

On the nonconvexity of some push-forward constraints and its consequences in machine learning

Lucas De Lara¹, Mathis Deronzier¹, Alberto González-Sanz², and Virgile Foy¹

¹Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, Université Paul Sabatier

²Department of Statistics, Columbia University

Abstract

The push-forward operation enables one to redistribute a probability measure through a deterministic map. It plays a key role in statistics and optimization: many learning problems (notably from optimal transport, generative modeling, and algorithmic fairness) include constraints or penalties framed as push-forward conditions on the model. However, the literature lacks general theoretical insights on the (non)convexity of such constraints and its consequences on the associated learning problems. This paper aims at filling this gap. In a first part, we provide a range of sufficient and necessary conditions for the (non)convexity of two sets of functions: the maps transporting one probability measure to another; the maps inducing equal output distributions across distinct probability measures. This highlights that for most probability measures, these push-forward constraints are not convex. In a second time, we show how this result implies critical limitations on the design of convex optimization problems for learning generative models or group-fair predictors. This work will hopefully help researchers and practitioners have a better understanding of the critical impact of push-forward conditions onto convexity.

Keywords: push-forward, machine learning, convexity, optimal transport, generative modeling, fairness

1 Introduction

Most penalties promoting group-level fairness in machine learning are nonconvex. Analogously, generative-modeling optimization problems are almost never convex even in function space. This article provides a common mathematical explanation: *push-forward constraints are generally non-convex, and no convex loss can quantify the deviation to a nonconvex subset.*

Given a Borel probability measure P on \mathbb{R}^d and a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$, the *push-forward measure* of P by f is defined as $f_{\#}P := P \circ f^{-1}$. This operation describes the redistribution of the mass from P through the deterministic allocation f , and plays an increasingly important role in statistics and machine learning. Notably, both optimal transport [Monge, 1781] and generative modeling [Goodfellow et al., 2014, Kingma and Welling, 2014, Rezende and Mohamed, 2015] address the computation of a map f satisfying $f_{\#}P = Q$ for two probability measures P and Q . Additionally, many concepts of group-wise algorithmic fairness can be framed as finding a predictor f such that $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q$ [Dwork et al., 2012, Hardt et al., 2016]. However, while convexity is critical to design statistically and numerically sound learning problems [Hjort and Pollard, 1993,

Bubeck et al., 2015], the literature has little analyzed the (non)convexity of such constraints and its consequences in machine learning.

Our paper aims at filling this gap. We refer to functions f such that $f_{\#}P = Q$ as *transport maps* between P and Q , and to functions f such that $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q$ as *equalizing maps* between P and Q . In a first time, we thoroughly study these sets of functions, notably proving that they are most often not convex. In a second time, we address the practical relevance of the first part to understand the limitations of popular machine-learning tasks. Our reasoning rests on an overlooked result from convex analysis: there is no convex loss quantifying the deviation from a nonconvex constraint. We show how this generally renders unfeasible the design of convex learning problems involving push-forward constraints or penalties on the model, such as generative modeling and fair learning.

As such, this theoretical work has a practical interest. While the first part can be seen as a “stand-alone” mathematical contribution that sheds a fresh light on the push-forward operation, it crucially provides guidance on what can(not) be achieved in generative modeling and algorithmic fairness through the second part. Concretely, we hope that this paper will not only provide a better understanding on measure transportation, but also save time to researchers and practitioners struggling to design convex learning problems.¹

Outline The rest of the paper is organized as follows.

- Section 2 furnishes the necessary background on the push-forward operation.
- Section 3 elucidates the convexity of the sets of transport maps (Section 3.1) and equalizing maps (Section 3.2) by proving that they are generally not convex.
- Section 4 first reminds that a convex loss is minimal on a convex set, and details the consequences of this result on the design of convex minimization programs (Section 4.1). Then, it applies this framework to explain why the machine-learning problems for generative modeling (Section 4.2.1) and group fairness (Section 4.2.2), which involve (generally nonconvex) push-forward constraints, cannot be convex.
- Section 5 proposes two directions to recover convexity in such machine-learning tasks: weakening or strengthening the constraint (Section 5.1), or relaxing the deterministic push-forward map to a random coupling (Section 5.2).
- Appendix A focuses on equalizing maps between discrete measures, which requires specific notations.

2 Preliminaries

This preliminary section introduces the basic notations and definitions that will be used throughout the paper, and provides basic knowledge on the push-forward operation.

2.1 Notations and definitions

Let $d, p \geq 1$ be two integers, and \mathcal{G} be the most general class of functions we consider in this work: the class of Borel measurable functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R}^p . The other key objects are the measures on

¹We emphasize that the motivation for this work comes precisely from failed attempts on our side to find a convex penalty for statistical parity. This led us to identify specific cases where this was impossible, and then to develop a general interpretation of this phenomenon.

Euclidean spaces. We denote by $\|\cdot\|$ the Euclidean norm regardless of the dimension. We refer to $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as respectively the set of Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d and the set of nonnegative Borel measures on \mathbb{R}^d . Additionally, we define $\mathcal{M}_s(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = s\}$ for $s \in \mathbb{R}$, and $\mathcal{M}_s^+(\mathbb{R}^d) := \{\mu \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d) \mid \mu(\mathbb{R}^d) = s\}$ for $s \geq 0$. As such, $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d) := \mathcal{M}_1^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the set of probability measures on \mathbb{R}^d . For $f \in \mathcal{G}$, and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we call $f_{\#}\mu := \mu \circ f^{-1}$ the *push-forward measure* of μ by f . If $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, note that $f_{\#}P$ is simply the probability law of the random variable $f(X)$ when the law of the random variable X is P .

We denote by δ_x the *Dirac measure* at a given point x , and by ℓ_d the Lebesgue measure on \mathbb{R}^d . A measure $\mu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is *absolutely continuous* with respect to a measure $\nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, written as $\mu \ll \nu$, if for any Borel set $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, $(\nu(E) = 0 \implies \mu(E) = 0)$. We say that μ is *continuous* if for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $\mu(\{x\}) = 0$. Two measures $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ are *singular* if there exists a partition $\{A, B\}$ of \mathbb{R}^d such that $\mu(B) = \nu(A) = 0$ for all Borel sets $A' \subseteq A$ and $B' \subseteq B$. Every $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ can be written as $P = P_c + P_\delta$ where P_c and P_δ are two singular measures of $\mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that P_c is continuous and P_δ is a discrete (or pure point) measure.

For $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, two functions $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ are *P -almost everywhere equal* if $P(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\}) = 0$, which we write as $f \stackrel{P\text{-a.e.}}{=} g$. Then, for any $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define $\{f\}_P := \{g \in \mathcal{G} \mid f \stackrel{P\text{-a.e.}}{=} g\}$. It describes a family of functions that cannot be distinguished by P . Throughout, we also consider a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma, \mathbb{P})$ that serves to define random variables. The *law* with respect to \mathbb{P} of any random variable or vector X defined on Ω is denoted by $\mathbb{L}(X) := X_{\#}\mathbb{P}$, while its *expectation* is denoted by $\mathbb{E}[X] := \int_{\Omega} X(\omega) d\mathbb{P}(\omega)$. Additionally, whenever it is well-defined, $\mathbb{L}(X \mid E)$ refers to the *law of X conditional to $E \in \Sigma$* .

A crucial concept for the second part of the paper is *convexity*. A set \mathcal{C} is convex if for any $u, v \in \mathcal{C}$ and $0 < t < 1$ the element $(1-t)u + tv$ belongs to \mathcal{C} . A real-valued function L defined on a convex set \mathcal{C} is convex if for any $u, v \in \mathcal{C}$ and $0 < t < 1$, $L((1-t)u + tv) \leq (1-t)L(u) + tL(v)$. Note that for any $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $\{f\}_P$ is convex.

2.2 Push-forward calculus

We formalize a series of elementary calculus rules for the push-forward operator that will be frequently used in the proofs of our main results. They directly follow from the definition of the push-forward measure.

Proposition 2.1 (basic push-forward calculus). *Let $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$, $\mu, \nu \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and $s \in \mathbb{R}$. The following properties hold:*

- (i) the function $f_{\#} : \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d) \rightarrow \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ is a linear map;
- (ii) $(\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(\mathbb{R}^d) \implies f_{\#}\mu \in \mathcal{M}_s(\mathbb{R}^p))$ and $(\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{|s|}^+(\mathbb{R}^d) \implies f_{\#}\mu \in \mathcal{M}_{|s|}^+(\mathbb{R}^p))$;
- (iii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}^p} h d(f_{\#}\mu) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} (h \circ f) d\mu$ for every measurable function $h : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$;
- (iv) $\psi_{\#}(f_{\#}\mu) = (\psi \circ f)_{\#}\mu$ for every measurable function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ where $k \geq 1$ is an integer;
- (v) if $\mu \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, then $(g \stackrel{\mu\text{-a.e.}}{=} f \implies g_{\#}\mu = f_{\#}\mu)$.

Basically, a push-forward operation does not change the absolute value nor the sign of the mass: it only changes its location. The next section dives into more advanced push-forward calculus, by examining sets of functions satisfying a mass-preservation constraint.

