
Distributionally Robust Performative Optimization

Zhuangzhuang Jia, Yijie Wang, Roy Dong,
Grani A. Hanasusanto

Abstract In this paper, we propose a general distributionally robust framework for performative optimization, where the selected decision can influence the probabilistic distribution of uncertain parameters. Our framework facilitates safe decision-making in scenarios with incomplete information about the underlying decision-dependent distributions, relying instead on accessible reference distributions. To tackle the challenge of decision-dependent uncertainty, we introduce an algorithm named repeated robust risk minimization. This algorithm decouples the decision variables associated with the ambiguity set from the expected loss, optimizing the latter at each iteration while keeping the former fixed to the previous decision. By leveraging the strong connection between distributionally robust optimization and regularization, we establish a linear convergence rate to a performatively stable point and provide a suboptimality performance guarantee for the proposed algorithm. Finally, we examine the performance of our proposed model through an experimental study in strategic classification.

Keywords Distributionally robust optimization; Performative optimization; Decision-dependent uncertainty

Zhuangzhuang Jia, Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. E-mail: zj12@illinois.edu
Yijie Wang, Graduate Program in Operations Research and Industrial Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin. E-mail: yijie-wang@utexas.edu
Roy Dong, Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. E-mail: roydong@illinois.edu
Grani A. Hanasusanto, Department of Industrial and Enterprise Systems Engineering, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. E-mail: gah@illinois.edu

1 Introduction

In stochastic optimization problems, the goal of the decision maker is to find a decision θ that minimizes the risk

$$R(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)], \quad (1)$$

where the vector \tilde{z} comprises the uncertain parameters and \mathbb{P} is the underlying distribution. Despite the success of stochastic optimization frameworks in various fields, including machine learning and operations management, the shortcomings of ignoring the impact of decision-makers on the environment have raised increasing concerns.

Decision-makers' initiatives often have a ripple effect on the external environment, which can lead to changes in the distribution of uncertain parameters. For instance, in the realm of portfolio management, the decisions of institutional investors can have a profound effect on stock prices. This is partly due to their substantial capital, which can propel stock prices to rise (or fall) when they are buying (or selling) [42], and partly because their actions shape market sentiment towards those particular stocks, which in turn has a further impact on the trend of asset prices [1]. In the area of revenue management, airlines often make forecasts and design pricing strategies based on the historical patterns of passenger behavior. However, passengers are not static; they often modify their behaviors in reaction to the new pricing strategies of airlines, which in turn shifts the overall pattern of consumer behavior [6].

When the solution of a stochastic optimization problem affects the distribution of the uncertain parameters, we call such problem *performative* [11, 33]. A natural way of introducing this decision-dependent uncertainty is through a map $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ from the set of decisions to the space of distributions. Hence, in performative stochastic optimization problems, the objective of the decision maker is to obtain a decision θ that minimizes the *performative risk*

$$PR(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(\theta)}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)], \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{P}(\theta)$ is the distribution of uncertain parameters \tilde{z} given the choice of the decision θ . Unfortunately, the true underlying distribution map $\mathbb{P}(\theta)$ is unknown to the decision makers and usually approximated using the reference distribution $\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ derived from historical data or expert knowledge. While methods grounded in empirical distribution might perform satisfactorily on the observed dataset, they often fail to achieve acceptable performance in out-of-sample circumstances.

This paper aims to tackle this core deficiency by leveraging the ideas of Distributionally Robust Optimization. Unlike traditional approaches that assume a single distribution map, distributionally robust optimization adopts a more flexible strategy: it establishes an ambiguity set $\mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta))$ of plausible distributions centered at the reference distribution. In this setting, the decision maker minimizes the *distributionally robust performative risk*

$$DRPR(\theta) := \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta), \quad (3)$$

where \mathbb{Q} is a distribution from within the prescribed ambiguity set $\mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta))$. Because the model optimizes the expected risk in view of the worst-case distribution map, it mitigates overfitting to the observed samples and improves performance in unseen testing datasets.

The difficulty in minimizing $\text{DRPR}(\theta)$ stems from the dependence of \mathbb{P} on the decision θ , which prohibits the direct use of existing solution schemes from the robust optimization and distributionally robust distribution literature. A common approach to solving such decision-dependent problems is via iterative optimization. Specifically, the decision maker repeatedly obtains an optimal decision that minimizes DRPR risk using the reference distribution at the previous iteration. We adopt this approach in our paper.

Our major contributions can be summarized as follows

1. We propose a general distributionally robust framework for performative optimization that enables safe decision-making when we lack full information about the underlying decision-dependent distributions and only have access to some reference distributions. As a byproduct of our reformulations, we identify a relatively general setting where the distributionally robust model is equivalent to Tikhonov regularization.
2. We develop a repeated robust risk minimization algorithm for the problem that effectively mitigates the intractability of decision-dependent uncertainty. Our approach decouples the decisions associated with the ambiguity set from the expected loss, optimizing the latter while fixing the former to the previous decision in each iteration. Unlike traditional methods in distributionally robust optimization with decision-dependent uncertainty that often involve mixed-integer programming, our algorithm simplifies the process by solving a sequence of tractable conic programs.
3. Leveraging the intimate connection between distributionally robust optimization and regularization, we prove a linear convergence rate to a performatively stable point and establish a suboptimality performance guarantee for the algorithm. We further examine the performance of our proposed model through an experimental study in strategic classification. Numerical results suggest that our framework is superior to the non-robust scheme in terms of both convergence rate and out-of-sample performance.

1.1 Related Works

Performative stochastic optimization closely relates to the literature on optimization under decision-dependent uncertainty. In stochastic optimization, there is a body of research delving into endogenous uncertainty, a scenario wherein the decision made impacts the underlying probability distribution. For instance, Jonsbraten et al. [18] study a production planning problem where the probability of production cost depends on the scheduling decision. Goel and Grossmann [13] consider an oil and gas planning problem with decision-dependent information discovery. They assume the recovery and size of oil

fields are unknown in advance and are influenced by the investment decisions. Their solution entails constructing a scenario-tree-based stochastic programming model and implementing a decomposition algorithm for resolution. Building on this, their subsequent study [14] extends the methodology to the multi-stage setting, focusing on production scheduling that minimizes costs while fulfilling diverse product demands. Vayanos et al. [40] explore multistage stochastic optimization problems beset with endogenous uncertainty. They devise a conservative solution framework by leveraging piecewise constant and piecewise linear decision rule approximations.

