
LEARNING HEAVY-TAILED DISTRIBUTIONS WITH WASSERSTEIN-PROXIMAL-REGULARIZED α -DIVERGENCES

A PREPRINT

Ziyu Chen

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003, USA
ziyuchen@umass.edu

Hyemin Gu

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003, USA
hgu@umass.edu

Markos A. Katsoulakis

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003, USA
markos@umass.edu

Luc Rey-Bellet

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003, USA
luc@umass.edu

Wei Zhu

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Massachusetts Amherst
Amherst, MA 01003, USA
weizhu@umass.edu

May 24, 2024

ABSTRACT

In this paper, we propose Wasserstein proximals of α -divergences as suitable objective functionals for learning heavy-tailed distributions in a stable manner. First, we provide sufficient, and in some cases necessary, relations among data dimension, α , and the decay rate of data distributions for the Wasserstein-proximal-regularized divergence to be finite. Finite-sample convergence rates for the estimation in the case of the Wasserstein-1 proximal divergences are then provided under certain tail conditions. Numerical experiments demonstrate stable learning of heavy-tailed distributions—even those without first or second moment—without any explicit knowledge of the tail behavior, using suitable generative models such as GANs and flow-based models related to our proposed Wasserstein-proximal-regularized α -divergences. Heuristically, α -divergences handle the heavy tails and Wasserstein proximals allow non-absolute continuity between distributions and control the velocities of flow-based algorithms as they learn the target distribution deep into the tails.

1 Introduction

Heavy tails are ubiquitous, emerging in various fields such as extreme events in ocean waves [9], floods [21], social sciences [27, 16], human activities [17, 35], biology [18] and computer sciences [29]. Learning to generate heavy-tailed target distributions has been explored using GANs through tail estimation [10, 15, 1]. While estimating the tail behavior of a heavy-tailed distribution is important, selecting objectives that measure discrepancies between these distributions and facilitate stable learning is equally crucial. In generative modeling, the goal is to generate samples that mimic those from an underlying data distribution, typically by designing algorithms that minimize a *probability divergence* between the generated and target distributions. Thus, it is crucial to choose a divergence that flexibly and accurately respects the behavior of the data distribution.

In this work, we propose the Wasserstein-proximal-regularized α -divergence (W_p - α -divergence) as the objective functional for learning heavy-tailed distributions. It is defined as

$$D_{\alpha,p}^\lambda(P\|Q) := \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{D_\alpha(\eta\|Q) + \lambda \cdot W_p^p(P, \eta)\}. \quad (1)$$

In this work, we primarily focus on the cases when $p = 1$ and $p = 2$. This proposed divergence combines the advantages of both α -divergences and Wasserstein distances: α -divergences are effective for comparing heavy-tailed distributions, while Wasserstein distances can accommodate non-absolute continuity and measure transport distances, ensuring stable learning of tail behavior. As illustrated in Figure 1, a GAN based on W_1 - α -divergence learns a heavy-tailed distribution stably, whereas a GAN without proximal regularization produces “run-away” points (details in Section 5). This phenomenon is explained by our theoretical results in Section 4 and numerical experiments in Section 5.

In this work, we theoretically show that the W_p - α -divergences are suitable for learning heavy-tailed distributions by analyzing the (sufficient and necessary) conditions under which they remain finite for $p = 1, 2$; we also provide a finite-sample convergence rate for the empirical estimations of the proposed divergence for $p = 1$. Our results show that algorithms using W_p - α -divergences can stably learn heavy tails without extensive prior knowledge of the tail behavior, while those without a W_p proximal generally fail.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We review and discuss some related work in Section 2. Section 3 provides background and motivation for the proposed divergences. Theoretical results for W_p - α -divergences with $p = 1, 2$ are presented in Section 4. Numerical experiments are detailed in Section 5, and Section 6 concludes with discussions.




Figure 1: Learning heavy-tailed distribution using GANs based on α -divergence. Left: without W_1 proximal. Right: with W_1 proximal. See Section 5 for details.

2 Related work

Generative models for heavy-tailed distributions. Although heavy-tail distributions are common, there are few results to date in their generative modeling, primarily using GANs. For example, [33] generates heavy-tailed financial time series data by logarithmically transforming the data and then exponentiating the output, which does not produce truly heavy-tailed distributions. In a different approach, GANs are used for cosmological analysis [10], sharing a similarity with Pareto GANs [15] in their use of a heavy-tailed latent variable. However, both papers require accurate estimation of the tail decay rate for each marginal distribution. EV-GANs [1] use neural network approximations of the quantile function that to encode the tail decay rate in an asymptotic sense, which is essentially also a tail estimation approach. We note that the focus of our work is to devise appropriate divergences as objective functionals for comparing and learning heavy-tailed distributions stably, *without* prior knowledge of the tail behavior.

Empirical estimations of divergences. [28, 23, 31] estimate f -divergences using various assumptions and estimators, and [8] consider in particular the α -divergences. However, these studies either make additional structural assumptions or consider light tails or without establishing a convergence rate of the estimation. Recently, [20, 19] studied the convergence rate of entropic optimal transport and optimal transport with smooth costs. While our proof of the convergence rate in the estimations of the W_p - α -divergences is inspired by these works, the structure inherited from the α -divergences in our study requires different, non-trivial treatment, particularly as we consider even heavier tails.

3 Wasserstein-proximal-regularized α -divergences

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be a measurable space, and $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ be the set of probability measures on \mathcal{X} . A map $D : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}) \rightarrow [0, \infty]$ is called a *divergence* on $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ if

$$D(P, Q) = 0 \iff P = Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X}),$$

hence providing a notion of “distance” between probability measures. The class of α -divergences [2, 14], a subset of f -divergences [6], is capable of handling heavy-tailed distributions and is defined as

$$D_\alpha(P\|Q) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} f_\alpha \left(\frac{dP}{dQ} \right) dQ, \quad \text{if } P \ll Q, \quad (2)$$

where $f_\alpha(x) = \frac{x^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}$, with $\alpha > 0$ and $\alpha \neq 1$, and $P \ll Q$ means P is absolutely continuous with respect to Q . In the limiting case as $\alpha \rightarrow 1$, one recovers the Kullback–Leibler (KL) divergence with $f_{\text{KL}}(x) = x \ln x$. The α -divergence can be equivalently formulated in its dual form [24, 3] as

$$D_\alpha(P\|Q) = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f_\alpha^*(\gamma)] \}, \quad (3)$$

where $\mathcal{M}_b(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the set of bounded measurable functions and $f_\alpha^*(y)$ is the convex conjugate (Legendre transform) of f_α ,

$$f_\alpha^*(y) = \begin{cases} \alpha^{-1}(\alpha-1)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} y^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \mathbf{1}_{y>0} + \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)}, & \alpha > 1, \\ \infty \mathbf{1}_{y \geq 0} + \left(\alpha^{-1}(1-\alpha)^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} |y|^{-\frac{\alpha}{1-\alpha}} - \frac{1}{\alpha(1-\alpha)} \right) \mathbf{1}_{y < 0}, & \alpha \in (0, 1). \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

In practice, such as in generative modeling, we estimate the divergence from finite samples of P and Q , where the absolute continuity assumption typically no longer holds. To accommodate cases where $P \not\ll Q$, we add Wasserstein-proximal regularization to the α -divergences. Specifically, we consider Wasserstein-1 (W_1) and Wasserstein-2 (W_2) proximals, defined as

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) := \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ D_\alpha(\eta\|Q) + L \cdot W_1(P, \eta) \}, \quad (5)$$

and

$$D_{\alpha,2}^\lambda(P\|Q) := \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ D_\alpha(\eta\|Q) + \lambda \cdot W_2^2(P, \eta) \}, \quad (6)$$

where W_1 and W_2 are the Wasserstein-1 and Wasserstein-2 distances, respectively. One can easily verify that both $D_{\alpha,1}^\lambda$ and $D_{\alpha,2}^\lambda$ satisfy the conditions for being divergences.

The reason for using L as the superscript in Eq. (5) is that the W_1 - α -divergences coincide with the *Lipschitz-regularized* α -divergence proposed by [3] for $\alpha \geq 1$. According to [3, Theorem 15 (1)], the following dual equality holds for $\alpha \geq 1$:

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) = \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f_\alpha^*(\gamma)] \}, \quad (7)$$

where $\text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ is the class of bounded L -Lipschitz functions.

To illustrate the benefit of combining α -divergences and Wasserstein proximals, we provide an example where neither the α -divergence nor the W_1 distance is finite, but the W_1 - α -divergence, i.e., $D_{\alpha,1}^L$ in Eq. (5), is finite.

Example 1. Let P and Q be distributions on \mathbb{R} such that

$$p(x) = (1 + \delta)x^{-(2+\delta)} \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 1}, \quad q(x) = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{1}_{0 \leq x < 1} + \frac{1}{x^2} \mathbf{1}_{x \geq 2}.$$

It can be shown that neither $D_\alpha(P\|Q)$ nor $W_1(P, Q)$ is finite for any $\alpha > 1, \delta > 0$, but $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q)$ is nonetheless finite. See the calculations in Appendix B.

