

On a Class of Adversarial Classification Problems which admit a Continuous Solution

Guillaume Carlier*, Maxime Sylvestre †

March 3, 2025

Abstract

We consider a class of adversarial classification problems in the form of zero-sum games between a classifier and an adversary. The latter is able to corrupt data, at the expense of some optimal transport cost. We show that quite general assumptions on the classifier's loss functions and the adversary's transport cost functions ensure the existence of a Nash equilibrium with a continuous (or even Lipschitz) classifier's strategy. We also consider a softmax-like regularization of this problem and present numerical results for this regularization.

Keywords: Optimal transport, adversarial classification, convex duality.

MS Classification: 49K35, 91A05, 49Q22.

1 Introduction

Despite their tremendous success for performing difficult classification tasks (among others), machine learning algorithms raise major concerns about their robustness and vulnerability to small or even imperceptible perturbations of training data [23]. The problem of adversarial attacks and the analysis of perturbations of data leading to severe misclassification issues is

*CEREMADE, UMR CNRS 7534, Université Paris Dauphine, PSL, Pl. de Latre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, FRANCE and INRIA-Paris, MOKAPLAN, carlier@ceremade.dauphine.fr

†CEREMADE, UMR CNRS 7534, Université Paris Dauphine, PSL, Pl. de Latre de Tassigny, 75775 Paris Cedex 16, FRANCE and INRIA-Paris, MOKAPLAN, maxime.sylvestre@dauphine.psl.eu

now recognized as an important societal topic. This stimulated in the last decade a huge stream of research which strongly suggests to replace the risk minimization paradigm which was prevalent in machine learning by alternative training methods ensuring robustness. Starting from the seminal paper [12], adversarial training, i.e. training which is robust to (a class of) adversarial inputs, has gained a lot of popularity, see [15], [13] and the references therein.

Roughly speaking, the adversarial paradigm replaces risk minimization by its robust min-max (or worst case) counterpart where the max is taken over a set of adversarial scenarios. Such problems can be viewed as zero-sum games between a classifier and an adversary. The game-theoretic viewpoint on adversarial training naturally leads to a number of questions such as the existence of a value, of optimal (possibly randomized, see [16], [20]) strategies, the characterization and computations of these strategies.... Of course, these issues depend very much on the learning problem at stake, the loss of the learner and the adversarial cost and admissible strategies. A reasonable framework for adversarial learning is the situation where the probability distribution of data can be slightly corrupted by the adversary. Understanding what a small perturbation of a distribution is or the cost of this perturbation, one enters the realm of *optimal transport* theory. For instance, the recent series of works [10], [25] and [24] demonstrated how robust multi-class classification can be reformulated in optimal transport terms. In [25], [24] as in [20], the adversary is allowed to move each individual data point up to certain distance which makes his set of strategy a certain Wasserstein ball. The problem is also intimately related to the field of *distributionally robust optimization*, [17], [4], where optimal transport has gained a lot of popularity as well, see [2]. Note also that optimal transport distances can be used as meaningful losses in the context of generative modeling as was shown in the influential work [1] where Wasserstein GANs are introduced.

The first purpose of the present paper is to find, in the case of adversarial binary classification, simple conditions which guarantee not only that the game has a value but also that the classifier has a *continuous* optimal strategy. Of course, in the case of hard transport constraints, such as in [25], [20], [16], one cannot hope that this is the case and even the existence of a Borel optimal classifier is a delicate problem which was very nicely solved in [24]. This is why we will consider the softer situation where instead of a hard constraint the adversary has an integral optimal transport cost to pay to corrupt the data. We shall prove that continuity of this transport cost and mild convexity/monotonicity assumptions on the classifier's loss ensure the existence of an optimal continuous strategy. A second contribution of

our paper is the detailed investigation of the softmax regularization of the game and its use to solve some numerical examples. This approximation is of course connected to entropic optimal transport theory which has gained increasing interest in the machine learning community thanks to Sinkhorn algorithm and the works of Cuturi and Peyré, [19], [6] [7].

The paper is organized as follows. The setting and assumptions are introduced in section 2, then both the classifier and the adversary's problems are reformulated in a concise way in section 3. In section 4, after showing that the game has a value, we show the existence of a continuous optimal strategy for the classifier. Section 5 is devoted to a detailed analysis of the softmax approximation of the classifier/adversary game and its convergence, several numerical examples based on this approximation conclude the paper. Finally, section 6 concludes and gives some perspectives.

2 Setting and Assumptions

Let (X, d) be a compact metric space equipped with its Borel σ -algebra, $(x, y) \in X \times \{-1, 1\}$ be random labeled points drawn according to some joint Borel probability distribution \mathbb{P} . The probability distribution \mathbb{P} is fully characterized by the two measures $A \subset X$ Borel $\mapsto \mathbb{P}(A \times \{i\})$, these are not probability measures but coincide up to some normalization factors (that we will ignore in the sequel) with the two probability distributions of x given $y = i$ which we denote by $\mu_i \in \mathcal{P}(X)$.

The classifier has a loss function $(h, y) \in \mathbb{R} \times \{-1, 1\} \mapsto l(h, y)$ where h is interpreted as a soft classifier for the binary label y . Defining $l_i := l(\cdot, i)$ for $i = \pm 1$, we will always assume that $l_i: \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex (hence continuous) for $i = \pm 1$. Classical examples of such losses are

$$l(h, y) = \log(1 + e^{-yh}) \quad (2.1)$$

and

$$l(h, y) = (1 - yh)_+ = \max(0, 1 - yh). \quad (2.2)$$

The adversary may fool the classifier by perturbing the true distributions μ_1 and μ_{-1} at some cost. The adversary's (possibly randomized) strategies may be described by probability measures $\gamma_i \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X)$ where $\gamma_i(A \times B)$ represent the probability that the true value of x lies in A but the observed (corrupted by the adversary) lies in B , given $y = i \in \{-1, 1\}$. The set of admissible strategies for the adversary thus reads¹

$$\Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}} := \{(\gamma_i)_{i=\pm 1} \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X) : \text{proj}_{1\#} \gamma_i = \mu_i, i = \pm 1\}$$

¹The notation $\#$ will be used throughout the paper for pushforward of measures. More

where proj_1 denotes the first projection² so that $\text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma_i$ is the first marginal of γ_i . For each label i , there is a cost $c_i(x, z)$ incurred by the adversary for corrupting the true value x into the corrupted value z , observed by the classifier. We assume that for $i = \pm 1$, the cost $c_i : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is lsc, and that $c_i(x, x) = 0$ for every $x \in X$. This implies that corrupting the data is indeed costly for the adversary and the total cost of strategy γ_1, γ_{-1} is given by

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_{X \times X} c_i(x, z) d\gamma_i(x, z).$$

Typical examples of costs we have in mind are continuous costs of the form $c = d^\beta$ for some exponent $\beta > 0$ or discontinuous (but lsc) costs like

$$c(x, z) := \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } d(x, z) \leq r \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2.3)$$

Assumption 2.1. *To summarize our setting, throughout the paper we will always assume that*

- (X, d) is a compact metric space,
- for $i = \pm 1$, the classifier's loss function $l_i : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ is convex,
- for $i = \pm 1$, the adversary's cost $c_i : X \times X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+ \cup \{+\infty\}$ is lsc and $c_i(x, x) = 0$ for every $x \in X$.

All this results in the zero-sum game where the adversary's payoff is defined for every $h \in C(X)$ and $(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}$ by:

$$J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) := \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_{X \times X} [l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)] d\gamma_i(x, z). \quad (2.4)$$

Of course, setting

$$\bar{v} := \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sup_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1})$$

and

$$\underline{v} := \sup_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} \inf_{h \in C(X)} J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1})$$

precisely, if Z_1 is a metric space endowed with a Borel probability measure m_1 , Z_2 is another metric space and T is a measurable map $Z_1 \rightarrow Z_2$, $T_{\#}m_1$ is the probability measure on Z_2 defined by $T_{\#}m_1(B) = m_1(T^{-1}(B))$ for every B , Borel subset of Z_2 .

