

Statistical Robustness of Kernel Learning Estimator with Respect to Data Perturbation

Sainan Zhang*, Huifu Xu† and Hailin Sun‡

June 18, 2024

Abstract

Inspired by the recent work [28] on the statistical robustness of empirical risks in reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS) where the training data are potentially perturbed or even corrupted, we take a step further in this paper to investigate the statistical robustness of the kernel learning estimator (the regularized empirical risk minimizer or stationary point). We begin by deriving qualitative statistical robustness of the estimator of the regularized empirical risk minimizer for a broad class of convex cost functions when all of the training data are potentially perturbed under some topological structures, and then move on to consider the quantitative statistical robustness of the stationary solution for a specific case that the cost function is continuously differentiable but not necessarily convex. In the latter case, we derive the first-order optimality condition of the regularized expected risk minimization problem, which is essentially a stochastic variational inequality problem (SVIP) in RKHS, and then use the SVIP as a platform to investigate local and global Lipschitz continuity of the stationary solution against perturbation of the probability distribution under the Fortet-Mourier metric. A crucial assumption in the analysis is that the perturbed data are independent and identically distributed (iid). In some practical applications, this assumption may not be fulfilled when a small proportion of perceived data is seriously perturbed/contaminated. In this case, we use the influence function to investigate the impact of single data perturbation on the expected risk minimizer. Differing from Steinwart and Christmann [64, Chapter 10], we concentrate on constrained expected risk minimization problems. The research is essentially down to the derivation of the implicit function theorem of the SVIP in RKHS. Finally, we illustrate our theoretical analysis with a couple of academic examples.

Keywords. Kernel learning estimator; SVIP; RKHS; single data perturbation; all data perturbation; stability and statistical robustness

*Department of Systems Engineering and Engineering Management, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong. Email: snzhang.m@gmail.com.

†Department of Systems Engineering and Engineering Management, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong. Email: hfxu@se.cuhk.edu.hk.

‡School of Mathematical Sciences and Institute of Mathematics, Nanjing Normal University, Nanjing 210023, China, Email: hlsun@njnu.edu.cn

1 Introduction

We consider a stochastic program in machine learning where the uncertainties are characterized by the random variables in the input-output spaces with probability distributions. Without knowing the exact probability distribution of the variables, the stochastic program uses the discretization technique with a set of input-output pairs (training data). The task in supervised learning is to solve a stochastic program with the resulting empirical distribution over a hypothesis class and obtain the empirical risk minimizer (ERM). This raises a question as to whether ERM converges to its true counterpart as sample size increases, which is known as consistency or learnability. The former property can be characterized by the convergence of empirical risks to the expected counterparts uniformly for all functions in hypothesis class, see [8], [2, Chapter 19] and [68]. Qi et al. [52] establish the consistency and convergence rates of stationary solutions and values of a class of coupled nonconvex and nonsmooth empirical risk minimization problems. The learnability relates to the learning rules and sensitivity to perturbations in the training set. For example, Shalev-Shwartz et al. [62] and Mukherjee et al. [45] state that stability is a necessary and sufficient condition for learnability. Roger and Wagner [57] discuss that the sensitivity of a learning algorithm with respect to (w.r.t.) small perturbation in the model controls the variance of the leave-one-out estimate.

A conventional assumption in the stability analysis is that the samples are independent and identically distributed (iid) generated from the true probability measure. In practice, however, data are often perturbed for various reasons such as data contamination and data/distribution shifts from past/present to future. For instance, in data-driven problems such as biology and medical experiments, data may be corrupted with outliers (see [41]) which do not follow the true distribution. The least squares estimators of Lasso are not stable in corrupted environments (see [65]). M -estimators using loss functions such as Huber or L_1 loss are not robust to outliers (see [33]). Consequently, it is necessary to investigate whether empirical risks and empirical risk minimizers obtained with perceived contaminated data are useful. This kind of research stems from Tukey [66, 67] and Hampel [29, 30], and popularized by others particularly the monographs of Huber [32] and Huber and Ronchetti [33]. Steinwart and Christmann [64] extend the research to support vector machine by studying the sensitivity of learning estimator using the concept of influence function in single data perturbation. They also propose to investigate the quality of learning estimators by estimating the difference between the distributions of the empirical learning estimators obtained with contaminated data and ideal pure data under the Prokhorov metric in the case of all data being potentially contaminated. In a more recent development, Liu and Pang [43] propose an interval CVaR (In-CVaR) approach to reduce the effect of outliers on the kernel learning estimator. Data shift is another important example of data perturbation. It occurs when (a) the true probability distribution is known or subjective, but the perceived data are often perturbed due to measurement errors or occurrence of unexpected events, (b) the validation data deviate from the past and present data ([6]), (c) information about agent's subjective probability of the scenarios of the state of nature in decision analysis is poor, which may lead to model uncertainty [44]. In either case, it is necessary to estimate the difference between the kernel learning estimator based on perceived data and the one based on real data to ensure the usefulness of the estimator.

Guo et al. [28] seem to be the first to investigate qualitative and quantitative statistical robustness of the optimal value of the empirical risk minimization problem in reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS). Specifically, they derive sufficient conditions under which the expected risk changes stably (continuously) against small perturbation of the probability distributions of the underlying random variables and demonstrate how the cost function and kernel affect the stability. Moreover, they examine the difference between laws of the statistical estimators of the expected optimal loss based on pure data and contaminated data using the Prokhorov metric and Kantorovich metric, and derive some asymptotic qualitative and non-asymptotic quantitative statistical robustness results. They also identify appropriate metrics under which the statistical estimators are uniformly asymptotically consistent.

In practice, it might be more important to consider the optimal solution (regularized empirical risk minimizer/stationary solution) than the optimal value (regularized empirical risk) because the former is the focus of the empirical risk minimization problem. In this paper, we complement the research of [28] to study the former in both all data perturbation and single data perturbation cases. The former is instrumental as it allows us to assess the relative influence of individual data on the value of the kernel learning estimator. The latter is also important in practice because we may not have specific information to identify the structure of the perturbed data and consequently we treat all the data as potentially perturbed. In this case, it requires us to quantify the extent of data perturbation under which the resulting laws of statistical estimators remain stable. The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows.

First, we derive asymptotic qualitative statistical robustness of the estimator of the regularized empirical risk minimizer for a broad class of cost functions (which are not necessarily differentiable) when all of the training data are potentially perturbed under some topological structure. Specifically, we show that the difference between the laws of kernel learning estimators based on real data and perceived data under the Prokhorov metric is small when the distance between the true probability distribution underlying the real data and the true probability distribution underlying the perceived data is small and the sample size is sufficiently large (Theorem 3.1). This kind of research is motivated by Steinwart and Christmann in [64, Chapter 10] for support vector machine although they do not go into detailed discussions in theory as presented in this paper.

Second, we derive non-asymptotic quantitative statistical robustness of the estimator of the stationary solution for a specific class of cost functions which are continuously differentiable but not necessarily convex, which gives rise to an explicit relationship between the distance of two statistical estimators and the distance between the true probability distributions underlying the real data and perceived data independent of sample size. To this end, we derive the first-order optimality condition which is in essence a stochastic variational inequality problem (SVIP) in RKHS (Theorem 4.1). Under some moderate conditions, we show the local and global Lipschitz continuity of the stationary solution mapping over a relatively compact set of probability measures (Theorem 4.2). The stability results enable us to derive the desired non-asymptotic quantitative statistical robustness which guarantees that difference between laws of kernel learning estimators based on pure data and perturbed data under the Kantorovich metric is linearly bounded by the Kantorovich distance of the original probability distributions generating the two sets of data (Theorem 4.3, c is twice continuously differentiable but not necessarily convex).

The adoption of the Kantorovich metric allows us to derive a linear error bound as opposed to the Prokhorov metric envisaged by Steinwart and Christmann in [64, Chapter 10]. While this kind of research has been conducted by Jiang and Li [34] for SVIP and by Guo and Xu [26] for the stochastic generalized equation in finite-dimensional spaces, it is the first time to be presented in the context of machine learning. One of the new challenges that we have to tackle is that the decision variable depends on random variables. In the case when the kernel learning estimator lies in the interior of the set of feasible solutions, we demonstrate quantitative statistical robustness results which does not require second order continuous differentiability of the cost function (Theorem 4.4, c is continuously differentiable and convex). We have managed this result by deriving a new implicit function theorem (Theorem F.1) extended from Dontchev and Rockafellar [22, Theorem 1H.3].

Third, for single data perturbation, we take a step forward from the existing work of Steinwart and Christmann [64, Chapter 10] on the unconstrained minimization problem to the constrained minimization problem. This is essentially down to derive the implicit function theorem for the SVIP in RKHS. We propose to use proto-derivative to tackle the differentiation of the normal cone, and discuss sufficient conditions under which the influence function is bounded.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we set up the regularized empirical risk minimization models, recall basic ideas of statistical robustness and ψ -weak topology. In Section 3, we derive qualitative statistical robustness of the estimator of the regularized empirical risk minimizer for a broad class of cost functions when all of the training data are potentially perturbed. In Section 4, we take a step further to discuss quantitative statistical robustness of the estimator of the regularized empirical risk minimizer/stationary solution for a more specific class of empirical risk minimization problem where the cost function is continuously differentiable. In Section 5, we derive an explicit form and boundedness of the influence function. In Section 6, we report some numerical tests on the established theoretical results for both all data perturbation and single data perturbation, and finally Section 7 concludes with some remarks.

2 Problem statement and preliminaries

In this section, we give a precise mathematical description of the empirical risk minimization model, followed by a motivation for statistical robustness and a recall of some related basic results in applied probability.

2.1 The expected risk minimization model

In the framework of learning, there are two sets of variables: an input variable $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and an output variable $y \in Y$, where $X \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$. Let $Z := X \times Y$. The relation between an input $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and an output $y \in Y$ is described by a probability distribution $P(\mathbf{x}, y)$. Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}(X)$ be a convex set of measurable functions, where $\mathcal{H}(X)$ is known as hypotheses space. The problem of learning is down to look for the oracle in \mathcal{F} such that expected risk is minimized,

i.e.,

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} R_P(\mathbf{f}) := \mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))], \quad (2.1)$$

where $c(\cdot, \cdot) : Z \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ denotes the loss function, $\mathbf{z} = (\mathbf{x}, y) : \Omega \rightarrow Z$ is random vector defined on an atomless probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}, \mathbb{P})$, $P = \mathbb{P} \circ \mathbf{z}^{-1}$ is the probability measure on Z induced by \mathbf{z} , $\mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ denotes the expected loss.

Typically, the cost function $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ is determined by learners. For instance, in various regression and support vector machine models (see e.g. [61, 62]), $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) = L(y, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$, where $L : \mathbb{R} \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ takes different forms such as

- (i) $L(t, y) = \max\{0, 1 - t \cdot y\}$ (the hinge loss function) which is not differentiable (satisfied in Theorem 3.1);
- (ii) $L(t, y) = (t - y)^2/2$ for $|t - y| \leq 1$ and $L(t, y) = |t - y| - 1/2$ for $|t - y| > 1$ (the Huber loss function), which is continuously differentiable but not twice differentiable (satisfied in Theorem 4.4);
- (iii) $L(t, y) = \frac{1}{2}(t - y)^2$ (the squared loss function) and $L(t, y) = \log(1 + e^{-t-y})$ (log-loss function), which are k -th differentiable for all $k \geq 1$ (satisfied in Theorem 4.3).

A key ingredient of model (2.1) is the hypothesis space $\mathcal{H}(X)$. In this paper, we concentrate on the reproducing kernel Hilbert space, see e.g., [19, 28].

Definition 2.1 (Reproducing kernel Hilbert space (RKHS)) *Let $\mathcal{H}(X)$ be a Hilbert space with inner product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. A function $k : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called a kernel of $\mathcal{H}(X)$ if there exists a feature map $\Phi : X \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ such that $\forall \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in X$, $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := \langle \Phi(\mathbf{x}), \Phi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle$. $\mathcal{H}(X)$ is said to be a reproducing kernel Hilbert space if there is a kernel $k : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that: (a) $k_{\mathbf{x}} := k_{\mathbf{x}}(\cdot) = k(\cdot, \mathbf{x}) \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X$ and (b) $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{f}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}(X)$ and $\mathbf{x} \in X$. In this case, k is said to be a reproducing kernel of $\mathcal{H}(X)$ and \mathcal{H}_k is written for $\mathcal{H}(X)$. The norm in \mathcal{H}_k is subsequently defined by $\|\mathbf{f}\|_k := \sqrt{\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle}$.*

A kernel $k : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be symmetric if $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t}) = k(\mathbf{t}, \mathbf{x})$ for each $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{t} \in X$, positive semidefinite if for any finite set $\{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\} \subset X$, the $m \times m$ matrix whose (i, j) entry is $k(\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j)$ is positive semidefinite. A kernel k is called a *Mercer kernel* if it is continuous, symmetric, and positive semidefinite. Let \mathbb{N} denote the set of positive integers. We list some of Mercer kernels as follows, see e.g. [19, Corollary 2.19] and [47, page 481].

- (i) **Polynomial kernel:** $k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = (\gamma \mathbf{x}_1^T \mathbf{x}_2)^d$ where $\gamma > 0$ is a constant and $d \in \mathbb{N}$.
- (ii) **Gaussian kernel:** $k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = e^{-\gamma \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2^2}$, where $\gamma > 0$ is a constant.
- (iii) **Inverse multiquadrics kernel:** $k(\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2) = (c^2 + \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|_2^2)^{-\alpha}$, where $\alpha > 0$ and $c > 0$.

In this paper, we assume that a Mercer kernel $k(\cdot, \cdot)$ is given. By Moore–Aronszajn theorem [3], there is a unique RKHS \mathcal{H}_k for which k is a reproducing kernel. In particular, let $\mathcal{H}_0 :=$

$\text{span}\{k_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in X\}$, then \mathcal{H}_0 is dense in \mathcal{H}_k . We can let

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \alpha_i k_{\mathbf{x}_i} : \alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}, \mathbf{x}_i \in [a_i, b_i] \subset X, i = 1, \dots, m \right\} \subset \mathcal{H}_0.$$

Note that kernels allow us to efficiently fit linear models to non-linear data without explicitly transforming them to feature spaces where they are linear. An interesting case is polynomial kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') = (\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{x}')^2$ with $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^2$. There exists a feature mapping $\phi : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^3$: $(x_1, x_2) \mapsto (x_1^2, \sqrt{2}x_1x_2, x_2^2)$ such that $\langle \phi(\mathbf{x}), \phi(\mathbf{x}') \rangle = (x_1x_1')^2 + 2x_1x_1'x_2x_2' + (x_2x_2')^2 = k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}')$. In such a case, the non-linear data in \mathbb{R}^2 is almost linear in the feature space and fits kernel-based linear models.

We make a blanket assumption that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is measurable for each \mathbf{f} and the expected value is well-defined. A sufficient condition is that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is continuous for every fixed \mathbf{z} and is measurable for each fixed \mathbf{f} , and there is a function ψ such that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z})$, $\forall \mathbf{z} \in Z$, $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$ with $\mathbb{E}_P[\psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty$. Moreover, we make the following blanket assumption to secure the existence of an optimal solution to problem (2.1): there exists some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that the lower-level sets

$$\text{lev}_{\leq \alpha} R_P := \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F} : R_P(\mathbf{f}) \leq \alpha\}, \quad (2.2)$$

are nonempty and relatively compact under the weak topology of \mathcal{H}_k . It is known as inf-compactness condition, which is the weakest condition to guarantee the existence of an optimal solution to a minimization problem, see [64, Theorem A.6.9]. By [4, Theorem 8.2.11], it ensures that the optimal values and optimal solutions of problem (2.1) is measurable when c is a Carathéodory function. The assumption implies that the set of the optimal solutions to problem (2.1) is bounded, which is satisfied when either \mathcal{F} is weakly compact and/or $R_P(\mathbf{f})$ is coercive, i.e., $R_P(\mathbf{f}) \rightarrow \infty$ as $\|\mathbf{f}\|_k \rightarrow \infty$.

2.2 The regularized empirical risk minimization model

In the case when the true probability distribution P is known, \mathcal{F} is the set of all measurable functions, and the cost function c takes a specific form, we may obtain a closed form of the optimal solution. For example, when c is a quadratic loss function, the minimizer is $\mathbb{E}_P[y|\mathbf{x}]$ ([7]). When $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) = \max\{(1 - \nu)(\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - y), \nu(y - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\}$, for $0 < \nu < 1$, the minimizer is a conditional ν -quantile function of P . However, in many practical data-driven problems, the true probability distribution P is often unknown and the problem is generally ill-posed. With iid samples $\{\mathbf{z}^i = (\mathbf{x}^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^N$, we consider the regularized empirical risk minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} R_{P_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}) := \mathbb{E}_{P_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2, \quad (2.3)$$

where $\lambda_N > 0$ is a regularization parameter, $P_N(\cdot) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\mathbf{z}^i}(\cdot)$ denotes the empirical probability measure and $\delta_{\mathbf{z}^i}(\cdot)$ denotes the Dirac measure at \mathbf{z}^i for $i = 1, \dots, N$. In the case that $\lambda_N = 0$, problem (2.3) is the sample average approximation (SAA) of problem (2.1). In general, λ_N is driven to 0 but the choice of the value may affect the rate of convergence. Some papers have been devoted to this, see for instance Breheny and Huang [11] for logistic regression

models in a finite-dimensional space, Cucker and Smale [18] and Caponnetto and Vito [13] for regularized least squares models in RKHS.

The coerciveness of the objective function ensures well-definedness of problem (2.3). Under the condition that the cost function c is convex w.r.t. the second argument, the objective function in problem (2.3) is strongly convex and has bounded level sets, and thus (2.3) has a unique solution $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$. By the representation theorem (see e.g. [59, Theorem 1] and [60, Theorem 4.2]), a solution of problem (2.3) with $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_k$ can be written in the following form

$$\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N} = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^* k_{\mathbf{x}_j}, \quad (2.4)$$

which means problem (2.3) can be equivalently written as

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}_N(P_N)} R_{P_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}) := \mathbb{E}_{P_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2, \quad (2.5)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_N(P_N) = \left\{ \mathbf{f} = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k_{\mathbf{x}_j} \in \mathcal{F} : (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N \right\}.$$

We call an optimal solution (2.4) to problem (2.3) a *kernel learning estimator* (in this paper, it represents the regularized empirical risk minimizer when c is convex and the stationary solution when c is not convex) based on the training data and the corresponding optimal value the regularized empirical risk.

2.3 Data perturbation

In practice, samples are often obtained from perceived empirical data which are potentially perturbed, which means that they are not generated by P , rather they are generated by some Q (a perturbation of P). We call $\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N$ real data or pure data which are not perturbed but are not obtainable in our setup. With the perceived data $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N$, we define $Q_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^i}$, and consider the perturbed regularized empirical risk minimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2. \quad (2.6)$$

Let $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ be an optimal solution to (2.6). In the literature, there are usually two ways to describe convergence of the optimal solution. One is to look into convergence of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By the law of large numbers, $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_Q$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\lambda_N \rightarrow 0$ under some moderate conditions. This is known as the asymptotic convergence/consistency, see e.g. [45, 52, 28]. The other is to investigate convergence of \mathbf{f}_Q to \mathbf{f}_P (an optimal solution of problem (2.1)) as $Q \rightarrow P$, which is known as stability of the optimal solution \mathbf{f}_P when P is perturbed to Q , see e.g. [58]. In this context, P_N is not obtainable, our interest is to investigate whether $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ can be used as an estimator of \mathbf{f}_P when N is sufficiently large and λ_N is close to zero. This requires not only stability of \mathbf{f}_P , but also uniform consistency of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ to \mathbf{f}_Q for all Q near

P . Statistical robustness provides a new effective approach for this. It examines the difference between empirical distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$. This is because we are guaranteed in theory that the latter is a reliable estimator of \mathbf{f}_P ($\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_P$), the former will also be a reasonably good estimator when the difference is small.

To quantify the closeness of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$, we need to choose an appropriate metric to quantify the distance between them. We observe that solutions $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ continuously depend on the whole samples $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ respectively, so we can consider them as \mathcal{H}_k -valued random variables, defined on a product of the original probability space, i.e., $(Z^{\otimes N}, \mathcal{B}(Z)^{\otimes N}, P^{\otimes N})$. Consequently, we may use the difference between the probability distributions induced by the estimators corresponding to $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ to quantify their distance. This kind of research is in alignment with the statistical robustness ([16, 25, 28, 39]), which examines the continuity of the difference between the induced probability distributions w.r.t. the original probability distribution underpinning the random data (Q and P). We will give formal definitions in Sections 3 and 4.

