view of the definition of  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned}
0 & \geq \mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}^*)] = \mathbb{E}[F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] \\
& = \mathbb{E}[F_N(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] \\
& \stackrel{\text{Eq. (70)}}{\geq} \mathbb{E}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] - \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} - 2\widehat{C}' \frac{\lambda_0}{N(q'-1)} \mathbb{E}[V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \\
& \geq \mathbb{E}[\lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] - \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} - 2\widehat{C}' \frac{\lambda_0}{N(q'-1)} \mathbb{E}[V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})].
\end{aligned}$$

Note that  $\lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*} \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$ . In view of the assumption that  $N \geq C_2 \frac{(\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2)R^*}{(q'-1)\epsilon^2} \geq C_2 \frac{1}{q'-1}$  (where we have utilized the assumption that  $\sigma_p \geq 1$ ,  $R^* \geq 1$ , and  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ , and we may as well also let  $C_2 \geq 10\widehat{C}'$ ), we can re-arrange the inequality above into the below:

$$\frac{4}{5} \mathbb{E}[\lambda_0 V_{q'}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] \leq \mathbb{E}[\lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*)] + \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N}.$$

This inequality, combined with (70), leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}})] & \leq \widehat{C}' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} + \frac{2\widehat{C}'}{N(q'-1)} \cdot \left( \frac{5}{8}\epsilon + \frac{5\widehat{C}'}{4} \cdot \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} \right) \\
& \leq \widehat{C}'' \frac{\sigma_p^2 + \mathcal{M}^2}{(q'-1)\lambda_0 N} + \frac{\epsilon}{8}. \tag{71}
\end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C}'' > 0$ , where the last inequality above invokes  $N \geq C_2 \frac{1}{q'-1} \geq 10\widehat{C}' \frac{1}{q'-1}$  again. Then, combining (62) and (71), after some re-organization, we obtain the first inequality of this theorem in (24).

Furthermore, if we invoke Markov's inequality together with (62) and (71), we then obtain (25) as the second inequality of this theorem. Q.E.D.

**4.2. Proof of large deviations-type, metric entropy-free complexity bounds in Section 3.2.** We prove Proposition 1 and Theorem 3 in Sections 4.2.1 and 4.2.2, respectively, making use of a pillar proposition in Section 4.2.3.

**4.2.1. Proof of Proposition 1.** The core of the proof is to extend a pillar result (by Feldman and Vondrak 2019) formally stated in Proposition 2 of Section 4.2.3 below, which has been previously utilized to derive generalization bounds for machine learning algorithms. The canonical form of this proposition assumes the aforementioned uniform stability (also stated in (119)), whose satisfaction currently stipulates a uniform Lipschitz condition; namely, (14) should hold for all possible realizations of the random parameters. In contrast, the extension made in our proof weakens this stipulation into the condition that (14) should hold with high probability. As a result, Proposition 2 becomes applicable to SAA (3) in our settings.

We start by introducing a few notations. Let  $f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \xi) := f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})$  for  $(\mathbf{x}, \xi) \in \mathcal{X} \times \Theta$ . For any given  $t \geq 0$ , denote that

$$\mathcal{E}_t := \{\xi \in \Theta : M(\xi) \leq t\} \quad (72)$$

and that  $\mathcal{E}_t^N := \{\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) \in \Theta^N : M(\xi_j) \leq t, \forall j = 1, \dots, N\}$ . Furthermore, we use the following notations related to a family of  $\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_j, \dots, \zeta_N, \zeta'_1, \dots, \zeta'_j, \dots, \zeta'_N \in \Theta$ :

- We denote that  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N} = (\zeta'_1, \dots, \zeta'_N)$ ; namely,  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}$  is the collection of all  $\zeta_j$  and  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}$  is that of all  $\zeta'_j$ .
- We also denote that

$$\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}^{(j)} = (\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_{j-1}, \zeta'_j, \zeta_{j+1}, \dots, \zeta_N) \quad (73)$$

for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ . With this notation, all but one components of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}^{(j)}$  are the same as  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}$  and the only difference is in the  $j$ th component. Namely, by switching the  $j$ th component of  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}$  with  $\zeta'_j$ , one obtains  $\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}^{(j)}$ .

[To prove Part (a)]: Our proof is in four steps. Step 1 establishes a Lipschitz-like property of function  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \cdot)$ , with  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$  defined as in (5) w.r.t. SAA (3). Using this property in Step 2, we construct a surrogate function  $g$  and prove that it satisfies all the conditions needed to invoke Proposition 2, with the intention that the resulting inequalities of this proposition on  $g$  can infer those on  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \cdot)$ . The necessary correspondence to enable the said inference is proven in Step 3, which establishes the equivalence between  $g$  and  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \cdot)$  when their arguments are within a set that defines a high-probability event. Step 4 then finally invokes Proposition 2 and collects all the proceeding steps to prove the desired result.

**Step 1.** Recall the notation of  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$  as defined in (5) w.r.t. SAA (3). For some  $\gamma \geq 0$  (to be explicated in (78)), define by  $d_\gamma(\zeta_1, \zeta_2)$  the Hamming distance between  $\zeta_1 = (\zeta_{1,j} : j = 1, \dots, N)$  and  $\zeta_2 = (\zeta_{2,j} : j = 1, \dots, N)$  in the following sense:

$$d_\gamma(\zeta_1, \zeta_2) = \sum_{j=1}^N \gamma \cdot \mathbb{1}(\zeta_{1,j} \neq \zeta_{2,j}), \quad \text{for } (\zeta_1, \zeta_2) \in \Theta^{2N}. \quad (74)$$

We would like to first show that

$$|f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta)| \leq d_\gamma(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta'_{1,N}), \quad (75)$$

for all  $(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta'_{1,N}, \zeta) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t$ ; that is, when  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ , the function  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \zeta)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{E}_t^N$  w.r.t. the hamming distance defined in (74). This is an important property to facilitate us in constructing the aforementioned surrogate function  $g$ .

To show (75), we first observe the below for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , and all  $(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta'_{1,N}) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t^N$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j) \\ &= \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} + \sum_{j: \zeta_j = \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} \\ &= \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} - \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} \\ & \quad + \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} + \sum_{j: \zeta_j = \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} \\ &= \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} - \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} \\ & \quad + \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} + \sum_{j: \zeta_j = \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} \\ &= \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} - \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N} \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) \\ &\leq \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta_j)}{N} - \sum_{j: \zeta_j \neq \zeta'_j} \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N}), \zeta'_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta'_j)}{N}, \quad (76) \end{aligned}$$

where (76) is due to the fact that  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\zeta'_{1,N})$ , by definition, minimizes  $N^{-1} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, \zeta'_j) \right]$  over the feasible region  $\mathcal{X}$ .

Invoking Assumption 5.(a) (and noting that  $q' \leq q$ ) and the Lipschitz condition of  $V_{q'}$  (as shown in (135) of Appendix A for completeness), we further obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta_j) \\ & \leq \frac{(M(\zeta_j) + M(\zeta'_j) + 2\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N})\|_{q'}}{N} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\zeta'_j \neq \zeta_j) \\ & \leq \frac{2 \cdot (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N})\|_{q'}}{N} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\zeta'_j \neq \zeta_j), \end{aligned} \quad (77)$$

where the last inequality is due to the assumption that  $(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t^N$ .

