

A Reliability Theory of Compromise Decisions for Large-Scale Stochastic Programs

Shuotao Diao*, Suvrajeet Sen[†]

shuotao.diao@northwestern.edu, s.sen@usc.edu

First Version: May 20, 2024

Abstract

Stochastic programming models can lead to very large-scale optimization problems for which it may be impossible to enumerate all possible scenarios. In such cases, one adopts a sampling-based solution methodology in which case the reliability of the resulting decisions may be suspect. For such instances, it is advisable to adopt methodologies that promote variance reduction. One such approach goes under a framework known as “compromise decision”, which requires multiple replications of the solution procedure. This paper studies the reliability of stochastic programming solutions resulting from the “compromise decision” process. This process is characterized by minimizing an aggregation of objective function approximations across replications, presumably conducted in parallel. We refer to the post-parallel-processing problem as the problem of “compromise decision”. We quantify the reliability of compromise decisions by estimating the expectation and variance of the “pessimistic distance” of sampled instances from the set of true optimal decisions. Such pessimistic distance is defined as an estimate of the largest possible distance of the solution of the sampled instance from the “true” optimal solution set. The Rademacher average of instances is used to bound the sample complexity of the compromise decision.

Keywords: Stochastic Programming, Sample Average Approximation, Rademacher Average

1 Motivation

Artificial Intelligence, Machine Learning, and Data Science (AMD) have become major sources of applications of stochastic optimization. In general, the class of AMD models are often based on the idea of Empirical Risk Minimization (ERM) in which vast amounts of data can be characterized via a class of

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Management Sciences, Northwestern University, Evanston IL, 60208, USA

[†]Epstein Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, University of Southern California, Los Angeles CA, 90089, USA

functions (e.g., affine, convex etc.) which can be used for predictive purposes. Concomitantly, we are also witnessing the growth of decision and design (DD) optimization for new applications in sustainable energy, environment, and even health-care decisions using Sample Average Approximation (SAA) [23]. These two classes of “applications” (AMD and DD) tend to have slightly different algorithmic requirements: AMD problems tend to seek *functions* which perform well across a range of plausible data using ERM, while DD seeks a finite dimensional *vector* which is predicted to perform well across a sampled collection of plausible scenarios using SAA. Statistically speaking, ERM and SAA are cousins of each other, drawing from the same “well” of sample complexity theory developed within the statistical learning (SL) literature. However, there are real-world implications associated with models of predictive and prescriptive analytics: in case of the former, small errors in predictions are often “easily forgiven,” (e.g., errors in predicting precipitation) whereas, errors in DD can often represent loss of coordination among multi-variate choices (e.g., different product lines), and can lead to operational havoc. Because coordination across multiple facets may contribute to much of the value-proposition of DD, it is important to have plans which dovetail well, even in the presence of significant uncertainty. For these reasons, choices which are recommended in the DD setting often call for greater reliability, especially because uncertainty has the potential to up-end the entire plan. To accommodate such coordination, our prior work has put forward the concept of “compromise decisions” for various versions of stochastic programming (SP) structures (e.g., Stochastic LPs [35], Stochastic Multi-Stage LPs [41], and Stochastic MIPs [42]). While the specifics of compromise decisions for each class is designed to address the specific structure of the model, they are all intended to enhance the reliability of decisions. However unlike the above papers, which are computationally motivated, this paper is envisioned as one providing *mathematical/statistical* foundations for the concept of Compromise Decisions.

There are several challenges which present barriers to overcoming the goals outlined above: a) Traditional SAA (as well as ERM) focuses on sample complexity based on probability estimates of approximation quality, b) it is not obvious how multiple sampling-based runs should be combined to provide one decision for the purposes of implementation, c) it is also burdensome to characterize the worst-case scenario (in distribution) of the estimated solution generated by a given SP algorithm. One recommendation (due to Nesterov) is to simply average outputs resulting from parallel runs (e.g., using multiple Stochastic Gradient Descent (SGD) runs). The challenge here is that it is unclear whether the variability associated with decisions are to be considered in some way. In this paper, we plan to provide sample complexity of DD associated with convex SP models. We expect that future papers will present more comprehensive theory to accommodate integer as well as other non-convex settings.

Importance sampling is one popular approach to reduce the variance associated with objective function estimates (of values as well as gradient/subgradient estimates) when using Monte Carlo sampling

[8]. It has been widely used to reduce variance in gradient estimates for portfolio [44, 19] and credit risk optimization [13]. Kozmík and Morton [24] also propose an importance sampling methodology to reduce the variance of the upper bound estimate of optimal cost from the Stochastic Dual Dynamic Programming (SDDP) algorithms in a risk-averse setting. Carson and Maria [7] summarized that the key to the success of importance sampling lies in the appropriate change of the probability measure used for rare event simulation.

Additionally, other popular variance reduction methods include linear control random variables method ([36]), in which a correlated random variable with mean zero is added to the objective function, as well as using common random numbers for variance reduction approach ([15], [22]). For a review of modern variance reduction techniques in stochastic optimization, we refer the readers to a survey by Homem-de-Mello and Bayraksan [17].

Other than the above-mentioned variance reduction techniques, Pasupathy and Song [29] propose an adaptive sequential SAA framework where the inner loop stopping criterion depends on the optimality gap and pointwise variance estimates and the outer loop utilizes previously estimated solution as a warm start.

When memory and computational time are no longer the bottleneck in computation (e.g. [43]), performing several replications of sampling procedures, perhaps in parallel, becomes an alternative to improve the objective function estimate and/or optimal solution estimate. Sen and Liu [35] propose a closed-loop methodology based on a composite function which aggregates the sum of piecewise linear objective function approximations (from multiple *independent runs*), together with a regularizing term which measures deviation from a sample average of decisions. The above approximation is what [35] refers to as the compromise problem, and the optimum solution of that problem is referred to as the compromise decision. The computational results reported in the aforementioned paper illustrates the power of aggregated approximations for stochastic linear programming problems, and their computational results demonstrate the variance reduction due to the compromise decision approach.

At approximately the same time as the publication of [35], the International Conference on SP (ICSP-13 in 2016) was held in Buzios, Brazil where several SP luminaries made the case for recommending general-purpose methodologies which could support *low variance decisions* for SP problems. During that session it was noted that while SP methodology was strongly supported by SAA-based theory, most SP algorithms were not designed to provide computational support for establishing the *reliability of decisions* proposed by SP software.

Motivated by the “disconnect” between SP theory and computations, we aim to present a theory which is based on a small set of principles that can be used to explain the computational success reported in the above-mentioned papers. Indeed, we focus on studying the finite-sample complexity of the Compromise

Decision approach to solve the following generic stochastic program

$$\min_{x \in X} f(x) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})]^*, \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{\xi} : \Omega \mapsto \Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a random variable with distribution μ defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma_{\Omega}, \mathbb{P})$, $X \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is the feasible region of x , and $F : X \times \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a Carathéodorian function (i.e., continuous in X and measurable for almost every $\xi \in \Xi$).

Given m ($m \geq 2$) replications, we let ξ_i^n , $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ and $\hat{x}(\xi_i^n)$ denote the sampled data sets (each of size n), objective function approximations (based on sampling-based estimates), and decision estimate in the i^{th} replication of Monte Carlo sampling to recommend an approximate solution to the problem in (1), respectively. The compromise decision problem for convex SP, based on m replications is formulated as follows:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2. \quad (2)$$

The addition of the quadratic regularizer to the objective function has been widely used in SP algorithms such as the proximal point method [32], proximal bundle method [21], mirror descent method [27], regularized SD [16], regularized SDDP [1, 14], and more recently, SDLP [12]. Furthermore, the use of the decision-based regularizer in (2) can be interpreted as one way of countering overfitting. SP models in our setting often involve multi-dimensional random variables and the sampling distribution $\hat{\mu}_N$ often involves N which is so large, as to be untenable for constrained optimization. In this sense, the size of n which we use in SP is relatively small as to be similar to the case of overfitting in statistics .

Algorithm 1 Compromise Decision Approach

Initialization: Set sample size $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, replication number $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$, $\rho \in (0, +\infty)$, and an *Algorithm* Υ for the *replication* step.

Replication Step: For $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, use *Algorithm* Υ compute estimated decision, $\hat{x}(\xi_i^n)$, and function estimation, $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$, of the i^{th} replication.

Aggregation Step: Aggregate function estimates $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ with certain augmentation. Aggregate estimated decisions as $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n)$. Obtain the ϵ -optimal solution of the compromise decision problem in (2).

The compromise decision problem consists of an estimated aggregation of sampled value function approximations, and a penalty based on a distance to the average decision estimate. It can also be interpreted as performing one step of the proximal point method for solving $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ given that the initial estimate is $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n)$. Let $\bar{x}_N(\xi^N) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}(\xi_i^n)$ and let $x_N^c(\xi^N)$ denote the optimal solution of (2). It is obvious that if $\bar{x}_N(\xi^N)$ and $x_N^c(\xi^N)$ agree, then both are optimal to $\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$. This observation has been transformed into a stopping rule for compromise SD

* $\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] = \int_{\Omega} F(x, \tilde{\xi}(\omega)) d\mathbb{P} = \int_{\Xi} F(x, \xi) \mu(d\xi)$.

([35]). In short, the Compromise Decision approach consists of two steps: a *replication* step and an *aggregation* step. We summarize the Compromise Decision approach in Algorithm 1.

Motivated by the computational evidence of successful use of the Compromise Decision problem [35, 41, 42], this paper aims to expound on a mathematical foundation for those successes. In particular, we shall address the following questions which will support a mathematical (as opposed to computational) basis for Compromise Decisions:

1. How should one quantify the reliability of the estimated decisions of stochastic programs?
2. What is the reliability of a compromise decision when a particular algorithm is used in each replication?
3. More specifically, what is the reliability of compromise decisions with SD algorithm involved in each replication of a stochastic QP?

The above agenda is not only novel, but it provides a theoretical justification for reliable decision-making using SP. It is important to recognize that in the absence of such a theory, sampling-based computational algorithms for SP (including traditional SDDP [30]) are likely to lead to *both sub-optimality and/or lower reliability* (i.e., *greater variability*). Computational evidence of such risks, especially for multi-stage SP, are presented in [41].

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we review Rademacher complexity and its use in bounding the sample complexity of point estimates of the objective function and its variance. In section 3, we present both *exact* and *inexact* compromise decision problem formulation and its quantitative reliability. In section 4, we discuss the sample complexity analysis of the compromise decision when a cutting-plane-type algorithm is used to solve each replication of the approximation problem. Finally, we provide the theoretical evidence of the success of using SD algorithms for the compromise decision problem in section 5.

1.1 Notations

We let $\tilde{\xi} : \Omega \mapsto \Xi \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ denote a random vector defined on a probability space $(\Omega, \Sigma_\Omega, \mathbb{P})$ and let ξ denote one realization of $\tilde{\xi}$. Let $\tilde{\xi}_1, \tilde{\xi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n$ denote independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) copies of $\tilde{\xi}$. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, we let ξ_i denote the realization of $\tilde{\xi}_i$ and let $\xi^n \triangleq \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\}$ denote the set of realizations of n i.i.d. copies of $\tilde{\xi}$. Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be a nonempty compact set of decisions, and let $F : X \times \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodorean function. We let $\Pr\{\cdot\}$ denote the probability of an event, and let $\|\cdot\|$ denote the Euclidean norm.

Without further specification, we let n denote the sample size of each replication and let m denote the

number of replications. We let ξ_i^n denote the sample set with size n in the i^{th} replication. In particular, we let $\xi_i^n = \{\xi_{(i-1)n+j}\}_{j=1}^n$. We let $N = mn$ denote the total sample size and let $\xi^N = \cup_{i=1}^m \xi_i^n$ denote the mega-sample set. Without loss of generality, we consider the case in which the sample size for each replication is the same, although it is straightforward to extend the analysis to the case of heterogeneous sample sizes among the replications.

As for the notations in the Rademacher complexity, we let $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables with $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ being equally likely to be 1 or -1 . That is, $\Pr(\tilde{\sigma} = 1) = \Pr(\tilde{\sigma} = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$. Furthermore, we require that $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ are independent of $\tilde{\xi}$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$.

To study ϵ -optimality of a solution, we shall define the following metric to measure the *pessimistic* distance between two sets (see [10, 11, 29] for similar uses).

Definition 1 (Pessimistic Distance). *Let A and B be two sets from an Euclidean space. The pessimistic distance of A to B is defined as follows:*

$$\Delta(A, B) \triangleq \sup_{a \in A} \inf_{b \in B} \|a - b\|. \quad (3)$$

An interpretation of $\Delta(A, B)$ is that it is the largest distance from a point of set A to set B . For instance, if A is the set of possible estimated solutions and B is the set of optimal solutions. Then $\Delta(A, B)$ is the farthest distance from the estimated solution to the optimal solution set.

The following theorem describes the Lipschitzian behavior of the ϵ -optimal solution set in terms of the metric defined in (3).

Theorem 1.1. [10] *Assume that X is a nonempty compact convex set and $f : X \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ is a lower semicontinuous convex function. Let the following definitions hold: $D_X = \max_{x, x' \in X} \|x - x'\|$; $\theta^* = \min_{x \in X} f(x)$; $\epsilon' > \epsilon > 0$, $X_\epsilon = \{x \in X : f(x) \leq \theta^* + \epsilon\}$, and $X_{\epsilon'} = \{x \in X : f(x) \leq \theta^* + \epsilon'\}$. Then the following holds:*

$$\Delta(X_{\epsilon'}, X_\epsilon) \leq \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X.$$

Proof. See [10, Theorem 3.11]. ■

The results of Theorem 1.1 relate the perturbation of the objective function (e.g., estimation error from sampling) to the ϵ -solution set. It will be one of the major tools for studying the reliability of the compromise decisions. When $\epsilon' = \epsilon > 0$, $\Delta(X_{\epsilon'}, X_\epsilon) = 0$ and $\frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X = 0$. Hence, the inequality in Theorem 1.1 still holds when $\epsilon' = \epsilon > 0$.

Finally, we summarize key notations and their use in computation and/or analysis in Appendix A.

1.2 Contributions

The contributions of this paper are two-fold: (1) We propose a unifying framework to compute compromise decisions by aggregating information from multiple replications of SP runs; (2) We provide a quantitative way to measure the reliability of the compromise decision.

Here, we summarize our contribution to the reliability of the compromise decisions when a class of SP methods are involved in solving each replication in Table 1. We say that if one compromise decision has better reliability than another compromise decision, then the former one has a faster convergence rate in both expectation and variance of the pessimistic distance (in Definition 1) to the (ϵ) -optimal solution set. Thus we use a 2-tuple to describe the reliability of the compromise decision. In particular, the first element (of the 2-tuple) will denote the expectation of the pessimistic distance, whereas, the second element of the 2-tuple measures the variance of the pessimistic distance to the (ϵ) -optimal solution set. Due to the sublinear convergence rate of SD for SQQP problems, we observe that the compromise decision using SD (in section 5) has a higher reliability than the one using SAA (in section 3) or cutting-plane-type methods (in section 4). It is also expected that deterministic cutting-plane methods (such as Benders Decomposition or L-shaped method) and SAA have the same reliability because a deterministic method can only deliver what is permissible within the SAA setup.