In robust optimization, decision-dependent uncertainty is usually imposed directly on the uncertainty set. Spacey et al. [39] apply customized endogenous uncertainty sets to address software partitioning problems. Vujanic et al. [41] study a robust scheduling problem under a decision-dependent uncertainty set. The endogenous uncertainty set is the combination of a series of sets, while the combination policy is determined by the decision. Within the realm of control systems, Zhang et al. [47] design decision-dependent sets for primitive uncertainty. The complexity analysis of robust selection problem with decision-dependent information discovery is studied by Michel et al. [25], where they present polynomial complexity results for two special cases. Nohadani and Sharma [29] first study robust optimization with endogenous uncertainty under the general settings. They show the problem is NP-complete and demonstrate the benefit of using endogenous uncertainty sets via a shortest-path problem. For two-stage decision-dependent robust optimization problems, an exact solution scheme based on a nested decomposition algorithm is proposed by Paradiso et al. [30]. The multistage setting is studied by Zhang and Feng [46], where the authors design an approximation scheme based on the decision rule approach.

Our research expands upon the conventional framework of distributionally robust optimization by incorporating the influence of decision-making on the probability distribution. Recently, decision-dependent distributionally robust optimization has received increasing attention. Zhang et al. [45] study a broad class of distributionally robust optimization problems with decision-dependent moment ambiguity sets and conduct stability analysis. Luo and Mehrotra [23] address two-stage distributionally robust optimization problems with endogenous uncertainty. They analyze a wide range of decision-dependent ambiguity sets and establish non-convex semi-infinite reformulations. Ryu and Jiang [35] propose a distributionally robust nurse staffing model that considers both exogenous and endogenous uncertainties. Basciftci et al. [4] study the distributionally robust facility location problem under a moment ambiguity set, considering external demands and providing an exact mixed-integer linear programming reformulation. Doan [10] designs a marginal-based distributionally robust optimization framework to address endogenous uncertainties and applies the method in retrofitting planning. In multistage settings, Yu and Shen [44] assume that the distribution of uncertainties at each stage is contingent on prior decisions. They focus on moment-based ambiguity sets and derive a mixed-integer semidefinite programming reformulation. Jin et al. [17] explore

two-stage distributionally robust problems involving decision-dependent information discovery. They utilize the K-adaptability approximation scheme and design an exact decomposition algorithm for solving these complex problems.

Our study also belongs to an emerging class of research on performative supervised learning, where algorithmic predictions can actively mold the surrounding environment and alter the underlying distributions of uncertain parameters [11, 15, 24, 26, 33]. The origins of performative learning can be traced back to studies on supervised learning under distribution drifts [2, 3, 12]; however, it is a more expansive category, encompassing all types of shifts beyond just performativity. The foundational work on performative prediction, pioneered by Perdomo et al. [33], posits that the distribution of data is contingent upon the predictive decision rule employed. The primary goal is to identify a performative optimal decision rule that minimizes expected losses over the distribution it engenders. To tackle this challenge, the authors propose a retraining algorithm and analyze the stability conditions and convergence behaviors. Based on the initial framework, subsequent research [21] has extended the scope of performative prediction to decision-making contexts through the introduction of a novel concept known as performative omniprediction. Peet-Pare et al. [32] propose a distributionally robust performative optimization method to promote machine learning fairness. However, their robust smoothness assumption on the objective and robust sensitivity assumption on the worst-case distributions are unrealistic. Additionally, their phi-divergence ambiguity set precludes any continuous distribution, so it cannot ensure true probability distribution coverage guarantee. Contrasted against the robust optimization and distributionally robust optimization paradigms, performative learning offers a notable advantage of generality. Typically, current robust and distributionally robust approaches usually make specific structure assumptions on uncertainty sets or ambiguity sets. Additionally, these methods often involve solving non-convex optimization problems such as mixed-integer linear programs, which are computationally inefficient. Conversely, the inherent flexibility of the performative learning framework allows for its application across a broad spectrum of statistical learning and decision-making scenarios. We refer readers who are interested in performative learning to a comprehensive review [16].

1.2 Notation and terminology

We use \mathbb{R}_+ to denote the set of nonnegative real numbers and \mathbb{R}_{++} to denote the set of strictly positive real numbers. For any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define $[n]$ as the index set $\{1, \dots, n\}$. The Euclidean norm of a vector v is denoted by $\|v\|_2$. For a vector v , its i -th component is denoted by $[v]_p$. For any real-valued matrix A , the notation $\|A\|_q$ represents its Schatten- q norm, which is defined as $(\text{tr}(A^\top A)^{q/2})^{1/q}$. A generalized inequality $x \preceq_{\mathcal{U}} y$ with respect to a proper (closed, convex, pointed, solid) cone \mathcal{C} implies that $y - x \in \mathcal{C}$. The set of all symmetric matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ is represented by \mathbb{S}^K while the cone of positive

semidefinite matrices is denoted by \mathbb{S}_+^K . The cone dual to a proper cone \mathcal{C} is denoted as \mathcal{C}^* . We write $A \succeq 0$ if the symmetric matrix A is positive semidefinite. We represent the inner product of two matrices A and B by $\langle A, B \rangle$. Random variables are designated with tilde signs (e.g., \tilde{z}), while their realizations are denoted by the same symbols without tildes (e.g., z).

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we introduce some basic definitions and technical tools necessary for the subsequent developments.