3 The shape of push-forward constraints

This section focuses on clarifying the sets of transport maps and equalizing maps, by providing various necessary or sufficient conditions on the cardinality and convexity of these sets.

3.1 Transport maps

Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be two probability measures. We consider the set of functions pushing-forward P to Q , that we refer as the *transport maps* or *measure-preserving maps* between P and Q . Formally, we define

$$\mathcal{T}(P, Q) := \{f \in \mathcal{G} \mid f_{\#}P = Q\}.$$
²

As detailed latter in Section 4.2.1, the constraint described by this set plays a fundamental role in so-called *push-forward generative modeling* [Salmona et al., 2022], where one aims at generating Q by a deterministic function f pushing-forward a distribution P typically satisfying $d \ll p$. It also corresponds to the admissible solutions of the Monge formulation of optimal transport [Monge, 1781], which looks for the elements in $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ minimizing a certain mass-displacement cost.

People familiar with optimal-transport theory know that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ can be empty and nonconvex (which is often mentioned as a motivation for the well-known relaxation of Kantorovich and Rubinshtein [1958]). However, the literature lacks a general understanding of what connects the cardinality and convexity of the set of transport maps to the measures P and Q . This is precisely what we address in this subsection. For starters, let us illustrate the possible values of $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ for simple discrete measures P and Q .

Example 3.1 (simple transport maps). *We provide three examples:*

- (i) Let $P := \delta_x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $Q := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_2}$ for two distinct $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$. Remark that for any $f \in \mathcal{G}$, $f_{\#}P = \delta_{f(x)} \neq Q$. Thereby $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is empty. More generally, this occurs in particular whenever the support of Q is larger than the support of P . Note that in this case, $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is trivially convex.
- (ii) Let $P := \delta_x$ for some $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $Q := \delta_y$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^p$. It readily follows from $f_{\#}P = \delta_{f(x)}$ that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q) = \{f\}_P$ where $f : \{x\} \rightarrow \{y\}, x \mapsto y$. Note that in this case as well, $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is trivially convex.
- (iii) Let $P := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_2}$ for two distinct $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, and $Q := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_2}$ for two distinct $y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$. We define the following surjective functions from $\{x_1, x_2\}$ to $\{y_1, y_2\}$: f such that $f(x_1) = y_1$ and $f(x_2) = y_2$; g such that $g(x_1) = y_2$ and $g(x_2) = y_1$. Note that f and g belong to $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$. Moreover, $\frac{f(x_1)+g(x_1)}{2} = \frac{y_1+y_2}{2} \notin \{y_1, y_2\}$. Therefore, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g) \notin \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$, and the set $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is not convex.

We observe three configurations where the cardinality of $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ and its convexity seem intertwined. To theoretically ground this observation for general probability measures, we firstly study the set of functions aligning the squared Euclidean norm across P and Q , formally defined as

$$\mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q) := \left\{ f \in \mathcal{G} \mid \int \|f\|^2 dP = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ \right\}$$

for $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ such that $\int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ < +\infty$. Critically, similarly to a sphere, $\mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$ has no convex subset with more than one point, as explained below.

²This definition can naturally be extended to any measures $P \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ such that $P(\mathbb{R}^d) = Q(\mathbb{R}^p)$.

Theorem 3.2 (nowhere convexity of the set of squared-norm matching functions). *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be two probability measures such that Q has finite second order moments. For any $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$, \mathcal{F} is either:*

- (i) empty;
- (ii) equal to $\{f\}_P$ for some $f \in \mathcal{G}$;
- (iii) not convex.

The strategy of the proof amounts to finding a necessary condition for the convexity of $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$ that holds only if \mathcal{F} is either empty or reduced to a singleton. It remarkably involves the equality case of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality.

Proof of Theorem 3.2 By definition of $\mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$, and since $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$, if \mathcal{F} is convex then for every $0 < t < 1$ and any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $\int \|(1-t)f + tg\| dP = \int \|\cdot\| dQ$. After developing and simplifying using the fact that $\int \|f\|^2 dP = \int \|g\|^2 dP = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ < +\infty$ we obtain the following necessary condition that does not involve t anymore: for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $\int \langle f, g \rangle dP = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ$. Now, according to Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and again the fact that $\int \|f\|^2 dP = \int \|g\|^2 dP = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ$ we obtain $\int \langle f, g \rangle dP \leq \left(\int \|f\|^2 dP\right)^{1/2} \left(\int \|g\|^2 dP\right)^{1/2} = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ$. There is equality if and only if there exists $\alpha_{f,g} \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that $g \stackrel{P\text{-a.e.}}{=} \alpha_{f,g} f$.

Wrapping everything up, if \mathcal{F} is convex then for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ there exists a constant $\alpha_{f,g} \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$ such that $g \stackrel{P\text{-a.e.}}{=} \alpha_{f,g} f$. We distinguish three cases regarding the set \mathcal{F} in the light of this condition.

- (i) $\mathcal{F} = \emptyset$: therefore it is trivially convex.
- (ii) \mathcal{F} is reduced to a function P -almost-everywhere unique: therefore it is trivially convex. It corresponds to the setting where for every $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$, $\alpha_{f,g} = 1$.
- (iii) There exist elements $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ that are not P -almost everywhere equal. Assuming *ad absurdum* that \mathcal{F} is convex, the necessary condition ensures that there is a positive $\alpha_{f,g} \neq 1$ such that $g \stackrel{P\text{-a.e.}}{=} \alpha_{f,g} f$. Therefore, $\int \|g\|^2 dP = \alpha_{f,g}^2 \int \|f\|^2 dP = \alpha_{f,g}^2 \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ \neq \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ$. This contradicts the fact that $\int \|g\|^2 dP = \int \|\cdot\|^2 dQ$. Consequently, \mathcal{F} is not convex. ■

Theorem 3.2 is a strong result. It signifies that *any* subclass of functions merely matching the squared Euclidean norm between two probability distributions can only take a restricted number of shapes: it is basically either trivial or nonconvex. Because $\mathcal{T}(P, Q) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$ (a transport map matches all moments, not just one) the following corollary holds.

Corollary 3.3 (nonconvexity of the set of transport maps). *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be two probability measures such that Q has finite second order moments. Then, $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is either:*

- (i) empty;
- (ii) equal to $\{f\}_P$ for some $f \in \mathcal{G}$;
- (iii) not convex.

Proof Recall that two probability measures μ and ν are equal only if $\int h d\mu = \int h d\nu$ for every measurable function h . Therefore, if $f \in \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$, then $\int (h \circ f) dP = \int h dQ$ for every measurable function h . In particular, the integral equality must be true for $h := \|\cdot\|^2$, leading to $f \in \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$.

This shows that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{\|\cdot\|^2}(P, Q)$. Theorem 3.2 concludes the proof. \blacksquare

While we find it interesting to exploit the squared-norm alignment to prove Corollary 3.3 through Theorem 3.2, it comes at the price of a moment assumption on Q . We leave the question of its necessity for further research.

Remarkably, Corollary 3.3 automatically converts knowledge on the cardinality of $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ into information on its convexity. More precisely, if $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ contains at least two elements that cannot be distinguished by P , it is not convex. In light of this result, we determine the convexity of $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ for standard probability measures P and Q by specifying its cardinality. The proposition below addresses the case where P is continuous.

Proposition 3.4 (transport maps for a continuous source measure). *Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be continuous, and $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ not be a Dirac measure. Then, $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ contains an uncountable number of functions that are two-by-two not P -almost-everywhere equal.*

The proof distinguishes three situations: if Q is continuous, if Q is discrete, if Q has continuous and discrete parts. Whatever the case, the general idea is to firstly send P onto U , the uniform probability measure on $[0, 1]$, and then to exhibit an uncountable number of redistributions from U to Q .

Proof of Proposition 3.4 For starters, let us specify the objects that will be common to all parts of the proof. Since P is continuous there exists according to [Kechris, 2012, Theorem 17.41] a bijective measurable function $T_P : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $T_{P\#}P = U$. Next, we define an uncountable number of allocation from U to U . More precisely, we construct the parametric family of functions $(\xi_a)_{a \in [0, 1]}$ by

$$\xi_a(u) := \begin{cases} u + a, & \text{if } u \in [0, 1 - a) \\ u - 1 + a, & \text{if } u \in [1 - a, 1]. \end{cases}$$

For every $a \in [0, 1)$, $\xi_{a\#}U = U$ and therefore $(\xi_a \circ T_P)\#P = U$. Moreover, for every distinct $a, a' \in [0, 1)$, $\xi_a(u) \neq \xi_{a'}(u)$ for all $u \in [0, 1]$. This means that we possess an uncountable collection of distinct allocation from P to U . Now, the crucial question is how to send the reallocated mass from U to Q .