Method in the <i>replication</i> step	Problem type	Reliability
SAA	Convex	$(O(\frac{1}{n^\lambda}), O(\frac{1}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{1}{n^2\lambda}))$, $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$
Cutting-plane-type methods	Convex	Same as above
SD	Two-stage SQQP	$(O(\frac{1}{n}), O(\frac{1}{mn} + \frac{1}{n^2}))$

Table 1: Reliability of Compromise Decisions

2 Background on Sample Complexity: Point Estimates and Rademacher Average

In order to set the stage for the goals outlined earlier, we begin by reviewing the notion of Rademacher average and its use in bounding a sample average approximation of the objective function and a sample variance of the random cost function.

As mentioned by [3], “Rademacher complexity is commonly used to describe the data-dependent complexity of a function class”. One key advantage of (empirical) Rademacher average (or complexity) is that it can be measured from a finite sample set (see [3] for i.i.d. cases, and [26] for non-i.i.d. cases). As a result, it can be used to estimate the finite-sample error of a function class. Rademacher average has been widely used in neural networks ([2]), support vector machine ([39]), and decision trees ([18]).

The common finite-sample approximation of (1) is known as the sample average approximation (SAA), and is written as follows.

$$\min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi^n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_i). \quad (4)$$

Since we will study multiple replications of sampling, we write the sample set explicitly in the argument of the $f_n(x; \cdot)$ to distinguish different sample sets. A similar notational style will apply to sample variance, estimated solutions and compromise decisions.

The variance of the random cost function, $F(x, \tilde{\xi})$, parameterized by the decision x , is defined as

$$\text{Var}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[\left(F(x, \tilde{\xi}) - f(x) \right)^2 \right].$$

The unbiased estimate of the variance of $F(x, \tilde{\xi})$ is formulated as

$$s_n^2(x; \xi^n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n \left[F(x, \xi_i) - \hat{f}_n(x) \right]^2. \quad (5)$$

We let Y denote a convex compact set in \mathbb{R} , and define a compound function $H : X \times Y \times \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ with $H(x, y, \xi) = (F(x, \xi) - y)^2$. As suggested in [11], the variance of $F(x, \tilde{\xi})$ can be written as a compound function as follows:

$$\text{Var}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[H(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \tilde{\xi}) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[\left(F(x, \tilde{\xi}) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] \right)^2 \right].$$

Furthermore, the sample variance, $s_n^2(x)$, can be rewritten as the sum of compound functions below.

$$s_n^2(x; \xi^n) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, \frac{1}{n} F(x, \xi_i), \xi_i). \quad (6)$$

Throughout the paper, we make the following assumptions:

Assumption 2.1. *Let $X \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be a nonempty compact set of decisions, and let $F : X \times \Xi \mapsto \mathbb{R}$ be a Carathéodoraian function.*

1. $X \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ is a nonempty compact convex set contained in a cube whose edge-length is D .
2. $F(x, \xi)$ is Hölder continuous in x with constant L_F and $\gamma \in (0, 1]$ for all $\xi \in \Xi$. That is, $|F(x, \xi) - F(y, \xi)| \leq L_F \|x - y\|^\gamma$ for all $x, y \in X$ and $\xi \in \Xi$.
3. There exists $M_F \in (0, \infty)$ such that $\sup_{x \in X, \xi \in \Xi} |F(x, \xi)| < M_F$. Let $Y \subset \mathbb{R}$ be $Y \triangleq [-M_F, M_F]$.

We note that the assumption of boundedness of the feasible region and the objective function is common in the SP literature [38, 27, 11]. Also, the Hölder continuity condition of the objective function is a generalization of its Lipschitzian counterpart. The introduction of the soundness parameters and Hölder continuity-related parameters are later used to bound the Rademacher average of the random cost function and its variance.

Next we introduce the definition of the Rademacher average of a finite set of vectors.

Definition 2 ([6]). *Let $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables with $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ being equally likely to be 1 or -1 (i.e., $\Pr(\tilde{\sigma}_i = 1) = \Pr(\tilde{\sigma}_i = -1) = \frac{1}{2}$ for $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$). Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a bounded set of vectors $a = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$, the Rademacher average associated with A is defined below:*

$$R_n(A) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\sup_{a \in A} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right| \right]. \quad (7)$$

The following lemma yields an upper bound of the Rademacher average of a finite set. Note that it is a modification of [6, Theorem 3] which requires a slight re-orientation.

Lemma 2.1. *If $A = \{a^{(1)}, \dots, a^{(N)}\} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is a finite set, then*

$$R_n(A) \leq \max_{j=1, \dots, N} \|a^{(j)}\| \frac{\sqrt{2 \log 2N}}{n} \quad (8)$$

Proof. See the Appendix B.1. ■

Lemma 2.1 is fundamental to the study of the upper bound of the Rademacher average of a function class. The Rademacher average of a function class is defined as follows.

Definition 3 ([11]). *Let $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables with $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ being equally likely to be 1 or -1 . For a set of points $(\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n) = \xi^n$ in Ξ and a sequence of functions $\{F(\cdot, \xi_i) : X \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}$, the Rademacher average of a function class is defined as:*

$$R_n(F, \xi^n) \triangleq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i F(x, \xi_i) \right| \right]. \quad (9)$$

Furthermore, the Rademacher average of a family of functions $\{F(\cdot, \xi) : X \mapsto \mathbb{R}\}_{\xi \in \Xi}$ is defined as:

$$R_n(F, \Xi) \triangleq \sup_{\xi_1 \in \Xi, \dots, \xi_n \in \Xi} R_n(F, \xi^n). \quad (10)$$

The following lemma provides upper bounds of Rademacher average of a sequence of functions studied by [11], although we modify the affected constant resulting from Lemma 2.1. Note that the lemma below

assumes that the feasible region is discrete and it is free of the Assumption 2.1. Moreover, it should be regarded as a building block for further results.

Lemma 2.2 ([11]). *Let the set $X \subset \mathbb{R}^p$ be discrete and contain a finite number of elements $|X| \leq m^p$, and assume $\sup_{x \in X} |F(x, \xi_i)| \leq M(\xi_i) \leq \max_{1 \leq i \leq n} M(\xi_i) = M_n(\xi^n)$, then the following holds:*

$$R_n(F, \xi^n) \leq M_n(\xi^n) \sqrt{2 \log 2 |X| / n} \leq M_n(\xi^n) \sqrt{2p(\log 2m)/n} \quad (11)$$

With the help of Lemma 2.2, we can derive the upper bound of Rademacher average of the random cost function, $F(x, \xi)$, in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.3 ([11]). *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Then*

$$R_n(F, \xi^n) \leq \left(L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2 + \frac{p}{2\gamma} \log n)} \right) / \sqrt{n}, \quad (12)$$

where L_F and γ are the constants in the Hölder continuity of $F(\cdot, \xi)$, n is the sample size, p is the dimension of the decision, x , and D is the edge length of the cube that contains the feasible region, X . Furthermore, for $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have

$$R_n(F, \xi^n) \leq \frac{N_F}{n^\lambda} \quad (13)$$

where $N_F = L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2)} + \frac{M_F p^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\gamma(1-2\lambda)e}}$.

Proof. See the Appendix B.2 ■

Since the constant N_F in Lemma 2.3 stays the same for any $\xi \in \Xi$, we conclude that

$$R_n(F, \Xi) = \sup_{\xi_1 \in \Xi, \dots, \xi_n \in \Xi} R_n(F, \xi^n) \leq \frac{N_F}{n^\lambda}.$$

To derive the upper bound of Rademacher average of the compound function, $H(x, y, \xi) = (F(x, \xi) - y)^2$, we need to show that $H(x, y, \xi)$ is Lipschitz continuous in (x, z) given that $F(x, \xi)$ is Hölder continuous in x and $F(x, \xi)$ is uniformly bounded.

Lemma 2.4. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Then $H(x, y, \xi) \triangleq (F(x, \xi) - y)^2$ is Lipschitz continuous in (x, y) with Lipschitz constant $4M_F \sqrt{L_F^2 + 1}$ (i.e., $|H(x_1, y_1, \xi) - H(x_2, y_2, \xi)| \leq 4M_F \sqrt{L_F^2 + 1} \|(x_1, y_1) - (x_2, y_2)\|$, $\forall (x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$). Furthermore, $H(x, y, \xi)$ is Lipschitz continuous in y with Lipschitz constant $4M_F$ and $H(x, y, \xi)$ is uniformly bounded by $4M_F^2$.*

Proof. See Appendix B.3. ■

The upper bound of the Rademacher average of the compound function $H(x, y, \xi)$ follows from Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4, which is summarized below.

Lemma 2.5. *Let $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \tilde{\sigma}_2, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n$ be i.i.d. random variables with $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ being equally likely to be 1 or -1 . Let the Rademacher average of the set of sequences of H be*

$$R_n(H, \xi^n) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \sup_{x \in X, y \in Y} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i H(x, y, \xi_i) \right|.$$

Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Let $L_H = 4M_F \sqrt{L_F^2 + 1}$ and $M_H = 4M_F^2$. For any $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have the following result:

$$R_n(H, \xi^n) \leq \frac{N_H}{n^\lambda}, \quad (14)$$

where $N_H = L_H D(p+1)^{\frac{1}{2}} + M_H \sqrt{2(\log 2)} + \frac{M_F(p+1)^{1/2}}{\sqrt{(1-2\lambda)e}}$.

Proof. This is a direct result of combining Lemmas 2.3 and 2.4. ■

In the following, we will use the Rademacher average to study the sampling error of the objective function estimates. Given a sample set ξ^n , we define the supremum of sampling error of the objective function estimate below.

Definition 4. *Let $\xi^n = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_n\}$ denote the realizations of n i.i.d. copies of $\tilde{\xi}$. The supremum of sampling error of the objective function estimate is defined as follows:*

$$\delta_n^f(\xi^n) = \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] \right|. \quad (15)$$

In Appendix C, we explain how to use the Rademacher average of a function class, shadow random variables (i.e., ξ'_1, \dots, ξ'_n so that $\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d.), and symmetric argument to bound $\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)]$. For more details about the symmetric argument, please see [6].

We summarize the bound of $\delta_n^f(\xi^n)$ derived by Ermoliev and Norkin [11] using Rademacher average of a function class in the following theorem.

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Let N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. For any $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, then the following holds:*

1.

$$\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)] \leq 2R_n(F, \Xi) \leq \frac{2N_F}{n^\lambda},$$

2.

$$\Pr \left\{ n^\lambda \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n) \geq 2N_F + t \right\} \leq \exp \left(-\frac{t^2}{2M_F^2} \right).$$

Proof. See [11, Corollary 3.2]. ■

By Assumption 2.1, we observe that $|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_i) - \mathbb{E}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})]| \leq 2M_F$, which implies that $\delta_n^f(\xi^n) \leq 2M_F$. One direct consequence of Theorem 2.6 is that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)] &= \mathbb{E}[(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n))^2] - \mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)]^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}[(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n))^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[2M_F \delta_n^f(\xi^n)] \leq \frac{4M_F N_F}{n^\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

We derive the sample complexity of the sample variance in the next lemma.

Lemma 2.7. *Denote*

$$\delta_n^h(\xi^n) = \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H \left(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F(x, \xi_j), \xi_i \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[H \left(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \tilde{\xi} \right) \right] \right|$$

and

$$\hat{\delta}_n(\xi^n) = \sup_{x \in X, y \in Y} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, y, \xi_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[H(x, y, \tilde{\xi}) \right] \right|.$$

Suppose that Assumption 2.1 holds. Then the following holds:

1.

$$\delta_n^h(\xi^n) \leq 4M_F \delta_n^f(\xi^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\xi^n)$$

2.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta_n^h(\tilde{\xi}^n)] &\leq 8M_F R_n(F, \Xi) + 2R_n(H, \Xi) \\ &\leq \frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{n^\lambda}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, N_F is a constant defined in Lemma 2.3, and N_H is a constant defined in Lemma 2.5.

Proof. See Appendix B.4. ■

With a slight abuse of the notation, we let $\sigma(x) = \text{Var}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})]$. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} |s_n^2(x) - \sigma^2(x)| &= \left| \frac{n}{n-1} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F(x, \xi_k), \xi_i) - \sigma^2(x) \right| \\ &\leq \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F(x, \xi_k), \xi_i) - \sigma^2(x) \right| \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{n-1} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F(x, \xi_k), \xi_i) \right|. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

By Lemmas 2.4 and 2.7, it follows from (17) that

$$\sup_{x \in X} \left| s_n^2(x, \tilde{\xi}^n) - \sigma^2(x) \right| \leq 4M_F \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\tilde{\xi}^n) + \frac{4M_F^2}{n-1}, \quad (18)$$

and hence,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| s_n^2(x, \tilde{\xi}^n) - \sigma^2(x) \right| \right] \leq \frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{n^\lambda} + \frac{4M_F^2}{n-1}.$$

Let $Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$ be the Z score of two-sided $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval (i.e., $Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2})$, where $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is the inverse of the cumulative distribution function of standard normal distribution). Let $s_n^2(x; \xi_i^n)$ be the sample variance of $F(x, \xi)$ in the i^{th} replication. With the bound in (18), we could derive the sample complexity of the margin of error with m replications as follows (see Appendix D for detailed derivation):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m s_n^2(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n)}{n}} Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right] &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{mn} + \frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{mn^{(1+\lambda)}} + \frac{4M_F^2}{mn(n-1)}} Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ &\leq O((mn)^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The upper bound given in (19) not only agrees with the common sense, which is $\left(O\left((mn)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right)$, but also indicates that the bias term $\left(\frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{mn^{(1+\lambda)}} + \frac{4M_F^2}{mn(n-1)} \right)$ diminishes faster than the unbiased term $\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{mn}$.

3 Sample Complexity of Compromise Decisions

In this section, we shall formulate an *exact* compromise decision problem and its *inexact* counterpart. We aim to study the quantitative reliability of the associated compromise decisions. We make one additional convexity assumption of the random cost function, $F(x, \xi)$, and one additional assumption on the sampling scheme, below:

Assumption 3.1. $F(x, \xi)$ is convex in $x \in X$ for every $\xi \in \Xi$.

Assumption 3.2. Given integer replication number $m \in \mathbb{Z}_+$ and integer sample size per replication $n \in \mathbb{Z}_+$. Let $N \triangleq mn$ denote the total sample size. Assume that $\tilde{\xi}_1, \tilde{\xi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_N$ are i.i.d. random variables which follow the distribution of $\tilde{\xi}$.