4 Theoretical analysis

In generative modeling, a specific divergence between the target and generated distributions is often chosen as the loss function. To optimize and minimize this loss, it is essential to ensure that (1) the loss function or divergence is *finite*, and (2) it can be *accurately estimated* from finite minibatches of samples. Therefore, we examine how the tail behaviors of P and Q determine the finiteness of W_p - α -divergences and their finite-sample estimation rate. We make the following assumption about distributions P and Q .

Assumption 1. Let P and Q be distributions on \mathbb{R}^d whose densities $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ are absolutely continuous with respect to the Lebesgue measure.

Definition 1. For a pair of distributions (P, Q) on \mathbb{R}^d , we say they are of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) , $\beta_1, \beta_2 > d$, if there exists some $R > 0$, such that

$$p(x) \asymp \|x\|^{-\beta_1}, \quad q(x) \asymp \|x\|^{-\beta_2},$$

for $\|x\| \geq R$. That is, there exist constants $0 < c_{p,1} \leq c_{p,2}$ and $0 < c_{q,1} \leq c_{q,2}$ such that

$$c_{p,1}\|x\|^{-\beta_1} \leq p(x) \leq c_{p,2}\|x\|^{-\beta_1}, \quad c_{q,1}\|x\|^{-\beta_2} \leq q(x) \leq c_{q,2}\|x\|^{-\beta_2},$$

for $\|x\| \geq R$.

Remark 1. Definition 1 implies that $P \not\ll Q$ at most on a bounded subset of \mathbb{R}^d .

4.1 Finiteness of $D_{\alpha,1}^L$ and $D_{\alpha,2}^\lambda$

We focus on the case where $\alpha > 1$. We first study the finiteness of $D_{\alpha,1}^L$, making extensive use of its dual formula Eq. (7). We prove the following sufficient and necessary conditions on the tail behaviors of (P, Q) for the W_1 - α -divergence to be finite. The proof is provided in Appendix C.

Theorem 1 (Necessary and sufficient condition for $D_{\alpha,1}^L < \infty$). *Suppose $\alpha > 1$, and (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) . Then $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) < \infty$ if and only if one of the following two conditions holds:*

- (i) $d < \beta_1 \leq d + 1$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$;
- (ii) $\beta_1 > d + 1$.

Remark 2. *If P has finite first moment (mean), then $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q)$ is finite for any $\beta_2 > d$ and $\alpha > 1$. This indicates that we can learn a heavy-tailed distribution, with or without a finite first moment, starting from an easy-to-sample light-tailed distribution such as the Gaussian.*

Remark 3. *We can prove a similar finiteness result for W_1 -KL-divergences, i.e., the special case where $\alpha = 1$. More specifically, $D_{KL,1}^L(P\|Q) < \infty$ is finite for any $\beta_1, \beta_2 > d$. The precise statement and proof can be found in Lemma 3 and Proposition 1 in the appendix.*

In cases where the data distribution lies on a low-dimensional submanifold, which is typically the case for real-world datasets, Assumption 1 can be relaxed as shown in the following corollary. The proof can be found in Appendix C.

Corollary 1. *Let \mathcal{M} be a d^* -dimensional smooth embedded submanifold of \mathbb{R}^d via an L^* -Lipschitz embedding $\varphi : \mathbb{R}^{d^*} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\mathcal{M} = \varphi(\mathbb{R}^{d^*})$. Suppose (P, Q) are of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) on \mathbb{R}^{d^*} , and let $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $q_{\mathcal{M}}$ be their push-forward distributions on \mathcal{M} , i.e., $p_{\mathcal{M}} = p \circ \varphi^{-1}$ and $q_{\mathcal{M}} = q \circ \varphi^{-1}$. Then the W_1 - α -divergence between $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $q_{\mathcal{M}}$, defined as*

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(p_{\mathcal{M}}\|q_{\mathcal{M}}) = \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathcal{M})} \{ \mathbb{E}_{p_{\mathcal{M}}}[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{q_{\mathcal{M}}}[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)] \},$$

is finite if and only if one of the following two conditions holds:

- (i) $d^* < \beta_1 \leq d^* + 1$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d^*}{\alpha - 1}$;
- (ii) $\beta_1 > d^* + 1$.

Remark 4. *The Lipschitz condition on the embedding φ is necessary to guarantee that the tails of $p_{\mathcal{M}}$ and $q_{\mathcal{M}}$ do not become heavier than those of p and q .*

Lastly, we provide a sufficient condition for the W_2 - α -divergences to be finite. The proof can be found in Appendix C.

Theorem 2 (Sufficient condition for $D_{\alpha,2}^\lambda < \infty$). *Suppose $\alpha > 1$ and (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) . Then $D_{\alpha,2}^\lambda(P\|Q) < \infty$ if one of the following two conditions holds:*

- (i) $d < \beta_1 \leq d + 2$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$;
- (ii) $\beta_1 > d + 2$.

4.2 Finite-sample estimations of $D_{\alpha,1}^L$

The finiteness result in Section 4.1 is crucial for comparing distributions with heavy tails, making it feasible to learn heavy-tailed distributions by minimizing these divergences. In this section, we address two additional questions: providing an easily computable a posteriori upper bound on $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q)$ and deriving its finite-sample estimation rate, allowing the loss function based on W_1 - α -divergences to be efficiently estimated on minibatches. Let $X = \{x_1, \dots, x_m\}$ and $Y = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ be i.i.d. samples from P and Q , with empirical distributions $P_m = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \delta_{x_i}$ and $Q_n = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{y_j}$, respectively.

Using formula (15) by [3], the W_1 - α -divergences can be equivalently formulated as $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) = \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \Lambda_{f_{\alpha}^Q}^Q[\gamma] \}$, where $\Lambda_{f_{\alpha}^Q}^Q[\gamma] := \inf_{\nu \in \mathbb{R}} \{ \nu + \mathbb{E}_Q[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma - \nu)] \}$ by adding an additional shift parameter. The following lemma provides a pseudo-triangle inequality for $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q)$, with the proof in Appendix D.

Lemma 1. *For any distribution $\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have*

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) \leq L \cdot W_1(P, \eta) + D_{\alpha,1}^L(\eta\|Q). \quad (8)$$

By setting $P = P_m$ and $\eta = Q_n$ in Eq. (8), we obtain the following corollary.

Corollary 2.

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m\|Q) \leq L \cdot W_1(P_m, Q_n) + D_{\alpha,1}^L(Q_n\|Q). \quad (9)$$

If we set $\eta = Q$ in Eq. (8), we get

Corollary 3. For any $P, Q \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R}^d)$, we have

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) \leq L \cdot W_1(P, Q). \quad (10)$$

Corollary 3 indicates that the convergence rate of the expectation of $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m\|P)$ can be bounded by the rate of Wasserstein-1 distance $W_1(P_m, P)$. Moreover, combining Lemma 1, Corollary 2 and Corollary 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) &\leq L \cdot W_1(P, P_m) + D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m\|Q) \\ &\leq L (W_1(P, P_m) + W_1(P_m, Q_n) + W_1(Q_n, Q)), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where each term on the right hand side can be bounded using the convergence result of W_1 in [11].

Remark 5. Eq. (11) provides a practical perspective for generative modeling through divergence $D_{\alpha,1}^L$. Suppose our goal is to learn a heavy-tailed target distribution Q from its finite samples Q_n , and we want to estimate how close the generated distribution P is to Q . If P_m and Q_n accurately represent P and Q in terms of W_1 distance (which holds true when m and n are large), and the generated samples P_m are close to true samples Q_n such that $W_1(P_m, Q_n)$ is small, then we can conclude P is close to the target Q in terms of $D_{\alpha,1}^L$. Eq. (11) essentially provides an easily computable a posteriori upper bound on $D_{\alpha,1}^L$, where the dominating term $W_1(P_m, Q_n)$ can be computed via linear programming.

Finally, we derive the convergence bound for the empirical estimations of $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q)$ under certain tail conditions. The result for $d = 3$ is stated below, with its proof deferred to Appendix D. The results for $d = 1, 2$ can be found as Proposition 2 and Proposition 3 in Appendix D.

Theorem 3 (Finite sample estimation of $D_{\alpha,1}^L$ for heavy-tailed distributions). Assume $d \geq 3$. For $\alpha > 1$, let (P, Q) be distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) , where $\beta_1 > 3d$ and $\beta_2 > 5d$. Suppose α satisfies $\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1} < \beta_1 - d$ and $\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} < \frac{\beta_2}{d} - 3$. If m and n are sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left| D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m\|Q_n) - D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{m^{1/d}} + \frac{C_2}{n^{1/d}}, \quad (12)$$

where C_1 depends on $M_{\frac{d}{d-1}}(p)$ and C_2 depends on $M_{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(p)$, $M_{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(q)$, and $M_{dr_2}(q)$ for any $2 + \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} < r_2 < \frac{\beta_2}{d} - 1$. Here, we use $M_r(p)$ to denote the r -th moment of $p(x)$. Both C_1 and C_2 are independent of m, n .

