

# Residuals-Based Contextual Distributionally Robust Optimization with Decision-Dependent Uncertainty

Qing Zhu\* Xian Yu<sup>†</sup> and Güzin Bayraksan<sup>‡</sup>

## Abstract

We consider a residuals-based distributionally robust optimization model, where the underlying uncertainty depends on both covariate information and our decisions. We adopt regression models to learn the latent decision dependency and construct a nominal distribution (thereby ambiguity sets) around the learned model using empirical residuals from the regressions. Ambiguity sets can be formed via the Wasserstein distance, a sample robust approach, or with the same support as the nominal empirical distribution (e.g., phi-divergences), where both the nominal distribution and the radii of the ambiguity sets could be decision- and covariate-dependent. We provide conditions under which desired statistical properties, such as asymptotic optimality, rates of convergence, and finite sample guarantees, are satisfied. Via cross-validation, we devise data-driven approaches to find the best radii for different ambiguity sets, which can be decision-(in)dependent and covariate-(in)dependent. Through numerical experiments, we illustrate the effectiveness of our approach and the benefits of integrating decision dependency into a residuals-based DRO framework.

**Keywords:** Data-driven stochastic programming, distributionally robust optimization, decision-dependent uncertainty, Wasserstein distance, covariates, machine learning

## 1 Introduction

Modeling uncertainty is a major challenge in real-world decision-making problems because a decision-maker typically only has limited access to the uncertainty realizations or has partial knowledge of the underlying distributions. Stochastic Programming (SP) and Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) are two of the popular approaches that deal with optimization under uncertainty. While traditional SP seeks a solution that minimizes (maximizes) the expected total cost (revenue) [65, 15], DRO aims to find an optimal solution against the worst-case expectation within an ambiguity set of distributions [60]. To construct this ambiguity set, commonly used ways include moment-based

---

\*Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, Email: zhu.2166@osu.edu;

<sup>†</sup>Corresponding author; Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, Email: yu.3610@osu.edu;

<sup>‡</sup>Department of Integrated Systems Engineering, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, USA, Email: bayraksan.1@osu.edu

[e.g., 21, 49, 77], distance-based [e.g., 38, 50, 31, 4], and sample robust [11, 12] approaches. For problems with limited data, DRO can be very appealing because it explicitly models the ambiguity in the uncertain distributions. DRO can also have better out-of-sample performance in the limited data regime [25, 60].

In addition to limited data or partial knowledge about the underlying distributions, two other important complicating factors in real-world applications are that (i) the underlying uncertainty can be affected by contextual/covariate information and (ii) decisions to be optimized can also have a significant impact on the uncertainty. For example, in facility location problems, the decision maker needs to decide where to open new stores to sell a product in order to maximize total revenue under customer demand uncertainty. Customer demand could be affected by contextual information (e.g., seasonality, advertisements, promotions) as well as the facility location decisions. For instance, opening a facility in an area could increase the demand in that area. In portfolio management problems, capturing the contextual information of the market (e.g., economic indicators, company performance) is essential for better predicting the uncertain returns. And, the decision of buying and selling stocks can greatly affect uncertain stock returns, especially for large-volume transactions or by large players in the market. Another example in the realm of power systems is that accurately predicting electricity demand entails identifying contextual factors (e.g., seasonal variations). At the same time, long-term investment decisions regarding electricity generation, expansion, and distribution can significantly influence the future electricity demand. Therefore, in many real-world problems, it is imperative to capture the impact of both contextual information and decision dependency on the underlying uncertainty.

To address the issue of leveraging covariate information in decision-making problems under uncertainty, the following conditional (or contextual) stochastic program (CSP) has been proposed [2, 7, 64]:

$$v^*(x) := \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}_Y[c(z, Y)|X = x], \quad (\text{CSP})$$

where  $z$  denotes the decision variables with feasible set  $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ ,  $X \in \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$  denotes the random vector of covariates with  $x$  being its realization, and the random vector  $Y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  denotes the model uncertainty. In the above setup, the decision maker typically has access to joint observations of  $(X, Y)$ , and the covariate  $x$  is observed before the optimization model is solved. There has been a stream of research papers that focus on solving the above (CSP) in recent years; see, e.g., the recent survey [63]. We will briefly review these works in Section 1.1. Among them, [1] and [64] proposed adding residuals from the prediction model to account for estimation error in the prediction step. [41] formalized this approach and investigated the theoretical properties of the so-called empirical residuals-based sample average approximation (ER-SAA), and [42] proposed distributionally robust optimization variants (denoted ER-DRO). However, none of these works considered decision dependency on the uncertainty, which is critical in many real-world applications. This work extends this approach by modeling decision-dependency in an ER-DRO framework.

Motivated by the aforementioned decision-dependency in many real-world applications, in this paper, we focus on the following CSP, where the uncertain parameter depends on both covariate

information  $x$  and our decision  $z$ . Given joint random observations of  $(X, Z, Y)$ , drawn from an unknown ground truth distribution, at a new given covariate  $X = x$ , the goal is to solve the following decision-dependent CSP

$$v^*(x) := \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}_Y [c(z, Y) | X = x, Z = z]. \quad (\text{DD-CSP})$$

Decisions  $z$  can be regarded as another covariate that can impact the uncertainty  $Y$ , similar to  $x$ . For notational simplicity, we omit the dependence of  $Y$  on  $x$  and  $z$  here. We will write  $Y$  as  $Y(x, z)$  explicitly to facilitate our analysis later. Note that the above setup, without loss of generality, considers a portion of decisions  $z$  that affect uncertainty and others that may not. Because the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given the covariates  $x$  and decisions  $z$  is typically unknown (but assumed to exist) and the resulting conditional expectation (assumed to be well defined and finite) often cannot be calculated, problem (DD-CSP) cannot be solved exactly. To approximate the above (DD-CSP), we propose an empirical residuals-based decision-dependent DRO (ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO) approach. Specifically, we first apply a regression model to estimate the dependency of random parameter  $Y$  on the covariate  $x$  and decision  $z$ . The residuals obtained during the training step of the regression model are then added to this point prediction to construct an empirical distribution. Centered at this empirical distribution, we then construct ambiguity sets to find optimal decisions against the worst-case scenario within the distributional ambiguity.

## 1.1 Related Work

This work contributes to three lines of research: (i) DRO, (ii) contextual stochastic optimization, and (iii) decision-dependent stochastic optimization. For DRO, we refer the readers to the extensive survey [60]. We instead focus on contextual and decision-dependent stochastic optimization and look into the intersections between these three research areas.

We begin with contextual stochastic optimization. While traditional methods consider purely statistical error in the prediction step without considering the downstream optimization, there has been a series of works that integrated optimization and prediction. We refer interested readers to [58, 63] for extensive reviews on integrating prediction and optimization under a contextual setting. In one such integrated approach, [24] proposed a new smart “predict, then optimize” (SPO) framework with an SPO loss function that measures the decision error induced by a prediction and demonstrated its consistency and asymptotic validity. [23] extended this SPO loss function’s finite sample guarantee property through generalization bounds and [27] extended previous work to two-stage linear SPs. In a similar vein, [40] trained random forest decision policies that targeted the optimization tasks directly. Another approach, “estimate-then-optimize” (ETO), incorporates learning of the conditional distributions into the optimization step. For example, [7] investigated nonparametric regression models by assigning weights to each data point that depend on the covariates, creating a reweighted SAA, and [10] extended this approach to multistage problems. The residuals-based approach, in contrast to reweighted SAA, creates an SAA approximation by using both the point prediction at the new covariate and the empirical residuals obtained from the learn-

ing step, where both parametric and nonparametric methods can be used [1, 64, 41, 42]. Besides SPO- and ETO-type models, there is another stream of research that seeks to learn the optimal feature-to-decision mapping. Some examples of this approach include, but not limited to, the following. [8] proposed a feature-to-decision mapping based on regression in reproducing kernel Hilbert spaces and provided finite sample guarantees and asymptotic optimality. In the realm of newsvendor problems, [2] used empirical risk minimization with affine decision rules, [55] introduced a deep learning-based algorithm to learn the optimal feature-to-decision mapping, [59] explored data-to-decision mapping considering intertemporal dependencies and non-stationary conditions, and [76] investigated end-to-end distributionally robust policies.

Let us now briefly discuss decision dependency (or endogenous uncertainty) in stochastic optimization. Modeling uncertainty with decision dependency is critical in many applications because failing to take this into account can lead to severely suboptimal solutions. This topic therefore has been extensively studied in the fields of dynamic programming [e.g., 71], stochastic programming [e.g., 32, 36, 44], and robust optimization [e.g., 53, 57]. There are two types of decision dependency. In the first one, decisions affect probability distributions, and in the second one decisions affect when the uncertainty is revealed. Historically, the second type received more attention in the stochastic programming literature [e.g., 32], with recent works investigating decision-dependent information discovery [68, 67]. Our work considers the first type.

More recently, there has been a vein of models that integrate decision dependency in a DRO framework. Among these, [47] studied a DRO model with multiple decision-dependent ambiguity sets, and [3] formulated a two-stage DRO facility location problem with endogenous demand, which the decisions can affect the moments of the stochastic demand at customer sites. [54] introduced a DRO problem with ambiguity sets centered at a decision-dependent distribution. The paper adopted both the Wasserstein metrics and total variation distance to construct the ambiguity sets. [75] extended the decision-dependent DRO model to a multistage setting and considered various moment-based ambiguity sets.

Similarly, there has been a number of works in the intersection of DRO and contextual stochastic optimization. For instance, [10] extended the reweighted SAA approach of [7] to the DRO setting by using the sample robust ambiguity set of [11, 12], and [42] extended the residuals-based approach using a variety of ambiguity sets. [13] proposed a bootstrap robust model, and [33] proposed a  $\chi^2$ -distance-based DRO formulation that uses Nadaraya-Watson regression estimates to approximate value functions in multistage stochastic programs. Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity sets have also been used in a variety of contextual settings [e.g., 52, 22, 76]; see also the variants in [26, 74].

However, the literature in the intersection of decision-dependent and contextual stochastic optimization is scarce. To date, only a very few works have considered this important setup. [7, 8] studied extensions of their methods when decisions affect the conditional distributions/expectations; see also [46] for specialization of [7] to a pricing newsvendor problem. On the other hand, [45] used local linear regression models to predict the latently decision-dependent uncertainty in problems without additional covariates. Note that this topic has been identified as an active/future research area in the survey [63].

Finally, to our knowledge, there exist no works that lie in the intersection of all three topics. Investigating a DRO framework in problems where the uncertainty depends on both covariates and decisions can be very beneficial. This is because, in many such systems, data can be limited (e.g., new products/systems). Even in seemingly data-rich environments, when conditioned on covariates  $x$  and decisions  $z$ , one may end up with only few observations. This causes ambiguities in the conditional distributions used for these applications. This motivates us to use a DRO framework because DRO can have better out-of-sample performance by reducing the so-called “optimizer’s curse” or “negative bias” of stochastic optimization with limited data.

To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to integrate decision-dependent DRO within a contextual setting. Motivated by the aforementioned applications and the prevalent limited-data regime in these applications, it builds upon the work of [41, 42] by incorporating decision dependency in a residuals-based contextual DRO. This causes some subtleties and thus necessitates updates to the theoretical and computational methods, which will be investigated in later sections. We end with a remark that, our theoretical guarantees provide general conditions under which the resulting decision-dependent contextual DRO models have desired properties. These general conditions, while not covering all, allow the use of a multitude of learning methods (parametric or nonparametric) and a variety of ambiguity sets (e.g., Wasserstein, sample robust, phi-divergences).

## 1.2 Contributions

We summarize the main contributions of this paper as follows:

1. We introduce decision-dependent uncertainty under the residuals-based DRO framework for approximating the solution to problem (DD-CSP) in this setting. We formulate this problem using three types of ambiguity sets: Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity set, sample robust ambiguity set, and ambiguity sets with the same support (e.g., phi-divergences), which utilize both covariate and decision information.
2. We study asymptotic optimality, pointwise and average rates of convergence, and finite sample guarantees of solutions determined using various ambiguity sets, with both decision-dependent and decision-independent radii.
3. We propose three different algorithms to choose the radii for our ambiguity sets, which can be decision-dependent/independent and covariate-dependent/independent.
4. Finally, we conduct numerical experiments on a decision-dependent shipment planning and pricing problem and compare the efficacy of our ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model with ER-SAA, and ER-DRO (its decision-independent counterpart). Our results illustrate the impact of incorporating decision-dependency in contextual DRO.

## 1.3 Outline

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We begin in Section 2 by providing background and formalizing the problem setting. We then analyze the statistical guarantees of the proposed

residuals-based ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model under the Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity set in Section 3.1 and the sample robust and same support (as the empirical distribution) ambiguity sets in Section 3.2, both with decision-independent radii. We discuss the subtleties and differences in this analysis compared to its non-decision-dependent variant in Section 3.3.1 and the extension to decision-dependent radii in Section 3.3.2. Using cross-validation, we further design data-driven algorithms to find the best radii under different functional forms with respect to the covariate and decisions in Section 4. Numerical experiments in Section 5 compare different models and decision dependencies in the limited data regime, and Section 6 concludes this paper and discusses possible future work.

## 2 Problem Setting

### 2.1 Preliminaries

Suppose that the ground truth relationship between the random parameter  $Y$ , the covariate  $X$  and decision  $Z$  is given by  $Y = f^*(X, Z) + \epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon$  denotes the associated regression error with zero mean and is independent of both  $X$  and  $Z$ . Then,  $f^*(x, z) := \mathbb{E}[Y|X = x, Z = z]$  describes the true regression function, which is not restricted to be linear. We assume that the true regression model  $f^*$  belongs to a function class  $\mathcal{F}$ . However, the approximation framework and theoretical results discussed in subsequent sections still work if  $f^* \notin \mathcal{F}$  (i.e., when the model is misspecified) by replacing  $f^*$  with the best approximation in  $\mathcal{F}$ , where the convergence and other results updated with respect to this best approximation; we refer interested readers to Remark 1 in [42] for detailed discussions. We assume that the support of  $X, Y, Z, \epsilon$  are  $X \in \mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_x}$ ,  $Y \in \mathcal{Y} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ ,  $Z \in \mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ ,  $\epsilon \in \Xi \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , and denote  $P_\epsilon, P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}$  as the distribution of  $\epsilon$  and the conditional distribution of  $Y$  given  $X = x, Z = z$ , respectively. We further assume that  $\mathcal{Y}$  is nonempty closed and convex, which is required for the orthogonal projection onto  $\mathcal{Y}$  to be unique and Lipschitz continuous, and  $\mathcal{Z}$  is nonempty and compact. Under these assumptions, the *decision-dependent* CSP (DD-CSP) could be written as

$$v^*(x) := \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left\{ g(z, x) := \mathbb{E}_\epsilon [c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon)] \right\}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbb{E}_\epsilon[\cdot]$  denotes expectation taken with respect to the distribution of  $\epsilon$ . Notice that problem (1) is well-defined and finite with a nonempty optimal solution set  $S^*(x) \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$  if  $g(\cdot, x)$  is lower semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathbb{E}_\epsilon[|c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon)|] < +\infty$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ .

Let  $D_n := \{(x^k, z^k, y^k)\}_{k=1}^n$  denote the joint observations of  $(X, Z, Y)$ . We assume throughout that the decision maker has access to such joint observations. If we know the true regression function  $f^*$ , we can construct the following full-information decision-dependent SAA (FI-DD-SAA) using the data  $D_n$ :

$$\text{(FI-DD-SAA)} \quad \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left\{ g_n^*(z, x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k) \right\}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\epsilon^k := y^k - f^*(x^k, z^k)$  is the corresponding error under  $f^*$ . However, since the true regression function  $f^*$  is unknown, we first need to use a regression method on data  $D_n$  to get an estimated regression function  $\hat{f}_n$ . Then we calculate the empirical residuals  $\hat{\epsilon}_n^k := y^k - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)$  from each observation  $k$  to construct the following empirical residuals-based decision-dependent SAA (ER-DD-SAA) of problem (1):

$$\text{(ER-DD-SAA)} \quad \hat{v}_n^{ER}(x) := \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left\{ \hat{g}_n^{ER}(z, x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n c(z, \text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k)) \right\}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\text{proj}_S(y)$  denotes the orthogonal projection of  $y$  onto a nonempty closed convex set  $S$ . This projection step helps to avoid any unwanted quantities that can cause infeasibilities. For instance, a negative value of  $\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k$  (e.g., demand, inflow) can render the downstream optimization problem infeasible if  $c(\cdot, \cdot)$  denotes the optimal value of a second-stage problem. In some applications, however,  $\mathcal{Y}$  may not be known. In these cases, a closed convex superset of  $\mathcal{Y}$  could be used to leverage partial knowledge (e.g., nonnegativity) about the uncertainty, if such information is known. Alternatively, the superset can be set to  $\mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , essentially removing the projection step. The analysis below then follows on this superset; see [42] for more details. For simplicity, we continue our analysis with projection onto a known  $\mathcal{Y}$ . We end with a note that, unlike the decision-independent setting where the projection step could be done outside of the optimization, this projection is more complicated in the decision-dependent setting because it also involves the decisions  $z$ . We will discuss this and other changes with respect to the decision-independent setting in more detail in Section 3.3.

Because  $\mathcal{Y}$  (or its superset) is nonempty closed and convex, the orthogonal projections are Lipschitz continuous. Then, for all  $k = 1, \dots, n$  and for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , we have

$$\|\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k) - (f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k)\| \leq \|\hat{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z) &:= (\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k) - (f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k) \\ &= \underbrace{(\hat{f}_n(x, z) - f^*(x, z))}_{\text{prediction error}} + \underbrace{(f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k))}_{\text{estimation error}}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The first term in (5) is the so-called ‘‘prediction error’’ given a new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and decision  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , and the second term in (5) is the ‘‘estimation error’’ at the training point  $(x^k, z^k)$ . This split is a key component of the subsequent analysis.

Finally, to be able to construct ambiguity sets, let us formalize the empirical distributions these ambiguity sets are based on. Toward this end, denote  $P_n^*(x, z)$  as the true empirical distribution of  $Y$  given  $X = x$ ,  $Z = z$  corresponding to the FI-DD-SAA problem (2), and  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  as the

estimated empirical distribution corresponding to the ER-DD-SAA problem (3), defined as follows:

$$P_n^*(x, z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\text{proj}_Y(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k)}.$$

Because the true regression function  $f^*$  is not known, the observable empirical distribution  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  is used to form the ambiguity sets. On the other hand, the true empirical distribution  $P_n^*(x, z)$ , while unobservable, forms a critical part of the subsequent analysis. We will shortly review the ambiguity sets considered in our analysis. We first list common notations used throughout the paper, including some defined earlier for ease of reference.

**Notation.** Let  $\|\cdot\|_q$  denote the  $l_q$ -norm for  $q \in [1, +\infty]$  and  $\|\cdot\|$  denote the  $\ell_2$ -norm as a shorthand. Similarly, let  $\|\cdot\|_{L^q}$  represent the  $L^q$ -norm of a measurable function for  $q \in [1, +\infty]$ , i.e., for a measure space  $(S, \Xi, \mu)$  and measurable function  $G$ ,  $\|G\|_{L^q} = (\int_S \|G\|^q)^{1/q}$ . We assume that all functions, sets, and selections are measurable. As mentioned,  $\text{proj}_S(y)$  denotes the orthogonal projection of  $y$  onto a nonempty closed convex set  $S$ . We use the shorthand notation to denote the set  $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ . Let  $C(S)$  denote the Banach space of real-valued continuous functions on  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$  equipped with the sup-norm. Denote “a.e.”, “LLN”, “i.i.d.”, “w.r.t.”, “s.t.”, “Eq.” and “r.h.s.” to be the abbreviations for “almost every/everywhere”, “the law of large numbers”, “independent and identically distributed”, “with respect to”, “such that”, “equation”, and “right-hand side”. We denote  $\xrightarrow{P}$ ,  $\xrightarrow{d}$ ,  $\xrightarrow{a.s.}$  to be convergence in probability, in distribution, and almost surely, respectively, with respect to the probability measure generating observations of  $(X, Z, Y)$ . Let  $\mathbb{P}^n$  denote the product measure of  $n$  independent and identically distributed samples, for  $n = 2, 3, \dots$ . We denote by  $\delta_y$  the Dirac distribution concentrating unit mass at  $y \in \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . For two sets  $S_1, S_2 \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_z}$ , denote the deviation of  $S_1$  from  $S_2$  to be  $\mathbb{D}(S_1, S_2) := \sup_{a \in S_1} \text{dist}(a, S_2)$ , where  $\text{dist}(a, S_2) := \inf_{b \in S_2} \|a - b\|$ . Denote  $o_p$ ,  $O_p$  to be convergence in probability to zero and bounded in probability, and  $O(1)$  represents constants.

Let  $\mathcal{P}(S)$  be the space of probability distributions supported on  $S \subseteq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ . Denote the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance between probability distributions  $P_1 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  and  $P_2 \in \mathcal{P}(S)$  as  $d_{W,p}(P_1, P_2)$ , where the set of joint distributions with marginals  $P_1$  and  $P_2$  is represented by  $\Pi(P_1, P_2)$ . Then, the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance for  $p \in [1, +\infty]$  is given by

$$d_{W,p}(P_1, P_2) := \begin{cases} \left( \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(P_1, P_2)} \int_{S^2} \|y_1 - y_2\|^p d\pi(y_1, y_2) \right)^{1/p} & \text{when } p \in [1, +\infty) \\ \inf_{\pi \in \Pi(P_1, P_2)} \pi\text{-ess sup}_{S \times S} \|y_1 - y_2\| & \text{when } p = +\infty, \end{cases}$$

where  $\pi\text{-ess sup}_{S \times S} \|y_1 - y_2\|$  denotes the essential supremum w.r.t. measure  $\pi$ . Note that in the above definition, we use  $\ell_2$ -norm as the reference distance; however, the results derived in this paper can also be extended to Wasserstein distances defined using  $l_q$ -norm for  $q \neq 2$ . Throughout the paper, we use  $C$ ,  $\kappa$ ,  $K$ ,  $\beta$ ,  $\omega$ ,  $\Omega$  to denote constants from the literature when discussing our



assumptions. While some of these notations could be used more than once to denote different constants, their meanings should be clear from the context.

## 2.2 Problem Formulations

To approximate problem (1), especially with limited data, we consider the following decision-dependent DRO variant, denoted ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem:

$$\text{(ER-D}^3\text{RO)} \quad \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) = \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x,z)} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z, Y(x, z))]. \quad (6)$$

Above, the expectation is taken with respect to the worst-case distribution  $Q$  of  $Y(x, z)$  from the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$ . Let  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  denote an optimal solution to problem (6) and  $\hat{S}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  denote the set of optimal solutions. We assume that the objective function is real-valued and lower semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , which ensures that the optimal solution set  $\hat{S}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  is nonempty for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

We construct the following data-driven ambiguity sets  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  for the distribution of  $Y$  given  $X = x$ ,  $Z = z$ , centered around the empirical distribution  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$ . Note that we allow the radii of the following ambiguity sets to depend on a certain risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  but for simplicity of notation, we omit the dependence of the radius on  $\alpha$ . Below, we consider decision-*independent* radii that may depend on covariates  $x$  but not on  $z$ . We will discuss decision-*dependent* radii in Section 3.3.2. Moreover, we omit the dependence of the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  on the radii  $\xi_n(x)$  and  $\mu_n(x)$ .

1. Wasserstein ambiguity set of order  $p \in [1, +\infty]$ :

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z) = \left\{ Q \in P(\mathcal{Y}) : d_{W,p}(Q, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \xi_n(x) \right\}, \quad (7)$$

centered at  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  with a given radius  $\xi_n(x) \geq 0$  [25, 31].

2. Sample robust ambiguity set:

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z) = \left\{ Q = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \delta_{\bar{y}^k} : \|\bar{y}^k - \text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k)\|_p \leq \mu_n(x), \bar{y}^k \in \mathcal{Y}, \forall k \in [n] \right\}, \quad (8)$$

which can perturb the atoms of  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  with a given radius  $\mu_n(x) \geq 0$  and parameter  $p \in [1, +\infty]$  [11, 12] while keeping the probabilities the same ( $1/n$ ). We typically pick  $p = 2$ .

3. Ambiguity sets with the same support as  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  (or simply, same support ambiguity sets):

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z) = \left\{ Q = \sum_{k=1}^n p_k \delta_{\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k)} : p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x)) \right\}, \quad (9)$$

centered at  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  with a given radius  $\xi_n(x) \geq 0$  which can perturb the probabilities  $p_k$

while keeping the atoms of  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  the same. Here,  $\mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))$  denotes a generic ambiguity set for the probability vector  $p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n$ , which satisfies that for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$p \in \mathbb{R}_+^n \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{k=1}^n p_k = 1 \quad \forall p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x)), \quad \text{such that}$$

$$\lim_{\xi \downarrow 0} \mathcal{B}_n(\xi) = \mathcal{B}_n(0) = \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n} \right) \right\}. \quad (10)$$

For a given measure of similarity or distance between  $p$  and the nominal probability vector  $\hat{p}_n = (1/n \ 1/n \ \dots \ 1/n)$ , denoted  $\mathcal{D}(p, \hat{p}_n)$ , such ambiguity sets typically include the radius  $\xi_n(x)$  through the constraint  $\mathcal{D}(p, \hat{p}_n) \leq \xi_n(x)$ . This last category of ambiguity sets include, for instance, phi-divergence-based ambiguity sets [4, 5] and mean-upper semideviation-based ambiguity sets [42, 65].

### 3 Theoretical Guarantees for Residuals-Based D<sup>3</sup>RO

For each of the three ambiguity sets, our goal is to provide conditions under which the resulting ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem obtains good in- and out-of-sample performance, both asymptotically as the sample size tends to infinity and with finite sample sizes. Specifically, we will show conditions under which each ambiguity set satisfies one or more of the following statistical guarantees for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  under our decision-dependent setting.

1. **Consistency and asymptotic optimality:** The optimal value  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  and solution  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  of the problem (6) satisfy

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x), \quad \text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{and} \quad g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x).$$

2. **Rate of convergence:** For some constant  $r \in (0, 1]$  (the higher the better), the optimal value  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  and solution  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  of the problem (6) satisfy

$$|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(n^{-r/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad |g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(n^{-r/2}).$$

3. **Mean convergence rate:** For some constant  $r \in (0, 1]$  (the higher the better), the optimal value  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  and solution  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  of the problem (6) satisfy

$$\|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2}) \quad \text{and} \quad \|g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2}).$$

4. **Finite sample certificate guarantee:** For a given risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  (close to 0), the optimal value  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  provides a certificate on the out-of-sample cost of  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$ , given by

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha.$$

5. **Finite sample solution guarantee:** The solution  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  of the D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) satisfies: for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , given  $\eta > 0$ , there exists constants  $\Gamma(\eta, x) > 0$ ,  $\gamma(\eta, x) > 0$  s.t.

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \geq \eta \right\} \leq \Gamma(\eta, x) \exp(-n\gamma(\eta, x)).$$

The theoretical guarantees we seek are similar to the decision-independent case. However, several assumptions, and hence the corresponding proofs, need to be adjusted to account for the decisions  $z$  that also affect the random parameters  $Y$ . For instance, the cost function  $c(z, Y(x, z))$  has decisions  $z$  in both the first and second arguments, which must be accounted for. The assumptions on the regression functions, which now depend on  $z$ , also need adjustments. Particularly, because we are dealing with decision-independent radii first, we often require stronger conditions of the regression setup to remove the dependency of  $z$  on the radii-related constants.

We begin by studying the theoretical guarantees for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model with the Wasserstein ambiguity set (7) (denoted ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W) in Section 3.1. We then continue with sample robust optimization-based ambiguity sets (8) (denoted ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR) and ambiguity sets with the same support as  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  (9) (denoted ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS) in Section 3.2. As mentioned, in both Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we consider decision-dependent regression models with decision-*independent* radii. In Section 3.3.1, we discuss the main differences between our decision-dependent regression setup and the decision-independent counterpart studied in [42]. We also discuss the possible extension of our theoretical results to decision-*dependent* radii of the ambiguity sets in Section 3.3.2.

### 3.1 Theoretical Guarantees for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO with Wasserstein Ambiguity Set

To establish the finite sample certificate guarantee for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO, we begin by making the following light-tail distribution assumption for the error  $\epsilon$ , which is common in DROs formed via the Wasserstein distance [e.g., 25, 42]. This light-tail assumption allows to use readily available concentration inequalities [29]; see also Proposition 4 below. Such inequalities provide bounds on the probability of how much the empirical distribution deviates—in terms of the Wasserstein distance—from the true distribution.

**Assumption 1.** There is a constant  $a > p$  such that  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\|\epsilon\|^a)] < +\infty$ .

This assumption holds trivially when the support of the error  $\Xi$  is compact [25]. Additionally, for sub-Gaussian errors, which include Gaussian errors with zero mean, the assumption holds with  $p \in [1, 2)$  [42, Proposition 1].

Next, we make the following assumption for the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n$ .

**Assumption 2.** For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  and any risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , there exist constants  $\kappa_{p,n}(\alpha, x) > 0$  and  $\kappa_{p,n}(\alpha) > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\|^p > \kappa_{p,n}^p(\alpha, x) \right\} \leq \alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad (11)$$

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p > \kappa_{p,n}^p(\alpha) \right\} \leq \alpha. \quad (12)$$

Note that for simplicity, we use the same notation  $\kappa_{p,n}$  in Eqs. (11) and (12), but they represent different values depending on the argument and context. Here, the superscript  $p$  denotes the power of the number. Both constants  $\kappa_{p,n}$  are independent of the decisions  $z$ . Especially, Eq. (11) is different than the typical way such results may exist in the literature. For instance, for parametric regressions, such constants normally depend on *all* covariates ( $x$  and  $z$ ); we further discuss this next.

Assumption 2 holds for parametric regression methods such as Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Lasso with  $p = 2$ , where  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha, x, z) = C_1 \frac{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$  in Eq. (11) and  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha) = C_2 (\frac{1}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}))$  in Eq. (12) for some constants  $C_1, C_2 > 0$  [37, 61, 17]. Recall from Section 2 that we assume the feasible set  $\mathcal{Z}$  to be nonempty and compact. Then, we can derive a decision-independent constant  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha, x)$  for Eq. (11) by identifying an upper bound on  $\|z\|^2$  and thus obtaining  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha, x) = C_3 \frac{\|x\|^2}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$  for some constant  $C_3 > 0$ . Similar bounds hold for  $p \neq 2$ . We note that if Assumption 2 holds for  $p = 2$ , then it holds for any  $p = [1, 2)$  with the same constant  $\kappa_{p,n}(\alpha, x) = \kappa_{2,n}(\alpha, x)$  by Jensen's (or power mean) inequality. This may be useful especially in the case of sub-Gaussian errors. Nonparametric regression methods, such as  $k$ -nearest neighbor ( $k$ NN), typically satisfy Assumption 2 with  $\kappa_{p,n}^p(\alpha, x) = \kappa_{p,n}^p(\alpha) = C_4 (\frac{1}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}))^{C_5/(d_x + d_z)}$  for some constants  $C_4, C_5 > 0$  [9, Lemma 10].