Furthermore, Let $\tilde{\xi}^N \triangleq \{\tilde{\xi}_1, \tilde{\xi}_2, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_N\}$ denote the collection of all samples. For $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$, let $\tilde{\xi}_i^n \triangleq \{\tilde{\xi}_{n(i-1)+1}, \tilde{\xi}_{n(i-1)+2}, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_{ni}\}$ denote the collection of samples used in the i^{th} replication.

We start with a basic formulation where we can solve each replication of the SAA problem to optimality and use it to give a brief introduction to the compromise decision methodology. The compromise

decision methodology consists of two key steps, which are *replication* step and *aggregation* step (see Algorithm 1). In the *replication* step, we build a SAA function for each replication,

$$f_n(x; \xi_i^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F(x, \xi_{(i-1)n+j}^n), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (20)$$

Then we solve the SAA problem to obtain the minimizer of $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$, which is denoted by $x_n(\xi_i^n)$. The problem below illustrates the *replication* step.

$$x_n(\xi_i^n) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi_i^n), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m.$$

In the *aggregation* step, we find the compromise decision that minimizes the *aggregation* of the information from SAA functions and their corresponding minimizers. Given a regularizer $\rho \in (0, \infty)$, this *aggregation* problem (which we refer to as *exact* compromise decision problem) can be formulated as follows:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_n(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2. \quad (21)$$

We let $\tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\xi^N)$ denote the optimal solution of the *exact* compromise decision problem in (21). Let $\theta_{N,\rho}(\xi^N)$ and θ^* denote the optimal values of *exact* compromise decision problem in (21) and true problem in (1), respectively. We shall show that $\mathbb{E}[|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|] \leq \frac{6m-4}{mn^\lambda} N_F$ and $\text{Var} \left[|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*| \right] \leq \frac{36M_F N_F}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{36N_F^2}{n^{2\lambda}}$, for $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and a problem-specific constant N_F defined in Lemma 2.3.

In the second part of this section, we will focus on a more general case in which only inexact optimal solutions from m replications are accessible to us. Let $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$ denote an ϵ -optimal solution set of the i^{th} replication of the SAA problem:

$$X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) = \left\{ x \in X : f_n(x; \xi_i^n) \leq \text{minimum} \left\{ f_n(x; \xi_i^n) \mid x \in X \right\} + \epsilon \right\} \quad (22)$$

We let $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$ denote one element of $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$ (i.e., $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$). As a result, the *inexact* compromise decision problem which allows a collection of ϵ -optimal solutions from all the m replications is written below:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2. \quad (23)$$

Let $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}$ and X_ϵ^* denote ϵ -optimal solution sets of *inexact* compromise decision problem in (23) and true problem in (1), respectively. We shall measure the reliability of the compromise decisions to (23) by showing that

1. $\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] \leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}$.

2. $\Pr \left\{ \frac{\epsilon n^\lambda}{2D_X} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \geq C + t \right\} \leq m \exp \left\{ -\frac{m^2 t^2}{2M_F^2(2m-1)^2} \right\}$ for $\rho = n$.
3. $\text{Var}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] \leq \frac{64D_X^2 M_F N_F}{m\epsilon^2 n^\lambda} + \left(\frac{8D_X N_F}{\epsilon n^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right)^2$.

3.1 Sample Complexity of the Exact Compromise Decision Problem

In this subsection, we focus on deriving the sample complexity of the optimal cost of the *exact* compromise decision problem (21). Recall that we let $f(x)$ denote the expectation of the random cost function (i.e., $f(x) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})]$) and let θ^* denote the optimal cost of the true problem (i.e., $\theta^* = \min_{x \in X} f(x)$).

We start with introducing several notations in the *replication* step. We let $\theta_n(\xi_i^n)$ denote the optimal cost of the i^{th} SAA problem:

$$\theta_n(\xi_i^n) = \min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi_i^n), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (24)$$

In the last section, we have defined the estimation error of objective function estimate in each replication as follows:

$$\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) = \sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x; \xi_i^n) - f(x)|, \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m. \quad (25)$$

With a symmetric argument (see [6, 11] or (106) in Appendix C), we have shown that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)] \leq 2R_n(F, \Xi) \leq \frac{2N_F}{n^\lambda}$ for any $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Next, we provide a relation for deriving the upper bound of the variance of interest. Given two non-negative random variables X, Y so that $0 \leq X \leq Y$ *a.s.*, we have the following relationship between $\text{Var}[X]$ and $\text{Var}[Y]$:

$$\text{Var}[X] = \mathbb{E}[X^2] - (\mathbb{E}[X])^2 \leq \mathbb{E}[X^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[Y^2] = \text{Var}[Y] + (\mathbb{E}[Y])^2, \quad (26)$$

Theorem 3.1. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Let N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. Then the following hold:*

1.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*| \right] \leq \frac{6m-4}{m} R_n(F, \Xi) \leq \frac{6m-4}{mn^\lambda} N_F,$$

2.

$$\text{Var} \left[|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*| \right] \leq \frac{36M_F N_F}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{36N_F^2}{n^{2\lambda}},$$

where $R_n(F, \Xi)$ is the Rademacher average associated with F and sample size n in Definition 3, and $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$.

Proof. To begin with, we give an overview of the proof strategy. The proof consists of three steps. In step 1, we aim to use the supremum of the sampling error defined in (15) to bound $|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|$. The idea is based on the convexity of the objective function in Assumption 3.1 and triangular inequality. By convexity, we observe that $f_n\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) \leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right)$. Note that $|f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f(x)|$ is bounded above by $\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)$ and $|f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_j^n) - f(x)|$ is bounded above by $\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)$. Then by triangular inequality, $|f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_j^n)|$ is bounded above by $\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)$.

In step 2, we utilize Theorem 2.6 to derive the upper bound of the supremum of the sampling error in expectation. In step 3, we use the variance relation in (26) and the upper bound of the variance of supremum of the sampling error in (16) to get the upper bound of $\text{Var}\left[|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|\right]$.

(Step 1: Upper Bound of $|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|$). We aim to derive the upper bound and lower bound of $\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*$ separately. By optimality of the problem (21), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) &= \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m f_n\left(\tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) + \frac{\rho}{2}\left\|\tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m x_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)\right\|^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^m f_n\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m^2}\sum_{i=1}^m\sum_{j=1}^m f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) \quad \text{by convexity of } f_n(\cdot; \tilde{\xi}_i^n).\end{aligned}\tag{27}$$

On the other hand, for $i, j \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$ and $i \neq j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) &= f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_j^n\right) + f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) - f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_j^n\right) \\ &\leq \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) + \left|f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) - f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_j^n\right)\right| \\ &\leq \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) + \left|f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n\right) - f\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)\right)\right| \\ &\quad + \left|f_n\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n); \tilde{\xi}_j^n\right) - f\left(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)\right)\right| \\ &\leq \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n), \quad \text{by (25)}.\end{aligned}\tag{28}$$

Let $x^* \in \arg \min_{x \in X} f(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) - \theta^* &\leq f_n(x^*; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - \theta^* \quad \text{by the definition of } \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \text{ in (24)} \\ &= f_n(x^*; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f(x^*) \\ &\leq \sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f(x)| = \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n).\end{aligned}\tag{29}$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) - \theta^* &\geq f_n(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n); \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)) && \text{by } f(x_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)) \geq \theta^* \\ &\geq -\sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n) - f(x)| = -\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n).\end{aligned}\tag{30}$$

The combination of (27) and (28) implies that

$$\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \\ i \neq j}}^m \left(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) \right).\tag{31}$$

By subtracting θ^* from both sides of (31), we have the upper bound of $\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*$ shown below:

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) - \theta^* \right) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \\ i \neq j}}^m \left(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) \right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \\ i \neq j}}^m \left(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

As for the lower bound of $\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*$, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(\tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N); \tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \right\|^2 &\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(\tilde{x}_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N); \tilde{\xi}_i^n) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n).\end{aligned}$$

Hence, this implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* &\geq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\theta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) - \theta^* \right) \\ &\geq -\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)\end{aligned}\tag{33}$$

Combining (32) and (33) we derive the upper bound of $|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|$ below:

$$\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1, \\ i \neq j}}^m \left(\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) \right).\tag{34}$$

(Step 2: Upper bound of $\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \right]$). Taking expectation on both sides of (34) and applying

Theorem 2.6, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \right] &\leq 2R_n(F, \Xi) + \frac{4m(m-1)}{m^2} R_n(F, \Xi) \\ &= \frac{6m-4}{mn^\lambda} N_F.\end{aligned}$$

(Step 3: Upper bound of $\text{Var} \left[\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \right]$). Next, we will derive the upper bound of the variance of $|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|$. According to (34), we have

$$\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \left(\frac{1}{m} + \frac{2(m-1)}{m^2} \right) \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{3}{m} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n). \quad (35)$$

By Assumption 3.2, $\tilde{\xi}_i^n$ is independent of $\tilde{\xi}_j^n$ for $i \neq j$. Hence, we have

$$\text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{3}{m} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \right] = \frac{9}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \text{Var} \left[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \right] \leq \frac{36M_F N_F}{mn^\lambda}. \quad (36)$$

The last inequality in (36) is obtained by using the upper bound of the variance of $\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)$ in (16). Again, by Assumption 3.2, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{3}{m} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \right] \leq \frac{6N_F}{n^\lambda}. \quad (37)$$

Hence, using the relation in (26), and combining (35) - (37), we have

$$\text{Var} \left[\left| \theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^* \right| \right] \leq \frac{36M_F N_F}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{36N_F^2}{n^{2\lambda}}.$$

■

In Theorem 3.1, the upper bound of the variance of $|\theta_{N,\rho}(\tilde{\xi}^N) - \theta^*|$ consists of two components, where $\frac{36M_F N_F}{mn^\lambda}$ is due to the average of m replications of sample average approximation of the true function and $\frac{36N_F^2}{n^{2\lambda}}$ is due to the sampling error from each replication.

3.2 Sample Complexity of the Inexact Compromise Decision Problem

Here, we aim to study the reliability of the ϵ -optimal compromise decisions, $\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, to the *inexact* compromise decision problem (23). To achieve this goal, we first need to find a suitable upper bound of the pessimistic distance, $\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*)$. With the help of theorem of the Lipschitzian behavior of the ϵ -optimal solution set (Theorem 1.1), we will show that such upper bound could be further bounded by a function of the supremum of the sampling error of the objective function estimate (see Definition 4).

To begin with, we introduce several notations in the *aggregation* step to ease the analysis. Let $\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$ denote the average of SAA functions across m replications:

$$\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(x; \xi_i^n). \quad (38)$$

We then let $\bar{\theta}_N(\xi^N)$ denote the minimum of $\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$ over X :

$$\bar{\theta}_N(\xi^N) = \min_{x \in X} \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N). \quad (39)$$

We further let $\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ denote ϵ -optimal solution set of the aggregated SAA problem in (39):

$$\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) = \{x \in X : \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N) \leq \bar{\theta}_N(\xi^N) + \epsilon\}. \quad (40)$$

We now proceed to introduce several notations for the *inexact* compromise decision problem in (23). Given $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, defined in (22), we let $\theta_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ denote the optimal cost of the *inexact* compromise decision problem:

$$\theta_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) = \min_{x \in X} \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2. \quad (41)$$

The associated ϵ -optimal solution set of the *inexact* compromise decision problem is defined as follows:

$$\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) = \left\{ x \in X : \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2 \leq \theta_{N,\rho,\epsilon} + \epsilon \right\}. \quad (42)$$

Recall that θ^* is the optimal cost of the true problem in (1). We let X_ϵ^* denote the ϵ -optimal solution set of the true problem:

$$X_\epsilon^* = \{x \in X : f(x) \leq \theta^* + \epsilon\}. \quad (43)$$

The following lemma sets up the relationship among elements of ϵ -optimal solution set of the *inexact* compromise decision problem, m replications of SAA problems, and the true problem.

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, X_ϵ^* , and $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ be defined in (42), (40), (43), and (22), respectively. Let $\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $x_\epsilon^* \in X_\epsilon^*$, $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then the following relation holds:*

$$\|\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x_\epsilon^*\| \leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}.$$

Proof. We provide a brief sketch here, and postpone the details to Appendix B.5. In essence, we use the optimality of the compromise decision problem in (41) to bound $\left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|$. The final result follows from an application of the triangle inequality. ■

With the upper bound of $\|\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x_\epsilon^*\|$ obtained in Lemma 3.2, we derive the upper bound of pessimistic distance of $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ to X_ϵ^* , $\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*)$, in the next lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, X_ϵ^* , and $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ be defined in (42), (40), (43), and (22), respectively. Let $\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, $x_\epsilon^* \in X_\epsilon^*$, $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Then the following relation holds:*

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\left(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*\right) &\leq \inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \\ &\quad + \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. See Appendix B.6. ■

In the next result, we aim to use Theorem 1.1 and estimation errors defined in (15) to bound

$$\inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\|.$$

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ and $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ be defined in (40) and (22), respectively. Let $\delta_n^f(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4. Let $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. The following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)]}{\epsilon} D_X.$$

Proof. We first provide a proof sketch, which consists of two steps. In Step 1, we show that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ is an ϵ' -optimal solution of the problem in (39), where $\epsilon' = \epsilon + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n(\xi_j^n))$. The key part of the proof is to derive the following relation,

$$f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) \leq \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon + \delta_n(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n(\xi_j^n),$$

where $\theta_n(\xi_j^n)$ is defined in (24). Note that if we evaluate $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ at the point $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$, it should depend on three factors: (1) the minimum of $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ over X ; (2) the systematic error ϵ ; (3) the sampling errors from $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ and $f_n(x; \xi_j^n)$. In Step 2 of the proof, we can apply Theorem 1.1 to derive the upper bound on $\inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\|$.

(Step 1: To show $\sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ is an ϵ' -optimal solution of the problem in (39)). We let $\bar{x}_N(\xi^N) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$, where $\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$ is defined in (38). First, by convexity assumption in Assumption 3.1, we observe that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n \right) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) \quad \text{by convexity in Assumption 3.1} \\ & = \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m [f_n(\bar{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) + f_n^i(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f_n(\bar{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n)]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Similar to the derivation in (28) from Theorem 3.1, for $i \neq j$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) &= f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) + f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \\ &\leq \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon + |f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n)| \\ &\leq \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon + \sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x; \xi_i^n) - f_n(x; \xi_j^n)| + \sup_{x \in X} |f_n(x; \xi_j^n) - f_n(x)| \\ &= \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon + \delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n). \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The combination of (44) and (45) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n \right) &\leq \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \left[f_n(\bar{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) + \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)) \mathbb{I}(i \neq j) - f_n(\bar{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) \right] \\ &= \theta_N(\xi^N) + \epsilon + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\theta_n(\xi_j^n) - f_n(\bar{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m \left[\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n) \right] \\ &\leq \theta_N(\xi^N) + \epsilon + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m \left[\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Hence, equation (46) shows that $\sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ is the ϵ' -optimal solution of the problem $\min_{x \in X} \bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$, where $\epsilon' = \epsilon + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)]$.