Note that  $V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^2$  with  $q' \in (1, 2]$  is  $(q' - 1)$ -strongly convex w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm (Ben-Tal et al. 2001) in the sense of (133) in Appendix A. Thus, if we additionally invoke Assumption 4 and the definition of  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot)$  we have  $0 \leq \lambda_0 \cdot \frac{q'-1}{2} \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N})\|_{q'}^2 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}), \zeta_j) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta_j)$ . Combining this with (77), we obtain  $\|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N})\|_{q'} \leq \frac{4 \cdot (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'})}{N \cdot \lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\zeta'_j \neq \zeta_j)$ . Let

$$\gamma := \frac{4 \cdot (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'})^2}{N \cdot \lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)}. \quad (78)$$

Thus, for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta) - f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}), \zeta)| \leq (t + \lambda \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \|\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}) - \tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N})\|_{q'} \\ & \leq \frac{4 \cdot (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'})^2}{N \cdot \lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\zeta'_j \neq \zeta_j) = \gamma \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{1}(\zeta'_j \neq \zeta_j) = d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}, \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

which proves the desired result in Step 1.

**Step 2.** Define the aforementioned surrogate function  $g : \Theta^N \times \Theta \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\begin{aligned} g(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \zeta) := & \min \left\{ 2\mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t), \right. \\ & \left. \mathbb{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) + \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right\} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Below, we would like to show that Proposition 2 applies to  $g$ , using the result from Step 1. To that end, we will verify that  $g$  satisfies the conditions for the said proposition.

**Step 2.1.** We would like to first show that the following inequality holds for every  $j = 1, \dots, N$  and for all  $(\zeta_1, \dots, \zeta_N, \zeta'_1, \dots, \zeta'_N) \in \Theta^{2N}$ ,  $\zeta \in \Theta$ :

$$|g(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \zeta) - g(\boldsymbol{\zeta}'_{1,N}, \zeta)| \leq \gamma, \quad (81)$$

where we recall the definition of  $\zeta_{1,N}^{(j)}$  (as well as its relations with  $\zeta_{1,N}$  and  $\zeta_j'$ ) as in (73) and  $\gamma$  is defined as in (78).

To that end, we first observe that (79) immediately implies the below, for every  $j = 1, \dots, N$  and for all  $(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta_j', \zeta) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t \times \mathcal{E}_t$ , with  $\zeta_{1,N}^{(j)}$  defined as in (73):

$$\left| \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right] - \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_{1,N}^{(j)}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right] \right| \leq \gamma. \quad (82)$$

By the same Lipschitz extension argument as in Combes (2015) (Section 3.2 therein, which invokes results by McShane 1934), we have that (82) leads to:

$$\left| \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) + d_\gamma(\zeta_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) \right\} - \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) + d_\gamma(\zeta_{1,N}^{(j)}, \mathbf{z}) \right\} \right| \leq \gamma, \\ \forall (\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta_j', \zeta) \in \Theta^N \times \Theta \times \mathcal{E}_t, \forall j = 1, \dots, N,$$

which further leads to

$$\left| \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) + d_\gamma(\zeta_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) \right\} - \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) + d_\gamma(\zeta_{1,N}^{(j)}, \mathbf{z}) \right\} \right| \leq \gamma, \quad (83)$$

for every  $(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta_j', \zeta) \in \Theta^N \times \Theta \times \Theta$  and all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ . Comparing (83) with the definition of  $g$  in (80), we know that the desired relationship in (81) holds.

**Step 2.2.** We would like to secondly show that the range of  $g$  obey  $g(\cdot, \cdot) \in [0, 2\mathcal{D}_{q'}(t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'})]$ . To that end, we first observe that the upper bound to the range is evident by the definition of  $g$ . To prove the lower bound (namely, non-negativity of  $g$ ), we observe that, for any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , when  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ , then Assumption 5.(a) implies that  $|f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \zeta) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)| \leq (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|_{q'} \leq (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} \implies 0 \leq f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \zeta) + (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \implies g(\cdot, \zeta) \geq 0$ . Meanwhile, in the case where  $\zeta \notin \mathcal{E}_t$ , we have  $g(\cdot, \zeta) = 0$ . Combining both cases, we have established that the range of  $g(\cdot, \cdot)$  meets the desired criteria. Steps 2.1 and 2.2 together have now verified all the conditions needed to apply Proposition 2.

**Step 3.** In this step, we will show that  $g(\cdot, \cdot)$ , as defined in (80) is equivalent to  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \cdot)$  everywhere on  $\mathcal{E}_t^N \times \Theta$  in the sense that the identity below holds:

$$g(\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta) = \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot [f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}(\zeta_{1,N}), \zeta) + \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)], \quad \forall (\zeta_{1,N}, \zeta) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \Theta. \quad (84)$$

This ensures that, when Proposition 2 is invoked on  $g$ , the implications will infer the desired results for  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot), \cdot)$ . To that end, we will consider two complementary cases:  $\zeta \notin \mathcal{E}_t$  or  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ .

**Step 3.1.** We first observe that (84) holds trivially for the case of  $\zeta \notin \mathcal{E}_t$ .

**Step 3.2.** We consider the case of  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$  below. Observe that due to (79),  $f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) \geq f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta)$  for any  $(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \times \mathcal{E}_t^N$ . Thus, it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z})\} = f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta), \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N. \\ \implies & \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \{f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)\} \\ & = \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot [f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)], \quad \forall \boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N. \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

Meanwhile, in the same case of  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ , Assumption 5.(a) implies that, for every  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $|f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \zeta) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)| \leq (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^*\|_{q'} \leq (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} \implies 2(t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \geq f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \zeta) + (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)$ . This immediately leads to

$$2(t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \geq \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot [f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \zeta) + (t + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'}) \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta)], \quad \forall (\mathbf{x}, \zeta) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{E}_t. \quad (86)$$

Therefore, in the case for  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$  of our consideration, for any  $(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}) \in \mathcal{E}_t^N$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} g(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \zeta) &= \min \left\{ 2\mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t), \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left[ \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \inf_{\mathbf{z} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N} \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\mathbf{z}), \zeta) + d_\gamma(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}, \mathbf{z}) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right\} \right] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(85)}{=} \min \left\{ 2\mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t), \left[ \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right\} \right] \right\} \\ &\stackrel{(86)}{=} \mathbf{1}(\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t) \cdot \left\{ f_{\lambda_0}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\zeta}_{1,N}), \zeta) + D_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \zeta) \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

which is immediately the desired equality in (84) for the case of  $\zeta \in \mathcal{E}_t$ .

Combining Steps 3.1 and 3.2, we have the desired result of Step 3.

