
DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST POLICY EVALUATION AND LEARNING FOR CONTINUOUS TREATMENT WITH OBSERVATIONAL DATA

Cheuk Hang Leung^{*1}, Yiyang Huang^{*2}, Yijun Li¹, and Qi Wu^{†1}

¹City University of Hong Kong

²The Hong Kong Polytechnic University

ABSTRACT

Using offline observational data for policy evaluation and learning allows decision-makers to evaluate and learn a policy that connects characteristics and interventions. Most existing literature has focused on either discrete treatment spaces or assumed no difference in the distributions between the policy-learning and policy-deployed environments. These restrict applications in many real-world scenarios where distribution shifts are present with continuous treatment. To overcome these challenges, this paper focuses on developing a distributionally robust policy under a continuous treatment setting. The proposed distributionally robust estimators are established using the Inverse Probability Weighting (IPW) method extended from the discrete one for policy evaluation and learning under continuous treatments. Specifically, we introduce a kernel function into the proposed IPW estimator to mitigate the exclusion of observations that can occur in the standard IPW method to continuous treatments. We then provide finite-sample analysis that guarantees the convergence of the proposed distributionally robust policy evaluation and learning estimators. The comprehensive experiments further verify the effectiveness of our approach when distribution shifts are present.

1 Introduction

Most decision-making problems necessitate learning an effective personalized policy based on individual features from observational data. This process, commonly referred to as offline policy evaluation/learning, has diverse applications across various domains, including healthcare Tang and Wiens (2021), recommendation Li et al. (2010), and finance Qin et al. (2022). Many studies have investigated offline policy evaluation/learning in discrete treatment settings which assume that the deployment environment is identical to the environment generating the training data, i.e., that there are no distributional shifts. This assumption, however, is often unrealistic in many real-world applications Huang et al. (2023). For instance, an investment firm has developed an automated investment strategy for the US stock market based on extensive historical trading data. When attempting to apply this strategy directly to the UK stock market, it may lose the predictive power due to the substantial difference between financial market environments. Similarly, a phar-

^{*}These authors contributed equally to this work.

[†]The corresponding author (qiwu@cityu.edu.hk).

maceutical company has developed a strategy for individualized Warfarin dosage adjustment according to their recent research on older adults. This strategy may perform well in the original clinical trial population, yet it may falter when applied to a new population, such as young adults, due to significant differences in physical conditions.

To address the challenge of distribution shifts in policy evaluation and learning, the problem can be formulated as a Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) problem. In the DRO framework, the goal is to find the worst-case solution within a set of distributions under certain degrees of model uncertainties. The uncertainty set is assumed to contain the distributions due to potential distribution shifts, and it can be characterized by constraining certain moments of order Δ Delage and Ye (2010); Zymler et al. (2013) or by using divergence measures Hu and Hong (2013); Kuhn et al. (2019); Chen et al. (2019); Gao et al. (2022) to define appropriate deviations from a nominal distribution. The resulting solution provides robust, reliable, and conservative guarantees which can cope with the most adverse situations.

Furthermore, the objective function of the formulated DRO utilizes an inverse probability weighting (IPW) estimator Wooldridge (2007) to estimate the expected potential reward under continuous treatment. Specifically, we extend the existing IPW estimator designed for discrete treatment settings to accommodate continuous treatments. Generally, the discrete-based IPW approach cannot be directly applied in continuous treatment settings, as it would reject most observed data. Moreover, although discretizing continuous treatments into categories is an intuitive and simple solution, it can lead to information loss and may fail to produce inferences that vary continuously with the treatment. We introduce a modified IPW approach incorporating a scaled kernel function with a bandwidth parameter, serving as a smooth nonparametric extension for computing histogram “buckets”. The proposed IPW estimator enables the distributionally robust policy evaluation and learning using observational datasets.

In summary, our framework addresses the challenges of policy evaluation and learning in continuous treatment settings in the presence of distribution shifts. The key contributions of our paper are threefold:

1. We formulate the DRO problem with an IPW approach for policy evaluation/learning under the continuous treatment setting, and convert it to its equivalent dual form. As the standard IPW approach is not directly applicable in this context, we develop a tractable kernel-based form to approximate the dual problem.
2. We establish estimators for policy evaluation/learning and investigate their asymptotic properties. Specifically, the established estimators of distributionally robust values exhibit asymptotic normality, and the finite-sample regret decays to zero asymptotically.
3. Through simulated and empirical studies, we demonstrate that the policy learned using our method provides robustness to distribution shifts compared to standard nonrobust policy learning methods.

1.1 Literature Review

Considerable research has focused on causality in discrete treatment settings. However, exploring causality under continuous treatment remains limited in many real-world applications. Existing research on continuous treatment settings primarily focuses on directly modeling the relationship among response, treatment, and covariates. Notable contributions include Schwab et al. (2020), who construct a multi-head neural network for this purpose; Bica et al. (2020), who propose an end-to-end neural network based on generative adversarial networks (GANs); and Bahadori et al. (2022), who introduce a novel algorithm within the entropy balancing framework to optimize accuracy through end-to-end optimization. Another approach modifies IPW-based and Doubly Robust-based estimators (e.g., Chernozhukov et al. (2018); Huang et al. (2022))

from discrete treatment settings by incorporating kernel functions to mitigate the direct rejection of observed data, as demonstrated by Su et al. (2019) and Colangelo and Lee (2019).

Recent studies have focused on offline policy evaluation and learning. Kitagawa and Tetenov (2018) establish finite sample regret bounds with a rate of $O_P\left(1/\sqrt{N}\right)$ for policy learning over a policy class with finite VC dimension. Athey and Wager (2021) extend this analysis to examine regret bounds from an asymptotic perspective. Zhao et al. (2012) and Zhou et al. (2017) propose algorithms for policy learning and explore the statistical properties of learned policies and associated regret bounds. Dudík et al. (2011) utilize classic estimators for policy evaluation. Kallus (2018) proposes a balance-based approach to reweight historical data and mimic datasets generated by evaluated or learned policies. Zhou et al. (2023) exploit a cross-fitted approach for policy learning. The aforementioned studies primarily assume discrete treatment and do not account for distributional shifts. Nevertheless, distributional shifts are common since the studies are often conducted in different environments, highlighting the significance of studying distributionally robust policies. For instance, Yang et al. (2023), Shen et al. (2024), Mo et al. (2021), and Faury et al. (2020) primarily focus on shifts in covariates, whereas Si et al. (2023) and Kallus et al. (2022) address shifts in the joint distribution of responses, features, and treatments. Notably, to the best of our knowledge, studying policy evaluation and learning in the presence of distribution shifts under continuous treatment settings is still an open problem.

2 Background

2.1 Notations and Assumptions

Throughout the paper, we denote $A \in \mathcal{A} \subset \mathbb{R}$, $X \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $Y \in \mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ as the continuous treatment (also known as action or intervention), the covariates, and the continuous response (also known as outcome), respectively. We write $Y(A)$ to mean the potential response variable under the treatment A . We also assume that Y and $Y(A)$ are non-negative bounded variables, i.e., there exists $M > 0$ such that $0 \leq Y(a)$, $Y \leq M$. Finally, we let $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N$ be N independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) triples from a fixed underlying distribution, and the probability measure of the underlying distribution is denoted as \mathbb{P}_0 .

Further, we adopt the Rubin potential outcome framework (e.g., Rubin (1974); Imbens (2004); Imbens and Rubin (2015); Huang et al. (2021, 2024); Li et al. (2024)). Throughout the paper, we impose the following (*causal*) assumptions that are standard in the causal inference literature:

Assumption 1 (Consistency). *If $A = a$, we have $Y = Y(a)$.*

Assumption 2 (Unconfoundedness). $Y(a) \perp\!\!\!\perp A|X$, $\forall a$.

Assumption 3 (Positivity). *There exists a positive constant $\epsilon > 0$ such that $\inf_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \text{ess inf}_{x \in \mathcal{X}} f_0(a|x) \geq \epsilon > 0$.*

Additionally, we follow Kallus and Zhou (2018); Colangelo and Lee (2019) and impose differentiability assumptions on the probability density functions $f_0(y|a, x)$ and $f_0(a|x)$: $f_0(y|a, x)$ and $f_0(a|x)$ are three-times differentiable w.r.t. a and bounded uniformly on $(y, a, x) \in (\mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{X})$. All proofs of the theorems are in the Appendix[†].

2.2 Problem Setup

Our objective is to find a policy π^* that maps \mathcal{X} to \mathcal{A} within a policy class Π that maximizes the expected outcomes, i.e.,

$$\pi^* = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} Q(\pi) := \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_0}[Y(\pi(X))]. \quad (1)$$

[†]Available in the “proof” file of the Supplementary Material.

The learned policy obtained in Eqn. (1) may not generalize well to a new environment with a distribution that differs from \mathbb{P}_0 . As such, we can consider distributionally robust formulation of Eqn. (1):

$$\begin{aligned}\pi_{\text{DRO}}^* &= \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi), \quad \text{where} \\ Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) &= \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[Y(\pi(X))], \\ \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta) &= \{\mathbb{P} : \mathbb{D}(\mathbb{P} \parallel \mathbb{P}_0) \leq \eta\}.\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

Here, $\mathbb{D}(\cdot \parallel \cdot)$ denotes the distribution discrepancy. Throughout the paper, we choose it as the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence Kullback (1959); Kullback and Leibler (1951)[†]. $\mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta)$ is the *ambiguity set* (also known as the uncertainty set) with an *ambiguity radius* η . The ambiguity set contains all the possible distributions \mathbb{P} such that the discrepancy of \mathbb{P} relative to \mathbb{P}_0 is at most η .

3 Distributionally Robust Policy Evaluation

3.1 The Estimation of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$

As proven in Hu and Hong (2013), Eqn. (2) is equivalent to solving its Lagrangian dual, which is given as follows:

$$-\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{-Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + \alpha \eta \right\} = \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{-Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \alpha \eta \right\} := \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \phi(\pi, \alpha).\tag{3}$$

Since $Y(\pi(X))$ in Eqn. (3) is inaccessible, we reformulate $\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{-Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right]$ to an IPW form similar to that in Horvitz and Thompson (1952). The result is given in Lemma 1.

Lemma 1. *Under Assumptions 1 - 3, we have*

$$\mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{-Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\delta(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} e^{\frac{-Y}{\alpha}} \right]\tag{4}$$

for any $\alpha \geq 0$, where $\delta(\cdot)$ is the Dirac Delta function[†].

Using Lemma 1, the expectation in Eqn. (3) can be replaced according to Eqn. (4). Note that the Dirac function $\delta(\cdot)$ is a theoretical generalized function and is often approximated by the scaled kernel function $K_h(\cdot)$ [†]. As a result, we can consider the following approximated form:

$$Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] - \alpha \eta \right\}.\tag{5}$$

The above two quantities, $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ and $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$, bring two important insights: (1) The optimal solutions of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ and $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ are obtained by solving Eqns. (3) and (5) which are attainable for positive α

[†]Other measures such as the Wasserstein metric or other ϕ -divergence measures can be utilized (e.g., see Kuhn et al. (2019) and Husain et al. (2023)). However, these approaches typically involve solving multi-level optimization problems which can be challenging to analyze.

[†] $\delta(x) = \begin{cases} \infty & x = 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$ such that i) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta(x) dx = 1$ and ii) $\int_{\mathbb{R}} \delta(x) f(x) dx = f(0)$ for any arbitrary f defined on \mathbb{R} .