A key assumption in statistical robustness analysis is that both the real data $\{\mathbf{z}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ and the perturbed data $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}_i\}_{i=1}^N$ are iid. While this assumption is widely used in the literature on statistical robustness and machine learning [13, 38, 40, 47], it is not fulfilled in the case when some perturbed data are corrupted (significantly contaminated) while most of the data are good [33]. For example, some data (outliers) deviate significantly from most of the data set. Outliers do occur in practice. There are often no or virtually no gross errors in high-quality data, but 1 percent to 10 percent of gross errors in routine data seem to be more than the exception, see Hampel et al. [31, pages 25, 27]. Consequently, the question arises as to what impact a small proportion of data such as outliers may have on the kernel learning estimator. This issue has been raised and partly investigated by Steinwart and Christmann in [64] in the context of support vector machines. Specifically, the authors introduce the notions of qualitative statistical robustness ([64, Definition 10.2]) in all data perturbation case and the influence function in single data perturbation case and give strong motivations for investigating them albeit they have not presented further discussions on the former. Moreover, they provide a number of interesting examples for the influence function of empirical regularized risk minimizer $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ with nice graphical illustrations. Here we revisit the issue under a broader framework of kernel learning problems in hope that we will be able to fill out some gaps for both the all data perturbation case (Sections 3 and 4) and the single data perturbation case (Section 5) by giving a comprehensive theoretical treatment of both.

2.4 ψ -weak topology

The statistical robust analysis requires some basic concepts and results about weak topology. Here we recall some relevant materials extracted mainly from [15, 24] and references therein for a more comprehensive discussion.

We write $\mathcal{C}_b(Z)$ for the set of all bounded and continuous functions on Z and $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ for the set of all probability measures on the measurable space $(Z, \mathcal{B}(Z))$. The weak topology on $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ is the coarsest topology for which the mapping $P \mapsto \int_Z g(\mathbf{z})P(d\mathbf{z})$ is continuous for every

$g \in \mathcal{C}_b(Z)$. Let $\psi : Z \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a gauge function, that is, a continuous function with $\psi(\mathbf{z}) \geq 1$ outside some compact set. We denote by $\mathcal{C}_\psi(Z)$ the linear space of all continuous functions g on Z for which there exists a constant κ such that $|g(\mathbf{z})| \leq \kappa\psi(\mathbf{z})$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z$. Let

$$\mathcal{M}_Z^\psi := \left\{ P' \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) P'(d\mathbf{z}) < \infty \right\}. \quad (2.7)$$

\mathcal{M}_Z^ψ defines a subset of probability measures in $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ with ψ -finite moment. In the case when $\psi(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|^p$, where $p \geq 1$, we write

$$\mathcal{M}_Z^p := \left\{ P' \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z \|\mathbf{z}\|^p P'(d\mathbf{z}) < \infty \right\}. \quad (2.8)$$

The ψ -weak topology on \mathcal{M}_Z^ψ is the coarsest topology for which mapping $P \mapsto \int_Z g(\mathbf{z}) P(d\mathbf{z})$ is continuous for every $g \in \mathcal{C}_\psi(Z)$. A sequence $\{P_N\}_{N=1}^\infty \subset \mathcal{M}_Z^\psi$ is said to ψ -weakly converge to P , written $P_N \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} P$, if $\int_Z g(\mathbf{z}) P_N(d\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \int_Z g(\mathbf{z}) P(d\mathbf{z})$ for every $g \in \mathcal{C}_\psi(Z)$. We refer readers to [24, Definition A.47] for more details of the definition. Moreover, it follows by Corollary 2.62 in [15] that the ψ -weak topology on \mathcal{M}_Z^ψ is generated by the metric $\text{dl}_\psi : \mathcal{M}_Z^\psi \times \mathcal{M}_Z^\psi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\text{dl}_\psi(P', P'') := \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}(P', P'') + \left| \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) P'(d\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) P''(d\mathbf{z}) \right| \text{ for } P', P'' \in \mathcal{M}_Z^\psi, \quad (2.9)$$

where $\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}} : \mathcal{P}(Z) \times \mathcal{P}(Z) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is the Prokhorov metric defined as follows:

$$\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}(P', P'') := \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : P'(A) \leq P''(A^\epsilon) + \epsilon \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(Z)\} \quad (2.10)$$

where $A^\epsilon := A + B_\epsilon(0)$ denotes the Minkowski sum of A and the open ball centred at 0 (w.r.t. the norm in Z) and $\mathcal{B}(Z)$ is the Borel sigma algebra of Z . We also define the Prokhorov metric in the space of probability measures over \mathcal{F} ,

$$\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^\mathcal{F}(P', P'') := \inf\{\epsilon > 0 : P'(A) \leq P''(A^\epsilon) + \epsilon \text{ for all } A \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})\}, \quad (2.11)$$

where $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{F})$ is Borel sigma algebra of metric space $(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_k)$. When ψ takes some specific form, the corresponding ψ -weak topology can be metricized by the following Fortet-Mourier metric.

Definition 2.2 (Fortet-Mourier metric) *Let*

$$\mathcal{F}_p(Z) := \{h : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : |h(\mathbf{z}') - h(\mathbf{z}'')| \leq L_p(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'') \|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}''\|, \forall \mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'' \in Z\}, \quad (2.12)$$

be the set of locally Lipschitz continuous functions of growth order p , where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes some norm on Z , $L_p(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'') := \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}'\|, \|\mathbf{z}''\|\}^{p-1}$ for all $\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'' \in Z$, and $p \geq 1$ describes the growth of the local Lipschitz constants. The p -th order Fortet-Mourier metric over $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ is defined by

$$\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(P', P'') := \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p(Z)} \left| \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) P'(d\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) P''(d\mathbf{z}) \right|, \forall P', P'' \in \mathcal{P}(Z). \quad (2.13)$$

In the case when $p = 1$, it reduces to Kantorovich metric, in which case we denote the distance by dl_K . We refer readers to Römisch [58], and Rachev and Römisch [53] for a comprehensive overview of the topic. It is well-known that the Fortet-Mourier distance metricizes weak convergence on the set of probabilities possessing uniformly p -th moment when Z is a finite-dimensional space, see [53]. Here we include a version in general normed space.

Proposition 2.1 *Assume that Z is a separable Banach space equipped with norm $\|\cdot\|$. Then the Fortet-Mourier metric dl_{FM} metricizes the ψ -weak topology on \mathcal{M}_Z^ψ for $\psi(\mathbf{z}) := 1 + \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\|$, where $\mathbf{z}' \in Z$ is a fixed point.*

We defer the proof to the appendix to facilitate reading. This result is also a step further from [24, Corollary A.48] which asserts that ψ -weak topology is metrizable but is short of giving a specific metric for the metrization.

3 Qualitative statistical robustness

In this section, we investigate from the statistical point of view how $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ deviates from $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ in terms of the push-forward distributions induced by them. To derive the qualitative statistical robustness result, we need the following assumption on the cost function c and the feasible set \mathcal{F} .

Assumption 3.1 *Let c be defined as in (2.1). The following hold.*

(C1) *For almost every $\mathbf{z} \in Z$, $c(\mathbf{z}, \cdot)$ is convex.*

(C2) *There is a gauge function $\psi(\cdot)$ such that*

$$c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z}), \quad \forall \mathbf{z} \in Z \text{ and } \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}. \quad (3.14)$$

(C3) *The function $c : Z \times Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is uniformly continuous over any compact subset of $Z \times Y$.*

Assumption 3.1(C1) is a sufficient condition for the uniqueness of the optimal solution of the regularized problem (2.6) with $\lambda_N > 0$. Assumption 3.1(C2) is trivially satisfied when Z is compact. Our focus in this section is on the case that Z is unbounded. Obviously ψ depends on the concrete structure of c . Consider for example $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) = \max\{0, 1 - y\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}$. Then

$$c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \leq |1 - y\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})| \leq 1 + |y| \cdot |\langle \mathbf{f}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \leq 1 + |y| \cdot \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k.$$

Moreover, if there exists a positive number β such that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_k \leq \beta$, then we can work out an explicit form of ψ for some specific kernels.

- If k is a linear kernel, then $\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2 = \|\mathbf{x}\|^2$ and $\psi(\mathbf{z}) := 1 + \beta\|\mathbf{x}\||y|$.
- If k is a Gaussian kernel or Laplacian kernel, then $\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2 = 0$ and $\psi(\mathbf{z}) := 1$.

- If k is a polynomial kernel, then $\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2 = (\gamma\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + 1)^d$ and

$$\psi(\mathbf{z}) := 1 + \beta(\gamma\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + 1)^{d/2}|y|. \quad (3.15)$$

We also need some conditions on the kernel function.

Assumption 3.2 *For any compact subset $Z_0 \subset Z$, let X_0 be its orthogonal projection on X . The following hold.*

(K1) *The set of functions $\{k_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in X_0\}$ is uniformly continuous over X_0 , i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\|k_{\mathbf{x}'} - k_{\mathbf{x}''}\|_k < \epsilon, \forall \mathbf{x}', \mathbf{x}'' \in X_0 : \|\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}''\| < \eta,$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is some norm on X .

Condition (K1) is considered in [28]. It is satisfied by the linear kernel, Gaussian kernel and polynomial kernel, see details there. Under (K1), $\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \leq \beta_{X_0}$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in X_0$, where β_{X_0} is a positive constant depending on X_0 .

Next, we introduce a formal definition of statistical estimator $T_{(\cdot, \lambda)}$ parameterized by λ , where $T_{(\cdot, \lambda)}$ maps from a subset of $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{P}(Z)$ to \mathcal{H}_k . To ease the exposition, we write \mathbf{z}^N for (z^1, \dots, z^N) and $\widehat{T}(\mathbf{z}^N, \lambda_N)$ for T_{P_N, λ_N} for fixed sample size N .

Definition 3.1 (Qualitative Statistical robustness [39]) *Let $\mathcal{M} \subset \mathcal{P}(Z)$ be a set of probability measures and dl_ψ be defined as in (2.9) for some gauge function $\psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, let $\{\lambda_N\}$ be a sequence of parameters. A parameterized statistical estimator $\widehat{T}(\cdot, \lambda_N)$ is said to be robust on \mathcal{M} with respect to dl_ψ and $\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ if for all $P \in \mathcal{M}$ and $\epsilon > 0$, there exist $\delta > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that*

$$Q \in \mathcal{M}, \text{dl}_\psi(P, Q) \leq \delta \implies \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}} \left(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{T}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{T}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1} \right) \leq \epsilon \text{ for } N \geq N_0,$$

where $\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined as in (2.11).

As explained in Section 2.3, we care about the distance between the laws induced by $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$. It not only requires $\mathbf{f}_Q \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_P$ (stability), but also requires $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_P$ (consistency) and

$$\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_Q \quad (3.16)$$

uniformly for all Q close to P (uniform consistency). Here “uniform” is needed because unlike P (which is fixed albeit we do not know where it is in the space $\mathcal{P}(Z)$), Q could be anywhere around P . The uniform convergence (3.16) requires Q_N to converge to Q uniformly over a set containing P and this is known as uniform Glivenko-Cantelli (GC) property.

Definition 3.2 (Uniform Glivenko-Cantelli property) Let ψ be a gauge function and dl_ψ be defined as in (2.9). Let \mathcal{M} be a subset of \mathcal{M}_Z^ψ , where \mathcal{M}_Z^ψ is defined as in (2.7). The metric space $(\mathcal{M}, \text{dl}_\psi)$ is said to have Uniform Glivenko-Cantelli (UGC) property if for every $\epsilon > 0$ and $\delta > 0$, there exists $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$P^{\otimes N}(\vec{z}^N : \text{dl}_\psi(Q, Q_N) \geq \delta) \leq \epsilon \text{ for all } Q \in \mathcal{M}, N \geq N_0.$$

This uniform GC property in turn requires the perceived data to satisfy some topological structure. In other words, one can secure the GC property or (3.16) only when the perceived data is of reasonable structure such as light-tail, see [38, Corollary 3.5]. We are now ready to state the main result of this section.

Theorem 3.1 (Qualitative statistical robustness of kernel learning estimator) Let

$$\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma} := \left\{ P' \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z \psi(z)^\gamma P'(dz) \leq M_1 \right\},$$

where $M_1 > 0$ and $\gamma > 1$ are some positive constants. Let $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\vec{z}^N, \lambda_N) := \mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$. Assume: (a) (C1)-(C3) and (K1) hold; (b) there exists a positive number β such that $\|\mathbf{f}\|_k \leq \beta$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$; (c) the true probability distribution $P \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$. Then the following assertions hold.

(i) If $\lambda_N \downarrow \tau$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ where τ is any small positive number, then for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exist positive numbers $\delta > 0$ and $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}, \text{dl}_\psi(P, Q) \leq \delta \implies \text{dl}_{\text{PrOk}}^{\mathcal{F}}\left(P^{\otimes N} \circ \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}\right) \leq \epsilon \quad (3.17)$$

for all $N \geq N_0$, where dl_ψ is defined as in (2.9) and $\text{dl}_{\text{PrOk}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ is defined as in (2.11).

(ii) If, in addition, (d) problem (2.1) has a unique solution \mathbf{f}_P , then (3.17) holds for all $N \geq N_0$ and $\lambda_N \downarrow 0$.

Part (i) of the theorem says that the kernel learning estimator $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ is qualitatively statistically robust for all λ_N so long as it is lower bounded by a positive number τ . In that case, $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ converges to $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. The underlying reason that we want to have a positive number τ for lower bound of λ_N is that $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}$ is single-valued and hence continuous in Q under the ψ -weak topology whereas $\mathbf{f}_{Q, 0}$ is not necessarily so. Continuity is a key ingredient for deriving the desired qualitative statistical robustness. In Part (ii) of the theorem, we have removed such a condition but require the original problem (2.1) to have a unique solution. Under such a circumstance, $\mathbf{f}_{Q, 0}$ is continuous in Q and we assert that $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ is qualitatively statistically robust for all $\lambda_N \geq 0$. In other words, if $\lambda_N = 0$ for all N , i.e., we solve problem (2.1) with perceived data, then the resulting kernel learning estimator is still statistically robust so long the other conditions of the theorem are fulfilled. Next, we make some remarks on the conditions of the theorem. Condition (a) is justified earlier. Condition (b) is used in the literature, see e.g. [28, 48] and references therein. Condition (d) is more restrictive, it is satisfied when $\mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ is strictly quasi-convex. A sufficient condition is that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is strongly convex in \mathbf{f} for almost

every \mathbf{z} , i.e., there exists a positive integrable function $\sigma(\mathbf{z})$ such that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) - \sigma(\mathbf{z})\|\mathbf{f}\|^2$ is convex for almost every \mathbf{z} , where $\mathbb{E}_P[\sigma(\mathbf{z})] > 0$.

Proof of Theorem 3.1. We only prove Part (i) as Part (ii) follows from Part (i) directly. Observe that

$$\sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \left| R_{Q'}^{\lambda'}(\mathbf{f}) - R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f}) \right| \leq \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{Q'}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] \right| + \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} (\lambda' - \tau) \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2.$$

Under the condition that $\lambda' \downarrow \tau$ and condition (c), the second term at the right-hand-side (rhs) of the inequality above goes to 0. On the other hand, following a similar proof to [28, Theorem 2], we can show under condition (b) that the first term at the rhs of the inequality converges to 0 as $Q' \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} Q$ for any $Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$. Let $Q' = Q_N$. By [38, Corollary 3.5], $Q_N \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} Q$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Likewise, $P_N \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} P$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Under condition (a), $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ is the unique solution of problem (2.6). Thus, we can use Berge's maximum theorem (see Appendix A) to assert that $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}$ as $Q \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} P$. Next, note that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}) &\leq \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}}) \\ &\quad + \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}}, \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}}) \\ &\quad + \text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}), \end{aligned}$$

where δ_a denotes the Dirac measure at $a \in \mathcal{F}$. Let ϵ be any small positive number. We consider

$$\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \quad (3.18a)$$

$$\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}}, \delta_{\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \quad (3.18b)$$

$$\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}(\delta_{\mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (3.18c)$$

Since $(\mathcal{F}, \|\cdot\|_k)$ is a compact metric space, then it is separable and hence a Polish space. By definition of Prokhorov metric $\text{dl}_{\text{Prok}}^{\mathcal{F}}$ and Strassen's theorem [32], inequalities (3.18) are implied respectively by

$$\text{Prob} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\vec{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) - \mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}\|_k \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \quad (3.19a)$$

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau} - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}\|_k \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}, \quad (3.19b)$$

$$\text{Prob} \left(\|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\vec{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}\|_k \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}. \quad (3.19c)$$

By Berge's maximum theorem (see Theorem A.1), the optimal solution $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ is continuous in (Q, λ) , there exists $\delta > 0$ such that when $\text{dl}_\psi(P', P) < \delta$ and $|\lambda_N - \tau| < \delta$, we have $\|\mathbf{f}_{P', \lambda'} - \mathbf{f}_{P, \tau}\|_k < \frac{\epsilon}{6}$ ($\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}$). Thus we are left to show (3.19a) and (3.19c). We only prove the latter as the former is only a special case of the latter with $Q = P$. Note that for fixed positive number τ , problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \tau \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2$$

has a unique optimal solution $\mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}$ for any $Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$. Moreover, for any $Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$, the objective function satisfies the growth condition

$$R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f}) \geq R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}) + \tau \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}\|_k^2, \quad \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}.$$

By [27, Lemma A.1],

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q',\lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}\|_k \leq \frac{3}{\tau} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} |R_{Q'}^\lambda(\mathbf{f}) - R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f})| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z).$$

Let $Q' = Q_N, \lambda = \lambda_N$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N,\lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}\|_k &\leq \frac{3}{\tau} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} |R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}) - R_Q^\tau(\mathbf{f})| \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{\tau} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]| + \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} (\lambda_N - \tau) \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{3}{\tau} \left(\sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} |\mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]| + (\lambda_N - \tau) \beta^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.20)$$

For $Q_N \xrightarrow{\tau\psi} Q$, $\mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] \rightarrow 0$ for each fixed $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. Moreover, by Assumption 3.1(C3), the function c is uniformly continuous over any compact subset of $Z \times Y$, which ensures $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is uniformly continuous in $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. Since \mathcal{F} is compact, by the finite covering theorem, we can show that $\mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly for all $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$.

Let δ be such that when $\text{dl}_\psi(Q_N, Q) \leq \delta$ and $|\lambda_N - \tau| \leq \delta$, the rhs of (3.20) is less than $\frac{\epsilon}{6}$. On the other hand, it follows by Corollary 3.5 in [38] that $(\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}, \text{dl}_\psi)$ has the UGC property which implies that there exists N_0 such that

$$Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \text{dl}_\psi(Q_N, Q) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \quad (3.21)$$

for all $N \geq N_0$ and $Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$ including $Q = P$. Let $\text{dl}_\psi(Q, P) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}$ such that

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{P,\tau} - \mathbf{f}_{Q,\tau}\|_k \leq \frac{\epsilon}{6} \quad (\leq \frac{\epsilon}{3}). \quad (3.22)$$

By (3.21)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\epsilon}{3} &\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \text{dl}_\psi(Q_N, Q) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} \right) \\ &\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \text{dl}_\psi(Q_N, P) \geq \frac{\delta}{2} + \text{dl}_\psi(Q, P) \right) \\ &\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \text{dl}_\psi(Q_N, P) \geq \delta \right) \quad (\text{because } \text{dl}_\psi(Q, P) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}) \\ &\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N,\lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\tau}\|_k \geq \frac{\epsilon}{6} \right) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : |\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}| \geq |\mathbf{f}_{P, \tau} - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}| + \frac{\epsilon}{6} \right) \\
(3.22) \quad &\geq Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : |\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau}| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right) \\
&= Q^{\otimes N} \left(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N : \left| \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) - \mathbf{f}_{Q, \tau} \right| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{3} \right), \forall Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete. \square

Remark 3.1 *From the proof of Theorem 3.1, we can draw the following additional conclusions which are not explicitly stated in the theorem.*

- (i) Stability of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$. For fixed λ , $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda} \rightarrow \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ as $Q \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} P$ which is known as stability of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ w.r.t. perturbation of probability distribution from P to Q .
- (ii) Uniform consistency of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda}$. For fixed λ , $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda}$ converges to $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$ uniformly for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$. This result is known as uniform consistency which ensures the kernel learning estimator converges to its true counterpart when the sample size goes to infinity and such convergence is uniform so long as Q lies in $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$. The latter in turn requires a specific structure of perceived data.