**Step 4.** We are now ready to apply Proposition 2 on  $g$ . Steps 1 and 2 have verified the conditions for the said proposition, which then immediately implies that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi)] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi_j) \right| \geq c\Delta_\gamma(t) \right] \leq \frac{\beta}{2}, \quad (87)$$

where  $c$  is some universal constant,  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N) \in \Theta^N$  collects  $N$ -many i.i.d. copies of  $\xi$ ,  $\gamma$  is defined as in (78), and  $\Delta_\gamma(t)$  is a short-hand notation defined as

$$\Delta_\gamma(t) := \gamma \ln N \cdot \ln \frac{2N}{\beta} + \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}^2 (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t)^2}{N} \cdot \ln(2/\beta)}. \quad (88)$$



This combined with Eq. (84) in Step 3 leads to the following for  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} := \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N})$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathbb{E}_\xi [\{f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)\} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t)] \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t) \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathbb{E}_\xi [\{f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)\} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t)] \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t), \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \right] \\ & \geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \mathbb{E}_\xi [\{f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)\} \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t)] - \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_j)}{N} \leq c \Delta_\gamma(t), \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \right] \end{aligned} \quad (89)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq \mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_j)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi_j \in \mathcal{E}_t) \right| \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t), \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \right] \end{aligned} \quad (90)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) + \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) + \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot (\lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + t) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_j)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi_j \in \mathcal{E}_t) \right| \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t), \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{(84)}{=} \mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi)] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi_j) \right| \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t), \boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \right] \\ & \geq 1 - \mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi)] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N g(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi_j) \right| \geq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t) \right] - \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\xi_j \notin \mathcal{E}_t] \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

$$\stackrel{(87)}{\geq} 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\xi_j \notin \mathcal{E}_t], \quad (92)$$

where (89) is due to  $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi_j) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_j)] \leq 0$ , by the definition of  $\widehat{\mathbf{x}} := \widetilde{\mathbf{x}}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N})$ , (90) employs the fact that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} \in \mathcal{E}_t^N \implies \xi_j \in \mathcal{E}_t$  for all  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , and (91) is due to the combination of the union bound and the De Morgan's law.

Below, we will invoke several observations to simplify the probability bound in (92) into the desired results. Firstly, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\xi \{ [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)] \cdot \mathbf{1}(\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t) \} = \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \middle| \xi \in \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \in \mathcal{E}_t] \\ & = \mathbb{E}_\xi [f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi)] - \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \middle| \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t], \\ & = F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*) - \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \middle| \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t], \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

where we may achieve further explication of the second term by invoking (i) Assumption 5.(a), (ii) the choice of parameter that  $q' \leq q$ , and (iii) the definition of  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}$ :

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \middle| \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t] \leq \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot M(\xi) \middle| M(\xi) > t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[M(\xi) > t].$$

Here, we introduce a short-hand  $Z(\xi) := M(\xi) \cdot \mathbf{1}(M(\xi) > t)$ , which is a non-negative random variable. We may continue from the above to obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \mid \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t] \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \mathbb{E}[Z(\xi)] = \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[Z(\xi) \geq s] ds \\ & = \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} \left[ M(\xi) \cdot \mathbf{1}(M(\xi) > t) \geq s \right] ds = \mathcal{D}_{q'} \int_t^\infty \mathbb{P} \left[ M(\xi) \geq s \right] ds \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \int_t^\infty \frac{\psi_M^p}{s^p} ds = \frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}}{p-1} \cdot \frac{\psi_M^p}{t^{p-1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

where the first inequality in Eq. (94) is due to Markov's inequality under Assumption 5.(b).

Invoking (i) Equations (93) and (94), (ii) the choice of parameter such that  $R^* \geq \max\{1, \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2\}$ , (iii) the relationship that  $\lambda_0 \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*} V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ , (iv) the definition of  $F_{\lambda_0}$ , and (v) for every  $j = 1, \dots, N$ , the fact that  $\mathbb{P}[\xi_j \notin \mathcal{E}_t] \leq \frac{\psi_M^p}{t^p}$  for any given  $t > 0$  (which is due to Markov's inequality under Assumption 5.(b)), we can re-organize (92) into the below:

$$F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \leq F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq F_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq c \cdot \Delta_\gamma(t) + \frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}}{p-1} \cdot \frac{\psi_M^p}{t^{p-1}}, \quad (95)$$

with probability at least

$$1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbb{P}[\xi_j \notin \mathcal{E}_t] \geq 1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - \frac{N\psi_M^p}{t^p}.$$

Here, we recall that  $\Delta_\gamma(\cdot)$  is defined as in (88).

Recall that  $\lambda_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}$  and  $\gamma$  is chosen as in (78). We may as well let  $t = \left(\frac{2N}{\beta}\right)^{1/p} \psi_M$  in (95) to achieve

$$\begin{aligned} F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) & \leq c \cdot \Delta \left( \left(\frac{2N}{\beta}\right)^{1/p} \psi_M \right) + \frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}}{p-1} \cdot \psi_M \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2N}\right)^{1-1/p} + \epsilon/4 \\ & \stackrel{(88)}{\leq} \frac{\widehat{C} \cdot R^* \cdot \left[ \left(\frac{2N}{\beta}\right)^{1/p} \psi_M + \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} \right]^2}{N \cdot \epsilon \cdot (q' - 1)} \cdot \ln N \cdot \ln \frac{2N}{\beta} \\ & \quad + \widehat{C} \sqrt{\frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}^2 \left[ \lambda_0 \mathcal{D}_{q'} + \left(\frac{2N}{\beta}\right)^{1/p} \psi_M \right]^2}{N}} \cdot \ln(2/\beta) + \frac{\mathcal{D}_{q'}}{p-1} \cdot \psi_M \cdot \left(\frac{\beta}{2N}\right)^{1-1/p} + \epsilon/4, \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C} > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ . Re-organizing the above in view of  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$  and the specified choice of parameter  $\lambda_0$ , we obtain the desired in Part (a).

[To prove Part (b)]: The proof argument is exactly the same as that for Part (a), except that the inequalities used starting from (94) vary due to the assumption of light-tailed-ness (Assumption 6.(b)). More specifically, (94) should be modified into

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \mid \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t] = \mathcal{D}_{q'} \int_t^\infty \mathbb{P}[M(\xi) \geq s] ds \\ & \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \int_t^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{s}{\varphi}\right) ds \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \varphi \cdot \exp(-t/\varphi). \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

where the first inequality in (96) is the direct result of Assumption 6.(b). Then, the same argument as in obtaining (95) implies that

$$F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \leq c\Delta_\gamma(t) + \varphi \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \exp(-t/\varphi), \quad (97)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - N \exp(-t/\varphi)$ . Here, we recall again that  $\Delta_\gamma(\cdot)$  is as defined in (88). We may as well let  $t := \varphi \ln(2N/\beta)$  in (97). After re-organizing the above based on the assumption that  $R^* \geq \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2$ , we then immediately obtain that  $\mathbb{P}[F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta$  holds when

$$N \geq \widehat{C}' \cdot \frac{[\varphi \cdot \ln(2N/\beta)]^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \left( \frac{R^* \cdot \ln N \cdot \ln(2N/\beta)}{q' - 1} + \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2 \cdot \ln(2/\beta) \right) + \widehat{C}' \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \frac{\varphi\beta}{\epsilon}.$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C}' > 0$ . This can then be further simplified into the desired for Part (b) by further noting that  $N \geq 3$  (such that  $\ln N \geq 1$ ),  $\varphi \geq 1$ ,  $R^* \geq \max\{1, \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2\}$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ .

[To show Part (c)]: The proof is closely similar to that for Part (b), except that (96) should be modified into the below:

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \left[ f_{\lambda_0}(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}, \xi) - f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi) \mid \xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t \right] \cdot \mathbb{P}[\xi \notin \mathcal{E}_t] = \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \int_t^\infty \mathbb{P}[M(\xi) \geq s] ds \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \int_t^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{\varphi^2}\right) ds. \quad (98)$$

Observe that, by some simple algebra,

$$\int_t^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{s^2}{\varphi^2}\right) ds = \frac{\varphi\sqrt{\pi}}{2} \mathbf{erfc}\left(\frac{t}{\varphi}\right), \quad (99)$$

where  $\mathbf{erfc}(\cdot)$  is the complementary error function associated with a standard Gaussian distribution. By the well known inequality that  $\mathbf{erfc}\left(\frac{t}{\varphi}\right) \leq 2 \exp(-t^2/\varphi^2)$  as per, e.g., Chiani et al. (2003), we can utilize the above in the same argument as in (97) to obtain the below:

$$F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) - \frac{\epsilon}{4} \leq c\Delta_\gamma(t) + \varphi\sqrt{\pi} \cdot \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \exp(-t^2/\varphi^2), \quad (100)$$

with probability at least  $1 - \frac{\beta}{2} - N \exp(-t^2/\varphi^2)$ . If we let  $t = \varphi \sqrt{\ln(2N/\beta)}$  in (100), we can obtain the desired result in Part (c) after re-organization and simplification based on the observation that  $N \geq 3$  (such that  $\ln N \geq 1$ ),  $\varphi \geq 1$ ,  $R^* \geq \max\{1, \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2\}$ ,  $\beta \in (0, 1)$ , and  $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$ . Q.E.D.

**4.2.2. Proof of Theorem 3.** This current theorem is to explicate the sample requirement in Proposition 1. More specifically, the said proposition requires that the sample size  $N$  should be greater than some poly-logarithmic function of  $N$ , leading to implicit sample complexity estimates. In achieving explication, both parts of this theorem are proven in two steps. In Step 1, we find “coarse” sample complexity bounds in the format of the below: whenever  $N \geq \widetilde{N}$ , for some  $\widetilde{N}$  independent from  $N$ , SAA (3) provably achieves the desired efficacy. Then, in Step 2, we show that

the sample complexity bounds in Proposition 1 can be reduced to requiring  $N$  to be greater than some poly-logarithmic functions of  $\tilde{N}$  (substituting “poly-logarithmic of  $N$ ” by “poly-logarithmic of  $\tilde{N}$ ” in the original error bounds from the said proposition). Then immediately follow the claimed explicit results.

Our proof employs the following notations: For any  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , we let  $f_{\lambda_0}(\cdot, \xi) := f(\mathbf{x}, \xi) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})$ , define  $F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{j=1}^N f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}, \xi_j)$ , and denote  $F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}) := F(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})$ , throughout this proof. Also let

$$\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \in \arg \min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}).$$

[To show Part (a)]: Our proof has two steps as mentioned: Step 1 derives a coarse sample complexity bound based on the result by Theorem 2; then, Step 2 combines this coarse bound with Proposition 1 to obtain the desired result.

**Step 1.** Under Assumption 6.(a), it is well-known that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p \leq M(\xi)$  for  $p = q/(q-1)$  and all  $\xi \in \Theta$ . Here,  $q$  is defined as in Assumption 6.(a). This combined with Assumption 6.(b) implies that, for all  $t \geq 0$  and all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $\mathbb{P} \left[ \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p \geq t \right] \leq \exp(-t/\varphi)$ . Thus, if we let  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  denote the gamma function (namely,  $\Gamma(z) = \int_0^\infty t^{z-1} e^{-t} dt$  for  $z \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ ), we have, for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2] &= \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2 \geq t] dt \\ &= 2 \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p \geq s] \cdot s ds \leq 2 \cdot \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{s}{\varphi}\right) \cdot s ds = 2 \cdot \int_0^\infty \varphi^2 \exp(-s') \cdot s' ds' \\ &= 2 \cdot \varphi^2 \cdot \Gamma(2) \leq \widehat{C} \varphi^2, \end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C} > 0$ .

Note that  $\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2] \geq \|\mathbb{E} [\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)]\|_p^2 = \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p^2$ . This combined with (101) then also implies that  $\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p^2 \leq \widehat{C} \varphi^2$ . Thus, it must hold that  $\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2] \leq 4\widehat{C} \varphi^2$ . Thus, we can invoke Theorem 2 (where we may let  $\mathcal{L}$ ,  $\mathcal{M}^2$ , and  $\sigma_p^2$  therein to be zero,  $\widehat{C} \varphi^2$ , and  $4\widehat{C} \varphi^2$ , respectively) to obtain:

$$\text{Prob} \left[ F(\widehat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{\widehat{C}' R^*}{q' - 1} \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\beta \epsilon^2} := \tilde{N}_1. \tag{102}$$

for some universal constant  $\widehat{C}' > 0$ .

**Step 2.** Below, we will show the desired result by considering two different cases when comparing the sample requirement in (102) and that in Proposition 1.(b):

**Case 1.** Consider the case where

$$\tilde{N}_1 \geq \tilde{N}_2 := C_4 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2 \cdot \ln \tilde{N}_1 \cdot \ln^3(\tilde{N}_1/\beta)}{\epsilon^2 \cdot (q' - 1)}. \tag{103}$$

In this case, there are two scenarios to study as the below:

**Scenario 1.1.** Let  $\tilde{N}_1 \geq N$ . Whenever  $N \geq C_4 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2 \cdot \ln \tilde{N}_1 \cdot \ln^3(\tilde{N}_1/\beta)}{\epsilon^2 \cdot (q' - 1)}$ , it must hold that

$$N \geq C_4 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2 \cdot \ln N \cdot \ln^3(N/\beta)}{\epsilon^2 \cdot (q' - 1)}. \quad (104)$$

Then, based on Proposition 1.(b), we have  $\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta$ .

**Scenario 1.2.** Alternatively, let  $N > \tilde{N}_1$ . Then the outcome of Step 1 as in (102) ensures  $\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta$ .

**Case 2.** Consider the case where  $\tilde{N}_1 < \tilde{N}_2$ . Thus, whenever  $N \geq \tilde{N}_2$ , it must hold that  $N \geq \tilde{N}_1$ . Then, the result of Step 1 as in (102) ensures that  $\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta$ .

Combining both Cases 1 and 2 above and invoking the definition of  $\tilde{N}_2$  as in (103), we have the desired result after some simplification.

[To show Part (b)]: Again, our proofs are in two steps: Step 1 provides two coarse sample complexity bounds, among which the first bound is a direct counterpart to that of Part (a); Step 2 of this proof then follows the same argument as the second step of Part (a) to show the desired result.

**Step 1.** This step derives two “coarse bounds” for the sample complexity.

**Step 1.1.** To derive the first “coarse bound” under Assumption 7, we first notice that, with  $p = q/(q - 1)$ , it holds that  $\sup_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} \|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p \leq M(\xi)$ . Thus, for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2 \geq t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\varphi^2}\right), \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (105)$$

Here,  $q$  is defined as in Assumption 7.(a). Correspondingly, following a closely similar argument as in Step 1 for Part (a), we observe that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2 \geq t] dt \leq \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\varphi^2}\right) ds = \varphi^2. \quad (106)$$

Consequently,  $\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p^2 = \|\mathbb{E}[\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)]\|_p^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^2] \leq \varphi^2$ . As a result, we can invoke Theorem 2 (where we may let both  $\sigma_p^2$  and  $\mathcal{M}^2$  therein to be  $\varphi^2$ , and we also let  $\mathcal{L} = 0$ ) to obtain

$$\text{Prob} \left[ F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon \right] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{\hat{C}'' R^*}{q' - 1} \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\beta \epsilon^2}, \quad (107)$$

for some universal constant  $\hat{C}'' > 0$ . This is the first “coarse bound” as desired.