Before we introduce the finite sample certificate guarantee, we first state the following propositions to bound the Wasserstein distance in the decision-dependent case. The proofs of these three propositions can be found in Appendices A.1, A.2, and A.3, respectively. Then we present the concentration inequality that uses Wasserstein distance from [29].

**Proposition 1.** For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} + d_{W,p}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}).$$

**Proposition 2.** For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \leq \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}}.$$

**Proposition 3.** Suppose Assumption 2 holds. For each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , given a risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} > \kappa_{p,n} \left( \frac{\alpha}{4}, x \right) + \kappa_{p,n} \left( \frac{\alpha}{4} \right) \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

**Proposition 4** ([29]). Under Assumption 1, assuming the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. and  $p \neq d_y/2$ , we have the following concentration inequality, i.e., there exist constants  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$  such that for

all  $\kappa > 0$ ,  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \geq \kappa \right\} \leq \begin{cases} c_1 \exp(-c_2 n \kappa^{\max\{d_y/p, 2\}}) & \text{if } \kappa \leq 1 \\ c_1 \exp(-c_2 n \kappa^{a/p}) & \text{if } \kappa > 1, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where the constants  $c_1, c_2$  only depend on  $a, d_y$ , and  $\mathbb{E}[\exp(\|\epsilon\|^a)]$ .

For brevity, we skipped the case when  $p = d_y/2$  in Proposition 4 above because it results in a more complicated (but similar) inequality; for details we refer the readers to [29, Theorem 2].

Next, we set the radius of the Wasserstein ambiguity set (7) to

$$\xi_n(\alpha, x) := \kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) + \kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) \quad (14)$$

at a given risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  and covariate information  $x$ . Here  $\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) := \kappa_{p,n}(\frac{\alpha}{4}, x) + \kappa_{p,n}(\frac{\alpha}{4})$ , where  $\kappa_{p,n}(\frac{\alpha}{4}, x)$  and  $\kappa_{p,n}(\frac{\alpha}{4})$  are defined in Assumption 2, and  $\kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha)$  is defined as

$$\kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) := \begin{cases} \left( \frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2 n} \right)^{\min\{p/d_y, 1/2\}} & \text{if } n \geq \frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2} \\ \left( \frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2 n} \right)^{p/a} & \text{if } n < \frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2}, \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which is obtained by setting the r.h.s. of Eq. (13) to  $\alpha/2$ . The first component ( $\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x)$ ) of the radius in (14) is due to the estimation of the regression function, and the second component ( $\kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ ) is due to the estimation of the true conditional distribution via a Wasserstein ball around the empirical distribution. While the second component uses a similar concentration inequality, the first component of the radius is expected to be larger than a decision-dependent radius because we use a more conservative result in (11) by removing the dependence on decisions  $z$ .

In the rest of this section, we use  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha, x))$  to denote the ambiguity set (7) in order to highlight its dependence on radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  given in Eq. (14).

**Theorem 1** (Finite sample certificate guarantee for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W). Suppose Assumptions 1 and 2 hold,  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  is a given risk level, and samples of the errors  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the finite sample certificate guarantee  $\mathbb{P}^n \{g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)\} \geq 1 - \alpha$  holds for the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under Wasserstein ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha, x))$  defined in Eq. (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  defined in Eq. (14).

*Proof.* We claim that it is equivalent to show  $\mathbb{P}^n \{d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \xi_n(\alpha, x)\} \leq \alpha$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  due to the construction of problem (6). By Propositions 3, 4, and the radius defined in Eqs. (14) and (15), we have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{1/p} > \kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}, \quad \text{and}$$

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) \right\} \leq \frac{\alpha}{2}.$$

Then by Proposition 1 and the probability inequality for any two random variables  $A, B$  and constants  $a, b$  that  $\mathbb{P}\{A + B > a + b\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{A > a\} + \mathbb{P}\{B > b\}$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \xi_n(\alpha, x) \right\} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\hat{e}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{1/p} > \kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) \right\} + \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) \right\} \\ & \leq \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

Next, we make the following assumptions on the cost function  $c$ .

**Assumption 3.** The function  $c(\cdot, Y(x, \cdot))$  is lower semi-continuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Furthermore, there exists  $C_p \geq 0$  such that

$$|c(z, Y(x, z))| \leq C_p(1 + \|Y(x, z)\|^p), \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}, x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (16)$$

**Assumption 4.** (a) If we use  $p$ -Wasserstein distance with  $p \in [1, \infty)$ , then for each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the function  $c(z, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L_1(z)$ . (b) If we use  $p$ -Wasserstein distance with  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , then for each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\nabla c(z, \cdot)$  exists and is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L_2(z)$ , where  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z, Y)\|^2] < +\infty$ . In the case of  $p \in [2, \infty)$ , it is enough if either of the conditions (a) or (b) hold.

Assumption 3 in particular is different in the current decision-dependent setting because it must consider the effect of  $z$  on the uncertain parameters  $Y$ . Note that Assumption 3 is satisfied if (i)  $c(z, Y)$  is lower semi-continuous on the first argument and either one of the following two conditions hold: (ii-a) the regression function  $f^*(x, \cdot)$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  or (ii-b)  $f^*(x, \cdot)$  is lower semi-continuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  and  $c(z, Y)$  is nondecreasing on the second argument. Condition (i) and Assumption 4 can be satisfied by a fairly large class of stochastic optimization problems including two-stage stochastic linear and mixed-integer programs with continuous recourse; see, e.g., [41, Appendix E]. Since our uncertain parameter  $Y$  depends on the decision  $z$ , we further need continuity/lower semi-continuity of the regression function  $f^*(x, \cdot)$  (i.e., (ii-a) or (ii-b)) to ensure the lower semi-continuity of cost function  $c(\cdot, Y(x, \cdot))$  on  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

For the class of problems whose cost functions  $c$  satisfy the above conditions, we can establish convergence properties of optimal values and solutions of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W with radius  $\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)$  under a suitable sequence of risk levels  $\{\alpha_n\}$ . We present conditions on these next.

**Assumption 5.** The sequence of risk levels  $\{\alpha_n\} \subset (0, 1)$  satisfies  $\sum_n \alpha_n < +\infty$ , and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n(\alpha_n, x) = 0$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  with the radius defined in (14).

We are now ready to establish asymptotic optimality properties of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W. To facilitate this analysis, we first introduce two important lemmas. The proofs of Lemmas 1 and 2 can be found in Appendices A.4 and A.5, respectively.

**Lemma 1.** Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 hold, and the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Let  $\{Q_n(x, z)\}$  be a sequence of distributions with  $Q_n(x, z) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$ . Then, for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , (i)  $\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, Q_n(x, z)) \leq 2\xi_n(\alpha_n, x) \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha_n$ , and (ii) for  $n$  large enough, we a.s. have  $d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, Q_n(x, z)) \leq 2\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)$ . (iii) Furthermore, under  $p$ -Wasserstein distance,  $\{Q_n(x, z)\}$  converges a.s. to  $P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}$ , i.e.,  $\mathbb{P}^\infty \left\{ \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, Q_n(x, z)) = 0 \right\} = 1$ .

**Lemma 2.** Suppose Assumptions 1, 2 and 5 hold, and the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for  $n$  large enough, we a.s. have

$$v^*(x) \leq g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \quad (17)$$

for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Furthermore, let  $z^*(x)$  be an optimal solution to the problem (1). If Assumption 4(a) holds, then we a.s. have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $n$  large enough

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \leq v^*(x) + 2L_1(z^*(x))\xi_n(\alpha_n, x). \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, if Assumption 4(b) holds, then we a.s. have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $n$  large enough

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \leq v^*(x) + 2(\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z^*(x), Y)\|^2])^{\frac{1}{2}}\xi_n(\alpha_n, x) + 4L_2(z^*(x))\xi_n^2(\alpha_n, x). \quad (19)$$

**Theorem 2** (Consistency and asymptotic optimality for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W). Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, and 5 hold, and  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the optimal value and solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under Wasserstein ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$  defined in Eq. (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)$  defined in Eq. (14) are consistent and asymptotically optimal, i.e.,

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x), \quad \text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x).$$

*Proof.* By Theorem 1, we a.s. have  $\mathbb{P}^n \{ d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \xi_n(\alpha_n, x) \} \leq \alpha_n$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . For any given  $Q_n(x, z) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$ , Lemma 1(iii) implies that we a.s. have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, Q_n(x, z)) = 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}.$$

Theorem 6.9 in [69] then shows that  $Q_n(x, z)$  converges weakly to  $P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  in the space of distributions with finite  $p$ -th order moments. By Eq. (17) in Lemma 2, we know for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $v^*(x) \leq g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  for  $n$  large enough. Therefore, to show  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) = v^*(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x)$  in probability (or a.s.) for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , it suffices to prove  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \leq v^*(x)$  a.s. for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Given any positive constant  $\delta$ , let  $z^*(x)$  be an optimal solution to the true problem (1) for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , and choose  $Q_n^*(x, z) \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$  such that it satisfies:

$$\sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z^*(x), Y)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q_n^*(x, z)}[c(z^*(x), Y)] + \delta. \quad (20)$$

Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we a.s. have

$$\begin{aligned}
\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_n^{D^3 RO}(x) &\leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z^*(x), Y)] \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q_n^*(x, z)}[c(z^*(x), Y)] + \delta \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} g(z^*(x), x) + \delta \\
&= v^*(x) + \delta,
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds by the choice of  $Q_n^*(x, z)$  in Eq. (20), and (b) holds because  $Q_n^*(x, z)$  converges weakly to  $P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}$  due to Definition 6.8 and Theorem 6.9 of [69] (by virtue of Assumption 3). Since  $\delta > 0$  is arbitrary, we claim that for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_n^{D^3 RO}(x) \leq v^*(x)$ .

Next, we show that any accumulation point of the solution sequence  $\{\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x)\}$  is a.s. an element of  $S^*(x)$ . From Eq. (17) in Lemma 2 and the results derived above, we have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x), x) \leq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \hat{v}_n^{D^3 RO}(x) = v^*(x)$ . Let  $\bar{z}(x)$  be an accumulation point of  $\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x)$ . Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we a.s. have

$$v^*(x) \leq g(\bar{z}(x), x) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{E} \left[ \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} c(\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x), f^*(x, \hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x)) + \epsilon) \right] \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x), x) \leq v^*(x), \tag{21}$$

where (a) holds due to the lower semicontinuity of  $c(\cdot, Y(x, \cdot))$  on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for each  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  in Assumption 3, and (b) holds due to Fatou's lemma under Assumption 3. Therefore, we a.s. have  $\bar{z}(x) \in S^*(x)$ .

The rest of the proof follows directly from the proof of Theorem 9 in [41].  $\square$

In order to establish the rate of convergence, as opposed to convergence as in Theorem 2, we additionally need Assumption 4. Assumption 3 on its own was enough for Theorem 2.

**Theorem 3** (Rate of convergence for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W). Suppose Assumptions 1–5 hold, and  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under Wasserstein ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$  defined in Eq. (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)$  defined in Eq. (14) satisfies

$$|\hat{v}_n^{D^3 RO}(x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)) \text{ and } |g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3 RO}(x), x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)).$$

*Proof.* When Assumptions 1, 2, 3 and 5 hold and  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d., we have the consistency and asymptotic results in Theorem 2. Lemma 2 also holds under Assumptions 1, 2, and 5. Suppose Assumption 4(a) holds with  $p \geq 1$ , then the desired result follows from Eq. (18). On the other hand, suppose Assumption 4(b) holds with  $p \geq 2$ , then the desired result follows from Eq. (19).  $\square$

The rate of convergence established in Theorem 2 is stated for a given covariate realization  $x$ . However, performance over a variety of realizations of  $X$  is also desirable. To do this, we consider the *mean* convergence rate w.r.t. the  $L^q$ -norm on the range of covariates  $\mathcal{X}$  for  $q \in [1, +\infty]$ . Next, we make the following stronger assumption to derive the mean convergence rate.



**Assumption 6.** The regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n$  satisfies the following finite sample property: for any risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , there exists a positive constant  $\kappa_n(\alpha)$  such that  $\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| > \kappa_n(\alpha) \right\} \leq \alpha$ .

This is a stronger version of Assumption 2, where the constant  $\kappa_n(\alpha)$  only depends on the risk level, independent of the values that covariate  $x$  and decision  $z$  take. Recall that parametric regression methods such as OLS satisfy Assumption 2 with  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha, x) = C_3 \frac{\|x\|^2}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$  for some constant  $C_3 > 0$  when we assume that the feasible set of  $z$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{Z}$ ) is compact [37, 61, 17]. If we further assume the support set of covariate  $x$  (i.e.,  $\mathcal{X}$ ) to be compact as well, then by identifying an upper bound on  $\|x\|^2$ , we obtain a covariate-independent constant  $\kappa_n(\alpha) = C_6 \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})}$  for Assumption 6 with some constant  $C_6 > 0$ . Nonparametric regression methods readily satisfy Assumption 6 with  $\kappa_n(\alpha) = (C_4(\frac{1}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}))^{C_5/(d_x+d_z)})^{1/p}$  for some constants  $C_4, C_5 > 0$  [9, Lemma 10].

When Assumption 6 holds, we write the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  of the Wasserstein ambiguity set as  $\xi_n(\alpha)$  instead, where in Eq. (14),  $\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) = 2\kappa_n(\alpha)$  with  $\kappa_n(\alpha)$  defined in Assumption 6.

**Theorem 4** (Mean convergence rate for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W). Suppose Assumptions 1, 3, 5 and 6 hold, and  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Let  $q \in [1, +\infty]$ , and suppose either Assumption 4(a) holds with  $\|L_1(z^*(\cdot))\|_{L^q} < +\infty$  for  $p \geq 1$  or Assumption 4(b) holds with  $\|(\mathbb{E}_Y[\|\nabla c(z^*(\cdot), Y)\|^2])^{1/2}\|_{L^q} < +\infty$  and  $\|L_2(z^*(\cdot))\|_{L^q} < +\infty$  for  $p \geq 2$ . Then, the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under Wasserstein ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n))$  defined in Eq. (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha_n)$  defined in Eq. (14) that adjusts  $\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)} = 2\kappa_n(\alpha_n)$  where  $\kappa_n(\alpha_n)$  is from Assumption 6 satisfies

$$\|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(\xi_n(\alpha_n)) \text{ and } \|g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(\xi_n(\alpha_n)).$$

*Proof.* Since the radius is now independent of both  $x$  and  $z$ , we can make the following statement jointly for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ :

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \xi_n(\alpha_n), \forall x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z} \right\} \leq \alpha_n.$$

The rest of the proof then follows from the proof of Lemma 2 and mirrors that of Theorem 11 in [42].  $\square$

Next, we consider the following large deviation properties of the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n$ , which is a stronger version of Assumption 2. This assumption is needed to establish the finite sample solution guarantee.