[†]A bounded differentiable function $K(\cdot)$ (i.e., $|K(\cdot)| \leq M_K$) is said to be a second-order kernel function if it satisfies i) $K(\cdot)$ is a symmetric function; ii) $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} u K(u) du = 0$; iii) $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} K(u) du = 1$. The scaled kernel function $K_h(\cdot)$ is defined such that $K_h(x) = \frac{1}{h} K\left(\frac{x}{h}\right)$, where h is termed as the *bandwidth* parameter. Note that $K_h(x) \xrightarrow{w} \delta(x)$ when $h \rightarrow 0$. Examples of kernels include Gaussian kernels or the Epanechnikov kernel.

due to the causal assumption. Further, the optimal solutions are finite for any π (see Auxiliary Result 2 in Appendix for details); (2) $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) \rightarrow Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ as $h \rightarrow 0$. These two insights, consequently, guarantee that the optimal solutions of $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ also converge to the optimal solutions of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$. Therefore, we can construct an estimator of the IPW-based distributionally robust value $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ to study the original distributionally robust value $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ in Eqn. (2). We define

$$\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}}. \quad (6a)$$

$$\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) = \frac{\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)}{S_N^h} = \frac{\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}}. \quad (6b)$$

It is known that the IPW-based estimator $\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ in Eqn. (6a) suffers from high-variance Swaminathan and Joachims (2015); Khan and Ugander (2023). To address this challenge, we can use a normalized estimator $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ with a normalization factor S_N^h in Eqn. (6b) to approximate $\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$. Note that $\mathbb{E}[S_N^h] = 1$ and $S_N^h \rightarrow 1$ almost surely (see Auxiliary Result 1 in Appendix). Thus, $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ is asymptotically equivalent to $\bar{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$. Consequently, we use the following $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ as the estimator of $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ in Eqn. (5):

$$\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \hat{\phi}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) := \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) - \alpha \eta \}. \quad (7)$$

$\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ can be used to evaluate distributional robustness of a policy π . To summarize, we present the specific steps of obtaining $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ in the following Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Distributionally robust policy evaluation

- 1: **Input** observed dataset $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N$, h , policy $\pi \in \Pi$. Initialize: $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup 0$.
- 2: **repeat**
- 3: Compute $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ given in Eqn. (6b).
- 4: Update α : $\alpha \leftarrow \alpha - \frac{\frac{\partial \hat{\phi}_N^h}{\partial \alpha}}{\frac{\partial^2 \hat{\phi}_N^h}{\partial \alpha^2}}$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \hat{\phi}_N^h}{\partial \alpha} &= -\eta - \log \hat{W}_N^h - \frac{\alpha \frac{\partial \hat{W}_N^h}{\partial \alpha}}{\hat{W}_N^h}, \\ \frac{\partial^2 \hat{\phi}_N^h}{\partial \alpha^2} &= -\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} Y_i^2 e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}}}{\alpha^3 S_N^h \hat{W}_N^h} + \frac{\alpha \left(\frac{\partial \hat{W}_N^h}{\partial \alpha} \right)^2}{(\hat{W}_N^h)^2}, \\ \frac{\partial \hat{W}_N^h}{\partial \alpha} &= \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} Y_i e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}}}{\alpha^2 S_N^h}. \end{aligned}$$

- 5: **until** α converges

- 6: **Return** $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) \leftarrow \hat{\pi}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$
-

3.2 The Statistical Property of $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$

As $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ is an estimator established using observed empirical samples, it is important to delve into the finite-sample statistical performance guarantee for the estimator $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$. To achieve this, we first discuss the theoretical property of \hat{W}_N^h in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $Nh \rightarrow \infty$ and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - B_\pi(\alpha) h^2 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha)),$$

where $B_\pi(\alpha) = \frac{\left(\int u^2 K(u) du \right)}{2} \times$ (8)

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)}{f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right],$$

$$\mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha) = \left(\int K(u)^2 du \right) \times$$

$$\left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] \right.$$

$$+ \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \right] \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right)^2$$

$$\left. - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The estimator \hat{W}_N^h is the key component of $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$, as shown in Eqn. (7). Consequently, based on the statistical property of \hat{W}_N^h , we can derive the asymptotic normality of $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ in Theorem 2.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $Nh \rightarrow \infty$ and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$. Furthermore, denote $\alpha_*(\pi)$ s.t. $\phi(\pi, \alpha_*(\pi)) \geq \phi(\pi, \alpha) \forall \alpha \geq 0$. Then we have*

$$\sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) + \frac{\alpha_*(\pi) B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}} \right]} h^2 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{\alpha_*^2(\pi) \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}} \right] \right)^2} \right).$$

A good choice of bandwidth is essential for effective policy learning and evaluation. We can use a rule-of-thumb bandwidth (see e.g., Su et al. (2019)), or select h^* by minimizing the asymptotic mean squared error (AMSE) (e.g., Kallus and Zhou (2018)) of $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$:

$$h^* := \arg \min \left[B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))^2 h^4 + \frac{\mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{Nh} \right]$$

$$\Rightarrow h^* = \left(\frac{\mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{4N B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))} \right)^{\frac{1}{5}} = \Theta(N^{-\frac{1}{5}}). \quad (10)$$

Empirically, we would follow the notions presented in Kallus and Zhou (2018), of which we choose the optimal bandwidth via a plug-in estimator.

4 Distributionally Robust Policy Learning

4.1 The Estimation of π_{DRO}^*

In the preceding section, we have established $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ as an estimator for $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$. Next, we aim to construct an estimator for the optimal policy π_{DRO}^* . Specifically, we derive $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ from $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ such that

$$\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) - \alpha \eta \}.$$

$\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ is the distributionally robust policy learned from $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$. To summarize, we present the specific steps of obtaining $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ in Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 2 Distributionally robust policy learning

- 1: **Input** observed dataset $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^N, h$. Initialize: $\pi \in \Pi$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^+ \cup 0$.
 - 2: **repeat**
 - 3: Compute $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ given in Eqn. (6b).
 - 4: Solve $\min_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ using any numerical methods. Update π : $\pi \leftarrow \arg \min_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$.
 - 5: Solve $\max_{\alpha \geq 0} \hat{\phi}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ using any numerical methods where $\hat{\phi}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ is given in Eqn. (7). Update α :
 $\alpha \leftarrow \arg \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \hat{\phi}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$.
 - 6: **until** α converges
 - 7: **Return** $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h \leftarrow \pi$
-

4.2 The Statistical Property of $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$

An essential aspect of our study is examining the statistical performance guarantee of $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$, which enables researchers to assess the gap between the learned policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ and the optimal distributionally robust policy $\pi_{\text{DRO}}^* = \max_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi} Q_{\text{DRO}}(\tilde{\pi})$. To achieve this, we use the distributionally robust regret defined in Definition 1 as the evaluation metric.

Definition 1. Let the optimal distributionally robust policy be $\pi_{\text{DRO}}^* = \arg \max_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi} Q_{\text{DRO}}(\tilde{\pi})$. The distributionally robust regret of a policy $\pi \in \Pi$, denoted by $R_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$, is then defined as

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) &= \max_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[Y(\tilde{\pi}(X))] - \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[Y(\pi(X))] \\ &= \max_{\tilde{\pi} \in \Pi} Q_{\text{DRO}}(\tilde{\pi}) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) = Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi). \end{aligned}$$

Before studying $R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h)$, we will now introduce the required notions of the Rademacher complexity and the covering number of a functional class Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014); Mohri et al. (2018); Wainwright (2019), which are stated in Definition 2.

Definition 2. Let \mathcal{F} be a family of real-valued functions f where $f : \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Given $Z_1, \dots, Z_N \in \mathcal{Z}$, the Rademacher complexity of \mathcal{F} is defined as $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F})$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) &= \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Z}}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_N(\mathcal{F})] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{Z}, \sigma} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i f(Z_i) \right| \right], \\ \hat{\mathcal{R}}_N(\mathcal{F}) &:= \mathbb{E}_{\sigma} \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i f(Z_i) \right| \middle| Z_1, \dots, Z_N \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_N$ are i.i.d. with the distribution $\mathbb{P}\{\sigma_i = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{\sigma_i = -1\} = \frac{1}{2}$. Additionally, consider a set $\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}$ in a metric space with metric $\|\cdot\|$. A set $\mathcal{A}_{\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is said to be a t -covering of \mathcal{F} if, for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $\tilde{f} \in \mathcal{A}_{\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}}$ such that $\|(f(X_1), \dots, f(X_N)) - (\tilde{f}(X_1), \dots, \tilde{f}(X_N))\| \leq t$. The size of the smallest t -covering, denoted by $\mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|)$, is the t -covering number.

With Definition 2, the regret $R_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ can be generally upper bounded as the following Theorem 3.

Theorem 3. Suppose that the kernel function $K(x)$ is bounded where $|K(x)| \leq M_K$. Given $\delta > 0$, $h > 0$, and a policy class Π , denote

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Pi} := \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi \right\},$$

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x} := \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M] \right\}.$$

Then, with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \leq \frac{4}{\epsilon} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}) + \frac{4}{\epsilon} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi}) + \frac{4\sqrt{2}M_K \sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{h\epsilon^2 \sqrt{N}} + O(h^2). \quad (11)$$

The Rademacher complexities in Eqn. (11) can be further bounded using covering numbers (see, for instance, Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014)). Under certain conditions, such as when the square root of the metric entropy (i.e., the logarithm of the covering number) is summable, we can bound $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x})$ and $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi})$ by the covering number of Π . This result is presented in detail in Corollary 4.

Corollary 4. If the kernel function $K(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L_K > 0$ (i.e., $|K(x) - K(y)| \leq L_K|x - y|$) and there exists a finite value κ which equals

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}(t, \Pi(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})} dt \right].$$

Then, for some constant \mathcal{K} , Eqn. (11) becomes

$$R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \leq \frac{288L_K \kappa}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} + \frac{192M_K(\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2})}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + \frac{4M_K \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + O(h^2). \quad (12)$$

Note that the distributionally robust regret is independent of η , as it is unaffected by the expectation term in the dual problem. In conjunction with Eqn. (10), selecting $h = O(N^{-\frac{1}{5}})$ in Corollary 4 ensures consistent learning of the optimal linear policy, as the distributionally robust regret $R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h)$ converges to zero when N tends to infinity.

To conclude this section, we discuss the covering numbers of various policy classes. A common policy class is the linear policy class, defined as $\Pi = \{\pi : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{A} | \pi(X) = w^\top X, \|w\|_p \leq a, \|X\|_q \leq b, w, X \in \mathbb{R}^d\}$. For instance, when $p = \infty$ and $q = 1$, we can demonstrate that

$$\mathfrak{N}(t, \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_\infty(\mathbb{P}_N)}) \leq \left(\frac{\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|X_i\|_1}{t} + 2 \right)^d.$$

Consequently, κ in Eqn. (12) is bounded above by $\sqrt{d} \left\{ \frac{2\sqrt{2}M_K h}{L_K} + 2\sqrt{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \mathbb{E} \left[\max_{1 \leq i \leq N} \|X_i\|_1 \right] \right\}$, as per its definition. Zhang (2002) provide the covering number of linear policy class for $2 \leq p < \infty$.

We can extend the study from linear policy classes to classes containing non-linear policies such as neural networks or support vector machines (SVMs). For example, shallow neural networks can be represented as linear functions composed with Lipschitz activations. The covering number for the class can be bounded by the Lipschitz constant and the linear class (Zhang, 2002; Anthony et al., 1999). Covering numbers for other classes can be found in sources such as (Bartlett et al., 2017).

5 Experiments

In this section, we mainly investigate the robustness of the proposed policy π_{DRO}^h against distribution shift. Our analysis includes two parts: simulation and empirical studies. First, in the ‘‘Simulation Experiment’’ subsection, we compare results under continuous treatments with those under discretized treatments, as well as outcomes with and without robustness. We evaluate these results in a distributionally robust manner to assess the policy’s performance under varying conditions. Following this, in the ‘‘Empirical Experiment’’ subsection, the experiments on Warfarin dataset compare the robustness performance of the robust and nonrobust policies. All experiments are run on a Dell 3640 with an Intel Xeon W-1290P 3.60GHz CPU[†].

5.1 Simulation Experiment

Continuous v.s. Discrete. We begin by comparing our distributionally robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ under continuous treatment with the distributionally robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis-}k}$, where the continuous treatment is discretized using the method proposed in Si et al. (2023) into k bins ($k \in 2, 3, 4$) based on the discretized strategy in Zhou et al. (2017). To enable a fair comparison between these two forms, we consider a simple data generating process with known optimal values. Specifically, we assume: $X \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$, $A|X \sim \text{Uniform}(X, X + 1)$, $Y = 5 + X/A + \epsilon$, $\epsilon \sim \text{Uniform}(0, 1)$. We define the policy class Π as $\{\beta X : 1 \leq \beta \leq 3\}$, and set the ambiguity radius $\eta = 0.05$. With these specifications, we compute the optimal distributionally robust value $Q^* = \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \inf_{\mathbb{P} \in \mathcal{U}_{\mathbb{P}_0}(\eta)} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}}[Y(\pi(X))]$, which evaluates to 6.41 using numerical approaches.

For the bandwidth parameter h , we follow the approach of selecting the bandwidth as given by Kallus and Zhou (2018) using a plug-in estimator based on Eqn. (10). We generate 100 different datasets, each consisting of 2500 training samples and 2500 test samples.

For policy learning on training data, both $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ and $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis-}k}$ are learned using $\eta^{\text{train}} = 0.05$. We then compute $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h)$ and $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis-}k})$ on the test data and compare the results. For various $\eta^{\text{test}} \in \{0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4\}$, $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h)$ is estimated according to Algorithm 1, while $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis-}k})$ is estimated by solving $\max_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \hat{W}_N(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis-}k}, \alpha) - \alpha \eta\}$. Here $\hat{W}_N(\pi, \alpha) =$

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\pi(X_i)=A_i\}} e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}}}{\hat{p}_0(A_i|X_i)} \right) / \left(\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{1}_{\{\pi(X_j)=A_j\}}}{\hat{p}_0(A_j|X_j)} \right)$$

and $\hat{p}_0(A|X)$ is the estimated probability of receiving treatment A conditioning on X . The results given in Table 1 indicate that the learned policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$ achieves the best robust performance when evaluated using the \hat{Q}_{DRO}^h metric (see the first row of Table 1). Furthermore, the mean value 6.24 exhibits a significantly smaller gap with the optimal distributionally robust value of 6.41 compared to the discrete-treatment policies evaluated using $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^{\text{dis}}$.