The next example shows how the qualitative statistical robustness results may be established in support vector machine (SVM).

Example 3.1 *Consider a specific constrained SVM (see [64, Section 1])*

$$\inf_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_P[\max\{0, 1 - y\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}],$$

where $\mathcal{F} = \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}_k : \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \leq \beta\}$, $\beta > 0$ is a constant, \mathcal{H}_k is a RKHS with polynomial kernel $k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}') := (\gamma \langle \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \rangle + 1)^d$, for $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma > 0$ is a constant, P is the probability measure of random vector \mathbf{z} with support Z . The regularized formulation of the problem can be written as

$$\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} := \arg \min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[\max\{0, 1 - y\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\}] + \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2, \quad (3.23)$$

where $Q_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^i}$ is the empirical probability measure constructed by perturbed data $\{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^i\}_{i=1}^N$, $\lambda_N \downarrow \tau > 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. We can set $\psi(\mathbf{z})$ as in (3.15). Then all of the conditions in Theorem 3.1 are satisfied, which means that the statistical estimator $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ defined in (3.23) is qualitatively statistical robust.

4 Quantitative statistical robustness

The qualitative statistical robustness results guarantee that the laws of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ are close when Q is sufficiently close to P . However, it is short of giving an explicit relation between ϵ and δ in (3.17), which means that for a given ϵ , it could be the case that δ should be very small which is undesirable. In this section, we propose to address the issue by deriving quantitative statistical robustness of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ where the relation between ϵ and δ is explicitly described. To this end, we will confine our discussions to a specific class of differentiable functions.

4.1 First order optimality condition

A key step to establish the quantitative statistical robustness of the regularized empirical risk minimizer/stationary solution $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$ is to show the continuity of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ w.r.t a small perturbation of P and λ . In this section, we investigate the effect of perturbation of probability P on the optimal solutions to problems (2.1) and (2.3). This kind of research is well-known in the literature of stochastic programming [58] but much in machine learning.

We begin by deriving the first-order optimality conditions of the two problems. To this end, we investigate the differentiability of functional $R_P(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$. Our aim is to establish

$$D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]) = \mathbb{E}_P[D_{\mathbf{f}}c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))], \text{ for } \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}, \quad (4.24)$$

see Appendix B for the definition of $D_{\mathbf{f}}$. We need to come up with some additional conditions on function c to ensure (4.24).

Assumption 4.1 *Let c be defined as in (2.1) and $\Psi : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is an integrable function. The following hold.*

(C3)' *There exists Ψ such that, for almost every $\mathbf{z} \in Z$,*

$$|c(\mathbf{z}, w_1) - c(\mathbf{z}, w_2)| \leq \Psi(\mathbf{z})|w_1 - w_2|, \quad \forall w_1, w_2 \in Y.$$

(C4) *For almost every $\mathbf{z} \in Z$, $c(\mathbf{z}, w)$ is continuously differentiable in w .*

Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}} := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \mathbb{E}_Q[\psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty, \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty\}, \quad (4.25)$$

where ψ is defined as in (C2). (C3)' requires Lipschitz continuity of $c(\mathbf{z}, w)$ in w . (C3)' will be used to derive the Lipschitz continuity of the integrand $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ in \mathbf{f} under (K1). The assumption is standard in stability analysis and algorithm design in stochastic programming, see e.g. [63, Theorem 7.44]. This condition is trivially satisfied when Z is compact. In [48], Norkin and Keyzer commented on page 1208 that ‘‘compactness of Z or Y is commonly accepted in the statistical learning literature, where it allows us to apply exponential concentration measure inequalities for bounded random variables as developed by Bernstein, McDiarmid, and Hoeffding’’, see for example Cucker and Smale [18, 17], Bousquet and Elisseeff [10], Schölkopf and Smola [60], Poggio and Smale [50], De Vito et al. [20]. (C4) is required when we derive the first-order optimality condition of problems (2.1) and (2.3).

Proposition 4.1 *Assume: (a) (C1), (C2), (C3)', and (C4) hold; (b) k satisfies that $\mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$ for all $Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$; (c) for each fixed $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{E}_Q[\|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\|_k] < \infty$, for all $Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}$. Then*

$$D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]) = \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}], \text{ for each } Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}},$$

where $D_{\mathbf{f}}(R_Q(\mathbf{f}))$ is the Gâteaux derivative of functional R_Q w.r.t. \mathbf{f} in an open neighborhood containing \mathcal{F} and c'_2 denotes the derivative of $c(\cdot, \cdot)$ w.r.t. the second argument, $c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}$ is \mathcal{H}_k -valued random element.¹

The proposition states that under some appropriate conditions, the interchange of the differentiation in \mathbf{f} and the integration can be made in the setting of infinite dimensional space and hence the objective function in (2.1) is continuously differentiable. The main difference between Proposition 4.1 and [63, Theorem 7.44] is that the former considers the derivative of the nonlinear functional defined over function space \mathcal{H}_k , where the chain rule, the definition of the derivative in infinite dimensional space, and the properties of RKHS are considered, whereas the latter focuses on the functions defined over Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m (i.e., \mathbf{f} is independent of \mathbf{x} in our context), see also [14, Theorem 2.7.2]. Note that we can represent $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ artificially as a function $\hat{c}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f})$ and then invoke [9, Theorem 7.44] or [14, Theorem 2.7.2] but this may require additional conditions, we leave interested readers to explore. For functions defined over Banach space, if the integrand $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is continuous jointly in \mathbf{z} and \mathbf{f} , and $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is convex in \mathbf{f} for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z$, then the differentiation and the integration can be interchanged, see [9, Proposition 2.175], where convexity plays an important role and the monotone convergence theorem is applied, while in Proposition 4.1, we use uniform integrability and the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. Under Assumption 4.1(C3)', $\mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ is well-defined. Moreover, it follows by Assumption 4.1(C4) that for any $\mathbf{f}_1, \mathbf{f}_2 \in \mathcal{F}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R_Q(\mathbf{f}_1) - R_Q(\mathbf{f}_2)| &\leq \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})|\mathbf{f}_1(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}_2(\mathbf{x})|] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})|\langle \mathbf{f}_1, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{f}_2, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle|] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k\|\mathbf{f}_1 - \mathbf{f}_2\|_k] = L\|\mathbf{f}_1 - \mathbf{f}_2\|_k, \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

where $L := \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k]$. This shows that $R_Q(\mathbf{f})$ is Lipschitz continuous over \mathcal{F} . For any fixed $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{h}\|_k = 1$ and $t > 0$ consider the ratio

$$\mathfrak{R}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h}) := t^{-1}[c(\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{x})) - c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))].$$

Inequality (4.26) implies $|\mathfrak{R}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h})| \leq \Psi(\mathbf{z})\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k\|\mathbf{h}\|_k$. By Assumption 4.1(C4), $c(\mathbf{z}, \cdot)$ is continuously differentiable, then

$$\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathfrak{R}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h}) = c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle.$$

Consequently, by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{R_Q(\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h}) - R_Q(\mathbf{f})}{t} &= \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathbb{E}_Q[\mathfrak{R}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h})] = \mathbb{E}_Q[\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \mathfrak{R}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h})] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle], \end{aligned}$$

which shows that $R_Q(\mathbf{f})$ is directionally differentiable. Thus

$$R'_Q(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h}) = \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle].$$

¹For a basic probability space (Σ, S, \mathbf{P}) and let (F, S') be some measurable space. A random element in F (more precisely, an F -valued random element) is any mapping $X : \Sigma \rightarrow F$, measurable with respect to the σ -algebras S and S' , see [12, page 86].

Since $R'_Q(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h})$ is linear and continuous in \mathbf{h} , then R_Q is Gâteaux differentiable. To show continuous differentiability of $R_Q(\mathbf{f})$, we note that for fixed \mathbf{z} , $c(\mathbf{z}, w)$ is continuously differentiable in w , and for fixed \mathbf{x} , with the continuity of $k(\cdot, \cdot)$, $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{f}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle$ is continuously differentiable in \mathbf{f} . This guarantees that for fixed \mathbf{z} , $D_{\mathbf{f}}(c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})))$ is continuous in \mathbf{f} . This ensures that $D_{\mathbf{f}}(R_Q(\mathbf{f}))(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\langle \cdot, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle]$ is continuous in \mathbf{f} . \square

With Proposition 4.1, we are ready to derive the first-order optimality conditions of (2.1) and (2.3).

Theorem 4.1 (First-order optimality conditions of (2.1) and (2.3)) *Assume the setting and conditions of Proposition 4.1. Then the first order optimality conditions of (2.1) and (2.3) can be written respectively as*

$$0 \in \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}), \quad (4.27)$$

and

$$0 \in \mathbb{E}_{P_N}[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda_N \mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}), \quad (4.28)$$

where $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}) := \{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{H}_k : \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbf{g} - \mathbf{f} \rangle \leq 0, \forall \mathbf{g} \in \mathcal{F}\}$ denotes the normal cone in \mathcal{H}_k for a convex set $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ at \mathbf{f} (see [9, page 48]).

Proof. Note that $D_{\mathbf{f}}(\|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2) = D_{\mathbf{f}}(\langle \mathbf{f}, \mathbf{f} \rangle) = 2\mathbf{f}$. We can apply Proposition 4.1 to problems (2.1) and (2.6) to obtain (4.27) and (4.28). \square

Systems (4.27) and (4.28) are SVIP in RKHS \mathcal{H}_k . Differing from Guo and Xu [26] where the decision variables are deterministic, here the decision variable is infinite dimensional and is a function of \mathbf{x} which is random. In the case when $c(\mathbf{z}, \cdot)$ is convex, any solutions to (4.27) and (4.28) correspond to the the solutions of (2.1) and (2.3). Let \mathbf{f}_P (resp. $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}$) be a solution to (4.27) (resp. to (4.28)). In order to secure statistical robustness of the solution against perturbation of P (resp. P_N), we need to ensure the perturbation is under the appropriate topology of probability measures/distributions which is more restrictive than the usual topology of weak convergence. The next subsection prepares us for this and we will come back to re-explain in Remark 4.2.

4.2 Lipschitz continuity of the stationary solution

We begin by examining the continuity of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ as P, λ varies. We propose to do so by exploiting a generic stability result for an abstract generalized equation in Banach space in [9] because SVIP (4.28) may be regarded as a special generalized equation. To this end, we need to make some additional assumptions on the cost function and the kernel function and derive some intermediate technical results in the next proposition.

Assumption 4.2 *Let c be defined as in (2.1) and $L_p(\mathbf{z}', \mathbf{z}'')$ be given in (2.12). The following hold.*

(C2)' There exist an exponent $p_0 > 1$ and a constant $C_0 > 0$ such that

$$|c(\mathbf{z}, w)| \leq C_0(\|\mathbf{z}\|^{p_0-1} + |w|^{p_0-1} + 1), \quad \forall (\mathbf{z}, w) \in Z \times Y.$$

(C3)'' Let Ψ be defined as in (C3)'. In addition to (C3)', there exists $\bar{p}_0 (= p_0 - 1) > 1$ and $\bar{C}_0 > 0$ such that

$$\Psi(\mathbf{z}) \leq \bar{C}_0 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{\bar{p}_0-1}.$$

(C4)' There exist a constant $C_1 > 0$ and $p_1 \geq 1$ such that for any $w_1, w_2 \in \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z$

$$|c'_2(\mathbf{z}_1, w_1) - c'_2(\mathbf{z}_2, w_2)| \leq C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)(\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + |w_1 - w_2|).$$

(C5) There exist a constant $C_2 > 0$ and $p_2 \geq 1$ such that for any $w_1, w_2 \in Y$, $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z$,

$$|c''_2(\mathbf{z}_1, w_1) - c''_2(\mathbf{z}_2, w_2)| \leq C_2 L_{p_2}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)(\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + |w_1 - w_2|).$$

Condition (C2)' characterizes the growth condition of function c whereas (C4)' and (C5) stipulate locally Lipschitz continuity of $c'_2(\mathbf{z}, w)$ and and global Lipschitz continuity of $c''_2(\mathbf{z}, w)$ w.r.t. the second argument w . These assumptions are more specific and/or restrictive than those of (C3)' and (C4) in terms of growth in \mathbf{z} and Lipschitz continuity w.r.t. w . The condition is trivially satisfied by the quadratic loss function $c(\mathbf{z}, w) = \frac{1}{2}|y - w|^2$. In the case when Z is bounded, (C2)' is automatically satisfied whereas (C4)' and (C5) reduce to global Lipschitz continuity in both \mathbf{z} and w .

Assumption 4.3 *Assume:*

(K1)' Kernel function k is Lipschitz continuous, i.e., there exists constant $C_3 > 0$ such that

$$\|k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k \leq C_3 \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in X.$$

Condition (K1)' is stronger than condition (K1). However, it can be easily satisfied when X is a compact set in that most kernel functions in machine learning are locally Lipschitz continuous. The assumption implies that

$$\|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2)\| \leq \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k \leq C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|, \quad (4.29)$$

for any $\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2 \in X$. In the case when $\|\mathbf{f}\|_k$ is bounded, the condition ensures local Lipschitz continuity of \mathbf{f} over X .

Remark 4.1 *It is possible to unify conditions (C2)', (C3)'', (C4)' and (K1)' such that $\mathbb{E}_Q[\psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty$, $\mathbb{E}_Q[|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$, and $\mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z}) \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$ when Q is restricted to a specific set of probability distributions. We streamline the idea as follows.*

(i) Under (C2)' and (C3)'', we are guaranteed that

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \mathbb{E}_Q[\psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty, \mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z})] < \infty\} = \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0-1\}}.$$

(ii) Let $\mathbf{z}_0 = (\mathbf{x}_0, y_0) \in Z$ be fixed. Under (K1)',

$$\|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \leq \|k_{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_k + C_3 \|\mathbf{x} - \mathbf{x}_0\| \leq (\|k_{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_k + 2C_3 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{x}_0\|\}) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} =: \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} \quad (4.30)$$

which ensures $\int_X \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k Q_X(d\mathbf{x}) < \infty$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^1$, where Q_X denotes the marginal distribution w.r.t. \mathbf{x} and \mathcal{M}_Z^p is defined as in (2.8).

(iii) Let \mathbf{f} and \mathbf{z}_0 be fixed. Then

$$L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_0) \leq \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\}^{p_1-1} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_1-1} \quad (4.31)$$

and $\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_0\| \leq \|\mathbf{z}\| + \|\mathbf{z}_0\| \leq 2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}$. Combining with (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_0\| + |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)| &\leq (1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_0\| \\ &\leq 2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.32)$$

and subsequently

$$\begin{aligned} |c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| &\stackrel{(C4)'}{\leq} |c'_2(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_0) (\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_0\| + |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)|) \\ &\stackrel{(4.32)}{\leq} |c'_2(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_0) \left(2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(4.31)}{\leq} |c'_2(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| \\ &\quad + C_1 \left(\max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\}^{p_1-1} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_1-1} \right) \left(2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} \right) \\ &\leq \left(|c'_2(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + 2C_1 (1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\}^{p_1} \right) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_1} \\ &=: \widehat{M}_2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_1}, \forall \mathbf{z} \in Z. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, for each fixed $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{E}_Q[|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))|] < \infty$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{p_1}$.

(iv) By the results in Parts (ii) and (iii) in this remark, we obtain

$$|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \leq \widehat{M}_1 \widehat{M}_2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_1+1}, \forall \mathbf{z} \in Z.$$

Thus, for each fixed $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}$, $\mathbb{E}_Q[|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$, for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{p_1+1}$.

(v) By Part (ii) in the remark, under (C3)'' and (K1)',

$$\Psi(\mathbf{z}) \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \leq \bar{C}_0 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{\bar{p}_0-1} \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} = \bar{C}_0 \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{\bar{p}_0}.$$

Thus $\mathbb{E}_Q[\Psi(\mathbf{z}) \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$, for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{\bar{p}_0}$.

Part (i) means that $\hat{\mathcal{P}} = \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0-1\}}$ and Parts (iv) and (v) mean that the conditions (b) and (c) in Proposition 4.1 hold for $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_1+1, \bar{p}_0\}}$. Therefore, the optimality condition in proposition 4.1 holds for $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0-1\}} \cap \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_1+1, \bar{p}_0\}} = \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0, p_1+1\}}$.

Next, we derive the second order derivative of $\mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ w.r.t. \mathbf{f} , that is, the derivative of $\mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) k_{\mathbf{x}}]$, when Q is restricted to a specific set of probability distributions.

Proposition 4.2 Let $\text{span}\{k_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in X\} \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ be the space spanned by $k_{\mathbf{x}}$ and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{h}} := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \mathbb{E}_Q[\|c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty, \mathbb{E}_Q[\|c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\| \|T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}\|_k] < \infty\} \quad (4.33)$$

for $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, where $T_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \text{span}\{k_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in X\}$ is a projection mapping on $\text{span}\{k_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathbf{x} \in X\}$ and

$$T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h} := k_{\mathbf{x}}\langle k_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{h} \rangle. \quad (4.34)$$

Assume that (C2)', (C4)', (C5) and (K1)' hold. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{h}} \subset \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_1+1, p_2+2\}}$ for all $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ and

$$D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]) = \mathbb{E}_Q[c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}], \quad \forall Q \in \mathcal{M}^{\max\{p_1+1, p_2+2\}}.$$

The proof is included in Appendix D. Note that

$$\langle T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \rangle = \langle k_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{h}_1 \rangle \langle k_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{h}_2 \rangle \quad (4.35)$$

for any $\mathbf{h}, \mathbf{h}_1, \mathbf{h}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Observe that $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a linear operator, and from the definition in (B.63), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|T_{\mathbf{x}}\|_{\mathcal{L}} &= \sup_{\|\mathbf{h}\|_k \leq 1} \|T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}\|_k = \sup_{\|\mathbf{h}\|_k \leq 1} \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\langle k_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{h} \rangle\|_k \leq \sup_{\|\mathbf{h}\|_k \leq 1} \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k |\langle k_{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{h} \rangle| \\ &\leq \sup_{\|\mathbf{h}\|_k \leq 1} \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \|\mathbf{h}\|_k \leq \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2 = k(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}), \end{aligned}$$

which implies that for every $\mathbf{x} \in X$, $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a bounded linear operator, and thus $T_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k)$, which means $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ is a $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k)$ -valued random element. The next proposition states that under some moderate conditions, both $c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}$ are locally Lipschitz continuous in \mathbf{z} uniformly for all \mathbf{f} in a neighborhood $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}$.

Proposition 4.3 Let (C2)', (C3)'', (C4)' and (K1)' hold and $\mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ is fixed. Let $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0} := \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F} : \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_0\|_k \leq \epsilon_{\mathcal{V}}\}$ be a neighborhood of \mathbf{f}_0 . Then the following assertions hold.

(i) There exists a positive constant $C_{\mathbf{f}_0} > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{d}\|_k \leq 1$,

$$|\langle (c'_2(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c'_2(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_2})\mathbf{d} \rangle| \leq C_{\mathbf{f}_0} L_{p_1+1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z, \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0},$$

where $L_p(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2)$ is defined as in (2.12) for all $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z$, and $p_1 \geq 1$ is defined as in (C4)'.

(ii) In addition, under (C5), there exists a positive constant $\hat{C}_{\mathbf{f}_0} > 0$ such that for any $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{d}_1\|_k \leq 1, \|\mathbf{d}_2\|_k \leq 1$,

$$|\langle (c''_2(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))T_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c''_2(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))T_{\mathbf{x}_2})\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \rangle| \leq \hat{C}_{\mathbf{f}_0} L_{p_2+2}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|, \quad \forall \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z, \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}.$$

where $p_2 \geq 1$ is defined as in (C5).

The proof is standard, we include an outline of it in Appendix E. By Remark 4.1 and Propositions 4.2 and 4.3, we know that the derivative result and the Lipschitz continuity of the derivative hold for all probability distributions in $\mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0, p_1+1\}} \cap \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_1+1, p_2+2\}} = \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_0-1, \bar{p}_0, p_1+1, p_2+2\}}$.