**Step 1.2.** Now, to derive the second “coarse bound”, we notice that, under Assumption 7, the same argument as for (105) leads to, for all  $t \geq 0$ , all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , and  $\tau_\beta := \max\{2, 2 \ln(1/\beta)\}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^{\tau_\beta} \geq t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^{\frac{2}{\tau_\beta}}}{\varphi^2}\right), \quad \text{for all } t \geq 0. \quad (108)$$

Consequently, if we recall that  $\Gamma(\cdot)$  is the gamma function, we have

$$\begin{aligned} d^{-\tau_\beta} \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_{\tau_\beta}^{\tau_\beta}] &\leq \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^{\tau_\beta}] = \int_0^\infty \mathbb{P} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p^{\tau_\beta} \geq t] dt \\ &\leq \frac{\tau_\beta}{2} \cdot \int_0^\infty \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\varphi^2}\right) \cdot t^{\tau_\beta/2-1} dt \\ &= \frac{\tau_\beta}{2} \cdot \varphi^{\tau_\beta} \cdot \Gamma\left(\frac{\tau_\beta}{2}\right) \leq \frac{3\tau_\beta}{2} \cdot \left(\frac{\tau_\beta}{2}\right)^{\tau_\beta/2} \cdot \varphi^{\tau_\beta}, \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

where the last inequality is due to  $\Gamma(x) \leq 3x^x$  for all  $x \geq 0.5$ . Additionally because  $\tau_\beta \geq 2$ ,

$$\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_{L^{\tau_\beta}} \leq \tilde{C} d \tau_\beta \varphi, \quad (110)$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$ .

In view of the fact that  $\tau_\beta \geq 2$  again, it holds that  $\mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_{\tau_\beta}^{\tau_\beta}] \geq \|\mathbb{E} [\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)]\|_{\tau_\beta}^{\tau_\beta} = \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_{\tau_\beta}^{\tau_\beta}$ . This combined with (110) then also implies that

$$\|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_{L^{\tau_\beta}} \leq \tilde{C} d \tau_\beta \varphi. \quad (111)$$

By almost the same argument based on (109), it also holds that

$$\tilde{C} \tau_\beta \varphi \geq \mathbb{E} [\|\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)\|_p] \geq \|\mathbb{E} [\nabla f(\mathbf{x}, \xi)]\|_p = \|\nabla F(\mathbf{x})\|_p. \quad (112)$$

By  $(q' - 1)$ -strong convexity of  $V_{q'}$  (w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm) in the sense of (133) in Appendix A, Assumption 4, as well as the definition of  $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*$  in the beginning of this proof, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F_{\lambda_0, N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) \geq \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \rangle + \frac{\lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)}{2} \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_{q'}^2 \\ &= \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \rangle + \frac{\lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)}{2} \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_{q'}^2 + \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \rangle \\ &\geq \langle \nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \rangle + \frac{\lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)}{2} \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_{q'}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

where (113) is due to the definition of  $\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*$ . By invoking Hölder's inequality, it holds, for  $q' \leq q$ , that

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_{q'} \leq \frac{2}{\lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)} \|\nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_p \quad (114)$$

$$\leq \frac{2}{\lambda_0 \cdot (q' - 1)} \cdot d \cdot \|\nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_{\tau_\beta}. \quad (115)$$

Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} [\|\nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_{\tau_\beta} \geq t] = \mathbb{P} [\|\nabla F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_{\tau_\beta}^2 \geq t^2] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Lemma 2}}{\leq} \left( \frac{\|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*, \xi) - \nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_{L^{\tau_\beta}}}{t \sqrt{\tau_\beta^{-1} \cdot N}} \right)^{\tau_\beta} \leq \left( \frac{\|\nabla f_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*, \xi)\|_{L^{\tau_\beta}} + \|\nabla F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*)\|_{L^{\tau_\beta}}}{t \sqrt{\tau_\beta^{-1} \cdot N}} \right)^{\tau_\beta} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{2\tilde{C} d \tau_\beta^{1.5} \varphi}{t \cdot \sqrt{N}} \right)^{\tau_\beta}, \end{aligned}$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$ , where the last inequality is due to (110) and (111). This, combined with (115), then leads to, for some universal constant  $\tilde{C}' > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_{q'} \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4\tilde{C}\tau_\beta\varphi} \right] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \tilde{C}' \cdot \frac{d^4\varphi^4\tau_\beta^5}{\epsilon^2 \cdot \lambda_0^2 \cdot (q' - 1)^2} \cdot \frac{1}{\beta^{2/\tau_\beta}}. \quad (116)$$

This combined with (112) implies that, with probability at least  $1 - \beta$ ,

$$F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) \leq \langle \nabla F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^* \rangle \leq \|\nabla F(\hat{\mathbf{x}})\|_p \cdot \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_q \leq \tilde{C}\tau_\beta\varphi \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*\|_q \leq \frac{3\epsilon}{4}. \quad (117)$$

Since  $\lambda_0 = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}$  with  $R^* \geq \mathcal{D}_{q'}^2 \geq 2V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ , it must hold that  $\lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{4}$  for all  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ . As a result, we have  $F(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) \leq F(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) + \lambda_0 \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_{\lambda_0}^*) \leq F_{\lambda_0}(\mathbf{x}^*) = F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \lambda_0 \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{\epsilon}{4}$ . This combined with (117) and the fact that  $\tau_\beta := \max\{2, 2\ln(1/\beta)\}$  implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[F(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq \epsilon] \geq 1 - \beta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \tilde{C}'' \cdot (R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{d^4\varphi^4 \max\{1, \ln^5(1/\beta)\}}{\epsilon^4 \cdot (q' - 1)^2}. \quad (118)$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C}'' > 0$ .

**Step 2.** We may now invoke the same argument as in Step 2 of the proof for Part (a), except that now we let

$$\tilde{N}_1 := \min \left\{ \frac{\tilde{C}'' R^*}{q' - 1} \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\beta\epsilon^2}, \quad \tilde{C}'' \cdot (R^*)^2 \cdot \frac{d^4\varphi^4 \max\{1, \ln^5(1/\beta)\}}{\epsilon^4 \cdot (q' - 1)^2} \right\}$$

and  $\tilde{N}_2 := C_5 \cdot R^* \cdot \frac{\varphi^2}{\epsilon^2} \cdot \frac{\ln \tilde{N}_1 \cdot \ln^2(\tilde{N}_1/\beta)}{q' - 1}$ . Also different from Part (a) of this proof in this analysis, we invoke Proposition 1.(c) instead of Proposition 1.(b). Then, we obtain the desired result for Part (b) of Theorem 3 after some re-organization and simplification. Q.E.D.

### 4.2.3. Useful lemmata for Proposition 1

**PROPOSITION 2.** *Let  $\beta \in (0, 1)$  be any scalar. Let  $A : \Theta^N \times \Theta \rightarrow [0, U]$  be a measurable and deterministic function for some  $U > 0$ . Denote that  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N)$  and  $\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}^{(j)} = (\xi_1, \dots, \xi_{j-1}, \xi'_j, \xi_{j+1}, \dots, \xi_N)$ ; that is, the two vectors are different only in the  $j$ th entry. For a given  $\gamma \geq 0$ , assume that*

$$|A(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi) - A(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}^{(j)}, \xi)| \leq \gamma, \quad \forall (\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi'_j, \xi) \in \Theta^N \times \Theta \times \Theta, \quad j = 1, \dots, N. \quad (119)$$

Then, it holds that

$$\mathbb{P} \left[ \left| \mathbb{E}_\xi [A(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi)] - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N A(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1,N}, \xi_j) \right| \geq c \left( \gamma \ln N \cdot \ln \frac{N}{\beta} + U \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\ln(1/\beta)}{N}} \right) \right] \leq \beta, \quad (120)$$

for some universal constant  $c > 0$ .