For any fixed decision θ , we assume access to a reference discrete distribution $\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta) = \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s(\theta) \hat{z}_s(\theta)$, where $\{\hat{z}_s(\theta)\}_{s \in [S]}$ represent the scenarios and $\{\hat{p}_s(\theta)\}_{s \in [S]}$ are their respective probabilities. This reference distribution could be derived from observations or expert knowledge elicitation. In this paper, we employ the *event-wise decision-dependent ambiguity set* for the distributionally robust model (3) defined as

$$\mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta)) = \left\{ \mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{P}_0(\mathcal{Z}) : \begin{array}{l} \tilde{z} \sim \mathbb{P}, \tilde{y} \sim \hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta), (\tilde{z}, \tilde{y}) \sim \mathbb{Q} \\ \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\tilde{z} | \tilde{y} \in \mathcal{E}_k] \in \mathcal{D}_k \quad \forall k \in [K] \\ \mathbb{Q}(\tilde{z} \in \mathcal{Z}_s | \tilde{y} = \hat{z}_s(\theta)) = 1 \quad \forall s \in [S] \end{array} \right\}, \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{E}_k , $k \in [K]$, are given events, and \mathcal{D}_k , $k \in [K]$, and \mathcal{Z}_s , $s \in [S]$, are prescribed conic representable sets. The set $\mathcal{P}_0(\mathcal{Z})$ denotes the set of all Borel probability distributions on $\mathcal{Z} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^P$. Here, the conditional support of \tilde{z} may differ for each scenario $\hat{z}_s(\theta)$, and its conditional expectation can vary based on the events where the scenarios occur. While the reference distribution is discrete, we remark that the ambiguity set could contain both continuous and discrete distributions. This ambiguity set is inspired by its decision-independent counterpart in [8], which we adopt for its versatility and effective modeling capabilities, including moment-based as well as the popular data-driven Wasserstein ambiguity sets.

We introduce the following concepts regarding the optimality and stability of the solutions.

Definition 1 (Robust performative optimality and risk) A decision θ_{RPO} is *robust performatively optimal* if the following relationship holds:

$$\theta_{\text{RPO}} \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta).$$

Definition 2 (Performative stability and decoupled risk) A decision θ_{RPS} is *robust performatively stable* if the following relationship holds:

$$\theta_{\text{RPS}} \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta).$$

We define $\mathbb{J}_{\eta}(\theta) := \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathbb{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\eta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)$ as the *robust decoupled performative risk*, separating the decision η associated with the ambiguity set and the decision θ associated with the risk; then, $\theta_{\text{RPS}} \in \arg \min_{\theta} \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta)$.

In this paper, we assume that the feasible set Θ is a closed convex set and impose the following strong convexity condition on the loss function.

Definition 3 (Generalized Strong Convexity) We say that a loss function $\ell(z, \theta)$ is γ -strongly convex if

$$\ell(z, \theta) \geq \ell(z, \theta') + \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta')^{\top} (\theta - \theta') + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta - \theta'\|_2^2, \quad (\text{A1})$$

for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. If $\gamma = 0$, this condition reduces to the standard definition of convexity. We will also use the following equivalent definition of strong convexity. A loss function $\ell(z, \theta)$ is γ -strongly convex if the function

$$f(z, \theta) = \ell(z, \theta) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2 \quad (\text{A1}')$$

is convex for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$.

The following result establishes strong convexity of worst-case expectations of a strongly convex loss function.

Lemma 1 *If $\ell(z, \theta)$ is γ -strongly convex (A1), then the worst case expectation*

$$\mathbb{J}_{\eta}(\theta) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{P}(\eta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)]$$

is γ -strongly convex in θ .

Proof By the equivalent definition of γ -strong convexity (A1'), we have that $\ell(z, \theta) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2$ is convex in θ . Hence, the worst-case expectation

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{P}(\eta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2 \right]$$

is convex in θ since the expectation and the pointwise supremum operations preserve convexity. Thus, we have that

$$\mathbb{J}_{\eta}(\theta) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{P}(\eta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}} \left[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2 \right] + \frac{\gamma}{2} \|\theta\|_2^2$$

is γ -strongly convex by the definition (A1'). \square

We will also invoke the following smoothness assumption on the loss function.

Definition 4 (Joint Smoothness) We say that a loss function $\ell(z, \theta)$ is β -jointly smooth if the gradient $\nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta)$ is β -Lipschitz in θ and z , that is

$$\begin{aligned} \|\nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta) - \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta')\|_2 &\leq \beta \|\theta - \theta'\|_2, \text{ and} \\ \|\nabla_{\theta} \ell(z, \theta) - \nabla_{\theta} \ell(z', \theta)\|_2 &\leq \beta \|z - z'\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$ and $z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}$.

We further define the concept of Lipschitz continuity on distributions, which is a standard assumption in performative optimization literature.

Definition 5 (ϵ -sensitivity) We say that a distribution map $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ is ϵ -sensitive if for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$

$$W(\mathbb{P}(\theta), \mathbb{P}(\theta')) \leq \epsilon \|\theta - \theta'\|_2,$$

where W denotes the Wasserstein metric [20] defined as

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathbb{P}(\theta), \mathbb{P}(\theta')) &:= \inf \int_{\mathcal{Z} \times \mathcal{Z}} \|z_1 - z_2\|_2 \Pi(dz_1, dz_2) \\ \text{s. t. } &\Pi \text{ is a joint distribution of } \tilde{z}_1 \text{ and } \tilde{z}_2 \\ &\text{with marginals } \mathbb{P}(\theta) \text{ and } \mathbb{P}(\theta'), \text{ respectively.} \end{aligned}$$

We will sometimes use the dual representation of the Wasserstein metric.

Lemma 2 (Kantorovich-Rubinstein [20]) *A distribution map $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ is ϵ -sensitive if and only if for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$, we have*

$$\sup_{g \in \mathcal{L}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(\theta)}[g(\tilde{z})] - \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(\theta')}[g(\tilde{z})] \right| \leq \epsilon L \|\theta - \theta'\|_2,$$

where \mathcal{L} is the space of all L -Lipschitz continuous functions satisfying $|g(z) - g(z')| \leq L\|z - z'\|_2$ for all $z, z' \in \mathcal{Z}$.

Finally, we will employ a standard result concerning the optimality of solutions to a constrained convex optimization problem.