In a first time, we assume that Q is also continuous. According to [Kechris, 2012, Theorem 17.41] again, there exists a bijective measurable function with measurable inverse $T_Q : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $T_{Q\#}Q = U$. Then, let us define the family $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]}$ by $f_a := T_Q^{-1} \circ \xi_a \circ T_P$. Crucially, it follows from the push-forward relationships that $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$. Moreover, recall that for every distinct $a, a' \in [0, 1)$, $\xi_a(u) \neq \xi_{a'}(u)$ for all $u \in [0, 1]$. This implies by injectivity of T_Q that for every $x \in T_P^{-1}([0, 1])$, $f_a(x) \neq f_{a'}(x)$. Since $P(T_P^{-1}([0, 1])) = U([0, 1]) = 1$, the $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]}$ are all distinct P -almost everywhere. Noting that $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]}$ is uncountable permits to conclude.

In a second time, we assume that Q is discrete but different from a single Dirac. More precisely, for $m \geq 2$ possibly equal to $+\infty$ we write $Q := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}$ where the $(\beta_j)_{j=1}^m$ are probability weights and the $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are two-by-two-distinct elements of \mathbb{R}^p . Next, we set $\sigma : [m] \rightarrow \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m, j \mapsto y_j$, such that by defining $Q_1 := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_j \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ we have $\sigma\#Q_1 = Q$. Moreover, we write T_Q^\dagger for the generalized inverse distribution function of the univariate discrete measure Q_1 . It satisfies $T_{Q\#}^\dagger U = Q_1$. We define the family $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]}$ by $f_a := \sigma \circ T_Q^\dagger \circ \xi_a \circ T_P$. As before, it follows from the push-forward relationships that $(f_a)_{a \in [0, 1]} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$. To see that the elements of this family are distinguishable under P , recall that for every distinct $a, a' \in [0, 1)$, $f_a(x) = f_{a'}(x)$ if and only if $T_Q^\dagger \circ \xi_a \circ T_P(x) = T_Q^\dagger \circ \xi_{a'} \circ T_P(x)$. Because Q_1 is not a Dirac, there exists $u_0 \in (0, 1)$

such that for every $u < u_0 < u'$, $T_Q^\dagger(u) \neq T_Q^\dagger(u')$. Additionally, note that there exists a nontrivial interval $I_{a,a'} \subseteq [0, 1]$ such that for any $u \in I_{a,a'}$, $\xi_a(u) < u_0 < \xi_{a'}(u)$ or for any $u \in I_{a,a'}$, $\xi_{a'}(u) < u_0 < \xi_a(u)$. As a consequence, for any $x \in T_P^{-1}(I_{a,a'})$, $f_a(x) \neq f_{a'}(x)$. Thereby, f_a and $f_{a'}$ are not P -almost everywhere equal for $a \neq a'$ since $P(T_P^{-1}(I_{a,a'})) = U(I_{a,a'}) > 0$.

In a third time, we address the case where Q has a nonzero continuous part and a nonzero discrete part. Here again, we rely on U and T_P as previously defined. We decompose Q as $Q = Q_c + Q_\delta$ where $Q_c \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^p)$ is continuous and $Q_\delta \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^p)$ is discrete, and we write $q_c := Q_c(\mathbb{R}^p)$ to $q_\delta := Q_\delta(\mathbb{R}^p)$. By assumption, $0 < q_c = 1 - q_\delta < 1$. We also divide U into $U = U_c + U_\delta$ where U_c and U_δ are the Lebesgue measures on respectively $[0, q_c]$ and $[q_c, 1]$. Using the conclusions from the first two parts of the proof, we know that there exists a family of measurable functions $(g_{\delta,a})_{a \in [0,1]}$ from $[q_c, 1]$ to \mathbb{R}^p that are two-by-two distinct on an interval, and such that $g_{\delta,a} U_\delta = Q_\delta$. Additionally, there exists a bijective measurable function $g_c : [0, q_c] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $g_{c,a} U_c = Q_c$. Then, we define the family $(g_a)_{a \in [0,1]}$ by $g_a(u) := g_c(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{u < q_c\}} + g_{\delta,a}(u) \mathbf{1}_{\{u \geq q_c\}}$, which is composed of functions that are not U -almost-everywhere equal and satisfy

$$g_{a,a} U = g_{a,a} U_c + g_{a,a} U_\delta = g_{c,a} U_c + g_{\delta,a,a} U_\delta = Q_c + Q_\delta = Q.$$

Finally, we conclude the proof by defining the family $(f_a)_{a \in [0,1]}$ as $f_a := g_a \circ T_P$. It verifies $(f_a)_{a \in [0,1]} \subseteq \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$, consists of functions that are two-by-two not P -almost everywhere equal, and is uncountable. \blacksquare

Remark 3.5 (existence and uniqueness of monotone push-forward maps). *A famous result of McCann [1995] states that if $d = p$ and $P \ll \ell_d$ (which is more specific than being continuous), then among the infinity of transport maps from P to Q , there exists a P -almost everywhere unique function f that can be written as the gradient of a convex function. Interestingly, being the gradient of a convex function generalizes the notion of monotonic functions to dimensions higher than one. Thereby, this map can be seen as the canonical redistribution from P to Q . In particular, if $d = 1$ then $f = F_Q^{-1} \circ F_P$ where F_P and F_Q are the cumulative distribution functions of respectively P and Q . See [Hallin et al., 2021] for an extension to $d > 1$.*

Another classical scenario, particularly relevant in statistics, concerns transport maps between empirical measures. Empirical probability measures drawn from continuous probability measures are almost-surely uniform finitely supported measures, and thereby apply to the next proposition.

Proposition 3.6 (transport maps between uniform finitely supported measures). *Let $n, m \geq 1$ be two integers, and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be composed of two-by-two distinct elements. If $P := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_{y_j}$, then*

- (i) if $n < m$, then $\mathcal{T}(P, Q) = \emptyset$;
- (ii) if $n = m$, then $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ contains exactly $n!$ functions that are two-by-two not P -almost everywhere equal;
- (iii) if $n > m$ and m does not divide n , then $\mathcal{T}(P, Q) = \emptyset$;
- (iv) if $n > m$ and m divides n , then $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ contains at least two functions that are not P -almost everywhere equal.

Proof of Proposition 3.6 We prove each item separately.

- (i) If $n < m$, then there is no surjections from $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Therefore, there is no transport map from P to Q .
- (ii) If $n = m$, then there are exactly $n!$ surjections from $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ to $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Since all probability weights of P and Q are equal to $1/n$, this entails that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is composed of $n!$ distinct functions up to P -negligible sets.
- (iii) We prove this point by contrapositive. Assuming that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is not empty, there exists $f \in \mathcal{G}$ such that $f_{\#}P = Q$. Thereby, the definition of P and Q implies for every $1 \leq j \leq m$ the equality $\frac{k_j}{n} = \frac{1}{m}$, where k_j is the cardinality of $\{i \in [n] \mid f(x_i) = y_j\}$. This means in particular that m divides n .
- (iv) Suppose now that m divides n , so that there exists an integer $r \geq 1$ satisfying $n = mr$. Then, let $\{I_k\}_{k=1}^m$ be partition of $[n]$ such that the cardinality of each I_k for $k \in [m]$ is r . We define $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ such that

$$f(x_i) = y_j \text{ if } i \in I_j, \quad g(x_i) = \begin{cases} y_1 & \text{if } i \in I_2 \\ y_2 & \text{if } i \in I_1 \\ y_j & \text{if } i \in I_j, i \notin \{1, 2\} \end{cases}.$$

They satisfy $f_{\#}P = Q$ and $g_{\#}P = Q$ while $P(\{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid f(x) \neq g(x)\}) > 0$.

■

To sum-up, through Corollary 3.3, it follows from Propositions 3.4 and 3.6 that $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ is trivial for very specific P and Q and nonconvex otherwise. In the next subsection, we tackle a similar clarification work for the set of equalizing maps.

3.2 Equalizing maps

Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be two probability measures. We turn to the set of functions transforming P and Q into a same arbitrary measure in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$, that we refer as the *equalizing maps* between P and Q . Formally, we define

$$\mathcal{E}(P, Q) := \{f \in \mathcal{G} \mid f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q\}.^3$$

The definition above is motivated by algorithmic-fairness problems, where one typically tries to design models producing the same distributions of outputs across distinct protected groups. We detail this connection in Section 4.2.2.

In contrast to the set of transport maps, which became more apprehensible due to its key role in the intensely-studied optimal-transport theory, the set of equalizing maps lacks basic insights. Let us begin the clarification by presenting trivial facts.

Proposition 3.7 (basic properties). *For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*

- (i) $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) = \mathcal{E}(Q, P)$;
- (ii) if $P = Q$, then $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) = \mathcal{G}$;
- (iii) $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) \neq \emptyset$, as it contains in particular all the constant functions;

³Similarly to transport maps, this definition can naturally be extended to any measures $P, Q \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $P(\mathbb{R}^d) = Q(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

(iv) for any $f \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, $\psi \circ f \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ for any measurable $\psi : \mathbb{R}^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$.⁴

As a preliminary analysis, let us resolve the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ for simple discrete measures P and Q .