To ease exposition in the forthcoming discussions, we set

$$p := \max\{p_0 - 1, \bar{p}_0, p_1 + 1, p_2 + 2\}. \quad (4.36)$$

With the proposition, we move on to investigate the stability of the following generalized equation

$$0 \in \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda\mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}), \quad (4.37)$$

which is the first-order optimality condition of the regularized optimization problem

$$\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_Q[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda\|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2, \quad (4.38)$$

where $Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$, $\lambda \geq 0$. We are interested in existence of a unique solution \mathbf{f} to (4.37) and local Lipschitz continuity of \mathbf{f} w.r.t. variation of (Q, λ) near (P, λ_0) for some $\lambda_0 > 0$, which is, in essence, to derive an implicit function theorem for (4.37). Observe first that under the inf-compactness condition (2.2), the set of solutions to (4.38) is nonempty and bounded, which means that the set of solutions to (4.37) is nonempty and bounded. Let $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ be a stationary point to (4.38). Our ultimate interest is global Lipschitz continuity of $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ in (Q, λ) which is an important step towards establishing quantitative statistical robustness of the solution in the forthcoming discussions. To this end, we consider the case that for $Q = P$ and $\lambda = \lambda_0$, (4.37) has a solution $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}$, and demonstrate that $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in a neighborhood of (P, λ_0) . We then take a step further to derive sufficient conditions under which $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is globally Lipschitz continuous.

The proof will be based on an existing stability result about an abstract generalized equation established by Bonnans and Shapiro [9]. Let S, W be Banach spaces, $\phi : S \rightarrow W$ be a continuously differentiable mapping, and $\mathcal{N} : S \rightrightarrows W$ be a set-valued mapping. Consider the following abstract generalized equation: find $s \in S$ such that

$$0 \in \phi(s) + \mathcal{N}(s). \quad (4.39)$$

s_0 is called a *strong regular solution* of the abstract generalized equation (4.39) if there exist neighborhoods \mathcal{V}_S and \mathcal{V}_W of $s_0 \in S$ and $0 \in W$ respectively such that for every $\delta \in \mathcal{V}_W$, the linearized abstract generalized equation $\delta \in \phi(s_0) + D\phi(s_0)(s - s_0) + \mathcal{N}(s)$, which is parameterized by δ , has a unique solution in \mathcal{V}_S , denoted by $\zeta(\delta)$, and the mapping $\zeta : \mathcal{V}_W \rightarrow \mathcal{V}_S$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant β , that is

$$\|\zeta(\delta) - \zeta(\tilde{\delta})\|_S \leq \beta\|\delta - \tilde{\delta}\|_W, \quad \forall \delta, \tilde{\delta} \in \mathcal{V}_W, \quad (4.40)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_S$ and $\|\cdot\|_W$ are the respective norms in Banach spaces S and W . A combination of the existence of $\zeta(\cdot)$ and the Lipschitz conditions (4.40) is known as strong regularity condition in the generalized equations, see [9, Definition 5.12].

Lemma 4.1 ([9, page 415]) *Let V be an open neighborhood of s_0 and consider the Banach space $C^1(V, W)$ of continuously differentiable mappings $\phi : V \rightarrow W$ equipped with norm $\|\phi\|_{1,V} := \sup_{s \in V} \|\phi(s)\| + \sup_{s \in V} \|D\phi(s)\|$. If s_0 is a strongly regular solution of the generalized equation (4.39), then for all $\tilde{\phi}$ in a neighborhood of ϕ with respect to the norm $\|\cdot\|_{1,V}$, the generalized equation $0 \in \tilde{\phi}(s) + \mathcal{N}(s)$ has a Lipschitz continuous (and hence unique) solution $\bar{s}(\tilde{\phi})$ in a neighborhood of s_0 .*

We are now ready to present our stability results about the generalized equation (4.37). Let $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be an open neighborhood of some function $\mathbf{f}_0 \in \mathcal{F}$, where \mathcal{F} is the feasible set of problem (2.1). Let $C^1(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}, \mathcal{H}_k)$ be a space of continuously differentiable mappings $\psi : \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ equipped with the norm:

$$\|\psi\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}} := \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}} \|\psi(\mathbf{f})\|_k + \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}} \|D\psi(\mathbf{f})\|_{\mathcal{L}}, \quad (4.41)$$

where $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}}$ is defined as in (B.63), $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}$ is given in Proposition 4.3. Note that $(C^1(\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}, \mathcal{H}_k), \|\cdot\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}})$ is a Banach space, see [9, page 415]. The norm defined as in (4.41) is standard in Euclidean space \mathbb{R}^m . Specifically, let $K \subset \mathbb{R}^m$ be a domain (an open connected subset), and $C^1(K, \mathbb{R})$ denotes the set of continuously differentiable real-valued functions defined over K , endowed with bounded norm $\|\mathbf{f}\|_{C^1(K, \mathbb{R})} := \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in K} |\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})| + \sup_{\mathbf{x} \in K} \|D\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})\|$, where $D\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ is the derivative of \mathbf{f} at $\mathbf{x} \in K$. $(C^1(K, \mathbb{R}), \|\cdot\|_{C^1(K, \mathbb{R})})$ is a Banach space, see e.g. [19, page 18].

Theorem 4.2 (Lipschitz continuity of the solution of (4.27) and (4.37)) *Let p be defined as in (4.36) and \mathcal{M}_Z^p be defined as in (2.8), let $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ be a solution to (4.37) and $\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}} = \{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F} : \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}\|_k \leq \epsilon_{\mathcal{V}}\}$ be a neighborhood of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}$ under the norm $\|\cdot\|_k$. Let $\psi : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ be defined as*

$$\psi(\mathbf{f}) := \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda_0 \mathbf{f}.$$

Under (C2)', (C3)'', (C4)', and (C5),

the following assertions hold.

- (i) *Let $Q = P \in \mathcal{M}_Z^p$ and $\lambda = \lambda_0 \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ for some $\tau > 0$ and $\bar{\lambda} > 0$. Let \mathcal{V}_{ψ} be a neighborhood of ψ . If $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}$ is a strongly regular solution of (4.37), then (4.37) has a unique solution $\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}}$ for $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathcal{V}_{\psi}$ such that*

$$\|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}_1} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}_2}\|_k \leq \kappa_{P, \lambda_0} \|\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}}, \forall \tilde{\psi}_1, \tilde{\psi}_2 \in \mathcal{V}_{\psi}. \quad (4.42)$$

- (ii) *Then there exist constants $\delta > 0$ and $\bar{C}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}} > 0$ such that*

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_1, \lambda_1} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_2, \lambda_2}\|_k \leq 2\bar{C}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}} \kappa_{P, \lambda_0} (\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q_1, Q_2) + |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|) \quad (4.43)$$

for all $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{M}_Z^p$ satisfying $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q_1, P) \leq \delta$ and $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q_2, P) \leq \delta$, and $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ satisfying $|\lambda_1 - \lambda_0| \leq \delta$ and $|\lambda_2 - \lambda_0| \leq \delta$.

(iii) For some constants $\gamma > 1$, $p \geq 1$ and M_2 , let

$$\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} := \left\{ Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z \|z\|^{p\gamma} Q(dz) \leq M_2 \right\}. \quad (4.44)$$

Let $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p} \times \tau_{\mathbb{R}}$ denote the product topology of $\|\cdot\|^p$ -weak topology and the standard topology on \mathbb{R} ([46, page 81]). If, in addition, (a) there is a continuous $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ to (4.38) such that $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \cdot)} : \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}] \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ is continuous under $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p} \times \tau_{\mathbb{R}}$, (b) the strong regularity condition for (4.37) holds at $\mathbf{f}_{P', \lambda'}$ for any $P' \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ and $\lambda' \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$, then there exists a constant $C_\kappa > 0$ such that for any $(Q', \lambda'), (Q'', \lambda'') \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$,

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q', \lambda'} - \mathbf{f}_{Q'', \lambda''}\|_k \leq 2C_\kappa(\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q'') + |\lambda' - \lambda''|).$$

(iv) Let $\mathcal{P}_N := \{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \delta_{z^i} : z^i \in Z\}$. If, in addition, $\mathcal{P}_N \subset \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$, then

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N^1, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_N^2, \lambda_N}\|_k \leq \frac{2C_\kappa}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \max\{1, \|z_1^l\|, \|z_2^l\|\}^{p-1} \|z_1^l - z_2^l\|, \quad (4.45)$$

where $Q_N^1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \delta_{z_1^l}$, $Q_N^2 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \delta_{z_2^l}$, and $\lambda_N \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ for all $N \in \mathbb{N}$.

Before presenting a proof, we make a few comments about the conditions and results of this theorem. Part (i) of the theorem states that the local Lipschitz continuity of the solution mapping of the system (4.37) in terms of variations of $\int_Z c'_2(z, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) k_{\mathbf{x}} Q(dz) + 2\lambda \mathbf{f}$ as Q and λ vary. Part (ii) quantifies the continuity in terms of Q and λ under the product topology $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p} \times \tau_{\mathbb{R}}$, where topology $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p}$ can be metricized by the Fortet-Mourier metric (see Proposition 2.1) and $\tau_{\mathbb{R}}$ can be metricized by the standard metric in \mathbb{R} (see [46, Example 2, page 120]). Part (iii) of the theorem says that if there is a continuous solution trajectory to the system (4.37) over $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$, and the strong regularity condition holds at every point of the trajectory, then the solution mapping is globally Lipschitz continuous in Q and λ over $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ under the product topology of the $\|\cdot\|^p$ -weak topology and the standard topology in \mathbb{R} . The continuity holds when (4.37) has a unique solution for every $P \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$, $\lambda_0 \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$, and strong regularity condition holds (see Lemma 4.1) although our interest is not restricted to this case. Note that $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \subset \mathcal{M}_Z^p$. We need the boundedness of the $p\gamma$ -moment because it ensures relative compactness of $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ under topology $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p}$ (see [15, Lemma 2.69]) required in the proof of Part (iii). Part (iv) is a specific version of Part (iii) when Q' and Q'' are empirical probability distributions and $\mathcal{P}_N \subset \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$. The result prepares us for the statistical robustness of the regularized stationary point in Theorem 4.3. Finally, we note that all of the results cover (4.27) as a special case with λ being fixed as a constant 0.

A key condition required in this theorem is strong regularity of the solution $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}$ in Part (i) and $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ in Part (iii) for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ and $\lambda \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$. To see how these conditions may be possibly satisfied, we consider the case where the cost function $c(z, w)$ is convex in w . In this case, $R_P(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_P[c(z, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))]$ is convex in \mathbf{f} and subsequently $R_P(\mathbf{f}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2$ is strongly convex for $\lambda > 0$. The strong convexity of $R_P(\mathbf{f}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2$ ensures that the regularized problem (4.38) has a unique optimal solution and the second order growth condition holds at the solution. The discussions above show that the strong regularity conditions may be satisfied when $c(z, w)$

is convex in w and $\lambda > 0$. It is important to note that strong regularity condition does not necessarily imply convexity of $c(\mathbf{z}, \cdot)$.

Another important condition required in this theorem is continuous differentiability of the cost function in w . In the literature of machine learning, some cost functions are not continuously differentiable. A potential way to tackle this is smoothing ([54]) so that the smoothed cost function is twice continuously differentiable in w . We can then perform the analysis with the smoothed problem and drive the smoothing parameter to zero, again we leave this for future exploration.

Proof of Theorem 4.2. We use Lemma 4.1 to prove the results. We begin by identifying s_0, S, V, W, ϕ and $\|\cdot\|_{1,V}$ of the lemma in the context of generalized equation (4.37), i.e., $s_0 = \mathbf{f}_0, S = \mathcal{H}_k, V = \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}, W = \mathbb{R}, \phi(s) = \psi(\mathbf{f})$, and $\|\cdot\|_{1,V}$ corresponds to $\|\cdot\|_{1,\mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}}$. Part (i) follows directly from Lemma 4.1.

Part (ii). In Part (i), the implicit function is defined over the space of parameter ψ . Since ψ is determined by (Q, λ) , then we can describe the implicit function in terms of the latter. Let $\tilde{\psi}_1, \tilde{\psi}_2 \in \mathcal{V}_\psi$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_i, \lambda_i} = \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$. By (4.42),

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_1, \lambda_1} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_2, \lambda_2}\|_k = \|\bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}_1} - \bar{\mathbf{f}}_{\tilde{\psi}_2}\|_k \leq \kappa_{P, \lambda_0} \|\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}}. \quad (4.46)$$

To prove (4.43), it suffices to show that

$$\|\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}} \leq 2\bar{C}_{P, \lambda_0} \kappa_{P, \lambda_0} (\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_1, Q_2) + |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|).$$

Since \mathcal{H}_k is a Hilbert space, the dual space \mathcal{H}_k^* is canonically identified with \mathcal{H}_k . Under Assumption 4.2(C3)'', (C4)' and (C5), we have by Proposition 4.3 that for any $\mathbf{d}, \mathbf{d}_i \in \mathcal{H}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{d}\|_k \leq 1, \|\mathbf{d}_i\|_k \leq 1, i = 1, 2$,

$$\frac{1}{\max\{C_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}, \hat{C}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}\}} \langle \mathbf{d}(\cdot), c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_p(Z)$$

and $\frac{1}{\max\{C_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}, \hat{C}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}\}} \langle c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{F}_p(Z)$. Note that

$$\|(\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2)(\mathbf{f})\|_k = \sup_{\mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{H}_k, \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \leq 1} \langle \mathbf{d}, (\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2)(\mathbf{f}) \rangle.$$

It follows by the definition of $\|\cdot\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2\|_{1, \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}} \\ &= \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}} \|(\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2)(\mathbf{f})\|_k + \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda_0}}} \|D_{\mathbf{f}}((\tilde{\psi}_1 - \tilde{\psi}_2)(\mathbf{f}))\|_{\mathcal{L}} \\ &\leq \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}} \\ \mathbf{d} \in \mathcal{H}_k, \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \leq 1}} \langle \mathbf{d}, \mathbb{E}_{Q_1}[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_2}[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] \rangle + 2|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \\ &\quad + \sup_{\substack{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda_0}}, \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_k \\ \|\mathbf{d}_1\|_k \leq 1, \|\mathbf{d}_2\|_k \leq 1}} | \langle (\mathbb{E}_{Q_1}[c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_2}[c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}])\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \rangle | + 2|\lambda_1 - \lambda_2| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq 2\bar{C}_{P,\lambda_0}(\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_1, Q_2) + |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|) \quad (4.47)$$

for $Q_1, Q_2 \in \mathcal{M}_Z^p$, where $\bar{C}_{P,\lambda_0} = \max\{C_{\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda_0}}, \hat{C}_{\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda_0}}, \|\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda_0}\| + \epsilon_{\mathcal{V}}\}$, with $\epsilon_{\mathcal{V}}$ being given in Proposition 4.3. Let $\tilde{\psi}_1 = \tilde{\psi}_i$ and $\tilde{\psi}_2 = \psi$, then there exists $\delta > 0$ such that $\tilde{\psi}_i \in \mathcal{V}_{\psi}$ for all $(Q_i, \lambda_i) \in \mathcal{M}_Z^p \times \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfying $\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_i, P) \leq \delta$ and $|\lambda_i - \lambda_0| \leq \delta$, $i = 1, 2$. Combining (4.47) and (4.46), (4.43) holds.

Part (iii). We use the finite covering theorem to prove the result. Observe first that $[\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ is compact under the standard topology, [46, Example 1, page 14] and [46, Theorem 27.1], and $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ is relatively compact under $\|\cdot\|^p$ -weak topology when $p \geq 1$ and $\gamma > 1$ (see [15, Lemma 2.69]). Moreover, it follows from and Proposition 2.1 that \mathbf{d}_{FM} metricizes the $\|\cdot\|^p$ -weak topology. Thus, by virtue of Prokhorov's theorem [51] and the compactness of $[\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$, we can construct a δ -net $\mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda := \{(Q_1, \lambda_1), \dots, (Q_J, \lambda_J)\}$ in $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}) \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ under the metric $\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(\cdot, \cdot) \times d_{\mathbb{R}}(\cdot, \cdot)$ such that $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}] \subset \cup_{j=1}^J B((Q_j, \lambda_j), \delta)$, where $d_{\mathbb{R}}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) := |\lambda_1 - \lambda_2|$, $\text{cl}(S)$ denotes the topological closure of the set $S \subset \mathcal{P}(Z)$, $B(Q_j, \delta)$ denotes a closed ball centered at Q_j with radius δ under the metric $\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(\cdot, \cdot) \times d_{\mathbb{R}}(\cdot, \cdot)$. Note that the argument can also be looked at from a different perspective. By [33, Theorem 2.15], $\mathcal{P}(Z)$ is a Polish space. Thus we can apply the finite covering theorem to $\text{cl}(\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}) \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ which is weakly compact under topology $\tau_{\|\cdot\|^p} \times \tau_{\mathbb{R}}$. Since $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \cdot)}$ is assumed to be defined continuously over $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ and the strong regularity condition holds at every point $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ for $(Q, \lambda) \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$, then we may set δ sufficiently small such that $\mathbf{f}_{Q, \lambda}$ is the unique solution to (4.38) for $(Q, \lambda) \in B(Q_j, \delta)$, $j = 1, \dots, J$. Following a similar argument to Part (ii), we can show that

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_j, \lambda_j'} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_j'', \lambda_j''}\|_k \leq 2C_{Q_j, \lambda_j}(\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_j', Q_j'') + |\lambda_j' - \lambda_j''|) \quad (4.48)$$

for any $(Q_j', \lambda_j'), (Q_j'', \lambda_j'') \in B((Q_j, \lambda_j), \delta)$ satisfying $\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_j', Q_j) + |\lambda_j' - \lambda_j| \leq \delta$ and $\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q_j'', Q_j) + |\lambda_j'' - \lambda_j| \leq \delta$ for $j = 1, \dots, J$, where $C_{Q_j, \lambda_j} := \bar{C}_{Q_j, \lambda_j} \kappa_{Q_j, \lambda_j}$ is a positive constant depending on (Q_j, λ_j) .

For any $(Q', \lambda'), (Q'', \lambda'') \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \times [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ and $\theta \in [0, 1]$, define $(Q(\theta), \lambda(\theta)) := ((1-\theta)Q', (1-\theta)\lambda') + (\theta Q'', \theta \lambda'')$. Let $(\hat{Q}_1, \hat{\lambda}_1) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda$ be such that $(Q', \lambda') \in B((\hat{Q}_1, \hat{\lambda}_1), \delta)$ and θ_1 be the smallest value in $(0, 1)$ such that $(Q(\theta_1), \lambda(\theta_1))$ lies at the boundary of $B((\hat{Q}_1, \hat{\lambda}_1), \delta)$ and in the next ball $B((\hat{Q}_2, \hat{\lambda}_2), \delta)$, where $(\hat{Q}_2, \hat{\lambda}_2) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda$. Next, we let θ_2 be the smallest value in $[\theta_1, 1)$ such that $(Q(\theta_2), \lambda(\theta_2))$ lies at the boundary of $B((\hat{Q}_2, \hat{\lambda}_2), \delta)$ and in the next ball labelled $B((\hat{Q}_3, \hat{\lambda}_3), \delta)$, where $(\hat{Q}_3, \hat{\lambda}_3) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda$. Continuing the process, we let θ_{J-1} be the smallest value in $[\theta_{J-2}, 1)$ such that $(Q(\theta_{J-1}), \lambda(\theta_{J-1}))$ lies at the boundary of $B((\hat{Q}_{J-1}, \hat{\lambda}_{J-1}), \delta)$ and in the next ball $B((\hat{Q}_J, \hat{\lambda}_J), \delta)$, where $(\hat{Q}_{J-1}, \hat{\lambda}_{J-1}) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda$, $(\hat{Q}_J, \hat{\lambda}_J) \in \mathcal{Q}_j^\lambda$, and $(Q'', \lambda'') \in B((\hat{Q}_J, \hat{\lambda}_J), \delta)$.