Lemma 3 (First-order optimality condition) *Let f be a convex function and let Ω be a closed convex set on which f is differentiable, then*

$$x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in \Omega} f(x)$$

if and only if

$$\nabla f(x^*)^T (y - x^*) \geq 0, \quad \forall y \in \Omega.$$

3 Repeated Robust Risk Minimization Algorithm

In this section, we introduce the *repeated robust risk minimization (R^3M)* algorithm for solving the distributionally robust performative risk minimization problem and investigate its fundamental properties. The algorithm starts with an initial solution θ_0 , and performs the following sequence of updates for every $t \geq 0$:

$$\theta_{t+1} = G(\theta_t) := \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)]. \quad (R^3M)$$

Lemma 1 guarantees the uniqueness of the optimal solution under the strong convexity assumption on the loss function. The algorithm addresses the computational challenges posed by decision-dependent distributions by constructing the ambiguity set using the reference distribution based on the optimal decision from the previous iteration. Thus, it effectively decouples the current decision from the ambiguity set, simplifying the optimization process.

3.1 Tractable Reformulations

Under the setting where the loss function is convex piecewise quadratic in θ and piecewise affine in z , we can reformulate **(R³M)** as a tractable conic program that can be solved using standard off-the-shelf solvers.

Proposition 1 *Assume that the loss function is given by*

$$\ell(z, \theta) = \max_{j \in [J]} \theta^\top A_j(z) \theta + b_j(z)^\top \theta + c_j(z),$$

where $A_j(z) \in \mathbb{S}^N$, $b_j(z) \in \mathbb{R}^N$, and $c_j(z) \in \mathbb{R}$, $j \in [J]$, are affine functions defined as

$$A_j(z) = \bar{A}_{j0} + \sum_{p \in [P]} z_p \bar{A}_{jp}, \quad b_j(z) = \bar{b}_{j0} + \bar{B}_j z, \quad c_j(z) = \bar{c}_{j0} + \bar{c}_j^\top z,$$

such that $A_j(z) \succeq 0$ for all $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ and $j \in [J]$. Let $\mathcal{D}_k = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^P : D_k z \preceq_{\mathcal{U}_k} d_k\}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_s = \{z \in \mathbb{R}^P : F_k z \preceq_{\mathcal{V}_s} d_k\}$ for semidefinite representable cones \mathcal{U}_k and \mathcal{V}_k , and assume that Slater's condition holds in all optimization problems. Then, **(R³M)** is equivalent to the conic program

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s \alpha_s + \sum_{k \in [K]} d_k^\top \beta_k \\ & \text{s. t. } \alpha_s \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall s \in [S], \quad \beta_k \in \mathcal{U}_k^* \quad \forall k \in [K], \quad \psi_{sj} \in \mathcal{V}_s^* \quad \forall s \in [S] \quad j \in [J] \\ & \quad \theta \in \Theta, \quad \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^N, \quad \begin{bmatrix} \Gamma & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0 \\ & \quad \alpha_s \geq \theta^\top \bar{A}_{j0} \theta + \bar{b}_{j0}^\top \theta + \bar{c}_{j0} + f_k^\top \psi_{sj} \quad \forall s \in [S] \quad j \in [J] \\ & \quad \left[\theta^\top \bar{B}_j + \bar{c}_j^\top - \sum_{k: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} \beta_k^\top D_k - \psi_{sj}^\top F_k \right]_p + \langle \Gamma, \bar{A}_{jp} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall s \in [S] \quad j \in [J]. \end{aligned}$$

Proof Using the law of total expectations, we can decompose the expected loss with respect to the scenarios as

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] = \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s(\theta) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_s}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)],$$

where \mathbb{Q}_s denotes the conditional distribution of \tilde{z} given that the scenario $\hat{z}_s(\theta)$ is realized. Optimizing over these conditional distributions, the worst-case expectation can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] = \sup \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s(\theta_t) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_s}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] \\ & \quad \text{s. t. } \mathbb{Q}_s \in \mathcal{P}_0(\mathcal{Z}_s) \quad \forall s \in [S] \\ & \quad \left(\sum_{s \in [S]: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} \hat{p}_s(\theta_t) \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}_s}[\tilde{z}] \right) \in \mathcal{D}_k \quad \forall k \in [K]. \end{aligned}$$

Dualizing the maximization problem, we arrive at the semi-infinite program

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] \\
= & \inf \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s \alpha_s + \sum_{k \in [K]} d_k^\top \beta_k \\
\text{s. t.} & \alpha_s \in \mathbb{R} \quad \forall s \in [S], \quad \beta_k \in \mathcal{U}_k^* \quad \forall k \in [K] \\
& \alpha_s + \sum_{k \in [K]: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} \beta_k^\top D_k z \geq \ell(z, \theta) \quad \forall s \in [S] \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}_s.
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

Next, introducing the matrix variable $\Gamma = \theta\theta^\top$, we rewrite the loss function as

$$\ell(z, \theta) = \max_{j \in [J]} \langle \Gamma, A_j(z) \rangle + b_j(z)^\top \theta + c_j(z).$$

Under the assumption that the matrices $A_j(z)$, $j \in [J]$, are positive semidefinite, we can relax the nonconvex constraint $\Gamma = \theta\theta^\top$ with the semidefinite constraint $\Gamma \succeq \theta\theta^\top$, which can be represented tractably using the Schur complement:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \Gamma & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0.$$

For each $s \in [S]$, we can reformulate the semi-infinite constraint in (5) as a system of finite constraints using conic duality:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \alpha_s + \sum_{k: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} \beta_k^\top D_k z \geq \max_{j \in [J]} \langle \Gamma, A_j(z) \rangle + b_j(z)^\top \theta + c_j(z) \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}_s \\
& \iff \\
& \alpha_s \geq \sum_{k: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} -\beta_k^\top D_k z + \langle \Gamma, A_j(z) \rangle + b_j(z)^\top \theta + c_j(z) \quad \forall j \in [J] \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}_s \\
& \iff \\
& \alpha_s \geq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}_s} \sum_{k: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} -\beta_k^\top D_k z + \langle \Gamma, A_j(z) \rangle + b_j(z)^\top \theta + c_j(z) \quad \forall j \in [J] \\
& \iff \\
& \alpha_s \geq \theta^\top \bar{A}_{j0} \theta + \bar{b}_{j0}^\top \theta + \bar{c}_{j0} + f_k^\top \psi_{sj} \quad \forall j \in [J] \\
\exists \psi_{sj} \in \mathcal{V}_s^* : & \left[\theta^\top \bar{B}_j + \bar{c}_j^\top - \sum_{k: \hat{z}_s(\theta_t) \in \mathcal{E}_k} \beta_k^\top D_k - \psi_{sj}^\top F_k \right]_p + \langle \Gamma, \bar{A}_{jp} \rangle = 0 \quad \forall j \in [J].
\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. \square

Next, we consider the case where the loss function is given by the composition of a Lipschitz continuous function and a quadratic function.