²For $(x, z) \in X \times X$, $\text{proj}_1(x, z) = x$ and $\text{proj}_2(x, z) = z$.

we have

$$\bar{v} \geq \underline{v}. \quad (2.5)$$

We now ask ourselves whether $\bar{v} = \underline{v}$ i.e. the game has a value and whether there exist equilibrium strategies i.e. whether J has a saddle-point $(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1})$ in $C(X) \times \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}$. Of course, if $(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1})$ is such a saddle-point then it is a Nash equilibrium in the sense that h is an optimal classifier for the corrupted data (γ_1, γ_{-1}) and (γ_1, γ_{-1}) maximizes the payoff of the adversary $J(h, \cdot, \cdot)$ over $\Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}$.

3 Concise Formulations

The goal of this short section is to reformulate the inner maximization problem in the definition of \bar{v} and the inner minimization problem in the definition of \underline{v} . Let us start by observing that for fixed $h \in C(X)$, and any $x \in X$, $i = \pm 1$, the set $\Gamma_i(x) := \operatorname{argmax}_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\}$ is a nonempty compact subset of X since c_i is lsc and $l_i \circ h$ is continuous. Moreover, again by lower semicontinuity of c_i and compactness of X , thanks to Proposition 7.33 in [3], one can find a Borel map $S_i : X \rightarrow X$ such that $S_i(x) \in \Gamma_i(x)$ for every $x \in X$. The maximization of $J(h, \cdot, \cdot)$ with respect to γ_1, γ_{-1} in $\Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}$ is therefore straightforwardly achieved by

$$\gamma_i := (\operatorname{id}, S_i)_{\#} \mu_i.$$

We thus have

$$\max_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) = \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} d\mu_i(x)$$

so that the upper value \bar{v} reads as the value of the convex minimization problem:

$$\bar{v} = \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} d\mu_i(x). \quad (3.1)$$

As for the lower value, let us remark that it can be written in terms of the second marginals $\nu_i := \operatorname{proj}_{2\#} \gamma_i$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \underline{v} &= \sup_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} \left\{ - \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_{X \times X} c_i d\gamma_i + \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h) d\operatorname{proj}_{2\#} \gamma_i \right\} \\ &= \sup_{(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2} \left\{ - \sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h) d\nu_i \right\} \end{aligned}$$

where $T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ denotes the value of the Monge-Kantorovich optimal transport problem:

$$T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) := \min_{\gamma \in \Pi(\mu_i, \nu_i)} \int_{X \times X} c_i(x, z) d\gamma(x, z)$$

where

$$\Pi(\mu_i, \nu_i) := \{\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(X \times X), \text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma = \mu_i, \text{proj}_{2\#}\gamma = \nu_i\}$$

denotes the set of transport plans between μ_i and ν_i . To further simplify the expression of $\underline{\nu}$, it is useful to observe:

Lemma 3.1. *Let $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ let $\bar{\nu} := \nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$ and let α_i be the density of ν_i with respect to $\bar{\nu}$ (so that $\alpha_{-1} = 1 - \alpha_1$ and $\alpha_1 \in [0, 1]$, $\bar{\nu}$ -almost everywhere), then*

$$\inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h) d\nu_i = \int_X \Phi(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z), \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$\Phi(\alpha) := \inf_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\alpha l_1(t) + (1 - \alpha)l_{-1}(t)\}, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1]. \quad (3.3)$$

Proof. The fact that the left-hand side of (3.2) is larger than its right-hand side follows from the very definition of Φ . For the converse inequality, by monotone convergence, we first have

$$\int_X \Phi(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \int_X \Phi_M(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z),$$

where

$$\Phi_M(\alpha) := \min_{t \in [-M, M]} \left\{ \alpha l_1(t) + (1 - \alpha)l_{-1}(t) + \frac{t^2}{2M^4} \right\}, \quad \forall \alpha \in [0, 1].$$

Note that the minimum defining $\Phi_M(\alpha)$ is uniquely attained and that the point, which we denote by $T_M^*(\alpha)$, where this minimum is achieved depends continuously on α . Now remark that

$$\int_X \Phi_M(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z) \geq \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X l_i(T_M^*(\alpha_1(z))) d\nu_i(z)$$

and that, thanks to Lusin's Theorem (see [21]), for every $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $h_\varepsilon \in C(X)$ such that $-M \leq h_\varepsilon \leq M$ and $\bar{\nu}(\{z \in X : h_\varepsilon(z) \neq$

$T_M^*(\alpha_1(z))\} \leq \varepsilon$, so

$$\begin{aligned} \int_X \Phi_M(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z) &\geq \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X l_i(h_\varepsilon(z)) d\nu_i(z) - \varepsilon \max_{[-M, M]} (l_1 + l_{-1}) \\ &\geq \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X l_i \circ h d\nu_i - \varepsilon \max_{[-M, M]} (l_1 + l_{-1}). \end{aligned}$$

Letting $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ and then $M \rightarrow \infty$, we get the desired inequality and thus deduce (3.2). □

Thanks to lemma 3.1, the lower value can be rewritten as

$$\underline{v} := \sup_{(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2} - \sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X \Phi \left(\frac{d\nu_1}{d(\nu_1 + \nu_{-1})} \right) d(\nu_1 + \nu_{-1}) \quad (3.4)$$

where Φ is the concave function defined in (3.3).

4 Duality and Attainment Results

4.1 Duality

Proposition 4.1. *Under assumption 2.1, one has*

$$\bar{v} = \underline{v} = \max_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} \inf_{h \in C(X)} J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}).$$

Proof. We first claim that (3.1) can be reformulated as

$$\inf_{(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) \in C(X)^3} \left\{ \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \varphi_i d\mu_i : \varphi_i(x) + c_i(x, z) \geq l_i(h(z)), \forall (x, z) \in X^2, i = \pm 1 \right\}. \quad (4.1)$$

Note first that the inequality $\bar{v} \leq \inf (4.1)$ is obvious. To show the converse inequality, take $h \in C(X)$ and set

$$\varphi_i(x) := \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\}, \quad x \in X, i = \pm 1.$$

Note now that φ_i is usc and bounded. By standard arguments, φ_i can be written as $\varphi_i = \inf_{n \in \mathbb{N}^*} \varphi_i^n$ where φ_i^n is the n -Lipschitz function $x \in X \mapsto \varphi_i^n(x) := \max_{y \in X} \{\varphi_i(y) - nd(x, y)\}$, in particular, we have

$$\int_X \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} d\mu_i(x) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_X \varphi_i^n d\mu_i$$

since $(\varphi_1^n, \varphi_{-1}^n, h)$ is admissible for (4.1) and $h \in C(X)$ is arbitrary, we can easily conclude that $\bar{v} \geq \inf (4.1)$.