*Proof.* This is an immediate result of Theorem 1.1 by Feldman and Vondrak (2019). Q.E.D.

**4.3. Proof of sample complexity beyond Lipschitz conditions in Section 3.3.** Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 present the proofs for Theorems 4 and 5, respectively, utilizing two lemmata from Appendix B.

**4.3.1. Proof of Theorem 4.** To show the first part of this theorem, we first observe that Eq. (42) is an immediate result of (41) due to Markov's inequality. Below, we prove (41). By the definition of solution  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  in solving SAA (2) and Assumption 8 w.r.t. the  $q$ -norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\geq F_N(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) - F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) & (121) \\ &\geq \langle \nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 - N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \kappa(\xi_j), \quad a.s. \\ &= \langle \nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 - N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \kappa(\xi_j). \end{aligned}$$

By the fact that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  minimizes  $F$ , which is differentiable, we have  $\langle \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle \geq 0$ . We thus may continue from the above to obtain:

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq -\langle \nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle + N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \kappa(\xi_j), \quad a.s. \quad (122)$$

Taking expectations on both sides and noting that  $\mathbb{E}[N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \kappa(\xi_j)] = 0$ , we have

$$\frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] \leq -\mathbb{E}[\langle \nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*), \hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^* \rangle]. \quad (123)$$

Now we observe the following general relationships for any pair of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors  $\mathbf{u} = (u_i) \in \mathbb{R}^d$  and  $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ . Let  $(p, q, \eta)$  be any tuple of numbers such that  $p^{-1} + \eta^{-1} = 1$ ,  $p \geq 1$ ,  $q \in [1, \eta]$ ,  $\eta \in (1, 2]$ . Then, by Hölder's and Young's inequalities, for any given scalar  $b > 0$ , it holds that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\langle \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v} \rangle] &\leq \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\eta} \cdot \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p} \leq \frac{b}{2} \|\mathbf{u}\|_{L^\eta}^2 + \frac{1}{2b} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p}^2 = \frac{b}{2} \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[|u_i|^\eta] \right)^{2/\eta} + \frac{1}{2b} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p}^2 \\ &\stackrel{\eta \leq 2}{\leq} \frac{b}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^d |u_i|^\eta \right)^{2/\eta} \right] + \frac{1}{2b} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p}^2 = \frac{b}{2} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{u}\|_\eta^2] + \frac{1}{2b} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p}^2 & (124) \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{q \leq \eta}{\leq} \frac{b}{2} \mathbb{E} [\|\mathbf{u}\|_q^2] + \frac{1}{2b} \|\mathbf{v}\|_{L^p}^2 \quad (125)$$

where the inequality in (124) is due to the fact that  $(\cdot)^{2/\eta}$  is convex as  $2/\eta \geq 1$ . Combining this observation with (123) immediately leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mu}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] &\leq \frac{1}{\mu} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p}^2] + \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{\mu}{4} \|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{x}^*\|_q^2 \right] \\ &\implies \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] \leq \frac{4}{\mu^2} \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p}^2]. & (126) \end{aligned}$$



By Lemma 1 in Section B, since  $2 \leq p < \infty$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p}^2 &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla_i F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|^p] \right)^{2/p} \\ &= \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \left[ \|\nabla_i F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p} \right]^p \right)^{2/p} \\ &\leq \left( \left( \hat{C} \sqrt{p \cdot N^{-1}} \right)^p \sum_{i=1}^d \left[ \|\nabla_i f(\mathbf{x}^*, \xi_1) - \nabla_i F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_{L^p} \right]^p \right)^{2/p} \leq \frac{\hat{C}^2 \cdot p}{N} \psi_p^2. \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

for some universal constant  $\hat{C} > 0$ . We may then continue from (126) to obtain

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2] \leq \frac{Cp}{\mu^2 N} \psi_p^2, \quad (128)$$

for some universal constant  $C > 0$ , which immediately leads to the desired result in (41) (and thus the first part of the theorem).

To show (43) in the second part of the theorem, we may continue from (122) (where we note that  $\kappa(\xi_j) = 0$  for all  $j$ , a.s., under the assumption of this part of the theorem), as well as Hölder's and Young's inequalities, to obtain:

$$\|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq \frac{4}{\mu^2} \|\nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_p^2, \quad a.s. \quad (129)$$

Now, we can invoke Lemma 2 and Assumption 8.(b) w.r.t. the  $p$ -norm to obtain, for any  $t > 0$

$$\text{Prob}[\|\nabla F_N(\mathbf{x}^*) - \nabla F(\mathbf{x}^*)\|_q^2 \geq t] \leq \left( \tilde{C} \psi_p \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \right)^p$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$ . This combined with (129) implies that

$$\text{Prob} \left[ \|\mathbf{x}^* - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_q^2 \leq \frac{4t}{\mu^2} \right] \geq 1 - \left( \tilde{C} \psi_p \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \right)^p, \quad (130)$$

which evidently leads to the desired result in (43) after some simple re-organization. Q.E.D.

**4.3.2. Proof of Theorem 5.** Observe that SAA (3) can be viewed as the SAA (2) formulation to an SP problem of the below:

$$\min_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} F(\mathbf{x}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (131)$$

Denote by  $\mathbf{y}$  the optimal solution to this new SP problem. It must hold that

$$F(\mathbf{y}) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{y}) \leq F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \lambda_0 V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) = F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*} \cdot V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}^*) \leq F(\mathbf{x}^*) + \epsilon, \quad (132)$$

where we recall that  $\mathbf{x}^*$  denotes the optimal solution to the SP problem (1). Therefore,  $\mathbf{y}$  is an  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solution to the original SP problem in (1). As a result, Assumption 9 implies that Assumption 8.(b) holds at  $\mathbf{y}$ , an optimal solution of (131), with the same constant  $\psi_p$ . Here, “ $\mathbf{x}^*$ ” in Assumption 8.(b) should be equal to  $\mathbf{y}$  for this current proof.

Meanwhile, by Assumption 4 and the  $(q' - 1)$ -strong convexity of  $V_{q'}$  w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm in the sense of (133) in Appendix A (Ben-Tal et al. 2001), we know that the objective function of SAA (3) must be  $\lambda_0(q' - 1)$ -strongly convex. Therefore, the SP problem in (131) admits a unique solution  $\mathbf{y}$  and Assumption 8.(a) holds with modulus  $\mu := \lambda_0(q' - 1) = \frac{\epsilon}{2R^*}(q' - 1)$  w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm for  $\kappa(\cdot) = 0$ . Again, “ $\mathbf{x}^*$ ” in Assumption 8.(a) should be equal to  $\mathbf{y}$  for this current proof.