5 Numerical experiments

In this section, we demonstrate how using our proposed Wasserstein-proximal-regularized α -divergences as objective functionals enables stable learning of heavy-tailed distributions in various generative models. In Section 5.1, we introduce the generative models used and explain how their learning objectives relate to W_p - α -divergences. In Section 5.2, we illustrate our points with two examples. First, we compare the effects of incorporating Wasserstein proximals in the learning objectives by training on a 2D Student-t distribution. Then, we provide an example of learning a real-world heavy-tailed dataset, comparing the efficacy of W_1 and W_2 proximals in the objective functions. We use Gaussian priors for all our experiments.

5.1 Generative models with Wasserstein-proximal-regularized learning objectives

W_1 and W_2 proximals can be found, sometimes implicitly, in the learning objectives of several existing generative models. Below, we list various models based on α -divergences used in our experiments and explain why some of them are (either implicitly or explicitly) regularized by Wasserstein proximals.

- **Generative models without proximal regularization:**

- **α -GAN:** Generative adversarial networks (GAN) [12, 25] based on the variational representation of the α -divergence Eq. (3);
- **α -GPA:** Generative particle algorithm (GPA) based on the α -divergence [13];
- **CNF:** Continuous normalizing flow (CNF) by [4], where the loss function is based on the KL divergence, a special case of the α -divergence when $\alpha = 1$.

- **Generative models with W_1 -proximal regularization:**




Figure 2: Generative models in the experiment and their relationship with the W_p - α -divergences. See Section 5.1 for detailed explanations of the models and notations.

- W_1 - α -GAN [3]: GAN using the W_1 - α -divergence γ as the objective function, with the Lipschitz constant set to $L = 1$ in our experiment;
- W_1 - α -GPA [13]: GPA using the W_1 - α -divergence γ as the objective function, with the Lipschitz constant set to $L = 1$ in our experiment.
- **Generative models with W_2 -proximal regularization:** We consider the following class of flow-based models, which minimize W_2 - α -divergences Eq. (6) written as Eq. (13) via the Benamou-Brenier formula,

$$\inf_{v, \rho} \mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, T)) + C \int_0^T \frac{1}{2} |v(x, t)|^2 \rho(x, t) dx dt. \quad (13)$$

Here, $\rho : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is the evolution of the probability measure via the (trainable) velocity field $v : \mathbb{R}^d \times [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, satisfying the Fokker–Planck equation:

$$\rho_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) = \frac{\sigma^2}{2} \Delta \rho, \quad \rho(\cdot, 0) = \rho_0 \text{ is a tractable prior distribution, e.g., Gaussian.} \quad (14)$$

- **OT flow** [26]: Optimal transport (OT) normalizing flow, which is equivalent to the W_2 -proximal of CNF, with $\mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, T)) = D_{\text{KL}}(Q, \rho(\cdot, T))$ and $\sigma = 0$ in Eq. (13);
- **VE-SGM** [30]: Score-based generative model (SGM) with variance-exploding (VE) forward SDE [30]. According to the mean-field game formulation by [34], it is equivalent to Eq. (13) with stochastic dynamics ($\sigma > 0$) and a cross-entropy terminal cost $\mathcal{F}(\rho(\cdot, T)) = -\mathbb{E}_{\rho(\cdot, T)}[\log Q]$, essentially also a W_2 -proximal of CNF.

Refer to Fig. 2 for a visual illustration of the relationships among the models being compared.

5.2 Learning heavy-tailed distributions

2D Student-t example. We first consider various generative models for learning the heavy-tailed 2D isotropic Student-t distribution with ν degrees of freedom, $q(x) \propto (1 + \frac{|x|^2}{\nu})^{-\frac{\nu+2}{2}}$. This synthetic example allows us to adjust the tail decay rate $\beta = \nu + 2$ by selecting different degrees of freedom ν . In the main text, we present an extremely heavy-tailed example with $\beta = 3$, while the relatively easier case of $\beta = 5$ is deferred to Appendix F. We used 10,000 samples to train the models.

Figure 3 and Figure 4 present the performance of various generative models. Each model is evaluated in two plots. First, a 2D scatter plot displays the generated samples (orange) and the true samples (blue), providing a visual assessment of the sample quality. Next, the tail behavior is assessed by plotting the ground truth Radial Complementary Cumulative Distribution Function (rCCDF) (red curve) and the histogram of the radii of generated samples (gray). The rCCDF is defined as:

$$\text{rCCDF}(r) = 1 - \text{CDF}(r), \quad (15)$$

where $\text{CDF}(r)$ is the cumulative distribution function of the radius. We then calculate the L_1 error between the ground truth rCCDF and the generated sample histogram. Generative models with W_1 - or W_2 -proximal regularizations significantly outperform those without in learning heavy-tailed distributions, corroborating our theoretical results in Section 4.




Figure 3: Learning a 2D isotropic Student-t with degree of freedom $\nu = 1$ (tail index $\beta = 3.0$) using generative models based on W_1 - α -divergences with $\alpha = 2$. Models with W_1 -proximal regularizations (right) learn the heavy-tailed distribution significantly better than those without (left). See Section 5.1 for detailed explanations of the models.

Additionally, without proximal regularizations, models often exhibit a “runaway” behavior, chasing far-away samples deep into the heavy tails and creating a “star-like” unstable pattern in the generated samples. This issue is resolved with W_1 - or W_2 - proximal regularizations, as the W_p -proximal term controls the “velocity” of the generative particles. The W_2 -proximal controls velocities through the kinetic energy of the particles (see Eq. (13)), while the W_1 -proximal provides pointwise control of velocities [13]. These proximal regularizations enable stable learning of the tail behavior in a “tactically controlled” manner.

Keystroke example. Finally, we provide a real-world heavy-tailed example of learning the inter-arrival time between keystrokes from multiple users typing sentences [7]. The target dataset consists of 7,160 scalar samples, and we generated 10,000 samples using generative models with W_1 - or W_2 -proximal regularization.

We display the tail behavior by plotting the ground truth CCDF (red curve) and the corresponding histogram of the generated samples (gray). Unlike the previous synthetic example, the ground truth CCDF here is obtained by interpolating the heights of the histogram bins of the true samples. In Figure 5, generative models with W_1 -proximal regularization (W_1 - α -GPA and W_1 - α -GAN) outperform those regularized with W_2 -proximals (OT flow and VE-SGM) in capturing the tails. This observation suggests that W_1 -proximal algorithms can potentially handle heavier tails more effectively than W_2 -proximal methods.

6 Conclusions and discussions

We propose Wasserstein-proximal-regularized α -divergences as objective functionals for learning heavy-tailed distributions and provide rigorous analysis to demonstrate their feasibility. This includes analyzing the sufficient and necessary conditions for the divergence to be finite and quantifying its finite-sample estimation rate. Numerical simulations show that adding Wasserstein proximals to α -divergences significantly improves the learning process of heavy-tailed distributions.

Limitations and future work: There are several future directions that can be explored:

- **Choosing optimal α values:** Theorem 1 does not impose any restriction on the selection of α when starting with a light-tailed distribution. However, Theorem 3 suggests using larger α , as simulations in [3] show that larger α can lead to faster convergence.




Figure 4: Learning a 2D isotropic Student-t with degree of freedom $\nu = 1$ (tail index $\beta = 3.0$) using generative models based on W_2 - α -divergences with $\alpha = 1$. Models with W_2 -proximal regularizations, (b) and (c), learn the heavy-tailed distribution significantly better than that without, (a). See Section 5.1 for detailed explanations of the models.




Figure 5: Sample generation of inter-arrival time between keystrokes. Generative models with W_1 -proximal regularization, panel (a), outperform those with W_2 -proximal regularization, panel (b), in capturing the tails. This observation suggests that W_1 -proximal algorithms can potentially handle heavier tails more effectively than W_2 -proximal methods.

- Closing the gap in the conditions:** Theorem 3 considers $\beta_1 > 3d$ and $\beta_2 > 5d$. More techniques are needed to close the gap $d + 1 < \beta_1 \leq 3d$ and $d + 1 < \beta_2 \leq 5d$. Additionally, we lack finite sample estimation for target data distributions without a finite first moment, as the law of large numbers does not apply.
- Guarantees for learning heavy-tailed distributions:** Our paper focuses on devising divergences that are efficiently computable from finite samples and guaranteed to effectively compare heavy-tailed distributions, which is a necessary condition for learning such distributions. Future work will focus on ensuring *learning* of heavy-tailed distributions with theoretical guarantees for specific generative algorithms.
- Completing the analysis of W_2 -proximals:** The story of W_2 -proximals is not complete. We only provided sufficient conditions for its finiteness in Theorem 2, and further study on their finite-sample estimation rate is needed.
- Comparison of W_1 and W_2 proximals:** Numerical experiments suggest that both W_1 and W_2 proximal can make learning heavy-tailed distributions stable. However, when the target distribution lacks a finite first moment, W_1 -proximal-based algorithms learn deeper into the tails compared to their W_2 counterparts.

- **More testing on benchmark datasets:** There are limited large-scale and/or high-dimensional benchmark heavy-tailed datasets, such as MNIST or CIFAR-10 for images. Future applications can be explored once such datasets become broadly available.

7 Acknowledgement

Z. Chen, H. Gu, M. Katsoulakis, L. Rey-Bellet are partially funded by AFOSR grant FA9550-21-1-0354. M.K. and L. R.-B. are partially funded by NSF DMS-2307115. M.K. is partially funded by NSF TRIPODS CISE-1934846. Z. Chen and W. Zhu are partially supported by NSF under DMS-2052525, DMS-2140982, and DMS2244976.