Let us now rewrite the program (4.1) in Fenchel-Rockafellar form as

$$\inf_{(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) \in C(X)^3} F(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) + G(\Lambda(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h))$$

where:

- F is the linear form

$$(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) \mapsto F(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) := \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \varphi_i d\mu_i,$$

- Λ is the linear continuous operator from $C(X) \times C(X) \times C(X)$ to $C(X \times X) \times C(X \times X) \times C(X)$ defined through

$$(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) \mapsto \Lambda(\varphi_1, \varphi_{-1}, h) = (\varphi_1 \circ \text{proj}_1, \varphi_{-1} \circ \text{proj}_1, h),$$

- and for $(\psi_1, \psi_{-1}, h) \in C(X \times X)^2 \times C(X)$,

$$G(\psi_1, \psi_{-1}, h) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \psi_i(x, z) + c_i(x, z) \geq l_i(h(z)), \forall (x, z) \in X^2, i = \pm 1, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Identifying the dual of $C(X)$ (resp. $C(X \times X)$) with the space of measures on X (respectively $X \times X$) which we denote by $\mathcal{M}(X)$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}(X \times X)$), a direct application of the Fenchel-Rockafellar duality Theorem (see [9]) gives

$$\bar{v} = \max_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}, \nu) \in \mathcal{M}(X \times X)^2 \times \mathcal{M}(X)} -F^*(\Lambda^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}, \nu)) - G^*(-\gamma_1, -\gamma_{-1}, -\nu) \quad (4.2)$$

where Λ^* is the adjoint of Λ which explicitly writes as

$$\Lambda^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}, \nu) = (\text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma_1, \text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma_{-1}, \nu), \quad \forall (\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}, \nu) \in \mathcal{M}(X \times X)^2 \times \mathcal{M}(X)$$

whence

$$F^*(\Lambda^*(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}, \nu)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma_1 = \mu_1, \text{proj}_{1\#}\gamma_{-1} = \mu_{-1}, \text{ and } \nu = 0, \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

and a direct computation gives

$$-G^*(-\gamma_1, -\gamma_{-1}, 0) = \begin{cases} \inf_{h \in C(X)} \sum_{i=\pm 1} J(h, \gamma_i) & \text{if } \gamma_i \geq 0, i = \pm 1 \\ -\infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Replacing in (4.2) thus yields

$$\underline{v} = \max_{(\gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) \in \Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}} \inf_{h \in C(X)} J(h, \gamma_1, \gamma_{-1}) = \bar{v}.$$

Remark 4.2. Note that the above application of the Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem says that the sup in the supinf definition of \underline{v} is indeed a max. The fact that this sup is achieved can also be directly checked from the concise formulation in (3.4) which is the maximization of a weakly * usc function (for the term involving Φ , this follows directly from Lemma 3.1) over the weakly * compact set $\Delta_{\mu_1, \mu_{-1}}$.

□

4.2 Existence of Continuous Optimal Classifiers

It cannot be taken for granted for discontinuous c_i 's that the classifier has a continuous optimal classification strategy i.e. that (3.1) admits solutions. However, under quite general conditions including the continuity of the costs c_i , we have:

Theorem 4.3. *In addition to assumption 2.1, let us assume that*

- c_1 and c_{-1} are continuous on $X \times X$,
- l_1 is nonincreasing, l_{-1} is nondecreasing,
- $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} l_1(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} l_{-1}(t) = +\infty$.

Then, (3.1) admits at least one solution, i.e. the classifier has a continuous optimal strategy.

Proof. Let $(h^n)_n \in C(X)^\mathbb{N}$ be a minimizing sequence for (3.1), that is

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \varphi_i^n(x) d\mu_i(x) = \bar{v} \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\varphi_i^n(x) := \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h^n(z)) - c_i(x, z)\}, \quad i = \pm 1, \quad x \in X.$$

Since c_1 and c_{-1} are uniformly continuous, the modulus

$$\omega(t) := \max_{i=\pm 1} \max \{ |c_i(x, z) - c_i(x', z')|, (x, z, x', z') \in X^4, d(x, x') + d(z, z') \leq t \}$$

satisfies $\omega(t) \rightarrow 0$ as $t \rightarrow 0$. By definition of ω , for every $(x, x', z) \in X^3$, we have

$$l_i(h^n(z)) - c_i(x, z) \leq l_i(h^n(z)) - c_i(x', z) + \omega(d(x, x'))$$

taking the supremum with respect to z yields $\varphi_i^n(x) \leq \varphi_i^n(x') + \omega(d(x, x'))$. Reversing the role of x and x' , we obtain that for every n and every $(x, x') \in X^2$ and $i = \pm 1$, one has

$$|\varphi_i^n(x) - \varphi_i^n(x')| \leq \omega(d(x, x')).$$

So that both sequences $(\varphi_1^n)_n$ and $(\varphi_{-1}^n)_n$ are uniformly equicontinuous. Moreover since $l_i \geq 0$ and $c_i(x, x) = 0$, $\varphi_i^n \geq 0$, but thanks to (4.3) we also have a uniform upper bound on $\min \varphi_i^n$, together with the uniform equicontinuity of $(\varphi_i^n)_n$ this shows that (φ_i^n) is also uniformly bounded. Thanks to Arzelà-Ascoli Theorem, this shows that, up to a subsequence, φ_i^n converges uniformly to some φ_i . Together with (4.3), this entails

$$\bar{v} = \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \varphi_i(x) d\mu_i(x). \quad (4.4)$$

Our goal now is to deduce the existence of an optimal solution to (3.1) which requires some more work. For $i = \pm 1$ and any n and $z \in X$, set

$$\psi_i^n(z) := \min_{x \in X} \{\varphi_i^n(x) + c_i(x, z)\}$$

and observe that uniform convergence of φ_i^n to φ_i implies uniform convergence of ψ_i^n to ψ_i given by

$$\psi_i(z) := \min_{x \in X} \{\varphi_i(x) + c_i(x, z)\}. \quad (4.5)$$

By construction, we have

$$\psi_1^n \geq l_1 \circ h^n, \quad \psi_{-1}^n \geq l_{-1} \circ h^n, \quad (4.6)$$

and since $\lim_{t \rightarrow -\infty} l_1(t) = \lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} l_{-1}(t) = +\infty$ and ψ_i^n is uniformly bounded, this gives a uniform bound on h^n : there is some C such that $-C \leq h^n \leq C$ for every n . Now it is convenient to reexpress the inequalities in (4.6) in terms of ψ_1^n and ψ_{-1}^n only, using suitable generalized inverses of the convex and monotone losses l_1 and l_{-1} . For $t \geq l_1(C)$, let

$$l_1^{-1}(t) := \inf\{h \in (-\infty, C] : l_1(h) \leq t\}$$

our assumptions ensure that l_1^{-1} is nonincreasing continuous (recall that l_1 is both nonincreasing and convex so in fact, depending on whether its infimum is attained or not, it is either decreasing on \mathbb{R} , or decreasing on some interval $(-\infty, a]$ and constant on $[a, +\infty)$) and that for $h \leq C$, the inequality $t \geq l_1(h)$ is equivalent to $h \geq l_1^{-1}(t)$. Similarly, set for $t \geq l_{-1}(-C)$:

$$l_{-1}^{-1}(t) := \sup\{h \in [-C, \infty) : l_{-1}(h) \leq t\}$$

so that l_{-1}^{-1} is nondecreasing continuous and for $h \geq -C$, the inequality $t \geq l_{-1}(h)$ is equivalent to $h \leq l_{-1}^{-1}(t)$. With these considerations in mind, (4.6) rewrites

$$l_{-1}^{-1} \circ \psi_{-1}^n \geq h^n \geq l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1^n$$

which, by continuity, passes to the limit as

$$\bar{h} := l_{-1}^{-1} \circ \psi_{-1} \geq \underline{h} := l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1.$$

Note that both \bar{h} and \underline{h} are continuous and that any $h \in C(X)$ such that $\underline{h} \leq h \leq \bar{h}$ satisfies

$$\psi_i \geq l_i \circ h, \quad i = \pm 1.$$

Recalling (4.5), for such an h , we have

$$\max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} \leq \varphi_i(x), \quad \forall x \in X$$

which, with (4.4), implies that h solves (3.1). □

In fact, the above proof enables us to find even more regular solutions of the classifier problem:

Proposition 4.4. *If, in addition to the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, we assume that*

- *either c_1 is Lipschitz on $X \times X$, and l_1 is either decreasing or of the form (2.2),*
- *or c_{-1} is Lipschitz on $X \times X$, and l_{-1} is either increasing or of the form (2.2).*

Then, (3.1) admits at least one Lipschitz solution.