Under condition (a), we can set δ to be sufficiently small such that inequality (4.43) holds in each of the ball. Consequently, by inequality (4.48) for all $j = 1, \dots, J$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{f}_{Q', \lambda'} - \mathbf{f}_{Q'', \lambda''}\|_k &\leq \|\mathbf{f}_{Q', \lambda'} - \mathbf{f}_{Q(\theta_1), \lambda(\theta_1)}\|_k + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} \|\mathbf{f}_{Q(\theta_j), \lambda(\theta_j)} - \mathbf{f}_{Q(\theta_{j+1}), \lambda(\theta_{j+1})}\|_k \\ &\quad + \|\mathbf{f}_{Q(\theta_{J-1}), \lambda(\theta_{J-1})} - \mathbf{f}_{Q'', \lambda''}\|_k \\ &\leq 2C_{\hat{Q}_1, \hat{\lambda}_1}(\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q(\theta_1)) + |\lambda' - \lambda(\theta_1)|) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} 2C_{\hat{Q}_j, \hat{\lambda}_j}(\mathbf{d}_{\text{FM}}(Q(\theta_j), Q(\theta_{j+1})) + |\lambda(\theta_j) - \lambda(\theta_{j+1})|) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2C_{\hat{Q}_J, \hat{\lambda}_J} \mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q(\theta_{J-1}), Q'') + |\lambda(\theta_{J-1}) - \lambda''| \\
\leq & 2 \max_{j=1, \dots, J} C_{\hat{Q}_j, \hat{\lambda}_j} [(1 - \theta_1)(\mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q'') + |\lambda' - \lambda''|) \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} (\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j)(\mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q'') + |\lambda' - \lambda''|) \\
& + \theta_{J-1}(\mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q'') + |\lambda' - \lambda''|)] \\
= & 2C_\kappa(\mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q', Q'') + |\lambda' - \lambda''|),
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\kappa := \max_{j=1, \dots, J} \{C_{\hat{Q}_j, \hat{\lambda}_j}\}$.

Part (iv). Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q_N^1, Q_N^2) &= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p(Z)} \left| \int_Z h(z) Q_N^1(dz) - \int_Z h(z) Q_N^2(dz) \right| \\
&= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p(Z)} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N h(z_1^l) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N h(z_2^l) \right| \\
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N |h(z_1^l) - h(z_2^l)| \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \max\{1, \|z_1^l\|, \|z_2^l\|\}^{p-1} \|z_1^l - z_2^l\|.
\end{aligned}$$

Then by Part (iii),

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N^1, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_N^2, \lambda_N}\|_k \leq 2C_\kappa \mathbf{dl}_{\text{FM}}(Q_N^1, Q_N^2) \leq \frac{2C_\kappa}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \max\{1, \|z_1^l\|, \|z_2^l\|\}^{p-1} \|z_1^l - z_2^l\|.$$

The proof is complete. \square

4.3 Quantitative statistical robustness

We are now ready to present our desired quantitative statistical robustness results. We present them according to the conditions required on the cost function because this determines the scope of the applicability of the results.

4.3.1 Cost function is twice continuously differentiable

In Theorem 4.2 (iv), we have derived an error bound for $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ based on two different sets of samples, which allows us to calculate the deterministic quantity $\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N^1, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{Q_N^2, \lambda_N}\|_k$ for any two given samples. In this section, we derive an error bound for the difference of the probability distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N^1, \lambda_N}$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N^2, \lambda_N}$ when the samples vary randomly: one is constructed with perceived data and the other is constructed with real data. Differing from (4.45), the new error bound to be established will allow us to estimate the difference between the cumulative distribution functions of the two estimators. The next theorem states this.

Theorem 4.3 (Quantitative statistical robustness of stationary point) *Assume the setting and conditions of Theorem 4.2. Let Z be a compact set and $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) := \mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ be a statistical estimator of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$. Then*

$$\mathbf{d}_K(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}) \leq \tilde{C}_\kappa \mathbf{d}_K(P, Q), \quad \forall P, Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma} \quad (4.49)$$

for all $\lambda_N \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ is defined as in (4.44) and \mathbf{d}_K is the special case of \mathbf{d}_{FM} defined as in (2.13) with $p = 1$.

Proof. Since Z is compact, there exists some $M > 0$ such that $\mathcal{P}_N \subset \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$, where \mathcal{P}_N is defined as in Theorem 4.2. By Part (iv) of Theorem 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N, \lambda_N)\|_k &= \|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N} - \mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}\|_k \\ &\leq \frac{2C_\kappa}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \max\{1, \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^l\|, \|\mathbf{z}^l\|\}^{p-1} \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^l - \mathbf{z}^l\| \leq \frac{\tilde{C}_\kappa}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^l - \mathbf{z}^l\| \end{aligned}$$

for any $Q_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^l}$, $P_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \delta_{\mathbf{z}^l}$, and $\lambda_N \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\tilde{C}_\kappa := 2C_\kappa \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p-1}$. Let \mathcal{G} be a set of Lipschitz continuous functional $g : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with its modulus is 1. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \left| g\left(\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)\right) - g\left(\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N, \lambda_N)\right) \right| &\leq \left\| \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^1, \dots, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N) - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^N, \lambda_N) \right\|_k \\ &\leq \frac{\tilde{C}_\kappa}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \|\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^i - \mathbf{z}^i\|. \end{aligned}$$

By [25, Lemma 1],

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{d}_K\left(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}\right) \\ &= \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \int_{\mathcal{H}_k} g(t) P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}(dt) - \int_{\mathcal{H}_k} g(t) Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}(dt) \right| \\ &= \sup_{g \in \mathcal{G}} \left| \int_{Z^{\otimes N}} g\left(\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)\right) P^{\otimes N}(d\tilde{\mathbf{z}}^N) - \int_{Z^{\otimes N}} g\left(\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}^N, \lambda_N)\right) Q^{\otimes N}(d\mathbf{z}^N) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\tilde{C}_\kappa}{N} \mathbf{d}_K(P, Q) = \tilde{C}_\kappa \mathbf{d}_K(P, Q) \end{aligned}$$

for all $\lambda_N \in [\tau, \bar{\lambda}]$ with $N \in \mathbb{N}$. The proof is complete. \square

The theoretical result is useful in at least two cases: (a) P and Q are known but in actual calculations, only empirical data of Q are used. This is either because errors occurring in the process of data generation and processing, or the distribution of validation data (for the future) is shifted from the distribution of training data (in the past); (b) the difference between Q and P is known in the sense that the shift of the distribution is within a controllable range. In the case only when perceived data (the sample data of Q) is known, we will not be able to say much about the quality of the learning estimator. Since the result is built on Theorem 4.2, it might be desirable to relax some of the conditions imposed on Theorem 4.2 such as strong regularity to extend the applicability of Theorem 4.3.

Remark 4.2 Before concluding this subsection, we note in both the qualitative and quantitative statistical robustness, the perturbation is under some topology of probability measures in $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p^\gamma}$ respectively, which posts some restriction on the tail distribution and thus are more restrictive than the usual weak topology.

- (i) The proof of quantitative statistical robustness in Theorem 4.3 requires the statistical estimator $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)$ to be globally Lipschitz continuous in $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$. The global Lipschitz continuity is derived by virtue of the finite covering theorem to be applied over a relatively closed line segment connecting two probability measures in the set $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p^\gamma}$. This explains why we require $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p^\gamma}$ to be relatively compact, see [15, Lemma 2.69].
- (ii) The qualitative statistical robustness presented in Theorem 3.1 for $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)$, where the probability is restricted to set $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_1}^{\psi^\gamma}$, because we need to use Uniform Glivenko–Cantelli property, see [38, Corollary 3.5].

4.3.2 Cost function is merely continuously differentiable

One of the key conditions in Theorem 4.3 is the second order continuous differentiability of the cost function c which might be undesirable in some practical applications. However, we may get rid of this under the circumstances when the optimal solution $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ of problem (2.5) lies in the interior of \mathcal{F} and c is convex w.r.t. the second argument. The next theorem addresses this.

Theorem 4.4 Let ψ be defined as in (3.14) and $M_3 > 0$ be a positive constant. Define the set of probability distributions

$$\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3} := \left\{ P' \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) P'(d\mathbf{z}) \leq M_3 \right\}$$

Assume: (a) (C1), (C2), (C3)' and (C4)' hold with $\sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z} L_p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z})$ being bounded; (b) (K1)' hold; (c) $\beta > \sqrt{\frac{M}{\tau}}$, where β is defined as in Theorem 3.1, (d) For N sufficiently large, $P_N, Q_N \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3}$. Then

$$\mathbf{d}_K(P^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}, Q^{\otimes N} \circ \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)^{-1}) \leq \tilde{C}_\kappa \mathbf{d}_K(P, Q), \forall P, Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3} \quad (4.50)$$

for all $\lambda_N \geq \tau$, with $N \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, where τ is any fixed positive number.

Proof. Let N be sufficiently large such that condition (d) is satisfied, and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$ and $\lambda_N \geq \tau$ be fixed. We proceed the proof in three steps.

Step 1. We show that the optimal solution $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ lies in the interior of \mathcal{F} . To see this, we note that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \geq 0$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in Z$ and $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}_k$. Thus

$$R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2 \geq \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2 \geq \tau \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2. \quad (4.51)$$

Moreover, it follows from Assumption 3.1(C2) that $c(\mathbf{z}, 0) \leq \psi(\mathbf{z})$ for all $\mathbf{z} \in Z$. Consequently,

$$R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(0) = \mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[c(\mathbf{z}, 0)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[\psi(\mathbf{z})] \leq M_3.$$

Note also that

$$R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}) \leq R_{Q_N}^{\lambda_N}(0) \leq M_3$$

because $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ is optimal. Combining with (4.51), we obtain $\tau \|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}\|_k^2 \leq M_3$ and thus $\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}\|_k \leq \sqrt{\frac{M}{\tau}}$. Under condition (c), this implies that $\|\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}\|_k < \beta$, which means the optimal solution $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ lies in the interior of \mathcal{F} .

Step 2. By Theorem 4.1, the optimality condition of problem (2.5) is

$$0 \in \psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}), \quad \forall Q_N \in \hat{\mathcal{P}},$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ is defined as in (4.25) and $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N c'_2(\mathbf{z}^l, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^l))k_{\mathbf{x}^l} + 2\lambda_N \mathbf{f}$.

Then $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}) = 0$, which means that the optimality condition reduces to

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}) = 0 \tag{4.52}$$

in this case. Observe that Q_N is determined by $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$. So we can write $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)$ for $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$. Moreover, since λ_N is fixed, we may write $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N)$ for $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \lambda_N)$ to ease the exposition.

Let $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N} \subset Z^{\otimes N}$ be a neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$. We use the implicit function theorem, Theorem F.1 in Appendix F, to show that equation (4.52) defines an implicit function $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot)$ mapping from $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N}$ to $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$, where $\mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$ denotes a neighborhood of $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N)$ and the mapping is locally Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. variation of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$ in $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N}$. It suffices to verify the conditions of the theorem. Observe first that $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N)) = 0$ and $\psi(\cdot, \cdot)$ is continuous in a neighborhood of point $(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N))$, written $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N} \times \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$. Second, since $c(\mathbf{z}, \cdot)$ is convex for every \mathbf{z} , then $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N c'_2(\mathbf{z}^l, \langle \cdot, k_{\mathbf{x}^l} \rangle)k_{\mathbf{x}^l}$ is monotone. Moreover, since $\lambda_N > 0$, then $\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \cdot)$ is strongly monotone, that is,

$$\langle \psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}_1) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}_2), \mathbf{f}_1 - \mathbf{f}_2 \rangle \geq \lambda_N \|\mathbf{f}_1 - \mathbf{f}_2\|_k^2.$$

Third, we can show that $\psi(\cdot, \mathbf{f})$ is Lipschitz continuous on $\mathcal{B}_{\mathbf{z}}$ uniformly for $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$. To see this, for any $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{B}_{\hat{\mathbf{f}}}$ and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N \in Z$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N, \mathbf{f}) - \psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N, \mathbf{f})\|_k \\ &= \left\| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N c'_2(\mathbf{z}^{1,l}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{1,l}))k_{\mathbf{x}^{1,l}} + 2\lambda_N \mathbf{f} - \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N c'_2(\mathbf{z}^{2,l}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}^{2,l}))k_{\mathbf{x}^{2,l}} - 2\lambda_N \mathbf{f} \right\|_k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N \|c'_2(\mathbf{z}_{1,l}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{1,l}))k_{\mathbf{x}_{1,l}} - c'_2(\mathbf{z}_{2,l}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{2,l}))k_{\mathbf{x}_{2,l}}\|_k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N L_{c'} \|\mathbf{z}_{1,l} - \mathbf{z}_{2,l}\| + \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{2,l}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_{1,l})\|_k \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N L_{c'} (\|\mathbf{z}_{1,l} - \mathbf{z}_{2,l}\| + \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}_{2,l}} - k_{\mathbf{x}_{1,l}}\|_k) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N L_{c'} (\|\mathbf{z}_{1,l} - \mathbf{z}_{2,l}\| + \beta \|k_{\mathbf{x}_{2,l}} - k_{\mathbf{x}_{1,l}}\|_k) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^N L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k) \|z_{1,l} - z_{2,l}\| \\
&= \frac{1}{N} L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k) \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1 - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2\|,
\end{aligned}$$

where $L_{c'} := C_1 \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z} L_p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z})$ is bounded. Thus, by Theorem F.1 in Appendix F, we claim that there exists a unique implicit function $\hat{\mathbf{f}} : \mathcal{B}_z \rightarrow \mathcal{B}_f$ such that

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N, \mathbf{f}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N)) = 0, \quad \forall \bar{\mathbf{z}}^N \in \mathcal{B}_z$$

and

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N) - \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N)\|_k \leq \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N\|, \quad \forall \bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N \in \mathcal{B}_z. \quad (4.53)$$

Step 3. We show that the implicit function can be extended over $Z^{\otimes N}$ and inequality (4.53) holds for any $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1^N, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_2^N \in Z^{\otimes N}$. Observe that the optimal solution $\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N)$ exists for any $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N \in Z^{\otimes N}$. To ease the exposition, we will write $\bar{\mathbf{z}}$ for $\bar{\mathbf{z}}^N$.

We will use the finite covering theorem to show the global Lipschitz continuity (with the same Lipschitz modulus). Let $\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}'' \in Z^{\otimes N}$ be any two fixed vectors. For $\theta \in [0, 1]$, let $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta) := (1 - \theta)\bar{\mathbf{z}}' + \theta\bar{\mathbf{z}}''$ and

$$Z_{[\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}'']} = \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta) : \theta \in [0, 1]\}$$

be the line segment connecting $\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}''$. For any fixed point, $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta) \in Z_{[\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}'']}$, we can use the implicit function theorem detailed in Step 2 to show that the equation

$$\psi(\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta), \mathbf{f}) = 0$$

defines a unique implicit function in a δ -neighborhood of $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta)$, denoted by $B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta), \delta)$ and

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)}) - \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)})\|_k \leq \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)}\|, \quad \forall \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(1)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}^{(2)} \in B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta), \delta),$$

where $B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j, \delta)$ denotes a closed ball centered at $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j$ with radius δ under the distance $\|\cdot\|$ over $Z^{\otimes N}$. By the finite covering theorem, we can construct a δ -net $\bar{\mathbf{z}}_1, \dots, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_J$ over $Z_{[\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}'']}$ such that (i) $Z_{[\bar{\mathbf{z}}', \bar{\mathbf{z}}'']} \subset \cup_{j=1}^J B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j, \delta)$, (ii) a unique implicit function is well-defined over each of the balls and (iii) these implicit functions are connected to form a continuous function over $\cup_{j=1}^J B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j, \delta)$. Following a similar argument to that in Step 1, we can show that

$$\|\hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(1)}) - \hat{\mathbf{f}}(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(2)})\|_k \leq \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(1)} - \bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(2)}\|, \quad \forall \bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(1)}, \bar{\mathbf{z}}_j^{(2)} \in B(\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j, \delta), \quad j = 1, \dots, J \quad (4.54)$$

Let $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_1 \in \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j\}_{j=1}^J$ be such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}' \in B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_1, \delta)$ and θ_1 be the smallest value in $(0, 1)$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta_1)$ lies at the boundary of $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_1, \delta)$ and in the next ball $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_2, \delta)$, where $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_2 \in \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j\}_{j=1}^J$. Next, we let θ_2 be the smallest value in $[\theta_1, 1)$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta_2)$ lies at the boundary of $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_2, \delta)$ and in the next ball labelled $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_3, \delta)$, where $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_3 \in \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j\}_{j=1}^J$. Continuing the process, we let θ_{J-1} be the smallest value in $[\theta_{J-2}, 1)$ such that $\bar{\mathbf{z}}(\theta_{J-1})$ lies at the boundary of $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_{J-1}, \delta)$ and in the next ball $B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_J, \delta)$, where $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_{J-1} \in \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j\}_{j=1}^J$, $\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_J \in \{\bar{\mathbf{z}}_j\}_{j=1}^J$, and $\bar{\mathbf{z}}'' \in B(\hat{\bar{\mathbf{z}}}_J, \delta)$.

We can set δ to be sufficiently small such that inequality (4.54) holds in each of the ball. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}') - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}'')\|_k &\leq \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}') - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}(\theta_1))\|_k + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}(\theta_j)) - \widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}(\theta_{j+1}))\|_k \\
&+ \|\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbf{z}(\theta_{J-1})) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{z}'')\|_k \\
&\leq \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}(\theta_1)\| + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\mathbf{z}(\theta_j) - \mathbf{z}(\theta_{j+1})\| \\
&\quad \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\mathbf{z}(\theta_{J-1}) - \mathbf{z}''\| \\
&\leq \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} [(1 - \theta_1)\|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}''\| + \sum_{j=1}^{J-2} (\theta_{j+1} - \theta_j)\|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}''\| \\
&\quad + \theta_{J-1}\|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}''\|] \\
&= \frac{L_{c'}(1 + \beta L_k)}{N\lambda_N} \|\mathbf{z}' - \mathbf{z}''\|.
\end{aligned}$$

The rest is analogous to the proof of Theorem 4.3, we omit the details. \square

Theorem 4.4 differs from Theorem 4.3 on several aspects. First, inequality (4.50) holds for all N sufficiently large as opposed to all N as in (4.49). This is because only when N is sufficiently large, we will be able to ensure $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}$ to lie in the interior of \mathcal{F} under condition (d). Second, condition (d) is not very demanding because when N is sufficiently large, we know by the law of large numbers that $\mathbb{E}_{Q_N}[\psi(\mathbf{z})]$ is close to $\mathbb{E}_Q[\psi(\mathbf{z})]$ with probability 1. So condition (d) is satisfied with high probability when $Q \in \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3/2}$. Third, the local Lipschitz continuity of $\widehat{\mathbf{f}}(\cdot, \lambda_N)$ is derived in a completely different manner from that of Theorem 4.2 (ii). This is because we use the new implicit function theorem, Theorem F.1, as opposed to Lemma 4.1. One of the main advantages is that we no longer require strong regularity condition and replace it with strong monotone of $\psi(\mathbf{z}^N, \mathbf{f})$. A sufficient condition for this is the cost function $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is convex in \mathbf{f} in (C1). Moreover, we no longer require second order continuous differentiability of the cost function. Fourth, when $\psi(\mathbf{z}) = \|\mathbf{z}\|^p$, we can compare set $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ with set \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3} . Let $M_2 = M_3$. Then we can see that $\mathcal{M}_{Z, M_2}^{p\gamma}$ is only a subset of \mathcal{M}_{Z, M_3} which means the quantitative statistical robustness result is applicable to a large set of probability distributions (and hence a larger class of data sets).

5 Single data perturbation

We now move to discuss the impact of single data perturbation on the optimal solution of the regularized problem $\min_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{E}_P[c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))] + \lambda \|\mathbf{f}\|_k^2$. To this end, we consider the perturbation of the true probability distribution P by a Dirac distribution $\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ at a perturbed data point $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$. For $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $t \in (0, 1)$, let $(1-t)P + t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ denote the mixture distribution between P and $\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$. Consider

$$0 \in \mathbb{E}_{(1-t)P + t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}} [c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda\mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}). \quad (5.55)$$

In this section, we assume (C1) hold and thus the solution of $0 \in \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2((\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda\mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f})$ and (5.55) is a singleton. Let $\mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}},\lambda}$ denote the solution of (5.55). We will investigate the impact of probability perturbation on the solution by the so-called influence function of $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}$.

Definition 5.1 (*Influence function, [64, Definition 10.4]*) Let $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in Z$. The influence function $\text{IF} : Z \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ of $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)} : \mathcal{P}(Z) \rightarrow \mathcal{F}$ at a point $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ for a distribution $P \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ is given by

$$\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}},\lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}}{t}$$

provided that the limit exists.