Robust v.s. Nonrobust. We then compare our distributionally robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}$ with the non-robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{\text{NRO}} \in \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{W}_N^h(\pi)$, where $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi) = \frac{\bar{W}_N^h(\pi)}{S_N^h}$ and $\bar{W}_N^h(\pi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i)-A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} Y_i$, as given in Kallus and Zhou (2018), with $\Pi = \{\zeta^\top X : \|\zeta\|_\infty \leq 2\}$. We follow Kallus and Zhou (2018) to simulate

[†]The code for the experiments can be found at <https://github.com/cleung87/Distributionally-Robust-Policy-Evaluation-and-Learning-for-Continuous-Treatment-with-Observed-Data>.

		η^{test}				
		0.05	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
		6.24±0.32	6.19±0.33	6.11±0.36	6.04±0.38	5.99±0.40
		5.88±0.15	5.81±0.15	5.71±0.15	5.64±0.15	5.58±0.15
		5.85±0.12	5.79±0.12	5.70±0.12	5.63±0.12	5.58±0.12
		5.83±0.12	5.77±0.12	5.68±0.12	5.61±0.12	5.56±0.12

Table 1: Comparison of robustness performance (continuous v.s. discrete) with $\eta^{train} = 0.05$ for policy learning and various η^{test} for policy evaluation. When $\eta^{train} = \eta^{test} = 0.05$, the optimal distributionally robust value is $Q^* = 6.41$. The reported Mean \pm Standard Error (the Standard Error is in %) is computed over 100 runs. The first/second/third/fourth row records values produced by $\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^h)/\hat{Q}_{DRO}^{dis}(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{dis-2})/\hat{Q}_{DRO}^{dis}(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{dis-3})/\hat{Q}_{DRO}^{dis}(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{dis-4})$.

i.i.d. data as follows: $X_k \sim \text{Uniform}(-0.2, 0.2)$ for $k = 1$ to 10, $A|X \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X, 0.1) + X_1 + 2X_2 - 3X_3$, and $Y = 5 + \beta_1^\top X + \beta_2^\top XA + \beta_3 A$. Here, $\theta, \beta_1, \beta_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{10}$ such that $\theta^\top = \beta_1^\top = \beta_2^\top = \mathbf{1}^{10} := [1, \dots, 1]^\top$, $\beta_3 = 1$. To induce sparsity, we randomly set three dimensions of the coefficients β_1^\top and β_2^\top and two dimensions of θ^\top to zero. For the bandwidth parameter h , we follow the approach of selecting the bandwidth as given by Kallus and Zhou (2018) using a plug-in estimator based on Eqn. (10). We repeat the data generating process to create 100 different datasets, each consisting of N_{train} ($N_{train} \in 500, 1000, 1500, 2000, 2500$) training samples and $N_{test} = 2000$ test samples.

For policy learning on the training data, both $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^h$ and $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$ are learned within a linear policy class, and $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}$ is learned with $\eta^{train} = 0.2$, denoted by $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2}$. For policy evaluation on the test data, in addition to the evaluation metric $\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\pi)$ (Eqn. (7)), we also introduce another metric $\hat{Q}_{pert}(\pi)$ based on a data perturbation strategy. For each of the total 100 original datasets, we perturb each original test dataset $(X_i, A_i, Y_i)_{i=1}^{N_{test}}$ to obtain a new dataset $(\tilde{X}_i, \tilde{A}_i, \tilde{Y}_i)_{i=1}^{N_{test}}$ such that the new dataset lies within a KL-ball centred at the original test dataset with a radius η^{test} , introducing a distribution shift in the new dataset relative to the original test dataset. Then we can evaluate each policy using $\hat{Q}_{pert}(\pi) = \min_{1 \leq j \leq 100} \left\{ \frac{1}{N_{test}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{test}} \tilde{Y}_i^{(j)}(\pi(\tilde{X}_i^{(j)})) \right\}$.

The results presented in Table 2 and Table 3 demonstrate that $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2}$ exhibits superior robustness compared to the non-robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$. Specifically, $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2}$ showcases significantly lower sensitivity to data perturbations than $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$, consistently achieving higher reward in most cases. Moreover, in Table 2, as the level of data perturbation η^{test} increases from 0.05 to 0.4, $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2}$ shows more stable performance than $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$. Notably, in Table 3, even with an increase in training sample size, $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$ shows no improvement when faced with a distribution shift η^{test} . In contrast, $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2}$ demonstrates significant improvement as the number of training samples increases.

5.2 Empirical Experiment - The Warfarin Case Study

Description. We follow Kallus and Zhou (2018) to conduct a semi-synthetic study using the Warfarin dataset Consortium (2009). The dataset contains 5528 patients’ medical records, including personal information (e.g., age, gender, race, height, weight), medical problems (e.g., comorbidities and diabetes), medical medication history (e.g., aspirin, atorvastatin, etc.), and their genotypes. The dataset also provides the suggested treatment dose (therapeutic dose).

η^{test}				
0.05	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.4
5.66±12.06	5.60±11.97	5.52±11.85	5.45±11.77	5.40±11.70
5.05±8.68	4.99±8.60	4.91±8.50	4.85±8.44	4.80±8.39
5.48±15.46	5.47±15.46	5.46±15.46	5.45±15.47	5.44±15.47
5.02±10.37	5.01±10.36	5.00±10.34	4.99±10.33	4.98±10.32

Table 2: Comparison of robustness performance (robust v.s. nonrobust) with $\eta^{train} = 0.2$ and $N_{train} = 2000$ for policy learning and various η^{test} for policy evaluation. The reported Mean \pm Standard Error (the Standard Error is in %) is computed over 100 runs. The first/second/third/fourth row records values produced by $\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2})/\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\hat{\pi}_{NRO})/\hat{Q}_{pert}^h(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2})/\hat{Q}_{pert}^h(\hat{\pi}_{NRO})$.

N_{train}				
500	1000	1500	2000	2500
5.19±11.45	5.32±11.55	5.43±14.31	5.48±12.04	5.52±11.85
4.85±8.19	4.79±8.10	4.83±7.95	4.84±7.86	4.91±8.50
4.94±15.64	5.12±16.70	5.19±15.82	5.21±16.05	5.46±15.46
4.95±10.46	4.99±10.16	5.02±10.34	5.00±10.35	5.00±10.34

Table 3: Comparison of robustness performance (robust vs. nonrobust) for various N_{train} . η is chosen as 0.2 for both policy learning and evaluation. The reported Mean \pm Standard Error (the Standard Error is in %) is computed over 100 runs. The first/second/third/fourth row records values due to $\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2})/\hat{Q}_{DRO}^h(\hat{\pi}_{NRO})/\hat{Q}_{pert}^h(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.2})/\hat{Q}_{pert}^h(\hat{\pi}_{NRO})$.

Setting. We employ a random forest regressor on the therapeutic dose and select 41-dimensional covariates based on the feature importance ranking. There are 3306 samples after dropping those with missing values. The observed dataset is generated as follows: $A|X \sim \mathcal{N}(\theta^\top X + 1, 0.1)$ and $Y = 5 + \beta_1^\top X + \beta_2^\top X A + \epsilon$, where $\beta_1, \beta_2, \theta \in \mathbb{R}^p$ (with $p = 41$ in our setting), $\beta_1^\top = 0.2 \cdot \mathbf{1}^p$, $\beta_2^\top = 0.1 \cdot \mathbf{1}^p$, $\theta^\top = 0.1 \cdot \mathbf{1}^p$. We also assume $\Pi = \{\zeta^\top X : \|\zeta\|_\infty \leq 2\}$. We again follow the approach of selecting the bandwidth as given by Kallus and Zhou (2018) using a plug-in estimator based on Eqn. (10). To create distribution shifts, we split the training and test data based on patients’ age information. We select 1983 patients aged 10-69 as the training set and 1323 patients older than 70 as the test set. We repeat this process 1000 times to create a total of 1000 semi-synthetic Warfarin datasets.

Results. We learn a non-robust policy $\hat{\pi}_{NRO}$ and robust policies $\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta}$ for $\eta \in \{0.3, 0.4, 0.5, 0.6, 0.7\}$ on the training set, and we evaluate the six policies on test set based on the sample averaged potential outcome: $\hat{Q}_{mean}(\pi) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N Y_i(\pi(X_i))$. Consequently, we obtain 1000 values of $\hat{Q}_{\mathcal{M}}(\pi)$ w.r.t. each of the six policies. We then report the mean, standard error, and the 5th/10th/15th/20th/25th/30th percentile of the total 1000 values in Table 4.

Table 4 demonstrates four important insights: (1) $\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{DRO}^{h,\eta=0.3})$ exhibits a comparable mean value to $\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{NRO})$. (2) The expected reward initially increases, reaching the optimal (e.g., when $\eta^{train} \in \{0.4, 0.5\}$), and then decreases with larger η . This trend is reasonable, as a very small η neglects the robustness effect and results in a relatively aggressive policy, while a very large η results in an overly conservative policy[†]. (3) The standard error of all robust policies is smaller than that of the non-robust policy.

[†]Determining the optimal η is beyond the scope of this study and is left for future work. Some useful guidances are provided. For example, Pardo (2018) show that the distance $\mathbb{D}(\cdot)$ is asymptotically χ^2 distributed which enables us to select proper η .

Mean	SE	percentile					
		5 th	10 th	15 th	20 th	25 th	30 th
6.377	4.5	4.058	4.525	4.887	5.114	5.350	5.605
6.372	4.3	4.054	4.648	5.020	5.298	5.533	5.703
6.454	4.3	4.244	4.653	5.086	5.306	5.523	5.737
6.409	4.5	4.112	4.552	4.884	5.212	5.449	5.671
6.355	4.5	4.085	4.536	4.774	5.106	5.344	5.548
6.350	4.4	4.092	4.613	4.908	5.240	5.434	5.620

Table 4: Comparison of the rewards of robust and nonrobust policies in Warfarin study. The reported result are computed over 1000 runs. Note that the SE in the table represents the Standard Error which is reported in %. The first/second/third/fourth/fifth/sixth row records values produced by $\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{NRO}})/\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{h,\eta=0.3})/\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{h,\eta=0.4})/\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{h,\eta=0.5})/\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{h,\eta=0.6})/\hat{Q}_{mean}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^{h,\eta=0.7})$.

(4) From the percentile results, most robust policies outperform the non-robust policy in “bad” scenarios, underscoring the robustness of the proposed $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$.

6 Conclusion, Limitation and Future Work

Conclusion. We investigate offline policy evaluation and learning under continuous treatment in the distributionally robust optimization (DRO) setting. We propose an estimator, $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$, for offline policy evaluation and obtain a distributionally robust policy, $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$, based on $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$. We study the asymptotic distribution and the statistical guarantee of $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ and $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h$. Experimental results demonstrate the superior performance of our approach.

Future Work and Limitations. The proposed framework can be applied in various fields where distribution shifts occur in the context of continuous-valued treatments. For instance, doctors may seek to determine a robust dosage that minimizes potential disease risks for target patients, while policymakers might aim to establish a robust credit-increasing strategy that maximizes potential consumption for target customers. Thus, applying our framework to real-world scenarios represents a significant next step. Additionally, several potential technical investigations can be further explored. First, selecting the divergence measures and determining the ambiguity radius for the distributional ambiguity set pose significant challenges in both the Operations Research and Machine Learning communities. Future research would benefit from establishing statistical guarantees for other metrics (e.g., Wasserstein metric) and offering guidance on setting the radius for policy evaluation and learning. Second, exploring methods for the generalized propensity score when it is unknown would be interesting. Third, expanding our framework to include the doubly robust estimator might improve the convergence rate of policy learning. Lastly, strictly limiting the policy class to linear functions may fail to capture complex relationships between covariates and treatment, leading to suboptimal results. Considering broader policy classes (e.g., nonlinear policy classes with infinite VC dimensions) is therefore essential.

7 Acknowledgements

Qi WU acknowledges the support from The CityU-JD Digits Joint Laboratory in Financial Technology and Engineering and The Hong Kong Research Grants Council [General Research Fund 11219420/9043008]. The work described in this paper was partially supported by the InnoHK initiative, the Government of the HKSAR, and the Laboratory for AI-Powered Financial Technologies.