(Step 2: To derive upper bound of $\inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \|\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x\|$ using Theorem 1.1) Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n))$, then $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon'}(\xi^N)$. Hence, by Theorem 1.1, we

have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| &\leq \Delta(\bar{X}_{N,\epsilon'}(\xi^N), \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)) \\ &\leq \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X \leq \frac{\frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n))}{\epsilon} D_X. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

■

Similar to the proof of Lemma 3.4, we will apply Theorem 1.1 to obtain the upper bound of

$$\inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}^j - x \right\|.$$

Lemma 3.5. *Let $X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$ and X_ϵ^* be defined in (22) and (43), respectively. Let $x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Let $\delta_n^f(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Then the following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)}{\epsilon} D_X.$$

Proof. The proof strategy is similar to Lemma 3.4. See Appendix B.7. ■

With the bounds obtained in Lemmas 3.3 - 3.5, we now present the finite-sample complexity of the compromise decisions in the following theorem.

Theorem 3.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Let $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ be defined in (42). Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. Let $\delta_n^f(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4. Then the following hold:*

1.

$$\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) \leq \frac{\frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)]}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \quad (48)$$

2.

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] \leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}.$$

3. Further let $\rho = n$ and $C = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{D_X} + \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m}$, then we have

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{\epsilon n^\lambda}{2D_X} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \geq C + t \right\} \leq m \exp \left\{ -\frac{m^2 t^2}{2M_F^2 (2m-1)^2} \right\}.$$

Proof. As with some of the previous results, we begin with an overview of the proof. Part 1 (48) of the theorem follows by directly combining the results of Lemmas 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5. Hence, we will skip the proof of Part 1. Part 2 of the theorem follows by taking the expectation of both sides of (48) and then

applying Theorem 2.6.1. Part 3 of the theorem follows by applying Theorem 2.6.2 into (48).

(Proof of Part 2) By Theorem 2.6, note that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)] \leq 2R_n(F, \Xi)$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. By taking the expectation of both sides of (48) and by the i.i.d assumption in Assumption 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] &\leq \frac{4R_n(F, \Xi) + \frac{4m^2-4m}{m^2}R_n(F, \Xi)}{\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \\ &\leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \quad \text{by Theorem 2.6.} \end{aligned}$$

(Proof of Part 3) Equation (48) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr \left\{ \frac{\epsilon n^\lambda}{2D_X} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \geq C + t \right\} \\ &\leq \Pr \left\{ \frac{n^\lambda}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) + \frac{n^\lambda}{2m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)] + \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}} n^\lambda}{D_X n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \geq C + t \right\} \\ &\leq \Pr \left\{ \frac{n^\lambda}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n) + \frac{n^\lambda}{2m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)] + \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{D_X} \geq C + t \right\} \quad \text{because } \frac{n^\lambda}{n^{\frac{1}{2}}} \leq 1 \\ &\leq \Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n^\lambda(2m-1)}{m^2} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \geq \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m} + t \right\} \end{aligned} \tag{49}$$

Given two random variables X_1, X_2 and constants ϵ , we have $\Pr(X_1 + X_2 \geq \epsilon) \leq \Pr(X_1 \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2}) + \Pr(X_2 \geq \frac{\epsilon}{2})$ (see [37, equation (5)] for a similar argument). Hence it follows from (49) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{n^\lambda(2m-1)}{m^2} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \geq \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m} + t \right\} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr \left\{ \frac{n^\lambda(2m-1)}{m^2} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \geq \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m^2} + \frac{t}{m} \right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^m \Pr \left\{ n^\lambda \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) \geq 2N_F + \frac{mt}{2m-1} \right\} \\ &\leq m \exp \left\{ -\frac{m^2 t^2}{2M_F^2 (2m-1)^2} \right\} \quad \text{by Theorem 2.6.2 .} \end{aligned} \tag{50}$$

■

Finally, we close this section by deriving the upper bound on the variance of $\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*)$ (i.e., the largest distance from the ϵ -optimal solution set of the compromise decision problem to the ϵ -optimal solution set of the true problem).

Theorem 3.7. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Let $\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ and X_ϵ^* be defined in (42) and (43), respectively. Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. Then the*

following holds:

$$\text{Var}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] \leq \frac{64D_X^2 M_F N_F}{m\epsilon^2 n^\lambda} + \left(\frac{8D_X N_F}{\epsilon n^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right)^2.$$

Furthermore, let K be a positive constant. Letting $\rho \geq Kn$, we have $\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] = O(\frac{1}{n^\lambda})$ and $\text{Var}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] = O(\frac{1}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{1}{n^{2\lambda}})$.

Proof. Here is a proof sketch: we use the relation in Theorem 3.6.1, relation in (26), and, bound of variance of estimation error in (16) to derive the upper bound of $\text{Var}[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)]$. In particular, we make use of the assumption that the sample set in replication i is independent of the sample set in replication j (given $i \neq j$) to decompose the variance.

Next, we shall give the details of the proof. It follows from Theorem 3.6 that

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) &\leq \frac{\frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)]}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{4D_X}{m\epsilon} \delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

According to (16), we have $\text{Var}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)] \leq \frac{4M_F N_F}{n^\lambda}$. Hence, by i.i.d. assumption in Assumption 3.2, we can derive the upper bound of the variance of the right-hand side of 51 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{4D_X}{m\epsilon} \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right] &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{16D_X^2}{m^2 \epsilon^2} \text{Var}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)] \\ &\leq \frac{64D_X^2 M_F N_F}{m\epsilon^2 n^\lambda}. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Using equations (51), (52), and Theorem 2.6.1, we can derive the upper bound of the variance of $\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{Var} \left[\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \right] \\ &\leq \text{Var} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{4}{m\epsilon} D_X \delta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right] + \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{4}{m\epsilon} D_X \delta_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right] \right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{64D_X^2 M_F N_F}{m\epsilon^2 n^\lambda} + \left(\frac{8D_X N_F}{\epsilon n^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Finally, the big O results follows by plugging $\rho \geq Kn$ into Theorem 3.6.2 and (53). ■

4 Algorithms for Compromise Decision Problems

In the previous section, we have discussed the reliability of the compromise decision using SAA in the *replication* step. There are two issues which remain unresolved: (1) How should we solve the SAA problems in the *replication* step? (2) How should we simplify the aggregated objective function estimate without losing reliability?

In this section, we will continue studying the case in which a proper algorithm is applied to solve each replication of the SAA problem. We aim to provide a framework to combine the computational objects which are created during a replication of a cutting-plane-type algorithm, and then use such information to formulate an *algorithm-augmented* compromise decision problem.

Given a sample set ξ^n , we let $\hat{x}_n(\xi^n)$ and $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n)$ denote the estimated solution and approximated objective function of SAA objective function $f_n(x; \xi^n)$ (i.e., $f_n(x; \xi^n) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_i)$) output by the algorithm. We assume that the algorithm constructs a piecewise linear outer approximation of the SAA objective function.

Condition 1 (Outer Approximation). $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n)$ is a convex piecewise linear approximation of $f_n(x; \xi^n)$ (i.e., $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n) = \max_{\ell \in L} \{\alpha_\ell + \langle \beta_\ell, x \rangle\}$, where L is the index set of the pieces of $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n)$), such that $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n) \leq f_n(x; \xi^n)$ for all $x \in X$.

When the algorithm terminates, we assume that the following condition holds.

Condition 2 (Termination Condition). Let $\hat{x}_n(\xi^n) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} \hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n)$. There exists $\epsilon_1 \in (0, \infty)$ such that $f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) - \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) \leq \epsilon_1$.

Condition 1 ensures that it outputs an outer approximation of the SAA of the objective function. Condition 2 is often used as a stopping criterion for Benders' type decomposition-based algorithms (see [4, Chapter 6.5] for an example). For instance, Kelley's Cutting Plane Methods ([20]) and other Benders' type decomposition-based algorithms ([28, 31, 33, 40]) will satisfy the conditions above. Overall, Conditions 1 and 2 altogether ensure that an algorithm yields an ϵ_1 -optimal solution of the SAA problem. To see why, let $x_n(\xi^n) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi^n)$, $\theta_n(\xi^n) = \min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi^n)$, and $\hat{\theta}_n(\xi^n) = \min_{x \in X} \hat{f}_n(x; \xi^n)$. Then by Conditions 1 and 2, we derive the following relation:

$$\theta_n(\xi^n) = f_n(x_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) \geq \hat{f}_n(x_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) \geq \hat{\theta}_n(\xi^n) = \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n). \quad (54)$$

Hence, by Condition 2 and inequality in (54), we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) &= \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) + f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) - \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi^n); \xi^n) \\ &\leq \theta_n(\xi^n) + \epsilon_1 \end{aligned}$$

To answer the second question, we discuss a necessary pre-processing in the *aggregation* step. For $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we let $\hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n)$ and $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ denote the estimated solution of $\min_{x \in X} f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ and surrogate function of $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ (i.e., $f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ is defined in (20)), respectively. Given $\epsilon_2 \geq 0$, in the pre-processing step, we augment $\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$ by letting

$$\check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n) = \max\{\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n), \max_{j=1, \dots, m} \{f_n(\hat{x}_n^j; \xi_i^n) + \langle v_{n, \epsilon_2}(\hat{x}_n^j; \xi_i^n), x - \hat{x}_n^j \rangle - \epsilon_2\}\}, \quad (55)$$

where $v_{n, \epsilon_2}(\hat{x}_n^j; \xi_i^n)$ is the ϵ_2 -subgradient of $f_n(\cdot; \xi_i^n)$ at \hat{x}_n^j . This pre-processing controls the deviation of the augmented function from its associated SAA function at the candidate solution from each replication.

With the augmented functions and candidate solution from each replication, we can set up the compromise decision program below:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2. \quad (56)$$

To distinguish (56) from previously introduced compromise decision problems in section 3, we shall refer to the problem (56) as *algorithm-augmented* compromise decision problem.

We let $\hat{\theta}_N(\xi^N)$ denote the minimum of the average of the approximation functions across m replications:

$$\hat{\theta}_N(\xi^N) = \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n). \quad (57)$$

Given a constant $\epsilon > 0$, we then let $\hat{X}_{N, \epsilon}(\xi^N)$ denote the ϵ -optimal solution set of the problem in (57):

$$\hat{X}_{N, \epsilon}(\xi^N) = \left\{ x \in X : \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n) \leq \hat{\theta}_N(\xi^N) + \epsilon \right\} \quad (58)$$

We let $\hat{\theta}_{N, \rho, \epsilon}(\xi^N)$ and denote $\check{X}_{N, \rho, \epsilon}(\xi^N)$ the optimal cost and ϵ -optimal solution set of *algorithm-augmented* compromise decision problem in (56):

$$\hat{\theta}_{N, \rho, \epsilon}(\xi^N) = \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2,$$

$$\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) = \left\{ x \in X : \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m f_n(x; \xi_i^n) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| x - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n) \right\|^2 \leq \hat{\theta}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) + \epsilon \right\}. \quad (59)$$

By the same proof technique in Lemma 3.3, we can derive the upper bound of the pessimistic distance of $\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ to X_ϵ^* :

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) &\leq \inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \\ &\quad + \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

We derive the upper bounds of $\inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\|$ and $\inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\|$ in the following two lemmas.

Lemma 4.1. *Let X^* be defined in (43). Let $\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)$ be the candidate solution in the j^{th} replication, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Let $\delta_n^f(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Further, suppose that Conditions 1 and 2 hold. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then the following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\tau_1 + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)}{\epsilon} D_X,$$

where $\tau_1 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon$.

Proof. We aim to show that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)$ is an ϵ' -optimal solution of true problem in (1), where $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1 + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)$. Next, we can utilize Theorem 1.1 to finish the proof. See Appendix B.8 for detailed proof. \blacksquare

Lemma 4.2. *Let $\hat{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$ be defined in (58). Let $\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)$ be the candidate solution in the j^{th} replication, for $j = 1, 2, \dots, m$. Let $\delta_n^f(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Further suppose that Conditions 1 and 2 hold. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1 + \frac{m-1}{m} \epsilon_2$, then the following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in \hat{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\tau_2 + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n))}{\epsilon} D_X,$$

where $\tau_2 = \epsilon_1 + \frac{m-1}{m} \epsilon_2 - \epsilon$.

Proof. Here, we aim to show that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)$ is the ϵ'' -optimal solution of the aggregated problem in (57), where $\epsilon'' = \tau_2 + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n))$. Then we can apply Theorem 1.1 to derive the upper bound of its associated pessimistic distance. See Appendix B.9 for detailed proof. \blacksquare

We derive the finite-sample complexity of the *algorithm-augmented* compromise decision problem (56) in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.3. *Let $\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N)$ and X_ϵ^* be defined in (59) and (43), respectively. Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Further suppose that Conditions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then the following hold:*

1.

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \right] \leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{(\tau_1 + \tau_2)D_X}{\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho},$$

where $\tau_1 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon$ and $\tau_2 = \epsilon_1 + \frac{m-1}{m}\epsilon_2 - \epsilon$.

2. Furthermore, if $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, $\epsilon_2 = 0$, $\rho = n$, and $C = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{D_X} + \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m}$, then

$$\Pr \left\{ \frac{\epsilon n^\lambda}{2D_X} \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \geq C + t \right\} \leq m \exp \left\{ -\frac{m^2 t^2}{2M_F^2 (2m-1)^2} \right\}.$$

Proof. The proof strategy is similar to the Theorem 3.6. By Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) &\leq \frac{\tau_1 + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)}{\epsilon} D_X \\ &\quad + \frac{\tau_2 + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n))}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (60)$$

According to Theorem 2.6, we have $\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_j^n)] \leq \frac{2N_F}{n^\lambda}$. Hence, by taking the expectation of both sides of (60), we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \right] \leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{(\tau_1 + \tau_2)D_X}{\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}.$$

Pick $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, $\epsilon_2 = 0$, and $C = \frac{\epsilon^{\frac{3}{2}}}{D_X} + \frac{(4m-2)N_F}{m}$. Then $\tau_1 = \tau_2 = 0$. Hence, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \right] \leq \frac{D_X N_F}{\epsilon} \frac{8m-4}{mn^\lambda} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/n}.$$

Then rest of the proof is the same as the proof of Theorem 3.6. ■

To end this section, we obtain the upper bound of the variance of $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)$ in the following theorem.