**Assumption 7.** For any given constant  $\kappa > 0$ , there exist positive constants  $K_p(\kappa, x)$ ,  $\bar{K}_p(\kappa)$ ,  $\beta_p(\kappa, x)$ , and  $\bar{\beta}_p(\kappa)$  that satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\|^p > \kappa^p \right\} &\leq K_p(\kappa, x) \exp\left(-n\beta_p(\kappa, x)\right), \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z} \\ \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p > \kappa^p \right\} &\leq \bar{K}_p(\kappa) \exp\left(-n\bar{\beta}_p(\kappa)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Both constants  $K_p(\kappa, x)$ ,  $\beta_p(\kappa, x)$  are independent of the decisions  $z$ . This assumption again differs from the literature as such constants normally depend on all covariates ( $x$  and  $z$ ). We provide further conditions under which this assumption holds below.

Theorem 2.2 of [61] and Remark 12 of [37] provide some parametric regression setups that satisfy this assumption for  $p = 2$  with specific constants  $K_2(\kappa, x, z)$ ,  $\bar{K}_2(\kappa)$ ,  $\beta_2(\kappa, x, z)$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_2(\kappa)$ , and Lemma 10 of [9] provides some nonparametric regression setups that satisfy this assumption. For instance, OLS satisfies this assumption with decision-independent bounds  $K_2(\kappa, x, z) = C_7 \exp(d_x + d_z)$ ,  $\bar{K}_2(\kappa) = C_8 \exp(d_x + d_z)$ ,  $\bar{\beta}_2(\kappa) = C_9 \frac{\kappa^2}{\sigma^2 d_y}$  and decision-dependent bound  $\beta_2(\kappa, x, z) = C_{10} \frac{\kappa^2}{\sigma^2 d_y (\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2)}$  for some constants  $C_7, C_8, C_9, C_{10} > 0$  [61]. We can further identify an upper bound on  $\|z\|^2$  to obtain a decision-independent constant  $\beta_2(\kappa, x)$  for Assumption 7.

Using Assumption 7, we derive the following proposition and the finite sample solution guarantee in Theorem 5. The proofs can be found in Appendices A.6 and A.7, respectively.

**Proposition 5.** Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 hold, and the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and any  $\kappa > 0$ , there exist positive constants  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa, x)$ ,  $\tilde{\omega}(\kappa, x)$  such that the solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under Wasserstein ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha, x))$  defined in (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  defined in (14) and risk level  $\alpha = \tilde{\Omega}(\kappa, x) \exp(-n\tilde{\omega}(\kappa, x))$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \geq v^*(x) + \kappa \right\} \leq 2\alpha. \quad (22)$$

**Theorem 5** (Finite sample solution guarantee for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W). Suppose Assumptions 1, 2, 3, 4 and 7 hold, and the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and any  $\eta > 0$ , there exist positive constants  $\Omega(\eta, x)$ ,  $\omega(\eta, x)$  such that the solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha, x))$  defined in (7) with the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  defined in (14) and risk level defined as  $\alpha = \Omega(\eta, x) \exp(-n\omega(\eta, x))$  satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \geq \eta \right\} \leq 2\Omega(\eta, x) \exp(-n\omega(\eta, x)).$$

### 3.2 Theoretical Guarantees for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO with Sample Robust and Same Support Ambiguity Sets

In this section, we present a unified form of ambiguity set that integrates both sample robust optimization-based ambiguity sets defined in Eq. (8) and ambiguity sets with the same support as  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  defined in Eq. (9) as in [42]. Specifically, the ambiguity set has the following form:

$$\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z) := \left\{ Q = \sum_{k=1}^n p_k \delta_{\bar{y}^k} : p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x)), \bar{y}^k \in \hat{\mathcal{Y}}_n^k(x, z, \mu_n(x)) \right\} \text{ with} \quad (23a)$$

$$\hat{\mathcal{Y}}_n^k(x, z, \mu_n(x)) := \left\{ y \in Y : \|y - \text{proj}_Y(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k)\| \leq \mu_n(x) \right\}, \quad (23b)$$

where  $\mu_n(x)$  is the decision-independent radius for constraining the atom location  $\bar{y}^k$ , and  $\xi_n(x)$  is the decision-independent radius for constraining the probabilities  $p_k$ . Notice that this ambiguity

set can be reduced to the sample robust ambiguity set (8) if we set  $\xi_n(x) = 0$  and to the ambiguity set with the same support with  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  defined in (9) if we set  $\mu_n(x) = 0$ . As opposed to the Wasserstein ambiguity set studied in Section 3.1, in this section, we do not need the assumption that the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. to derive the consistency and asymptotic optimality (Theorem 6), and convergence rate results (Theorems 7 and 8). However, to derive a finite sample certificate-type guarantee (Theorem 9), we will add this i.i.d. assumption back.

We first study the convergence of the optimal value  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  and the set of optimal solutions  $\hat{S}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  to the true problem (1) and make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 8.** For each  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , the function  $c(z, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous on  $\mathcal{Y}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L(z)$  satisfying  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} L(z) < +\infty$ .

Assumption 8 strengthens the first part of Assumption 4 and can be satisfied by many popular stochastic programs, including two-stage stochastic mixed-integer linear programs with continuous recourse (see, e.g., Appendix E of [41]).

**Assumption 9.** The regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n$  has the following consistency properties:

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|\hat{f}_n(x, z) - f^*(x, z)\| &\xrightarrow{P} 0, \text{ for a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}, \\ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k) - f^*(x^k, z^k)\|^2 &\xrightarrow{P} 0. \end{aligned}$$

The uniform convergence of  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  over  $\mathcal{Z}$  in Assumption 9 is required to derive the consistency and asymptotic optimality result for our ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model, different from the pointwise convergence in Assumption 11 of [42] for ER-DRO model. This uniform convergence assumption can be satisfied by many regression models under the compactness of  $\mathcal{Z}$ . For example, if our regression model is linear, i.e.,  $f^*(x, z) = f(x, z; \theta^*) = (\theta_1^*)^\top x + (\theta_2^*)^\top z + \theta_3^*$  and  $\hat{f}_n(x, z) = f(x, z; \hat{\theta}_n) = \hat{\theta}_{n,1}^\top x + \hat{\theta}_{n,2}^\top z + \hat{\theta}_{n,3}$ , where  $\hat{\theta}_{n,1} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_1^*$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_{n,2} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_2^*$ ,  $\hat{\theta}_{n,3} \xrightarrow{P} \theta_3^*$  as  $n \rightarrow +\infty$ , then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|\hat{f}_n(x, z) - f^*(x, z)\| &\leq \|(\hat{\theta}_{n,1} - \theta_1^*)^\top x\| + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|(\hat{\theta}_{n,2} - \theta_2^*)^\top z\| + \|\hat{\theta}_{n,3} - \theta_3^*\| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \|\hat{\theta}_{n,1} - \theta_1^*\| \|x\| + C \|\hat{\theta}_{n,2} - \theta_2^*\| + \|\hat{\theta}_{n,3} - \theta_3^*\| \xrightarrow{P} 0. \end{aligned}$$

Here (a) is due to the compactness of feasible set  $\mathcal{Z}$  (i.e.,  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|z\| \leq C$  for some constant  $C > 0$ ).

**Assumption 10.** The radius  $\xi_n(x)$  of the ambiguity set (23) satisfies

$$\sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))} \sum_{k=1}^n \left(p_k - \frac{1}{n}\right)^2 = C_\xi n^{-\rho}, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}$$

for some constants  $\rho > 1$  and  $C_\xi > 0$ .

The radius  $\xi_n(x)$  based on Assumption 10 ensures that the ambiguity set  $\mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))$  converges

to  $\{\frac{1}{n}, \dots, \frac{1}{n}\}$  at a fast enough rate. We refer interested readers to [42] for different ambiguity sets that satisfy Assumption 10.

**Assumption 11.** For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the sequence  $\{g_n^*(\cdot, x)\}$  converges in probability to the function  $g(\cdot, x)$  uniformly on  $\mathcal{Z}$ .

**Assumption 12.** For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the following weak uniform LLN holds:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k))^2 - \mathbb{E}[(c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon))^2] \right| \xrightarrow{P} 0,$$

where  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \mathbb{E}[(c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon))^2] < +\infty$ .

Assumptions 11 and 12 can be interpreted as the uniform weak LLN on the mean and the second moment of the cost function, respectively. Based on Theorem 7.48 of [65], Assumptions 11 and 12 hold under the following conditions: (i) For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $c(\cdot, Y(x, \cdot))$  is continuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$ , (ii)  $\{|c(z, Y(x, z))| : z \in \mathcal{Z}\}$  is dominated by an integrable function, (iii) the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. and as already assumed, (iv)  $\mathcal{Z}$  is compact. Similar conditions exist under non i.i.d. settings.

To facilitate the analysis, denote  $\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x)$  as the objective function of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) with ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  defined in (23), and  $g_{s,n}^*(z, x)$  as the objective function when we know the true regression model and build an ambiguity set around the probability  $p$ , respectively. That is,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) &= \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))} \sum_{k=1}^n p_k \sup_{\mathcal{Y}_n^k(x, z, \mu_n(x))} c(z, y), \\ g_{s,n}^*(z, x) &= \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))} \sum_{k=1}^n p_k c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k). \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $g_{s,n}^*(z, x)$  reduces to the objective function of the FI-DD-SAA problem (2) when  $\xi_n(x) = 0$  and  $\mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))$  satisfies Eq. (10).

Next, we introduce an important lemma to bound  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g(z, x)|$  by three terms using triangle inequality in Lemma 3 below. We omit its proof here as it follows the proof of Lemma 14 in [42], where we replace all  $\tilde{c}_n^k(x)$  with  $\tilde{c}_n^k(x, z)$  and  $f^*(x)$  with  $f^*(x, z)$ , respectively.

**Lemma 3.** Suppose Assumption 8 holds. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g(z, x)| \\ & \leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g_{s,n}^*(z, x)| + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_{s,n}^*(z, x) - g_n^*(z, x)| + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_n^*(z, x) - g(z, x)| \quad (24) \\ & \leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} L(z) \left( \mu_n(x) + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (\|\tilde{c}_n^k(x, z)\|)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))} \left( 1 + n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ & \quad + \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))} \left( n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k))^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_n^*(z, x) - g(z, x)| \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

Using this lemma, we prove the consistency and asymptotic optimality results in Theorem 6, convergence rate results in Theorem 7, and mean convergence rate results in Theorem 8, respectively.

**Theorem 6** (Consistency and asymptotic optimality for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR). Suppose Assumptions 3, 8–12 hold, and the radius  $\mu_n(x)$  satisfies  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(x) = 0$ . Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the optimal value and solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under ambiguity set defined in Eq. (23) are consistent and asymptotically optimal, i.e.,

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x), \quad \mathbb{D}(\hat{S}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{and} \quad g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x).$$

*Proof.* We first establish the uniform convergence of  $\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x)$  on the set  $\mathcal{Z}$ :

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g(z, x)| \xrightarrow{P} 0, \quad \text{for a.e. } x \in \mathcal{X}. \quad (26)$$

To do this, we denote constants generally as  $O(1)$ . Using Lemma 3, the first term on the r.h.s. of Eq. (25) is bounded by  $O(1)o_p(1)O(1) = o_p(1)$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by Assumptions 8, 9, 10, Proposition 2, and  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(x) = 0$ . The second term on the r.h.s of Eq. (25) is bounded by  $o(1)O_p(1) = o_p(1)$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by Assumptions 10 and 12. The third term on the r.h.s of Eq. (25) converges to 0 in probability for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  by Assumption 11. Therefore, the r.h.s. of Eq. (25) is bounded by  $o_p(1) + o_p(1) + o_p(1) = o_p(1)$  and Eq. (26) holds. Because of this, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) - v^*(x) &= \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - \min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} g(z, x) \\ &\leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g(z, x)| \xrightarrow{P} 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Thus,  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \xrightarrow{P} v^*(x)$ .

Furthermore, Assumption 3 ensures that  $g(z, x) = \mathbb{E}_\epsilon[c(z, f^*(x, z) + \epsilon)]$  is lower semi-continuous on  $z$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , which enables the use of Lemma 10 in [41]. The rest of the proof then follows from the one of Theorem 5 in [41] with appropriate changes to notation.  $\square$

We now turn our attention to convergence rate results, which require stronger assumptions.

**Assumption 13.** For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the functional central limit theorem holds for  $g_n^*(x, z)$ , that is,

$$\sqrt{n}(g_n^*(\cdot, x) - g(\cdot, x)) \xrightarrow{d} V(\cdot, x)$$

where  $g_n^*(\cdot, x)$ ,  $g(\cdot, x)$  and  $V(\cdot, x)$  are random elements of  $C(\mathcal{Z})$ .

**Assumption 14.** For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,  $\hat{f}_n$  satisfies:

$$\|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\|^2 = O_p(n^{-r}), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^2 = O_p(n^{-r})$$

for some  $0 < r \leq 1$ .

Assumption 14 strengthens Assumption 9 with a specific convergence rate, where  $r$  is independent of  $n$  but may depend on the dimensions of covariates ( $d_x$ ) and decisions ( $d_z$ ). [14, 72, 18] present conditions under which nonparametric regression models satisfy Assumption 14 with  $r = C/(d_x + d_z)$  for some constant  $C > 0$  due to the curse of dimensionality, and under which parametric regression models such as OLS and Lasso regression satisfy Assumption 14 with  $r = 1$ .

With these assumptions, we are ready to state the convergence rate results in the following theorem. We omit the proof here as it is similar to that of Theorem 17 in [42].

**Theorem 7** (Rate of convergence for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR). Suppose Assumptions 8, 12, 13, and 14 hold. Furthermore, Assumption 10 holds with  $\rho = r + 1$ , and radius satisfies  $\mu_n(x) = C_\mu n^{-\frac{r}{2}}$  with some  $C_\mu > 0$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , where the constant  $r$  is defined in Assumption 14. Then for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , the optimal value and solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under ambiguity set defined in Eq. (23) satisfy

$$|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(n^{-r/2}), \text{ and } |g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) - v^*(x)| = O_p(n^{-r/2})$$

We then state the following assumptions for deriving the mean convergence rate results.

**Assumption 15.** A suitable radius  $\xi_n(x)$  is chosen such that

$$\sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sup_{p \in B_n(\xi_n(x))} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 = \bar{C}_\xi n^{-\rho}$$

for some constants  $\rho > 1$  and  $\bar{C}_\xi > 0$ .

**Assumption 16.** The regression function satisfies the following convergence rate criteria:

$$\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|f^*(X, z) - \hat{f}_n(X, z)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2}), \text{ and } \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^2 = O_p(n^{-r})$$

for some constant  $0 < r \leq 1$ .

**Assumption 17.** The cost function  $c$  and the data  $D_n$  satisfy:

$$\left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( c(z, f^*(X, z) + \epsilon^k) \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^q} = O_p(1), \text{ and } \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_n^*(z, X) - g(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-1/2}).$$

Assumption 15 strengthens Assumption 10 with uniform convergence over the covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Assumption 16 requires the regression estimator  $\hat{f}_n$  to converge to  $f^*$  on average over the covariate and uniformly over the decision variable  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . When the regression function  $f(x, z; \cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous at  $\theta^*$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  with Lipschitz constant  $L_f(x, z)$ , i.e.,  $\|f(x, z; \theta^*) - f(x, z; \hat{\theta}_n)\| \leq L_f(x, z) \|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}_n\|$ , Assumption 16 holds if  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|L_f(X, z)\|_{L^q} < +\infty$  and  $\|\theta^* - \hat{\theta}_n\| = O_p(n^{-r/2})$  (see the discussion after Assumption 14). Assumption 17 holds when the corresponding

uniform LLNs w.r.t. the decisions  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  hold uniformly over covariates based on Theorem 7.48 of [65].