Proposition 2 *Let the random parameters $\tilde{Z} \in \mathbb{S}^{N+1}$ be defined as*

$$\tilde{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{A} & \tilde{b} \\ \tilde{b}^\top & \tilde{c} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Assume that the loss function is given by

$$\ell(Z, \theta) = \mathcal{L}(\theta^\top A\theta + 2b^\top \theta + c),$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\cdot)$ is an L -Lipschitz continuous function. We further assume that all scenarios $\hat{Z}_1(\theta_t), \dots, \hat{Z}_S(\theta_t) \succeq 0$ are positive semidefinite.

Let (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{v}) be an expanded random parameter vector with a scalar variable \tilde{v} . Suppose that the ambiguity set is defined through (4) with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_s &= \left\{ (Z, v) \in \mathbb{S}^{N+1} \times \mathbb{R} : \|Z - \hat{Z}_s(\theta_t)\|_q \leq v \right\} \quad \forall s \in [S], \\ \mathcal{Z} &= \mathbb{R}^D, \quad \mathcal{E}_1 = \{\hat{Z}_1(\theta_t), \dots, \hat{Z}_S(\theta_t)\}, \quad \mathcal{D}_1 = \{(Z, v) \in \mathbb{S}^{N+1} \times \mathbb{R} : v \leq \tau\}, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\tau \in \mathbb{R}_{++}$ is a prescribed constant and $\|\cdot\|_q$ denotes the Schatten- q norm. Then, $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ is equivalent to the conic program

$$\begin{aligned} &\inf \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t)} [\mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, \tilde{Z} \rangle)] + \tau L \|\Gamma\|_* \\ &\text{s.t. } \theta \in \Theta, \quad \lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+, \quad \Gamma \in \mathbb{S}_+^{N+1}, \quad H \in \mathbb{S}_+^N \\ &\quad \Gamma \succeq \begin{bmatrix} H & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \succeq 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\|\cdot\|_*$ is the dual Schatten norm of $\|\cdot\|_q$.

Proof We introduce the matrix variable

$$\Gamma = \begin{bmatrix} \theta\theta^\top & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

and rewrite the loss function as $\ell(Z, \theta) = \mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, Z \rangle)$. Under the prescribed specification, the ambiguity set simplifies to the Wasserstein ball [28] of radius $\tau > 0$ [8, Theorem 1]. Thus, by [5, Remark 1], we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{Z}, \theta)] \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \tau \lambda + \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s(\theta_t) \left(\sup_{Z \in \mathbb{S}^{N+1}} \mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, Z \rangle) - \lambda \|Z - \hat{Z}_s(\theta_t)\|_q \right). \end{aligned}$$

Next, by [37, Lemma A.3], we reformulate the maximization problem for each $s \in [S]$:

$$\sup_{Z \in \mathbb{S}^{N+1}} \mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, Z \rangle) - \lambda \|Z - \hat{Z}_s(\theta_t)\|_q = \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, \hat{Z}_s(\theta_t) \rangle) & \text{if } L \|\Gamma\|_* \leq \lambda \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Therefore, the worst-case expectation can be rewritten as

$$\sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{Z}, \theta)] = \inf_{\lambda \in \mathbb{R}_+} \tau L \|\Gamma\|_* + \sum_{s \in [S]} \hat{p}_s(\theta_t) \mathcal{L}(\langle \Gamma, \hat{Z}_s(\theta_t) \rangle).$$

The desired result then follows by relaxing the semidefinite constraint (7), which is valid since $A_s(\theta_t) \succeq 0$, and applying [27, Lemma 4] to linearize the outer product $\theta\theta^\top$. \square

As a corollary of this result, we obtain the popular Tikhonov regularization formulation as a special case.

Corollary 1 *If $q = \infty$ is used in the description of the sets \mathcal{Z}_s in (6), then (R³M) is equivalent to the Tikhonov regularized problem*

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta_t)} [\mathcal{L}(\theta^\top \tilde{A}\theta + 2\tilde{b}^\top \theta + \tilde{c})] + \tau L\|(\theta, 1)\|_2^2.$$

Proof When $q = \infty$, the dual corresponds to the nuclear norm. Hence, we have

$$\left\| \begin{bmatrix} \theta\theta^\top & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_* = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} \theta\theta^\top & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right\|_1 = \text{tr} \left(\begin{bmatrix} \theta\theta^\top & \theta \\ \theta^\top & 1 \end{bmatrix} \right) = \|(\theta, 1)\|_2^2,$$

which proves the claim. \square

We note that the recent work [22] shows that when the loss function is given by

$$\ell(z, \theta) = \mathcal{Q}(z^\top \theta),$$

where \mathcal{Q} is a strongly convex quadratic function, and the ambiguity set is defined through the Wasserstein ball with additional *martingale constraints*, then the distributionally robust optimization problem is equivalent to a Tikhonov regularization formulation. Our result extends this by showing that Tikhonov regularization can be obtained for a broader class of loss functions without the need for complicating martingale constraints.

3.2 Convergence Analysis

We now establish that, under certain conditions, the algorithm converges linearly to a stable point.