Theorem 4.4. *Suppose that Assumptions 2.1, 3.1, and 3.2 hold. Further suppose that Conditions 1 and 2 hold. Let $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and N_F be a constant defined in Lemma 2.3. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon_1$, then the following hold:*

1.

$$\text{Var} \left[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*) \right] \leq \frac{64D_X^2 M_F N_F}{m\epsilon^2 n^\lambda} + \left(\frac{8D_X N_F}{\epsilon n^\lambda} + \frac{(\tau_1 + \tau_2)D_X}{\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right)^2,$$

where $\tau_1 = \epsilon_1 - \epsilon$ and $\tau_2 = \epsilon_1 + \frac{m-1}{m}\epsilon_2 - \epsilon$.

2. Furthermore, let K_1 be a positive constant. For $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, $\epsilon_2 = 0$, and $\rho \geq K_1 n$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] = O\left(\frac{1}{n^\lambda}\right), \quad \text{Var}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] = O\left(\frac{1}{mn^\lambda} + \frac{1}{n^{2\lambda}}\right).$$

Proof. The proof strategy is similar to Theorem 3.7. It follows from Theorem 4.3 that

$$\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) \leq \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{4D_X}{m\epsilon} \delta(\xi_i^n) + \frac{(\tau_1 + \tau_2)D_X}{\epsilon} + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}.$$

Compared with Theorem 3.7, the only difference is that we have an extra term $\frac{(\tau_1 + \tau_2)D_X}{\epsilon}$, which bounds the systematic error in the algorithm. Furthermore, when $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, $\epsilon_2 = 0$, the upper bound of $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*)$ is reduced to the one of Theorem 3.7. ■

Inspired by the above results, we end this section with a mean-variance optimization problem which summarizes the reliability of decisions in terms of statistical estimates of the pessimistic distance to the set of optimal decisions.

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{n,m} \mathbb{E}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] + \vartheta \text{Var} [\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\tilde{\xi}^N), X_\epsilon^*)] \\ \text{s.t. (43) and (59), a.s.} \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Here $\vartheta > 0$ is a parameter which reflects a decision-maker's desire for a choice which is near-optimum, even though it may be difficult (or even impossible) to verify optimality (of the decision) with certainty. Nevertheless, the mean and variance of the pessimistic distance provide a statistical measure of optimality. The SSN instance [34] of the SP literature is one such case.

5 Stochastic Decomposition for Compromise Decision Problem

In the previous two sections, we have discussed the reliability of the compromise decisions for general convex stochastic programs. In this section, we focus on deriving the sample complexity of compromise decisions for two-stage stochastic quadratic programs with quadratic programming recourse (SQQP) [25]. In particular, we consider that SD Algorithm is used to (approximately) solve the SQQP problem in the *replication step*. We will later show that the associated compromise decision has higher reliability under certain assumptions.

First, we formulate the SQQP problem as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(x) &= \frac{1}{2}x^\top Qx + c^\top x + \mathbb{E}[h(x, \tilde{\xi})] \\ \text{s.t. } Ax &\leq b, \end{aligned} \tag{62}$$

where b and c are n_1 dimensional vectors, A is a $m_1 \times n_1$ matrix, Q is a $n_1 \times n_1$ symmetric and positive definite matrix, and $h(x, \xi)$ is the minimum cost of the following second-stage problem:

$$h(x, \xi) = \min \frac{1}{2}y^\top Py + d^\top y \tag{63a}$$

$$\text{s.t. } Dy = e(\xi) - C(\xi)x, \quad [\lambda], \tag{63b}$$

$$y \geq 0, \quad [\gamma]. \tag{63c}$$

Here, P is a $n_2 \times n_2$ symmetric and positive definite matrix, d is a n_2 -dimensional vector, D is a $m_2 \times n_2$ matrix, $e(\xi)$ a m_2 -dimensional random vector that depends on ξ , and $C(\xi)$ is a $m_2 \times n_1$ random matrix that also depends on ξ . We let λ and γ denote the dual multipliers of constraints (63b) and (63c).

According to [25], we make the following assumptions:

Assumption 5.1. *Let X and $h(x, \xi)$ denote the first-stage feasible region and second-stage recourse function, respectively.*

1. Q and P are symmetric and positive definite matrices.
2. The first-stage feasible region $X = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^{n_1} : Ax \leq b\}$ is compact. The set of possible realizations Ξ is compact.
3. The second-stage problem satisfies relatively complete recourse condition.
4. The second-stage recourse function is uniformly bounded below by 0.
5. Linear independence constraint qualification holds at the optimal solution x^* of (62).
6. There exists $L_h \in (0, \infty)$ such that $|h(x_1, \xi) - h(x_2, \xi)| \leq L_h \|x_1 - x_2\|$ for almost every $\xi \in \Xi$.
7. There exists a neighborhood $B(x^*, \delta)$ with $\delta \in (0, \infty)$, such that $h(x, \xi)$ is differentiable for all $x \in X$ and for almost every $\xi \in \Xi$.
8. The unique optimal solution x^* is sharp.
9. Strict complementarity holds at x^* .

Under the assumptions above, the optimal solution to the SQQP problem (62) is unique. Let x^* denote the optimal solution to (62) and let $X^* = \{x^*\}$. For the discussion about the validation of those assumptions, we refer the readers to [25].

A sketch of the Stochastic Decomposition algorithm for SQQP is provided below. In Algorithm 2, minorant generated in the k^{th} iteration is an inexact lower bound approximation of $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k h(x, \xi_i)$. SD stores previously visited faces of the polyhedral set to accelerate the minorant construction. SD also rescales the previously generated minorants to adapt to the incremental sampling scheme. The incumbent selection rule in SD is used to maintain a sequence of incumbents with certain probabilistic improvement in terms of minimizing the true objective function. Please see [25, Algorithm 3.3] for detailed descriptions of the minorant construction and incumbent selection rule.

Algorithm 2 Stochastic Decomposition for SQQP

Initialize $\{\alpha_k\}_k$, $x_0 \in X$, $h_0(x) = 0$, $k = 0$, and $\mathcal{J}_0 = \{0\}$.
Set $\hat{f}_0(x) = \frac{1}{2}x^\top Qx + c^\top x + \max\{h_j^k(x), j \in \mathcal{J}_0\}$.
while Stopping criterion is not satisfied **do**
 Let $k \leftarrow k + 1$.
 Compute $x_k = \arg \min_{x \in X} \hat{f}_{k-1}(x) + \frac{1}{2\alpha_k} \|x - \hat{x}^{k-1}\|$.
 Construct \mathcal{J}_k to store active minorants at x_k .
 Sample $\xi_k \sim \mathbb{P}_{\tilde{\xi}}$.
 Compute dual optimal solutions (λ_k, γ_k) of subproblem (63) at (x_k, ξ_k) .
 Store visited dual faces for accelerating computing future lower bounds.
 Construct minorants, $h_k^k(x_k, \xi_k)$ and $h_{-k}^k(x_k, \xi_k)$, of $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k h(x, \xi_i)$ at \hat{x}^{k-1} and x^k , respectively.
 for $j \in \mathcal{J}_k$ **do**
 Update minorant $h_j^k(x) \leftarrow \frac{|j|}{k} h_j^{|j|}(x)$
 end for
 Update $\mathcal{J}_k \leftarrow \mathcal{J}_k \cup \{-k, k\}$.
 Update \hat{x}^k according to the *incumbent selection rule*.
end while

The following theorem due to [25] derives the convergence rate of SD algorithm for solving SQQP problems.

Theorem 5.1. *Suppose that Assumption 5.1 holds and samples used in SD are i.i.d random variables following the distribution of $\tilde{\xi}$. Let $\{\hat{x}_n\}_n$ denote the sequence of incumbent solutions generated by SD. Choose the initial stepsize $\tau > 0$ so that $\tau\theta_{\min}(Q) > 1$, where $\theta_{\min}(Q)$ is the smallest eigenvalue of Q . Set the sequence of step sizes of SD to be $\frac{\tau}{n+1}$. Then there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that for large enough n , we have*

$$\mathbb{E} [\|\hat{x}_n - x^*\|] \leq \frac{K}{n}.$$

Proof. See [25, Theorem 4.9]. ■

We leave a detailed explanation of the constant K in Appendix E. In short, the constant K depends

on the Lipschitz modulus of the objective function as well as the Hessians of the first-stage objective and the quadratic pieces of the second-stage recourse function.

By Markov's inequality, given $t \in (0, \infty)$, we can further get the following probabilistic bound from Theorem 5.1:

$$\Pr \{ \|\hat{x}_n - x^*\| \geq t \} \leq \frac{\mathbb{E}[\|\hat{x}_n - x^*\|]}{t} \leq \frac{K}{tn}. \quad (64)$$

We let \hat{x}_n^j denote the incumbent decision generated by SD in the j^{th} replication and let \hat{f}_n^j denote the local approximation of f_n^j also generated by SD. Let $L_f = \max_{x \in X} \|Qx\| + \|c\| + L_h$. Then both $f(x)$ and $\{\hat{f}_n^i\}_i$ are Lipschitz continuous with a constant L_f . Hence, we observe that with probability at least $(1 - \frac{K}{tn})$,

$$f(\hat{x}_n) - f(x^*) \leq L_f \|\hat{x}_n - x^*\|. \quad (65)$$

Combining (64) and (65), we observed that \hat{x}_n is a $L_f t$ -optimal solution of problem (62) with probability at least $(1 - \frac{K}{tn})$.

Compared with cutting-plane-type methods mentioned in section 4, which creates a global approximation of the SAA objective function in each replication, SD only creates a local approximation of the counterpart. As a result, the function augmentation approach proposed in Section 4 is no longer valid here. Alternatively, we augment the SD's function approximation by including a lower bound estimate of the optimal cost of (62). The following explains how we augment the function estimate by SD. First of all, we pick a tolerance constant $\epsilon' > 0$. Then for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, we augment \hat{f}_n^i by letting

$$\check{f}_n^i(x) = \max\{\hat{f}_n^i(x), \hat{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \epsilon'\}, \quad (66)$$

where $\hat{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \epsilon'$ provides the estimate of the lower bound of the optimal cost while ensuring the stability of the later aggregation of the function estimates.

The augmentation of the function estimate ensures that the incumbent solution from the i^{th} replication, \hat{x}_n^i , is the ϵ -optimal solution of the problem $\min_{x \in X} \check{f}_n^i(x)$, which further helps bound the later-introduced pessimistic distance. Note that

$$\check{f}_n^i(x) \geq \hat{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \epsilon', \quad \forall x \in X,$$

and

$$\check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) = \hat{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i).$$

Hence, we have

$$\check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \min_{x \in X} \check{f}_n^i(x) \leq \epsilon'. \quad (67)$$

We introduce the following condition on the estimated solution of (62) as an intermediate piece to derive the probabilistic bound of the reliability of the compromise decision. At the end of this section, we will derive the probability that such an intermediate condition holds.

Condition 3 (Intermediate Condition). *Given $t > 0$, we have $\|\hat{x}_n^j - x^*\| \leq t$, $\forall j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, where x^* is the unique optimal solution of problem (62).*

With the incumbent solution and augmented location function approximation of each replication introduced, we formulate the *SD-augmented* compromise problem below:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(x) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x \right\|^2. \quad (68)$$

We let $\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}$ denote the ϵ -optimal solution set of the *SD-augmented* compromise decision problem (68).

The aggregated problem without the regularizer is written below:

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(x). \quad (69)$$

We let $\check{X}_{N,\epsilon}$ denote the ϵ -optimal solution set of the problem (69).

We start with deriving the upper bound of the pessimistic distance of $\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}$ to X^* .

Lemma 5.2. *The following relation holds:*

$$\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) \leq \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} + \inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x \right\|$$

Proof. Since $X^* = \{x^*\}$, we have $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) = \sup_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}} \|x - x^*\|$. By following the same proof technique of Lemma 3.2 (see Appendix B.5), we can get

$$\left\| \check{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i \right\| \leq \left\| \check{x}_{N,\epsilon} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \quad (70)$$

Hence, inequality (70) implies that

$$\|\check{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon} - x^*\| \leq \left\| \check{x}_{N,\epsilon} - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \quad (71)$$

We take the infimum of the right-hand side of (71) over $\check{x}_{N,\epsilon} \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}$, and get

$$\|\check{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon} - x^*\| \leq \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} + \inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x \right\| \quad (72)$$

The final results follow by taking the supremum of the left-hand-side of (72) over $\check{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon} \in \check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}$. \blacksquare

By the construction of augmented local function approximation \check{f}_n^i in (66), we can derive the upper bound of $\inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x \right\|$.

Lemma 5.3. *In the i^{th} iteration ($i \in \{1, 2, \dots, m\}$), let \hat{x}_n^i be the incumbent generated by the SD (Algorithm 2). Suppose that Condition 3 holds. If $\epsilon \leq 2L_f t + \epsilon'$, then the following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - x \right\| \leq \frac{2L_f t + \epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X$$

Proof. This proof consists of two steps. In the first step, we will show that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i$ is a $(2L_f t + \epsilon')$ -optimal solution of the aggregated problem in (69). In the second step, we can use Theorem 1.1 to obtain the upper bound of its associated pessimistic distance.

Here is the detailed proof. By Condition 3, for $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - \hat{x}_n^j \right\| &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\hat{x}_n^i - \hat{x}_n^j\| \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\|\hat{x}_n^i - x^*\| + \|\hat{x}_n^j - x^*\|) \\ &\leq 2t, \end{aligned}$$

which implies that

$$\left| \check{f}_n^j \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i \right) - \check{f}_n^j(\hat{x}_n^j) \right| \leq 2L_f t. \quad (73)$$

Let $y \in \arg \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_i^k(x)$ and let $\check{\theta}_N = \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(x)$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j \right) &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) + 2L_f t \quad \text{by (73)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \check{f}_n^i(y) + \check{f}_n^i(y)] + 2L_f t \\ &\leq \check{\theta}_N + 2L_f t + \epsilon' \quad \text{by (67)}. \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

The inequality above implies that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j$ is the $(2L_f t + \epsilon')$ -optimal solution of the problem

$$\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(x).$$

Then the final result follows by Theorem 1.1. \blacksquare

In the following theorem below, we aim to derive the lower bound of probability that Condition 3 holds and provide the probabilistic bound of $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) \leq \frac{2L_f t + \epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X + t + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}$.