Proof. Following the proof of Theorem 4.3, we find ψ_1 and ψ_{-1} of the form (4.5) (that is ψ_i is c_i -concave in the usual optimal transport terminology) such that $l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \leq l_{-1}^{-1} \circ \psi_{-1}$ and any $h \in C(X)$ such that $l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1 \leq h \leq l_{-1}^{-1} \circ \psi_{-1}$ solves (3.1). Because ψ_1 and ψ_{-1} are of the form (4.5), if c_1 (respectively c_{-1}) is Lipschitz so is ψ_1 (respectively ψ_{-1}). Assume that c_1 is Lipschitz. If l_1 is decreasing, since it is convex, its subgradient is bounded away from zero on each compact interval, so that its inverse, l_1^{-1} is in fact Lipschitz on compact sets and then so is $l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1$. The case where l_1 is of the form (2.2) leads to the same conclusion since the generalized inverse l_1^{-1} is also Lipschitz in this case. Finally, if c_{-1} is Lipschitz and l_{-1} is increasing, or of the form (2.2), we similarly obtain a Lipschitz solution by considering $l_{-1}^{-1} \circ \psi_{-1}$ instead of $l_1^{-1} \circ \psi_1$. □

Remark 4.5. . If the losses attain their minimum and arrive there with a zero slope (for instance, with a quadratic behavior like $l_i(h) = (1 - ih)_+^2$), their inverse functions are not Lipschitz (in the quadratic example $(1 - ih)_+^2$, they behave like a square root near 0 and are no better than $\frac{1}{2}$ -Hölder continuous).

Remark 4.6. The previous proofs heavily rely on the continuity of the c_i 's, convexity and monotonicity of the l_i 's but the measures μ_i are totally arbitrary as well as the compact metric space X .

4.3 Primal-Dual Conditions and Consequences

In this paragraph, we make the same assumptions as in Theorem 4.3. Under these assumptions, we know that both the classifier's problem (3.1) and the adversary's problem (3.4) admit solutions and that they have the same value by Proposition 4.1. We may take further advantage of duality to obtain a characterization and some properties of solutions by exploiting primal-dual optimality conditions derived from Proposition 4.1. Let $h \in C(X)$, it directly follows from Proposition 4.1 that h solves (3.1) if and only if there exist $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} d\mu_i(x) \\ = \int_X \Phi\left(\frac{d\nu_1}{d(\nu_1 + \nu_{-1})}\right) d(\nu_1 + \nu_{-1}) \end{aligned} \quad (4.7)$$

in which case (ν_1, ν_{-1}) automatically solves (3.4). Likewise $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ solves (3.1) if and only if there exists $h \in C(X)$ such that (4.7) holds, in which case h automatically solves (3.1). The basic primal-dual relation (4.7) therefore characterizes optimal strategies. We now recall (see [22], [26]) the Kantorovich duality formula which expresses the value of the optimal transport problem $T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ as

$$T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) = \sup_{\psi \in C(X)} \left\{ \int_X \psi^{c_i} d\mu_i + \int_X \psi d\nu_i \right\} \quad (4.8)$$

where ψ^{c_i} denotes the c_i transform of ψ :

$$\psi^{c_i}(x) := \min_{z \in X} \{c_i(x, z) - \psi(z)\}, \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Optimizers in (4.8) are called Kantorovich potentials between μ_i and ν_i and they are well-known to exist (if c_i is continuous and X is compact (see [22], [26])). We then have

Proposition 4.7. *Let $h \in C(X)$, $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ set $\bar{\nu} = \nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$ and let α_1 be the density of ν_1 with respect to $\bar{\nu}$. Then (h, ν_1, ν_{-1}) satisfies the primal-dual relation (4.7) if and only if:*

- for $i = \pm 1$, $l_i \circ h$ is a Kantorovich potential between μ_i and ν_i ,
- and, for $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. $z \in X$, one has

$$h(z) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\alpha_1(z)l_1(t) + (1 - \alpha_1(z))l_{-1}(t)\}. \quad (4.9)$$

Proof. By Kantorovich duality formula (4.8), we have for $i = \pm 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X \max_{z \in X} \{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)\} d\mu_i(x) &= T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) - \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{c_i} d\mu_i \\ &\geq \int_X (l_i \circ h) d\nu_i = \int_X (l_i \circ h) \frac{d\nu_i}{d\bar{\nu}} d\bar{\nu} \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

summing these inequalities and using the definition of Φ (see (3.3)) yields

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}(\mu_i, \nu_i) - \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{c_i} d\mu_i \geq \int_X \Phi(\alpha_1(z)) d\bar{\nu}(z). \quad (4.11)$$

Hence (4.7) is equivalent to having equality in (4.10) for $i = \pm 1$ (which means that $l_i \circ h$ is a Kantorovich potential between μ_i and ν_i) and having equality in (4.11) i.e. for $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. $z \in X$

$$\Phi(\alpha_1(z)) = \alpha_1(z)l_1(h(z)) + (1 - \alpha_1(z))l_{-1}(h(z))$$

which is exactly (4.9). □

A first consequence is that as soon as the loss functions do not achieve their infimum, the adversary uses strategies that mix the two labeled classes $i = 1$ and $i = -1$ in the sense that:

Corollary 4.8. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, assume that l_1 is decreasing and l_{-1} is increasing. Then, if (ν_1, ν_{-1}) solves (3.4) and we set $\bar{\nu} = \nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$, we have*

$$\frac{d\nu_1}{d\bar{\nu}} \in (0, 1), \quad \bar{\nu}\text{-a.e.}$$

Proof. Again let α_1 be the density of ν_1 with respect to $\bar{\nu}$. We know from Theorem 4.3 that there exists $h \in C(X)$ solving (3.1). It then follows from (4.9) that for $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. z for which $\alpha_1(z) = 0$, $h(z)$ minimizes l_{-1} but the infimum of l_{-1} is not achieved; this shows that, $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e., $\alpha_1 > 0$. In a similar way α_1 has to be strictly less than 1, $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. since otherwise l_1 would achieve its minimum. □

Remark 4.9. Actually the argument in the previous proof shows that if l_1 is decreasing (respectively l_{-1} is increasing) then the density of ν_1 with respect to $\bar{\nu} = \nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$ is $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. strictly less than 1 (respectively strictly positive).

Another consequence is the uniqueness of the optimal classifier's strategy on the support of the adversary's strategies:

Corollary 4.10. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, assume that l_1 is decreasing, that l_{-1} is increasing and that either l_1 or l_{-1} is strictly convex. Let (ν_1, ν_{-1}) solve (3.4) and $\bar{\nu} = \nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$, then all solutions of (3.1) coincide on the support of $\bar{\nu}$.*

Proof. We know from Corollary 4.8 that α_1 , the density of ν_1 with respect to $\bar{\nu}$, lies in $(0, 1)$ $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e.; with (4.9) this implies that whenever h solves (3.1), for $\bar{\nu}$ -a.e. z , $h(z)$ is the minimizer of the strictly convex function $\alpha_1(z)l_1(\cdot) + (1 - \alpha_1(z))l_{-1}(\cdot)$. Since h is continuous, it is in fact uniquely determined on the support of $\bar{\nu}$. □

5 Softmax Regularization, Numerical Results

5.1 Softmax Approximation

In order to provide an algorithm for the computation of the optimal classifier as well as the optimal adversarial strategy, we replace the maximum in the problem (3.1) by a softmax approximation. More precisely, we fix a reference measure $m \in \mathcal{P}(X)$ with full support, and for $\varepsilon > 0$, $\psi \in C(X)$, $x \in X$ and $i \in \{-1, 1\}$, we define:

$$\psi^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}(x) := \varepsilon \log \left(\int_X \exp \left(\frac{\psi(z) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon} \right) dm(z) \right), \quad x \in X$$

the softmax approximation of

$$\psi^{[0, c_i]}(x) := \max_{z \in X} \{ \psi(z) - c_i(x, z) \}.$$

Since m has full support and c_i is continuous, it is a classical fact that $\psi^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ converges uniformly (and obviously from below) to $\psi^{[0, c_i]}$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$. We then consider the following regularized classifier's problem:

$$\bar{v}_\varepsilon = \inf_{h \in C(X)} T_\varepsilon(h), \quad T_\varepsilon(h) := \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]} d\mu_i \quad (5.1)$$

and recall that (3.1) reads

$$\bar{v} = \inf_{h \in C(X)} T_0(h), \quad T_0(h) := \sum_{i=\pm 1} \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{[0, c_i]} d\mu_i.$$