Example 3.8 (simple equalizing maps). *We provide three examples:*

- (i) Let $P := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_2}$ and $Q := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{y_2}$ for distinct $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We set two distinct $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and write $R := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{z_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{z_2}$. Then, we define $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $f(x_1) = f(y_1) = z_1$ and $f(x_2) = f(y_2) = z_2$. Similarly, we define $g : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $g(x_1) = g(y_2) = z_1$ and $g(x_2) = g(y_1) = z_2$. Note that $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q = R$. Moreover, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P = R$ whereas $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q \neq R$ since $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)(y_1) = \frac{z_1 + z_2}{2} \notin \{z_1, z_2\}$. Therefore, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.
- (ii) Let $P := \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_1} + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{x_2}$ and $Q := \frac{1}{3}\delta_{y_1} + \frac{2}{3}\delta_{y_2}$ for distinct $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Note that for any $f \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, the push-forward of P and Q is supported by one or two points. The one-point case corresponds to the almost-everywhere-constant functions. However, due to incompatible masses, there is no output measure R supported by two points such that $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = R$. Therefore, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ narrows down to the functions that are constant P and Q almost everywhere, which is a convex set.
- (iii) Let $P := \frac{1}{3}\delta_{x_1} + \frac{2}{3}\delta_{x_2}$ and $Q := \frac{1}{3}\delta_{y_1} + \frac{2}{3}\delta_{y_2}$ for distinct $x_1, x_2, y_1, y_2 \in \mathbb{R}^d$. As in (ii), for any $f \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, the push-forward of P and Q are supported by one or two points, with the one-point case corresponding to the almost-everywhere-constant functions. In the two-point case, the output measure necessarily has the form $R := \frac{1}{3}\delta_{z_1} + \frac{2}{3}\delta_{z_2}$ for two distinct $z_1, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}^p$, and the admissible f are constrained to send $\{x_1, y_1\}$ to $\{z_1\}$ and $\{x_2, y_2\}$ to $\{z_2\}$. Checking the different convex combinations shows that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is convex, but not reduced to constant functions.

These examples do not highlight a universal classification as explicit as the “trivial versus non-convex” from Corollary 3.3 which focused on transport maps. Nevertheless, we can identify sharp conditions on the (non)convexity of the set of equalizing maps for specific classes of probability measures P and Q . The proposition below fully determines the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ when P, Q both have a density with respect to ℓ_d .

Proposition 3.9 (equalizing maps between absolutely-continuous measures). *Let $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be two Lebesgue-absolutely-continuous probability measures such that $P \neq Q$. Then, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.*

Up to a subtlety when the supports of P and Q intersect each other, the key idea amounts to equally dividing the mass in P and Q to recover the same configuration as the (i)-case from Example 3.8.

Proof of Proposition 3.9 We denote by φ_P and φ_Q two density functions of respectively P and Q . Then, we define $\mathcal{S}_P := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \varphi_P(x) > 0\}$ and $\mathcal{S}_Q := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid \varphi_Q(x) > 0\}$. In a first time, we assume that $\mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_Q = \emptyset$. Let $U \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})$ be the uniform measure on $[0, 1]$. Since P and Q are absolutely continuous with respect to Lebesgue’s measure, there exist two measurable maps T_P and T_Q such that $T_{P\#}P = T_{Q\#}Q = U$ as a consequence of [Kechris, 2012, Theorem 17.41]. Next, we set $z, z' \in \mathbb{R}^p$ such that $z \neq z'$, and define two functions: $\psi_1 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ by

⁴It directly follows from (iv) that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is path connected for any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

$\psi_1(x) := \mathbf{1}_{\{x < 1/2\}}z + \mathbf{1}_{\{x \geq 1/2\}}z'$; $\psi_2 : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^p$ by $\psi_2(x) := \mathbf{1}_{\{x < 1/2\}}z' + \mathbf{1}_{\{x \geq 1/2\}}z$. Observe that $\psi_{1\#}U = \psi_{2\#}U = \frac{1}{2}\delta_z + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{z'}$. Finally, using the fact that $\mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_Q = \emptyset$, we define $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ as,

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} \psi_1 \circ T_P(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}_P, \\ \psi_1 \circ T_Q(x) & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}_Q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad g(x) = \begin{cases} \psi_1 \circ T_P & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}_P, \\ \psi_2 \circ T_Q, & \text{if } x \in \mathcal{S}_Q, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

They satisfy $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q$, and $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P = f_{\#}P = \frac{1}{2}\delta_z + \frac{1}{2}\delta_{z'}$. Moreover, for any $x \in \mathcal{S}_Q$, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)(x) = \frac{z+z'}{2} \notin \{z, z'\}$. Therefore, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q \neq (\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P$, and $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.

In a second time, we address the more general case where possibly $\mathcal{S}_P \cap \mathcal{S}_Q \neq \emptyset$. We define three Lebesgue-absolutely continuous measures: $I \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with density $\min\{\varphi_P, \varphi_Q\}$ with respect to ℓ_d , $P' := P - I \in \mathcal{M}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $Q' := Q - I \in \mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that P' and Q' have the same total mass. More precisely, $P'(\mathbb{R}^d) = P(\mathbb{R}^d) - I(\mathbb{R}^d) = 1 - I(\mathbb{R}^d) = Q(\mathbb{R}^d) - I(\mathbb{R}^d) = Q'(\mathbb{R}^d) > 0$. We write $\gamma := P'(\mathbb{R}^d) = Q'(\mathbb{R}^d)$, so that $P', Q' \in \mathcal{M}_{\gamma}^+(\mathbb{R}^d)$. They admit respectively $\varphi_{P'} := (\varphi_P - \varphi_Q) \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_P - \varphi_Q > 0\}}$ and $\varphi_{Q'} := (\varphi_Q - \varphi_P) \mathbf{1}_{\{\varphi_P - \varphi_Q < 0\}}$ as densities with respect to ℓ_d . Critically, these densities are positive on disjoint sets. Therefore, we know by the previous case that there exist f and g such that $f_{\#}P' = f_{\#}Q' = g_{\#}P' = g_{\#}Q'$ and $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P' \neq (\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q'$. Let us show that f and g provide a counterexample for the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$. First, $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}I + f_{\#}P' = f_{\#}I + f_{\#}Q' = f_{\#}Q$, and by a similar computation $g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q$. Second,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}P &= \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}I + \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}P', \\ \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}Q &= \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}I + \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}Q'. \end{aligned}$$

It follows from $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P' \neq (\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q'$ that $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P \neq (\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q$. Consequently, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex. \blacksquare

Additionally, in the important case where P and Q are both finitely supported, we can completely characterize the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$. For the sake of simplicity and concision, we defer this result to Appendix A (see Theorem A.1) since the obtained conditions are fairly intricate and involved notation wise. Basically, it asserts that there is no universal convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ in this discrete setting (it depends on the location, number, and probability weights of the points). A significant implication of this characterization concerns empirical measures, as precised by the following proposition. Recall that two integers are *coprime* if the only positive integer that divides both of them is 1.

Proposition 3.10 (equalizing maps between uniform finitely supported measures). *Let $n, m \geq 1$ be two integers, and the sets $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be both composed of two-by-two distinct elements such that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cap \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m = \emptyset$. If $P := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_{y_j}$, then:*

- (i) *if m and n are coprime, then $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is the set of functions in \mathcal{G} whose restrictions on $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ are constant, which is a convex set;*
- (ii) *if m and n are not coprime, then $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.*

According to Proposition 3.10, the set of equalizing maps between empirical measures are either trivial or nonconvex. The proof, detailed in Appendix A, consists in checking one of the necessary

conditions for convexity given by Theorem A.1. We also refer to Proposition A.2 to address the case with intersecting supports.

All in all, while the possible shapes of the equalizing constraint are richer than the ones of the transport constraint, Propositions 3.9 and 3.10 highlight that convexity remains rare, and sometimes occurs only because the equalizing maps are constant (that is trivial). In the rest of the article, we discuss the consequences of these results on machine-learning problems.

4 Application to machine learning

This section illustrates the role of the sets $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ and $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ in popular machine-learning problems, and highlight the consequences of their (non)convexity.

4.1 Learning and convexity

First of all, we introduce unified formulations of learning problems involving a specific condition on the models. Most machine-learning problems amount to minimizing a numerical criteria (e.g., prediction accuracy) under a constraint or a penalty (e.g., sparsity). Formally, let $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be a set of *base* models (e.g., neural networks with a fixed architecture), and $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ be a *constraint*. In this case $\mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}$ represents the set of *admissible* or *feasible* models. In optimization and learning problems, a loss serves to quantify the deviation of a model to some constraint. For the sake of clarity, we use the following terminology in the rest of the paper.

Definition 4.1 (*C-loss*). *Let \mathcal{C} be a subset of \mathcal{G} . A function $L : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a \mathcal{C} -loss if for any $f \in \mathcal{G}$, $L(f) = 0 \iff f \in \mathcal{C}$.*

For a given loss function $L : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$, a learning problem including \mathcal{C} in its objective fits either the *constrained* optimization problem

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F} \cap \mathcal{C}} L(f) \tag{1}$$

or the *penalized* optimization problem

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} L(f) + \lambda L_{\mathcal{C}}(f), \tag{2}$$

where $\lambda > 0$ governs a trade-off between L and a \mathcal{C} -loss $L_{\mathcal{C}}$.