Theorem 5.4. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.2 and 5.1 hold. If $\epsilon \leq 2L_f t + \epsilon'$, then the following holds:*

$$\Pr \left\{ \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) \leq \frac{2L_f t + \epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X + t + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right\} \geq \exp \left(-\frac{\frac{mK}{tn}}{1 - \frac{K}{tn}} \right)$$

Proof. First, we note that $1 - y \geq \exp(-\frac{y}{1-y})$ for $0 \leq y < 1$. By (64), for $n > \frac{K}{t}$, we first note that

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr \{ \|\hat{x}_n^i - x^*\| < t, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\} \} &\geq \left(1 - \frac{K}{tn}\right)^m \\ &\geq \exp \left(-\frac{\frac{mK}{tn}}{1 - \frac{K}{tn}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

Given $\|\hat{x}_n^i - x^*\| < t, \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, it follows from Lemmas 5.2 and 5.3 that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) &\leq \inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \\ &\leq \frac{2L_f t + \epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X + t + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

Thus, the final result follows from combining (75) and (76). ■

Remark: We observe that there exists some freedom to choose parameters in Theorem 5.4. We now let $t \in (0, 1)$, $\alpha \in (0, 3)$, $\epsilon' = L_f t$, $\rho = \frac{(3-\alpha)L_f}{t}$, $\epsilon = (3-\alpha)L_f t$. Then it follows from Theorem 5.4 that

$$\Pr \left\{ \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) \leq \frac{\alpha}{3-\alpha} D_X + 3t \right\} \geq \exp \left(-\frac{\frac{mK}{tn}}{1 - \frac{K}{tn}} \right),$$

where $\exp \left(-\frac{\frac{mK}{tn}}{1 - \frac{K}{tn}} \right)$ goes to 1 as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

In the next result, we aim to study the compromise decision's impact on variance reduction. We let $d_n^i = \|\hat{x}_n^i - x^*\|$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$. We start with bounding $\inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x \right\|$ using d_n^i in the lemma below.

Lemma 5.5. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.2 and 5.1 hold. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon'$, then the following relation holds:*

$$\inf_{x \in \check{X}_{N,\epsilon}} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j - x \right\| \leq \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i}{\epsilon} D_X$$

Proof. The proof is similar to Lemma 5.3. We show that $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j$ is $(\epsilon' + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i)$ -optimal solution of the problem in (69) and then use Theorem 1.1 to finish the proof. See Appendix B.10 for the

complete proof. ■

Finally, we conclude this section by providing the upper bounds on the expectation and variance of the pessimistic distance of $\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}$ to X^* , $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)$.

Theorem 5.6. *Suppose that Assumptions 3.2 and 5.1 holds. Let $\tau_3 = \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}$. If $\epsilon \leq \epsilon'$, then the following hold:*

1.

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)] \leq \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right) \frac{K}{n} + \tau_3,$$

2.

$$\text{Var}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)] \leq \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \frac{K D_X}{mn} + \left[\left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right) \frac{K}{n} + \tau_3\right]^2.$$

3. *Furthermore, let K_1 be a positive constant. Let $\epsilon = \epsilon'$ and $\rho \geq K_1 n^2$. Then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)] = O\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad \text{Var}[\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)] = O\left(\frac{1}{mn} + \frac{1}{n^2}\right).$$

Proof. Generally speaking, the proof strategy is similar to Theorem 3.7. At first, we show that the upper bound of the variance of the pessimistic distance, $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)$, can be expressed as a linear combination of d_n^i plus some systematic error. Then we can use the fact that d_n^i is independent of d_n^j given $i \neq j$ by Assumption 3.2 to decompose the upper bound of the variance of the pessimistic distance. Finally, we make use of the compactness of the feasible region and the convergence rate of the first moment of d_n^i (by Theorem 5.1) to finish the proof.

Let $\tau_3 = \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}$. By Lemma 5.5, it follows from Lemma 5.2 that,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*) &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i + \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i}{\epsilon} D_X + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right) d_n^i + \tau_3. \end{aligned} \tag{77}$$

Furthermore, since $d_n^1, d_n^2, \dots, d_n^m$ are independent of each other by Assumption 3.2 and τ_3 is a constant, the variance of the right-hand-side of (77) is

$$\text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right) d_n^i + \tau_3 \right] = \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{1}{m^2} \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon}\right)^2 \text{Var}[d_n^i]. \tag{78}$$

Since $0 \leq d_n^i \leq D_X$, we have $\mathbb{E}[(d_n^i)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[d_n^i D_X] \leq \frac{K D_X}{n}$ for large enough n by Theorem 5.1. This

implies that $\text{Var}[d_n^i] \leq \mathbb{E}[(d_n^i)^2] \leq \frac{KD_X}{n}$. Hence, it follows from (78) that

$$\text{Var} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right) d_n^i + \tau_3 \right] \leq \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \frac{KD_X}{mn}. \quad (79)$$

On the other hand,

$$\mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right) d_n^i + \tau_3 \right] \leq \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right) \frac{K}{n} + \tau_3 \quad (80)$$

Finally, using (26), (79), and (80), we derive the upper bound of the variance of $\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)$ below:

$$\text{Var} [\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)] \leq \left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right)^2 \frac{KD_X}{mn} + \left[\left(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon} \right) \frac{K}{n} + \tau_3 \right]^2. \quad (81)$$

Finally, the big O argument follows from direct algebraic derivation based on (80) and (81). ■

In Theorem 5.6, the reliability of the compromise decision could be understood in the following way. The first part of the upper bound (i.e., $(1 + \frac{2L_f D_X}{\epsilon})^2 \frac{KD_X}{mn}$) of $\text{Var} [\Delta(\check{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}, X^*)]$ derives from the effect of averages of the solution and function estimate. The second part of the upper bound of the variance is due to the systematic error from the ϵ -optimal solution and the expected distance of estimated solution by SD to the optimal solution set. We also observe that smaller ϵ is prone to have a more conservative (larger) upper bound on the variance. That is, smaller ϵ tends to make the compromise decision more adapted to the particular realization of the regularized objective in the Compromise Decision problem.

6 Conclusion

In this paper, we have presented a theory of reliability for compromise decisions in stochastic programming problems under one unifying framework. Our theoretical findings not only validate the computational observations provided in [35] and [41], but also extend the previous stopping rule to seeking a non-dominated solution of an estimated mean-variance problem (61). From a computational perspective, we suggest using parallel computing to implement stopping rules which would lead to greater reliability as mentioned in [35]. These developments also underscore the differences between deterministic optimization and truly large-scale stochastic optimization.

Based on our theory, we also provide some implementable guidance for choosing the regularization coefficient, ρ , and tolerance, ϵ based on the sample size, n . Let K_1 be a positive constant. If the ‘‘replication’’ step involves a cutting-plane-type method, we require that $\rho \geq K_1 n$, $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, and $\epsilon_2 = 0$. On the

other hand, if the “replication” step involves SD, we require that $\rho \geq K_1 n^2$ and $\epsilon = \epsilon'$.

There remain several open questions about extensions of the compromise decision framework. The first open question is whether it is possible to connect our decision-based regularizer to a class of Distributionally Robust Optimization (DRO) problems. In connection with this question, we note that a study of DRO and robust statistics (Blanchet et al. [5]), reveals that ϕ -Divergence-Based DRO is related to the variance regularization problem and optimal transport-based DRO is related to norm regularization of the fitted parameters. In the context of SP, we observe that our decision-based regularizer shares some properties which are similar to norm regularization. A second open question is about how one might reformulate compromise decision problems for nonconvex SP problems and problems with constraint sets that are specified by nonlinear equations/inequalities such as those arising in Neural Networks (NN). The latter have the reputation of being reasonably good on average, and yet they can be unreliable. Perhaps, a study of reliability of solutions for non-convex stochastic optimization models will lead to greater reliability in algorithms for NN. In connection with these directions, one could also investigate the impact of different regularizers (e.g., kernel methods [42]) for compromise decisions.

Acknowledgements

This research originated during the grant FA9550-20-1-0006 from AFOSR, but was only completed due to a new grant DE-SC0023361 from the ASCR program of the Department of Energy. We thank both sources for this invaluable support. We also thank Roger Wets for highlighting the need for reliability of SP decisions (ICSP conference in Buzios, Brazil, 2016), and his encouragement since.

Appendix A Table of Notations

Notations	Description	Usage
$f_n(x; \xi_i^n)$	Objective function of SAA problem given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$x_n(\xi_i^n)$	Optimal solution of SAA problem given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$X_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$	ϵ -optimal solution set of SAA problem given sample set ξ_i^n	Analysis
$x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_i^n)$	ϵ -optimal solution of SAA problem given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$	ϵ -optimal solution of the Compromise Decision problem	Analysis
$X_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$	ϵ -optimal solution of the aggregated SAA problem	Analysis

Table 2: Notations in Section 3

Notations	Description	Usage
$\hat{x}_n(\xi_i^n)$	Estimated decision (by a deterministic algorithm) of SAA problem given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$\hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$	Piecewise linear approximation of SAA objective function given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$\nu_{n, \epsilon_2}(x; \xi_i^n)$	ϵ_2 -subgradient of SAA objective function given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$\check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$	Augmented piecewise linear approximation of SAA objective function given sample set ξ_i^n	Computation and Analysis
$\bar{X}_{N, \epsilon}(\xi^N)$	ϵ -optimal solution of the problem $\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$	Analysis
$\bar{X}_{N, \rho, \epsilon}(\xi^N)$	ϵ -optimal solution of the Compromise Decision problem	Analysis

Table 3: Notations in Section 4

Notations	Description	Usage
\hat{x}_n^i	Incumbent solution at the n^{th} iteration of SD in the i^{th} replication	Computation and Analysis
$\hat{f}_n^i(x)$	Approximation function at the n^{th} iteration of SD in the i^{th} replication	Computation and Analysis
$\check{f}_n^i(x)$	Augmented approximation function at the n^{th} iteration of SD in the i^{th} replication	Computation and Analysis
$\bar{X}_{N, \rho, \epsilon}$	ϵ -optimal solution set of the Compromise Decision Problem	Analysis
$\bar{X}_{N, \epsilon}$	ϵ -optimal solution set of the problem $\min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{f}_n^i(x)$	Analysis

Table 4: Notations in Section 5

Appendix B Some Proofs

B.1 Proof of Lemma 2.1.

Proof. Let \bar{A} be the symmetric hull of A , i.e., $\bar{A} = A \cup \{-a : a \in A\}$. Then $|\bar{A}| \leq 2|A| = 2N$ and $\max_{a \in A} \|a\|^2 = \max_{a \in \bar{A}} \|a\|^2$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{a \in A} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right| &\leq \max_{a \in \bar{A}} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right| && (A \subset \bar{A}) \\
&= \max_{a \in \bar{A}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i && (\bar{A} \text{ is symmetric})
\end{aligned} \tag{82}$$

By taking the expectation over $\tilde{\sigma}_1, \dots, \tilde{\sigma}_n$ for both sides of (82) and by Definition 2, we have

$$R_n(A) \leq R_n(\bar{A}) = \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\max_{a \in \bar{A}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right]. \tag{83}$$

We claim that the rest of the proof follows from the proof of [6, Theorem 3]. Here is why: for $a \in \bar{A}$ and $s > 0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\exp \left(s \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right) \right] &= \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\exp \left(s \frac{1}{n} \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right) \right] \quad (\text{by independence of } \{\sigma_i\}_{i=1}^n) \\ &\leq \prod_{i=1}^n \exp \left(\frac{s^2 a_i^2}{2n^2} \right) \quad (\text{by Hoeffding's inequality}) \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{s^2 \|a\|^2}{2n^2} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(sR_n(A)) &\leq \exp \left(s \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\sup_{a \in \bar{A}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right] \right) \quad (\text{by 83}) \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\exp \left(s \sup_{a \in \bar{A}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right) \right] \quad (\text{by Jensen's inequality}) \\ &\leq \sum_{a \in \bar{A}} \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\sigma}} \left[\exp \left(s \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \tilde{\sigma}_i a_i \right) \right] \quad (85) \\ &\leq 2N \max_{a \in \bar{A}} \exp \left(\frac{s^2 \|a\|^2}{2n^2} \right) \quad (\text{by 84}) \\ &= 2N \max_{a \in A} \exp \left(\frac{s^2 \|a\|^2}{2n^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

The last equality of (85) follows because \bar{A} is the symmetric hull of A . Take the logarithm of both sides of (85), we have

$$R_n(A) \leq \frac{1}{s} \log \left(2N \max_{a \in A} \exp \left(\frac{s^2 \|a\|^2}{2n^2} \right) \right) \quad (86)$$

By minimizing the right-hand side of (86) over $s > 0$, the final result follows. ■

B.2 Proof of Lemma 2.3.

Proof. According to Lemma 2.2 and the proof of [11, Lemma B.2], we derive (12).

For any $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_n(F, \xi^n) &\leq (L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2 + \frac{p}{2\gamma} \log n)}) / \sqrt{n} \\ &\leq \left(L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2)} + M_F \sqrt{\frac{p}{\gamma} \log n} \right) / \sqrt{n} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n^\lambda} \left(\frac{L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2)}}{n^{\frac{1}{2}-\lambda}} + M_F p^{1/2} \gamma^{-1/2} \sqrt{\frac{\log n}{n^{1-2\lambda}}} \right) \quad (87) \\ &\leq \left(L_F D^\gamma p^{\frac{\gamma}{2}} + M_F \sqrt{2(\log 2)} + \frac{M_F p^{1/2}}{\sqrt{\gamma(1-2\lambda)e}} \right) \frac{1}{n^\lambda}. \end{aligned}$$

■

B.3 Proof of Lemma 2.4

Proof. Pick $(x_1, y_1), (x_2, y_2) \in X \times Y$. Note that both (x_1, y_1) and (x_2, y_2) are $(p + 1)$ -dimensional vectors. For $\xi \in \Xi$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |H(x_1, y_1, \xi) - H(x_2, y_2, \xi)| \\
&= |(F(x_1, \xi) - y_1)^2 - (F(x_2, \xi) - y_2)^2| \\
&= |F(x_1, \xi) - y_1 + F(x_2, \xi) - y_2| |F(x_1, \xi) - y_1 - F(x_2, \xi) + y_2| \\
&\leq 4M_F (|F(x_1, \xi) - F(x_2, \xi)| + |y_1 - y_2|) \\
&\leq 4M_F (L_F \|x_1 - x_2\|^\gamma + |y_1 - y_2|) \\
&\leq 4M_F (L_F \|x_1 - x_2\| + |y_1 - y_2|) \\
&\leq 4M_F \sqrt{L_F^2 + 1} \|(x_1, y_1) - (x_2, y_2)\|.
\end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

The last inequality holds because

$$\begin{aligned}
& (L_F^2 + 1) \|(x_1, y_1) - (x_2, y_2)\|^2 - (L_F \|x_1 - x_2\| + |y_1 - y_2|)^2 \\
&= \|x_1 - x_2\|^2 + L_F^2 (y_1 - y_2)^2 - 2L_F \|x_1 - x_2\| |y_1 - y_2| \\
&= (\|x_1 - x_2\| - L_F |y_1 - y_2|)^2 \geq 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

Also note that for $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$, we have

$$H(x, y, \xi) = (F(x, \xi) - y)^2 \leq (2M_F)^2 = 4M_F^2.$$

By following the same proof strategy as in the first part of Lemma 2.4, we can prove the rest of the second claim. ■

B.4 Proof of Lemma 2.7

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of [11, Lemma 3.4]. Note that

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta_n^h(\xi^n) &= \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H \left(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \xi_k), \xi_i \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[H \left(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \tilde{\xi} \right) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H \left(x, \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F(x, \xi_k), \xi_i \right) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \xi_i) \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H \left(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \xi_i \right) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}} \left[H \left(x, \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})], \tilde{\xi} \right) \right] \right| \\
&\leq \sup_{x \in X} 4M_F \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{k=1}^n F(x, \xi_k) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] \right| \\
&\quad + \sup_{x \in X, y \in Y} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(x, y, \xi_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[H(x, y, \tilde{\xi})] \right| \\
&= 4M_F \delta_n^f(\xi^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\xi^n).
\end{aligned}$$

The second claim follows based on the symmetric argument [6, 11]. ■

B.5 Proof of Lemma 3.2

Proof. By the definitions in (39), (40), and (42), we have

$$\bar{f}_N(\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) \leq \bar{\theta}_N(\xi^N) + \epsilon \leq \bar{f}_N(\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) + \epsilon, \quad (90)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{f}_N(\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2 - \epsilon \\
&\leq \theta_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \\
&\leq \bar{f}_N(\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2.
\end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

The combination of (90) and (91) implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\bar{f}_N(\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2 - \epsilon \\
&\leq \bar{f}_N(\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N); \xi^N) + \epsilon + \frac{\rho}{2} \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2.
\end{aligned}$$

This further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2 &\leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\|^2 + \frac{4\epsilon}{\rho} \\ &\leq \left(\left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, we have

$$\left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| \leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \quad (92)$$

Finally, by triangular inequality and (92), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| &\leq \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho} \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

■

It is worth noting that the proof of Lemma 3.2 does not specify the form of the approximation function $\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$, which provides certain flexibility in the later analysis. For instance, $\bar{f}_N(x; \xi^N)$ may be replaced by its piecewise linear approximation or even some local inexact approximation function.