Next, we establish the mean convergence rate for  $\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X)$  and  $g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X)$  under the  $L^q$ -norm.

**Theorem 8** (Mean convergence rate for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR). Suppose Assumptions 8, 16, 17 hold and Assumption 15 holds with  $\rho = 1 + r$  and  $r \in (0, 1]$  defined in Assumption 16. Then the optimal solution to the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under the ambiguity set defined in Eq. (23) with the radius  $\mu_n(x)$  satisfying  $\|\mu_n(X)\|_{L^q} = C'_\mu n^{-r/2}$  for some  $C'_\mu > 0$  has the following mean convergence rate:

$$\|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2}) \text{ and } \|g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2}).$$

*Proof.* By Eq. (24) in Lemma 3 and properties of  $L^q$ -norm, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |(\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x)) - g(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g_{s,n}^*(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} + \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_{s,n}^*(z, X) - g_n^*(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} + \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_n^*(z, X) - g(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Similar to the proof in Theorem 6, we bound the three terms in Eq. (28) with Assumptions 8, 15, and 16. To begin, by Lemma 3, the first term in Eq. (28) satisfies:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |\hat{g}_{s,n}^{D^3RO}(z, x) - g_{s,n}^*(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} L(z) \left( \mu_n(X) + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(X, z)\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(X))} \left( 1 + n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^q} \\ & = O(1) \left( \|\mu_n(X)\|_{L^q} + \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|f^*(X, z) - \hat{f}_n(X, z)\|_{L^q} + \left\| \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^q} \right) \\ & = O_p(n^{-r/2}) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

With Assumptions 15 and 17, the second term in Eq. (28) satisfies the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_{s,n}^*(z, X) - g_n^*(z, X)| \right\|_{L^q} \\ & \leq \left\| \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(X))} \left( n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( c(z, f^*(X, z) + \epsilon^k) \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^q} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= O_p(1) \left\| \sup_{p \in \mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(X))} \left( n \sum_{k=1}^n \left( p_k - \frac{1}{n} \right)^2 \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\|_{L^q} \\
&= O_p(n^{-r/2})
\end{aligned}$$

The third term in Eq. (28) satisfies  $\|\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} |g_n^*(z, X) - g(z, X)|\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-1/2})$  by Assumption 17. As a result,  $\|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} = O_p(n^{-r/2})$ . Additionally, from the result derived above, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} \\
&\leq \|g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(X), X) - \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X)\|_{L^q} + \|\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(X) - v^*(X)\|_{L^q} \\
&= O_p(n^{-r/2})
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.  $\square$

According to Theorem 5 in [8], the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) with sample robust optimization-based ambiguity set (8) is equivalent to the  $\infty$ -Wasserstein distance-based problem with ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z) := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) : d_{W, \infty}(Q, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \mu_n(\alpha, x)\}$ . This connection allows to establish a finite sample certificate-type guarantee for sample robust optimization-based ambiguity set (8) (i.e., when  $\xi_n(\alpha, x) = 0$ ). First, we make the following assumptions.

**Assumption 18.** The conditional probability  $P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}$  has density  $\Lambda(x, z, \cdot) : \bar{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow [0, +\infty)$ , where  $\bar{\mathcal{Y}} \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$  is open, connected, and bounded with a Lipschitz boundary. For each  $y \in \bar{\mathcal{Y}}$ , it satisfies  $1/M(x) \leq \Lambda_Y(x, z; y) \leq M(x)$  for some  $M(x) \geq 1$ .

Note that this assumption differs from the typical results found in literature since we require the bound  $M(x)$  on the probability density  $\Lambda(x, z, \cdot)$  to be dependent on  $x$  and independent of  $z$ . Theorem 1.1 of [66] identifies situations under which Assumption 18 holds with  $1/M'(x, z) \leq \Lambda_Y(x, z; y) \leq M'(x, z)$  for some constant  $M'(x, z) \geq 1$ . We can then obtain a decision-independent bound  $M(x) = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} M'(x, z) \geq 1$  in Assumption 18. Moreover, according to Theorem 1.1 of [66], for i.i.d. samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$ , this assumption yields the following concentration of measure result for the true empirical distribution  $P_n^*(x, z)$ . That is, for any constant  $\gamma > 2$  and a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W, \infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \geq C_1^\infty \frac{\log(n)}{n^{1/d_y}} \right\} \leq C_2^\infty n^{-\gamma/2}, \quad (30)$$

where  $C_1^\infty > 0$ ,  $C_2^\infty > 0$ , and  $C_1^\infty$  only depends on  $\gamma$ , and  $M(x)$ ,  $\bar{\mathcal{Y}}$  from Assumption 18.

Given a new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ , we hereafter consider the radius of the sample robust optimization-based ambiguity set (8) as follows:

$$\mu_n(\alpha, x) := \kappa_{\infty, n}^{(1)}(\alpha) + \kappa_{\infty, n}^{(2)}(x), \quad \xi_n(\alpha, x) := 0 \quad (31)$$

where  $\kappa_{\infty, n}^{(1)}(\alpha) = 2\kappa_n(\alpha)$  with  $\kappa_n(\alpha)$  being the constant defined in Assumption 6. We set  $\kappa_{\infty, n}^{(2)}(x) >$



$C_1^\infty \frac{\log(n)}{n^{1/d_y}}$  from Eq. (30) for  $n$  large enough and get  $\kappa_{\infty,n}^{(2)}(x) = \bar{C}_1^\infty n^{-\eta/d_y}$  for some constant  $\bar{C}_1^\infty > C_1^\infty$ , where the constant  $C_1^\infty$  is defined in Eq. (30), and constant  $\eta \in (0, 1)$  (preferably close to 1).

**Theorem 9** (Finite sample certificate-type guarantee for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR). Suppose Assumptions 6 and 18 hold, and the samples  $\{\epsilon^k\}_{k=1}^n$  are i.i.d. Suppose also there exists a sequence of risk levels  $\{\alpha_n\} \subseteq (0, 1)$  such that  $\sum_n \alpha_n < +\infty$  and for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mu_n(\alpha_n, x) = 0$ . Then, for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , there exists  $N(x) \in \mathbb{N}$  such that the optimal value and solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) under the ambiguity set defined in Eq. (23) with radii  $\zeta_n(\alpha_n, x)$  and  $\mu_n(\alpha_n, x)$  defined in Eq. (31) satisfies

$$g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x), \forall n \geq N(x)$$

The proof of Theorem 9 is presented in Appendix A.8, which mirrors the proof of Theorem 21 in [42] with appropriate notation changes.

### 3.3 Discussions on Decision Dependency

In this section, we discuss and summarize the impact of decision dependency on empirical residuals-based contextual stochastic optimization. If the uncertain parameter  $Y$  (or the regression model  $f^*$ ) depends on our decision  $z$ , we need to adopt an ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO framework (6), as opposed to the ER-DRO that considers decision-independent regression models [42]. Within the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO framework, the radii of the ambiguity sets can be either decision-dependent or decision-independent, leading to different theoretical guarantees and reformulations. We first illustrate the differences in the analysis between our ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO framework with decision-independent radii and the ER-DRO in Section 3.3.1. Then, we discuss extensions of our analysis to ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO with decision-dependent radii in Section 3.3.2.

#### 3.3.1 Comparison between ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO with Decision-Independent Radii and ER-DRO

In Sections 3.1 and 3.2, we discussed the case when the regression model  $f^*(x, z)$  is decision-dependent and the radii of the ambiguity sets (e.g.,  $\xi_n(x)$ ,  $\mu_n(x)$ ) are decision-*independent*. This setting is in line with many prior works including [54, 3, 75]. Compared to the decision-independent counterpart (ER-DRO) considered in [42], the main differences are threefold.

First, we require stronger assumptions on the regression models to achieve decision-*independent* radii. For instance, in Assumption 2 of [42], the constant  $\kappa_{p,n}(\alpha, x)$  depends on all the covariate information  $x$ . In our setting, this would correspond to both  $x$  and  $z$ . Using the compactness of  $\mathcal{Z}$ , we obtain a more conservative constant that is independent of decision  $z$ . Similarly, in Assumptions 7 and 18, we need to take the supremum over  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  on the original bounds to obtain decision-independent ones since the radius of the ambiguity sets depends on these bounds. All these assumptions are used in establishing finite sample results. That said, Assumption 2 appears in the theoretical radius in Eq. (14), and hence is fundamental to most results for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W.

Second, we also require stronger assumptions on the regression models for the *proofs*. As illustrated in Assumptions 9 and 16, we require a *uniform* convergence of the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n$  over

$\mathcal{Z}$ , which is a stronger version of Assumptions 11 and 15 in [42]. Assumption 9 is used in the proof of Theorem 6, especially when we bound the first term in Eq. (25), i.e.,  $\sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} (\frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n (\|\hat{e}_n^k(x, z)\|)^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ . This term is defined in Eq. (5) and its convergence relies on the uniform convergence of  $\hat{f}_n$  over  $\mathcal{Z}$ . Similarly, we need the uniform convergence in Assumption 16 to prove Theorem 8, especially to get Eq. (29). Another difference is that we assume the cost function  $c(\cdot, Y(x, \cdot))$  to be lower semi-continuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  in Assumption 3, as opposed to  $c(\cdot, Y)$  being lower semi-continuous only on the first argument in Assumption 3 of [42]. This assumption is needed by the nature of the decision dependency of  $Y$  and is useful to prove the consistency and asymptotic optimality results (i.e., Theorems 2 and 6).

Third, the reformulations of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models are more computationally expensive than their corresponding ER-DRO models. Specifically, for Wasserstein ambiguity sets (7), [25, 34, 73] provided conditions under which the ER-DRO model is computationally tractable when the true problem (1) is a two-stage stochastic linear program. For sample robust and same support ambiguity sets (23), when  $\xi_n(x) = 0$ , [73] provided a tractable reformulation of the ER-DRO model. When  $\mu_n(x) = 0$ , [5] provided tractable reformulation of the ER-DRO model under different  $\mathcal{B}_n(\xi_n(x))$ . When  $\mu_n(x) > 0$ , [42] discussed tractability of the ER-DRO model. For our ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem, if we further assume that (i)  $\mathcal{Y} = \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$ , (ii) the decision variable  $z$  is binary valued and (iii) the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  affinely depends on  $z$ , then we can use McCormick envelopes [48] to provide exact reformulations of the bilinear terms that often appear as the products of  $z$  and some continuous variables. Thus, we are able to recast the resulting ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model as a mixed-integer linear program (MILP). We refer interested readers to [3, 75] for detailed reformulation techniques. However, when either of these conditions is violated, the resulting ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models can quickly become computationally intractable. The increased computational burden of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models can appear in various aspects. (i) **Projection Step.** If  $\mathcal{Y} \subsetneq \mathbb{R}^{d_y}$  is some convex set incorporating our knowledge on the uncertainty  $Y$ , we need to project the regression model onto this convex set, i.e.,  $\text{proj}_{\mathcal{Y}}(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{e}_n^k)$ . For a decision-independent regression function  $\hat{f}_n(x)$ , this step can be done before solving the optimization model. However, if the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  depends on  $z$ , the projection step must be integrated into the optimization model, which will often increase the computational burden. (ii) **Non-binary  $z$ .** The exactness of McCormick envelopes for bilinear terms relies on one of the variables being binary. If our decision  $z$  is integer-valued, we can use binary expansion to reformulate it as a set of binary variables and then apply McCormick envelopes. However, if the first-stage decision variable  $z$  is continuous instead, we need to solve a non-convex program in general as the bilinear terms will become products of continuous  $z$  and some other continuous variables. In this case, we can use McCormick envelopes to provide convex relaxation. (iii) **Non-affine Regression.** If the regression estimate  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  does not affinely depend on decision  $z$ , we often need to solve a non-convex program again as there will be products of  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  and continuous variables, where  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  may have highly complicated functional forms. Moreover, incorporating nonparametric regression models into the downstream optimization problem is not straightforward in the decision-dependent setting as many such models lack a simple functional form. Some possibilities exist with  $k$ NN [35], classification and regression

trees [16, 6], Nadaraya–Watson kernel regression [51, 70] due to their analytical forms and/or already studied optimization frameworks [e.g. 16, 6], but these need further investigations. Therefore, while we opted to present theoretical results under general setups, in our computational results (Section 5), we focus on parametric models and leave nonparametric models to future work.

### 3.3.2 Extension to ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO with Decision-Dependent Radii

Up to this point, we have discussed theoretical results for the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model with decision-*independent* radii and compared our framework with the decision-independent counterpart (ER-DRO) considered in [42]. However, in some real-world applications, the confidence in the prediction/regression model may also depend on our decisions. For instance, we may get more historical data under certain decisions  $z \in \mathcal{Z}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{Z}$  and thus have higher confidence on the estimated regression model, compared to the regression estimate under other decisions  $z \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \mathcal{Z}_1$ . To account for such differences in confidence levels, we may consider decision-*dependent* radii in the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model. We note that decision-*dependent* radii have been considered in prior works [47, 28]. [47] provided general reformulations of DRO models with different ambiguity sets and decision-dependent radii but did not specify any functional form of the radii. In [28], the authors assumed that the radii depend on the objective function’s Lipschitz constant linearly. In a mean-risk portfolio optimization problem, based on the Lipschitz constant of the objective function, the authors adopted a functional form of  $C\|z\|$  for the radii. However, to the best of our knowledge, no prior work provides general explicit forms of decision-dependent radii, especially in the contextual setting.

We first note that all the theoretical results derived in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 can be extended to the decision-dependent radii case with relative ease. For instance, for Wasserstein ambiguity set (7), we need to modify its radius to  $\xi_n(\alpha, x, z) = \kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x, z) + \kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha)$ . Since the radius of the ambiguity set now depends on all covariates ( $x$  and  $z$ ), we can concatenate  $x$  and  $z$  as a new covariate vector  $x' = (x, z)$ , and all the radii-related constants  $\kappa_{p,n}(\alpha, x')$ ,  $K_p(\kappa, x')$ ,  $\beta_p(\kappa, x')$ ,  $\xi_n(\alpha, x')$ ,  $\mu(x')$ ,  $M(x')$  will follow from [42] if we set their  $x$  to be  $x'$ . Note that all other changes we made in the assumptions (e.g., Assumptions 3, 9, and 16) and related adjustments to the proofs should stay the same to derive similar theoretical results for the decision-dependent radii case.