Remark 5.1. The convergence (in the sense of Γ -convergence³ of T_ε to T_0 in $C(X)$) of the regularized problem (5.1) to the original problem (3.1) is easy to see. Indeed, since we assumed that m has full support, for each $h \in C(X)$, $T_\varepsilon(h)$ converges to $T_0(h)$, which implies the Γ -lim sup inequality: $\limsup_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon(h_\varepsilon) \leq T_0(h)$ with the constant recovery sequence $h_\varepsilon = h$. As for the Γ -lim inf inequality, take a sequence (h_ε) that converges to h in $C(X)$. Note that for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon'$ we have $T_\varepsilon(h_\varepsilon) \geq T_{\varepsilon'}(h_\varepsilon)$ by the monotonicity of the softmax. Thus, since the right hand side converges to $T_{\varepsilon'}(h)$ by taking the lim inf we get $\liminf_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon(h_\varepsilon) \geq T_{\varepsilon'}(h)$. And we conclude that the Γ -lim inf inequality $\liminf_\varepsilon T_\varepsilon(h_\varepsilon) \geq T_0(h)$ holds by letting ε' tend to 0. This in principle ensures that the regularized problem is well-suited in order to compute an optimal classifier i.e. a minimizer of T_0 . Indeed, Γ -convergence ensures convergence of values and minimizers, provided we can prove that T_ε admits minimizers h_ε (in $C(X)$) and that a family of minimizers $(h_\varepsilon)_\varepsilon$ remain in a compact set of $C(X)$. This is not obvious a priori and we will need several steps (relaxation, duality and uniform continuity estimates) to achieve this goal.

Relaxation. The existence of a minimizer of T_ε in $C(X)$ is not completely straightforward at first glance. We shall therefore relax (5.1) to the larger class of m -measurable functions. Since $l_i \geq 0$ and c_i is bounded, $(l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ is bounded from below as soon as h is m -measurable, and a necessary and sufficient condition to prevent that it takes the value $+\infty$ somewhere (equivalently everywhere) on X is the integrability of $\exp\left(\frac{l_i \circ h}{\varepsilon}\right)$. In other words, one can define $(l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ for h measurable and in this larger class of classifiers, the set where T_ε is finite is the (convex) set

$$F_\varepsilon := \left\{ h \in L^1(m) : \sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i \circ h}{\varepsilon}\right) \in L^1(m) \right\} \quad (5.2)$$

³see the textbook [5] for an overview of Γ -convergence.

for h in this class, not only $(l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ is well defined, but it is actually continuous with a modulus of continuity which only depends on that of c_i (see [8]). The relaxed formulation of (5.1) then reads:

$$\inf_{h \in F_\varepsilon} T_\varepsilon(h). \quad (5.3)$$

We then have

Proposition 5.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, one has relaxation and existence of a relaxed solution to (5.3) in the sense that*

$$\bar{v}_\varepsilon = \min_{h \in F_\varepsilon} T_\varepsilon(h).$$

If one further assumes that either l_1 or l_{-1} is strictly convex then the relaxed problem (5.3) admits a unique solution.

Proof. Of course, \bar{v}_ε is larger than or equal to the value of (5.3). To prove the converse inequality, let $h \in F_\varepsilon$ and consider its truncations

$$h_n := \max(-n, \min(h, n)), \quad n \in \mathbb{N}^*.$$

By monotonicity of l_1, l_{-1} , one has

$$\exp\left(\frac{l_i \circ h_n}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \max\left(\exp\left(\frac{l_i(0)}{\varepsilon}\right), \exp\left(\frac{l_i \circ h}{\varepsilon}\right)\right) \in L^1(m),$$

so that one easily deduces from Lebesgue's dominated convergence Theorem that $T_\varepsilon(h_n)$ converges to $T_\varepsilon(h)$. Since each h_n belongs to $L^\infty(m) \subset F_\varepsilon$ this implies that the value of (5.3) coincides with $\inf_{L^\infty(m)} T_\varepsilon$. Now, for $h \in L^\infty(m)$ and $\delta > 0$, by Lusin's Theorem, we can find $h_\delta \in C(X)$ with $\|h_\delta\|_{L^\infty(m)} = \|h\|_{L^\infty(m)}$ such that $X_\delta := \{h = h_\delta\}$ satisfies $m(X \setminus X_\delta) \leq \delta$. For fixed x and i , we then have for some positive constant C (depending on $\|h\|_{L^\infty(m)}, \varepsilon, l_i$ and c_i but not on δ)

$$\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h_\delta(z)) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z) \leq \int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z) + C\delta$$

from which we deduce that $T_\varepsilon(h) \geq \limsup_{\delta \rightarrow 0} T_\varepsilon(h_\delta) \geq \bar{v}_\varepsilon$. Since $h \in L^\infty(m)$ is arbitrary in the previous argument, we obtain

$$\bar{v}_\varepsilon \leq \inf_{L^\infty(m)} T_\varepsilon = \inf_{F_\varepsilon} T_\varepsilon.$$

Let us now prove that T_ε admits a minimizer over F_ε (equivalently over measurable classifiers). One easily deduces from Fatou's Lemma (together

with the nonnegativity of l_i and the boundedness of c_i) that T_ε is lsc for the strong topology of L^1 , since it is convex it is also weakly sequentially lsc for the weak topology of L^1 . Let (h_n) be a minimizing sequence for (5.3). The sequence of (nonnegative) functions $(l_i \circ h_n)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ is bounded in $L^1(\mu_i)$, since it is also uniformly equicontinuous, it is uniformly bounded hence relatively compact in $C(X)$ by Arzelà-Ascoli's Theorem. But having a uniform bound on $(l_i \circ h_n)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ and using again the boundness of c_i gives a uniform bound on $\int_X \sum_{i=\pm 1} e^{\frac{l_i \circ h_n}{\varepsilon}} dm$. Now observe that since l_{-1} is convex nondecreasing and $\lim_{+\infty} l_{-1} = +\infty$ one can find $a \in (0, 1)$ such that $l_{-1}(t) \geq a \max(t, 0) - \frac{1}{a}$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. In a similar way, since l_1 is convex nonincreasing and $\lim_{-\infty} l_1 = +\infty$ and up to choosing a possibly smaller a , we may also assume $l_1(t) \geq a \max(-t, 0) - \frac{1}{a}$ for every $t \in \mathbb{R}$. This implies that

$$\max(l_1(t), l_{-1}(t)) \geq a|t| - \frac{1}{a}, \quad \forall t \in \mathbb{R},$$

which gives a bound on $\int_X \exp\left(\frac{a|h_n|}{\varepsilon}\right) dm$. In particular (h_n) is uniformly integrable and therefore by the Dunford-Pettis Theorem, it has a subsequence that converges weakly in L^1 to some h . Thanks to the sequential weak lower semicontinuity in L^1 of T_ε , we have $h \in F_\varepsilon$ and $T_\varepsilon(h) \leq \bar{v}_\varepsilon$ so that h solves (5.3). Finally, the uniqueness of a solution to (5.3) is a direct consequence of the strict convexity of T_ε in the case of the strict convexity of either l_1 or l_{-1} . \square