References

- Anthony, M., Bartlett, P. L., Bartlett, P. L., et al. (1999). *Neural network learning: Theoretical foundations*, volume 9. Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- Araujo, A. and Giné, E. (1980). *The Central Limit Theorem for Real and Banach Valued Random Variables*. Probability and Statistics Series. Wiley.
- Athey, S. and Wager, S. (2021). Policy learning with observational data. *Econometrica*, 89(1):133–161.
- Bahadori, T., Tchetgen, E. T., and Heckerman, D. (2022). End-to-end balancing for causal continuous treatment-effect estimation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1313–1326. PMLR.
- Bartlett, P. L., Foster, D. J., and Telgarsky, M. J. (2017). Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.
- Bica, I., Jordon, J., and van der Schaar, M. (2020). Estimating the effects of continuous-valued interventions using generative adversarial networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:16434–16445.
- Chen, Z., Sim, M., and Xu, H. (2019). Distributionally robust optimization with infinitely constrained ambiguity sets. *Operations Research*, 67(5):1328–1344.
- Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. (2018). Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters. *The Econometrics Journal*, 21(1):C1–C68.
- Colangelo, K. and Lee, Y.-Y. (2019). Double debiased machine learning nonparametric inference with continuous treatments. Technical report, Centre for Microdata Methods and Practice, Institute for Fiscal Studies.
- Consortium, I. W. P. (2009). Estimation of the warfarin dose with clinical and pharmacogenetic data. *New England Journal of Medicine*, 360(8):753–764.
- Delage, E. and Ye, Y. (2010). Distributionally robust optimization under moment uncertainty with application to data-driven problems. *Operations research*, 58(3):595–612.
- Dudík, M., Langford, J., and Li, L. (2011). Doubly robust policy evaluation and learning. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’11*, page 1097–1104, Madison, WI, USA. Omnipress.
- Faury, L., Tanielian, U., Dohmatob, E., Smirnova, E., and Vasile, F. (2020). Distributionally robust counterfactual risk minimization. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(04):3850–3857.
- Gao, R., Chen, X., and Kleywegt, A. J. (2022). Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization and variation regularization. *Operations Research*.
- Horvitz, D. G. and Thompson, D. J. (1952). A generalization of sampling without replacement from a finite universe. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 47(260):663–685.
- Hu, Z. and Hong, L. J. (2013). Kullback-leibler divergence constrained distributionally robust optimization. *Optimization Online*, 1(2):9.
- Huang, Y., Leung, C. H., Ma, S., Yuan, Z., Wu, Q., Wang, S., Wang, D., and Huang, Z. (2023). Towards balanced representation learning for credit policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3677–3692. PMLR.
- Huang, Y., Leung, C. H., Wu, Q., Yan, X., Ma, S., Yuan, Z., Wang, D., and Huang, Z. (2022). Robust causal learning for the estimation of average treatment effects. In *2022 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–9. IEEE.

- Huang, Y., Leung, C. H., Yan, X., Wu, Q., Peng, N., Wang, D., and Huang, Z. (2021). The causal learning of retail delinquency. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 35(1):204–212.
- Huang, Y., Siyi, W., Leung, C. H., Qi, W., Dongdong, W., and Huang, Z. (2024). Dignet: Learning decomposed patterns in representation balancing for treatment effect estimation. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*.
- Husain, H., Nguyen, V., and van den Hengel, A. (2023). Distributionally robust bayesian optimization with φ -divergences. In Oh, A., Naumann, T., Globerson, A., Saenko, K., Hardt, M., and Levine, S., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 20133–20145. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Imbens, G. W. (2004). Nonparametric estimation of average treatment effects under exogeneity: A review. *Review of Economics and statistics*, 86(1):4–29.
- Imbens, G. W. and Rubin, D. B. (2015). *Causal inference in statistics, social, and biomedical sciences*. Cambridge university press.
- Kallus, N. (2018). Balanced policy evaluation and learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.
- Kallus, N., Mao, X., Wang, K., and Zhou, Z. (2022). Doubly robust distributionally robust off-policy evaluation and learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 10598–10632. PMLR.
- Kallus, N. and Zhou, A. (2018). Policy evaluation and optimization with continuous treatments. In *International conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1243–1251. PMLR.
- Khan, S. and Ugander, J. (2023). Adaptive normalization for ipw estimation. *Journal of Causal Inference*, 11(1):20220019.
- Kitagawa, T. and Tetenov, A. (2018). Who should be treated? empirical welfare maximization methods for treatment choice. *Econometrica*, 86(2):591–616.
- Kuhn, D., Esfahani, P. M., Nguyen, V. A., and Shafieezadeh-Abadeh, S. (2019). Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization: Theory and applications in machine learning. In *Operations research & management science in the age of analytics*, pages 130–166. Informs.
- Kullback, S. (1959). *Information Theory and Statistics*. Wiley, New York.
- Kullback, S. and Leibler, R. A. (1951). On information and sufficiency. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 22(1):79–86.
- Li, L., Chu, W., Langford, J., and Schapire, R. E. (2010). A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *Proceedings of the 19th international conference on World wide web*, pages 661–670.
- Li, Y., Leung, C. H., Sun, X., Wang, C., Huang, Y., Yan, X., Wu, Q., Wang, D., and Huang, Z. (2024). The causal impact of credit lines on spending distributions. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(1):180–187.
- Mo, W., Qi, Z., and Liu, Y. (2021). Learning optimal distributionally robust individualized treatment rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 116(534):659–674.
- Mohri, M., Rostamizadeh, A., and Talwalkar, A. (2018). *Foundations of machine learning*. MIT press.
- Pardo, L. (2018). *Statistical inference based on divergence measures*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.
- Qin, R.-J., Zhang, X., Gao, S., Chen, X.-H., Li, Z., Zhang, W., and Yu, Y. (2022). Neorl: A near real-world benchmark for offline reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:24753–24765.

- Rubin, D. B. (1974). Estimating causal effects of treatments in randomized and nonrandomized studies. *Journal of educational Psychology*, 66(5):688.
- Schwab, P., Linhardt, L., Bauer, S., Buhmann, J. M., and Karlen, W. (2020). Learning counterfactual representations for estimating individual dose-response curves. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 34(04):5612–5619.
- Shalev-Shwartz, S. and Ben-David, S. (2014). *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press.
- Shen, Y., Xu, P., and Zavlanos, M. (2024). Wasserstein distributionally robust policy evaluation and learning for contextual bandits. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*. Featured Certification.
- Si, N., Zhang, F., Zhou, Z., and Blanchet, J. (2023). Distributionally robust batch contextual bandits. *Management Science*, 69(10):5772–5793.
- Su, L., Ura, T., and Zhang, Y. (2019). Non-separable models with high-dimensional data. *Journal of Econometrics*, 212(2):646–677.
- Swaminathan, A. and Joachims, T. (2015). The self-normalized estimator for counterfactual learning. *advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.
- Tang, S. and Wiens, J. (2021). Model selection for offline reinforcement learning: Practical considerations for healthcare settings. In *Machine Learning for Healthcare Conference*, pages 2–35. PMLR.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. (2000). *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press.
- Wainwright, M. J. (2019). *High-dimensional statistics: A non-asymptotic viewpoint*, volume 48. Cambridge university press.
- Wooldridge, J. M. (2007). Inverse probability weighted estimation for general missing data problems. *Journal of econometrics*, 141(2):1281–1301.
- Yang, Z., Guo, Y., Xu, P., Liu, A., and Anandkumar, A. (2023). Distributionally robust policy gradient for offline contextual bandits. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 6443–6462. PMLR.
- Zhang, T. (2002). Covering number bounds of certain regularized linear function classes. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 2:527–550.
- Zhao, Y., Zeng, D., Rush, A. J., and Kosorok, M. R. (2012). Estimating individualized treatment rules using outcome weighted learning. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 107(499):1106–1118.
- Zhou, X., Mayer-Hamblett, N., Khan, U., and Kosorok, M. R. (2017). Residual weighted learning for estimating individualized treatment rules. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 112(517):169–187.
- Zhou, Z., Athey, S., and Wager, S. (2023). Offline multi-action policy learning: Generalization and optimization. *Operations Research*, 71(1):148–183.
- Zymler, S., Kuhn, D., and Rustem, B. (2013). Distributionally robust joint chance constraints with second-order moment information. *Mathematical Programming*, 137:167–198.

A Proofs

Before presenting the proofs of our main results in the paper, we present the necessary auxiliary results in Section ‘Auxiliary Results’. The proofs of the main results are given in Section ‘Proofs of results in the main paper’.

A.0.1 Auxiliary Results

We present the auxiliary results that are required when proving the results in the main paper.

Auxiliary Result 1 - Convergence Studies of S_N^h

Proposition 1. *Given that $S_N^h = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}$. We have:*

1. if $N \rightarrow \infty, h \rightarrow 0, \frac{1}{Nh} \rightarrow 0$, then $S_N^h \xrightarrow{P} 1$;
2. if $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $Nh^2 \rightarrow \infty$, then $S_N^h \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$.

Proof of Claim 1. Note that $\mathbb{P}\{|S_N^h - 1| \geq \gamma\} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|S_N^h - 1|^2]}{\gamma^2}$. We consider the term $\mathbb{E}[|S_N^h - 1|^2]$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[|S_N^h - 1|^2] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - 1\right)\right|^2\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - 1\right)^2\right] \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^N \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - 1\right) \times \left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} - 1\right)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} - 1\right)^2\right] + \frac{N(N-1)}{N^2} O(h^4). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Note that

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} - 1\right)^2\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)}\right] - 2\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right] + 1.$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} \middle| X\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\int K_h^2(\pi(X) - a) \tilde{g}_0(a, y, X) dy da\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}\left[\int K^2(u) \left\{\tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) + \partial_a \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) u h + \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X)}{2} u^2 h^2 + O_P(h^3)\right\} dy du\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \left(\int \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy\right) + \left(\int u^2 K^2(u) du\right) \left(\frac{\int \partial_{aa}^2 \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy}{2}\right) h^2 + O_P(h^3)\right] \\ &= \frac{1}{h} \left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\int \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy\right)\right] + \frac{1}{h} \left(\int u^2 K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\int \partial_{aa}^2 \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy}{2}\right)\right] h^2 + O(h^2) \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \middle| X\right]\right] = \mathbb{E}\left[\int K_h(\pi(X) - a) g_0(a, y, X) dy da\right] \\ &= 1 + \left(\int u^2 K(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\left(\frac{\int \partial_{aa}^2 g_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy}{2}\right)\right] h^2 + O(h^3). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\tilde{g}_0(a, y, X) = \frac{f_0(y|a, X)}{f_0(a|X)}$ and $g_0(a, y, X) = f_0(y|a, X)$ such that $\partial_a \tilde{g}_0(a, y, X)$, $\partial_a g_0(a, y, X)$, $\partial_{aa}^2 \tilde{g}_0(a, y, X)$, and $\partial_{aa}^2 g_0(a, y, X)$ are the first-order derivative of $\tilde{g}_0(a, y, X)$, the first-order derivative of $g_0(a, y, X)$, the second-order derivative of $\tilde{g}_0(a, y, X)$, and the second-order derivative of $g_0(a, y, X)$ respectively. Substituting the above two results into Eqn. (14), we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\{|S_N^h - 1| \geq \gamma\} &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[|S_N^h - 1|^2]}{\gamma^2} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\gamma^2 N h} \left(\int K^2(u) du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{h^2}{\gamma^2 N h} \left(\int u^2 K^2(u) du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\int \partial_{aa}^2 \tilde{g}_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy}{2} \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{h^2}{N \gamma^2}\right) - \frac{2}{N \gamma^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\int g_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy \right)^2 \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{2}{N \gamma^2} \left(\int u^2 K(u) du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{\int \partial_{aa}^2 g_0(\pi(X), y, X) dy}{2} \right)^2 \right] h^2 \\ &\quad + O\left(\frac{h^3}{N \gamma^2}\right) + \frac{1}{N \gamma^2} + \frac{1}{\gamma^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{N}\right) O(h^4) \rightarrow 0 \end{aligned}$$

according to the given conditions.

Proof of Claim 2. We prove the assertion using Hoeffding's Inequality. Indeed, for each h , since $0 \leq \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \leq \frac{M_K}{h\epsilon}$, by Hoeffding's Inequality, we then obtain

$$\mathbb{P}\left\{\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right]\right| \geq \gamma\right\} \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{2N h^2 \epsilon^2 \gamma^2}{M_K^2}\right). \quad (15)$$

Usual derivations show that $\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right] = 1 + o(h^2)$. Thus, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, for $N \geq \frac{M_K^2}{2h^2 \epsilon^2 \gamma^2} \log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + o(h^2) - \gamma &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \leq 1 + o(h^2) + \gamma \\ \text{or} \quad &\left(\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - 1\right| \leq o(h^2) + \gamma\right). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Taking the infinite sum on both sides of Eqn. (15), we also have

$$\sum_{N=1}^{\infty} \mathbb{P}\left\{\left|\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right]\right| \geq \gamma\right\} \leq 2 \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} e^{-\frac{2N h^2 \epsilon^2 \gamma^2}{M_K^2}} = 2 \frac{e^{-\frac{2\epsilon^2 h^2 \gamma^2}{M_K^2}}}{1 - e^{-\frac{2\epsilon^2 h^2 \gamma^2}{M_K^2}}} < \infty.$$

Hence, we can conclude that

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right] \xrightarrow{a.s.} 0.$$

When $h \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1.$$

□

Auxiliary Result 2 - Optimal Solutions Studies of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ and $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$

Define

$$Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) = -\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{\frac{-Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + \alpha \eta \right\} \quad \text{and}$$

$$Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = -\sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] + \alpha \eta \right\}.$$

We therefore analyse the following four functions of α :

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\phi}_0(\alpha) &= \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\alpha Y}], & \bar{\phi}_0(\alpha) &= \log \mathbb{E}[Z e^{-\alpha Y}], \\ \tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha) &= \alpha \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] + \alpha \eta, & \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha) &= \alpha \log \mathbb{E}[Z e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] + \alpha \eta, \end{aligned}$$

where $Z > 0$ and $Z = \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}$. First, we study the convexity of $\tilde{\phi}_0(\alpha)$ and $\bar{\phi}_0(\alpha)$. The corresponding results are summarized in Proposition 2.