References

- [1] M. Allouche, S. Girard, and E. Gobet. Ev-gan: Simulation of extreme events with relu neural networks. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(150):1–39, 2022.
- [2] S.-i. Amari and H. Nagaoka. *Methods of information geometry*, volume 191. American Mathematical Soc., 2000.
- [3] J. Birrell, P. Dupuis, M. A. Katsoulakis, Y. Pantazis, and L. Rey-Bellet. (f, Γ) -Divergences: Interpolating between f -Divergences and Integral Probability Metrics. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(39):1–70, 2022.
- [4] R. T. Chen, Y. Rubanova, J. Bettencourt, and D. K. Duvenaud. Neural ordinary differential equations. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31, 2018.
- [5] Z. Chen, M. Katsoulakis, L. Rey-Bellet, and W. Zhu. Sample complexity of probability divergences under group symmetry. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4713–4734. PMLR, 2023.
- [6] I. Csiszar. Eine information’s theoretische ungleichung und ihre anwendung auf den beweis der ergodizitat von markoschen ketten, magyar tud. *Akad. Mat*, 1963.
- [7] V. Dhakal, A. M. Feit, P. O. Kristensson, and A. Oulasvirta. Observations on typing from 136 million keystrokes. In *Proceedings of the 2018 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, CHI ’18, page 1–12, New York, NY, USA, 2018. Association for Computing Machinery.
- [8] R. Ding and A. Mullhaupt. Empirical squared hellinger distance estimator and generalizations to a family of α -divergence estimators. *Entropy*, 25(4):612, 2023.
- [9] M. Farazmand and T. P. Sapsis. Closed-loop adaptive control of extreme events in a turbulent flow. *Phys. Rev. E*, 100:033110, Sep 2019.
- [10] R. M. Feder, P. Berger, and G. Stein. Nonlinear 3d cosmic web simulation with heavy-tailed generative adversarial networks. *Physical Review D*, 102(10):103504, 2020.
- [11] N. Fournier and A. Guillin. On the rate of convergence in Wasserstein distance of the empirical measure. *Probability theory and related fields*, 162(3-4):707–738, 2015.
- [12] I. Goodfellow, J. Pouget-Abadie, M. Mirza, B. Xu, D. Warde-Farley, S. Ozair, A. Courville, and Y. Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- [13] H. Gu, P. Birmpa, Y. Pantazis, L. Rey-Bellet, and M. A. Katsoulakis. Lipschitz regularized gradient flows and latent generative particles. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.17230*, 2022.
- [14] J. Havrda and F. Charvát. Quantification method of classification processes. concept of structural a -entropy. *Kybernetika*, 3(1):30–35, 1967.
- [15] T. Huster, J. Cohen, Z. Lin, K. Chan, C. Kamhoua, N. O. Leslie, C.-Y. J. Chiang, and V. Sekar. Pareto gan: Extending the representational power of gans to heavy-tailed distributions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 4523–4532. PMLR, 2021.
- [16] L. B. Klebanov and Y. V. Kuvaeva. Heavy-tailed probability distributions in social sciences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.09393*, 2023.
- [17] A. J. Lotka. The frequency distribution of scientific productivity. *Journal of the Washington academy of sciences*, 16(12):317–323, 1926.
- [18] C. W. Lynn, C. M. Holmes, and S. E. Palmer. Heavy-tailed neuronal connectivity arises from hebbian self-organization. *Nature Physics*, pages 1–8, 2024.
- [19] T. Manole and J. Niles-Weed. Sharp convergence rates for empirical optimal transport with smooth costs. *The Annals of Applied Probability*, 34(1B):1108–1135, 2024.

- [20] G. Mena and J. Niles-Weed. Statistical bounds for entropic optimal transport: sample complexity and the central limit theorem. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [21] B. Merz, S. Basso, S. Fischer, D. Lun, G. Blöschl, R. Merz, B. Guse, A. Viglione, S. Vorogushyn, E. Macdonald, et al. Understanding heavy tails of flood peak distributions. *Water Resources Research*, 58(6):e2021WR030506, 2022.
- [22] M. Mohri, A. Rostamizadeh, and A. Talwalkar. *Foundations of machine learning*. MIT press, 2018.
- [23] K. Moon and A. Hero. Multivariate f-divergence estimation with confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 27, 2014.
- [24] X. Nguyen, M. J. Wainwright, and M. I. Jordan. Estimating divergence functionals and the likelihood ratio by convex risk minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(11):5847–5861, 2010.
- [25] S. Nowozin, B. Cseke, and R. Tomioka. f-gan: Training generative neural samplers using variational divergence minimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29, 2016.
- [26] D. Onken, S. W. Fung, X. Li, and L. Ruthotto. Ot-flow: Fast and accurate continuous normalizing flows via optimal transport, 2021.
- [27] V. Pareto. *Cours d’économie politique*, volume 1. Librairie Droz, 1964.
- [28] P. Rubenstein, O. Bousquet, J. Djolonga, C. Riquelme, and I. O. Tolstikhin. Practical and consistent estimation of f-divergences. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [29] H. Sasaki, F.-H. Su, T. Tanimoto, and S. Sethumadhavan. Why do programs have heavy tails? In *2017 IEEE International Symposium on Workload Characterization (IISWC)*, pages 135–145. IEEE, 2017.
- [30] Y. Song, J. Sohl-Dickstein, D. P. Kingma, A. Kumar, S. Ermon, and B. Poole. Score-based generative modeling through stochastic differential equations, 2021.
- [31] S. Sreekumar, Z. Zhang, and Z. Goldfeld. Non-asymptotic performance guarantees for neural estimation of f-divergences. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 3322–3330. PMLR, 2021.
- [32] A. W. van der Vaart and J. A. Wellner. *Weak convergence and empirical processes: with applications to statistics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1996.
- [33] M. Wiese, R. Knobloch, R. Korn, and P. Kretschmer. Quant gans: deep generation of financial time series. *Quantitative Finance*, 20(9):1419–1440, 2020.
- [34] B. J. Zhang and M. A. Katsoulakis. A mean-field games laboratory for generative modeling, 2023.
- [35] G. K. Zipf. *Human behavior and the principle of least effort: An introduction to human ecology*. Ravenio Books, 2016.

A Notation

We denote by $A \lesssim B$ if there are some $c, d > 0$, such that $A \leq cB + d$; and $A \asymp B$ if both $A \lesssim B$ and $B \lesssim A$ hold. For a bounded set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $\text{diam}(\Omega) = \sup_{x, y \in \Omega} \|x - y\|_2$, where $\|\cdot\|_2$ is the Euclidean norm on \mathbb{R}^d . Moreover, given a probability density $p(x)$, we use $M_r(p)$ to denote the r -th moment of $p(x)$. For convenience, we will abuse notation and use symbols p, q, P, Q , to represent probability distributions as well as the density functions associated with them. Whether a character refers to a probability distribution or a density should be clear from the context.

B Proof of Example 1

Since P is not absolutely continuous with respect to Q , we have $D_\alpha(P||Q) = \infty$; applying the cumulative distribution functions formula for 1-dimensional Wasserstein-1 distance, it is straightforward to see $W_1(P, Q) = \infty$. Consider the formula (5), and in particular, we design the intermediate probability measure as

$$d\eta = (1 + \delta)2^{1+\delta}x^{-(2+\delta)}\mathbf{1}_{x \geq 2}.$$

Then we have

$$D_\alpha(\eta||Q) = \int_2^\infty \frac{(1 + \delta)^\alpha 2^{\alpha(1+\delta)} x^{-\alpha\delta} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} \cdot \frac{1}{x^2} dx < \infty,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
W_1(P, \eta) &= \int_1^2 \int_1^y (1 + \delta)x^{-(2+\delta)} dx dy \\
&\quad + \int_2^\infty \left| \int_1^y (1 + \delta)x^{-(2+\delta)} dx - \int_2^y (1 + \delta)2^{1+\delta}x^{-(2+\delta)} dx \right| dy \\
&= \int_1^2 1 - y^{-(1+\delta)} dy + \int_2^\infty \left| (1 - y^{-(1+\delta)}) - (1 - 2^{1+\delta}y^{-(1+\delta)}) \right| dy \\
&= \int_1^2 1 - y^{-(1+\delta)} dy + \int_2^\infty (2^{1+\delta} - 1)y^{-(1+\delta)} dy < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) \leq D_\alpha(\eta\|Q) + L \cdot W_1(P, \eta) < \infty$.

C Proof of Theorem 1

We first provide a lemma that generalizes Lemma A.12 in [5].