A *minimization problem* is convex if both the objective to minimize and the set of feasible solutions are convex. Researcher and practitioners generally endeavor to design convex optimization problems for essentially two reasons. From an optimization viewpoint, there exist efficient numerical procedures to solve convex programs [Bubeck et al., 2015]. From a statistical viewpoint, the minimizers of empirical convex objectives often enjoy asymptotic and nonasymptotic guarantees [Haberman, 1989, Pollard, 1991, Nemiro, 1992, Arcones, 1998, Bartlett et al., 2006]. On the basis on the above generic formulations, we can easily identify sufficient conditions for convexity in learning problems.

- Problem 1 is convex if \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{F} are convex sets (since convexity is stable under intersection), and if L is a convex function.
- Problem 2 is convex if \mathcal{F} is a convex set, and if L and $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ are convex functions.

Let us underline the specific role of \mathcal{C} , as we aim at studying examples where \mathcal{C} is a set of transport maps or equalizing maps. The influence of \mathcal{C} is straightforward in Problem 1, while it depends on a \mathcal{C} -loss $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ in Problem 2. Notably, a \mathcal{C} -loss is obviously not uniquely determined by \mathcal{C} , which makes the choice of $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ crucial to attain convexity in Problem 2. But we critically emphasize that designing a convex \mathcal{C} -loss is sometimes impossible, as a consequence of a classical result of convex analysis.

Theorem 4.2 (no convex loss for nonconvex constraints). *If $L : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ is a convex function, then $L^{-1}(\{0\})$ is a convex set. Therefore, if $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ is nonconvex, then there exist no convex \mathcal{C} -loss.*

Proof of Theorem 4.2 For any $f, g \in \mathcal{F}$ and $0 < t < 1$, we have by convexity and non-negativity,

$$0 \leq L((1-t)f + tg) \leq (1-t)L(f) + tL(g).$$

Therefore, if f and g belong to $L^{-1}(\{0\})$, that is $L(f) = L(g) = 0$, this inequality entails $L((1-t)f + tg) = 0$, that is $(1-t)f + tg \in L^{-1}(\{0\})$, which means that $L^{-1}(\{0\})$ is convex. ■

This furnishes a simple criterion to check whether a condition \mathcal{C} can(not) be quantified by a convex loss: it suffices to verify that \mathcal{C} itself is (not) a convex set. The consequences of this result in machine learning are significant and perhaps not well appreciated. It means that it can be vain to look for a convex penalty.

All in all, the sufficient conditions for convexity along with Theorem 4.2 entail that one cannot guarantee the convexity of Problem 1 and Problem 2 as soon as \mathcal{C} is not convex. Next, we advance from general constraints \mathcal{C} to specifically transport maps and equalizing maps.

4.2 Learning under (approximate) push-forward constraints

If $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ or $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, then convexity depends on (P, Q) according to Section 3. Notably, such constraints are not universally convex (i.e., convex whatever the input measures) and even actually nonconvex in many classical scenarios. In particular, this (informally) signifies through Theorem 4.2 that *there exist no losses $L_{\mathcal{T}(P, Q)}$ and $L_{\mathcal{E}(P, Q)}$ that are convex for all measures P and Q* , in contrast to (for instance) the mean square error which is convex regardless of the data distribution. This is a strong limitation on the design of convex learning problems, since in typical scenarios the measures are exogenous factors. Moreover, being able to certify the convexity of $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ or respectively $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ does not even mean being able to construct a workable convex \mathcal{C} -loss for this specific case. Of course, if \mathcal{C} is convex then $L_{\mathcal{C}}(f) := \text{dist}(f, \mathcal{C})$ or $L_{\mathcal{C}}(f) := \mathbf{1}_{\mathcal{G} \setminus \mathcal{C}}(f)$ define convex \mathcal{C} -losses, but they require knowing \mathcal{C} *explicitly* to be computed while the role of a loss is precisely to *implicitly* quantify a condition.

In what follows, we illustrate that this setting applies to generative modeling and group-level algorithmic fairness, explaining why such problems are generally not provably convex.

4.2.1 Generative modeling

Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be an source probability distribution, $Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p)$ be a target probability distribution with bounded support, and $D : \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^p) \rightarrow [0, +\infty]$ be discrepancy function between probability measures. Finding a push-forward generative model for Q from P amounts to finding a model $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f_{\#}P \approx Q$, which can be achieved by solving

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} D(f_{\#}P, Q). \quad (3)$$

This setting notably includes *generative adversarial networks* (GAN) and *variational auto-encoders* (VAE). Typically, the discrepancy D is chosen as the Kullback-Leibler divergence [Goodfellow et al., 2014], the Wasserstein-1 distance [Arjovsky et al., 2017], or a Sinkhorn divergence [Genevay et al., 2018]. Critically, the formulation fits Problem 2 with $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{T}(P, Q)$, $L_{\mathcal{C}}(f) := D(f_{\#}P, Q)$, and $L(f) := 0$. *Thereby, Problem 3 is not universally convex.* More precisely, there are two limits to its convexity according to the sufficient conditions discussed in Section 4.1.

First limit: the convexity of the set of feasible models \mathcal{F} . In most cases, \mathcal{F} is a set of neural networks with fixed architecture. Remark that such a set is not necessarily convex, since in particular the sum of two neural networks is generally a neural network with different depth and widths. One could work instead with a convex class of models, like linear models, but it would sacrifice the necessary inductive power of neural networks for generative tasks.

Second limit: the convexity of $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$, which only holds in restricted cases according to Section 3.1. More specifically, in the GAN scenario, the true (or population) target distribution Q is continuous. Therefore, Proposition 3.4 along with Theorem 4.2 ensures that Problem 3 cannot be convex—whatever the choice of D , *even if it is convex*. This emphasizes that the convexity of $Q^* \mapsto D(Q^*, Q)$ (in measure space) is *radically* different from the convexity of $f \mapsto D(f_{\#}P, Q)$ (in function space).⁵ Notably, the global convergence guarantees from the original GAN paper leverages unrealistic assumptions to reframe the GAN minimization problem as a convex program in *measure space* [Goodfellow et al., 2014, Proposition 2]. Following a more statistically-driven approach, one rather solves Problem 3 between some empirical measures P_n and Q_m , respectively corresponding to an n -sample from P and an m -sample from Q . According to Proposition 3.6, $\mathcal{T}(P_n, Q_m)$ is convex only if m does not divide n . Not only this is restrictive, but this would solely guarantee the existence of a convex \mathcal{C} -loss; it would not provide a closed-form expression as previously mentioned.

Lastly, we shall mention that the class $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{\theta}\}_{\theta \in \Theta}$ is generally parametric, with Θ included in an Euclidean space. Therefore, in practice, one does not optimize in function space but in parameter space. Several references noticed the nonconvexity of the GAN objective in parameter space, pointing out the nonconvexity of $\theta \mapsto f_{\theta}$ for common neural networks [Nagarajan and Kolter, 2017, Guo and Mounjid, 2023]. Our analysis highlights a more structural culprit: the nonconvexity of the push-forward operation. *All in all, push-forward generative modeling suffers from strong limitations to convexity at every level, making it almost never convex.*

4.2.2 Group-level algorithmic fairness

We turn to the design of fair machine-learning predictors. Let $X : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$ be a random vector representing some covariates, and $S : \Omega \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a random variable encoding a binary protected status (e.g., males and females) such that $0 < \mathbb{P}(S = 1) < 1$. A function $f \in \mathcal{G}$ satisfies *statistical parity* with respect to S if $f(X, S) \perp S$ [Dwork et al., 2012]. We define $P := \mathbb{L}((X, S) \mid S = 0)$ and $Q := \mathbb{L}((X, S) \mid S = 1)$ the conditional probability measures of the two protected groups. In this binary case, note that statistical parity can be framed as $\mathbb{L}(f(X, S) \mid S = 0) = \mathbb{L}(f(X, S) \mid S = 1)$, that is $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q$, namely $f \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$.

Maximizing the accuracy of the model under the statistical parity constraint corresponds to Problem 1 with $L(f) := \mathbb{E} \left[\|f(X, S) - Y\|^2 \right]$ (or any other convex loss for accuracy) and $\mathcal{C} := \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ (as in [Thibaut Le Gouic et al., 2020, Chzhen et al., 2020]). Obtaining a trade-off between accuracy and fairness corresponds to Problem 2 with $L_{\mathcal{C}}$ an $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ -loss (as in [Pérez-Suay et al.,

⁵Another striking illustration of this distinction comes from [Ambrosio et al., 2005, Section 7.3], which shows that the Wasserstein-2 distance is *convex* in both input measures but *concave* along its geodesics.

2017, Risser et al., 2022]). Most often, people work with $L_C(f) := D(f_{\#}P, f_{\#}Q)$ where D is (the power of) a distance or divergence between probability measures.