To find a specific functional form of the decision-dependent radius, we are motivated by how much confidence a decision maker has on the prediction/regression model that feeds into the contextual optimization problem based on decisions  $z$ . Recall that Appendix F.1.1 in [41] and Remark 12 in [37] verified that OLS satisfies Assumption 2 with  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha, x, z) = C_1 \frac{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha})$  and  $\kappa_{2,n}^2(\alpha) = C_2 (\frac{1}{n} \log(\frac{1}{\alpha}))$  for some constants  $C_1, C_2 \geq 0$ . Based on Eq. (14) and Proposition 4, we choose  $\kappa_{2,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x, z) = \kappa_{2,n}(\alpha/4, x, z) + \kappa_{2,n}(\alpha/4)$  and  $\kappa_{2,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) = (\frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2 n})^{\min\{p/d_y, 1/2\}}$  for  $n \geq \frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2}$  and some constants  $c_1, c_2 \geq 0$ . As a result, we derive a potential functional form of the decision-dependent radius  $\xi_n$  as follows:

$$\xi_n(\alpha, x, z) = \kappa_{2,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x, z) + \kappa_{2,n}^{(2)}(\alpha)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sqrt{C_1 \frac{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2}{n} \log\left(\frac{4}{\alpha}\right)} + \sqrt{C_2 \left(\frac{1}{n} \log\left(\frac{4}{\alpha}\right)\right)} + \left(\frac{\log(c_1 \alpha^{-1})}{c_2 n}\right)^{\min\{p/d_y, 1/2\}} \\
&= \tilde{C}_1 \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2} + \tilde{C}_2 = \tilde{C}_1 \|(x, z)\| + \tilde{C}_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

for some  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \geq 0$ . Note that Eq. (32) is similar to the radius used in [28] in the sense that we concatenate the decision  $z$  with covariate  $x$ . While the form of radius in Eq. (32) is motivated by Wasserstein ambiguity sets, in our numerical experiments, we test its performance on sample robust and same support ambiguity sets as well. Next, in Section 4, we design data-driven algorithms to specify these constants  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2$  using cross-validation.

## 4 Cross-Validation Schemes for Determining Radii

Specifying the radii of the ambiguity sets is always challenging in DRO models. First of all, the constants derived in our theoretical results (e.g., in Eq. (32)) are rarely known. Even if we could obtain or estimate these constants, they could lead to very conservative decisions. Therefore, often in practice, a decision maker must resort to a numerical method to determine appropriate radii for their problem. In this section, we design data-driven algorithms for specifying the radii of the ambiguity sets using cross-validation, where the radii could be decision-(in)dependent and covariate-(in)dependent.

Algorithm 1 chooses decision- and covariate-dependent radii via  $R$ -fold cross-validation on the dataset  $D_n$  given a new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . We fix the functional form of the radius as  $\xi_n(x, z) = \tilde{C}_1 \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2} + \tilde{C}_2$  based on Eq. (32), where we aim to find the best constants  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2$  from a candidate set  $\Delta$  via cross-validation. Specifically, for each fold  $r = 1, \dots, R$  and each candidate  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \in \Delta$ , the algorithm first fits a regression model  $\hat{f}_{-r}$  using the  $R - 1$  folds' data  $D_{-r} = D_n \setminus \{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$  (i.e., training dataset), based on which we construct the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model and obtain an optimal solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2)$ . Here,  $S_r$  denotes the index set corresponding to  $r$ -th fold's data. Next, it uses the  $r$ -th fold data  $\{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$  (i.e., validation dataset) and fits a regression model the second time, denoted by  $\hat{f}_r$ , under which we evaluate the cost of the solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2)$  on the validation dataset. The algorithm then picks the best constants  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2$  that minimize the average cost on the validation dataset across  $R$  folds.

Algorithm 2, on the other hand, specifies decision-independent and covariate-dependent radii via  $R$ -fold cross-validation on the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO. Similar to Algorithm 1, it fits a regression model  $\hat{f}_{-r}$  using the  $R - 1$  folds' data  $D_{-r} = D_n \setminus \{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$  to construct the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model at a given new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Then, using the  $R$ -th fold as a validation dataset, it evaluates the cost of the obtained solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \xi)$ . The difference between Algorithm 2 and 1 is that since we only consider the dependence of the radius on the new covariate  $x$  but not on the decision  $z$ , the candidate radius  $\xi$  can be specified as a constant from some radii set  $\Delta$ , as opposed to the functional form in Algorithm 1.

We also present Algorithm 3 that chooses the decision- and covariate-independent radii based on a DRO extension of a Naive-SAA problem via  $R$ -fold cross-validation in Appendix B. Even

---

**Algorithm 1:** Specifying a decision-dependent, covariate-dependent radius  $\xi_n(x, z)$ 


---

**Input** :  $D_n$ , a set of candidate constants  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \in \Delta$ , number of folds  $R$ , and new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

- 1 Partition  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  into subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_R$  of roughly equal size randomly. Define  $D_{-r} := D_n \setminus \{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$
- 2 **for**  $r = 1, \dots, R$  **do**
- 3     **for**  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \in \Delta$  **do**
- 4         Fit a regression model  $\hat{f}_{-r}$  using the data  $D_{-r}$  and calculate the in-sample residuals  $\{\hat{\epsilon}_{-r}^i\}_{i \notin S_r} := \{y^i - \hat{f}_{-r}(x^i, z^i)\}_{i \notin S_r}$
- 5         At a given new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , solve:
 
$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}(x, z)} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z, Y)]$$

to obtain the solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2)$ . The ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}(x, z)$  with radius  $\xi_n(x, z) = \tilde{C}_1 \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + \|z\|^2} + \tilde{C}_2$  is centered at the empirical distribution  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}^{ER}(x, z) := \frac{1}{n - |S_r|} \sum_{i \notin S_r} \delta_{\hat{f}_{-r}(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_{-r}^i}$ .
- 6         Fit a regression model  $\hat{f}_r$  using data  $\{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$  and calculate its in-sample residuals  $\{\hat{\epsilon}_r^i\}_{i \in S_r} := \{y^i - \hat{f}_r(x^i, z^i)\}_{i \in S_r}$
- 7     **end**
- 8 **end**

**Output** :  $\xi_n(x, z) \in \arg \min_{\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2 \in \Delta} \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r \in [R]} \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{i \in S_r} c(\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2), \hat{f}_r(x, \hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2)) + \hat{\epsilon}_r^i)$  for the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  for the problem.

---

though it is the least computationally intensive, it does not yield good out-of-sample performance compared to Algorithm 1 and 2 when considering covariate and decision dependency.

## 5 Computational Experiments

To conduct our experiments, we consider a two-stage shipment planning and pricing problem, where we have  $|\mathcal{I}|$  warehouses to satisfy the demand of a product at  $|\mathcal{J}|$  customer sites, similar to the model in [7]. In the first stage, we aim to determine the price  $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  of this product and the production amounts  $z_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}$  at  $|\mathcal{I}|$  warehouses, with a unit production cost of  $p_1 \geq 0$ . Then in the second stage, demand  $Y_j \in \mathbb{R}_+$  is realized at each customer site  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and we must ship from the warehouses to satisfy all the demand. We ship  $s_{ij} \geq 0$  units from warehouse  $i$  to customer site  $j$  at a unit transportation cost of  $c_{ij} \geq 0$ . We also have an option of last-minute production  $t_i$  at warehouse  $i$  with a higher unit production cost  $p_2 > p_1$ . Specifically, we focus on the following model:

$$\min_{z_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+, z_2 \in \mathbb{R}_+^{|\mathcal{I}|}} p_1 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} z_{2,i} + \mathbb{E}_Y[H(z, Y(x, z_1))] + \rho \text{CVaR}_\theta(H(z, Y(x, z_1))), \quad (33)$$

---

**Algorithm 2:** Specifying a decision-independent, covariate-dependent radius  $\xi_n(x)$ 


---

**Input** :  $D_n$ , a set of candidate radii  $\xi \in \Delta$ , number of folds  $R$ , and new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

- 1 Partition  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  into subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_R$  of roughly equal size randomly. Define  $D_{-r} := D_n \setminus \{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_R}$
- 2 **for**  $r = 1, \dots, R$  **do**
- 3     **for**  $\xi \in \Delta$  **do**
- 4         Fit a regression model  $\hat{f}_{-r}$  using the data  $D_{-r}$  and calculate the in-sample residuals  $\{\hat{\epsilon}_{-r}^i\}_{i \notin S_R} := \{y^i - \hat{f}_{-r}(x^i, z^i)\}_{i \notin S_R}$
- 5         At a given new covariate  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , solve:
 
$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}(x, z)} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z, Y)]$$

to obtain the solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \xi)$ . The ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}(x, z)$  with radius  $\xi$  is centered at the empirical distribution  $\hat{P}_{-r}^{ER}(x, z) := \frac{1}{n - |S_r|} \sum_{i \notin S_r} \delta_{\hat{f}_{-r}(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_{-r}^i}$ .
- 6         Fit a regression model  $\hat{f}_r$  using data  $\{(x^i, z^i, y^i)\}_{i \in S_R}$  and calculate its in-sample residuals  $\{\hat{\epsilon}_r^i\}_{i \in S_R} := \{y^i - \hat{f}_r(x^i, z^i)\}_{i \in S_R}$
- 7     **end**
- 8 **end**

**Output** :  $\xi_n(x) \in \arg \min_{\xi \in \Delta} \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r \in [R]} \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{i \in S_r} c(\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \xi), \hat{f}_r(x, \hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(x, \xi)) + \hat{\epsilon}_r^i)$  for the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  for the problem.

---

where we aim to minimize the first-stage production cost and a combination of expectation and Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) [62] of the second-stage cost  $H(z, Y(x, z_1))$ . The parameter  $\rho \geq 0$  is the weight of the CVaR term, and  $\theta \in (0, 1)$  specifies the risk aversion level, with  $\text{CVaR}_\theta$  roughly averaging over the  $100(1 - \theta)\%$  worst-case outcomes. Here, we assume that the random customer demand  $Y(x, z_1)$  depends on some covariate information  $x$  and our first-stage pricing decision  $z_1$ . Given a realization  $Y^k(x, z_1)$ , the second-stage problem is defined as follows:

$$H(z, Y^k(x, z_1)) := \min_{s_{ijk}, t_{ik} \in \mathbb{R}_+} p_2 \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} t_{ik} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} c_{ij} s_{ijk} - z_1 \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} Y_j^k(x, z_1) \quad (34a)$$

$$\text{s.t.} \quad \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} s_{ijk} \geq Y_j^k(x, z_1), \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, k \in [n] \quad (34b)$$

$$\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} s_{ijk} \leq z_{2,i} + t_{ik}, \quad \forall i \in \mathcal{I}, k \in [n], \quad (34c)$$

where we aim to minimize the total production and transportation cost minus the profit, subject to demand satisfaction and capacity constraints.

## 5.1 Parameter Setup

We randomly sample  $|\mathcal{I}| = 2$  warehouses and  $|\mathcal{J}| = 3$  customer sites on a  $100 \times 100$  grid. The unit transportation cost  $c_{ij}$  is calculated based on the Euclidean distance between facility  $i$  and customer site  $j$ , and the production costs are  $p_1 = 5$  when done in advance and  $p_2 = 100$  for last-minute

production. Following the economics literature on the pricing-demand model (see [56, 20, 19]), we assume the ground truth demand model to be

$$Y_j(x, z_1) = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} A_{jl} X_l^2 - B z_1 + \alpha_j + \epsilon_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}, \quad (35)$$

where we consider  $|\mathcal{L}| = 3$  demand-predictive covariates  $X$ ,  $z_1$  is our price, and  $\epsilon_j \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  is the zero-mean additive error term. The coefficients  $A_{jl}$  and  $B$  are sampled uniformly between 3 and 5 for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$  and  $l \in \mathcal{L}$ , and the coefficient  $\alpha_j$  is uniformly sampled between 1000 and 2000 for each  $j \in \mathcal{J}$ . Once these coefficients are fixed, we generate different replications of dataset  $D_n := \{(x^k, z^k, y^k)\}_{k=1}^n$  by sampling i.i.d. covariates  $x^k$  from a Gamma distribution with shape parameter  $k = 2$  and scale parameter  $\theta = 3$  and i.i.d. price  $z^k$  from a Beta distribution with parameters  $\alpha = 2$  and  $\beta = 5$  (we then scale  $z^k$  to be between 0 and 200). The error term  $\epsilon_j^k$  is sampled from a Normal distribution with mean of 0 and standard deviation of 1. Then we obtain  $y^k$  according to Eq. (35).

Given a dataset  $D_n := \{(x^k, z^k, y^k)\}_{k=1}^n$ , we first apply OLS to estimate a linear regression prediction model  $\hat{f}_n(x, z)$  as follows

$$Y_j = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \hat{A}_{jl} X_l + \hat{B}_j z_1 + \hat{\alpha}_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J}. \quad (36)$$

At a given new covariate  $x$ , Model (36) is then used to construct empirical residuals and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models for computing in-sample solutions. Given an optimal in-sample solution  $z^*$  and a new covariate  $x$ , we use the ground truth model (35) to generate 1000 scenarios to evaluate the out-of-sample cost of the solution  $z^*$ . All variants are evaluated on the same newly-seen scenarios.

Numerical tests are conducted on a Macbook Pro with 8 GB RAM and an Apple M1 Pro chip. Since Model (33) and its DRO reformulations involve non-convex terms, we use Gurobi 10.0.0 coded in Python 3.11.0 for solving all non-convex programming models (with Non-Convex parameter set to 2), where the computational time limit is set to one hour.

## 5.2 Results

We compare the ER-DD-SAA model (3), ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model (6) with 1-Wasserstein ambiguity set (7) using  $\ell_1$ -norm (denoted by ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W), sample robust ambiguity set (8) using  $\ell_1$ -norm (denoted by ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR), the ambiguity set with the same support as  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}$  (9) using the Variation distance (denoted by ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS), and their decision-independent counterparts, denoted by ER-DRO-W, ER-DRO-SR, ER-DRO-SS, respectively. For each of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models, we consider a decision- and covariate-dependent radius  $\xi_n(x, z) = \tilde{C}_1 \sqrt{\|x\|^2 + z_1^2} + \tilde{C}_2$  and use Algorithm 1 to pick the best constants  $\tilde{C}_1, \tilde{C}_2$ . For each of the ER-DRO models, we consider a decision-independent but covariate-dependent radius and use Algorithm 2 to pick the best constant  $\tilde{C}_2$ . The constant  $\tilde{C}_1$  is chosen from the candidate set  $\{0, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1\}$  for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS and from  $\{0, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, 1, 10\}$  for both ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR, while the constant  $\tilde{C}_2$  is

chosen from the candidate set  $\{0, 0.001, 0.005, 0.05, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2\}$ ,  $\{0, 1, 10, 100, 500, 1000, 1500, 2000\}$ , and  $\{0, 0.001, 0.005, 0.05, 0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5\}$  for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS, ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W, and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR, respectively. The differences in the candidate sets of  $\tilde{C}_1$ ,  $\tilde{C}_2$  are due to the inherent differences in the ambiguity sets. For instance, the Variation distance is always between 0 and 2; so it requires smaller values. Overall, Algorithm 1 has more candidate points in the radii set than Algorithm 2 and thus is more computationally expensive. We generate 10 replications of datasets  $D_n := \{(x^k, z^k, y^k)\}_{k=1}^n$  and report the average and standard deviation of out-of-sample costs over these 10 independent runs.

**Comparison of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO and ER-DD-SAA models.** We first vary the sample size  $n$  and report the average out-of-sample costs of ER-DD-SAA and the three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models over the 10 independent runs in Figure 1, where we plot the 10% standard deviation as error bars. From Figure 1, when the sample size is small ( $n = 50$ ), ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR perform better than ER-DD-SAA model with ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS performing slightly worse. This is because when we have insufficient data points in the training dataset, the radius selection algorithm cannot accurately predict the regression models and is not guaranteed to pick the radius that performs well in the out-of-sample scenario set. However, when the sample size  $n$  increases, we observe larger gaps between ER-DD-SAA and the three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models, where ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR always outperform ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS. Moreover, as we have more training data points, the standard deviations of all models decrease.