Theorem 1 *Suppose that the worst-case expectation in (R³M) is equivalent to the regularized model*

$$\mathbb{J}_\eta(\theta) = \sup_{\mathbb{Q} \in \mathcal{B}(\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\eta))} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{Q}}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] = \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\eta)}[\ell(\tilde{z}, \theta)] + r(\theta), \quad (8)$$

where r is a convex regularizer with strong convexity parameter $\rho \geq 0$. Assume that the loss function $\ell(z, \theta)$ has a strong convexity parameter $\gamma \geq 0$ and is β -jointly smooth (A2), while the distribution map $\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ satisfies the ϵ -sensitivity condition (5). Suppose $\gamma + \rho > 0$. Then, we have:

- (a) $\|G(\theta) - G(\theta')\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon\beta}{\gamma + \rho} \|\theta - \theta'\|_2$ for all $\theta, \theta' \in \Theta$; and
- (b) if $\epsilon < \frac{\gamma + \rho}{\beta}$, the iterates θ_t of (R³M) converge to a unique performatively stable point θ_{RPS} at a linear rate:

$$\|\theta_t - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2 \leq \delta \text{ for } t \geq \left(1 - \epsilon \frac{\beta}{\gamma + \rho}\right)^{-1} \log \left(\frac{\|\theta_0 - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2}{\delta}\right).$$

Proof Fix $\eta, \eta' \in \Theta$. By our assumptions, the functions $\mathbb{J}_\eta(\theta)$ and $\mathbb{J}_{\eta'}(\theta)$ are $(\gamma + \rho)$ -strongly convex in θ . By the definition of strong convexity, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta)) - \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta')) &\geq (G(\eta) - G(\eta'))^\top \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta')) + \frac{\gamma + \rho}{2} \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2^2, \\ \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta')) - \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta)) &\geq \frac{\gamma + \rho}{2} \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2^2, \end{aligned}$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that

$$(G(\eta') - G(\eta))^\top \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta)) \geq 0$$

in view of the first-order optimality condition in Lemma 3 since $G(\eta) \in \arg \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{J}_\eta(\theta)$. Combining the two inequalities, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma + \rho) \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2^2 &\leq -(G(\eta) - G(\eta'))^\top \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta')) \\ &\leq (G(\eta) - G(\eta'))^\top [\nabla \mathbb{J}_{\eta'}(G(\eta')) - \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta'))], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the second inequality follows from the fact that $(G(\eta) - G(\eta'))^\top \nabla \mathbb{J}_{\eta'}(G(\eta')) \geq 0$ in view of the first-order optimality condition of $G(\eta')$. Next, we will upper bound (9) using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &(G(\eta) - G(\eta'))^\top [\nabla \mathbb{J}_{\eta'}(G(\eta')) - \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta'))] \\ &\leq \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2 \|\nabla \mathbb{J}_{\eta'}(G(\eta')) - \nabla \mathbb{J}_\eta(G(\eta'))\|_2 \\ &= \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2 \left\| \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\eta')}[\nabla \ell(\tilde{z}; G(\eta'))] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\eta)}[\nabla \ell(\tilde{z}; G(\eta'))] \right\|_2 \\ &\leq \|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2 \cdot \epsilon \beta \|\eta - \eta'\|_2. \end{aligned}$$

Here, the first equality follows from the representation (8), while the last inequality follows from the Kantorovich-Rubinstein Lemma 2 since the loss function is β -jointly smooth and the map $\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\theta)$ is ϵ -sensitive. Combining this bound with (9), we get

$$\|G(\eta) - G(\eta')\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon \beta}{\gamma + \rho} \|\eta - \eta'\|_2.$$

Our claim (a) is then established by simply performing the change of variables $\eta \leftarrow \theta$ and $\eta' \leftarrow \theta'$.

To prove claim (b), we observe that $\theta_t = G(\theta_{t-1})$ by the definition of (R³M), and $G(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) = \theta_{\text{RPS}}$ by the definition of stability. Applying the result of the claim (a) yields

$$\|\theta_t - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2 \leq \frac{\epsilon \beta}{\gamma + \rho} \|\theta_{t-1} - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2 \leq \left(\frac{\epsilon \beta}{\gamma + \rho} \right)^t \|\theta_0 - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2.$$

Setting the right-hand side expression to be at most δ and solving for t completes the proof. \square

We note that the equivalence between distributionally robust optimization and regularization has been established under many practically relevant settings in several works [7, 22, 31, 36, 37, 38, 43]; see also the review paper [34] and the recent generalization [9]. The ambiguity sets discussed in these papers are special cases of our more general ambiguity set (4). For the setting described in Corollary 1, where the distributionally robust model is equivalent to a Tikhonov regularization, the regularization term $r(\theta) = \tau L \|\theta, 1\|_2^2$ has a strong convexity parameter of $\rho = 2\tau L > 0$. Thus, the distributionally robust formulation not only ensures safe decision-making but also accelerates the convergence of the algorithm.

The result in Theorem 1 also showcases an additional benefit of the DRO framework since convergence can be achieved as long as the combined strong convexity $\gamma + \rho$ is strictly positive. Thus, it is not necessary that the loss function is strongly convex ($\gamma > 0$), so long as the regularizer is.

3.3 Suboptimality Guarantees

Our next result relates the robust performatively stable solution θ_{RPS} and the robust performatively optimal solution θ_{RPO} .

Theorem 2 *Suppose all conditions in Theorem 1 hold. Furthermore, assume that the loss function $\ell(z, \theta)$ is L_z -Lipschitz in z . Then, we have the suboptimality bound*

$$\mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) - \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPO}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) \leq \frac{2\epsilon^2 L_z^2}{\gamma + \rho}. \quad (10)$$

Proof By our assumptions, the function $\mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta)$ is $(\gamma + \rho)$ -strongly convex in θ . Thus, we have

$$\frac{\gamma + \rho}{2} \|\theta_{\text{RPO}} - \theta_{\text{RPS}}\|_2^2 \leq J_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) - J_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}})$$

since $(\theta_{\text{RPO}} - \theta_{\text{RPS}})^\top \nabla \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) \geq 0$ by the optimality of θ_{RPS} . Using the fact that $\mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) \geq \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPO}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}})$, we can further upper bound the right-hand side

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) - \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) &\leq \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) - \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPO}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) \\ &\leq \epsilon L_z \|\theta_{\text{RPS}} - \theta_{\text{RPO}}\|_2, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the second inequality holds due to the ϵ -sensitivity of the distribution map $\hat{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ and the L_z -Lipschitz continuity of the loss function in z . In summary, we obtain

$$\|\theta_{\text{RPS}} - \theta_{\text{RPO}}\|_2 \leq \frac{2\epsilon L_z}{\gamma + \rho}. \quad (12)$$

Next, we derive a bound on the suboptimality of the robust performatively stable solution θ_{RPS} . We have

$$\mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPS}}) - \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPO}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) \leq \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}}) - \mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPO}}}(\theta_{\text{RPO}})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\leq \epsilon L_z \|\theta_{\text{RPS}} - \theta_{\text{RPO}}\|_2 \\ &\leq \frac{2\epsilon^2 L_z^2}{\gamma + \rho}, \end{aligned}$$

where the first inequality follows from the suboptimality of θ_{RPO} in $\mathbb{J}_{\theta_{\text{RPS}}}(\theta)$, the second inequality is from (11), and the last inequality is from (12). This completes the proof. \square

The result in Theorem 2 shows that the robust performatively stable solution θ_{RPS} constitutes a close approximation of the robust performatively stable solution θ_{RPO} whenever the ϵ -sensitivity of the distribution map $\mathbb{P}(\cdot)$ is small, the loss function has a large strong convexity parameter γ , or the distributionally robust model induces a regularization with large strong convexity parameter ρ .