Lemma 2. For $\alpha > 1$ and any non-negative integrable functions $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ defined on some bounded $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with non-zero integrals, $\Gamma = \text{Lip}_L(\Omega)$, we have

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left\{ \int_\Omega \gamma(x)p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) dx \right\} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \int_\Omega \gamma(x)p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) dx \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\Omega) : \|\gamma\|_\infty \leq (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\int p(x) dx}{\int q(x) dx} \right)^{\alpha-1} + L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Proof of Lemma 2. For any fixed $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define

$$h(\nu) = \int_\Omega (\gamma(x) + \nu) p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x) + \nu]q(x) dx.$$

Since $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) - \inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \leq L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$, interchanging the integration with differentiation is allowed by the dominated convergence theorem:

$$h'(\nu) = \int_\Omega p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha'^*(\gamma + \nu)q(x) dx,$$

where

$$f_\alpha'^*(y) = (\alpha - 1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} y^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \mathbf{1}_{y>0}. \quad (17)$$

If $\inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) > (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\int p(x) dx}{\int q(x) dx} \right)^{\alpha-1}$, then $h'(0) < 0$. So there exists some $\nu_0 < 0$ such that $h(\nu_0) > h(0)$. This indicates the supremum on the left side of (16) is attained only if $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \leq (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\int p(x) dx}{\int q(x) dx} \right)^{\alpha-1} + L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$. On the other hand, if $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) < 0$, then there exists $\nu_0 > 0$ that satisfies $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) + \nu_0 < 0$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_\Omega (\gamma(x) + \nu_0) p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x) + \nu_0]q(x) dx &= \int_\Omega (\gamma(x) + \nu_0) p(x) dx \\
&> \int_\Omega \gamma(x)p(x) dx \\
&= \int_\Omega \gamma(x)p(x) dx - \int_\Omega f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

This indicates that the supremum on the left side of (16) is attained only if $\inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \geq -L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$. Therefore, we have that the supremum on the left side of (16) is attained only if $\|\gamma\|_\infty \leq (\alpha - 1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\int p(x) dx}{\int q(x) dx} \right)^{\alpha-1} + L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$. \square

Proof of Theorem 1. 1. Sufficiency.

Let $\Gamma = \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) &= \sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left\{ \int \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\|x\| < R)} \left\{ \int_{\|x\| < R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| < R} f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\} \\ &\quad + \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\|x\| \geq R)} \left\{ \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\} \\ &:= I_1 + I_2. \end{aligned}$$

For I_1 , by Lemma 2, we have

$$I_1 \leq C \int_{\|x\| < R} p(x) \, dx + \left(\alpha^{-1}(\alpha-1)^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} C^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} + \alpha^{-1}(\alpha-1)^{-1} \right) \int_{\|x\| < R} q(x) \, dx < \infty,$$

where $C = (\alpha-1)^{-1} \left(\frac{\int_{\|x\| < R} p(x) \, dx}{\int_{\|x\| < R} q(x) \, dx} \right)^{\alpha-1} + 2LR$.

For I_2 , we have

$$\int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx = \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) \left(\gamma(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)] \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right) dx.$$

(i) If $d < \beta_1 \leq d+1$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$:

Note that the set of bounded L -Lipschitz functions on $\{x : \|x\| \geq R\}$ is a subset of $\mathcal{M}_b(x : \|x\| \geq R)$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(x : \|x\| \geq R)} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) \left(\gamma(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)] \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right) dx \\ &\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_b(x : \|x\| \geq R)} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) \left(\gamma(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)] \frac{q(x)}{p(x)} \right) dx \\ &= \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} \left(\left[\frac{p(x)}{q(x)} \right]^{\alpha} - 1 \right) q(x) \, dx \\ &\asymp \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \|x\|^{\alpha(\beta_2 - \beta_1) - \beta_2} \, dx < \infty, \end{aligned}$$

since $\alpha(\beta_2 - \beta_1) - \beta_2 = (\alpha-1)(\beta_2 - \beta_1) - \beta_1 < -d$, and the equality is due to the dual formula Eq. (3).

(ii) If $\beta_1 > d+1$:

In this case, we still have $I_1 < \infty$. Now we prove that $I_2 < +\infty$. Let $M(\gamma) = \sup_{\|x\|=R} |\gamma(x)|$, where $\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\|x\| \geq R)$. We show that there exists some $\overline{M} > 0$ such that

$$I_2 = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\}, \quad (18)$$

where

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ \gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\|x\| \geq R) : M(\gamma) \leq \overline{M} \right\}.$$

Indeed, we have for any $\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\|x\| \geq R)$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \\ &= \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} \gamma(x)p(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx + \int_{\|x\| \geq 2R} \gamma(x)p(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \\ &\leq \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} \gamma(x)p(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx + \int_{\|x\| \geq 2R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\leq (M(\gamma) + LR) \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} p(x) dx - \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR)q(x) dx \\
&\quad + \int_{\|x\| \geq 2R} p(x) (M(\gamma) + LR + L\|x\|) dx \\
&= LR \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) dx + L \int_{\|x\| \geq 2R} p(x)\|x\| dx + M(\gamma) \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) dx \\
&\quad - f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} q(x) dx,
\end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is due to the fact that $\gamma(x)$ is L -Lipschitz and that for any $x : \|x\| \geq R$, we have $|\gamma(x) - M(\gamma)| \leq L(R + \|x\|)$. The first two terms are finite and are independent of γ since $\beta_1 > d + 1$. For the difference between the last two terms, we have

$$\lim_{M(\gamma) \rightarrow +\infty} M(\gamma) \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) dx - f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} q(x) dx = -\infty,$$

since the exponent of x in $f_\alpha^*(x)$ is $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} > 1$. This indicates that the supremum in I_2 should be taken over γ such that $M(\gamma) \leq \bar{M}$ for some $\bar{M} > 0$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} \left\{ \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) dx \right\} \\
&\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) dx \\
&\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{G}} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) (LR + L\|x\| + M(\gamma)) dx \\
&\leq \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) (LR + L\|x\| + \bar{M}) dx < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

2. Necessity.

Suppose $\beta_1 \leq d + 1$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 \geq \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$. We split $\beta_2 - \beta_1 \geq \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$ into two cases.

(i) If $\beta_2 - \beta_1 \geq \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}$:

Let $\hat{\gamma}(x) = \tau\|x\|$, where $\tau \in (0, L]$ is to be determined. Then we have $\hat{\gamma} \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Using this $\hat{\gamma}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) &\geq \int \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) dx - \int f_\alpha^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) dx \\
&= \int_{\|x\| < R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) - f_\alpha^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) dx + \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) - f_\alpha^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) dx.
\end{aligned}$$

It is straightforward that the first integral over $\|x\| < R$ is finite. For the latter one, we have

$$\int_{\|x\| \geq R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_\alpha^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) dx \gtrsim \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \left(\tau\|x\|^{1-\beta_1} - \tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \|x\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}-\beta_2} \right) dx.$$

We need to show the right-hand side is infinite. First, since $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} > 1$, we can choose τ sufficiently small such that $\tau > \tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}$. Moreover, by the assumption, we have $1 - \beta_1 \geq -d$ and $\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} - \beta_2 \leq 1 - \beta_1$, so that we have

$$\int_{\|x\| \geq R} \left(\tau\|x\|^{1-\beta_1} - \tau \frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1} \|x\|^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}-\beta_2} \right) dx = \infty,$$

and thus $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) = \infty$.

(ii) If $\frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1} \leq \beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{1}{\alpha - 1}$:

Define

$$\hat{\gamma}(x) = \begin{cases} \tau R^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)}, & \text{if } \|x\| < R; \\ \tau\|x\|^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)}, & \text{if } \|x\| \geq R, \end{cases}$$

where $\tau \in (0, L]$ is to be determined. Since in this case we have $(\beta_2 - \beta_1)(\alpha - 1) < 1$, we have $\hat{\gamma}(x) \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$ if we pick R sufficiently large which is independent of $\tau \leq L$. Using this $\hat{\gamma}(x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) &\geq \int \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) \, dx - \int f_{\alpha}^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) \, dx \\ &= \int_{\|x\| < R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) \, dx + \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) - f_{\alpha}^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of $\hat{\gamma}$, we know that the first integral over $\|x\| < R$ is finite. For the latter one, we have in this case

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \hat{\gamma}(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\alpha}^*[\hat{\gamma}(x)]q(x) \, dx \\ \gtrsim \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \left(\tau \|x\|^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)-\beta_1} - \tau^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \|x\|^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)-\beta_1} \right) \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

We show the right-hand side is infinite. Again, we can choose τ sufficiently small such that $\tau > \tau^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}}$. On the other hand, by the assumption in this case, we have $(\alpha - 1)(\beta_2 - \beta_1) - \beta_1 \geq -d$, so that we have

$$\int_{\|x\| \geq R} \left(\tau \|x\|^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)-\beta_1} - \tau^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \|x\|^{(\alpha-1)(\beta_2-\beta_1)-\beta_1} \right) \, dx = \infty,$$

hence $D_{\alpha,1}^L(P\|Q) = \infty$. \square

We prove the finiteness result for the W_1 proximal-regularized KL divergence ($\alpha = 1$).