Figure 1: Out-of-sample cost comparison between ER-DD-SAA, ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS, ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W, and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR with different sample size  $n$ .

**Comparison of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO and ER-DRO models.** We compare the three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models with their decision-independent counterparts in Figure 2. Specifically, we use the same dataset  $D_n$  but fit a linear regression model  $\tilde{f}_n(x)$  without  $z$  variable below

$$Y_j = \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \tilde{A}_{jl} X_l + \tilde{\alpha}_j, \quad \forall j \in \mathcal{J} \quad (37)$$



These estimated regression models  $\tilde{f}_n(x)$  are used to construct empirical residuals and ER-DRO models with decision-independent ambiguity sets. We denote these decision-independent counterparts as ER-DRO-SS, ER-DRO-W, and ER-DRO-SR, respectively.



(a) ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS vs. ER-DRO-SS (b) ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W vs. ER-DRO-W (c) ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR vs. ER-DRO-SR

Figure 2: Out-of-sample cost comparison between ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models and their decision-independent counterparts with different sample size  $n$ .

When the demand  $Y_j$  is independent of decision  $z_1$  (as shown in Eq. (37)), model (33) becomes unbounded and drives  $z_1$  to infinity at optimality. As a result, the out-of-sample scenarios of the demand generated by the ground truth model (35) become all zero and thus lead to a cost of 0. From Figure 2, all three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models with decision-dependent ambiguity sets obtain much lower costs, illustrating the benefit of considering decision dependency.

**Comparison of Radii Selection Algorithms.** Next, we compare different radii selection algorithms. Due to the same reasoning as in the decision-independent case, the Naive-SAA problem proposed in Algorithm 3 is also unbounded since it only considers the uncertainty realization  $y^k$  but ignores all other covariates  $x^k$  and  $z^k$ . As a result, we only compare Algorithms 1 and 2 on the shipment planning and pricing problem (34). Specifically, in Figure 3, we report the average out-of-sample costs of the three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models with decision-dependent ambiguity sets when we use Algorithms 1 and 2 to select their radii, respectively. From Figure 3, Algorithm 1 always performs better than Algorithm 2 in ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W and ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SR models. On the other hand, for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-SS model, when  $n = 100$ , Algorithm 2 performs slightly better. This is because Algorithm 1 typically results in larger radii in the radii selection phase, which works well in the Wasserstein and sample robust ambiguity sets but may lead to overly conservative decisions in the Variation distance set.

**Comparison of Different Regression Models.** Finally, we compare different regression setups (i.e., OLS, Lasso, and Ridge regression) for ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W model under different sample size  $n$ . Specifically, we first integrate OLS, Lasso, and Ridge regression in Algorithm 2 to determine the best constant  $\tilde{C}_2$  and the best regularization parameter from the candidate set  $\{1, 5, 10\}$  for each of the regression setups. We then use the best constants and regression models to solve the downstream optimization problem. Figure 4 shows that the Ridge regression achieves the best average out-of-sample cost compared to OLS and Lasso. Since all covariates have predictive power in our model and Lasso is well-suited for situations where data is sparse, it does not perform well for this problem.




Figure 3: Out-of-sample cost comparison between Algorithm 1 and 2 for the three ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models with different sample size  $n$ .

On the other hand, OLS stands out as a commonly adopted and straightforward linear regression technique.




Figure 4: Out-of-sample cost comparison of ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO-W between OLS, Lasso, and Ridge regression with different sample size  $n$ .

## 6 Conclusion and Future Work

In this paper, we considered a contextual stochastic program where the uncertainty could be affected by both covariate information and our decisions. We introduced an empirical residuals framework, where the uncertainty on the prediction is considered in a distributionally robust manner with three types of decision-dependent ambiguity sets: the Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity set, the sample robust ambiguity set, and the ambiguity set with the same support as  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$ . Under each of these ambiguity sets, we investigated statistical guarantees of the proposed ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO framework, including consistency and asymptotic optimality, (mean) rate of convergence, finite sample certificate guarantee, and finite sample solution guarantee. Furthermore, we proposed three data-driven algorithms to choose the radii for our ambiguity sets, which can be decision-(in)dependent and covariate-(in)dependent. Numerical results on a shipment planning and pricing problem illustrated that the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO model outperforms the decision-dependent ER-SAA model, showing the benefit of considering distributional ambiguity. On the other hand, all ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO models also achieved better out-of-sample cost compared to their decision-independent counterparts, illustrating the benefit of considering decision dependency.

The radii selection algorithms proposed in this paper achieved good empirical performance on the shipment planning and pricing problem when we had a relatively high sample size. However, in a limited data regime, due to the insufficient data points in each fold during cross-validation, the algorithms are not guaranteed to select a radius that performs well on the out-of-sample scenario set. One possible future direction is to design data augmentation methods and cross-validation algorithms that can achieve good empirical and theoretical performance in a limited data regime. Investigating appropriate forms of decision-dependent radii backed with theoretical guarantees merit further research. Another future direction is to design efficient optimization formulations and algorithms to incorporate nonparametric regression models into a decision-dependent contextual DRO setting.

## References

- [1] Ban, G.-Y., Gallien, J., and Mersereau, A. J. (2019). Dynamic procurement of new products with covariate information: The residual tree method. *Manufacturing & Service Operations Management*, 21(4):798–815.
- [2] Ban, G.-Y. and Rudin, C. (2019). The big data newsvendor: Practical insights from machine learning. *Operations Research*, 67(1):90–108.
- [3] Basciftci, B., Ahmed, S., and Shen, S. (2021). Distributionally robust facility location problem under decision-dependent stochastic demand. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 292(2):548–561.
- [4] Bayraksan, G. and Love, D. K. (2015). Data-driven stochastic programming using phi-divergences. In *The operations research revolution*, pages 1–19. INFORMS.
- [5] Ben-Tal, A., Den Hertog, D., De Waegenaere, A., Melenberg, B., and Rennen, G. (2013). Robust solutions of optimization problems affected by uncertain probabilities. *Management Science*, 59(2):341–357.
- [6] Bertsimas, D. and Dunn, J. (2017). Optimal classification trees. *Machine Learning*, 106:1039–1082.
- [7] Bertsimas, D. and Kallus, N. (2020). From predictive to prescriptive analytics. *Management Science*, 66(3):1025–1044.
- [8] Bertsimas, D. and Koduri, N. (2022). Data-driven optimization: A reproducing kernel hilbert space approach. *Operations Research*, 70(1):454–471.
- [9] Bertsimas, D. and McCord, C. (2019). From predictions to prescriptions in multistage optimization problems.
- [10] Bertsimas, D., McCord, C., and Sturt, B. (2023a). Dynamic optimization with side information. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 304(2):634–651.

- [11] Bertsimas, D., Shtern, S., and Sturt, B. (2022). Two-stage sample robust optimization. *Operations Research*, 70(1):624–640.
- [12] Bertsimas, D., Shtern, S., and Sturt, B. (2023b). A data-driven approach to multistage stochastic linear optimization. *Management Science*, 69(1):51–74.
- [13] Bertsimas, D. and Van Parys, B. (2022). Bootstrap robust prescriptive analytics. *Mathematical Programming*, 195(1):39–78.
- [14] Biau, G. and Devroye, L. (2015). *Lectures on the nearest neighbor method*, volume 246. Springer.
- [15] Birge, J. R. and Louveaux, F. (2011). *Introduction to Stochastic Programming*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [16] Breiman, L. (2017). *Classification and Regression Trees*. Routledge.
- [17] Bunea, F., Tsybakov, A. B., and Wegkamp, M. H. (2007). Sparsity oracle inequalities for the lasso. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 1:169–194.
- [18] Chatterjee, S. (2014). Assumptionless consistency of the lasso.
- [19] Chen, X., Sim, M., Simchi-Levi, D., and Sun, P. (2007). Risk aversion in inventory management. *Operations Research*, 55(5):828–842.
- [20] Chen, X. and Simchi-Levi, D. (2004). Coordinating inventory control and pricing strategies with random demand and fixed ordering cost: The finite horizon case. *Operations Research*, 52(6):887–896.
- [21] Delage, E. and Ye, Y. (2010). Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations Research*, 58(3):595–612.
- [22] Dou, X. and Anitescu, M. (2019). Distributionally robust optimization with correlated data from vector autoregressive processes. *Operations Research Letters*, 47(4):294–299.
- [23] El Balghiti, O., Elmachtoub, A. N., Grigas, P., and Tewari, A. (2019). Generalization bounds in the predict-then-optimize framework. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32.
- [24] Elmachtoub, A. N. and Grigas, P. (2022). Smart “predict, then optimize”. *Management Science*, 68(1):9–26.
- [25] Esfahani, P. M. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1):115–166.

- [26] Esteban-Pérez, A. and Morales, J. M. (2022). Distributionally robust stochastic programs with side information based on trimmings. *Mathematical Programming*, 195(1):1069–1105.
- [27] Estes, A. S. and Richard, J.-P. P. (2023). Smart predict-then-optimize for two-stage linear programs with side information. *INFORMS Journal on Optimization*, 5(3):295–320.
- [28] Fonseca, D. and Junca, M. (2023). Decision-dependent distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03971*.
- [29] Fournier, N. and Guillin, A. (2015). On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability theory and related fields*, 162(3-4):707–738.
- [30] Gao, R. (2023). Finite-sample guarantees for Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Breaking the curse of dimensionality. *Operations Research*, 71(6):2291–2306.
- [31] Gao, R. and Kleywegt, A. (2023). Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(2):603–655.
- [32] Goel, V. and Grossmann, I. E. (2006). A class of stochastic programs with decision dependent uncertainty. *Mathematical Programming*, 108(2):355–394.
- [33] Hanasusanto, G. A. and Kuhn, D. (2013). Robust data-driven dynamic programming. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 827–835.
- [34] Hanasusanto, G. A. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Conic programming reformulations of two-stage distributionally robust linear programs over Wasserstein balls. *Operations Research*, 66(3):849–869.
- [35] Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., Friedman, J. H., and Friedman, J. H. (2009). *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*, volume 2. Springer.
- [36] Hellemo, L., Barton, P. I., and Tomasgard, A. (2018). Decision-dependent probabilities in stochastic programs with recourse. *Computational Management Science*, 15(3):1619–6988.
- [37] Hsu, D., Kakade, S. M., and Zhang, T. (2012). Random design analysis of ridge regression. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 9–1. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings.
- [38] Jiang, R. and Guan, Y. (2018). Risk-averse two-stage stochastic program with distributional ambiguity. *Operations Research*, 66(5):1390–1405.
- [39] Kallenberg, O. (1997). *Foundations of Modern Probability*, volume 2. Springer.
- [40] Kallus, N. and Mao, X. (2023). Stochastic optimization forests. *Management Science*, 69(4):1975–1994.
- [41] Kannan, R., Bayraksan, G., and Luedtke, J. R. (2022). Data-driven sample average approximation with covariate information. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.13554*.

- [42] Kannan, R., Bayraksan, G., and Luedtke, J. R. (2023). Residuals-based distributionally robust optimization with covariate information. *Mathematical Programming*, pages 1–57.
- [43] Kuhn, D., Esfahani, P. M., Nguyen, V. A., and Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, S. (2019). Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Theory and applications in machine learning. In *Tutorials in Operations Research: Operations Research & Management Science in The Age of Analytics*, pages 130–166. INFORMS.
- [44] Lee, S., Homem-de Mello, T., and Kleywegt, A. J. (2012). Newsvendor-type models with decision-dependent uncertainty. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 76:189–221.
- [45] Liu, J., Li, G., and Sen, S. (2022). Coupled learning enabled stochastic programming with endogenous uncertainty. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 47(2):1681–1705.
- [46] Liu, W. and Zhang, Z. (2023). Solving data-driven newsvendor pricing problems with decision-dependent effect. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13924*.
- [47] Luo, F. and Mehrotra, S. (2020). Distributionally robust optimization with decision dependent ambiguity sets. *Optimization Letters*, 14(8):2565–2594.
- [48] McCormick, G. P. (1976). Computability of global solutions to factorable nonconvex programs: Part i—convex underestimating problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 10(1):147–175.
- [49] Mehrotra, S. and Papp, D. (2014). A cutting surface algorithm for semi-infinite convex programming with an application to moment robust optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 24(4):1670–1697.
- [50] Mohajerin Esfahani, P. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1-2):115–166.
- [51] Nadaraya, E. A. (1964). On estimating regression. *Theory of Probability & Its Applications*, 9(1):141–142.
- [52] Nguyen, V. A., Zhang, F., Blanchet, J., Delage, E., and Ye, Y. (2020). Distributionally robust local non-parametric conditional estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:15232–15242.
- [53] Nohadani, O. and Sharma, K. (2018). Optimization under decision-dependent uncertainty. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1773–1795.
- [54] Noyan, N., Rudolf, G., and Lejeune, M. (2022). Distributionally robust optimization under a decision-dependent ambiguity set with applications to machine scheduling and humanitarian logistics. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 34(2):729–751.
- [55] Oroojlooyjadid, A., Snyder, L. V., and Takáč, M. (2020). Applying deep learning to the newsvendor problem. *IIE Transactions*, 52(4):444–463.

- [56] Petruzzi, N. C. and Dada, M. (1999). Pricing and the newsvendor problem: A review with extensions. *Operations Research*, 47(2):183–194.
- [57] Poss, M. (2013). Robust combinatorial optimization with variable budgeted uncertainty. *4OR*, 11:75–92.
- [58] Qi, M. and Shen, Z.-J. (2022). Integrating prediction/estimation and optimization with applications in operations management. In *Tutorials in Operations Research: Emerging and Impactful Topics in Operations*, pages 36–58. INFORMS.
- [59] Qi, M., Shen, Z.-J. M., and Zheng, Z. (2024). Learning newsvendor problem with intertemporal dependence and moderate non-stationarities. *Production and Operations Management*.
- [60] Rahimian, H. and Mehrotra, S. (2022). Frameworks and results in distributionally robust optimization. *Open Journal of Mathematical Optimization*, 3:1–85.
- [61] Rigollet, P. and Hütter, J.-C. (2017). High dimensional statistics. Lecture Notes for MIT’s 18.657 Course. URL: <http://www-math.mit.edu/~rigollet/PDFs/RigNotes17.pdf>.
- [62] Rockafellar, R. T., Uryasev, S., et al. (2000). Optimization of conditional value-at-risk. *Journal of risk*, 2:21–42.
- [63] Sadana, U., Chenreddy, A., Delage, E., Forel, A., Frejinger, E., and Vidal, T. (2024). A survey of contextual optimization methods for decision-making under uncertainty. *European Journal of Operational Research*, pages 1–19. Article in press.
- [64] Sen, S. and Deng, Y. (2022). Predictive stochastic programming. *Computational Management Science*, 19:1–45.
- [65] Shapiro, A., Dentcheva, D., and Ruszczyński, A. (2021). *Lectures on Stochastic Programming: Modeling and Theory*. SIAM.
- [66] Trillos, N. G. and Slepčev, D. (2015). On the rate of convergence of empirical measures in  $\infty$ -transportation distance. *Canadian Journal of Mathematics*, 67(6):1358–1383.
- [67] Vayanos, P., Georghiou, A., and Yu, H. (2020). Robust optimization with decision-dependent information discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.08490*.
- [68] Vayanos, P., Kuhn, D., and Rustem, B. (2011). Decision rules for information discovery in multi-stage stochastic programming. In *2011 50th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*, pages 7368–7373. IEEE.
- [69] Villani, C. et al. (2009). *Optimal Transport: Old and New*, volume 338. Springer.
- [70] Watson, G. S. (1964). Smooth regression analysis. *Sankhyā: The Indian Journal of Statistics, Series A*, pages 359–372.