Proposition 2. *Suppose that $\mathbb{V}(Y) > 0$. Then we have*

1. *the functions $\tilde{\phi}_0(\alpha)$ and $\tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ are convex functions;*
2. *the functions $\bar{\phi}_0(\alpha)$ and $\bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ are convex functions.*

Proof. We only prove Claim 2 of Proposition 2 since Claim 1 follows immediately after setting $Z = 1$ in the proofs. For $\lambda \in [0, 1]$, α and $\bar{\alpha}$ are two arbitrary values where $\alpha \neq \bar{\alpha}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\phi}_0(\lambda\alpha + (1-\lambda)\bar{\alpha}) &= \log \mathbb{E}[Z \exp(-(\lambda\alpha + (1-\lambda)\bar{\alpha})Y)] \\ &= \log \mathbb{E}[Z \exp(-\lambda\alpha Y) \exp(-(1-\lambda)\bar{\alpha}Y)] \\ &= \log \mathbb{E}[Z^\lambda Z^{1-\lambda} \exp(-\lambda\alpha Y) \exp(-(1-\lambda)\bar{\alpha}Y)] \\ &\stackrel{\star}{\leq} \log(\mathbb{E}[(Z^\lambda e^{-\lambda\alpha Y})^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}])^\lambda (\mathbb{E}[(Z^{1-\lambda} e^{-(1-\lambda)\bar{\alpha}Y})^{\frac{1}{1-\lambda}}])^{1-\lambda} \\ &= \lambda \log(\mathbb{E}[Z e^{-\alpha Y}]) + (1-\lambda) \log \mathbb{E}[Z e^{-\bar{\alpha}Y}] \\ &= \lambda \bar{\phi}_0(\alpha) + (1-\lambda) \bar{\phi}_0(\bar{\alpha}). \end{aligned}$$

Again, \star is due to Hölder's inequality, and the equality in \leq holds if and only if $Z e^{-\alpha Y} = k Z e^{-\bar{\alpha}Y}$ for some constant k . Since $\mathbb{V}(Y) > 0$, we conclude that $\bar{\phi}_0(\alpha)$ is a strictly convex function.

Next, note that $\bar{\phi}_1(\alpha) = \alpha \bar{\phi}_0(\frac{1}{\alpha}) + \alpha \eta$. Since $\bar{\phi}_0(\alpha)$ is strictly convex function, we have $\alpha \bar{\phi}_0(\frac{1}{\alpha})$ is strictly convex. Together with the fact that $\alpha \eta$ is convex, we conclude that $\bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ is strictly convex since it equals $\alpha \bar{\phi}_0(\frac{1}{\alpha}) + \alpha \eta$. \square

Proposition 3.

1. *The optimal solution of*

$$\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha) = \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] + \alpha \eta \}$$

is finite;

2. *Denote $f_0(y|a, x)$ as the conditional density function of the variable Y conditioning on A and X . Suppose that $\partial_a^i f_0(y|a, X)$ is bounded uniformly for any (y, a, X) where $0 \leq i \leq N + 1$. The optimal solution of $\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha) = \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \right] + \alpha \eta \right\}$ is finite.*

Proof. We prove Claim 2 first.

Proof of Claim 2 We now consider the asymptotic properties of $\frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha}$. Note that

$$\frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} = \eta + \log \mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] + \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}]}.$$

When $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, since Y is bounded, $\log \mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] \rightarrow \log \mathbb{E}[Z]$. Further, we can also show that $\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}]} \rightarrow$

0. Hence, $\frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} > 0$. We then study the case when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. First, denote $f_Y(\cdot)$ be the density of variable Y . Since $0 \leq Y \leq M$ and it is a continuous variable, $f_Y(\cdot)$ is continuous on a compact interval $[0, M]$ such that $\max_{x \in [0, M]} f_Y(x)$ and $\min_{x \in [0, M]} f_Y(x)$ are finite. Denote $\bar{b} = \max_{x \in [0, M]} f_Y(x)$ and $\underline{b} = \min_{x \in [0, M]} f_Y(x)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] &\lesssim \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] = \int_0^M e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} f(y) dy \leq \bar{b} \int_0^M e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} dy \leq \bar{b} \int_0^\infty e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} dy = \bar{b}\alpha \\ \Rightarrow \log \mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] &\lesssim \log \bar{b}\alpha \Rightarrow \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \log \mathbb{E}[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] = -\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Second, since $Z = \frac{K_h(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0(A|X)}$ and $\partial_a^i f_0(y|a, X)$ is bounded uniformly for any (y, a, X) where $0 \leq i \leq N+1$ (i.e., $\underline{b}^i \leq \inf_{y, a, X} |\partial_a^i f_0(y|a, X)| \leq \partial_a^i f_0(y|a, X) \leq \sup_{y, a, X} |\partial_a^i f_0(y|a, X)| \leq \bar{b}^i$), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right] &= \sum_{i=0}^N \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \partial_a^i f_0(y|\pi(X), X) dy\right]}{i!} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i \\ &\quad + \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \partial_a^{N+1} f_0(y|\theta(X), X) dy\right]}{(N+1)!} \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^{N+1} K(u) du\right) h^{N+1} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{1}{i!} \left(\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \bar{b}^i dy\right) \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i \\ &\leq \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \left(\int_0^\infty \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} dy\right) \leq \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \alpha. \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can write

$$\mathbb{E}\left[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right] = \sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{1}{i!} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^M e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \partial_a^i f_0(y|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dy\right] \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i,$$

where $\tilde{\theta}(X) = \begin{cases} \pi(X) & \text{if } 0 \leq i \leq N \\ \theta(X) & \text{if } i = N + 1 \end{cases}$. Finally, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]} &\leq \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \alpha}{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \partial_a^i f_0(y|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dy\right]} \\ &= \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!}}{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq \frac{M}{\alpha}\}} z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(z\alpha|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dz\right]}. \end{aligned}$$

Note that given X , $\mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq \frac{M}{\alpha}\}} z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(z\alpha|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) \rightarrow z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(0|\tilde{\theta}(X), X)$ when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. Since

$$\int_0^\infty z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(0|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dz = \partial_a^i f_0(0|\tilde{\theta}(X), X),$$

we can conclude that

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq \frac{M}{\alpha}\}} z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(z\alpha|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dz\right] \text{ is finite}$$

using the Lebesgue convergence theorem. Denote

$$\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^\infty \mathbf{1}_{\{z \leq \frac{M}{\alpha}\}} z e^{-z} \partial_a^i f_0(z\alpha|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dz\right] = c_i.$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]} &\leq \limsup_{\alpha \geq 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{ZY}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[Ze^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]} \\ &\leq \limsup_{\alpha \geq 0} \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \alpha}{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!} \mathbb{E}\left[\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \partial_a^i f_0(y|\tilde{\theta}(X), X) dy\right]} \rightarrow \frac{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{\bar{b}^i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}{i!}}{\sum_{i=0}^{N+1} \frac{1}{i!} c_i \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}} u^i K(u) du\right) h^i}, \end{aligned}$$

which is a finite quantity. As such, we can conclude that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \rightarrow -\infty$.

From the above analysis, we know that $\bar{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ is a strictly convex function such that it decreases first and then increases. The optimal point is finite.

Proof of Claim 1 The arguments are almost the same when we replace Z with 1 when presenting the proof of Claim 2. The only difference is bounding the quantity $\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Y}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}$:

$$\frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Y}{\alpha}e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]} = \frac{\int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} f_Y(y) dy}{\int_0^M e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} f_Y(y) dy} \leq \frac{\bar{b} \int_0^M \frac{y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} dy}{\underline{b} \int_0^M e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} dy} = \frac{\bar{b} \alpha \int_0^{\frac{M}{\alpha}} z e^{-z} dz}{\underline{b} \alpha (1 - e^{-\frac{M}{\alpha}})} \leq \frac{\bar{b}}{\underline{b} (1 - e^{-\frac{M}{\alpha}})}.$$

Hence, we conclude that $\limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{Y}{\alpha} e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]}{\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right]} \leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\bar{b}}{b(1-e^{-\frac{M}{\alpha}})} = \frac{\bar{b}}{b}$. We therefore conclude that $\lim_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \leq \limsup_{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial \tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha)}{\partial \alpha} \rightarrow -\infty$.

From the above analysis, we know that $\tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ is a strictly convex function such that it decreases first and then increases. Thus, the optimal solution of $\tilde{\phi}_1(\alpha)$ is finite. \square

From Proposition 3, we conclude that the optimal solutions of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ and $Q_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ are finite. This result is useful in proving Theorem 1.

Auxiliary Result 3 - Uniform boundedness of two probability measures

Proposition 4. For any probability measures \mathbb{P}_1 and \mathbb{P}_2 on the continuous variable Y , we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] \right| \leq \sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(t) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(t)|. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}}(t) = \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_{\mathbb{P}}(x) \geq t\}$ is the t -quantile of the probability measure \mathbb{P} where $F_{\mathbb{P}}(x)$ is the cumulative density function (CDF) of the probability measure \mathbb{P} . Additionally, suppose that one of the probability measure (e.g., \mathbb{P}_1) has a probability density $f_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\cdot)$ which is bounded below by a constant $c > 0$. Then we have

$$\sup_{t \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(t) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(t)| \leq \frac{1}{c} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x)|.$$

Proof. The proof can be found in Si et al. (2023). We restate here for completeness. Note that $|\sup_x f_1(x) - \sup_x f_2(x)| \leq \sup_x |f_1(x) - f_2(x)|$. Recall that, given a variable X with CDF $F_{\mathbb{P}}(\cdot)$ and a quantile function $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}}(t) = \inf\{x : F_{\mathbb{P}}(x) \geq t\}$, we have $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}}(U) \stackrel{d}{=} X$ under \mathbb{P} where U is a uniform random variable under measure \mathbb{P} . Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left| \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] \right| = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left| \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(U)}{\alpha}} \right] - \alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}} \left[e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(U)}{\alpha}} \right] \right| \\ & = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

Consider the term $\log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right)$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) \\ & \leq \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{\frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|}{\alpha}} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) = \frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|}{\alpha} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) \\ & \geq \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{\frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|}{\alpha}} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) = -\frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|}{\alpha}, \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_1}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_2}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\} \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) - \log \left(\int_{u \in [0,1]} e^{-\frac{\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)}{\alpha}} du \right) \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \frac{\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|}{\alpha} = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)| = \sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we further bound $\sup_{u \in [0,1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)|$. Write $x_1 = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(t)$ and $x_2 = \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(t)$. Since the measure \mathbb{P}_1 is continuous, we have $F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) = t$ where $F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\cdot)$ is the CDF of measure \mathbb{P}_1 . Simultaneously, we do not impose the continuity of measure \mathbb{P}_2 , but the CDF of measure \mathbb{P}_2 (denoted as $F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(\cdot)$) must be right continuous with left limit. As a result, we have $F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x_2) \geq t$ and $F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x_2-) \leq t$. We now consider two cases: 1) $x_1 \geq x_2$ and 2) $x_1 < x_2$.