4 Numerical Experiments

In this section, we examine the convergence and out-of-sample performance of (R³M) vs. the non-robust model. We consider a simulated strategic classification problem from [33] using a class-balanced subset of a Kaggle credit scoring dataset [19]. The dataset contains features $\tilde{x} \in \mathbb{R}^P$ about borrowers, such as their ages and the number of open loans. The outcomes $\tilde{y} \in \{-1, 1\}$ are equal to 1 if the individual defaulted on a loan and -1 otherwise. The institution's objective is to predict whether an individual will default on their debt.

Under the strategic classification setting, individuals respond to the institution's classifier by altering their features to increase their likelihood of receiving a favorable classification. The institution employs logistic regression for classification, with $\tilde{z} = \tilde{x}\tilde{y}$, and the loss function is given by $\log(1 + \exp(-z^\top \theta))$. This setting aligns with Corollary 1, where \mathcal{L} represents the logloss function, and the quadratic function $\theta^\top A\theta + 2b^\top \theta + c$ simplifies to the affine function $z^\top \theta$. Hence, the DRO problem in (R³M) can be reformulated as the Tikhonov regularization problem

$$\inf_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}(\theta_t)} [\log(1 + \exp(-\tilde{y}\tilde{x}^\top \theta))] + \tau L\|(\theta, 1)\|_2^2.$$

Following [24, 33], we assume that individuals have linear utilities $u(\theta, \tilde{x}) = -\theta^\top \tilde{x}$ and quadratic costs $c(\tilde{x}', \tilde{x}) = -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \|\tilde{x}' - \tilde{x}\|_2^2$, where ϵ is a positive constant regulating the cost of altering features and thus the sensitivity of the

Input: base distribution \mathbb{P} , classifier f_θ , cost function c , and utility function u

Sampling procedure for $\mathbb{P}(\theta)$:

1. Sample $(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) \sim \mathbb{P}$
2. Compute best response $x_{\text{BR}} \leftarrow \arg \max_{\tilde{x}'} u(\tilde{x}', \theta) - c(\tilde{x}', \tilde{x})$
3. Output sample $(x_{\text{BR}}, \tilde{y})$

Fig. 1: Distribution map for strategic classification




Fig. 2: Convergence of repeated risk minimization for varying ϵ -sensitivity parameters for robust and non-robust models. A marker indicates that at the next iteration, the distance between iterates is numerically zero. We normalize the distance by $c = \|\theta_{0,S}\|_2^{-1}$.

distribution map. In other words, individuals aim to minimize their assigned probability of default but are unable to change their true outcome \tilde{y} . We select $S \subseteq [P - 1]$ strategic features, such as the number of open credit lines. Each time an individual manipulates their strategic features as depicted in Figure 1, the best response for an individual results in the update

$$\tilde{x}'_S = \tilde{x}_S - \epsilon \theta_S$$

where $\tilde{x}'_S, \tilde{x}_S, \theta_S \in \mathbb{R}^{|S|}$.

First, we consider the convergence of $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$. Our theoretical analysis indicates that $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ is guaranteed to converge to a unique performatively stable point θ_{RPS} at a linear rate of $\frac{\gamma + \rho}{\beta}$, which is faster than the non-robust repeated risk minimization (RRM) method proposed in [33]. In Figure 2, it is evident that $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ does indeed converge faster compared to the non-robust model. Additionally, we can see that $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ converges in just a few iterations for small values of ϵ , whereas it diverges when ϵ is too large.

Next, we validate the out-of-sample performance of $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$. We fix our training data size to 200 and use approximately 3600 data points for the out-of-sample test. As a benchmark, we compare $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ with non-robust RRM. Both models are trained for 50 iterations. Figure 3 displays the box plots of 50 independent trials. As shown, for small values of ϵ , $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ shows little advantage over non-robust RRM. However, for large ϵ , $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ consistently outperforms the non-robust model. When ϵ is small, the distribution shift is minimal, so both $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$ and non-robust RRM are not significantly affected. However, as ϵ increases, the non-robust RRM is much more impacted by distribution shift than $(\mathbf{R}^3\mathbf{M})$. This further demonstrates the advantage of our proposed distributionally robust performative optimization framework.




Fig. 3: Out of sample testing results for robust and non-robust models

Acknowledgements Grani A. Hanasusanto was supported by the National Science Foundation under grants 2342505 and 2343869.

References

1. M. Baker and J. Wurgler. Investor sentiment and the cross-section of stock returns. *The journal of Finance*, 61(4):1645–1680, 2006.
2. P. L. Bartlett. Learning with a slowly changing distribution. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 243–252, 1992.
3. P. L. Bartlett, S. Ben-David, and S. R. Kulkarni. Learning changing concepts by exploiting the structure of change. In *Proceedings of the ninth annual conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 131–139, 1996.
4. B. Basciftci, S. Ahmed, and S. Shen. Distributionally robust facility location problem under decision-dependent stochastic demand. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 292(2):548–561, 2021.
5. J. Blanchet and K. Murthy. Quantifying distributional model risk via optimal transport. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(2):565–600, 2019.
6. A. P. Calmon, F. D. Ciocan, and G. Romero. Revenue management with repeated customer interactions. *Management Science*, 67(5):2944–2963, 2021.
7. R. Chen and I. C. Paschalidis. A robust learning approach for regression models based on distributionally robust optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 19(13):1–48, 2018.
8. Z. Chen, M. Sim, and P. Xiong. Robust stochastic optimization made easy with rsome. *Management Science*, 66(8):3329–3339, 2020.