B.6 Proof of Lemma 3.3

Proof. First, we observe that

$$\inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x \right\| \leq \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x_\epsilon^* \right\|.$$

By Lemma 3.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x \right\| &\leq \left\| \hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| \\ &\leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| \\ &\quad + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (94)$$

Take the supremum of the left-hand side of (94) over $\hat{x}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x' \in \hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \|x' - x\| \\ & \leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| + \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x_\epsilon^* \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (95)$$

Note that, by definition in (3), $\Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) = \sup_{x' \in \hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \|x' - x\|$. Next, by minimizing the right-hand side of (95) over $x_\epsilon^* \in X_\epsilon^*$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) & \leq \left\| \bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) - \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \right\| \\ & \quad + \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned} \quad (96)$$

Finally, by taking the infimum of the right-hand side of (96) over $\bar{x}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N) \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta(\hat{X}_{N,\rho,\epsilon}(\xi^N), X_\epsilon^*) & \leq \inf_{x \in \bar{X}_{N,\epsilon}(\xi^N)} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \\ & \quad + \inf_{x \in X_\epsilon^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| + 2\sqrt{\epsilon/\rho}. \end{aligned}$$

■

B.7 Proof of Lemma 3.5

Proof. By (29) from the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\theta_n(\xi_j^n) - \theta^* \leq \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n), \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

which implies that

$$\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \theta_n(\xi_j^n) \leq \theta^* + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n). \quad (97)$$

By convexity in Assumption 3.1, we also observe that

$$\begin{aligned}
f\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)\right) &\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m f(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)) \\
&= \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) + f(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n)) - f_n(x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m (\theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon) + \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n) \\
&\leq \theta^* + \epsilon + \frac{2}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n), \quad \text{by (97)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{98}$$

Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon + \frac{2}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)$, then $\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) \in X_{\epsilon'}^*$ (i.e., the average of the estimated decisions across all the replications is an ϵ' -optimal solution of the true problem). Hence, by Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\inf_{x \in X_{\epsilon'}^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m x_{n,\epsilon}(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\epsilon' - \epsilon}{\epsilon} D_X \leq \frac{\frac{2}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)}{\epsilon} D_X. \tag{99}$$

■

B.8 Proof of Lemma 4.1

Proof. By Conditions 1 and 2, we observe that

$$f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \leq \theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon_1.$$

By the inequality in (29) from the proof of Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\theta_n(\xi_j^n) \leq \theta^* + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n).$$

Furthermore, by the convexity of $f(x)$ according to Assumption 3.1, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f\left(\frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)\right) &\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) \\
&= \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m (f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) + f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) - f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n)) \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m (\theta_n(\xi_j^n) + \epsilon_1 + f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) - f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n)) \\
&\leq \theta^* + \epsilon_1 + \frac{2}{m}\sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n).
\end{aligned}$$

Let $\epsilon' = \epsilon_1 + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)$, then $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) \in X_{\epsilon'}^*$ and $\epsilon' > \epsilon$. By Theorem 1.1, we have

$$\inf_{x \in X_{\epsilon'}^*} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n) - x \right\| \leq \frac{\epsilon_1 - \epsilon + \frac{2}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)}{\epsilon} D_X.$$

■

B.9 Proof of Lemma 4.2

Proof. We let $\hat{x}_N(\xi^N) \in \arg \min_{x \in X} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(x; \xi_i^n)$. By the convexity of \check{f}_n^i inferred from Condition 1, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n \right) &\leq \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

For $i \neq j$, we have

$$\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) = \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) + \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n).$$

By the definition of \check{f}_n in (55) and Condition 1, we have $0 \leq f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) \leq \epsilon_2$ and $0 \leq f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \leq \epsilon_2$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) &= \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n), \xi_i^n) - f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) \\ &\quad + f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) \\ &\leq \delta_n^f(\xi_i^n), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) &= f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) - f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \\ &\quad + f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \\ &\leq \epsilon_2 + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) &\leq \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) \\ &\quad + f(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n)) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \\ &\leq \epsilon_2 + \delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n). \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by Condition 2 and the property $\check{f}_n(x; \xi_j^n) \geq \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_j^n)$ due to (55), we have

$$\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) \geq \min_{x \in X} \check{f}_n(x; \xi_j^n) \geq \min_{x \in X} \hat{f}_n(x; \xi_j^n) = \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n), \quad (101)$$

which implies that

$$\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) \leq \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \quad (102a)$$

$$\leq f_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \hat{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) \quad (102b)$$

$$\leq \epsilon_1. \quad (102c)$$

The inequality in (102a) holds due to (101). The inequality in (102b) holds because of Condition 1. The inequality in (102c) holds because of Condition 2. For $i \neq j$, we have

$$\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n) \leq \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 + \delta_n(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n(\xi_j^n).$$

Hence, it follows from (100) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^m [\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n) + \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n)] \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n) + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{j=1}^m [\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_j^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_j^n)] \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\check{f}_n(\hat{x}_n(\xi_j^n); \xi_i^n) - \check{f}_n(\hat{x}_N(\xi^N); \xi_i^n)] \\ & \leq \hat{\theta}_N + \epsilon_1 + \frac{m-1}{m} \epsilon_2 + \frac{1}{m^2} \sum_{\substack{i,j=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m [\delta_n^f(\xi_i^n) + \delta_n^f(\xi_j^n)] \end{aligned}$$

The rest of the proof is similar to Lemma 3.4. ■

B.10 Proof of Lemma 5.5

Proof. The proof is similar to the Lemma 5.3. We observe that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \hat{x}_n^i - \hat{x}_n^j \right\| & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|\hat{x}_n^i - \hat{x}_n^j\| \\ & \leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (\|\hat{x}_n^i - x^*\| + \|x^* - \hat{x}_n^j\|) \\ & \leq d_n^j + \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i. \end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$\check{f}_n^i \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j \right) \leq \check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) + L_f d_n^i + \frac{L_f}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m d_n^j.$$

By (67), we observe that $\check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \check{f}_n^i(y) \leq \epsilon'$. Let y and $\check{\theta}_N$ be one optimal solution and the optimal value of the problem $\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(x)$, respectively. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \hat{x}_n^j \right) &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m [\check{f}_n^i(\hat{x}_n^i) - \check{f}_n^i(y) + \check{f}_n^i(y)] + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i \\ &\leq \check{\theta}_N + \epsilon' + \frac{2L_f}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m d_n^i. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

Hence, the final result follows by Theorem 1.1. ■

Appendix C Symmetric Argument of Rademacher Averages

Here, we aim to use symmetric argument to show that $\mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)] \leq 2R_n(F, \Xi)$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}^n)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) - \mathbb{E}_{\tilde{\xi}}[F(x, \tilde{\xi})] \right| \right] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \mid \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \right| \right] \end{aligned} \quad (104a)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \mid \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \right] \quad (104b)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \right] \quad (104c)$$

The equality in (104a) holds because $\xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n, \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d. random variables. The inequality in (104b) holds due to Jensen's inequality ([9, Theorem 1.6.2]). The inequality in (104c) holds is because of the following observations:

$$\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \leq \sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right|$$

implies that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \mid \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \\ &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \mid \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \end{aligned}$$

which further implies that

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{x \in X} \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \middle| \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \middle| \tilde{\xi}_1, \dots, \tilde{\xi}_n \right] \end{aligned}$$

The symmetric argument is based on the following observation. Since $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n, \xi'_1, \dots, \xi'_n$ are i.i.d. random variables, for any $\mathcal{J} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j) + \sum_{\substack{i=1, \dots, n \\ i \notin \mathcal{J}}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) \right) \right. \right. \\ & \quad \left. \left. - \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j) + \sum_{\substack{i=1, \dots, n \\ i \notin \mathcal{J}}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right) \right| \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{105}$$

By definition of $\tilde{\sigma}_j, \tilde{\sigma}'_j$ ($F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j) - F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j)$) is equally likely to be $F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j) - F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j)$ or $F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j) - F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j)$.

Given $\{\sigma_i^*\}_{i=1}^n$ as one realization of $\{\tilde{\sigma}_i\}_{i=1}^n$. Let $\mathcal{J}^* = \{j \in \{1, \dots, n\} : \sigma_j^* = 1\}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^* \left(F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j) - F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j) \right) \\ & = \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} F(x, \tilde{\xi}_j) + \sum_{\substack{i=1, \dots, n \\ i \notin \mathcal{J}^*}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) \right) - \frac{1}{n} \left(\sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}^*} F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_j) + \sum_{\substack{i=1, \dots, n \\ i \notin \mathcal{J}^*}} F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right) \end{aligned}$$

Hence, it follows from (105) that

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{x \in X} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \right] \\ & = \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{x \in X} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i \left(F(x, \tilde{\xi}'_i) - F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right) \right| \right] \right] \\ & \leq 2 \mathbb{E} \left[\mathbb{E}_\sigma \left[\sup_{x \in X} \frac{1}{n} \left| \sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i F(x, \tilde{\xi}_i) \right| \right] \right] \\ & \leq 2R_n(F, \Xi) \end{aligned} \tag{106}$$

Appendix D Margin of Error: Sample Complexity

Recall that we let $\xi_i^n = \{\xi_{(i-1)n+j}\}_{j=1}^n$ denote the i^{th} sample set with size n . Without replications, the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $f(x)$ is given below:

$$\left[f_n(x; \xi^n) - \sqrt{\frac{s_n^2(x; \xi^n)}{n}} \Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right), f_n(x; \xi^n) + \sqrt{\frac{s_n^2(x; \xi^n)}{n}} \Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right) \right], \quad (107)$$

where $\Phi(\cdot)$ denotes the cumulative distribution function of standard normal distribution and $\Phi^{-1}(\cdot)$ is its inverse. To further reduce the width of the confidence interval (margin of error), one could either increase n or perform replications.

The SAA objective function of the i^{th} replication is

$$f_n(x; \xi_i^n) \triangleq \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n F(x, \xi_{(i-1)n+j}), \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, m,$$

and $s_n^2(x; \xi_i^n)$ is the sample variance of $F(x, \xi)$ in the i^{th} replication:

$$s_n^2(x; \xi_i^n) = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{j=1}^n [F(x, \xi_{(i-1)n+j}) - f_{n,i}(x)]^2. \quad (108)$$

Let $Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} = \Phi^{-1}\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}\right)$. With m replications, the margin of error of the $1 - \alpha$ confidence interval of $f(x)$ is $\frac{1}{m} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m s_n^2(x; \xi_i^n)}{n}} Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}}$.

By (18), we have

$$\frac{1}{m} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m s_n^2(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n)}{n}} \leq \sqrt{\frac{m\sigma^2(x) + \frac{4mM_F^2}{n-1} + 4M_F \sum_{i=1}^m [\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)]}{m^2n}}. \quad (109)$$

By Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(\mathbb{E} \left[\sqrt{\frac{m\sigma^2(x) + \frac{4mM_F^2}{n-1} + 4M_F \sum_{i=1}^m [\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)]}{m^2n}} \right] \right)^2 \\ & \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{m\sigma^2(x) + \frac{4mM_F^2}{n-1} + 4M_F \sum_{i=1}^m [\delta_n^f(\tilde{\xi}_i^n) + \hat{\delta}_n(\tilde{\xi}_i^n)]}{m^2n} \right] \\ & \leq \frac{\sigma^2(x)}{mn} + \frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{mn^{(1+\lambda)}} + \frac{4M_F^2}{mn(n-1)}, \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

where $\lambda \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$. Hence, the upper bound of the expected margin of error is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{1}{m} \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{i=1}^m s_n^2(x; \tilde{\xi}_i^n)}{n}} Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \right] &\leq \sqrt{\frac{\sigma^2(x)}{mn} + \frac{8M_F N_H + 2N_F}{mn^{(1+\lambda)}} + \frac{4M_F^2}{mn(n-1)}} Z_{1-\frac{\alpha}{2}} \\ &\leq O((mn)^{-\frac{1}{2}}). \end{aligned}$$

Appendix E Properties of Two-stage Stochastic QPs with QP Recourse (SQQP)

This appendix is intended to keep our presentation somewhat self-contained. According to [25, Theorem 4.9 and Proposition 4.2], the dominating term of the convergence rate of SD is $\frac{4M_0M_1}{(\Gamma-1)n}$, where M_0 is the upper bound of the Lipschitz modulus of the objective function and M_1 is the upper bound of the matrix norm of the Hessians of the quadratic pieces of the objective function inside the ball $B(x^*, \delta)$. Hence, the quantity K in Theorem 5.1 could be multiples of M_0M_1 . We have derived that $M_0 = L_f = \max_{x \in X} \|Qx\| + \|c\| + L_h$. So we now focus on deriving M_1 .