The influence function is closely related to the directional derivative at P along direction $\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} - P$. It quantifies the sensitivity (instead of stability) of $\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}$ when the true probability P is perturbed along the direction. From a data perspective, the mixture distribution means that there is a probability t , the sample data could be an outlier $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ and the influence function allows one to quantify the sensitivity of the optimal solution w.r.t. the change. In general, a closed form of \mathbf{f} is not obtainable. However, since \mathbf{f} satisfies the first order optimality condition (4.27), we may compute $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P)$ by applying the implicit function theorem to (4.27). Indeed, this is what Steinwart and Christmann [64] do for the case when \mathcal{F} is the whole space. The main technical challenge here is that \mathcal{F} is not necessarily the whole space. In this case, the implicit function theorem would have to involve differentiation of the normal cone $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f})$. To this end, we use the proto-derivative of set-valued mapping in the Hilbert space, see e.g. [1].

Let H be a Hilbert space. Recall that a set-valued mapping $\Gamma : H \rightrightarrows H$ is said to be proto-differentiable at a point \mathbf{f} and for a particular element $\mathbf{h} \in \Gamma(\mathbf{f})$ if the set-valued mappings $\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon} : d \rightarrow \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{f}+\epsilon d) - \mathbf{h}}{\epsilon}$, regarded as a family indexed by $\epsilon > 0$, graph-converge as $\epsilon \downarrow 0$. The limit, if exists, is denoted by $\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}}$ and called the *proto-derivative* of Γ at \mathbf{f} for \mathbf{h} . The graph-convergence of $\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}$ means that

$$\limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}) = \liminf_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}) = \text{gph}(\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}}),$$

where $\limsup_{t \rightarrow t_0} A(t) := \{a \in H \times H : \exists t_k \rightarrow t_0, \exists a_k \rightarrow a \text{ with } a_k \in A(t_k)\}$, $\liminf_{t \rightarrow t_0} A(t) := \{a \in H \times H : \forall t_k \rightarrow t_0, \exists \mathcal{N} \in \mathcal{N}_{\infty}, a_k \xrightarrow{\mathcal{N}} a \text{ with } a_k \in A(t_k)\}$, $\mathcal{N}_{\infty} := \{\mathcal{N} \subset \mathbb{N} : \mathbb{N} \setminus \mathcal{N} \text{ finite}\}$, see [56, Chapter 5], and

$$\text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}) = \left\{ (d, g) \in H \times H \mid g \in \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{f} + \epsilon d) - \mathbf{h}}{\epsilon} \right\} = \frac{\text{gph}\Gamma - (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{h})}{\epsilon},$$

see e.g. [56, Definition 5.32] and [21]. In the case that the proto-derivative exists, by [55, Proposition 2.3], we have

$$\text{gph}(\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}}) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}) = \left\{ (d, \mathbf{g}) \in H \times H : \mathbf{g} \in \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, d' \rightarrow d} \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{f} + \epsilon d') - \mathbf{h}}{\epsilon} \right\},$$

which means the proto-derivative of Γ equals to

$$\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}}(d) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, d' \rightarrow d} \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{f} + \epsilon d') - \mathbf{h}}{\epsilon}. \quad (5.56)$$

A closely related concept is *graphical derivative*, see e.g. [56, Definition 8.33], which is defined by the outer limit of $(\text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}))_{\epsilon>0}$ (the graphical outer limit of the set-valued mappings $\{\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon} : \epsilon > 0\}$, denoted by $D\Gamma(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{h})$, that is,

$$\text{gph}(D\Gamma(\mathbf{f}|\mathbf{h})) := \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \text{gph}(\Delta_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h},\epsilon}) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, \mathbf{d}' \rightarrow \mathbf{d}} \frac{\Gamma(\mathbf{f} + \epsilon \mathbf{d}') - \mathbf{h}}{\epsilon}.$$

The graphical derivative always exists and its graph is the *contingent (Bouligand) cone* of $\text{gph}\Gamma$ at point (\mathbf{f}, \mathbf{h}) , see the definition in [9, page xv]. By the definitions of the proto-derivative and graphical derivative, they are equal when the proto-derivative exists. When Γ is single-valued, the proto-derivative $\Gamma'_{\mathbf{f},\mathbf{h}}(\mathbf{d})$ with $\mathbf{h} = \Gamma(\mathbf{f})$ reduces to a directional derivative in which case we denote it by $\Gamma'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{d})$ to ease the exposition.

Let

$$\Phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, P, \lambda}(\mathbf{f}, t) := \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + t(c'_2(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} - \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]) + 2\lambda \mathbf{f}.$$

Then (5.55) can be succinctly written as

$$0 \in \Phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, P, \lambda}(\mathbf{f}, t) + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}). \quad (5.57)$$

Differing from Theorem 4.2, here we investigate the derivative of the implicit function \mathbf{f} defined in (5.57) when the true probability P is perturbed along direction $\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} - P$. For fixed $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$, P and λ , we assume that (5.57) has a unique solution $\mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}, \lambda}$ parameterized by t , denoted by $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t$, i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t := \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}, \lambda}.$$

By the definition of proto-derivative, the proto-derivative of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t : t \mapsto \mathcal{H}_k$ at $t = 0$ (single-valued) for $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ reduces to the directional derivative of $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_{(\cdot)}$ at 0 with direction s , i.e.,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{0; s} = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, s' \rightarrow s} (\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s')P + \epsilon s' \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}, \lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}) / \epsilon,$$

which is equal to the directional derivative of $\mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}$ at P for direction $\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} - P$, that is, equals to the influence function $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)$, that is,

$$\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P) = \mathbf{f}'_{(\cdot, \lambda)}(P; \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} - P) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, s' \rightarrow s} (\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s')P + \epsilon s' \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}, \lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}) / \epsilon.$$

In the case that $c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is continuously differentiable in \mathbf{f} for almost every $\mathbf{z} \in Z$ and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is proto-differentiable, we may represent $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)$ in terms of the derivatives of c and the proto-derivative of $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}$. The next proposition states this.

Proposition 5.1 (Expression of IF of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$) *Assume: (a) (C1), (C2), (C3)', (C4) and (C5) hold; (b) $P \in \hat{\mathcal{P}} \cap \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{h}}$, for all $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$, where $\hat{\mathcal{P}}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{h}}$ are defined as in (4.25) and (4.33) respectively; (c)*

normal cone mapping $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}$ is proto-differentiable at $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ for \mathbf{u}^ , where $\mathbf{u}^* = -\mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_P(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]$. If influence function $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)$ is well-defined, then it has the following expression:*

$$\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P) = \left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k : \begin{array}{l} -c'_2(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} + \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] \\ -\mathbb{E}_{P, \lambda}[c''_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}] - 2\lambda \mathbf{h} \in (\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}})'_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}, \mathbf{u}^*}(\mathbf{h}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Moreover, if $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_k$ and $\mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}] : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ is one-to-one and onto, then

$$\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P) = -(\mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}])^{-1}(c_2'(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} - \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]). \quad (5.58)$$

Proof. This is a special case of [42, Theorem 4.1] with $\mathbf{z} = 0$, $p = t$. Under (C4), $c_2'(\mathbf{z}, w)$ is continuous in w . Combining with the continuity of $\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})$ w.r.t \mathbf{f} for fixed \mathbf{x} , we obtain that $c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}$ is continuous in \mathbf{f} . Then we have the following direction derivative

$$\begin{aligned} & \Phi'_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, P, \lambda}(\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}, 0; \mathbf{h}, 1) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \tilde{t}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{h}, 1)} [\Phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, P, \lambda}(\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{h}}, 0 + \epsilon \tilde{t}) - \Phi_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, P, \lambda}(\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}, 0)]/\epsilon \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, (\tilde{\mathbf{h}}, \tilde{t}) \rightarrow (\mathbf{h}, 1)} \epsilon \tilde{t} (c_2'(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, (\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{h}})(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} - \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{h}})(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}])/\epsilon \\ & \quad + \{\mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{h}})(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]\}/\epsilon \\ & \quad + \{2\lambda(\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda} + \epsilon \tilde{\mathbf{h}}) - 2\lambda\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}\}/\epsilon \\ &= c_2'(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} - \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + \mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})] + 2\lambda\mathbf{h}. \end{aligned}$$

By (4.34), $T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h} = k_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})$. Then it follows from [42, Theorem 4.1] that

$$\tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{0;1} = \left\{ \mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k : \begin{array}{l} -c_2'(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}} + \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] \\ -\mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}] - 2\lambda\mathbf{h} \in (\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}})'_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}, u^*}(\mathbf{h}) \end{array} \right\}.$$

In the case that $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{H}_k$, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}) = \{0\}$. Since $\mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}] : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ is one-to-one and onto, then (5.58) holds by the classical implicit function theorem. \square

The next theorem states a sufficient condition for the boundedness of influence function $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)$. Let $d(\mathbf{f}, S) := \inf_{\mathbf{f}' \in S} \|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}'\|_k$ denote the distance from a function $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ to a set $S \subset \mathcal{H}_k$.

Theorem 5.1 (Boundedness of IF) *Assume the setting and conditions of Proposition 5.1. Suppose that the generalized equation*

$$0 \in \mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})] + 2\lambda\mathcal{I} + (\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}})'_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}, u^*}(\mathbf{h})$$

has a unique solution 0, where \mathcal{I} is the identity operator from \mathcal{H}_k to \mathcal{H}_k . Then the following assertions hold.

(i) $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)$ is bounded for every $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in Z$ provided that it is well-defined.

(ii) If, in addition, $\Psi(\mathbf{f}) := \mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda\mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f})$ is strongly metrically subregular at $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ for 0 with regular modulus κ' , i.e., there exist a constant $\kappa' > 0$, neighborhoods $U_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}} \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ of $\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}$ and $U_0 \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ of 0 such that $\|\mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}\|_k \leq \kappa' d(0, \Psi(\mathbf{f}) \cap U_0)$ for all $\mathbf{f} \in U_{\mathbf{f}_{P, \lambda}}$, then there exists a constant $t_0 > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in Z} \|\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P)\|_k \leq \kappa' \sup_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in Z} \Upsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \quad (5.59)$$

where

$$\Upsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}) := \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \|\mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \lambda}}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - c_2'(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \lambda}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\|_k.$$

Proof. Part (i). By a similar argument to that of Proposition 5.1, we have $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}'_{0;0} = \{\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k : 0 \in \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})] + 2\lambda\mathcal{I} + (\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}})'_{\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}, \mathbf{u}^*}(\mathbf{h})\} = \{0\}$, which implies $D\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t(0|\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda})(0) = \{0\}$ for each $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then for each fixed $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in \mathcal{Z}$, by [36, Proposition 2.1], there exist constants $\tau > 0$, $\kappa > 0$ and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ depending on $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ such that $\{\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t\} \cap (\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_0 + \tau\mathcal{B}) \in \tilde{\mathbf{f}}_0 + \kappa t\mathcal{B}$ for all $t \in (0, \beta)$, where \mathcal{B} is a closed unit ball in \mathcal{H}_k . Recall that $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_t = \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{f}}_0 = \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}$. Moreover, $\{\frac{\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s)P+\epsilon s\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}}{\epsilon}\} \cap \frac{\tau}{\epsilon}\mathcal{B} \subset \kappa s\mathcal{B}$ for $\epsilon s \in (0, \beta)$. Thus $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, s \rightarrow 1} \frac{\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s)P+\epsilon s\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}}{\epsilon} \in \kappa\mathcal{B}$, which implies $\|\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P)\|_k \leq \kappa$.

Part (ii). Under the subregularity condition, we have

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}\|_k \leq \kappa' d(0, \Psi(\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}) \cap U_0), \quad \forall \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda} \in U_{\mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}} \text{ with } Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z).$$

On the other hand, since \mathbf{f}_Q satisfies that $0 \in \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] + 2\lambda\mathbf{f} + \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda})$, then

$$\Delta_Q := \mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] \in \Psi(\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}).$$

Let $Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z)$ be such that $\Delta_Q \in U_0$. Then $\Delta_Q \in \Psi(\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}) \cap U_0$ and hence

$$\|\mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}\|_k \leq \kappa' d(0, \Delta_Q) = \kappa' \|\mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - \mathbb{E}_Q[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{Q,\lambda}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]\|_k. \quad (5.60)$$

Let $Q = (1-t)P + t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}$ and $t_0 > 0$ and $\tau > 0$ be positive constants such that $\mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} \in U_{\mathbf{f}_P}$ for all $t \in [0, t_0]$ and $U_0 \subset \tau\mathcal{B}$. Then by (5.60),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} \\ & \in \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda} + \kappa' \min \left\{ t \sup_{t \in [0, t_0]} \|\mathbb{E}_P[c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}] - c'_2(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}}(\tilde{\mathbf{x}}))k_{\tilde{\mathbf{x}}}\|_k, \tau \right\} \mathcal{B} \end{aligned}$$

for all $t \in [0, t_0]$, which implies

$$\frac{\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s)P+\epsilon s\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda}}{\epsilon} \in \kappa' \min \left\{ s\Upsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}), \frac{\tau}{\epsilon} \right\} \mathcal{B}$$

for $\epsilon s \in [0, t_0]$. Thus

$$\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P) = \limsup_{\epsilon \downarrow 0, s \rightarrow 1} (\mathbf{f}_{(1-\epsilon s)P+\epsilon s\delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}},\lambda}} - \mathbf{f}_{P,\lambda})/\epsilon \in \kappa'\Upsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})\mathcal{B},$$

which implies $\|\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot,\lambda)}, P)\|_k \leq \kappa'\Upsilon(\tilde{\mathbf{z}})$. By taking the supremum w.r.t. $\tilde{\mathbf{z}} \in Z$, we obtain (5.59). The proof is complete. \square

We make some comments about how the established theoretical results in Proposition 5.1 and Theorem 5.1 may be applied to data-driven problems where the true probability distribution P is unknown and the sample contains an outlier $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$. Let $Z_N := \{\mathbf{z}^1, \dots, \mathbf{z}^{N-1}, \tilde{\mathbf{z}}\}$ where the first $N-1$ samples are iid and are not perturbed whereas $\tilde{\mathbf{z}}$ is an outlier. Let

$$P_{N-1} := \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\mathbf{z}^i} \text{ and } Q_N := \frac{1}{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\mathbf{z}^i} + \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}} \right) = \left(1 - \frac{1}{N} \right) P_{N-1} + \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\tilde{\mathbf{z}}}.$$

First, we can compute the influence function $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot)}, P_{N-1})$ by Proposition 5.1. Next, by Definition 5.1, we can estimate the difference between the solutions based on P_{N-1} and Q_N ,

$$\mathbf{f}_{Q_N} - \mathbf{f}_{P_{N-1}} \approx \frac{1}{N} \text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot)}, P_{N-1}), \quad (5.61)$$

when $\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P_{N-1})$ is singleton. In the case that the outlier is known, (5.61) may give us guidance on the difference between the confidence regions constructed with the two estimators. In the case that the outlier is unknown, we cannot use (5.61) to compute the influence function, rather we have to treat every data as a possible outlier and compute an upper bound of the true unknown influence function by

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{IF}(\tilde{\mathbf{z}}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}, P_{N-1})\|_k \leq \kappa' \sup_{\mathbf{z} \in Z_N} \sup_{t \in [0, 1]} & \left\| \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z}^i \in Z_N \setminus \mathbf{z}} c'_2(\mathbf{z}^i, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P_{Z_N \setminus \mathbf{z}} + t\delta_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}}(\mathbf{x}^i)) k_{\mathbf{x}^i} \right. \\ & \left. - c'_2(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P_{Z_N \setminus \mathbf{z}} + t\delta_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}}(\mathbf{x})) k_{\mathbf{x}} \right\|_k, \end{aligned}$$

where $P_{Z_N \setminus \mathbf{z}} := \frac{1}{N-1} \sum_{\mathbf{z}^i \in Z_N \setminus \{\mathbf{z}\}} \delta_{\mathbf{z}^i}$. We can then use the bound and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda}$ to obtain a conservative confidence region of $\mathbf{f}_{P_{N-1}, \lambda}$. In practice, it will be difficult to compute the right-hand side of the inequality because it is difficult to obtain $\mathbf{f}_{(1-t)P_{Z_N \setminus \{\mathbf{z}\}} + t\delta_{\mathbf{z}, \lambda}}$. It might be interesting to derive a bound for the right-hand side of the inequality which is independent of \mathbf{f} . We leave all these for future research.

6 Numerical tests

We have undertaken some numerical tests on the established theoretical results in the previous section with two small academic examples.

6.1 All data perturbation

Consider problem (2.1), where

$$c(\mathbf{z}, f(x)) := \frac{1}{2}(f(x) - y)^2, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (6.62)$$

and kernel function $k(x_1, x_2) := \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle^2$. Assume that x follows a normal distribution with mean value μ and standard deviation σ . Let $F_{P_{\mathbf{x}}}$ be the cumulative distribution function (cdf) of x . In this case, the regularized SAA problem (2.6) can be written as

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in [\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}]} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} (\tilde{y}^i - \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(\tilde{x}^j, \tilde{x}^i))^2 + \lambda_N \boldsymbol{\alpha}^T \tilde{\mathbf{K}} \boldsymbol{\alpha},$$

where $[\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}] := [a_1, b_1] \times \cdots \times [a_N, b_N]$ with $a_i = -10$ and $b_i = 10$, for $i = 1, \dots, N$, $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N)^T$, $\tilde{\mathbf{K}} = (\tilde{K}_{i,j}) \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times N}$ with $\tilde{K}_{i,j} = k(\tilde{x}^i, \tilde{x}^j)$, $i, j = 1, \dots, N$. Here we write the feasible solution of (2.6) as $\sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(\tilde{x}^j, x)$. The sample data \tilde{x}^j and \tilde{y}^j , $j = 1, \dots, N$ are generated as follows. First, we consider a perturbation $Q_{\mathbf{x}}$ of $P_{\mathbf{x}}$ with cdf:

$$F_{Q_{\mathbf{x}}}(x) := \begin{cases} F_{P_{\mathbf{x}}}(x), & \text{for } x \leq x_0, \\ p + \beta(x - x_0), & \text{for } x_0 \leq x \leq x_1, \\ 1, & \text{for } x > x_1, \end{cases}$$

where $x_0 = F_{P_x}^{-1}(p)$, $x_1 = x_0 + \frac{1}{\beta}(1-p)$, β and $p \in (0, 1)$ are fixed positive constants. Next, we use Q_x to generate samples $\tilde{x}^j, j = 1, \dots, N$ and $\tilde{y}^j = (\tilde{x}^j)^2$. Let $\tilde{z}^j = (\tilde{x}^j, \tilde{y}^j)$, and $Q_N = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\tilde{z}^j}$, where $\delta_{\tilde{z}}$ denotes the Dirac distribution at a perturbed data point \tilde{z} . Let P_N be defined in a similar way except that $x^j, j = 1, \dots, N$ are generated by P_x . The optimal solution of (2.6) can be written as $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(\tilde{x}^j, x)$. The Kantorovich distance between $P_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N})^{-1}$ and $Q_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N})^{-1}$ is $\text{dl}_K(P_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N})^{-1}, Q_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N})^{-1})$. For a fixed number $x \in \mathbb{R}$, let G_1 and G_2 be the cdfs of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ respectively. In this case,

$$\Delta_1(x) := \text{dl}_K(P_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x))^{-1}, Q_x^{\otimes N} \circ (\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x))^{-1}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |G_1(t) - G_2(t)| dt.$$

We use Q_x of P_x to generate M groups of samples each of which with size $N = 100$ and calculate $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^{P_N} k(\tilde{x}^j, x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j^{Q_N} k(\tilde{x}^j, x)$ for each group of samples. For fixed x , we can then obtain the M data points and use to construct empirical cdfs. Figure 1 (a) depicts the difference between the cdfs of P_x and Q_x . Figure 1 (b) depicts the cdfs (more precisely the cumulative frequency) of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ at point $x = -1.9$. We can see that most data are located within the range $[3.2, 3.5]$ (the cdfs are very steep, see smaller embedded graph) and the red curve approximates the blue ones very well. Figure 1 (c) displays similar phenomena when $x = -1$. In this case, most data points fall within the range $[0.88, 0.98]$.