In view of the above, we may invoke Eq. (41) of Theorem 4, treating (131) as the target SP problem and treating SAA (3) as the corresponding SAA (2) formulation, whose optimal solution is denoted by  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$ . The result of Theorem 4 then implies that

$$\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \mathbf{y}\|_q^2] \leq \vartheta, \quad \text{if } N \geq \frac{\hat{C}p\psi_p^2}{\lambda_0^2(q' - 1)^2\vartheta} = \frac{\hat{C}'p(R^*)^2 \cdot \psi_p^2}{\epsilon^2(q' - 1)^2\vartheta},$$

for some universal constants  $\hat{C}, \hat{C}' > 0$  and any given  $\vartheta > 0$ . Combining this with (132)—that is,  $\mathbf{y}$  must be an  $\epsilon$ -suboptimal solution to the original SP problem in (1)—we immediately have the desired result in Eq. (44).

Similarly, the result in Eq. (45) holds as a result of (43) from Theorem 4. Q.E.D.

**5. Conclusion.** This paper revisits the sample complexity bounds for SAA in both strongly convex and general convex SP problems. Under regularity conditions that are common to (if not weaker than) the literature, our findings show, perhaps for the first time, that SAA achieves sample complexity rates completely free from any metric entropy terms. This represents a significant deviation from the benchmark results where the inclusion of those metric entropy terms has been seemingly inevitable. Generally, as these terms elevate the dependence of the sample requirement on the problem dimensionality, our newly established sample complexity bounds are less sensitive to the increase of dimensionality compared to the state-of-the-art results in many scenarios. In particular, under the common assumptions for the SMD methods, a mainstream alternative solution approach to SP, part of our results provides the first revelation that SAA and the canonical SMD entail identical sample efficiency, closing a seemingly persistent theoretical gap of the order  $O(d)$  between these two methods. Furthermore, we also identify some non-Lipschitzan cases where SAA can be shown to retain effectiveness but, in contrast, the results for SMD are currently unavailable to our knowledge.

---

## References

- A. Agarwal, M. J. Wainwright, P. Bartlett, and P. Ravikumar. Information-theoretic lower bounds on the oracle complexity of convex optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 22, 2009.
- Z. Artstein and R. J. Wets. Consistency of minimizers and the slrn for stochastic programs. *J. Convex Anal.*, 2(1-2):1–17, 1995.
- P. L. Bartlett, M. I. Jordan, and J. D. McAuliffe. Convexity, classification, and risk bounds. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 101(473):138–156, 2006.
- A. Ben-Tal, T. Margalit, and A. Nemirovski. The ordered subsets mirror descent optimization method with applications to tomography. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(1):79–108, 2001.
- J. R. Birge. State-of-the-art-survey — stochastic programming: Computation and applications. *INFORMS journal on computing*, 9(2):111–133, 1997.
- J. R. Birge. Uses of sub-sample estimates to reduce errors in stochastic optimization models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.07052*, 2023.
- J. R. Birge and F. Louveaux. *Introduction to stochastic programming*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2011.
- O. Bousquet and A. Elisseeff. Stability and generalization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2:499–526, 2002.
- C. Bugg and A. Aswani. Logarithmic sample bounds for sample average approximation with capacity-or budget-constraints. *Operations Research Letters*, 49(2):231–238, 2021.
- M. Chiani, D. Dardari, and M. K. Simon. New exponential bounds and approximations for the computation of error probability in fading channels. *IEEE Transactions on Wireless Communications*, 2(4):840–845, 2003.
- R. Combes. An extension of mdiarmid’s inequality. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05240*, 2015.
- J. Dupacová and R. Wets. Asymptotic behavior of statistical estimators and of optimal solutions of stochastic optimization problems. *The annals of statistics*, 16(4):1517–1549, 1988.
- V. Feldman and J. Vondrak. Generalization bounds for uniformly stable algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 31, 2018.
- V. Feldman and J. Vondrak. High probability generalization bounds for uniformly stable algorithms with nearly optimal rate. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 1270–1279. PMLR, 2019.
- S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Optimal stochastic approximation algorithms for strongly convex stochastic composite optimization i: A generic algorithmic framework. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 22(4):1469–1492, 2012.
- S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Stochastic first-and zeroth-order methods for nonconvex stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2341–2368, 2013.

- 
- S. Ghadimi and G. Lan. Accelerated gradient methods for nonconvex nonlinear and stochastic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 156(1-2):59–99, 2016.
- G. H. Golub, P. C. Hansen, and D. P. O’Leary. Tikhonov regularization and total least squares. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications*, 21(1):185–194, 1999.
- V. Guigues, A. Juditsky, and A. Nemirovski. Non-asymptotic confidence bounds for the optimal value of a stochastic program. *Optimization Methods and Software*, 32(5):1033–1058, 2017.
- A. E. Hoerl and R. W. Kennard. Ridge regression: applications to nonorthogonal problems. *Technometrics*, 12(1):69–82, 1970.
- Y. Hu, X. Chen, and N. He. Sample complexity of sample average approximation for conditional stochastic optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(3):2103–2133, 2020.
- A. J. King and R. T. Rockafellar. Asymptotic theory for solutions in statistical estimation and stochastic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18(1):148–162, 1993.
- A. J. King and R. J. Wets. Epi-consistency of convex stochastic programs. *Stochastics and Stochastic Reports*, 34(1-2):83–92, 1991.
- A. J. Kleywegt, A. Shapiro, and T. Homem-de Mello. The sample average approximation method for stochastic discrete optimization. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 12(2):479–502, 2002.
- Y. Klochkov and N. Zhivotovskiy. Stability and deviation optimal risk bounds with convergence rate  $o(1/n)$ . *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:5065–5076, 2021.
- V. Krätschmer. First order asymptotics of the sample average approximation method to solve risk averse stochastic programs. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–34, 2023.
- H. Lam and F. Li. General feasibility bounds for sample average approximation via vaponik–chervonenkis dimension. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 32(2):1471–1497, 2022.
- G. Lan. An optimal method for stochastic composite optimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 133(1-2):365–397, 2012.
- G. Lan. *First-order and stochastic optimization methods for machine learning*, volume 1. Springer, 2020.
- H. Y. Lee, C. Hernandez, and H. Liu. Regularized sample average approximation for high-dimensional stochastic optimization under low-rankness. *Journal of Global Optimization*, 85(2):257–282, 2023.
- Y. Lei and Y. Ying. Sharper generalization bounds for learning with gradient-dominated objective functions. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- H. Liu, X. Wang, T. Yao, R. Li, and Y. Ye. Sample average approximation with sparsity-inducing penalty for high-dimensional stochastic programming. *Mathematical programming*, 178:69–108, 2019.
- H. Liu, Y. Ye, and H. Y. Lee. High-dimensional learning under approximate sparsity with applications to nonsmooth estimation and regularized neural networks. *Operations Research*, 70(6):3176–3197, 2022.