Lemma 3. *For the KL case, i.e., $f_{KL}^*(y) = e^{y-1}$ and any non-negative integrable functions $p(x)$ and $q(x)$ defined on some bounded $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ with non-zero integrals, $\Gamma = \text{Lip}_L(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\sup_{\gamma \in \Gamma} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_{KL}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\} = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}} \left\{ \int_{\Omega} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_{KL}^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx \right\}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F} = \left\{ \gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\Omega) : \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1 - L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega) \leq \gamma \leq \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1 + L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega) \right\}.$$

Proof. For any fixed $\gamma \in \Gamma$, define

$$h(\nu) = \int_{\Omega} (\gamma(x) + \nu) p(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_{KL}^*[\gamma(x) + \nu] q(x) \, dx.$$

Since $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) - \inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \leq L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$, interchanging the integration with differentiation is allowed by the dominated convergence theorem:

$$h'(\nu) = \int_{\Omega} p(x) \, dx - \int_{\Omega} f_{KL}'(\gamma + \nu) q(x) \, dx.$$

If $\inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) > \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1$, then $h'(0) < 0$. So there exists some $\nu_0 < 0$ such that $h(\nu_0) > h(0)$. This indicates the supremum on the left side of (19) is attained only if $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \leq \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1 + L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$. On the other hand, if $\sup_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) < \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1$, then $h'(0) > 0$. So there exists some $\nu_0 > 0$ such that $h(\nu_0) > h(0)$. This indicates that the supremum on the left side of (19) is attained only if $\inf_{x \in \Omega} \gamma(x) \geq \ln \frac{\int p(x) \, dx}{\int q(x) \, dx} + 1 - L \cdot \text{diam}(\Omega)$. \square

Proposition 1. *Suppose $\alpha = 1$ (the KL case), and (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) , then $D_{KL,1}^L(P\|Q) < \infty$ for any $\beta_1, \beta_2 > d$.*

Proof. Same as in the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1, we can split $D_{KL,1}^L(P\|Q)$ into I_1 and I_2 , where I_1 is bounded by Lemma 3 with appropriate R .

For I_2 , we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(x: \|x\| \geq R)} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x) p(x) dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\text{KL}}^*[\gamma(x)] q(x) dx \\
& \leq \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{M}_b(x: \|x\| \geq R)} \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x) p(x) dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_{\text{KL}}^*[\gamma(x)] q(x) dx \\
& = \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \ln \frac{p(x)}{q(x)} p(x) dx \\
& \asymp \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \|x\|^{-\beta_1} \ln \|x\| dx < \infty,
\end{aligned}$$

since $\beta_1 > d$ and the equality is due to the dual formula of KL divergence. \square

Proof of Corollary 1. Note the change-of-variable formula

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \gamma(y) dp_{\mathcal{M}}(y) = \int_{\mathbb{R}^{d^*}} (\gamma \circ \varphi)(x) \cdot p(x) dx, \text{ (similarly for } q_{\mathcal{M}} \text{ and } q)$$

and $\gamma \circ \varphi$ is an LL^* -Lipschitz function on \mathbb{R}^{d^*} for any $\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Then the proof of Theorem 1 can be followed. \square

Proof of Theorem 2. Suppose $d < \beta_1 \leq d + 2$ and $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$. Let Ω be the ball $B_R(0)$ as in Definition 1 or even with larger R if necessary. We design the intermediate measure η^* such that

$$\eta^*(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x \in \Omega \setminus \text{supp}(q) \\ p(x), & \|x\| > R. \end{cases}$$

Basically η^* has the same tail as P outside Ω , and we redistribute the density of $p(x)$ inside Ω to form $\eta^*|_{\Omega}$ so that $\text{supp}(\eta^*|_{\Omega}) \subset \text{supp}(q)$. Hence the Wasserstein-2 distance $W_2(P, \eta^*)$ is bounded since we only need to transport inside Ω . Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha}(\eta^* \| Q) &= \int_{\Omega} \frac{(\frac{\eta^*(x)}{q(x)})^{\alpha} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} q(x) dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega} \frac{(\frac{\eta^*(x)}{q(x)})^{\alpha} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} q(x) dx \\
&\leq C + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega} \frac{(\frac{p(x)}{q(x)})^{\alpha} - 1}{\alpha(\alpha - 1)} q(x) dx \\
&\asymp C + \int_{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus \Omega} \|x\|^{(\beta_2 - \beta_1)\alpha} \|x\|^{-\beta_2} dx,
\end{aligned}$$

and to ensure finiteness, we are only to require $(\beta_2 - \beta_1)\alpha - \beta_2 < -d$, which is $\beta_2 - \beta_1 < \frac{\beta_1 - d}{\alpha - 1}$. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
D_{\alpha,2}^{\lambda}(P \| Q) &= \inf_{\eta \in \mathcal{P}(\mathbb{R})} \{D_{\alpha}(\eta \| Q) + \lambda W_2(P, \eta)\} \\
&\leq D_{\alpha}(\eta^* \| Q) + \lambda W_2(P, \eta^*) < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

For the case when $\beta_1 > d + 2$, we can design η^* so that $\text{supp}(\eta^*) \subset \text{supp}(q) \cap \Omega$, so that both $D_{\alpha}(\eta^* \| Q)$ and $W_2(P, \eta^*)$ are finite. \square

D Proof of Lemma 1 and Theorem 3

Proof of Lemma 1. From Theorem 70 in [3], we have

$$\Lambda_{f_{\alpha}}^Q[\gamma] = \sup_{\mu} \{\mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\gamma] - D_{\alpha,1}^L(\mu \| Q)\},$$

such that we have

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P \| Q) = \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \Lambda_{f_{\alpha}}^Q[\gamma]\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \sup_{\mu} \{ \mathbb{E}_{\mu}[\gamma] - D_{\alpha,1}^L(\mu \| Q) \} \} \\
&\leq \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \{ \mathbb{E}_{\eta}[\gamma] - D_{\alpha,1}^L(\eta \| Q) \} \} \\
&= \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{\eta}[\gamma] \} + D_{\alpha,1}^L(\eta \| Q) \\
&= L \cdot W_1(P, \eta) + D_{\alpha,1}^L(\eta \| Q).
\end{aligned}$$

□

To prove Theorem 3, we need a few lemmas. Let $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$ be i.i.d. samples of distribution P , and P_m be the corresponding empirical distributions. We define $L_2(P_m)$ the metric between any functions f, g as

$$L_2(P_m)(f, g) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - g(x_i)|^2}.$$

Lemma 4 (Metric entropy with empirical measures). *Let \mathcal{F} be a class of real-valued functions on \mathbb{R}^d and $0 \in \mathcal{F}$. Let $\xi = \{\xi_1, \xi_2, \dots, \xi_m\}$ be a set of independent random variables that take values on $\{-1, 1\}$ with equal probabilities (also known as Rademacher variables). Suppose $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_m\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ are i.i.d. samples of distribution P , then we have*

$$\mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i f(x_i) \right| \leq \inf_{0 < \theta < M_X} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\theta}^{M_X} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta, L_2(P_m))} d\delta \right),$$

where $M_X = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i)|^2}$.

Proof. Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ be an arbitrary positive integer and $\delta_k = M_X \cdot 2^{-(k-1)}$, $k = 1, \dots, N$, with $M_X = \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i)|^2}$. Let V_k be the cover achieving $\mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta_k, L_2(P_m))$, and denote $|V_k| = \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta_k, L_2(P_m))$.

For any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, let $\pi_k(f) \in V_k$, such that $\sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m |f(x_i) - \pi_k(f)(x_i)|^2} \leq \delta_k$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i f(x_i) \right| \\
&\leq \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i (f(x_i) - \pi_N(f)(x_i)) \right| + \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i (\pi_{j+1}(f)(x_i) - \pi_j(f)(x_i)) \right| \\
&\quad + \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i \pi_1(f)(x_i) \right|.
\end{aligned}$$

For the third term, observe that it suffices to take $V_1 = \{0\}$ so that $\pi_1(f)$ is the zero function and the third term vanishes. The first term can be bounded using Cauchy-Schwartz inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i (f(x_i) - \pi_N(f)(x_i)) \right| &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbb{E}_{\xi}(\xi_i)^2} \sqrt{\sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{i=1}^m (f(x_i) - \pi_N(f)(x_i))^2} \\
&\leq \delta_N.
\end{aligned}$$

To handle the middle term, for each j , let $W_j = \{\pi_{j+1}(f) - \pi_j(f) : f \in \mathcal{F}\}$. We have $|W_j| \leq |V_{j+1}| |V_j| \leq |V_{j+1}|^2$, then

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i (\pi_{j+1}(f)(x_i) - \pi_j(f)(x_i)) \right| = \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{w \in W_j} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i w(x_i) \right|.$$

Moreover, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \sup_{w \in W_j} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m w(x_i)^2} \\
&= \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m (\pi_{j+1}(f)(x_i) - \pi_j(f)(x_i))^2} \\
&\leq \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m (\pi_{j+1}(f)(x_i) - f(x_i))^2} + \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^m (f(x_i) - \pi_j(f)(x_i))^2} \\
&\leq \sqrt{m} \delta_{j+1} + \sqrt{m} \cdot \delta_j \\
&= 3\sqrt{m} \delta_{j+1}.
\end{aligned}$$