Duality. Integral functionals involving softmax as in the definition of T_ε are well-known to be related by convex duality to entropic optimal transport (see [18] and [14]). The regularized optimal transport cost between μ_i and ν_i with respect to the cost c_i and the regularization parameter ε and the reference measure m is defined by

$$T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) = \inf_{\gamma_i \in \Pi(\mu_i, \nu_i)} \int c_i d\gamma_i + \varepsilon H(\gamma_i | \mu_i \otimes m). \quad (5.4)$$

where

$$H(\gamma_i | \mu_i \otimes m) = \begin{cases} \int_{X \times X} \log\left(\frac{d\gamma}{d(\mu_i \otimes m)}\right) d\gamma & \text{if } \gamma \ll \mu_i \otimes m \\ +\infty & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

denotes the relative entropy of γ with respect to $\mu_i \otimes m$. This term forces the (unique by strict convexity) optimal entropic plan to have a density with respect to $\mu_i \otimes m$ so that $T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i)$ is finite only if the second marginal ν_i is

itself absolutely continuous with respect to m . The dual formulation of the previous entropic optimal transport problem takes the form

$$T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) = \sup_{\psi \in C(X)} \left\{ \int_X \psi d\nu_i - \int_X \psi^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]} d\mu_i \right\} \quad (5.5)$$

If ψ is a solution⁴ of this dual formulation, it is called a *Schrödinger potential* between μ_i and ν_i . Thanks to Fenchel-Rockafellar duality, arguing as in the proof of Proposition 4.1, the value \bar{v}_ε of the regularized classifier problem (5.1) can be expressed as

$$\underline{v}_\varepsilon = \sup_{(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2} - \sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X \Psi\left(\frac{d\nu_1}{dm}(z), \frac{d\nu_{-1}}{dm}(z)\right) dm(z) \quad (5.6)$$

where Ψ is defined similarly to Φ but here the reference measure is m instead of $\nu_1 + \nu_{-1}$ and thus the function depends on two variables (α_1, α_{-1}) which represent respectively the density of ν_1 and ν_{-1} with respect to m . The precise definition of Ψ is

$$\Psi(\alpha_1, \alpha_{-1}) = \min_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{\alpha_1 l_1(t) + \alpha_{-1} l_{-1}(t)\}.$$

Note that the existence of a solution to (5.6) is guaranteed by the Fenchel-Rockafellar Theorem and that the equality $\bar{v}_\varepsilon = \underline{v}_\varepsilon$ (absence of duality gap) can be interpreted as the existence of a value for a zero-sum game between a classifier and an adversary incurring an entropic optimal transport cost.

As in the non regularized case, we can derive properties of the optimizers by exploiting the primal-dual optimality conditions. In particular, these optimality conditions allow us to show that the optimal classifier is continuous and thus that the original problem admits a solution. Let $h \in F_\varepsilon$ (recall that F_ε , defined in (5.2) is the subset of $L^1(m)$ where T_ε is finite) it directly follows from the absence of duality gap that h solves (5.3) if and only if there exist $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ such that

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]} d\mu_i(x) = \int_X \Psi\left(\frac{d\nu_1}{dm}(z), \frac{d\nu_{-1}}{dm}(z)\right) dm(z) \quad (5.7)$$

and likewise for (ν_1, ν_{-1}) which would solve (5.6) if such an h exists. We then have the following proposition.

⁴In (5.5), one can consider more general potentials than continuous ones, and maximize in the class of m -measurable ψ 's for which $\psi^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]}$ is finite i.e. satisfy the exponential integrability condition $\exp(\varepsilon^{-1}\psi) \in L^1(m)$.

Proposition 5.3. *Let $h \in F_\varepsilon$, $(\nu_1, \nu_{-1}) \in \mathcal{P}(X)^2$ and let α_i be the density of ν_i with respect to m . Then (h, ν_1, ν_{-1}) satisfies the primal-dual relation (5.7) if and only if:*

- for $i = \pm 1$, $l_i \circ h$ is a Schrödinger potential between μ_i and ν_i ,
- for m -a.e. $z \in X$, one has

$$h(z) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{t \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \alpha_1(z) l_1(t) + \alpha_{-1}(z) l_{-1}(t) \}, \quad (5.8)$$

- for $i = \pm 1$, ν_i satisfies,

$$\frac{d\nu_i}{dm}(z) = \int_X \frac{\exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z')) - c_i(x, z')}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z')} d\mu_i(x). \quad (5.9)$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the one of proposition 4.7. Indeed given $h \in F_\varepsilon$, thanks to (5.5) we have the following inequality:

$$T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]} d\mu_i(x) \geq \int_X l_i \circ h d\nu_i \quad (5.10)$$

which by summation gives

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} T_{c_i}^{\varepsilon, m}(\mu_i, \nu_i) + \int_X (l_i \circ h)^{[\varepsilon, c_i, m]} d\mu_i(x) \geq \int_X \Psi\left(\frac{d\nu_1}{dm}(z), \frac{d\nu_{-1}}{dm}(z)\right) dm(z). \quad (5.11)$$

Note that (5.7) implies equality in the chain of inequalities which proves the desired properties of h . Now (5.5) grants that the entropic optimal transport plan between μ_i and ν_i has a density with respect to $\mu_i \otimes m$ of the form

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\mu_i \otimes m}(x, z) = \frac{\exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z')) - c_i(x, z')}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z')}. \quad (5.12)$$

Integrating over x with respect to μ_i gives back the second marginal of γ and thus ν_i has the following density with respect to m :

$$\frac{d\nu_i}{dm}(z) = \int_X \frac{\exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z)) - c_i(x, z)}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z')) - c_i(x, z')}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z')} d\mu_i(x). \quad (5.13)$$

□

From the previous primal-dual optimality conditions, we can prove that the optimal classifier for the relaxed problem (5.3) is in fact continuous.

Corollary 5.4. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, assume that m has full support and either l_1 is decreasing or l_{-1} is increasing. If $h \in F_\varepsilon$ solves the relaxed problem (5.3), it has a continuous representative. Hence the initial problem (5.1) admits a (unique) solution.*

Proof. By Proposition 5.3, we know that, defining $\alpha_i(z) = \frac{d\nu_i}{dm}(z)$, for m -a.e. $z \in X$, $h(z)$ is a minimizer of the function

$$g : s \mapsto \alpha_1(z)l_1(s) + \alpha_{-1}(z)l_{-1}(s). \quad (5.14)$$

This function is convex and finite hence right and left differentiable everywhere and thus by the characterization of minimizers we have

$$g'(h(z)^-) \leq 0 \leq g'(h(z)^+). \quad (5.15)$$

Note that, again by Proposition 5.3, $\alpha_i(z) = \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z))}{\varepsilon}\right)F_i(z)$ where

$$F_i(z) = \int_X \frac{\exp\left(\frac{-c_i(x,z)}{\varepsilon}\right)}{\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i(h(z')) - c_i(x,z')}{\varepsilon}\right) dm(z')} d\mu_i(x), \quad (5.16)$$

so that F_i is a positive and continuous function. Let us now observe that the optimality conditions (5.15) satisfied by $h(z)$ are the same as for the minimization with respect to s of the function

$$H : (s, z) \mapsto \sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i(s)}{\varepsilon}\right)F_i(z) \quad (5.17)$$

which, under our assumptions, is strictly convex and coercive in s (uniformly in z) and jointly continuous in (s, z) . This guarantees that the map $\tilde{h} : z \in X \mapsto \operatorname{argmin}_{s \in \mathbb{R}} H(s, z)$ is continuous. Now h coincides m -a.e. with \tilde{h} and thus the continuous function \tilde{h} is also optimal and is the unique minimizer of (5.1) because m has full support. □

Finally in order to have a quantitative rate of convergence of the value of the regularized problem to the value of the original problem we strengthen the assumptions and show that the optimal classifier is Lipschitz uniformly in the regularization parameter.