- [71] Webster, M., Santen, N., and Parpas, P. (2012). An approximate dynamic programming framework for modeling global climate policy under decision-dependent uncertainty. *Computational Management Science*, 9:339–362.
- [72] White, H. (2014). *Asymptotic theory for econometricians*. Academic press.
- [73] Xie, W. (2020). Tractable reformulations of two-stage distributionally robust linear programs over the type- $\infty$  Wasserstein ball. *Operations Research Letters*, 48(4):513–523.
- [74] Yang, J., Zhang, L., Chen, N., Gao, R., and Hu, M. (2022). Decision-making with side information: A causal transport robust approach. Optimization Online. URL: <https://optimization-online.org/?p=20639>, pages=1–40.
- [75] Yu, X. and Shen, S. (2022). Multistage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming with decision-dependent moment-based ambiguity sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 196(1):1025–1064.
- [76] Zhang, L., Yang, J., and Gao, R. (2023). Optimal robust policy for feature-based newsvendor. *Management Science*.
- [77] Zhang, Y., Jiang, R., and Shen, S. (2018). Ambiguous chance-constrained binary programs under mean-covariance information. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(4):2922–2944.

## A Omitted proofs

### A.1 Proof of Proposition 1

*Proof.* By triangle inequality, we have

$$d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \leq d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_n^*(x, z)) + d_{W,p}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}).$$

Then by Eq. (4) and the definition of the  $p$ -Wasserstein distance we get

$$\begin{aligned} d_{W,p}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_n^*(x, z)) &\leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\text{proj}_Y(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k) - (f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k)\|^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{1/p}. \end{aligned}$$

This yields the desired result. □



## A.2 Proof of Proposition 2

*Proof.* By the definition of  $\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)$ , we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{1/p} &\leq \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \left( \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| + \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\| \right)^p \right)^{1/p} \\ &\leq \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p \right)^{1/p} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from the triangle inequality of the  $\ell_2$ -norm, and the second one follows from the triangle inequality for the  $\ell_p$ -norm.  $\square$

## A.3 Proof of Proposition 3

*Proof.* For a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|\tilde{\epsilon}_n^k(x, z)\|^p \right)^{1/p} > \kappa_{p,n}\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}, x\right) + \kappa_{p,n}\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}\right) \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| + \left( \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p \right)^{1/p} > \kappa_{p,n}\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}, x\right) + \kappa_{p,n}\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}\right) \right\} \\ &\leq \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| > \kappa_{p,n}\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}, x\right) \right\} + \mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n \|f^*(x^k, z^k) - \hat{f}_n(x^k, z^k)\|^p > \kappa_{p,n}^p\left(\frac{\alpha}{4}\right) \right\} \\ &\leq \frac{\alpha}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{4} = \frac{\alpha}{2} \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Proposition 2, the second inequality comes from the probability inequality below: for any random variables  $V, W$  and  $c_1, c_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ , we have

$$\mathbb{P}\{V + W > c_1 + c_2\} \leq \mathbb{P}\{V > c_1\} + \mathbb{P}\{W > c_2\}, \quad (38)$$

and the last inequality comes from Assumption 2.  $\square$

## A.4 Proof of Lemma 1

*Proof.* Following the proof of Lemma 3.7 in [25], by triangle inequality

$$\begin{aligned} d_{W,p}(Q_n(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) &\leq d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) + d_{W,p}(Q_n(x, z), \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \\ &\leq d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) + \xi_n(\alpha_n, x). \end{aligned}$$

By Theorem 1, we have  $\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \xi_n(\alpha_n, x) \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha_n$ . As a result,  $\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ d_{W,p}(Q_n(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \leq 2\xi_n(\alpha_n, x) \right\} \geq 1 - \alpha_n$ . By Borel-Cantelli lemma [39, Theorem 2.18], we have (ii), and because  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \xi_n(\alpha_n, x) = 0$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we obtain (iii).  $\square$

## A.5 Proof of Lemma 2

*Proof.* By Theorem 1, we have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^n\{v^*(x) \leq g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)\} \geq 1 - \alpha_n \forall n \in \mathbb{N}$ . Because  $\sum_n \alpha_n < +\infty$ , by Borel-Cantelli lemma, for  $n$  large enough, we a.s. have  $v^*(x) \leq g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) \leq \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x)$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ .

Suppose Assumption 4(a) holds for  $p \geq 1$  with Lipschitz constant  $L_1(z)$ . Denote  $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{1,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)) = \{Q \in P(\mathcal{Y}) : d_{W,1}(Q, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)\}$ . Since  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{1,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$  for all orders  $p \in [1, +\infty)$ , we a.s. have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and  $n$  large enough,

$$\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) \leq \sup_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{1,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z^*(x), Y(x, z^*(x)))] \leq g(z^*(x), x) + 2L_1(z^*(x))\xi_n(\alpha_n, x)$$

where the second inequality is due to Lemma 1(ii), Assumption 4(a) and Theorem 5 in [43].

Suppose Assumption 4(b) holds for  $p \geq 2$ , where  $\nabla c(z, \cdot)$  is Lipschitz continuous with Lipschitz constant  $L_2(z)$ . Denote  $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{2,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)) = \{Q \in P(\mathcal{Y}) : d_{W,2}(Q, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)\}$ . Since  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x)) \subseteq \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{2,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))$  for all orders  $p \in [2, +\infty)$ , we a.s. have for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) &\leq \sup_{Q \in \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{2,n}(x, z; \xi_n(\alpha_n, x))} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z^*(x), Y(x, z^*(x)))] \\ &\leq g(z^*(x), x) + 2 \left( \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z^*(x), Y(x, z^*(x)))\|^2] \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \xi_n(\alpha_n, x) + 4L_2(z^*(x))\xi_n^2(\alpha_n, x) \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality is due to Lemma 1(ii), Assumption 4(b) and Lemma 2 in [30].  $\square$

## A.6 Proof of Proposition 5

*Proof.* We choose the radius  $\xi_n(\alpha, x)$  according to (14). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}^n\{g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) > v^*(x) + \kappa\} &= \mathbb{P}^n\{g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) - \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) + \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) > v^*(x) + \kappa\} \\ &\leq \alpha + \mathbb{P}^n\{\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) > v^*(x) + \kappa\}, \end{aligned}$$

where the inequality follows from Theorem 1 and the probability inequality (Eq. (38)). Suppose Assumption 4(a) holds with  $p \geq 1$  and Lipschitz constant  $L_1(z)$ , then following the proof of Lemma 2, we have for any  $z^*(x) \in S^*(x)$ ,  $\mathbb{P}^n\{\hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) > v^*(x) + 2L_1(z^*(x))\xi_n(\alpha, x)\} \leq \alpha$ . If we choose the risk level  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  s.t.  $2L_1(z^*(x))\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$ , and  $2L_1(z^*(x))\kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$ , then we have  $2L_1(z^*(x))\xi_n(\alpha, x) \leq \kappa$ , which further implies

$$\mathbb{P}^n\{g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) > v^*(x) + \kappa\} \leq 2\alpha. \quad (39)$$

By Assumption 7, if we choose  $\alpha$  s.t. for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,

$$\alpha \geq 4 \max \left\{ K_p \left( \frac{\kappa}{8L_1(z^*(x))}, x \right) \exp(-n\beta_p \left( \frac{\kappa}{8L_1(z^*(x))}, x \right)), \bar{K}_p \left( \frac{\kappa}{8L_1(z^*(x))} \right) \exp(-n\bar{\beta}_p \left( \frac{\kappa}{8L_1(z^*(x))} \right)) \right\},$$

then the constant  $\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x)$  in Eq. (14) satisfies  $2L_1(z^*(x))\kappa_{p,n}^{(1)}(\alpha, x) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$ . Furthermore, by Eq. (15), we know for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , if  $\alpha \geq c_1(\exp(-c_2n(\frac{\kappa}{4L_1(z^*(x))})^{1/s}))$  with  $s = \min\{p/d_y, 1/2\}$  or  $p/a$ , then we have  $2L_1(z^*(x))\kappa_{p,n}^{(2)}(\alpha) \leq \frac{\kappa}{2}$ . Therefore, there exist positive constants  $\tilde{\Omega}_1(\kappa, x)$ ,  $\tilde{\omega}_1(\kappa, x)$  s.t. the solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) with risk level  $\alpha = \tilde{\Omega}_1(\kappa, x) \exp(-n\tilde{\omega}_1(\kappa, x))$  satisfies Eq. (22).

Suppose instead that Assumption 4(b) holds with  $p \geq 2$  and Lipschitz constant  $L_2(z)$  with  $\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z, Y)\|^2] < +\infty$ . Then following the proof of Lemma 2, we have for any  $z^*(x) \in S^*(x)$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}^n \left\{ \hat{v}_n^{D^3RO}(x) > v^*(x) + (\mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z^*(x), Y)\|^2])^{1/2} \xi_n(\alpha, x) + 4L_2(z^*(x)) \xi_n^2(\alpha, x) \right\} \leq \alpha.$$

Therefore, Eq. (39) is satisfied if we choose  $\alpha \in (0, 1)$  s.t.

$$\left( \mathbb{E}[\|\nabla c(z^*(x), Y)\|^2] \right)^{1/2} \xi_n(\alpha, x) + 4L_2(z^*(x)) \xi_n^2(\alpha, x) \leq \kappa. \quad (40)$$

Using the similar analysis above, if we bound the smallest value of  $\alpha$  using Assumption 7 and Eq. (14), then we can find positive constants  $\tilde{\Omega}_2(\kappa, x)$ ,  $\tilde{\omega}_2(\kappa, x)$  that satisfy Eq. (40).  $\square$

## A.7 Proof of Theorem 5

*Proof.* According to Proposition 5, we have for all  $\kappa > 0$ , there exist constants  $\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa, x) > 0$  and  $\tilde{\omega}(\kappa, x) > 0$  such that the solution of the ER-D<sup>3</sup>RO problem (6) with  $\alpha = \tilde{\Omega}(\kappa, x) \exp(-n\tilde{\omega}(\kappa, x))$  satisfies Eq. (22). Suppose for some  $\eta > 0$  and  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , we have  $\text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \geq \eta$  and sample path. By Assumption 3,  $g(\cdot, x)$  is lower-semicontinuous on  $\mathcal{Z}$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . Since  $\mathcal{Z}$  is compact, according to Lemma 10 in [41], we have  $g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) > v^*(x) + \kappa(\eta, x)$  for some  $\kappa(\eta, x) > 0$  on that path. Therefore, for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}$

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}^n \{ \text{dist}(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), S^*(x)) \geq \eta \} \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}^n \{ g(\hat{z}_n^{D^3RO}(x), x) > v^*(x) + \kappa(\eta, x) \} \leq 2\tilde{\Omega}(\kappa(\eta, x), x) \exp(-n\tilde{\omega}(\kappa(\eta, x), x)) \end{aligned}$$

where the desired result holds for constant  $\Omega(\eta, x) = \tilde{\Omega}(\kappa(\eta, x), x)$ ,  $\omega(\eta, x) = \tilde{\omega}(\kappa(\eta, x), x)$ .  $\square$

## A.8 Proof of Theorem 9

*Proof.* Since the ambiguity set (23) centered at  $\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)$  with radius defined in Eq. (31) is equivalent to the  $\infty$ -Wasserstein distance-based ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z, \mu_n(\alpha, x)) := \{Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}) : d_{W,\infty}(Q, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \mu_n(\alpha, x)\}$ , we can derive the conclusion by showing  $d_{W,\infty}(P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}, \hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z)) \leq \mu_n(\alpha_n, x)$  for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ . Consider  $\gamma = 4$  in Eq. (30). By the definition of  $\infty$ -Wasserstein distance and Eq. (4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & d_{W,\infty}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \\ & \leq d_{W,\infty}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_n^*(x, z)) + d_{W,\infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq \sup_{k \in [n]} \|\text{proj}_Y(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k) - (f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k)\| + d_{W, \infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \\
&\leq \sup_{k \in [n]} \|(\hat{f}_n(x, z) + \hat{\epsilon}_n^k) - (f^*(x, z) + \epsilon^k)\| + d_{W, \infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \\
&\leq 2 \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}} \|f^*(x, z) - \hat{f}_n(x, z)\| + d_{W, \infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \tag{42}
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by Eq. (42), Assumption 6, and the radius  $\mu_n(\alpha_n, x)$  defined in (31) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{P}^n \{d_{W, \infty}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \mu_n(\alpha_n)\} \\
&\leq \alpha_n + \mathbb{P}^n \{d_{W, \infty}(P_n^*(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \kappa_{\infty, n}^{(2)}\} \\
&\leq \alpha_n + C_2^\infty n^{-2}
\end{aligned}$$

for all  $n$  large enough [66]. Consequently, we have  $\sum_{n=1}^\infty \mathbb{P}^n \{d_{W, \infty}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) > \mu_n(\alpha_n)\} < +\infty$ . Then by Borel-Cantelli lemma, for a.e.  $x \in \mathcal{X}, z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , there exists  $N \in \mathbb{N}$  such that  $\forall n \geq N, d_{W, \infty}(\hat{P}_n^{ER}(x, z), P_{Y|X=x, Z=z}) \leq \mu_n(\alpha_n)$ .  $\square$

## B Omitted Algorithm

In this appendix, we present Algorithm 3 that chooses the decision- and covariate-independent radii based on a DRO extension of a Naive-SAA problem via  $R$ -fold cross-validation. It does not fit any regression models to estimate  $f^*$  and ignores the covariate information. Instead, in each fold, it constructs an empirical distribution that is supported on the uncertainty realizations  $y^i$  directly and solves the corresponding SAA problem.

---

**Algorithm 3:** Specifying a decision-independent, covariate-independent radii  $\xi_n$  using a naive-SAA-based DRO

---

**Input** :  $D_n$ , a set of candidate radii  $\Delta$ , number of folds  $R$ .

- 1 Partition  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  into subsets  $S_1, \dots, S_R$  of roughly equal size randomly.
- 2 **for**  $r = 1, \dots, R$  **do**
- 3     **for**  $\xi \in \Delta$  **do**
- 4         Solve the  $D^3RO$  problem to obtain the solution  $\hat{z}_{-r}^{D^3RO}(\xi)$ :
$$\min_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \sup_{Q \in \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}} \mathbb{E}_{Y \sim Q}[c(z, Y)]$$

where the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{-r}$  with radius  $\xi$  is centered at the empirical distribution

$$\tilde{P}_{-r} := \frac{1}{n - |S_r|} \sum_{i \in [n] \setminus S_r} \delta_{y^i}$$
- 5     **end**
- 6 **end**

**Output** :  $\xi_n \in \arg \min_{\xi \in \Delta} \frac{1}{R} \sum_{r \in [R]} \frac{1}{|S_r|} \sum_{i \in S_r} c(\hat{z}_{-r}^{DRO}(\xi), y^i)$  for the ambiguity set  $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_n(x, z)$  for the problem.

---

This figure "box.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>

This figure "compare1.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>

This figure "compare3.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>

This figure "dd\_di.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>



This figure "out\_of\_sample\_cost\_comparison.png" is available in "png" format from

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>

This figure "table.png" is available in "png" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/2406.20004v1>