First, we provide the dual form of the quadratic piece of the second-stage recourse function. Recall that $P \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2 \times n_2}$ is a symmetric and positive definite matrix and $D \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n_2}$ is a matrix with full row rank. The quadratic recourse function is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} h(x, \omega) &\triangleq \min \frac{1}{2} y^\top P y + d^\top y \\ &\text{s.t. } D y = e(\xi) - C(\xi)x, \quad [\lambda] \\ &\quad y \geq 0, \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \quad [\gamma]. \end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

The dual multiplier notation associated with (111) is shown in square brackets $[\cdot]$ above. Let $g(x, \xi) = e(\xi) - C(\xi)x$. The dual of (111) can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} h(x, \omega) &= \max \psi(\gamma, \lambda; x, \xi) = -\frac{1}{2} (-d + D^\top \lambda + \gamma)^\top P^{-1} (-d + D^\top \lambda + \gamma) + g(x, \xi)^\top \lambda \\ &\text{s.t. } \lambda \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}, \quad \lambda \text{ is free}, \quad \gamma \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}, \quad \gamma \geq 0. \end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

Proposition E.1. *The dual problem in (112) can be simplified to the following problem:*

$$h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} g(x, \xi)^\top (M M^\top)^{-1} g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2} d^\top H d + \max_{\gamma \geq 0} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} \gamma^\top H \gamma + g(x, \xi)^\top \gamma \right\}$$

where $M = DP^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, $\Phi = (I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M)$, $H = P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi^2P^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, and

$$q(x, \xi) = Hd - P^{-\frac{1}{2}}M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi).$$

Proof. Given an γ, x, ξ , the maximizer of $\psi(\gamma, \lambda; x, \xi)$ over λ is $\lambda^* = (DP^{-1}D^\top)^{-1}[-DP^{-1}(-d + \gamma) + g(x, \xi)]$. Let us denote $M = DP^{-\frac{1}{2}}$.

By plugging $\lambda^* = (DP^{-1}D^\top)^{-1}[-DP^{-1}(-d + \gamma) + g(x, \xi)]$ into $\psi(\gamma, \lambda; x, \xi)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \psi(\gamma, \lambda^*; x, \xi) \\ &= \overbrace{-\frac{1}{2} \left\| (I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M)P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma - (I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M)P^{-\frac{1}{2}}d \right\|^2}^{\text{Part I}} \\ & \quad + \underbrace{\left\| M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) \right\|^2}_{\text{Part I}} + \underbrace{g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} \left[MP^{-\frac{1}{2}}(-d + \gamma) + g(x, \xi) \right]}_{\text{Part II}} \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Note that $[I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M]$ is a symmetric matrix and

$$\begin{aligned} & [I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M]M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} \\ &= M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}MM^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} \\ &= M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1} \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

Let us further denote $\Phi = [I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M]$ and $H = P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi^2P^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. By expanding Part I of (113), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi^2P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\gamma - \frac{1}{2} \left\| M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \Phi P^{-\frac{1}{2}}d \right\|^2 \\ & \quad - \gamma^\top P^{-\frac{1}{2}}\Phi \left[M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \Phi P^{-\frac{1}{2}}d \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top H\gamma + \gamma^\top Hd - \underbrace{\frac{1}{2} \left\| M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \Phi P^{-\frac{1}{2}}d \right\|^2}_{\text{Part III}}. \end{aligned} \quad (115)$$

By expanding Part III, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{Part III}) &= -\frac{1}{2}\|M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi)\|^2 \\
&\quad + d^\top P^{-\frac{1}{2}} \underbrace{(I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M)M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi)}_{\text{equals to 0 due to (114)}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\|(I - M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}M)P^{-\frac{1}{2}}d\|^2 \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}MM^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd \\
&= -\frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd
\end{aligned} \tag{116}$$

Hence, it follows from (115) that

$$(\text{Part I}) = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top H\gamma + \gamma^\top Hd - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd - \frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) \tag{117}$$

Thus, it follows from (113) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\psi(\gamma, \lambda^*; x, \xi) &= \frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd \\
&\quad + [Hd - P^{-\frac{1}{2}}M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi)]^\top \gamma \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top H\gamma + \gamma^\top Hd
\end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

We let $q(x, \xi) = Hd - P^{-\frac{1}{2}}M^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi)$, then it follows from (118) that

$$\psi(\gamma, \lambda^*; x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd + q(x, \xi)^\top \gamma - \frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top H\gamma. \tag{119}$$

Hence, problem (112) can be simplified to the following problem:

$$h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2}g(x, \xi)^\top(MM^\top)^{-1}g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2}d^\top Hd + \max_{\gamma \geq 0} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}\gamma^\top H\gamma + q(x, \xi)^\top \gamma \right\}. \tag{120}$$

■

Example 1.

$$\begin{aligned}
h(x, \xi) &\triangleq \min \frac{1}{2}y^\top y \\
&\quad s.t. \ y = \xi(\xi) - C(\xi)x \\
&\quad \quad y \geq 0, \ y \in \mathbb{R}^{n_2}
\end{aligned} \tag{121}$$

In this example, $P = I_{n_2 \times n_2}$, $d = 0$, $D = I_{n_2 \times n_2}$. Then $M = I_{n_2 \times n_2}$, $H = 0$, $q(x, \omega) = -g(x, \omega)$. Then it follows from (120) that

$$h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \|g(x, \xi)\|^2 + \max_{\gamma \geq 0} -g(x, \xi)^\top \gamma. \quad (122)$$

For x which satisfies $g(x, \xi) = e(\xi) - C(\xi)x \geq 0$, the optimal value of (121) satisfies $h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} \|g(x, \xi)\|^2$. On the other hand $\frac{1}{2} \|g(x, \xi)\|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \|g(x, \xi)\|^2 + \max_{\gamma \geq 0} -g(x, \xi)^\top \gamma$ for $g(x, \xi) \geq 0$. So we have verified that dual optimal values in (122) are equal to the primal optimal values (121).

Proposition E.2. Let M, P be the same form in Proposition E.1, Let $\Lambda(\xi) = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} M^\top (MM^\top)^{-1} C(\xi)$ and $T(\xi) = C(\xi)^\top (MM^\top)^{-1} C(\xi) + \Lambda(\xi)^\top H^{-1} \Lambda(\xi)$. Then the constant M_1 in [25, Theorem 4.9] can be written as follows:

$$M_1 = \|P\| + \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \|T(\xi)\|.$$

Furthermore, let $M_0 = \max_{x \in X} \|Qx\| + \|c\| + L_h$, then K in Theorem 5.1 satisfies $K = O(M_0 M_1)$.

Proof. Given $x \in X \cap B(x^*, \delta)$. We consider the following maximization problem:

$$\max_{\gamma \geq 0} -\frac{1}{2} \gamma^\top H \gamma + q(x, \omega)^\top \gamma \quad (123)$$

The KKT condition of the problem above is

$$-H\gamma^* + q(x, \omega) - \theta^* = 0, \quad (124)$$

where θ^* is the Lagrange multiplier of the nonnegativity constraint $\gamma \geq 0$. It implies that

$$s\gamma^* = H^{-1}(q(x, \omega) - \theta^*).$$

Hence, the value function at x can be written as

$$h(x, \xi) = \frac{1}{2} g(x, \xi)^\top (MM^\top)^{-1} g(x, \xi) - \frac{1}{2} d^\top H d + \frac{1}{2} (q(x, \xi) + \theta^*)^\top H^{-1} (q(x, \xi) - \theta^*) \quad (125)$$

Let $\Lambda(\xi) = P^{-\frac{1}{2}} M^\top (MM^\top)^{-1} C(\xi)$, the Hessian of $h(x, \xi)$ at x is

$$\nabla^2 h(x, \xi) = C(\xi)^\top (MM^\top)^{-1} C(\xi) + \Lambda(\xi)^\top H^{-1} \Lambda(\xi), \quad (126)$$

which does not depend on x . Hence, let $T(\xi) = \nabla^2 h(x, \xi)$, we can get $M_1 = \|Q\| + \sup_{\xi \in \Xi} \|T(\xi)\|$. The rest of the proof follows from [25, Theorem 4.9 and Proposition 4.2]. \blacksquare

References

- [1] T. Asamov and W. B. Powell. Regularized decomposition of high-dimensional multistage stochastic programs with markov uncertainty. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 28(1):575–595, 2018.
- [2] P. L. Bartlett, D. J. Foster, and M. J. Telgarsky. Spectrally-normalized margin bounds for neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 30, 2017.
- [3] P. L. Bartlett and S. Mendelson. Rademacher and gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.
- [4] D. Bertsimas and J. N. Tsitsiklis. *Introduction to linear optimization*, volume 6. Athena Scientific Belmont, MA, Belmont, 1997.
- [5] J. Blanchet, J. Li, S. Lin, and X. Zhang. Distributionally robust optimization and robust statistics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.14655*, 2024.
- [6] S. Boucheron, O. Bousquet, and G. Lugosi. Theory of classification: A survey of some recent advances. *ESAIM: probability and statistics*, 9:323–375, 2005.
- [7] Y. Carson and A. Maria. Simulation optimization: methods and applications. In *Proceedings of the 29th conference on Winter simulation*, pages 118–126, 1997.
- [8] A. Deo and K. Murthy. Achieving efficiency in black-box simulation of distribution tails with self-structuring importance samplers. *Operations Research*, 2023.
- [9] R. Durrett. *Probability: theory and examples*, volume 49. Cambridge university press, Cambridge, 2019.
- [10] Y. M. Ermoliev and V. I. Norikin. Normalized convergence in stochastic optimization. *Annals of Operations Research*, 30(1):187–198, 1991.
- [11] Y. M. Ermoliev and V. I. Norikin. Sample average approximation method for compound stochastic optimization problems. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(4):2231–2263, 2013.
- [12] H. Gangammanavar and S. Sen. Stochastic dynamic linear programming: A sequential sampling algorithm for multistage stochastic linear programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(3):2111–2140, 2021.
- [13] P. Glasserman and J. Li. Importance sampling for portfolio credit risk. *Management science*, 51(11):1643–1656, 2005.

- [14] V. Guigues, M. A. Lejeune, and W. Tekaya. Regularized stochastic dual dynamic programming for convex nonlinear optimization problems. *Optimization and Engineering*, 21:1133–1165, 2020.
- [15] J. L. Higle. Variance reduction and objective function evaluation in stochastic linear programs. *INFORMS J. Comput.*, 10:236–247, 1998.
- [16] J. L. Higle and S. Sen. Finite master programs in regularized stochastic decomposition. *Mathematical Programming*, 67(1):143–168, 1994.
- [17] T. Homem-de Mello and G. Bayraksan. Stochastic constraints and variance reduction techniques. In *Handbook of simulation optimization*, pages 245–276. Springer, 2014.
- [18] M. Kääriäinen and T. Elomaa. Rademacher penalization over decision tree prunings. In *European Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 193–204. Springer, 2003.
- [19] R. Kawai. Optimizing adaptive importance sampling by stochastic approximation. *SIAM Journal on Scientific Computing*, 40(4):A2774–A2800, 2018.
- [20] J. E. Kelley, Jr. The cutting-plane method for solving convex programs. *Journal of the Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics*, 8(4):703–712, 1960.
- [21] K. C. Kiwiel. Proximity control in bundle methods for convex nondifferentiable minimization. *Mathematical Programming*, 46(1-3):105–122, 1990.
- [22] N. L. Kleinman, J. C. Spall, and D. Q. Naiman. Simulation-based optimization with stochastic approximation using common random numbers. *Management Science*, 45(11):1570–1578, 1999.
- [23] A. J. Kleywegt, A. Shapiro, and T. Homem-de Mello. The sample average approximation method for stochastic discrete optimization. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 12(2):479–502, 2002.
- [24] V. Kozmík and D. P. Morton. Evaluating policies in risk-averse multi-stage stochastic programming. *Mathematical Programming*, 152:275–300, 2015.
- [25] J. Liu and S. Sen. Asymptotic results of stochastic decomposition for two-stage stochastic quadratic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 30(1):823–852, 2020.
- [26] M. Mohri and A. Rostamizadeh. Rademacher complexity bounds for non-iid processes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 21, 2008.
- [27] A. Nemirovski, A. Juditsky, G. Lan, and A. Shapiro. Robust stochastic approximation approach to stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 19(4):1574–1609, 2009.

- [28] W. Oliveira, C. Sagastizábal, and S. Scheimberg. Inexact bundle methods for two-stage stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 21(2):517–544, 2011.
- [29] R. Pasupathy and Y. Song. Adaptive sequential sample average approximation for solving two-stage stochastic linear programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 31(1):1017–1048, 2021.
- [30] M. V. Pereira and L. M. Pinto. Multi-stage stochastic optimization applied to energy planning. *Mathematical programming*, 52(1):359–375, 1991.
- [31] A. B. Philpott and Z. Guan. On the convergence of stochastic dual dynamic programming and related methods. *Operations Research Letters*, 36(4):450–455, 2008.
- [32] R. T. Rockafellar. Monotone operators and the proximal point algorithm. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 14(5):877–898, 1976.
- [33] A. Ruszczyński. A regularized decomposition method for minimizing a sum of polyhedral functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 35:309–333, 1986.
- [34] S. Sen, R. D. Doverspike, and S. Cosares. Network planning with random demand. *Telecommunication Systems*, 3(1):11–30, 1994.
- [35] S. Sen and Y. Liu. Mitigating uncertainty via compromise decisions in two-stage stochastic linear programming: Variance reduction. *Operations Research*, 64(6):1422–1437, 2016.
- [36] A. Shapiro. Monte carlo sampling methods. *Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science*, 10:353–425, 2003.
- [37] A. Shapiro. On complexity of multistage stochastic programs. *Operations Research Letters*, 34(1):1–8, 2006.
- [38] A. Shapiro and A. Nemirovski. On complexity of stochastic programming problems. *Continuous optimization: Current trends and modern applications*, pages 111–146, 2005.
- [39] S. Sun. Multi-view laplacian support vector machines. In *Advanced Data Mining and Applications: 7th International Conference, ADMA 2011, Beijing, China, December 17-19, 2011, Proceedings, Part II 7*, pages 209–222. Springer, 2011.
- [40] R. M. Van Slyke and R. Wets. L-shaped linear programs with applications to optimal control and stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 17(4):638–663, 1969.
- [41] J. Xu and S. Sen. Compromise policy for multi-stage stochastic linear programming: Variance and bias reduction. *Computers & Operations Research*, 153:106132, 2023.

- [42] J. Xu and S. Sen. Ensemble variance reduction methods for stochastic mixed-integer programming and their application to the stochastic facility location problem. *INFORMS Journal on Computing*, 36(2):587–599, 2024.
- [43] H. Zhang, G. Chen, B. C. Ooi, K.-L. Tan, and M. Zhang. In-memory big data management and processing: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 27(7):1920–1948, 2015.
- [44] P. Zhao and T. Zhang. Stochastic optimization with importance sampling for regularized loss minimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1–9. PMLR, 2015.