Proposition 5.5. *In addition to the assumptions of Theorem 4.3, assume that m has full support and that*

- *for $i = \pm 1$, l_i is differentiable, l_1 is decreasing and l_{-1} is increasing,*
- *for $i = \pm 1$, c_i is Lipschitz in the second variable uniformly in the first one.*

Then, the optimal classifier i.e. the solution of (5.1) is bounded and Lipschitz uniformly in ε .

Proof. Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and h be the solution of (5.1). In what follows C will denote a positive constant that does not depend on ε but which may change from a line to another. Using the same notations as in Corollary 5.4 and its proof, we know that $h(z)$ is the minimizer of

$$g_z : s \mapsto \sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i(s)}{\varepsilon}\right) \exp\left(\frac{K_i(z)}{\varepsilon}\right) \quad (5.18)$$

where $K_i(z) = \varepsilon \log(F_i(z))$ (with F_i defined by (5.16)). That is $h(z)$ is the unique root of the equation

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} l'_i(s) \exp\left(\frac{l_i(s)}{\varepsilon}\right) \exp\left(\frac{K_i(z)}{\varepsilon}\right) = 0.$$

Remark that by boundedness of c_i and optimality of h we have

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} \varepsilon \log\left(\int_X \exp\left(\frac{l_i \circ h}{\varepsilon}\right) dm\right) \leq C$$

this implies that $K_i(z)$ is bounded uniformly in z and in ε . Together with our Lipschitz assumption on c_i , this gives

$$|K_i(z)| \leq C, |K_i(z_1) - K_i(z_0)| \leq C|z_1 - z_0|, \forall (z, z_0, z_1) \in X^3. \quad (5.19)$$

Moreover since $s = h(z)$ minimizes g_z , we have

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i(s)}{\varepsilon}\right) \exp\left(\frac{K_i(z)}{\varepsilon}\right) \leq \sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i(0)}{\varepsilon}\right) \exp\left(\frac{K_i(z)}{\varepsilon}\right). \quad (5.20)$$

Taking the logarithm of each side of the previous inequality, by (5.19) and concavity of the logarithm, we obtain

$$\sum_{i=\pm 1} l_i(s) + K_i(z) \leq 2 \max_{i=\pm 1} l_i(0) + 2 \max_{i=\pm 1} K_i(z) \leq C. \quad (5.21)$$

We already observed in the proof of Proposition 5.2 that $l_1(s) + l_{-1}(s) \geq a|s| - \frac{1}{a}$ for some $a \in (0, 1)$ and every s , hence h can be uniformly bounded independently of ε .

Let us now show that h is Lipschitz on X uniformly in ε . Let us further assume for the moment that l_1 and l_{-1} are of class C^2 . Take $z_0, z_1 \in X$ define $s_0 = h(z_0)$, $s_1 = h(z_1)$ and for $t \in [0, 1]$, set $K_i^t := (1-t)K_i(z_0) + tK_i(z_1)$ and

$$G_t(\cdot) := \sum_{i=\pm 1} \exp\left(\frac{l_i(\cdot) + K_i^t}{\varepsilon}\right), \quad s(t) := \operatorname{argmin} G_t$$

so that $s(t)$ is a curve joining s_0 to s_1 . Arguing as for (5.21) and using the uniform bound (5.19), we can find a uniform bound for $s(t)$: $s(t) \in [-M, M]$ for every $t \in [0, 1]$. It follows from the implicit function Theorem that $s(\cdot)$ is differentiable and by differentiating the optimality condition $G'_t(s(t)) = 0$, we see that its derivative $\dot{s}(t)$ satisfies

$$|\dot{s}(t)| \leq \frac{\sum_{i=\pm 1} e^{\frac{l_i(s(t)) + K_i^t}{\varepsilon}} |l'_i(s(t))| |K_i(z_1) - K_i(z_0)|}{\sum_{i=\pm 1} e^{\frac{l_i(s(t)) + K_i^t}{\varepsilon}} [\varepsilon l''_i(s(t)) + l'_i(s(t))^2]}$$

hence by (5.19) and using the fact that $|l'_i|$ is bounded and bounded away from 0 on $[-M, M]$, we get

$$|h(z_1) - h(z_0)| \leq \int_0^1 |\dot{s}| \leq C \max_{i=\pm 1} |K_i(z_1) - K_i(z_0)| \leq C|z_1 - z_0|$$

where the constant C depends on the first derivatives of the losses but neither on their second derivatives nor on ε . If the losses l_i are just differentiable, we can approximate them by C^2 ones by convolution. By the previous argument, the optimal classifiers for these approximated losses are uniformly Lipschitz (with a Lipschitz constant that does not depend on ε) and converge (by uniqueness) to the optimal classifier for the initial losses l_i . We can therefore remove the extra assumption that l_i is C^2 and reach the very same estimate which enables us to conclude that the solution of (5.1) is Lipschitz uniformly in ε . \square

We conclude with the following rate of convergence which is a direct consequence of the rate of convergence of the softmax towards the maximum.

Proposition 5.6. *Under the assumptions of Proposition 5.5, if we further assume that there is $\delta > 0$ such that*

$$\liminf_{r \rightarrow 0} \inf_{x \in Z} \frac{m(B(x, r))}{r^\delta} > 0. \quad (5.22)$$

Then we have $0 \leq \bar{v} - \bar{v}_\varepsilon = O(\varepsilon \log(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}))$ as $\varepsilon \downarrow 0$.

Proof. The lower bound is a direct consequence of the softmax being smaller than the maximum. For the upper bound, we will use the following argument. Given $L > 0$ and an L -Lipschitz function g from X to \mathbb{R} , we have for $\varepsilon > 0$:

$$\varepsilon \log \left(\int_X e^{g(z)/\varepsilon} dm(z) \right) - \max_{z \in X} g(z) \geq -\alpha + \varepsilon \log(m(\{g - \max g \geq -\alpha\}))$$

for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_+$. The fact that g is L -Lipschitz ensures that $m(\{g - \max g \geq -\alpha\}) \geq m(B(x_0, \alpha/L)) \geq C \left(\frac{\alpha}{L}\right)^\delta$ (where x_0 is a maximum point of g and C is a positive constant obtained from the condition (5.22), hence only depending on m). Thus we have

$$\varepsilon \log \left(\int_X e^{g(z)/\varepsilon} dm(z) \right) - \max_{z \in X} g(z) \geq -\alpha + \varepsilon \left(\delta \log \left(\frac{\alpha}{L} \right) + \log(C) \right).$$


Taking $\alpha = L\varepsilon$ grants the result since the optimal classifiers for (5.1) are uniformly Lipschitz as $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ as we have shown in Proposition 5.5. \square

5.2 Numerical Results


The interest of the regularized problem lies in the fact that under suitable differentiability assumptions on l_i one can directly use a gradient descent algorithm to compute the solution. In this section, we present numerical solutions of the regularized problem (5.1) for different values of ε . In all the examples, the space X will be the one dimensional torus⁵ $X = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$; the cost will be functions of the distance d on the torus and we will take $c_1 = c_{-1} = c$. The loss functions will be given by $l_i(s) = \log(1 + e^{-is})$. The reference measure is $m = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \frac{1}{N} \delta_{\frac{k}{N}}$. Throughout this section, we take $N = 10^3$ and the measures μ_i will have a density with respect to m .

Impact of ε . In this paragraph, we look at the impact of ε . We set μ_1 the measure supported on $[0.5, 1]$ with uniform density with respect to m and μ_{-1} the measure supported over $[0, 0.5]$ with uniform density with respect to m . The cost c is taken to be equal to the distance on the torus. In Figure 1a, we show the classifier we obtain for different values of ε . As ε decreases the classifier becomes less and less regular and more and more confident. This is a direct consequence of the fact that the larger the ε the more the adversary will be able to move mass around. Note that the singularity of the optimal adversarial attack, which involves splitting the mass, only appears for $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$.


Figure 1: Impact of ε




(a) Graph of the classifier for varying values of ε .