Similarly to generative modeling, the convexity of a learning process involving statistical parity has two restrictions according to Section 4.1: the convexity of \mathcal{F} and the one of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$. Regarding the former: if \mathcal{F} is a set of neural networks with fixed architecture, then the learning is not convex; if \mathcal{F} is the parametric set of linear predictors, then the learning could be convex (but likely less efficient on complex data). Regarding the latter: the discussion from Section 4.1 along with the results from Section 3.2 show that the learning is rarely convex, whether it be for Lebesgue-absolutely-continuous population measures P, Q (Proposition 3.9) or their empirical counterparts (Proposition 3.10). *As such, no practitioner can design a group-fair learning problem that universally guarantees convexity.* Notably, as for Section 4.2.1, modifying L_C (using for instance a convex D) is pointless.

Strictly, we should take into account that the models belong to \mathcal{F} instead of \mathcal{G} . It could happen that for relevant subclasses of models \mathcal{F} , the set of feasible solutions $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) \cap \mathcal{F}$ is convex. In the next proposition, we show that convexity does not universally hold for the widely-used class of weight-linear predictors.

Proposition 4.3 (no universal convexity of the set of linear equalizing maps). *We define the parametric class of functions $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Lin}} := \{x \mapsto \theta x + \theta_0; \theta \in \mathbb{R}^{p \times d}, \theta_0 \in \mathbb{R}^p\}$. If $d \geq 2$, then there exist $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{Lin}}$ is not convex.*

Proof of Proposition 4.3 We define two functions f and g in \mathcal{F}_{Lin} by $f(x_1, \dots, x_d) := x_1$ and $g(x_1, \dots, x_d) := -x_2$. Set A and B two i.i.d. nonconstant random variables, and let $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$ be the laws of respectively $(A, B, 0, \dots, 0)$ and $(A, A, 0, \dots, 0)$. Remark that $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = \mathbb{L}(A)$ and $g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q = \mathbb{L}(-A)$ since A and B are equal in law. Moreover, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P = \delta_0$ and $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q = \mathbb{L}(\frac{1}{2}B - \frac{1}{2}A)$ which is not equal to δ_0 since A and B are independent and not constant. Therefore, $(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}P \neq (\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g)_{\#}Q$, and $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) \cap \mathcal{F}_{\text{Lin}}$ is not convex. ■

Note that the same conclusion holds for any class \mathcal{F} such that $\mathcal{F}_{\text{Lin}} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$.

5 Towards recovering convexity

As explained in the previous section, one cannot guarantee the convexity of a learning problem involving a nonconvex condition \mathcal{C} , be it as a constraint or a penalty. This section explores two directions that one can follow to recover convexity, exemplified on problems involving transport maps or equalizing maps.

5.1 Weakening or strengthening the condition

The simplest approach amounts to replacing the constraint \mathcal{C} by a different one that still captures the same principle while being convex. Let us illustrate this idea with statistical parity. In this subsection, we assume that $p = 1$, so that all models f are functions from \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} .

Basically, statistical parity requires the predictions $f(X, S)$ to be independent to the protected attribute S . More precisely, it leverages the probabilistic notion of independence between random variables. However, other concepts of dependence could be employed. For instance, one could simply demand $\text{Cov}(f(X, S), S) = 0$ where Cov is the covariance between two random variables. This leads to a weaker definition of fairness, that still limits the dependence of $f(X, S)$ to S , but that is convex in the model. This is notably what Zafar et al. [2017] did to obtain a convex learning problem while their primary goal was to enforce statistical parity. Conversely, one can

also reach convexity by strengthening the definition. In contrast to statistical parity, which is a distributional (or group) definition of fairness, *counterfactual fairness* focuses on input-level predictions [Kusner et al., 2017]. It holds when the model produces the same outputs for every input and their counterfactual counterparts *had the protected status changed*. While it became famous for addressing causality rather than mere associations, another interesting aspect explored in [Kusner et al., 2017, De Lara et al., 2021] lies in the fact that (under standard assumptions) it implies statistical parity by being its input-scale counterpart. Moreover, counterfactual fairness represents a convex constraint that can be quantified through a convex loss [Russell et al., 2017, De Lara et al., 2021]. It can thereby be used as a stronger convex surrogate for statistical parity.

This illustrates that weakening or strengthening the constraint \mathcal{C} is a natural option to attain convexity. However, we point out that such a change can sometimes raise other challenges, like computing the causal model needed for counterfactual fairness.

5.2 Radically changing the models

The last strategy for dealing with a convex constraint consists in changing the nature of the base models f , that is changing the space of models \mathcal{G} into a radically different one. In this subsection, we focus on replacing the deterministic mapping f by a random coupling.

The most notorious illustration comes from optimal transport theory. Suppose that $p = d$ and consider the Monge formulation of optimal transport between P and Q in $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$:

$$\min_{f \in \mathcal{T}(P, Q)} \int \|x - f(x)\|^2 dP(x).$$

Although the loss to minimize is actually convex, the constraint $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ renders the problem nonconvex in most configurations according to Corollary 3.3. Interestingly, one can recover convexity by rewriting $\mathcal{T}(P, Q)$ with random couplings π rather than deterministic functions f . Let us denote by $\Pi(P, Q) \subset \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ the set of couplings with P and Q as respectively first and second marginal, which is a convex set. The Kantorovich formulation of optimal transport [Kantorovich and Rubinshtein, 1958] addresses the following relaxation:

$$\min_{\pi \in \Pi(P, Q)} \int \|x - y\|^2 d\pi(x, y).$$

Not only this problem always admits a solution in contrast to Monge’s version, but it remains convex since $\Pi(P, Q)$ is a convex set whatever (P, Q) and $\pi \mapsto \int \|x - y\|^2 d\pi(x, y)$ is a convex function. As such, the underlying idea of Kantorovich’s relaxation could be generalized to attain convexity at the model level (not necessarily the parameter level) in learning problems with a mass-transportation constraint.

This raises the question whether such an exchange of the deterministic coupling induced by f by a random coupling π can similarly render the set $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ convex. However, one can easily convince themselves that there is no natural coupling reformulation in this context.

6 Conclusion

By diving into the theory of transport maps and equalizing maps, we showed that pushing-forward measures was a nonconvex operation in general. Analyzing popular machine-learning problems in light of this underappreciated characteristic enabled us to provide a structural understanding of their (non)convexity. This will hopefully help practitioners and researchers know when it is vain to

try designing a convex objective, and consequently encourage them to rapidly consider a different approach if convexity is required.

Our work also opens further lines of research. From a mathematical perspective, there is still much to discover regarding the shape of push-forward constraints, notably equalizing maps. From an applicative angle, a valuable direction would be to investigate deeper the ideas from Section 5, to furnish better guidance on the construction of alternative convex problems.

A Equalizing maps between finitely supported probability measures

This supplementary section provides insight on $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, notably on its convexity, when P and Q are two discrete probability measures with finite supports.

A.1 Setup

Formally, let $n, m \geq 1$ be two integers, $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset [0, 1]$ be two sets of probability weights, and $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be two sets of values. Then, we define P and Q as $P := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}$. In a first time, we restrict our analysis to measures with disjoint supports, which means supposing that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cap \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m = \emptyset$. Later, we explain through Proposition A.2 how to extend our results to measure with nondisjoint supports.

Let us introduce extra notations before proceeding. We denote by $[k]$ the set $\{1, \dots, k\}$ and by $2^{[k]}$ the set of parts of $[k]$ for any integer $k \geq 1$. We also define the following sets:

$$S_\alpha = \left\{ \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i, I \in 2^{[n]} \right\}, \quad S_\beta = \left\{ \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j, J \in 2^{[m]} \right\}.$$

They correspond to the reachable values by sums of the weights of respectively P and Q , and can be seen as the image sets of these discrete measures. They will play a key role in the results below. Finally, we write $S_{\alpha, \beta} := S_\alpha \cap S_\beta$. Remark that $\{0, 1\} \subseteq S_\alpha, S_\beta \subset [0, 1]$.

A.2 Characterization of convexity

The following theorem gives a sufficient and necessary condition on P and Q to have the convexity of the set $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$.

Theorem A.1 (equalizing maps between finitely supported discrete measures). *Let $n, m \geq 1$ be two integers, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be two sets of two-by-two distinct elements such that $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cap \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m = \emptyset$, and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset [0, 1]$ be probability weights. Define $P := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}$. Then, the set $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is convex if and only if the three following conditions hold:*

(i) for every γ in $S_{\alpha, \beta}$, there exists a unique couple $(I_\gamma, J_\gamma) \in 2^{[n]} \times 2^{[m]}$ such that

$$\sum_{i \in I_\gamma} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J_\gamma} \beta_j = \gamma;$$

(ii) the sets $\{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}}$ and $\{J_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}}$ defined by (i) are σ -algebras of respectively $[n]$ and $[m]$;

(iii) for every $\gamma, \gamma' \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$, the index sets $\eta_\alpha(\gamma, \gamma'), \eta_\beta(\gamma, \gamma') \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$ defined by (i) and (ii) such as $I_{\eta_\alpha(\gamma, \gamma')} = I_\gamma \cap I_{\gamma'}$ and $J_{\eta_\beta(\gamma, \gamma')} = J_\gamma \cap J_{\gamma'}$ satisfy

$$\eta_\alpha(\gamma, \gamma') = \eta_\beta(\gamma, \gamma').$$

The above conditions may seem convoluted. Nevertheless, remark that item (i) alone is a strong condition on P and Q . It requires that *every* probability attainable by both P and Q corresponds to unique events for respectively P and Q . Therefore, it provides a powerful criterion to identify settings where $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex. This is precisely the strategy we follow to prove Proposition 3.10.