To examine the approximation of the optimal solutions more closely, we consider the Kantorovich distance between the cdfs of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ relative to the Kantorovich distance between the cdfs of the input data generated by P_x and Q_x . Let

$$\Delta_2 := \text{dl}_K(P_x, Q_x) \text{ and } \Delta_1^M(x) := \text{dl}_K(F_{\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)}^M, F_{\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)}^M),$$

where $F_{\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)}^M$ is the empirical distribution of random variable $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ using M samples, that is, we first generate N iid samples to compute $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$, and then simulate M times to obtain M samples $\{\mathbf{f}_{P_N^m, \lambda_N}(x)\}_{m=1}^M$, consequently we obtain $F_{\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)}^M(y) := \frac{1}{M} \sum_{m=1}^M \mathbb{1}_{y \geq \mathbf{f}_{P_N^m, \lambda_N}(x)}(y)$.

Figure 2 (a) depicts the ratios $\frac{\Delta_1^M(x)}{\Delta_2}$ at five different points, we can see that as M increases the ratios converge. The ratio $\frac{\Delta_1^M(x_l)}{\Delta_2}$, $l = 1, \dots, 5$, is somehow related to the constant \tilde{C}_κ in (4.49).

6.2 Single data perturbation

We consider the same example as in the previous subsection with the cost function (6.62). The true distribution P of random vector $\mathbf{z} = (x, y)$ is defined as follows: component x follows a normal distribution with the mean value μ and standard deviation σ whereas component y is equal to $x^2 + \epsilon$, where ϵ follows a normal distribution with mean 0 and variance 0.01. We follow the standard procedures (see e.g. [49]) to generate N samples $\mathbf{z}_P^j = (x^j, y^j)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$ of $\mathbf{z} = (x, y)$ with P . To generate N samples $\mathbf{z}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}^j = (x_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}^j, y_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}^j)$, $j = 1, \dots, N$ of $\mathbf{z} = (x, y)$ with the mixture distribution $(1-t)P + t\delta_{\tilde{z}}$, where $\tilde{z} = (\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$ with $\tilde{y} = \tilde{x}^3$ is an outlier, we begin by generating N samples with distribution $(1-t)P + t\delta_{\tilde{z}}$ using the Dirac distribution $\delta_{\tilde{x}}$ at \tilde{x} and a switching variable X , which takes the value $X = 1$ with probability




Figure 1: (a) F_{P_x} and F_{Q_x} . (b)-(c): Empirical distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ at points $x = -1.9$ and $x = -1$ with $M = 500$. The embedded smaller graphs are plotted over larger ranges whereas the bigger graphs are enlargements of the curves over a specific range where the gap between blue and red curves is significant. The red curve represents empirical distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$, the blue curve represents empirical distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$.




Figure 2: (a) $\frac{\Delta_1^M(x)}{\Delta_2^M(x)}$ by M simulations at five points when M varies from 100 to 500. (b)-(c): Empirical distributions of $\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ and $\mathbf{f}_{Q_N, \lambda_N}(x)$ at point $x = -1.9$ with $M = 10$ and $M = 30$ simulations.

$1-t$ and $X = 2$ with probability t . Here X is independent of P and $\delta_{\bar{z}}$. Specifically, we generate

$$\mathbf{z}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\bar{z}}}^j := \begin{cases} \mathbf{z}_P^j := (x_P^j, y_P^j) & \text{if } X^j = 1, \\ \bar{\mathbf{z}} & \text{if } X^j = 2, \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j = 1, \dots, N,$$

where x_P^j , $j = 1, \dots, N$, are the iid samples generated by P_x . The empirical distributions can be respectively written as

$$P_N := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \delta_{\mathbf{z}_P^j} \quad \text{and} \quad ((1-t)P + t\delta_{\bar{z}})_N := \frac{1-t}{N-1} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \delta_{\mathbf{z}_P^j} + t\delta_{\bar{z}}.$$

In this case, the optimal solutions of the regularized SAA problem (2.6) with probability distributions P and $(1-t)P + t\delta_{\bar{z}}$ take the form of

$$\mathbf{f}_{P_N, \lambda}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(x_P^j, x) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{f}_{((1-t)P+t\delta_{\bar{z}})_N, \lambda}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(x_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\bar{z}}}^j, x).$$

The regularized SAA problem (2.6) and its single data perturbation problem can be solved via the following two problems

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{1}{N} \left(y^i - \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(x^j, x^i) \right)^2 + \lambda \alpha^T \mathbf{K}_P \alpha$$

and

$$\min_{\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^N} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \frac{1-t}{N-1} \left(y^i - \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(x^j, x^i) \right)^2 + t \left(y^N - \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j k(x^j, x^N) \right)^2 + \lambda \alpha^T \mathbf{K}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}} \alpha,$$

where \mathbf{K}_P and $\mathbf{K}_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}$ are the Gramer matrices with $(K_P)_{ij} := k(x_P^i, x_P^j)$, and $(K_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}})_{ij} := k(x_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}^i, x_{(1-t)P+t\delta_{\tilde{z}}}^j)$, for $i, j = 1, \dots, N$.

Figure 3 depicts the change of the influence function as the outlier varies. We can see that as \tilde{x} increases (hence \tilde{y} also changes accordingly), the influence function increases, which means that when the outlier shifts away from the normal sample data, it has a greater effect on the sensitivity of the kernel learning estimator. Moreover, we can see that as λ_N increases, the influence function value decreases, which is consistent with the fact that a larger λ_N enhances the stability of the kernel learning estimator and hence makes it less sensitive to the outlier.




Figure 3: Performance of the influence function $\text{IF}(\tilde{z}; \mathbf{f}_{(\cdot, \lambda)}(x_0), P)$ at point $x_0 = 0.5$ when outlier \tilde{z} satisfies $\tilde{y} = (\tilde{x})^3$, and $\mu = 0$, $\sigma = 1$.

7 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we investigate quality of the kernel learning estimator (the optimal solution to the empirical risk minimization problem) obtained with perturbed data. In single data perturbation case, we use the notion of influence function to measure the sensitivity of the kernel learning estimator w.r.t. the perturbation of the data; in the case when all data are potentially perturbed, we derive conditions under which the learning kernel learning estimator based on the perturbed data is close to the one that is based on real data (without perturbation) in the sense that the distributions of the two learning estimators are linearly bounded by the difference of the true probability distributions generating the training data under the Kantorovich metric. This is a step forward from the traditional stability analysis which measures the difference of two statistical estimators based on each set of sample data. While the theoretical results are useful in some practical applications as outlined in Sections 3 and 4 and the numerical tests confirm the theoretical results in the small academic examples, it would be more interesting to apply the theoretical results in substantial practical cases. For instances, Kern et al. [35] apply the influence function approach to a Markov decision-making process when the transition probability

deviates from the true one. Besbes et al. [6] propose distributionally robust optimization models in data-driven decision-making such as newsvendor, pricing, and ski rental under heterogeneous environments. It might be interesting to apply our theoretical results to these circumstances. It will also be interesting to consider an approach similar to the In-CVaR of Liu and Pang [43] to reduce the effect of data perturbation when all data are potentially contaminated. We leave all these for future research.

Acknowledgments.

This project is supported by RGC grant 14204821. The third author is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12122108).

A Berge's maximum theorem

Theorem A.1 (Berge's maximum theorem, Page 116 [5]) *Let ϕ be a continuous numerical function in a topological space $X \times Y$ and Γ be a continuous mapping of X into Y such that for each x , $\Gamma(x) \neq \emptyset$. Then the numerical function M defined by $M(x) := \max\{\phi(y) : y \in \Gamma(x)\}$ is continuous in X and the mapping Φ defined by $\Phi(x) := \{y : y \in \Gamma(x), \phi(y) = M(x)\}$ is an upper semicontinuous mapping of X into Y .*

B Differentiability of a function defined over \mathcal{H}_k

Recall that a functional $g : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be directionally differentiable at $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ if the limit

$$g'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h}) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{g(\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h}) - g(\mathbf{f})}{t}$$

exists for all direction $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$. If, in addition, the directional derivative $g'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h})$ is linear and continuous in \mathbf{h} , then g is said to be Gâteaux differentiable at \mathbf{f} with derivative $Dg(\mathbf{f})$ satisfying

$$g'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h}) = Dg(\mathbf{f})\mathbf{h}.$$

If the derivative $Dg(\cdot) : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ is continuous on an open set $S \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ in terms of the norm $\|\cdot\|_k$, then g is said to be continuously differentiable on S .

For an operator $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$, it is said to be directionally differentiable at $\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{H}_k$ if the limit

$$\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h}) := \lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h}) - \mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f})}{t}$$

exists for any fixed direction $\mathbf{h} \in \mathcal{H}_k$. If, in addition, the directional derivative $\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h})$ is linear and continuous in \mathbf{h} , then \mathcal{A} is said to be Gâteaux differentiable at \mathbf{f} with derivative $D\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f})$ satisfying

$$\mathcal{A}'(\mathbf{f}; \mathbf{h}) = D\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f})\mathbf{h}.$$

Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k)$ be the space of linear continuous operators $\mathcal{A} : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_k$ equipped with the operator norm

$$\|\mathcal{A}\|_{\mathcal{L}} := \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{B}} \|\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f})\|_k, \quad (\text{B.63})$$

where \mathcal{B} is the closed unit ball in \mathcal{H}_k . If the derivative $D\mathcal{A}(\cdot) : \mathcal{H}_k \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_k)$ is continuous on an open set $S \subset \mathcal{H}_k$ in terms of the norm $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}}$, then \mathcal{A} is said to be continuously differentiable on S , see [9, pages 35-36]. In what follows, we consider the case that $g(\mathbf{f}) := c(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ for some fixed \mathbf{z} , where c is differentiable in the second argument, and $\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f}) := Dg(\mathbf{f})$. We will use $D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathcal{A}(\mathbf{f}))$ to denote the derivative of functional \mathcal{A} w.r.t. \mathbf{f} .

C Proof of Proposition 2.1

The proof is inspired by that of [35, Lemma 9]². By [24, Corollary A.48], the ψ -weak topology is metrizable. Thus the notions of continuity and sequential continuity coincide and it suffices to prove that for any $\{\mu_N\}_{N=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathcal{M}_Z^{\psi}$ and $\mu \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{\psi}$,

$$\mu_N \xrightarrow{\tau_{\psi}} \mu \iff \text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0.$$

Note that $\mu_N \xrightarrow{\tau_{\psi}} \mu$ if and only if $\mu_N \xrightarrow{w} \mu$ and $\int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z})$. We proceed the rest of the proof in two steps.

Step 1. Suppose $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0$. First, we show that $\mu_N \xrightarrow{w} \mu$. By the Portmanteau Theorem ([37, Theorem 13.16]), it suffices to show that for any bounded *Lipschitz continuous* function $h : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) = \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}). \quad (\text{C.64})$$

Let L_h be the Lipschitz modulus of h and $\tilde{h} := h/L_h$. Then $\tilde{h} \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Thus $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0$ implies $\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} \int_Z \tilde{h}(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) = \int_Z \tilde{h}(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z})$, and hence (C.64) as desired. Next, we show $\int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z})$. It is enough to verify that there exists $L > 0$ such that $\psi/L \in \mathcal{F}_p$. Observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi(\mathbf{z}_1) - \psi(\mathbf{z}_2)| &= |1 + \max\{\|\mathbf{z}_1\|, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}'\| - (1 + \max\{\|\mathbf{z}_2\|, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{z}_2 - \mathbf{z}'\|)| \\ &\leq \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_1\|, \|\mathbf{z}_2\|\}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

Let $L := \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\}$. Then $\psi/L \in \mathcal{F}_p$. By the condition that $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0$, $\int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) \rightarrow \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z})$.

Step 2. Conversely, suppose $\mu_N \xrightarrow{\tau_{\psi}} \mu$. We need to show that $\text{dl}_{\text{FM}}(\mu_N, \mu) \rightarrow 0$, that is, for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists some $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p} \left| \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall N \geq N_0. \quad (\text{C.65})$$

²The second author would like to thank Henryk Zähle for referring him to the lemma.

Let K be a sufficiently large positive constant and $h_K := h\mathbb{1}_{|h|\leq K} + K\mathbb{1}_{h>K} - K\mathbb{1}_{h<-K}$, and $h^K := h - h_K$. Then

$$\sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p} \left| \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z h(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| \leq R_1 + R_2,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} R_1 &:= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p} \left| \int_Z h_K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z h_K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right|, \\ R_2 &:= \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p} \left| \int_Z h^K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z h^K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

It suffices to show that $R_1, R_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Since the set \mathcal{F}_p has a one-to-one correspondence relationship with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p := \{h : Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : h(\mathbf{z}') = 0, |h(\mathbf{z}_1) - h(\mathbf{z}_2)| \leq L_p(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|, \forall \mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2 \in Z\},$$

then we may consider $\tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p$. Consequently, we have

$$|h(\mathbf{z})| = |h(\mathbf{z}) - h(\mathbf{z}')| \leq \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|, \|\mathbf{z}'\|\}^{p-1} \|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}'\| < \psi(\mathbf{z}). \quad (\text{C.66})$$

In this case,

$$\begin{aligned} |h^K(\mathbf{z})| &= |h(\mathbf{z}) - (h(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|h(\mathbf{z})|\leq K} + K\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})>K} - K\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})<-K})| \\ &= |h(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})>K} + h(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})<-K} - (K\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})>K} - K\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})<-K})| \\ &= |(h(\mathbf{z}) - K)\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})>K} + (h(\mathbf{z}) + K)\mathbb{1}_{h(\mathbf{z})<-K}| \\ &\leq |h(\mathbf{z})|\mathbb{1}_{|h(\mathbf{z})|>K} \leq \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds because (C.66) implies $\mathbb{1}_{|h(\mathbf{z})|>K} \leq \mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K}$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned} R_2 &\leq \sup_{h \in \mathcal{F}_p} \left| \int_Z h^K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) \right| + \sup_{h \in \tilde{\mathcal{F}}_p} \left| \int_Z h^K(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\ &\leq \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) + \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) =: R_{21} + R_{22}. \end{aligned}$$

Since $\mu_N \xrightarrow{\tau_\psi} \mu$, then for any ϵ , we can set K sufficiently large such that $R_{22} = \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \leq \frac{\epsilon}{5}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} R_{21} &\leq \left| \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| + \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \\ &\leq \left| \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|>K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| + \frac{\epsilon}{5} \\ &\leq \left| \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z}) d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| \\ &\quad + \left| \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|\leq K} d\mu_N(\mathbf{z}) - \int_Z \psi(\mathbf{z})\mathbb{1}_{|\psi(\mathbf{z})|\leq K} d\mu(\mathbf{z}) \right| + \frac{\epsilon}{5}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.67})$$

Since $\mu_N \xrightarrow{\tau\psi} \mu$, the first term in the last inequality of (C.67) converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. Thus we can find $N_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that it is bounded above by $\frac{\epsilon}{5}$ for $N \geq N_0$. Since $\mu \circ \psi^{-1}$ as a probability measure on the real line has at most countably many atoms, we choose $K > 0$ such that $\mu(\mathbf{z} \in Z : \psi(\mathbf{z}) = K) = 0$. Since $\mu_N \rightarrow \mu$ (ψ -weakly and thus) weakly, it follows by the Portmanteau theorem that the second term in the last inequality of (C.67) converges to 0 as $N \rightarrow \infty$. By possibly increasing N_0 we obtain that the second term in the last inequality of (C.67) is at most $\epsilon/5$ for all $N \geq N_0$. So far we have shown that R_2 is bounded above by $\frac{4\epsilon}{5}$ for $N \geq N_0$. Since the functions in $\{h_K : h \in \mathcal{F}_p\}$ are uniformly bounded and equicontinuous, [23, Corollary 11.3.4] ensures that one can increase N_0 further such that $R_1 \leq \frac{\epsilon}{5}$ for all $N \geq N_0$. Therefore, we have (C.65) holds. \square

D Proof of Proposition 4.2

By Assumption 4.2(C5) and (K1)', for every $\mathbf{z} \in Z$,

$$\begin{aligned}
& |c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \\
& \leq \left(|c_2''(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_2 L_{p_2}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_0) (\|\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{z}_0\| + \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0)\|) \right) \\
(4.32) \quad & \leq \left(|c_2''(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + 2C_2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\} L_{p_2}(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}_0) \right) \\
(4.31) \quad & \leq \left(|c_2''(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + 2C_2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \right) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\}^{p_2} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_2} \\
& =: \tilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_2},
\end{aligned}$$

where $\tilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}} := \left(|c_2''(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))| + 2C_2(1 + C_3 \|\mathbf{f}\|_k) \right) \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_0\|\}^{p_2}$, and thus

$$|c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|T_{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{h}\|_k = |c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k \leq |c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2 \stackrel{(4.30)}{\leq} \widehat{M}_1^2 \tilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}\|\}^{p_2+2}.$$

Then $\mathbb{E}_Q[|c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty$ for all $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{p_2+2}$. Let

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{\mathbf{h}} = \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(Z) : \mathbb{E}_Q[|c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty, \mathbb{E}_Q[|c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x})) \langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k] < \infty\}.$$

Combining Remark 4.1(iv)-(v) that, under (C4)' and (K1)', $\mathbb{E}_Q[|c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k]$ is well-defined for $Q \in \mathcal{M}_Z^{p_1+1}$. Then $\tilde{\mathcal{P}} \subset \mathcal{M}_Z^{\max\{p_1+1, p_2+2\}}$.

Let $\tilde{\mathfrak{R}}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h}) := t^{-1}[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}} - c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]$. Then

$$\|\tilde{\mathfrak{R}}_t(\mathbf{z}; \mathbf{h})\|_k \leq \Psi(\mathbf{z}) \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k |\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})| \leq C_2 L_p(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{z}) \|\mathbf{h}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k^2.$$

Analogous to Proposition 4.1, we can obtain by the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}])(\mathbf{h}) \\
& = \mathbb{E}_P \left[\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{c_2'(\mathbf{z}, (\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h})(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}} - c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}}{t} \right] \\
& = \mathbb{E}_P \left[\lim_{t \downarrow 0} \frac{c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \langle (\mathbf{f} + t\mathbf{h}), k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle) - c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \langle \mathbf{f}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle)}{t} k_{\mathbf{x}} \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))\langle \mathbf{h}, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle k_{\mathbf{x}}],$$

for all $P \in \tilde{\mathcal{P}}$. This shows $D_{\mathbf{f}}(\mathbb{E}_P[c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))k_{\mathbf{x}}]) = \mathbb{E}_P[c_2''(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))T_{\mathbf{x}}]$, where $T_{\mathbf{x}}$ is defined as in (4.34). \square

E Proof of Proposition 4.3

Part (i). Under (K1)',

$$\|k_{\mathbf{x}_1}\|_k \leq \|k_{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_k + C_3\|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_0\| \leq \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_1\|\}. \quad (\text{E.68})$$

Under (C3)', (C4)' and (K1)', we have $|c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))| \leq \widehat{M}_2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_2\|\}^{p_1}$. By (K1)', (C4)', and inequality (4.29), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} & |\langle \mathbf{d}, c_2'(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))k_{\mathbf{x}_1} \rangle - \langle \mathbf{d}, c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_2} \rangle| \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \|c_2'(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \left(\|c_2'(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_1}\|_k + \|c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k \right) \\ & \leq \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \left(C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|k_{\mathbf{x}_1}\|_k \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + |c_2'(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))| C_3 \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| \right) \\ & = \|\mathbf{d}\|_k \left(C_1 \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_1\|\} L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + C_3 \widehat{M}_2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_2\|\}^{p_1} \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| \right) \\ & \leq (C_1 \widehat{M}_1 + C_3 \widehat{M}_2) L_{p_1+1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| \\ & =: C_{\mathbf{f}_0} L_{p_1+1}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|, \end{aligned}$$

where $C_{\mathbf{f}_0} := (C_1 \widehat{M}_1 + C_3 \widehat{M}_2)$, \widehat{M}_1 and \widehat{M}_2 are defined as in Remark 4.1 (ii) and (iii), C_1 and C_3 are defined as in Assumption 4.2(C4)' and Assumption 4.3(K1)'. Moreover, by Assumption 4.2(C4)',

$$\begin{aligned} |c_2'(\mathbf{z}, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}))| & \leq |c_2'(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_0) \|\mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0) - \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{x}_0)\| \\ & \leq |c_2'(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_0) \|\langle \mathbf{f} - \mathbf{f}_0, k_{\mathbf{x}_0} \rangle\| \\ & \leq |c_2'(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}_0(\mathbf{x}_0))| + C_1 L_{p_1}(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{z}_0) \|k_{\mathbf{x}_0}\|_k \epsilon_{\mathcal{V}}, \forall \mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E.69})$$