(b) The adversarial strategies for $\varepsilon = 10^{-1}$




(c) The adversarial strategies for $\varepsilon = 10^{-2}$




(d) The adversarial strategies for $\varepsilon = 10^{-3}$


Figure 2: Impact of the cost




(a) Graph of the classifier for varying values of the cost $c = d^r$.



(b) The adversarial strategies for $r = 0.5$




(c) The adversarial strategies for $r = 1$




(d) The adversarial strategies for $r = 1.5$


Figure 3: Impact of the initial measures




(a) Graph of the classifier for varying initial measures μ_i .



(b) The adversarial strategies for $p = 2$



(c) The adversarial strategies for $p = 4$



(d) The adversarial strategies for $p = 6$

Impact of the cost. We now look at the impact of the power r on the distance. The measures are the same as in the study of the impact of ε . The regularity parameter ε is taken to be equal to 10^{-2} . In Figure 2a, we display the classifier we obtain for different costs of the form $c(x, z) = d(x, z)^r$ for $r \in \{0.5, 1, 1.5, 2, 2.5\}$. Notice that as the power r increases it becomes less and less costly for the adversary to move mass around. This is coherent with the fact the absolute value of the classifier h decreases with r . Note as well that as r increases ν_1 and ν_{-1} become closer and closer. It is also worth noting the cusp of the optimal attack for the square root cost.

Impact of the initial measures. Finally, we take a discontinuous

⁵conveniently identified with the unit circle or with the unit interval $[0, 1]$ with periodic boundary conditions.

cost which prevents the adversary from moving mass too far away, namely $c(x, z) = 1_{d(x, z) > 0.1}$. The measures μ_i are taken to be constant over interleaving intervals of growing number $p \in \{2, 4, 6, 8, 10\}$. More precisely, μ_{-1} is uniform over $\cup_{k=0}^{p/2} [2k/p, (2k+1)/p]$ and μ_1 is uniform over the complement. Figure 3a shows the evolution of the classifiers with the total number of intervals. When there are 10 intervals it is possible for the adversary to match ν_1 and ν_{-1} without incurring any cost. This explains that the classifier cannot distinguish between the two measures.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we have considered a zero-sum game between a player designing a soft binary classifier and an adversary who may corrupt the true distributions at the expense of some transport cost. Under some mild regularity assumptions on the loss and transport cost functions, we have shown that this game has a value. More importantly, in our opinion, we established the existence of *continuous* optimal classifiers by exploiting some specific properties of a convex minimization problem (see (3.1)) sharing some similarities with the Kantorovich dual formulation of optimal transportation. We also proposed a softmax approximation of this problem, studied its convergence, as the regularization parameter vanishes, and presented some numerical simulations based on this approximation. In these simulations, we considered toy one-dimensional situations (not because of special properties of optimal transport in one dimension but because of the dimension of the softmax approximation which involves integrations with respect to a reference measure m with full support).

Among possible perspectives, let us mention, on the theoretical side, the extension of our analysis to adversarial multi-class classification [11]. On the computational side, investigating efficient schemes that are able to treat more realistic higher-dimensional examples would be desirable.

Acknowledgments: G.C. acknowledges the support of the Lagrange Mathematics and Computing Research Center.

References

- [1] Martin Arjovsky, Soumith Chintala, and Léon Bottou. Wasserstein generative adversarial networks. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh,

- editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 214–223. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017.
- [2] Waïss Azizian, Franck Iutzeler, and Jérôme Malick. Regularization for Wasserstein distributionally robust optimization. *ESAIM Control Optim. Calc. Var.*, 29:Paper No. 33, 31, 2023.
 - [3] Dimitri P. Bertsekas and Steven E. Shreve. *Stochastic optimal control*, volume 139 of *Mathematics in Science and Engineering*. Academic Press, Inc. [Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers], New York-London, 1978. The discrete time case.
 - [4] Jose Blanchet, Yang Kang, and Karthyek Murthy. Robust Wasserstein profile inference and applications to machine learning. *J. Appl. Probab.*, 56(3):830–857, 2019.
 - [5] Andrea Braides. *Γ -convergence for beginners*, volume 22 of *Oxford Lecture Series in Mathematics and its Applications*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2002.
 - [6] Marco Cuturi. Sinkhorn distances: Lightspeed computation of optimal transport. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 26, 2013.
 - [7] Marco Cuturi and Arnaud Doucet. Fast computation of wasserstein barycenters. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 685–693. PMLR, 2014.
 - [8] Simone Di Marino and Augusto Gerolin. An optimal transport approach for the Schrödinger bridge problem and convergence of Sinkhorn algorithm. *J. Sci. Comput.*, 85(2):Paper No. 27, 28, 2020.
 - [9] Ivar Ekeland and Roger Témam. *Convex analysis and variational problems*, volume 28 of *Classics in Applied Mathematics*. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, english edition, 1999. Translated from the French.
 - [10] Nicolás García Trillos, Jakwang Kim, and Matt Jacobs. The multi-marginal optimal transport formulation of adversarial multiclass classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:Paper No. [45], 56, 2023.
 - [11] Nicolás García Trillos, Jakwang Kim, and Matt Jacobs. The multi-marginal optimal transport formulation of adversarial multiclass classification. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 24:Paper No. [45], 56, 2023.

- [12] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. In Z. Ghahramani, M. Welling, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 27. Curran Associates, Inc., 2014.
- [13] Ian J. Goodfellow, Jonathon Shlens, and Christian Szegedy. Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015, San Diego, CA, USA, May 7-9, 2015, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2015.
- [14] Christian Léonard. From the Schrödinger problem to the Monge-Kantorovich problem. *J. Funct. Anal.*, 262(4):1879–1920, 2012.
- [15] Aleksander Madry, Aleksandar Makelov, Ludwig Schmidt, Dimitris Tsipras, and Adrian Vladu. Towards deep learning models resistant to adversarial attacks. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [16] Laurent Meunier, Meyer Scetbon, Rafael B Pinot, Jamal Atif, and Yann Chevaleyre. Mixed nash equilibria in the adversarial examples game. In Marina Meila and Tong Zhang, editors, *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7677–7687. PMLR, 18–24 Jul 2021.
- [17] Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani and Daniel Kuhn. Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Math. Program.*, 171(1-2):115–166, 2018.
- [18] Marcel Nutz. Introduction to Entropic Optimal Transport, 2021.
- [19] Gabriel Peyré and Marco Cuturi. Computational optimal transport: With applications to data science. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5-6):355–607, 2019.
- [20] Rafael Pinot, Raphael Ettetdgui, Geovani Rizk, Yann Chevaleyre, and Jamal Atif. Randomization matters how to defend against strong adversarial attacks. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7717–7727. PMLR, 13–18 Jul 2020.

- [21] Walter Rudin. *Real and complex analysis*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, third edition, 1987.
- [22] Filippo Santambrogio. *Optimal transport for applied mathematicians*, volume 87 of *Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications*. Birkhäuser/Springer, Cham, 2015. Calculus of variations, PDEs, and modeling.
- [23] Christian Szegedy, Wojciech Zaremba, Ilya Sutskever, Joan Bruna, Dumitru Erhan, Ian J. Goodfellow, and Rob Fergus. Intriguing properties of neural networks. In Yoshua Bengio and Yann LeCun, editors, *2nd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2014, Banff, AB, Canada, April 14-16, 2014, Conference Track Proceedings*, 2014.
- [24] Nicolas Garcia Trillos, Matt Jacobs, and Jakwang Kim. On the existence of solutions to adversarial training in multiclass classification, 2023.
- [25] Nicolas Garcia Trillos, Matt Jacobs, Jakwang Kim, and Matthew Wernski. An optimal transport approach for computing adversarial training lower bounds in multiclass classification, 2024.
- [26] Cédric Villani. *Topics in optimal transportation*, volume 58 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2003.