For the case $x_1 \geq x_2$, by the mean value theorem, we have

$$\begin{aligned} F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2) &= F'_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\theta)(x_1 - x_2) \\ &= f_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\theta)(x_1 - x_2) \quad \text{Here, } \theta \text{ lie in between } F_{\mathbb{P}_1}^{-1}(t) \text{ and } F_{\mathbb{P}_2}^{-1}(t) \\ \Rightarrow (x_1 - x_2) &= \frac{1}{f_{\mathbb{P}_1}(\theta)} (F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)) \\ \Rightarrow (x_1 - x_2) &\leq \frac{1}{c} (F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)) \\ &= \frac{1}{c} (F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x_2) + F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x_2) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c} (t - t + F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x_2) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

For the case $x_1 < x_2$, let $(x^{(n)})_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence such that $x^{(n)} \uparrow x_2$. For any $\epsilon > 0$, we have

$$|F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(n)}) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)| \leq \epsilon \quad \forall n \geq N.$$

Particularly, choosing $n = N$ gives $|F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(N)}) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2)| \leq \epsilon$. Besides, we have $F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x^{(N)}) \leq t = F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1)$. Consequently, we have

$$\begin{aligned} x_2 - x_1 &\leq \frac{1}{c}(F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1)) \\ &= \frac{1}{c} \left(F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(N)}) + F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(N)}) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x^{(N)}) + F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x^{(N)}) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_1) \right) \\ \Rightarrow x_2 - x_1 &\leq \frac{(|F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x_2) - F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(N)})| + |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x^{(N)}) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x^{(N)})| + 0)}{c} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{c}(\epsilon + \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x)|). \end{aligned}$$

Since ϵ is arbitrary, we conclude that $x_2 - x_1 \leq \frac{1}{c} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x)|$. Combining the two cases, we can conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)| &= |x_2 - x_1| \leq \frac{1}{c} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x)| \\ \Rightarrow \sup_{u \in [0, 1]} |\mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_1}(u) - \mathcal{Q}_{\mathbb{P}_2}(u)| &\leq \frac{1}{c} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} |F_{\mathbb{P}_1}(x) - F_{\mathbb{P}_2}(x)|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Proposition 4 is useful in proving Theorem 3.

A.1 Proofs of results in the main paper

A.1.1 Proof of Lemma 1

Proof. Consider the quantity $\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \delta(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right]$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \delta(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \delta(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \delta(\pi(X) - a)}{f_0(a|X)} \middle| Y = y, A = a, X \right] f_0(y, a|X) \, dady \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int e^{-\frac{y}{\alpha}} \frac{f_0(y, \pi(X)|X)}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \, dy \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} | A = \pi(X), X \right]}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} f_0(\pi(X)|X) \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} | A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

□

A.1.2 Proof of Theorem 1

We restate the Theorem here:

Theorem. Suppose that $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $Nh \rightarrow \infty$ and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$. We have

$$\sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - B_\pi(\alpha) h^2 \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha)),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 B_\pi(\alpha) &= \frac{\left(\int u^2 K(u) du\right)}{2} \times \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)}{f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] \\
 \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha) &= \left(\int K(u)^2 du \right) \times \\
 &\quad \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] \right. \\
 &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \right] (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])^2 - 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 1. Denote $W^h(\pi; \alpha) = \frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)}$. Considering $\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]$, we have

$$\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] = \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\}}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}}.$$

By the Central Limit Theorem, for each h , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 &\sqrt{N} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right\} \sqrt{h} \right. \\
 &\quad \left. - \mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h} \right) \\
 &\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, h \mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right) \right) \\
 &\Rightarrow \sqrt{N} h \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right\} \right) \\
 &\xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\text{Mean}^h, \text{Variance}^h),
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Mean}^h &= \mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h} \\
 \text{Variance}^h &= h \mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right).
 \end{aligned}$$

From Proposition 1, we know that $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \xrightarrow{p} 1$. Therefore by Slutsky's Theorem, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{Nh} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ \frac{e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right\} \right)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\text{Mean}^h, \text{Variance}^h). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We now study the quantities

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)], \\ & \mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h}, \quad \text{and} \\ & h\mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right) \end{aligned}$$

accordingly.

For the quantity $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + \\ & \underbrace{\frac{h^2}{2} \left(\int K(u) u^2 du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)}{f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right]}_{:= B_\pi(\alpha)} + O(h^3). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Therefore, the quantity $\sqrt{Nh}(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)])$ in Eqn. (17) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - B_\pi(\alpha) h^2 \right), \quad \text{where} \\ & B_\pi(\alpha) = \frac{\left(\int K(u) u^2 du \right)}{2} \times \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)}{f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

For the quantity $\mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h}$, we know that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[\int \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \middle| Y = y, A = a, X \right] f_0(y, a|X) dy da \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\int f_0(y|\pi(X), X) dy \right] + \frac{\left(\int u^2 K(u) du \right) h^2}{2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int \partial_{aa}^2 f_0(y|\pi(X), X) dy \right] + O(h^3) \\ &= 1 + O(h^2). \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h} &= \left(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \right] \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right) \sqrt{h} \\ &= \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] (1 - (1 + O(h^2))) \sqrt{h} = \left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + B_\pi(\alpha) h^2 + O(h^3) \right) O(h^{\frac{5}{2}}) \rightarrow 0. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we study $h\mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right)$. Notice that

$$\begin{aligned} &h\mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right) \\ &= h\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\}^2 \right] \\ &\quad - h \left(\mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \right)^2 \\ &= h\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\}^2 \right] \\ &\quad - h \left(\left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + B_\pi(\alpha) h^2 + O(h^3) \right) O(h^{\frac{5}{2}}) \right)^2 \\ &\rightarrow h\mathbb{E} \left[\left\{ W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\}^2 \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next, we move to consider the quantity $h\mathbb{E} \left[\left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right)^2 \right]$. Note that

$$\begin{aligned} &h\mathbb{E} \left[\left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \underbrace{h\mathbb{E}[(W^h(\pi; \alpha))^2]}_{\text{I}} \\ &\quad - \underbrace{2h\mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right]}_{\text{II}} \\ &\quad + \underbrace{h\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} \right] (\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)])^2}_{\text{III}}. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

We consider each quantity sequentially. For the quantity I, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{I} &= h\mathbb{E}[(W^h(\pi; \alpha))^2] = h\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}} \right] = h\mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}} \middle| X \right] \right] \\ &= h\mathbb{E} \left[\int K_h^2(\pi(X) - a) e^{-\frac{2y}{\alpha}} \tilde{g}(y, a; X) dy da \right] \\ &= \left(\int K^2(u) du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\tilde{g}(Y, \pi(X); X)}{f_0(Y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right] + O(h^2) \\ &\rightarrow \left(\int K^2(u) du \right) \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X \right] \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\tilde{g}(Y, A; X) = \frac{f_0(Y|A, X)}{f_0(A|X)}$. For the quantity II, we consider $h\mathbb{E}\left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) \frac{K_h(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]$ separately. First, for the quantity $h\mathbb{E}\left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) \frac{K_h(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} h\mathbb{E}\left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) \frac{K_h(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0(A|X)}\right] &= h\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}\right] \\ &= \left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] + O(h^2). \end{aligned}$$

Eqn. (18) investigates the quantity $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]$. Recall that

$$\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} | A = \pi(X), X]] + O(h^2) = \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] + O(h^2).$$

As such, II $\rightarrow \left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}]$.

For the quantity III, we compute $h\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0^2(A|X)}\right]$ since $(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)])^2$ equals $(\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])^2 + O(h^2)$.

In the followings, we compute $h\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0^2(A|X)}\right]$:

$$\begin{aligned} h\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0^2(A|X)}\right] &= h\mathbb{E}\left[\int \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h^2(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0^2(A|X)} \middle| Y = y, A = a, X\right] f_0(y, a|X) dy da\right] \\ &= \left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)}\right] + O(h^2). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, the quantity III would converge to $\left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)}\right] (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])^2$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} &h\mathbb{E}\left[\left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X)-A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]\right)^2\right] \\ &\rightarrow \left(\int K^2(u) du\right) \times \\ &\quad \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)}\right] (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. - 2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] \right\} \\ &:= \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

The proof is now completed. □

A.1.3 Proof of Theorem 2

We restate the Theorem here:

Theorem. Suppose that $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$ such that $Nh \rightarrow \infty$ and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$. Further, denote $\alpha_*(\pi)$ s.t. $\phi(\pi, \alpha_*(\pi)) \geq \phi(\pi, \alpha) \forall \alpha \geq 0$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) + \frac{\alpha_*(\pi) B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}} \right]} h^2 \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{\alpha_*^2(\pi) \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\left(\mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}} \right] \right)^2} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Proof of Theorem 2. Denote

$$\begin{aligned} W^h(\pi; \alpha) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \quad \text{and} \\ W_i^h(\pi; \alpha) &= \frac{e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}} K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}. \end{aligned}$$

We have the following prevalent result:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{Nh} (\bar{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]) \\ &= \sqrt{Nh} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ W_i^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\} \right) \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\text{Mean, Variance}) := Z^h(\alpha), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Mean} &= \mathbb{E} \left[W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right] \sqrt{h}, \\ \text{Variance} &= h \mathbb{V} \left(W^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \xrightarrow{p} 1$, by Slutsky's Theorem, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{Nh} (\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]) &= \frac{\sqrt{Nh} \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ W_i^h(\pi; \alpha) - \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right\} \right)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}} \\ & \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(\text{Mean, Variance}) := Z^h(\alpha). \end{aligned}$$

Denote

$$\begin{aligned}
 \alpha_*(\pi) &= \arg \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \alpha \eta \right\} \\
 &= \arg \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] + \alpha \eta \right\} \\
 \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) &= \arg \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} [W^h(\pi; \alpha)] - \alpha \eta \right\} \\
 &= \arg \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E} [W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right\} \\
 \bar{\alpha}_*^{N, h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) &= \arg \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \bar{W}^h(\pi, \alpha) - \alpha \eta \right\} \\
 &= \arg \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \bar{W}^h(\pi, \alpha) + \alpha \eta \right\} .
 \end{aligned}$$

According to Claim 1 of Proposition 3, $\alpha_*(\pi)$ is finite and $\alpha_*(\pi) > 0$.

Note also that $-\eta\alpha \leq \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \alpha \eta \right\} \leq M - \alpha\eta$. Due to the concavity and continuity of $\left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \alpha \eta \right\} \leq M - \alpha\eta$, its optimal value is positive.

Since for sufficiently large N and small h , $\bar{\alpha}_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi)$ and $\bar{\alpha}_*^{N, h; \text{IPW}}(\pi)$ are closed to $\bar{\alpha}_*(\pi)$. Thus, for sufficiently large N and small h , we can choose $\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha} > 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
 0 < \underline{\alpha} < \alpha_*(\pi), \bar{\alpha}_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi), \bar{\alpha}_*^{N, h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) < \bar{\alpha}, \quad \text{and} \\
 -\underline{\alpha} \log \mathcal{E}(\pi, \underline{\alpha}) - \underline{\alpha} \eta &> 0, \\
 -\bar{\alpha} \log \mathcal{E}(\pi, \bar{\alpha}) - \bar{\alpha} \eta &> 0, \\
 \underline{\alpha} \log \mathcal{E}(\pi, \underline{\alpha}) + \underline{\alpha} \eta &\neq \bar{\alpha} \log \mathcal{E}(\pi, \bar{\alpha}) + \bar{\alpha} \eta,
 \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{E}(\pi, \alpha) \in \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right], \mathbb{E} [W^h(\pi, \alpha)], \bar{W}^h(\pi, \alpha) \right\}$. Next, we aim to show that $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha) = \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j | X_j)}}$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$. From Claim 2 of Proposition 1, we conclude that for

$0 < \gamma < 1$, there exists $\tilde{N} > 0$ and $\tilde{h} > 0$ such that $0 < 1 - \gamma < \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j | X_j)} < 1 + \gamma$ for $N > \tilde{N}$ and $0 < h < \tilde{h}$. In fact, when $N > \tilde{N}$ and $h < \tilde{h}$, $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j | X_j)} \leq \frac{1}{1 - \gamma}$. Note that $W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)$ is

Lipschitz continuous on $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$. The derivations are as follows: for any $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 |W^h(\pi, \alpha_1) - W^h(\pi, \alpha_2)| &= \left| \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A | X)} \left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha_1}} - e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha_2}} \right] \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A | X)} \left[\frac{Y e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha_\theta}}}{\alpha_\theta^2} \right] |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2| \leq L_h |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, α_θ lies between α_1 and α_2 and we assume $|K(\cdot)| \leq M_K$ to be such that $L_h = \frac{MM_K}{h\epsilon\alpha^2}$. As such, we can conclude that $\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha)$ is Lipschitz continuous on $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$: indeed, for $N > \tilde{N}$, $h < \tilde{h}$ and $\alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$,

we have

$$\begin{aligned} & |\hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha_1) - \hat{W}_N^h(\pi, \alpha_2)| \\ &= \left| \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha_1)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha_2)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} \right| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{1-\gamma} L_h |\alpha_1 - \alpha_2|, \quad \text{where } L_h = \left(1 + \frac{2M_K}{h\epsilon}\right) \frac{MM_K}{h\epsilon\alpha^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, we have the following result:

$$\sqrt{Nh}(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \cdot)]) = \sqrt{Nh} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \cdot)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \cdot)] \right) \xrightarrow{d} Z^h(\cdot) \quad (20)$$

uniformly in Banach space $\mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}])$ of continuous function $\psi : [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ equipped with the sup norm $\|\psi\| := \sup_{x \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} |\psi(x)|$ (see Araujo and Giné (1980)).