Part (ii). Let $\mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \in \mathcal{H}_k$ with $\|\mathbf{d}_1\|_k \leq 1$, $\|\mathbf{d}_2\|_k \leq 1$. Note that $|\mathbf{d}_i(\mathbf{x})| = |\langle \mathbf{d}_i, k_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle| \leq \|\mathbf{d}_i\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}}\|_k$. By (4.34) and (4.35), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & | \langle (c_2''(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))T_{\mathbf{x}_1} - c_2''(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2))T_{\mathbf{x}_2}) \mathbf{d}_1, \mathbf{d}_2 \rangle | \\ & \leq |c_2''(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{x}_1) \mathbf{d}_2(\mathbf{x}_1) - c_2''(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{x}_2) \mathbf{d}_2(\mathbf{x}_2)| \\ & \quad + |c_2''(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1)) \mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{x}_2) \mathbf{d}_2(\mathbf{x}_2) - c_2''(\mathbf{z}_2, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_2)) \mathbf{d}_1(\mathbf{x}_2) \mathbf{d}_2(\mathbf{x}_2)| \\ & \leq |c_2''(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_1))| \|\mathbf{d}_1\|_k \|\mathbf{d}_2\|_k (\|k_{\mathbf{x}_1}\|_k + \|k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k) \|k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k \\ & \quad + \|k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k^2 C_2 L_{p_2}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) (\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + \|\mathbf{f}\|_k \|k_{\mathbf{x}_1} - k_{\mathbf{x}_2}\|_k) \\ & \leq \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{\mathbf{f}_0}} \left(\tilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}} \max\{1, \|\mathbf{z}_1\|\}^{p_2} \right) \left(2 \widehat{M}_1 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{x}_1\|, \|\mathbf{x}_2\|\} \right) C_3 \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\| \\ & \quad + \widehat{M}_1^2 \max\{1, \|\mathbf{x}_2\|\}^2 C_2 L_{p_2}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) (\|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\| + \|\mathbf{f}\|_k C_3 \|\mathbf{x}_1 - \mathbf{x}_2\|) \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \widehat{C}_{f_0} L_{p_2+2}(\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2) \|\mathbf{z}_1 - \mathbf{z}_2\|,$$

where $\widehat{C}_{f_0} := \sup_{\mathbf{f} \in \mathcal{V}_{f_0}} \widetilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}} 2\widehat{M}_1 C_3 + \widehat{M}_1^2 C_2 (1 + \|\mathbf{f}\|_k C_3)$. Analogous to the derivation of (E.69), we can show that $|c_2''(\mathbf{z}_0, \mathbf{f}(\mathbf{x}_0))|$ and hence $\widetilde{C}_{\mathbf{f}}$ are uniformly bounded over \mathcal{V}_{f_0} . By the definition of \widehat{C}_{f_0} , \widehat{C}_{f_0} is bounded. \square

F Implicit function theorem

Theorem F.1 (Implicit Function Theorem for Strictly Monotone Functions) *Let U be a Banach space equipped with norm $\|\cdot\|$ and V be a Hilbert space. Consider a function $\psi : U \times V \rightarrow V$ and a point $(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) \in \text{int dom } \psi$ satisfying $\psi(\bar{u}, \bar{v}) = 0$. Assume: (a) there are neighborhoods \mathcal{B}_U of \bar{u} and \mathcal{B}_V of \bar{v} such that ψ is continuous on $\mathcal{B}_U \times \mathcal{B}_V$, (b) $\psi(u, \cdot)$ is strongly monotone on \mathcal{B}_V uniformly in $u \in \mathcal{B}_U$ and (c) $\psi(\cdot, v)$ is Lipschitz continuous on U uniformly in $v \in \mathcal{B}_V$. Then following assertions hold.*

(i) *The solution mapping*

$$S(u) = \{v \in V : \psi(u, v) = 0\}$$

for $u \in U$ has a single-valued localization around \bar{u} for v .

(ii) *$S(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz continuous around \bar{u} for \bar{v} .*

Proof. The proof is similar to [22, Theorem 1H.3] which is in finite dimensional space. Here we give a sketch for completeness particularly because we will use Schauder's fixed point theorem as opposed to Brower's fixed point theorem in the proof of [22, Theorem 1H.3].

Part (i). Observe that if $u \in \text{dom } S \cap \mathcal{B}_U$, then $S(u) \cap \mathcal{B}_V$ consists of one element, if any. In fact, if there existed two elements $v_1, v_2 \in S(u) \cap \mathcal{B}_V$ with $v_1 \neq v_2$, then from the strong monotonicity, we would have

$$0 = \langle \psi(u, v_1) - \psi(u, v_2), v_1 - v_2 \rangle > 0,$$

which leads to a contradiction. Thus, all we need is to establish that $\text{dom } S$ contains a neighborhood of \bar{u} . Without loss of generality, let $\bar{v} = 0$ and choose $\delta > 0$ such that $\delta\mathbb{B} \subset \mathcal{B}_V$. For $\epsilon \in (0, \delta]$ define

$$d(\epsilon) := \inf_{\epsilon \leq \|v\| \leq \delta} \frac{\langle v, \psi(\bar{u}, v) \rangle}{\|v\|}. \quad (\text{F.70})$$

Choose $v \in V$ with $\|v\| \in [\epsilon, \delta]$. Since $\psi(\bar{u}, 0) = 0$, from strict monotonicity of $\psi(\bar{u}, \cdot)$, we obtain that

$$\langle \psi(\bar{u}, v), v \rangle = \langle \psi(\bar{u}, v) - \psi(\bar{u}, 0), v - 0 \rangle > 0,$$

hence $d(\epsilon) \geq 0$ for all $\epsilon \in (0, \delta]$. We claim that $d(\epsilon) > 0$. Assume for the sake of a contradiction that there exists $\epsilon_0 > 0$ such $d(\epsilon_0) = 0$. Then there exists a sequence $\{v_k\}$ with $\|v_k\| \in [\epsilon_0, \delta]$ such that

$$\frac{\langle v_k, \psi(\bar{u}, v_k) \rangle}{\|v_k\|} \rightarrow 0.$$

On the other hand, it follows by the strong monotonicity of $\psi(\bar{u}, \cdot)$

$$\frac{\langle v_k, \psi(\bar{u}, v_k) \rangle}{\|v_k\|} = \frac{\langle v_k - 0, \psi(\bar{u}, v_k) - \psi(\bar{u}, 0) \rangle}{\|v_k\|} \geq \tau \|v_k\| \geq \tau \epsilon.$$

Part (ii). We proceed in three steps.

Step 1. Let $\mu \in (0, d(\delta))$ and $\nu > 0$ be such that $B(\bar{u}, \nu) \subset \mathcal{B}_U$. From the continuity of ψ in $u \in B(\bar{u}, \nu)$ uniformly with respect to $v \in \{v : \|v\| = \delta\}$ there exists $\alpha_\mu \in (0, \nu)$ such that for any $u \in B(\bar{u}, \alpha_\mu)$ and $v \in \{v : \|v\| = \delta\}$, $\|\psi(u, v) - \psi(\bar{u}, v)\| \leq \mu$. Consequently

$$\frac{\langle v, \psi(u, v) \rangle}{\|v\|} = \frac{\langle v, \psi(\bar{u}, v) \rangle}{\|v\|} + \frac{\langle v, \psi(u, v) - \psi(\bar{u}, v) \rangle}{\|v\|} \geq \frac{\langle v, \psi(\bar{u}, v) \rangle}{\|v\|} - \mu \geq d(\delta) - \mu > 0. \quad (\text{F.71})$$

Step 2. For fixed $u \in B(\bar{u}, \nu)$, consider the function

$$\Psi(v) := \Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u, v)), \text{ for } v \in \delta\mathbb{B} \quad (\text{F.72})$$

where $\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}$ is a orthogonal project in V . We use Shauder's fixed point theorem to show that $\Phi(\cdot)$ has a fixed point in the interior of $\delta\mathbb{B}$. To this end, we need to show that $\Psi : \delta\mathbb{B} \rightarrow \delta\mathbb{B}$ is a compact operator. By Arzela-Ascoli theorem, it suffices to what that (a) $\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u, v))$ is uniformly bounded, i.e.,

$$\sup_{v \in \delta\mathbb{B}} \|\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u, v))\| \leq \delta,$$

which is obvious and (b) $\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u, v))$ is equicontinuous, i.e., for any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a $\beta > 0$ such that

$$\sup_{v \in \delta\mathbb{B}} \|\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u', v)) - \Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u'', v))\| \leq \epsilon, \quad \forall u', u'' \in B(\bar{u}, \nu), \|u' - u''\| \leq \beta. \quad (\text{F.73})$$

Inequality (F.73) is guaranteed by the uniform continuity of $\psi(u, v)$ in u w.r.t. $v \in \mathcal{B}_V$ because

$$\|\Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u', v)) - \Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v - \psi(u'', v))\| \leq \|\psi(u', v) - \psi(u'', v)\|.$$

By Shauder's fixed point theorem, there exists $v^* \in \delta\mathbb{B}$ such that

$$v^* = \Psi(v^*) = \Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v^* - \psi(u, v^*)).$$

Next, we show that $\|v^*\| < \delta$. Assume for the sake of contradiction $\|v^*\| = \delta$. By the definition of orthogonal projection $\langle 0 - v^*, v^* - \psi(u, v^*) - v^* \rangle \leq 0$, which implies $\frac{\langle v^*, \psi(u, v^*) \rangle}{\|v^*\|} \leq 0$. On the other hand, it follows by (F.71)

$$\frac{\langle v^*, \psi(u, v^*) \rangle}{\|v^*\|} \geq d(\delta) - \mu > 0, \quad (\text{F.74})$$

a contradiction. Thus

$$v^* = \Pi_{\delta\mathbb{B}}(v^* - \psi(u, v^*)) = v^* - \psi(u, v^*)$$

and hence $\psi(u, v^*) = 0$.

Step 3. To prove continuity of $S(\cdot)$ at \bar{u} , we note that by the strong monotonicity of $\psi(u, \cdot)$,

$$\|S(u') - S(u'')\| \|\psi(u', S(u')) - \psi(u', S(u''))\| \geq \langle S(u') - S(u''), \psi(u', S(u')) - \psi(u', S(u'')) \rangle$$

$$\geq \tau \|S(u') - S(u'')\|^2.$$

Since $\psi(u', S(u')) = \psi(u'', S(u'')) = 0$, then by the Lipschitz continuity of $\psi(\cdot, v)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\psi(u', S(u')) - \psi(u'', S(u''))\| &= \|\psi(u'', S(u'')) - \psi(u', S(u''))\| \\ &\leq L \|u' - u''\|. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the two inequalities above, we obtain

$$\|S(u') - S(u'')\| \leq \frac{L}{\tau} \|u' - u''\|.$$

The proof is complete. □

References

- [1] Adly S, Rockafellar RT (2021) Sensitivity analysis of maximally monotone inclusions via the proto-differentiability of the resolvent operator. *Mathematical Programming* 189(1):37–54.
- [2] Anthony M, Bartlett PL (1999) *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*, volume 9 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [3] Aronszajn N (1950) Theory of reproducing kernels. *Transactions of the American mathematical society* 68(3):337–404.
- [4] Aubin JP, Frankowska H (2009) *Set-Valued Analysis* (Springer Science & Business Media, New York).
- [5] Berge C (1877) *Topological spaces: Including a treatment of multi-valued functions, vector spaces and convexity* (Oliver & Boyd).
- [6] Besbes O, Ma W, Mouchtaki O (2022) Beyond iid: data-driven decision-making in heterogeneous environments. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 35:23979–23991.
- [7] Bishop CM, Nasrabadi NM (2006) *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning* (Springer, New York).
- [8] Blumer A, Ehrenfeucht A, Haussler D, Warmuth MK (1989) Learnability and the vapnik-chervonenkis dimension. *Journal of the ACM* 36(4):929–965.
- [9] Bonnans JF, Shapiro A (2000) *Perturbation Analysis of Optimization Problems* (Springer Science & Business Media, New York).
- [10] Bousquet O, Elisseeff A (2002) Stability and generalization. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 2:499–526.
- [11] Breheny P, Huang J (2015) Group descent algorithms for nonconvex penalized linear and logistic regression models with grouped predictors. *Statistics and Computing* 25(2):173–187.
- [12] Buldygin VV, Kharazishvili AB (2013) *Geometric aspects of probability theory and mathematical statistics*, volume 514 (Springer Science & Business Media).

- [13] Caponnetto A, De Vito E (2007) Optimal rates for the regularized least-squares algorithm. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 7:331–368.
- [14] Clarke FH (1983) *Optimization and Nonsmooth Analysis* (SIAM, Philadelphia).
- [15] Claus M (2016) *Advancing stability analysis of mean-risk stochastic programs: Bilevel and two-stage models*. Ph.D. thesis, Dissertation, Duisburg, Essen, Universität Duisburg-Essen, 2016.
- [16] Cont R, Deguest R, Scandolo G (2010) Robustness and sensitivity analysis of risk measurement procedures. *Quantitative Finance* 10(6):593–606.
- [17] Cucker F, Smale S (2002) On the mathematical foundations of learning. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society* 39(1):1–49.
- [18] Cucker F, Smale S, et al. (2002) Best choices for regularization parameters in learning theory: on the bias-variance problem. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 2(4):413–428.
- [19] Cucker F, Zhou DX (2007) *Learning Theory: An Approximation Theory Viewpoint*, volume 24 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [20] De Vito E, Caponnetto A, Rosasco L (2005) Model selection for regularized least-squares algorithm in learning theory. *Foundations of Computational Mathematics* 5:59–85.
- [21] Do CN (1992) Generalized second-order derivatives of convex functions in reflexive banach spaces. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 334(1):281–301.
- [22] Dontchev AL, Rockafellar RT (2009) *Implicit functions and solution mappings*, volume 543 (Springer).
- [23] Dudley RM (2002) *Real Analysis and Probability*, volume 74 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge).
- [24] Föllmer H, Schied A (2016) *Stochastic Finance: An Introduction in Discrete Time* (De Gruyter, Berlin).
- [25] Guo S, Xu H (2021) Statistical robustness in utility preference robust optimization models. *Mathematical Programming* 190(1):679–720.
- [26] Guo S, Xu H (2023) Data perturbations in stochastic generalized equations: statistical robustness in static and sample average approximated models. *Mathematical Programming* 1–34.
- [27] Guo S, Xu H, Zhang L (2021) Existence and approximation of continuous bayesian nash equilibria in games with continuous type and action spaces. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 31(4):2481–2507.
- [28] Guo S, Xu H, Zhang L (2023) Statistical robustness of empirical risks in machine learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 24(125):1–38.

- [29] Hampel FR (1971) A general qualitative definition of robustness. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 42(6):1887–1896.
- [30] Hampel FR (1974) The influence curve and its role in robust estimation. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 69(346):383–393.
- [31] Hampel FR, Ronchetti EM, Rousseeuw P, Stahel WA (1986) *Robust Statistics: The Approach Based on Influence Functions* (Wiley-Interscience, New York).
- [32] Huber PJ (1981) *Robust statistics* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York).
- [33] Huber PJ, Ronchetti EM (2009) *Robust Statistics* (John Wiley & Sons, Inc., Hoboken, NJ).
- [34] Jiang J, Li S (2022) Statistical robustness of two-stage stochastic variational inequalities. *Optimization Letters* 16(9):2591–2605.
- [35] Kern P, Simroth A, Zähle H (2020) First-order sensitivity of the optimal value in a markov decision model with respect to deviations in the transition probability function. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research* 92(1):165–197.
- [36] King AJ, Rockafellar RT (1992) Sensitivity analysis for nonsmooth generalized equations. *Mathematical Programming* 55(2):193–212.
- [37] Klenke A (2013) *Probability Theory: A Comprehensive Course* (Springer Science & Business Media, New York).
- [38] Krätschmer V, Schied A, Zähle H (2012) Qualitative and infinitesimal robustness of tail-dependent statistical functionals. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 103(1):35–47.
- [39] Krätschmer V, Schied A, Zähle H (2014) Comparative and qualitative robustness for law-invariant risk measures. *Finance and Stochastics* 18(2):271–295.
- [40] Krätschmer V, Schied A, Zähle H (2017) Domains of weak continuity of statistical functionals with a view toward robust statistics. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis* 158:1–19.
- [41] Lecué G, Lerasle M (2020) Robust machine learning by median-of-means: theory and practice. *The Annals of Statistics* 48(2):906–931.
- [42] Levy AB, Rockafellar RT (1994) Sensitivity analysis of solutions to generalized equations. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* 345(2):661–671.
- [43] Liu J, Pang JS (2023) Risk-based robust statistical learning by stochastic difference-of-convex value-function optimization. *Operations Research* 71(2):397–414.
- [44] Maccheroni F, Marinacci M, Rustichini A (2006) Ambiguity aversion, robustness, and the variational representation of preferences. *Econometrica* 74(6):1447–1498.
- [45] Mukherjee S, Niyogi P, Poggio T, Rifkin R (2006) Learning theory: stability is sufficient for generalization and necessary and sufficient for consistency of empirical risk minimization. *Advances in Computational Mathematics* 25(1):161–193.

- [46] Munkres JR (2000) *Topology* (Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ).
- [47] Murphy KP (2012) *Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective* (MIT Press, Cambridge).
- [48] Norkin VI, Keyzer MA (2010) On convergence of kernel learning estimators. *SIAM Journal on Optimization* 20(3):1205–1223.
- [49] Peng RD (2016) *R Programming for Data Science* (Leanpub Victoria, BC, Canada).
- [50] Poggio T, Smale S (2003) The mathematics of learning: Dealing with data. *Notices of the AMS* 50(5):537–544.
- [51] Prokhorov YV (1956) Convergence of random processes and limit theorems in probability theory. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications* 1(2):157–214.
- [52] Qi Z, Cui Y, Liu Y, Pang JS (2022) Asymptotic properties of stationary solutions of coupled nonconvex nonsmooth empirical risk minimization. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 47(3):2034–2064.
- [53] Rachev ST, Römisch W (2002) Quantitative stability in stochastic programming: The method of probability metrics. *Mathematics of Operations Research* 27(4):792–818.
- [54] Ralph D, Xu H (2005) Implicit smoothing and its application to optimization with piecewise smooth equality constraints. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 124(3):673–699.
- [55] Rockafellar RT (1989) Proto-differentiability of set-valued mappings and its applications in optimization. *Annales de l’Institut Henri Poincaré C, Analyse non linéaire*, volume 6, 449–482.
- [56] Rockafellar RT, Wets RJB (1998) *Variational Analysis* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin).
- [57] Rogers WH, Wagner TJ (1978) A finite sample distribution-free performance bound for local discrimination rules. *The Annals of Statistics* 506–514.
- [58] Römisch W (2003) Stability of stochastic programming problems. *Stochastic programming*, volume 10 of *Handbooks Oper. Res. Management Sci.*, 483–554 (Elsevier Sci. B. V., Amsterdam).
- [59] Schölkopf B, Herbrich R, Smola AJ (2001) A generalized representer theorem. *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, 416–426 (Springer).
- [60] Schölkopf B, Smola AJ, Bach F, et al. (2002) *Learning with Kernels: Support Vector Machines, Regularization, Optimization, and Beyond* (MIT Press, Cambridge).
- [61] Shafieezadeh-Abadeh S, Kuhn D, Esfahani PM (2019) Regularization via mass transportation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 20(103):1–68.
- [62] Shalev-Shwartz S, Shamir O, Srebro N, Sridharan K (2010) Learnability, stability and uniform convergence. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11:2635–2670.

- [63] Shapiro A, Dentcheva D, Ruszczyński A (2009) *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory* (SIAM, Philadelphia).
- [64] Steinwart I, Christmann A (2008) *Support Vector Machines* (Springer Science & Business Media, New York).
- [65] Tibshirani R (1996) Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Methodological)* 58(1):267–288.
- [66] Tukey JW (1960) A survey of sampling from contaminated distributions. *Contributions to Probability and Statistics* 448–485.
- [67] Tukey JW (1962) The future of data analysis. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* 33(1):1–67.
- [68] Vapnik VN, Chervonenkis AY (2015) On the uniform convergence of relative frequencies of events to their probabilities. Vovk V, Papadopoulos H, Gammerman A, eds., *Measures of Complexity: Festschrift for Alexey Chervonenkis*, 11–30 (Springer International Publishing).