9. H. Chu, M. Lin, and K.-C. Toh. Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization and its tractable regularization formulations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.03942*, 2024.
10. X. V. Doan. Distributionally robust optimization under endogenous uncertainty with an application in retrofitting planning. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 300(1):73–84, 2022.
11. D. Drusvyatskiy and L. Xiao. Stochastic optimization with decision-dependent distributions. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(2):954–998, 2023.
12. J. Gama, I. Žliobaitė, A. Bifet, M. Pechenizkiy, and A. Bouchachia. A survey on concept drift adaptation. *ACM computing surveys (CSUR)*, 46(4):1–37, 2014.
13. V. Goel and I. E. Grossmann. A stochastic programming approach to planning of offshore gas field developments under uncertainty in reserves. *Computers & chemical engineering*, 28(8):1409–1429, 2004.
14. V. Goel and I. E. Grossmann. A class of stochastic programs with decision dependent uncertainty. *Mathematical programming*, 108(2):355–394, 2006.
15. M. Hardt, M. Jagadeesan, and C. Mendler-Dünnner. Performative power. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22969–22981, 2022.
16. M. Hardt and C. Mendler-Dünnner. Performative prediction: Past and future. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.16608*, 2023.
17. Q. Jin, A. Georghiou, P. Vayanos, and G. A. Hanasusanto. Distributionally robust optimization with decision-dependent information discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05900*, 2024.
18. T. W. Jonsbråten, R. J. Wets, and D. L. Woodruff. A class of stochastic programs with decision dependent random elements. *Annals of Operations Research*, 82(0):83–106, 1998.
19. Kaggle. Give me some credit. <https://www.kaggle.com/c/GiveMeSomeCredit/data>, 2012.
20. L. V. Kantorovich and S. Rubinshtein. On a space of totally additive functions. *Vestnik of the St. Petersburg University: Mathematics*, 13(7):52–59, 1958.
21. M. P. Kim and J. C. Perdomo. Making decisions under outcome performativity. In *14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2023)*. Schloss-Dagstuhl-Leibniz Zentrum für Informatik, 2023.
22. J. Li, S. Lin, J. Blanchet, and V. A. Nguyen. Tikhonov regularization is optimal transport robust under martingale constraints. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:17677–17689, 2022.
23. F. Luo and S. Mehrotra. Distributionally robust optimization with decision dependent ambiguity sets. *Optimization Letters*, 14(8):2565–2594, 2020.
24. C. Mendler-Dünnner, J. Perdomo, T. Zrnic, and M. Hardt. Stochastic optimization for performative prediction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:4929–4939, 2020.

25. G. Michel, J. Omer, and M. Poss. Robust selection problem with decision-dependent information discovery under budgeted uncertainty. In *23ème congrès annuel de la Société Française de Recherche Opérationnelle et d’Aide à la Décision*, 2022.
26. J. P. Miller, J. C. Perdomo, and T. Zrnic. Outside the echo chamber: Optimizing the performative risk. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7710–7720. PMLR, 2021.
27. A. Mittal, C. Gokalp, and G. A. Hanasusanto. Robust quadratic programming with mixed-integer uncertainty. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 32(2):201–218, 2020.
28. P. Mohajerin Esfahani and D. Kuhn. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1):115–166, 2018.
29. O. Nohadani and K. Sharma. Optimization under decision-dependent uncertainty. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(2):1773–1795, 2018.
30. R. Paradiso, A. Georghiou, S. Dabia, and D. Tönissen. Exact and approximate schemes for robust optimization problems with decision dependent information discovery. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.04115*, 2022.
31. H. Park, G. A. Hanasusanto, and Y. Li. Robust system identification: Finite-sample guarantees and connection to regularization.
32. L. Peet-Pare, N. Hegde, and A. Fyshe. Long term fairness for minority groups via performative distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.05777*, 2022.
33. J. Perdomo, T. Zrnic, C. Mendler-Dünner, and M. Hardt. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7599–7609. PMLR, 2020.
34. H. Rahimian and S. Mehrotra. Distributionally robust optimization: A review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05659*, 2019.
35. M. Ryu and R. Jiang. Nurse staffing under absenteeism: A distributionally robust optimization approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.09875*, 2019.
36. S. Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, L. Aolaritei, F. Dörfler, and D. Kuhn. New perspectives on regularization and computation in optimal transport-based distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.03900*, 2023.
37. S. Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, D. Kuhn, and P. M. Esfahani. Regularization via mass transportation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 20(103): 1–68, 2019.
38. S. Shafieezadeh Abadeh, P. M. Mohajerin Esfahani, and D. Kuhn. Distributionally robust logistic regression. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28, 2015.
39. S. A. Spacey, W. Wiesemann, D. Kuhn, and W. Luk. Robust software partitioning with multiple instantiation. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 24(3):500–515, 2012.
40. P. Vayanos, D. Kuhn, and B. Rustem. Decision rules for information discovery in multi-stage stochastic programming. In *2011 50th IEEE Con-*

- ference on Decision and Control and European Control Conference*, pages 7368–7373. IEEE, 2011.
41. R. Vujanic, P. Goulart, and M. Morari. Robust optimization of schedules affected by uncertain events. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications*, 171:1033–1054, 2016.
 42. R. Wermers. Mutual fund herding and the impact on stock prices. *the Journal of Finance*, 54(2):581–622, 1999.
 43. Q. Wu, J. Y.-M. Li, and T. Mao. On generalization and regularization via wasserstein distributionally robust optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.05716*, 2022.
 44. X. Yu and S. Shen. Multistage distributionally robust mixed-integer programming with decision-dependent moment-based ambiguity sets. *Mathematical Programming*, 196(1):1025–1064, 2022.
 45. J. Zhang, H. Xu, and L. Zhang. Quantitative stability analysis for distributionally robust optimization with moment constraints. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 26(3):1855–1882, 2016.
 46. Q. Zhang and W. Feng. A unified framework for adjustable robust optimization with endogenous uncertainty. *AIChE journal*, 66(12):e17047, 2020.
 47. X. Zhang, M. Kamgarpour, A. Georghiou, P. Goulart, and J. Lygeros. Robust optimal control with adjustable uncertainty sets. *Automatica*, 75: 249–259, 2017.