Define the functional

$$G(\psi, \alpha) = \alpha \log \psi(\alpha) + \alpha \eta \quad \text{and} \quad V(\psi) = \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} G(\psi, \alpha).$$

By the Danskin's Theorem, $V(\cdot)$ is the directional differentiable at any $\mu \in \mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}])$, (which is denoted as $V'_\mu(\cdot)$), such that

$$V'_\mu(\nu) = \inf_{\alpha \in \bar{X}(\mu)} \frac{\alpha}{\mu(\alpha)} \nu(\alpha), \quad \forall \nu \in \mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}])$$

where $\bar{X}(\mu) = \arg \min_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log(\mu(\alpha)) + \alpha \eta\}$. Here, $V'_\mu(\nu)$ is the directional derivative of $V(\mu)$ at μ in the direction of ν . Notice that for those $\psi \in \mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}])$ such that $\min_{x \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \psi(x) \geq m > 0$, $V(\cdot)$ is a Lipschitz continuous function. The corresponding proofs are given as follows: for ψ and $\bar{\psi}$ lies $\mathcal{A} = \{\psi \in \mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]) : \min_{x \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \psi(x) \geq m > 0\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(\psi) &= \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log \psi(\alpha) + \alpha \eta\} \\ &= \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log \bar{\psi}(\alpha) + \alpha \eta + \alpha \log \psi(\alpha) - \alpha \log \bar{\psi}(\alpha)\} \\ &\geq \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log \bar{\psi}(\alpha) + \alpha \eta\} + \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log \psi(\alpha) - \alpha \log \bar{\psi}(\alpha)\}. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V(\bar{\psi}) - V(\psi) &\leq \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \{\alpha \log \bar{\psi}(\alpha) - \alpha \log \psi(\alpha)\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left\{ \frac{\alpha}{\beta(\alpha)} [\bar{\psi}(\alpha) - \psi(\alpha)] \right\} \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{m} \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} [\bar{\psi}(\alpha) - \psi(\alpha)] \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{m} \|\bar{\psi} - \psi\|. \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\beta(\alpha)$ lies between $\bar{\psi}(\alpha)$ and $\psi(\alpha)$. Similarly, we can also show that $V(\psi) - V(\bar{\psi}) \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{m} \|\psi - \bar{\psi}\|$. As such, we conclude that $|V(\psi) - V(\bar{\psi})| \leq \frac{\bar{\alpha}}{m} \|\psi - \bar{\psi}\|$ and $V(\cdot)$ is a Lipschitz continuous function for those $\psi \in \mathcal{C}([\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}])$ such that $\min_{x \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \psi(x) \geq m > 0$.

Note that $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] \geq e^{-\frac{M}{\underline{\alpha}}} > 0$. Besides, we have $0 \leq \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] = \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] + O(h^2)$. When $h \rightarrow 0$, $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] \rightarrow \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] > 0$. Hence, for sufficiently small h , $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] > 0$ and we can conclude that $V(\cdot)$ is Hadamard differentiable at $\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right]$ and $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)]$. By the Functional Delta Theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{Nh}(V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \cdot)) - V(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \cdot)])) \xrightarrow{d} V'_{\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \cdot)]}(Z^h).$$

According to Claim 2 of Proposition 3, we see that $\alpha \log(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)]) + \alpha\eta$ is a strictly convex function for $\alpha > 0$. Further, when $h \rightarrow 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} V'_{\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \cdot)]}(Z^h) &\rightarrow \\ \frac{\alpha_*(\pi)Z^0(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}\right)\right]} &= \mathcal{N}\left(0, \frac{\alpha_*^2(\pi)\mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}\right)\right]\right)^2}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi)) &= \left(\int K^2(u)du\right) \\ &\times \left\{ \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{2Y}{\alpha_*(\pi)}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] \right. \\ &\quad + \mathbb{E}\left[\frac{1}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)}\right] (\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}}])^2 \\ &\quad \left. - 2\mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha_*(\pi)}}}{f_0(\pi(X)|X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}}] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Besides, we simplify the quantity $\sqrt{Nh}(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])$, the derivations are presented as follows: since

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}}{f_0(A|X)} \middle| X\right]\right] \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right] + h^2 \times \\ &\quad \underbrace{\frac{(\int u^2 K(u)du)}{2} \mathbb{E}\left[\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}} \frac{\partial_{aa}^2 f_0(y|\pi(X), X)}{f_0(y|\pi(X), X)} \middle| A = \pi(X), X\right]\right]}_{:=B_\pi(\alpha)} + O(h^3) \\ &= \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] + B_\pi(\alpha)h^2 + O(h^3), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that

$$\sqrt{Nh}(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}]) = \sqrt{Nh}(B_\pi^w(\alpha)h^2 + O(h^3)).$$

Under the given convergence assumptions (i.e., $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$, $Nh \rightarrow \infty$ and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$), we notice that $\sqrt{Nh}(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])$ is Lipschitz continuous w.r.t. α when $\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$, and we can thus conclude that

$$\sqrt{Nh}(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \cdot)] - \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\cdot}}]) \xrightarrow{d} \sqrt{Nh}B_\pi^w(\cdot)h^2.$$

Hence, by applying the Functional Delta Theorem again, we have

$$\sqrt{Nh}(V(\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \cdot)]) - V(\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}])) \xrightarrow{d} V'_{\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}]}(\sqrt{Nh}(B_\pi(\cdot)h^2)),$$

where

$$V'_{\mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}]}(\sqrt{Nh}(B_\pi(\cdot)h^2)) = \sqrt{Nh} \frac{\alpha_*(\pi)}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}\right)\right]} B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))h^2$$

We rewrite $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ as follows:

$$\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}} - \alpha \eta \right\} = -\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}} + \alpha \eta \right\}.$$

Similarly, we also rewrite $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ as follows:

$$Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) = \max_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] - \alpha \eta \right\} = -\min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right] + \alpha \eta \right\}.$$

The optimal solution of $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$ is $\alpha_*(\pi)$ which is finite according to Claim 1 of Proposition 3. According to our definition of $V(\psi)$, we have $Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) = -V\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right]\right)$.

Our objective is showing that

$$\mathbb{P}\{\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) \neq -V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha))\} \rightarrow 0$$

under the convergence conditions (i.e., $N \rightarrow \infty$, $h \rightarrow 0$, $Nh \rightarrow \infty$, and $Nh^5 \rightarrow C \in [0, \infty)$). First, the convergence of

$$\sqrt{Nh}(\hat{W}_N^h - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]) = \sqrt{Nh} \left(\frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right) \xrightarrow{d} Z^h(\alpha)$$

also implies the uniform convergence

$$\sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left| \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right| = \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left| \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{a.s.}$$

As a result, we can show that

$$\sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left| (\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta) - (\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta) \right| \rightarrow 0$$

almost surely. The derivations are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \left| \left(\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta \right) - \left(\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right) \right| \\
 &= \left| \alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right| = |\alpha| \left| \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right| \\
 &\leq |\alpha| \left| \log \bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] \right| + |\alpha| \left| \log \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} \right| \\
 &\leq |\alpha| \left| \log \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} \right| + |\alpha| \left| \frac{1}{\beta(\alpha)} \right| |\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]| \\
 &\leq |\alpha| \left| \log \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} \right| + \frac{|\bar{\alpha}|}{\tilde{M}} |\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]| \quad \text{for some } \tilde{M} > 0.
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\beta(\alpha)$ lies in between $\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha)$ and $\mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]$. To justify the last inequality, note that

$$0 < \tilde{M} = \inf_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \min\{\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha), \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]\} \leq \min\{\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha), \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]\} \leq \beta(\alpha)$$

and

$$\beta(\alpha) \leq \max\{\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha), \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]\} \leq \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \max\{\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha), \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]\}.$$

Together with the result from Claim 2 of Proposition 1 where $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} \xrightarrow{a.s.} 1$ when $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $h \rightarrow 0$, we conclude that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left| (\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta) - (\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta) \right| \\
 &\leq \frac{|\bar{\alpha}|}{\tilde{M}} \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} |\bar{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) - \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)]| + \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} |\alpha| \left| \log \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)} \right| \rightarrow 0 \quad a.s..
 \end{aligned}$$

The above result means that, for arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, given the event

$$\left\{ \sup_{\alpha \in [\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]} \left| (\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta) - (\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta) \right| \leq \epsilon \right\},$$

we have

$$\left(\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right) - \epsilon \leq \left(\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta \right) \leq \left(\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right) + \epsilon. \quad (21)$$

Suppose that

$$\alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) = \arg \min_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ \alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right\},$$

we therefore have that

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi))] + \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) \eta \\
 &< \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha} \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \underline{\alpha})] + \underline{\alpha} \eta, \bar{\alpha} \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi, \bar{\alpha})] + \bar{\alpha} \eta \right\}.
 \end{aligned}$$

From Eqn. (21), for sufficiently small $\epsilon > 0$ such that ϵ is negligible, we can treat

$$\left(\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi; \alpha) + \alpha \eta \right) \approx \left(\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[W^h(\pi; \alpha)] + \alpha \eta \right).$$

In addition, for small h such that the convergence conditions still hold, $\alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi)$ should lie in $[\underline{\alpha}, \bar{\alpha}]$ since $\alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) \rightarrow \alpha_*(\pi)$. As a consequence, we also have

$$\begin{aligned} & \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) \log \hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi)) + \alpha_*^{h; \text{IPW}}(\pi) \eta \\ & < \min \left\{ \underline{\alpha} \log \hat{W}^h(\pi, \underline{\alpha}) + \underline{\alpha} \eta, \bar{\alpha} \log \hat{W}^h(\pi, \bar{\alpha}) + \bar{\alpha} \eta \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Due to the fact that $\alpha \log \hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha) + \alpha \eta$ is a convex function, we can conclude that $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = -V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha))$ under the convergence conditions:

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)) &= \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) + V\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right]\right)) \\ &= \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) + V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha))) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{Nh}(V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)) - V(\mathbb{E}[\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)])) \\ &\quad - \sqrt{Nh}(V(\mathbb{E}[\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)]) - V\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right]\right)) \\ \Rightarrow \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) + V(\mathbb{E}[\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)]) - V\left(\mathbb{E}\left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}\right]\right)) \\ &= \sqrt{Nh}(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) + V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha))) - \sqrt{Nh}(V(\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)) - V(\mathbb{E}[\hat{W}^h(\pi, \alpha)])). \end{aligned}$$

Ultimately, using the Slutsky's Theorem, we have

$$\sqrt{Nh} \left(\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) + \frac{\alpha_*(\pi) B_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi)) h^2}{\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}\right)\right]} \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N} \left(0, \frac{\alpha_*^2(\pi) \mathbb{V}_\pi(\alpha_*(\pi))}{\left(\mathbb{E}\left[\exp\left(-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha_*(\pi)}\right)\right]\right)^2} \right).$$

□

A.1.4 Proof of Theorem 3

Theorem. Suppose that the kernel function $K(x)$ is bounded where $|K(x)| \leq M_K$. Given $\delta > 0$, $h > 0$, and a policy class Π , denote

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_\Pi &:= \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi \right\}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x} &:= \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M] \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

Denote $\alpha_Y^*(\pi; h) = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{-\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[e^{-\frac{\cdot}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta\}$ where $\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[\mathcal{Z}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \mathcal{Z}_i$. If

$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |\alpha_Y^*(\pi; h) - \alpha_Y^*(\pi(X))(\pi; h)| = o(h)$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \leq \frac{4}{\epsilon} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}) + \frac{4}{\epsilon} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_\Pi) + \frac{4\sqrt{2}M_K \sqrt{\ln\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{h\epsilon^2\sqrt{N}} + O(h^2).$$

Proof. Recall that $R_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) = Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi)$. Now, denote

$$\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi) = \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \alpha \eta \right\}.$$

As $\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h \in \arg \max_{\pi \in \Pi} \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$, we have $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \geq \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)$ for any $\pi \in \Pi$. In particular, $\hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \geq \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*)$. As a consequence, we can reformulate $R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) &= Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \\ &= Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) - \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) + \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \\ &\leq Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) - \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi_{\text{DRO}}^*) + \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) - Q_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |Q_{\text{DRO}}(\pi) - \hat{Q}_{\text{DRO}}^h(\pi)| \\ &= 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N W_i^h(\pi, \alpha)}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \alpha \eta \right\} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Denote the empirical measure \mathbb{P}_N and the empirical weighted measure \mathbb{P}_N^h such that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N}[\mathcal{Z}] = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathcal{Z}_i \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[\mathcal{Z}] = \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)}}{\sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} \mathcal{Z}_i.$$

Eqn. (22) can be bounded as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Eqn. (22)} &= 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \left\{ -\alpha \log \frac{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} e^{-\frac{Y_i}{\alpha}}}{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_j) - A_j)}{f_0(A_j|X_j)}} - \alpha \eta \right\} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} \right| \\ &\leq 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[e^{-\frac{Y}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} \right| \end{aligned} \quad (23a)$$

$$+ 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \left| \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} - \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \{ -\alpha \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \alpha \eta \} \right|. \quad (23b)$$

We consider Eqns. (23a) - (23b) sequentially.