By the Massart finite class lemma (see, e.g. [22]), we have

$$\mathbb{E}_\xi \sup_{w \in W_j} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i w(x_i) \right| \leq \frac{3\sqrt{m} \delta_{j+1} \sqrt{2 \ln |W_j|}}{m} \leq \frac{6\delta_{j+1} \sqrt{\ln |V_{j+1}|}}{\sqrt{m}}.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}_\xi \sup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \left| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i f(x_i) \right| &\leq \delta_N + \frac{6}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^{N-1} \delta_{j+1} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta_{j+1}, L_2(P_m))} \\
&\leq \delta_N + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{j=1}^N (\delta_j - \delta_{j+1}) \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta_j, L_2(P_m))} \\
&\leq \delta_N + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\delta_{N+1}}^{M_X} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta, L_2(P_m))} d\delta.
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, select any $\theta \in (0, M_X)$ and let N be the largest integer with $\delta_{N+1} > \theta$, (implying $\delta_{N+2} \leq \theta$ and $\delta_N = 4\delta_{N+2} \leq 4\theta$), so that

$$\delta_N + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\delta_{N+1}}^{M_X} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta, L_2(P_m))} d\delta \leq 4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{m}} \int_{\theta}^{M_X} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}, \delta, L_2(P_m))} d\delta.$$

□

Lemma 5. Suppose P_m is the empirical distribution of P of heavy-tail $\beta > d + 1$, and $\Lambda = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \|x\|^\beta$ with $1 \leq \hat{\beta} < \beta - d$, then for $1 \leq z \leq \hat{\beta}$, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_m} \|x\|^z \leq \Lambda + 1.$$

Proof. Note that $\|x\|^z \leq \max\{1, \|x\|^{\hat{\beta}}\} \leq 1 + \|x\|^{\hat{\beta}}$, so we have the bound. □

We provide the following lemma that sets up a landmark for the magnitude of the Lipschitz functions under the supremum.

Lemma 6. Suppose $\alpha > 1$, and (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) with $\beta_1 > d + 1$. Let $M(\gamma) = \sup_{\|x\|=R} |\gamma(x)|$, then there exists \bar{M} that depends on P, Q and R , such that

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P||Q) = \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq \bar{M}}} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f_\alpha^*(\gamma)] \}.$$

Proof. For any $\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$, let

$$J_1 := \int_{\|x\| < R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| < R} f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx,$$

$$J_2 := \int_{\|x\| \geq R} \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| \geq R} f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx,$$

then

$$\int \gamma(x)p(x) \, dx - \int f_\alpha^*[\gamma(x)]q(x) \, dx = J_1 + J_2.$$

We have for any $\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)$,

$$J_1 \leq \int_{\|x\| < R} (M(\gamma) + LR)p(x) \, dx - \int_{\|x\| < R} f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR)q(x) \, dx$$

$$= (M(\gamma) + LR) \cdot \int_{\|x\| < R} p(x) \, dx - f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \cdot \int_{\|x\| < R} q(x) \, dx.$$

On the other hand, by the same argument in the proof of part (ii) of the sufficiency of Theorem 1, we have

$$J_2 \leq LR \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) \, dx + L \int_{\|x\| \geq 2R} p(x)\|x\| \, dx + M(\gamma) \int_{\|x\| \geq R} p(x) \, dx$$

$$- f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \int_{R \leq \|x\| < 2R} q(x) \, dx,$$

Both the upper bounds for J_1 and J_2 tend to $-\infty$ as $M(\gamma) \rightarrow \infty$. Thus, there exists such \bar{M} as claimed.

$$J_1 + J_2 \leq (M(\gamma) + LR) \int p(x) \, dx + L \int p(x)\|x\| \, dx$$

$$- f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \int_{\|x\| < 2R} q(x) \, dx$$

Therefore, we can pick $\bar{M} > 0$ as

$$\inf \left\{ \hat{M} : (M(\gamma) + LR) \int p(x) \, dx + L \int p(x)\|x\| \, dx - f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 3LR) \int_{\|x\| < 2R} q(x) \, dx < 0, \forall M(\gamma) > \hat{M} \right\},$$

Such $\bar{M} > 0$ only depends on P, Q and R . \square

Let $\bar{M}_{m,n}$ be the quantity in Lemma 6 where (P, Q) are replaced by their empirical counterparts (P_m, Q_n) , then $\bar{M}_{m,n}$ is a random variable. We have the following lemma to estimate the expectation of the r -th moment ($r \geq 1$) of $\bar{M}_{m,n}$. The proof is different from that for Lemma 6.

Lemma 7. *Suppose $\alpha > 1$, and (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) with $\beta_1, \beta_2 > d + r$ for some $r \geq 1$. Let $M(\gamma) = \sup_{\|x\|=R} |\gamma(x)|$, then there exists $\bar{M}_{m,n}$ that depends on P_m, Q_n and R , such that*

$$D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m \| Q_n) = \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq \bar{M}_{m,n}}} \{ \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_n}[f_\alpha^*(\gamma)] \},$$

Moreover, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[\bar{M}_{m,n}^r \right] \leq M_{p,q,r},$$

where $M_{p,q,r}$ depends on $\alpha, L, R, M_r(p)$ and $M_r(q)$, and is independent of m, n .

Proof. We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_n}[f_\alpha^*(\gamma)] \leq \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{M(\gamma) + L\|x_i\| - R}{m} - \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{f_\alpha^*(M(\gamma) - 2LR - L\|y_j\| - R)}{n}.$$

Hence $\overline{M}_{m,n}$ can be taken as

$$\overline{M}_{m,n} = \inf \left\{ z : \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{s + L\|x_i\| - R}{m} < \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{f_\alpha^*(s - 2LR - L\|y_j\| - R)}{n}, \forall s > z \right\}.$$

Moreover, by Jensen's inequality, we have

$$\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{f_\alpha^*(s - 2LR - L\|y_j\| - R)}{n} \geq f_\alpha^*\left(s - 2LR - L \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\|y_j\| - R}{n}\right),$$

since the convex conjugate f_α^* is convex, and so that

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{M}_{m,n} &\leq \inf \left\{ z : \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{s + L\|x_i\| - R}{m} < f_\alpha^*\left(s - 2LR - L \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\|y_j\| - R}{n}\right), \forall s > z \right\} \\ &:= \widetilde{M}_{m,n}. \end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that $\widetilde{M}_{m,n}$ solves the following equation in variable z :

$$f_\alpha^*(z - c_1) = z + c_2, \quad (20)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 &= 2LR + L \sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\|y_j\| - R}{n}, \\ c_2 &= \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{L\|x_i\| - R}{m}. \end{aligned}$$

Equation (20) can be reformulated as to find y^* that solves:

$$f_\alpha^*(y) - y = c_1 + c_2, \quad (21)$$

where $z - c_1 = y$. We derive an upper bound for y^* as follows. Let $g(y) = f_\alpha^*(y) - y$, then

$$g'(y) = (\alpha - 1)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} y^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} \mathbf{1}_{y>0} - 1,$$

such that $g'(y) \geq 1$ for $y > 2^{\alpha-1}(\alpha - 1)^{-1}$. Given that $g(2^{\alpha-1}(\alpha - 1)^{-1}) = \frac{2^\alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} - \frac{2^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha-1}$, we can take $y^* \leq 2^{\alpha-1}(\alpha - 1)^{-1} + c_1 + c_2 + \left| \frac{2^\alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} - \frac{2^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha-1} \right|$. Therefore, we have

$$\overline{M}_{m,n} \leq \widetilde{M}_{m,n} = y^* + c_1 \leq 2^{\alpha-1}(\alpha - 1)^{-1} + 2c_1 + c_2 + \left| \frac{2^\alpha}{\alpha} + \frac{1}{\alpha(\alpha-1)} - \frac{2^{\alpha-1}}{\alpha-1} \right|.$$

The claim follows since by Jensen's inequality, $\mathbb{E}_X \left[\left(\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\|x_i\|}{m} \right)^r \right] \leq \mathbb{E}_X \left[\sum_{i=1}^m \frac{\|x_i\|^r}{m} \right] = M_r(p)$. (Similarly for

$$\mathbb{E}_Y \left[\left(\sum_{j=1}^n \frac{\|y_j\|}{n} \right)^r \right]. \quad \square$$

Proof of Theorem 3. Without loss of generality, we assume that both

$$\int_{\|x\| \leq 1} p(x) dx > 0, \quad \int_{\|x\| \leq 1} q(x) dx > 0.$$

Let $\Omega_0 = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|x\| \leq 1\}$ and $\Omega_k = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^d : 2^{k-1} < \|x\| \leq 2^k\}$ for $k \geq 1$. For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the Lebesgue measure of $\{x : d(x, \Omega_k) \leq 1\}$ is bounded by $C_d 2^{kd}$ for some $C_d > 0$. Let $\Lambda_2 = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|y_j\|^{\hat{\beta}_2}$, where $2 + \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} < \hat{\beta}_2 < \frac{\hat{\beta}_2}{d} - 1$. By Markov's inequality, the mass or proportion of Q_n that lies in Ω_k is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} \Pr(x \sim Q_n : \|x\| > 2^{k-1}) &= \Pr(x \sim Q_n : \|x\|^{\hat{\beta}_2} > 2^{(k-1)\hat{\beta}_2}) \\ &\leq \frac{\mathbb{E}_{Q_n} \|x\|^{\hat{\beta}_2}}{2^{(k-1)\hat{\beta}_2}} = \Lambda_2 2^{-(k-1)\hat{\beta}_2}. \end{aligned}$$