- 
- T. Liu, D. Tao, and D. Xu. Dimensionality-dependent generalization bounds for k-dimensional coding schemes. *Neural computation*, 28(10):2213–2249, 2016.
- P.-L. Loh. Statistical consistency and asymptotic normality for high-dimensional robust m-estimators. 2017.
- P.-L. Loh and M. J. Wainwright. High-dimensional regression with noisy and missing data: Provable guarantees with non-convexity. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 24, 2011.
- E. McShane. Extension of range of functions. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 40(12):837–842, 1934.
- J. Milz. Sample average approximations of strongly convex stochastic programs in hilbert spaces. *Optimization Letters*, 17(2):471–492, 2023.
- S. N. Negahban, P. Ravikumar, M. J. Wainwright, and B. Yu. A unified framework for high-dimensional analysis of  $m$ -estimators with decomposable regularizers. *Statistical science*, 27(4):538–557, 2012.
- A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009.
- Y. Nesterov and V. Spokoiny. Random gradient-free minimization of convex functions. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics*, 17(2):527–566, 2017.
- R. I. Oliveira and P. Thompson. Sample average approximation with heavier tails i: non-asymptotic bounds with weak assumptions and stochastic constraints. *Mathematical Programming*, 199(1-2):1–48, 2023.
- G. C. Pflug. Asymptotic stochastic programs. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 20(4):769–789, 1995.
- G. C. Pflug. Stochastic programs and statistical data. *Annals of Operations Research*, 85(0):59–78, 1999.
- G. C. Pflug. Stochastic optimization and statistical inference. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 10:427–482, 2003.
- A. Rakhlin, S. Mukherjee, and T. Poggio. Stability results in learning theory. *Analysis and Applications*, 3(04):397–417, 2005.
- A. Rakhlin, O. Shamir, and K. Sridharan. Making gradient descent optimal for strongly convex stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1109.5647*, 2011.
- R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets. *Variational analysis*, volume 317. Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.
- A. Ruszczyński and A. Shapiro. Stochastic programming models. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 10:1–64, 2003.
- S. Shalev-Shwartz, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, and K. Sridharan. Stochastic convex optimization. In *COLT*, volume 2, page 5, 2009.
- S. Shalev-Shwartz, O. Shamir, N. Srebro, and K. Sridharan. Learnability, stability and uniform convergence. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:2635–2670, 2010.
- A. Shapiro. Asymptotic properties of statistical estimators in stochastic programming. *The Annals of Statistics*, 17(2):841–858, 1989.

- A. Shapiro. Asymptotic behavior of optimal solutions in stochastic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 18(4):829–845, 1993.
- A. Shapiro. Monte carlo sampling methods. *Handbooks in operations research and management science*, 10: 353–425, 2003.
- A. Shapiro and A. Nemirovski. On complexity of stochastic programming problems. *Continuous optimization: Current trends and modern applications*, pages 111–146, 2005.
- A. Shapiro, D. Dentcheva, and A. Ruszczyński. *Lectures on stochastic programming: modeling and theory*. SIAM, 2021.

**A. Appendix: Some useful properties of  $V_{q'}$  in Eq (3).** We discuss some properties of  $V_{q'}$  for  $q' \in (1, 2]$  in this section. Note that this function is differentiable and  $(q' - 1)$ -strongly convex w.r.t. the  $q'$ -norm, according to Ben-Tal et al. (2001). Therefore,

$$V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_1) - V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_2) - \langle \nabla V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}_2), \mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2 \rangle \geq \frac{q' - 1}{2} \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_{q'}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (133)$$

As a result of (133), when  $F_N(\cdot)$  is convex,  $F_{\lambda_0, N}(\cdot)$  is also  $(q' - 1)$ -strongly convex w.r.t. the same norm. Then, if we recall that  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}$  denotes the minimizer of  $F_{\lambda_0, N}$  on  $\mathcal{X}$ , we have the following inequality:

$$F_{\lambda_0, N}(\mathbf{x}) - F_{\lambda_0, N}(\hat{\mathbf{x}}) \geq \frac{q' - 1}{2} \|\mathbf{x} - \hat{\mathbf{x}}\|_{q'}^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Another important property of  $V_{q'}$  is its Lipschitz continuity under mild conditions. To see this, one may observe that, for any  $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^0) \in \mathcal{X}^2$ , the below holds with  $\varrho = q'/(q' - 1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\nabla V_{q'}(\mathbf{x})\|_{\varrho} \\ &= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^{2-q'} \left( \sum_{i=1}^d (|x_i - x_i^0|)^{(q'-1)\varrho} \right)^{1/\varrho} \\ &= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}^{2-q'} \cdot \left( \sum_{i=1}^d (|x_i - x_i^0|)^{q'} \right)^{(q'-1)/q'} \\ &= \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}^0\|_{q'}, \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

Thus, when the  $q'$ -norm diameter of the feasible region is bounded by  $\mathcal{D}_{q'}$ , we can tell that  $V_{q'}$  is Lipschitz continuous in the following sense:

$$|V_{q'}(\mathbf{x}) - V_{q'}(\mathbf{y})| \leq \mathcal{D}_{q'} \cdot \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{y}\|_{q'}, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (135)$$

## B. Additional lemmata

**LEMMA 1.** *Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$ . Denote by  $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_N \in \mathbb{R}$  an i.i.d. sequence of random variables with  $\mathbb{E}[\xi_1] = 0$ . Then  $\left\| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \right\|_{L^p} \leq C \cdot \sqrt{pN^{-1}} \cdot \|\xi_1\|_{L^p}$  for some universal constant  $C > 0$ .*

*Proof of Lemma 1* This lemma is largely based on the proof embedded in Proposition 1 by Oliveira and Thompson (2023). By Marcinkiewicz' inequality, for some universal constant  $C > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j \right\|_{L^p} &\leq N^{-1} C \cdot \sqrt{p} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^N \xi_j^2 \right\|_{L^{p/2}}^{1/2} \leq N^{-1} C \cdot \sqrt{p} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \|\xi_j^2\|_{L^{p/2}}} \\ &= N^{-1} C \cdot \sqrt{p} \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N \|\xi_j\|_{L^p}^2} = C \cdot \sqrt{p \cdot N^{-1}} \cdot \|\xi_1\|_{L^p}. \end{aligned} \quad (136)$$

as desired. Q.E.D.

LEMMA 2. Let  $p \in [2, \infty)$ . Denote by  $\mathbf{v}_1, \dots, \mathbf{v}_N \in \mathbb{R}^d$  an i.i.d. sequence of  $d$ -dimensional random vectors with  $\mathbb{E}[\mathbf{v}_1] = \mathbf{0}$ . Then, for any  $t > 0$ , it holds that

$$\text{Prob} \left[ \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{v}_j \right\|_p^2 \geq t \right] \leq \left( \tilde{C} \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_{L^p} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \right)^p,$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$ .

*Proof of Lemma 2.* The proof slightly strengthens that of Proposition 1 by Oliveira and Thompson (2023) and is a quick result of the Markov's inequality.

Let  $v_{ij}$  be the  $i$ th component of  $\mathbf{v}_j$ . Then, it holds, for any  $t > 0$ , that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob} \left[ \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathbf{v}_j \right\|_p^2 \geq t \right] &= \text{Prob} \left[ \left( \sum_{i=1}^d \left| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{ij} \right|^p \right)^{2/p} \geq t \right] \\ &\stackrel{\text{Markov's}}{\leq} \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^d \left| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{ij} \right|^p \right]}{t^{p/2}} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^d \left( \left\| N^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^N v_{ij} \right\|_{L^p} \right)^p}{t^{p/2}} \stackrel{\text{Lemma 1}}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^d \left( \tilde{C} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \|v_{i1}\|_{L^p} \right)^p \\ &= \left( \tilde{C} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \right)^p \cdot \sum_{i=1}^d \|v_{i1}\|_{L^p}^p = \left( \tilde{C} \cdot \sqrt{\frac{p}{Nt}} \right)^p \cdot \|\mathbf{v}_1\|_{L^p}^p, \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

for some universal constant  $\tilde{C} > 0$ , which immediately leads to the desired result. Q.E.D.