Eqn. (23a): According to the given conditions, we know that

$$\text{Eqn. (23a)} \leq 2o(h) = O(h^2).$$

Eqn. (23b): Since $|\sup_x f(x) - \sup_x g(x)| \leq \sup_x |f(x) - g(x)|$, we have

$$\text{Eqn. (23b)} \leq 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] - \log \mathbb{E}[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}}] \right|.$$

Combining the resulting bounds of Eqns. (23a) and (23b), we have

$$\text{Eqn. (22)} \leq O(h^2) + 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right|.$$

It remains to bound the term

$$2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right|.$$

We now show that the claim holds. The derivations are as follows: first, undergoing usual derivations gives that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}} \right] = \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}] + O(h^2).$$

Hence, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right| \\ & \stackrel{\ddagger}{\leq} 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} [\mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}] - \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}] \right| \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \frac{1}{NS_N^h} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}} \right] \right| + O(h^2) \\ & \leq 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}} \right] \right| + O(h^2) \\ & + 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \frac{(S_N^h - 1)}{NS_N^h} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right|. \end{aligned}$$

\ddagger is due to Proposition 4. By Wainwright (2019), we have with probability at least $1 - e^{-\frac{Nh^2\epsilon^2\gamma^2}{2M_K^2}}$ that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}} \right] \right| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}) + \gamma), \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where the function class $\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}$ is defined such that

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x} := \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M] \right\}.$$

Additionally, we have

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi, x \in [0, M]} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left| \frac{(S_N^h - 1)}{NS_N^h} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right| \leq \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon} |S_N^h - 1|.$$

Again, by Wainwright (2019), we have with probability at least $1 - e^{-\frac{Nh^2\epsilon^2\gamma^2}{2M_K^2}}$ that

$$\sup_{\pi \in \Pi} |S_N^h - 1| \leq 2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi}) + \gamma + O(h^2) \tag{25}$$

where the function class \mathcal{F}_Π is defined such that

$$\mathcal{F}_\Pi := \left\{ f_\pi(X, Y, A) = \frac{K_h(\pi(X) - A)}{f_0(A|X)} : \pi \in \Pi \right\}.$$

Hence, combining Eqns. (24) and (25), the following result hold: with probability $1 - 2e^{-\frac{Nh^2\epsilon^2\gamma^2}{2M_K^2}}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right| \\ & \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}) + \gamma) + \frac{2}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_\Pi) + \gamma + O(h^2)). \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

□

A.1.5 Proof of Corollary 4

We restate the corollary here.

Corollary. *If the kernel function $K(x)$ is Lipschitz continuous with constant $L_K > 0$ (i.e., $|K(x) - K(y)| \leq L_K|x - y|$) and there exists a finite value κ such that*

$$\kappa := \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}(t, \Pi(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})} dt \right].$$

Then for some constant \mathcal{K} , Eqn. (11) becomes

$$R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) \leq \frac{288L_K\kappa}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} + \frac{192M_K(\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2})}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + \frac{4M_K\sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + O(h^2).$$

Proof. We consider bounding $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x})$ and $\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_\Pi)$ in Eqn. (26). Consider the class \mathcal{F}_Π . Since $K(\cdot)$ is Lipschitz, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{K_h(\pi_1(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{K_h(\pi_2(X_i) - A_i)}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right)^2} \\ & \leq \sqrt{\frac{L_K^2}{Nh^4\epsilon^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (\pi_1(X_i) - \pi_2(X_i))^2} = \frac{L_K}{h^2\epsilon} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N (\pi_1(X_i) - \pi_2(X_i))^2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we can conclude the following result for the coverage number:

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}_\Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}) \\ & \leq \mathfrak{N}\left(t, \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \frac{L_K}{h^2\epsilon} \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right) = \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h^2\epsilon}{L_K}t, \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here, $\mathfrak{N}(t, \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})$ is the covering number of Π under the \mathcal{L}_2 norm with the probability measure \mathbb{P}_N . Mathematically, we can find a cover \mathcal{A} for Π such that for any $y \in \Pi$, there exists $\tilde{y} \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\|\tilde{y} - y\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)} \leq t$. We then consider the class $\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}$, and we claim that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}) \\ & \leq \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h^2\epsilon t}{2L_K}, \Pi(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right) \times \sup_{\mathbb{P}} \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h\epsilon t}{2M_K}, \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{I}}(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P})}\right) \\ & := \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t) \times \mathfrak{N}_{\mathbf{I}}(t), \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_I = \{f(t) = \mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq x\}} : x \in [0, M]\}$. Suppose now $\{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_{\mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t)}\}$ is a cover of Π and $\{\mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq x_1\}}, \dots, \mathbf{1}_{\{t \leq x_{\mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t)}\}}\}$ is a cover of \mathcal{F}_I under the distance $\|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}$. We aim to show that $\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}^t$ is t -cover set of $\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}$, where

$$\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}^t = \left\{ \frac{K_h(\pi_i(X) - A) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi_i(X)) \leq x_j\}}}{f_0(A|X)} : i \leq \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t), j \leq \mathfrak{N}_I(t) \right\}.$$

Indeed, for any $f_{\pi, x}(X, Y, A) \in \mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}$, we can pick $\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{x}$ such that $f_{\tilde{\pi}, \tilde{x}}(X, Y, A) \in \mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}^t$ such that $\|\mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X)) \leq x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\tilde{\pi}(X)) \leq \tilde{x}\}}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)} \leq \frac{h\epsilon t}{2M_K}$ and $\|\pi - \tilde{\pi}\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)} \leq \frac{h^2\epsilon t}{2L_K}$. Denote

$$\text{Diff} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{K_h(\pi(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} - \frac{K_h(\tilde{\pi}(X_i) - A_i) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\tilde{\pi}(X_i)) \leq \tilde{x}\}}}{f_0(A_i|X_i)} \right)^2$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Diff} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{h^2\epsilon^2} \times \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(K \left(\frac{\pi(X_i) - A_i}{h} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}} - K \left(\frac{\tilde{\pi}(X_i) - A_i}{h} \right) \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\tilde{\pi}(X_i)) \leq \tilde{x}\}} \right)^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{h^2\epsilon^2} \times \left\{ \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[K \left(\frac{\pi(X_i) - A_i}{h} \right) \times [\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\tilde{\pi}(X_i)) \leq \tilde{x}\}}] \right]^2 \right. \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left(K \left(\frac{\pi(X_i) - A_i}{h} \right) - K \left(\frac{\tilde{\pi}(X_i) - A_i}{h} \right) \right)^2 \times \mathbf{1}_{\{Y(\tilde{\pi}(X_i)) \leq \tilde{x}\}} \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{h^2\epsilon^2} \left\{ \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N M_K^2 [\mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\pi(X_i)) \leq x\}} - \mathbf{1}_{\{Y_i(\tilde{\pi}(X_i)) \leq \tilde{x}\}}]^2 + \frac{2}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{L_K^2}{h^2} (\pi(X_i) - \tilde{\pi}(X_i))^2 \right\} \\ & \leq \frac{1}{h^2\epsilon^2} \left(2M_K^2 \times \frac{h^2\epsilon^2 t^2}{4M_K^2} + \frac{2L_K^2}{h^2} \times \frac{h^4\epsilon^2 t^2}{4L_K^2} \right) \leq t^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\sqrt{\text{Diff}} \leq t.$$

To further proceed with the proof, we need the result of the Dudley's integral formula given in Wainwright (2019). We state the result here as a Proposition:

Proposition 5. *Given that a function class \mathcal{F} and Rademacher variables $(\sigma_i)_{i=1}^N$ where $\mathbb{P}\{\sigma_i = 1\} = \mathbb{P}\{\sigma_i = -1\} = \frac{1}{2}$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_N(\mathcal{F}) &= \mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i f(X_i) \right| \middle| X_1, \dots, X_N \right] \\ &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \int_0^{2b} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})} dt, \end{aligned}$$

where b is chosen such that $\sup_{f, g \in \mathcal{F}} \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)} \leq 2b$ and $\mathbb{E}_\sigma[\cdot]$ is the expectation over the Rademacher variables.

Now, we apply Dudley's integral formula on \mathcal{F}_Π . Since $\sup_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}_\Pi} \|f - g\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)} \leq \frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}$ and we have that

$\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_N(\mathcal{F})]$ where the expectation $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ is taken over X_1, \dots, X_N according to Definition 2, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_\Pi) &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}_\Pi(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})} dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h^2 \epsilon t}{L_K}, \Pi(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right)} dt \right] \\ &= \frac{24L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(s)} ds \right]. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{N}_\Pi\left(\frac{h^2 \epsilon t}{L_K}\right) = \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h^2 \epsilon t}{L_K}, \Pi(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right).$$

Simultaneously, since $\sup_{f,g \in \mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}} \|f - g\| \leq \frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}$, applying the Dudley's Integral formula on the $\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}$, together with the result given in Eqn. (28), gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}) &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}(X_1, \dots, X_N), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)})} dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi\left(\frac{h^2 \epsilon t}{2L_K}\right) + \log \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{F}_I}\left(\frac{h \epsilon t}{2M_K}\right)} dt \right], \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{F}_I}\left(\frac{h \epsilon t}{2M_K}\right) = \sup_{\mathbb{P}} \mathfrak{N}\left(\frac{h \epsilon t}{2M_K}, \mathcal{F}_I(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \|\cdot\|_{\mathcal{L}_2(\mathbb{P}_N)}\right).$$

Further, according to Van der Vaart (2000), we have

$$\sup_{\mathbb{P}} \mathfrak{N}(t, \mathcal{F}_I(\{X_1, \dots, X_N\}), \mathbb{P}) \leq \mathcal{K} \left(\frac{1}{t}\right)^2 \quad (29)$$

for any arbitrary (X_1, \dots, X_N) , N , and some universal constant \mathcal{K} . Together with the fact that $\sqrt{a+b} \leq \sqrt{a} + \sqrt{b}$ for $a, b > 0$ and the fact that $\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} dt \leq \int_0^1 \sqrt{\frac{1}{t}} dt = 2$, we therefore conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi,x}) &\leq \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi\left(\frac{h^2 \epsilon t}{2L_K}\right)} dt \right] + \frac{24}{\sqrt{N}} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K}{\epsilon h}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{F}_I}\left(\frac{h \epsilon t}{2M_K}\right)} dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{48L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t)} dt \right] + \frac{48M_K}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^1 \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\mathcal{F}_I}(t)} dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{48L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t)} dt \right] + \frac{48M_K}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon} \left[\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + \int_0^1 \sqrt{2 \log\left(\frac{1}{t}\right)} dt \right] \\ &\leq \frac{48L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_\Pi(t)} dt \right] + \frac{48M_K}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon} [\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2}]. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 & 2 \sup_{\pi \in \Pi} \sup_{\alpha \geq 0} \alpha \left| \log \mathbb{E}_{\mathbb{P}_N^h} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] - \log \mathbb{E} \left[e^{-\frac{Y(\pi(X))}{\alpha}} \right] \right| \\
 & \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi, x}) + \gamma) + \frac{2}{\epsilon} (2\mathcal{R}_N(\mathcal{F}_{\Pi}) + \gamma + O(h^2)) \\
 & \leq \frac{2}{\epsilon} \left\{ \frac{96L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(t)} dt \right] + \frac{96M_K}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon} [\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2}] + \gamma \right\} \\
 & \quad + \frac{2}{\epsilon} \left\{ \frac{48L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(s)} ds \right] + \gamma \right\} + O(h^2) \\
 & = \frac{192L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(t)} dt \right] + \frac{192M_K(\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2})}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} \\
 & \quad + \left\{ \frac{96L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(s)} ds \right] \right\} + \frac{4\gamma}{\epsilon} + O(h^2) \\
 & \leq \left\{ \frac{288L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(t)} dt \right] \right\} + \frac{192M_K(\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2})}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + \frac{4\gamma}{\epsilon} + O(h^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

To conclude, we set $\delta = 2e^{-\frac{Nh^2\epsilon^2\gamma^2}{2M_K^2}}$ such that $\gamma = \frac{M_K\sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon}$, then with probability $1 - \delta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 R_{\text{DRO}}(\hat{\pi}_{\text{DRO}}^h) & \leq 2M + \frac{288L_K}{\sqrt{N}h^2\epsilon^2} \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^{\frac{2M_K h}{L_K}} \sqrt{\log \mathfrak{N}_{\Pi}(t)} dt \right] \\
 & \quad + \frac{192M_K(\sqrt{\log \mathcal{K}} + 2\sqrt{2})}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + \frac{4M_K\sqrt{2\log\left(\frac{2}{\delta}\right)}}{\sqrt{N}h\epsilon^2} + O(h^2).
 \end{aligned}$$

□