Proof of Proposition 3.10 We address each item separately.

Firstly, let us suppose that m and n are coprime. Notice that if $S_{\alpha, \beta} := S_\alpha \cap S_\beta = \{0, 1\}$, then $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is the set of constant functions over $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Therefore, we aim at showing in this part of the proof that $S_{\alpha, \beta} = \{0, 1\}$. By definition of P and Q we have

$$S_\alpha = \{k/n, 0 \leq k \leq n\}, \quad S_\beta = \{k'/m, 0 \leq k' \leq m\}.$$

Consequently, for any $\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$, there exist two integers $0 \leq k \leq n$ and $0 \leq k' \leq m$ such that $\gamma = k/n = k'/m$, hence $k'n = km$. This entails that n divides km , and thereby n divides k since n and m are coprime. Finally, recall that $0 \leq k \leq n$, leading to $k = n$ or $k = 0$, therefore $\gamma = 1$ or $\gamma = 0$.

Secondly, let us suppose that m and n are not coprime: there exist three integers $r \geq 2$ and $n', m' \geq 1$ such that $n = rn'$ and $m = rm'$. For every element $I \in 2^{[n]}$ of size n' and element $J \in 2^{[m]}$ of size m' we have

$$\frac{1}{r} = \sum_{i \in I} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J} \beta_j.$$

This contradicts condition (i) of Theorem A.1, as the number of elements $I \in 2^{[n]}$ of size n' is larger than one. Hence, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex. \blacksquare

The proof of Theorem A.1 is divided in two parts, one for each side of the equivalence. We address the necessary condition by contrapositive; proving the sufficient condition is more straightforward.

Proof of Theorem A.1 Let us start with the **necessary condition** (\Leftarrow). First, suppose that condition (i) does not hold: there exists $\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$ such that there are two distinct couples $(I_\gamma, J_\gamma), (I'_\gamma, J'_\gamma) \in 2^{[n]} \times 2^{[m]}$ verifying $\sum_{i \in I_\gamma} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J_\gamma} \beta_j = \sum_{i \in I'_\gamma} \alpha_i = \sum_{j \in J'_\gamma} \beta_j = \gamma$. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $I_\gamma \neq I'_\gamma$, meaning that there exists $i_0 \in I_\gamma$ such that $i_0 \notin I'_\gamma$. Then, for z_1 and z_2 two distinct elements of \mathbb{R}^p , we define the functions $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ as:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} z_1 & \text{if } x \in \{x_i, i \in I_\gamma\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J_\gamma\} \\ z_2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} z_1 & \text{if } x \in \{x_i, i \in I'_\gamma\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J_\gamma\}, \\ z_2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Since $\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$, these functions satisfy $f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q = \gamma\delta_{z_1} + (1 - \gamma)\delta_{z_2}$. In addition,

$$\left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}P = \alpha_{i_0}\delta_{\frac{z_1+z_2}{2}} + \sum_{i \in [n], i \neq i_0} \alpha_i \delta_{\frac{f(x_i)+g(x_i)}{2}} \neq \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_{\#}Q = \gamma\delta_{z_1} + (1 - \gamma)\delta_{z_2}.$$

This proves that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.

Second, suppose that (i) holds but (ii) does not hold. It readily follows from $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j = 1$ that for every $\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}$, $I_\gamma^c := [n] \setminus I_\gamma = I_{1-\gamma}$ and $J_\gamma^c := [m] \setminus J_\gamma = J_{1-\gamma}$. This implies that both $\{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}}$ and $\{J_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha, \beta}}$ are stable under complementary and not empty. Therefore,

(ii) being false means that $\{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha,\beta}}$ or $\{J_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha,\beta}}$ is not stable under intersection. Let us find a counterexample for the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ using this property. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha,\beta}}$ is not stable under intersection: there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in S_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that $I_{\gamma_1} \cap I_{\gamma_2} \notin \{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha,\beta}}$. Then, for z_1 and z_2 two distinct elements of \mathbb{R}^p , we define the functions $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ as:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} z_1 & \text{if } x \in \{x_i, i \in I_{\gamma_1}\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J_{\gamma_1}\} \\ z_2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and

$$g(x) = \begin{cases} z_1 & \text{if } x \in \{x_i, i \in I_{\gamma_2}\} \cup \{y_j, j \in J_{\gamma_2}\} \\ z_2 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

As before, it follows from $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in S_{\alpha,\beta}$ that $f_\#P = f_\#Q = \gamma_1\delta_{z_1} + (1 - \gamma_1)\delta_{z_2}$ and $g_\#P = g_\#Q = \gamma_2\delta_{z_1} + (1 - \gamma_2)\delta_{z_2}$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# P &= \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\gamma_1} \cap I_{\gamma_2}} \alpha_i\right) \delta_{z_1} \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{i \in I_{\gamma_1}^c \cap I_{\gamma_2}^c} \alpha_i\right) \delta_{z_2} + \left(\sum_{i \in (I_{\gamma_1} \cup I_{\gamma_2}) \setminus (I_{\gamma_1} \cap I_{\gamma_2})} \alpha_i\right) \delta_{\frac{z_1+z_2}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# Q &= \left(\sum_{j \in J_{\gamma_1} \cap J_{\gamma_2}} \beta_j\right) \delta_{z_1} \\ &\quad + \left(\sum_{j \in J_{\gamma_1}^c \cap J_{\gamma_2}^c} \beta_j\right) \delta_{z_2} + \left(\sum_{j \in (J_{\gamma_1} \cup J_{\gamma_2}) \setminus (J_{\gamma_1} \cap J_{\gamma_2})} \beta_j\right) \delta_{\frac{z_1+z_2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

Critically, $I_{\gamma_1} \cap I_{\gamma_2} \notin \{I_\gamma\}_{\gamma \in S_{\alpha,\beta}}$ entails that $\sum_{i \in I_{\gamma_1} \cap I_{\gamma_2}} \alpha_i \neq \sum_{j \in J_{\gamma_1} \cap J_{\gamma_2}} \beta_j$. Therefore, $\left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# P \neq \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# Q$, meaning that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.

Finally, suppose that (i) and (ii) hold, and that (iii) does not hold: there exist $\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in S_{\alpha,\beta}$ such that $\eta_\alpha(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \neq \eta_\beta(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$. Let us define $f, g \in \mathcal{G}$ as before. They still verify $f_\#P = f_\#Q$ and $g_\#P = g_\#Q$. In addition,

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# P &= \eta_\alpha(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\delta_{z_1} \\ &\quad + \eta_\alpha(1 - \gamma_1, 1 - \gamma_2)\delta_{z_2} + (\eta_\alpha(\gamma_1, 1 - \gamma_2) + \eta_\alpha(1 - \gamma_1, \gamma_2))\delta_{\frac{z_1+z_2}{2}}, \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# Q &= \eta_\beta(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\delta_{z_1} \\ &\quad + \eta_\beta(1 - \gamma_1, 1 - \gamma_2)\delta_{z_2} + (\eta_\beta(\gamma_1, 1 - \gamma_2) + \eta_\beta(1 - \gamma_1, \gamma_2))\delta_{\frac{z_1+z_2}{2}}. \end{aligned}$$

By assumption $\eta_\alpha(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) \neq \eta_\beta(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$. Hence $\left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# P \neq \left(\frac{1}{2}f + \frac{1}{2}g\right)_\# Q$, meaning that $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ is not convex.

We now turn to the **sufficient condition** (\implies). Consider that conditions (i), (ii) and (iii) hold. By definition, for any $f, g \in \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ there exist two integers $K, L \geq 1$, two sets of probability

weights $\{\gamma_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{\gamma'_l\}_{l=1}^L$, and two sets of values $\{f_k\}_{k=1}^K, \{g_l\}_{l=1}^L \subseteq \mathbb{R}^p$ such that

$$f_{\#}P = f_{\#}Q = \sum_{k=1}^K \gamma_k \delta_{f_k} \quad \text{and} \quad g_{\#}P = g_{\#}Q = \sum_{l=1}^L \gamma'_l \delta_{g_l}.$$

Then, according to (i) and (ii):

$$[n] = \bigcup_{k=1}^K I_{\gamma_k} = \bigcup_{l=1}^L I_{\gamma'_l} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \bigcup_{l=1}^L I_{\eta_{\alpha}(\gamma_k, \gamma'_l)},$$

where $I_{\eta_{\alpha}(\gamma_k, \gamma'_l)} = I_{\gamma_k} \cap I_{\gamma'_l}$. Condition (i) gives $I_{\gamma_k} = \{i \in [n], f(x_i) = f_k\}$ and $I_{\gamma'_l} = \{i \in [n], f(x_i) = g_l\}$. Similarly,

$$[m] = \bigcup_{k=1}^K J_{\gamma_k} = \bigcup_{l=1}^L J_{\gamma'_l} = \bigcup_{k=1}^K \bigcup_{l=1}^L J_{\eta_{\beta}(\gamma_k, \gamma'_l)},$$

with $J_{\gamma_k} = \{j \in [m], f(y_j) = f_k\}$ and $J_{\gamma'_l} = \{j \in [m], f(y_j) = g_l\}$ again from Condition (i). Then, for all $t \in [0, 1]$

$$\begin{aligned} (tf + (1-t)g)_{\#}P &= \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \eta_{\alpha}(\gamma_k, \gamma'_l) \delta_{tf_k + (1-t)g_l} = \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{l=1}^L \eta_{\beta}(\gamma_k, \gamma'_l) \delta_{tf_k + (1-t)g_l} \\ &= (tf + (1-t)g)_{\#}Q, \end{aligned}$$

due to condition (iii). This concludes the proof. ■

A.3 When the probability measures have nondisjoint supports

Theorem A.1, and thereby Proposition 3.10, hold for P and Q with disjoint supports. Nevertheless, one can deduce conditions for the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ in more general cases by subtracting the common mass of P and Q . More formally, for $P := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}$ two finitely supported elements of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we define their minimum as:

$$\min(P, Q) := \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^m \min(\alpha_i, \beta_j) \mathbf{1}_{\{x_i=y_j\}} \delta_{x_i},$$

which is a finitely supported element of $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Note that if P and Q have disjoint supports, then $\min(P, Q)$ is the null measure. Crucially, the following result holds.