Let $M = \max(\overline{M}, \overline{M}_{m,n})$, where \overline{M} is the quantity in Lemma 6 with $R = 1$, and $\overline{M}_{m,n}$ is the random counterpart for (P_m, Q_n) as defined in Lemma 7. M is a random variable since $\overline{M}_{m,n}$ is random. Let \mathcal{F}_M be the following class of functions

$$\mathcal{F}_{\alpha, M} = \left\{ f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma) : \gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d), \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\gamma(x)| \leq M \right\}.$$

By formulas (4) and (17), functions in $\mathcal{F}_{\alpha, M}$ have Hölder norm on Ω_k bounded by $C_{\alpha} (M^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} + L^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} 2^{\frac{\alpha k}{\alpha-1}})$ for some $C_{\alpha} > 0$ that only depends on α . By Corollary 2.7.4 in [32] with $V = d$ and $r = 2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha, M}, \delta, L_2(Q_n)) &\leq K \delta^{-d} \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (C_d 2^{kd})^{\frac{2}{d+2}} \left(C_{\alpha} (M^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} + L^{\frac{\alpha}{\alpha-1}} 2^{\frac{\alpha k}{\alpha-1}}) \right)^{\frac{2d}{d+2}} (\Lambda_2 2^{-(k-1)\hat{\beta}_2})^{\frac{d}{d+2}} \right)^{d+2} \\ &\leq K \delta^{-d} (M + L)^{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \Lambda_2^d \left(\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} 2^{\frac{2kd}{d+2} + \frac{2\alpha kd}{(\alpha-1)(d+2)} - \frac{\hat{\beta}_2 d(k-1)}{d+2}} \right)^{d+2} \\ &\leq K \delta^{-d} (M + L)^{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}} \Lambda_2^d. \end{aligned}$$

where the constant K can vary from line to line and does not depend on n , and the last step follows as the choice of $\hat{\beta}_2$ such that the series is summable over k independent of Q_n . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{E}_{X, Y} \left| D_{\alpha, 1}^L(P_m \| Q_n) - D_{\alpha, 1}^L(P \| Q) \right| \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{X, Y} \left| \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq \overline{M}_{m,n}}} \{ \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_n}[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)] \} - \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq \overline{M}}} \{ \mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)] \} \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_{X, Y} \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq M}} \left| \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_n}[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)] - (\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_Q[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)]) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]| + \mathbb{E}_{X, Y} \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq M}} |\mathbb{E}_Q[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)] - \mathbb{E}_{Q_n}[f_{\alpha}^*(\gamma)]| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]| + \mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{E}_Y \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq M}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j (f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(y_j)] - f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(y'_j)]) \right| \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]| + 2 \mathbb{E}_X \mathbb{E}_Y \mathbb{E}_{\xi} \sup_{\substack{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d) \\ M(\gamma) \leq M}} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \xi_j f_{\alpha}^*[\gamma(y_j)] \right| \end{aligned}$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]| + 2\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,M}, \delta, L_2(Q_n))} d\delta \right),$$

where ξ_i 's are the Rademacher variables.

First note that the first term $\mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]|$ is the convergence rate of the Wasserstein-1 distance and the bound follows the result of Theorem 1 in [11]:

$$\mathbb{E}_X \sup_{\gamma \in \text{Lip}_L(\mathbb{R}^d)} |\mathbb{E}_P[\gamma] - \mathbb{E}_{P_m}[\gamma]| \leq \frac{CM_r^{1/r}(p)}{m},$$

with $r = \frac{d}{d-1}$. For the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,M}, \delta, L_2(Q_n))} d\delta \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} K(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \int_{\theta}^{\infty} \delta^{-\frac{d}{2}} d\delta \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{\theta > 0} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} K(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \cdot \frac{2}{2-d} \theta^{1-d/2} \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left(4n^{-\frac{1}{d}} + 12K(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \cdot \frac{2}{2-d} n^{-\frac{1}{d}} \right) \\ & = 4n^{-\frac{1}{d}} + \frac{24K}{2-d} n^{-\frac{1}{d}} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \right] \end{aligned}$$

where we pick $\theta = n^{-\frac{1}{d}}$. By the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left[(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \right] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} (M+L)^{\frac{2d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}}} \sqrt{\mathbb{E}_Y \Lambda_2^d}.$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} (M+L)^{\frac{2d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}}$ is bounded by Lemma 7 and the bound depends on $M_{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(p)$ and $M_{\frac{2d\alpha}{\alpha-1}}(q)$. And we have

$$\mathbb{E}_Y \Lambda_2^d = \mathbb{E}_Y \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|y_j\|^{\hat{\beta}_2} \right)^d \leq \mathbb{E}_Y \left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n \|y_j\|^{\hat{\beta}_2 d} \right) = M_{\hat{\beta}_2 d}(q),$$

where the inequality follows Jensen's inequality. Combining all these bounds, we obtain the result as in the statement of the theorem. \square

Proposition 2. For $d = 2$. Assume (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) , where $\beta_1 > 10$ and $\beta_2 > 18$. Suppose α satisfies $\frac{4\alpha}{\alpha-1} + 4 < \beta_1 - 2$ and $\frac{8\alpha}{\alpha-1} < \beta_2 - 10$, then if m and n are sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left| D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m \| Q_n) - D_{\alpha,1}^L(P \| Q) \right| \leq \frac{C_1 \ln m}{m^{1/2}} + \frac{C_2 \ln n}{n^{1/2}}, \quad (22)$$

where C_1 depends on $M_{r_1}(p)$ for any $r_1 > 2$ and C_2 depends on $M_{\frac{4\alpha}{\alpha-1}+4}(p)$, $M_{\frac{4\alpha}{\alpha-1}+4}(q)$ and $M_{d r_2}(q)$ for any $2 + \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} < r_2 < \frac{\beta_2-2}{4}$; both C_1 and C_2 are independent of m, n .

Proposition 3. For $d = 1$. Assume (P, Q) are distributions on \mathbb{R}^d of heavy-tail (β_1, β_2) , where $\beta_1 > 7$ and $\beta_2 > 13$. Suppose α satisfies $\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} + 4 < \beta_1 - 1$ and $\frac{6\alpha}{\alpha-1} < \beta_2 - 7$, then if m and n are sufficiently large, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \left| D_{\alpha,1}^L(P_m \| Q_n) - D_{\alpha,1}^L(P \| Q) \right| \leq \frac{C_1}{m^{1/2}} + \frac{C_2}{n^{1/2}}, \quad (23)$$

where C_1 depends on $M_2(p)$ and C_2 depends on $M_{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1}+4}(p)$, $M_{\frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1}+4}(q)$ and $M_{d r_2}(q)$ for any $2 + \frac{2\alpha}{\alpha-1} < r_2 < \frac{\beta_2-1}{3}$; both C_1 and C_2 are independent of m, n .

Proof. The only difference from the proof of Theorem 3 is that we need to bound the random metric entropy differently since $\sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,M}, \delta, L_2(Q_n))}$ is no longer integrable at infinity, and the upper limit of the integral in Lemma 4 cannot be relaxed to ∞ . Instead, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{0 < \theta < M_Y} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} \int_{\theta}^{M_Y} \sqrt{\ln \mathcal{N}(\mathcal{F}_{\alpha,M}, \delta, L_2(Q_n))} d\delta \right)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{X,Y} \inf_{0 < \theta < M_Y} \left(4\theta + \frac{12}{\sqrt{n}} K(M+L)^{\frac{d\alpha}{(\alpha-1)}} \Lambda_2^{d/2} \int_{\theta}^{M_Y} \delta^{-\frac{d}{2}} d\delta \right),$$

where $M_Y = \sup_{\gamma \in \mathcal{F}_{\alpha,M}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n |\gamma(y_j)|^2} \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n (M+L+L\|y_j\|)^2}$.

For $d = 2$, we have $\int_{\theta}^{M_Y} \delta^{-\frac{d}{2}} d\delta = \ln M_Y - \ln \theta$, and we can pick $\theta = \frac{\ln n}{\sqrt{n}}$, and use the inequality $\ln M_Y \leq M_Y - 1$ and combine it with Lemma 5 and Lemma 7 as in the proof of Theorem 3.

For $d = 1$, we have $\int_{\theta}^{M_Y} \delta^{-\frac{d}{2}} d\delta = \frac{\sqrt{M_Y} - \sqrt{\theta}}{2}$, and we can pick $\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}$ to balance the two terms. □

E Compute resources

Our experiment is computed using personal computer in the environment: Apple M2 8 cores and Apple M2 24 GB - Metal 3.

F Additional experiments




Figure 6: Learning a 2D isotropic Student-t with degree of freedom $\nu = 3$ (tail index $\beta = 5.0$) using generative models based on W_1 - α -divergences with $\alpha = 2$. Models with W_1 -proximal regularizations (right) learn the heavy-tailed distribution significantly better than those without (left). See Section 5.1 for detailed explanations of the models.




Figure 7: Learning a 2D isotropic Student-t with degree of freedom $\nu = 3$ (tail index $\beta = 5.0$) using generative models based on W_2 - α -divergences with $\alpha = 1$. Models with W_2 -proximal regularizations, (b) and (c), learn the heavy-tailed distribution significantly better than that without, (a). See Section 5.1 for detailed explanations of the models.