Proposition A.2 (equalizing maps between finitely supported measures with nondisjoint supports). *Let $n, m \geq 1$ be two integers, $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be two sets of two-by-two distinct elements, and $\{\alpha_i\}_{i=1}^n, \{\beta_j\}_{j=1}^m \subset [0, 1]$ be probability weights. Define $P := \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q := \sum_{j=1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}$. Then, $P - \min(P, Q)$ and $Q - \min(P, Q)$ have disjoint supports, share the same total mass, and satisfy*

$$\mathcal{E}(P, Q) = \mathcal{E}(P - \min(P, Q), Q - \min(P, Q)).$$

This proposition enables one to determine conditions for the convexity of $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$ by applying for instance the previous results to $P - \min(P, Q)$ and $Q - \min(P, Q)$.

Proof of Proposition A.2 The proof is trivial when P and Q already have disjoint supports. Let us assume that the supports of P and Q are not disjoint. Then, one can define a nonempty set $\{z_k\}_{k=1}^l := \{x_i\}_{i=1}^n \cap \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ where $l \geq 1$ is an integer. Without loss of generality, we reorder the elements in $\{x_i\}_{i=1}^n$ and $\{y_j\}_{j=1}^m$ so that $z_k = x_k = y_k$ for every $k \in [l]$. This enables us to express $\min(P, Q)$ as

$$\min(P, Q) = \sum_{k=1}^l \min(\alpha_k, \beta_k) \delta_{z_k}.$$

In the rest of the proof, we write $P' := P - \min(P, Q)$ and $Q' = Q - \min(P, Q)$.

First, we show that P' and Q' have disjoint supports. Remark that

$$P' = \sum_{k=1}^l (\alpha_k - \min(\alpha_k, \beta_k)) \delta_{z_k} + \sum_{i=l+1}^n \alpha_i \delta_{x_i} \quad \text{and} \quad Q' = \sum_{k=1}^l (\beta_k - \min(\alpha_k, \beta_k)) \delta_{z_k} + \sum_{j=l+1}^m \beta_j \delta_{y_j}.$$

By hypothesis, $\{x_i\}_{i=l+1}^n \cap \{y_j\}_{j=1}^m = \emptyset$. Additionally, for every $k \in [l]$, if $\alpha_k - \min(\alpha_k, \beta_k) > 0$, then $\alpha_k > \beta_k$, hence $\beta_k - \min(\alpha_k, \beta_k) = 0$. These two remarks ensures that P' and Q' have disjoint supports. They also clearly share the same total mass since P and Q both sum to one, and the subtrahend is the same, namely $\min(P, Q)$.

Second, we prove that $\mathcal{E}(P', Q') = \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$. Every function f in $\mathcal{E}(P', Q')$, satisfies $f_{\#} P' = f_{\#} Q'$ by definition. Therefore, it follows from $P = P' + \min(P, Q)$, $Q = Q' + \min(P, Q)$, and the linearity of the push-forward operation that:

$$f_{\#} P = f_{\#} P' + f_{\#} \min(P, Q) = f_{\#} Q' + f_{\#} \min(P, Q) = f_{\#} Q.$$

This means that $\mathcal{E}(P', Q') \subseteq \mathcal{E}(P, Q)$. Conversely, for every f in $\mathcal{E}(P, Q)$, the linearity of the push-forward yields

$$f_{\#} P' = f_{\#} P - f_{\#} \min(P, Q) = f_{\#} Q - f_{\#} \min(P, Q) = f_{\#} \min(P, Q).$$

Consequently, $\mathcal{E}(P, Q) \subseteq \mathcal{E}(P', Q')$. This concludes the proof. ■

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Armand Foucault and Iain Henderson for helpful discussions

References

- L. Ambrosio, N. Gigli, and G. Savaré. *Gradient flows: in metric spaces and in the space of probability measures*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- M. A. Arcones. Asymptotic theory for M-estimators over a convex kernel. *Econometric Theory*, 14(4):387–422, 1998.
- M. Arjovsky, S. Chintala, and L. Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 2017.
- 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.

- S. Bubeck et al. Convex optimization: Algorithms and complexity. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 8(3-4):231–357, 2015.
- E. Chzhen, C. Denis, M. Hebiri, L. Oneto, and M. Pontil. Fair regression with Wasserstein barycenters. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 7321–7331. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020.
- L. De Lara, A. González-Sanz, N. Asher, L. Risser, and J.-M. Loubes. Transport-based counterfactual models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.13025*, 2021.
- C. Dwork, M. Hardt, T. Pitassi, O. Reingold, and R. Zemel. Fairness through awareness. In *Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, pages 214–226, 2012.
- A. Genevay, G. Peyré, and M. Cuturi. Learning generative models with Sinkhorn divergences. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1608–1617. PMLR, 2018.
- I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27, 2014.
- X. Guo and O. Mounjid. GANs training: A game and stochastic control approach. *Mathematical Finance*, 2023.
- S. J. Haberman. Concavity and estimation. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1631–1661, 1989.
- M. Hallin, E. del Barrio, J. Cuesta-Albertos, and C. Matrán. Distribution and quantile functions, ranks and signs in dimension d : A measure transportation approach. *The Annals of Statistics*, 49(2):1139 – 1165, 2021.
- M. Hardt, E. Price, and N. Srebro. Equality of opportunity in supervised learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3315–3323, 2016.
- N. L. Hjort and D. Pollard. Asymptotics for minimisers of convex processes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.3806*, 1993.
- L. V. Kantorovich and S. Rubinshtein. On a space of totally additive functions. *Vestnik of the St. Petersburg University: Mathematics*, 13(7):52–59, 1958.
- A. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156. Springer Science & Business Media, 2012.
- D. P. Kingma and M. Welling. Auto-encoding variational bayes. *stat*, 1050:1, 2014.
- M. J. Kusner, J. Loftus, C. Russell, and R. Silva. Counterfactual fairness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30, pages 4066–4076. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- R. J. McCann. Existence and uniqueness of monotone measure-preserving maps. *Duke Math. J.*, 80(2):309–323, 11 1995. doi: 10.1215/S0012-7094-95-08013-2.
- G. Monge. Mémoire sur la théorie des déblais et des remblais. *Histoire de l’Académie Royale des Sciences de Paris*, 1781.
- V. Nagarajan and J. Z. Kolter. Gradient descent GAN optimization is locally stable. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.

- W. Niemi. Asymptotics for M-estimators defined by convex minimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, pages 1514–1533, 1992.
- A. Pérez-Suay, V. Laparra, G. Mateo-García, J. Muñoz-Marí, L. Gómez-Chova, and G. Camps-Valls. Fair kernel learning. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pages 339–355. Springer, 2017.
- D. Pollard. Asymptotics for least absolute deviation regression estimators. *Econometric Theory*, 7(2):186–199, 1991.
- D. Rezende and S. Mohamed. Variational inference with normalizing flows. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 1530–1538. PMLR, 2015.
- L. Risser, A. Gonzalez-Sanz, Q. Vincenot, and J.-M. Loubes. Tackling algorithmic bias in neural-network classifiers using Wasserstein-2 regularization. *Journal of Mathematical Imaging and Vision*, pages 1–18, 2022.
- C. Russell, M. J. Kusner, J. Loftus, and R. Silva. When worlds collide: Integrating different counterfactual assumptions in fairness. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017.
- A. Salmona, V. De Bortoli, J. Delon, and A. Desolneux. Can push-forward generative models fit multimodal distributions? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:10766–10779, 2022.
- Thibaut Le Gouic, Jean-Michel Loubes, and Philippe Rigollet. Projection to fairness in statistical learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.11720*, 2020.
- M. B. Zafar, I. Valera, M. G. Rodriguez, and K. P. Gummadi. Fairness constraints: Mechanisms for fair classification. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 962–970. PMLR, 2017.